j:s51 24-5-1999 p:1 c:0

New Test. Stud. vol. 45, 1999, pp. 51–69
Printed in the United Kingdom
Copyright © 1999 Cambridge University Press

TEMPLE AND SYNAGOGUE IN JOHN

JUDITH LIEU

Dept of Theology and Religious Studies, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS

Jesus' answer to the High Priest in 18.20 offers a key to the pattern of his ministry. Each of the pairs 'openly: secretly'; 'the world: the Jews' and 'synagogue and Temple' function significantly in the Gospel, but the last named are most important. In each of the Gospels, 'synagogue', 'house', and 'Temple' play narrative roles in the exploration of the relationship between Jesus with his community and the community of the Scriptures and contemporary Judaism. John's use of these narrative spatial-markers is very different and does not trace the separation of John's community from the synagogue, as often supposed. Instead, the Temple is the place for divine manifestation and where Jesus must be both revealed and rejected.

> Then the High Priest asked Jesus about his disciples and about his teaching. Jesus answered him,
> I have spoken *openly to the world*,
> I have always taught **in synagogue** and in **the temple**
> where *all the Jews* come together,
> and *in secret* I have spoken nothing.
> Why do you ask me? Ask those who have heard what I spoke to them. They surely know what I said. (John 18.19–21)

Jesus' words before 'the High Priest'[1] in the Fourth Gospel are baffling, not because, as often in this Gospel, they self-evidently, at least for the initiated, carry a deeper meaning, but because they defy our expectations. At the same time they encapsulate a fundamental problem in the Gospel's attitude to the Jews or Judaism, which we may summarize by 'synagogue and Temple'.

In the 'Jewish' trial of the Synoptic accounts both Jesus' silence (Mark 14.60; Matt 26.63) and his words (Mark 14.62; Matt 26.64; Luke 22.67–70) are laden with significance. However we may judge their historical plausibility, for the Gospel writers and readers they establish the person of Jesus and his claims as that for which he dies, and that which the believing reader is compelled to ack-

[1] The confusion regarding the identity of the High Priest and between Annas and Caiaphas is not relevant here, and the text of vv. 13–24 may be read in its standard order.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:2 c:0

nowledge as true. The trial before Pilate adds little of serious kerygmatic significance, introducing only the charge under which Jesus will die, as 'King of the Jews', a title whose ambiguity is by now self-evident. This is but one facet of the oft-observed phenomenon that for apologetic and polemical reasons the trial narratives progressively lighten the blame laid on and the attention paid to the Romans, represented by Pilate, turning these rather on the Jews.

Notoriously, however, John reverses this tendency and concentrates all his attention and skill on the trial before Pilate (18.29–19.16), using it to explore the true meaning of Jesus' mission and therefore of his death. By contrast, his hearing before the High Priest is fraught with ambiguity and hardly constitutes a trial; there are no charges, no witnesses, no Sanhedrin. The commonly noted explanation for this is that the Jewish trial has already taken place;[2] the verdict has already been reached in 11.47–53 where 'the high priests and the Pharisees' do 'gather as a sanhedrin' (cf. Mark 14.53, 55), an incident deliberately recalled as Jesus is led to Annas in John 18.13.[3] It is true that what provokes them on that occasion are 'the many signs he does' (11.47; cf. 12.37) and that no witnesses are called; however, the question of witnesses has already been extensively treated in the Gospel (5.31–40; 8.13–18), and in these passages the claims of Jesus have been the focus of the debate. Thus, it can be argued, the central chapters of the Gospel constitute the 'trial' of Jesus before 'the Jews'.[4]

This should not, however, lead us to ignore the brief scene before the High Priest in 18.19–23. Surprisingly, the question he asks of Jesus is not about his identity or his claims, as we might expect from both the Synoptics and the earlier chapters, but 'concerning his disciples and concerning his teaching'. Jesus' refusal to give a direct reply is expressed not through a pregnant silence or provocative σὺ εἶπας (Mark 14.60; Matt 26.64), but through what may appear to be a deliberate prevarication. 'Why ask me? Ask those who have heard what I spoke to them! They surely know what I said.' His introductory words (v. 20) which prefaced this paper might at first suggest that 'those who have heard' here are 'the world' or 'all the Jews'. Understood as historical reminiscence they could support a picture of a Jesus who in his final week(s) began to gather around him in the Temple followers, a potential revolution-

[2] E.g. A. E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1976).
[3] This cross-reference exacerbates the confusion noted in n. 1.
[4] Worked out in detail by Harvey, *Jesus on Trial*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:3 c:0

ary movement.[5] We should not totally dismiss this hint, for the Johannine traditions give as much support as any for 'Jesus the revolutionary';[6] but this is unlikely to be John's concern. On another level the words are a surprise, for within the context of the Gospel itself it is the Johannine disciples whose task is to acknowledge what they have heard and know (John 3.11; 4.42; cf. 1 John 1.1–15). This may, for the 'knowing' reader, create a sense of irony, typical of this Gospel. Yet it does not mean that Jesus' answer is a dismissal of the question and can itself be dismissed while we await the testimony of others. If in the Gospel we encounter the testimony of those who heard what he said as well as saw what he did (20.30; 21.25), Jesus' own manifesto in 18.20 must contain a key to the meaning of his ministry:

> ἐγὼ παρρησίᾳ λελάληκα τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐγὼ πάντοτε ἐδίδαξα ἐν συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπου πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέρχονται, καὶ ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν.

There are three pairs here, each of which plays a key role in the Gospel and in its interpretation: openly vs. in secret; the world vs. the Jews; in synagogue vs. in the temple. They may be seen as indicating manner, location, and audience, but in another sense all are indicators of location: thus 'in secret' (ἐν κρυπτῷ) in the final clause contrasts with both 'openly' (παρρησίᾳ) and 'to the world' (τῷ κόσμῳ), both datives, in the first, yet may also be seen as the obverse of 'in (ἐν) synagogue and in the temple'. We may explore each in turn.

SYNAGOGUE AND TEMPLE

Jesus' claim here draws attention to the remarkable fact that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus does not *teach* outside synagogue or Temple. This is in marked contrast to the Synoptics where we find him teaching on the way (Luke 13.22), by the sea (Mark 4.1), seated in a boat (Luke 5.3), on a mountain (Matt 5.2), as well as in their synagogues (Matt 4.23) and in the Temple (Matt 26.55). In part this is, of course, a reflection of what Jesus does in John: he is only occasionally addressed as teacher,[7] and his speaking is rarely re-

[5] See R. Leistner, *Antijudaismus im Johannesevangelium? Darstellung des Problems in der neueren Auslegungsgeschichte und Untersuchung der Leidensgeschichte* (Berne & Frankfurt: Lang, 1974) 101–5.

[6] Cf. 6.15, and the cohort in 18.3.

[7] Διδάσκαλος: John 7x (Matt 12; Mark 12; Luke 17): translating 'rabbi/rabbuni' in 1.38; 20.16; by Nicodemus in 3.2, combined with, and reinterpreted by, κύριος in 11.28; 13.13–14; in 3.10 of Nicodemus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:4 c:0

ferred to as 'teaching'.[8] Such references, however, are programmatic: 6.59: 'these things he said *in synagogue* **teaching** in Capernaum'; 7.28; 8.20: '**teaching** *in the temple*'; only in 7.14 is the indicative used: 'Jesus went up *to the temple* and was **teaching**'.[9] Accordingly, the noun 'teaching' (διδαχή) is used only in the same context, in 7.16, 17. Here Jesus anticipates the High Priest's question in 18.19 'concerning his teaching': 'My teaching is not mine but his who sent me. If anyone wishes to do his will, he will know concerning the teaching whether it is from God or whether I speak on my own authority' (7.16–17).

Thus Jesus' conversations with Nicodemus, with the Samaritan woman, and with the disciples (3; 4; 13–17), which surely could be said to be 'in secret' and not 'openly', are not described as 'teaching'. Indeed, Jesus implicitly rejects the epithet 'teacher' ascribed him by Nicodemus (3.2). Instead, as the above references indicate, it is, as 18.20 claims, only 'in synagogue and in the temple' that Jesus teaches. Location, audience and content thus need careful attention.

IN SECRET/OPENLY

The question of whether Jesus acts *openly*/παρρησίᾳ belongs in a similar framework.[10] In 7.4 Jesus' brothers urge him to go to Judaea so that his disciples 'may see the works which you do'. 'For', they continue, 'no-one does anything *in secret* (ἐν κρυπτῷ) and seeks himself to be *public* (ἐν παρρησίᾳ). If you do these things, manifest (φανερόω) yourself to the world.' What Jesus does is to go up 'but not manifestly (φανερῶς) but *in secret* (ἐν κρυπτῷ)' (7.10).[11] Leaving the Temple means leaving the sphere of the public: in 8.59 Jesus *hid* himself (κρύπτω) and left the Temple. Finally in 11.54 'Jesus, therefore, no longer moved *openly* among the Jews, but went away from there to a place near the wilderness'; and in 12.36, at the close of his public ministry, 'Jesus went away and *hid* from them'.

Yet does Jesus speak *'openly'* in the Temple? In 7.26 the crowd believe so: 'Behold he is speaking *openly*'; but in 10.24, once again

[8] Διδάσκειν: Matt 14; Mark 17; Luke 17; John 9. διδαχή: Matt 3; Mark 5; Luke 1; John 3.

[9] Also 8.28 (the father); 14.26 (the spirit); 8.35 (by the crowds); 9.34 (the blind man).

[10] D. Mollat, 'Remarques sur le vocabulaire spatial du quatrième évangile', *Studia Evangelica* 1 (ed. K. Aland *et al.*; TU 73; Berlin: Akademie, 1959) 321–8, notes this but associates 'secret' with Galilee and 'public' with Jerusalem (p. 334). John's use of παρρησία shows little similarity with the Pauline use and its background in the personal freedom of the (Cynic) philosopher (see A. Malherbe, '"Gentle as a Nurse": The Cynic Background to 1 Thess ii', *NT* 12 [1970] 203–17).

[11] **P**$^{66, 75}$ B L T W etc. prefix ὡς possibly in an attempt to soften what follows.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:5 c:0

in the Temple (10.22), they demand, 'If you are the Christ tell us *openly*', only to be answered, 'I have spoken and you do not believe. The works which I do in the name of my Father, these witness concerning me.' It is in fact only to his disciples that Jesus manifests himself or his glory (2.11; 17.6; cf. 21.1), yet the disciples experience the same ambiguity. In 16.25 Jesus declares, 'These things I have spoken to you in parables (παροιμίαι). The hour is coming when I shall no longer speak to you in parables, but I will announce to you *openly* (παρρησίᾳ) concerning the Father'; just four verses later the disciples triumphantly claim, 'Now indeed you are speaking *openly* and are not saying a parable' (16.29), only to be ironically rebuked, 'Do you just now believe?' For John, then, there is on one level no 'openness' in Jesus' own ministry; without the insight or 'remembering' which belongs to the future, all that he says belongs to the level of parables.[12]

Thus Jesus' *openness* is not transparent. It does not guarantee understanding and belief. Those who have experienced it may not, perhaps cannot, testify to who Jesus is.

THE WORLD AND THE JEWS

The problems surrounding John's use of 'the Jews' are well known and cannot be explored in detail here.[13] The same might be said of 'the world'; indeed, the relationship between 'the world' and 'the Jews' for John is never entirely clear – which determines the boundaries of the other? As we have just seen, in 7.4 Jesus' brothers urge him to manifest himself 'to the world', but it is to Judaea that they wish him to go. His answer to them is characteristic: 'The world cannot hate you, but it hates me' (7.7); these words are echoed to his disciples in 15.18, 'If the world hates you, know that it hated me first', a section which moves towards the declaration 'They will make you excluded from the synagogue (ἀποσυνάγωγος)', thus producing the same elision between 'world' and 'synagogue' = Jews. In John Jesus is indeed 'light of the world' and speaks 'to the world' that which he has heard from the one who sent him (8.12, 26), yet ultimately Jesus was not of the world (8.23) and the world did not and would not know him (1.10).

[12] See X. Léon-Dufour, 'Towards a Symbolic Reading of the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 27 (1981) 439–56.

[13] The bibliography is considerable: e.g. J. Ashton, 'The Identity and Function of the ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ', *NT* 27 (1985) 40–75; U. von Wahlde, 'The Johannine "Jews": A Critical Survey', *NTS* 28 (1982) 33–60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:6 c:0

Seen against this background, Jesus' answer to the High Priest contains a deep irony. His words are indeed true, but what could be discovered by following them? Openness is an illusion, and the world does not believe; his 'teaching' does not produce disciples. To learn about Jesus' teaching and his disciples will be to gain nothing. There may also be a further level of irony: Jesus' answer suggests a scriptural echo, from Deutero-Isaiah, John's most formative Scripture (Isa 45.19): 'I have not spoken in secret nor in a darkened place of earth . . . I am' – this is the language of divine epiphany. Yet this only underscores the enigma posed by Jesus' own appeal to his open teaching 'in synagogue and in the Temple'.

NARRATIVE SPACE, DIVINE PRESENCE, AND THE COMMUNITY

That Temple and synagogue should play a focal role in the Fourth Gospel will be no surprise. The two cardinal themes in recent analysis are the 'Jewishness' of the Gospel, exemplified by its use of Temple symbolism, primarily drawn from festival practice, and the separation from and conflict with 'the synagogue' which has been seen as formative for the Johannine community. These concerns are not, of course, peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. Here it is the way they are explored in each of the Gospels through narrative structure and the use of location that is of particular significance. Thus it has frequently been observed that in Mark in particular the 'house' on the one hand and 'synagogue' and 'Temple' on the other provide a means of exploring the relationship between the revelation of Jesus and the community he establishes and the community of the Scriptures and of contemporary Judaism.[14] Such a pattern is hardly surprising, for throughout the biblical tradition 'space' or location are powerful markers of divine presence, blessing, or judgment; exploring this as a literary construct in the post-exilic prophets, R. P. Carroll has spoken of 'the textual temple', in contrast to the 'real temple'.[15] The Gospels' use of significant narrative space may be understood in the same way. That John uses location or space symbolically to explore the identity of both

[14] E. Best, *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup 4; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981) 226–9; E. S. Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986) 131–6. Other elements in Mark's use of narrative space are not relevant here.

[15] R. P. Carroll, 'So What Do We *Know* about the Temple? The Temple in the Prophets', in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple and Community in the Persian Period* (ed. T. C. Eskenazi and K. H. Richards; JSOTSup 175; Sheffield: SAP, 1994) 34–51, 38.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:7 c:0

Jesus and those who believe in him needs no demonstration, but this has been studied particularly in relation to his oppositional 'above/below'.[16] However, the above analysis suggests that synagogue and Temple are also important spatial constructs. A comparison of the way each of the Gospels establishes a relationship between these *loci* will highlight their different patterns of community experience and theological interpretation, and provide a way of understanding the Fourth Gospel's own formulation.

Mark's antithesis between synagogue and house has often been noted. The synagogue provides the location for Jesus only in the first part of the Gospel; after his rejection in his unidentified hometown, πατρίς (6.1–6), Jesus does not again appear in the synagogue.[17] Instead Mark emphasizes a move from synagogue to house – either οἰκία or οἶκος. Already in 1.29, after the healing of the man with an unclean spirit, Mark emphasizes (εὐθὺς; ἐξέρχομαι) Jesus' departure from the synagogue into the house of Simon. The Gospel underlines that both the gathering with Levi and the healing of the paralysed man were in a house, possibly Jesus' own (2.1, 29); again in 3.20 the Pharisees' accusation that Jesus heals by Beelzebul is located when Jesus is in a house with a crowd.[18] At the end of that incident a pointed contrast is drawn between his mother and brothers who are left standing outside (ἔξω; cf. 4.11), and those seated around him, presumably inside, who are now named his mother and brothers (3.31–5): there is now a new definition of house and of family.[19] From now on Mark makes the house the place where, away from the crowds, the disciples ask Jesus privately for more instruction.[20] At the same time Mark emphasizes the return of those who have been healed to their house.[21] Thus in Mark 'the synagogue' is left and 'the house' becomes the new location for those who have experienced healing and form the nucleus of the new community. For Elizabeth Malbon this is equally an affirmation that the sacred cannot contain Jesus' teaching, in contradistinction to Pharisaic and later rabbinic Judaism

[16] Most incisively by W. Meeks, 'The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism', *JBL* 91 (1972) 44–72; however, see Mollat, 'Remarques'; J. Neyrey, 'The Footwashing in John 13.6–11', *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (ed. L. M. White and O. L. Yarbrough; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1995) 198–213.

[17] Immediately afterwards, Jesus goes teaching in a circle in the villages (6.6); Matthew, in the closest parallel (Matt 9.35), earlier in the ministry, adds 'in their synagogues'. Earlier references are in an editorial summary in Mark 1.39 and two miracles in the synagogue: 1.23–8; 3.1–6.

[18] Matthew and Luke omit the references to the house in their parallels to Mark 2.1; 3.20.

[19] Cf. Malbon, *Narrative Space*, 130.

[20] Mark 7.17; 7.24; 9.28; 9.33; 10.10 – none of these references is followed by Matthew or Luke.

[21] Mark 2.11; 5.19; 7.30; 8.26: Matthew omits 5.19; 7.30; 8.26; Luke omits the last two.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:8 c:0

for whom, particularly after the destruction of the Temple, the synagogue becomes the place of the sacred.[22]

In Matthew, as is well known, the synagogue is *their* synagogue, a phrase he found in Mark 1.39 but fully exploited to create a sense of distance between Jesus and them.[23] The rejection at Nazareth (13.54–8) immediately follows the parables of the Kingdom and the celebration of 'every scribe discipled in the kingdom of God' (13.52): the 'new' with its own implicit structures is already in place, if only in anticipation. Matthew has already omitted the healing of the man with an unclean spirit, and this means that the synagogue is never neutral – it is the place of conflict (12.9–14), of spurious religious behaviour (6.2, 5), and of predicted suffering, although this will come not in some eschatological countdown (so Mark 13) but in the mission of the apostles (10.17; 23.34). In contrast to Luke, neither the centurion nor Jairus is linked to the synagogue. Yet in Matthew the house does not offer the primary alternative to the synagogue: there is little clear pattern in his use of οἶκος or οἰκία; although he ignores occasions where Mark uses it for private teaching, he adds two others of his own (13.36; 17.25).[24] Moreover, Matthew introduces the term ἐκκλησία, and although this is not in explicit contrast to the synagogue, the seeds of what will become a stylized opposition in later Christian writers have been sown here.

Luke also shapes his narrative so as to change the role of the synagogue, in ways which do not cohere with his much-debated 'anti-Jewishness'. The sermon at Nazareth now inaugurates the ministry of Jesus, who goes there 'as was his custom' (4.16). This incident, then, does not mark Jesus' rejection of or by the synagogue, for we find Jesus back in the synagogue both on 'Markan occasions' – the healing of the man with an unclean spirit and the man with a withered hand – on specifically Lukan occasions – as late as the healing of the bent woman (13.10) – and in Lukan summaries including the surprising 4.44 where Jesus 'was preaching in the synagogues of Judaea'.[25] Luke emphasizes Jesus' preaching and teaching in the synagogues both in his own material and in editing his sources.[26] He also presumably approves of the centurion

[22] Malbon, *Narrative Space*, 131–3.
[23] Matt 4.23; 9.35; 12.9; 13.54.
[24] At 13.36 perhaps interpreting the κατ' ἰδίαν of Mark 4.34.
[25] If taken from Mark 1.39, Luke has dropped the Markan 'their', but cf. 4.15.
[26] Luke 4.15; 4.44; 6.6; 13.10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:9 c:0

who has built the Jews a synagogue (7.5), and explains that Jairus is a ruler of the synagogue (8.41).[27]

Yet Luke also signals a move from synagogue to house, most notably during the journey to Jerusalem, but already anticipated during the Galilean ministry, in the meal Levi prepares 'in his house', and in that at the house of Simon the Pharisee (5.29; 7.36).[28] As these two examples indicate, 'the house' for Luke is not the place for the new community of disciples – he omits all the Markan references to the house as a place where Jesus is alone with his disciples. Instead 'the house' is for him the place for the meals, another favourite Lukan topic, an echo of and at times an overturning of the Greco-Roman symposium;[29] similarly, the house is a favourite theme of Lukan parables, and of teaching about the demands of discipleship.[30] These meals Jesus shares are public events and so we may wonder whether for Luke the move into the house/meal is the move into the social life of the non-Jewish world;[31] however, the one house which Jesus most pointedly does not enter is that of the presumably non-Jewish centurion (7.6, 10), whereas in the opening chapters the house no less than the Temple is the locus for the divine response to faithful Israel in the annunciation to Mary and the birth of John.

There is little equivocation about the Temple in Mark. Its first appearance on the narrative stage when Jesus goes there 'to look' in 11.11 is immediately followed by the parabolic cursing of the fig tree, which itself interprets the subsequent 'cleansing', a misnomer in Mark. Although it is in the Temple that the various controversies of chs. 11–12 take place, Jesus leaves the Temple and predicts its destruction as he takes his seat opposite it (omitted by Matthew and Luke) (13.2–3). Matthew is, perhaps, more ambivalent, at least in that even there Jesus is able to heal both blind and lame, and is praised by the children singing (21.14–15) – just as he also teaches there (21.23). Matthew can still apparently, at least in theory, conceive of someone leaving their gift on the altar (5.23; cf. 23.18–20). Yet he, like Mark, has Jesus finally leave the Temple before delivering his eschatological discourse, and much earlier, as

[27] Mark's ἀρχισυνάγωγος could be ambiguous; Matthew uses the general ἄρχων. Luke still anticipates persecution in the synagogue in 12.11; 21.12.

[28] In 8.41 Luke introduces the story of Jairus's daughter with the father's invitation that Jesus come to his house.

[29] Luke 10.38; 14.1; 19.5, 9; cf. 22.10–11.

[30] Luke 12.39; 14.23; 15.6; 16.4; 18.14; 9.61; 17.31; 12.52.

[31] On Luke 14 see W. Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (SNTSMS 85; Cambridge: CUP, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:10 c:0

soon as controversy had darkened Jesus' ministry, has had him declare, 'Something greater than the Temple is here' (12.6).

Luke's picture is very different, and no less ambiguous than his presentation of the synagogue. His narrative both begins and ends in the Temple: it begins, admittedly, with faithful Israel represented by Zechariah, by Simeon and by Anna, but ends with the disciples there praising God.[32] In Luke Jesus' 'cleansing' of the Temple marks the beginning and not the end of his teaching there (19.45–6): thereafter Jesus spends every day of those final days in the Temple where the people flock to hear him.[33] There is no suggestion that Jesus leaves the Temple to preach the 'eschatological sermon' of ch. 21, and this chapter focuses rather on Jerusalem, which Luke virtually dissociates from the Temple. For Luke, then, the Temple is not the place of sacrifice, now rejected and finished; it has been taken over by Jesus and by the faithful, although perhaps only as a place of prayer at least for believers (cf. 18.10) – so Luke changes Jesus' quotation of Isa 56.7 from 'This house shall be called . . .' to 'This house shall be a House of Prayer', but omits 'for all nations' (19.45–6). Perhaps it shares in the ambiguity that Israel itself has for this evangelist, a symbol of God's fulfilment of blessing but ultimately not sufficient. Although the Gospel ends with the disciples 'praising God in the Temple', they have already been told to go out 'to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem' (24.49).

In this light, Mark speaks for a community for whom the Temple, if not already destroyed, has had its doom assured;[34] the synagogue too is forgotten: it is no longer a place of dispute and controversy and seems irrelevant to the new family of the house. An obvious point of comparison is the Pauline letters which nowhere refer to the synagogue and presuppose the 'house' as the home of the community; a related tradition may be offered by 1 Peter, although here the relation of the household imagery to the Temple is more ambiguous.[35] By contrast, as with the Law and perhaps the Sab-

[32] Luke 1.8; 2.22 ναός; 2.27, 37, 47; 24.53 ἱερόν. Ctr. J. H. Elliott, 'Temple versus Household in Luke–Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions', *The Social World of Luke–Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. J. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991) 211–40, who portrays the Temple as 'a structure symbolic of Jewish national identity, constituted by Torah and an elaborate purity system . . . [a] center of Jewish political, economic, and social power' (p. 223); this is not Luke's picture, and the move from the Temple emphasized by Elliott only happens, if anywhere, in Acts.

[33] Luke 19.47; 20.1; 21.37–8.

[34] J. P. Heil, 'The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark', *CBQ* 59 (1997) 76–100, finds a new Temple/house theme; however, this involves finding references to a house where the word is not used (13.34; 14.12–25).

[35] See J. H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (London: SCM, 1982) 165–266, who denies that the 'spiritual house' of 1 Pet 2.5 draws on Temple imagery and stresses the 'household' framework of the letter.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:11 c:0

bath, Matthew's community still values the Temple but struggles to articulate consistently its place for the present. Much more immediate is the sense of conflict with 'their' synagogue, and the beginnings of an alternative structure of scribes, prophets and little ones in the ἐκκλησία. However, this need not mean that 'the synagogue' equals 'Judaism', as if Matthew were opposed to 'Judaism': both συναγωγή and ἐκκλησία have a septuagintal background, and whether Matthew sees the two opposing forms of assembly as rival claimants within the Jewish heritage remains an issue for debate and more precise definition.[36] Luke's picture is, as we have seen, more equivocal, particularly when the Gospel is viewed on its own; Luke struggles to affirm the continuity from the tradition of faithful Israel to Jesus and the earliest community. Only in the light of the two-volume Luke–Acts does this become a staging post on a longer journey; whereas in Luke 'the house' hints at the context of Jesus' message in society, it is only in Acts that the house becomes the locus of the new community (Acts 2.42).[37]

John's picture is surprisingly different, particularly in the light of the current consensus regarding the interpretation of the Gospel. It is now a commonplace to assume that the Johannine narrative is a two-level narrative: the level of the community's own formative experience of exclusion and opposition from 'the synagogue' has become the mirror or window through which the level of the story of Jesus is recounted and understood.[38] The favourite exemplar of this is the narrative of the blind man whose healing introduces the agreement by 'the Jews' that 'If anyone should confess him as Messiah, they should become ἀποσυνάγωγος', presumably 'excluded from the synagogue' (9.22); such a situation can hardly fit within the ministry of the earthly Jesus, but has been seen as the theme story of the Johannine community, itself excluded from the synagogue. Although the anchor of Martyn's reconstruction, the identification of that exclusion with the so-called 'Benediction of the Heretics' (*Birkat-haMinim*), has now largely been abandoned, the underlying reconstruction is widely maintained.[39]

Thus John has often been paired with Matthew as the two

[36] See A. J. Saldarini, 'Boundaries and Polemics in the Gospel of Matthew', *Biblical Interpretation* 3 (1995) 239–65, 255.

[37] See T. K. Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke–Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994) 137–45.

[38] J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979 [1968]).

[39] Ibid., 42–62. For a recent acceptance and development of the scheme see M. de Boer, *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:12 c:0

Gospels which most clearly reflect the split with 'the synagogue', although debate continues in each case as to whether the conflict we are witnessing is *intra* or *extra muros*.[40] For Matthew, as we have seen, this conflict is expressed in the narrative through Jesus' deliberate stance over against 'their synagogue'. Yet in John's case few have explained why, for a Gospel which is shaped by conflict with 'the synagogue', the synagogue appears surprisingly rarely – only in 18.20 and its reference back to 6.59. Thus the enigmatic hapax ἀποσυνάγωγος of 9.22, repeated in 12.42 and 16.2, is the more enigmatic, because within the narrative world of John the συναγωγή is so unimportant. Not only is the synagogue absent from ch. 9 but the reader has been given no clues as to what this exclusion would mean and why it would matter. The synagogue is not in John antithetical to Jesus; it is the locus neither of fundamental conflict with 'the Jews' nor of behaviour which he condemns.[41]

The second 'given' in much Johannine scholarship is the assumption of (a) distinctive community/ies behind the Gospel and Epistles. Their idiosyncratic language and coded ironies or double meanings, and their creation of an insider mentality through the rhetoric of above/below, of this world/not of this world, being born again, seem to presuppose a highly articulated separate identity which has even been labelled sectarian.[42] If the First Epistle reflects schism within one community (1 John 2.18–19), the Second and Third Epistles suggest a number of such communities linked by travelling teachers and troubled by the consequent problems of testing, hospitality, and exclusion (2 John 9–11; 3 John 3–10). It has been natural to locate such an arrangement within a framework of households, abetted not least by 2 John's injunction, 'If anyone comes to you and does not bear this teaching, do not receive them εἰς οἰκίαν'.[43]

[40] On Matthew and John see S. Freyne, 'Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus', *"To See Ourselves as Others see Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (ed. E. S. Frerichs and J. Neusner; Chico: Scholars, 1985) 117–43. On *intra* vs *extra muros* see G. N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992) esp. 113–68; A. J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian–Jewish Community* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago, 1994).

[41] H. Thyen, '"Das Heil kommt von den Juden"', *Kirche: Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm zum 75 Geburtstag* (ed. D. Lührmann and G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr, 1980) 163–84, 178, rightly notes that the exclusion from the synagogue is not seen as the foundation legend of the church in John.

[42] Meeks, 'Man from Heaven', followed by many others since.

[43] R. E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (London: Chapman, 1979) 98–9; J. M. Lieu, *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:13 c:0

It is then remarkable to realize that 2 John 10, just quoted, must bear the weight of such a household construction on its own. Not only do 1 and 3 John fail to use the term, but the Gospel nowhere develops the house as a place of Jesus' activity – in striking contrast to both Mark and Luke. The only domestic house, besides the nobleman's household in 4.53, is that of Mary, Martha and Lazarus; although filled with the scent of the perfume in 12.3, it is the place which first Mary and then the Jews who mourn with her must leave in order to find Jesus (11.20, 31).[44] Whether or not John is in 13.1–17.26 establishing the new community of disciples, he does not locate this as a household association to be affirmed as the locus of membership in contradistinction to Temple and feasts.[45] Many have seen in the flesh which must be eaten and the blood which must be drunk in John 6.54 a reference to the eucharist: that John should displace this from Jesus' final meal with his disciples is, in the light of his other displacements, not surprising; that he should locate its offer 'in synagogue' and not in a private setting/house is, for any 'mirror-reading', more so. There is in John no move into the house – in sharp contrast to Mark, and in a different way to Luke.[46]

More important than the 'domestic' house is the Temple as 'my Father's (= 'your', 2.17) house'. The Temple is immediately so identified by Jesus at the beginning of his ministry, to where John has moved the so-called 'cleansing of the Temple'. This means that in terms of narrative sequence the 'cleansing' does not signal Jesus' decisive and final judgment sign, as in Mark and, to a lesser degree, Matthew; but neither is there any sense that it is because of this act that Jesus is able to teach there, claiming it, as it were, for his own, as in Luke. It is often argued that John has moved the incident in order to provide a prologue for the Gospel narrative – the changing of water into wine at Cana and the cleansing of the Temple together symbolize the replacement of the 'Jewish system' by the new life and the new locus of worship which Jesus offers. Attractive and much-repeated though this is, it faces serious problems. Were it not for the Synoptic parallels with the clear message of coming destruction, particularly in Mark, we would be unlikely to read the Johannine narrative in similar terms. There is no word of judgment, and the Scripture recalled comes not from Jeremiah's

[44] John does not distinguish between οἶκος and οἰκία.

[45] Ctr. J. Neyrey, 'The Footwashing in John 13.6–11'.

[46] Seim, *Double Message*, 146, notes that when women meet Jesus in John they cross the threshold of the house, in contrast to the Lukan pattern where the house remains a prime location for women.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:14 c:0

prophecy of destruction, as in the Synoptics, but from a Psalm (69.10) which in the Christian testimony tradition belongs to Jesus' passion. This is confirmed at the end of the narrative when there is no discussion of the Temple or its destruction and no splitting of the veil of the shrine at Jesus' death.

This suggests that in John synagogue and Temple are not architectural markers of the community; they do not tell the story of the rejection of the Temple and all it represents or of the conflict with 'the synagogue'. Jesus' appeal to his teaching there ascribes to them a more positive role, although one in which they will still function as paradigmatic textual and narrative symbols.

SYNAGOGUE AND TEMPLE IN JOHN

One solution to John's reticence about the synagogue has been that here he is more historical. According to this view the prevalence of the synagogue in the Synoptics, and particularly in Luke, reflects the situation towards the end of the first century when these Gospels were written. Other evidence for ubiquitous synagogues, at least as recognizable buildings, in pre-70 Palestine is lacking. John, in 'ignoring' the synagogues, is in fact reflecting the historical reality of Jesus' ministry when they were not there to be noticed or ignored.[47] John may indeed be right to the extent that the earliest Jesus traditions may have known only one specific synagogue, that at Capernaum,[48] and the anarthrous ἐν συναγωγῇ in 6.59, repeated in 18.20, may refer to the community rather than to a physical building, again in keeping with the earlier situation; yet historical verisimilitude alone will not serve as a total explanation of John's reticence. Likewise, the observation that the rarity of the synagogue is a result of John's reticence about Galilee traditions, the locus of the majority of the Synoptic synagogue settings, merely switches attention to John's co-relative interest in Jerusalem and the Temple.

The bald statement of 6.59, 'These things he said in synagogue teaching in Capernaum', itself comes as a surprise after a narrative which could more convincingly be read as a lakeside encounter (6.25), and it is not surprising that the verse has been seen as a

[47] See H. C. Kee, 'Defining the First-Century Synagogue: Problems and Progress', *NTS* 41 (1995) 481–500, 490.

[48] The πατρίς of Mark 6.1 is not identified; the identification with Nazareth depends on Mark 1.9 and Mark's reference to Jesus as 'the Nazarene'. Capernaum and not Nazareth is condemned for its unbelief in Matt 11.20–3//Luke 10.13–15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:15 c:0

redactional addition.[49] Countering this, recent analysis has demonstrated that the sermon of John 6.26–58 convincingly follows the pattern of a synagogue homily, here based on the Passover texts, Exodus 16 and Psalm 78, alluded to in v. 31, and thus belongs in a synagogue context.[50] Yet this should not be taken merely as reminiscent of an actual sermon preached by Jesus or within the Johannine community. Recognition of the scriptural paradigm demands that the Jews who oppose Jesus in this chapter belong to the scriptural context rather than to the narrative context: their 'murmuring' (γογγύζω) in vv. 41–3 is determined by the 'murmuring' of the Israelites in the wilderness in Exod 16.2, a murmuring which led to the gift of manna, the *leitmotif* of John 6.[51] The seriousness of this is unmistakable. In v. 49 Jesus declares, 'Your fathers ate manna in the wilderness and they died'; the reference is not to the death that comes to all mortals but recalls Numbers 14, where God decrees, 'of all of your number . . . who have murmured against me, not one shall come into the land . . . your dead bodies shall fall in this wilderness' (Num 14.29–30, 32). Murmuring led not only to manna but also to death.

Why should John set this scene 'in synagogue'? The synagogue is not for him, as we have seen, the place for conflict over sabbath healings, as in the Synoptic Gospels, over the assumption of divine authority, nor even over Jesus' status vis-à-vis God (5.18), the issues which have usually been seen as making inevitable the break between the Johannine community and 'the synagogue'.[52] Instead it is the place where 'the Jews' (6.41, 52) – surprisingly in Galilee[53] – repeat their scriptural intransigence towards the Lord's demand for obedience; yet it is also the place where the scriptural gift of manna is firmly relegated to the past and countered by the revelatory 'I am' (6.32–5). It is, moreover, the place where even disciples are found repeating the scriptural model: they too 'murmur' (6.61) and may forfeit by God's decree the possibility of approaching not the land but Jesus (6.65). Might it be that John sets this scene ἐν συναγωγῇ because in both Exodus 16 and Numbers 14

[49] E. Haenchen, *John I* (ET Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 296.

[50] See P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (NovTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1981); also R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* I (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 1966) 277–80.

[51] In the LXX the root γογγύζω is primarily associated with Exod 16 and Num 14.

[52] Although there are links between the healing and subsequent controversy in 5.1–18 and Synoptic sabbath healings, the Johannine healing does not take place in the synagogue.

[53] Thus invalidating the translation 'Judaeans': see von Wahlde, 'Johannine Jews', 42–4 who favours the argument that the 'Jews' here is a redactional addition, but so misunderstands the narrative role of the Jews and the cross-reference in 18.20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:16 c:0

it is the whole congregation of Israel who are involved – in Hebrew עדה, in the Septuagint συναγωγή:[54] his scripture has located this as a synagogue incident, in whom are represented 'all the Jews' (18.20).

Jesus' inaugural act ('the cleansing') in the Temple also brings him into conflict with 'the Jews'. Here it is often supposed that the destruction of the Temple is foreshadowed in Jesus' challenge 'Destroy this shrine'. Yet it is important that these words are not recalled later: it is only in the Synoptic and not the Johannine trial account that the charge is brought, 'We heard him say, "I will destroy this shrine"' (Mark 14.58; 15.29). Moreover, the switch from ἱερόν, used by the narrator, and even οἶκος which Jesus uses, to ναός is surely deliberate: the shrine is the locus of divine presence. The connection between Jesus' action and words in the Temple and his saying about 'this shrine' remains open-ended, at least for the moment; yet a hint has already been given by the appeal to the 'passion' Psalm 69, and now John, through anticipating the later recollection of the disciples, emphasizes that the reference is to Jesus' coming death: the shrine is his body (2.21).[55]

Thus the Temple incident at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, still explicitly associated with Passover, forms an inclusio with the final Passover.[56] Through the words of Psalm 69, 'Zeal for your house shall consume me' (2.17), the first scene anticipates Jesus' death – the past tense of the Hebrew and LXX 'has consumed' is replaced by a prophetic future 'will consume'[57] – and conveys the perhaps surprising message that this will be occasioned by 'zeal for your house'. That Jesus should thereafter continue to focus his presence on the Temple is no surprise – as it would be if we were to accept an interpretation that suggests that Jesus is rejecting the Temple. 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 commu-

[54] Exod 16.1, 2, 9, 10, 22; Num 14.1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 27, 35, 36.

[55] On the remembering motif see J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991) 414–17. However, Ashton's combination of this 'remembering' with Martyn's 'second level' may be too simplistic. The former is a narrative and rhetorical device which includes the reader. If only later do the disciples 'remember', what was the meaning at the first level? See Léon-Dufour, 'Symbolic Reading'.

[56] Cf. M. Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage. Ein Lösungsversuch* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993) 191, who emphasizes the link between 1.29, 39, the Passover lamb, and the Temple.

[57] Both the Johannine and the LXX text show variants from cross-influence.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:17 c:0

nity.[58] In ch. 4 the question of the right place of worship centres not on the Temple but on 'neither Jerusalem nor this mountain' (4.20–1).[59] Jerusalem is not a metonym for the Temple: Luke clearly distinguishes between the two, and so, as already noted in his careful references to the Temple, does John. As the final Passover draws near, in 14.2, Jesus once again refers to 'my Father's house', now also a reference to God's heavenly dwelling,[60] as a place not of worship but of presence.

Within the narrative the Temple is also the focus for the Jewish feasts: as often noted, John pays far more attention to the cycle of Jewish festivals than do the Synoptics, and has Jesus go to Jerusalem for them more frequently. This may be historically more credible than the single visit of the Synoptics, at least if Jesus' ministry lasted more than a year, but is not therefore to be ascribed to historical accuracy alone. Yet although commentators will find numerous links between Jesus' teaching and the details of the festival rituals, John makes no attempt to draw attention to these, or to suggest that Jesus in some way replaces them.[61] It remains impossible to determine whether he, conventionally in the Diaspora some 20 or more years after the destruction of the Temple, could or did take for granted the transparency of the cross-references. For John the festivals are ancillary to the Temple, occasions for the presence there of Jesus and 'all the Jews' (cf. the regular 'of the Jews'). Such scriptural/liturgical echoes as there are serve rather as moments of divine presence and revelation (7.38–9).

Jesus' one synagogue appearance at Capernaum is also dated as when 'the Passover, the feast of the Jews was near' (6.4). This is the middle Passover which links the first of ch. 2 and the last of ch. 18 and confirms the association of Passover and Jesus' death (6.51). Yet 6.46 perhaps also suggests an allusion to the Sinai theophany, pointing again to divine epiphany.[62] Thus the synagogue serves only to reinforce the Temple themes, almost as a pale shadow thereof.

The Temple, therefore, is not a symbol for an idea, such as 'worship' or 'access to God', nor for a system, such as 'Judaism', but

[58] Ctr. J. McCaffrey, *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14.2–3* (AB 114; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1988) 225–44.

[59] Ctr. O. Cullmann, 'L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant', *NTS* 5 (1958–9) 157–73, 168–70, who sees ch. 4 as confirming the replacement of the Temple cult by Christ: 'L'esprit [*cf. 4.23*], le Christ, remplace désormais le lieu du culte.'

[60] See McCaffrey, *House with Many Rooms*, 30.

[61] As frequently argued; see R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple* (Oxford: OUP, 1969) 75–84.

[62] See Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, 148–52.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:18 c:0

has a 'symbolic role . . . in the narratological construction of the story'.[63] This role is shaped by the scriptural past, and primarily points to the locus of divine presence. So too, following the hint in 2.17, 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.[64] If in 'house of trade' there is a reference to Zech 14.21, 'And there shall no longer be a trader in the house of the LORD of hosts on that day', this too affirms zeal and divine presence, not judgment.[65]

If zeal is the affirmation of the 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. Yet not only to speak, for the Temple, as we have seen, is also the place for openness and 'manifestation'. When Jesus no longer moves openly and has finally hidden from them (12.36), the evangelist comments on all that has happened through the words of Isa 6.10: 'they could not believe, because Isaiah again said, "He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart . . ."' (12.37–40).[66] Isaiah, the evangelist continues, could say this for 'he saw his glory' (12.41); the reference is to Isaiah's vision of God in the Temple (Isa 6), now interpreted as a vision of Jesus. In 1.14 this was already proclaimed as the theme of the Gospel and of Jesus' coming: 'We beheld his glory.' Where else, not just from Isaiah but within the whole biblical tradition, should his glory be manifested but in the Temple?

The irony of the Gospel is that Jesus' glory is never experienced in the Temple. It is only to his disciples that Jesus manifested his glory, first in 2.11 and not again until ch. 17.[67] In the Temple 'glory' is a matter of conflict, and cannot be seen by those who seek their own glory (5.41, 44; 7.18; 8.50, 54). In the Temple the Jews can only perceive that what Jesus is doing is 'making himself God' (10.33), the ultimate blasphemy which in the person of Antiochus Epiph-

[63] Carroll, 'So What Do We *Know*?', 40, on the Temple in Jeremiah. Ctr. Mollat, 'Remarques', 323–4: 'Jérusalem est le symbole de l'option religieuse juive.'

[64] See M. Hengel, *The Zealots* (ET Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989) 216.

[65] The LXX χαναναῖος renders a reference uncertain.

[66] See J. M. Lieu, 'Blindness in the Johannine Tradition', *NTS* 34 (1988) 83–95.

[67] I am grateful to Dr Peter Bolt for bringing this to my attention. In 11.4 'the Son of God' is glorified 'through it', most naturally Lazarus's sickness, but perhaps also the glory of God.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j:s51 24-5-1999 p:19 c:0

anes led to the defilement of the Temple, as was recalled at the feast of Dedication (10.22).[68]

For John, the Temple is the supreme centre of 'the Jews'. If Paul thinks of 'the Law', John thinks of 'the Temple'.[69] Yet, for the same reason, not just Judaea but Jerusalem and perhaps even the Temple is Jesus' own πατρίς (4.44).[70] The Temple is where Jesus must teach, where he must be openly, where he must speak of the one who sent him. If, again as promised in the Prologue (1.11), 'he came to his own', this must be in the Temple.[71] If God was to be made known, whom no-one has ever seen (1.18), not even Isaiah, this too must be in the Temple. Yet if 'his own received him not', this also must be in the Temple. Both revelation and the hardening, blinding power of revelation belong in the Temple. Those who respond in faith, whose testimony will be heard, are to be found elsewhere.

[68] See J. VanderKam, 'John 10 and the Feast of Dedication', *Of Scribes and Scholars: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins presented to John Strugnell* (ed. H. Attridge, J. J. Collins and T. Tobin; New York: UPA, 1990) 203–14, who strains to find links between John 10.22–39 and Hannukah traditions. John does not identify this as a 'feast of the Jews', perhaps because it is not 'biblical'.

[69] The Law, although important for John, is secondary to the Temple. If 6.46 alludes to the Sinai theophany (n. 62), and manna to the Torah, the synagogue might point to the Law, but this is far from obvious.

[70] Within the Johannine narrative the contrast of 4.44 is not Galilee vs. Judaea but vs. Jerusalem. This is surely why 'salvation is of the Jews' (4.22).

[71] For Thyen, 'Das Heil kommt', 179, Judaea is 'the own' of the sent one, but this too needs to be narrowed to the Temple and what it represents. Mollat, 'Remarques', describes Jerusalem as 'le lieu de l'inquiétude juive' (p. 334), but this applies better to the Temple.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598000514 Published online by Cambridge University Press