Temple Christology in the Gospel of John

Replacement Theology and Jesus as the Self-Revelation of God

by Ken Brown

Supervisor: Dr. Tony Cummins
Second Reader: Dr. Tom Hatina

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in Biblical Studies at Trinity Western University, Langley, B.C., Canada.

April 2010

Abstract

The past decade has seen remarkable interest in John's view of the Temple, marked by the publication of several monographs and numerous articles. Many of these have been produced independently of one another and reflect a variety of approaches, but all of them find in the traditions and expectations of the Temple vital background to John's presentation of Jesus. Most of these studies, however, continue to assume that John's Temple theme is primarily a reaction to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, and conclude from this that Jesus (or the church) in some sense "replaces" the Temple and its festivals, taking their place as the locus of God's presence. This "replacement" has been understood and qualified in various ways, from supersession to fulfillment, symbolism to typology, but the common assumption is that the Jerusalem Temple has become "defunct," with Jesus taking its place completely and finally.

A few more recent studies, however, have begun to call this replacement paradigm into question. Often arguing on sociological grounds, scholars such as Judith Lieu, Jonathan Klawans, Kåre Fuglseth, and most recently Mary Spaulding have noted that reapplications of Temple language and imagery—in John and elsewhere—can be better understood as positive attempts to *extend* the meaning of the cult to other realms, than as attempts to replace it. They note that reapplications of Temple language were common in the period, especially among those loyal to the Temple, and in John itself a number of details imply that Jesus and his disciples were Temple participants (e.g. 2:13; 4:45; 5:1; 7:10, 37; 8:20; 10:22-23; 18:20). If this raises the possibility of a non-replacement reading of John's Temple theme, however, no one has yet attempted as comprehensive an exegetical treatment of that theme from that perspective as previous studies have provided within the replacement paradigm. As such, it remains to be seen not just whether a non-replacement paradigm can be *maintained* throughout the whole of John, but whether it might actually provide a *more fruitful* reading of John's Temple theme than has previously been offered. Such will be the question this thesis seeks to answer.

It will be argued that John's many references and allusions to the Temple and its festivals are not to be understood merely as a reaction to 70 CE, but rather serve an essential purpose in advancing John's more fundamental christological agenda (cf. 20:31). Focusing primarily on John's prologue (esp. 1:14-18), the Temple incident (2:13-23), Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman (esp. 4:4-26), the festival cycle (5:1-10:42) and Jesus' death and resurrection (esp. 17:1-20:31), it will be argued that the imagery, traditions, rituals and expectations of the Temple, festivals and priesthood are given a persistent and vital role in John's presentation of Jesus, and are consistently focused on his identity as the incarnation of the self-revelation of God. In short, Jesus embodies the Wisdom, glory, presence and name through which God has always been known, including in the Temple. He "tabernacles" among us, and his death and resurrection are tied to the destruction and raising of the Temple. "True worship" depends on knowledge of his true identity, and he fulfills the hopes for the restoration of Israel celebrated and anticipated by the Temple festivals, preeminently in his death and resurrection.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> The Temple was, in Jesus' day, the central symbol of Judaism, the location of Israel's most characteristic praxis, the topic of her most vital stories, the answer to her deepest questions, the subject of some of her most beautiful songs.
>
> *N. T. Wright*[1]

> It is true also that the Feast is a symbol of gladness of soul and of thankfulness to God, but we should not for this reason turn our backs on the general gatherings of the year's seasons.
>
> *Philo of Alexandria*[2]

The Temple's influence can be felt in nearly every corner of first-century Jewish thought and practice. It symbolized Israel's God and all that the divine presence promised—stability, blessing, atonement, salvation, hope, light and life. Religiously, it was the focus of daily ritual and annual festival, and represented the cosmic or heavenly Temple. Politically, it embodied hope for independence from Rome, but also incited frequent controversy and rivalry. Some doubted it was legitimate at all, and looked for God to rebuild it. Yet many others remained fiercely loyal to the Temple, and its destruction in 70 CE was to them a crushing blow.[3]

John's Gospel reflects the centrality of the Temple in many ways. In the prologue, Jesus "tabernacled among us" (1:14). At the beginning of his ministry he predicts the

---

[1] N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 406.

[2] *Migration* 92, cf. 89-93 (trans. Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

[3] For introductions to the Temple, cf., e.g., Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (trans. Timothy J. Hallett; New York: Seabury Press, 1972; repr. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997); Jon D. Levenson, "The Temple and the World," *JR* 64.3 (1984): 275-98; *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985); John M. Lundquist, "What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology," in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall* (ed. H. B. Huffman, F. A. Spina and A. R. W. Green; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 205-219; Robert P. Carroll, "So What Do We *Know* about the Temple? The Temple in the Prophets," in *Second Temple Studies 2. Temple Community in the Persian Period* (ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards; JSOTSupp 175, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 34-51; Margaret Barker, *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem* (London: SPCK, 1991); *Temple Theology: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2004); and esp. John Day, ed. *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (London: T&T Clark, 2007); and Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (London: Oxford University Press, 2006).

destruction and raising of "the temple of his body" (2:13-23). In the festival cycle (John 5-10), he sets himself in the Temple at a series of feasts, drawing on their symbolism and hopes to reveal his identity. In the passion narrative (esp. 19:23-37), this imagery is drawn together and combined with high priestly and kingship themes. In all this, Jesus' divine origin, identity and role are repeatedly tied to the traditions, imagery and expectations of the Temple and its festivals.

In this introductory chapter we will first summarize the recent research on the Temple in John, noting that the vast majority of work that has been done on this subject has accepted two key assumptions: that the Fourth Gospel is *reacting* to the fall of Jerusalem, and that it *replaces* the Temple with Jesus or the church. We will argue that these presuppositions are not only unnecessary, but have actually distorted and constrained our understanding of the Temple in John. Instead, we will begin with John's own statement of purpose in 20:31, and argue that its focus on Jesus' identity and life-giving power better account for the actual content and emphases of the Temple theme. As such, John's imagery will not be found to be reactionary at all, but rather evidences a deep knowledge of and sympathy for the Temple and its festivals, which are used to emphasize and clarify Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel. Our approach will be to trace John's references and allusions to the Temple more or less sequentially, and to read them in light of their current literary context and their background in the Jewish Scriptures[4] and

[4] What these should be called is a subject of considerable debate, without any fully satisfactory answer. "Hebrew Bible" is often favored, but it is inaccurate, not just because the Masoretic Text (MT) includes some Aramaic, but because John also shows familiarity with the Greek Septuagint (LXX) (for further problems with this designation cf. Christopher R. Seitz, "Old Testament or Hebrew Bible: Some Theological Considerations," *ProEccl* 5 (1996): 292-303; repr. in *Word without End*: *The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 61-74). If carefully defined, "Old Testament" has the advantages of indicating a connection with the "New Testament" (NT), and reflecting John's claim that the Scriptures "testify" on Jesus' behalf (5:39), but it is also confessional, likely anachronistic and possibly misleading (if taken to mean old-fashioned). Thus, while we will sometimes use Old Testament, our

Second Temple Judaism. The chapter will close with a fuller summary of the argument to be presented.

History of Recent Research

John's Temple theme has received a great deal of attention in recent studies. Though these differ in many details, they all affirm that Jesus' relation to the Temple plays a vital role in the Fourth Gospel.[5] This will not be a comprehensive history of research, but rather an attempt to set the context and summarize the more significant studies that have been published in the past twenty-five years. Particular attention will be paid to the ways these studies have described Jesus' relation to the Temple, be it supersession, replacement, typology, fulfillment, reinterpretation or otherwise. We will conclude with a few summary observations.

While few commentaries treat the Temple theme independently,[6] the subject is inevitably raised by certain passages—especially 2:13-22 and 4:20-24—and these are usually taken to affirm that Jesus has "replaced" the Jerusalem Temple.[7] In older studies

---

preferred designation will be "the (Jewish) Scriptures" as this reflects how John itself most often refers to them (2:22; 5:39; 7:38, 42; 10:35; 13:18; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36, 37; 20:9; cf. 8:17; 18:31), while remaining ambiguous enough not to unduly impose later canonical limits that may or may not be in view.

[5] Besides those discussed below, cf. also R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 75-84; Craig R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (CBQMS 22; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1989), 100-115; Andrea Spatafora, *From The "Temple of God" to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation* (Tesi Gregoriana Series Teologia 27, Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997), 100-116; P. W. L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1996), 161-175; and the bibliography in Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (PBM; Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 16-18.

[6] Andrew Lincoln devotes more of his introduction to the subject than most, and even he spends only two pages on it (*The Gospel According to Saint John* [BNTC; New York: Continuum, 2005], 76-77). Craig Keener's massive two-volume commentary does not even include "temple" in its subject index, though he does discuss it in the relevant passages (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [2 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003]).

[7] For instance, F. F. Bruce says of John 2:19-21, "His words provided a motif which was taken up later in the church – the replacement of the doomed material temple" (*The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 76).

on the Temple, this was sometimes attached to a broad supersessionist paradigm, which viewed Judaism as defunct and replaced by Christianity. For instance, in 1972 J. T. Williams claimed that in John "the Temple is abolished and replaced by Christ,"[8] and "Judaism has been replaced by Christ."[9] Even when not going that far, many still affirmed the obsolescence and rejection of the Jerusalem Temple, as in Bertil Gärtner's 1965 study, which affirms John's "polemic against the Jerusalem temple and its cultus,"[10] which "had reached the limit of its usefulness and must be replaced."[11]

In the 1970s and 1980s full-length treatments of John's Temple passages appeared, focused particularly on 2:19, 4:21 and 14:2-3.[12] The first attempt at a more comprehensive analysis of John's Temple theme, however, appears in Gale Yee's influential 1989 study on the Jewish feasts in John 5-10.[13] Though Yee affirmed Jesus' replacement, supersession and "opposition to the temple and its cult,"[14] she focused on the way the Temple's symbolism was *fulfilled* by Jesus. Something of this kind of approach could already be seen, for instance, in Beasley-Murray's commentary,[15] but it has become much more common since.

---

[8] J. T. Williams, "Cultic Elements in the Fourth Gospel," in *Studia Biblica* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; vol. 2; JSNTSupp. 2; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1980), 344.

[9] Williams, "Cultic Elements," 345.

[10] Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; London: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 119.

[11] Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 120.

[12] Cf. Lucius Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple: An Exegetico-Theological Study on the Meaning of Jesus' Temple-Logion in Jn 2.19* (Bangalore: Dharmaram College, 1978); cf. also his "New Worship and New Temple." *Bible Bhashyam* 16.4 (1990): 216-233; Hendrikus Boers, *Neither on This Mountain Nor in Jerusalem* (SBLMS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988); James McCaffrey, *The House With Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2-3* (AnBib 114; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1988).

[13] Gale Yee, *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John* (Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1989; repr. Eugene, Ore.; Wipf and Stock, 2007). Elwood McQuaid's *The Out-pouring: Jesus in the Feasts of Israel* (Bellmawr, N. J.: Friends of Israel, 1991) also emphasizes Jesus' fulfillment and replacement of the Temple and feasts in John, but it is devotional and little-known.

[14] Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 22.

[15] George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987). See also Christopher Bryan's excellent but hardly-known article, "Shall We Sing Hallel in the Days of the Messiah? A Glance at John

In 1998, Mark Kinzer presented a paper at the SBL Annual Meeting that well illustrates the direction most of the more recent studies would take.[16] He noted a wide range of Temple and festival allusions in John, and sought to tie these into its larger christological agenda. Though still insisting that "the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood are in their essential functions superseded,"[17] this is "not attributed to the failure of the priesthood…. It is instead a further act of divine grace, bringing to fulfillment that which the Temple and priesthood represent."[18] This combined affirmation of the basic (but former) legitimacy of the Temple with Jesus' fulfillment and replacement of it has become the standard view in the more recent commentaries.[19]

Mary Coloe's *God Dwells with Us* (2001)[20] and Alan Kerr's *The Temple of Jesus' Body* (2002)[21] both maintain such a fulfillment and replacement paradigm, tracing it across the entire Gospel. Kerr's monograph especially emphasizes replacement, even claiming, "Jesus' actions and words declare the Jerusalem Temple as void,"[22] and represent "a decisive break from the Jewish Torah and cultic institutions."[23] In the end, however, Kerr's lengthy work is a little unfocused, and statements such as this do not

---

2:1-3:21," *SLJT* 29 (1985): 25-36, which insists on a more positive reading of John's treatment of Judaism in chs. 2-3.

[16] Mark Kinser, "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 447-464.

[17] Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 463.

[18] Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 463; he also emphasizes that "John does not call into question the fundamental legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood" (462).

[19] For instance, Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, e.g. 76-77; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998), e.g. 79; Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), e.g. 108-9; Keener, *Gospel of John*, e.g. 1:520-531.

[20] Mary Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier/Litrugical, 2001). This is a revised version of her 1998 Th.D dissertation, written under Francis J. Moloney.

[21] Alan Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup 220; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2002). Kerr had read Coloe's unpublished dissertation, and interacts with it in that form, but is unaware of the published version.

[22] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 32.

[23] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 32.

prevent him from concluding that "The Torah becomes a signpost pointing towards Jesus. Jesus is the fulfillment of the Torah. And this is true of every aspect of Judaism, including the Temple and its associated ritual and festivals."[24]

Coloe focuses more narrowly on how "the actual plot of this Gospel is announced as the destruction and raising of a Temple (2:19),"[25] which she connects to John's passion narrative. Describing the Temple as a "symbol," she argues that "The Temple, as the dwelling place of God, points to the identity and role of Jesus," and "The imagery of the Temple is transferred from Jesus to the Christian community, indicating its identity and role."[26] Despite this emphasis on symbolism, however, she still claims that Jesus "brings completion to the rituals and symbols of Israel's cult,"[27] and concludes that "Jesus fulfils and replaces Israel's Temple traditions."[28]

In contrast, Judith Lieu published an article in 1999 that affirmed the importance of the Temple in John, but denied that it was replaced by Jesus.[29] Instead, the Temple is "the supreme centre of the Jews" and the essential setting for Jesus' revelation of God and his rejection by "his own."[30] She clarifies, "at no time in the Johannine ministry does Jesus speak words of judgment against or anticipate the destruction within the divine dispensation of the Temple – indeed he does not talk *about* the Temple at all. Yet equally, there is no indication that Jesus establishes a new temple or that such is constituted by the community."[31] Nevertheless, she still asserts that Jesus' glory is never experienced in the

[24] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 373.
[25] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 3.
[26] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 3, cf. 4-7.
[27] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 205, cf. 219.
[28] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 219.
[29] Judith Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue in John," *NTS* 45 (1999): 51-69.
[30] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 69, cf. 51.
[31] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 66-67.

Temple, and concludes, "Those who respond in faith, whose testimony will be heard, are to be found elsewhere."[32]

Coloe does not interact with Lieu's article and Kerr finds it unconvincing,[33] but one study that follows in its footsteps is Kåre Fuglseth's *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective* (2005).[34] This study is focused on whether the Johannine community is a "sect," but it approaches the question by comparing John's Temple references with those found in Philo and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Fuglseth argues that reapplications of Temple language and symbolism were common in the period, even among those loyal to the Jerusalem Temple,[35] and John itself presents Jesus as a Temple participant.[36] Denying replacement, Fuglseth instead suggests a "conjunction model" in which the Temple is reinterpreted rather than rejected.[37] Nevertheless, this "sociological" study is more concerned with whether the Johannine community was a "sect" than with detailing what John's "reinterpretation" of the Temple actually entails. Fuglseth concludes only that, "it is fair to say that if the temple buildings had not been destroyed, the Jewish members of the Johannine community would probably not have been neglecting the temple worship and celebration."[38]

---

[32] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 69, cf. 68.

[33] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 5-6.

[34] Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran* (NovTSupp 119; Leiden: Brill; 2005). This is a revised version of his 2002 Dr.Art thesis, written under Peder Borgen and Jarl Ulrichsen.

[35] E.g. *Johannine Sectarianism*, 189-249; cf. also Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 116-123.

[36] E.g. going up to Jerusalem for Passover (2:13), the unnamed feast (5:1), Tabernacles (7:1-14), Dedication (10:22-23), and his final Passover (11:7), cf. 18:20; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 160, 169, etc.

[37] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 174-6, 249. He defines the "conjunction model" as "a 'laissez-faire' attitude, indicating [a] break in some way theoretically (e.g. re-interpretation), a fact that in principle makes the temple institution redundant, but there is no break in practice, it is not neglected in a significant way" (175). He clarifies that, according to the conjunction model, "the temple institution in principle was looked upon as superfluous but in practice [it was] not necessarily to be abandoned or neglected" (175).

[38] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 249, cf. 281-84.

Fuglseth's thesis has not yet had a wide impact, and at least two further monographs on the subject do not interact with it. The first is Paul Hoskins' *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (2006).[39] Hoskins distinguishes himself from Coloe and Kerr by tying this discussion into a more traditional typological framework.[40] Though he is not aware of Fuglseth's work, he does recognize that replacement has been questioned (e.g. by Lieu), and admits that it risks implying "radical supersessionism," which he would reject.[41] Yet he insists that the term is appropriate, so long as one maintains the intimate connections between the Old and New Testaments. Though the Temple and its festivals are "replaced" for Hoskins, they also "anticipate and reach their fullness through the blessings that Jesus brings."[42]

Subsequently, Stephen Um published *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel* (2006),[43] focusing on the Temple theme in John 4, and especially its relation to water and the Spirit. Um argues that these themes are used to draw Jesus into the very identity of God, connecting them with the high Christology of the rest of John.[44] "This source of life flowing from the end-time Temple is usually associated with the presence of God, and John presents Jesus as the true Temple who replaces the old Temple as the source of eschatological life."[45] As this indicates, Um is not opposed to speaking of Jesus

---

[39] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*; a revised form of his 2002 dissertation, written under D.A. Carson.

[40] He was unaware of their books until after finishing his thesis, but he does interact with Coloe and Kerr.

[41] By "radical supersessionism" he means the view that ethnic Israel has been rejected and replaced by the church (Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 191 n. 42). He also notes that "it hardly seems adequate simply to say that Jesus is the new Temple who replaces the old Temple. This would be more fitting if one were describing the Temple as the replacement for the Tabernacle" (190).

[42] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 203.

[43] Stephen T. Um, *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel* (LNTS 312; New York: T&T Clark, 2006). This is a revised version of his 2002 dissertation, written under Richard Bauckham.

[44] Relying on Richard Bauckham's concept of "divine identity," as described in *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); cf. Um, *Temple Christology*, 170-75.

[45] Um, *Temple Christology*, 190; he concludes that, "[E]nd-time worship can be experienced when true believers receive the gift of the Spirit from the True Temple, thereby making their fellowship more intimate

"as the true Temple who replaces the old Temple," but his primary emphasis is on Jesus' "divine identity" and eschatological role.

One final monograph, however, has taken up Fuglseth's non-replacement paradigm. Mary Spaulding's *Commemorative Identities* (2009)[46] focuses especially on the presentation of the Feast of Booths (or Tabernacles) in John 7-8, and applies social memory theory to illuminate how in times of crises (such as after 70 CE) previous patterns of behavior tend to be reinterpreted rather than rejected. As she puts it, "Jewish beliefs and practices are not repudiated in this passage [John 7-8]. The underlying message of God's provision and promise, well known and understood, is partly transferred in time and location to Jesus, and partly transformed from an immediate to an eternal perspective."[47] In other words, the application of festival imagery to Jesus is not intended to replace the Feast of Booths, but to maintain and even extend its significance *despite* the fall of Jerusalem. She does, however, still identify an "overtly negative portrayal" in "the criticism leveled at the Temple in 2.15-16,"[48] and allows that Jesus "replaces" the water-pouring and light ceremonies post-70, since these could not be practiced without the Temple, but insists that this need not indicate the replacement of the feast itself, which "may be continued as a viable vehicle for the worship of the Father through Jesus the Son

---

than their former ceremonial Temple worship. They are now able to experience the fullness of eschatological life and the abundant blessing of the new creation already inaugurated in the person of Jesus" (190).

[46] Mary B. Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities: Jewish Social Memory and the Johannine Feast of Booths* (LNTS 396; London: T&T Clark, 2009). This is a revised version of her 2007 dissertation, written under Dwight Swanson. Note that I only became aware of this monograph after the body of my thesis was written, when she presented on this subject at SBL New Orleans, Johannine Literature section, November 22, 2009.

[47] *Commemorative Identities*, 134; she clarifies, "Traditional ways of thinking are sustained at the same time as provision is made to cope with the loss…. It would seem incongruous for the 4G author to develop these links in continuity only for the purpose of discarding them as valueless" (134). She finds this approach especially valuable to understanding John's references to the Jewish festivals, as these were themselves focused on shaping and maintaining memory and social cohesion (cf. *Commemorative Identities*, 1-20).

[48] Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 158.

(as light) in the Spirit (as water)."[49] Thus she concludes that John "portrays the Feast of Booths rituals positively in order to transfer festival associations onto the work and person of Jesus,"[50] and "The author does so in order to encourage these festival associations, not to repudiate them."[51]

These monographs, produced largely independently of one another, have greatly advanced our understanding of John's Temple theme on all levels, and will represent our primary conversation partners as we proceed. It can now be said without hesitation that the Jerusalem Temple and its related festivals play a major, if not central, role in the Fourth Gospel, stretching from the prologue to the resurrection. By emphasizing Jesus' fulfillment of the Temple, the more recent studies have rightly abandoned the old super-sessionist view and provided a more helpful approach to John. We will be especially indebted to those studies that emphasize Jesus' identity, the Temple's connection to the presence of God, and the way John's Temple theme climaxes in the crucifixion account. Nevertheless, the majority of these studies have continued to place far too much emphasis on the "obsolescence" and "replacement" of the Jerusalem Temple, while those that have denied or qualified this replacement paradigm (esp. Lieu, Fuglseth and Spaulding), have not yet provided a full exegetical account of the significance of the Temple throughout

[49] Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 144.
[50] Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 158.
[51] *Commemorative Identities*, 160. A similar approach is also seen in Brian D. Johnson's "'Salvation Is from the Jews': Judaism in the Gospel of John," in *New Currents Through John: A Global Perspective* (ed. Francisco Lazada Jr. and Tom Thatcher; SBLMS 54; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2006), 83-99. Johnson also accepts replacement (95), but emphasizes "a more positive appropriation of the themes and symbols of Judaism… focused upon the person of Jesus" (83). Though his discussions of the Temple and festivals are brief (89-90, 94-97), he especially emphasizes "the identity of Jesus" (89) as "the embodiment of the self-revelation of God" (98). For other non-replacement readings, cf. also Bryan, "Shall We Sing Hallel," 25-26; Armond Barus, "John 2:12-25: A Narrative Reading," in *New Currents Through John*, 123-140; Harold S. Songer, "John 5-12: Opposition to the Giving of True Life," *RevExp* 85 (1988): 459-471.

John.[52] Such will be the purpose of this thesis, and it must begin by reexamining some widely held presuppositions.

Presuppositions: Replacement, the Fall of the Temple and the Identity of God

Despite the many ways in which these studies have enriched our understanding of the Temple in John, they too often assume that this theme is primarily a reaction to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE.[53] For instance, Coloe emphasizes God's indwelling of Jesus, but she sees this as a parallel to the later rabbinic "replacement" of the Temple with the Torah. "When the rabbis were proclaiming that they had the Torah which could replace the Temple as a means of sanctification of the people, so that God could still dwell with them, what could a small, recently formed Christian community offer to counter the Mosaic Torah?"[54] This starting point makes Jesus' replacement of the Temple nearly inevitable for these scholars, but it is open to question. While it is most likely that John reached its final form only after the destruction of the Temple, it is far from clear that John's Temple theme is framed as a *reaction* to that event. Fuglseth is correct that, "We cannot simply presuppose that the overthrow in 70 CE led to an immediate departure of the temple institution by emerging Jewish-Christian groups."[55] To be sure, the Temple's destruction is reflected in John (e.g. in 2:13-22; 4:21; 11:48), but it is not emphasized as

[52] Lieu's article is necessarily general, Fuglseth is concerned with whether John is sectarian, and Spaulding is primarily focused on John 7-8, with much briefer discussion of the Temple and festivals in the rest of John.

[53] E.g. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 21-22; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 1-3, 6-7, 62-63; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 20-26; Um, *Temple Christology*, 155 n.151; even Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, e.g. 92-94.

[54] *God Dwells with Us*, 2; Kerr is even more emphatic: "with the demise of the Temple and its associated rituals, John presents Jesus as the replacement and fulfillment of the Jewish Temple complex. In effect Jesus is John's answer to the urgent question following the fall of the Temple in 70 CE. What now? This question presupposes some degree of understanding of, and sympathy with Jewish Temple worship" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 25-26; cf. 31, 371).

[55] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 120.

it is in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g. Matt. 24:1-2; par. Mark 13:1-2; Luke 21:5-6; cf. 19:41-44), and it is by no means clear that John's Temple imagery is reactionary.

Even if it is granted that John responds to the events of 70 CE, this still need not imply replacement. Rabbi Yohannan ben Zakkai is often quoted as saying over the ruins of the Temple, "We have another atonement as effective as this. And what is it? It is acts of loving kindness,"[56] but this sentiment was hardly universal. Reactions to the fall of Jerusalem were wide-ranging and it is certainly not the case that all Jews immediately abandoned the institution. In a widely cited article, Jacob Neusner highlighted four different reactions,[57] and Kerr notes an even broader spectrum, from despair, to hope for a restored Temple, to various attempts to replace it, to Merkebah mysticism and various forms of apocalypticism.[58] Even the early rabbis were far from maintaining a uniform replacement of the Temple, as evidenced by their ongoing efforts to celebrate the festivals in modified form, and their early support for the Second Jewish Revolt.[59] Neusner only briefly mentions this incident,[60] yet a major goal of that war was to restore the Temple, and it was backed by no less a rabbinic luminary than Rabbi Akiba.[61] In short,

---

[56] *Avot of Rabbi Nathan*, ch. 6; cited by Jacob Neusner, "Judaism in a Time of Crisis: Four Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple," *Judaism* 21 (1972): 324, also cited by Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 19; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 2; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 54.

[57] Neusner, "Judaism in a Time of Crisis," 313-327; also cited by Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 2; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 47-48, 54-57. Some expected imminent restoration (cf. *4 Ezra*; *2 Baruch* and the Second Jewish Revolt). Then, according to Neusner, there were three broad attempts to "replace" the Temple: at Qumran, by the rabbis, and by Christians. Neusner focuses on the latter two, as they survived long term, and Coloe at least follows him in viewing them as comparable attempts to replace the Temple (Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 1-3).

[58] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 45-66; cf. also Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 67-81, 92-94.

[59] Cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 19-20; Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple*, esp. 175-211; Richard G. Marks, *The Image of Bar Kokhba in Traditional Jewish Literature: False Messiah and National Hero* (University Park, Penn.: Penn State University Press, 1994), 1-56; Benjamin Isaac and Aaron Oppenheimer, "Bar Kokhba," *ABD* 1.599.

[60] Noting that "the visionaries who lamented the past and hoped for near redemption enjoyed considerable success in sharing their vision with other Jews. The result was the Bar Kokhba War, but no redemption followed" (Neusner, "Judaism in a Time of Crisis," 325-6; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 64).

[61] Cf. Isaac and Oppenheimer, *ABD* 1:599; Marks, *Image of Bar Kokhba*, 4-9; that the rebels stamped their currency with images of the Temple and the words "For the Freedom of Jerusalem" makes clear that

the period after 70 CE was simply too unsettled to take replacement as a universal presupposition.[62]

In fact, Jonathan Klawans has argued that replacement was not a common assumption at all in this period or before. Temple worship was itself symbolic, primarily symbolizing the imitation of God, and applications of Temple language to other realities typically attempted to *extend* the meaning of the Temple, not replace it.[63] For instance, Philo can speak of the body as a "temple" (*Creation* 136-37), and elsewhere insists that "the highest and truest Temple is the universal world" (*Spec. Laws* 1.66), yet he goes on to advocate pilgrimage to Jerusalem (1.67-68).[64] Far from indicating a critique or supersession of the Temple, "these efforts are merely further attestations to the temple's meaning and significance."[65] As he notes elsewhere:

> [S]acrifice itself is meaningful and symbolic, which is precisely the reason why sacrificial terms are used metaphorically…. To turn sacrificial metaphors into "spiritualizations" *of* sacrifice is to misread them. These metaphors are, rather, *borrowings from* sacrifice. Sacrificial metaphors operate on the assumption of the efficacy and meaning of sacrificial rituals, and hope to appropriate some of that meaning and apply it to something else.[66]

---

they, at least, did not seek to replace the Temple with a non-cultic alternative. In a more recent work, Neusner emphasizes that the pattern of exile and return was deeply entrenched in the Jewish worldview, and it was only after the failure of Bar Kokhba that hope for restoration was lost and alternatives gained prominence, a process seen in the Mishnah (*Transformations in Ancient Judaism: Textual Evidence for Creative Responses to Crisis* [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004], 37-38; also noted by Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 68 n. 138).

[62] The point is not necessarily that John sought the Temple's physical reconstruction (Kerr denies that John expresses such an "activist eschatology;" *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 65), but that replacement was not an assumption for late first-century Jews, even among those who emphasized Torah and other "alternatives."

[63] Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*. esp. 103-144, 161-174.

[64] "We ought to look upon the universal world as the highest and truest temple of God…. But the other temple is made with hands… [and] he orders all men to rise up, even from the furthest boundaries of the earth, and to come to this temple" (*Special Laws* 1.66-68; trans. Young, *Philo*, 540; cf. Colson, LCL). Elsewhere Philo explicitly rejects replacement (*Migration* 89-93, quoted above, pg. 1; but contrast *Plantation* 126; *Worse* 21). That this is not merely theoretical is evident from Philo's positive references to the Temple tax (*Special Laws* 1:76-78; *Embassy* 155-56), and his own pilgrimage to the Temple (*Providence* 2.64). As Fuglseth notes, such references are all the more remarkable given that Philo lived in Egypt, yet never even mentions the nearby Jewish temple in Leontopolis (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 194, cf. 187-219; cf. also Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 116-123).

[65] Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 106.

[66] Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 220, emphasis original.

In other words, reapplications of Temple and sacrificial imagery typically draw meaning *from* the cult; they do not seek to replace it. As he notes, the imitation of the Temple no more indicates a critique or replacement of the Temple than the imitation of *God* indicates a critique or replacement of God.[67] This connection is particularly appropriate to John, as we will argue that its application of Temple imagery to Jesus is consistently focused on his relation to God. In that context, replacement is not only an unnecessary inference, but a thoroughly unhelpful one.

None of the studies discussed above interact with Klawans, but Kerr and Hoskins are aware that the replacement paradigm is open to question, and seek to defend it. Kerr raises the issue most fully when discussing the Torah in John 1:17, "The law points forward to Jesus… and finds its fulfillment when it leads to Jesus. Once Jesus is 'reached' the law effectively becomes redundant, or putting it in terms of the flow of history, it is superseded."[68] He compares this to a road sign pointing to a city, "Once the city is reached there is a sense in which the road sign is redundant."[69] Yet surely as long as there are still people on the road, the sign is never redundant, and even when the city is reached, it does not *replace* the sign, though it may fulfill the sign's promise. Sign and city occupy fundamentally different categories, and it is reductionistic at best to claim that one can "replace" the other. To say that an institution as central and complex as the Temple is simply "redundant" both underestimates the Temple's importance in Judaism

[67] Cf. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 172.

[68] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 131. He admits that it is "an open question" whether Jesus replaces or fulfills the Temple, "Replacement carries with it the idea that there has been a radical disjunction. One thing has been removed and another put in its place. This is in effect what happened with the Temple…. On the other hand, John speaks of the scriptures finding fulfillment in Jesus…. I think it depends on emphasis. Where John wants to stress the radicality of the new beginning in the Word made flesh, replacement is the better word. However, where the accent falls on the outworking of the purpose of the Torah, fulfillment is the better word" (133 n. 80).

[69] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 131.

as a whole, and in John's Gospel in particular. It assumes a "radical disjunction"[70] that is nowhere explicit in John, and leaves little room for the rich engagement with the Temple's traditions, symbolism, rituals and expectations that Kerr and others find reflected in John. Such would be like reducing the relation between Jesus and the Spirit to a simple replacement.[71] After all, John refers to the latter as "another Advocate" (14:16), who will only come *after* Jesus has gone away (16:7), but these claims must be set in tension with the closely related promise that "*I* will not leave you orphaned; *I* am coming to you" (14:18; emphasis added).[72] Whatever the precise relation between Jesus and the Spirit in John, it is surely more subtle than replacement, and there is no reason to suppose that Jesus' relation to the Temple is any less complex. "The [Spirit] blows where it wills" (3:8), and we dare not box it in with our choice of terms.

Therefore, in this thesis a variety of terms will be used to refer to Jesus' relation to the Temple, including fulfillment, transformation, reinterpretation, extension, restoration, raising, culmination, and so on. Using Johannine terms, the Temple can be seen as a sign, symbol or a witness to Jesus, though none of these fully captures its significance either. All of these terms bring out different aspects of John's presentation, but none are sufficient on their own, as they are not equally appropriate in all circumstances. For instance, if John 7-8 alludes to Zechariah's vision that God would return to the Temple at Tabernacles, offering eschatological water and light, it may be that Jesus "fulfills" this aspect of the Temple's hopes, but that is not quite the same thing as saying he fulfills the Temple itself, since Jesus does not stand in for the Temple in this image, but for the God

[70] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 133 n. 80.

[71] I owe this analogy to Dr. Hatina. This is not to say that the relation between Jesus and the Temple is precisely the same as that between Jesus and the Spirit, but the two sets of imagery are connected (esp. in 7:37-39).

[72] Unless otherwise noted, all translations are from the NRSV.

who returns *to* the Temple.[73] The Temple's symbolism—especially the water-pouring and light ceremonies—is not replaced in this case, but rather claimed to point to Jesus, just as it was always understood to point to God's own life- and light-giving power.

On the other hand, when John applies Temple language directly to Jesus (as in 2:18-22), this can be seen as an extension or reinterpretation of the meaning of the Temple, but that does not necessarily rule out more radical implications for John's understanding of the Temple itself, for instance that its destruction and raising somehow participate in Jesus' own death and resurrection, or even that the Temple's meaning can *only* be properly understood in light of Jesus' death and resurrection. Teasing out such possibilities will be the job of the entire thesis, but in no case can Jesus' relation to the Temple be captured by a single term, much less one so reductionistic as replacement.[74] Indeed, we will argue that John is, in general, far less concerned with clarifying the precise nature of Jesus' relation to the Temple as with using the Temple and its festivals to clarify Jesus' relation to the God of Israel.

For his part, Hoskins defends replacement by tying it to a typological framework. Distinguishing two primary views of typology based on whether the "Old Testament types" are understood to be intentionally predictive or merely parallel to their New Testament counterparts,[75] Hoskins favors the former and claims that since the "antitype

---

[73] Spaulding notes that "fulfillment" is somewhat ambiguous, "Fulfillment implies a completed meaning or purpose; it may indicate a replacement of something that has gone before or it may allow for the continuation of that which has been fulfilled" (*Community Identities*, 149).

[74] Even Hoskins admits that "it hardly seems adequate simply to say that Jesus is the new Temple who replaces the old Temple. This would be more fitting if one were describing the Temple as the replacement for the Tabernacle" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 190), but this does not stop him from using the term anyway.

[75] Cf. Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 18-36. The first view sees "types" as divinely intended and predictive (21-27); the second views them as expressions of a common pattern to God's interactions with the world (27-31). He objects to the second view's rejection of prediction (not unfairly; 28-29), but he seems much too quick to dismiss the possibility that the New Testament authors have conformed their descriptions to older patterns in order to indicate Jesus' significance (31). In John at least, there is ample

[Jesus] does what the type did and what it was supposed to do in the future," it "abundantly fills the role of the type in a way that makes the type unnecessary and effectively obsolete."[76] Yet there are significant problems with this analysis, especially when applied to the Temple. First, Fuglseth is correct that replacement is never emphasized by John, and the Temple is simply not treated as obsolete. Jesus repeatedly sets himself within the Temple (2:13-25; 5:1-47; 7:14-8:59; 10:22-39), and even summarizes his ministry as teaching "in the synagogues and in the temple" (18:20), so any interpretation that views the Temple as obsolete runs counter to Jesus' own practice in John. Hoskins himself admits that the type maintains "one important role… as a pointer to its antitype,"[77] but in light of Klawans' recognition that the Temple is *fundamentally* symbolic—that is, its pointing function is a reflection of its primary purpose—the retention of this function is no small qualification on the replacement paradigm. Indeed, it would seem that the legitimacy of Jesus' claim to be the one to whom the Temple points is a major factor in the controversies in John, which repeatedly focus on Jesus' identity, not his replacement of an institution.

Further, if our reading of 1:14-18 and 12:37-41 is correct (see Chapter One), John views Jesus' connection to the Temple as pre-existent as well as eschatological, which means that from John's perspective the Temple has *always* pointed to Jesus, so this can hardly be seen as a reduction of its role. Thus, when Jesus applies the Temple's symbolism to himself, especially in 2:18-22, 7:37-39, 8:12, and 19:23-37, this is not a reflection of his replacement of the institution, but an affirmation of his fundamental

---

evidence that it has indeed "modified details of the narrative tradition in order to bring out the meaning… derived from the Old Testament History" (31; quoted disapprovingly from G. W. H. Lampe, "The Reasonableness of Typology," in G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* [SBT 11; London: SCM Press, 1957], 19).

[76] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 23.

[77] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 23.

connection to it. Embodying the self-disclosure of God, Jesus *is the one* whose glory has been seen on Sinai, in the Tabernacle, and in the Temple. While Jesus does indeed fulfill certain expectations concerning the Temple's eschatological significance, he does not do so as its replacement, but as the embodiment of God's own return to the Temple. Thus, when Hoskins elsewhere admits that, "The language of fulfillment and replacement does not seem to be thoroughly consistent with the Temple as symbol and metaphor,"[78] this observation cuts both ways. He sees it as a reason to deny the symbolic understanding of the Temple, but the opposite may be more accurate: that John's persistent use of symbolism renders the replacement paradigm itself highly problematic.[79]

If the Temple theme is focused on Jesus' relation to God, however, this raises difficult problems concerning our understanding of Christology and early Jewish monotheism, which warrant some comment.[80] The Second Temple literature includes many exalted claims for various figures—ascended patriarchs, principal angels, personifications of divine attributes like Wisdom—and it remains controversial how these should be understood. Are these claims purely figurative?[81] If not, are such figures seen as created

---

[78] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 17; responding to Coloe; he adds in a footnote, "Is it proper to say that a member in a metaphorical relationship fulfills and replaces the other member as Coloe implies?" (17 n. 73).

[79] We will discuss John's use of symbolism in greater detail in the next section.

[80] For introductions to Christology and its relation to early Jewish monotheism, cf. James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989); Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (2nd ed.; New York: T&T Clark, 1998); Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel:* God Crucified *and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); James F. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (SNTSMS 111; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); for a different take, cf. Margaret Barker, *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992).

[81] A claim made especially with regard to Wisdom, λόγος and the Spirit; cf. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 176; Hurtado, *One God*, 35-41; the latter notes that *Jos. Asen.* 15:7-8 describes Penitence (or Repentance) in just as personal terms as other texts describe Wisdom, yet surely does not intend to imply that such a being truly exists (*One God*, 47; cf. further examples in Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 174-75; but cf. C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," *OTP* 2:277 n. q).

beings who merely bear God's authority as agents,[82] or are they independent deities alongside God,[83] or even included within the unique "identity" of God himself?[84] This is a complex debate into which we cannot enter in any detail, but a few points will be important to what follows. Despite the claims of some, there is no good reason to deny that first-century Jews maintained the uniqueness of God. However exalted their ascriptions to various angelic figures,[85] or patriarchs,[86] these always remained creatures and agents of God. When it comes to personified divine attributes such as Wisdom, λόγος or glory, however, matters are somewhat less clear. They also could be described as independent agents, but it appears that this was generally meant to be a poetic means of describing God's own activity, specifically God in God's self-disclosure.[87] It is this

---

[82] This is usually applied to the exalted patriarchs, cf. Wayne A. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968; repr. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 354-371; Hurtado, *One God*, 51-69; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 71-79).

[83] As claimed, e.g., by Barker, *The Great Angel*; rejected by McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 71-79.

[84] To use Bauckham's helpful term; cf. *Jesus and the God of Israel*, esp. 6-7. By "divine identity" he means that which distinguishes God from all other reality. He argues that in the Second Temple period this was not expressed through ontological speculation about God's "nature," but through affirmations of "*who* the one God is, rather than what the divine identity is" (183, emphasis original). In particular, God's unique identity was seen in his relation to Israel (salvation and covenant), and to the world (creation and sovereignty; 182-85). Though our conclusions will not depend on Bauckham's reconstruction, his focus on identity rather than function or ontology is helpful, and will occasionally be reflected in what follows. Note that creation (including giving life), sovereignty (including judgment and kingship), and continuity with God's history with Israel are all applied to Jesus in John.

[85] E.g., even the most exalted claims made about the principal angels stand in the context of affirmations of monotheism. Thus, *T. Dan* 6:2 commands, "Draw near to God and to the angel who intercedes for you because he is the mediator between God and men for the peace of Israel," but then immediately goes on to affirm of the Lord that "none of his angels is like him" (6.6; trans. H.C. Kee, "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," *OTP* 1:810). For several further examples, cf. Hurtado, *One God*, 82-85, 35-37; cf. also the numerous angelic refusals of worship, e.g. Tob 12:16-22; *Apoc. Zeph.* 6:11-15; noted by Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 15 n. 31; cf. 5-13, 82-94).

[86] E.g. Philo's citation of Exod 7:1, "When Moses is appointed 'a god unto Pharaoh,' he did not become such in reality" (*Worse* 160; trans. Colson and Whitaker, LCL; noted Hurtado, *One God*, 62. Cf. 51-69). Possible exceptions might include the "Elect One" and the "Son of Man," who is/are worshipped on God's throne in *1 En.*51:3; 61:8; 62:2, 5; 69:29; and Moses' dream of being set on God's throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian (68-81, cf. 82-89), though Bauckham is probably correct that the latter is meant merely as a symbol of Moses' earthly rule in Israel, comparable to Joseph's dream in Gen. 37:9-10 (*Jesus and the God of Israel*, 16).

[87] E.g., *2 En.* 33.4 claims God had "no advisor and no successor to my creation" but then explains "my wisdom is my advisor and my deed is my word," implying that God's wisdom and word are aspects of God

concept in particular, Jesus as the self-disclosure of God, that will prove helpful in understanding John's Temple imagery.[88]

Methodology and the Purposes of John

Instead of assuming that John is reacting to 70 CE or seeking to replace the Temple, it seems better to begin with John's own statement of intent: "these are written so that you may come to believe[89] that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name" (20:31). This emphasizes Jesus' identity as Messiah, his relation to God, and his life-giving power. As "the Messiah," Jesus is frequently presented as fulfilling messianic expectations in John (especially in John 10), but even more important to our theme is the reference to Jesus as "Son of God." This expression could carry a variety of senses in first-century Judaism and Greco-Roman culture at large, but in John the phrase must at least emphasize Jesus' unique relation to God. In the prologue, it is precisely as the μονογενής, or "only son," that the glory of the λόγος is seen in Jesus (1:14), and his unique position "close to the Father's

himself (trans. F.I. Anderson, "2 Enoch," *OTP* 1:156; noted by Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 17). Cf. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 130, 163-176; Hurtado, *One God*, 41-50; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 138-39. Coloe also seems to take this approach, stressing Wisdom's "*personification* in a literary sense" (*God Dwells with Us*, 53 n. 71, emphasis original), and notes that "the sages in the post-Exilic community choose the term '*Wisdom'* to describe God's self-communication in the world" (*God Dwells with Us*, 53, emphasis original; cf. also 60).

[88] We will discuss this issue further in Chapter One.

[89] There is a variant here: ℵ^2 A C D L N W Δ Ψ 0141 f^1 f^{13} 33 180 and many later manuscripts have the aorist subjunctive πιστεύσητε, which could be translated "you might come to believe," while ℵ* B Θ 0250 157 and 892^{supp} have the present subjunctive πιστεύητε, "you might (continue to) believe." The same variant, which could indicate a difference in intended audience, also appears in 19:35, where the aorist is even more strongly represented (only ℵ^2 B Ψ and Origen have the present, *contra* Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* [2 vols.; AB 29-29A; New York: Doubleday, 1966-1970], 2:1056; see Chapter Five n. 61 below). UBS^4 and NA^{27} do not decide between these variants, printing πιστεύ[σ]ητε, on the grounds that a determination of John's intended audience should not hinge upon a textual variant consisting of a single letter (cf. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2nd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994], 219-220; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 387-88). Most commentators appear to favor the present reading, but if the aorist is original (as reflected in the NRSV above) it could suggest a more apologetic than polemical purpose to John, and so to John's Temple theme, a notion to which we will return in the Conclusion.

heart" is emphasized (1:18). Then throughout the Gospel Jesus describes himself as the Son who uniquely bears the Father's authority (especially in John 5). Finally, immediately before this statement of purpose, the Gospel has been brought to a climax with Thomas' exclamation: "My Lord and my God!" (20:28). This suggests that in John the title "Son of God" is more than just another synonym for Messiah, it points to his unique relation to the God of Israel.[90] Finally, the claim to offer "life in his name" points to John's consistent emphasis on Jesus' offer of (eternal) life, which is strongly tied to the Temple in chapters 7-9 especially. In fact, all three of these themes—Jesus' identity as Messiah, unique relation to God, and life-giving power—are prominent throughout the Temple theme, as may be seen repeatedly in the following chapters. To give just one example, in the festival cycle (5:1-10:42) Jesus invokes the traditions and imagery of the festivals to claim God's unique prerogative over life and judgment on the Sabbath, to promise "bread from heaven" at Passover, to offer God's own water and light at Tabernacles, and to claim to be "one" with the Father who sent him at Dedication. Here, as elsewhere in John, the emphasis is squarely on Jesus' identity, origin and role, not the replacement of the Temple or its festivals.

Of course, 20:31 probably cannot account for the *whole* purpose behind the Fourth Gospel. Many commentators doubt that John has a unifying purpose at all,[91] which if true would certainly problematize the notion of an overarching Temple theme. With most of the studies discussed above, however, we also will argue that the Temple

---

[90] Cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:1059-1061.

[91] For introductions to the various challenges to the unity of the Fourth Gospel, and the range of solutions, cf. Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (ed. Francis Moloney; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 40-69; Stephen Smalley, *John: Evangelist & Interpreter* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 95-119; Gary Burge, *Interpreting the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 57-75.

theme extends throughout the Gospel, indicating a substantial degree of thematic unity.[92] To be sure, this does not require assuming a perfectly homogenous text,[93] and consideration of the Temple in John could even bolster the case that certain portions of the Gospel have undergone redaction. John 1:1-18, 6:1-71 and 10:1-42 especially stand off in various ways from the other Temple-related passages in John, with their distinctive vocabulary, apparent *aporias*, and other idiosyncrasies.[94] It certainly cannot be assumed that John's Temple theme proves that it has had no textual history.[95] What is more important, however, is that concern with the Temple and its festivals extends through nearly all of these apparent layers. This suggests that Jesus' relation to the Temple is no mere secondary feature of the text—perhaps only added in response to the fall of Jerusalem—but cuts to the very heart of what this Gospel is trying to do. Thus, while we can never rule out the presence of tensions even within the Temple theme, it will be seen that a remarkably consistent presentation of the Temple does emerge from John, and persists through (nearly) all levels of redaction.[96]

---

[92] E.g., Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 9-10; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus Body*, 26; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 6-7.

[93] Yee in particular affirms that John is "a product of a complex literary history" (*Jewish Feasts*, 13); Fuglseth discusses the issue in some depth (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 31-38).

[94] For instance, note the odd geographical, chronological and thematic difficulties in chs. 4-7, summarized by Burge, *Interpreting the Fourth Gospel*, 63-64, 69-71. Might it be that the *aporias* in these chapters reflect a secondary attempt to conform the sequence of feasts to their chronological sequence (Passover in Spring, Tabernacles in Fall, Dedication in Winter), or to their order in Lev 23 (Sabbath first, then Passover, with Tabernacles later, and Dedication—not in Lev 23—last)? It hardly needs to be added that similar arguments confirm the text-critical conclusion that 7:53-8:11 is secondary, as it inadvertently splits the Tabernacles discourse in half. The likelihood that John 21 is an appendix may also be strengthened by the fact that it is one of the few chapters in John (and perhaps the only) to lack any clear allusions to the Temple or festivals; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 9.

[95] Thus, this study will speak of "John" as the author or source of the Fourth Gospel, but this is merely a term of convenience; it does not imply an assumption of unified authorship by a single individual, named John or otherwise.

[96] It is noteworthy that the "author" of John has been associated with the Jerusalem priesthood, perhaps in 18:15-16, but certainly in the early church. For instance, Polycrates claimed that John was a high priest himself (noted by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 17; following Richard Bauckham, "Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 44 [1993]: 24-68, esp. 33-44). Even if this is highly improbable, it still lends weight to the priestly and Temple allusions in this Gospel, and should further undermine any

This leads to the question of methodology. Previous studies on the Temple in John have tended towards one of two approaches. All look to the Scriptures and other Jewish literature for background, but while Coloe, Kerr, Hoskins and Um emphasize John's literary and theological features,[97] Fuglseth and Spaulding adopt a more sociological posture, characterized by the application of "models" and an emphasis on the community believed to stand behind the text.[98] Our approach will clearly fall into the first group. Though Fuglseth and Klawans especially have done vital work in clearing the ground for a non-replacement reading of John's Temple theme, and Spaulding's stimulating work could offer valuable confirmation of our conclusions, we will not be applying a sociological model to the text, nor are we concerned to identify the nature of the Johannine community. Our focus is instead on John's thematic and theological features, as these have not yet received as much attention from a non-replacement stand-point. As in all studies on the Temple, however, these must also be read against the backdrop of the Jewish Scriptures and Second Temple literature especially.

That said, we will not attempt a full-blown exegetical treatment of the texts under consideration. Rather we will focus on those passages that most clearly refer to the Temple and its festivals, devoting our attention primarily to those aspects of the text

---

hasty conclusion that the Temple theme is primarily a reaction to 70 CE. If the author or community behind John had priestly connections, they may well have been thinking about Jesus' significance in light of the Temple's language and symbolism long before Jerusalem fell.

[97] All of them seek to integrate literary approaches with an investigation of John's background in the Scriptures and Second Temple Judaism; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 7-9; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 5-9; Um, *Temple Christology*, 2-8; also Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 1-5; Kerr is not explicit about his methodology, but seems to follow a fairly typical historical-critical approach, beginning by considering John's authorship and context, then overviewing the Old Testament background to the Temple (*Temple of Jesus' Body,* 1-66); the same is true of Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, ix-xi; McKelvey, *New Temple*, vii-ix; and Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 11-27.

[98] Cf. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 30-43; Spaulding is not as strictly focused on sociological questions as Fuglseth is, and also emphasizes John's historical-cultural context and the importance of taking a narrative approach to its text (cf. *Commemorative Identities*, 4-5), but her emphasis remains on the application of a social memory "model" to John's community (1-20).

claimed to indicate replacement, and those that highlight Jesus' relation to God or the Temple. From there, John's citations and allusions, as well as broader thematic emphases, will be investigated in light of the Jewish Scriptures and later works. Our approach will be closest to that adopted by Coloe, who begins with the same question as we will: "in what way does the Temple, as it is presented in the Fourth Gospel, reveal the identity and mission of Jesus?"[99] In answering this question, she reads each passage literarily, that is, by examining its references to the Temple in their narrative context within John.[100] She then investigates any quotations or allusions to scripture, customs or liturgical practices, with primary reference to the MT, LXX and Targums, and "some reference" to the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature.[101] This will be our approach as well, though due to dating concerns we give greater attention to the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and Dead Sea Scrolls, and less to the Targums and rabbinic literature.[102]

That we should focus on John's Jewish context particularly reflects our concern with the *Jewish* Temple, but it also reflects a strong sense that the Gospel of John as a whole is most fruitfully read in light of the Jewish Scriptures and Second Temple

---

[99] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 7; we will be less concerned with her second question: "in the absence of the historical Jesus of Nazareth, what is the significance of the Temple for the Christian community?" (7).

[100] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 7-8; following R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (New Testament Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

[101] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 7-9. Hoskins also defends a similar "integrative" approach, combining literary, historical and theological concerns (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 5-9).

[102] Though we will occasionally address later works, such as the rabbinic material, this will mainly be in response to others who have appealed to them in support of a replacement paradigm. Otherwise, they will normally only be appealed to where they confirm ideas already seen in texts that clearly predate John, or where it is virtually certain that they reflect pre-70 CE traditions (i.e. the descriptions of the Tabernacles water-pouring and light ceremonies, which, however embellished they may be in the Mishnah and later sources, surely were not invented from whole cloth only after the fall of Jerusalem). The uncertain dating of the rabbinic texts is noted by, e.g., Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 106; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 118 n. 47; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 168; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:350. Even among the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha there is considerable doubt regarding dating, so emphasis will be given to texts like Sirach and *Jubilees* that are demonstrably pre-Christian.

Judaism.[103] It is, after all, the Jewish Scriptures that John cites at key points in the narrative (e.g. 1:23; 2:17, 22; 5:39-47; 19:36-37), Jewish titles that are most often applied to Jesus (The Prophet, rabbi, Messiah, King of Israel/the Jews), and Jewish figures to which he is compared (Moses, John the Baptist, Jacob, Abraham). Most importantly, it is the Jewish Temple and Jewish festivals at which John sets most of Jesus' ministry, and these which we will find to inform and clarify much of what Jesus says and does. As R. Alan Culpepper notes, John presupposes extensive knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures and later traditions on the part of its readers, as these references are often unexplained.[104] Therefore when we find other less explicit allusions to the Scriptures—such as Genesis 1 and Exodus 34 in the prologue—it is reasonable to ask whether these too are intentional and meant to clarify the meaning of the passages in which they appear.

How then are we to identify and evaluate such potential allusions?[105] Obviously where there is an explicit citation formula and an exact reproduction of the LXX, the matter is relatively straightforward (e.g. Isa 53:1 in John 12:38), but this is rarely the case in the Fourth Gospel. In most instances, a judgment must be made based on how closely John's wording corresponds—verbally, conceptually, grammatically, and/or syntactically—to its purported source. Since even John's explicit citations are sometimes quite free, most of all in 7:38, none of these criteria are necessary (or sufficient) by themselves, but the more of these features that are present, the more likely it is that the quotation or

[103] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 1; Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 82-83.

[104] Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 219-222. This, however, stands in tension with the frequent glosses on extremely basic aspects of Jewish culture, e.g., translating "rabbi" (1:38) and "Messiah" (1:41), which could indicate either a mixed audience, or later redaction for a broader audience than was originally intended, but it can hardly be used to dismiss the presence of other details that presuppose far more knowledge of Judaism than these translations imply (cf. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 224-27, esp. 225).

[105] For cautions, cf. Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81 (1962): 1-13; Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990); Thomas R. Hatina, *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative* (JSNTSupp 232/SSEJC 8; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), esp. 1-48.

allusion is intentional. Craig Koester helpfully identifies the following approach to potential antecedents: (1) Preference is given to materials older or contemporary with the NT, with later works only referenced where they elucidate earlier sources. (2) It must be asked whether a given text represents a direct source or simply reflects a common tradition. (3) If several types of tradition seem to lie behind the same passage, it must be asked which are most directly relevant, and focus on these. (4) It must be asked whether there were already pre-existing connections between these traditions.[106] Of course, the likelihood that a purported quotation or allusion is intentional depends on a number of other factors as well. Preference must be given to texts that John can be shown to have known, which (judging by the explicit citations) includes the Torah, the Psalms and at least a few of the Prophets.[107] Other traditions that are less explicitly invoked, but seem to be reflected quite often in John, include the Wisdom and apocalyptic traditions. In these latter cases, it may not be that John knows of the specific texts to which we compare it (e.g. Sirach or *1 Enoch*), but they may well reflect common traditions.

For instance, 1:14e is widely thought to allude to Exod 34:6e even though the only word it has in common with the LXX is καί, because John's phrase, though idiosyncratic, is nevertheless a sensible translation of the MT, and the context in the prologue boasts many other connections with Exodus 33-34. Yet since the phrase in question is repeated throughout the Jewish Scriptures as a stereotypical expression of God's character, it is also possible that John alludes to that whole tradition rather than to the one

[106] Summarized from Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 5; cf. also Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), esp. 152-157. We will rarely be explicit in discussing these questions, but they should inform our treatment of John's citations and allusions throughout.

[107] According to the UBS[4], John explicitly quotes Isa 40:3 (1:23), Ps 69:9 (2:17), Ps 78:24 (6:31), Isa 54:13 (6:45), Ps 82:6 (10:34), Ps 118:25-26 (12:13), Zech 9:9 (12:15), Isa 53:1 (12:38), Isa 6:10 (12:40), Ps 41:9 (13:18), Ps 35:19, 69:4 (15:25), Ps 22:18 (19:24), Exod 12:46//Num 9:12 (19:36), Zech 12:10 (19:37) (UBS[4], 889; cf. further allusions listed 891-901).

instance in Exodus 34, or indeed that the two possibilities might both be true.[108] Similarly, when 4:10-14 speaks of "living water" and "the gift of God," this need not be tied to a single "source," but likely reflects numerous passages that use water to symbolize God's gifts of life, (new) creation, and the restoration of Israel.[109]

In considering the potential contribution of any of these—citations, allusions, shared traditions—we will not assume that John is simply pulling memorable phrases out of context. Though this is always a possibility, it will be seen that John typically quotes and alludes to passages whose original contexts are directly relevant to their new contexts in John. Indeed, in many cases it is precisely these larger connections between contexts that confirm the allusion, as we noted in the case of Exod 34:6. Nevertheless, it must be asked what *new* meanings John imposes on these texts by placing them in new narrative contexts.[110] For instance, John 2:17 quotes Ps 69:9, but changes the verb from past to future, "zeal for your house *will* consume me" rather than "it is zeal for your house that *has* consumed me" (emphasis added). Whether John views this as a prophecy of the Temple incident, or of Jesus' death, neither is a straightforward inference from Ps 69:9 when read in its original context. This is *not*, however, proof that John takes the verse out of context, for we will note several important connections between Psalm 69 and John 2 in Chapter Two below, but rather evidence of John's reinterpretation of the Jewish Scriptures (and Temple) in light of Christ. John himself practically admits this method in 2:22, "After he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the word that Jesus had spoken" (cf. 20:9). That is, it was only in light of the resurrection that Scripture (and Jesus' words and deeds) could be

[108] Cf. Chapter One below.
[109] Cf. Chapter Three below. This feature of John is noted by Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 128.
[110] Cf. Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 32; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 184.

understood properly, but once so understood, it is to be "believed." At the least, this implies that John's use of Scripture is (intended to be) sympathetic rather than polemical, and it is most likely that John's allusions to other aspects of Jewish tradition, including the Temple, are comparably sympathetic. Thus, when John alludes to various texts that anticipate the restoration of the Temple—Psalm 69, Ezekiel 47, Zechariah 12-14, Malachi 3—it will not be assumed that this is because he thinks the Temple has been "replaced" by Jesus; it is instead to be asked whether John *shares* this expectation of the Temple's restoration, and asked how its fulfillment is understood.

Also with Coloe, and following the work of scholars such as Culpepper, Koester, Dorothy Lee and others, we will assume that "the Fourth Gospel displays a self-conscious use of symbolism."[111] As Culpepper notes, the central importance of symbolism in John is seen especially in the way Jesus' words and deeds are constantly misunderstood to refer to mundane realities when they actually refer symbolically or metaphorically to something higher. Jesus says, "I have food to eat that you do not know about" (4:32) and the disciples think someone must have brought him lunch (4:33), when in fact he is speaking metaphorically: "My food is to do the will of him who sent me and to complete his work" (4:34). Jesus is not always so quick to clarify his meaning, but the use of symbol and metaphor (and its inevitable misunderstanding) is ever-present.[112] Not only does John make frequent use of metaphors, such as "the temple of his body" (2:21) and "I

[111] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 4; cf. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 150-202; Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (2nd Ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); Dorothy A. Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning* (JSNTSupp 95; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1994). Koester defines a symbol as "an image, an action, or a person that is understood to have transcendent significance. In Johannine terms, symbols span the chasm between what is "from above" and what is "from below" without collapsing the distinction…. The person who makes God known is Jesus, and those he meets represent types of belief and unbelief" (*Symbolism*, 4).

[112] Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 152-165, esp. 161-62; Lee also traces a frequent pattern moving from misunderstanding to either acceptance or rejection in John's narratives (*Symbolic Narratives*, 11-15 *et passim*).

am the bread of life" (6:35), but also refers to Jesus' actions as "signs" (e.g. 2:11; 4:54; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 12:37; 20:30) and so points to a symbolic understanding of the narratives themselves. Thus, when John describes the turning of water into wine (2:1-11), this is to be seen as more than a simple historical report of Jesus' actions at a wedding; it is a "sign" that reveals Jesus' "glory" (2:11). In this case, the symbolism appears to point especially to Jesus' death (cf. "my hour has not yet come," 2:4), and recalls Jewish descriptions of the restoration of Israel, in which wine and weddings often featured prominently.[113] As we will see, similar motives underlie John's Temple theme as well, as John uses images of Wisdom, glory, water, bread, light, and the Temple itself to present Jesus as the one through whom God returns to and restores Israel. Since, as Klawans emphasizes, the Temple itself was always understood to be symbolic—pointing to the presence of God and the true heavenly or cosmic Temple—John's symbolic approach should not be seen to change the function of the Temple so much as to apply it to a new referent, to claim that *Jesus* stands in the same basic relation to the Temple as God always has. Thus, if Hoskins is correct that symbolism and replacement operate in two fundamentally different spheres, John appears to be more at home in the symbolic one, giving Jesus God's own place in the Temple's imagery.

Thesis Statement and Overview of the Argument

With that background in mind, this thesis will argue that the primary purpose of John's Temple theme is to explicate and symbolize Jesus' relation to the God of Israel, which in turn explains the significance of his death and resurrection. Though this

[113] Cf. Koester, *Symbolism*, 82-86. Thus, our concern is not historical in the sense of asking "what really happened in Cana," but rather literary and theological, asking what meaning John expects to convey through the account.

christological focus to John's Temple theme has been emphasized in previous studies (esp. Coloe, Hoskins and Um), this has typically been obscured and distorted by the replacement paradigm. Unlike Fuglseth, however, our rejection of replacement will not be based on the application of sociological models, but on a close reading of John's Temple theme in its narrative context. In comparison with the Jewish Scriptures and Second Temple period literature, it will be argued that John's purpose in applying Temple language and imagery to Jesus is not to show that the Temple is obsolete, but to clarify Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel. For John, Jesus embodies the presence and glory of God that have always been known in the Temple. He does not replace Israel's institutions, because they have always pointed beyond themselves to him, and indeed when properly understood they continue to do so even more fully when seen in light of the resurrection. When Jesus fulfills their eschatological hopes, he does so by placing himself *within* the Temple and offering the blessings God was expected to pour out from it. Thus, if 20:31 summarizes the Fourth Gospel's purpose as promoting belief in Jesus' identity as Messiah and Son of God, in order that we might have "life in his name," these themes of Jesus' identity and offer of life will also be seen to be central to the Temple theme, and will be emphasized throughout.

The thesis will be divided into five chapters, each focusing on how the Temple theme is developed in successive portions of the Fourth Gospel. Primary emphasis will be placed on 1:14-18, 2:13-23, 4:4-26, the festival cycle (5:1-10:42) and the passion narrative (esp. 19:23-37), but many other passages will be situated around these high points. The purpose will not be to provide full exegetical treatment of these texts, but to focus on how Temple and festival themes serve to highlight, clarify and symbolize Jesus'

relation to the Father. In short, it will be argued that John does not see Jesus replacing the Temple, but rather as, in some unique but ultimately indefinable sense, embodying God's return to it.

Chapter One will focus on the prologue, and especially 1:14-18, since this establishes the trajectory of the Gospel as a whole. In particular, it will be argued that the Tabernacle allusions in 1:14 are best understood in the light of the prologue's over-arching emphasis on Jesus' preexistence and embodiment of the λόγος and glory of God. As such, the Tabernacle is invoked to affirm that the λόγος made flesh in Jesus is the very same presence of God that Israel also met on Sinai, in the Tabernacle and in the Temple. Far from introducing a "polemic" against the Temple, John affirms Jesus' continuity with Israel's sanctuary by tying him to the glory seen there (cf. also 12:37-41). Even the prologue's well-known contrasts between Jesus and Moses are not intended to denigrate Moses, but to claim that in Jesus, believers can glimpse the same glory Moses also saw. It will further be argued that John's use of μονογενής points ahead to the passion, and explains how Jesus' embodies the glory of God, through his death and resurrection as the beloved son.

Chapter Two will set the context for the rest of John 1 to 4, then focus on the "Temple incident" in 2:13-23. Taking the clue provided by the prologue,[114] it will be argued that this invokes the eschatological expectations of the Temple to emphasize Jesus' unique relation to God. When Jesus clears the Temple, he does not attack the institution—which he calls "my Father's house" in 2:16—he anticipates its eschatological cleansing and restoration, drawing on Psalm 69 and other Temple restoration texts in

[114] This does not necessarily mean assuming that the Temple theology of the prologue is entirely consistent with that of the rest of the Gospel, but it does mean respecting the prologue's inclusion in the final form of the Gospel.

Malachi 3, Zechariah 14. Likewise, when Jesus says "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (2:19), and John clarifies that this refers to "the temple of his body" (2:21), he is not replacing the Temple with Jesus; he is indicating their essential connection, so close that Jesus' death and resurrection actually entail the Temple's destruction and raising. We will also address this passage's connection with 14:1-3.

In Chapter Three, we will consider Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman in 4:4-26. In particular, we will examine its use of betrothal and water imagery, and argue that these are intended to highlight Jesus' identity, the restoration of Israel, and the divine gift of eternal life. Though John does affirm that "the hour is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (4:21), this does not imply the rejection or replacement of the Jerusalem Temple, for "salvation is from the Jews" (4:22). Nor do John's references to "true worship… in Spirit and truth" (4:23) criticize physical, Temple worship; rather they contrast worship in ignorance with worship that knows the true identity of God, in Jesus ("we worship what we know"; 4:22). Thus 4:25-26 brings the passage to a climax by applying to Jesus God's self-identification as "I am" (cf. esp. Isa 52:6). This latter connection is especially significant, as Isaiah specifically ties it with YHWH's "return" to Jerusalem, announcing "salvation" (52:7-10), and John itself follows this with Jesus' own return to Jerusalem (5:1).

Chapter Four will then turn to John 5 to 10, which place Jesus at the Temple or in a synagogue for several successive Jewish festivals: Sabbath (at an unnamed feast), Passover, Tabernacles, Sabbath again, and Dedication. Throughout these chapters the traditions, rituals and expectations of these institutions will be seen to highlight Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel. In John 5, Jesus appeals to traditional Sabbath

theology to claim God's unique authority to give life and judge, even on the Sabbath. If this emphasizes his divine prerogatives and eschatological role, it will be argued that very similar motives drive the rest of the festival cycle as well. As the true bread from heaven (ch. 6), the true source of God's water and light (chs. 7-9), and the good shepherd and consecrated one (ch. 10), Jesus fulfills the hopes for God's presence and blessing that each festival celebrated. Thus, Jesus is repeatedly challenged by "the Jews" in these chapters,[115] but he is accused of "making himself equal to God" (5:18; cf. 10:33), not of abolishing or replacing the Temple.

Both of these aspects of John's Temple theme—Jesus' relation to God and the controversy this fosters—are brought to a head in the second half of the Gospel, which will be the focus of Chapter Five. Here the Temple theme is supplemented by two related themes: Jesus' relation to the high priesthood, and kingship. Both will be found to advance the same emphasis on Jesus' relation to God that we have traced across the Gospel. As the true high priest (chs. 17-19), Jesus is the one the Jerusalem priesthood represents (especially in bearing the divine name), and the one to whom the priests bear witness (cf. 11:47-53). As the true King (chs. 18-20), Jesus embodies an ancient enthronement myth that ties divine kingship to cosmic battle, new creation and Temple building. In 19:23-37 especially, this imagery is skillfully interwoven with elements drawn from each of the festival discourses, and may even reach back to the prologue by alluding to the beloved son tradition. Finally, we will note further Temple symbolism in

[115] Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι; the term has attracted considerable attention in the effort to understand John's presentation of Judaism. It occurs only 17 times in all three Synoptic Gospels combined, but 71 times in John alone (including references in the singular), many of which appear with negative connotations. On the surface, this could suggest that John is anti-Semitic, but this is now usually recognized as anachronistic (cf. the helpful discussions by Brown, *Introduction*, 157-175; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:214-223; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 70-74). Nevertheless, substantial disagreement remains on the precise implications of John's usage, so we will consistently translate "the Jews" (with quotes) to emphasize this uncertainty. We will return to this subject in the Conclusion.

the resurrection accounts themselves. In all this, John presents Jesus as the true high priest and king, whose death and resurrection encompass divine enthronement, the "raising" of the true heavenly Temple of which Jerusalem was the symbol, and the inauguration of the new creation.

Together, these five chapters will argue that the Temple theme is central to the purposes of the Fourth Gospel, and is consistently focused on Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel. He is the λόγος become flesh, who embodies the Wisdom and glory through whom God has always been known, including on Sinai, in the Tabernacle, and in the Temple. Thus, his body is a "Temple," not in *contrast* to the Jerusalem Temple, but in essential continuity with it, as the one who has been met in it, and who now returns to it to restore Israel and enable "true worship." As such, Jesus bears God's unique authority over the Sabbath, offers his flesh as the true bread from heaven anticipated at Passover, pours out God's eschatological water and light expected at Tabernacles, and is sent as the consecrated one at Dedication. He is the true high priest and divine king, and his death and resurrection fulfill the hopes of the Temple, as he is enthroned as the divine king, restores the people of God, and pours out blessing for the whole world.

In all of this, John's emphasis is consistently set on Jesus' relation to God, not on the replacement of the Temple. The history, traditions, rituals and expectations of the Temple and festivals are drawn upon in *support* of this christological message, not in contrast to it. Again and again they are used to picture Jesus as the incarnation of the self-revelation of God in Wisdom, glory, name, life, light and judgment. This imagery is centered in the Temple and points most of all to Jesus' death and resurrection, as he repeatedly sets himself within the Temple (and a synagogue) at those feasts most closely

associated with Temple construction and restoration (Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles and Dedication), and declares in many different ways that the promised restoration has arrived. He enacts the Temple's cleansing at Passover, offers life and judgment on the Sabbath, promises water and light from the Temple at Tabernacles, and claims consecration and oneness with God at Dedication. Thus, when this imagery is drawn together again to describe the crucifixion (19:28-37) and resurrection (20:12-23), this should not be seen as the *replacement* of the Temple's imagery, but as its *referent*. John implies that the hopes and expectations of the Temple festivals find their ultimate fulfillment in Jesus, which gives to those festivals not less but greater significance than could be understood previously. In light of his glorification and exaltation, terms Isaiah used repeatedly of the self-revelation of God and the restoration of the Temple, Jesus does not just fulfill the hopes of the Temple, but is also revealed as the one who has *always* been known within it, the one whose glory Isaiah himself saw within the Temple (12:37-41), Moses saw on Sinai (1:14-18), and all believers can now see in Jesus.

Chapter One
Tabernacle, Sinai and the Beloved Son in John's Prologue[1]

John's prologue presents a rich tapestry of Jewish traditions, skillfully inter-weaveing allusions to creation, Wisdom, Tabernacle, Sinai, Torah, the beloved son and more to produce an image of Jesus as the incarnation of the self-revelation of God.[2] Yet by and large scholars have viewed these traditions as evidence of a "replacement" motif, contrasting Jesus with the Torah, the Tabernacle, and Moses' experience on Sinai especially. For instance, Paul Hoskins argues that the allusions to the Tabernacle in 1:14 show that Jesus "takes the place of the Tabernacle and the Temple as the locus for the manifestation of the glory of God to his people."[3] Despite its widespread acceptance, however, this replacement approach is open to question. Fuglseth only briefly discusses the passage, but he is correct that it falls well short of proving replacement.[4] This chapter will look especially at John's allusions to the Tabernacle, Sinai, Moses and the Torah in 1:14-18, and argue that these do not signal their replacement, but rather present Jesus as the incarnation of the same λόγος and glory through which God has been known in them.

---

[1] A version of this chapter was presented to the Johannine Literature Section at the SBL Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA, November 22, 2009. At SBL, Wilson Paroschi suggested that his *Incarnation and Covenant in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, John 1:1-18* (EUS Series 23, vol. 820; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2006) defends a similar position. He graciously provided a copy of the relevant chapter, which confirms several of this chapter's points and offers an extensive bibliography (ch. 4, pp. 143-216; note that these page numbers reflect Paroschi's manuscript, and may differ from the published edition). Paroschi still emphasizes the "replacement" of Sinai and the first covenant, even stating, "John's view represents a complete break with the Judaism of his day, which still posited some form of continuity between Israel's sanctuaries of the past and life in the future" (163, cf. 151, 201, 204, 212-14, but cf. 209), but he rightly argues that John "does not depreciate the law" (152; cf. 213).

[2] Though it may be that a previously existing composition (perhaps a hymn; cf. Phil 2:6-11; Col 1:15-20) has been adapted, expanded and interwoven with material about John the Baptist, these sources are not haphazardly arranged, nor can any sharp thematic dichotomy be maintained between the prologue and Gospel, so we will treat the text as it stands (for discussions of the origin of the prologue, cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:18-23; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 28; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 3-4; Köstenberger, *John*, 19-20; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:333-37).

[3] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 125, cf. 116-125; cf. also Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 15-29; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 102-135; Um, *Temple Christology*, 153-54; Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 105-8.

[4] Fuglseth concludes only that John's allusions to the Tabernacle are "still quite ambiguous when seen as a testimony of the temple relationship of the Johannine community" (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 168-69).

In Jesus, and especially his death as the μονογενής, the glory glimpsed on Sinai and in the Tabernacle has been fully revealed; the λόγος who gave the Torah has *become* flesh.

Λόγος, Torah and Wisdom

Any reading of John's prologue must begin with the λόγος, usually but inadequately translated: "Word."[5] This is prominent from the controversial first verse, translated in the NRSV, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."[6] However we understand this verse, the intimate relation between God and the λόγος is surely unquestionable, and that must be our starting point for interpreting John's later claim that the λόγος "became flesh" (1:14). Still, much clearly depends on how we understand the background to John's term. A wide variety of proposals have been put forward, but given the Fourth Gospel's overwhelmingly Jewish character, it seems best to look primarily to Jewish parallels.[7]

Among these proposed backgrounds, the personification of Torah might seem the most conducive to a replacement reading. Those who accept this parallel tend to read John's exalted claims for the λόγος as a direct challenge to the primacy of the Torah

---

[5] A few key terms that are not easily translated, such as λόγος and μονογενής, will generally be left untranslated and defined in context.

[6] The difficulty in translating and interpreting θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος is well known. The usual translation, "the Word was God," is accepted by Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:5; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 31; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 1, 10-11; but it requires caution; cf. Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 97; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:373; Philip B. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns in Mark 15:39 and John 1:1," *JBL* 92 (1973): 75-87; D.A. Fennema, "John 1.18: 'God the Only Son'," *NTS* 31 (1985), 128-131.

[7] Cf. "λέγω, λόγος, ῥῆμα, λαλέω," *TDNT* 4.69-136; Ed L. Miller lists nine options: 1. The OT דבר/λόγος; 2. Wisdom; 3. The Stoic λόγος; 4. Philo's λόγος; 5. The Targumic *Memra*; 6. Rabbinic speculation about the Torah; 7. The Gnostic λόγος; 8. Gnostic redeemer-myths; 9. Hellenistic hymns to Silence ("The Johannine Origins of the Johannine Logos," *JBL* 112 [1993]: 448-49). He rejects these and takes John itself as the most immediate context for the term (449-457), but this cannot rule out John's influence by prior concepts. Craig A. Evans rejects the relevance of non-Jewish parallels (*Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* [JSNTSupp 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], 47-76); Dunn claims "a considerable consensus" that Jewish tradition provides John's primary background (*Christology in the Making*, 215; cf. also John Ashton, "The Transformation of Wisdom: A Study of the Prologue of John's Gospel," *NTS* 32 [1986]:162).

within Judaism. John 1:17 especially is often read as polemical, as in the KJV, "The law was given by Moses, *but* grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."[8] For instance, Mary Coloe argues that the rabbis sought God's Wisdom in Torah, but John claims it is revealed in Jesus instead. "Though there are allusions to Sinai and Wisdom, the evangelist uses these traditions in a polemical manner, for the Gospel presents God's dwelling in the midst of humanity not by way of Israel's Torah, but in the humanity of Jesus."[9] We will find a number of reasons to doubt this reading as we proceed, but for now it is enough to note that while the Torah was vitally important within Second Temple Judaism,[10] the evidence of its *personification* is sparse. Indeed, only Sir 24:23-32 and Bar 4:1-2 personify Torah itself, and both do so only as an extension of their personifications of Wisdom.[11]

As most scholars accept, then, Wisdom itself seems to provide the most direct backdrop for John's λόγος.[12] Wisdom also was personified, pre-existent, active in creation, dwelt with Israel, and was associated with God's λόγος, Torah and glory in a variety of pre-Johannine texts (cf. esp. Prov 8; Sir 24; Wis 7-9).[13] There are differences of course—Wisdom is not incarnate, and often seems to be a created being (cf. Prov 8:22;

---

[8] Italics original; "but" is not present in the Greek and is omitted by the NRSV, NIV, ESV, NAB, NASB.

[9] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 62, cf. also 20-21, 28, 62-63; cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:359-63; Ashton, "Transformation," 169; Eldon Jay Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merril C. Tenney; Presented by His Former Students* (ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 139-140; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus Body*, 126-29; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 120-23; following Ruth B. Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος (John 1.16) Grace and the Law in the Johannine Prologue," *JSNT* 32 (1988): 3-15. Beasley-Murray is one of the few to insist that, "there is no hint of polemic against the Law" (*John*, 15).

[10] For a good summary of its centrality in the period, cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:357-58.

[11] Though Epp notes numerous rabbinic personifications of Torah, the only other Second Temple period texts he notes personify *Wisdom*, or tie Torah to Wisdom in a more general way, but do not clearly personify Torah itself (cf. Sir 14:20-15:10; 19:20; 34:8, 34-39:1; 4 Macc 1:16-17; *2 Bar*. 77:16; cf. Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word," 130-35; cf. also Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:350-363). Other rabbinic parallels are noted by, e.g., Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:33-34; Evans, *Word and Glory*, 114-134; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 58-61; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 123-24.

[12] See esp. Ashton, "Transformation," 161-186.

[13] Koester lists several parallels each between John 1 and Prov 8, Sir 24 and Wis 7 (*The Dwelling of God*, 109).

Sir 24:9; Wis 6:22; 8:3)—but these hardly disprove the allusion.[14] The unprecedented nature of the incarnation is precisely John's point, so the fact that no previous text claims the same about Wisdom is to be expected. Even the references to Wisdom's creation can be indirectly connected to John's image of the λόγος both *with* God and *as* God. In such texts, Wisdom is personified *as though* it were distinct from God,[15] much like the λόγος is in John 1. This is significant because, just as often, Wisdom appears to be a literary means of describing God's *own* self-disclosure, as in Sir 42:21, "He has set in order the splendors of his wisdom; he is from all eternity one and the same. Nothing can be added or taken away, and he needs no one to be his counselor."[16] Whether intentionally or not, such denials that God can be distinguished from Wisdom stand in apparent contrast with those texts which speak of Wisdom's creation,[17] and it seems to me that this tension is actually exploited by John's claim that, "the Word was with God and the Word was God" (1:1). Yet for John the tension is stronger still, as "all things came into being [ἐγένετο] through him, and without him not one thing came into being [ἐγένετο]" (1:3), but "the Word became [ἐγένετο] flesh" (1:14). In other words, for John the λόγος is *both* created and uncreated; God's Wisdom is eternal, but has in some unique sense *become* human.[18]

---

[14] *Contra* Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 153-54, 215.

[15] Cf. Prov 8:22, 30; Sir 1:4; 24:1-3, 8-11; Wis 8:3-4; 9:4, 9; Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 35-39, 49-50; Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 16-17; Barker, *The Great Angel*, 48-69. Cf. the parallel in Wis 6:22, which claims to explain "what wisdom is and how she came to be [ἐγένετο]."

[16] Cf. also Prov 3:19-20; Isa 10:13; 40:13-14; *1 En* 14.23-25; *2 En* 33.4; cf. Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 17; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 130-31, 163-176; Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 41-50; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology,* 138-39. Ashton discusses a similar "constant tension" in the tradition, between Wisdom's immanence and inaccessibility ("Transformation," 162-170; following Bultmann; e.g. contrast Job 28:1-27 with 28:28; Pro 3:13 with 3:19-20; Pro 8:1-21 with 8:22-31; Pro 30:2-4 with Deut 30:11-14 and Bar 3:29-4:4).

[17] Dunn acknowledges that many texts describe Wisdom as "a being clearly subordinate to Yahweh" (*Christology in the Making*, 174), but ultimately he thinks it is simply "a way of speaking about God himself, of expressing God's active involvement with his world and his people without compromising his transcendence" (176).

[18] Coloe notes that John 1:14a-b "present the antithesis" of 1:1a-b, but "there is no corresponding antithesis for 1c. The statement καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος remains operative…. There is no attempt to explain

By alluding to Wisdom, John is able to maintain the closest possible relation between God and the λόγος, now enfleshed, without collapsing all distinction between them.[19] To picture the connection between the man Jesus and the God of Israel with a concept that sometimes describes God's self-disclosure, but other times was explicitly distinguished from God, seems to imply that Jesus embodies the self-disclosure of God, but is not simply equated with God in Godself. I believe this same tension drives John's Tabernacle and Sinai allusions as well.[20] Though "no one has ever seen God" (1:18), it is and always has been through the λόγος and its glory that God has been made known, and it is this same "glory" that Jesus embodies. In this light, the glory seen on Sinai and in Tabernacle is not replaced by Jesus; rather it provides an image of his unique—if ultimately indefinable—embodiment of the self-revelation of God.

Tabernacle, Sinai and the Glory of God in 1:14-18

John 1:14 claims: "the Word became flesh and dwelled [σκηνόω] among us, and we have seen his glory…." The verb σκηνόω means literally "tabernacled,"[21] and very likely alludes to the Tabernacle (σκηνή), in which God's glory dwelt (e.g. Exod 40:34-

---

how this mystery could occur. There is just the bold statement of a profound paradox, supported by primary witnesses—the divine Word became human flesh and we saw his glory" (*God Dwells with Us*, 26; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:32). Though John neglects to explain how this occurs ontologically, the final section of this chapter will consider a rather different sense in which John does explain how Jesus incarnates the Wisdom and glory of God.

[19] So Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 26; Fennema, "God the Only Son," 129-30, following Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns," 75-87. As McGrath puts it, the really startling thing is that John would "identif[y] this personification with a person" (*John's Apologetic Christology*, 143).

[20] Johnson also emphasizes Jesus' embodiment of the self-disclosure of God in relation to the Temple theme ("'Salvation Is from the Jews'," 98).

[21] The term is rare; referring to dwelling in tents in the LXX (Gen 13:12; Judg B 5:17; 8:11) and God's presence in the New Testament (Rev 7:15; 12:12; 13:6; 21:3). More common is κατασκηνόω, which occurs 70 times in the LXX and New Testament, often referring to God dwelling with Israel (e.g. Num 35:34; 1 Chr 23:25; 2 Chr 6:2; Ezek 43:6-9; Joel 4:17 [Eng. 3:17]; Zech 2:14-15 [Eng. 2:10-11]; cf. Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 118-19).

35).[22] Most take this to imply the Tabernacle's "replacement" by the incarnate λόγος,[23] but this is by no means explicit. It was believed of Wisdom herself, "In the holy tent [σκηνή] I ministered before him, and so I was established in Zion" (Sir 24:10).[24] Here we have an explicit distinction between Wisdom and God, combined with a claim that it was through *Wisdom* that God was known in the Tabernacle and Temple. In this light, John's claim that the λόγος "tabernacled among us" can be read the same way. The point would not be that God's Wisdom is no longer present in Israel's sanctuary, but that the same Wisdom through which God *has been known there* has now become flesh.[25]

That this is John's point can be seen by comparison with Exod 40:34, where "the glory [δόξα] of the LORD filled the Tabernacle." Note that it is not *the Tabernacle's* glory that was seen, but rather the glory *of the LORD* filled the Tabernacle. Thus, John's claim that "we have seen *his* glory" does not identify Jesus as a new Tabernacle,[26] but rather as the incarnation of the glory that *filled* the Tabernacle. Similarly, the description

---

[22] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 26-27; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 117-126; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 117-120; Um, *Temple Christology*, 153-54; Bruce, *John*, 41-42; Beasley-Murray, *John,* 14-15; Moloney, *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1-4* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 42-45; John C. Meagher, "John 1.14 and the New Temple," *JBL* 88 (1969): 57; Henry Mowvley, "John 1^{14-18} in the Light of Exodus 33^{7}-34^{35}," *ExpTim* 95 (1984): 136-37; Anthony Hanson, "John I. 14-18 and Exodus XXXIV," *NTS* 23 [1976]: 90-101; Peder Borgen, "Creation, Logos and the Son: Observations on John 1:1-18 and 5:17-18," *Ex Auditu* 3 (1987): 93; Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God,"* 110-111; Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 100-115; Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 191-200. Surprisingly, Fuglseth denies a connection with the *Shekinah*, but does not even consider an allusion to the σκηνή (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 168-69). McKelvey also finds a link to the Feast of Tabernacles (*New Temple*, 75-76).

[23] "In John the presence of God is no longer found in the Tent/Temple, but in the incarnate Word" (Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 103, cf. 112); cf. Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 105-6, 108; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 123-25; Um, *Temple Christology*, 153. Coloe sees this as polemic against the Torah (*God Dwells with Us*, 27-29, 62-63).

[24] Cf. 24:4, 8; Wis 9:8-9; Ashton thinks John's σκηνόω deliberately alludes to Sir 24 ("Transformation," 178); cf. also Philo *Alleg. Interp.* 3.46; *QE* 2.68 (on Philo's use of λόγος as potential background to John, cf. Evans, *Word and Glory*, 100-114, 123-26; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:343-47).

[25] Cf. Hoskins: "When the Word becomes flesh, God's dwelling place among his people takes on a new form, a human body" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 118, cf. 119, 124; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:32; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 75-76; Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God",* 110-111; Koester , *Dwelling of God*, 104,115; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 137).

[26] As claimed by Meagher, "John 1.14," 57.

in 1:14 of the λόγος, or its glory,[27] as "full of grace and truth" likely alludes to the Sinai theophany in Exod 34:6, "The LORD, the LORD, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness [רב־חסד ואמת]." John seems to quote the last phrase,[28] which is a stereotypical expression of God's character that appears throughout the Hebrew Bible.[29] The point, it seems, is not to replace Sinai, but to present Jesus as the one who embodies the self-revelation of the same God known through the Tabernacle, on Sinai and throughout Israel's history.

Yet just as the allusion to the Tabernacle is often taken to imply replacement, this reference to Sinai is often seen as polemical. As Coloe puts it, "In 14c, the claim is made that 'we saw his glory,' a vision Moses desired (Exod 33:18) but was not permitted (Exod 33:20-23). The community of those who received the Word (John 1:12) are able to see what Israel could not."[30] In support of this, it is claimed that "no one has ever seen God" in 1:18 is a direct denial that Moses saw God's glory. There are, however, good reasons to doubt this interpretation.

Exodus itself is famously ambiguous about what Moses saw on Sinai: In 33:18 he asks to see God's "glory," and in 33:19-20 God says his "goodness" (MT) or "glory"

---

[27] Or even the μονογενής; the syntax is ambiguous; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:14.

[28] The allusion to Exod 34:6 is almost universally accepted; cf. Hanson, "John I. 14-18," 90-91, with bibliography; for others cf. n. 22 above. John's πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας differs from the LXX translation of καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός, but almost certainly translates רב־חסד ואמת. On a syntactical level, John's expression is a more literal translation of the Hebrew than the LXX is, but John's vocabulary is idiosyncratic; cf. Hanson, "John 1. 14-18," 93; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 119.

[29] The whole phrase appears in Ps 86:15 [85:15 LXX]; חסד ואמת describes God's character in 2 Sam 2:6; 15:20; Ps 25:10 [24:10 LXX]; 61:8 [60:8 LXX; 61:7 Eng.]; 85:11 [84:11 LXX; 85:10 Eng.]; 89:15 [88:15 LXX; 89:14 Eng.]; 117:2 [LXX 116:2]; and ורב־חסד appears in Num 14:18; Neh 9:17; Ps 86:5 [85:5 LXX]; 103:8 [102:8 LXX]; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2 (each time translated καὶ πολυέλεος in the LXX); cf. Hanson, "John I. 14-18," 91, 99-100.

[30] *God Dwells with Us*, 27; cf. also Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:36; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 44; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 15-16; Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 48; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 108; Koester, *Dwelling of God*, 115; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 124; Um, *Temple Christology*, 154; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 112, 124-26 (though he admits the question is "not easy to answer;" 124); partial exceptions include: Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:419, 422-24, 2:884; Borgen, "Creation, Logos and the Son," 95; and esp. Hanson, "John 1. 14-18," 96-97; Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 200-208.

(LXX) will pass before Moses, but he will not be able to see God's "face." Then in 33:21-23 God promises to hide Moses until *after* his glory passes so Moses will only see his "back." Yet in the end 34:6 simply states that "the LORD passed before him."[31] Perhaps that is why the Jewish tradition boasts two very different views on the matter. Some maintained God's absolute invisibility,[32] but others fostered a vibrant apocalyptic (and perhaps mystical) tradition in which various figures claimed at least a partial vision of the one on God's throne.[33] Nearly all studies on John's prologue think it defends the first view, but in light of the relation we have seen between the λόγος and God, may we not see here a similar relation involving God's glory? Both Exodus and John imply a distinction between what can and cannot be seen of God (even if the details are ambiguous). Exodus 33-34 appears to distinguish between God's "glory" or "goodness," which will "pass before you" (33:19) and God's "face," which "no one shall see" (33:20). John 1:18 also pairs the claim that "no one has ever seen God" with a claim that Jesus has "made him known" (1:18). As Anthony Hanson, Wilson Paroschi and others have argued, John's point seems to be that while God in Godself is and always has been invisible, God has been known through the λόγος and glory. It is this very same λόγος that has "lived among us," and whose glory has been seen most fully in the flesh.[34] Thus, when 1:18 says no one has *ever* seen God, but the μονογενής has "made him known," this

[31] The relation between God's "glory" and "face" is thus unclear. On the difficulties interpreting Exodus 33-34, cf. Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 595-600, 610. "Probably the most definite thing which one can say is that all these stories revolve about the one theme of God's presence" (*Book of Exodus*, 585, referring specifically to ch. 33; cf. also John I. Durham, *Exodus* [WBC 3; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987], 450-52).

[32] E.g. 1QS 11.18-20; *2 En*. 48:5; cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 15; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:423 nn. 564, 566-69.

[33] E.g. Sir 45:3; 49:8; Philo, *Moses* 1.158; cf. Warren Carter, "The Prologue and John's Gospel: Function, Symbol and the Definitive Word," *JSNT* 39 (1990): 43-48; Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 150-171; Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 48; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:423 nn. 565, 570. On the exalted claims made for Moses in some Jewish works; cf. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," 354-371.

[34] Cf. Hanson, "John 1. 14-18," 90-101; Paroschi *Incarnation and Covenant*, 200-8, with bibliography.

should not be taken to indicate a reversal of God's fundamental invisibility,[35] for Jesus is the incarnation of the one through whom God has *always* been known.

Of course, for John to claim this about a *man* was probably unprecedented,[36] but many Jewish texts do maintain that God's glory, Wisdom or λόγος were seen throughout Israel's history. God's glory filled the Tabernacle (Exod 40:34) and the Temple (2 Chr 5:13-14). Wisdom was present in the cloud, in the Tabernacle and on Zion (Sir 24). Wisdom is "a pure emanation of the glory [δόξα] of the Almighty" (Wis 7:25). Philo is especially emphatic that while God cannot be seen, God's λόγος can be.[37] John 12:37-41 may imply the same thing. Here John applies Isa 53:1 and 6:10 to Jesus, then claims "Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke about him" (John 12:41). Though some think this means Isaiah saw a vision of the incarnate Jesus,[38] the reference to "glory" points more clearly to Isaiah's vision of "the LORD seated on a throne, high and lofty, and the hem of his robe filled the Temple… the whole earth is full [πλήρης] of his glory [δόξα]" (6:1, 3). Here also the one on the throne seems to be invisible (only "the hem of his robe" is seen), yet not only the Temple but *the whole earth* is full of his glory. For John to quote from this context and assert that it was *Jesus'* glory that Isaiah saw,

---

[35] The universal scope of the denial is emphasized by Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 48; Hanson notes that 1 John 4:7-20 also affirms the utter invisibility of God, even among believers (cf. esp. 4:12, 20; "John I. 14-18," 94).

[36] Unless Barker is correct; cf. *Gate of Heaven*, 133-177; *The Great Angel*, *passim*.

[37] *Confusion* 96-97; *Dreams* 229-230, 238-39, though cf. *Spec. Laws* 1.41-50; Note also the Targumic references to God's *Shekinah* or *Memra* being seen (e.g., the Targums Onqelas, Neofiti, and Pseudo-Jonathan on Exod 33:23; 34:5-6; 40:34). Coloe, who thinks these may stand behind John's prologue, admits that in the Targums, "the word can be heard, the glory can be seen, albeit veiled in a cloud, and God's dwelling among us can be experienced" (*God Dwells with Us*, 61), but if John does use these terms in so similar a manner to the Targums, why should this be called a "polemic" against the rabbinic view, as she calls it (*God Dwells with Us*, 62-63; cf. 27-28)?

[38] Cf. 8:56; also Sir 48:24-25; *Asc. Isa.* 6-11; so Craig A. Evans, "The Obduracy of the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 232; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 126; Köstenberger, *John*, 391-92; Brown notes the possibility without deciding on it (*Gospel According to John*, 1:486-87). Coloe, Hoskins and Um do not even mention 12:41.

seems to imply that the glory seen in the Temple and elsewhere was in fact that of the pre-incarnate Jesus.[39] If 1:14-18 may be read the same way, John's point would be that it was the glory *of the λόγος* that was seen on Sinai and in the Tabernacle, the same glory that has now been seen even more fully in the flesh.[40] There is certainly a discontinuity here, but it is not in the replacement of an institution but in the incarnation itself. On Sinai it was revealed *that* God is "full of grace and truth"; in Jesus God's grace and truth actually *became* flesh.[41]

Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος in 1:16-17

Perhaps the most significant obstacle to such a non-polemical interpretation appears in 1:16-17. After an apparent parenthesis in 1:15,[42] these verses take up where 1:14 left off, "from his fullness we have all received [χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος]. The law was indeed given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." Most translations and many commentators read χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος as "grace upon grace" or "one

---

[39] As most accept, e.g., Keener: "in the Fourth Gospel, the glory witnessed by Israelite prophets was that of Jesus himself (12:41)" (*Gospel of John*, 1:419, cf. 2:882-85; so also on 12:41: Hanson, "John I. 14-18," 96; Bruce, *John*, 272; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 217; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 358; Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 206-7; several of whom note that the Targum specifies that it was "the glory of the Lord" [6:1] and "the glory of the *Shekinah* of the Lord" [6:5] that Isaiah saw). It is strange how many accept that Isaiah saw Jesus' pre-incarnate glory in 12:41, but still read 1:18a as a polemic against Moses (e.g. Beasley-Murray, *John*, cf. 15-16, 217).

[40] So also Hanson, "John 1. 14-18," 96-97; Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 200-208; Keener comes close to this position, allowing that Moses saw *part* of God's glory (though not "all" of it; *Gospel of John*, 1:422). He rightly affirms that "Christ is greater than Moses as the one whom Moses saw is greater than Moses" (*Gospel of John*, 1:419; cf. 2:884; cf. also Borgen, "Creation, Logos and the Son," 92-97).

[41] So Bruce: "The glory seen in the incarnate Word was the glory which was revealed to Moses when the name of Yahweh was sounded in his ears: but now that glory has been manifested on earth in a human life" (*John*, 42; cf. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 76; Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God,"* 111; but contrast Bruce, *John*, 43; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 80; Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God,"* 110-111).

[42] Though John 1:15 seems to be parenthetical (the ὀτί in 1:16 would then be resumptive; so Beasley-Murray, *John*, 15), Kerr notes that by further emphasizing Jesus' pre-existence, it advances the main point of 1:14 (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 113 n. 22). He follows Mowvley in noting that this reference to the "witness" of John the Baptist may be intended to guard against the potential inference that Jesus is "the tent of witness" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 121-22 nn. 47-48; Mowvley, "John 1^{14-18}," 136), but Kerr misses the key point: this would imply that Jesus is *not* the Tabernacle, but the one met in it. He is not the new "tent of witness" but the one to whom the tent bore witness.

blessing after another,"[43] but Hoskins follows Ruth Edwards in arguing that ἀντί should be translated "instead of" or "in place of."[44] They then argue that 1:17 clarifies these two uses of χάρις, and take this to mean the replacement of the "gracious gift" of the Torah with the "gracious gift" of "grace and truth" in Jesus.[45]

Admittedly, this employs a far more common meaning of ἀντί than "grace upon grace" does,[46] but as many note, precedent for the traditional translation might be found in Philo, *Posterity* 145, which uses ἀντί to affirm that God gives gifts (χάριτες) one after another.[47] Edwards and Hoskins insist that even here ἀντί should be translated "instead of," and the standard translations of Philo appear to agree,[48] but the fact that the gifts in question include God's unfolding revelation (cf. *Posterity* 143), seems to make this unlikely, as it is hardly plausible that Philo thinks God's newer revelations replace God's older ones.[49] Whether this is accepted or not, it is at least certain that Philo does not intend a polemical force to his use of ἀντί here, as all are gifts of God, and he may well

---

[43] E.g. NRSV, ESV, NASB, NIV, NET; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 43; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:421; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 116; Hanson, "John I. 14-18," 97; Edwards lists Bultmann, Schnackenburg, Lindars, Barrett, Gnilka and Bruce as proponents of this view ("Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος," 5); it is also accepted by LSJ 153 and BDAG 88.

[44] Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος," 3, 5-6; Hoskings, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 120-25; cf. Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 212; this is the primary definition given by LSJ 153 and BDAG 87-88 (though not the one applied to John 1:16; cf. n. 46 below); NJB follows this with "one gift replacing another;" NAB has "grace in place of grace."

[45] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 121-23; cf. Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος," 6-12; also accepted by Beasley-Murray, *John*, 15; Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 46-47; Köstenberger, *John*, 46-47; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 107-8; Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 212; cf. Ashton, "Transformation," 169.

[46] The first definition of ἀντί in BDAG does indicate, "that one person or thing is, or is to be, replaced by another, *instead of, in place of*" (BDAG 87; cf. LSJ 153); John 1:16 is placed under the second definition, "indicating that one thing is equiv. to another, *for, as, in place of*," even insisting John is "differently to be understood" than all the others in this category (almost all of which reflect *lex talionis*; BDAG 88).

[47] Noted by BDAG 88; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:15-16; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 65 n. 29; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 116 n. 30; Hanson, "John I. 14-18," 97; Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος," 5.

[48] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 120-21 n. 62, citing Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος," 5-6. Colson and Whitaker translate, "others in their stead, and a third supply to replace the second, and ever new in place of earlier boons" (LCL; cf. Young, *Works of Philo*, 147; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 107).

[49] Cf. Hanson, "John I. 14-18," 97.

mean something like "after" or "upon."[50] Either way, this gives grounds for reading John's use of ἀντί in a non-polemical manner as well.

Yet few seem to do so. Hoskins notes that even those who read ἀντί in the synthetic sense of "upon" generally do not deny replacement in 1:17; they simply wish to avoid the implication that the Torah is also a χάρις.[51] That is, to maintain a contrast between "grace" and "law," they deny that 1:17 explains the two χάριτες from 1:16. Kerr makes this explicit: "If ἀντί means 'in place of,' as Edwards insists, then it follows that the grace and truth that come by Jesus Christ have replaced other grace, presumably the grace that was given by Moses, namely the law. But there is nothing in v. 17 that indicates that grace and truth have come via the law."[52] Yet for Kerr the Torah is still "redundant" and "superseded,"[53] he simply denies that it was ever a source of "grace and truth" in the first place. Meanwhile, Hoskins may read 1:17 synthetically, "identifying the successive graces of 1:16,"[54] but since he interprets ἀντί as "in place of," he still claims that "The Law was replaced by the second gracious gift, the grace and truth that came though Jesus Christ."[55] Replacement is such a controlling motif, it seems, that it is maintained both by those who read 1:17 antithetically *and* by those who read it synthetically.

Yet there is a third option left unconsidered: to read *both* verses synthetically, so 1:17 does clarify the two χάριτες in 1:16, but does not contrast them. In support of this,

---

[50] *Posterity* 143 claims God limits his "oracular power" so as not to overwhelm his listeners; 144 compares this to the seasons, then 145 applies this generally to all of God's gifts. The point, however, does not seem to be that God takes away one gift to give another, but that God gives gifts a little at a time. Though this sequential sense for ἀντί is rare, it does appear in LXX Josh 24:20 and Judges 11:36 (in Codex A), which translate אחרי אשר with ἀνθ' ὧν.

[51] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 121-22; even Hanson accepts this ("John I. 14-18," 96-97); despite admitting that Sinai "was the revelation of God in Christ" (97), he still thinks this is "contrasted" with the Law, which "is certainly regarded as temporary, obsolete, and above all indirect (cf. Gal. iii. 19)" (96-97).

[52] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 115-16.

[53] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 131.

[54] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 121.

[55] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 122; cf. Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος," 8-9.

note that 1:16 explicitly states that *both* χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος are received from the same "fullness" (πλήρωμα) of the λόγος.[56] If Edwards and Hoskins are correct that the two "gifts" of 1:16 correspond to the two halves of 1:17—and this does seem the most natural reading[57]—this means the Torah is given *by the λόγος*, allowing 1:17 to be read in a complementary and sequential manner as well. Since the Torah was *given* through Moses, while grace and truth *became* (ἐγένετο) though Jesus—a clear allusion to σάρξ ἐγένετο in 1:14—that means the Torah is indeed a "gift," but Jesus is not just another gift to replace the first; he is the incarnation of the one who *gave* the gift of the Torah in the first place.

That this is John's point is also suggested by the comparison with Exodus 34, which follows the same pattern that we find in John 1:17. First, the Torah is, in John's words, "given through Moses," as Moses is commanded to remake the tablets he broke during the golden calf incident (Exod 34:1-4).[58] Then immediately after this, Moses is granted the revelation of God's חסד ואמת, the Sinai theophany itself. (34:5-6).[59] Now if it is undeniable that in Exodus the Sinai theophany was in no sense thought to "replace" the giving of Torah,[60] but was rather a second (and fuller) gift given to Moses, should we not understand in the same way John's own assertion that, "the Torah was indeed given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ"?[61] John's point is not the

[56] A point also made by Hoskins, though he does not draw the same conclusions (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 123).

[57] This gives the use of ὀτί in 1:17 its full weight and clarifies the ambiguity of 1:16 (cf. Edwards, "Χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος," 8; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 121-22).

[58] Childs observes that Moses is commanded to procure the stones, but it is still God who writes on them (Exod 34:1, 4-5; cf. 32:15-16; *Book of Exodus*, 611).

[59] Childs also notes that the Sinai theophany is presented as a re-establishment of the covenant first given in chs. 19-20 (*Book of Exodus*, 612). In other words, the revelation of God's character and glory serve as the basis for the Torah, much as the "fullness" of the λόγος is presented as the source of both "gifts" in John 1:16-17. Paroschi also notes this, though it does not prevent him from concluding, "the grace of Sinai has been replaced by the grace of incarnation" (*Incarnation and Covenant*, 212, cf. 210-13).

[60] Much less the Tabernacle, which is built right after this (cf. Exodus 35-40, esp. 40:34-38).

[61] Sirach 45:3-5 provides another close parallel to John 1:17, claiming God gave Moses "commandments for his people, and revealed to him his glory [δόξα]" (NRSV); according to the KJV and NJB Moses only

"replacement" of one gift by another, but rather that the very one who gave the Torah and appeared on Sinai, has now *become* flesh.[62] Like a parent who gives gifts to their children, God gives gifts to "the children of God" (1:13), but God's presence in Jesus does not "replace" those gifts, for they remain expressions of God's love and grace.[63]

Returning to 1:14, John's claim that "we have seen his glory," far from implying a "polemic" against Moses, instead affirms that the vision of God's glory Moses *did* glimpse has now been made even more fully available to *all* who believe, in Jesus. Yet that immediately begs another question, our last: *How* did Jesus incarnate God's glory? That is where John's description of Jesus as μονογενής becomes vital.

The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son in 1:14 and 18

John 1:14 specifies that the glory "we have seen" is in fact the glory of the μονο-γενής. John 1:18 further adds that it is the μονογενής who has made God known.[64] Liddel

---

saw "part of" or "something of his glory" (respectively; followed by R. A. F. MacKenzie, *Sirach* [Wilmington, Del: Michael Glazier, 1983], 171), but this qualifier is without basis in the text. The Greek is ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ πρὸς λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, while the Heb. is defective: [……..]ויר […]ל[.] ויצוהו (preserved only in B; Heb. text from Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and A Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* [VTSupp 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 79; cf. also Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987], 506, 509).

[62] Keener also notes, "the contrast of John 1:17 is between something good and something better, which are not mutually exclusive…. John accepts the divine origin of the Torah ('it was given' is presumably a divine passive) and the Mosaic agency, but contends that Christ, not Moses, is the mediator of the character of God to which the law bore witness" (*Gospel of John*, 1:422, cf. 421; but cf. 1:422 n. 554; cf. also Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 43).

[63] To elaborate: In a healthy relationship, a parent's gifts remain an expression of love even in their presence; it is only in an unhealthy relationship that the gifts might be seen to replace, or be replaced by, the parent. Thus, to cling to the gift while *rejecting* the one who gave it misapprehends the purpose of the gift itself, but to treasure the gift *as a gift* is expected. Applying this to John, the Torah and Tabernacle, when properly understood, are gifts of the same λόγος that has become flesh. Yet the gifts have *not* been properly understood, "he came to what was his own, and his own people did not receive him" (1:11; cf. 5:37-47). There is polemic, then, against those who reject Jesus for the Torah, but John is not attempting to "replace" the Torah, any more than a parent replaces the gifts they give.

[64] The earliest mss read [ὁ] μονογενὴς θεός (without the article: P^{66}, **א***, B, C*, L, etc.; with the article: P^{75}, **א**^{2}, 33, etc.), while many later mss, versions and Fathers read ὁ μονογενὴς ὑιός (A, C^{3}, W^{supp}, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f^{1}, f^{13}, etc.). Thus, the mss evidence is inconclusive, but since [ὁ] μονογενὴς θεός is the more difficult reading (and has the earliest attestation), it is likely original, making ὁ μονογενὴς ὑιός a scribal assimilation

and Scott define μονογενής as "*the only member of a kin* or *kind*; hence, generally, *only*, *single*…unique."[65] The term is particularly fitting here, for it not only highlights Jesus' unique relationship with God,[66] but also recalls the long Jewish tradition of the "beloved son," which carried strong connotations of death and resurrection.[67] Throughout the Jewish Scriptures and in many later texts we hear of certain children especially favored by God or their parents. These are often called יחיד, which the LXX usually translates ἀγαπητός, but occasionally glosses μονογενής.[68] As Jon Levenson has shown, this attribution is always ominous, since in each case the "beloved" is blessed and exalted only after facing some deadly peril.[69] This is true of every other New Testament occurrence of μονογενής, including Luke's three uses of the term for only children whom Jesus saves from death (7:12; 8:42; 9:38), Hebrews' description of Isaac as μονογενής in the context of his near-sacrifice (11:17-19), and all three Johannine uses of the term outside the prologue, each of which is associated with Jesus' death (John 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9).[70]

---

to 3:16, 18. So Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 169-70; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:17; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2-3 n. e; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 111 n. 20; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 93 n. 2; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:425-6; Köstenberger, *John*, 50. Either way, it is as μονογενής that Jesus makes God known.

[65] LSJ 1144; similarly BDAG: "1. pert. to being the only one of its kind within a specific relationship, *one and only*, *only*… 2. pert. to being the only one of its kind or class, *unique (in kind)*"; the Johannine references are placed in the latter category (BDAG 658).

[66] Fennema translates 1:18a, "the only Son, (himself) God" ("God the Only Son," 131). Note that Wis 7:22 calls Wisdom μονογενής, Col 1:15-18 uses πρωτότοκος of Christ (cf. also Heb 1:6), and Philo uses πρωτόγονος to describe the λόγος (*Agriculture* 51; *Confusion* 63; 146; *Dreams* 215).

[67] Cf. Jon D. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), esp. 53-199. Fennema especially emphasizes that in all other NT occurrences, μονογενής carries a filial sense ("only child") even when not explicitly accompanied by υἱός or θυγάτηρ ("God the Only Son," 126-27).

[68] Cf. the A text of Judg 11:34; cf. also Tob 3:15; 6:14; 8:17. The connection between μονογενής and יחיד, and especially the use of these terms for Isaac, have been noted by many commentators on John, e.g. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:13-14; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 41; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 14; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:414-16; Köstenberger, *John*, 43; cf. also Paroschi, *Incarnation and Covenant*, 183-87.

[69] E.g. Abel (Gen 4:1-8), Ishmael (Gen 21:8-20), Isaac (Gen 22), Esau (Gen 27-34), Jacob (e.g., Gen 27:41-45), Joseph (Gen 37, 39-45; esp. 37:3), Jephthah's daughter (Judg 11:34-40), David (e.g., 1 Sam 16; 2 Sam 7; cf. 2 Sam 11-19), Solomon (2 Sam 12:24), Israel (e.g., Hos 11), etc.

[70] John 3:16 itself may allude to Abraham's giving of Isaac; so Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:147, following Westcott, Bernard, Barrett and Glasson; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 51; Köstenberger, *John*, 43.

Therefore it is very likely that John's use of the term in 1:14 and 18 is also meant to point to the crucifixion.[71] This connection between prologue and passion is also confirmed by the climax of John's crucifixion narrative itself (19:37), where it cites Zech 12:10, which in its original context is another beloved son text:

> And I will pour out a spirit of compassion and supplication on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that, when they look upon the one whom they have pieced, they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for a beloved son [יחיד; ἀγαπητός], and weep bitterly over him, as one weeps over a firstborn [בכור; πρωτότοκος].[72]

Though John only quotes "they will look upon the one whom they have pierced," the likelihood that the full context is in view is strengthened by the reference to the Spirit being "poured out," which appears to explain the flow of blood and water from Jesus' pierced side (19:34).[73] The water recalls Jesus' Tabernacles discourse in 7:37-39, where he promised living water "from his κοιλία"—his heart or side—and there also the water was a symbol for the Spirit (7:39), as in Zechariah's image. The connection with 7:37-39 is especially significant since that passage—set on "the last and greatest day of the feast" (7:37) appears to draw on the imagery of the water-pouring ceremony performed at Tabernacles, and its traditional associations with Zechariah 14, Ezekiel 37 and other texts that anticipate God's return to the Temple to pour out from it life-giving waters.[74] Similarly, the blood from Jesus' side, along with various other details of 19:23-37,

---

[71] Coloe also notes that 1:14's use of σάρξ points the same way, as most of John's other uses of the term allude to Jesus' death (cf. 3:6; 6:51-63; *God Dwells with Us*, 25; cf. Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 41; but cf. 8:15; 17:2).

[72] The relevance of this text for John 19 is also emphasized by Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 206-9.

[73] We will discuss this passage further in Chapter Five below.

[74] Most note an allusion to these texts (e.g. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:327-29; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 127, 130-31; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 237-41; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 165-66; Um, *Temple Christology*, 156-59), but several other texts might be in view instead, especially if one does not follow the christological punctuation of 7:38. The common denominator in virtually all proposed backgrounds is that the ultimate source of water is God, and this—I believe—is John's real point: to picture Jesus as the source of water, not in replacement of the Temple, but as the embodiment of the life-giving God of the Temple; cf. our discussion in Chapter Four below. Recall also McKelvey's suggestion that σκηνόω in 1:14 points forward to the Tabernacles discourse (*The New Temple*, 75-76).

alludes to the setting at the Passover and the discourse in John 6. The Passover itself also boasted longstanding associations with the Temple and the beloved son, especially in relation to the near sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22.[75] The ties between John's passion narrative, the beloved son tradition and Israel's sanctuary appear to run deep, and in the coming chapters will see that they bring to a climax the Temple and festival motifs that underlie so much of the Fourth Gospel.

Thus, if John's prologue uses λόγος, σκηνόω, and δόξα to affirm that the one who became flesh in Jesus is the same Wisdom and glory that also appeared to Moses and dwelt in Israel's Tabernacle, its use of μονογενής points to *how* Jesus embodies these—in his life-giving death. It is on the cross that Jesus is finally and completely "glorified," as the prologue implies and 12:23-36 makes explicit, but both the prologue and 12:37-41 also imply that this is not the first time God's glory has been seen. Jesus is, in fact, the incarnation of the same one whose glory *has also been seen* on Sinai, in the Tabernacle, and in the Temple. He does not replace these institutions, but rather embodies the one met within them.

Conclusion

As the incarnation of the λόγος, of the glory Moses *did* see (however imperfectly) on Sinai, John's prologue affirms that Jesus is the fulfillment of God's history with Israel, but not its replacement. Anticipating the image that will be central throughout the Temple and festival theme, John insists that in Jesus, and especially in his death and resurrection

[75] The Temple was placed on Mt. Moriah in 2 Chr 3:1, and was built by another "beloved son," Solomon (cf. 2 Sam 12:24; 1 Kgs 1:12; 5-9; 1 Chr 22; 28:6; 2 Chr 1-10). By the first century, the Temple was also where the Pascal lambs were slaughtered, and the Passover itself was tied to Isaac's "sacrifice" at least as early as *Jubilees* 18. Later Jewish tradition strongly emphasized these connections, making the *Aqedah* (the "binding" of Isaac) the basis for both the Passover and the daily Tamid offering (cf. Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 114-123, 173-199). Coloe finds allusions to the binding of Isaac in John's references to Jesus being "bound" in 18:12, 24 and 19:17 (*God Dwells with Us*, 191-92).

as the μονογενής, God's self-revelation finds its definitive form. For if 1:14 and 16 allude to Sinai, it is notable that the Sinai theophany itself was quintessentially a revelation of God's mercy, grace and forgiveness, given in the aftermath of the golden calf incident (cf. Exod 32:1-33:6; 34:6-10). By identifying Jesus as the μονογενής, "full of grace and truth," John implies that it is *as* the dying and rising "only son" that God's mercy and forgiveness, "grace and truth" are fully revealed, or rather *embodied* (cf. 1:29, 36). Thus it is *as* the μονογενής that Jesus has "made God known."

Chapter Two
The Temple and "The Temple of His Body" in John 2:13-23

If John's prologue does not present Jesus as the replacement of the Tabernacle, but as the incarnation of the glory of God that was seen there, we cannot assume that subsequent references to Israel's sanctuaries imply their replacement either. This chapter will focus on the Temple incident in 2:13-23. It will be argued that when John refers to "the Temple of [Jesus'] body" (2:21), it is not replacing the Temple, but marking Jesus' deep connection to it. When properly understood, the Temple is "my Father's house" (2:16), but it has *not* been properly understood, and ironically this ensures that Jesus' very "zeal" *for* the Temple leads to his death, and with it, the Temple's destruction. Drawing on 14:1-3, however, it will be suggested that Jesus' raising will also "prepare" the heavenly or eschatological Temple to which Jerusalem has always pointed. This not only allows a true understanding of Jesus' relation to the Temple, but also enables believers to experience the eschatological presence of God.

Larger Context in John 1-4

In line with the prologue, John 1:19-4:54 repeatedly emphasizes Jesus' identity in light of his Jewish background.[1] In chapter 1, John the Baptist testifies to Jesus' pre-existence (1:15, 30) and calls him "the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (1:29, cf. 36).[2] Then a series of titles present Jesus as Son of God (1:34, 49), rabbi (1:38, 49), Messiah (1:41), the one Moses and the prophets wrote about (1:45), king of Israel

[1] Kerr sees this whole section as a chiasm, which "balances the theme of the new Temple in B (2:13-25) with the theme of the new worship in B' (4:1-42)" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 168-69; cf. Um, *Temple Christology*, 186).

[2] It is debatable whether this alludes to Jesus' death, Passover, the Aqedah, the "suffering servant" of Isaiah 53:7, a messianic title, etc. (McKelvey, *New Temple*, 76-77; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 198; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 207-211; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 176), but regardless, the focus is on Jesus' identity.

(1:49) and Son of Man (1:51).[3] This sequence climaxes with Jesus' claim that, "you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (1:51). This alludes to Jacob's dream at Bethel (Gen 28:12-22), and many think it implies the replacement either of Israel's sanctuary or of Jacob himself. Hoskins claims, "the Son of Man is the true link between God in heaven and human beings on earth…. As such, he is the fulfillment and replacement of those places where God revealed himself to his people, including Bethel, the Tabernacle, and the Temple."[4] Yet the context points more to continuity than replacement, calling Jesus "the one about whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote" (1:45). At the least, there is no reason to assume that Jesus is replacing Bethel itself (which is not mentioned), and Neyrey may even be correct that Jesus corresponds to the *Lord* of Jacob's theophany.[5]

Some also find replacement in the wedding at Cana (2:1-11), since Jesus produces miraculous wine in "six stone water jars, for the purification of the Jews."[6] As Coloe puts it, "the six jars of water point to the inadequacy of Israel's religious institutions, an inadequacy now brought to perfection by the coming of the true bridegroom (John 3:29)."[7] Yet

---

[3] The Baptist also denies two titles for himself which are later applied to Jesus, again stressing Jesus' uniqueness: "the Christ" (1:20; 3:28; cf. e.g. 1:17; 4:25, 29; 20:31), and "the Prophet" (1:21; 1:25; cf. e.g. 4:19; 6:14; 7:40; 9:17).

[4] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple,* 126; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 73, 215; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 448, 455; Kerr rightly denies replacement here, identifying the "greater things" the disciples will see as "nothing less than the heavenly exaltation and glorification of Jesus, the Son of Man" (Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 165).

[5] Jerome H. Neyrey, "The Jacob Allusions in John 1:51," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 589; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 165. Hoskins thinks Jesus is pictured as the ladder (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 132), but if even if so, the ladder was more closely associated with revelation than sanctuary in pre-Christian texts, and this seems to fit John's context better (so Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 136-166, esp. 165-66; cf. Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 133).

[6] My translation; κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Most English translations paraphrase this, e.g., "for the Jewish rites of purification" (NRSV; cf. NASB), or "used by the Jews for ceremonial washing" (NIV; cf. NJB); NKJ is somewhat better with "according to the manner of purification of the Jews."

[7] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 69; it is unclear what she means by this, as she goes on to say, "Israel's water rituals have been perfected," but also that "the jars of purification and the Temple in Jerusalem give way before Jesus" (*God Dwells with Us,* 69). Stanley D. Toussaint claims the fact that the wedding ran out of wine at all points to "the obsolescence of Judaism" ("The Significance of the First Sign in John's

John does not emphasize the "inadequacy" of the old, but the extravagance of the new: "you have saved the best until now" (2:10).[8] Anticipating Jesus' "hour" (2:4) and "glory" (2:11), the abundant wine and wedding feast both invoke traditional images of God's eschatological salvation.[9] That the jars are not emptied and refilled but rather filled "to the brim" (2:7) suggests not replacement but fulfillment and abundance. If the jars do represent Israel or its Torah, Jesus fills it (completely); he does not replace it.[10] One might even see in this filling of jars "for the purification of the Jews" an anticipation of the following passage, where Jesus attends a "feast of the Jews" (2:13), and clears the temple of animal sellers and money-changers.[11]

Similarly positive is the "second" of Jesus' signs in Cana (4:54), where Jesus heals the dying son of an official in "the seventh hour" (4:52). This passage explicitly affirms that the Galileans "welcomed" Jesus because, "they had seen all that he had done in Jerusalem at the festival; for they too had gone to the festival" (4:45).[12] It is unclear

---

Gospel," *BSac* 134 [1977]: 50), but even if John did mean to stress the lack of wine, nothing here equates it with *Judaism* (as a religion?).

[8] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 154.

[9] God promises wine in Gen 49:10-12; Amos 9:13-14; Isa 27:2-6; Joel 3:18; Zech 9:15-17; *1 En*. 10:19; *2 En.* 8:1-7; *2 Bar*. 29:5; a feast appears in Isa 62:5; *1 En.* 62:14; *2 En.* 42:5; Matt 8:11; 22:1-14; Luke 13:29; 14:15-24; Rev 19:7-9. These are combined in Isa 25:6-8; Hos 2:19-22; cf. Koester, *Symbolism*, 82-86; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 69; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 129; Um, *Temple Christology*, 31; Toussaint, "The First Sign," 50.

[10] One thinks of Psa 23:5, "my cup runs over," which suggests not replacement or "supersession," but overflowing outward. Note also that 1:19-2:11 seems to indicate a full week, ending at Cana, which some have connected to the eschatological Sabbath (cf. "the next day" in 1:29, 35, 43; plus "the third day" in 2:1; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 70; Köstenberger, *John*, 56). What is commonly missed, however, is that this would point to fulfillment *rather than* replacement, as the Sabbath does not abrogate the previous six days; it completes them.

[11] Mark A. Mattson notes that Ben Witherington III has made a similar suggestion (Mattson, "The Temple Incident," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* [ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 153 n. 1), and highlights several further connections between 2:1-11 and 2:13-25 (148). Kinzer notes that John elsewhere associates purification with Temple worship (11:55; 18:28; "Temple Christology," 458).

[12] Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 73. This is not discussed by Kerr, Coloe, Hoskins, or Um; even Fuglseth overlooks this positive reference to the feast (cf. *Johannine Sectarianism*, 156, 253, 299-300). Barus claims that in 4:43-45, "They welcome Jesus but do not give him honor by believing in him" ("John 2:12-25," 134), but nothing in 4:43-45 implies that their welcome was inadequate.

whether "all that he had done" includes only the "signs" of 2:23-25, the Temple incident itself, or both, but regardless this presupposes that Jesus and his followers are Temple participants.[13] This fits well with Jesus' further trips to Jerusalem (5:1; 7:10; 10:22-23; 12:12; cf. 18:20), and suggests that for John, the Temple and its festivals provide an essential context for Jesus' ministry.[14] Thus, as we turn to 2:13-23, it should not surprise that it also treats the Temple more positively than is generally recognized, as a pointer to Jesus' true identity and role. Jesus and the Temple are not mutually exclusive for John, but rather mutually interpretive.

Jesus and the Temple in 2:13-23

While the Synoptic Gospels set the Temple incident and Jesus' prophecy of its fall during his final week, John combines them at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, effectively setting the whole in the context of his passion.[15] The resulting pericope forms a "diptych," with two closely parallel halves (2:14-17, 18-22), framed by references to the Passover (2:13, 23-25).[16] As seen in the Structural Diagram (pg. 59), the parallelism is fairly strict, which makes the misunderstanding of "the Jews" in 2:20 stand out all the more. Clearly these two halves are meant to be mutually interpretive, and they seem to center on a misunderstanding about Jesus' relation to the Temple.

---

[13] *Contra* Lincoln, "the narrator is… [likely] putting distance between himself and Jewish religious festivals" (*Gospel According to Saint John*, 137).

[14] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 125, 153.

[15] The Temple incident appears in Matt 21:12-16, Mark 11:15-18 and Luke 19:45-48 and most accept that John is the one to have moved it from its actual historical setting, just before Jesus' death (e.g. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:518; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 142); John 2:18 parallels an accusation hurled at Jesus in his trial and on the cross in Mark 14:58; 15:29; Matt 26:61; 27:40; Acts 6:14. Cf. Larry J. Kreitzer, "The Temple Incident of John 2.13-25: A Preview of What is to Come," *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton* (ed. Christopher Rowland and Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis; JSNTSup 153; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998), 93-101; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:519.

[16] Cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 70, following Schnackenburg, Nereparampil and Beasley-Murray.

The Temple Incident in 2:13-17

In 2:13-17, Jesus drives the animals and money-changers from the Temple, demanding they "Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!" (2:16). This incident has been variously understood, as a "cleansing" from corruption (or externals),[17] as a prophecy of the Temple's destruction,[18] or even as an outright rejection of the whole institution.[19] Whether as a "cleansing or cursing," however, it is still generally assumed that this signals "the replacement, not simply the restoration, of Jewish worship and the temple sacrifices."[20] But is this so clear?[21]

In John 2:13 Jesus "went up [ἀναβαίνω] to Jerusalem" for the feast, employing a near-technical expression for pilgrimage (cf. also 2:23).[22] In line with this indication of Temple participation, Jesus' own explanation for his action, "Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!" (2:16), is more naturally read as a claim of loyalty to the Temple ("my Father's house") than as an attempt to replace it.[23] While there are hints of the Temple's destruction here, even these point to Jesus' connection to the Temple, as it is

---

[17] For references, cf. E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 61-63; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:121; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 39.

[18] Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61-71; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the 'Cave of Robbers': Toward a Jewish Context for the Temple Action," *BBR* 3 (1993): 110; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 416-26; Mattson, "The Temple Incident," 147; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:524-26; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 137.

[19] William W. Watty, "Jesus and the Temple – Cleansing or Cursing?" *ExpTim* 93 [1982]: 235-39; Coloe surprisingly also follows Neusner's claim that this "represents an act of the rejection of the most important rite of the Israelite cult… which now is null" (Jacob Neusner, "Money-Changers in the Temple: the Mishnah's Explanation," *NTS* 35 [1989]: 290; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 72-73).

[20] Joel R. Wohlgemut, "Where Does God Dwell? A Commentary on John 2:13-22," *Direction* 22 (1993): 88; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 72-73; Neusner, "Money-Changers," 290; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 77; Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God"*, 107.

[21] Cf. Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 63, 67; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 462-63; Barus, "John 2:12-25," 129, 131-32; Mattson, "Temple Incident," 147-48; and esp. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 117-185; Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple*, 77-100.

[22] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:115; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 71 n. 28; Barus, "John 2:15-25," 131; Francis J. Moloney claims "the narrator's main purpose is to set what follows firmly within a Jewish world and a Jewish feast" ("Reading John 2:13-22: The Purification of the Temple," *RB* 97 [1990]: 439 n.20; cf. 439-440; Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 98).

[23] Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 100-101.

Structural Diagram: John 2:13-23

Frame: [13] The Passover of the Jews was near, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

Problem: [14] In the temple he found people selling cattle, sheep, and doves, and the money-changers seated at their tables.

Jesus' Response: [15] Making a whip of cords, he drove all of them out of the temple, both the sheep and the cattle. He also poured out the coins of the money changers and overturned their tables.

Explanation: [16] He told those who were selling the doves, "Take these things out of here! Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!"

Disciples Remember: [17] His disciples remembered that it was written, "Zeal for your house will consume me." [Psalm 69:9]

Problem: [18] The Jews then said to him, "What sign can you show us for doing this?"

Jesus' Response: [19] Jesus answered them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."

The Response of "the Jews": [20] The Jews then said, "This temple has been under construction for forty-six years, and will you raise it up in three days?"

Explanation: [21] But he was speaking of the temple of his body.

Disciples Remember: [22] After he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the word that Jesus had spoken.

Frame: [23] When he was in Jerusalem during the Passover festival, many believed in his name because they saw the signs that he was doing.

---

precisely "zeal for your house" that will "consume" Jesus (2:17). This quotes Psalm 69:9a, and seems to point to Jesus' death,[24] which would mean that it is zeal *for* the Temple that will cause it.[25]

[24] The past tense is found in the Psalm ("has consumed me"), but John uses the future tense, which most take as an allusion to the crucifixion (so Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:124; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 73-75; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 83-86; also accepted by, e.g., McKelvey, *New Temple*, 77; Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 66; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 448; Barus, "John 2:12-25," 129; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 138-39; Kreitzer, "Preview," 97-98). John's other allusions to Ps 69 (15:25; 19:29) also point to his death.

[25] As Lieu notes, "The Temple is the object of Jesus' zeal, a term laden with significance in Jewish tradition where zeal often is associated with the Temple or with the maintenance of sole fidelity to God who alone is to be acknowledged there, and frequently does lead to death…. If zeal is the affirmation of the

Yet it might be objected that in John it is *not* Jesus' zeal for the Temple that leads to his death, as it is in the Synoptics. It is true that the Temple incident appears at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, with the raising of Lazarus taking its place at the end, but in fact John also stresses the connection between Jesus' death and the Temple, and not just in 2:17. Twice in John "the Jews" attempt to stone Jesus (8:59 and 10:31), and both times this occurs in the Temple, in direct response to his festival discourses (cf. also 5:14-18; 7:19, 25). In 14:1-3 as well, Jesus says he will "go away" (presumably referring to his death) to prepare a place for the disciples in "my Father's house." Most importantly, the actual plot to have Jesus killed is explicitly tied to the Temple in 11:45-53, and Jesus' response to the only question the high priests ask of him summarizes his ministry as "in the synagogues and in the temple" (18:20). Finally, as we will see, John's crucifixion account itself is laced with allusions to the Temple festivals. Thus, the mere fact that Lazarus' resurrection now stands where the Temple incident did in the Synoptics by no means indicates a reduced emphasis on the connection between Jesus' death and his relation to the Temple. Quite the contrary, the placement of the Temple incident at the beginning can be seen to *heighten* its importance, setting the stage for the whole ministry as a conflict over the correct understanding of the Temple, and foreshadowing Jesus' death and resurrection (cf. 2:22).[26]

It is also worth nothing that Psalm 69 itself goes on to anticipate the restoration of "Zion" (v. 35; MT v. 36),[27] so John's invocation of this text could be meant to set Jesus'

---

sovereignty of God, then it is a mark of his zeal that the Temple is the primary location where Jesus claims the absolute authority to speak for and represent God who sent him" ("Temple and Synagogue," 68; cf. Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 110).

[26] Kreitzer, "Preview," 93-105.

[27] Psalm 69:30-31 [MT 69:31-32] does say that "thanksgiving" is more pleasing than sacrifice, but does so within a context of fundamental Temple loyalty; so Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms* [NIBC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999], 268; Richard J Clifford, *Psalms 1-72* [AOTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002], 320-25;

Temple action in the framework of earlier attempts to restore the Temple. After all, the Jewish prophets voiced much more strident denunciations of the sacrifices than this, and their goal appears to have been reform and purification, not abolition.[28] In fact, two such prophetic passages seem to stand behind John 2:13-17: Mal 3:1-3 and Zech 14:21. The first anticipates a day when "the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his Temple" (3:1) to "purify [καθαρίζω] the descendents of Levi and refine [χέω; or "pour"] them like gold and silver" (3:3). Καθαρίζω could connect with the sign at Cana, with its reference to "the purification [καθαρισμός] of the Jews," while χέω closely parallels John 2:15's claim that Jesus "poured [ἐκχέω] out the coins of the money-changers."[29] If this is in view, it not only emphasizes the purification of the Temple,[30] but may even identify Jesus with *the Lord* who will appear.[31] Jesus is not referred to as κύριος here, but he is elsewhere in John, so this could imply that Jesus' Temple action in some way embodies the return of Israel's God. In line with such a reading, John 2:16 may allude to Zech 14:21, which anticipates a day when "there will no longer be traders[32] in the house of the

---

Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Continental Commentary* [trans. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993] , 60-62, 69; James Luther Mays, *Psalms* [Interp.; Louisville: John Knox, 1994], 229-233); but cf. John Eaton, *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with and Introduction and New Translation* [New York: T&T Clark, 2003], 255-57).

[28] Cf. Amos 5:21-24; Hos 6:6; 8:12-9:7; 10:1-2; Isa 1:11-17; Mic 6:6-8; Jer 7; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John,* 1:121-22; Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 101. Spatafora recognizes this, but she claims Jesus is different (*From the "Temple of God",* 107, cf. 106-110; cf. also Nereparampil, "New Worship," 220-224).

[29] Kerr notes the connection with χέω (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 73-74, following Carson, Bruce, Hoskins, etc.).

[30] It is important to note that by "purification," we are *not* suggesting a return to the old view which claimed that Jesus was cleansing worship of externals (criticized by Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism,* 61-62). This is evident from the context in Malachi, which affirms that "the offerings of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the LORD, as in days of old, and as in former days" (Mal 3:4; cf. David L. Peterson, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995], 211).

[31] Malachi is notably ambiguous about whom "the Lord" indicates. Is he "the messenger" mentioned in 3:1, or is he "the LORD" who is speaking? (cf. Peterson, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi,* 211-12; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco: Word, 1984), 328.

[32] Instead of John's ἐμπόριον, Zechariah has כנעני/Χαναναῖος ("Canaanite;" sometimes used to mean "trader" or "merchant"; cf. BDB 489), but it is understandable that John would replace a term with such nationalistic connotations. Kerr lists proponents in Brown, Barrett, Beasley-Murray, and Carson, with

LORD of hosts." In context, this also looks to God's eschatological return, when "The LORD will be king over the whole earth" (14:9) and all nations will "go up" to Jerusalem (ἀναβαίνω; cf. John 2:13) "to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the festival of booths" (Zech 14:16). If this text is in view, it again implies restoration rather than replacement,[33] and could also point to Jesus' divine kingship.[34]

Yet if John does have such texts in mind, what sort of restoration or purification can he mean? I would suggest that Jesus is seeking to restore the Temple to its true purpose: to point beyond itself to the heavenly Temple, and especially to Israel's God.[35] Properly understood, the Temple is "my Father's house," an expression that points both to God's presence in the Temple, and his close relation to Jesus. By making it "a marketplace" (2:16), however, "the Jews" have so obscured this purpose that even when

---

Bruce and Schnackenburg offering more tentative support (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 74 n. 14; 74-76; also accepted by Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 138).

[33] *Contra* Lincoln, who thinks Zech 14:21's claim that "every pot in Jerusalem and Judah will be holy to the LORD of hosts" implies "the end of he present temple order and its sacrifices in the expectation of their replacement" (*Gospel According to Sain John*, 138; cf. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 292-93). The next clause rules this out: "and all who come to sacrifice will take some of the pots and cook with them" (cf. Peterson, *Zechariah 8-14 and Malachi*, 160). Matson thinks Zech 14 is "incompatible with [John's] own view of Jesus [as] the new Temple" ("Temple Incident," 152; cf. also Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 67).

[34] Jesus' divine enthronement is emphasized especially in John's crucifixion account, which also quotes from the closely related passage in Zech 12:10 (John 19:37; see Chapter Five below). Peterson notes parallels between Zech 14 and the enthronement Psalms (Ps 93; 96, 97, 99) and notes a further allusion to the *Shema*: "on that day there will be one Lord [or the Lord shall be one] and his name shall be one" (14:9; *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 147-49).

[35] Klawans argues that the Temple was *fundamentally* symbolic, focused on *Imitatio Dei*, and maintaining the presence of God (*Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 53-73, 98-99). As Keel puts it, "Zion with its temple was the symbol and sacrament of the presence of the living, life-creating God" (*Symbolism of the Biblical World*, 112).

On Jerusalem's fundamental relation to the heavenly Temple, cf. Exod 25:9, 40; 1 Chr 28:11-19; Ps 11:4 [LXX 10:4]; 48:2 [MT 48:3; LXX 47:3]; Isa 2:2; 6:1-13; 1 Kgs 8:26-42; Wis 9:8; Heb 4:14; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.66; *Q. Exod.* 11.85; Jos., *War* 5.212-13; *Ant*. 3.124, 126, 180, 183. Cf. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 140, cf. also 103, 106, 115-176; followed by Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 455-56; Um, *Temple Christology*, 186; cf. also Levenson, "The Temple and the World," 270-298; Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 61. 65-68; Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World*, 171-76; Lundquist, "What is a Temple?" 207, 211).

On the Temple's purpose as divine dwelling, cf. Ps 11:4; 24:7, 9; 27:4; 42; 43:3; 46; 50; 63; 84 [LXX 10:4; 23:7, 9; 26:4; 41; 42:3; 45; 59; 62; 83]; Jer 3:17; Ezek 43:1-9; Hab 2:20; Zech 2:9; Mal 3:1; Tob 1:4; 2 Macc 14:35; Matt 23:21; cf. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 137; Lundquist, "What is a Temple?" 207; Mark S. Smith, "Like Deities, Like Temples (Like People)," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 3-4.

"the Lord" comes suddenly to his Temple, he is rejected by those who control it. Far from emphasizing the replacement of the Temple, 2:13-17 indicates Jesus' relation to the *God* of the Temple, and suggests that his "zeal" for the institution is so strong that it even leads to his death. This connection between the misunderstanding of the Temple and Jesus' death will become even more prominent in 2:18-22.

The Temple of His Body in 2:18-22

In the second half of the passage, "the Jews" demand a "sign" and Jesus responds, "destroy this temple and in three days I will raise [ἐγείρω] it up" (2:19). They think he means the Jerusalem Temple and object, but John clarifies that the "temple" in question is Jesus' own body (2:21). This brief but dense exchange is shaded with misunderstanding and paradox, but many think the mere reference to "the temple of his body" implies "the replacement for the Jerusalem Temple, whose days are numbered as the special locus for the presence of God and true worship (4:20-24)."[36] In light of the positive references to "my Father's house" in 2:13-17, however, this is questionable, and seems to depend on an over-reading of the definite article. Though ὁ ναός (*the* Temple of his body) can imply exclusivity,[37] it is more natural to take it in a simple anaphoric sense (that is, *the* Temple referred to before).[38] It answers the question: "What Temple?" not "What is the only Temple?" As noted in the Introduction, it was relatively common to use "temple" as a metaphor, without any presumption of exclusivity or replacement. For instance, Paul refers to the church (as a whole) as "*the* Temple of God" (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ

[36] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 116; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 101; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 83; Um, *Temple Christology*, 155-56; Matson, "Temple Incident," 151.

[37] On this aspect of the article, cf. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 222-24.

[38] On this extremely common usage of the article, cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 217-220.

θεοῦ; 1 Cor 3:17), yet goes on to call the bodies of individual believers "a temple of the holy spirit" (6:19).[39] Similarly, Jesus' body is "the temple" in John 2:21, but whether it is the only true Temple cannot be inferred from the use of the article. Given Klawans' observation that such reapplications of the Temple's symbolism generally serve to *extend* the meaning the Temple rather than replace it,[40] this reference can be seen to highlight to Jesus' essential *connection* to the Temple, not his rejection of it.[41]

This can also be seen in 2:19. Many seem to read it as though it said, "destroy this [οὗτος] Temple and in three days I will raise another [ἄλλος]."[42] What it actually says is, "destroy this [οὗτος] Temple, and in three days I will raise it [αὐτός] up," which implies that *the same Temple* that is destroyed will also be raised.[43] That is, if the Jerusalem Temple is the one destroyed, it must also be the one raised. Of course, that is precisely the misunderstanding of "the Jews," when they retort that it has taken 46 years to build (2:20), but John clarifies that Jesus was referring to his own body (2:21).[44] While there is little doubt that John also alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem here,[45] this should be seen *in parallel* with Jesus' death and raising, not in opposition to it. There is simply no

---

[39] Klawans notes that Paul uses Temple imagery in a variety of non-polemical contexts (e.g., Rom 1:9; 12:1; 15:25; 16:5; 1 Cor 16:18; 2 Cor 9:13-14; Phil 2:17; 4:18; *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 219-220; cf. also Steven M. Bryan, "The Eschatological Temple in John 14," *BBR* 15 [2005]:196-97). If Acts 21:17-29 is to be accepted, Paul even submitted to the Temple purification rites when he later visited Jerusalem.

[40] Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, esp. 66-68, 97-100, 103-6, 142-44, 173-74, 198-217.

[41] Spaulding suggests that "God's past presence in the Temple is not being denied," but rather "a new layer of knowledge and understanding is being applied to all that has gone before" (*Commemorative Identities*, 102; cf. Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 67-68; Barus, "John 2:12-25," 131-32, 135).

[42] Which would be similar to what he is accused of claiming in Mark 14:58, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands." Though it is Jesus' accusers who are claiming replacement in this passage from Mark, some think Mark sees the charge as paradoxically true (cf. Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 59; but contrast Matson, "Temple Incident," 147).

[43] Note also that οὗτος and αὐτός are used in precisely the same way in 2:20, where both clearly refer to the same thing (Herod's Temple).

[44] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 78, 81-83. Coloe notes that the scars on Jesus' resurrection body are highlighted in 20:24-29, presumably to emphasize just this continuity: it was the same Jesus who died who has been raised.

[45] Double entendre is a common feature of John's misunderstanding motif; cf. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 152-165.

basis for distinguishing the Temple that is destroyed from that which is raised in 2:19. If that is so, however, if Jerusalem's destruction is tied to Jesus' death,[46] does not the parallelism also tie Jerusalem's *restoration* to his raising?

This possibility might find support in 14:1-3, where Jesus claims that "in my Father's house there are many dwelling places" and promises that he will "go to prepare a place" (ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον) for the disciples. This is John's only other reference to "my Father's house" (cf. 2:16),[47] and τόπος is used of the Temple in John 11:48,[48] while the references to "many dwelling places"[49] and the Messiah as builder[50] both reflect expectations for the eschatological Temple. Kerr and Coloe claim this invites believers to participate in the temple of Jesus' body,[51] but as Steven Bryan argues, this identification between Jesus and "my Father's house" is extremely awkward. Jesus speaks of "my Father's house" as though it *already exists* in both 2:16 and 14:2, and certainly implies that it is distinct from himself and his disciples when he *goes* to it, and promises to *take* them there.[52] Even a metaphor can only be stretched so far. Thus, Bryan concludes,

---

[46] This "ironic connection" also appears in 11:48-50 (cf. Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 448).

[47] Though 2:16-17 has οἶκος, while 14:2 has the more relationally-oriented οἰκία (cf. 4:53; 8:35; Luke 16:27; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 161-62), the terms are used interchangeably in 11:20 and 11:31 (cf. also 12:3). In the LXX "my father's house" usually means "my family," while the Temple was commonly called *God's* "house" (e.g. Ps 23:4; 27:4 [LXX 22:6; 26:4]), so John's phrase recalls both the Temple, and Jesus' unique relation to God.

[48] Coloe notes that τόπος and ἑτοιμάζω together almost always refer to the Temple (1 Chr 15:1, 3; cf. 15:12; 2 Chr 3:1; cf. 1:4; *God Dwells with Us*, 164; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 303-308; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:932).

[49] Cf. Deut 30:4, 2 Sam 7:10 and Exod 15:17 (the latter of which may be in view in John 14:2's use of ἑτοιμάζω); 2 Macc 1:17, 27-29; 2:7. 17-18; *1 En* 39.4; 53.6; 71.16; 90.33-36; 4 QFlor; 11QTemple 44:3-16 (Bryan, "Eschatological Temple," 187-192; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 300-303; Neyrey, "Jacob Traditions," 431).

[50] Cf. Zech 6:12-13; *1 En* ; 4QFlor; *4 Ezra* 13; *Sib. Or.* 5.414-33; Bryan, "Eschatological Temple," 192-93; Donna Runnalls, "The King as Temple Builder: A Messianic Typology," in *Spirit Within Structure: Essays in Honor of George Johnston On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. E.J. Furcha; Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick Publications, 1983), 15-37.

[51] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 268-313; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 157-178; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:627; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 451.

[52] Bryan, "Eschatological Temple," 196-98; Thus, while Coloe may be right to connect the use of μονή in 14:2 with the mutual indwelling (μένω) of Father, Son and believers in the image of the vine and the

"Though the Temple in John 14:2 is the Temple, it is not the Temple of Jesus' body. Rather, it is the heavenly sanctuary. Neither use of the Temple imagery should be dissolved into the other."[53] Bryan still accepts the replacement paradigm,[54] but this connection between the heavenly and the earthly sanctuaries suggests a different reading. Since Jesus goes to prepare "my Father's house" through his death and resurrection,[55] this allows that the "raising" of the Temple in 2:18-22 means its raising *as* the heavenly or eschatological Temple. Like Jesus' glorified body, which 20:27 insists still shows the scars of crucifixion, the Temple that is "raised" remains, in some sense, the same Temple that was "destroyed." Jerusalem, then, is not replaced but rarified.[56]

It is in *this* context that we should understand the strong current of critique in 2:13-22. Though, when properly understood, the Temple participates in Jesus' death *and* resurrection, neither "the Jews" (2:20) nor even the disciples (2:22) understand this at the time. Therefore, as Lieu argues, the Temple may be the essential context for Jesus' self-revelation, but it also becomes the location of his *rejection*.[57] This can be seen in John's

---

branches (15:1-17), it seems quite a stretch to claim that the "many dwellings" *are* "many indwellings" (*God Dwells with Us*, 162-64; even Kerr hesitates to accept this suggestion, though he does find it interesting; *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 313 n.101).

[53] Bryan, "Eschatological Temple," 197; *contra* Lincoln, who takes this as no more than a general description of heaven as God's house, citing precedent in *1 En.* 39:4-8 (*Gospel According to Saint John*, 389). But *1 En.* 39:4-8 itself seems to be set in the heavenly Temple, as indicated by 38:7-8's references to the righteous dwelling "under the wings of the Lord of Spirits," which would seem to indicate God's cherubim throne.

[54] Bryan, "Eschatological Temple," 198.

[55] Which is surely what he means by "I am going" (14:2, 3, 5; cf. 14:28-31).

[56] This would be similar to the relation between the λόγος and Torah in the prologue: the λόγος can hardly be claimed to "replace" the Torah, for the Torah was itself a gift and expression of the λόγος. So also the heavenly Temple that is "prepared" through Jesus' death and resurrection does not "replace" the Jerusalem Temple, for it is and always was the primary reality that the earthly Temple reflected.

[57] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 69; but her conclusion that "Those who respond in faith, whose testimony will be heard, are to be found elsewhere" (69) is doubtful, given that the disciples who "remember" are precisely those here present, in the Temple. Barus identifies the key point, "The resurrection event opens the spiritual eyes of the disciples to see the Old Testament with new eyes and to understand the significance of Jesus' witnessing activities through deeds and words. Why? The resurrection reveals the protagonist's divinity. The resurrection intimates Jesus' witnessing activities as the image of the invisible God" ("John 2:12-25," 130; cf. 131-32).

use of the first and second person (emphasis added): "[*you*] stop making *my* Father's house a house of trade" (2:16), "what sign can *you* show *us*?" (2:18), "[*you*] destroy this Temple and in three days *I* will raise it" (2:19). Though the Temple is in fact "my Father's house," it has been misunderstood and "destroyed" just as Jesus has, if not *because* Jesus has.[58] Though "the Jews" think Jesus is attacking the Temple, John states that, "zeal for *your* house will consume me" (2:17).[59] Jesus does not attack or replace the Temple, he condemns the misunderstanding and misappropriation that distorts their view of his relation to it, and to its God.[60] For in the end, John 2:22 insists that it is only in light of the resurrection that the Temple can be rightly understood at all. This might also clarify the emphasis on the disciples in both 2:13-22 and 14:1-3. The focus in the latter is clearly on Jesus' presence with the disciples, and the Temple imagery supports this, with its reference to "many dwellings" (14:2).[61] The references to the remembering and *believing* of the disciples in 2:17 and 2:22 imply that the resurrection brings more than just a new understanding, but a new relationship between Jesus and believers.

Conclusion

If John 1 stressed Jesus' identity in continuity with Jewish predecessors like Moses, John the Baptist and Jacob, and 2:1-11 symbolized his fulfillment of Israel's eschatological hopes, 2:13-23 combines these with a renewed emphasis on his relation to

---

[58] A theme that will continue to build across the rest of John's Gospel; cf. Matson, "Temple Incident," 149-151; Moloney, "Reading John 2:13-22," 439.

[59] While "your" likely refers to God (as in the Psalm), it could also refer to "the Jews" (perhaps by double-entendre), which would further heighten the irony: Jesus' zeal for *their own Temple* leads them to destroy him.

[60] This is even clearer if read with the prologue's claim that Jesus *is* the one whose glory filled the Temple.

[61] Kerr and especially Coloe emphasize this communal aspect of 14:1-3, but unnecessarily infer from it that the post-Easter community "replaces" the Temple just as Jesus had done while on earth (Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 3, 178; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 460, following Cullman; less clearly Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 312-13).

the Temple. Properly understood, it is "my Father's house," an expression that both draws on a typical name for the Temple, and stresses Jesus' unique relation to God. Unfortunately, the Temple has *not* been properly understood, and Jesus' very zeal for "your house" will lead to his death. But if Jerusalem's fall is thereby tied to Jesus' death, so also must its restoration be tied to his raising. Thus it is only "after he was raised" that the disciples understand and believe (2:22), and it is only through Jesus' death and resurrection that "my Father's house" is prepared to welcome believers into the eschatological presence of God (14:1-3). It is this latter aspect to the Jewish Temple expectations—the restoration of Israel to full relationship with God through Jesus—that is emphasized in John 4. Here Jesus insists that "true worship" must "know" the one worshipped, which is possible only by the Spirit and truth he brings.

Chapter Three
Living Water and True Worship in John 4

When Jesus promises that, "the hour is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (4:21), then claims, "the hour is coming, and is now here, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth" (4:23), many take this as John's "clearest evidence for the Temple's obsolescence and replacement."[1] In contrast, Fuglseth notes that if true worship is *already* possible ("is now here"), this makes Jesus' subsequent trips to the Jerusalem Temple highly significant.[2] As we will see in our next chapter, John 5 to 10 repeatedly places Jesus in the Temple and applies its imagery to him, not to claim that it has been replaced, but to announce the fulfillment of its hopes for the return of Israel's God. These themes are also emphasized in John 4, where Jesus is presented as the divine bridegroom who restores Israel, offers the living water and life-giving Spirit God alone was expected to provide, and enables "true worship" by revealing the true identity of God.

Jesus as the Bridegroom of Israel

In John 4, Jesus meets a Samaritan woman at "Jacob's well," in an encounter often compared to the betrothal type-scene found in Genesis 24 and elsewhere.[3] Besides

---

[1] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 136; cf. 143, 145; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 86, 94, 99, 103, 112-13; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 167-168, 177, 185, 191-92, 204; Um, *Temple Christology*, 152, 160, 187-190; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 449; Neyrey even claims that John "is not simply claiming that Jesus is supplanting Jacob's well; rather Jesus as the supplanter is invalidating all previous cultic places and rites and is replacing them with a worship centered in Jesus' own person (4:42)" ("Jacob Allusions," 437; cf. "Jacob Traditions," 432 n. 50).

[2] John 5:1; 7:10; 10:22-23; 12:12; Fuglseth: "This must also be taken to mean that every temple-practice of Jesus and the disciples… becomes important for our understanding of the attitudes and relationship of the Johannine Christians to the temple institutions as well" (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 182, cf. 180-85).

[3] Cf. Gen 24:1-61; 29:1-20; Exod 2:15b-21; cf. Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 52; Donna Nolan Fewell and Gary A. Phillips, "Drawn to Excess, or Reading Beyond Betrothal," *Semeia* 77 (1997): 34-43; James G. Williams, "The Beautiful and the Barren: Conventions in Biblical Type Scenes," *JSOT* 17 (1980): 109; accepted by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 170-72, 175-76,

structural similarities, Jesus has already played the role of the bridegroom in 2:1-11 and 3:29-30, and this very passage mentions "husbands" in 4:16-18. If this is a betrothal, however, it is certainly an unusual one. The woman has already had five (or six) previous husbands, and Jesus does not *literally* marry her.[4] If the betrothal is figurative though, what does it signify? Most often it is taken as a generic image for "the abundance and universality of divine grace,"[5] but in Jewish tradition the most common use of marriage as a symbol is for God's relation with Israel. Several of the prophets had described Israel as an estranged wife (e.g. Jer 2:2; Ezek 16; 23; Hos 1), whom YHWH would again remarry (e.g. Isa 62:5).[6] so John's allusions to betrothal could be metaphorical, indicating the restoration of Israel. Hosea 1-3 is particularly striking, as it addresses Northern Israel (from whom the Samaritans claimed descent; cf. the woman's "our ancestor Jacob" in 4:12),[7] emphasizes their unfaithfulness with "the Ba'als" (2:13; which could be translated "husbands"[8]), and anticipates restoration:

> I will take you for my wife in faithfulness; and you shall know the LORD. On that day I will answer, says the LORD, I will answer the heavens and they shall answer the earth; and the earth shall answer the grain, the wine, and the oil… and I will say to Lo-ammi [i.e. "not my people"], "You are my people"; and he shall say, "You are my God." (Hos 2:20-23; MT and LXX 2:22-25)

179-180; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 97-99; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 53; Moloney, *John*, 106. Um rejects this approach on the mere grounds that it has been embraced by reader-response critics who "reject authorial intention" (*Temple Christology*, 7, cf. 6-7).

[4] Fewell and Phillips also note this, and claim that "there is no meal and no betrothal" ("Drawn to Excess," 27), but a bridegroom implies a betrothal, and there is certainly "food" (4:32-34; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 171). Note that subversion was always central to the concept of a type-scene (so Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 53).

[5] Fewell and Phillips, "Drawn to Excess," 38; cf. Neyrey, "Jacob Traditions," 426; cf. John 4:42, which refers to Jesus as "the savior of the world." For other possibilities, cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 179-80; Moloney, *John*, 131-32; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1.171; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 61; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 97-99.

[6] Cf. also the examples listed in Chapter Two, n. 9 above.

[7] Of course, this claim was rejected by (many of) the Jews, who considered Samaritan descent and worship impure (e.g. 2 Kgs 17:21-41; Ezra 4:1-4; Jos. *Ant*. 9:288-291; 11:340-41; *Gen. Rab.* 94:7), so Keener notes that "undoubtedly the woman means the '*our*' in 'our Father Jacob' emphatically (4:12)" (*Gospel of John*, 1:602).

[8] Noted by Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 98.

For Jesus to be called the bridegroom, meet a woman at a well, talk about "our ancestor Jacob" and her "husbands," and promise a great "harvest," seems calculated to evoke these hopes for the restoration of Israel—*all* Israel—even those long considered "not my people."[9] Whether this specific text is in view is certainly debatable, but its focus on the recognition of Israel's true God, "you will know the LORD" (Hos 2:20; cf. 2:23),[10] is well in line with the emphasis on knowing the true identity of God—in Jesus—that drives the rest of John 4.

Living Water and the Well of Jacob in 4:4-18

Jesus' conversation with the woman centers on the question of identity from the very beginning.[11] Sitting by "Jacob's well" (4:6), he asks for a drink and she responds, "How is it that you, a Jew, ask a drink of me, a woman of Samaria?" (4:9). Jesus' response not only stresses his identity ("who it is who says to you"), but also parallels "the gift of God" with the gift *he* gives:[12]

A Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ	If you knew the gift of God
B καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι·	and who it is who says to you,
C Δός μοι πεῖν,	'Give me a drink'
B' σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν	you would have asked him
A' καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν.	and he would have given you living water.

If this structural parallel highlights Jesus' divine prerogative, this is confirmed by the nature of the gift itself, as many Jewish texts insist that God alone is the true source of

[9] Coloe also notes Ezek 37:21-27, which speaks of the reunion of Israel and Judah, centered on God's "dwelling place" (37:27; *God Dwells with Us*, 111-12). Note also that the term for "jar" (ὑδρία) occurs only in 4:28 and 2:6-7 in the NT, and 9 of 22 LXX occurrences are in the betrothal type-scene in Gen 24. If the jars represent Israel in 2:6-7, the inclusion of the Samaritans could represent part of their filling "to the brim." The fact that the Samaritan woman leaves *her* jar behind, could indicate a distinction between Jewish and Samaritan traditions (cf. 4:22: "you worship what you do not know; we worship what we know"), or might it imply that she leaves her jar *with Jesus*?

[10] Cf. also Ezek 37:14; Jesus is called "Lord" three times in John 4 (vv. 11, 15, 19).

[11] The woman calls him "a Jew" (4:9), "Lord" (4:11, 15, 19), "prophet" (4:19) and "Messiah" or "Christ" (4:25, 29); finally, he is proclaimed "the savior of the world" (4:42); cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 86.

[12] Chiasm noted by Um, *Temple Christology*, 144-45; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 189 (though Kerr's arrangement has no C; it includes Δός μοι πεῖν at the end of B); cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 92.

(living) water.[13] Deutero-Isaiah is especially rich, combining emphatic declarations of the uniqueness of God with promises to provide eschatological water. For instance, 41:17-18 affirms that:

> When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue is parched with thirst [δίψος], I the LORD will answer them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them. I will open rivers on the bare heights, and fountains [πηγή] in the midst of the valleys; I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water.

John's familiarity with Isaiah is well attested by explicit citation (e.g. 12:37-41) and broader themes (e.g. John's use of δοξάζω, ὑψόω and ἐγώ εἰμί), and Isaiah is full of such water imagery in its descriptions of the restoration of Israel.[14] So when Jesus claims, "those who drink of the water that I will give them will never be thirsty [διψάω]. The water that I will give will become in them a spring [πηγή] of water gushing up to eternal life" (4:14), this very likely invokes such promises,[15] and further claims the divine prerogative of life-giving power.[16] It answers the woman's question, "Are you greater than our ancestor Jacob?" (4:12), not by replacing Jacob or his well, but by tying Jesus to the life-giving God of Jacob. The living water also anticipates the new creation,[17] and

---

[13] On the expectation of eschatological water; cf. Isa 30:23-26; 41:4, 17-20; 43:10, 19-21, 25; 44:1-6; 45:8, 18; 48:21; 49:10; Ezek 47:12; Joel 3:18 [LXX 4:18]; Zech 13:1; 14:8; Wis 11:4-8; *1 En* 89:28; *2 Bar* 29:5-8; Rev 7:16-17; 22:1, 17; cf. Um, *Temple Christology*, 55-61; Dale C. Allison, "The Living Water (John 4:10-14; 6:35c; 7:37-39)," *SVTQ* 30 (1986): 145. Um argues at length that water most often symbolized (eschatological) life (*Temple Christology*, 15-67).

On God as the unique source of water, cf. Jer 2:13 and 17:12-13; Exod 17; Num 20; Neh 9:15; Ps 36:10 [LXX 35:10]; 65:9-12 [LXX 64:10-13]; 78:16, 20 [LXX 77:16, 20]; 105:10-11 [LXX 104:10-11]; Isa 33:21; 41:17-20; 43:19; 44:3-4; 48:21; 58:11; Zech 14:8; Joel 4:18 [Eng. 3:18]; Rev 7:17; 21:6; *1 En* 89:28; 11:15; 1QH 16 (esp. 16.4, 16-17); Philo, *Posterity* 136; *Flight* 198; LAB 10:7; Rev 21:6; 22:1. cf. Allison, "Living Water," 144-47; Um, *Temple Christology*, 15-67, esp. 65-67, and 20, 133, 137, 162; Nyerey, "Jacob Traditions," 435; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 164 n. 88.

[14] Cf. n. 13 above for examples.

[15] Um, *Temple Christology*, 136-147; cf. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 8-11; cf. also John 5:21, 26.

[16] Um notes that, "These creation and new creation accounts clearly designate the unique identity of God (*2 En.* 47.5, 6) as the sole Creator (*2 En.* 47.4-5; *4 Ezra* 3.4-5; 6.6; *2 Bar.* 14.15-19; 21.4, 7; 54.2, 13; 78.3; 82.2; 1QS 4.19-22; 4Q392; 11Qps 26.9-15) and Ruler over all creation (*2 Bar.* 21.5-6, 9; 48.3; 54.2-4, 12-13; Sir 18.3), who has the authority to grant creative and eschatological life" (*Temple Christology*, 128; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 192).

[17] Um, *Temple Christology*, 139-144.

John will later connect it with the Spirit (7:37-39; cf. also 3:5; 4:23-24).[18] Um has demonstrated that the Spirit was often associated with (new) creation and life-giving, especially in such eschatological contexts.[19] If this is in view in 4:10-14, it implies that Jesus offers nothing less than the new-creative Spirit of God, surely a divine prerogative if there ever was one.

Nevertheless, while previous studies on the Temple in John recognize this,[20] they focus on Jesus' claim that, "Everyone who drinks of this water [from the well] will be thirsty again" (4:13). This is taken to indicate that Jesus replaces Jacob's well, which is thought to symbolize the Torah, the Temple, or the patriarch himself.[21] Yet surely that is reading too much into the comparison. Even apart from the likelihood of these symbolic understandings of the well, which we will discuss below, if the water Jesus offers is indeed a symbol for life, the Spirit, or both,[22] this hardly renders the water from Jacob's well obsolete. After all, the notion that one could "replace" the other is precisely the woman's misunderstanding: "Sir, give me this water, so that I may never be thirsty or have to keep coming here to draw water" (4:15). Jesus does not respond, "Now you

---

[18] Um, *Temple Christology*, 9-11, 166-67, 189; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 93-94; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 448-49; Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 132-33;. That such is also in view in 4:14 may be implied by John's use of the verb ἅλλομαι, a rare term that is used in the LXX of the Spirit in Jdg 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Sam 10:10 (Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 94). Thomas R. Hatina also notes that the "gift of God" was "a technical term associated with the Holy Spirit in the early church (Acts 2,38; 8,20; 10,45; 11,17; Heb 6,4)" ("John 20, 22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment?" *Biblica* 74 [1993]: 196-219).

[19] Cf. Gen 1:2, 11-12, 20-31; 2:7; Job 33:4; Ps 104:30 [LXX 103:30]; Isa 32:15; 42:5; 44:3; Ezek 25:26; 36:26; 37:5-6, 10, 14; Joel 2:28-29; Zech 12:10; Jdt 16:13-14; Wis 15:11; 2 Macc. 7:22-23; *Jub* 12:4-5; *4 Ezra* 3:5; 6:38-54; *2 Bar.* 23:5; *Jos. Asen.* 8:9 [8:10-11]; *Sib. Or.* 4.181-192; 4Q504 Frag. 8:4-5, all of which speak of God's spirit (or occasionally, breath) as the agent of creation, new creation or the giving of life (cf. Um, *Temple Christology*, 68-129, 170-73; Allison, "Living Water," 151-52; Neyrey, "Jacob Traditions," 433).

[20] E.g. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 93-96, 102; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 189-190; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 139-140; and esp. Um, *Temple Christology*, esp. 136-156.

[21] The replacement of the Temple is emphasized by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 191; cf. 166-68, 177; Um, *Temple Christology*, 152, 190; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 135-146, 160-170; Coloe says Jesus "supplants" Jacob (*God Dwells with Us*, 86, 113).

[22] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 90; Um, *Temple Christology*, 138.

understand!" but rather, "Go, call your husband, and come back" (4:16)—that is, come back to the well![23] There remains a fundamental connection between the *place* and Jesus' offer: Jacob's well provides an image of the "water" Jesus offers, but it is no more replaced by Jesus than ordinary food will be replaced by Jesus' "food" in 4:32-34.

Yet even if "Jacob's well" *does* symbolize something else, this still does not prove replacement. The possibility that Jesus replaces Jacob himself can be dismissed by analogy to 8:53,[24] and if the Torah's association with water and wells is in view,[25] it is notable that water imagery is as commonly used of Wisdom as of the Torah in the Second Temple literature.[26] As in the prologue, then, an allusion to the Torah here certainly need not imply replacement; it might even strengthen the emphasis on Jesus as the self-revelation of God, as the Torah itself is identified as a *witness* to Jesus in the very next chapter (5:39).[27]

More significantly, many think the living water Jesus offers as the "true Temple" contrasts with the water expected to flow from Jerusalem in Zechariah 14 and Ezekiel 47.[28] For instance, Um follows J. A. Draper in asserting, "What overcomes the traditional

---

[23] Kerr also notes this (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 176, 182), though it does not seem to impact his conclusions.

[24] In 8:53-58 "the Jews" ask, "Are you greater than our father Abraham?" and Jesus replies, "before Abraham was, I am" (8:58). Strangely, Neyrey notes this connection, but claims Jesus replaces *both* Jacob and Abraham ("Jacob Traditions," 437, cf. 420-21), but surely not: Jesus is the one Abraham *saw*, and it may well be the same with Jacob (cf. on 1:51 above), as Neyrey himself accepts elsewhere ("Jacob Allusions," 590-94, but cf. 604).

[25] E.g. *CD* 6:2-5 refers to the well in Num 21:17-18 as the Torah; cf. also. Deut 32:2; Sir 24:21-34; 19:34; 1QH 23:10-13; *1 En*. 42:3; 48:1; 49:1; Philo *Flight* 197-98; Neyrey, "Jacob Traditions," 422, 434-35; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:602-3; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 180-81; 189-90; Um, *Temple Christology*, 17-18; Hatina, "John 20,22," 209-210.

[26] Cf. Prov 10:11; 13:14; *1 En* 49:1; Sir 24:21; Philo, *Flight* 195-96, 200; *Posterity* 136, 38; but cf. *Drunkenness* 112; Allison, "Living Water," 150-51; Neyrey, "Jacob Allusions," 435. But even here the imagery is more closely tied to life than revelation (e.g. cf. Prov 13:14; 14:27; 16:22; 18:4; Sir 21:13)

[27] As Kerr notes, "what Jesus distances himself from is not so much the law itself as the Jewish interpretation of the law. In so far as the law is interpreted as referring to Jesus John is positive" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 184).

[28] Esp. in Ezek 47:1-12; Joel 3:18 [LXX 4:18] and Zech 14:8; these are discussed in Chapter Four below; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 93-96; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 165-66; Um, *Temple*

and deep rooted hostility [between Jews and Samaritans] is that the Jerusalem temple, which has in any case been destroyed at the time of the writing of the gospel, has been replaced by the heavenly temple."[29] Yet while it is entirely possible that Jesus alludes to the eschatological Temple here (cf. 7:37-39), it remains the case that as far as Jerusalem itself points to the heavenly Temple, and to the *God* of the Temple, it continues to have an important role and so is not replaced. In fact, Um himself recognizes that Deutero-Isaiah provides the most direct background to John 4:10-14, and as we have seen, it speaks primarily of *God's* promise to provide eschatological water.[30] If anything, the Temple symbolizes and localizes this hope, which explains why Jesus repeats the offer in the Temple itself (7:37-39), but Jesus' fulfillment of it nevertheless points primarily to his divine prerogative, not the replacement of an institution. Thus, as we turn to 4:19-26, where the subject of worship finally does become explicit, we find that Jesus focuses not on the *manner* of worship, but on its *object*, and follows this with perhaps his clearest claim of divine identity yet.

True Worship in 4:19-24

Now recognizing Jesus as a "prophet" (4:19), the woman raises the question of worship by invoking a traditional dispute between Jews and Samaritans, "Our ancestors worshiped on this mountain,[31] but you say that the place where people must worship is in Jerusalem" (4:20). Jesus' response in 4:21-24 is often taken to mean that "no physical site

---

Christology, 147-53, 159-67; Allison, "Living Water," 145-46, 154. Neyrey notes a later rabbinic tradition that both equates Jacob's well with the temple and understands its water as an image of the divine spirit ("Jacob Traditions," 433-34).

[29] J. A. Draper, "Temple, Tabernacle and Mystical Experience in John," *Neotestamentica* 31 (1997): 282; cited by Um, *Temple Christology*, 187; cf. Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 463.

[30] Um, *Temple Christology*, 136-153.

[31] Mt. Gerizim; its temple was destroyed in 128 BCE, but the site remained central to Samaritan piety and hope; cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:611-13; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 176-77.

can be an appropriate place for worship,"[32] but even if Jesus does imply that no physical temple is *necessary*, that hardly proves that none can be *appropriate* or even *beneficial*. As Jesus' own attendance at several Temple festivals indicates, the hour may be coming when Jerusalem will fall just as Gerizim already had, but in John it is *in Jerusalem* that they worship (9:38; 12:20).[33] Whatever else "worship in spirit and truth" might mean, clearly it does not preclude worship at Temple festivals.

A key point here relates to Jesus' use of ὥρα ("hour") in 4:21-23. In John, ὥρα usually refers to Jesus' death, resurrection and exaltation, which marks yet another connection between the Temple and Jesus' passion.[34] Nevertheless, 16:2 provides an even closer parallel, anticipating that "they will put you out of the synagogues. Indeed, an hour is coming when those who kill you will think that by doing so they are offering worship [προσφέρω] to God." Whether, as many think, this reflects the post-70 CE period,[35] it certainly refers to a time after Jesus' death, which would seem to be the period to which 4:21 refers. If these passages are anticipating similar situations, then, it is significant that expulsion from the synagogue in 16:2-4 is seen as comparable to being killed (cf. also 15:20-21), and decidedly non-ideal. In light of Jesus' own connection of

---

[32] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 103; cf. 86; 94, 99, 112, 113; cf. also Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 167-168, 177, 185, 191-92, 204; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 136, 143, 145; Um, *Temple Christology*, 152, 160, 187-190; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 449; Neyrey, "Jacob Traditions," 432 n. 50; "Jacob Allusions," 436-37.

[33] These are John's only other explicit references to "worship" (προσκυνέω), and both occur in Jerusalem, at a festival (Tabernacles and Passover). Kerr also suggests that 12:3 and 20:28 represent true worship (they occur in Bethany and an undisclosed location; *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 197-203), but even if so, this only proves that the Temple is not the *necessary* location of worship (was it ever?), not that it is obsolete or has been "replaced."

[34] Though John also uses ὥρα more generically (5:35; 16:21), including of the hours of the day (often modified by an ordinal number; cf. 1:39; 4:6. 52-53; 11:9; 19:14), unmodified references usually point to Jesus' death, raising, exaltation and glorification, viewed together (2:4; 5:25, 28; 7:30; 8:20; 12:23, 27; 13:1; 17:1; 19:27).

[35] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 61; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 74-79; Lincoln, *Gospel According to John*, 284; all following Martyn; for cautions, cf. Bruce, *John*, 215-16; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 277-78; Brown, *Introduction*, 68, 172, 213-14; Köstenberger, *John*, 288-89; cf. 1 Thes 2:13-16.

Temple and synagogue in 18:20, can we not read 4:21 similarly? Though "the hour is coming" when Jerusalem will be destroyed, this is not because Temple worship is (no longer) "appropriate;" it results from the same misunderstanding and "sin" that leads to Jesus' own death (cf. 15:18-25; 16:5-11). Even so, just as John 16 promises "the Spirit of truth" even outside the synagogue (16:13; cf. vv. 5-16), 4:23 insists that worship "in Spirit and truth" remains possible despite the destruction of Jerusalem, because "true worship" has much more to do with *who* is worshipped than where.

This is seen especially in the verse that comes *between* 4:21 and 4:23, "You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews" (4:22). If nothing else, this confirms the non-parity between traditional Samaritan and Jewish worship noted above. "Salvation is from the Jews" not only emphasizes that it comes through Jesus, "a Jew" (4:9; cf. 18:35), but may also reflect the essential connection between Jesus and the Jewish Temple, which was already raised in John 2 and will inform much of the festival cycle as well. More than this, however, 4:22 places the emphasis squarely on the identity of God: "we worship what [or "who"; ὅς] we know."[36] Where the woman fails to identify the one to be worshipped, Jesus twice specifies that it is "the Father" (4:21, 23), and goes on to describe God as "Spirit" (4:24). In line with the restoration imagery of the preceding conversation, this suggests that Jesus is not rejecting traditional Temple worship but reframing the discussion: The "place" of worship is only properly understood in relation to the *object* of worship.[37]

---

[36] Numerous texts anticipate a time when the restored Israel will finally "know the LORD"; besides Hos 2:20 [MT and LXX 2:22] and Ezek 37:14, which we suggested might stand behind John's betrothal imagery, cf. also, e.g., Isa 26:13; Jer 24:7; 31:34; Ezek 16:62; 20:42; Joel 2:27; 3:17 [MT and LXX 4:17]; Hab 3:2; Sir 23:27; 36:4.

[37] *Contra* Bruce, who claims "The important question is not *where* people worship God but *how* they worship him" (*Gospel of John*, 109; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:180; C. John Collins, "John 4:23-24, 'In Spirit and Truth': An Idiomatic Proposal," *Presb* 21 (1995): 120; Neyrey, "Jacob Traditions,"

This reading is also supported by a closer look at 4:23-24. Bruce claims worship ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ means, "Spiritual worship, genuine worship, cannot be tied to set places and seasons," but is "the sacrifice of a humble, contrite, grateful and adoring spirit."[38] This requires taking ἐν πνεύματι as a reference to the human spirit, but virtually all of John's other uses of πνεῦμα refer to the Spirit of God, including in the very next verse.[39] Nor does πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (4:24a) mean that God is incorporeal;[40] in context (esp. 4:6-18), this more likely refers to God's life-giving power.[41] "Worship in Spirit and truth," then, is worship empowered by the life-giving Spirit of God. It does not contrast internal worship with external,[42] but worship in ignorance ("what you do not know") with worship that "knows" the true identity of God. Since such knowledge is, according to John, made possible by the Spirit Jesus brings (cf. 4:10-14; 7:37-39) and the truth of who he is (cf. 14:6),[43] this hints that true worship demands recognition of the divine identity of *Jesus*, and 4:25-26 confirms this by tying Jesus to God's self-revelation as ἐγώ εἰμί.

---

432). McKelvey recognizes this, though he ties it to a supersessionist paradigm, "Christianity supersedes Judaism and Samaritanism not because it is spiritual whereas they are material but because it is centered in a person and not in a place" (*New Temple*, 80).

[38] Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 110-11; cf. Collins, "John 4:23-24," 121; Edwin D. Freed, "The Manner of Worship in John 4:23f," in *Search the Scriptures: New Testament Studies in Honor of Raymond T. Stamm* [ed. J. M. Myers, O. Reimherr, and H. N. Bream; Gettysburg Theological Studies 3; Leiden: Brill, 1969], 35); cf. Philo, *Worse* 21.

[39] Kerr (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 192-93), Um (*Temple Christology*, 170) and Hoskins (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 141) all note that "God is Spirit" is the key to understanding "in Spirit and Truth." Though Collins notes that 11:33 and 13:21 refer to Jesus' (human) spirit ("John 4:23-24," 120), there are no references to any other human's spirit.

[40] As claimed by, Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 110-11; Collins, "John 4:23-24," 120.

[41] Cf. n. 20 above for examples. Hoskins concurs, "'God is Spirit' is not an ontological definition of God, but a description of the nature of God as he reveals himself to human beings" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 141); cf. Um, *Temple Christology*, 171; cf. 68-129; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 192; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 102.

[42] Rightly Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:180; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 79-80; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 462-63; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 183; Um, *Temple Christology*, 11, 170, 173.

[43] Cf. also 1:14, 17; 8:32, 40; 17:17; Collins notes that many commentators read "truth" here to refer to "the true God as revealed in Jesus" ("John 4:23-24," 119). In contrast, Freed oddly claims that "neither truth nor spirit is something bestowed by God" ("Manner of Worship," 39; cf. 47).

"I AM" in 4:25-26

In the first chapter, we noted how the prologue exploits traditional means of describing God's self-disclosure—Wisdom, λόγος, glory—to tie Jesus to the divine identity, without simply equating Jesus with God in Godself. Something similar appears to be at work here. To speak of God as Spirit is another way of describing God's self-disclosure,[44] so if Jesus' offer of living water is indeed a claim to provide God's Spirit, that again ties him to the identity of God.[45] Most interesting of all, however, is Jesus' response to the woman's conclusion, "'I know that Messiah is coming' (who is called Christ). 'When he comes, he will proclaim all things to us.'" Jesus replies, ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι (4:26).[46] This could mean no more than a formal acknowledgement that he is the Messiah,[47] but John's other uses of ἐγώ εἰμί nearly all attribute some sort of divine attribute or prerogative to Jesus, like pre-existence (8:58), or the ability to give resurrection life (11:25).[48] The absolute uses of the phrase especially seem to allude to the LXX of Deutero-Isaiah, where ἐγώ εἰμί appears repeatedly as the unique self-revelation of YHWH.[49] The closest to John's phrasing is 52:6, "My people will know my

---

[44] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:172; followed by Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 102; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 192; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 141; Um, *Temple Christology*, 171. As Dunn notes, Wisdom, glory and Spirit are all related means "of asserting God's nearness, his involvement with his world, his concern with his people" (*Christology in the Making*, 176).

[45] In 14:15-21 Jesus even identifies himself with the Spirit; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 193.

[46] Coloe (*God Dwells with Us*, 102) and Kerr (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 196-97) note this; Hoskins and Um do not discuss 4:25-26; but it could support the latter's claims about Jesus' divine identity (e.g. *Temple Christology*, 190).

[47] Freed argues that ἐγώ εἰμι carried messianic overtones in early Christianity, noting John the Baptist's denials in 1:20 (ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ χριστός) and 3:28 (οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός) and similar expressions in Mark 13:6; 14:62; Matt 24:5; Luke 21:6; 22:70; Acts 13:24-25 (Edwin D. Freed, "*Egō Eimi* in John 1:20 and 4:25 [*sic.*?]," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 288-291), but even if this is correct, it need not be *all* that is intended.

[48] With an object: 6:35, 41, 48, 51 ("the bread of life"); 8:12 ("the light of the world"); 8:18 ("the witness"?); 10:7, 9 ("the gate"); 10:11, 14 ("the good shepherd"); 11:25 ("the resurrection and the life");14:6 ("the way, the truth and the life"); 15:1, 5 ("the [true] vine"); without an object: 6:20; 8:24, 28, 58; 13:19; 18:5, 6, 8. Though John 9:9 uses the expression in its neutral sense, of the man born blind.

[49] Cf. Isa 41:4; 43:10, 25; 45:8, 18, 19, 22; 46:4, 9; 47:8, 10; 48:12, 17; 51:12; 52:6; 56:3; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 102; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 196-97; cf. Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 453.

name in that day, that [ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός, ὁ λαλῶν]. I am present."[50] Such affirmations of God's unique identity appear in the same context from which John drew his restoration imagery of in 4:10-14, and Isa 52:7 itself goes on to speak of "the messenger, who announces peace, who brings good news, who announces salvation, who says to Zion: 'Your God reigns!" If John does have such texts in mind, that confirms what was already implicit in 4:12-14: Jesus is not merely "greater" than Jacob as one man is to another; he is, in Coloe's words, "the incarnation in history of the God who revealed himself to Moses as I AM (Exod 3:14)."[51]

More than this, however, Isaiah immediately goes on to anticipate "the return of the LORD to Zion" to restore and redeem the "ruins of Jerusalem" (52:8-9). This dovetails nicely with the allusions to Zechariah and Malachi in John 2, and points ahead to the festival cycle, in which Jesus will indeed return to Jerusalem "and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God" (Isa 52:10). At the least, this gives much greater significance to 4:22's claim that "salvation is from the Jews." If the salvation Jesus brings is described with imagery reminiscent of the eschatological Temple—rivers of living water providing life and an abundant harvest—the point is not the replacement of the Temple, but the eschatological return of God.

Conclusion

John 1-4 sets a trajectory to the Temple theme that the rest of the Gospel will follow, and from start to finish it highlights Jesus' identity in continuity with the history

[50] Cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 102; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 196-97; Um, *Temple Christology*, 190.

[51] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 102; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 197; cf. 195; Um, *Temple Christology*, 174; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 459. This is all the more remarkable when we remember how the passage began, with Jesus "tired" from a long journey, sitting on a well to rest and asking for a drink of water (4:6-7). Fewell and Phillips note the juxtaposition of Jesus' humanity and divinity: "The Word made flesh, the provider of living water… is himself tired and thirsty" ("Drawn to Excess," 38).

and hopes of Israel. In line with the prologue, Jesus is the one about whom Moses and the prophets wrote (1:45), the one "greater than our father Jacob" (4:12), but whom Jacob saw (1:51), the true bridegroom of the restored Israel (2:1-11; 3:29; 4:4-42) and the "I am" (4:26). He provides abundant wine, water, harvest and the Spirit (2:1-11; 4:4-42), and even restores the dying to life (4:43-54). In all of this, Jesus fulfills roles and claims prerogatives unique to the one God of Israel, embodying the self-disclosure of God in Word and Spirit.

It is in this incarnational sense that we must understand his relation to the Temple. In John 4 especially, Jesus is the divine bridegroom who announces the restoration of God's people and offers living water expected to accompany God's return to the Temple. Though Jesus anticipates a time when worship in Jerusalem will no longer be possible, "true worship" is already a possibility, even in Jesus' lifetime. It is not set against traditional, Temple worship, but rather *informs* it. Properly understood, the Temple reveals Jesus' identity, and "true worship" contrasts not external worship with internal, but rather worship in ignorance with worship that "knows" the true identity of God. Such worship is made possible by the life-giving Spirit of God that Jesus himself brings, and as ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι, Jesus embodies God's return to the Temple, offering eschatological water, light and life. For if "salvation is from the Jews" implies that Jesus brings salvation *through* the traditions, festivals and Temple of "the Jews," it is in the festival cycle that the implications of this are best seen, and to that we now turn.

Chapter Four
God and Temple in the Festival Cycle (John 5-10)

The Cana festival may include John's most explicit references to the Temple, but the festival cycle carries the theme to much greater depths. John 5-10 is set at the Temple and in a synagogue for four Jewish feasts and two Sabbaths. Throughout, the traditions, rituals and expectations of each festival are used to highlight Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel. On the Sabbath, Jesus claims authority over life and judgment, prerogatives that God alone was believed to maintain, even on the Sabbath (chs. 5 and 9). At Passover, he professes to be the true bread from heaven, given by the same God who gave the manna to Israel (ch. 6). At Tabernacles, he offers God's living water and light, symbolized by the water-pouring ceremony and the great candelabra (chs. 7-8). At Dedication, he is accused of blasphemy like the Temple-desecrator Antiochus "Epiphanes" IV, but responds that he is consecrated by the Father (ch. 10). Again and again, the imagery and expectations of these festivals help interpret Jesus' claims and are themselves reinterpreted in Jesus' light. John does not challenge but rather *presupposes* traditional beliefs about their relation to God, and uses them to present Jesus as the incarnation of the self-disclosure of God. Notably, these claims spark significant controversy, but in each case the division centers on Jesus' (divine) identity, origin and role, not the replacement of the Temple.[1] If the prologue pictured Jesus as the incarnation of God's glory, the festival cycle may well picture its return to the Temple.

[1] Some previous studies have rightly emphasized the way John's (and the Temple's) symbolism reveals Jesus' identity in John 5-10 (esp. Koester, *Symbolism*, 52-62, 89-116, 152-62, 192-200; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 115-143), but even they continue to frame this in replacement terms (cf. Koester, *Symbolism*, 88; Coloe¸ *God Dwells with Us*, 130; cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 25-26; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 205). McGrath stresses Jesus' identity in these chapters, but is not focused on the Temple (*John's Apologetic Christology*, 80-130). Fuglseth denies replacement, but as elsewhere offers no alternative interpretation of John's festival allusions (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 251-284).

Jesus, the Sabbath, and Witnesses in John 5

John's festival cycle begins when Jesus goes up (ἀναβαίνω) to Jerusalem for "a feast of the Jews" (5:1) and heals a man on the Sabbath (5:1-9). That the section begins with the Sabbath is appropriate, since Leviticus 23 lists the Sabbath first among Israel's feasts.[2] Sabbath was also strongly tied to Israel's sanctuary, with which it was considered the essential counterpart:

> The Sabbath and the sanctuary represent the same moment in the divine life, one of exaltation and regal repose…. Sabbath and sanctuary partake of the same reality; they proceed, *pari passu*, from the same foundational [creation] event, to which they testify and even provide access.[3]

In this light, we might expect John's attitude toward the Sabbath to parallel his attitude toward the Temple festivals, especially since this Sabbath dispute appears to be set in the Temple itself (cf. 5:14).[4] Yet most scholars treat the Sabbath differently. According to Kerr, the Sabbath is "transformed," while the Temple and other festivals are "replaced."[5] This distinction is questionable, given that John's Passover and Tabernacles discourses are framed on both sides with Sabbath controversies, and we will argue that the precedent established in ch. 5 does indeed make better sense of what follows than is generally recognized.

"The Jews" directly accuse Jesus of "breaking [λύω] the Sabbath" in 5:18, and he does perform actions that could be considered Sabbath violations, namely healing and

---

[2] Cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 33; and Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 255. As in John, so also in Leviticus 23, Sabbath (23:1-3) is followed by Passover (Lev 23:4-8), with Tabernacles coming later (23:33-43). Dedication stands off on its own, as in John, not appearing until 1 Macc 4:37-59.

[3] Levenson, "The Temple and the World," 288, cf. 287-291; cf. Lev 19:30 // 26:2: "You shall keep my sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary: I am the LORD."

[4] Noted by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 256; Fuglseth thinks this connection is of "minor significance" (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 256), but he does not recognize the close ties between Sabbath and Temple.

[5] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 266-67, 374-75; most do not even devote a section to John 5, but cf. Songer, "John 5-12," 459. Yee discusses Sabbath first and recognizes that "Jesus in no way violates the Sabbath" (*Jewish Feasts*, 46). Coloe does not discuss ch. 5 specifically, but elsewhere claims that the fulfillment of the Sabbath "was not possible within Israel, that Israel's 'seventh' day of perfection was illusory…. Jesus was sent to finish the Father's work" (*God Dwells with Us*, 23; cf. 197).

telling the man to carry his mat.[6] Unlike a replacement reading might expect, Jesus does not accept the charge or claim the Sabbath has been rescinded. Instead, he claims *divine* prerogative over the Sabbath, "my Father is still working, and I also am working" (5:17). The first half of this statement has clear precedent in Jewish literature of the period,[7] and the response of "the Jews" in 5:18 appears to accept the premise as well. Thus the accusation that he is "breaking the Sabbath" is immediately reframed as a charge that he is usurping God's unique authority to work on it.[8] In the rabbinic literature, at least, God's work on the Sabbath was specifically identified with God's life-giving and judging activities,[9] and these are precisely the prerogatives Jesus claims the Father has granted him in 5:19-30, "For just as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself; and he has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is

---

[6] On the requirement that one may only heal life-threatening conditions on the Sabbath, cf. Luke 13:14; *b. Yoma* 85b; *Mek Sabbata* 1; on carrying burdens, cf. Num 15:32-36; Jer 17:21-22; Neh 13:15-19; *Jub* 2:29-33; 50:8-12; Philo, *Migr*. 91; *m. Sabb* 7:2; noted by Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 36-37; Borgen, "Creation, Logos and the Son," 89. Songer notes that works forbidden on the Sabbath are also forbidden on feast days (*m. Betzah* 5:2; "John 5-12," 459). Fuglseth notes that similar controversies in Philo do not indicate replacement (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 256).

[7] On God's activities even on the Sabbath, cf., e.g., Aristobulus Frag 5; Philo *Alleg. Int.* 1.5-7, 16-18; *Migr*. 91; also *Gen Rab*. 11:5, 10; *Exod Rab*. 30:6; *b. Ta'an* 2a; cf. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 1:216-17; Jerome H. Neyrey, "My Lord and My God: The Divinity of Jesus in John's Gospel," in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (vol. 25; Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1986), 156-57; Biance Latraire, "Jesus' Equality with God: A Critical Reflection on John 5,18," in *The Myriad Christ: Plurality and the Quest for Unity in Contemporary Christology* (Ed. T. Merrigan and J. Haers; BETL 152; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 180; Borgen, "Creation, Logos and the Son," 91; Songer, "John 5-12," 460; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 37-38; Koester, *Symbolism*, 91; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 259.

[8] This is nearly universally accepted; Cf. Neyrey, "My Lord and My God," 155-59; Meeks, "Equal to God," 309-324; for bibliography, cf. Latraire, "Jesus' Equality with God," 177-190, esp. 183-86. Borgen notes Philo, *Migr*. 89-93, which affirms that the Sabbath is a "symbol" (σύμβολον; 89) of God's power, but insists, "it does not follow that on that account we may abrogate [λύω] the laws which are established respecting it" (91, cf. 93; trans. Young). Borgen thinks John represents the position *rejected* by Philo (90-91), but nothing here indicates that the right to work on the Sabbath extends beyond the Father and the Son. John might even agree that those who obey the Sabbath are in a better position to understand its significance (cf. *Migr*. 93), as the whole argument in John 5 presupposes intimate knowledge of Sabbath theology.

[9] Cf. *b. Ta'an* 2a; *Gen Rab*. 11:10; noted by Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:216-17; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 37-38; Koester, *Symbolism*, 91; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 259. The conviction that God's activities could be summarized as life-giving and judgment also appears in Philo, e.g. *Cherubim* 1.27-28; *Sacrifices* 59; *Planting* 86-87; *Heir* 166; *Abraham* 124-25; *Moses* 11.99; cf. also Rom 4:17.

the Son of Man" (5:26-27; cf. vv. 21-22). If this passage may be read with the prologue,[10] especially its claim that "All things came into being through him" (1:3; cf. 17:5), then Jesus' exercise of God's creative power simply reflects the authority he has *always* had as the λόγος, and no more abolishes the Sabbath than God's own creation-work does.

Be that as it may, Jesus' claim to *resurrection* power (5:21, 25, 28-29) does give this an eschatological thrust, pointing ahead to his own death and resurrection (cf. 5:16, 18), set on the eve of "a great Sabbath" (19:31). Thus Kerr asks, "could it be that Jesus is saying to his opponents, 'The works I do are God's works—works of salvation and judgment. The Day of YHWH has come. The eschatological Sabbath has arrived'?"[11] This suggests that it is through Jesus' death and resurrection that God's ongoing work of creation is completed and Sabbath rest made fully possible.[12] To infer from this the abolition or replacement of the Sabbath as an institution—say, by Christian worship on Sundays[13]—merely obscures John's attempt to *use* the Sabbath's theology to highlight Jesus' divine prerogatives over life and judgment.

Such exalted claims cry out for verification, and in Jewish tradition that must come in the form of witnesses.[14] Jesus identifies several: John the Baptist (5:33-35), his works (5:36), the Father (5:37), the Scriptures (5:38-40), and Moses (5:45-47). Especially revealing are Jesus' "works" and the scriptures, which can only be understood together.

---

[10] As many do; e.g., Borgen, "Creation, Logos and the Son," 88-97; Neyrey, "My Lord and My God," 156-57; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 92-95; Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word," 142.

[11] *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 261; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 23, 197.

[12] Mary R. Huie-Jolly also suggests that 5:17-29 echoes the divine enthronement myth ("Threats Answered by Enthronement: Death/Resurrection and the Divine Warrior Myth in John 5.17-29, Psalm 2 and Daniel 7," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* [ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSupp 148; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997], 191-217). In Chapter Five, we will find a similar connection in John's crucifixion account.

[13] Cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 265-66; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 23, 197.

[14] Songer, "John 5-12," 459. When Jesus makes similar claims in chs. 7 and 8, the Pharisees challenge him on just this point, "You are testifying on your own behalf; your testimony is not valid" (8:13). Songer notes *m. Ketuboth* 2:9 "none may be believed when he testifies of himself" ("John 5-12," 469 n.16).

The "works," of course, tie into the preceding narrative, where Jesus does God's "work" on the Sabbath by giving life (note the use of ἐγείρω in 5:8, 21) and judging (cf. 5:14). Yet by themselves, these are not self-authenticating (5:31, though cf. 8:14),[15] and even his disciples do not understand them at first (cf. 2:22; 14:5; 16:18; 20:9). From this side of the resurrection, however, the scriptures can also be seen as witnesses, "it is they that testify on my behalf. Yet you refuse to come to me to have life" (5:39-40; cf. 5:46). At the least, this should eliminate any notion that Jesus has "replaced" the Torah or Moses, as these must retain at least some ongoing significance to serve as legitimate witnesses.[16] Yet when taken in the context of the festival cycle as a whole, it is tempting to infer that the Jewish *institutions* commanded in scripture are also part of its witness. In the light of the resurrection, the Temple and its festivals can themselves be seen as "witnesses" to Jesus, their symbolism and expectations pointing to him.[17] In John 5, at least, the theology of the Sabbath is not rejected but presupposed, and used to explicate Jesus' unique authority to give life and judge. As we will see, these themes will recur again and again throughout the following chapters, as the traditions, rituals and history of several further feasts are called upon to support and elucidate Jesus' self-proclamation.

The Passover and the Bread of Life in John 6

Set "near" the Passover (6:4) and at a synagogue (6:59), John 6 boasts a number of parallels to the festival and its Exodus context. Jesus goes up a mountain (6:3; cf. Exod

[15] Koester, *Symbolism*, 138-140. McGrath notes that Deut 13:1-5 warns against the signs and wonders of those who lead the people away from YHWH (*John's Apologetic Christology*, 188). Notably, Jesus appeals to his works in only one verse, but devotes the rest of the chapter to the scriptures and Moses.

[16] Cf. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 257-59; *contra* Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word," 142.

[17] Hoskins suggests something like this in a note, "When he [John] presents Jesus as the fulfillment of the Temple (and the Tabernacle), he is providing particular instances where Moses and the Prophets wrote about Jesus" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 185 n. 14; cf. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 259; Meeks, "Equal to God," 319).

19:3), provides miraculous food (6:1-13; cf. Exod 16) and passage across the sea (6:16-24; cf. Exod 14), yet is met with "grumbling" (6:41, 52, 61; cf. Exod 15:24; 16:2).[18] Drawing on the expectation that God would restore the gift of manna at the eschatological Passover, Jesus claims to be "the true bread from heaven" (6:30-32, cf. 35, 41, 48, 51; cf. Exod 16:4; Neh 9:15).[19] His flesh and blood are also claimed to provide life, recalling the Pascal lamb that protected the first-born (6:53-58; cf. Exod 12:1-30). As in John 5, this imagery highlights Jesus' origin and identity, but here it is also tied to several notable contrasts. Jesus states that, "it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven, but it is my Father who gives you the true bread from heaven" (6:32). He claims his bread is "not like that which your ancestors ate, and they died. But the one who eats this bread will live forever" (6:58, cf. 49-50), and concludes, "It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh is useless" (6:63). Like many others, Kerr infers from these contrasts that:

> The Jewish Passover Festival is superseded by Jesus becoming the Passover Lamb. The "flesh" of the Jewish Passover is of no avail; it is the spiritually ingested Jesus, the Passover Lamb, appropriated by faith, that brings life.[20]

This goes well beyond John. The Passover Lamb is not even explicitly mentioned, much less contrasted with Jesus, so there is no reason to identify it with the "flesh" of 6:63. He is compared with the manna, but this too falls well short of proving "the 'flesh'

---

[18] Connections with Exodus noted by Kerr, who also notes links to Num 11 (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 214-15). The transition from ch. 5 to 6 is notoriously awkward, and ch. 6 does stand off a bit from the context. It is the only chapter in the festival cycle not set in Jerusalem, and its treatment of the manna is more critical than anything in chs. 5; 7-10. Still, Moses is claimed as a "witness" to Jesus in 5:45-47 and ch. 6 boasts many parallels with Moses' actions in Exodus; God's "works" are discussed in 5:17 and 6:28-29; Jesus offers "life" in 5:19-30 and 6:27-58; etc.

[19] Building on Josh 5:10-12, which says the manna ceased falling the day after the first Passover was celebrated in the Promised Land, later Jewish tradition connected the Passover closely with the manna. cf. Rev 2:17; *Sib. Or*. 3.46-49; *Eccl Rab* I, 9, 1; *Mek. Vayassa'* 2:18-25; 5:63-65; *Gen Rab* 48:12; noted by Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:265; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 56-57; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:682; Severino Pancero, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity, According to John* [NTSupp 42; Leiden, Brill, 1975], 458. This is tied to the coming of the Messiah in *2 Bar* 29:3, 8.

[20] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 226, cf. 220, 224; cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 60, 64, 67; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 176, 180; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 223. Surprisingly, Coloe does not devote a chapter to John 6.

of the Jewish Passover is of no avail." If 6:49 acknowledges that Israel did recieve manna, then "it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven" (6:32) is not meant to contrast Moses with Jesus (cf. 5:45-47), but to insist that *the Father* gave the manna—the same Father who sends Jesus.[21] To be sure, as the "true" bread (ἀληθινός and ἀληθής), Jesus is *greater* than the original manna; it offered only temporary nourishment, while he offers eternal life (6:39-40, 44, 47, 50-51, 54, 58), but he has not thereby *replaced* it.[22] A parallel might be seen in the prologue, where Jesus is "the true [ἀληθινός] light" (1:9) in contrast to the Baptist, who is "not the light" (1:8a), but *is* a "witness to the light" (1:8b). If we may see the same relation here, it would imply that the manna never was the true "bread from heaven," but it does bear witness to it.

In support of such a connection, note that manna had long been understood to symbolize God's word or Wisdom.[23] For instance, Wis 16:26 follows Deut 8:3 in claiming, "it is not the production of crops that feeds humankind but… your word sustains those who trust [πιστεύω] in you." This parallels Jesus' contrasts between "food that spoils" and the "true bread" offered to those who "believe" (πιστεύω ; cf. 6:29-30,

[21] Rightly, Moloney: "Both contrast and continuity are found here. In the past it was God who gave the bread, not Moses (cf. v. 32). Now this same God, the Father of Jesus, gives the true bread from heaven" (*Gospel of John*, 212). Keener notes that there is ample precedent for this claim; cf. Exod 16:4, 6-8, 15, 29, 32; Ps 78:19-20; Neh 9:15; Philo, *Names* 259-260 (Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:265; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:680-82).

[22] When used of things (like bread) ἀληθινός (6:32) typically means "genuine, authentic, real" (BDAG 43; cf. LSJ 64), sometimes in contrast to that which is illusory or secondary (cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:500). On the other hand, ἀληθής (6:55) does not carry such a contrastive sense in John (nor anywhere else in the NT, though cf. Wis 12:27 and Philo, *Posterity* 45); in all of John's other 15 occurrences, it means "true, despite appearances" (*Gospel According to John*, 1:500; cf. BDAG 43; LSJ 64; *contra* Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 220 n. 37). That is, Jesus' flesh and blood *really are* food, and *really do* provide eternal life, despite appearances to the contrary.

[23] Not surprisingly, many commentators think the manna that is contrasted with Jesus stands for the Torah (e.g. Pancaro, *Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 454-472; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 212, 223; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 679; Hatina, "John 20,22," 210-12; cf. Neh 9:14-20; Sir 24:23; *Gen Rab* 70.5), but even Pancaro admits that Torah is nowhere explicitly identified as manna or "bread of life" the way God's Wisdom and word are (*Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 457), and even if Torah is in view, it too is a witness to Christ (1:45, 5:39, 45-47).

35-36, 40, 47).[24] As in Wisdom, then, the point is not to replace ordinary food with the "true bread" of Jesus (is that not the crowd's misunderstanding in 6:26-27, 52?), but to stress the even greater life-giving power of Jesus' death, and perhaps to emphasize Jesus' embodiment of God's Wisdom. Thus once again we see John using festival imagery—the promised eschatological manna—to emphasize Jesus' divine prerogative to give life. John 6:40 makes this explicit, "This is indeed the will of my Father, that all who see the Son and believe in him may have eternal life; and I will raise them up on the last day." It is no wonder the crowd reacts, not by decrying his replacement of the Passover, but by grumbling that this "son of Joseph" could claim to "come down from heaven" (6:41-42).

Nor is this the only indication of Jesus' divine identity in John 6; it is also seen when Jesus walks on the sea in 6:16-21. Both Jewish and non-Jewish texts describe similar incidents as theophanies,[25] and like John's many other absolute uses of ἐγώ εἰμί, Jesus' ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε (6:20), recalls God's self-identification in Exod 3:14 and Deutero-Isaiah (LXX).[26] The miracle itself points to "YHWH's unique authority over the terror of the sea,"[27] seen clearly in the crossing of the sea in Exod 14-15. Perhaps an even

---

[24] Though Pancaro notes that unlike in John, in Wisdom 16 the manna (unlike the "crops" here; cf. 16:20) is not contrasted with God's "word," but is in fact "a singular manifestation of the power of God's word" (Pancaro, *Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 456-57). Many other texts connect God's Wisdom or Word with food, especially bread, e.g., Sir 15:3; 24:21; Prov 9:5; Philo, *Heir* 191; *Creation* 158; *Flight* 137-38; *Worse* 118; *Alleg. Interp.* 3.162, 169 (Pancaro, *Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 455; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:683; Hatina, "John 20,22," 211).

[25] E.g. Exodus 14-15; Job 9:8; 38:16; Psa 29:3; 65:7; 77:19; 89:9; 93:3-4; Isa 43:1-5; 51:9-10; Virgil, *Aen*. 1.142; Valerius, *Flaccus* 1.651-52; Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 39; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1.672; Stephen S. Kim, "The Christological and Eschatological Significance of Jesus' Passover Signs in John 6," *BibSac* 164 (2007): 320.

[26] This is pre-Johannine (cf. Mark 6:50 and Matt 14:27), but it may point to a theophany even in the Synoptics (so Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 254-55; Kim, "Christological and Eschatological Significance,"320). Μὴ φοβεῖσθε introduces many theophanies, e.g., Gen 15:1; 26:24; 46:43; Isa 41:13; 43:1-3; Tob 12:17; Matt 28:5; Luke 1:30; Rev 1:17. The *Haggadah* states, "For I will pass through the land of Egypt, I and no angel; and I will smite all the firstborn, I and no seraph; and over all the gods of Egypt, I will execute judgment, I and no messenger; I, the LORD, I am and no other" (Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 213).

[27] Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 39. This follows an attempt to make Jesus king, just as YHWH's divine kingship was proven by his victory over the sea (e.g. Exod 15:18; Ps 29:10; 93:1-4; Rev 4:2-6).

closer parallel, however, appears in Job 9:8, which insists that God *alone* "walks on the waves of the sea" (LXX).[28] Once again Jesus, the man, is seen performing a unique divine prerogative.

Yet if this exodus and Passover imagery is not replaced, what about the allusions to the Eucharist some detect in 6:53-59?[29] Even if such allusions are intended, they are secondary to the passage's primary focus on Jesus death itself as the source of life.[30] The references to "blood" (four times in 6:53-56) strongly point to the crucifixion, as John's only comparable use of the term is of the blood from Jesus' side in 19:34.[31] As we will see in the next chapter, John 19 does indeed connect Jesus' death with the Pascal Lamb by a variety of means, but the point there as well is to emphasize the significance of Jesus' death, not to replace an institution.[32]

Drawing on Klawans' recognition that such reapplications of Temple and sacrificial language are not only widespread but usually positive, attempting to *extend* the Temple's meaning,[33] the point in John 6 is not to replace one feast (the Passover) with another (the Eucharist), but to draw *from* the Passover a depth of meaning that might otherwise be missed. In Klawans' language, John does not "spiritualize" an otherwise

---

[28] Περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης; cf. John 6:19 περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης (Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:673). MT has "tramples [דרך] the waves of the sea," which better fits God's victory over the sea.

[29] E.g. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:284-285; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 176.

[30] So Keener, "John's words invite his audience to look to Christ's death itself, not merely those symbols which point to his death" (*Gospel of John*, 1:690, cf. 689-691; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 218; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 177; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 221-24; Lincoln, *Gospel According to John*, 233. Others deny the Eucharist is in view at all (Beasley-Murray, *John*, 95; Köstenberger, *John*, 215-217).

[31] Though cf. 1:13. An emphasis on Jesus' death also fits well with Jesus' actions at the earlier Passover in John 2 (not to mention 1:32, 49, if those reflect the Pascal lamb), all of which, of course, point to Jesus' final Passover.

[32] Moloney is correct that, "The Passover context must not be forgotten. As once Israel ate of the manna in the desert… so now the world is summoned to accept the further revelation of God in the broken body and spilled blood of the Son of Man" (*Gospel of John*, 222, cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 94-95; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 219).

[33] E.g. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 220.

mundane ritual; he "sacrificializes" what might otherwise be mistaken for a mundane death.[34] Yet to go beyond Klawans, John is not just drawing from the festival's symbolism and expectations, it is also reinterpreting them. For John, the Passover itself is only properly understood in light of Jesus' death, to which it points. That is, Jesus' death is not just a potential extension of Passover symbolism; it is the *fulfillment* of that symbolism.[35] Especially when read with 1:29, 36; 2:13-25 and 19:28-37, it becomes clear that Jesus is not just *a* Passover lamb, but *the* Lamb of God, the true lamb of which all others are merely imperfect reflections. But the latter are not for that reason unimportant or replaced, for their pointing function remains intact even in fulfillment. After all, there is no point in describing Jesus' death as a Passover sacrifice unless one's audience can recognize the allusions, and such is only possible for those to whom the Passover remains meaningful, even if only as a memory. Indeed, if anything, recognition of the Passover's fulfillment in Jesus can make the ritual *more* meaningful, not less, as a means of remembering and participating in Jesus' death.

Water and Light at Tabernacles in John 7 and 8

Of all the festival discourses in John, none emphasizes Jesus' connection to the central aspects of the feast more clearly than the Tabernacles discourse. Set before (7:1-13), halfway through (7:14-36) and on "the last and greatest day of the feast" (7:37-8:59),[36] the discourse draws on the imagery of the festival's water-pouring ceremony and

[34] Crucifixion is, after all, normally reserved for slaves and criminals, not the Messiah.

[35] And in emphasizing that fulfillment, Yee, Kerr, Coloe, Hoskins and Um are quite correct, it is only in tying this to replacement that they go too far.

[36] Excluding 7:53-8:11, which is absent from the earliest manuscripts and obscures the connections between these chapters. With it bracketed, 8:12-59 plainly continues the discourse from ch. 7 and almost certainly takes place the same day of the feast (cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 219-21; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:335-6; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 77; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 118 n. 3; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 228 n. 59).

great candelabra. Many, of course, assume Jesus' allusions to these aspects of the feast point to their replacement,[37] but the controversy in these chapters quite clearly lies elsewhere. "The Jews" ask where Jesus is from (7:15, 27, 42-45) and where he is going (7:35; 8:22), and most of all question his identity (7:20, 25-27, 31, 40; 8:25, 48, 52-53, 57), all themes also evident in Jesus' own words (esp. 7:16-19, 28-29; 8:23-29, 54-58), but never do they accuse him of challenging the Temple itself.[38] The focus is on Jesus' identity, origin, and destination, and this provides a better way of reading Jesus' offer of water in 7:37-39 and light in 8:12. Jesus does not replace the Temple; he appears *within* the Temple to offer the water and light that the festival rituals appealed to *God* to send. As affirmed in the Hallel (Ps 113-118), sung each day during the water-pouring ceremony,[39] God is the true source of water (Ps 114:7-8) and light (118:27). In this context, Jesus' offer of living water and the light of the world should be seen to highlight his divine origin, identity and prerogatives, themes continued in the subsequent conversation as well.

Returning to the Temple for Tabernacles (ἀναβαίνω; 7:10, 14), "on the last and greatest day of the feast"[40] Jesus proclaims that all who thirst may come to *him*, and

---

[37] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:327; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 80-81; Spataora, *From the "Temple of God,"* 114; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 79-80; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 225-29; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 160-170; cf. also Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 130, 143; Um's brief treatment does not mention replacement (*Temple Christology*, 156-59; cf. Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 449); Songer rightly stresses Jesus' identity without affirming replacement, focusing mainly on the messianic expectations of the feast ("John 5-12," 463-65).

[38] Several previous studies note that the controversy sparked by Jesus' words focuses on his identity, but they do not recognize that the lack of any discussion of replacement in these debates undermines their position (cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 78-82; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 116, 125, 134-142; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 246-47; cf. also Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 122, 131).

[39] Cf. *m. Sukk.* 3:9; 4:8; *t. Sukk.* 3:2; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 74; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 121; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 248 n. 124; Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 67.

[40] Coloe and Kerr suggest this refers to the eighth day of "solemn rest" on which the water ritual may not have been performed, claiming this would indicate that Jesus offers what the Temple no longer does (so Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 128-30; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 229-31, 240-41; though at least one rabbi claimed the water ritual was still performed even on the eighth day; cf. *t. Sukk*. 3:16), but John's

"rivers of living water" will flow from his κοιλία (7:37-38). There is significant debate over the force of this offer.[41] At the least, it points ahead to Jesus' death and resurrection (cf. 7:39; 19:34-37; 20:19-23), but most think it also alludes to the water-pouring ceremony performed each morning during Tabernacles. In this ritual, the priests filled a golden flagon from the Pool of Siloam and poured it out on the altar while the crowds sung the Hallel, and Psalm 118 in particular.[42] As *t. Sukk* 3 makes explicit, the ceremony recalled the water given in the wilderness (e.g. Ps 114:7-8) and the river expected to pour from the eschatological Temple (e.g. Ezekiel 47; Zechariah 14).[43] If αὐτός in ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ (7:38) is taken to refer to Jesus, κοιλία can be taken to refer to his "side" (cf. 19:34),[44] and compared to the water expected from the "side" (κλίμα) of the eschatological Temple in Ezek 47:1.[45] Since *Jesus* (not the Temple) is said to be the source of water, and especially if it is Jesus' side from which the water flows, it is claimed that "Jesus becomes the new temple from which the waters of life will burst fourth."[46] But

---

expression more naturally suggests the seventh day (so Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:320; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 79; Songer, "John 5-12," 464).

[41] The major options depend on how one punctuates 7:37-38, which influences whether ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτου parallels "he who believes in me" (RSV; ESV, NASB, KJV, NKJV, NIV) or not (NJB; NET, NLT). If the latter option it followed, αὐτός can (but need not; cf. NRSV) be taken to refer to Jesus rather than the believer.

[42] Cf. *m. Sukk.* 3-4; *t. Sukk.* 3; though these date from the 2nd and 3rd C. CE, there seems to be little doubt that some form of this ceremony was performed in the Second Temple Period; for a good description, cf. Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 66-68; also accepted by, e.g., Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:326-27; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 74-74; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 119-121; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 226-27; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 161.

[43] The *Mishnah* does not make these connections, only the *Tosefta* (cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 130).

[44] But in the LXX κοιλία usually refers to the belly, womb or loins (BDAG 550-51; though there is precedent for the sense of "heart" in Sir 51:20-21). Ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας appears seven times, six of which refer to womb, loins or belly (Gen 25:23; Judg 3:22; 2 Sam 7:2; 16:11; 1 Chr 17:11; Jon 2:1 [MT and LXX 2:2; cf. also Isa 8:19).

[45] In the LXX κλίμα refers to spacial location rather than body parts, but the Hebrew term that stands behind it (כתף) generally means "shoulder" (Um, *Temple Christology*, 157). If κοιλία is meant to gloss כתף, it would not be the first time John chose a non-standard term to allude to scripture; e.g. πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας in 1:14. Ezekiel 47 is discussed at length in the Tabernacle's regulations in *t. Sukk* 3, along with Zech 14 and Num 21.

[46] Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 80; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 241; 130; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 170.

this is too hasty. The christological reading of αὐτός is by no means certain; in fact Yee, Coloe and Hoskins all reject it,[47] despite affirming Jesus' replacement of the Temple here.[48] Yet even if 7:37-39 *does* mean the water will flow from Jesus, this still points to continuity with the Temple, not replacement, as can be seen from a closer look at the scriptural background.

Most admit that Ezekiel 47 is only one of several texts that might stand behind 7:37-39,[49] and while the Temple only appears in some of them, they *all* picture God as the true source of water,[50] without any necessary criticism or replacement of the Temple.[51] For instance, Zechariah 14 explicitly sets God's outpouring of water at an eschatological celebration of Tabernacles, and connects this to the enthronement of the LORD over all nations (14:6-21).[52] The Hallel itself declares, "Tremble, O earth, at the

---

[47] Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 79-80; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 125-130; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 163, 170; also Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 122-134; the christological reading is accepted by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 236-37; Um, *Temple Christology*, 157-58; cf. also Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:320-28.

[48] Despite adopting the non-christological punctuation, all three still see Ezek 47 and Zech 14 as primary background for 7:37-38, insisting that Jesus remains the ultimate source of water, even if it flows *through* the believer (cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 79-80; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 126-27, 133; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 163-66), but if κοιλία does not refer to Jesus, how can he replace the Temple in this image?

[49] E.g. Kerr admits, "I do not deny that there are a host of possible allusions, but I believe the words of Jesus focus especially on Zech. 14.8 and Ezek. 47.1-11" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 241, cf. 239-40; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 130-131; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 163-66; Um, *Temple Christology*, 157).

[50] Other texts often noted are Ps. 36:8-9 [LXX 35:9-10]; 78[77]:15-16, 20; 105[104]:40-41; 114[113]:7-8 (which refer to God giving water from the rock; cf. Exod 17; Num 20); Zech 12:10 (cited in John 19:37 to explain the flow of blood and water from Jesus' side [πλευρά]); Zech 14:8 (discussed below); Jer 2:13; 17:13 (which call God himself "the fountain of living waters"); Isa 12:3; 44:2-3; 48:21; 55:1-2; 58:11 (all of which connect water with God's restoration); or Prov 18:4; Sir 24:20-24 (which connect water and Wisdom); cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:327-29; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 127, 130-31; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 237-41; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 165-66; Um, *Temple Christology*, 156.

[51] Especially in the Psalms, there are many references to God as the (only true) source of water, often in Psalms that express loyalty to the Jerusalem Temple, e.g.: 36:8-9; 65:9-13 (cf. positive reference to the Temple in v. 4); 68:8-9 (cf. vv. 5, 17, 24, 29, 35); 74:15 (cf. vv. 2-3); 77:17; 78:15-16, 20 (cf. vv. 68-69); 104:10-18; 105:40-41; 107:9, 35; 114:7-8; 147:8, 15-18 (cf. v. 12); cf. Chapter Three, n. 13 above.

[52] Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 72-74. Note that the Hallel also begins with an affirmation of God's kingship (and his glory and exaltation), "The LORD is exalted over all nations, his glory is above the heavens. Who is like the LORD our God, the one who sits enthroned on high, who stoops down to look at the heavens and the earth?" (Ps 113:4-6; cf. John 7:39; 8:27). According to *b. Meg*. 31a, Zechariah 14 was one of the *Haphtarah* readings during Tabernacles (noted by McKelvey, *New Temple*, 191; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 121).

presence of the LORD, at the presence of the God of Jacob, who turns the rock into a pool of water, the flint into a spring of water" (Ps 114:7-8).[53] That this was sung during the festival makes clear that it was not perceived to undermine loyalty to the Temple, which makes 114:2 all the more remarkable, "Judah became God's sanctuary, Israel his dominion." It seems even the Hallel has no problem extending Temple language and imagery beyond the Temple itself, with no implication of replacement.[54] Even Ezekiel notes that it is the return of "the glory of the God of Israel, coming from the east," whose sound was like "mighty waters" (43:2), that precedes this outflow in 47:1-11.

Regardless of whether the living water comes from Jesus' "side" or the believer's "heart," Jesus is clearly the ultimate source of the "living water" in John 7:37 ("come to me and drink") and given this background the image can be seen to point to his divine identity and eschatological role, not his replacement of the Temple. After all, Jesus is *in the Temple* (7:14; 8:20) when he offers the eschatological water expected to flow *from* the Temple, so the fact that he also goes out from the Temple (8:59) merely fulfills the outward spread both Ezekiel and Zechariah anticipate.[55] Just as in John 5 Jesus' actions on the Sabbath were seen not to violate but to fulfill the Sabbath's eschatological

[53] A connection between Jesus' words and the rock in the wilderness is not that far fetched. The rock was associated with the festival (e.g. *t. Sukk.* 3) and some think it informs John's image of blood *and* water flowing from Jesus' side in 19:34 (cf. *Tar. Num* 20:11; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 242 n. 104; Hatina, "John 20,22," 212-12; Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 130-31).

[54] For further examples, note also the numerous references to God as "my rock," "my fortress" or "my stronghold" (all expressions that elsewhere describe the Temple), again often in the context of expressions of Temple loyalty, e.g.: Ps 9:9 (cf. positive reference to the Temple in v. 11); 14:6 (cf. v. 7); 18:2, 46; 19:14; 27:1 (cf. vv. 4-6); 28:1, 8 (cf. v. 2); 31:2-4 (cf. v. 20); 42:9 (cf. v. 4); 43:2 (cf. v. 3); 46:1, 7, 11 (cf. v. 4-5); 48:3 (cf. v. 1, 9-14); 52:7 (cf. v. 8); 59:9, 16-17; 62:1-2, 5-8; 71:1, 3, 7; 73:28 (cf. v. 17); 89:26; 91:1-2, 4, 9; 92:15 (cf. v. 13); 94:22; 118:8-9; 144:1-2.

[55] Note also that the Temple in both Ezekiel and Zechariah is eschatological, so describing Jesus with its imagery points more strongly to his cosmic significance than his replacement of an institution. It is one thing to claim that this imagery is figurative and has been fulfilled by Jesus' offer of living water (this seems to be explicit in 7:39); it might even make sense to say Jesus has replaced *Harod's* Temple (though even this does not appear to be John's point), but what would it mean for Jesus to "replace" the *eschatological* Temple as the source of living water? Replacement implies historical succession, so how can one replace a Temple that is, by definition, last (ἔσχατος)?

expectations, so here Jesus does not replace the water-pouring ceremony but announces that the water they have been seeking is fully available.

That this is John's point is confirmed by 8:12, which is much more straight-forward. "I am the light of the world" almost certainly alludes to the four massive candelabra that lit the Temple during Tabernacles.[56] The Hallel again clarifies, "The LORD is God, and he has given us light. Bind the festal procession with branches, up to the horns of the altar" (Ps 118:27). Zechariah 14 also connects the return of the LORD at the eschatological Tabernacles with light (14:5-7).[57] No doubt, Yee is correct that, "The illumination represented God's own light,"[58] but she misses how this undermines her replacement paradigm.[59] This is especially clear if read in light of the prologue, as John is explicit that Jesus, as the incarnation of the λόγος, has *always* been the "true light" (1:4-5, 10).[60] As the light of the world, Jesus is the one the candelabra *represented*.[61]

This non-replacement reading is also confirmed by the ensuing dialogue, which again emphasizes Jesus' origin and identity (8:13-19), culminating in Jesus' claim that,

---

[56] Cf. *m. Sukk.* 5:2-4; this background is almost universally accepted; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:343-44; Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 69-70; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 76; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 121-22, 135-36; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 227; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 167; Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 136-144; she lists proponents on 140 n.124; Kerr also finds an allusion to Isa 9:1-2 (cf. Galilee in 7:52).

[57] As with water, the Psalms often refer to God as (the source of) light, e.g.: Ps 18:28; 27:1 (cf. positive references to the Temple in vv. 4-6); 36:9 (cf. v. 8); 50:2 (cf. vv. 3-23); 76:4 (cf. v. 2); 78:14 (cf. vv. 68-69); 84:11 (cf. vv. 1-7); 89:15; 94:1; 97:3-4 (cf. v. 8); 104:2; 105:39; 118:27; 132:17-18 (cf. v. 13); 136:7-9; 139:12. Psalms 132:17-18 is from the Songs of Ascent, which were sung during the lighting ceremony (cf. *m. Sukk.* 5:4; *t. Sukk.* 4:7; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 121), and ties God's light to the Messiah.

[58] *Jewish Feasts*, 76.

[59] "Jesus replaces the light that radiates from the great candelabra in the Court of Women…. Whereas the light from the Court of Women brightened all of Jerusalem (*m. Sukk.* 5:3), Jesus is the 'light of the world' itself, extending far beyond the confines of Jerusalem" (Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 80; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 135; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 245-46, 339; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 169-170).

[60] Hoskins admits that, "Jesus' provision of light is admittedly more difficult to tie to his fulfillment and replacement of the Temple," yet nevertheless concludes that, "Jesus fulfills and replaces the Temple as the locus of divine light" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 170).

[61] As Spaulding puts it, "Festival imagery is being employed to explicate the identity of Jesus, not to repudiate Jewish practices or beliefs. Without knowledge of those commemorative practices and beliefs, much less would be gained concerning the understanding of this person" (*Commemorative Identities*, 142).

"if you knew me, you would know my Father also" (8:19). John even reminds us, "He spoke these words while he was teaching in the treasury of the temple" (8:20), in full view of the candelabra. If our reading of 7:37-39 and 8:12 is correct, this makes perfect sense. Jesus is the one in whom God is known, the one to whom the Temple itself bears witness, the true source of life and light that "the Jews" sought in this very Temple. This emphasis on Jesus as the self-disclosure of God is then punctuated by several further "I am" statements (8:24, 28, 58, cf. 12, 18), the last of which is especially significant, "If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing. It is my Father who glorifies me, he of whom you say, 'He is our God'…. Your ancestor Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day; he saw it and was glad…. before Abraham was, I am" (8:54, 56, 58).[62] Coloe notes that the reference to Abraham seeing "my day," combined with John's claim that all this occurred on "the last [ἔσχατος] and greatest day of the feast" (7:37), could allude to the Day of the LORD, and with it the eschatological fulfillment of the festival anticipated in Zechariah 14.[63] John could hardly have made the point plainer, not that Jesus replaces Tabernacles or the Temple, but that he comes as the *God* of the Temple, to *fulfill* Tabernacles. Yet in the end this claim proves too difficult to accept, and "the Jews" respond by taking up stones against him, ironically—from John's perspective—seeking to kill him in his own Temple (8:59).

Thus if John 7 and 8 tie Jesus to the festival, they also anticipate his death. John 7:39 explicitly identifies the living water with the Spirit to be given when Jesus was "glorified," and 8:28 insists, "When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will

[62] Coloe notes that the repetition of ἐγώ εἰμί at a feast celebrating Israel's one God, "gives the phrase the character of a theophany" (Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 142, cf. 136-37, 140-41, 143; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 247).

[63] According to *Jubilees* 16, Abraham was the first to celebrate Tabernacles (cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 117, 129-130, 138-42; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 229-30, 246-47 n. 120).

realize that I am he [ἐγώ εἰμί], and that I do nothing on my own, but I speak these things as the Father instructed me." Nowhere is Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel more apparent than in this claim to be the "I am," immediately followed by a claim to "do nothing on my own." As the self-disclosure of God, he legitimately bears God's self-designation as "I am," but only speaks what the Father instructs.[64] And as elsewhere in John, here again it is primarily when Jesus is "lifted up," indicating both his crucifixion and glorification, that Jesus embodies the self-revelation of God.

Life and Judgment on the Sabbath in John 9

We will discuss John 9 only briefly, but it draws together much of what precedes it.[65] Here Jesus heals a man born blind (offering light and life), using mud, and water specially drawn from the Pool of Siloam (9:7). He does this on the Sabbath and so draws condemnation from the Jewish leaders, but "worship" from the healed man (9:38).[66] The passage thus closes by highlighting the divisive nature of Jesus' ministry, "I came into this world for judgment so that those who do not see may see, and those who do see may become blind" (9:39).[67]

---

[64] Coloe notes that in John, "doing as the father does is the true measure of sonship" (*God Dwells with Us*, 138).

[65] Kerr sets John 9 at Tabernacles (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 228, 251; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:376); Songer ("John 5-12," 465-66) and John C. Poirier ("Hanukkah in the Narrative Chronology of the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 54 [2008]: 465-478) connect it with Dedication. Most previous studies on the Temple in John do not treat John 9 independently; but cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 43-46; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, esp. 197-99, 256-58.

[66] There is, however, a significant textual variant here. P^{75} **א*** W an Old Latin and a few Coptic mss omit ὁ δὲ ἔφη· πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· (9:38-39a), though the vast majority of mss include it (e.g. P^{66} **א**^{2} A B D L Δ Θ Ψ and a great many more). Brown suggests that the longer reading represents a later liturgical addition (*Gospel According to John*, 1:375). This possibility is defended by C. L. Porter ("John 9.38, 39a: A Liturgical Addition to the Text," *NTS* 13 [1967]: 387-94), and Beasley-Murray finds it compelling, though he does not accept it (*John*, 151). Most do accept the longer reading with its explicit reference to worshipping Jesus (cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 195; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 199 n. 91), and on balance the external evidence weighs in its favor.

[67] Cf. John 12:37-41, which seems to connect sight and blindness to recognition of Jesus' pre-existence in the Temple. Does this imply that Jesus' opponents' failure to recognize his glory *in the Temple*

As in the preceding chapters, Jesus' identity and origin stand central (9:12, 16, 17, 24, 25, 29, 33, 35, 37, 39), but Jesus has just left the Temple, and is worshipped *outside* it. According to Kerr, this shows that Jesus "is the new Temple and the healed man worships him,"[68] but one does not worship the Temple; one worships the *God* of the Temple! The fact that Jesus is worshipped at an undisclosed location in Jerusalem only implies that the Temple is not the necessary location of worship (was it ever?), not that it has been replaced. In fact, this worship points much more clearly to Jesus' divine identity than to his replacement of the Temple. Again it is worth recalling the intimate connection between Sabbath and Temple: if the Sabbath is not replaced in John (as even Kerr admits[69]), it is unlikely that the Temple is either. Indeed, the importance of *place* is not rejected but reoriented around Jesus, as evidenced by the frequent emphasis in this passage on *where* Jesus is from (9:12, 29, 30, 33).[70] Throughout, the focus of the discussion is not the irrelevance of the Temple or Sabbath, but whether Jesus' healing activities on the Sabbath prove him a "sinner" or "from God" (9:33).

The details of the healing point the same way. Jesus makes mud, which may recall the creation of Adam from dust,[71] while the fact that the man was told to go and wash in the Pool of Siloam (9:7)—the very pool from which the priests drew water for the Tabernacles procession—also points to continuity.[72] Jesus may have left the Temple, but

---

epitomizes their blindness? For more on John 12, cf. Chapter One above and Five below. Coloe does not discuss ch. 9 or 12:37-41, but in her discussion of the prologue she does suggest, "Many in Israel see Jesus but their lack of receptivity blinds them to the deeper perception of his glory (9:40-41)" (*God Dwells with Us*, 27).

[68] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 199.

[69] "It is perhaps going too far to say that the eschatological Sabbath replaces the Jewish Sabbath. It is better to see the Jewish Sabbath as having come to fulfillment, that is, having been transformed" (Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 263; cf. 266).

[70] Cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 156; "where" means *from God*, but perhaps also *from the Temple*?

[71] Cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:372.

[72] Cf. Matt 8:4; Luke 17:14, in which Jesus sends healed men to the priests, "as a testimony to them" (Matt 8:4). Even more clearly than in John 5, this prerogative of working on the Sabbath seems to be

he has not rejected or abandoned it. Thus, it should come as no surprise that in the very next chapter he returns to it again, and there also the conversation centers on his identity.

Blasphemy or Consecration at the Feast of Dedication in John 10

John 10 provides a fitting conclusion to the festival cycle and creates a nice frame with John 5.[73] Here again Jesus is accused of "making himself God" (10:33), and responds with a similar insistence that he was sent by the Father to do what only God can (10:34-38). The first half of the chapter, 10:1-21, compares Jesus, "the good shepherd," with the "thieves and robbers" who came before. This seems to draw on similar parables in Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 34, which speak of YHWH as shepherd his people, again tying Jesus to the God of Israel. That theme is made explicit in 10:22-39, set in the Temple at the Feast of Dedication. Also known as Hanukkah, this "Feast of Lights" was patterned after Tabernacles,[74] and celebrates the restoration of the Temple by the Maccabees after its desecration by the second century BCE Seleucid king Antiochus IV "Epiphanes," meaning "The Manifest (God)."[75] In light of this history, the accusation of

---

exclusive to Jesus. The passage begins with a reference to "the works of God" that *Jesus* must do (9:3-4), the Pharisees accuse *Jesus* of working on the Sabbath (9:16), not the blind man, and the conversation that follows centers on whether *Jesus* is a "sinner" or truly "from God." Yee notes that Jesus performs activities prohibited on the Sabbath—making mud and healing a non-life threatening illness—but rightly concludes, "Jesus in no way violates the Sabbath when he heals the ailing. Like his Father, he cannot rest on the Sabbath from his creative and liberative work governing the world" (*Jewish Feasts*, 46; cf. 44-45; Songer, "John 5-12," 466).

[73] Like John 6, ch. 10 (esp. vv. 1-18) fits a little awkwardly in its context, but a few themes recur from chs. 5-9 (esp. the offer of life; 10:10), and Coloe notes that Dedication completes the liturgical year begun with the Passover, while the reference to the colonnades (στοά) of Solomon's Porch forms an *inclusio* with 5:2 (Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 145; cf. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 117-19; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 175).

[74] Cf. 1 Macc 4:5-59; 2 Macc 10:5-9; Jos. *Ant.* 12:316-325; Tabernacles was also tied to Temple dedication (cf. 1 Kgs 8:2, 64; Ezra 3:1-4; 2 Macc 1:9; 2:9-12; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 87; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 148-49; Jerry R. Lancaster and Larry Overstreet, "Jesus' Celebration of Hanukkah in John 10," *BibSac* 152 [1995]: 320; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 450. This time John is more concerned with the history of the feast than its rituals.

[75] Lancaster and Overstreet, "Hanukkah in John 10," 325; Antiochus stripped the Temple of its wealth (1 Macc 1:20-28), executed many Jews who refused to renounce their traditions (1 Macc 1:54-64), and finally offered a sacrifice to Zeus in the Temple itself (cf. 1 Macc 1:59; cf. Dan 11:31) before the Maccabees

"blasphemy"[76] in 10:33, and Jesus' claim to be "the one the Father has sanctified and sent into the world" (10:33-36), have both been taken to reflect his replacement of the Temple.[77] As throughout the festival cycle, however, the context points instead to Jesus' identity and role in continuity with the hopes of Dedication.

This emphasis on Jesus' identity is explicit in 10:24, where "the Jews" demand, "If you are the Messiah, tell us plainly!" It was a natural question to raise at a the festival with strong messianic associations involving the Maccabees (cf. 1 Macc 9:21).[78] Jesus responds, "I have told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father's name testify to me; but you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep" (10:25-26). This refers to Jesus' claim to be "the good shepherd" who "lays down his life for the sheep" (10:11). It recalls passages that describe God and the Messiah as shepherd(s) of Israel, "I myself will be the shepherd of my sheep, and I will make them lie down, says the Lord GOD." (Ezek 34:15; cf. Jer 23:3).[79] It is quite fitting, then, that when Jesus repeats his claim to be Shepherd in 10:24, it leads to his clearest claim yet of equality with God, "I and the Father are one" (10:30).[80]

---

retook and restored the Temple; cf. 1 Macc 4:36-58; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 83-88; Lancaster and Overstreet, "Hanukkah in John 10," 318-27.

[76] The term appears most often in 1-2 Macc in the LXX (cf. McGrath, *John Apologetic Christology*, 120).

[77] Cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:411; Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 147; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 91; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 255; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 172. Coloe rightly focuses on Jesus' identity (*God Dwells with Us*, 146), but still concludes, "The glory of the God of Israel, revealed in Jesus, permanently leaves the Temple. The cultic institutions of Israel are left emptied of the reality they once symbolized and celebrated" (*God Dwells with Us*, 155). As usual, Fuglseth denies replacement but does not look for any alternative meaning in John's symbolism (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 278-79).

[78] Noted by Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 149; cf. also 7:25-27, 31, 41-41; cf. 6:14-15.

[79] Kerr notes that the LXX adds καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος (*Temple of Jesus' Body,* 340-41). God is frequently pictured as the Shepherd of Israel, e.g., Gen 48:15; 49:24; Ps 23:1; 74:1; 79:13; 80:1; 95:7; Isa 40:10-11; Jer 23:4-6; Mic 5:2-5 [LXX and MT 5:1-4]; Zech 13:7; Ps Sol 17:40; Sir 18:13; 4Q509 4.24 [frag.; uncertain]; *1 En* 89:18; *LAB* 28:5; 30:5; Philo *Agric.* 50-53; *T. Neof.* Exod 12:42; (for others, cf. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 60, 267 n. 59; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:797-802, esp. 1:802 n. 246; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 89-90; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 149-51; Songer, "John 5-12," 466; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:397, 406; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 223-4; Koester, *Symbolism*, 113).

[80] This choice of words would have been especially resonant at a feast that celebrates the *oneness* of God in the face of idolatry (cf. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 88).

More remarkable, from our perspective, is the explicit contrast with "all who came before," who "were thieves and bandits" (10:8). In Jeremiah and Ezekiel, God promised to *remove* the wicked shepherds, before himself gathering the sheep.[81] If this is John's point, it might seem to offer just the sort of replacement claim that is lacking from John's treatment of the Temple, though if so it is directed towards the Jewish leadership, not "the Jews" as a people or their institutions.[82] But John, unlike Jeremiah and Ezekiel, does not call those "who came before" *shepherds*. There is only one Shepherd in John, so the "thieves and bandits" are simply those who arrogate to themselves Jesus' rightful authority over the sheep.[83] Perhaps that is why 10:12-13 compares them to a "hired hand," who sees a wolf and abandons the flock. A hired hand is a *representative* of the shepherd, but is not the shepherd himself.[84] Even in condemning the Jewish leadership, John implies that their office derives from Jesus' own authority.[85]

Even less likely to imply replacement are the references to consecration or sanctification and blasphemy. Though Jesus could be echoing the consecration of the Temple by claiming to be "the one the Father has sanctified [ἁγιάζω]" (10:36),[86] even

---

[81] Ezek 34:10-12 is especially forthright, "Thus says the Lord GOD, I am against the shepherds… I will rescue my sheep from their mouths, so that they may not be food for them. For thus says the Lord GOD: I myself will search for my sheep, and will seek them out. As shepherds seek out their flocks when they are among their scattered sheep, so I will seek out my sheep" (cf. Jer 23:1).

[82] In light of John 9, the Pharisees are the most natural referent for the "thieves and bandits," as most accept; e.g., Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:392; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 223; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:805.

[83] Cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:803.

[84] A somewhat more charitable view of the Jewish leaders than as "thieves," this admits their legitimate (though derivative) authority, and allows that their failure may reflect fear instead of malice (Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 226-27).

[85] This is a theme that will be applied to the high priesthood in John 17-19, which we will discuss in the next chapter. Fuglseth claims that in John 10, "the allusions to the priesthood of Jesus seem much closer than the allusion to the temple itself" (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 280). Brown also thinks allusions to the priesthood may be seen in both halves of John 10 (cf. *Gospel According to John*, 1:392, 411; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 340).

[86] Cf. 1 Macc 4:48; 3 Macc 2:9, 16; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 153. Kerr also suggests the reference to "Solomon's Porch" (10:23), which could allude to the fact that Solomon consecrated the first Temple (cf. 1 Kgs 9:3, 7; 2 Chr 2:4 [LXX 2:3]; 7:16, 20; Ps 46:6 [LXX 45:5]; *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 253).

Brown admits that without a wider replacement motif in John, Jesus' consecration "would not have been anomalous in the framework of traditional Israelite thought." [87] As he notes, ἁγιάζω is also used in the LXX of those set aside for important work or high office, including the priests.[88] Kerr even connects this with Peter's declaration that, "you are the Holy One [ὁ ἅγιος] of God" (6:69),[89] though he misses that when used as a title, ὁ ἅγιος nearly always refers to God himself.[90] Thus, even if John's use of ἁγιάζω does recall the consecration of the Temple, this again implies continuity rather than replacement: Jesus is the embodiment of the one *for whom* the Temple was consecrated.

Likewise, the accusation of blasphemy for "making yourself God" (10:33)[91] points more clearly to Antiochus' claim to be "the Manifest God" than to his desecration of the Temple.[92] Jesus' response emphasizes the legitimacy of his divine prerogative, as "the one whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world … God's son" (10:36). Quoting Ps 82:6 [LXX 81:6], "I say, 'you are gods,'" Jesus argues *a fortiori* that, if those *to whom* the word of God came are called gods, how much more the one the Father *sent*

---

[87] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:411; cf. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 280; in contrast, Hoskins claims, "The consecration of Jesus as the true Temple necessarily means that he takes the place of the Jerusalem Temple, for God only chooses one place at a time for his people to come and worship him" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 172; so also Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 254; but Jesus is not a *place*, but a person!). Cf. also Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, 91; cf. Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 148; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 450.

[88] Cf. Lev 8:30; 2 Chr 26:18; also Moses (Sir 45:5) and Jeremiah (Jer 1:5); Brown wonders if the term here could "constitute a Johannine allusion to the priesthood of Jesus" (*Gospel According to John*, 1:411).

[89] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 255.

[90] Cf. Ps 70:22; 97:1; Isa 5:16; 12:6; 14:27; 30:12, 15; 40:25; 41:20; 43:3, 14, 15; 45:11; 48:17; 49:7; Hab 1:12; 3:3; Odes 4:3; Sir 48:20 (cf. Rev. 3:7; 6:10; 22:11); ὁ ἅγιος does describe the Temple in Esd 7:5, but not as a title. Peter's exclamation in John 6:69 is paralleled in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34.

[91] Kerr claims the charge is meant to be ironic, as "the Jews" themselves are desecrating "the true Temple of God," by taking up stones against Jesue (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 253; cf. Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 148; Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 451).

[92] Yee notes, "The issue for John is Christological. The Jews stubbornly refuse to accept Jesus as Messiah and God's son, even in the face of Jesus' signs. They view Jesus not only as a mere human being, but also a dangerous one in arrogating to himself divinity and influencing others to believe in him" (*Jewish Feasts*, 91; cf. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 280-81). Thus even if John does intend the charge to rebound on "the Jews," the point would seem to be their blaspheming *God*, and only secondarily (if at all) their desecration of the Temple.

(10:35-36)? As Brown puts it, "For John, Jesus never makes himself anything; everything that he is stems from the Father. He is not a man who makes himself God; he is the Word of God who has become man."[93]

Hoskins notes that 2 Macc 2:8 anticipates the restoration of God's glory to the Temple.[94] Is it too much to see in Jesus' claim to be "the one the Father has sanctified and sent" the fulfillment of just that hope for the return of God's glory (cf. 1:14-18)?[95] Jesus is often connected with God's glory in John, including in 8:50, 54 and 9:24, and the same hope of God's return to Jerusalem appears in the context of many of John's scriptural allusions, including Malachi 3, Zechariah 14; Psalm 69, Isaiah 52 and Ezekiel 47. So when Jesus returns to the Temple at Dedication and claims to be "one" with the same Father whose house *is* the Temple (10:30; cf. 2:16; 14:1-3), there seems to be good grounds for understanding this as the fulfillment of such hopes. At the least, it is clear that in John 10, as in the rest of the festival cycle, the focus is once more on Jesus' identity as the one through whom God is revealed.

Conclusion

As already seen in John 1-4, so in the festival cycle as well John's allusions to the Temple serve again and again to highlight Jesus' divine origin, prerogatives and identity, not his replacement of a Jewish institution. He works on the Sabbath, not because the

---

[93] *Gospel According to John*, 1:408, cf. 410; also cited by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 252 n. 135. Though Brown admits that this reference to ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ can only be tied to the prologue very tentatively, it might imply a further *a fortiori* argument, "if it is permissible to call men 'gods' because they were vehicles of the word of God, how much more permissible to use 'God' of him who *is* the Word of God" (*Gospel According to John*, 1:410; cf. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 127-28). As Robert Kyser notes, "His identity is not found in any traditional messianic title but in a unique, unparalleled relationship with God" ("John 10:22-30," *Int* 43 [1989]: 68; cited by Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 151)

[94] *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 171.

[95] Wright argues for a similar paradigm in the Synoptics; cf. *Jesus and the Victory of God*, esp. 612-653: "I suggest, in short, that the return of YHWH to Zion, and the Temple-theology which it brings into focus, are the deepest keys and clues to gospel Christology" (*Jesus and the Victory of God*, 653).

Sabbath has been abolished, but because he bears God's unique authority over life and judgment (John 5). He is the true Bread of Life that fulfills the expectations of Passover (John 6). He is the true source of God's water and light to which the Temple points, especially at Tabernacles (John 7-9). He is the true Shepherd and Consecrated One (John 10). Many of these images carry messianic overtones, but more than that, they point to the one whose coming is as the return of God to his people, the return of God to his Temple. True, Jesus also leaves the Temple and offers the same blessings outside it, but even this can be seen to fulfill the expectations in Zechariah 14 and Ezekiel 47 that the Temple would be the source of God's blessing, but that they would also pour out *from* Jerusalem to fill the whole earth. It is consistent with this that Jesus concludes the festival cycle by leaving Jerusalem in 10:40-42, to continue his ministry by the Jordan, precisely where Ezekiel 47 expected the eschatological water to flow, "and many believed in Jesus in that place" (10:42).[96] Unfortunately, the festival cycle also closes on a mixed note, as he leaves the Temple on threat of death (10:39). It is "the feast[s] of the Jews" that have most clearly revealed Jesus' divine identity, yet "the Jews" by and large have not accepted him. Both halves of this tension, rejection and fulfillment, are brought to a head at Jesus' final Passover.

[96] Note that it is from Solomon's Porch that Jesus departs, and according to Acts 3:11 and 5:12, Jesus' earliest followers chose just that spot to meet after Jesus' resurrection (noted by Lancaster and Overstreet, "Hanukkah in John 10," 331).

Chapter Five
Priesthood, Temple and Kingship in John 11-21[1]

After the festival cycle, John's Temple allusions become less common and direct, but no less important. We have already noted connections in 12:37-41 and 14:1-3, but it is in the trial, crucifixion and resurrection accounts that John's Temple imagery reaches its height. First, in 11:45-53 and chapters 17-19 Jesus who dies for his people is contrasted with the priests who seek his life, but despite this abuse, the priesthood is still shown to represent and bear witness to Jesus. Then in 12:23-41 and chapters 19-20, John draws his earlier festival imagery to a climax by picturing Jesus' death and resurrection as an eschatological "lifting up" and "glorification" that encompass Temple restoration and divine enthronement. As throughout John, Jesus is not seen as the replacement of the Temple, but as the embodiment of the *God* of the Temple, whose enthronement promises the restoration of the Temple, the people of God, and the whole world.

Jesus as True High Priest

Though chapters 11 and 12 are generally considered part of the "Book of Signs,"[2] they prefigure key themes in John's passion narrative.[3] Jesus' death and resurrection are anticipated by the raising of Lazarus (11:1-44; cf. 12:1-11), Jesus' kingship is announced at the Triumphal Entry (12:12-19), and his glorification is stressed in 11:40, 12:23-28 and 12:37-41. Together, these anticipate Jesus' death and resurrection as his glorification and enthronement, both themes that connect him to the Temple in positive ways, as we will see in the second half of this chapter. Amidst all this, however, there is a brief incident

[1] *Portions of this chapter are adapted from a paper submitted to Dr. Tony Cummins for RELS 622, April 10, 2007.*

[2] E.g. Brown, *Introduction*, 298-316.

[3] Brown, *Introduction*, 306-7; Judith L. Kovacs, "'Now Shall the Ruler of this World be Driven Out': Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36," *JBL* 114(1995): 228.

that many take to indicate a more hostile relationship between Jesus, the Temple and the high priesthood: John 11:45-53.

Concerned that "many of the Jews" now believed in Jesus (11:45), "the chief priests and the Pharisees" (11:47) decide that Jesus must be killed, or else "the Romans will come and destroy both our holy place and our nation" (11:48).[4] Caiaphas then replies, "it is better for you to have one man die for the people than to have the whole nation destroyed" (11:50). Thus 11:45-53, like 18:12-19:22 after it, presents "the high priest(s)" as Jesus' primary opponents. Since the latter passage is framed by allusions to Jesus' own high priesthood in John 17 and 19, Kerr concludes that this contrast means the high priesthood "must be finished," replaced by Jesus "the real high priest."[5] In truth, the case for the rejection and/or replacement of the priesthood in John is stronger than that for the rejection or replacement of the Temple. Nowhere is John's presentation of the Temple anywhere near as unflattering as the depiction of the priests in John 18-19. Even here, however, it can be seen that John rejects only the *abuse* of the priesthood, not the institution or role of the priesthood itself. If Jesus is the true high priest, it is much too simplistic to outright dismiss the old priesthood as "finished," as the priesthood was more than just a person, but an office and an ideal. As with the Temple, Jesus' relation to it appears to be eternal as well as eschatological, and even in its present abuse by Annas and Caiaphas, it still bears witness to Jesus.

---

[4] "Holy" is a gloss added by the NRSV; the Greek is simply τόπος, but it likely refers to the Temple, cf. 4:20; so Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 165; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 88, 156, 303-6.

[5] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus Body*, 319, 318, cf. 314-370; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 201-6. John Paul Heil argues that John presents Jesus as a new and different kind of high priest, who "supersedes" the Jerusalem high priests ("Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John," *CBQ* 57 [1995], 729-745, esp. 730-31). This aspect of the Temple theme is not mentioned by McKelvey, Spatafora, Yee or Um; Hoskins (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 175), Fuglseth (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 280) and Walker (*Jesus and the Holy City*, 172-73) mention it briefly.

Reflecting a popular belief in the prophetic function of the high priest,[6] 11:45-53 actually emphasizes that it is "as high priest that year"[7] that Caiaphas "prophesied that Jesus was about to die for the [Jewish] nation, and not for the nation only, but to gather [συνάγω] into one the dispersed children of God" (11:51-52). Of course, Jesus is killed and the Romans *still* "take away both our holy place and our nation," but John presumeably thinks Caiaphas is ironically correct that Jesus' death will bring about the ingathering of the people of God.[8] Some think this presupposes the replacement of "our place and our nation" with the new Temple and people of Jesus' body,[9] but this is not explicit, and there is little reason to infer it. As in 2:13-23, Jesus' death is here connected with the Temple's destruction, but it is not identified as its cause. In fact, this ingathering of God's people was commonly associated with the restoration of the Temple, not least in the closing chapters of Zechariah from which John quotes so often.[10] Zechariah specifically ties this ingathering to the enthronement of God as King (14:6-21), so it is fitting that

---

[6] E.g. Philo *Spec. Laws* 4.191-92; Jos. *Ant.* 11.326-31; 13.299-300; *t. Sutah* 13.5-6; cf. C.H. Dodd, "The Prophecy of Caiaphas: John xi. 47-53," in *More New Testament Studies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 63-65. Dodd thinks this must be pre-Johannine, "for such a valuation of the office of high priest, even when its occupant was unworthy, could hardly have persisted among Christians already aware of a distance between them and the Jewish community" ("Prophecy," 65). Our study suggests much less "distance" between John and Judaism, and in line with this John shows no compunction about attributing such a prophecy to Caiaphas. Indeed, even Dodd admits that "the words of Caiaphas are accepted as a true prophecy, and this is taken so seriously that they occupy the place in a 'pronouncement story' which is normally given to a *Herrnwort*" ("Prophecy," 65).

[7] The significance of "that year" is disputed. Dodd thinks it mistakenly reflects the Greek practice of annual priestly appointments, showing that John was "without personal experience of conditions before the fall of the Temple" ("Prophecy," 67), but John's detailed knowledge of the Temple and festivals evidenced elsewhere makes this unlikely. Rather, "that year" likely means "that fateful year," i.e. the year Jesus died, which is consistent with John's treatment of time elsewhere (e.g. "that day" in 11:53; so Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:439-440; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:853-54; Heil, "Unique High Priest," 732-33).

[8] Fuglseth quotes Barrett: "Jesus was put to death and (politically) the people perished. Yet he died ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ and those of the nation who believed in him did not perish" (Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 311; he does not cite a specific source for this quotation).

[9] So Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:443; Coloe suggests that in killing Jesus, who *is* the true Temple, the priests bring about the very destruction they fear (cf. 2:19; *God Dwells with Us*, 165, 203; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 24-25, 88; Koester, *Symbolism*, 88-89).

[10] Cf. Isa 11:12; 43:5; Ezek 28:25; Mark 13:27; 2 Thes 2:1; Dodd, "Prophecy," 58-59; cf. also our discussion of 2:18-22 and 14:1-3 in Chapter Two above.

shortly after this scene in John, Jesus is acclaimed "the King of Israel" (12:12-19), is approached by some Greeks who had come up (ἀναβαίνω) to Jerusalem for the feast (12:20-22), and declares that "the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified" (12:23). In this light, John's explanation that Jesus would die "for the nation," does not imply the replacement of one people with another, but rather anticipates that Jesus' death will bring both Jews and Gentiles "together into *one*" (11:51-52).

Of course, this passage does implicitly contrast Jesus who dies for his people, with the "high priests" who seek to kill him, but even here there is no clear sense of replacement. The office of high priest is actually affirmed, as *even in abusing his position* Caiaphas rightly "prophesied" the significance of Jesus' death "for the people." The priesthood, John seems to imply, is *ideally* a pointer to Jesus, and even in abuse, it bears witness to his identity, a theme we will also find evident in chapters 17-19. To see this, we will first briefly examine the apparently priestly allusions in John 17 and 19:22-37, then return to the trial narrative in 18:1-19:21.

High Priestly Allusions in John 17

In John 17 Jesus prays for himself (17:1-5), his disciples (17:6-19), and future believers (17:20-26). This three-fold structure resembles Lev 16:17, in which the high priest enters the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement to "make atonement for himself and for his house [οἶκος] and for all the assembly of Israel."[11] If this similarity is

[11] This connection to Lev 16:17 is noted by Beasley-Murray, though he does not accept it (*John*, 295). Kerr notes that the high priest is frequently said to pray for the people of Israel (e.g., Jdt 9:1; Sir 50:11-26; Philo *Spec. Laws* 1.97; 1.168-67; 1.197; Jos. *Apion* 2.196; *Ant.* 4.203; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 321-322). These connections are denied by Moloney, *John*, 471-471; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1051; Köstenberger, *John*, 482 n. 1. If accepted, this might support Kerr and Coloe's claim that "my Father's house" in 14:2-3 refers to believers (cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 276-78, 293-313; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 157-178; but cf. Chapter Two above).

intentional (which is not certain), it not only gives Jesus a high priestly role, but even more importantly it places him in the holy of holies. John 12:37-41 has already tied Jesus to the "glory" that was seen there, even in the First Temple,[12] and John 17 also refers to Jesus' pre-existent "glory" (17:5, 24). Thus, if Jesus' prayer does echo the high priest's prayer in the holy of holies, this does not replace the priesthood, but rather indicates his embodiment of the one whose glory they represented.[13]

Similarly, references to Jesus' consecration and bearing of God's name may reflect the priestly consecration,[14] and bearing of the divine name.[15] Yet again replacement is no necessary inference. First, the fact that Jesus consecrates *himself* (ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν; 17:19), could refer to the self-consecration of the priests (cf. Exod 19:22; 1 Esd 1:3), but it could also allude to the self-consecration of *God*, which Ezekiel especially emphasizes.[16] In John 17, the references to consecration stand in the context of the

---

[12] As will be discussed below, there may be a further allusion to the holy of holies in John's resurrection account, where the place of Jesus' resurrection is flanked by two angels, just as the ark was (20:12).

[13] One might even say Jesus embodies the high priest's heavenly archetype, as Philo claimed of the λόγος, though this is not explicit in John; cf. Philo *Dreams* 1.215, which states that there are two Temples of God, one being the whole world, in which the θεῖος λόγος is high priest, and the other being "the rational soul," of which the human priesthood is a "copy" (μίμημα). Cf. also *Flight* 118; noted by Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 115-17.

[14] Kerr connects Jesus' self-consecration with the consecration of the priests (e.g. Exod 28:41; 29:1; 30:30; 40:13; Lev 8:12, 30; *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 366-68); Brown connects it with both the dedication of sacrificial animals (Deut 15:19) and the consecration of priests and prophets (e.g. Exod 28:41; Jer 1:5; *Gospel According to John*, 2:766-767; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 301; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 202; Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 172-73).

[15] Cf. Exod 28:36-37; *Ep. Arist.* 98; Philo *Life of Moses* 2.132; Jos. *Ant.* 11:331; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 333-335. Kerr notes that, "For the high priests there was a sense in which the name יהוה was external—they wore it as part of their priestly attire—whereas for Jesus the name was part and parcel of who he was" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 335, cf. 320-21 n. 21).

[16] Cf. Ezek 20:41; 28:22, 25; 36:23; 38:16, 23; 39:27; cf. also Num 20:13. Unlike John's ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν, the LXX of Ezekiel mostly uses ἁγιασθήσομαι, a passive that could be translated "I will be consecrated" (NETS has "I will be hallowed"; cf. JPS; KJV; NKJV), but it translates a Nifal, נקדשתי, which likely has a reflexive sense (as the NRSV indicates; so also ESV, NASB, NIV, NJB, NLT, Holman; cf. BDB 873; Christo H.J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004], 78). According to Conybeare and Stock, "Instances of passive form with middle meaning are common in the LXX," particularly in the first person (F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* [Boston: Hendrickson, 1995], 76). This reflexive sense is very similar to John's ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν, just less emphatic. Hoskins argues for a similar reflexive sense in Isaiah's

disciples being sent out "into the world" (17:18; cf. vv. 13-19), yet being "one" (17:20-23), a term used of ingathering in 11:45-53. So also, several of Ezekiel's references to God's self-consecration are also connected with the ingathering of Israel from among the nations, "I bring you out from the peoples, and gather you out of the countries where you have been scattered; and I will manifest my holiness [ἁγιασθήσομαι] among you in the sight of the nations" (Ezek 20:41; cf. 28:25; 39:27). Ezekiel describes this as God's self-revelation to "the nations," and for John also, Jesus' consecration results in "the world" believing and knowing "that you sent me" (17:21, 23; cf. Ezek 36:23).[17] This suggests that Jesus' consecration of himself and the disciples is more about revealing God to the world and restoring God's people, than replacing the high priesthood.

This also fits with Jesus' claim to reveal God's name (17:6, 11-12, 26).[18] In light of John's consistent emphasis on Jesus as ἐγώ εἰμί and the ties between this expression and God's self-revelation in Deutero-Isaiah, it is likely that "the name you gave me" is indeed ἐγώ εἰμί, and represents the covenant name of God.[19] John 17 itself highlights Jesus' preexistence in relation to God's name, "So now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed. I have made your name known to those whom you gave me from the world" (17:5-6; cf. 24-26).[20] If John has in mind the fact that the high priest also bears the divine name—literally, on his

---

use of the passive forms of ὑψόω and δοξάζω of God (2:11, 17; 5:16; 10:15; 12:6; 24:23; 30:18; 32:10; 49:3; cf. Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 153-54 n. 33).

[17] Cf. also the prayer's stress on Jesus' oneness with the Father (esp. 17:11, 22); Moloney does not mention Ezekiel, but does conclude that "his oneness with the Father is the basis of his holiness" (*Gospel of John*, 469).

[18] Ezekiel also tied God's self-consecration to the revelation of his "name" (36:23).

[19] So Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 323-336; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:755-56; Kerr notes that YHWH and his "name" are frequently appealed to for protection in the Psalms and elsewhere (e.g. Ps 12:5, 7; 18:3; 20:1-2; 121:3-8; 125:1-2; Prov 17:11-12; cf. also Num 6:24-27; *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 348-352).

[20] Note that Jesus also refers to "the glory you have given me" (17:22, 24), so the fact that the name is given (17:11-12) cannot itself imply a temporal distinction between his bearing of God's name and God's glory.

turban—and prays in that name for the protection of God's people (Num 6:24-27; cf. John 17:11-12), this does not prove that Jesus replaces the priesthood. Rather, as the incarnation of God's preexistent glory and name (cf. 1:1-18; 12:37-41), he is the one the high priesthood, ideally, was always meant to represent.

There is also an eschatological trajectory here. As Kerr notes, "the manifestation of God's name by Jesus also signals a day of salvation…. [W]ith the coming of the Johannine Jesus the day of YHWH has arrived,"[21] but the stress is on the presence of Israel's God, not the replacement of her institutions. Kerr goes beyond John when he ties this to 70 CE and suggests, "The name of God is no longer resident in the Jewish Temple, but in Jesus, who replaces and fulfills the temple."[22] Similarly, Walker finds "an implicit contrast" between Jesus, who draws *all* who believe into one (17:20-23), and the Jerusalem Temple that excluded Gentiles. He concludes that, "Jesus effectively functions as the high priest of an alternative Temple."[23] Like the similar claim in 11:50-53, however, 17:20-23 is better understood as a prayer that God would fulfill those very hopes for Israel's ingathering *to the Temple*. If Jesus is the true high priest, it is not in "an alternative Temple," but in the true, heavenly or eschatological, Temple of which Jerusalem has always been the earthly reflection (cf. 14:1-3).[24]

---

[21] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 337; cf. 336-37; cf. Isa 52:6 and our discussion of John 2:13-22 in Chapter Two.

[22] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 345; the destruction of the Temple is nowhere alluded to in John 17.

[23] Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 173; cf. Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 354-61, 370 n. 131. There are other themes in John 17 that might reflect the Temple: glory (17:1-5, 10, 22-24), holiness or consecration (17:11, 17-19, 25), God's name (17:6, 11-12, 26), divine indwelling (17:21-23). Noted by Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 172-73; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 314.

[24] Walker admits in discussing 14:1-3 that the "Temple in Jerusalem must (amongst other things) be a symbol of heaven and of God's dwelling there amongst his people in the heavenly Temple" (*Jesus and the Holy City*, 171).

High Priestly Allusions in John 19

All four Gospels mention that the soldiers cast lots for Jesus' clothing,[25] but John's account is the fullest, and some detect in it allusions to the priestly vestments. John's term for "casting lots" (λαγχάνω) is extremely rare, but it is used of the priests in Luke 1:9.[26] The fact that Jesus' garments were kept intact could reflect the priestly tunic that was not to be torn (cf. Exod 28:32).[27] Jesus' garment is called a χιτών in 19:23, a term that does not appear in Psalm 22:19 (LXX), which this is said to "fulfill" in John 19:24, but is used in Exodus and Leviticus of the priestly garments.[28] Finally, the claim that Jesus' χιτών was "seamless" and "woven" (ὑφαντός; 19:23) could reflect other aspects of the high priest's clothing.[29]

Despite these connections, however, surprisingly few commentators accept an allusion to the priestly vestments here. For instance, Lincoln claims John's only concern is "to find an exact fulfillment of scripture,"[30] but if that were so, John had no need to call Jesus' garment a χιτών, when the Psalm quoted in 19:24 calls it an ἱματισμός, while the details about the garment being "seamless" and "woven" are not present in the Psalm at

[25] Cf. Matt 27:35; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34.

[26] It occurs only in 3 Macc 6:1; Wis 8:19; Luke 1:9; Acts 1:17; 2 Pet 1:1; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 204.

[27] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 204; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 319-20, but John uses σχίζω; Exod has ῥήγνυμὶ.

[28] Cf. Exod 28:4, 39, 40; 29:5, 8, 35; 35:19; 39:27 [36:34 LXX], 40:14; Lev 6:3; 8:7, 13; 10:5; 16:4. This accounts for almost half of the LXX occurrences. Many of the other LXX occurrences also describe remarkable garments, such as the clothing God made for Adam and Eve (Gen 3:21), and the robe Jacob gave to Joseph (Gen 37:3, 23, 31, 32, 33), though it is also used of more mundane clothing (e.g. 2 Sam 15:32; Matt 5:40).

[29] Cf. Exod 28:6; 39:3, 5, 8, 22, 27 (LXX 36:10, 12, 15, 29, 34); cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1140; Heil, "Unique High Priest," 742; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 204; for an extended discussion of the priestly vestments, cf. E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63BCE-66CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1992), 92-102. Josephus also calls the high priest's robe a χιτών and describes it as seamless (cf. *Ant*. 3.161; though he does not use ἄραφος as John does; noted by Beasley-Murray, *John*, 347; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1140; Lincoln, *Gospel According to John*, 476; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body,* 320).

[30] *Gospel According to John*, 476; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:921-22; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 370; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 319-321); Bruce G. Schuchard thinks the unity of the church is the point (*Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* [SBLDS 133; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992], 128-32).

all.[31] Individually, none of these connections are strong enough to prove an allusion, but together they are certainly suggestive.[32] At the least, it is doubtful that John intends his scripture citations as mere proof-texts; he cites them to explicate the significance of Jesus' life and death.[33] So here, the Psalm emphasizes God's enthronement as King (Ps 22:3, 27-28) in response to the suffering both of the speaker (22:1-2, 6-21) and of Israel as a whole (22:4-5, 22-26). It further anticipates the ingathering of *all* people, "all the families of the nations shall worship before him. For dominion belongs to the LORD, and he rules over the nations" (22:27-28).[34]

These themes are connected for John. As "the good shepherd" Jesus lays down his life (10:1-21), and both 19:23-24 and 13:1-17 symbolize this as the laying aside of his clothes.[35] Both Caiaphas' prophecy and Jesus' prayer in John 17 also anticipate the ingathering of God's people from the nations, and Heil suggests that the unity of God's people may be indicated by Jesus' untorn tunic, since the high priest's vestments themselves symbolized his representative function for Israel and the world.[36] If these allusions are to be accepted, however, what do they imply about Jesus' relation to the Jerusalem priesthood? Heil thinks "the superior high priesthood of Jesus continues the theme of

---

[31] John also reverses the meaning of the Psalm's parallelism from synthetic (i.e. two parallel ways of saying "they divided my garments") to antithetic (i.e. "they divided my clothes" but they did *not* "divide my tunic"); noted by Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:920; Bruce, *Gospel of John*, 370.

[32] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 204-5; Heil, "Jesus as High Priest," 741-744.

[33] E.g. 2:17 cites Ps 69:9, not merely to prove that Jesus fulfilled scripture, but to explain *why* Jesus acted as he did in the Temple. As we will see, John intends a wider significance with his other scripture citations in 19:36 and 37, so it would be surprising if he did not intend the same thing here (cf. Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1139).

[34] As its many NT citations reflect, Psalm 22 boasts a number of parallels to Jesus' crucifixion, though the most striking, "they have pierced my hands and feet" (22:16; NIV), may not be original (cf. Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, 292, 297).

[35] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:903; Heil, "Unique High Priest," 741.

[36] Heil, "Unique High Priest," 743; cf. the use of σχίσμα in 7:43; 9:16; 10:19, and μὴ σχίσωμεν in 19:24. The high priest wore the names of the twelve tribes on his shoulders and breastplate (cf. Exod 28:9-12, 21, 29; 39:6-21; Heil, "Unique High Priest," 742-43; Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 99), the vestments may also represent the world (cf. Wis 18:24; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.84-87, 96-97; Jos. *Ant.* 3.184; Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 111-13).

Jesus superseding and surpassing various Jewish institutions."[37] The apparent contrasts between Jesus and the priesthood in 18:1-19:22 might seem to support this interpretation, but we will argue that even here John's point lies elsewhere.

Jesus and the High Priesthood in John 18:12-19:22

John 18:12-28 is somewhat unclear in its identification of "the high priest." Jesus is first brought to Annas, the "father-in-law of the high priest" (18:13), but then John states that "the high priest questioned Jesus" (18:19). If we expect this to refer to Caiaphas, however, it turns out to mean Annas himself, who only later sends Jesus to "Caiaphas, the high priest" (18:24).[38] Since this chapter is otherwise so well staged,[39] Kerr and Coloe argue that this ambiguity is intended to raise the question, "Who is the *real* High Priest?"[40] That Jesus is questioned by Annas, who was deposed nearly 20 years earlier, rather than Caiaphas, who was high priest "that year," could also contrast Jesus (the true high priest) with the *former* (and illegitimate) ones in Jerusalem.[41] If so, the contrast is certainly unflattering. Next to Jesus' thrice repeated verdict of innocence (18:38; 19:4, 6), it is *the high priests* who call for his crucifixion and stunningly declare: "we have no king but Caesar" (19:15, cf. v. 21).[42] Given that God's unique kingship is

[37] "Unique High Priest," 745; he mentions the Torah and Temple in particular.

[38] Cf. Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 448; Heil, "Jesus as High Priest," 736; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 203. Many note that it was customary to use the title even for past high priests, as Annas was (cf. Luke 3:2; Josephus *Ant.* 18:95; 20:198; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:820-821; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 323; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1089-1090; Köstenberger, *John*, 512; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 457).

[39] Note the tightly woven scene changes between Jesus' affirmations before the high priest, and Peter's denials before "the servants of the high priest" (18:20; cf. 18:15, 19, 25, 28).

[40] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 317; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 203.

[41] Keener suggests, "That Caiaphas was priest 'that year' (18:13) distinguishes his tenure from that of Annas, who lacked the legal right to interrogate Jesus" (*Gospel of John*, 2:1089). Coloe thinks this is parallel to other Johannine "contrasts" between Jacob and Jesus, the manna and Jesus, and the Temple and Jesus (*God Dwells with Us*, 203), but as we have seen, the sharp contrast seen here is *not* leveled at Jacob, Moses, the Temple or the festivals.

[42] Coloe notes eight references to "the high priests" in 19:13-27 alone (*God Dwells with Us*, 203).

emphasized throughout the Hebrew Bible,[43] and in the Passover liturgy,[44] this implies that the high priests are not only denying Jesus, but rejecting God himself as king.

This brings to a climax the opposition that has been building since 2:13-22, but like that previous account, it is not the institution itself that is condemned, but its abuse. As 10:7-13 put it, Jesus is the true Shepherd, and it is his own "hired hands" who have become "thieves and robbers." That this connection is intentional is suggested by the fact that the priestly "courtyard" is described in terms drawn directly from the Good Shepherd discourse,[45] and before entering it Jesus is once more revealed as ἐγώ εἰμί (18:5-8),[46] in the presence of "the servant of the high priest" (18:10). Then 18:14 repeats the claim that Caiaphas was the one who foretold the significance of Jesus' death. Thus, it is precisely those who are charged to represent Jesus to "the Jews" who are condemned for failing to do so. That is, their very condemnation presupposes the legitimacy and importance of their office itself.

This leads to Jesus' conversation with Annas in 18:19-24. Here Jesus says, "I have spoken openly to the world; I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where all the Jews come together [συνέρχομαι]. I have said nothing in secret. Why do you

---

[43] Cf. Judg 8:3; 1 Sam 8:7; Ps 22:27-28; 29:10; 47:6; 93:1; 97:1; 98:6; 145:1; Isa 26:10; 33:22; 43:15; Jer 10:7, 10; Zeph 3:15; Zech 14:9, 16; Mal 1:14; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 183).

[44] The Passover *Haggadah* is especially direct (though from a later period), "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God; / Beside thee *we have no king*, redeemer, or savior, / No liberator, deliverer, provider….*We have no king but thee*" (quoted by Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 210 n.13; emphasis added; following Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 135; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:895). Note that the priests also object to Pilate's charge against Jesus as "The King of the Jews" in John 19:19-22.

[45] It is called an αὐλή in 18:16, the same term used of the "sheep-fold" in 10:1, 16; and entrance to it is through the "gate" (θύρα; 10:1, 2, 7; 18:16), thus it is precisely in entering the courtyard of the high priest that Jesus fulfills 10:2, "The one who enters by the gate is the shepherd of the sheep" (Heil, "Unique High Priest," 745).

[46] Ἐγώ εἰμι (unpredicated) is repeated three times in 18:5-8 and seems to function as a theophany, as the arresting party falls to the ground (18:6; so Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 326-28; Heil, "Unique High Priest," 735-36). Strengthening the likelihood that "the name you gave me" in 17:11-12 is ἐγώ εἰμί is the fact that Jesus does protect them here by that name, "I told you that I am he [ἐγώ εἰμί]. So if you are looking for me, let these men go" (18:8).

ask me? Ask those who heard what I said to them; they know what I said" (18:20-21). Kerr concludes from this that:

> The door seems to have been closed on Judaism. He has testified within the institutions of Judaism where Jews gathered—the synagogues and the Temple—but now that era is over…. So the Jews may continue to gather at the synagogues and the Temple, but that is not where the children of God gather—they gather in Jesus.[47]

But if John's high priestly theme has already stressed the ingathering of God's people *to* the Temple, Jesus' words here can be read much more positively. Jesus is saying that it is *these very Jewish institutions* in which he has "spoken openly to the world" and in which "the Jews" gather (18:20). Far from implying the replacement of the Temple and synagogue, he claims that those who heard him within them are in the *best* position to testify on his behalf.[48] As we have seen throughout John, the Jewish Scriptures, Temple, festivals and priesthood have provided the primary images in the light of which Jesus is to be understood, and which are themselves to be understood in the light of Jesus' own life, death and resurrection.

Indeed, Lieu notes that Jesus' words here echo Isa 45:19, where YHWH declares, "I did not speak in secret, in a land of darkness; I did not say to the offspring of Jacob, 'Seek me in chaos.' I the LORD speak the truth, I declare what is right."[49] This is the language of theophany, and certainly renders ironic the reaction of the Jewish authorities, "Is this the way you answer the high priest?" (John 18:22). If Jesus truly is the incar-

---

[47] Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 318-19. He further suggests that while Jesus "himself is a Jew and he is speaking to leaders of the Jews… yet he puts himself at some distance from the Jews when he says of the synagogues and the Temple that they are the places where the Jews come together" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 318-19).

[48] Even Kerr allows that, "If this is a formal trial, then Jesus could well be insisting on the right for witnesses to be produced to support charges rather than be judged on self-testimony" (*Temple of Jesus' Body*, 318 n. 15), Lieu notes that in John Jesus is only said to teach in the synagogue and Temple ("Temple and Synagogue," 53-54).

[49] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 56; in the LXX, "I the LORD" (אני יהוה) is translated with a two-fold ἐγώ εἰμι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος. The passage goes on, "Assemble yourselves and come together, draw near, you survivors of the nations!" (45:20a); "assemble" translates συνάγω, the same term John used in 11:52.

nation of the "name" of God that the high priest bears, then yes: that is precisely how he answers the high priest, and as the representative of Israel it is appropriate that the high priest be the one to whom he does so. As the true high priest, Jesus is the one who fully represents God to God's people, and God's people to God, not in contrast to the Jerusalem Temple and priesthood, but as the one to whom they bear witness. So as we turn now to the crucifixion account it should come as no surprise that allusions to the Temple and its festivals will continue to provide a primary means of highlighting Jesus' unique relation to the God of Israel.

Jesus' Crucifixion as the Fulfillment of the Temple Festivals

Jesus' death looms large in all four canonical gospels, but John's presentation is unique. Here the crucifixion is not merely the dark hour of betrayal but also the great and climactic "hour" of glorification (12:23-33). Drawing together threads from many of the Temple and festival themes we have been exploring, Jesus death is set on the eve of "a great Sabbath" (19:31), at the moment the Passover lambs were being slaughtered, and the blood and water from his side especially take up imagery from the Passover and Tabernacles discourses. Far from replacing the Temple, this imagery presents Jesus' death as the fulfillment of the hopes embodied by these festivals.

John strongly emphasizes the Passover context of Jesus' death, mentioning the feast at least fourteen times throughout its narrative.[50] The most significant of these references is 19:14 (the last time marker before Jesus' death), which places his condemnation at "the sixth hour" of "the day of Preparation for the Passover" (cf. 18:28;

[50] Though not all use the word πάσχα: 2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:55-6 (3 times); 12:1, 12; 13:1; 18:28, 39; 19:14, 31, 42. These present three distinct Passovers, and each of them is explicitly tied to Jesus' death (and resurrection).

19:31).[51] This sets the crucifixion on the eve of the Passover, approximately the same time the Pascal lambs were also being slaughtered.[52] The crucifixion account then alludes to this setting in various ways: The giving of wine-vinegar (ὄξος) "on a hyssop" (19:28-29) recalls the hyssop used to sprinkle the blood of the Passover lamb (Exod 12:22).[53] The emphasis on not breaking Jesus' bones in 19:33, 36 probably reflects the prohibition against breaking the bones of the Paschal Lamb.[54] Finally, the flow of blood from Jesus' side in v. 34 could reflect the blood poured out in the sacrificial ritual, as John's only comparable uses of αἷμα appear in the Passover discourse in 6:52-56.[55]

In fact, John has already offered several different perspectives from which to understand this Passover symbolism. In 1:29 and 36, Jesus was called "The Lamb of God

---

[51] Though some think this refers only to the day before the Sabbath (e.g. Köstenberger, *John*, 537-8, 551, who lists proponents; cf. Matt 27:62, Mark 15:42 and Luke 23:54), most scholars correctly understand it to mean to the day before Passover (Beasley-Murray, *John*, 328; Moloney, *John*, 496; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1100, 1129-30; Lincoln, *Gospel According to John*, 460). Dodd notes that Jewish tradition is explicit that Jesus died on the eve of the festival (*B. Sanh*. 43a; Dodd, "Prophecy," 68). Brown notes that 18:28 uses the same phrase to describe that evening's meal (φάγωσιν τὸ πάσχα) as the Synoptics use of the last supper: Mark 14:12 (φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα) // Matt 26:17 (φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα) // Luke 22:15 (τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν); *Gospel According to John*, 2:846.

[52] Cf. Exod 12:6; Jos. *War* 6.423-7; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 341; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:883; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 192). Keener emphasizes the ambiguity in the tradition over precisely when the sacrifice began (*Gospel of John*, 2:1129-31), but it certainly occurred in the afternoon of Preparation day, which is all John states.

[53] It also echoes Ps 69, and so connects with the Temple incident, also at Passover. Psalm 69:21b (68:22b LXX) reads, "for my thirst [δίψα] they made me drink wine-vinegar [ὄξος]." John introduces Jesus' "I thirst" (19:29) with a scripture citation formula, and uses the verb form (διψάω) of the same root, followed with the same noun for wine-vinegar (ὄξος) in v. 30. On the other hand, Beasley-Murray considers the hyssop "a remote parallel" (*John*, 352), but the fact that hyssop does not even have a stalk firm enough to hold a sponge suggests a deliberate allusion, "The very implausibility of the literal portrait reinforces the probability that John intended his audience to envision the symbolic allusion to Passover" (Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1147; cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:930; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 477-8; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 193).

[54] Cf. Exod 12:10, 46; Num 9:12; Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 133-38; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 193; many also find a secondary allusion to Ps 34:19-22 [33:20-23 LXX]; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:937, 953; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 354-5; Moloney, *John*, 505; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1155-6; Köstenberger, *John*, 553-4, who also suggets Isa 53:5; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 481, who also notes *Jub*. 49.13; Schuchard notes that Ps 34 was associated with resurrection in rabbinic sources (*Scripture within Scripture*, 138-40).

[55] Köstenberger notes that "Jewish sacrificial law required the victim's blood not be congealed, but rather flow freely at the moment of death so that it could be sprinkled (*m. Pesah*. 5.3, 5)" (Köstenberger, *John*, 552-3); Keener notes that Passover lambs were hung on iron hooks (*m. Pesah*. 5:9) and "pierced" (*m. Pesah*. 7:1), though he doubts this is the main point of 19:34 (Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1153).

who takes away the sin of the world," which implies an atoning significance for Jesus' death.[56] John 2 had placed the Temple Incident at Passover, and explicitly connected Jesus' death and resurrection with the destruction and restoration of the Temple.[57] John 6, on the other hand, emphasized the eschatological and life-giving aspects of the Passover.[58] Finally, the Passover Lamb served a representative function—it died in place of the firstborn of Israel (πρωτότοκος; Exod 11:5-7; 12:12-13)—which recalls John's earlier references to Jesus as μονογενής, the unique Son whose death reveals the love of God for Israel and the world (1:14-18; 3:16-18).[59] This "beloved son" motif is arguably the most important aspect of John's Passover imagery, as seen in the climactic citation from Zech 12:10 in John 19:37, "they will look upon him whom they have pierced." As noted in Chapter One, the context in Zechariah 12 emphasizes the beloved son image:

> I will pour out a spirit of compassion and supplication on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that, when they look on the one whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for an only child [ἀγαπητός], and weep bitterly over him, as one weeps over a firstborn [πρωτότοκος]…. On that day a fountain shall be opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to cleanse them from sin and impurity. (Zech 12:10; 13:1)

If John had this larger context in mind,[60] it draws together each of the elements noted above: cleansing from sin, eschatological life-giving blessing, centered on Jerusalem (the Temple) *via* the death of the beloved son. The scriptural citation is specifically

---

[56] This also shows John's freedom in using these images, as the Pascal Lamb itself was not thought to be atoning (cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us,* 194, 198-99). Coloe claims 1:29 cannot refer to Jesus' death because "the Passover lamb was not directly expiatory" (*God Dwells with Us,* 198), but just because the Pascal Lamb was not expiatory does not prove that John did not view *Jesus' death* as expiatory, and it is difficult to imagine what he could be referring to if not Jesus' death.

[57] Cf. our discussion of 2:13-22 in Chapter Two above.

[58] Cf. 6:51-58; also 10:11, 15; 11:50-52; 15:13-15; 18:14 (all of which stress the life-giving power of Jesus' death; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us,* 194-95).

[59] Note that Jesus was also in Jerusalem for Passover for this conversation with Nicodemus in John 3.

[60] Accepted by Brown, *Gospel According to John,* 2:955; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us,* 196; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 156; in contrast Schuchard remarks, "we have consistently noted John's rather precise familiarity with the Old Testament contexts which his citations recall" (*Scripture within Scripture,* 147), yet curiously in this case he says, "it is difficult to establish that the context is invoked here" (148 n.31).

applied to the flow of blood and water in 19:34, emphasized with an unprece-dented claim of eyewitness support, "He who saw this has testified so that you also may [come to] believe. His testimony is true, and he knows that he tells the truth" (19:35).[61] The blood, as we have noted, points to the Passover discourse in chapter 6, and it is fitting that John should tie it to a beloved son text, as the Passover itself was tied to Isaac's near-sacrifice as "beloved son" at least as early as *Jubilees* 17:15-18:19.[62] Coloe suggests that since Isaac was (nearly) sacrificed on the future site of the Temple (cf. 2 Chr 3:1; Jos. *Ant.* 1.226), "By associating Jesus' death with the Isaac story, Golgotha becomes a new Moriah, the place where a new Temple is to be built, a new Passover Lamb is to be sacrificed, and a Father willingly surrenders his beloved Son."[63] She sees this as proof of a replacement paradigm, later stating, "the mediating dispensation of Israel, her worship and rituals, are no longer necessary,"[64] but whether the old Passover rituals are "no longer necessary" is nowhere in view; John's emphasis is on the signi-ficance of this imagery for understanding Jesus' death. By associating Jesus with Passover and the beloved son, John stresses not the replacement but the *continuity* between Moriah and Golgotha, the first Passover and the last, the Jerusalem Temple and the eschatological Temple.

---

[61] Modified NRSV; **א*** B Ψ and Origen read πιστεύητε, a present subjunctive that means "you may believe," while apparently all others read πιστεύσητε, an aorist subjunctive that means "you may come to believe." As noted in the Introduction, the same variant occurs in 20:31, and there also the aorist has wider support; cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 387-88; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 219; the aorist is accepted by Köstenberger, *John*, 582, who also notes Morris and Carson in support, but most accept the present; e.g. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:1056; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 544; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1215-16; Lincoln, *Gospel According to John*, 504). If the aorist is original, it could support an apologetic purpose to John.

[62] Cf. also the *Targums* on Exod 12:42 and *Melkita* on Exod 12:13; P. R. Davies and B. D. Chilton claim the link with Passover in *Jubilees* is not significant and deny that this should be called the *Aqedah* ("binding") until a later period ("The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History," *CBQ* 40 [1978]: 514-546, esp. 518-19), but the framing of the passage clearly dates the binding of Isaac to the first day of the feast (cf. Robert J. Daly, "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *CBQ* 39 [1977]: 55; Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 176-180, 246 n.6). Coloe also notes John's references to Jesus being "bound" (18:12, 24; cf. Gen 22:9; *God Dwells with Us*, 191-92).

[63] *God Dwells with Us*, 192.

[64] *God Dwells with Us*, 210.

Fuglseth has sought to downplay these allusions, noting especially that a flow of blood *and water* does not fit a Passover reference well,[65] but this objection is only significant if John intended no more than an allusion to Passover, and this does not appear to be the case. Rather, the Passover theme is just one aspect of the complex symbolism within which John wraps the crucifixion. In particular, the water recalls 7:37-39 and the Tabernacles discourse.[66] There Jesus seems to allude to Zech 14:8, and promises "rivers of living water" from his κοιλία, his heart, belly or side; here John quotes Zech 12:10 to explain the water from Jesus' side (πλευρά).[67] The passages are also connected by references to "the spirit." In 7:39, the narrator clarifies that he spoke of the Spirit, which had not yet come because Jesus "was not yet glorified"; here at the moment of Jesus' glorification he cries, "It is finished," and "gave over the spirit" (19:30).[68] The point, it seems, is to present Jesus' death as the moment these Tabernacles hopes are fulfilled, at least proleptically (cf. 20:19-23).

In light of Zechariah's references to Jerusalem as the source of eschatological water (13:1; 14:8; cf. Ezek 47:1-12) and John's earlier reference to "the Temple of [Jesus'] body" (2:21) many think these connections indicate that Jesus' body replaces the Temple. For instance, Coloe claims, "In Jesus' death, the 'inner chamber' of his body/Temple is opened, releasing the waters of the Spirit. One Temple is in the process

[65] *Johannine Sectarianism*, 270-272. He thinks the fact that Jesus' bones are not broken is "the only clear" allusion to Passover, concluding "the connection between Jesus as the Lamb of God (1:29, 36) and Jesus as Passover meal cannot be directly identified in the text and the degree of replacement involved therefore seems low" (272).

[66] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:949-50; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1153; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 479; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 206-9; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 241-45.

[67] But cf. our discussion of κοιλία in Chapter Four. Coloe connects this with Ezek 47, where water pours from the "side" of the Temple (*God Dwells with Us*, 206-7). Πλευρά does not appear in Ezek 47, but cf. Ezek 41:5-9, 26.

[68] The translation is my own. The Greek is παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, which the NRSV and most others gloss "gave up his spirit." It is an unparalleled expression for death, as παραδίδωμι suggests passing on or handing over, especially to a successor, and John does not say Jesus gave over *his* spirit, but *the* Spirit (Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 189, 197). Cf. again the reference to the Spirit in Zech 12:10.

of being destroyed, even as a new Temple is being raised."[69] If our reading of the Tabernacles discourse is correct, however, this imagery points instead to Jesus' embodiment of the life-giving presence of God that the festival expected. The citation from Zech 12:10 could support this, as the MT actually states that "they will look upon *me*," that is, they will look upon God (the speaker),[70] so when John quotes this with "him," it may imply that, in Schuchard's words, "In the person of Jesus, God himself is pierced."[71] Such an allusion to Jesus' divine identity would certainly fit with John's emphasis on Jesus' divine kingship, but regardless it is clear that John uses this imagery to point to Jesus' death as the moment when the eschatological significance of the festival is definitively, though not finally, brought to fruition.

Jesus' "Lifting Up" as Divine Enthronement and Temple Restoration

Jesus is identified as "the King of the Jews" five times in John's passion narrative (18:33, 39; 19:3, 19, 21; cf. 19:15), and much of the dialogue centers on the legitimacy of the title. Culminating an emphasis on Jesus' kingship that extends across the Gospel (esp. 1:49; 6:15; 12:13), Jesus discusses his kingship with Pilate (18:33-37) and is subjected to a mock coronation by the soldiers (19:1-3). He is then presented to "the Jews" with the words "Here is your King" (19:14; cf. 19:4-5), and the priests strongly object to the title, both in the trial (19:4-6, 14-15) and at the crucifixion itself (19:19-22). Jesus' claim that

[69] *God Dwells with Us*, 207; cf. 186-190, 206-9. She further identifies this "new Temple" as the believing community (186-90, based in part on her reading of 14:1-3; cf. our discussion of that text in Chapter Two above).

[70] The MT reads והביטו אלי את אשר־דקרו, which could even be translated "they will look upon me whom they have pieced" (cf. ESV, NIV, KJV, NKJV, NASV, CSB, NET; the RSV, NRSV and NAB obscure this, relegating the first person pronoun to a footnote). The NJB instead translates "they will look to me. They will mourn for the one whom they have pierced" (NJB; cf. JPS); the LXX reads καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, which still has them looking to God, but uses κατορχέομαι, meaning "despised," not ἐκκεντέω, meaning "pierced."

[71] Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 149. Brown thinks this unlikely (*Gospel According to John*, 2:956), instead noting that later Jewish tradition suggested they would look to YHWH while the Messiah was pierced (cf. *b. Sukk*. 52 and the JPS translation; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:955-56).

"my kingdom is not of this world" (18:36) could also reflect the emphasis on God's own kingship seen in the contexts of many of John's scriptural citations and allusions. In line with this, Jesus' death on the eve of "a great Sabbath" recalls not only the divine prerogatives emphasized in the Sabbath discourses, but may also reflect a traditional association between divine enthronement and the eve of the Sabbath. All of this suggests that Jesus is not just presented as the king of Israel, but as the *divine* King, whose death is seen as a divine enthronement.

John emphasizes the *titulus* upon which Jesus' charge was written more strongly than the other evangelists. The Synoptics mention only that it read "The King of the Jews" (Matt 27:37; Mark 15:26; Luke 23:38), but John places it first in his crucifixion account and even has Pilate himself defend its wording from the high priests (19:19-22). It reads "Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews" and John adds that it was written in Aramaic, Latin and Greek and that "many of the Jews read the sign" (19:19-20), a hint that Jesus' kingship holds significance not only for "the Jews" but also for the whole world.[72]

This is emphasized even more strongly in 18:33-37, in which Jesus repudiates attempts to reduce his kingship to mere political power (cf. also 6:15). Jesus' kingdom is "not of this world" (18:36), and in John's consistent above/below, heavenly/earthly dichotomies, that means his kingdom is heavenly.[73] That is not to say that it is "spiritual" in some non-physical sense, but rather that it is *God's* kingship.[74] God's divine kingship,

---

[72] Cf. Heil, "Unique High Priest," 741; yet it should be emphasized that even as Jesus' kingdom is universal (Aramaic, Latin and Greek), he is still identified first and foremost as the King *of the Jews*, and it is "the Jews" who are particularly mentioned as seeing the sign. Note that the kingly "triumphal entry" was also followed by the appearance of "Greeks" in 12:20.

[73] Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:852, 867-69.

[74] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 183-85. Jey J. Kanagaraj. "Jesus the King, Merkabah Mysticism and the Gospel of John," *TynBul* 47.2 (1996): 356-363. Note the Synoptic parallel "the kingdom of God/heaven";

over Israel and the nations, was seen in the larger context of many of John's scripture citations and allusions (esp. those from Zech 9-14; Ezek 34; Isa 6; 40-55; Ps 22; 118), and if 12:37-41 does allude to Isaiah 6, it places Jesus in the heavenly throne room, if not on the throne itself.[75] We have already noted that the high priests explicitly reject Jesus' kingship by declaring "we have no king but the emperor" (19:15), which ironically inverts traditional declarations concerning the unique kingship of God. In all this, Jesus' kingship is tied to God's, which casts a very interesting light on the Temple theme.

Creation, Temple construction and divine enthronement had long been connected, both inside and outside the Jewish scriptures.[76] For instance, the Ugaritic *Ba'al Epic* describes creation as victory over the gods of river and sea (2 iv.7-51), may depict Ba'al's death and resurrection (4 viii.48-5 iv), and acclaims him as King in a newly-built

---

Beasley-Murray notes that "kingdom of heaven" is a periphrasis for God, and both expressions really mean "God is king." Though "the expression βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, 'kingdom of God,' occurs only in John 3:3 and 5, the whole Gospel is concerned with the kingship of God in Jesus. And that is what Jesus was referring to in his utterance to Pilate" (*John*, 330; cf. 330-32; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:868-69; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 612-653).

[75] Kanagaraj has noted that Isa 6:8 refers to hearing the voice (φωνή) of the Lord, and in John 18:36 Jesus says, "You say that I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I came into the world, to testify to the truth. Everyone who belongs to the truth listens to my voice [φωνή]" (Kanagaraj. "Jesus the King," 358-59); cf. also Ezekiel's visions of the cherubim ark, which are also associated with the "voice" of the Lord: Ezek 1:28; 2:2; 3:12; 10:5; 43:6; cf. also *1 En* 15:1; *Ap. Abr.* 18:14; 19:1; Rev 1:10, 12, 16.

[76] For instance, a pattern of creation (pictured as victory over chaos/the sea), Temple construction and divine enthronement appears in the *Ba'al Epic*; the *Hymn to Aten*; *Enuma Elish*; Gen 1; Exod 15; Ps 2; 24; 29; 47; 65; 68; 74; 77; 89; 93; 97-99; 104; Isa 44; 51; Job 9:8, 13; 26:12-14; 38:8-11; Dan 7; 12; Zech 14; Luke 10:18; Rev 3:21; 5; 12:13; 19:11-21; 22; 1QS 4; 1QM 1; 15-18; *1 En.* 1:3-4, 9; 10:9; 55:4; *2 En.* 29:4-5; *4 Ez* 13:2-11; *Test. Mos.* 10:1, 7; I owe several of these references to Dr. Craig Broyles, from a RELS 621 handout; cf. Moshe Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the 'Sitz im Leben' of Genesis 1:1-2:3," in *Melanges Bibliques et Orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*. (d. by André Caquot and M. Delcor; AOAT 212; Kevelaer, Ger.: Butzon and Bercker, 1981), 501-512; Frank Moore, Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History and the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), esp. 162-63; Huie-Jolly, "Threats Answered by Enthronement,", 191-217; Kovacs, "Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 227-247, esp. 236-38. This symbolism was embodied in Solomon's Temple, with the bronze sea likely representing the waters of chaos, and the ark the divine throne (cf. Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, "'Who Is the King of Glory?' Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism," in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archeology in Honor of Philip J. King* (Ed. Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 18-31; Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World*, 163-176; Coloe especially emphasizes this background to John 18-20 (*God Dwells with Us*, 183, 200-211).

temple (2 iv.94-119; 4 i.4-vii.25; 5 v.1-52).[77] Similarly, enthronement hymns like Psalm 24 describe creation as victory over "the waters" (24:1-2) and tie this to God's enthronement in the Temple (24:3-10). It is notable that Jewish tradition specifically connects the divine enthronement Psalms with the eve of the Sabbath, a tradition already seen in the LXX superscription to Psalm 93 (92:1 LXX), "for the day before Sabbath."[78] The Psalm itself declares, "The LORD is king…. More majestic than the thunders of mighty waters, more majestic than the waves of the sea, majestic on high is the LORD!" (93:1, 4). That John was aware of these traditions may be seen not only in his claim that the crucifixion occurred on the eve of "a great Sabbath" (19:31),[79] but also from his earlier descriptions of Jesus' death in terms of cosmic combat, especially in 12:31-32.[80] All of this gives new depth to Jesus' declaration that "it is finished," his giving of the Spirit (19:30), and the flow of water from his side,[81] as seen especially in comparison to Zechariah 12-14. As John alludes in both 7:37-39 and 19:34-37, Zechariah explicitly ties

---

[77] Cf. Dennis Pardee, "The Ba'lu Myth," *COS* 1:241-274; cf. J.J.M. Roberts, "Mowinckel's Enthronement Festival: A Review," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (eds. Peter W. Flint, Patrick D. Miller; VTSupp XCIX; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 104-6; Huie-Jolly, "Threats Answered by Enthronement," 202-4. The legitimacy of the dying god aspect of this myth has been called into question; cf. Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 87-115.

[78] The superscription begins, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου (Psa 92:1 LXX; cf. also *m. Tamid* 7.4; *b. Rosh HaShana* 31a); noted by Wienfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord," 509-512. NETS relegates this to a footnote (594).

[79] Coloe also connects this (and 19:30's use of τετέλεσται) to the fulfillment of the "work" Jesus was sent by the Father to complete (cf. 5:17, 36; 9:4; 17:4): "As the sixth day comes to an end, Jesus announces the completion of God's creative work so the Sabbath can truly begin" (*God Dwells with Us*, 197). Note that the resurrection is placed on "the first day of the week" (20:1), which in Greek is μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, lit. "the first of the Sabbath."

[80] Cf. Kovacs, "Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 227-47; cf. also 1:5; 5:17-29 (on which, see Huie-Jolly, "Threats Answered by Enthronement," 191-217); 8:44; 13:2. 27; 14:30-31; 16:8-11; 17:15. Kanagaraj suggests a connection between Jesus' trial (esp. 19:7, "makes himself king") and the Sabbath dispute in 5:17-19 ("makes himself God; cf. Kanagaraj, "Jesus the King," 362).

[81] Cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 196-200; Um, *Temple Christology*, 68-129; cf. also our discussions of John 4 and 7:37-39 in Chapters Three and Four above. Deborah Sawyer suggests a connection between Jesus' side (πλευρά) and Adam's (Gen 2:21), but she overly limits John's imagery by connecting this to the creation of the *church* ("John 19:34: From Crucifixion to Birth, or Creation?" in *A Feminist Companion to John* [eds. Amy-Jill Levine, Marianne Blickenstaff; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003], 139, cf. 130-39; cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 207).

the flow of eschatological water to God's enthronement in the Temple, when *all* nations will come to Jerusalem and "worship the King, the LORD of Hosts, and keep the festival of booths" (14:16; cf. 14:3, 8-9, 16-21).[82] In using this image then, John not only ties together Jesus' Sabbath and Tabernacles discourses, but uses them to identify Jesus' death as the eschatological enthronement of God.[83]

This also ties into John's consistent presentation of Jesus' death, resurrection and exaltation (viewed as a single event) as his "lifting up" or "glorification" (ὑψόω and δοξάζω), as both of these terms are associated with theophany both inside and outside John.[84] Hoskins claims that John's language recalls Isaiah's expectation of the exaltation and glorification of the Temple,[85] so that "the lifting up of Jesus exalts him above all other temples, including the Jerusalem Temple,"[86] but even he admits that Isaiah uses ὑψόω and δοξάζω far more often of YHWH himself.[87] The fact that the Temple was also expected to be exalted, then, once again highlights Jesus' connection with the Temple, not its replacement.

If 2:13-22 and 14:1-3 depicted Jesus as the Temple builder, whose death and resurrection entail the destruction and raising of the Temple, here Jesus' "lifting up" can

---

[82] Kovacs follows Paul Hanson in finding the background to Zech 9-14 in "the ancient pattern of the conflict myth" (Kovacs, "Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 236; citing Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 280ff).

[83] Cf. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 183-190, but contrast 209-211.

[84] Cf. 3:14; 7:39; 8:28; 12:16, 23-34; 13:31-32; 17:1, 5; Hoskins notes that ὑψόω and δοξάζω are used synonamously in the LXX, esp. in Isaiah: Exod 15:2; Ps 36:20; Isa 4:2; 5:16; 10:15; 33:10; 52:13; Sir 43:30; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 149 n. 7. Kovacs also notes references in *1 En* 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 63:2-7; 69:29 ("Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 227-47, esp. 244-46).

[85] Cf. Isa 2:2; 55:5; 60:7, 13; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 147-159.

[86] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 156-7.

[87] Cf. 2:11, 17; 5:16; 12:4, 6; 24:23; 25:1; 33:10; 40:25; 42:10; 44:23; 66:5; as Hoskins notes, "The Septuagint of Isaiah commonly associates ὑψόω, δόξα and δοξάζω with God's revelation of himself in judgment and salvation" (*Fulfillment of the Temple*, 155; cf. 152-55). He also notes several parallels to the exaltation and glorification of the Servant and Jesus (e.g Isa 49:3, 5-6; 52:13; Acts 2:33; 5:31; Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 156).

be understood both as a divine enthronement and as a Temple restoration (cf. Isa 2; 33),[88] but not of some alternative "replacement" of the Jerusalem Temple. Jesus raises the heavenly archetype upon which the Temple in Jerusalem was itself patterned, and to which it was intrinsically linked. In his death and resurrection, Jesus accomplishes and anticipates the final restoration of the one Temple of God, in whom he has already been (12:37-41), and will be finally and completely (14:1-3), enthroned as King.

God and Temple in the Resurrection Accounts

Like the Gospel as a whole, John's Temple theme does not end with Jesus' crucifixion, and there are important aspects to the resurrection accounts that confirm the trajectory we have been tracing. Coloe notes that Jesus' extravagant burial is fitting for a king, and its garden setting recalls Eden (19:38-42).[89] Elsewhere she suggests a link between the promise of the Spirit on "last and greatest day of the feast" in 7:37-39, and Jesus' gift of the Spirit on "the eight day" in 20:19-23.[90] Perhaps even more interesting, however, is the position of angels in the empty tomb and the resurrection appearances themselves. The former suggests an allusion to the cherubim throne in the holy of holies (20:12), and so completes the enthronement motif we have just seen. The latter allude to the new creation, the restoration of the people of God, and the divine identity of Jesus (20:13-31), drawing together the festival themes traced above.

In John 20:12, Mary Magdalene looks into Jesus' tomb and sees "two angels seated in white, one at the head and one at the foot, where the body of Jesus had lay"

---

[88] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 148-159.

[89] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 209; which connects with both new creation and the Temple.

[90] Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 129-30; the expression is her own; cf. also Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 199-201, 229-31, 240-41. John does not actually refer to the "eight" day, either in ch. 7 or 20, but dates the resurrection and the appearances to "the first (day) of the week" (20:1, 19, 26). This stresses what is *beginning*, not what is ending.

(20:12). This is a curiously specific description, without parallel in the Synoptics, and Philippe Simenel and others have argued that it alludes to the presence of God between the cherubim in the holy of holies.[91] As described in Exod 25:10, 17-22, the ark of the covenant was covered with a כפרת or ἱλαστήριον, a " place of propitiation,"[92] flanked by two cherubim, "one cherub at the one end, and one cherub at the other end" (25:19). The space between the cherubim was thought to be the throne of God, and in fact the whole cherubim ark was associated with God's presence in a variety of texts.[93] Given the emphasis on divine enthronement in John's crucifixion account, it is highly significant that the largest concentration of these allusions appears in the enthronement psalms. For instance, Psalm 99 begins, "The LORD is king; let the peoples tremble! He sits enthroned upon the cherubim; let the earth quake!" (99:1).[94] It is fitting, then, that the place of Jesus' resurrection should be flanked by two angels, and this can be seen as the culmination of the divine enthronement motif emphasized in John 18-19.[95]

Simenel notes this connection with the presence of God, but sees it as contrastive: though God's presence was "formerly" (*autrefois*) between the cherubim, Jesus is the

---

[91] I owe this connection to Izaak de Hulster, who kindly provided a copy of his brief article on the subject (in Dutch, which he summarized for me), Izaak J. de Hulster, "Maria Magdalena en de twee engelen," *EBS-Bulletin* 38 (2009): 2-3. He also sent a copy of an article by Philippe Simenel that argues the same thesis, "Les 2 Anges de Jean 20/11-12," *ETR* 67 (1992): 71-76. De Hulster notes that this connection is also made by Matthew Henry and Arthur Pink, *Exposition of the Gospel of John* (vol. 3; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1945), 273; Simenel notes proponents in G. H. C. McGregor, J. H. Bernard and J.-J. Whetstein; it is also mentioned by Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2:989; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 451.

[92] BDB 498; BDAG 474.

[93] Cf. Lev 16:2; Num 10:33-36; 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 1 Kgs 8:10; 1 Chr 28:2, 18; 2 Chr 6:41; Ps 15:1; 18:9-10; 36:5-7; 47:5-9; 57:1; 61:4; 63:7; 68:4, 24, 33; 78: 61; 80:1; 89:13-17; 96:6-9; 97:2; 99:5; 132:7-8; Ezek 1:26; 10:1, 15, 19-22; within the First Temple, the whole ark was set between two cherubim (1 Kgs 6:19-28); cf. Simenel, "Les 2 Anges," 76; Craig C. Broyles, "The Psalms and Cult Symbolism: The Case of the Cherubim-Ark," in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches* (ed. David Firth, Philip S. Johnston; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 139-156).

[94] De Hulster emphasizes Ps 80:1 to the same effect, "Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead Joseph like a flock! You who are enthroned upon the cherubim, shine forth!" (cf. "Mary Magdalena," 2).

[95] Huie-Jolly notes that other Christian traditions tie the resurrection to Jesus' enthronement at the right hand of God (e.g. Mark 14:61-64; Acts 2:32-35; 13:33; Phil 2:9-11; "Threats Answered by Enthronement," 193, 198).

new ark of the covenant,[96] and "la présence divine n'est plus liée au Temple mais à la personne de Iésus."[97] But this emphasis on what is *no longer* the case is nowhere evident in John's resurrection account. To be sure, an allusion to the holy of holies here implies that God is not *limited* to the Temple—was God ever?—but God is certainly *connected* (*lier*) to the Temple, as even here its symbolism provides John a picture of Jesus' divine enthronement. This, in fact, sums up the whole problem with the replacement paradigm: it places far too much emphasis on what is "no longer" the case, when John is much more concerned with what was, is and *will be* the case: the presence of God in Jesus, in continuity with and culmination of the history and institutions of Israel.[98]

The same seems to be true of Jesus' resurrection appearances. Sandra Schneiders suggests that the use of δείκνυμι in 20:20, "he showed [δείκνυμι] them his hands and his side," employs "a quasi-technical term for revelation in John" (cf. 2:28; 5:20; 10:32; 14:8, 9).[99] She also notes the claim that Jesus "breathed" (ἐμφυσάω) the Spirit on them, which represents the fulfillment of the water and Spirit imagery in 7:37-39 and 19:34-37, uses a term associated with creation (Gen 2:7; Wis 15:11) and resurrection (1 Kgs 17:21; Ezek 37:9-10) in the LXX.[100] "In this scene, Jesus' manifestation of his open side reveals the full significance of Jesus as the New Temple. He is the presence of God's glory in

---

[96] He also finds connections with the blood sprinkled on the mercy seat on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:14), the new covenant, and the ark as the location of God's speaking to his people (Simenel, "Les 2 Anges," 76; cf. de Hulster, "Mary Magdalena," 2-3), all of which are possible, but need not be taken in a replacement sense.

[97] Simenel, "Les 2 Anges," 76; this is the last line of the article.

[98] In private correspondence, December 2009, de Hulster described this by saying, "[Jesus'] atonement assures that the tabernacle/temple is set free for service to God." I think that captures John's point very nicely: not that the Temple has been replaced, but that it has been *set free* from its abuse and misunderstanding.

[99] Sandra M. Schneiders, "The Raising of the New Temple: John 20:19-23 and Johannine Ecclesiology," *NTS* 52 (2006): 344, 347.

[100] Schneiders, "Raising the New Temple," 351; she claims these are the only four references, but cf. Tob 6:9; 11:11 (in ℵ); Ezek 21:31; which have no connection with creation or resurrection; cf. also Hatina, "John 20,22," esp. 198, 217-18

their midst, and the source of the life-giving water of the Spirit."[101] So long as this is not contrasted with the *old*, this provides an appropriate summary of the Temple themes that we have traced throughout John, and once again, these connections with theophany and creation stress Jesus' *divine* identity and prerogative.[102] As throughout John, so at the end, the Temple imagery is focused, not on the replacement of an institution, but on the incarnation of the self-revelation of God. Thus, it is entirely fitting that the resurrection appearances in John 20 themselves culminate in Thomas' acclamation of Jesus as "my Lord and my God!" (20:28).

Conclusion

On the surface, it might appear that John's Temple theme was restricted to the Book of Signs, but we have found that it informs key aspects of the Book of Glory as well. Here John not only draws on the eschatological significance of the festival discourses, but fills them with a new emphasis on Jesus' relationship to the high priesthood, the ingathering of the people of God, and divine enthronement. As true high priest, Jesus does not replace the Jerusalem priesthood, for he has always been the one it represented, and in fact, it still bears witness to him even in abuse. Thus, it is Caiaphas, "the high priest that year," who correctly prophesies that Jesus will die for "the nation, and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the dispersed children of God" (11:51-52). In Jesus' final prayer also he speaks of the "glory" and "name" he has from God, by which he protects the disciples and makes them "one" (17:22). This emphasis on ingathering is

[101] Schneiders, "Raising the New Temple," 347-48; she also compares the disciples' joyful reaction with 16:20-22, which she connects to Isa 66:7-14's description of the new creation and the restoration of the people of God. She concludes that these indicate "the establishment of the New Covenant with the New Israel and the raising of the new Temple, the body of Jesus, in it [*sic.*] midst" (337; cf. also Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 199-201; Hatina, "John 20,22," 199, 216).

[102] This is also seen in the several affirmations of having "seen the Lord" (20:18, 20, 25, 29).

closely tied to hopes for the restoration of the Temple and the manifestation of Israel's God before all nations, and this is precisely how John depicts Jesus' death and resurrection.

Described as a "lifting up" and "glorification," these are seen as a unified event and portrayed as a divine enthronement. Drawing on a mythic connection between creation, Temple construction and divine enthronement, John pictures Jesus' death and resurrection as the moment of his enthronement as divine king, entailing Temple restoration and new creation. In this way, John ties together not only his Temple and festival symbolism, but even reaches back to the prologue and its affirmation that the λόγος who became flesh most fully reveals God in his death as the "beloved son." In line with this, the resurrection accounts as well place Jesus on the divine throne in the holy of holies (20:12), and employ language of theophany and new creation (20:19-23, 28). In the end, as at the beginning, John's Temple imagery focuses on Jesus as incarnation of the *God* of Israel's Temple, not its replacement.

Conclusion

> I think that it is almost impossible to make too much of the Temple in first-century Jewish Palestine.
>
> *E. P. Sanders*[1]

Consistent with their centrality in first-century Judaism as a whole, the Temple and festivals are certainly prominent in the Gospel of John. Elwood McQuaid notes that more than three quarters of John is set at one or another Jewish feast,[2] and much of this time is spent in the Temple itself. As we have seen, John's presentation of Jesus cannot be fully understood without an awareness of the theology, rituals and expectations of these Jewish institutions. More than this, John suggests that these institutions themselves can only be properly understood in the light of Jesus' life, death and resurrection. In John, Jesus not only fulfills the hopes of the Temple and its festivals, but also in some unique manner embodies the self-revelation of God that had long been revealed through them. While many find in this Temple and festival imagery an affirmation of the "replacement" of Judaism or its institutions, John's Temple theme is better understood to depict Jesus as the incarnation of the λόγος, glory, presence and name through which God has *always* been known. Far from replacing the Temple, Jesus fulfills its hopes for the return of God *to* the Temple, and pours out the eschatological blessings expected *from* the Temple, to restore the world. In this concluding chapter, we will summarize the argument of the previous chapters, draw together some broader conclusions, then close by considering some possible implications for our understanding of the related issue of John's presentation of "the Jews."

---

[1] E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, (London, UK: Penguin, 1993), 262.

[2] McQuaid, *The Outpouring*, 7; by his count 660 of John's 879 verses (just over 75%) are set at a feast.

Summary of the Argument

Though the Temple itself does not appear until John 2, the prologue anticipates the theme in its treatment of Wisdom, the Tabernacle, Torah and Sinai. Despite the usual reading of these allusions, however, they do not indicate replacement, but continuity between Jesus and those means by which God has been revealed in Israel. If Jesus "tabernacled among us, and we saw his glory" (1:14; my translation), this does not mean Jesus replaces the glory of the Tabernacle, but that he embodies the glory that *tabernacled* with Israel. As Wisdom (λόγος) "become flesh," Jesus embodies the means through which God has always been known, including in the Tabernacle, on Sinai, through the Torah and (by implication) in the Temple. Though "no one has ever seen God" (1:18), it was the glory of the λόγος that Moses saw on Sinai, it was from the "fullness" of the λόγος that the Torah was given, and it is this same λόγος whose "grace and truth" have been most fully revealed in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the μονογενής.

The rest of John 1-4 further highlights Jesus' continuity with the history, traditions and institutions of Israel. As discussed in Chapter Two, he is witnessed to by John the Baptist (1:19-38; 3:22-35), fulfills Jacob's dream at Bethel (1:49-51), and provides miraculous wine from water "for the purification of the Jews" (2:1-11). In all this Judaism is treated positively, so when Jesus then clears the Temple, this too should be seen as a reflection of his "zeal" *for* the Temple (2:17), which he calls "my Father's house" (2:16). Quoting from Psalm 69 and possibly alluding to Zechariah 14 and Malachi 3, John points here to the restoration or purification of the Temple, not its replacement. Likewise, when Jesus promises, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (2:19), he does *not* mean Jerusalem will be destroyed but "the temple of his body" (2:21)

will be raised in its place; he means that Jesus' death and resurrection themselves entail the destruction and raising of the Temple. Just as Jesus' body was destroyed, but *the same body* (scars and all) was raised and glorified and returned to the Father (20:24-29), so when Jesus promises that he will also prepare "my Father's house" to enable the restored people of God to join him within it (14:1-3), this should not be taken to indicate the preparation of some *alternative*, replacement Temple. Rather, it anticipates that Jesus' death and resurrection will somehow "prepare" the true, heavenly and eschatological Temple of which Jerusalem was itself the earthly counterpart. Since the Jerusalem Temple had *always* been understood to point beyond itself to the cosmic or heavenly Temple, Jesus' promise to prepare the latter is again no claim of replacement, but an even more fundamental affirmation of his connection to the Temple, by tying him to its eternal archetype and eschatological goal.

In John 3:29-30, John the Baptist calls Jesus "the bridegroom," and as argued in Chapter Three, John 4 depicts Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman in terms strongly reminiscent of the betrothal scenes of Isaac and Jacob (in Genesis 24 and 29). Since Jesus does not *literally* marry the woman, this imagery must be taken figuratively, and in Jewish tradition the most common figurative use of the image of marriage is to describe God's relation to Israel. Thus, we have suggested that John here alludes to prophetic hopes for the restoration of Israel (including Samaria), which were not only frequently described as a (re)marriage, but were sometimes also associated with eschatological harvest and a recognition of the true identity of God (e.g., in Hosea 2). This sets the context for the rest of 4:4-26, which emphasizes Jesus' divine prerogative to give "living water" and eternal life, discusses the nature of "true worship," and echoes God's

self-revelation in Deutero-Isaiah, by calling Jesus "[ἐγώ εἰμί], the one who is speaking to you" (4:26). So when 4:21 anticipates an hour when worship will no longer be possible in Jerusalem, but 4:23 insists that *even now* "true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth," the point is not to contrast Temple worship with "spiritual" worship, but to insist that true worship is defined not by location but by *direction*. That is, who is worshipped matters much more than where. Nonetheless, "salvation is from the Jews" (4:22), and even if the Temple is not the *necessary* location of worship, it remains *beneficial* to true worship, in that it points to the true identity of God in Jesus.

The festival cycle especially emphasizes how the traditions, rituals and expectations of the Temple highlight Jesus' identity, as he sets himself within the Temple and at a synagogue for two Sabbaths, a Passover, Tabernacles and Dedication. As argued in Chapter Four, Jesus does the "work" of God on the Sabbath by healing a paralytic and a man born blind (John 5; 9), and judging the "blindness" of the leaders of "the Jews" (9:39-41; cf. 5:19-30). In doing so, Jesus does not "break" the Sabbath; he exercises God's unique authority over it—particularly his prerogatives over life and judgment—and anticipates the eschatological fulfillment of the Sabbath, which John ties to Jesus' resurrection by setting Jesus' death on the eve of "a great Sabbath" (19:31). Similarly, in John 6 Jesus claims to be the "Bread from heaven" expected to accompany the eschatological Passover and the return of the Messiah. As such, he does not replace the original manna; he embodies the divine Wisdom it has long symbolized and anticipated. Even more emphatically, at Tabernacles Jesus offers the "living water" and "light of the world" anticipated and symbolized by the Temple water-pouring and candelabra-lighting ceremonies, not as the replacement of the Temple, but as the embodiment of the life and

light-giving God of the Temple (John 7-8). Then, just as Ezekiel and Zechariah anticipated that God would pour out these blessings *from* the Temple *to* the world, so Jesus goes out from the Temple and heals a blind man, using water specifically drawn from the Pool of Siloam (9:7; from which the priests drew water for the Temple rituals), and is then "worshipped" by the man he healed (9:38). John 10 then defends such exalted claims against the charge of blasphemy (10:31-38; cf. 5:17-20), identifying Jesus as the true Shepherd of Israel, who is "one" with the Father and has been "sanctified and sent into the world" (10:36). In short, the festival cycle does not present Jesus as the replacement of the Temple, but as the one who embodies God's return *to* the Temple to fulfill its hopes and pour out *from* the Temple eschatological blessing. The bitter irony, however, is that most of "the Jews" do not understand or accept these claims, and therefore perceiving them as blasphemy, they drive him from his own Temple.

All of this Temple and festival imagery is drawn together in John's passion narrative, where it is combined with a new emphasis on Jesus' high priesthood and kingship. John 17 and 19 present Jesus as the eternal high priest, to whom the Jerusalem high priests bear witness and represent. Jesus *embodies* the divine name that the priests bear, and consecrates himself, not just as another priest, but as the self-revelation of God. His death brings unity to all the children of God ("prophesied" by the high priest Caiaphas in 11:51-52; 18:14, and symbolized by Jesus' untorn χιτών in 19:23-24). This connection between Jesus' death and the ingathering of the people of God is elsewhere tied to the depiction of Jesus' death as a "lifting up," when "the ruler of this world will be driven out" (e.g. 12:31-33), and may recall an ancient divine enthronement myth also seen in John 18-20. Jesus is executed as "King of the Jews" (18:33; 19:3, 19-22), but in 18:36

Jesus clarifies that "my kingdom is not of this world," indicating heavenly or divine kingship. He is executed on the eve of "a great Sabbath" (19:31), perhaps reflecting the association between Fridays and the divine enthronement Psalms (93-99). His extravagant burial is fitting for a king (19:38-42), and his empty tomb is described in terms reminiscent of God's cherubim throne in the holy of holies (20:12; cf. 12:37-41). Both Passover and Tabernacles celebrated the kingship of God, so it is fitting that John also draws upon their imagery in describing the blood and water from Jesus' side and his gift of the Spirit (both in 19:28-37 and 20:19-23). Together, these depict Jesus' death and resurrection as a "lifting up" that includes both divine enthronement and Temple restoration, offering life and the Spirit to the people of God and through them to the whole world.

In sum, Jesus is the incarnation of the λόγος, glory, presence and name through which God has always been known, including in the Temple. He "tabernacles" among us, and his death and resurrection can be understood as the destruction and raising of the Temple. He fulfills the hopes for the restoration of Israel, and "true worship" depends on knowledge of his true identity. He gives life and judges on the Sabbath, as only God can do, offers the eschatological manna expected at Passover, provides the life and light God promised at Tabernacles, and comes as the consecrated one at Dedication. He is the one the high priesthood represents, and the significance of his death is "prophesied" by Caiaphas himself. Most of all, Jesus' death and resurrection are pictured as a Temple enthronement, glorification, and exaltation, which not only fulfill the significance of the Temple festivals, but also tie him to the God of Israel to such an extent that his kingship *is* God's kingship. His enthronement is thus a divine enthronement, revealing the glory

through which God has always been known. Far from emphasizing the replacement of the Temple and its festivals, Jesus is presented as the one who embodies the self-revelation of God, the presence and glory recalled, anticipated and symbolized by these very institutions.

Temple Christology and the Replacement of the Temple

Though we have emphasized those aspects of John's Temple theme that undermine the replacement paradigm, it should be clear by now that our purpose has not simply been negative—to dismiss replacement—but also positive, to emphasize John's focus on the identity and divine prerogatives of Jesus. The most basic problem with the replacement paradigm, therefore, is not that it is reductionistic, or even that it is overly negative, but that it forces Jesus into the wrong position in John's Temple imagery. By and large, when John uses the Temple's traditions and imagery in reference to Jesus, it does so in the same ways that these traditions routinely spoke of *God*. Thus, Jesus "tabernacled among us," not because he is the new Tabernacle, but because God and God's Wisdom were frequently claimed to "tabernacle" with Israel. Similarly, Jesus offers living water, symbolized and anticipated by the Tabernacles ritual, not because he has taken the place of the Temple, but because the ritual itself (as well as various prophetic texts with which it was associated) appealed to God himself to send the water. Finally, Jesus' death and resurrection are wrapped in Temple and festival imagery, but here the imagery serves primarily to complement the more fundamental (and explicit) emphasis on Jesus' (divine) kingship, pictured as God's enthronement *within* the Temple.

In all of these cases, replacement is not just an unnecessary inference, but a misleading one. To say Jesus replaces the Tabernacle, Sinai, Moses or the Torah, is to

obscure the prologue's focus on Jesus' pre-existence. He is not a late-coming replacement for these aspects of Jewish history; he is the incarnation of the one who has been experienced through that history. He *is* the one who tabernacled with Israel, whose glory was seen on Sinai, and who gave the Torah. His incarnation has revealed God's glory, grace and truth all the more fully, enabling *all* believers to see what only Moses saw on Sinai. The point is not contrast but continuity.

Likewise, when Jesus offers water and light at Tabernacles, this can be connected with eschatological expectations of water pouring out from the Temple to restore the world, but to claim that Jesus thereby replaces the Temple (besides relying on a debatable punctuation of 7:37-38) ignores the fact that it was *God's* return to the Temple that was expected to precipitate this outpouring, and Jesus' own return to the Temple (after leaving it in John 2 and 5) at which he makes the offer. Once again, Jesus does not set himself *against* the Temple; he sets himself *within it* to offer what God was expected to provide there.

Most interesting of all, when John uses Temple imagery to describe the significance of Jesus' death and resurrection, this not only *need not* imply the replacement of the Temple, but can even be seen to assume the fundamental connection between the earthly and heavenly Temples. On the one hand, 2:13-23 calls the Jerusalem Temple "my Father's house," and ties its destruction and raising to Jesus' death and resurrection. On the other hand, 14:1-3 speaks of the heavenly Temple as "my Father's house," and promises that only when Jesus "goes away" (through his death and resurrection) can he "prepare" it for his disciples. Thus, when John uses Temple imagery again in the passion and resurrection narratives themselves, it cannot easily be said *which* Temple is in

view—the earthly or heavenly—nor indeed is it clear that any hard distinction should be made between them.

Thus when Isaiah 6 describes the LORD seated on a throne, and the train of his robe filled the Temple, is this in the earthly Temple or the heavenly, or both? When John quotes from this context and says Isaiah saw *Jesus'* glory (12:41), is the ambiguity any less? The earthly and the heavenly were always, ideally, intrinsically related and not fully distinguishable. So if John does view Jesus' crucifixion as his enthronement as divine king, if his "lifting up" implies the raising of the eschatological Temple, even if his tomb is described like the holy of holies, this no doubt places Jesus in the heavenly Temple, but it does not thereby *contrast* with the earthly Temple; it reveals the true significance of the earthly. As the incarnation of the Wisdom, glory and name through which God has always been known, Jesus is the divine presence to which the earthly Temple points and in which it participates, as the connection between 7:37-39 and 19:34-37 suggest. The eschatological waters are promised in the Temple at Tabernacles, and poured out on the cross, and once again Jesus stands in the position of God in the image—God enthroned—not in contrast to the Temple but *in* it, even if only symbolically.

The Temple, then, is not set aside and replaced, but rather provides both a context and a symbolic framework in which to understand Jesus' self-revelation. After all, if removed from this Temple background, much of John's imagery would be quite general and indistinct. For instance, water and light are among the most common symbols of all, referring to all manner of things within Judaism and outside of it. For Jesus to offer "living water" and claim to be "the light of the world," then, could be taken any number of ways *other* than to tie him to the God of Israel. It is precisely because he makes these

claims in the Temple, "on the last and greatest day" of Tabernacles, that the latter connection is apparent. It is the historical and eschatological associations of the water-pouring ritual and the great candelabra that give these claims depth and resonance. For those unfamiliar with the Temple and its traditions, Jesus might be offering little more than refreshment and enlightenment; thus it is primarily to those who have participated in—or at least heard about—these rituals that Jesus' words are most meaningful.[3]

At the same time, the application of this imagery to Jesus does more than just extend it to a new referent; it also entails a radical reinterpretation of the whole institution. By asserting that the Temple not only points to God, but also to Jesus, John not only claims an unexpected fulfillment of its eschatological hopes, but also sets its whole history and practice in a new light. Suddenly it is *Jesus* who was met in the Temple, not just for a few years in the first century, but from the beginning; it was *his* glory that was seen there (12:41). The upshot is that those who cling to the Temple (or the Torah) while rejecting Jesus inadvertently reject the Temple and Torah themselves. So when "the Jews" react to Jesus' claim to be "the light of the world" (8:12) with skepticism, Jesus responds, "You know neither me nor my Father. If you knew me, you would know my Father also" (8:19) and "if God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and now am here…. You are from your father the devil" (8:42, 44). It is divisive claims like these, not the purported replacement of the Temple, that lead to such a violent reaction from "the Jews" in John. "It is not for a good work that we are going to stone you, but for blasphemy, because you, though only a human being, are making yourself God" (10:33). It is not his rejection or replacement of the Temple, but

[3] Cf. Spaulding, *Commemorative Identities*, 142.

his insistence that its symbolism points to him—that he stands in the same fundamental relation to the Temple as God himself does—that "the Jews" find blasphemous.

From *John's* perspective, therefore, the Temple has not less significance but *more* in light of Christ. It is the place of his revelation; its water-pouring ceremonies and great candelabra symbolize his gifts of life and light; its Passover sacrifice provides the framework within which to understand his death; even its destruction and raising can be seen to provide a pattern to his death and resurrection. In all this, John *adds* to the Temple's significance; it does not subtract from it. Nothing in John implies that a believer in Jesus could not continue to celebrate these Jewish feasts, rather it insists that their proper celebration must recognize their ultimate significance in Jesus. For as we have noted, Jesus says in 4:23 that "the hour is coming, and *is now here*, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth" (emphasis added), so the fact that the festival cycle follows only after this indicates that worship "in spirit and truth" does not preclude festival participation, but can actually be enhanced by it. "We worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews" (4:22).

What then of the fall of the Temple? If John has only reached its final form after 70 CE, what kind of continuing significance can the Temple have? Of course, if John was composed before the Temple fell—which is denied by most commentators, but is not intrinsically impossible[4]—there need be no problem, but even if John's final form is post-70 CE, at the very least its knowledge of Palestinian places, situations and customs implies some pre-70 traditions.[5] If these traditions really are as central to the discourses as we have suggested, this means that whatever the date of its final form, John's interest

[4] Cf. John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), though he himself does maintain the "replacement of the temple by the person of Christ" (276).

[5] So Brown, *Introduction*, 209.

in the Temple by no means needs to be seen as a late reaction to its fall. On that score, it is tempting to take up Spaulding's work on Social Memory Theory, and note that in the face of crisis communities often seek to reinterpret rather than reject and replace their core symbols and practices, so we should not assume that the Johannine community would immediately give up their loyalty to the Temple post-70.

Our study has been focused on John's text itself, however, and in that respect John simply does not emphasize the destruction of the Temple. There are no predictions that "not one stone will be left on another," no dwelling on the armies that will march against Jerusalem or the terrors of its siege, indeed few references to the event at all. Where it is alluded to, it is most often connected to Jesus' death. Though many take this to indicate the replacement of the Temple by Jesus, 2:19 implies not contrast but parallelism. It is *the same* Temple that is destroyed that is raised. This then offers an intriguing perspective on John's use of glorification and exaltation language in relation to Jesus' death. As Hoskins notes, both terms were used repeatedly in Isaiah both of God and the Temple, especially in eschatological contexts.[6] To go beyond Hoskins, however, if Jesus and the Temple are destroyed together, are they not also glorified and exalted together? Especially if 12:41 does mean to imply that it was Jesus' glory that Isaiah saw in the Temple, then in John Jesus' glory *is* the Temple's glory, so there can be no contrast between them, much less replacing one with the other.

In that case, the likelihood that John only reached its final form after the destruction of the Temple need be no more indicative of a replacement paradigm than the fact that John's Gospel only reached its final form after Jesus' death. Though the Jerusalem Temple is no longer on earth, *neither is Jesus*, so physical absence is clearly no indication

[6] Hoskins, *Fulfillment of the Temple*, 147-159.

of insignificance. Indeed, if Jesus' death (and not just his resurrection) can be viewed as his exaltation, glorification and return to the Father, is it possible that the same is true of the destruction of the Temple? Admittedly, this is not explicit in John, but if so, then the reference in 14:1-3 to Jesus preparing "my Father's house" through his death and resurrection could indicate the taking up of the Jerusalem Temple into the heavenly Temple to which it was intrinsically related.

In truth, however, such questions—no less than replacement—are beyond John's point. As we have argued throughout, John is much less concerned with the question "what do we do now that the Temple has been destroyed?" as with the question "who was (and is) Jesus?" John's answer is that Jesus embodies the Wisdom, glory, name (and Spirit?) through which God has always been known, both in Israel's history and in its hopes for the future. In visions of the patriarchs like Jacob and Abraham (1:51; 8:53-58), on Sinai, in the Tabernacle and through the Torah (1:14-18), and in the Temple (12:41), it is and always as been the one incarnate in Jesus who has been known. The point is not contrast and replacement, but continuity and restoration.

A Case Study: The Temple and "the Jews" in John

Though we have found the Temple to inform a great deal of John's imagery, it remains just one of a number of important themes in John. We have sought especially to show how the Temple and festival themes serve primarily to support John's christological purposes and have noted connections with John's treatment of the Torah, but these themes are also tied to John's Pneumatology, Eschatology and Soteriology, as well as John's views of the church, the sacraments, "the Jews," and much else. Any and all of these could warrant further study in light of the positive treatment of the Temple that we

have traced, but rather than offer necessarily cursory remarks on several of these, we will close by exploring a few of the ways in which our reading of the Temple theme might advance our understanding of one particularly significant and contentious issue: the role of "the Jews" in John.[7]

If John's understanding of the Temple truly is as positive as we have argued, it must be asked how—or if—this can be reconciled with the more negative references to "the Jews" in John (e.g. 5:16-18; 6:41, 52; 7:1, 13, 15, 35; 8:22, 42-59; 9:22; 15:18-25). It certainly seems that the author(s) of John had a strained relationship with "the Jews," and the role this presentation of them has played in the history of Christian anti-Semitism can hardly be overstated. Nevertheless, there are good reasons to doubt that John is intentionally anti-Semitic. To be sure, "the Jews" is never a self-designation of believers in John (and cf. 13:33), and those to whom it is applied are the target of John's harshest rhetoric, but Jesus is himself "a Jew" (4:9), and the references to being put out of the synagogue (ἀποσυνάγωγος; 9:22; 12:42; 16:2) presuppose a desire to *participate* in the synagogue, and thus frame the dispute as an intra-Jewish controversy, rather than as an attack on Judaism or the Jews as a whole. In that case, even John's harshest rhetoric is hardly out of keeping with the kinds of denunciations found throughout the Jewish Scriptures (e.g. Isaiah 1; Ezekiel 16). Thus, while John concedes the title "Jews" to its opponents, this appears to be done somewhat grudgingly, and by no means indicates a categorical rejection of Judaism, the Jewish people, or their institutions. In fact, it may be that a more positive appreciation of the Temple and feasts in John can *better* explain the

[7] On the characterization of "the Jews" in John, cf. e.g. Brown, *Introduction*, 157-175; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 125-132; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:214-228; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 9-11; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 70-74; Johnson, "'Salvation Is from the Jews'," 83-99; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 88-89.

presentation of "the Jews" in this Gospel than the older suppersessionist and replacement paradigms.

As we have seen, the Fourth Gospel not only evidences an intimate familiarity with the Jerusalem Temple and its festivals, but even *assumes* such knowledge on the part of its audience. For instance, the prologue alludes to Wisdom and Sinai without referring to either by name, while the Tabernacles discourse recalls the water-pouring ceremony and great candelabra, without explicitly mentioning either. These and many other cases suggest that at least at some formative stage of its composition, John had in view an audience that was knowledgeable of these institutions, which were believed to point to Jesus. Thus it is highly significant that again and again John ties these very institutions to "the Jews." Jesus routinely "goes up to Jerusalem" for festivals "of the Jews" (2:13; 5:1; 7:2; 11:55), then summarizes his whole ministry as teaching in the Temple and synagogues "where all *the Jews* come together" (18:20, emphasis added).

If these very Jewish institutions serve as primary witnesses to Jesus' identity in John, it can hardly be that these references to "the Jews" are primarily meant to indicate "distance" between John and Judaism.[8] After all, Jesus was himself "a Jew" (4:9), and insists that "salvation is from the Jews" (4:22), so it is "his own" who did not receive him (1:11; 18:35). This suggests a different sense to the more negative presentation of "the Jews" in John: not condemnation from the *outside* in some anti-Judaic or even anti-Semitic sense, but rather critique, and appeal, from *within* Judaism. John is not rejecting or distancing itself from these institutions, but claiming that they have been misunderstood and abused—indeed that they can *only* be properly understood in relation to Jesus. Though, properly understood, the Temple is "my Father's house," "the Jews" have not

[8] So Brown, *Introduction*, 162.

properly understood it, and so think Jesus is blaspheming when he is really (from John's perspective) telling the truth about his identity. As John makes clear, *even the disciples* fail to understand these things until after the resurrection (2:22). On the other side of the cross, however, the Temple and festivals came to be seen in a new light, not as replaced, but as key witnesses to Jesus, who brings about the fulfillment of their eschatological hopes.

As far as "the Jews" do not (yet) see the Temple in the same way, John's references are often negative, but the consistent identification of these institutions with "the Jews" can be seen to serve an apologetic purpose: to show that their own institutions point to Jesus' unique relation to God. As noted, such an intention might be reflected in the statement of purpose in 20:31, especially if it is taken to read "these things are written so that you may come to believe." Regardless, the emphasis in 20:31 is on the call to believe, not the rejection of those who do not believe. In this light, John's insistence on calling Jesus' opponents "the Jews" becomes a way of emphasizing that *their own Temple* symbolizes Jesus' embodiment of the self-disclosure God, and anticipates his life-giving death. Indeed, John says precisely that in regards to the Jewish Scriptures, "You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf. Yet you refuse to come to me to have life" (5:39-40).

Unfortunately, this possibility is easily overshadowed by the more negative references to "the Jews," which can at times become extremely harsh, especially in John 8 and 18-19. In both cases, the rejection of Jesus by "the Jews" is viewed as tantamount to the rejection of God, and an abandonment of their own religious heritage. "You are from your father the devil" (8:44) and "we have no king but the emperor" (19:15),

however hyperbolic these may be, are hardly conducive to continuing dialogue, nor is it surprising that both lead to attempts on Jesus' life.[9] Even this, however, is not necessarily inconsistent with the positive treatment of the Temple and festivals we have traced. A fuller exploration of this possibility must be left for future research, but it is surely significant that the harshest rhetoric directed at "the Jews" in John 8 occurs in the context of Jesus' rejection at a Temple festival. The sense seems to be that, in the Temple of all places Jesus' true identity should be seen, so to reject him *there* is most serious indeed.

Yet even when Jesus is driven from the Temple itself (8:59) the break is not final, as Jesus will return again (cf. 10:22-23; and perhaps 14:1-3). John will even attribute the plot to have Jesus killed to the priesthood's fear that *too many* of "the Jews" were beginning to believe in him. This fear is then shown to be all the more ironic by Caiaphas' prophesy that Jesus' death itself will "gather into one the dispersed children of God" (11:52; cf. 11:45-53; 12:9-11). Whether this still remains a possibility in light of John's harsh rhetoric elsewhere may be unclear, but one might hope that a more sympathetic understanding of the Temple and its festivals could offer one small step towards that reconciliation. At the very least, the traditions, rituals and hopes of these institutions offer a much broader and deeper framework in which to appreciate the significance of Jesus in John than is sometimes recognized. Far from rejecting or replacing the Temple, John presents it as the essential locus of Jesus' revelation of God.

[9] Indeed, there is a danger that in denying that John is anti-Jewish one ends up backing into an implicit anti-Semitism. After all, the more strongly one emphasizes the connections between Jesus and the traditions of Judaism in John, the easier it becomes to condemn those "Jews" who reject Jesus anyway. In vindicating the institutions of Judaism, are "the Jews" themselves the more harshly condemned?

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. Fourth Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 2000.

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and A Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker. *Philo*. 10 vols. Loeb Classic Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962.

Elliger, K., W. Rudolph and R. Kittel, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellchaft, 1997.

Epstein, Isidore, ed. *The Babylonian Talmud: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices.* 18 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1978.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Gossfeld, Bernard. *The Targum Onqelos to Exodus: Translated, with Apparatus and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 7. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988.

Hallo, William W., and K. Lawson Younger Jr., eds. *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-2002.

McNamara, Martin, and Robert Hayward. *Targum Neofiti 1: Exodus: Translated, with Introduction and Apparatus and Notes*. Michael Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus: Translated, with Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 2. Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier/Liturgical, 1994.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX intreptretes*. Bibleworks 7.0.019d.1. 2007. Print ed.: Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1935.

Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1959-1973.

Thackeray, Henry St. John, Ralph Marcus and Louis H. Feldman. *Josephus: With an English Translation*. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1981.

Wevers, J.W., R. Hanhart, W. Kappler, A. Rahlfs, and J. Ziegler, eds. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. 16 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-1999.

Whiston, William. *Josephus: Complete Works*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1960.

Young, C.D. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Updated edition. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993.

Secondary Sources

Abegg, Martin G. "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 81-91

Aitken, James K. "The Semantics of 'Glory' in Ben Sira—Traces of a Development in Post-Biblical Hebrew?" Pages 1-24 in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah: held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997*. Edited by T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Allison, Dale C. "The Living Water (John 4:10-14; 6:35c; 7:37-39)." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 30 (1986): 143-157.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Ashton, John. "The Transformation of Wisdom: A Study of the Prologue of John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 161-186.

Barker, Margaret. *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem*. London: SPCK, 1991.

Barker, Margaret. *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Barker, Margaret. *Temple Theology: An Introduction*. London: SPCK, 2004.

Barus, Armand. "John 2:12-25: A Narrative Reading." Pages 123-140 in *New Currents Through John: A Global Perspective*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Francisco Lozada Jr.. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 54. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2006.

Barton, John, and John Muddiman, eds. *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Bauckham, Richard. *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the God of Israel:* God Crucified *and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Bauckham, Richard. "Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1993): 24-68.

Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco: Word Books, 1987.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. "'Who Is the King of Glory?' Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism." Pages 18-31 in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archeology in Honor of Philip J. King*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

Boers, Hendrikus. *Neither on This Mountain Nor in Jerusalem.* Society of Biblical Literature Manuscript Series 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Borgen, Peder. "Creation, Logos and the Son: Observations on John 1:1-18 and 5:17-18." *Ex Auditu* 3 (1987): 88-97.

Bowman, John. "The Identity and Date of the Unnamed Feast in John 5:1." Pages 43-56 in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by Hans Goedicke. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

Brendin, Mark R. "John's Account of Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple: Violent or Nonviolent?" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 33.2 (2003): 44-50.

Brooke, George J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Brooke, George J. "The Temple Scroll and the New Testament." Pages 181-199 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 7. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1989.

Brown, Ken. "Tabernacle, Sinai and the Beloved Son in John's Prologue." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Johannine Literature Section. New Orleans, La., November 22, 2009.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. New Edition. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 29-29A. New York: DoubleDay, 1966-1970.

Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. New York: DoubleDay, 2003.

Brown, Raymond E. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955): 403-19, 559-74. Repr., pages 183-207 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl and James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Broyles, Craig C. *Psalms.* New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.

Broyles, Craig C. "The Psalms and Cult Symbolism: The Case of the Cherubim-Ark." Pages 139-156 in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David Firth and Philip S. Johnson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Bryan, Christopher. "Shall We Sing Hallel in the Days of the Messiah? A Glance at John 2:1-3:21." *St. Luke's Journal of Theology* 29 (1985): 25-36.

Bryan, Steven M. "The Eschatological Temple in John 14." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15.2 (2005): 187-98.

Bulman, James M. "The Only Begotten Son." *Calvin Theological Journal* 16 (1981): 56-79.

Burge, Gary. *Interpreting the Gospel of John.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

Carroll, Robert P. "So What Do We *Know* about the Temple? The Temple in the Prophets." Pages 34-51 in *Second Temple Studies 2. Temple Community in the Persian Period.* Edited by Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 175. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Carter, Warren. "The Prologue and John's Gospel: Function, Symbol and the Definitive Word." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39 (1990): 35-58.

Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Chilton, Bruce. *The Temple of Jesus: His Sacrificial Program Within a Cultural History of Sacrifice*. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Clifford, Richard J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 4. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Clifford, Richard J. *Psalms 1-72*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

Collins, C. John. "John 4:23-24, 'In Spirit and Truth': An Idiomatic Proposal." *Presbyterion* 21.2 (1995): 118-123.

Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells With Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier/Litrugical, 2001.

Conybeare F. C., and George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes*. Boston: Hendrickson, 1995.

Cook, W. Robert. "The 'Glory' Motif in the Johannine Corpus." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27.3 (1984): 291-97.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "John 1^{14}: 'became'." *Expository Times* 93 (1982): 215.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History and the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. New Testament Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "*Abba* and 'Father': Imperial Theology and the Jesus Traditions." *Journal of Biblcal Literature* 111 (1992): 611-30.

Dahl, Nils. "The Atonement - an Adequate Reward for the Akedah (Ro 8:32)." Pages 15-29 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica; Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969. Repr., Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications, 2002

Daly, Robert J. "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 45-75.

Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Third Edition. Based on Walter Bauer, William Arndt, Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, eds. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen [sic] Literatur*. Sixth Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Davies, P. R., and B. D. Chilton. "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 514-546

Day, John, ed. *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 422. London: T&T Clark, 2005. Repr., London: T&T Clark, 2007.

de Hulster, Izaak J. "Maria Magdalena en de twee engelen." *EBS-Bulletin* 38 (2009): 2-3.

Dodd, C.H. "The Prophecy of Caiaphas: John xi. 47-53." Pages 58-68 in *More New Testament Studies.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Draper, J.A. 'Temple, Tabernacle and Mystical Experience in John." *Neotestamentica* 31 (1997): 263-88.

Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Durham, John I. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987.

Eaton, John. *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with and Introduction and New Translation*. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.

Edwards, Ruth B. "Χάριν ἀντὶ Χάριτος (John 1.16): Grace and the Law in the Johannine Prologue." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988), 3-15.

Epp, Eldon Jay. "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." Pages 128-146 in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation*: *Studies in Honor of Merril C. Tenney*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Evans, Craig A. "Jesus and the 'Cave of Robbers': Towards a Jewish Context for the Temple Action." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3 (1993): 93-110.

Evans, Craig A. "The Obduracy of the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 221-236 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Evans, Craig A. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Fennema, D. A. "John 1.18: 'God the Only Son'," *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 124-135.

Fewell, Donna Nolan and Gary A. Phillips. "Drawn to Excess, or Reading Beyond Betrothal." *Semeia* 77 (1997): 23-58.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Qumran Literature and the Johannine Writings." Pages 117-133 in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown, S.S.* Edited by John R. Donahue. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2005.

Freed, Edwin D. "*Egō Eimi* in John 1:20 and 4:25." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 4 (1979): 288-291.

Freed, Edwin D. "The Manner of Worship in John 4:23f." Pages 33-48 in *Search the Scriptures: New Testament Studies in Honor of Raymond T. Stamm*. Edited by J. M. Myers, O. Reimherr, and H. N. Bream. Gettysburg Theological Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Freedman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Fuchs, Esther. "Structure and Patriarchal Functions in the Biblical Type-Scene: Some Preliminary Notes." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 3 (1987): 7-13.

Fuglseth, Kåre Sigvald. *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 119. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Graetz, Naomi. "God is to Israel as Husband to Wife: The Metaphoric Battering of Hosea's Wife." Pages 126-145 in *A Feminist Companion to the Latter Prophets*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. The Feminist Companion to the Bible 8. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1995.

Hanson, Anthony. "John I. 14-18 and Exodus XXXIV." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976): 90-101.

Harner, Philip B. "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns in Mark 15:39 and John 1:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 75-87.

Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Hatina, Thomas R. *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 232/Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 8; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Hatina, Thomas R. "John 20,22 in its Eschatological Context: Promise of Fulfillment?" *Biblica* 74 (1993): 196-219.

Heil, John Paul. "Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 729-45.

Hooke, S.H. "The Spirit Was Not Yet." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1963): 372-80.

Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 115. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1992.

Huie-Jolly, Mary R. "Threats Answered by Enthronement: Death/Resurrection and the Divine Warrior Myth in John 5.17-29, Psalm 2 and Daniel 7." Pages 191-217 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997.

Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Second Edition. New York: T&T Clark, 1998.

Jaubert, A. "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John." Pages 62-75 in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Johnson, Brian D. "'Salvation Is from the Jews': Judaism in the Gospel of John." Pages 83-99 in *New Currents Through John: A Global Perspective*. Edited by Fracisco Lozada Jr. and Tom Thatcher. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 54. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2006.

Kanagaraj, Jey J. "Jesus the King, Merkabah Mysticism and the Gospel of John." *Tyndale Bulletin* 47 (1996): 349-366.

Keel, Othmar. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Trans. Timothy J. Hallett. New York: Seabury Press, 1978; Repr. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003.

Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 220. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2002.

Kim, Stephen S. "The Christological and Eschatological Significance of Jesus' Miracle in John 5." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165 (2008): 413-424.

Kim, Stephen S. "The Christological and Eschatological Significance of Jesus' Passover Sign in John 6." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 164 (2007): 307-322.

Kinzer, Mark. "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John." Pages 447-464 in *SBL 1998 Seminar Papers*. Edited by E.H.J. Lovering. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Kirchhevel, Gordon D. "The Children of God and the Glory That John 1:14 Saw." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6 (1996): 87-93.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism.* London: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 22. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1989.

Koester, Craig R. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. Second Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker. 2004.

Kovacs, Judith L. "'Now Shall the Ruler of this World be Driven Out': Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 227-247.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60-150: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Kreitzer, Larry J. "The Temple Incident of John 2:13-25: A Preview of What is to Come." Pages 93-101 in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 153. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Reasonableness of Typology." Pages 9-38 in G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe. *Essays on Typology.* Studies in Biblical Theology 11. London: SCM Press, 1957.

Lancaster, Jerry R., and Larry Overstreet. "Jesus' Celebration of Hanukkah in John 10," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 152 (1995): 318-333.

Latraire, Biance. "Jesus' Equality with God: A Critical Reflection on John 5,18." Pages 177-190 in *The Myriad Christ: Plurality and the Quest for Unity in Contemporary Christology*. Edited by T. Merrigan and J. Haers. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 152; Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Lee, Dorothy A. *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 95. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Lemcio, Eugene E. "The Parables of the Great Supper and the Wedding Feast: History, Redaction and Canon." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 8 (1986): 1-26.

Levenson, Jon D. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

Levenson, Jon D. "The Temple and the World." *Journal of Religion* 64.3 (1984): 275-298.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek English Lexicon*. Revised Edition. Edited by Sir Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Lieu, Judith. "Temple and Synagogue in John." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 51-69.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. Black's New Testament Commentaries 4. New York: Continuum, 2005.

Longenecker, Richard. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1975.

Lundquist, John M. "What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology." Pages 205-219 in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*. Edited by H. B. Huffman, F. A. Spina, and A. R. W. Green. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Maccini, Robert Gordon. "A Reassessment of the Woman at the Well in John 4 in Light of the Samaritan Context." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 53 (1994): 35-46.

MacKenzie, R. A. F. *Sirach.* Wilmington, Del: Michael Glazier, 1983.

Marks, Richard G. *The Image of Bar Kokhba in Traditional Jewish Literature: False Messiah and National Hero.* University Park, Penn.: Penn State University Press, 1994.

Matson, Mark A. "The Temple Incident: An Integral Element in the Fourth Gospel's Narrative." Pages 145-53 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster, 2001.

Mays, James Luther. *Psalms*. Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1994.

McCaffrey, James. *The House With Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2-3.* Analecta Biblica 114. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1988.

McGrath, James F. *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology.* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 111; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

McKelvey, J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

McQuaid, Elwood. *The Outpouring: Jesus in the Feasts of Israel*. Bellmawr, N.J.: Friends of Israel, 1990.

Meagher, John C. "John 1.14 and the New Temple." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 57-68.

Meeks, Wayne A. "Equal to God." Pages 309-321 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.

Meeks, Wayne A. "Moses as God and King." Pages 354-371 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968. Repr. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2004.

Merwe, Christo H.J. van der, Jackie A. Naudé and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004.

Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Second Edition. New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. "The Temple Discourse in John." Pages 200-213 in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Edited by Richard N. Longnecker and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

Miller, Ed L. "The Johannine Origins of the Johannine Logos." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 445-457.

Moloney, Francis J. *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1-4.* Minneapolis: Fortress. 1993.

Moloney, Francis J. *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21.* Minneapolis: Fortress. 1998.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina 4. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical. 1998.

Moloney, Francis J. *Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12*. Minneapolis: Fortress. 1996.

Moloney, Francis J. "Reading John 2:13-22: The Purification of the Temple." *Revue Biblique* 97 (1990): 432-452.

Moule, C. D. F. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1950): 29-41.

Mowvley, Henry. "John 1^{14-18} in the Light of Exodus 33^{7}-34^{35}." *Expository Times* 95 (1984): 135-37.

Murray-Jones, C. R. A. "The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources." Pages 400-431 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1998.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Neill, Stephen, and N.T. Wright. *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1986.* Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Nereparampil, L. *Destroy this Temple: An Exegetico-Theological study on the meaning of Jesus' Temple-Logion in Jn 2.19*. Bangalore: Dharmaram College, 1978.

Nereparampil, Lucius. "New Worship and New Temple." *Bible Bhashyam* 16.4 (1990): 216-233.

Neusner, Jacob. "Judaism in a Time of Crisis: Four Responses to the Destruction of the Temple." *Judaism* 21 (1972): 313-327.

Neusner, Jacob. "Money-Changers in the Temple: the Mishnah's Explanation." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 287-290.

Neusner, Jacob. *Transformations in Ancient Judaism: Textual Evidence for Creative Responses to Crisis*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Jacob Allusions in John 1:51." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 586-605.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "Jacob Traditions and the Interpretation of John 4:10-26." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 419-437.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "My Lord and My God: The Divinity of Jesus in John's Gospel." Pages 152-171 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1986.* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1986.

Pancero, Severino. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity, According to John.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum 42. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Paroschi, Wilson. *Incarnation and Covenant in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, John 1:1-18.* Europäische Hochschulschriften Series 23, vol. 820. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2006.

Peterson, David L. *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

Pilgaard, Aage. "The Qumran Scrolls and John's Gospel." Pages 126-42 in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives, Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel in Århus 1997*. Edited by Johannes Nissan and Sigfred Pederson. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1999.

Pink, Arthur. *Exposition of the Gospel of John*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1945.

Poirier, John C. "Hanukkah in the Narrative Chronology of the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 54 (2008): 465-478.

Porter, C.L. "John 9.38, 39a: A Liturgical Addition to the Text." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967): 387-94.

Prosic, Tamara. *The Development and Symbolism of Passover until 70 CE*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Roberts, J.J.M. "Mowinckel's Enthronement Festival: A Review." Pages 97-115 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception.* Edited by Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XCIX. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.

Rogers, Jessie. "'It overflows Like the Euphrates with Understanding': Another Look at the Relationship between Law and Wisdom in Sirach." Pages 114-120 in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Vol. 1. Studies in Scripture and Early Judaism and Christianity 9. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Runnalls, Donna. "The King as Temple Builder: A Messianic Typology." Pages 15-37 in *Spirit Within Structure: Essays in Honor of George Johnston On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by E.J. Furcha. Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick Publications, 1983.

Sanders, E.P. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 1993.

Sanders, E.P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Sanders, E.P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63BCE-66CE.* Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1992.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1-13.

Sawyer, Deborah. "John 19:34: From Crucifixion to Birth, or Creation?" Pages 130-39 in *A Feminist Companion to John*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Schauss, Hayyim. *The Jewish Festivals: History & Observance*. Translated by Samuel Jaffe. New York: Schocken. 1962.

Schneiders, Sandra M. "The Raising of the New Temple: John 20:19-23 and Johannine Ecclesiology." *New Testament Studies* 52 (2006): 337-355.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Segal, J.B. *The Hebrew Passover: From the Earliest Times to A.D. 70*. London: Oxford, 1963.

Seitz, Christopher R. "Old Testament or Hebrew Bible? Some Theological Considerations." *Pro Ecclesia* 5 (1996): 292-303. Repr. pages 61-74 in *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Shepherd, Coulson. *Jewish Holy Days: Their Prophetic and Christian Significance*. Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Brothers, 1967.

Simenel, Philippe. "Les 2 Anges de Jean 20/11-12." *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 67 (1992/1): 71-76.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Smalley, Stephen. *John: Evangelist & Interpreter*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary 32. Waco: Word Books, 1984.

Songer, Harold S. "John 5-12: Opposition to the Giving of True Life." *Review and Expositor* 85 (1988): 459-471.

Spatafora, Andrea. *From The "Temple of God" to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation*. Tesi Gregoriana Series Teologia 27, Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997.

Spaulding, Mary B. *Commemorative Identities: Jewish Social Memory and the Johannine Feast of Booths*. Library of New Testament Studies 396. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

Steenburg, Dave. "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39 (1990): 95-109.

Sulzbach, Carla. "Of Temples on Earth, in Heaven, and In-Between." Pages 166-185 in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity: Presented to James H. Charlesworth on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema. Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006.

Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

Toussaint, Stanley D. "The Significance of the First Sign in John's Gospel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 134 (1977): 45-51.

Trudinger, Paul. "The Cleansing of the Temple: St John's Independent, Subtle Reflections." *Expository Times* 108 (1997): 329-330.

Um, Stephen T. *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel*. Library of New Testament Studies 312. New York: T&T Clark. 2006.

Walker, P.W.L. *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1996.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Watty, William W. "Jesus and the Temple – Cleansing or Cursing?" *Expository Times* 93 (1982): 235-239.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the 'Sitz im Leben' of Genesis 1:1-2:3." Pages 501-512 in *Melanges Bibliques et Orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*. Edited by André Caquot and M. Delcor. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 212. Kevelaer, Ger.: Butzon and Bercker, 1981.

Weyde, Karl William. *The Appointed Festivals of YHWH: The Festival Calendar in Leviticus 23 and the* sukkôt *Festival in Other Biblical Texts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Whitcomb, John. C. "Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel." *Grace Theological Journal* 6 (1985): 201-217.

Williams, James G. "The Beautiful and the Barren: Conventions in Biblical Type-Scenes." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 17 (1980): 107-119.

Williams, J.T. "Cultic Elements in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 339-50 in *Studia Biblia*. Edited by E.A. Livingstone. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1978.

Wohlgemut, Joel R. "Where Does God Dwell? A Commentary on John 2:13-22." *Direction* 22 (1993): 87-93.

Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

Yee, Gale A. *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John*. Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1989. Repr. Euguen, Ore.; Wipf and Stock, 2007.

Zsengellér, József. "Does Wisdom Come from the Temple? Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple of Jerusalem." Pages 135-149 in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books: Shime`on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006.* Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 127. Leiden: Brill, 2008.