SPACE AND PLACE
IN THE
GOSPEL OF JOHN

By
KENNETH MTATA

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Academic Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Subject of
New Testament Studies

at the

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL
(Pietermaritzburg Campus)

PROMOTER
Prof. Jonathan Alfred Draper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
GLOSSARY	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xviii
LIST OF FIGURES	xix

DECLARATION

As required by University regulations, I hereby state unambiguously that this work has not been presented at any other University or any other institution of higher learning other than the University of KwaZulu-Natal, (Pietermaritzburg Campus) and that unless specifically indicated to the contrary within the text it is my original work.

KENNETH MTATA
June 15, 2009

As candidate supervisor I hereby approve this thesis for submission

---

PROFESSOR JONATHAN ALFRED DRAPER
June 15, 2009

DEDICATION

My father, Rev. Kephas Mtata was the first theologian I knew and from whom I learnt my first theology lessons. He only had Standard Six education and six months theological education. He often used to talk me about learned theologians in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Zimbabwe (ELCZ) in which he was a minister. These had inspired him, Dr Ambrose Moyo, Dr Lobi Sifobela, and Dr Aynos Masocha Moyo. Those conversations inspired and encouraged me to pursue my academic work to the same heights work towards achieving the same.

By virtue of his work as a minister, my father was a mobile man, not on an automobile, but on a bicycle. Typical of ministry in the ELCZ, my father also moved from one station to the other due to routine transfers. By he retired from full-time ministry responsibilities, he had traversed the many areas both in the rural and urban areas until his settlement at Masase in Mberengwa. It was from him that I had my firsthand experience of PLACE or even PLACELESSNESS. Although he had no place, he nevertheless had abundant SPACE for his children and for our dear mother Esther Mtata, who faithfully stood alongside him in their mobility. It is to this great sojourner that I dedicate this work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The lists of those people who have had positive influence on my life in order for me to produce this work are too many to enumerate in such limited SPACE. I will, however note a few who stand out in helping me reach this stage of my work. For the past two years, my wife Tsitsidzashe made sure that our two children, Anotidashe and Tomiranashe Jonathan, were attended to in a way that would not have been possible without her sacrifice in my absence. In addition to this Tsitsi also created an environment conducive for me to study and write. On the last stretch, she even went further to take our children away in order to create SPACE for me. I also thank my children for their 'understanding' their absent father. I thank you all greatly for this support.

Second, I worked with Professor Jonathan Draper at different levels from 1999. He taught me and mentored me by exposing me to various academic environments by arranging contacts for me with local and international academics. I appreciate mostly the SPACE he afforded me in my growth as a young academic. He allowed me physical SPACE by allowing me unlimited access to his rich library and to his electronic equipment. He also allowed me academic SPACE by allowing me to express myself as long as I made sense, sometimes even against his own positions. I thank him for his leadership.

I also want to thank Dr. Patricia Bruce, my New Testament Greek teacher during my undergraduate programme and as a valued colleague who shared with me the joy of my subject and topic of study. Professor Gerald West challenged me to be explicit about my context and he raised other blind spots I could have missed without him. He always made me remember there is something I do not know, while encouraging to be happy with my contribution. To Professor Anthony Balcomb, who pointed me to literature that I would otherwise have never consulted, as it was not familiar in my field. This enriched my understanding immensely. To Professor Cilliers Breytenbach from Humboldt University, Germany, who challenged me on the one hand to read Meyer and Strange (1981) (i.e. archaeology) and Rimmon-Kenan (1983) (i.e. narrative) on the other; I thank him for this. To my younger brother Munyengetero, who always inspired me with his excitement of the little we discussed concerning my

work. Finally, to the dedicated librarians and doctoral students at the School of Religion and Theology, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, I thank you for your support. With unconstrained SPACE, I would have named you all by name!

ABSTRACT

The Fourth Gospel uses space to arrange its narrative and uses its narrative to represent Johannine space and experience. The spaces alluded to in John are full of contestation and serve as identity markers. By Nathanael asking if anything good can come from Nazareth, he represents Nazareth and its inhabitants as insignificant. Yet, by Jesus seeing in Nathanael, not a Galilean but an Israelite, Jesus subverts the regional stereotypes operative in Nathanael and John's narrative world but maybe reflective of John's concrete experience. By denying the sacred places of Jerusalem and Samaria, and proposing worship in spirit and truth, the Johannine Jesus is theologically and socially located on the margins of sacred place but at the centre of sacred presence. When the Johannine Jesus sees the arrival of the Greeks as the 'hour of glory' he subverts diaspora existence and marginalises the centre, Palestine. If the ultimate place to access God in John is utopia, then this is, no place.

Key Terms: *70 CE; Bible; Diaspora; Exile; First space; Focal space; Fourth Gospel; Galilee; Galileans; Gospel of John; Greeks; John; Johannine; Johannine community; Judea; Judeans; Mount Gerizim; Narrative; Palestine; Place; Place and space; Replacement motif; Restoration; Ritualisation; Samaritans; Second space; Second Temple; Supercessionism; Space; Temple; Third space; Utopia.*

GLOSSARY[1]

BCE	Before the Common Era
CE	Common Era
FD	Farewell Discourse
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament

[1] Throughout, the present study utilises the standard set of abbreviations for use in Biblical Studies essays as approved by *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Alexander *et al* 1999).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: PREPARING A PLACE

1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	The Focus and Outline of the Research	3
2.	What is Space and Place?	8
2.1.	Thinking Space in Time	8
2.2.	The History of Space and Place	10
2.3.	Metaphysical Space	12
2.4.	Ptolemaic Space (Second Century CE through to the Middle Ages)	13
2.5.	Copernican Space	13
2.6.	Cartesian to Newtonian Space	14
2.7.	Einsteinian Space-Time (1879-1955)	15
2.8.	Space after Einstein	16
3.	Space and Place in Human Geography	17
3.1.	Spatial Intelligence	19
3.2.	Cyber Space and Post-Modernity: Manuel Castells	20
3.3.	Body as Gendered Space	22
3.4.	Body and Ritual Space	23
3.5.	Space and the Narrative	24
3.6.	Space and Religion	25
4.	Modern Scholarship on Palestinian Geography	27
4.1.	The Implications of Sacred Space for the Land of Palestine	30
4.2.	Locating the Reader in Her/ His Space	32
4.3.	African Politics of 'Circular' Spaces	33
4.4.	African Sacred Spaces	35
5.	Summary of Findings	35
5.1.	Space is Socially Constructed	36
5.2.	Space is Inextricably Related to Power	37
5.3.	Space is Inextricably Connected to Time	37
5.4.	Space is Gendered	38

6. Conclusion 38

CHAPTER 2: MAPS OF MEANING: METHODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES

1. Introduction 40
2. Narrative and the Modern Map 41
2.1 The *NIV Atlas of the Bible* 42
2.2. The *Student's Bible Atlas* 42
2.3. The *Holman's Quick Source Bible Atlas* 43
2.4. The *Reader's Digest Atlas of the Bible* 43
2.5. The *New Bible Atlas* 44
2.6. The *Macmillan Bible Atlas* 44
3. Archaeology and the Modern Map 45
3.1. Narrative Space and Historical Geography 47
3.2. Maps and Antiquity 50
4. The Madaba Mosaic and Egeria's Travel Narrative as Alternative Space Constructions from Antiquity 52
4.1. Features of the Madaba Mosaic Map 55
4.2. Theoretical Frameworks Useful in Reading Narrative Space 56
4.3. The Social Construction of Space: Lefebvre and Soja 60
4.3.1. Henri Lefebvre 60
4.3.2. Edward William Soja 61
5. Methodology 62
5.1. Geographical Concerns 64
5.1.1. Allusions To and Contestations Over Sacred Spaces 64
5.1.2. Reference to the Greeks and the Dispersion 64
5.1.3. The Esoteric Nature of the Group 64
5.1.4. Some Important Questions 65

5.2. Syreeni's Three-Level Analysis 65

5.2.1. The First Level of Analysis: Space in the *Text World* 66

5.2.2. Second Level of Analysis: Space in the *Concrete World* 69

5.2.3. Third Level of Analysis: Space in the *Symbolic World* 70

6. A Model for Reading Space in the Fourth Gospel 72

6.1. Application 73

7. Conclusion 74

CHAPTER 3: CONCEIVING SPACE AND PLACE: AN ANALYSIS OF JOHANNINE SPACE AND PLACE STUDIES

1. Introduction 75

2. How Has Biblical Space Been Conceived by Scholars? 76

3. Space as source of history 77

3.1. Brooke Foss Westcott (1881, 1971) 77

3.2. Chester C. McCown (1914, 1932) 79

3.3. Charles Kingsley Barrett (1960) 79

3.4. Urban C. von Wahlde (2006) 80

4. Johannine Space in the History of Religions Tradition 83

4.1. Karl Kundsin (1925) 84

4.2. Edwyn Clement Hoskyns (1947) 85

4.3. R. H. Lightfoot (1956) 86

4.4. Rudolf Bultmann (1971) 87

4.5. W. D. Davies (1974) 87

4.6. Sean Freyne (2002) 89

4.7. Martin Hengel (1989) 91

5. Space in Johannine Literary Traditions 91

5.1. Robert T. Fortna (1988) 91

5.2. J. Louis Martyn (1968) 92

5.3. Thomas Brodie (1993) 92

6. Space as Indicator of Johannine Regional Theologies 93

6.1. Wayne A. Meeks (1966) 93

6.2. Edwin D. Freed (1968) 93

6.3. M. Bassler (1981) 94

6.4. Peter Richardson (2002) 96

6.5. Peter-Ben Smit (2007) 97

6.6. Richard Bauckham (2007) 98

7. Social Scientific Approach to Johannine space 99

7.1. Jerome Neyrey (1994, 2002) 99

8. Space in Johannine Postcolonial Studies 100

9. Johannine Space in French Philosophical Interpretation 101

9.1 Fabien Nobilio (2008) 101

10. Space in other New Testament Studies 102

10.1 Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (1986) 104

10.2 Halvor Moxnes (2003) 105

11. Summary of Findings 107

12. My Social Location as a Reader 108

13. Conclusion 108

CHAPTER 4: SPACE, PLACE, AND IDENTITY IN JOHN

1. Introduction 109

1.1. Identity Politics in First Century Palestine 109

2. The Significance of the Baptist's Place of Operation 111

3. The Significance of the Galilean Origin of the Disciples 113

4. Jesus' Subversion of Space 116

4.1. Johannine Israel as Subversion of Regional Places 117

4.2. In Galilee: The Wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11) 120

4.3. Capernaum as the Place of Darkness: The Raising of the Royal Official's Son (John 4:46-54) 122

4.4. Proof of Capernaum Unbelief: The Feeding of the Five Thousand and Walking on Water (John 6:1-21) 124

4.5. In Judea 126

4.6. Jerusalemites and Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι 127

4.7. The Healing of the Paralysed Man (John 5:1-18) 132

4.8. The Healing of the Blind Man (John 9:1-41) 134

4.9. Samaria 137

5. Gendered Spaces in the Johannine Narrative 141

6. The Spatial Location of 'His Own' 147

7. Significance of Space and Place of Jesus' in Constructing Identity in John 152

7.1. Subversion of Traditional Space-Time Arrangements 153

8. Conclusion 155

CHAPTER 5: SACRED SPACE AND PLACE

1. Introduction 156

2. Jewish Developments in the Construction of Holy Place and Space 157

2.1. Setting the Scene: The Holy Place from Old Testament Times 157

2.2. Holy Place and Space following the Exile 160

2.3. The Case of Samaria 162

2.4. After the Hasmonians 163

2.5.	The Destruction of the Temple and Jewish Experience	165
2.6.	The Problem of Sources	167
2.7.	Josephus and Philo	168
2.7.1	Josephus	168
2.7.2	Philo	170
2.8.	Second Century CD Pseudepigrapha	172
2.9.	The *Psalms of Solomon* as Reflecting a Crisis	174
2.10.	Attitudes from the Mishnaic, Rabbinic and Qumran Literature	176
2.11.	Sacred Presence as Sacred Space	179
2.12.	The Conception of the Sacred Space circa 70 CE	181
3.	Sacred Space and Place and the Gospel of John	186
3.1.	Contestation over the Sacred Places in John	187
3.2.	John 1:1, 14	187
3.3.	John 1:38-39, 51	192
3.4.	John 2:13-25	194
3.5.	John 4:1-22	196
3.6.	The Replacement Myth Reconsidered	198
3.7.	A Response	201
3.7.1.	No Adequate Discussion in the Understanding of Sacred Place and Sacred Presence in the Gospel of John	201
3.7.2.	Disparity of Views of the Temple in the Gospel of John	203
3.7.3.	Significance of this Discussion in Relationship to the Diaspora Allusions in the Gospel of John	205
3.7.4.	A Disclaimer	206
3.7.5.	Reasons for the Popularity of the Replacement Motif	206
4.	Conclusion	206

CHAPTER 6: DIASPORA AND RESTORATION AND THE COMING OF THE GREEKS IN JOHN 12

1.	Introduction	208
2.	Diaspora as a Phenomenon	209
2.1.	Ritualisation	211
2.2.	The Awakening of the Urge to Return	214
2.3.	Jewish Diasporas	215
2.4.	Responses to the Exile	215
2.5.	The Myth of Return and Restoration	217
2.6.	The Exile as Punishment	218
2.7.	Positive Views on the Exile	222
2.8.	The Ritual of Return	222
3.	Johannine Allusions to the Exile	224
3.1.	The Incarnation of the Word as Exile	224
3.2.	The Passion as Exile	225
3.3.	The Exile and the Disciples	228
4.	Restoration in John	232
4.1.	The Rituals of Return	234
4.2.	John 12;20-36a	238
4.3.	Teaching the Greeks (John 7:35-36)	238
4.4.	The Coming of the Greeks (John 12:20-22)	241
4.5.	Philip, Andrew and Jesus (John 12:22)	244
4.6.	The Hour of Glory (John 12:23)	245
4.7.	The Seed that Falls to the Ground (John 12:24-27)	248
4.8.	The Voice of the Angel (John 12:28-29)	250
5.	Summary of Findings	251

6. Conclusion 252

CHAPTER 7: THE μοναὶ IN THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE: UTOPIAN AND SECTARIANISM IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

1. Introduction 254
2. What Do Scholars Say about the Farewell Discourse? 255
3. The Father's House with Many Rooms 259
3.1. Future Life in Heaven 259
3.2. The Temple 260
3.3. The Church and Community of Faith at the Coming of Jesus 260
3.4. A Mandaean Myth 261
3.5. Redactional *Aporia* 261
4. Eschatology and the μοναὶ 261
5. Sociological Analysis of the Farewell Discourse 264
5.1. Sociology of Utopia and the Farewell Discourses 264
5.2. What is Utopia? 265
5.3. The Background of the Utopia of Thomas Moore 265
5.4. Utopia as a Literary Genre 267
5.5. The Sociology of a Utopian Sect 269
5.5.1. The Conversionist Sect 269
5.5.2. The Revolutionist Sect 269
5.5.3. The Introversionist Sect 269
5.5.4. The Manipulationist or Gnostic Sect 270
5.5.5. The Thaumaturgical Sect 270
5.5.6. The Reformist Sect 270
5.5.7. The Utopian Sect 271
6. Relating Utopian Sectarianism to the Farewell Discourse 273

6.1. Emic Analysis 275

6.1.1. A High Sense of Exclusivity 275

6.1.2. Leadership and Rank 278

6.1.3. The Social Status of the Group 283

6.1.4. The Socio-Economic Status of John's Community: A Proposal 285

6.2. An Etic Analysis: Ambiguous Views 288

7. The Difference between Utopian and an Introversionist Sect 290

7.1. Is the Community of John an Introversionist Sect? 290

8. What is the 'Father's House with Many Rooms'? 293

9. Summary of Findings 295

10. Conclusion 296

CHAPTER 8: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. Where it all Began 297

1.1. The Need for Definition 297

2. Locating the Present Study within the Analysis of Spaces and Places in Johannine Scholarship 299

2.1. The Historical Worth of Spaces and Places 299

2.2. The Symbolic Value of Spaces and Places 299

2.3. The Literary Function of Spaces and Places 300

2.4. Transcending the Level of Debate 300

3. The Need for a New Methodology 301

3.1. The Focus on Historical and Concrete Spaces and Places 301

3.2. The Functionality and Structural Ordering of Spaces and Places 302

3.3. The Transformation and Redemption of Spaces and Places 303

3.4. Spatial Analysis: Reconstructing the Community behind the 303

Fourth Gospel

4. Findings of the Present Study 304

5. Overview of the Four Main Findings of the Present Study 304

5.1. Finding 1 304

5.2. Finding 2 306

5.3. Finding 3 307

5.4. Finding 4 310

6. Implications of this Present Study 311

7. Suggestions for Further Research 312

Bibliography 313

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 The Madaba Mosaic Map 54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Spatial Categories 70

SPACE AND PLACE IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

CHAPTER 1

PREPARING A PLACE

"Give me a place to stand on and I will move the world"

(Archimedes)

1. Introduction

Due to its ubiquitous nature within human existence, it is often possible to take place and space for granted. In reality however, people's identities are inextricably linked to the places they inhabit, the places they call 'home'. Only when people begin to lose such spaces do they begin to think deliberately about them and even exaggerate their value while narrating their stories. Indeed, it is said of the Pintupi, the Aboriginal people of Australia, that when a child is born they are already assigned their own sacred site around which the individual will be tied for the rest of her/his life.[2] As Malpas has pointed out:

> Life is an annexation of place. A child's identity is thus derived, on this account, from a particular place and thereby also from a particular spiritual and totemic ancestry. So important is this tie of person to place that for Aboriginal peoples the land around them everywhere is filled with marks of individual and ancestral origins and is dense with story and myth (1999:3).

Although Malpas writes from a context where 'individual' identity is of vital importance, one would guess that for the Pintupi and other communal peoples, the individual is invisibly dissolved into the communal relationship between her or his own people and the land upon which they inhabit. One can also see this among many African peoples. Rekayi Tangwena, a tribal leader in Manicaland, East of Zimbabwe, had this to say during the colonial period to the European settlers who wanted him off his ancestral land:

[2] This is also true of the Zulu people, some of whom bury the umbilical cord of the newly born child in the interior wall of the hut (*Umsamo*) to locate the child at his or her centre, the home (Braatvedt 1949:179; Low and Zuniga 2003:193). Among the Ndebele people of Zimbabwe, the umbilical cord is buried under the floor of the room where the child is born (Mbiti 1992:110). In many cultures, the place of the burial of the umbilical cord forms the pivot centre of life for the newborn child (Schwartz 2001:44ff). While it is not clear whether the navel is viewed as the centre of the human body, by burying part of the navel in the ground, that part of the earth becomes the centre of the universe for the individual and her/his community.

> I have traditional links with the land where I am living—these links are: I have to live there and appease the spirit of my deceased ancestors from time to time. There is a traditional burying ground at the kraal—one for chiefs and the other two for the other members of the tribe (Moore 2005:208-9).

The tribal leader Tangwena would never have uttered these spatial sentiments had his place on the land not come under threat. Only when threatened with loss of place does he begin to articulate his self-identity spatially.

It is this nature of space and place that makes it both mundane and precious—the obvious presence and crisis of losing it—that is going to inform this spatial reading of the Fourth Gospel. The focus of this study will be to show how space and place have become existential categories of the self-understanding and self-representation of the community served by John because that space is now under constriction due to exile and expulsion from the synagogue community. Such a reading emerges from the understanding argued in the course of this work that around John is a Christian community emerging in Palestine, but finding itself part of the diaspora following the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of Herod's Temple in 70 CE at the hands of Titus.

The way in which the community's displacement influenced its spatial imagination is most evident in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. The use of spatial categories in analysing narratives in general, and in the Fourth Gospel in particular, is a recent scholarly development (*cf.* Berquist 1999; Warf and Arias 2008). A number of reasons could be suggested as to why space as a category of constructing reality has not often been used in the reading of the Fourth Gospel. One major reason is because 'time' rather than 'space' was found to be more useful for the modern worldview in reading John. The recently published book by Estes (2008) is proof of this.[3] Most spatial readings,

[3] The researcher only became aware of this book towards the end of his research, and hence it did not influence the choosing of his research topic. Nevertheless, its appearance has served to vindicate the argument of this thesis that 'time', instead of 'space' is preferred in reading John. In his work, Estes borrows from the theory of relativity to show that the general trend in reading the Fourth Gospel is flawed in its presentation of the Jesus tradition, being wrongly influenced by modern conceptions of time. Estes' challenges his own reading in that it falls into the trap of a space-time dichotomy that is common among modern thinkers. One flaw this relativity sought to correct was the Newtonian absolute of time and space

especially among New Testament scholars were interested in the historical value of such spaces (Schmidt 1919; McCown 1941; Freyne 2000). The Fourth Gospel has long been considered not to contain such historical material, but rather theological reflection upon the story of Jesus (*cf.* Dodd 1970). Even though this position has been recently modified with the realisation that the Synoptic Gospels also include theological reflection, the Fourth Gospel is still supposed to be read "with care" (Brown 1970). Hence, even where the spatial structure of the Fourth Gospel narrative has been observed by prominent Johannine scholars, it was only served by way of limited interest, either for historical reconstruction or the symbolic construction of theological ideas.[4] Those convinced of identifying historical worth in the spaces and places from the Fourth Gospel have benefited from recent archaeological research (Charlesworth 2006).[5] On the other hand, the symbolic view which sought to see all the places and spaces in the Johannine narrative as having some symbolic meaning which needed to be decoded has also continued to find scholarly support (*cf.* Coloe 2001; Koester 2003).

1.1. The Focus and Outline of the Research

Although space and place are mundane in their usage, they acquire a more technically nuanced meaning when used as facets of the analysis of reality; hence, the need for precise definition. The focus of this chapter will be to develop possible definitions which can be used in reading Johannine space. Rather than give a neat and watertight definition of space, a task which would require more space than can be afforded in this present work, the present researcher will seek to use various definitions to construct an understanding of space useful for the analysis and reading of space in the Johannine narrative. In particular, this chapter will outline the historical development of the

---

that is abstracted from one another. It is the opinion of the present researcher that Estes is right in seeing that temporality has been the basis upon which reality has been constructed in Western thought for some time. By constructing theologies and other ideas, such scholars have thought that they were sifting universal ideas from the Jesus tradition (ideas thought to be developing in time and not in space and place).

[4] As C. H. Dodd can state, "It will have become clear that I regard the Fourth Gospel as being in its essential character a theological work, rather than a history" (1970:82).

[5] The new section in the *Society of Biblical Literature*, 'John, Jesus and History' which seeks to have the "glimpses of Jesus through the Johannine lens", demonstrates the surge of scholarly interest in the historical worth of Johannine material. This is not to say that to use John for historical purposes is illegitimate, but that in the process, other functions of space become marginalised.

conception of space, especially as held in the West, as well as what influence it has had upon the way biblical texts are read. Furthermore, the nature of space as being socially constructed will be emphasised.

As will be discussed below, space is socially constructed and therefore making contestation over its control inevitable. It will thus be shown that those who are overcome in this contest are often ascribed to the margins, while the victors assume the centre, vigilantly patrolling their space (Ortiz 1969; Smith 1969). One way marginalisation takes place is through the process of engendering space. It will thus be shown that space and place are not neutral categories, but are culturally engendered to locate some people in one place and others in another. Since space has to do with human identity and social location, this can only happen in time. As Tillich has argued, it "is expedient and in some ways unavoidable (as Kant has shown), to treat time and space interdependently" (Tillich 1968:336). The Newtonian separation of the two entities of human reality will also be rejected in preference for a more holistic understanding.

The *Aufklärung* dramatically influenced the way in which biblical scholars conceived of space. One such influence was the abstraction of space in the use of modern cartography. By so-doing, some kind of 'objectivity' was often assumed. Archaeology was also used as 'scientific' backing for the objective view of space. Those who constructed Palestinian historical geographies would use these tools, often times, uncritically. The result of all this was an anachronistic construction of ancient spaces. In chapter two these issues will be examined. The Madaba map will be used as an example of the ancient construction of space, which is very different from the way space has been constructed in the modern era. This map could be an example of how space is constructed and represented in the Fourth Gospel.

In chapter two a methodology of reading space and place in the Fourth Gospel will also be proposed. Since the concern is to map space and place as a phenomenon in the Fourth Gospel, a more "eclectic approach" to the text is preferred instead of a "sustained exegesis of a single, continuous passage from the Gospel" (Ashton 1991:445). Although

particular passages will be read as single units, others will be read for their individual contribution to the entire understanding of space in the Fourth Gospel. In order to understand the role of space in the narrative, it will be necessary to look at how space is related to history and how historical space and place are represented in the narrative. From the perspective of sociology, the works of Soja and Lefebvre will be useful, while from the perspective of narrative, Syreeni's model will be utilized.[6] Lefebvre writes about three ways of looking at space, each of which is followed by Soja. The first space or *perceived space* is that of concrete place and space (1991:45). This is what Syreeni (1999:115) would call "real space outside the text" (1999:115). The second space (Soja) or *conceived space* is space as represented in written narratives or modern maps, (Lefebvre 1991:38).[7] This is what Syreeni would call "space in the narrative world" (1999:115). The third instant of *lived space* is that which is fostered through the resistance and redefinition of limiting first and second spaces (Lefebvre 1991:38). This is what Syreeni (1999:115) calls "symbolic" or "ideological" space. In order to look at the text of John, a more comprehensive combination of both these views will be combined to form an analytical tool, useful for the purpose of reading space and place in the Fourth Gospel.

In chapter three, it will be shown that the history of the New Testament in general, and that of the Fourth Gospel in particular, has not been much interested in space and place as categories of history through which it could be read. Space and place were only been used for the purpose of historical reconstruction. As a result, since the Fourth Gospel has generally been assumed to be less concerned with historical narrative (Dodd 1970:82), its spaces and places have not been properly investigated as a way of illuminating its reading. Apart from a historical interest, it will be shown that symbolic interest has influenced the reading of Johannine spaces. Such readings—of history and symbol—do not fully account for the material of the Fourth Gospel and thus do not help in the reconstruction of the social circumstances of the community behind the text.

---

[6] The three are not discussed in detail in this chapter as they will be given more space in the next chapter on methodology.

[7] Further discussion is given in following chapters on the map as a representation of space and its implication to our reading of space in narratives.

A cursory reading of the Fourth Gospel reveals how space and place categories are used to locate people in society. Nathanael cannot come to Jesus because nothing good can come out of Nazareth (John 1:46). Jesus cannot be the messiah because he is not from Judea (John 7:41ff). The negative portrayal of all things happening at the Temple is also another indicator that value and place are interlocked in John. As such, the question of identity and space has to be investigated as a category in the Fourth Gospel. This will be explored in chapter four. The regional prejudices resulting in the statement noted here will be investigated, both as they function in history and in their usage in the narrative proper. As such, the portrayals of Judea, Galilee, Samaria and related debates will be discussed. Samaria will be examined specifically as a gendered space, not only because the Well is associated with female Old Testament traditions, but because Samaria as a region is presented as feminine according to Umiker-Sebeok's definition of gendered spaces (1996). In this definition, spaces are masculine when they are "constructed through repeated instances of (or the exhibition of the potential for) exerting force over animate and inanimate objects and overcoming obstacles, resulting in an increase in the size of territory controlled" (Umiker-Sebeok 1996:4ff). On the other hand, spaces are feminine if constructed to reveal "submission to force and avoidance of or submission to obstacles, with a resultant decrease in the size of territory controlled" (Umiker-Sebeok 1996:4ff). Obviously, this definition uses a gender construct derived from certain traditional societies in antiquity. Taken seriously in this study, it aptly describes first century Palestine in many ways. In this sense, it is not only that the Samaritan woman represents the bride prepared in marriage to God (Schneiders 1992), but the ultimate feminine gender role of Samaria as space being played by Samaria herself.

Central to the spatial structuring used in the Fourth Gospel is the ongoing debate in Israelite culture on the nature of sacred space. This will be the focus of chapter five. The history of the debate from the period of the Old Testament through to the Second Temple Judaism will be analysed. The debate has to do with where God can be encountered. Is it in the fixed Temple in Jerusalem or the mobile tabernacle of the Exodus story? What will also be explored are the particular historical circumstances that give credence to one position over against the other. It will be shown that those at the social centre would

prefer a centralised sacred place, whilst those at the margins, although they seem to accept the existence of a centralised national shrine, do not see anything that contradicts their access to God from local shrines on the margins. This discussion will subsequently be carried out in the light of the fall of Jerusalem and destruction of the sacred place of Herod's Temple in 70 CE. The question of the effect of this occurrence is significant for the reading of sacred space in the Fourth Gospel. This discussion will also, correctly so, be situated in the context of diaspora where it fits very well. What constitutes the sacred 'centre' when people are not resident on the land of covenantal promise therefore becomes critical.

The concern with the 'diaspora of Israel' in the Fourth Gospel is addressed in chapter six. The thesis that diaspora concerns are central to the reading of the Fourth Gospel in general, and its spatial structuring in particular, is advanced in this chapter. A brief history of the diaspora in Judaism and its different conceptions will also be interrogated here. Different ways of negotiating the diaspora as punishment through rituals of 'return' will also be explored. The coming of the Greeks in John 12 is regarded as the decisive turn of the narrative structure and theology. It is the arrival of the 'hour of glory'. It is the end of the movements of Jesus to-and-from Judea and Galilee and the final trip to Jerusalem. The coming of the Greeks will be seen as the change of focus of Jesus addressing the crowds and Jewish leaders to him turning inwards to focus on his disciples. The significance of the diaspora as reflective of the spatial location of the Johannine community will also be discussed here. Finally, the usefulness of diaspora as a theological resource to legitimise the community's existence will be highlighted.

The nature of the Johannine community will be discussed in chapter seven. Here, the Farewell Discourse (FD) will be read as the spatial reflection of a utopian sect. Utopia, as a religio-social concept and literary genre forms the essential background of the study. The history of utopian imagination will also be explored. Important characteristics of group composition such as leadership, social status and recruitment will be used as categories that can be used to analyse the Fourth Gospel. This chapter should be suggestive as to the constituency of the Johannine community and, augmented by the

findings from the previous chapters, how this constituency understands and articulates its existence. Finally, in constructing a coherent position as to the nature of the Johannine community this brings together ideas from previous chapters to account for its use of spatial imagination. Chapter eight provides a summary of findings and a conclusion. Any outstanding issues suggested for further research will also be noted here. The bibliography concludes the research proper. Here, only the research material referred to in the course of the work will be listed. The material read but not used directly will be omitted. A glossary list will be provided, including the ancient texts and abbreviations used throughout the work.

2. What is Space and Place?

> If two different authors used the words 'red', 'hard', or 'disappointed', no one doubts that they mean approximately the same thing…But in the case of words such as 'place' or 'space', whose relationship with psychological experiences is less direct, there exists a far-reaching uncertainty of interpretation. (Albert Einstein in Malpas 1999:19)

The purpose of this section is to give a panoramic view of the spaces and places that are of interest for this investigation. This is obviously not an exhaustive definition of space and place but the kind of definition that provides essential boundaries for this research. Having provided a general investigation into the development of space and place constructions from different traditions, space and place categories useful for this work will be offered in the summary of findings.

2.1. Thinking Space in Time

We have learnt from the Sociology of Knowledge that reality is constructed from people's social experiences (e.g., Berger and Luckmann 1967). The way people and associated 'groups' belong to and position themselves within society, "shapes their perception of the world, and consequently, their response to that world" (Hargrove 1984:4). From the time of antiquity, reality has largely been constructed and conceived in terms of space and time. It is *where* humans do what they do and *when*. Hence Archimedes' profound statement, "Give me a place to stand on and I will move the

world" (Archimedes in Smith 1978:129). The desire to reach out to other planets has been a demonstration that humanity wants to master space and time in order to 'move' the world. In a bid to make sense of the workings of the universe, humankind has learnt to separate things and analyse them as individual entities. This development has also seen the separation of space and time. The growth of industrialisation with its emphasis on speed of production has also made this separation of space and time convenient. The most important issue becomes 'how fast?' or 'when..?' and not 'where?' Those who could manipulate the earth faster (in shorter time) would benefit from the earth more than those who would follow the slow and natural processes of nature in place and fixed space.

In the early scientific work of Isaac Newton (1642-1727), we begin to see the formal arrangement of ideas separating space from time, although we must go back to Greek antiquity to find its genesis. This view was overturned with the advent of Albert Einstein's *Theory of Relativity* (1905), and then, later, the emergence of *Quantum Theory*. With this new science, both time and space become relative entities dependent upon the position of the observer. The inter-disciplinary[8] nature of this space-time discourse finds fertile ground in the post-modern era where various social texts[9] are read, not in universalised objectivity, but in critical subjectivity which acknowledges the involvement of the analysing subject in the process of observing the object.[10] This new surge of

[8] The interdisciplinary nature of the subject is notable in recent literature in human geography, architecture, robotics, literature and many other disciplines (King 1996; Ingraham 2006).

[9] By texts here I mean all forms of presentation from which meaning can be extracted or inferred.

[10] The work of Hans-Georg Gadamer (1960, translated 1975) on language and history, was for many a disappointment since it did not produce any method but instead refuted any possibility of achieving the goal of objectivity in seeking meaning. For Gadamer, language did not represent or "stand for" things or reality but rather revealed "something which henceforth exists" (Gadamer 1975:345). Language creates things by giving them meaning. In other words, for Gadamer, there is no brute data 'out there' existing independent of vocabulary in which particular social practices are grounded (refuting positivistic objectivity), nor is there pure language creating such reality (refuting naïve subjectivity). What exists between language and reality is a 'conversation' or a 'game'. In this sense, language is a 'game' or a 'conversation' which the participants "fall into" or "become involved in" and usually do not know what will "come out" from the conversation (Gadamer 1975:345). This radical position was opposed to the 'orthodox' view that the empirical world (directly available to us through our senses) exists independent of our description of it. In other words, different languages form the different cultural experiences we have of the world [what is commonly termed a world-view] (How 1995:91). For Gadamer then, it was language which was the "middle ground in which understanding and agreement concerning the object takes place between two people", creating the "fusion of horizons" (Gadamer 1975:345-346). In other words, conflict of conceiving and perceiving reality was linguistic since language was the embodiment of culture.

inquiry, termed by others the 'Spatial Turn', requires specific definition if it is going to be useful in the reading of the Fourth Gospel as an ancient text with contemporary meaning. Such definition is attempted below.

2.2. The History of Space and Place

The modern conception and chronological development of space developed over a long period of time and is not easy to plot.[11] Those who have tried to chart this development observe a complex interaction between metaphysics and natural sciences for the two are not separate until the specialisation in disciplines that reaches its climax in the nineteenth century (Best and Kellner 1997:18). Since several interdisciplinary approaches to space and place have been proffered (Dobschütz 1922; Jammer 1954; Tuan 1977; Harvey 1993; Low and Zuniga 2003; etc) and those focusing on space and theology (Inge 2003; Bergmann 2007), there is no need to rehearse it again here. What will be required is to bring together such approaches and see how they can guide the reading of Johannine space and place pursued in this current study.

As Max Jammer has pointed out (and maybe correctly), "the study of the history of scientific thought is most essential to a full understanding of the various aspects and achievements of modern culture" (1954: v).[12] Some of these "various aspects" would include the way in which the modern Western world has developed tools of 'reading' and interpreting the ancient world. If Hinckfuss is correct, that the way in which humankind expresses its thought directly affects the way in which space is conceived, it could be safely assumed that the scientific spatial presuppositions in the Western world[13] in the

[11] It is recognised here that Max Jammer (1954), while giving a general overview of the development of the Western conception of space, cannot represent conceptions of space in other cultures and traditions, hence the need to provide those where necessary in order to make this study a robust one.

[12] Jammer's work forms the basis for many scholars who wish to trace the ongoing relationship between theological, metaphysical, and scientific space constructions in history. Following the groundbreaking work of Thomas S. Kuhn (1962, 1970), Hans Küng (1989) has convincingly demonstrated the parallels between scientific and theological paradigm shifts. He has also shown that sometimes the paradigm shift in science does not only have a correspondence in theology but that sometimes these paradigm shifts inform one another.

[13] The terms, 'West' and 'Western world' (here interchangeable with 'modern') do not necessarily refer to the geographical West, but rather the world of ideas influenced by Western modernity which finds its full

modern era have created the basic framework for interpreting the places *of* and *in* the Bible (Hinckfuss 1975:84).[14]

In his Foreword to Max Jammer, Albert Einstein realises that the tools used by philosophers and scientists of the modern era in perceiving and conceiving the universe (theirs or others') were "imbibed practically with" the mother's milk, and hence may be used unconsciously (Jammer 1954:xi). It is no wonder therefore that the underlying assumptions of modern conceptions are "seldom" brought to consciousness even in academic discourse since they are taken for granted and "naturalised through the assignment of common-sense everyday meanings" (Harvey 1989:203). Instead, they are used "as something obviously, immutably given; something having objective value of truth which is hardly ever, and in any case not seriously, to be doubted" (Jammer 1954:xii). Additionally, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has proposed that the "ethics of interpretive practices" should seek to "critically research the process of how interpretation is produced" by investigating "common sense assumptions and unarticulated presuppositions" (2000:45).

One such presupposition, according to Jammer, is the modern concept of space. *Space*, "in spite of its fundamental role in physics and philosophy, has never been treated" with the seriousness it deserves (Jammer 1954:v-vi). The same observation has been made by Philip Alexander when he states, "it has long been understood that our images of the world can be extraordinarily revealing about our mentality, yet this insight has taken some time to make any real impact on the study of the ancient world" (in Scott 2002:1).

---

expression in North America and Western Europe. The Western world has obviously dominated the way space has been understood in biblical studies since they have produced major primary tools (maps, ethnographies, etc) used in the rest of the world in the study of the Bible. While this is obviously commendable, much of it was with the scholarly intention of 'reaching to the truth' and would not have escaped the scientific spatial conceptions dominating the Western mind. It will be argued however that the Western and scientific conception of space is contestable as the only and best way of representing the conception of space in the Fourth Gospel and the New Testament in general.

[14] The places 'of" the Bible, referred to here relate to the real geographical places behind the names in the Bible, while the places "in" the Bible are the narrative names of places which may or may not be real places. This distinction is important as it must be pointed out that the names of places in the biblical narratives do not necessarily correspond to real places in terms of real description and location. Instead, they could serve a literary or theological purpose within the narrative. That a place in the narrative existed historically is very likely, but not necessarily as understood by the narrative itself.

On the other hand, *time* has been the leading concept in the formulation of many ideas and in modern constructions of the past. One reason could be the Platonic idealism "with its antithesis between the eternal world of ideas and the phenomenal world of becoming and decaying" (Bultmann 1956:116). This Greek view, which has affected modern thought, sees space and place limiting the formulation of ideas that must transcend any spatial location and hence limitation. Space has therefore been used in service of time on the presupposition that humankind accumulates ideas and knowledge in time, but not in space. This separation of space from time has of course been proved problematic.

2.3. Metaphysical Space

The conception of reality in the modern era is based upon a scientific view that has its origins in ancient Greek metaphysics, but which finds its fossilisation through the Renaissance to the Enlightenment. The growing interest in the humanistic recovery of ancient texts saw the revival of ancient Greek philosophy whose initial content was not divorced from the then scientific explanations of the "structure of the world" (Sklar 1995:12). This initial speculative science imagined that all things in the universe were made up of a "small number of basic substances; that change is to be explained by rearrangement of unchanging atoms; that the world is fundamentally unchanging or, alternatively, that it is constantly in flux" (Sklar 1995:12). Against this speculative view of the universe, some Greek philosophers found the answer in geometry, whereby they used sets of "logical reasoning" from given "principles, axioms, or postulates" "grounded on sensory observation" to describe the universe (Sklar 1995:12-15).

In the *Timaeus* of Plato (428-348 BCE), space was seen as the "receptacle" of "material being" (Sklar 1995:16). In the *Physica* of Aristotle (384-322 BCE), space was that entity which can be occupied, hence the rejection of empty space as that occupied with air (Bochner 1973:295). Space is therefore seen as "the inner surface of the containing body" (Furley 1989:81). From defining space as containing surfaces was born the relationship between space and its content, that the container shapes its content, hence humans are shaped by their environment.

2.4. Ptolemaic Space (Second Century CE through to the Middle Ages)

The conquest of Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE) shaped the Greek conception of space in terms of territory. Besides his conquest project, Alexander also compiled "a large body of information on the geography and ethnography of the regions likely to be penetrated" (Dilke 1985:59). Such conquests and exploits ensured the spread of Greek culture and in its interaction with other cultures, thereby producing the dominant spatial conceptions which influenced the Ancient Near East (ANE) up to the Greco-Roman period. This syncretistic representation of space is evident in the formation of the two known maps featuring the "Holy Land" (Laor 1986: xi). The Ptolemaeus map by "Claudius Ptolemaeus, a second-century astronomer, geographer, and cartographer who lived in Alexandria (87-150 CE)" is said to have been a simple map of the known world (Laor 1986:xi). Even though none of Ptolemaeus' twenty-six maps are any longer extant, his work apparently shows a conception of space that demonstrated what would today be called "a subjective representation of space" (Laor 1986:xi). There is no proportion to the map and some places have more detail than others. His understanding also demonstrates the Hellenistic elements in seeing space as a container of the things in it. In this sense, the earth is presumed to be the centre of all created universe, around which all moving planets rotate. This made sense in the context of Palestinian religions which understood the universe to be arranged in tiers where the earth is at the centre and the heavens are above and the underworld below, a position that prevailed well into the Middle Ages (du Toit 1998:142-144).

2.5. Copernican Space

Early Greek conceptions of space and its syncretistic form in Ptolemaeus which separated the terrestrial and the celestial realm held sway until the fifteenth century C.E. when it was challenged by Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543). Seemingly small, his propositions marked a major deviation in thought. His proposition that the earth had become a "noble celestial body revolving among other planets" challenged the centrality of the earth and

in so doing implied that the "terrestrial and celestial realms might not be so different after all" (du Toit 1998:145). The Copernican view found its support in Galileo (1564-1642) who proposed a heliocentric universe, to the displeasure of the church which asked him to recant and then later placed him under house arrest (Drake 1978:367). This view garnered further confirmation from Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) who combined mathematics, astrology, astronomy and religion to explain the universe.

2.6. Cartesian to Newtonian Space

The helio-centric universe influenced Western thought up to Kepler. René Descartes (1596-1650) saw humankind as the centre of all reality. His axiom, *Cogito, ergo sum* set the human being as a thinking being whose proof of existence was founded on her/his innate ability to doubt. Doubt thus became the basis upon which reality was to be conceived including space and the cosmos. Space for Descartes was not a mere extension of nothing, but an extension of some substance. Departing from the Aristotelian view of space as containing body, Descartes saw space as an extension of bodies by which he meant the distance from one object to another was an extension and hence space. He also introduced place as the relative position of bodies. The only body that was infinite was God, the perfect body (Glouberman 1986:105).

Greek conceptions of space supported by Cartesian analysis prepared the way for the epoch-making work of Isaac Newton (1643-1727). In classical Newtonian physics, "both space and time exist in their own right, as do objects" (Massey 1994:260). The observer of this space can be detached from the object of his or her observation. Space and time are thought of as being both absolute and capable of being separated from one another. The absolute space was also infinite since its existence preceded the existence of all things.

Anthony Giddens suggests that the "key significance in the separation of time from space" was the "invention of the mechanical clock and its diffusion to virtually all members of the population (a phenomenon which dates at its earliest from the late

eighteenth century)" (1990:17).[15] This was a process of "emptying" of both space and time, as well as the distinction between space and place. For Giddens, 'place' was the "locale" or the "physical settings of social activity…situated geographically", while 'space' was the social signification given to a given locale (Giddens 1990:18-28). In hindsight one observes that this environment was conducive for the emergence of new understandings of space and time to be introduced by Albert Einstein.[16]

2.7. Einsteinian Space-Time (1879-1955) [17]

Albert Einstein (1879-1955) destabilised the 'stable' Newtonian cosmology by challenging any possibility of 'absolute' entity, either of space or time. Einstein criticised any understanding of space which did not take seriously the relationship between the container and its contained objects (Hugget 1999:261). Space between objects, i.e., the distance between them, does not possess some inert quality of measure, but has relative quality which depends on other factors, most of which impinge on the one measuring or observing. According to Einstein, any conception of space and objects would depend on

---

[15] This resonates well with the African (rural Zimbabwean) background of the present researcher where this separation of space and time is still a rare phenomenon, especially among the elderly.

[16] Newtonian space dominated the eighteenth century as the best scientific explanation of the universe. One reason was partly because this explanation conformed to the theological orthodoxy of the day. As Moreland and Craig point out, the "classical Newtonian" concepts of time and space were "firmly rooted in a theistic worldview" (Moreland and Craig 2003:376). He "justified his vision of space as an infinite Euclidian void, not by recourse to scientific argument but by associating it with God" (Wertheim 1998:140). The Newtonian scientific cosmology was thus "developed with theological support and sanction" (141). It had many backers from different parts of the world. In the New World, Newton's views were accepted and promoted by people such as Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758). Initially, Emmanuel Kant (1724-1804) in Germany thought that space should comprise of "coexisting matter" with "mutual effects and interactions among bodies" (Jammer 1954:129). This obviously aligned him with Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716), Newton's opponent, who saw space not as an entity but "merely the order of coexistence" (Adamson 1903:99). Leibniz had objected to the notion of absolute space and time showing time as a "system of relations" (Jammer 1954:116). In agreement with the Newtonian position, Kant later thought that space was "an independent existent of absolute reality" (1954:129). In his later work therefore, Kant fully succumbed to the Newtonian views but still saw space and time as basic elements upon which human beings organised their experiences. He concluded that through intuition one could perceive the existence of absolute space abstracted from other factors. Space was seen as belonging to the *noumenal*, i.e. those postulates which can not be verified of falsified and therefore not "scientific propositons".

[17] Although in the West linear time is still operative, it has been revolutionised under the Einsteinian arrangement. Giddens sees some "dialectical features" in this new conception "provoking opposing characteristics" (1990:19). For example, space and time are not thought of as being completely separate from one another as in the formulation of train timetables. The timetable is actually, "a time-space ordering device, indicating both when and where the trains arrive. As such, it permits the complex coordination of trains and their passengers and freight across large tracts of time-space" (1990:20).

the observer's position in relation to the object being observed in addition to the measuring conventions one employs (Hugget 1999:264). This view sees space as closely related and dependent on time such that the three-dimensional Euclidian space of Newton is replaced with four-dimensional space-time. From this perspective, every object observed stands out as an event happening, whose properties can only be told from the limited process of measuring affecting the observer.

2.8. Space after Einstein

While Einstein's theory of relativity demanded a revision of the separation of space and time, the later development of quantum theory required the revision of the "very understanding of such matters as the objective nature of reality and its independence from our perception of it, the nature of a complex system and its relation to its components, and the nature of causal and other kinds of determination in the world" (Sklar 1995:157). The quantum physics of Max Karl Ernst Ludwig Planck (1858-1947) is the corollary of Einstein's theories. While the physical laws were so deterministic that everything was meant to be understood according to these physics theories, quantum physics focused on the smallest particles of matter whose arrangement was found to defy the fixity of space and place characteristic of Einstein's theory. In this understanding, space should be understood as being made up of small particles whose arrangement means that every space is "just a little warp in eleven-dimensional space—thus whether protons, petunias and people, we all become just ripples in 'hyperspace'" (Wertheim 1998:141). This space is not fixed since the location of the smallest particles of matter is not easily predictable as there are many factors working on them. This means that this space is unpredictable and indeterminate (Wertheim 1998:141).

3. Space and Place in Human Geography[18]

Human geography, maybe rightly so, has produced more thinkers of space than many other disciplines. Although Michel Foucault cannot be classified as a geographer proper, his works (1972; 1986) have had much influence upon human geography (see Crampton and Elden 2007). Famous in this regard was his *Of Other Spaces* (1967) which opened up a hive of interdisciplinary reflection on space (Warf and Arias 2008). Foucault rightly points to the "great obsession" with evolution-centred historical thought of the nineteenth century (Foucault 1986:22). The problem of this history was its focus on ideas in time without taking seriously both their provenance and the ground upon which the thinkers were standing, namely, their own context. These taken-for-granted and context-less ideas gave a false sense of 'objectivity' and academic 'neutrality'.

Henri Lefebvre, also from France, pointed out how space and place were categories of power requiring a Marxist critique (Lefebvre 1991:26). He suggested three categories of space and place as illuminating the workings of this matrix of power:

i. Perception
ii. Conception
iii. Experience

For Lefebvre, the lived space of experience is where people exercise how they experience place by taking certain actions and avoiding others in order to find comfort and maximum

[18] In this view, I am indebted to David Harvey's work (1989:207) in which he states there is a "good deal of historical-geographical evidence for the thesis that different societies (marked by different forms of economy, social and political organisation and ecological circumstance) have 'produced' radically different ideas about space and time". This thesis can be taken farther. A seeming consensus can be constructed from these multiple enquiries to the effect that time and space are social constructs". As Chris Fitter (1995) has also pointed out, "landscape-consciousness of every culture is historically distinct and subjective, a fact belied by superficial continuities of landscape presentation: the traditions of tree and flower catalogue, the propagation of medieval rhetoricians of the Greco-Roman *locus amoenus*, the deference of Renaissance painters to the authority of inventories of landscape content found in Vitruvius and Pliny" (1995:2). This can also be observed in the rock paintings of the Khoi and San indigenous peoples of Southern Africa. Their paintings usually tell a story of their mastery or constrictions of their space. In my own research on the conflicting conceptions of space between the missionaries and the Ndebele people in Zimbabwe towards the end of the 19th century CE (forthcoming), I show the changing conceptions of space depending on the social pressure being experienced by a group of people.

benefit from their spaces. It is in 'real' spaces that utopian possibilities are forged among marginalised peoples. Here those on the cusp, who are 'exploited' and 'excluded' find new ways of negotiating the limitations imposed upon their spaces. Other scholars used this model in different ways[19] while still others saw this approach as negligent of the historical nature of the contest over space which preceded capitalism.[20]

In an effort to address spatial concerns beyond the socio-economic dichotomy, other geographers saw space as deeply subjective and even aesthetic. Yi-Fu Tuan emphasised that people developed varying attitudes towards the places they inhabit or encounter. People did not "live in a framework of geometric relationships but a world of meaning" (Hubbarb et al. 2004:5). Using the notion of *topophilia* and *topophobia*, Yi-Fu Tuan referred to the "desires and fears that people associate with specific places" (Hubbarb et al. 2004:5). This alerted geographers to the "sensual, aesthetic and emotional dimensions of space" which were otherwise considered as non-objective, hence not useful for analysis of space and place (Hubbarb et al. 2004:5). That the architectural and associated town and planning industries have grown to their present levels is a result of taking the aesthetic views of space as useful in planning places of habitation and therapy.

[19] Building on the work of earlier thinkers of space, Edward Soja gave a contemporary texture to the discussion. In introducing "Third-space" Edward W. Soja (1996) states, "[m]y objective in Third-space can be simply stated. It is to encourage you to think differently about the meanings and significance of space and those related concepts that compose and comprise the inherent spatiality of human life: place, locations, locality, landscape, environment, home, city, region, territory, and geography. In encouraging you to think differently, I am not suggesting that you discard your old and familiar ways of thinking about space and spatiality, but rather that you question them in new ways that are aimed at opening up the expanding scope and critical sensibility of your already established spatial or geographical imaginations" (1996:1). Although most of Soja's work had an American background at the core, it is most significant for any exegetical work. Soja developed Lefebvre's thoughts and gave them a postmodern tinge. Instead of thinking about space from a Marxist slant (Lefebvre), Soja develops the notion to cover wider horizons and to have the three spaces: (i) First-space (geophysical realities as perceived); (ii) Second-space (mapped realities as represented); (iii) Third-space (lived realities as practiced), each viewed as inseparably connected (1996:86).

[20] For example, Manuel Castells has challenged Lefebvre's understanding of space as "a kind of spatial fetishism" where he felt that Lefebvre exalted place and space above everything else even at the neglect of historical materialism (in Elden 1988:8).

3.1. Spatial Intelligence

Among the wide contributions of Howard Gardner's (1983) thesis of "multiple intelligences", has been the suggestion of "spatial abilities". Gardner proposes that central to "spatial intelligence are the capacities to perceive the visual world accurately, to perform transformations and modifications upon one's initial perceptions, and to be able to re-create aspects of one's visual experience, even in the absence of relevant physical stimuli" (1983:173). In many ways, Gardner's work does not radically deviate from the pretensions of modernist illusions of objectivity he intends to minimise. For example, he sees spatial intelligence as having to do with 'accurate' perceptions. In another place, he considers someone as spatially intelligent if they are able to (a) "recognise the identity of an object when it is seen from different angles" (b) "imagine movement of internal displacement among parts of a configuration, and (c) is able to "think about those spatial relations in which the body orientation of the observer is an essential part of the problem" (Gardner 1983:175).

There is however an inherent self-contradiction in Gardner's model. First, perception is by definition subjective and hence cannot be measured with the 'objectivity' presupposed in scientific positivism. It is not clear therefore how one could give a scientific account of the subjective spatial intelligences. Second, the perception of the world is culturally dependent. In some cultures, including many Mediterranean cultures, space is not conceived in abstraction. In other cultures, space can not be represented by numbers and intangible symbols like geographic co-ordinates, e.g. Latitude: 20° 48' 0 S, Longitude: 158° 28' 60 E. In many "pre-modern societies, space was understood in terms of concrete localities" and time was also understood in terms of "past disasters, the passing of the seasons and the cycle of agricultural work" (Cohen and Kennedy 2000:24). In such understanding, spatial intelligence has to do with one's experience in place and their ability to master that place. The expertise is less cognitive as it is intuitive and even 'superstitious'.

Goldstein (1980:119) is right in pointing out that perception of reality is "always selective". The importance "attached to objects influences not only perceptions of them, but also the ways in which information about these objects is inferred, stored, and recalled" since there is close link between language and perception (Goldstein 1980:120). Hence, by "categorising similar objects into broad classes and groups" people simplify their complex environment (Goldstein 1980:350). This varies from culture to culture and also it is dependent upon the existential experiences of a people in particular locality in time. As such, these perceptions are always changing.

Giddens notes that one clear distinction between the modern and pre-modern world is the conception of space and time (1990:17). In pre-modern times, "the majority of the population, always linked time with place–and was usually imprecise and variable" (Giddens 1990:17). Indeed, it was not possible for someone to tell time "without reference to other socio-spatial markers", hence "when" was not thought of in separation with "where" (Giddens 1990:17).

What this means is that in reading space in the Fourth Gospel one does not benefit by merely identifying 'accurate' representations of space, an obsession of many historically inclined scholars. The task required of spatial analysis is to locate the culturally significant spaces and their various categories which are used by the author to 'remember' or 'recall' the significant past. It must also be noted here that remembering significant past spaces may also be used in envisioning the expected future. In the same light, to think of space in John without its close relationship to the time-rhythms (agricultural festivals) associated with it would be missing the mark.

3.2. Cyber Space and Post-Modernity: Manuel Castells

While in the industrial age, space was thought of in terms of how it could be utilised to increase production, the present information age is more concerned with how information can overcome the barrier of space to quickly pass on information, utilising the smallest space to store the largest amounts of information. This is what is now being classified as

"the space of flows and timeless time" (Bromley 1999:6). The three volumes of sociological analysis of Manuel Castells (1996, entitled, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* (2000, 2004) are considered the most comprehensive work in the area by several contemporary scholars (Giddens in Bromley). According to his analysis, the present "network society is a social order embodying a logic" known as the "'space of flows' in contrast to the historically created institutions and organisations of the space of places which characterised industrial society" (Bromley 1999:6). In this information age:

> Space and time "operate through the new cultural-communication complex of real virtuality, thereby solidifying the social differentiation between the interactive elite, on the one hand, and the 'interacted' mass of the population enclosed in the fragmented space of places, on the other" (Bromley 1999:11).

What is apparent from this above scenario is that space and place never cease to be socially constructed and socially locating. While the advantaged members of society can easily traverse the virtual spaces to interact and produce wealth, the majority of the people on the lower rank of the social ladder only access the World Wide Web (WWW) to be caught up in the web of vanity with no significant benefit. This sensitivity is useful in 'third spacing' the Fourth Gospel spatial arrangements of exclusion and transforming them to spaces of inclusion emerge.

3.3. Body as Gendered Space[21]

One element that has emerged as thinkers have put space to the forefront of their work has been the discovery of how space is gendered. For example, the separation of public spaces such as toilets is overtly gender-based. This may appear harmless and not useful for critical spatiality until in the context of apartheid in South Africa these public spaces become separated on racial grounds. A critical reflection on gendered spatiality reveals that the social categorisation of bodies determines not only the differences but also the qualitative aspects of the body (Shilling 2003:94). This means that some bodies are considered inferior to others.

This awareness has serious implications for the way one reads body spaces in the New Testament in general and in the Fourth Gospel in particular. The use of the dead body (σώματος) of Jesus as an image for the Temple (John 2:21) in a cultural context where dead bodies are ritually unclean is of interest here. The hanging dead body of Jesus would be defiling for the priests preparing for the Sabbath but not defiling for the 'secret' disciples who took the body for burial (John 19:31, 38). While one woman can touch the body of Jesus and anoint it in preparation for burial (John 12:1-8) the other can not touch the resurrected body of Jesus because it must go back to the father (John 20:17). Awareness of the body as space and gender relations helps one to identify "many oppressive aspects to the construction of bodies in line with gender stereotypes" (Shilling 2003:97).[22]

[21] In the social theory of Mary Douglas (1966), the body is a microcosm of the social body. It could therefore be insightful to read the human bodies in the Fourth Gospel from this social understanding since allusions to such possibilities abound.

[22] In most African societies, these gendered spaces are mostly associated with gender roles. As such, the kitchen and kitchen utensils are the domain of the woman with taboos associated with trespassing. Among Shona male and female art, these gender distinctions have been documented (Dewey 1986:64). There are other female spaces, such as mourning rites at the grave and water wells which resonate very well with the well and tombs as gendered spaces in the Fourth Gospel. Later in this work, a detailed description will be presented on the Samaritan woman and the gendered spaces in John.

3.4. Body and Ritual Space

Closely linked to the gender stereotypes of the body is the function of the body as ritual space. Mary Douglas has shown that there are particular societal rituals on the physical body which are reflective of societal concerns (1966:114-115). What is performed on the "human flesh is an image of society" itself (Douglas 1966:116). But since bodies begin to reflect society, in order to maintain the purity of the society, some bodies are rendered unclean or else they must go through some ritual for them to be cleansed. In this sense, the body functions as a 'social map', a way of arranging space and symbolically representing it.

Eliade (1958:3) has already shown that in many indigenous cultures, rituals on the body allow the participants to participate fully in the "whole body of the tribe's mythological and cultural traditions". In other words, the body is 'worked' on so that one can fully "attain the status of" being human which is never complete until something is done on the body as space of cultural interaction (Eliade 1958:3). Actually, that these rituals are also called "rites of passage" is symbolic of the spatiality they embody (Holm and Bowker 1994). Victor Turner's (1969) spatial terminology of the Latin word *limen* (*lit:* threshold or doorstep) has become a key in the description of the "phases of rites of passage" (Holm and Bowker 1994:3-4). In this sense, the rite becomes a movement from one locale towards the other. For Turner, what has been significant in understanding ritual is the formation of '*communitas*' when the ritual participants are at the liminal stage of the rite (Holm and Bowker 1994:4).[23] In this social interaction, Turner has observed space as the locus of play and the outworking and transforming of power dynamics opening up new possibilities. In this understanding, once space has been given particular social, i.e. ritual, function, it is imbued with power to transform people.

[23] Holm and Bowker (1994:4) limit such experiences only to illiterate and pre-modern cultures. Nevertheless, similar experiences of the '*communitas*' can still be formed among the ritual participants for example in circumcision rites among modern day literate peoples of Southern Africa.

3.5. Space and the Narrative[24]

In referring to stories and story-telling in primordial societies, David Abram (1996:182) states that stories "are profoundly and indissolubly place-specific". So that, "to tell certain stories without saying precisely where those events occurred—or, if one is recounting a vision or dream, to neglect to say where one was when "granted" the vision—may alone render the telling powerless or ineffective" (Abram 1996:182; see also Prinsloo 2005:458). In other words, space and places can be mnemonic aids to remember and articulate narrative. Abram goes on to suggest that "contact with the regional landscape—and the diverse sites or places within that landscape—was the primary mnemonic trigger of the oral stories, and was thus integral to the preservation of those stories, and of the culture itself" (Abram 1996:183; Prinsloo 2005:458 n. 8).

Narrative can be defined as simply a story of "narrated events and participants" located in particular spaces (Rimmon-Kenan 1983:6). Understanding space in the narrative—especially narratives located in some known history—is important. The space and place in the text may not necessarily be the same as the places outside the text, but after which the place in the text is named. For example, in the Fourth Gospel, the naming of Galilee, Samaria, or Judea does not simply mean that for us to understand the narrative we only need to have a sound historical geography of first century CE Palestine based on the modern atlas. While this knowledge is vital, it is insufficient if we cannot understand how these places function within the narrative itself. Once in the narrative, these places begin to function in harmony with other theological and ideological arrangements in the text. Although not very common, it has already been noted that there are texts whose clarity is enhanced by understanding the spatial structure being employed in the narrative.[25]

One important contribution by Flanagan (from his unpublished paper of 2003) regards the "concepts of space and time" as "cultural subtexts". This means that people bring their presuppositions, largely unexamined and unconsciously, into their "interpretations of

[24] This area, still to be explored further as "Space in the narrative" is an important topic in narratology. Further refinement of theory here will be proffered as the work continues.

[25] One such prominent scholar is Flanagan (1999) whose work has of late been used by a number of scholars, especially in Old Testament. The volume edited by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt (2002) in honour of Flanagan is proof to his influence.

history and culture whether present, past, or future."[26] This has significant implications for the reading and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. As can be noted from a cursory reading, spatial categories stand out in the Johannine narrative. John brings spatial and temporal presuppositions into telling the story of Jesus and we as readers bring our own presuppositions in reading these space-times. Consciousness of this sharpens one's criticality and sensitivity towards the text.

3.6. Space and Religion

In many African cultures, religion can be seen to be thoroughly spatial. In many African Initiated Churches (AICs) particular sites are sacred and new ones are always being created to be territories for healing and confronting evil forces.[27] Various religious traditions, for example, Hinduism, early Greek and Chinese religion as well as Japanese Shintoism,[28] see the earth as sacred (Hitchcock and Esposito 2004:40), so do the Native Americans. Other "religions designate certain places as sacred or holy, and often encourage believers to visit those places in pilgrimage" (Park 2005:451). [29] It is however not very clear how such places acquire this "holiness or sanctity" (Park 2005:451). It is evident though that most such places are considered holy or sacred because at these places "humans sensed a close contact with the divine" (Hitchcock and Esposito 2004:40; *cf.* Park 2005:451).

One major factor in some places acquiring sacred status is their topography. Places close to water (for the Hindus; also John 3:23) become attractive for religious use (*cf.* Sharma 2004:73, 113). Among the Shona, one can see this significance of water spaces and the

---

[26] This is taken from the website: <http://www.case.edu/affi1/GAIR/constructions/Program2003.html/>
[27] I and Jonathan Draper are currently involved in space-related uses in healing in AICs.
[28] Even in these religions, one will find temples, shrines, holy places or sites of pilgrimage.
[29] Mircea Eliade is one scholar of religions who has written extensively about the subject of sacred and profane space-time (particularly 1954, 1959, and 1961). Eliade's work is known for its binary view of space, where religious space is considered sacred and space for the non-religious, profane. The same distinction was made for time. This binary view of space has been convincingly problematised by such scholars as Jonathan Smith (1978, 1987) and Sam Gill (1998:304-5) that the discussion, although useful, will not be rehearsed here. Harold Turner (1979) follows the lines of Eliade and Rudolf Otto (who sets the tradition) and hence will not be discussed here separately.

Shona divine name, *Dzivaguru* (the Great Pool) (Daneel 1971:81). Sometimes "springs, rivers, grottoes, caves, rocks, and mountains" are prime places as sacred sites (Hitchcock and Esposito 2004:40). In other traditions, however, "certain places on earth must be consecrated, made holy, and then be commemorated as such with the building of a temple, church or shrine upon the site" (Hitchcock and Esposito 2004:40). Sometimes, these holy sites are "recycled" from "earlier religions" (Park 2005:451; Turner 1979:87).

One important characteristic of such sacred spaces is their amenability for being controlled by the political leadership. It is said, in the story of the Buddha, that his "dwelling was in a monastery atop Mount Sumeru" and the "palace of Indra also stood there" (Lewis 1995:229) leading to Rabe (1995:235) noting the ambiguous relationship "between the royal patron and the patron deity". In the Old Testament, David's Palace stood next to the Temple. Even in the time of Jesus, the Roman Antonia fortress built by Herod stood at the corner of the Temple to keep "watch over the Temple, constantly ready to restore order if required" (Garrard 2001:21). While the relationship between the holy place and the palace has always been controversial, their interaction is ubiquitous. In some cases, the holy place is in control of the palace or the same as the palace while in other cases it's the reverse. There are many examples of similar arrangements in history[30] and in modern politics.[31]

In this society, as well as other similar societies, politics and religion are inseparable; hence the palace and the shrine must be in close proximity, even physically. The wider dangers of an arrangement where religious resources legitimate political establishment

[30] This is of course particularly true of some Islamic states governed by Sharia law, but the same arrangement, albeit unofficially, is true for many governments. The whole debate as to whether 'crosses' and other religious items can be worn at the work place is witness to how institutions are struggling to separate business space from religious space.

[31] This feature, concerning the sacred site was also noted towards the end of the nineteenth century by Croonenberghs, a Catholic Priest in Ndebele state (modern day Zimbabwe). Describing the Ndebele people, he states that the "oracles play a great role in the life and religion of the Matebele" (Lloyd 1979:264). Of such oracles, was the "famous oracle, that of the god Makalakala" who "lives in a subterranean cave in a labyrinth of rocks" (1979: 264). Attendant to this shrine are the *Amazizis* (King Lobengula's medicine men) who will explain the meaning of the sound from the oracle (1979:265). Similarities can also be seen in the introduction of the Jewish monarchy and the building of the Temple. It was King David who wanted to build it first but then it was built by his son, so that the house of the king was not thought of apart from the house of the Lord (1 Kings 3:1).

and political establishment enforce religious hegemony are too many to enumerate. Even in modern democracies, where the physical and constitutional separation of the 'state and the church' has been celebrated, there still seems to be an inextricable relationship between the 'Temple' and 'palace'.[32]

4. Modern Scholarship on Palestinian Geography

A number of scholars have recently taken some interest in reading the Christian Bible spatially particularly the spatiality of the land of Palestine.[33] An evaluation of these is given in detail in the coming chapters. The work of Davies (1974) seems to be among the leading works available. Davies is of course influenced by the earlier works: J. Joachim Jeremias' *Golgotha und der heilige Felsen* (1926), Gerson Cohen's *Zion in Rabbinic Literature* (1961), and the several works of Mircea Eliade, particularly *The Sacred and the Profane* (1959). In this understanding of space, the entire land of Palestine is holy and therefore habitable as opposed to the outside land which is chaotic and therefore must be transformed if it can be a place of habitation. Palestine was understood to be situated at the centre or the 'navel' of creation (Davies 1974:7-8). Palestine is the holy land, Jerusalem the most holy city. This concentric holiness is increased as one draws closer to the Holy of Holies within the Temple. It was here that the divine manifested Godself.[34] This view shaped the understanding of Palestine as space in the New Testament. In the Gospels, this space becomes christified, and Jesus becomes the holy place or Temple

[32] The role played by religion in politics, even of developed democracies, is phenomenal.

[33] The works of Neyrey (2002, 2003, 2004), Moxnes (2003), and the contribution from the *Space and Place* group in the *Society of Bible Literature* Conferences are referred to here. Much theoretical work has been produced as a result of reflections from this Conference. The present researcher is grateful to members of the group who generously made their unpublished papers available to me.

[34] This is testified to by the confusion experienced by those in Exile: "For there our captors asked us for songs, and our tormentors asked for mirth, saying, 'Sing us one of the songs of Zion!' How could we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land? If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither! Let my tongue cling to the roof of my mouth, if I do not remember you, if I do not set Jerusalem above my highest joy." Psalm 137:3-6). Compare this with Jeremiah 29:4-9: 'Thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, to all the exiles whom I have sent into Exile from Jerusalem to Babylon: Build houses and live in them; plant gardens and eat what they produce. Take wives and have sons and daughters; take wives for your sons, and give your daughters in marriage, that they may bear sons and daughters; multiply there, and do not decrease. But seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into Exile, and pray to the LORD on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare. For thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: Do not let the prophets and the diviners who are among you deceive you, and do not listen to the dreams that they dream, for it is a lie that they are prophesying to you in my name; I did not send them, says the LORD".

(Davies 1974:290). Particularly in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus becomes the "dwelling place of God with men" (Davies 1974:298), "the replacement" of the physical places of worship and the "critique of a 'holy space'" (Davies 1974:302).

Davies' work is obviously important for us here for two reasons. First, it highlights the significance of place not only in the study of the biblical texts but also in understanding the first century Jewish conceptions of space, a context from which John emerges. Second, Davies' work is also important because it shows how this conception of space is intricately linked to history[35]and theology. Even though Davies' work is influenced by the work of Eliade[36] it goes further by demonstrating how biblical narratives are redactionally influenced by each Evangelist's understanding of Palestinian geography in the light of Jesus' work of salvation.

As has already been noted by Marcel Poorthuis (1996:1), "claims of holiness can hardly be distinguished from claims of power." This means that the "myth of the centre of the earth needs to be criticised, not only because the history of religions has seen several such centres, which claim to be the *omphalos*, but also because of the seeds of exclusiveness and intolerance it may contain" (Poorthuis 1996:1). Poorthuis observes that the call for the equality of all places and times is a result of the *Aufklärung*. He laments however the fact that the *Aufklärung* did not reject the sacred nature of any place, but instead rejected sacredness altogether. But within religion itself, there had always been "voices that advocated a refined understanding of the holiness of time and place" (Poorthuis 1996:1). It is such "refined understanding" or rather, changing understanding of space and time that the Fourth Gospel offers and that will be explored.

---

[35] Turner (1979:6) put it correctly that "[w]e have forgotten that history always has a geography, and that each is essential to the other; it is no accident that while historical studies of religion flourished the very concept of a geography of religion is almost unknown in most religious studies. And yet for Christians the incarnation was spatial and geographical event as much as it was temporal and historical".

[36] Eliade's generalisation of the notion of the *axis mundi* in the Tjilpa cosmologies for all religions has been challenged by some scholars, especially Smith, quoted above. Smith has used the recent works of human geographers to develop more comprehensive spatial theories applicable to religious texts. This does not in any way make Eliade's work irrelevant for the study of both New Testament and Old Testament spatial constructions.

Eric Clark Stewart (2005) has also written on space in the field of New Testament studies, in his recently defended dissertation entitled, *Gathered around Jesus: An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark.*[37] While this work is useful for its bibliographical reference, it lacks focus on the text, something for which users of social-scientific methods have often rightly been chided.[38] I wish to compliment this work by taking the Johannine text for my primary pool of data.

Because of the symbolic nature of the places in John, much commentary has been made from this perspective. Almost all commentaries note the symbolism and double meaning that many places possess in the text. Because of the variance between the geography of the Fourth Gospel and that of the other synoptic Gospels, many scholars have relegated Johannine places to symbolism and theology. What still needs to be done is to look at the places in John as coming into the text from 'real' places of significance around which the story of Jesus could be told. How these places started to be used in telling the story of Jesus in John could tell us more about this Gospel. The lost place is always regained because while the place lasts, it is the centre of the universe. God can be met there though the prescribed rituals and rhythms. And when the place is destroyed it retains its space within the cultural memory of a people as 'remembered space' in narrative, song and ritual.

[37] The present researcher is indebted here to Jerome Neyrey who introduced him to his student's dissertation and a number of relevant reference materials in his personal correspondence.
[38] Many criticisms of the anthropological models have to do with their relationship to the text. See Gager (1982:256-265) and Tuckett (1987:136-149).

4.1. The Implications of Sacred Space for the Land of Palestine

Jonathan Z. Smith has noted that with the "repossession of the land of Israel in 1947 and the repossession of the site of the Temple in Jerusalem in 1947" has ushered in a reawakening of "the archaic language of sacred space" reacquainting "the modern Jew with a variety of myths and symbols which he had proudly thought he had forgotten, myths and symbols which he frequently boasted to others that he never had" (Smith 1978:10f). These are thoughts and myths that present the land of Palestine as:

i. Specially granted to the people of Israel who must dwell in it as theirs;
ii. Land which was "fought for and died for", hence the land that was "won" (110);
iii. Land that was destined to be the land of Israel by God from the "beginning" (111);
iv. Land which is vulnerable to outside attack and can only be secured through the following interventions:

    a. Performance and repetition of the myth of the creation of this land, "the crossing of the Sea of Reeds or the River Jordan";
    b. "Remembering in solemn cultic recitation the almighty deeds of old, the shared history of the people and their land, the events associated with the ancestors who were buried in the land";
    c. "Proper care of the land (e.g., the Sabbath rest every seventh year)";
    d. Living properly on the land in order to receive its blessings (Smith 1978:111).

This land was to be preserved by military might e.g. the War Scroll from Qumran or in other modern annuls. In the light of the current challenges in the Middle East, one might look at these myths with much trepidation. However, from the Old Testament to the rabbinic traditions, such constructions and claims of Palestinian space are strong. The following famous rabbinic text bears testimony to this:

> Just as the navel is found at the centre of a human being, so the land of Israel is found at the centre of the world…and it is the foundation of the world. Jerusalem is at the centre of the land Israel, the Temple is at the centre of Jerusalem, the Holy of Holies is at the centre of the Temple, the Ark is at the centre of the Holy of Holies and the Foundation Stone, is in front of the Ark, which spot is the foundation of the world (Midrash Tanhuma *Qedoshim 10*, quoted from Smith 1978:111; see also Lundquist 2007:26)

From this, one could note some continuing views on the land of Israel. First, if the land of Israel is holier than any other land, its inhabitants are holier than those living outside it; hence the need for pilgrimage for outsiders to partake of some of its holiness. Second, the use of the image of the human body impersonates the land of Israel, called by Theodore Gaster (1961:17) the 'topocosm', where a locality is "conceived as a living organism" (Smith 1978:106). Third, the land is present is a sign of covenant given to God's people who may lose it if the covenant terms are broken.

This spatial imagination has influenced and has itself been influenced by how the Jewish people conceptualised and articulated their relationship with Yahweh. Yahweh is always preparing the best place for the children of Israel, if not now, in the future. Jewish theology has for this reason been fundamentally spatial and temporal—never one without the other. Their founding myths of origin locate the prototype man and woman at a place allotted to them by God. It is at this bounded place that the first human beings can perform all their obligations of participation in co-working with God and procreating. It is only when they disobey the rules of this particular place that they are displaced. This displacement needed to be resolved by being restored in this particular place. Hence, when Abram is called by God to go "to the land that I will show you" (Gen. 12:1), it is as if the loss of place in Eden is being rectified. Generations later, this land promised to Abram is again lost, again gained and again lost. This experience has aptly been noted by J. N. Sanders, "The Bible is a textbook in how to live in the gaps between God's promises and their apparent lack of fulfilment" (1997:42). Or, as Robert Carroll has put it, the "Hebrew Bible is a book of exile. It is constituted in and by narratives and discourses of expulsion, deportation, and exile" (1997:64). Nevertheless, these stories are potent and dangerous. If God has foreordained that the Israelites will have to, at some eschatological future, occupy that land which is currently contested, then the conflict over this space cannot be resolved. A wider appreciation of how land as space functions in

constructions of self-identity, and how different levels of sacredness ascribed to it fossilises such identities could create fruitful avenues for negotiation.

4.2. Locating the Reader in Her/His Space

The present researcher does not come to read space in the Fourth Gospel as an empty container of space i.e. *tabula rasa*. His location in space and time influences his interest and appreciation of this aspect of the Fourth Gospel. In addition, there are particular space-time characteristics shared among African people and other indigenous peoples. African conceptions of space-time are not well-documented by African scholars because they do not appear as objects of analysis. It will thus be contended, that one window into understanding African culture and religion is to look more closely at how space and time is utilised.

Among the few African scholars who write on space and time is that of John Mbiti (1975, 1992).[39] Concentrating more on time, he only alludes to space without giving it much reflection. But even he does not give any detailed analysis of this category of reality. For example, he says that while there are "shrines" belonging "to a family, such as those connected with departed members of the family or their graves. Others belong to the community and these are often in groves, rocks, caves, hills, mountains, under certain trees and similar places. People respect such places, and in some societies no bird, animal or human being may be killed if it or he or she is hiding in such places" (Mbiti 1975:19). No further reflection is given as to how African people think about this space. Similar statements are made by Benjamin Ray (maybe with influence from Mbiti but without

[39] It can be observed that the African concept of time and not space is what interests Mbiti as seen in his 1992 work, *African Religions and Philosophy* in which a chapter is devoted to what he calls, the "concept of time as a key to the understanding and interpretation of African religions and philosophy." Problematically, all discussions are focused on time as a separate entity from space, buying into the Newtonian theory that influences the Christian theology whose categories are subsequently employed by African scholars in Western modes of thinking. For this reason, the work edited by Joseph K. Adjaye, *Time in the Black Consciousness: Contributions in Afro-American and African Studies* (1994) is problematic in one's investigation of African space-time conceptions since Mbiti's 'cyclic' time conceptions underlie almost all articles there. It is a typical modernist understanding of time where the complaint which Africans can make is that their history was considered "unhistorical" enough (Adjaye 1994:3). This conception of time as the flow of historical events fails not only to account for African time, but also to account for space which is inextricably linked to time.

quoting him), where he states that, in "Africa shrines may be purely natural in form…where gods and spirits dwell" (2000:26). One can easily see from such statements that there is no critical reflection or systematisation of African conceptions of space given. It is therefore our contention that the concept of "time as a key to the understanding and interpretation of African Religions and Philosophy" as suggested by Mbiti (1992, First Edition 1969) and confirmed by other African scholars (Bediako 1995; Oruka 1995:292ff) is to miss the relationship between space and time in the African conception of reality.[40] It is not surprising therefore, that African people have not written much about their conception of space. What remains helpful though are the records of uniquely African uses of space and time left behind early missionaries in Africa.

4.3. African Politics of 'Circular' Spaces

Many primal societies conceive the universe in what could be termed, circular models. Hence, it is not surprising that in Homer, the cosmos is "hemisphere of sky that roofs the flat, round disk" similar to the Achilles' round battle shield (Chyutin 2006:4). This is because there is a dialectical correspondence between the spaces of domicile and the imagined spaces of the gods who gave birth to both. In southern Africa, the early contact between the missionaries and the local populations allowed these two different cultures to reveal their differing conceptions of place resulting in mutual transformation.[41]

In this 'conversation' and "politics of space", one should note that the external shape of space by itself stood out for missionaries (Comaroff 1991:200). These missionaries observed that the shape of space, whether it was for humans or animal pens, was circular

[40] It is interesting that even though Mbiti is interested in time, typical to his African mentality he uses spatial categories to explain it, albeit unconsciously. Hence, he talks of *Zamani* (the past) as the "storehouse of all events" and "ocean of time" (Mbiti 1992:23).

[41] It is not surprising that by the end of the nineteenth century, a number of African kings, even though some would not live in them (e.g., Lobengula), had square or rectangular houses instead of circular huts (Lloyd 1979; *cf.* Comaroff 1991:283ff). The circular hut was opposed to the house made from straight lines, representing Cartesian geometry. There was power in a straight line according to Descartes. The straight line represented the "equation of the first degree" while the "conic" shape represented the "equation of the second degree" (Bronowski and Mazliah 1960 in Okur 1993:104). Hence, the European settlers building houses for the African kings with straight lines was no work of charity but rather a sign and symbol of conquest (see also Smith 1978:96).

(Comaroff 1991:283). These circular habitations were themselves arranged in a circular village with a centre, with the geometric margins of each location being of social significance. There were "sleeping chambers" set off from "sites of sociability, cooking, storage, servants' quarters", places for "long-term corn caches" and those for "everyday food pantries" (Comaroff 1991:283). Whether these circular spaces had anything to do with 'circular' time is not very clear, but nevertheless very likely (see also similar conceptions among the Ndebele).[42]

It was observed that the arrival of 'outsiders' threatened the existing socio-spatial arrangements resulting in conflict. The "parties tried to appropriate" control over space resulting in tensions (Comaroff 1991:199). The mental "map of Christendom" informed the missionaries that the 'empty' "regions beyond" Europe needed to be occupied in order to incarnate God's presence there (Comaroff 1991:200). When missionaries such as Campbell and Read sought to build a camp among the Tlhaping, they were "acutely aware of the symbolic impact of seizing the centre", but the local Chief Mothibi was aware of this and he denied them that right (Comaroff 1991:200). Instead, they could build their camp at some distance and have "some *children* sent to them for teaching" (Comaroff 1991:200, italics added)[43] or at Kuruman river, "in *uninhabited* country" (Comaroff 1991:200-201, italics added).[44]

The relationship on this social space was more complex than this given narration suggests. The Tswana chief wanted the missionaries to be close enough to provide the "valued goods and skills", but far enough away not to influence the chief's subjects (Comaroff 1991:201). The missionaries were also aware of this. On the one hand, the missionaries wanted to put their mission house close enough to tantalise the locals with

[42] This circular arrangement of the physical space was reflective of the African conception of holistic cosmological reality (Okur 1993:102-104; Welsh-Asante 1985:76ff; Richards 1985:212). That circles and curved lines form the ritual dances and the war strategies of the Ndebele armies is of interest here. See also similar spatial constructions among the Pueblo society of South America (Ortiz 1969:22ff).

[43] Children would in this world view be located on the margins of the social arrangement, hence the missionaries could have contact with them.

[44] 'Uninhabited' places are not innocent in this worldview. If a curse was to be delivered from an inhabited place, such as the home, a scapegoat would be sent unattended to the inhabited regions where evil spirits occupied (Eliade 1961:29-32; Smith 1978:109,111).

unfamiliar 'goods' and 'objects' of 'power'. It was one such object, the gun, which later made Chief Mothibi change his mind and allow Read to settle among the Tswana (Comaroff 1991:201).[45] As such, the missionaries had won. After all, the battle had not been for "sacred sites, but for mastery of the *mundane map of lived space*" (Comaroff 1991:202, italics added).

4.4. African Sacred Spaces

It has already been hinted above that although in most African societies, the sacred and profane co-exist peacefully, there were spaces and places when need arose that caused particular places to be used as sacred spaces. Hence, as with the Karanga people of Zimbabwe, the hut was often used as a sacred space to consult with mediums (Gelfand 1966:24). Likewise, a "sacred tree" located outside the village could be used as sacred space for conducting "rain rituals" (Gelfand 1966:26). In times of national crisis, all the people groups of Zimbabwe would go to the most sacred space in Matojeni, at the rocks in Matopo area, a place described by Terence Ranger as a "site of struggle between black and white over possession, representation, and control" (1996:157). Here they would hear the voice of the 'Great God' speaking to them concerning matters of chieftainship, war, and rain. Similar sacred places can also be identified among other African peoples (Gelfand 1966:33ff).[46]

5. Summary of Findings

Space and place in this present research are used in most cases interchangeably because of the nature of space and place. The terms are used to refer to the physical, social, symbolic location of interaction of objects or people. In this sense, physical places will be taken as carrying with them socio-political, symbolic and religious significance.

---

[45] Other relevant issues that have been left unaddressed due to limited space, include, missionaries' "industry" and agricultural space, contestation over rain and all water space, and the politics of space over the relocation of the city to Kuruman (Comaroff 1991:203-230).

[46] The significance of these sacred spaces has continued among the African Initiated Churches (AICs), most of which have a particular sacred place to which they annually go for pilgrimage.

From the above discussion, it becomes clear that whether one is talking about physical space located in history, imagined or mental space, or represented space in narratives of different kinds (stories, drawings, photographs) all space has one or more elements.

5.1. Space is Socially Constructed

Space is socially constructed in that it situates people or things either at its centre or at the margins (Ortiz 1969; Smith 1969). Nowhere are there spaces which are neutral, and where all objects occupying that space—such as people or things—are located at a position not related to the centre and the margins. As such, one way of understanding social relations is greatly enhanced by a critical analysis of the relations of the objects located in space as far as they relate among themselves in terms of their spatial location. Instead of asking the question 'who is Nathanael in the Gospel of John', one should rather ask, 'where is Nathanael from in the Gospel of John?' In other words, identity cannot be divorced from spatiality.

5.2. Space is Inextricably Related to Power

Space is usually contested because existence itself is "to have a place among the places of all other beings and to resist the threat of losing one's place and with it existence altogether" (Tillich 1968:336). As space is socially constructed, there are contestations that are continually going on over who controls what space such that all spaces are never fully under one's control with no contestation. Such contestation not only has to do with the control over space, but also how control is sought after the articulation of what the space signifies. Hence, in the Fourth Gospel, one not only finds contestation over the control of holy space, but also the 'naming' of it.

Where there is contestation over space, there are varying and competing ideas as to what that particular space symbolises. Is it Mount Gerizim or Mount Zion where the Temple should be? Or are both now obsolete? The one whose symbols are strong enough to name the space will give this space its new role and will thereby occupy the centre of this space, while those whose symbols have been defeated have their naming of space rejected and are pushed to the "margins" of this space (Hubbarb 2005:289). However, since meanings respond to many factors, control over space is never permanent; hence, the changing understandings of spaces must be sought in trying to see how space functions in a narrative.

5.3. Space is Inextricably Connected to Time

Tillich is correct in stating that it "is expedient and in some ways unavoidable (as Kant has shown), to treat time and space interdependently" (Tillich 1968:336). He however contradicts himself in saying that:

> The more a realm is under the predominance of the inorganic dimension, the more it is also under the predominance of the historical of space; and conversely, the more a realm is under the predominance of the historical dimension, the more it is also under the predominance of time (Tillich 1968:336).

The assumption that there are 'inorganic' dimensions, hence timeless, is faulty, as also is thinking that the 'historical' is not located in space. Space is the setting of the occurrences of events in time. As such, the two are inextricably connected and should be understood as such. Different technological developments that have unfolded have not managed to sever this space-time marriage. Time slowly begins to lose its value the moment it is abstracted from its incarnation in space.[47] Within biblical scholarship and theology no one can now talk about Palestine without qualifying it as first century CE or speaking about Galilee without specifying contemporary corresponding details.

[47] It is interesting that in a period when people can no longer find time to do anything socially meaningful because they 'have no time', they have to design expensive watches so that they can give some value to the time incarnated on their time pieces.

5.4. Space is Gendered

Not all spaces, but in most traditional settings, among the several divisions of spaces, the gender arrangement persists. In some of these societies, female spaces are ranked lower than male spaces. Even if these spaces are at the physical centre, they will be at the social margins. Hence, when one reads episodes in the Fourth Gospel where the prominence of female space is that of elevation, then it is important to notice that in this Gospel there is a shift going on in the conception of space. If Samaria is presented as a missionary enterprise executed by a woman, when the anointing of Jesus is ascribed to a woman and when the first resurrection experience is ascribed to a woman, then there is a redefinition of the social location of gendered spaces taking place in John.

6. Conclusion

The focus of this introductory chapter was to give an overview of the current understandings of space and place that interest this present research. However, the wide meanings of space and place are too wide to be exhausted in this short attempt. The four the categories of space discussed were:

i. Space as socially constructed;
ii. Space as inextricably related to power;
iii. Space as inextricably connected to time;
iv. Space as gendered.

These categories and definitions can be useful in the analysis of the Fourth Gospel and will be taken up further in what follows, providing the necessary platform upon which a spatial methodology can be constructed. This will be attempted in the chapter that follows.

CHAPTER 2

MAPS OF MEANING: METHODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO SPACE IN NARRATIVES[48]

What we see when we look at a map is not the world, but an abstract representation that we find convenient to use in place of the world

(MacEachren 2004: v)

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, an overview of the current scholarly understanding of spaces and places of interest to the reading of space and place in the Fourth Gospel was presented. The following four categories of space were given:

i. Space as socially constructed
ii. Space as inextricably related to power
iii. Space as inextricably connected to time
iv. Space as gendered

These categories however can only be useful in reading texts if they are built into a coherent methodology.

[48] This phrase is from Jordan Peterson's *Maps of Meaning: The Architecture of Belief* (1999), where he argues that in "more primordial" societies, the universe is filled with intrinsic value and a "place where all things have meaning" (1999:1). This conception of the universe is contrasted to the scientific one where the universe is construed as a "place of things" (1999:1). It is the argument of this work that the former conception of the universe concurs with the one in the Fourth Gospel.

In this chapter, the focus will be on how modern biblical scholarship has conceived and constructed biblical space. Two major areas of spatial expression have emerged, namely, the use of maps and the construction of historical geographies. These will be critically investigated and evaluated against that of map-making in antiquity. The ancient map of Madeba will be used to demonstrate how a different construction of space in antiquity was used to that of modern practice. If such differences are ascertained, they can become the grounds upon which a spatial methodology can be built.

2. Narrative Space and the Modern Map

Wertheim has pointed out, "our ideas about space inevitably shape our conception of" "the world around us and how we make meaning of it" (1998:140). The way people construe their universe or imagine space determines their designation of tools with which they investigate such a universe. In the modern era, the object-subject dichotomy of looking separately at both time and space (Bergmann 2007:354), where "both space and time exist in their own right, as do objects" (Massey 1994:260), have been paradigms through which biblical scholarship and other disciplines have looked at narratives. Among the tools designed to aid such investigations has been the extensive use of pictorial representations of the biblical world using the modern map. Characteristically, a pictorial representation of space makes some subtle but false claims about space. First, the modern pictorial map representation abstracts 'real' places from their historical location and presents them in a fixed and frozen state. Borders (political and ethnic), climates, topography appear fixed and frozen. Second, the data used to construct these maps is concealed so that the map is like the 'true' representation of how things are. In a contested geography of Palestine, this could have very serious implications. Third, because the places are just 'there', the map gives a false sense of objectivity. This claim to objectivity is enhanced by the appropriation of various scientific technologies (e.g., satellite and GPS positioning) and the mathematical abstraction of scales. This intimidates anyone who may want to question the validity of the map, especially if some groups of people use it as evidence for present-day legitimation of claims to some space in Palestine by any group. However, as has been observed, "scientific" constructions of

maps cannot escape the "concerns and assumptions of their authors and readers" (Shalev 2002:1). Maps are thus seen as ways of "structuring the human world which is biased toward, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations" (Harley 1988:278 in Long 2007:109).

A number of modern maps, when analysed, confirm the discussion above. Randomly chosen map representations in some known atlases are discussed below.

2.1. The NIV Atlas of the Bible

This publication claims that maps are designed to "enable the reader to enter into the world of the Bible" (Rasmussen 1989:9). This claim is mistakenly based on the presupposition that the material world of the Bible and that represented in the Bible are *always* identical. The truth, however, is that even though biblical space presented on the map is fixed (depending on when the map was made), the 'real' world of the Bible lands has changed many times depending on the politics of the day. In addition, the biblical narrative was not interested in representing such spaces in any objective way but rather, in a way that enhanced a particular envisaged symbolic universe. This does not mean that this symbolic construction can reduced allegorically to a one-to-one application, but through a careful spatial reading of the symbolic universe in question as will be shown below.

2.2. The Student's Bible Atlas

This publication sees the primary purpose of the atlas as "to enable the user to understand the Bible better" (Rowley 1965:3). A closer look at this particular atlas will reveal some focus which goes beyond this objective of "understanding the Bible". In the *Student's Bible Atlas*, Plates 19 to 23 have nothing to do with the Bible but provide a positive presentation of the "Protestant missionary activity" well after the Reformation, that is, outside biblical space-time. The medieval and modern Christian periods featured in the

maps present the propaganda of Western Christian missionary activity spread from Europe to the rest of the world.

2.3. The Holman Quick Source Bible Atlas

This publication is proud to have used the scientific tools of archaeology in the construction of its maps. The stated focus of this atlas is the "narrow strip of land that is broadly called Palestine, Israel, or the Holy land" (Wright 2001:19). The makers of this atlas are quick to emphasise that the use of these scientific tools serve a specific purpose of presenting the world of the Bible in the most objective way. The "narrow strip of land" is later considered to have been "promised to Abraham" and "came fully under Israel's control during the time of David" (Wright 2001:19). Again, here the biblical narrative is taken as a historically accurate representation of reality outside of the narrative. This presentation is uncritically harmonised with the present-day story of Israel.[49]

2.4. The Reader's Digest Atlas of the Bible

Here, "science of archaeology" is considered a "primary tool in unravelling the mysteries and filling in the gaps" of the biblical world (Gardner 1987:34). Archaeology is used to fill in the gaps in those biblical narratives which are assumed to be historically accurate only requiring extra material to paint the whole picture. In other words, archaeological (scientific) reconstruction of Palestine serves the biblical narrative. The makers of this atlas also claim that some archaeologist has "proved conclusively that the *tells* (*Tell el-Hesi*) were in fact the mounded-up, layered remains of ancient cities…such as that described in Joshua 8:28" (Gardner 1987:34). The atlas ends with the sign of the cross used by Constantine in C.E. 312 (ninth century drawing). What begins as a Bible atlas aided by scientific proof of archaeology, ends up as a story of the triumph of the Christian empire.

[49] It will be argued here that it is not possible to produce a purely objective story of Palestine.

2.5. The New Bible Atlas

Bimson (et al. 1977:5) suggest that the *New Bible Atlas* "serves to remind us that the events recorded in the Bible occurred in 'real' places, with 'real' rocks underfoot and 'real' rain falling" as demonstrated by the "colour photographs". The atlas is also useful in confirming biblical positions (see also Rainey and Notley 2005:9 in the *Sacred Bridge Carta's Atlas of the Biblical World*). So for example, the Moabites story is "valuable in revealing… that Omri subdued Moabites" (Bimson et al 1977:45). A satellite over-view is also given (12-13, climate 14). The reason why the biblical narrative has proven to be true is due to the archaeological findings that support the stories. One wonders why the discovery of Moab through archaeology becomes a proof for the biblical narrative of Omri. Is this not a faith statement validated by archaeology?

2.6. The Macmillan Bible Atlas

This publication is "guided by the most recent knowledge in Bible, historical and archaeological research, and new concepts in educational instruction" (Aharoni and Yonah 1968, 1977, in preface). One important comment in this atlas is the acknowledgement that modern maps with their fixed "border" do not represent ancient Palestinian reality, hence not biblical Palestine. The requirements of modern cartography for fixed "definitive" borders run into a crisis because borders were not points but regions for contest. They did not mark where one territory begins and another has ended.

The *Macmillan Bible Atlas* has problems accepting "the geographical details...of the Evangelists and of the first part of Acts at face value" (Aharoni and Yonah 1968, 1977, in preface). The reason offered is that this geography is fraught with propaganda for evangelistic success. New Testament narrative maps are thus viewed with suspicion while the "narrative of the wanderings of the Patriarchs" is seen to fit "well the reality of the first half of the second millennium B.C.", hence making claims that the narrative maps of the Old Testament are an accurate representation of what really happened

(Aharoni and Yonah 1977: Map 26).[50] In other words, the makers of this atlas want readers to believe that the Old Testament storytellers did not have any subjective interests in telling their stories. The territorial disputes in the Old Testament suggest otherwise. Or is it a matter of authenticating the right of the present Israel to claim legitimacy to the disputed lands? The makers of this map are advised to read the poignant words of Schofield (1964:9) who emphatically states that the "whole Bible is propaganda, written for a purpose, and humanly speaking it is because it is propaganda that it has survived". Questioning the usage of maps will help to show the normally-taken-for-granted conceptions and highlight what is normally ignored.

3. Archaeology and the Modern Map

To aid cartography, archaeology has appealed to "scientific foundations" for the reconstruction of ancient spaces (Charlesworth 2006:55).[51] For biblical scholars, maps have been relied upon to 'aid' biblical interpretation. Biblical spaces have been sought and located on the maps of Palestine. Biblical archaeology began between the middle and late nineteenth century CE with explorations of ancient Palestine, following that of Mesopotamia and Egypt in parallel with the "birth of modern literary-historical criticism of the Bible" (Dever 1997:315). Initially, it served as satisfaction of the spirit of "discovery" coupled with the "challenge of vindicating the historicity of the biblical accounts" (Dever 1997:315).

Recently, it has become evident that archaeology as a source of information for reconstructing past spaces is more complex. The first challenge that Neil Silberman observes is that the findings from archaeology need to be 'read' like any ancient text. But this process of "reading of material artefacts for their symbolic, ritual, or ideological

[50] A similar understanding is shown in Rainey and Notley (2005:9) where they claim that, "of all the writings held sacred by the world's religions, only the Bible presents a message linked to geography". This is only a biased representation, since it can be proved that other religions have links not only to geography, but to holy geography.

[51] Although both cartography and archaeology have now moved from being 'descriptive' as a result of 'map deconstruction' and cultural archaeology respectively, their early use served 'objective' and positivistic scientific pretensions still preferred by other scholars. For further details, see the heated discussion between Heikki Räisänen and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in Räisänen (2000).

meaning" is sometimes affected by "subtle and unwitting" "conscious or subconscious imposition of elements of modern beliefs (e.g., perceptions of gender, ethnicity, economics) onto the interpretation of ancient cultures in both scholarly and popular literature" (Silberman 1997:138). Silberman observes how modern concerns become a template upon which ancient space is constructed albeit with archaeology as "legitimation", such that "archaeologists' interpretations can reveal as much about the societies in which they are members and political actors as about the ancient societies whose cultures they attempt to explain" (1997:138). Sometimes, however, "particularly where political or cultural institutions exploit readings of the past as the basis of their legitimacy or power, some scholars may enthusiastically cooperate in the dissemination of ideologically inspired interpretation in public forums" (1997:138). Sometimes, the subjectivity of archaeology is seen in the choosing of the research subject itself, in other words, why one chooses to dig in this place and not in another.

From the ongoing discussion, it becomes evident that the archaeological findings of early archaeologists such as William Foxwell Albright in Palestine, utilised the "places recorded in the Bible" as the "base line for distinguishing their counterparts in the material world" in some kind of literal correspondence between "material artefact and text" (Silberman 1997:140). So the archaeological findings have served as "mere illustration of conventional modern conceptions of the role of prayer, sacred spaces, and ritual sacrifice" (1997:140). In this sense, archaeology has not enabled ancient space constructions in biblical narratives to go beyond contemporary space categories.

Recently, from the late 1960s to the mid 1980s, archaeology has begun to address some of the limitations mentioned above (Dever 1997:316). These changes include an orientation that is "more anthropological than historical" to cater for the cultural changes frozen in historical particularities (Dever 1997:316). This 'secularisation' of the discipline has freed it from the constraints of "long-dominant understanding of the history of ancient Israel as unique" (Dever 1997:318). This has led to a more interdisciplinary approach which also takes environmental issues seriously. Researchers are also expected

to draw up upfront research designs that hold them accountable so that their agenda is kept in check (Dever 1997:316).

3.1. Narrative Space and Historical Geography

Apart from the use of the modern map and archaeology, biblical scholars have also used historical geography texts to construct biblical spaces and places. Various texts have been used to reconstruct New Testament spaces particularly those emerging from the first century. A general survey of the sources used by several Palestinian historical geographers (Lightfoot, Schürer, Ginzberg, and Montefiore) reveal a particular pattern (Safrai *et al* 1974: VI). For example, in his introduction to the historical geography of Palestine, Emil Schürer states that the "chief sources of information" for his work would be the "extant literary products of that era" (1973:17). By this, he refers to the biblical narratives and other literary material outside of the Bible, emerging in the period under discussion. The canonical books of the Bible alone are insufficient for such an enormous task, so there is need to use the non-canonical or apocryphal books, says Schürer. This does not only mean the biblical books, but also secular books from Roman, Hellenistic, and Hellenistic Jewish authors (Schürer 1973:17). The other source of information is the plethora of rabbinic writings (Mishnah, Tosefta, Talmud, Midrash, and Targum). The discovery in 1948 of some ancient documents in the Judean Desert, commonly referred to the Dead Sea Scrolls, has increased the material that the historical geographer can make use of. Schürer also used "coins and inscriptions" and other material remains from the past to reconstruct the historical geographies of Palestine (particularly from the Christian era) (Schürer 1973:17).

As we have seen from the map and archaeology, the greatest challenge is how to 'read' and make use of these texts in the reconstruction of the physical, narrative and the social spaces. The first challenge one faces in using all the material, suggested by Schürer, is that of dating. It is difficult or impossible to identify with certainty the earlier layers of later redactions, for example of the Talmud, in order to properly locate the content of the material in space and time (Safrai et al. 1974:4). If one considers that cultural practices

are transient, then this concern is fundamental. Closely linked to the challenge of dating is that of the authenticity of material. For example, it is not known what sources Josephus used in setting out to describe the Palestinian geography from Ceasar Augustus to the "eve of the Revolt" (Safrai et al. 1974:28). Without knowing the sources, there is no real way of knowing the motive of the writings or their setting.

While the aforementioned are shortcomings from the material available or unavailable, the other challenges in reconstructing and articulating spaces from antiquity has to do with the interpreter him or herself. One impediment is the use of biblical or extra-biblical material or any other material for that matter, as pure 'data' knowing quite well that they are portraying reflections and not mere facts. The propaganda element of much of the material used in the readings of biblical spaces and places has sometimes been taken for granted. This weakness has become problematic in uncritical use of Josephus in the reconstruction of first century Palestine, a weakness already observed by other scholars (Freyne 1980:294; Kreissig 1989:265ff; Kirschner 1985:28; Groh 1997:32). Josephus, as an elite from the priestly family in Jerusalem, who was connected to the emperor as "an Imperial protégé" and "protected favourite of the Flavian dynasty" in Rome where he spent most of his time writing this literature cannot be taken uncritically as the source for historical reconstruction (Millar 1993:70, 338). Of course, most of the material available only reflects a certain class and gender of people, usually those who were economically privileged and male, and hence is not exhaustive in its portrayal of the wide spectrum of the social spaces available. Since the 'texts of the powerless' are never available, extra care is therefore required in gleaning their conceptions and voices under the fossils of the texts of the powerful. One has to read between the lines of all this material available in order to hear the voices of the absent sectors of society.

The other major challenge for interpreters of spaces in antiquity is their location. Western scholars have contributed much to the reconstruction of ancient spaces, but using their western categories of thought to articulate these spaces. Not that their academic contribution has no value, but that some of their contributions have been missing important elements that one cannot learn from books, but from the experience of space

where one is located. For example, a view of space that is overtly concerned with 'objectivity' may appear as a noble quest at face value, but it is very easy to miss the construction of spaces in antiquities which are not driven by the same concerns and many mask the ideological bias of the researcher. A quest for spatial reconstruction, that sees space as something objective, can miss the interrelatedness between land and the body, the productivity of the land and the fertility of the human body, the sacredness of the body, and the sacredness of the land (Smith 1978:115). Hence, a construction of spaces in ancient texts requires an aesthetic feel that sometimes only comes from one's cultural location.

The above discussion brings together a number of seemingly disparate issues which cannot however be ignored in a quest to interrogate spaces and places in the Fourth Gospel. In reading space and place in the Fourth Gospel, one needs to bring a wide variety of tools of investigation in addition to the plethora of tools previous cartographers, historians, and biblical scholars that have contributed to its study. As Yi Fu Tuan has stated, "the 'feel' of a place takes longer to acquire. It is made up of experiences" (1977:783).[52] It is African experiences of space and place and loss of such through many years of displacement that adds value to the discussion of space in antiquity in this research. It is this contribution which has, in part, motivated this present study.

This brief discussion serves to demonstrate that modern, hence Western, construction of biblical space is fraught with other interests of which the users of maps may or may not be aware. In the process of representing biblical space, different ideologies and theologies avail themselves of opportunity, especially where biblical narratives are used as "accurate

[52] Yi Fu Tuan has observed that "Space is a common symbol of freedom in the Western world. Space lies open; it suggests the future and invites action" (1977:54). But this is not the same view in many cultures in antiquity and in the Old and New Testaments. It has been observed, especially from the History of Religions, that in the Ancient Near East, that "that which is open, that which is boundless is seen as the chaotic, the demonic, the threatening. The desert and the sea are the all but interchangeable concrete symbols of the terrible, chaotic openness. They are the enemy *par excellence*" (Smith 1978:134). See also Romm, who shows that the "ocean presents itself to early Greeks as a terrifying and unapproachable entity" (1992:16). Similar views can be observed in many African cultures where the scapegoat is sent in the open and wild spaces based on the assumption that an evil occupies that space.

historical sources" for reconstructing ancient Palestine. Aided by archaeology and space technology, such reconstructions have semblances of objectivity and accuracy. The result of such reconstructions represented in map making allows for uncritical reading of biblical spaces. Such reconstructions however have serious implications for present-day Palestine and hence require critique. For such critique to be effective and close to the spatial representation in the narrative, the manner of construction of space in antiquity must be grasped. A brief investigation of mapping in antiquity therefore would be a good starting point before taking one map from antiquity as a model through which to read the Fourth Gospel.

3.2. Maps in Antiquity

It should be noted from the onset that "*geographia* represented a literary genre more than a branch of physical science" in antiquity (Romm 1992:3). Everything that would be known about distant lands was to be "derived from someone's report of them" (Romm 1992:5). Beyond what humans could reach were dangerous spaces to which only the gods could venture (Romm 1992:18). In this view, maps in antiquity represented a "religious geography" (Dozeman 2007:88). The cosmos was peopled with powers benevolent, malevolent, and ambivalent; hence, to master space was to master the gods.

In understanding the representation of space in ancient maps, one comes to terms with represented reality in the Bible. By the time we reach first century Palestine, the "bounded world" becomes the dominant model. In this cosmic arrangement, "the meaning of life is rooted in an encompassing cosmic order in which man [*sic*], society and the gods all participate" (Smith 1978:132). Such cosmology, even if represented on a diagram, carries this interrelationship between humans and the nature that surrounds them. For example, the cosmological representations known in Egypt were largely pictorial, showing the god, Shu, as covering the empty expanse above the earth, and in so doing, "separating the sky goddess from the earth god" (Dozeman 2007:89). The gods, Geb and Nut stand guard at the "boundary of the created world" (Dozeman 2007:89, also Shore 1987:120). In the same light, the Babylonian map of the world shows Babylon as

the centre of the universe with different geometric shapes representing some important locations in Babylon (Dozeman 2007:89). Protruding triangles represent the imagination of lands that are not habited. The commentary that accompanies the map explains the role of Marduk in creation in aiding the "heroic humans" "such as Utnapistim, the hero of the flood" (Dozeman 2007:89).

The Greeks, after Alexander, were also known for presenting their world from "written itineraries and also itinerary maps", but not with any sense of 'objectivity' that attends modern mapmaking (Crone 1953:16).[53] The construal of boundless space in Greek thought is seen in Hecataeus' representation of the ocean as an endless expanse.[54] These itineraries focused on "important routes" used by sea merchants or places of memorable experiences (Crone 1953:16). The map was meant to include, among other things, the "symmetry of nature"; an aspect reflected by Ptolemy's conception of an "enclosed Indian Ocean as a counterpart of the Mediterranean" as the forces balancing the whole creation (Crone 1953:17). The itinerary map or itinerary narrative always had its cosmic centre at Delphi. In Hellenistic Palestine however, "Jerusalem, not Greece, was thought of as the centre of the world, and all places were related to it" (D'Agapeyeff and Hadfield 1942:85) as we have already seen above (pages 29 and 45).

From the Greco-Roman period, there are at least "two maps in which the Holy Land" features (Laor 1986: xi). The Ptolemaeus map of Palestine is said to have been drawn by "Claudius Ptolemaeus, a second-century astronomer, geographer, and cartographer who lived in Alexandria (87-150 CE)" (Laor 1986:xi). Ptolemaeus is said to have made twenty-six maps, most of which are no longer extant. The other early map of Palestine is the "*Tabula Peutingeriana*" which is "an *itinerarium scriptum*, or road map of the world…divided into twelve sections" (Gold 1958: n 4). This was a "Roman military road

[53] Many itineraries were written in the ancient world but none were accompanied by a map. Detailed descriptions of places served as the maps of the day. It is believed that the whole "concept of maps and plans developed independently in different areas of the world", although the current use of scaled maps using scientific calculations is a product of the scientific revolution after Newton (Dilke 1985:11). The known ancient maps used both different conventions and conceptions of representing space. A description and review of one of the earliest maps of Palestine is given below.

[54] Dilke's (1985) 'conjectural' map (in Dozeman) of Hecataeus seems influenced by modern map constructions and hence could be flawed.

map, the original of which may have been drawn in 250 CE" (Laor 1986: xi). Both these maps had their focus on places of significance to their maker and never pretended to strive for any detachment of these places from the daily experiences of those who made them. The difference between the two maps is that while the *Peutingeriana* was meant to provide the routes to be used by Roman soldiers, the Ptolemaeus was interested in providing a picture of the known universe using the mystical cosmology of the day. Space was represented as it was experienced and envisioned. It was never abstracted. You only represented a place you were interested in and you were upfront in doing so.

4. The Madaba Mosaic and Egeria's Travel Narrative as Alternative Space Constructions from Antiquity[55]

The Mosaic Map of Madaba (Fig 1) is one of the most elaborate of the "few ancient maps of ancient Palestine still in existence" (Gold 1958:52). This Mosaic "found on the floor of the sixth-century Byzantine church in Madaba" in present-day Jordan represents space from a completely different perspective to the modern map (Laor 1986: xi). Even though it has been damaged with time, it remains an important piece of mosaic whose depiction of space can be related to the Fourth Gospel some four hundreds of years or so before it. This map does not depart from the conventions of the other ancient maps mentioned above even though they are separated by more than three hundred years. This can be explained by the lack of any major technological and cosmological changes during the period in question.

The Madaba Mosaic can be compared to the reminisces of Egeria, the Spaniard, who "visited the East between A.D. 381 and 384" (Wilkinson 1971:3). Even though in her account she enthusiastically comments on the "buildings (famous), mountains (steep), plains (fertile)", she is more concerned, as a Christian, to give a narrative geography on

[55] Madaba is preferred in this work to Madeba following the spelling in the Encyclopaedia Judaica. The reference to Egeria's narrative space does not here confirm the view of those scholars who see Johannine geography as some 'pilgrim's manual' (see Dodd 1970:91). Dodd rightly observes that "so far as our evidence goes" such claims are merely "anachronistic".

those spaces that "have to do with her understanding of the faith" (Wilkinson 1971:3). So for example, she speaks about the:

> Foundations of the walls of the city of Jericho, the ones which were overthrown by Joshua son of Nun…Not far from Jerusalem is Gibeon, which was captured by Joshua, and sixty stades from Jerusalem is Emmaus, where the Lord had the supper with his disciples after the resurrection. In the Tower Cades was the house of Jacob, and its foundations can still be seen today" (Wilkinson 1971:191-192).

The interest by which this is being narrated is not motivated by a mere objective portrayal of the land, although some honesty is suggested in the retelling. When Egeria says (Wilkinson 1971:192) that the "field is there in which the Lord ate with his disciples, and you can still see the stone on which he rested his arm", she is not simply fabricating material. Her imagination, historical account, and symbolic significance are fused together. The places that are narrated are significant for Egeria's faith community. She is also not interested in the period separating the places of Jacob and Jesus' times. For her, there is some continuity of the eras and the places. What the places served during Jacob's time, they also served during Jesus' ministry.

However, these spaces are not merely physical spaces. Egeria is also interested in the inner workings of the people situated in these places. Hence, she notes that not "far from this mountain (Mount Hermon) is a spring which the Saviour blessed, and it does good to sick people of all kinds" (Wilkinson 1971:192). This kind of geospatial representation assumes Jesus' effect on space which space in turn becomes effective in contact with human beings. There is no boundary in the narrative between material spaces and their symbolic meaning. This is typical space construction in antiquity and makes a mockery of modern reconstructions of spaces and places in antiquity with its fixed geographies and boundaries. This kind of spatial representation which is deliberately subjective trivialises the modern map-makers' concerns with objectivity in representation of land and all the pretentions of disinterest in such spaces. Representing of such spaces as isolated entities is also opposed by the spatial representations in antiquity which is keen to reveal the interconnectedness of such spaces as will be seen on the Madaba map as a spatial representation from antiquity.

4.1. Features of the Madaba Mosaic Map

The features of the Madaba Mosaic map which will be commented on below will include:

i. The map "represented the biblical Holy Land and the neighbouring regions from Byblos (Gebal) in the north to No-Ammon (Thebes in Egypt) in the south" (Encyclopaedia Judaica II: 676).

ii. The map was also "oriented toward the east, with the Mediterranean Sea at the bottom" (Encyclopaedia Judaica II: 676). This orientation represents "a 90° shift from the placement of maps to which we are accustomed" (Gold 1958:52). The main buildings of the "major cities are pictured as seen from the west and from a considerable height, a technique developed by Hellenistic artists" (Gold 1958:56). From this position, "one sees the outside of the western wall and the inside of the eastern wall of a city, where buildings do not obscure it" (Gold 1958:56).

iii. The scale of the map is "uneven", with "central Judea" at 1:15000 and "Jerusalem" at 1:1613. It should also be pointed out here that the Jerusalem section of the map has much more details than the other areas on the map. For example, the details show the "two colonnaded streets, the Tower of David, many churches, and monasteries, including the church of the Holy Sepulcher" (Encyclopaedia Judaica II: 677). Other details include the "baths" and the "western wall", while the other cities "are fragmentary" (Encyclopaedia Judaica II: 677).

iv. The map has some labels of names of places which seem to follow "the Onomasticon of Eusebius" but also "based on a Roman road map, with the addition of vignettes representing principal cities" (Encyclopaedia Judaica II: 677). These place names on the Mosaic include "contemporary" names and also names from the "Septuagint". Some names on the Mosaic are, however, not recorded anywhere else. "The names of important sites are also written with red cubes, e.g., Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Mamre, the place of Jesus' baptism" (Gold 1958:55).

v. There are some "natural features" on the map including "ships in the Dead Sea, animals in the deserts, and ferries across the Jordan" (Encyclopaedia Judaica II: 677).

vi. That the different locations on the map are represented in different colours also shows the intended differentiation of them in terms of value and significance.

From the Madaba Mosaic, Egeria's narrative map and other Jewish spatial representations,[56] it can be observed that conceptions of space and the surrounding world in antiquity were largely captured in narratives and not in abstracted diagrams of space. Places were represented, not necessarily with some 'objectivity', but according to their significance in terms of traditions of identity and theology. In order to grasp how space is represented in the New Testament narratives in general and in the Fourth Gospel in particular, it is important to take seriously the conception of space prevalent in the Greco-Roman world of antiquity.

4.2. Theoretical Frameworks Useful in Reading Narrative Space

It is now attested that space as a category of analysis of reality has generally been marginalised until very recently. Hence, only recently have spatial language and ideas been investigated as to their implication for the construction of the reality of humankind. The 'spatial turn', as it has been dubbed, has been attributed to a number of factors,[57] some related, and others developing independently (Bergmann 2007:353).

It is the contention of this present work that just as the spatial sensitivity become manifest in times of spatial dislocation, it is also true of recent surge of interest and concern for space as a means of understanding and articulating reality. As Brueggemann has put it, "our scholarly reading is never as mere scholars, but always as children of the disruption" and "recurring dislocation" (1997: xiv). In another place Brueggemann says "*displaced*

[56] Such have been seen in Jubilees 8-9 (Alexander 1999), in Qumran literature (1QM), in Luke-Acts (Bechard 2000), in Pseudo-Clementine (*Rec.* 1:27-71), and in the Diamerismos of Hippolytus (Scott 2002) (see Dozeman 2007:92 for further discussion).

57 These factors cannot be discussed here due to space. In addition, work has already been done in this area which does not warrant repetition here.

people needed a *place* from which to validate a theologically informed, peculiar sense of identity and practice of life. The traditioning process that produced Torah thus strikes me as a remarkable match for displacement, so that we may understand "the Torah of Moses" as a *script for displaced community*" (2003:22 *italics original*). There are a number of important reasons for this loss. First, the general situation is that while first century Palestine was largely an agrarian society, the land was under pressure to sustain the Jewish populations because of exploitation deriving from taxation, the Temple system and natural catastrophes. "The displacement of Jewish population from the coastal plain and Transjordan under Pompey would have converted large numbers of Jewish cultivators into landless labourers" with the situation being compounded by Herod's confiscation his opponents' property (Applebaum 1977:367). The language of the Gospels (e.g., Matt. 21:30-40) reveals the growth of tenancy which suddenly increased even after Herod was no longer there. An increase in the loss of land to mostly non-Jewish landlords and to Jewish aristocracy who continue "to hold large estates" created a tense sense of dislocation (Applebaum 1977:367). The burden of the triple taxation[58] affecting the Jewish people does not help this situation (Rausch 2003:57). In this situation, the majority of people, most of whom lived on the land, felt displaced, out of place and dislocated, physically, socially, spiritually and economically especially since culturally the land was regarded as the unalienable gift of Yahweh to each family through Yahweh's covenant with Israel.

Second, the Jerusalem Temple[59] played a central role in the identity contestation of the Jewish people and their well-being (Levine1998:33). Their long history and their symbolic universe influenced by their understanding of "covenantal nomism" were basic to their existence (Horton 2005:130, 151-160; Baltzer 1971). By doing what is right

[58] Or "double" taxation according to Herzog (2000:122) who tries to separate the taxation to Herod as the same that was passed on to the Romans. This argument however does not take seriously the fact that the payment demanded by Rome was less than the amount collected from the peasants since Herod had to keep part of it for his own projects. See Houtart (1976:15ff) for a detailed discussion of the various taxes employed.

[59] Here Jerusalem is deliberately put to signify its central role even when the Temple was no more. Chana Safrai (1996:220) and D. Schwartz (1996:114-127) discuss the different ways in which the Temple and the city of Jerusalem functioned. See also Draper (1997:264) who discusses Paul's concern for Jerusalem and the Temple.

through the Temple system, the Jews would enjoy the covenant blessings of staying on land the land and the land would be productive. To do the opposite would invite rejection by God leading to the barrenness of the people and the land and finally, being exiled from the land as the ultimate curse. The Temple was the central place of this land. Their relationship with God at the Temple determined the fertility of the land and the wellbeing of their families. To use Smith's language, this is a cosmic arrangement in which "the meaning of life is rooted in an encompassing cosmic order in which man, society and the gods all participate" (Smith 1978:132; see also Klawans 2007). In this understanding, there are five interrelated rules that govern the ecosystem of this cosmology:

i. There is a cosmic order "that permeates every level of reality;
ii. This cosmic order is the divine society of the gods;
iii. The structure and dynamics of this society can be discerned in the movements and patterned juxtapositions of the heavenly bodies;
iv. Human society should be a microcosm of the divine society;
v. The chief responsibility of priests and kings is to attune human order to the divine order" (Smith 1978:132-133).

Since the Temple is the microcosm of the heavenly arrangement, the faithful ministry of the priests there should guarantee productivity and fertility of the land. The Temple is the 'sacred space' and forms the central orientation from which all other spaces are conceived.[60] While regular Temple festivals are celebrated to commemorate important highlights in the formation of Israel as a nation (see Millar 1993:346-347), the entire period of the Roman occupation of Palestine saw sporadic demonstrations and riots due to the Roman governors' insensitivity to the sacrality of the Temple. Most Jews in the first century CE identify themselves with the Temple even though it had become a source of economic exploitation now controlled by the "elite owners of the land" who put everyone's meagre economies under pressure (Ling 2006:83). In 70 CE, after a period of violence, first from within the Jewish people—especially against the elite, then against

[60] Even the sects that have separated themselves from the Temple system because of its corruption (e.g., Qumran community) do hope for a purer sacred space.

the Romans, the Temple is destroyed and all its services suddenly brought to a halt. For the elite, the economic and social loss is unimaginable. For every Jewish person whose cosmology has the Temple as their centre, the disorientation is huge. For the vast numbers of people who were expelled from Palestine into Exile, this is a tragedy. Space and place have been lost at a deep level. There was an urgent need for some national or theological resources to be brought into play in this state of affairs for healing. For some, it is the intellectual analysis of the Torah that must now become central (Pharisees). For others, all these structures are only shadows of the real presence which can be experienced through mystical journeys (Jewish mysticism). Still for others, the Exile has always been the journey to restoration (John's community).

The underlying framework of this study is that the feeling of loss of place is usually a result of the 'real' loss of a place of orientation which receives expression in narratives in which spatial idiom is exaggerated:

i. Hostile climatic changes resulting from environmental pollution of land, water and air seems to threaten human survival more than ever before have raised new concerns for spatial idiom today. As such, thinkers find themselves needing to explain this situation in language making sense in their disciplines.
ii. Mobility due to globalisation and displacements due to economic developments have also awakened a sense of space more than ever before.
iii. The political tensions in the Middle East, the possibility of Iran and North Korea possessing nuclear warheads and the catastrophe associated with this in western media has also awakened a sense of spatial loss in many thinkers.
iv. The general feeling of insecurity in the western world due to 'real' and imagined threats of 'terrorism' has awakened a sense of dislocation.
v. The challenges of identity for many diaspora scholars and thinkers (including the present researcher), most of whom live with a strong sense of loss of place having left their home countries voluntarily or otherwise, has also contributed to the recent surge of theorising around space and place.[61]

[61] Said states that "Just as none of us is outside or beyond geography, none of is completely free from the struggle over geography. That struggle is complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and

vi. The emergence of the World Wide Web and its virtual spaces and cyber spaces has left everyone's solid ground shaky.

vii. Above all, the "hunger" for "wholeness" associated with post-modernity or 'hyper-modernity'—is the highest form of dislocation since it emphasises locality but does not reject globality, hence creating a sense of no home, to use Martin Marty (1989:180-181).

In the area of biblical studies, James Flanagan (1987; 1999) has been a leading figure in this regard. His book, *The Constructions of Space 1: Theory, Geography, and Narrative* is a result of the *Constructions of Ancient Space* project, of which Flanagan was one of the founding members (Berquist 2007: ix). The subsequent space research, like the preceding work, did not depart from the human geography foundations. In particular, the contribution of Henry Lefebvre and its application in Edward Soja became easily applicable to biblical studies. The under-girding theories are now explored below.

4.3. The Social Construction of Space: Lefebvre and Soja

4.3.1. Henri Lefebvre

Henry Lefebvre, a French sociologist who belonged to the French Communist Party (although he was later expelled from the organisation), is generally recognised as the leading figure in space as a category of analysis. Lefebvre's thesis was that space is socially produced and not some neutral category 'out there'. Resonances with the sociology of knowledge of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) can be felt in this thought process. In this view, space was seen as a "means of control, and hence of domination, of power "and not some neutral container waiting to be filled, but as dynamic and humanly constructed (Lefebvre 1991:26).

---

cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings (Said from Derek Gregory 2000:302). Such views of space and geography are shaped by Said's own experience of displacement as a Palestinian in the Diaspora. He observes that space and place have been used in categorising the 'other' (e.g., Orientalism and Imperialism) (Gregory 2000: 306-307). Other scholars see locating the 'other' in space as rooted in sense of territoriality (Delaney 2005:14; William Connolly 1996).

In effect, Lefebvre offered a critique of the contemporary 'capitalist' political practices. He saw at the centre of knowledge production a "false consciousness" that concealed the ideological nature of space. His discussion was around the nature of settlement arrangements in urban areas where the poor were settled in bad neighbourhoods (terrain, waste, wind direction, vegetation etc.) while the rich chose good and spacious locations for themselves since they controlled the planning of the cities (1991:38). Lefebvre recognised that cities were arranged according to the social status of the citizens, yet those on the margins had been made to think that it was an 'objective' feat of engineering that laid out the city as it was. By saying that space was a social 'construction', Lefebvre suggested that people's physical location defined who they were and that things were arranged in such a way that this condition could reproduce itself thereby maintaining the *status quo*.[62]

Lefebvre understood space and place in three categories. The first category he called '*espace perçu*' or perceived space by which he meant all the 'real' physical places that people create (1991:45). The second space Lefebvre called '*espace conçu*' or conceived space. By this, he meant the way people communicated or the discourse used to articulate and think about space. This included city plans and drawings used by engineers. This is mental space. This is space as represented in maps used by most scholars for their reconstruction of the ancient world. The third category of space Lefebvre called '*espace veçu*' or lived space (1991:38). This is space, Lefebvre saw as potential space with many utopian possibilities. This was space sometimes transformed by marginalised people as they found their way of negotiating the limitations of the 'capitalist' control of space. One could say this is the space of dreams or visions.

4.3.2. Edward William Soja

Soja developed Lefebvre's thoughts within a post-modern framework. Soja maintained Lefebvre's the three spaces, but called them the *Firstspace* (geophysical realities as perceived), *Secondspace* (mapped realities as represented), and *Thirdspace* (lived

[62] Refer to previous chapter for the definition and discussion of place and space from Lefebvre (1991), Soja (1989), and Neyrey (2002). See also James Flanagan (2002).

realities as practiced). What is vital in reading Soja is his conclusion that these spatial arrangements are inseparably connected (Soja 1996:86). He took Lefebvre's three categories as they were, but placed more emphasis on the third category which he called "Thirdspace". His emphasis on the "*Thirdspace*" is important:

> My objective in *Thirdspace* can be simply stated. It is to encourage you to think differently about the meanings and significance of space and those related concepts that compose and comprise the inherent *spatiality of human life:* place, locations, locality, landscape, environment, home, city, region, territory, and geography. In encouraging you to think differently, I am not suggesting that you discard your old and familiar ways of thinking about space and spatiality, but rather that you question them in new ways that are aimed at opening up the expanding scope and critical sensibility of your already established spatial or geographical imaginations (1996:1).

There are many other scholars within this interdisciplinary field of space and place who have and are still contributing to the thinking about space whose contribution require more treatment than can be afforded in this limited space.[63] As the need arises in the course of the present work, such works will be discussed. For now, the three categorisations of space given by Lefebvre and Soja are discussed methodologically so that such categorisations can be used in the reading space in John.

5. Methodology

Constructing a methodology for modern readers of the Bible to imagine biblical space is a big challenge. This is because the way modern readers conceive of their space and place is usually assumed to be the way biblical peoples conceived of theirs. This present study is not going to claim a complete sea change in Johannine space analysis in the shadow of recent scholarship tendencies towards this direction (e.g. Neyrey 2001). Rather, what this section will seek to achieve is to try and consolidate and develop a comprehensive method for reading space and place in the Fourth Gospel, a narrative in which history and

[63] Among these is Yi-Fu Tuan (1977). In this work, the author concentrates on how people from different cultural backgrounds experience space. His thesis is that the experience of space is not homogenous in all cultures. Doreen Massey (1992:66) has also contributed much to the place and space discourse. She warns that scholars need to be careful at the use of these terms (space and place) and never pretend that their meaning is clear. She is right in thinking that writers generally fail to realise that they have many different interpretations of the same concept. She accepts that Lefebvre realised this, and that he is explicit in his understanding of these problematic terms.

faith story meet. It has already been observed that no "convincing methodology has been worked out for evaluating the geographical references of the Gospels." Although it must be pointed here, that spatiality is seen to be more than mere geography (Freyne 1980:357). Actually, it is such an observation that conceals part of the challenge. The bulk of biblical scholarship has looked at biblical space and place for its mere geographical (historical geography) background to the text (this will be discussed in detail in the next chapter). This is not to suggest that historical investigation is not useful for a clearer understanding of the space and place in the New Testament in general and the Fourth Gospel in particular, but that a historical analysis is only half the task.

The major implication of how biblical interpreters grapple with conceptions of space has to do with how this influences interpretation. How space in the Bible was thought of and represented will affect how we read space from the Bible for what it means. As Wertheim has pointed out; "our ideas about space inevitably shape our conception of" the world around us and how we make meaning of it (1998:140). Therefore, a correct appreciation of biblical space directly aids an accurate understanding of what is going on in the text.

Paul Julian observes that, "[t]he Fourth Gospel is a multi-storey phenomenon calling for a multi-disciplinary methodology" (2000:5). The same observation has been made by John Ashton who notes that, "'the Johannine problem' is not one but many, and when tackling commentators who are sometimes convinced that they have pinned it down without realising that in another of its protean shapes it may have eluded them altogether" (1993:3). With all these intimidating observations, one has to come up with a comprehensive approach that can address the different facets of this Gospel. The issues that will need clarity in reading John are those that relate the concerns alluded to in the Gospel with the setting in the life (Sitz in Leben) of the recipients of the Gospel.[64] A number of such issues, particularly those that are spatial in nature, are now briefly noted.

[64] This understanding of Sitz im Leben traces its roots to the Form Criticism of Hermann Gunkel (see Klatt 1969).

5.1. Geographical Concerns

The apparent interest in providing geographical references for each episode in John's Gospel needs to be accounted for, so too does the identity of characters by reference to where they come from. The reason why Jesus in the Fourth Gospel moves often between Judea and Galilee, yet only once through Samaria, should also be explained. The preference for Cana in Galilee, as opposed to Capernaum, which is prominent in the synoptics and the Fourth Gospel's suggestion of some region being more believing than another, is significant in understanding John.

5.1.1. Allusions To and Contestations Over Sacred Spaces

The references to the Temple and holy places and the fact that most of Jesus' discourses take place there need some explication (5:14-47; 7:14, 28; 8:2, 20; 12:20; 18:20). The discussion should take into consideration the reference to the Samaritan holy place and the discourse on worship appended to it (4:20-24). Is the concern here the Temple(s) or any holy place? Why is the question about the holy places so important for John and his community?

5.1.2. Reference to the Greeks and the Dispersion

The frequent link of the Johannine Jesus with the dispersion and the 'Greeks' (7:35; 12:20) should form an important part of this research. That at the turning point of the narrative in John 12, the Greeks arrive, will require some explanation to illuminate the overall understanding of space in the Fourth Gospel. What is the dispersion and who are the Greeks? Why do they seem so important for John?

5.1.3. The Esoteric Nature of the Group

The recipients of the Gospel of John seem to be of a special kind. The language they use seems mysterious, apocalyptic, inward looking and suspicious of the outsiders. Even though the group uses the Jesus tradition and seems to be faithful to this traditional as much as possible, the urgency with which Jesus speaks, and the exclusivity of the group require some explanation.

5.1.4. Some Important Questions

This above arrangement is going to determine the following chapters of this present study. One will need to develop a way of relating what arises from the text to what is known outside the text but has been alluded to in the text. For example, if John talks of Capernaum, is it the same as the Capernaum of first Century Palestine? Can one identify a pattern showing how all these places are being 'used' in the narrative? Is it enough to conclude that if John talks about Bethsaida in Galilee then one can say he is not aware of Palestinian geography? How does one deal with the places that are accurately located? Is there precedence in the use of spatial categories in telling a narrative? Can such patterns be collated to identify a particular spatial phenomenon? In other words, the aim would be to account for the spatial allusions in the Fourth Gospel and use such an account in interpretation of the gospel.

5.2. Syreeni's Three-Level Analysis

In his reading of the narrative character, Kari Syreeni (1999) has identified the relationship between "author and reader and a mimetic axis between text and reality" outside the text as important elements for one to grasp the meaning of a text (Syreeni 1999:112). This kind of analysis seems relevant in reading 'historical narratives'[65], where meaning is sought from the function of spatial settings and spatial elements in the narrative but which at the same time have life outside the text. For one to understand this relationship between author and reader and the "mimetic axis between text and reality" Syreeni proposes "three levels of analysis" of a text which can be related to three categories of space suggested by Lefebvre and Soja.

This kind of analysis has already been used by other scholars in reading the Gospels in general (Merenlahti 2002:120ff) and the Fourth Gospel in particular (Hakola 2005). Hakola for example has observed that due to the sudden interest and appraisal of the

[65] Historical narratives are distinguished from 'fictional narrative' as being grounded on some reality outside the world of the text and with "explicit or implicit truth claims that make clear the purpose of the work" (Merenlahti and Hakola 1999:36-39).

historical worth of the Fourth Gospel, there has been a hasty and "careless leap from the narrative of the Gospel to the historical reality behind it" resulting in "distorted views of the early rabbinic movement" of the time (Hakola 2005:22). As has been rightly put by Ismo Dunderberg, this "strategy of mirror reading" developed from Martyn's 'two level drama' hypothesis (1968), "has often produced neo-allegorical interpretations of narrative figures in John" (2006:41). This criticism of Martyn's hypothesis is necessary as it seeks to highlight the need to emphasis the mediation between the world outside the text and the world in the text through the ideological and theological interest of the narrative.

5.2.1. First Level of Analysis: Space in the Text World

The first level of analysis, according to Syreeni, looks at the "narrative world" (1999:115). This level of analysis, says West, "emphasises the literary and narrative context of the Bible" (1993:27). This world unfolds before the reader in the process of reading the narrative. In terms of space, this level of analysis is interested in the "manner in which" spaces are "presented" in the narrative (van Aarde 1991:118). Here also is even the interest in the "implicit or explicit emotional value (atmosphere) associated with" space (van Aarde 1991:118). Expressions like, 'darkness', 'inside' 'outside', 'below' 'above' and even the "metaphorical" representations of space (van Aarde 1991:118). As van Aarde, rightly puts it, in the sense of our analysis here, the "concept of spatiality thus comprises more than mere place(s). The manner in which the narrator presents the various spaces in his narrative also contributes to the different meanings and functions that should be attached to these spaces" (van Aarde 1991:118).

The first level of analysis developed for reading space in the Fourth Gospel was the level of looking at spaces and places as they function in the narrative. While spaces and places could be mentioned in a narrative as mere reporting (local setting), any close examination can see that some places are given special description linked to narrative characterisation (focal space) (van Aarde 1991:118). This study however sought to show that the distinction between space as mere local setting or as focal space was difficult to make.

The 'intra' and 'intertextual' relations of the narrative will be investigated in what follows.[66] There are number of texts that would be comparable with the Fourth Gospel's rendering of space whose comparison could illuminate reading space in John. We have seen that the Old Testament would obviously form the first category of such texts. Both the Masoretic and the LXX texts are important in this regard. It is not assumed here that John used either of them, but that he could have drawn from traditions that are illumined by comparing with these two important sources.[67] A comparison between pre-exilic (Tiemeyer (2006:207ff) and post-exilic texts (Tiemeyer 2006:73ff) should also demonstrate different conceptions of space which could be relevant in looking at space in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel.[68] For example, when one reads Old Testament texts emerging from periods of instability, where space is under threat (e.g., exilic prophecies), one finds important insights for reading the Fourth Gospel although these texts are separated by a long period. What relates them are the contexts from which they are emerging. This level of analysis takes seriously the text as we have it but also other related textual traditions. What is important here is not the Palestinian places as seen from antiquity in general, but as they are actualised within the text itself (Green 1995:8).

Hellenistic literature, especially from around first century before and after the beginning of this era, would also be useful in this regard. A critical reading of apocryphal material from both the Old and New Testaments will be useful for a full appreciation of the context and scope of spatial representation in religious texts.

The use of rabbinic texts will also be necessary since they shade light into an important epoch after the destruction of the *Second Temple*. Care will be taken here as this literature

[66] It is accepted here that the final text is the product of editorial processes, possibly with different sources and conflicting theologies, hence multilayered. The fact that the spatial motif remains apparent could however be proof that by the time we have the final text it has emerged as the organising principle of the narrative and must therefore be given prominence in reading the Gospel.

[67] Some scholars suggest that John uses the Old Testament targumically (e.g Draper 1997, Evans and Porter 1987) and not dependent on the Septuagint (Reim 1974) as opposed to those who see John as dependent on the Septuagint (Menken 1996).

[68] On the debate whether there was ever a pre-exilic text, see Winkel (2000:16, n. 27). While the argument against pre-exilic texts could be weakened by the fact that the closure of the Old Testament canon only takes place after Exile, hence putting all the Old Testament content as post exilic, it is still possible to see the pre-exilic tradition that survived the editorial effect was meant to harmonise previous traditions with Exile experience.

is fraught with dating challenges. These and many other challenges make it very difficult to appropriate the changes in conception of space in Jewish thinking from rabbinic literature. Rabbinic literature is varied in its significance since the rabbis produced a number of scriptural reflections (e.g. Mishnah, Talmud, Targum, and Midrash) and several works in different geographical locations in a wide span of time. It may be tempting to look at the rabbinic corpus, as if it was "one seamless whole" due to its similarity of "vocabulary, values, and 'culture'" (Cohen 1987:214). This will be avoided since at close examination the "homogeneity of the rabbinic corpus is offset to some extent by geographical, chronological, and literary diversity" (Cohen 1987:215). This is especially the case with the difference that emerges from the examination of the Babylonian Talmud and Palestinian Talmud where the Babylonian Talmud is, for example, already feeling at home in the Persian Empire (Gafni 1997:13). We will, in this regard note that the *tannaim* (rabbis of the second century CE) who produced the Mishnah and the *tannaitic* works need to be distinguished from the third to fifth century CE *amoraim* who are the producers of the amoraic works and two Talmudim (Cohen 1987:215). Although reference to the 'rabbis' and 'rabbinic' literature will be used, where historical veracity is at stake, we will try to locate each literature within its approximate dating.

Apart from the inter-textual comparisons, the text of John will be read itself at this level of analysis. It will be read synchronically (Schneiders 1991:132). The linguistic features are examined so that they reflect what is meant by the text (1991:138). The main concern here has to do with the 'discourse', 'genre', and 'rhetoric' (Green 1995:8). In this sense, the text functions as a mirror reflecting the reader but also as a glass through which the reader sees (Schneiders 1991:113).

In this analysis, spatial relations are read in the Fourth Gospel as they relate to the spatial structure in the Gospel itself and in relationship and comparison to other related texts such as the synoptic Gospels. The reason is to see if spatial representations in John have precedents elsewhere in the literature of the time, or those which predates it. Is there a detectable convention or conventions of spatial representation operative in John's

presentation of space? That John has used these spatial constructions to respond to his unique context does not make him completely divorced from the wider milieu.

5.2.2. Second Level of Analysis: Space in the Concrete World

The second level of analysis is that of the 'real world' outside the text. Gerald West says that this level of analysis "emphasizes the historical and sociological context of the Bible" so that the "social, political, economic, religious, and cultural dimensions of a text become apparent" (1993:27, 34). He also notes that this level of analysis engages the reader and his or her social location just as in the first level analysis. Most contests for space behind the text are masked in the text and hence must be unearthed (West 1991 (1):55). This is the level of analysis that brings into focus and reconstructs the concrete places and spaces, people, bodies, wells, Diasporas, Judea, Samaria, and Galilee in first century Palestine. As van Aarde puts it, at this level the focus of analysis is the "appurtenances of place" as they can be investigated historically or as their historical existence can illuminate their presence in the narrative (van Aarde 1991:118).

This is what Schneiders refers to as the 'world behind the text' (1991). The common questions here are diachronic with the intention of unearthing the spaces and the places mentioned in the text but which can be found outside the text at the time of its production (1991:132). This comes from the presupposition that characterisation in the biblical narratives emerge from some form of reality "historically mediated" in the text (1991:97). Hence, the "ontic" questions and the "facticity" of spaces and places form the core of this level of analysis (1991:100). Philological, archaeological, and sociological methods aid this analysis. In this sense, the text serves as 'a window' into the "intent of the author, into the history of traditions by which the materials collected by the Evangelist were formed, or into the (possibly) historical events reported by the text" (Green 1995:7).

Concrete spaces and places can be investigated through the critical use of archaeological findings, historical geographies, maps and many other sources that must always be read

with 'suspicion'.[69] All these spaces are read in the context of historical transition, i.e., how they are viewed in different contexts. For example, when we read of fields that "are ripe for harvesting" (John 4:35), productive vineyards (John 15), and all the allusions to productive agriculture. In first century Palestine however, only a few people had access to land in such scales that they could be so productive (Charlesworth 2007:461-468). We can start to make sense of what is going on in the text or the status of the recipients of this text. If there are several allusions to the Temple, which we know was no longer there by 70 CE, we begin to suspect that something is going on in the text. Historical-critical tools are used here to assist in the reconstruction of the socio-political and religious context of space in the Fourth Gospel.

5.2.3. Third Level of Analysis: Space in the Symbolic World

The third level of analysis, Syreeni suggests, is the "symbolic world" of the narrative. This level of analysis takes seriously the role of the reader, not because the reader is uninvolved at the other levels of analysis, but so as to highlight the reader's symbolic, ideological and theological positions and the possibilities of having them transformed through the encounter between spaces from the world outside the text and their representation in the narrative. This mode of reading "emphasizes the thematic and symbolic context of the Bible as a whole" (West 1993:27). West sees the purpose of this level of analysis as 'third spacing' since he sees the whole purpose of reading for different scholars as being to "find in the biblical tradition a situation of struggle which is potentially empowering for the poor and marginalised" (1991:131). This is the space and place of the struggle of the first readers and the struggles of the subsequent generations of readers including biblical scholars. The ideological, symbolical, and theological representations of possible space and place are explored at this level of analysis. Preferential choices and 'ethically responsible' spaces are highlighted here.

At this level of analysis, the reader's 'ideological' preferences are made bare—in as much as self-knowledge is ever more than partial and incomplete—hopefully, as they

[69] Halvor Moxnes (2001:1) has observed that a place is not "something that can be taken for granted, something which has an existence independent of viewers". There is no "unmediated access" to place, but place is approached "through maps, films, photos, books that are produced by someone" (Moxnes 2001:1).

influence the way the reader 'reads' the spaces in history as they are represented in the narrative (Syreeni 1999:115). For example, the mere recognition that there is a spatial structuring motif is a reading interest. It does not come by divine inspiration (or maybe!), but through the reader's construction of reality as dictated by his life experiences. This is what Ashton is understood to mean here when he says that there "is no disinterested reading" in as much there is no "disinterested writing" (1993:3). This is not an 'arbitrary' approach, to borrow Thiselton's terminology, but a critical "pre-understanding" (1980:18-19). The reader brings questions and tentative answers to the reading process, but allows new insights to come out of the reading process because of questions he or she asks, in this case within the spatial framework.

As will be seen in the application of this model of reading space in the Fourth Gospel, these levels of analysis are not steps to be followed one after the other. They are intertwined and comprehensive approaches towards the text. To view space from these three perspectives helps to avoid giving over biblical space to mere history, or mere narrative technique, or then again to mere symbolism. Space is an expression of holistic existence. That is why, as has been shown above, these levels of analysis of the narrative should be done in the light of sociological critique of spatial categories proposed by Lefebvre and Soja as shown in the following table.

Lefebvre	Perceived space	Conceived space	Lived space
Soja	*Firstspace*: Geophysical realities as perceived	*Secondspace*: mapped realities as represented	*Thirdspace*: lived realities as practiced
Syreeni	'real' world	Narrative world	Symbolic and ideological world
Schneiders/ West	The World behind the text:	The World of the text:	World before the text:
Fourth Gospel	'real' places and spaces that can be located historically in John	Places and spaces and their literary function in narrative-world of John	Symbolic and ideological function of places

6. A Model for Reading Space in the Fourth Gospel[70]

In bringing the three views together, the Fourth Gospel is read as a narrative representing some aspects of 'real' space and place.[71] Once in the narrative, the historical and social spaces take on new meaning. Their presentation on the narrative 'translates' them. The analysis of the ideologies and theologies used to bring these new spaces to the acceptance of the recipients is the effort of exegesis here. The narrative world, although presenting the spatial viewpoint of the narrator,[72] cannot fully hide the 'real' world. The narratives can only reveal the ideological contestations of the spaces it represents. In the effort to provide explanation to the reader, the narrator reveals more of the tensions present than concealing them.[73]

Hakola has argued convincingly that the "three-world model" compensates for the weakness of the two-world analysis common in Johannine scholarship (2005:36). The two-world analysis focuses on the "text world and the symbolic world" in which case space will be seen only as a symbolic characteristic of the Gospel (Bultmann and Gräßer). On the other hand, some scholars only focus on the 'real' world and text world

[70] The use of such model locating meaning 'behind the text, in the text, or in front of the text' was originally developed by Abrams (1953). Different scholars have now employed it, although here only Schneiders (1991) has been chosen for her extensive and comprehensive use of the model. This reading has not generally been used the way it is being employed here where the focus is specifically on space in the biblical narrative. For further discussion on the use of these models, see Green (1995).

[71] It is acknowledged in this work that no 'real' places exist but only perceptions of places. What we call 'real' is always a 'representation'. In his contribution to the Historical Jesus study, John Meier begins with a provocative statement that "The historical Jesus is not the real Jesus" (Meier 1991:21). Meier said this to provide a corrective to any scholastic arrogance that hopes to recover the 'real' Judea, Galilee and all the other places and spaces of First century Palestine. With Meier's caution, the investigation into the 'real' world alluded to within the text could be designated the 'concrete' world, although this term will still fall under the same criticism. The representation of this world as 'real' is meant to demonstrate the caution which Meier and other scholars alert us to (see also Scott 2002 especially page 250 footnote 11).

[72] In the case of the New Testament narratives, the mainstream Christian position(s).

[73] The style in John of giving explanatory notes to describe places: "…there is in Jerusalem by the Sheep gate a pool…" (5:2), "…saying to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam" (which means Sent) (9:7), and "…in Bethany beyond the Jordan..." (1:28) function like a "guide book" (Davies 1974:306). Maybe this suggests how the book wants to be read!

(Martyn 1968) and forget that "all historical reality in John is mediated only through the creative imagination of the writer and his community, i.e., through their symbolic universe" (Hakola 2005:36).

6.1. *Application*[74]

As has already been pointed above, the reading of space in the Fourth Gospel is not a neutral process. Just as the narrative spatialities raise 'faith claims' demanded from the first readers, today's reader should come to the text open enough to be challenged and transformed by the 'third spaces' emerging from the text. This is a "call for a critical response" from the reader, immersed in her/his particular contested spatialities (Hakola 2005:37). The two spatialities, from the narrative and from the reader, must be allowed to converse. Such a conversation[75] does not only produce meaning for the reader, but may open new insights for other readers of the Fourth Gospel. Due to the limited scope of this present study, the application of much of the analysis of selected texts will be footnoted where possible, but some will be recommended for separate study.

7. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to analyse the domination of modern maps in constructions of biblical space made by biblical scholarship and how this was ideologically pre-determined. Juxtaposed to this analysis was the analysis of maps from antiquity as an alternative model by which space can be read in ancient texts. Since space in the narratives emerges from 'real' history, there was need to investigate how its mediation in the narrative takes place.

What became apparent in this task has been the fact that the 'real' space and place of history needs independent inquiry if it is going to be useful in conversing with the space

[74] 'Application' is here understood as explained by Richard Palmer (1969:186-191) where it is seen as the "function of interpretation in relating the meaning of the text to the present".

[75] The image of 'conversation' is developed from Hans Gadamer's 'conversation' of language (1961), from Clifford Geertz's (1973) conversation of cultures, and from the historical anthropology of Jean and John Comaroff (1991).

in the narrative, which should also be given its own voice. It is where two spaces meet that the mediation process becomes clear for the analysis of the text. The methodological and theoretical implications of such an analysis will become clearer as we put to test the findings from this brief overview and reflection.

The places and spaces will be investigated as to their socio-political and theological function in history outside the text. On the other hand, space and places in the narrative will be looked at as to their function in the narrative using narrative critical tools. This means taking the spatial narrative structure of events and ideas seriously and locating such spatial structure in the wider narrative traditions. Sociological and theological tools will be used in investigating the symbolic and ideological places in the Fourth Gospel. In this third category, conflicting conceptions of space in the Fourth Gospel will be highlighted. Utopian (*ou Topos*) dreams and other visions or 'third' spaces will also be highlighted. Since these categories are not necessarily independent from each other, the analysis will not necessarily be done in isolation. Such analysis must allow for the development of a compressive methodology of reading space in John. The tool will now be tested by exegesis of relevant texts. First, however, an investigation into how space in the Fourth Gospel has been read in previous scholarship is necessary.

CHAPTER 3

CONCEIVING SPACE AND PLACE: AN ANALYSIS OF JOHANNINE SPACE AND PLACE STUDIES

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, the modern map, in addition to ethnographic representation of Palestine by biblical scholars from the global North was highlighted and critiqued as a particular cultural construct. It was shown that construction of space in antiquity was different from this Western construction as demonstrated by the Madeba and other ancient maps. In this chapter, the focus will be on how space and place have been read in the Fourth Gospel in previous scholarship. Obviously, this will not cover the entire corpus of Johannine scholarship, but an effort will be made to provide an overview of that scholarship whose focus has been spatial elements of the Fourth Gospel. What makes this an achievable task is that not many scholars, as far as this researcher is concerned, have found John's spatial features important since the Fourth Gospel has generally been considered to be 'spiritual', hence, only containing 'universal' (i.e., not located in place) 'timeless' and 'pure' doctrine. Indeed, the influence of conceptions of Christian time beginning at the birth of Christ and ending at his eschatological return as driven by scholars such as Oscar Cullmann's concept of 'salvation History' (1951) pushed space to the periphery of New Testament studies in general in preference to that of time.

2. How Has Biblical Space Been Conceived by Scholars?

It has earlier been pointed out that Newtonian cosmology has by-and-large dominated the conception of space and place in the modern era. Biblical scholars have not been exempt from this anachronism which has not been improved by modern controversies over the land of Palestine.

From the time of the *Aufklärung*, the universe began to be seen from a scientific perspective. The corollary of this was to see the ancient world and different worlds through the same scientific and 'objective' lens. The Bible was exposed to such an "objective" and material examination. The background for this had already been anticipated by thinkers like Copernicus (1473-1543) whose views were then advanced by Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) and also by Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) (Hasel 1978:25). These pioneers had become convinced that science was "no longer informed by Scripture, but Scripture [was] to be interpreted by means of the conclusions from science" (Hasel 1978:25-26). This meant that the world in Bible narratives was to be read through the lens of a scientific cosmology. The birth of the historical-critical method as a scientific tool for reading the Bible, gave biblical scholarship much needed scientific 'respectability' since the tool allowed for the analysing of biblical data with some measure of rationality and scientific empiricism. As a result, through historical criticism, space in the biblical narrative would only be acceptable as making scientific sense if it passed the rigor of scientific empiricism and historical rationality, in other words only its "historicity" could be established within Kantian epistemology.

Such a view of biblical space and place was more pronounced in the reading of space in the Synoptic Gospels in general because they were thought of as reservoirs of historically useful data (McArthur 1970:4). It was only among the more conservative scholars that the Gospel of John could be thought of as useful for historical purposes. Since the dominant interest in New Testament studies was the quest for the historical Jesus, the Fourth Gospel was not seen as a credible source because of its open theological

statements. Even though it signalled some early Jesus tradition, the Gospel of John was considered by many scholars to be too 'spiritual' and 'symbolic' to be of historical value.

The dominant view on the Gospel of John changed for a number of reasons.[76] First, although William Wrede predates redaction criticism proper by about fifty years, he had already anticipated that not only John but also the Synoptic gospels were fraught with theological concerns (Lindars 1972:54; Brown 2002:6). This meant that one could also find history in John, hence the beginning of taking spatial categories in John seriously. Second, a close reading of the Fourth Gospel revealed that there were some old traditions embedded within the narrative. The many place names in the Fourth Gospel could not be accounted for from the Synoptic Gospels. Some archaeological findings raised new historical curiosity for scholars. The discovery of the John Rylands Papyrus 457 (P^{52}), the oldest known New Testament papyrus, pushed the dating of the Fourth Gospel into the frame of 125-150 C.E. or so, as opposed to the later dates previous scholarship had posited. In addition, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls dispelled the current view that the apparent 'dualism' in John was evidence of its later Gnostic provenance (see Charlesworth 1972). Nevertheless, the doubt as to the historical value of the Fourth Gospel has not yet been exorcised from biblical scholars as will be revealed by the emphasis on historical nature of investigation into Johannine space and place. This background informs what kind of spaces and places would be prominent in Johannine studies. The following categorisation may not be very accurate since some issues raised by one scholar could overlap into other categories. The categorisation, however, serves the purposes of this research adequately.

3. Space as Source of History

Though the majority of the scholars in this list emerge from the Great Britain, it was not necessarily in this part of the world that historical quest started but nevertheless flourished there. This Victorian era of New Testament studies was founded by the Cambridge triumvirate of F. J. A. Hort, J. B. Lightfoot, and B. F. Westcott at a time

[76] For example the work of von Wahlde (2006) has revealed this new trend.

when the new Darwin' scientific discoveries were threatening the Christian faith (Baird 2003:54). Unlike their Tübingen counterparts of David Friedrich Strauss and company whom they considered to have abandoned the faith, the Cambrigde school sought to assimilate the historical findings to the Christian faith. For them, "God's truth had been revealed in history—a history that had nothing to fear from rigorous criticism. So for these, biblical spaces and places were the right angle to start.

3.1. Brooke Foss Westcott (1881, Reprinted 1971)

B. F. Westcott (1881) starts by alluding to John's good "local knowledge," demonstrated by speaking about "places with an unaffected precision, as familiar in every case with the scene which he wishes to recall" (1971: xi). John "moves about in a country which he knows" states Westcott (1971: xi). Westcott suggests that places such as "Bethany beyond Jordan" have "already" been "forgotten in the time of Origen" (1971: xi), whereas, place names such as Aenon are "a sure sign of the genuineness of the reference" (1971: xi). For Westcott, it is the direct knowledge of the localities that "can account for the description added in each" of the places mentioned (1971: xi). Concerning Sychar in Samaria, Westcott suggests it to be identified with Shechem, "a city with which no one could have been unacquainted who possessed the knowledge of Palestine which the writer of the Fourth Gospel certainly had" (1971: xi). Westcott goes on to suggest that the "prospect of cornfields (v. 35), and of the heights of Gerizim (v. 20), are details which belong to the knowledge of an eyewitness" (1971: xi).

Westcott's conclusion is worth quoting in its entirety to grasp the heart of his argument:

> The notices of the topography of Jerusalem contained in the Fourth Gospel are still more conclusive as to its authorship than the notices of isolated places in Palestine. The desolation of Jerusalem after its capture was complete…No creative genius can call into being a lost site. And the writer of the Fourth Gospel is evidently at home in the city as it was before its fall (1971: xii).

From this argument, Westcott concludes that the "local knowledge of the author of the Fourth Gospel" shows "beyond all doubt, as it appears, that he was a Palestinian Jew"

(1971:xiii). Westcott's argument is a historical one. In such understanding, place is used to resolve historical questions. Once the scholar is certain of John's knowledge of Palestine as the author's provenance, he or she can then link the Gospel to the historical Jesus; hence conclude that the Gospel is of historical value.

3.2. Chester C. McCown (1914, Reprinted 1932)

In 1914, Chester McCown, was strong in advocating that the "geographical data in the Fourth Gospel" was so peculiar as to be "hardly worthy of consideration" in reconstructing the "geographical data in the Fourth Gospel" (1914:18). He concluded that most of the place names in John were just made up and "purely allegorical in intention" or they "may be pilgrim sites visited by pious Christians and followers of John the Baptist about the beginning of the second century" (1914:18-19).

In 1932, McCown made a major shift by proposing that a proper interpretation of space in the Gospels should include the "use of ancient authors and documents, such as onomastica and itineraries, and of modern topographical; archaeological, and geographical studies" (1932:107). The challenges of such a task, he lamented, was "the unscientific and historic vicious practice of harmonisation" (1932:107). McCown thus recommends that each Gospel be "regarded only as representing a separate tradition of geography and topographical knowledge, or ignorance" (1932:107-8). Nevertheless, McCown never changed his views on the historical value of John. He posited that John should not be considered for serious historical construction, especially John 7:1-12:19. He concludes that the "events and topography of John might belong to entirely unrelated history" and therefore can "make no contribution" to the reconstruction of the itinerary of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem (1932:109).

3.3. Charles Kingsley Barrett (1960)

C.K. Barrett does not think John was "a native of Palestine" (1960:103). The knowledge of "Jewish purifications proves nothing" since a Jew in the diaspora could easily have

had this knowledge (Barrett 1960:103). The "Samaritan schism was well known, and Jews had good reason to be aware of the rival worshippers on Mount Gerizim", although he does not give any evidence that this schism was 'well known'. Thus Barrett concludes that John was likely a Jew but not "a Palestinian Jew" (1960:103). Barrett's position is clear. For him, the Gospel of John is written from outside Palestine possibly by a Diasporic Jew influenced by Hellenistic rather than Jewish ideas. One wonders however why Jews in the diaspora would be interested in the Palestinian spatial details which are so ubiquitous in the Johannine narrative if they are not Palestinian Jews who have left Palestine and are part of a congregation in diaspora constantly having to deal with their being away from the Land?

3.4. Urban C. von Wahlde (2006)[77]

In a recent publication whose focus is to demonstrate the historical veracity of spaces and places in the Gospel of John, archaeology has been extensively used as a method for this undertaking (Charlesworth 2006). On the basis of the various archeological discoveries, in his contribution to this work, von Wahlde (2006:526-527) seeks to show that the spatial arrangement in the Gospel of John is largely historical. So he notes the following arrangement:

1. **Bethany Beyond the Jordan** (1:28; 10:40)
2. **Bethsaida** (1:44)
   Galilee (1:43)
   Nazareth (1:45, 46)
3. **Cana in Galilee** (2:1, 11;4:46-54;21:2)
4. **Capernaum** (2:12; 4:46; 6:17, 24)
   The harbor (6:24-25),
   The synagogue (6:59)
   Jerusalem for Passover (2:13; 5:1; 7:10; 12:12-18)
5. **Area of the Cleansing of the Temple** (2:13-16)
   The Judean Countryside (3:22)

[77] The order followed here seeks to demonstrate how the most current views have not changed very much from the ones in the 19th century scholarship.

6. **Aenon near Salim** (3:23)
7. **Sychar** (4:5)
8. **Jacob's well** (4:4-6)
9. **Mount Gerizim** (4:20)
10. **The Sheep Gate/Pool** (5:2)
11. **The Pool of Bethesda** (5:2)
    Sea of Tiberias (6:1; 21:1)
12. **Tiberias** (6:1, 23; 21:1)
    The Place of the multiplication (6:1-15)
    A Crossing of the Sea of Galilee to Capernaum (see above)
    The Synagogue in Capernaum (see above)
    The Temple in Jerusalem for the Tabernacles (7:14, 28, 37)
    Bethlehem (7:42)
    The treasury in the Temple (8:20)
13. **The Pool of Siloam** (9:1-9)
    Solomon's Portico in the Temple (10:22-39)
14. **Bethany Near Jerusalem** (11:1-17; 12:1-11)
    The House of Lazarus (11:1-17)
    The Tomb of Lazarus (11:38-44)
15. **Ephraim** (11:54)
    Jerusalem (12:12-18)
    The House of the Last Supper (13:1-17:26)
16. **The Winter-Flowing Kidron** (18:1)
    The Mount of Olives (18:1)
    The House of and Courtyard of Annas (18:13)
    The House of Caiaphas (18:24)
17. **The Praetorium** (18:28, 33; 19:9)
18. **The Lithostrotos** (19:13)
19. **Golgotha** (19:17-18, 20, 41)
20. **A Tomb in the Garden** (19:41-42)
    The Room Where the Disciple Were Gathered (20:19-29)

Von Wahlde points out that the reference includes "places Jesus himself visited and also to the various places mentioned in the Gospel in passing" although he chooses to omit places such as Magdala or Arimathea since they are "found in the Synoptics and are too peripheral to be discussed here" (2006:526). What makes these places peripheral for von

Wahlde was the fact that because they were mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels, he concluded them to be historical and hence no further proof was required! In other words, his entire interest was to check the "historical reliability of this topographical information" so as to enhance the "general understanding of the background of the Gospel" and by so doing "draw some general conclusions about the curious interplay of the remarkably historical and the remarkably unhistorical elements of the Gospel" (2006:526). Having used all the resources from literary and archaeological evidence, von Wahlde concludes that the "intrinsic historicity and accuracy of the references should be beyond doubt" (2006:583). Only two of the twenty places ('Bethany beyond the Jordan' and Aenon near Salim) cannot with certainty have their historical location identified, he concludes. He also concludes that the details given of all the sites is accurate, demonstrating the "Evangelist's knowledge" of Palestinian geography. Therefore, wherever the Evangelist seems to be contradicting our knowledge of some places, the Evangelist's information is right and there is something wrong with our knowledge, he says (2006:584). Von Wahlde's conclusion is that the topographical references are "entirely historical" (2006:585).

First, it can be observed that von Wahlde's conception of Johannine spatial arrangement is simply topographical. As will be shown below, this conclusion is unsatisfactory since it does not take seriously other spatial references, for example, that Nathanael was seen "under the fig tree" (John 1:48, 50). If, "under the fig tree" is a peripheral location, according to von Wahlde, at least, "the Dispersion among the Greeks" (John 7:35) is worth identifying, especially since it is unique among the Gospels.

Second, von Wahlde does not "draw some general conclusions about the curious interplay of the remarkably historical and the remarkably unhistorical elements of the Gospel" as he had promised to do (2006:526). In other words, his study demonstrates that the historicity of the places in the Fourth Gospel seems not to help one interpret the Gospel, whereas, as will be argued shortly, the whole spatial arrangement is full of meaning and should be explored as a whole.

Third, von Wahlde's presentation of fictional place[78] (*fiktive Orte*) as "intended to convey symbolism rather than historical collection" makes too clean a separation between 'real' places and their narrative function (2006:524). Maybe what may need to be examined is how places and spaces function in the Johannine narrative. The moment these places and other spatial categories are in the narrative, their historicity should be subordinated to their function in the narrative. Whether or not their function is mimetically drawn from the 'real' places, once in the narrative they function at a level beyond historical reporting.

Von Wahlde's approach is only the continuation of a long tradition which has dominated the way space and place is read in the biblical narrative. Either the place names in the Gospel of John are used to 'prove' that John is not historically accurate, and therefore cannot be relied on in constructing Jesus of history, or, they are used to 'prove' the historical worth of the Fourth Gospel, thus its usefulness in constructing the historical Jesus. This broader pattern is observed in its various shades in wider Johannine scholars' approach to space in John. By going back in time, one can observe how this pattern has developed.

4. Johannine Space in the History of Religions Tradition

The "history of religions" school (*religionsgeschichtliche Schule*), though its membership is disputed was a New Testament approach largely driven by scholars from Göttingen in the 1880s and 1890s (Baird 2003:222). The main thrust of this school was to "view the history of Christianity within the course of the larger history of religion, an emphasis on the history of tradition rather than literary criticism, and a conviction that Christianity was decisively shaped by the impact of foreing religion" but was ultimately the climax of all religious experience (Baird 2003:222). As such space was seen as useful as far as it revealed subsequent traditions of Christian groups.

4.1. Karl Kundsin (1925)

[78] Von Wahlde's use of 'fiction' is taken from N. Krieger (1954:121-123).

Karl Kundsin is one of the few early Johannine scholars to see the spatiality of the Fourth Gospel beyond mere historical geography. He observed the trend also in Mark[79] in which spatial location was evidenced by the frequent use of ἐκεῖ and ἐκεῖθεν. Kundsin also observed that unlike Mark and John, Luke was rarely interested in place (Kundsin 1925:9). Instead, Luke was interested in the temporal sequence of events in relation to the 'profane world events' (1925:9). Matthew did not fit very neatly into this temporal-spatial dichotomy. Paul was not interested with spatial categories, asserts Kundsin. For example, Paul never talks about Golgotha, Jerusalem, and Nazareth. In terms of his conversion testimony, his highlight is time, for example, "two years" (Acts 19:10) or "then after three years" (Gal. 1:18). For Kundsin therefore Paul is interested in the chronological orientation of salvation history e.g., "on the night when he was betrayed…" (1 Cor. 11:23) (1925:8).

For Kundsin, the above observation is a demonstration that the authorial voice of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with Palestine and uses this knowledge to arrange the Gospel. The whole arrangement of having episodes with corresponding localisation is not accidental but an essential feature (*Wesensmerkmal*) of the Gospel (1925:12). He follows Herman Gunkel in speculating that these places in John have to be read etiologically since they are likely to be based on local legends which are not necessarily linked to historical reality. Hence, the repetition of many sayings pointing to Cana as the place of the wine miracle, Bethsaida as the city of Philip, Bethany 'beyond the Jordan' as the place of John's ministry, Bethany in Jerusalem as the home of Lazarus, Martha and Mary fall within this etiological convention (1925:12). The details of each of these geographical places are intimately woven into the narrative while the name of each locality leans to the etymology of the place (1925:13).

Kundsin sees this tradition in Genesis, in Greek topological legends of the local deities and also in Christian legends of saints in the middle ages. For him, such legends sought to

[79] Mark 1:38; 2:6; 3:1; 5:11; 6:5, 10, 33; 11:5; 13:21; 14:15; 16:7 and Mark 6:1, 10f; 7:24; 10:1. It is surprising though that it has taken almost sixty years for a New Testament scholar (Malbon 1985, 1991) to produce some work to address the glaring spatial structure in Mark.

glorify places where communities carrying particular Christian traditions lived. In other words, according to Kundsin, the places came first (being occupied by a Christian group) and then the legends would be assigned to them to give them legitimacy since the narrative would link them to the historical Jesus. He concludes this argument by pointing out that even though the place names point to 'real' places, the case is different for the narratives (1925:14). Kundsin's argument, like many arguments of his time, is interested in history. In Kundsin we begin to see two historical concerns coming together, the quest for the historical Jesus and the history of ideas. The first is explained by *form history* while the other is explained phenomenologically.

4.2. Edwyn Clement Hoskyns (1947)

Edwyn Hoskyns (1947) saw the function of space and place as an indication of the difference of focus of narrative as compared to that of the Synoptic Gospels. "The topography of the Fourth Gospel", Hoskyns writes, has to do with Jesus' relationship to them more than the locale itself (Hoskyns 1947:63). In the Jerusalem Temple and during important "Jewish Feasts", Jesus "speaks and acts" (1947:63). Not that places such as Galilee did not exist, but that the "energy of the narrative is not directed towards" them (1947:64). Each place has its value depending on how it responds to Jesus so that place of Jesus' origin and the origin of his disciples form "a major theme of the Fourth Gospel" (1947:64).

The spatial narratives in John are "bracketed by references to Jerusalem", asserts Hoskyns (1947:65). In other words, it is Jerusalem which is the centrifugal centre attracting other places to itself in John's Gospel. The itinerary of the Johannine Jesus, according to Hoskyns, reveals weaknesses in the Synoptic narratives. He argues that the one time journey to Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels is "the result of editorial manipulation" since there should have been many "journeys to Jerusalem which, for some reason or other, found no place in the earlier Gospel (1947:65). One notes here that Hoskyns is interested also with the historical reconstruction of the historical Jesus and finds places and space in John amenable to his quest. According to Hoskyns, John is

influenced by the Old Testament, and thus the Gospel narrative shows how the ideas and theologies associated with particular places have developed in time. In a way this agrees with Kundsin's analysis of the development of ideas from the Old to the New Testament.

4.3. R. H. Lightfoot (1956)

R. H. Lightfoot observes that some scholars say "whereas in the other Gospels the Lord's '*Heimat*', to use a German equivalent, is Galilee (*cf.* Luke 4:16-30), in John it is located in Judea, and in particular at Jerusalem" (Lightfoot 1956:35). However, he thinks John 4:43-45 should not be taken in isolation. He sees that the people in Galilee would not be commended as having Johannine faith since their "belief" is "based on the sight of signs and wonders" (1956:35). Lightfoot concludes by observing that the Lord's *patris* is not to be "sought anywhere on earth" since he is "not of this world" (1956:35). Since on earth the Johannine Jesus spends the larger part of his ministry in the as opposed to Galilee in Mark, for Lightfoot this shows that Judea is to be preferred as the place of the Johannine Jesus. He also believes that the itinerary of the Fourth Gospel provides us with "better historical guidance than that provided by St. Mark" (1956:36). As a result, Mark is seen as "influenced" by something "other than purely historical considerations" (1956:36).

In Mark, Galilee is "Galilee of the nations" while Jerusalem is "mentioned in connection with hostility (Mark 3:22, 7:1); and the Lord's only journey to the south is a *via dolorosa* (Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:33); and there in Jerusalem, as the result of a disciple's treachery, the Jewish authorities' relentless opposition, and a Roman procurator's weakness, he dies" (1956:36-37). Lightfoot concludes that since Samaria is not mentioned in Mark, the contrast between Galilee and Jerusalem is emphasised, and John corrects this by providing a more "historical" account (1956:37). For doctrinal reasons, argues Lightfoot, John intends to show that "light and darkness are to be found in both" Judea and Galilee (1956:38). He concludes with the manifestation account in John 21 in Galilee which is meant to balance with the manifestation account in Jerusalem in John 20.

4.4. Rudolf Bultmann (1971)

For Rudolf Bultmann, the places in John are "not of importance for exegesis" (1971:115). Therefore, whether Nathaniel despises the fact that Jesus is from Nazareth or not, "makes no difference whether one takes the sentence as a question or an ironic statement… it is enough that it was an insignificant village" (Bultmann 1971:104 n. 7). That the mother of Jesus is "thought of as being temporarily or permanently resident in Cana" does not help in understanding John according to Bultmann (1971:115). The location of Cana for Bultmann is "not of importance for the exegesis" of John (1971:115). After Kundsin, Bultmann suggests that the "origins" of most stories in John "must be sought in the local tradition of the Christian communities" and should not be linked to any historical reality (1971:177).

Bultmann's reading of John reduces it to nothing other than a product of a faith community with no link to history. This in itself is not a problem. What is a problem is to think that the spatial arrangements in John would not aid in understanding the Gospel when all events in John have a locality assigned to them. It would be important to realise that Bultmann's position is one which puts no trust in historical reconstruction. Instead, it seeks to identify and abstract theological trajectories from the Gospel narratives in connection with the timeless and universal existentialist philosophy as "explication of believing self-understanding" of the modern person for which Bultmann argues (Bultmann 1955:251; see also 1984:5). This is a historical quest turned upon its head. It is still a historical quest, but not the historical Jesus quest but the quest of religious ideas.

4.5. W. D. Davies (1974)

W. D. Davies comes from the argument against those who see the Fourth Gospel as a "spiritual" and as "an essentially Hellenistic document" (Davies 1974:288). Instead, for Davies, the theological use of locale in the Gospel of John is based on his presupposition that the "Fourth Gospel reveals a well-marked practice of ascribing two meanings or even more to certain phenomena" (1974:289). Thus, it is "not unnatural to ask whether spatial

or geographical terms, like others, might have a double significance" (1974:289). "There is evidence that the Fourth Gospel was concerned with the question of "holy space," or, at least, with tradition that was so concerned and did impose a double-connotation on certain spatial realities" (1974:289). With this in mind, Davies concludes that, "it might be expected that precisely in such a spiritual Gospel would a theological significance be given to geographical realities" (1974:288).

For Davies therefore, the Gospel of John has a tendency to "personalise or Christify" spaces (1974:290) and to have other places "replaced, or rather transcended" (1974:296). Most of these places, Davies asserts, are considered holy because of their connection with some isolated Old Testament traditions. Since some of the places cannot be identified, Davies concludes that this erodes any "confidence both in John's geographical knowledge and in the significance he ascribes to geography" (1974:308). Davies also sees polarity between the Johannine Judea and Galilee. Nevertheless, for him, the significance of both Judea and Galilee is that Jesus does not have them as his home since in John he "is actually from heaven" (1974:330). Davies concludes that the "fundamental spatial symbolism of the Fourth Gospel was not horizontal but vertical. It does not lend itself easily to geographical concern so much as to the personal confrontation with the One from above, whose Spirit bloweth where it listeth and is not subject to geographical dimensions that had been dear to Judaism" (1974:335). Underlying this interpretation is the "displacement motif" which sees Jesus as the "new localisation of God's presence on earth" (1974:335). According to Davies, in John "Topography subserves theology" (1974:319).

Davies' interpretation is greatly influenced by over theologising space and place. It is not very different from that of Kundsin. It is not interested in the 'real' historical places alluded to in John since their presentation is not very 'accurate'. Instead, it spiritualises all spaces. It does not account for the use of various spatial motifs that connect the entire Johannine narrative, but instead tries to see the spiritual meaning of each place mentioned in the narrative. While his argument remains a good basis for fruitful reflection on space

and place in John, it does not take seriously the use of geographical terms beyond their etymological and spiritualising functions.

4.6. Sean Freyne (2002)

Biblical scholars have largely focused on geographical space from which theological conclusions have sometimes been drawn. From this position, the geographical differences between Galilee and Judea also contributed to the differences of theologies of these two regions. Scholars such as Sean Freyne (2002) and Richard A. Horsley (1995) conclude that "historical factors played much greater role in bringing about regional variations" (Freyne 2002:124). Others believe that the topography of Galilee makes its theology different from that of Judea (Koester 1995). Scholars who use history to construct the Galilean-Judean dichotomy do not always have convergent views since their constructions have a bearing on their respective interpretation of the historical Jesus. As Freyne has bluntly said it, "in this field there is not neutral ground" (2002:128). Hence, it has "become evident that the quest for the historical Jesus and the Quest for the historical Galilee are often just two sides of the same issue" (Freyne 2002:128).

On one side, there are scholars who believe that Galileans are the "descendants of the Israelite population, who remained undisturbed" by Assyrian and later the Babylonian invasions (2002:129). This position claims that this population willingly "joined" the "Jewish nation" during the "Hasmonean expansion to the north" (Freyne 2002:129).[80] Richard Horsley, who takes to this view, suggests that over time the Galileans developed their own "separate customs and practices that made them quite different from the Judeans" even though they both shared in the "Yahwistic beliefs based on the Pentateuch" (2002:129). Yet, most of the interpretations of the Pentateuch from Judea were designed to "serve the material needs of the aristocracy of the Judean Temple state" this position goes (Freyne 2002:129).

[80] This played a large role in the German theology of the Nazi era which rejected Jesus' Jewish heritage (Heim 2006:274-275).

On the other side of this debate is an argument based on Isa. 8:23 and *1 Macc*. 5:15 which sees Galilee as "Galilee of the nations". This even suggests that from the Hellenistic period the population mix in the north was such that these areas were pagan, suggesting that even Jesus was not a Jew (2002:129). Others in this debate would suggest the Greco-Roman influences in Galilee produced counter-cultural movements like the Cynics and groups like the Jesus movement (Freyne 2002:129). Since these counter-cultural groups in the neighbouring cities of Galilee were an urban phenomenon, proponents of this view would suggest that Galilee was also influenced by its urban centres.

Yet another position sees Galilee to be Jewish as a result of " Judaisation" of the area as a result of the Hasmonean movement in the "north and east" (Freyne 2002:130). Schürer suggests that those who originally inhabited this area were Arabs, (e.g., 1973:561-573). This position says that the expansion of the South by those from Judea after its vacation as a result of the Assyrians conquest. This position concludes that as a result Galileans were Jews but were more rural and had an agriculturally based economy as opposed to the Judeans who were more cosmopolitan.

Freyne suggests that the geographical places in John should be looked at in the "context of the 'geography of restoration' as this is represented in various Jewish writings of the *Second Temple* period" (Freyne 2001:289). Freyne observes that in Jerusalem-Galilee relations there always lingered the "greater Israel" hope or "Jewish restoration hopes" (2001:292). Even though geographically these were separated people, they had been one people in the past and their internal divisions were concretised by external forces. Among many of them was a "deep-seated concern for Jerusalem and its Temple combined with territorial claims based on the tribal confederation of Israel" (2001:292). The vision did not only include Galilee and Judea, but also Samaria and many other places that were inhabited by all ancient Israelite tribes including the "Jewish people who had been scattered through the whole world" (2001:294; 301).

It is surprising that in presenting New Testament evidence that backs his argument, Freyne largely refers to Mark and Q as his readily available sources, hence legitimating

these as more historical than John. The only one time he refers to John is when he makes a generalising comment of the "patronising attitude toward Galilee and Galileans by Jerusalem elites" (Freyne 2001:304). As such, Freyne and other scholars who share his position are concerned with reconstructing the historical Jesus and not reading Johannine space for what it is.

4.7. Martin Hengel (1989)

For Martin Hengel (1989), the geography of John only helps to prove that the "author, of the Gospel had a Palestinian origin, although the work itself was not written in a Jewish milieu" (Hengel 1989:110). He notes the use of "Jewish-Aramaic" names and also where Greek names are used "respective translations" are given (Hengel 1989:110). Furthermore, the "geographical, historical and religious details" are "astonishingly accurate" (1989:110). The author knows the "deep hatred between Jews and Samaritans as also the village of Sychar as the main place in Samaria, Jacob's well, opposite the holy Mount Gerizim" (1989:111). For Hengel therefore, Johannine geography is proof that the authorial authority behind the Gospel is familiar with Palestine and possibly makes use of his or her knowledge in locating all events. It tells "who wrote John and where was he from" (1989:111). For Hengel, the Fourth Gospel is useful historically as one trajectory of early Christianity that reveals the diversity of the reception of the Jesus tradition (also Käsemann 1968).

5. Space in Johannine Literary Criticisms

The view to the Fourth Gospel as literature is old. In this sense, literature is not understood in the way Culppeper has used in his introduction to the Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel in which he criticises redaction, historical and source criticism. Literary is here used to refer to the different literary approaches that see space as a literary feature useful in the reading of John.

5.1. Robert T. Fortna (1988)

Robert Fortna (1988) has built on the earlier work of Lightfoot and Davies (Fortna 1988:294). Fortna seeks to identify the "locale of those who see signs and believe" and whose faith is considered to be valid (1988:295). For him, the source used by John assumes the readers know that all the places in John are arranged according to the two opposing regions, Judea and Galilee. Thus, the "reader is expected to know the part of Palestine in which Cana, Capernaum, and the Sea of Tiberius are to be found, and that Jerusalem (with its environs) is in Judea, or more likely is not expected to be concerned with the matter of region at all" (1988:296). According to Fortna, the details of all these localities are a result of the final redaction of the Fourth Gospel, since in the first stages of the Gospel there were no detailed locations of the signs.

5.2. J. Louis Martyn (1968)

Fortna's work is deeply rooted in J. Louis Martyn's (1968) seminal work. Martyn reconstructs the Fourth Gospel as portraying multiple layers of milieus. At the first layer is the experience of Jesus and his disciples and at the second is the Johannine Christian community, whose interaction with the Judean authorities is reflected in the final redaction of the Gospel.

One great weakness with the 'Signs Source' hypothesis is that it cannot be located in a particular *Sitz im Leben*. Furthermore, it is not easy to see if the Judea-Galilee 'conflict'

can be located in the first or second layer of J. L. Martyn's reconstruction of the Johannine narrative. Though the first century Galileans such as those from Cana and Capernaum would have known of their marginalisation by the Judeans, one cannot ascertain to what extent they were aware of this. Moreover, one should account for the place of Samaria in this binary opposition between Galilee and Judea.[81]

5.3. Thomas Brodie (1993)

The work of Thomas Brodie (1993) seems to be groundbreaking in recognising not only the significance of space in the construction of narrative, but also its relationship to time and the relevance of such to the study of the Fourth Gospel. Even though Brodie thinks that space plays a "complimentary role" to time, he corrects himself later by observing that "time and space are interwoven" hence mutually complimentary (Brodie 1993:27). Brodie observes that space plays an important role in the composition of "religious narratives" (1993:27). He gives a number of examples from the Old Testament using the categories of "sacralising of space" from the work of Mircea Eliade noting though that the "place of geography in John is not immediately obvious" (1993:27). This geography, according to Brodie is both "highly schematic and quite symbolic", not implying that it is "unhistorical" (1993:27). He points out that the symbolic function of geography in John has been noted before (e.g., by Meeks 1966), where Jerusalem and Galilee are symbols of "rejection and acceptance" respectively (Brodie 1993:27). He recognises similar "schematic and symbolic" dimensions of Galilee in Mark in the work of Senior (1984) and that of Kelber (1974) and a similar function of Jerusalem in Luke-Acts in the analysis of Fitzmeyer (1981).

Brodie's contribution is that he tries to see the significance of space and place as narrative structure in Fourth Gospel. His desire to locate spatiality as inextricably connected to time is both novel and commendable. However, because for Brodie space is an afterthought, actually in the appendix, it is not given the useful position in his argument which would help open up the Fourth Gospel for new insights. As with his

[81] This binary view of Galilee and Judea will be discussed in detail in subsequent chapters of this study.

predecessors, his argument of a Galilee-Jerusalem dichotomy does not take seriously the evidence from the Gospel itself. He thus finds himself in the same trap of limiting spatiality to physical geography only.

6. Space as an Indicator of Johannine Regional Theologies

The idea of a regional approach to different areas of first century Palestine rather than the generalising trend should partly be given to Eric M. Meyers' studies on Galilean Reginalism (1976). In this work Meyers reveals that even though Palestine, and indeed the areas like Galilee can be seen as a homogenous entity, in actual fact there were internal differences within the various regions which must be taken seriously if the true identity of these places and the people can be understood. Many scholars though have not gone beyond Galilean-Judean dichotomy as will be shown below. This is below Meyers' expectation.

6.1. Wayne A. Meeks (1966)

For Wayne Meeks, the Galilee-Judea dichotomy lies "within the literary structure of John" itself where the emphasis is "the conflict between Jesus' Galilean origin and eschatological traditions connected with Judea" (Meeks 1966:159). Meeks sees the Judean traditions based on the "Davidic royal Messiah" while the northern traditions are based on Deuteronomic promise of the Prophet like Moses model (1966:159). In the Gospel of John, the two traditions are present and sometimes in conflict.

Meeks' position develops the line followed by Kundsin. The important development by Meeks is the recognition of the literary structure which uses these regions. Instead of seeing Judea as opposed to Galilee, Meeks put Galilee together with Samaria to form the northern Palestine and then leaves Judea as forming one pole with a different understanding of the Messiah. This is also important as it takes the historical axis of north and south seriously. As will be seen below, the separation of the North from the South arrangement, which goes back to days of the monarchy, is informative of how the Fourth

Gospel utilises the ancient traditions to seek a possibility of the restoration of the tribes of Israel in the eschatological age.

6.2. Edwin D. Freed (1968)

Some scholars have seen wider concern for the restoration of Israel in the spatial arrangement in John. Meeks' thesis is advanced by Edwin Freed's regional arrangement of John's Gospel (1968). Freed views geographical space in John as an attempt by the author to "make a bridge between Samaritans and Jews in Christ" (Freed 1968:580). He sees in the story of the "good shepherd" in John 10 the underlying influence of Ezekiel. The Ezekiel tradition is "interested in reuniting Israel and Judah" and it is for the same purpose the tradition is inherited by John (Freed 1968:580). For Freed, the "other sheep not of your fold" are the Samaritans. For Freed, the mention of Aenon, Salim, Sychar, and Ephraim, all of which are in Samaria provides good evidence to support this argument. Freed is one of the scholars who posits a Samaritan influence on the writing of the Fourth Gospel. He suggests that some terms in John's Gospel carry a standard "Samaritan usage" (1968:582). Additionally, the use and "emphasis on priest and priesthood" was prevalently a Samaritan usage as is the reference to the figure of Moses (1968:582).

Freed's contribution is important in locating the Johannine tradition in the ongoing debates on Jewish identity in first century Palestine. It is further important in taking the Samaritan presence in the Gospel seriously.

6.3. J. M. Bassler (1981)

While these different constructions have manifested themselves in looking at space in the Gospels, their limitation has been evident, for example, in trying to reconstruct the Ἰουδαῖοι of John. Since J. L. Martyn's seminal work, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (1968), it has become customary for Johannine scholars to decide whether to read Ἰουδαῖοι in John as a figure derived "from the life and history of the Johannine

community" or a classification from the Jesus tradition (Bassler 1981:243). Those who construct Galilee and Judea in following the interpretation of Martyn do not wish to "rely on the argument of historicity" which points to the "actual Galilean origins of Jesus as the sole referent" of understanding Jews and Galileans in John (1981:245). What seems important for those following this interpretation is to see both Judea and Galilee as symbols. It is therefore common to find in John a paradigm "of Galilean faith" which is different from the negative Judean response to Jesus (1981:246). Because Galilee and Judea are looked at as binary opposites, Samaria becomes only an "interlude" between these two poles of faith (1981:247). In this view, the dichotomy that Galilean—faith and Judea—rejection seems logical (1981:248).

J. M. Bassler realises that the "geographical symbolism of the Synoptics" has influenced the way these places are looked at in John (1981:252). He thinks that the fourth "evangelist is nevertheless not primarily interested in regions, the place of acceptance and the place of rejection, but in people, those who reject or accept the word" "apart from the geographical location or identity of the person" (1981:242-253). In this sense, the "Galileans symbolise those who receive the word, Judeans symbolise those who reject it" (1981:253). In this interpretation, the "Ἰουδαῖοι are no longer identified strictly by geographical location of Judea but by their response to Jesus" (1981:254).

The strength of Bassler's rejection of exaggerated binary dichotomy between Judea and Galilee is in the inclusion of Samaria. In the Gospel of John, Samaria and Samaritans seem to be playing whatever role the other regions are playing and hence to exclude them is to miss what John is doing. Bassler's argument goes to the other extreme of ignoring the identity of characters in the Gospel of John according to their regional locations. While regional identity is subverted, it is nevertheless initially highlighted. As a result, all the disciples are conscious of where they come from and can even despise one another depending on where they come from. In the Gospel of John people are placed as much as places are peopled. There is no Galilee without Galileans in as much as there is no Jerusalem without the Jerusalemites.

6.4. Peter Richardson (2002)

For other scholars, the focus on Galilee and Judea misses the point in that it does not take the foremost place, Cana into account. Peter Richardson (2002) narrows the argument of places in the Gospel of John to Cana as the counterpart of the Capernaum of Mark. He argues that place is important in the reconstruction of the historical Jesus and then raises the need to draw "Cana as a real 'place'" into the mainstream "discussions of historical Jesus traditions" (Richardson 2002:315). Richardson "argues that places in the narrative are important since the "geographical marker" serves the "author's theological purposes and constructions of reality" (Richardson 2002:316). Drawing on the works of Josephus, he points the significance of Cana as the "centre for part of the time" Josephus was in "Galilee while preparing for the expected Roman counter-attack" (2002:315). He notes from this that Josephus uses "Cana for administration purposes and Capernaum for an emergency" (2002:376).

In Richardson's reading, Cana and Capernaum are to be set "alongside each other as literary rivals for Jesus' home base" even though whether Cana is actually a centre of Jesus' activity is a separate but related question (2002:316). He suggests that there could have been "small Johannine communities in Judea, Galilee, Samaria and Peraea in the early period, rivalling for example, Petrine communities, especially in Capernaum" (2002:324). He shows from pilgrim literature that "Khirbet Qana is the site of the Cana of Josephus" and also maybe that of the origin of the Gospel of John, a position he supports from archaeological findings (2002:327, 330). The economy of Cana being "agriculturally based" as opposed to that of Capernaum which was "fishing based", the two had developed in similar ways (2002:330). These descriptions, he concludes, give Cana the accurate sense of 'place' for the historical Jesus" (2002:331).

Richardson's introduction of Cana and Capernaum is very significant in this spatial analysis. While Kundsin sees these locations as producing etiological legends to legitimate their centres as places of the historical Jesus' ministry, Richardson sees these places as real contenders in the construction of the historical Jesus geography. This

discussion weakens an overly binary Judea-Galilee focus and broadens the Johannine material that must be taken into account. The weakness of this discussion is that it is not related to the entire Gospel. For example, Richardson does not locate this discussion in the wider diaspora concerns raised in the Gospel.

6.5. Peter-Ben Smit (2007)

Using a literary analysis, Peter-Ben Smit (2007) sees John 1:19-12:50 as a "literary unit" meant to clarify John's concept of appropriate faith and this "kind of faith is exemplified by the royal official at Cana (Jn. 4:43-54)" (Smit 2007:144). For Smit, the Johannine "theological and narrative interests" become clearer "if John 2:1-4:54 is referred to as the Galilee-to-Jerusalem-to-Galilee-cycle or Galilee-to-Galilee-cycle, rather than as Cana-to-Cana-cycle (2007:144). For him, the reason for Cana's significance in John is "its location in Galilee" (2007:144). As Smit notes, in the Gospel of John it is the "symbolic significance of Galilee and Judea" that is key. Smit notices that Galilean places like "Kafernaum" are "introduced favourably" as opposed to the reinforced "negative portrayal of the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (2007:145). There is "authentic 'Galilean' faith" as opposed to "questionable 'Jerusalemite' faith" (2007:145-46). According to Smit, a close reading of John 2:1- 3:23-26 shows Jesus to be moving away from Jerusalem. The "further away Jesus is from Jerusalem, the better is he accepted" (2007:146). There is a "chiastic contrast with the Jerusalemites and Nicodemus" exhibiting wrong faith and Galilee and Samaria demonstrating true and growing faith in Jesus (2007:147).

As has already been suggested above and as will be further argued, a close reading shows that this binary tension between Galilee and Judea, although present, is not the overarching spatial arrangement in the Gospel of John, both literary and theological. It only belongs to a larger spatial structure of the Gospel. Indeed, there is abundant proof to show that there are people who believe in Judea as much as in Galilee and Samaria. There are signs of rejection in Galilee also, especially in John 6.

6.6. Richard Bauckham (2007)

Richard Bauckham (2007) gives a summary of different methodologies used in interpreting space in the Gospel of John. What is significant with his investigation is the realisation that what many "approaches fail to do is to recognise precise topographical references as a characteristic feature of the Gospel in need of a comprehensive explanation" (Bauckham 2007:22). He notes that more than half of John's topographic references are not found in the Synoptic Gospels (2007:22:23). He presents the spatial references in John as von Wahlde does as discussed above:

> Jerusalem;*Bethany beyond Jordan*; Galilee; Bethsaida; *Cana of Galilee*; Capernaum; Temple; Judaea; *Aenon*; *Salim*; Jordan; Samaria; *Sychar*; *Joseph's field*; *Jacob's well*; *Sheep Gate*; *Bethesda (Bethzatha)*; *Sea of Tiberias* (Galilee); *Tiberias*; Capernaum synagogue; *Temple treasury*; *pool of Siloam*; *Solomon's portico*; Bethany (near Jerusalem); *Ephraim*; *wadi Kidron*; *garden*; high priest's house (with courtyard); Praetorium; *Gabbatha, the Stone Pavement*; Golgotha, the Place of the Skull. Other named or specified places, not used to locate an event, are: Nazareth; mountain (Gerizim); Bethlehem; Arimathea.

Von Wahlde points out that these places in italics are unique to John (2007:22). He follows Kundsin in observing that the even though John's events are made longer due to the accompanying discourses, they are few, but all are located in space (2007:23). This characteristic shows John to be more of a "biography" and its "topographical precision is not primarily a matter of symbolism but of realistic historiography" (2007:24).

In other words, Bauckham locates the Fourth Gospel within the "Greco-Roman" conventions of historiography and biography (2007:29). This, he argues is evidenced by John's use of topography, chronology, selectivity, narrative asides (Parentheses), eyewitness testimony, the use of long discourse and dialogue. Bauckham raises the question of space as a literary feature. This is important for this discussion because once the literary function of space is ascertained it can assist in the reading of spaces in the Fourth Gospel. However, to reduce all spaces and places to the level of literary device is to de-historicise space and hence de-concretising it. This raises problems for any potential emancipatory effect of such space and place.

7. Social Scientific Approach to Johannine Space

Sociological and social historical approach to biblical studies is not very old as a discipline but quite old in its implicit use if the early works of Emile Schürer (1885) and Alfred Edersheim (1876) are considered. In a more purposive way, the study of early Christian communities using modern sociological knowledge is a development closely related to historical approach but within the understanding that human life has some similarities even if separated in space and time. Through the use of sociological models, psychologies of dissonance, role analysis, sociology of knowledge, Marxist historical materialism, etc, this approach sought to use modern categories to augment meagre evidence in the study of ancient literature (Domeris 1991). The Gospel of John alienable to this form of reading as there was little evidence outside it to help in its exegesis (Domeris 1991:219).

7.1. Jerome Neyrey (1994, 2002)

Among the Johannine scholars, Neyrey is the one of the few known to me who has addressed the Johannine spatial motif from a sociological perspective. In his reading of John 4, Neyrey observes that readings of the Samaritan woman are always gendered in that male readers see "the sexual and marriage allusions in the story, whereas feminist readers focus on aspects of the story with potential for liberating Christian women" (1994:77). He suggests that a close analysis of the cultural gender arrangements of the time will show that there are many things wrong with the picture. He further suggests that if the author of this gospel is imagining it as 'private' space, then there is nothing wrong with the picture. He goes to show that 'female space' was considered 'private space' in classical Greek world (1994:79). He sees a wrong picture in the time the woman came to the well as normally they came in either the morning or evening (1994:82). He notes specifically the meeting and conversation between male and female strangers as a "cultural taboo" (1994:78, 82). At the end of his analysis, Neyrey sees the agenda of the author being to break ethnic boundaries, disregard of purity laws, inclusion of gentile disciples, and inclusion of women (1994:86-87). In his later work, Neyrey uses the

anthropology of territoriality from Robert Sack in his reading of space in the Fourth Gospel (2002:60). He uses again the categories of 'private' and 'public' spaces as gendered to represent female and male spaces respectively (2002:61). He also uses classifications like the fluidity and fixity of sacred and profane spaces (2002:61-62).

It should be pointed out that Neyrey's contribution to the spatial reading of John is very significant in that he is one of the few scholars who 'see' space. Neyrey can detect that the narrative is spatially arranged and then seek, through the anthropological categories to organise this space. The problem with Neyrey's approach is how he generalises the Greek cultural constructs and imposes them on, for example the Samaritan woman. Is it possible to use ancient Greek conceptions of gender constructions in understanding first century Palestinian gender?

The other weakness of Neyrey's approach is his neglect of historical questions in preference for anthropological models. A very good example is the use of 'private' and 'public' dichotomies of space categories which have been historically challenged (e.g., Sawicki 1997; 2000:79). It is also not clear how 'territoriality' could be useful without taking the historical reality of displacement that results in the diaspora, that Neyrey only alludes to (2002:60) but not address it although the Johannine material seems to suggest its centrality to the mapping out of space in the Fourth Gospel.

8. Space in Johannine postcolonial studies

Postcolonialism constitutes a postmodern discourse too varied to be fully accounted for here. As Benita Parry (2004:3), the concept has come to refer to "historical transition, a cultural location, a discursive stance, an epochal condition distinguished by the entry into metropolitan cultures of other voices, histories and experiences, and an achieved transition". Part or all of these features have become present in various forms of postcolonial approaches to the bible. Readings of the bible from the global South as

suggested by Sugirtharajah and others in *Voices from the Margin* (1991)[82], are given prominence equal to the traditional readings from Europe and North America. Location of readers is emphasised in *Reading from this Place*, edited by Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (1995). So it seems that by default, postcolonial approaches are spatial.

The volume, *John and Postcolonialism: Travel, Space and Power* (Dube and Staley 2002) introduces us to Johannine postcolonial studies with some emphasis on space and place. Underlying the book is the focus on the textuality of postcolonialism, such that the historical integrity of fourth gospel is clear. The materiality of space and place in life of the Johannine community has become so textualised that the original materialist project of postcolonialism has been abandoned in preference for an "essentially textualist account of culture" (Parry 2004:3-4). Such an approach to Johannine space is not going to aid what I am going to be doing in this work. The critical theory that underlies the original postcolonial project will be of great value though.

9. Johannine Space in French Philosophical Interpretation

9.1. Fabien Nobilio (2008)[83]

Although Fabien Nobilio's doctoral thesis, *Le soufflé de l'Esprit dans l'évangile de Jean*, focuses on John, it is difficult to categorise hence I put it in the category of other approaches to space and place in John. Nobilio's thesis is divided into two volumes. The first volume focuses on the concept of Spirit in relationship to space. In this section, the Spirit is seen as providing the map of relationships of people that are separated geographically. According to John, says Nobilio, Galileans are presented as believing while the Samaritans are said to be producing perfect faith. The Romans and the Judeans play the role of allowing the manifestation of the spirit by facilitating the destruction of

[82] Sugirtharajah followed this first volume up after fifteen years to evaluate the first one (see Sugirtharajah 2008).
[83] I am indebted to Jonathan Draper for his English summary he allowed me to use.

the Temple through their actions, Nobilio says. The Judeans are attached to the outward forms of religion and must come to realise Jesus who is the true presence of God.

Nobilio sees the Spirit as playing the role of marginalising all the regional divisions. The purpose of the gospel is therefore to show the spiritual unity of cultural diverse peoples and demonstrate possibilities of cohabitation in a spiritual place and in a material place not as a last resort but as an aspect of the imitation of divinity (Nobilio 2008:67). The Spirit is the theological unity of a culturally diverse people. John seeks to substitute for a multiplicity of geographical spaces, which are symbolic, into a unique symbolic space, that of the truth, so that the believer, whatever his origin is, can be invited to participate. It is a call to universality but with new particularities, that of a new special community! John transcends a territorial space already symbolic, i.e., "Palestine", by means of a symbolic space thought of in territorial fashion, that of faith. The spiritualization of the Temple rightly placed at the heart of John, concludes Nobilio, is inscribed in a theological process of spiritualization of the land of Israel and of the universe. The second volume focuses on Time and hence not relevant to our study here.

Nobilio uses Philo as the influence behind the Fourth Gospel hence Nobilio's use of philosophical perspectives on Johannine space and time. What is significant in Nobilio's approach is that he does not separate space and time in his analysis. The only difference between our work and that of Nobilio is that in our work, in place of philosophy, we employ sociological and historical perspectives. Again, the social location of the reader is also emphased in our research. The present research do not read John from the perspective of Philo although the wide Hellenistic influence on John is not ruled out. What is significant though is that Nobilio becomes one of the most recent scholars to notice the spatial-temporal nature of the Johannine narrative which has been neglected for some time. This recognition of spatio-temporal categories in the Fourth Gospel vindicates this present research.

10. Space in other New Testament Studies

Although this work is not going to focus at the concept of space and place in the whole New Testament, it is important to locate this particular study in the wide burgeoning field of space and place studies in biblical studies. According to my assessment, I will consider two scholars who stand out above the rest especially as far as their methodological clarity is concerned.

10.1. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (1986)

Though Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (1986, 1991) does not look at space in John but in Mark, she provides an important base upon which reading space in John could be developed. She looks into "all Markan spatial locations in their system of relationships for the purposes of considering their significance as a narrative and "mythological system" (Malbon 1991:2). She derives this methodology from the French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss who initially developed his study from "traditional mythic texts" (1991:2). Malbon's efforts identify "geo-political" spaces whose "relationships" can be plotted on a "political map" (1991:50). On the other hand, "topological" space can have its "relationships" "observed from an aerial photograph or a relief map" (1991:50). The "architectural" "space locates "events in relation to artificially enclosed spaces: a house, synagogue, the Temple etc" (1991:106).

Malbon's reading of space is very insightful in that it widens the scope of spatiality, but not wide enough to go beyond geographical structures.

10.2. Halvor Moxnes (2003)

Although the work of Halvor Moxnes is largely a contribution to the recent 'quest' for the historical Jesus and is not concerned with John's Gospel, it has had a major influence

on the scope and development of this present study.[84] His approach to space is neither merely 'objective' nor naively 'subjective.' For Moxnes, the starting point in looking for spaces in antiquity is the realisation of one's own socio-spatial location, from history and in the present (Moxnes 2003:1). When readers are looking at the place of Jesus, they must also ask questions to do with their own place—a practice that was frowned at in past scholarship but which has become important now (2003:3). This does not only have to do with me as a reader inquiring about my place of reading but also to interrogate the location of the previous scholars who are my interlocutors in investigating the places in the biblical narratives and their interpretations of these spaces (Moxnes 2003:3). This is significant for this study since the modern constructions of biblical spaces have largely been produced by the West, influenced by their cultural conceptions of space. My hope is that an African reading of similar spaces in the Fourth Gospel could enrich and compliment reading of spaces already in use.

Moxnes also shows the dialectical relationship between people who are shaped by their places of origin and how they in turn shape those places (2003:2). Hence, the relationship between "identities" and their location is of key importance in Moxnes' reading of spaces in antiquity. For this reason, Moxnes does not focus mainly on the geographical places in the sense of physical geography, but on 'human geography'—looking at "the house with household, the village and the large area, and Galilee itself as important locations of identities" (2003:2). This is important, in that places are not looked at as empty containers with people as mere contents. Nor does this allow places to be looked at in isolation. Places are presented as peopled and people are presented as located or even dislocated. They are shaped as they also shape their locales.

The social location of people—both in the narrative and the readers—in place, is an important contribution of Moxnes' work. He observes that to be in place or to be placed,

[84] My awareness to spatial analysis was awakened by the book by the Norwegian New Testament scholar, Halvor Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom.* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), and the lectures he gave at the University of Natal around the same period of the publication. Another significant reading not fully explored in this thesis is Moxnes' critical analysis of the Galilee as Place in the Historical Jesus research (2001) where he shows the heavy influence of the social location of scholars in their historical reconstruction.

"does not just imply geographical location; we may also, for instance, speak of social, ideological, or mental places in terms of gender, ideology and power. To say that Jesus and his followers were placed in a house or a village also indicated that they were placed in a system of social and gender positions" (2003:2). Moxnes goes on to show possibilities of reading what Soja would call the 'third spaces' opted by Jesus and his followers. By Jesus leaving his household and setting up new systems, he was creating new spaces as well as transforming old ones.

When Moxnes separates Jesus' 'biography' or 'life' from space and calls his spatial reading of the historical Jesus only a "particular perspective", he weakens his discussion (2003:2). Is it ever possible to look at the 'life' of Jesus or to attempt to reconstruct his 'biography' without foregrounding his spatial location? Other scholars have attempted it when they presented Jesus either as a mere teacher of universal ethics (e.g., *Aufklärung* theology) or as the universal 'teacher of wisdom', but this has rightly been challenged as inadequate.[85] As Malpas correctly puts in engaging Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty that, "it is not merely human identity that is tied to place or locality, but the very possibility of being the sort of creature that can engage with a world (and, more particularly, with objects and events within it), that can think about the world, and that can find itself in the world" (1999:8). In summing up this holistic view of space and place, Malpas continues:

> The idea of place encompasses both the idea of social activities and institutions that are expressed in and through the structure of a particular place (and which can be seen as partly determinative of that place) and the idea of the physical objects and events in the world (along with the associated causal processes) that constrain, and are sometimes constrained by, those social activities and institutions. There is no doubt that the ordering of a particular place—and the specific way in which a society orders space and time—is not independent of social ordering (in as much as it encompasses the social, so place is partially elaborated by means of the social, just as place is also elaborated in relation to orderings deriving from individual subjects and from underlying physical structures) (1999:35-36).

It seems clear therefore that any effort to reconstruct or to interpret the Gospel of John that does not take seriously the spatio-social ordering of this Gospel misses the point in as

[85] The different views on this kind of Jesus not located in place and time is presented by Chilton and Evans (1994:17-19).

much as any effort to investigate narrative representation of space which does not take seriously the historical milieu of the narrative will also miss the point.

11. Summary of Findings

It has been noted that what has been of interest to biblical scholars in the study of biblical space is geography and topography. This interest served the 'quest' for the historical Jesus. For conservative Christian scholars, this historical 'quest' used Palestinian geography and topography to confirm the accuracy of Scripture and the 'objectivity' of the *Heilsgeschichte* ('Salvation history'), the proof that God chose Israel, put the people of Israel in its place and at the climax of God's revelation, chose the church and also put that in its place. Where this history could not be verified, the places were read symbolically or even allegorically. For more liberal scholars, the historical purpose of studying biblical space was to locate Jesus in his culture. In this view, the understanding of, "familiarity with Palestine" would be a prerequisite for comprehending the Gospel of Jesus, who himself was shaped by his geography (Dalman 1935:1). In this understanding, the terrain of Galilee, for example, was responsible for producing 'courageous' and 'quarrelsome' people (Dalman 1935:6).[86] Bultmann's reaction to liberal biblical scholarship with its concerns for history saw the Gospel of John's geography as of no use for exegesis. He saw the focus of the Gospel as revealing of the religious ideas comprehensible not by historical geography investigation, but by comparing them with Hellenistic and Iranian ideas with which they resonated.

It has been observed that an effective reading of biblical spaces and places will require taking particular locales as individual entities while at the same time recognising the interactive nature of these places. Such a reading will reveal the uniqueness of each space and place and the transient nature of places (Freyne 2001:304). For this reason, Galilee and Judea and Samaria are presented as individual places, but whose relationship is also taken seriously.

[86] This is Dalman's reading of Josephus (*Bell. Jud*. iii.3.2) and the Talmud (*Ned.* 48a).

Bauckham has shown the narrative function of spaces and places. What is important from this contribution is the realisation that geographical places once incorporated in the narrative take on a new meaning. As such, there is no point in just looking at concrete Jerusalem in first century Palestine as represented by historical geography, and conclude whether John is historically reliable or not. Once in the Gospel of John, Jerusalem, although a 'real' historical place, assumes a narrative function in relationship to other places and spaces. In the wider web of the narrative, spatiality depends so much on what the narrative is trying to achieve by referring to these places. In the Gospel of John, space and place are categories that permeate the various parts of the narrative. Although geographical places are obvious, and hence will take considerable section of analysis, a more phenomenological analysis of the function of space and place in the Gospel needs to be followed. Accordingly, wider investigations, with the help of social theory into the use of spatial conceptions and representation in sectarian societies will be illuminating.

In developing a more "comprehensive" spatial reading of the Fourth Gospel, one will take seriously Bauckham's emphasis that the Johannine "material" must be taken as "whole" instead of fragmenting it (Bauckham 2007:22). Some scholars see literary and theological 'incoherence' of some pericopes in the Gospel of John, thereby seeing a need to cut-and-paste and rearrange this material. While this effort is commendable, no final arrangement of the material has been agreed upon, hence the need to read Johannine spatiality with the text as we have it, however recognising the problematic nature of some of its texts. Once read as a whole, the spatial structuring will, hopefully, become apparent as it is mapped out according to the spatial features that stand out within the narrative.

The social elements of space, which have been highlighted by Moxnes, also need to be emphasised. The questions of identity and location will inform the earlier part of this research. It will be seen if characters are presented as strongly attached to particular localities. It will also be observed if there are allusions to their identity being shaped by coming from these places. The Temple as an organising space will also be investigated as to how it functions in the whole light of the sacred space in the Fourth Gospel. Allusions to the Samaritan holy place will also be investigated. Allusions to exile and diaspora

which are regularly alluded to in the Gospel of John will be attended to. It will be seen if John is sympathetic to the diaspora, and as far as is possible, to understand why it is so. The function of the detailed geography and topography in the Gospel of John will also be investigated beyond the general debate of whether this confirms or fails to confirm the Palestinian provenance of the Fourth Gospel.

12. My social location as a reader

Jeffrey Staley begins his postcolonial reading of space in John his own context of 'dis-placement' (2002). This biographic approach to theological reflection is presently in vogue in postmodern methodologies (see also Staley 1995; Segovia 1995). As seen above, Halvor Moxnes has also emphasised that the reading of spaces in the Gospels should take cognisance of the location of present-day readers since the reader's location affects the places and the spaces he or she 'sees' in the narrative. Even in one's engagement with previous scholarship, one should realise that they read spaces in history, archaeology and the narratives from their own places. This made these readers highlight some and marginalise other. This present thesis is not a biographical reading of Johannine space, hence I will not depend so much on my personal experience other than stating how my social location has influenced my reading. For this reason I disclose my 'status' as a Zimbabwean reader of the Fourth Gospel space in a foreign country, South Africa, in other words, 'dis-placed'. The spatial allusions of dislocation in the narrative, though investigated with as much scholarly 'objectivity' as is possible, are seen as resonating with my own situation as a reader hence are read in solidarity. All the 'third spacing' or the transformative nature of such spaces is taken seriously as opportunities for the transformation, not only of my sense of dislocation but for many people who could be in such situations.

13. Conclusion

While the previous chapter dealt with the domination of modern maps on constructions of biblical space within biblical scholarship in general, this chapter dealt with the way in

which space and place have been read in the Fourth Gospel by various key scholars. Such scholarship has been narrated and critiqued and the positive characteristics of previous readings appraised. Having noted that the major views on Johannine spatiality are biased towards historical and symbolic interpretation, it has been observed that such categories of analysis of the spaces in the Gospel of John although useful, have proved inadequate. In the chapter which follows, the question of identity and its spatial implication in John will be examined to see if Johannine identity is spatially determined.

CHAPTER 4

SPACE, PLACE, AND IDENTITY IN JOHN

1. Introduction

This section examines how space construction is used to determine identity in John. The questions addressed will concern:

i. Where do the disciples in John come from and what has it to do with identity?
ii. What is the spatial identity of Jesus and how does it function in identity construction in the Fourth Gospel?

This will be achieved by focusing on the initial ministry of Jesus according the Fourth Gospel. In looking at the regionally constructed identities, special attention will be given to the way characters from each region interact. Some conclusions will be offered and suggestions for further investigation proposed.

1.1. Identity Politics in First Century Palestine

Johannine characters are identified according to their places of origin. In other words, Johannine identity is spatially determined. The emphasis on Galilee as the place of origin of the disciples is deliberate. The place of greatest significance for John is Cana, hence, the place of the disciple who receives the divine promise, Nathanael, to whom and the rest of Israel Jesus says: "you will see (ὄψεσθε)[87] heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (John 1:51). Even Jesus' place of origin disqualifies him before his opponents, most of whom are Jerusalemites. It is this

[87] This promise is in the plural.

significance of location and the quest for building new identities beyond regional and ethnic boundaries that this chapter seeks to explore in detail.

That the Jews of the South were suspicious of the ritual purity of the Jews in the North is suggested (Hoehner 1972:53; Elliott-Binns 1956:18-19). It is also clear that this suspicion of the identity of Galileans was not of "actual biological descent" but was rather of "identity, or ethnicity", both of which are social constructions (Millar 1993:5).[88] This redefinition of identities was rife in first century Palestine since external forces, the Romans, would not have loved to see strong solidarity between Israelites. The desire by some Judeans to see themselves as ritually purer than the northerners would have easily played into the hands of the Romans. While the South looked down upon the North, the Israelite north prided itself in the prophetic tradition that suggested that they could actually do without the South (Reed 2000:58). In describing the nature of this conflict, Herzog (2005:173) has suggested three possible causes:

> First, the world of Jesus was dominated by advanced agrarian societies built on systemic tensions and conflicts between rulers and ruled. Second, the presence of the Temple in Jerusalem further complicated an already-difficult political relationship between Judea and Galilee because of its demand for tithes. Third, Palestine was under the colonial domination of the Roman Empire through the client kingship of the Herods in Galilee and its environs and through the high priestly house in Jerusalem.

Herzog is likely to be correct in seeing this conflict as multidimensional. Economics (agriculture), religion (Temple), and politics (Romans) conspired in a complex way towards this tension. While such tension is seen as playing itself out in the ministry of Jesus as portrayed in the Synoptics, it is explicitly present in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel.

[88] Jonathan Reed suggests that—especially during the rabbinic era—the derogatory language was not directed against all Galileans, but rather exhibited the socio-economic "condescending attitude of some wealthier urban rabbis towards rural Jewish peasants" (2000:27). The present researcher is not concerned that mere economic difference would make such rich use of strong language if there was no real tension resulting from even theological difference as a result of the religion from the Temple which was seen to contradict the understanding of the Galileans.

2. The Significance of the Baptist's Place of Operation

From the beginning, the ministry of John the Baptist is presented from the perspective of potential South-North volatility. The Baptist operates in areas not familiar to the Synoptic tradition, colouring this part of the narrative with spatial language foregrounding the identities to be encountered throughout the narrative (John 1:19-28). The delegation that seeks to confirm John's identity is sent from the Judeans (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι)[89] in Jerusalem (John 1:19) and from the Pharisees (John 1:24).[90] Apart from the identities of the interrogators qualified by their place of origin, the Baptist's place of operation is also stated. He is baptising "in Bethany across the Jordan" (John 1:28; 10:40; 11:1)[91] (see Krieger 1954; Riesner 2002) [92] and "at Aenon near Salim" (John 3:23) (Hoskyns 1947:225).[93] While this geospatial overtone could be illuminating for the Gospel, Bultmann does not see the significance of such place detail since it is not "of any interest in the exposition of the text" (1971: n. 3:93).[94] John the Baptist, who is preparing the way for the restoration of Israel, can be identified with both the northern and southern part of Israel as he moves between the different regions.

John the Baptist wants to be identified with the desert. He is the voice crying out in the desert (φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) (John 1:23). In the Synoptic Gospels, the words of

---

[89] The usage will not always be used in reference to place as in other cases in John the designation has to do with ethnicity or religious affiliation.

[90] The absence of the Sadducees could be a telling sign of the post 70 CE era where the Pharisees are the sole remaining prominent group following the destruction of the Temple (Brown 1982:44).

[91] The arguments that Bethany where John baptises is the same as the one close to Jerusalem where Lazarus lives with his sisters is attractive, but still has some problems (Parker 1955). This argument relies on the correctness of Parker's translation of πέραν to mean "on the other side" rather than "over against" (1955:257-261. See also Bultmann 1971:93). The whole question of orientation when reading the Gospels is discussed above since it is possible that the modern north orientation used on maps could be anachronistic if used for biblical space.

[92] Riesner (2002) has produced a detailed study to try and identify this site, but the conclusion is unconvincing since the efforts are simply historical and there is insufficient evidence to back his historical conclusions. A detailed discussion of Riesner's discussion with Karl Kundsin is given above.

[93] Hoskyns (1947:225) says that this place is "situated in the Samaritan section of the Jordan valley and on the Galilean pilgrims' route to Jerusalem".

[94] Bultmann seems not to be interested in localities since he does not see any historical possibility of verifying them. For him, even the question of which Cana is meant in John "is not of importance for exegesis" of the Gospel (1971: n. 2:115). Both Barrett (1960:146) and Lightfoot (1956:102) submit that this "geographical statement is incapable of verification", and hence is of no use in reading John. It is only when one looks at the function of these places in the narrative that some fresh light is shed.

Isaiah are cited, while in the Fourth Gospel, the desert is a significant location of self-identity for the Baptist as it puts him in the tradition of "Isaiah's promise of a new exodus and a messenger preparing" the place for the king's entourage (Keener 2003:438). The Qumran community in the desert makes similar claims. In the Rule of the Community (1QS9:19-20), it is says: "It is time to prepare the way in the Wilderness." In 1QS8:16, the community is encouraged to prepare the way in the wilderness. They can do this through the study of the Torah (1QS8:26).

Juxtaposing the desert to Jerusalem is a significant spatial ploy employed by John. The historical significance of the wilderness would have brought to remembrance many Jewish sacred stories. As Freyne observes, by Jesus beginning his ministry with John the Baptist in the desert, the ministerial succession stories are replayed (2004:18) although in the case of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is not presented as succeeding John the Baptist. Both John the Baptist and Jesus are seen in John to be starting the ministry from the wilderness, from a place of no habitation. The northern prophetic tradition of Elijah and Elisha seems at play here. John denies being "Elijah", the "Prophet", leaving these titles for Jesus, but accepted being the voice crying in the wilderness (John 1:21).

In addition, the desert would have played an important role in contradistinction to the Temple. Those who come to inquire of John's activities are from the central place of worship, the Temple in Jerusalem. Their identity is engraved on their place of origin—they are "priests and Levites" (John 1:19) representing the Temple system. Where they come from determines their theology. Their God resides at the Temple. However, this theology is presented as redundant in the Gospel of John since very soon in chapter 2 and chapter 4 the significance of the Temple is undermined. It is not however going to be replaced by a new Temple. The desires and the hopes fanned into flame in the Fourth Gospel is the restoration of the desert tabernacle, the decentralised way of worship that characterised primal northern theology. If therefore John the Baptist is inaugurating a new ministry based on the desert traditions, he is portrayed as one who affirms the identity of true Johannine worship.

The desert location serves to legitimate Jesus' supercession of John just as Elisha succeeded Elijah and as Joshua succeeded Moses at the Jordan although in the Fourth Gospel, John plays the role of the one who prepares the ground for Jesus' ministry and not the owner of the ministry itself. Spatially, the ministry of John functions to identify the Baptist and Jesus with the northern prophetic tradition, the desert traditions, and most importantly, the contrast between desert and Temple, hence the Temple and tabernacle tradition. By portraying the desert as a place of 'increase' of discipleship, John alludes to the Exodus tradition where much was providentially supplied to Israel by God, thereby foreshadowing the restoration era. These ideas are going to be replayed in different formats in the examinations which follow. This is the identity of John the Baptist as he is portrayed at the opening of the narrative.

Next we see how the disciples who are pointed to Jesus by John are portrayed. Obviously, the intention to demonstrate continuity is emphasised while the North-South conflicts are also maintained. In the context of external influence however, internal conflicts and despising will also be apparent.

3. The Significance of the Galilean Origin of the Disciples

All the named disciples[95] in John —Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael— have their place of origin mentioned. The first three come from "Bethsaida in Galilee" (John 12:21).[96] This Galilean origin is significant for John. It is not only these first disciples that are from Galilee; Nathanael is also from 'Cana in Galilee'. For the Fourth Gospel the qualification 'of Galilee' or 'in Galilee' is common, be it for Cana (John 2:1, 11;

[95] Keener (2003:501) seems to miss the significance of the namelessness of some disciples in John as this is designed to mystify and immortalise them. It is about the unnamed 'beloved disciple' that Jesus says "If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you?" to which Peter sees immortality (John 21:22-23).

[96] Modern critics who point to the lack of historical accuracy here because Bethsaida is not situated in Galilee but Gaulanitis (Bethsaida Julias is 2.5 km north of the Sea of Galilee) (Barrett 1975:351; Meyers 1997:302) miss John's spatial usage. In addition, the speculation by some scholars that there could have been two places with the same name (Meyers 1997:303), or that that this could have been "popular usage" as in Josephus (Brown 1982:82) misses what John is doing here with space. Significant work in archaeology has been undertaken at Tell Araj and et-Tell Tell Araj to settle the question (Meyers 1997:303). Although such efforts are commendable, for John the significance is that this place is in Galilee in the narrative.

4:46) or for the Sea of Tiberias (John 6:1) because discipleship in John is Galilean.[97] It is Nathanael's identity that has a more detailed explanation in his long conversations and protestations to yield to the call of Jesus through Phillip's invitation (John 1:45-1:59). It is at the response of Nathanael that the physical places of origin are subverted to the ultimate space called "Israel".

Nathanael is said to come from "Cana in Galilee" (John 4:46; 21:2). Cana is important for John because it is here where the 'first' of the signs is performed and many believed (John 2:11). It is also at Cana that the healing of the believing man from Capernaum takes place (John 4:46). If the "Cana in Galilee" in John 2:1 forms an *inclusio* with the "Cana in Galilee" in John 21:2, then this spatial arrangement should be taken seriously as a hermeneutical key to the understanding of the Gospel.[98] The narrative sequence from John 1:35-51 covers the section of the calling of the first disciples (Fortna 1970:180). While the section begins with a typical Johannine temporal "on the morrow" (τῇ ἐπαύριον) (John 1:35), it is the spatial-temporal relationship that dominates its arrangement. It is John the Baptist's testimony about Jesus on this "following day" that leads his disciples to inquire from Jesus where he stays (μένεις) so that they can join him (John 1:38). It is this concept, associated with the word μένω, which permeates the Fourth Gospel. In the Fourth Gospel and 1 John the word and its derivatives appears about sixty-four times (forty-two in the Gospel of John alone) while in all the New Testament books put together it appears about fifty-four times (Bible Works© version 7 statistics). The term seems to stress 'abiding' or 'living' as a sign of existential relationship or even unity with Jesus to the Father as in the Farewell Discourses.[99] In this regard, Draper shows that the word is used in the sense of to "stay with someone" or "to remain in a place" (1999:46). To 'stay' or 'remain' (μένῶ) is central in understanding the spatial implications of the conversation and flow of the narrative that follows because they also remain (ἐμένιαν) with him that day (John 1:39). Nevertheless "staying" also implies duration of time, so

[97] The disciples do not come from Capernaum as in the Synoptic Gospels, nor is their fishing career a virtue (Bultmann 1971:107-8; Barrett 1960:149).
[98] The majority scholarly feeling is that John 21 is a addition although some few scholars are not satisfied by this proposal. The debate continues!
[99] This idea will be addressed in detail later in this study.

that 'remaining' in John presupposes space-time. Hence, two of John's disciples remained and it "was about the tenth hour" (John 1:39). These are designated as followers (ἀκολουθησάντων) of Jesus. Though the idea of following is prevalent in Matthew, it is also common in John.[100] The only one who finds it hard to follow Jesus is Nathanael.

Nathanael scoffs at the fact that Jesus is from Nazareth. [101] He is used in this narrative as the individual who brings the issue of regional segregation, yet he also must come and see (ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε) (John 1:46). The initial response of Jesus to those who want to follow him where he "abides" is "come and you will see" (ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε) (John 1:39). Philip's promise to see is in the aorist tense (John 1:46), unlike that of Jesus in the future tense, which carries the implication for the future. When the Samaritan woman invites the people of the city to come and see (δεῦτε ἴδετε) the man who has told her everything, she uses an adverb and aorist imperative (John 4:24). The invitation is extended to Jesus to come and see (ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε) where Lazarus is buried (John 11:34).

Only Jesus' invitation to come and see is in the future, unlike all the other invitations here. So Nathanael also must come and see (John 1:46). He is not going to see first, but he has already been seen in a specific place, under the fig tree, to be a "true Israelite" and not even as a Galilean (John 1:48). Nathanael is amazed at how Jesus knows him and exclaims that Jesus is the "Son of God" and the "King of Israel" (John 1:49). This is an important discovery for a disciple since Jesus' kingship is not of this world (John 18:36). But Nathanael is still to see even greater things. He will see "heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (John 1:51). Here the reference is to the ladder of Jacob on which the angels were going up and down (Gen. 28:10-17); Jesus will be that ladder.[102] Jesus becomes the place Nathanael must see.[103]

---

[100] The word appears twenty-five times in Matthew and nineteen times in John

[101] Maybe Nathanael's scepticism came from the fact that "Galilean messiahs had already caused" enough disturbances (Hoskyns 1947:184. See Josephus *Ant.* 20:5 and Acts 5:36-37). Alternatively, is it that in this part of the Roman Empire, people have learnt to look down upon each other if they come from different places just as they are looked down upon by the foreign Romans? See also Barrett (1960:154)

[102] The rabbis also knew the ambivalence of the language here which could mean that angels were climbing on the ladder or they were climbing on Jacob (Rowland 1982, 1984, Draper 2001, Fossum 1995, and Meeks 1966).

As Hoskyns (1947:183) puts it, Jesus becomes the "place of revelation, the place over which the heaven has been opened". The invitation to 'come and see' (ὄψεσθε) forms an *inclusio* of John 1:39 and 1:51 marking out the entire section with this motif of 'seeing'. The promise to see in the future is linked to a place to be seen. The first is the place where Jesus remains and the last is the opening of the heavens where angels ascend and descend upon the son of Man.

In the meantime, Nathanael has already seen that Jesus is the Messianic King of Israel.[104] But Nathanael, as a true Israelite, is no longer an individual Israelite because the promise (ὄψεσθε) is now for all true Israel since the promise is in plural. It is true Israel that receives the promise to see the ultimate place, the open heaven and the bridging ladder. All those who have believed and followed attain a new identity which allows them to see, not Jesus as a despised person from Nazareth, but as one who is the space that links all Israel with the eschatological kingdom of Israel.

4. Jesus' Subversion of Space

In the previous section, Jesus calls his disciples from a particular region and they are conscious of their different places of origin. In John, these differences are being continually subverted. In this section, we will see that Jesus' ministry, constituted by his teaching and performing the Signs, are characterised by subversion of space.

---

[103] This idea is explored in further detail below under the section on Embodied Space.

[104] Even though "King of Israel" is usually meant to distinguish him from the "King of Judah" as a result of the divided Kingdom, it seems as if the nostalgic "King of Israel" refers to the David and hence the Messianic Ruler of the united ethnic people of God (Israel). It seems as if it is in this sense that it is used in the Gospel of John. The Fourth Gospel refers also to Jesus as the True Vine, which seems to have Davidic connotations (see Didache 9:2 – the holy vine of David).

4.1. Johannine Israel as Subversion of Regional Places

In Nathanael Jesus saw "an Israelite in whom there is no deceit" (John 1:47). Jesus' insight into his private life prompts Nathanael to respond: "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!" (John 1:49). The use of "Israel" is obviously special in John as it seems to be used in the sense of eschatological hope. John says that he came baptising so that Jesus could be "revealed to Israel" (John 1:31). The greatest title Jesus receives from Nathanael from Cana is that he is the "King of Israel" (John 1:49). This is the triumphal entry title which the crowd sings as he enters Jerusalem, signifying the future messianic "King of Israel" (John 12:13). It is a disciple from Cana who discovers Jesus as the King of Israel and on this disciple, indeed on behalf of all the followers of Jesus, a promise is given, that "you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (John 1:51). Nathanael, and all those who have seen the ***abode*** of the presence of God must also ***abide*** since ***remaining*** or ***abiding*** and discipleship are synonymous in John. Fruitful discipleship (John 15:5, 16) is being obedient to the call: "Abide in Me, and I in you" (John 15:4). The one who does not 'abide' is "thrown away" and will dry up, then gathered to be cast in the fire (John 15:6). 'Abiding' is also characteristic of the Father-Son relationship (John 14:10; 15:9), it must also characterise discipleship. A "slave does not remain in the house forever; the son does remain forever" (John 8:35). But what is that Israel in which Jesus abides as 'King of Israel'?

Freyne suggests that while in the New Testament, Israel has become a designation of the ideal people of God only found in the early golden years of their nationhood, in the Old Testament it was not so much found as "history but as prophecy, concentrating more on how Israel might or could be rather than how Israel once was" (2004:22). In this imagination, Israel is in its ideal relationship with Yahweh and Yahweh speaks the blessing on Israel (Deut. 33) and Israel is in a united relationship among the twelve blessed tribes (2004:63-67). If God is blessing Israel, it means that they stay on their land and the land produces enough food for them and for their care of the widows and the orphans. The way the Israelites treat other Israelites is one of the conditions that

determines God's faithfulness to the covenant with them. Hence, God's covenant relationship with Israel is conditional (2004:68). While the covenant was in place, God was the only King of Israel. It has been observed by Hamid-khani that 'Israel' was the "preferred Jewish self-identification" "in terms of election and covenant promise" while Ἰουδαῖος was a "name by which Jews were distinguished from other ethnic and religious groups" (2000:239). Even the Rabbis would generally refer to the people as Israel or the people of God (2000:240).

Only Israel is able to 'see' God, as Peder Borgen has suggested. For Philo the possibility of Israel 'seeing' God because of its philological derivation was seen as אִישׁ רָא אֵל (*The man seeing God*).[105] Borgen sees Philo's writings as influenced by "early Merkabah mysticism" that shed some light on the role of Israel as the heavenly agent that sees God (1986:89). He sees the closest "to this heavenly figure" being the "idea of the heavenly Israel, 'who sees God'" (1986:90). The agent has many names according to Philo, one of which is "the one who sees". This name says Borgen, refers to Israel (1986:90). In John, Jesus comes as that king of Israel sent in place of the Father.

Jesus in John is the one sent or *Shaliach* (Thompson 2001:126-129) such that by seeing Jesus, Israel sees God. Thompson suggests that the designation of *Shaliach*, though it is widely attributed in rabbinic literature, none such literature is contemporary with John (2001:126). This is contrary to Draper (1998:558) who cites C.K. Barrett to conclude that,

> "it is not unreasonable to suppose that the sending out of שליחים in some form and for some limited purposes does go back to the New Testament period." "A man's shaliach is as himself" (שליחו אדם כמותו: *m. Ber* 5.5; *b. Ned* 72b; *b. Kidd* 41b; *b. Hag* 10b; *b. Nazir* 12b; *b. BM* 96a; *b. Men* 93b). The principle in Jewish law is that "the apostle is as the one who sent him," he is a plenipotentiary. He is inextricably linked to the person and authority of the one who sends him.

That such designation is so spread in rabbinic literature could indicate enough that John is aware of this tradition. John therefore sees Jesus as the representative of the Father in the world. The prevalence of the participle πέμψας with its variations is testimony to this.

[105] For an extensive discussion of this tradition, see Kugel (1998:387-389) and recently (Barker and Christensen 2008:143-174).

This title of course is first used for John as one sent by God to baptise with water (John 1:33) in contrast to those sent from the Judean authorities to interrogate him (John 1:22). Jesus understand mission as that of accomplishing the work (τὸ ἔργον) and do the will of the one who sent him (τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με) (John 4:43). Doing the will of the one who sent him (τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με) becomes central to Jesus' self-understanding and the understanding of his duty (John 4:34; 5:30; 6:38, 39). The corollary of this is to understand God as the 'one who sent' him (ὁ πέμψας με) as shown in the following citations:

> **John 1:33** κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' **ὁ πέμψας με** βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν· ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.
>
> **John 5:37** καὶ **ὁ πέμψας με** πατὴρ ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ. οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε,
>
> **John 6:44** οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ **ὁ πέμψας με** ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν, κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
>
> **John 7:28** ἔκραξεν οὖν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ λέγων· κἀμὲ οἴδατε καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί· καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς **ὁ πέμψας με**, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε·
>
> **John 8:16** καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστιν, ὅτι μόνος οὐκ εἰμί, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ **ὁ πέμψας με** πατήρ.
>
> **John 8:18** ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ **ὁ πέμψας με** πατήρ.
>
> **John 8:26** πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν, ἀλλ' **ὁ πέμψας με** ἀληθής ἐστιν, κἀγὼ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
>
> **John 8:29** καὶ **ὁ πέμψας με** μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν· οὐκ ἀφῆκέν με μόνον, ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε.
> **John 12:49** ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα, ἀλλ' **ὁ πέμψας με** πατὴρ, αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν δέδωκεν τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω.

The 'one who sent me' for Jesus is also the father (πατὴρ). Such that the relationship of Jesus and God is not that of mere messenger (*Shaliach*) but is understood in familial bond.

Those who submit to the kingship of Jesus, according to John, are actually submitting to the father who sent him (John 5:23; 7:18). God was the king of Israel until Israel rebelled against him in preference to a human king to imitate the neighbouring nations, according to the anti-monarchy tradition (1 Sam. 8:1-22). This led to the disintegration of the nation

of Israel whose restoration to unity would only happen if God would be seen by Israel as King again, hence the claims Jesus makes about himself in John. The kingship of Jesus only grows among the disciples when they cede their regional identities for the new identity of the nation of Israel. This nation of Israel unifies the Galileans, Samaritans, Judeans, and the other people of God in the diaspora of Israel scattered throughout all parts of the world. The value in comparison to the land of Palestine is minimised in value to that of the nation (ἔθνος) of Israel (John 11:48,50; 18:35). The king of Israel is not the king of earthly kingdoms, only those who do not recognise him as such will try and force him to take up such a role (John 6:15). Only those who do not recognise him see him as a regional king of the Judeans (John 18:33, 39, 19:3, 19, 21). Just as some of the Jewish people rejected God as their king in Samuel's time, even now they reject Jesus as their king in place of the foreign ruler, Caesar (John 19:15). Nathanael and the crowd that sings for Jesus in his triumphal entry recognise that he is king of Israel (John 1:49; 12; 12:13).

4.2. In Galilee: The Wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11)

The wedding at Cana is the first sign "marking the end of the introduction" and foreshadowing the "future" of the Gospel (Suggit 1993:36). As has already been noted above, "Cana in Galilee" of John 2:1 forms a literary *inclusio* with the "Cana in Galilee" in John 21:2 such that this spatial arrangement should be taken seriously. That Nathanael is from Cana in Galilee is therefore not a coincidence. The spatial allusion is a hermeneutical key to the understanding of the entire Gospel narrative. It is in Galilee that Jesus performs his signs to reveal his glory. This is achieved because people believe after the sign (John 2:11).

Jesus had been invited to the wedding together with his disciples and his mother. Once the wine runs short, his mother implored him to do something about it (John 2:1-3). The fact that it was a "third day" cannot be overlooked, especially if the third day refers ahead to the coming resurrection narrative which concludes with: "Now Jesus did many other signs (σημεῖα) in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book" (John

20:30). It is at the first sign of changing water into wine and the last sign of his death and resurrection, that the significance of the mother of Jesus is shown. In the midst of his pain on the cross, Jesus assigns the Beloved Disciple to her mother's care (19:25-27). The place of first and last contact between Jesus and his disciples was a place of signs and belief and her mother is central to both.

Responding to his mother's request, Jesus subverts space by instructing the use of the "six stone water jars for the Jewish rites of purification" for purposes other than the one assigned them (John 2:6). By so doing, he gives new meaning to these stone jars. In transforming them from ritual usage[106] to usage in wedding celebration he not only transforms the jars, but transforms the wedding. Whether John is drawing on Greek Dionysian rites (Bultmann 1963:238), or Philo's allegorical interpretation (Hoskyns 1947:192), or the usage of wine in the Old Testament (Suggit 1993:42), is not very clear. What is clear however is the transformation of a marriage into a ritual of plenty, a feature certainly common to but not exclusive to Dionysian rites, while combining it with the rejoicing of the Jewish eschatological banquet. The ritual of cleansing (καθαρισμός) presided over by the 'servants' (διακόνοι) (John 2:5, 9) and the 'chief servant' (ἀρχιτρίκλινος) (John 2:8) is clearly assumed. In this sense, the space of celebration because of the wedding has been ritually transformed and sacralised through the use of sacred utensils. In the process though, the utensils obviously ironically loose their sacred use. By taking holy things (ritual pots of cleansing) and putting the wedding wine (fermented substances), this would have defiled the pots according to laws of ritual purity prescribed by the law (Isa. 65:4; Mark 7:4).

4.3. Capernaum as the Place of Darkness: The Raising of the Royal Official's Son

[106] 'Ritual' is not here being used in a pejorative sense to mean one who "performs external gestures which imply commitment to a particular set of values, but he is inwardly withdrawn, dried out and uncommitted" (Douglas 1982:2). This must be noted, since the generality of scholarship influenced by "the anti-ritualists in the long history of religious revivalism" including the Protestant Reformation would read Jesus' turning of water into wine as an indictment of Jewish religion as "empty symbols of conformity" (Douglas 1982:2 *cf.* Suggit 1993:43-44). See also the rituals of fertility among the Ndembu women in Victor Turner where ritual serves to strengthen and not just to fulfil an empty religious duty (1967:13ff).

(John 4:46-54)

The healing of royal official's son again is in Galilee. A Galilean *inclusio* is also intended as Galilee is mentioned at the beginning to introduce the scene of the narrative and at the end to emphasise the same scene (John 4:46, 54). It is interesting to note that the man is from Capernaum and that it is in Capernaum where his sick son is lying (John 4:46). This is the right place to emphasise the deliberate contrast between Cana and Capernaum in John. Peter Richardson (2002) has proposed that "Cana as a place in John is almost as significant as Capernaum in Mark" and that "this is the case in the first century" Palestine (2002:314). Richardson follows the works of C.H. Dodd (1963) and J. A. T. Robinson who see the historical Jesus tradition as the foundation of the Fourth Gospel (1985:159). These scholars see the central role played by Nathanael of Cana (John 1:43-51) and the flashback in the contentious John 21:2. The first Johannine sign takes place here (John 2:1-11). This is his centre of operations where he returns after short periods of ministry in other areas (John 4:46). It is from Cana that the Johannine Jesus can even conduct remote controlled healings in such places like Capernaum (John 4:46-54). Although the Signs Gospel is not easy to ascertain, others go on to suspect that in that original gospel, the Johannine Jesus never leaves Cana (Richardson 2002:321). This last point is not easy to support from available evidence, but the above hints from the Gospel narrative itself shows how prominent Cana is and especially in comparison to Capernaum which, though prophesied against in the synoptic tradition, is the home of Jesus and his disciples (Matt. 4:13; Mark 9:33).

Capernaum, although in Galilee, is, in John, deliberately represented as less significant than Cana. In Capernaum, Jesus 'remains' not for many days (οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας) (John 2:12). That this statement is presented in the negative is noteworthy since, by implication, in Galilee he remained (ἔμεινεν) (John 7:9). Unlike in the Synoptic Gospels, where Jesus and the disciples have their home in Capernaum (Matt. 4:13; Mark 9:33), in John only renegades and false disciples are found there (John 6:26, 59, 66). The journey to Capernaum is commenced at night in John, when it is dark (John 6:17). The implication of 'darkness' in John serves a very significant rhetorical function. Nicodemus comes to

Jesus at night, a sign of defective discipleship in John (3:2). From here on Nicodemus is known as the "one who came to Jesus at night" (John 19:39). Disciples of Jesus work by day since the night is coming when no one can do any work (John 9:4). The people walking in the night stumble since "the light is not in them" (John 11:9-10). Only people such as Judas, who do not belong to the light, go out into the darkness at night (John 13:30). Thus, darkness in John becomes more of a spatial than a temporal category.

Apart from the use of night (νύξ) to spatially locate those outside his community, John also uses the word darkness (σκοτία) to express the same sense. Hence, Jesus is from the beginning presented as the light that shines in the dark, although the darkness cannot comprehend it (John 1:5). By darkness, John means the deep ignorance that leads to unbelief. Hence, if the setting of Jesus' entrance into Capernaum is darkness (John 6:17), the expectation is unbelief and that is what he gets in Capernaum (John 6:26, 59, 66). On the other hand, in the Synoptic tradition, Capernaum is the place where Jesus can reside with his disciples and performs many miracles (Matt. 4:13; Mark 9:33). Not in Mark, but in the Q tradition, the rejection of Capernaum due to its unbelief is pronounced (Luke 10:15; Matt. 11:23). In John there is no pronouncement, but prophetic action. Jesus goes there at night.

The darkness is contrasted with light. Jesus is the light of the world and those who follow him do not walk in darkness but in light (John 8:12). Those who walk in darkness do not know where they are going, so the disciples must follow him who is the light (John 12:35). Belief in Jesus takes people from darkness to light (John 12:45). Significantly, those who choose darkness (σκότος) call judgement upon themselves (John 3:19). They are judged because of their works which can only be done in darkness and not in the light (John 3:20). Darkness and night become spatial categories of those outside the community of John. Inside the community is light and outside is darkness.

Because of this presentation of Capernaum, the healing of the royal official's son is not performed there but in Cana, maybe a place that would have not have been well known by the main Jesus traditions. By so doing, the dominant traditions of Capernaum and its

claims to hegemony would be weakened. The healing itself only takes place after the rebuke of the royal man's desire for signs as if this desire is not expected in John (John 4:48). While signs function in John to extract faith from people, those who seek the signs are presented in a negative way. Among these are οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι[107] who are opponents of Jesus in John. Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (John 2:18; 12:37) and those from Capernaum (John 6:26, 30) will not believe even if they see the signs. In this healing narrative therefore, Capernaum is presented as a place of inauthentic faith even though it is in Galilee. Capernaum, although forming part of the older Jesus tradition in the Synoptic Gospels, is here presented as less significant than Cana, thereby weakening its claim to control the Jesus tradition. This is how John would weaken regional differences, by exalting the weak ones and weakening the stronger ones.

4.4. Proof of Capernaum Unbelief: The Feeding of the Five Thousand and Walking on Water (John 6:1-21)

This is the last sign to be performed in Galilee. It is also very likely that this narrative is connected to John 4:54 as Cana is close to Tiberias (Barrett 1955:227). That the whole feeding narrative and the related discourse is associated with Capernaum makes the naming of the Sea of Galilee the Sea of Tiberias significant.[108] The association of the narrative with Herod's building projects and how these projects are named after the Roman Empire is not accidental. In other words, the negative setting of the narrative prepares the reader for the unsatisfactory ministry of Jesus there. [109]

Jesus crossed the Sea of Galilee from Cana to Capernaum where huge crowds followed him (John 6:2). Jesus goes from the land and crosses the sea and then goes up the mountain (ὄρος) with his disciples (John 6:3). It is from this mountain that Jesus can see the crowds coming and asks Philip how they could feed the crowd (John 6:5) and it is to this mountain he goes to flee from the crowds that want to force him to be king (John

[107] see the discussion below.
[108] In the New Testament, it is only John (6:1; 21:1) that uses this designation. The name is also used by Josephus and the Sibylline Oracles (Brown 1966:232).
[109] Some similarities between Matthew and John more than John and Mark can be noted. Dodd has given a detailed discussion on these (1963:196-222).

6:15). The allusion to Moses typology in Jesus' ministry in John 6 has already been noted (Brown 1966:232, 255). The significant spatial connections include sea (θάλασσα) (John 6:1) and the mountain (ὄρος) (John 6:3, 15). The other allusions include the signs (σημεῖα) (John 6:2, 14), Passover (John 6:4), bread or food (John 6:5), testing (πειράζων) (John 6:6), gathering of fragments (John 6:12), and prophet (John 6:14). From the 'sea'—'mountain'—'testing'—'feeding'—'unbelief' literary arrangement, the exodus motif becomes apparent. It has been observed, especially from the history of religions, that in the Ancient Near East, "that which is open, that which is boundless is seen as the chaotic, the demonic, the threatening. The desert and the sea are the all but interchangeable concrete symbols of the terrible, chaotic openness. They are the enemy *par excellence*" (Smith 1978:134). That Jesus has overcome and subverted the sea, rehearses not only the ritual of the exodus but also the conquest of the primeval waters of creation (and of Noah).

In the Old Testament, the sea was a place for God through Moses to reveal his power and the mountain and the feeding with manna and quails were spaces of revelation and yet the people of Israel remained stubborn. In John 6, the sea is a place of revelation as Jesus subverts nature by walking on water.[110] Jesus subverts distance, time, and water density. He had been left alone when the disciples had gone into the boat to go to Capernaum (John 6:16). As they were rowing the boat in the storm they saw Jesus drawing near the boat, walking on water (John 6:19). Just as Moses calmed the fear of the Israelites in the face of the impending danger of the Egyptians at the sea, so Jesus calms the fears of his disciples by declaring the 'I am' (ἐγώ εἰμι) (John 6:19-20). While Moses proved himself to be a 'prophet' sent from God by his exercise of authority at the sea, self-identity of Jesus with the use of ἐγώ εἰμι accords him the divine status (Dodd 1963:198 *cf.* Brown 1966:252, 254).[111] Interestingly, the reference to the Passover here resonates with the "Passover *Haggadah*" recited "at the Passover meal" as a reminder of the "crossing of the

[110] Although Dodd's (1963:197ff) argument that Jesus was "walking on the beach", is interesting, it does not seem to take the narrative seriously. If the narrative intended to show that Jesus was on the beach it would have said just that! In this case, Jesus is drawing close to the boat to the fear of the disciples, thereby showing what was happening was extraordinary.

[111] The omission of μὴ φοβεῖσθε by *Syrus Curetonianus* (sy^{c}) cannot be taken in favour against all the other external witnesses as Brown suggests (1966:252).

sea and the gift of the manna" (Brown 1966:255-256). In being at the mountain and the sea close to the Passover Jesus synchronises sacred time and sacred space. Space and time find their harmony in the person of Jesus.

4.5. In Judea

This following section looks at Jesus' ministry and spatial expressions in the Judean area. This movement to Jerusalem in John is characterised by the use of ἀνέβη. The movement to Jerusalem is always ascent, up to Jerusalem (John 2:13; 5:1; 11:55). As Smith puts it:

> For the "Jew who journeys "up to Jerusalem" (and the journey to Jerusalem is always "up," though it stands only 2,200-2,310 feet above sea level and is surpassed in height by places such as Bethel and Hebron), he is undergoing what must be described as a mystical ascent. He is ascending to the centre, to the one place on earth which is closest to heaven, to that place which is horizontally the exact centre of the geographical world and vertically the exact midpoint between the upper world and the lower world, the place where both are closest to the skin of the earth, heaven being only two or eighteen miles above the earth at Jerusalem, the waters of *Tehom* lying only a thousand cubits below the Temple floor (in some traditions, the earthly Temple is connected to the heavenly sanctuary by an invisible tube and by shafts to the dangerous waters below) (1978:113).

It is in this imagination, that anyone who goes up to Jerusalem is going into the presence of God. Hence Smith says that it was said by the early rabbis that, "before the Temple was constructed evil spirits used to trouble the people in the world, but since the Tabernacle was built, the evil spirits have ceased from the world" (Smith 1978:113; Han 2002:51-52). Some characters in the Fourth Gospel seem to share this view concerning the significance although not all. The Judeans are presented are presented in John as fond of their place of origin and despising those from other places. Though the Fourth Gospel does not completely reject this self-understanding of the inhabitants of Judea, he tempers this view and subordinates such a claim to a less claim of "neither in Jerusalem nor in Samaria" thereby putting Jerusalem at par with other regional places and after that denying every place any special value.

4.6. Jerusalemites and Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι

In this view, it is not surprising that the people from Jerusalem in the Gospel of John look down upon everyone else who comes from other regions. It is in this light that the enigmatic Johannine οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is used.[112] More than in any other Gospel, the association of Jesus with Judea and Jerusalem abounds in John. Closely related to Judea is its relationship with οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, a designation not strictly reserved for, but mainly referring to, the Temple authorities. Extensive work has already been done on the Johannine Ἰουδαῖοι (e.g., Hamid-khani 2000:232-250), such that the following brief is only meant to situate Jesus' ministry among those people who cannot be separated from the place, or the territory they inhabit.[113]

The term, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, has raised significant discussion among Johannine scholars. Its historical associations with Anti-Judaic[114] interpretations of the Bible have also been argued to have caused "incalculable harm" (BDAG 2000:478). Scholars have approached the debate with different levels of caution. Some have tried to rescue "the New Testament against allegations of Anti-Jewish bias" hence restricting the term only to refer to the Jews of Jesus' time in the New Testament (de Jonge 2004:342 referring to Gregory Baum 1961). Others have approached each text according to the text's literary content without the hang-ups with Anti-Judaic interpretations that touched European scholarship in the shadow of Auschwitz. For example, Segovia reads οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι as equivalent to the notion of κόσμος in John (1981:270 *cf.* Brown 1966: lxxff). In the "farewell discourse as well as in John 7:1-9, the category 'the world' is, in the present researcher's opinion, presented as being synonymous with that of 'the Jews'" opposed to Jesus (Segovia 1981:270). This generalisation does not however seem to fully represent the Fourth Gospel's use of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι as it can be shown that this generic term is not always used

---

[112] The translation 'Judeans' for οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι follows Brodie's instructive comment that this term "omits any modern overtones of the word "Jews"…has an appropriate suggestion of provincialism". (Brodie 1993).

[113] Hamid-khani provides invaluable bibliography on the subject.

[114] Anti-Judaic is preferred to Anti-Semitic because of the latter's anachronistic texture. The possible conflict between the Jewish Christian against their fellow Jewish people cannot and should not be equated to the Anti-Semitic tendency of outsiders' negative feelings against Jewish people, even though the former would influence the latter.

with such polarity. Schnelle (1992:34) could be right in saying that in the Fourth Gospel, the term's frequency points "to a usage that results from theological reflection." In its seventy one occurrences in the Fourth Gospel alone, this term is used sometimes in conflict episodes between Jesus and the Judean or Jerusalem authorities, and at other times, it is used to depict the identity of the crowd present at a scene, which is likely from the Judea-Jerusalem area. The term is also used to refer to Judeans as an ethnic group (John 18:33, 35, 39; 19:3, 19, 21). It is sometimes used positively for the Judeans "who in various degrees identify with Jesus and his teachings" (John 8:31; 11:45; 12:11) (BDAG 2000:479). However, there is "no indication that John uses the term in the general ethnic sense suggested in modern use of the word 'Jews', which covers diversities of belief and practice that were not envisaged by biblical writers, who concern themselves with intra-Judean (intra-Israelite) differences and conflicts" (BDAG 2000:479). Jesus is also called a Judean (John 4:9) and he calls himself such (John 4:22). Even the Judean authorities also put their faith in Jesus (John 12:42) but do so secretly because they are afraid of the Pharisees. It is noteworthy that the Judeans are sometimes separated from the generic 'Pharisees' who seem frequently to be hostile to Jesus.

Also of interest for this present study are the geographical implications of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. In this sense the term "characteristically" refers to "the Jews of Judea, especially those in and around Jerusalem" (Morris 1995:115). It is very likely that the implied audience of the Fourth Gospel understood these regional divisions and the identities without confusing them with the generic ethnic reference. This can be seen by the use of alternative designations such as Jerusalemites (Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν) to refer to people from Jerusalem (John 7:25). This term, which does not appear anywhere else in the New Testament (except in Mark 1:5), seems to refer to Judean people who have some privy knowledge of the plot to kill Jesus. Also in *4 Maccabees*, the reference has to do with people from Jerusalem as opposed to those from other regions, hence, a spatial usage (4 Mac. 4:22; 18:5).

The context of John 7, where the term is used, provides strong argument against the possibility of Jesus being the Messiah because he is not a Judean, that is, not from

Bethlehem (John 7:42ff). That there is an expected Prophet-Messiah is apparent in the Gospel (John 1:24, 41; 3:28; 4:25,29; 7:27,27,31,41-42; 9:22; 10:24; 11:27; 12:34; and 20:31 etc.).[115] The messianic designations for Jesus have been observed to be stronger in the Gospel of John than in the Synoptics (Dodd 1953:228ff). The spatial implication of that expected Prophet-Messiah is of interest. The question is whether the Messiah (John 7:41) or Prophet (John 7:52) comes from Galilee (Ashton 1991:299). If anyone says that Jesus, who is from Galilee, is the Prophet-Messiah, they are also from Galilee or they are part of the ignorant crowd.

A number of positions are given as to the place of origin of the Prophet-Messiah in John. First, when the Messiah comes "no one will know where he is from" (John 7:27). On the other hand, when he comes, as a seed of David (τοῦ σπέρματος), he must be "from Bethlehem" (Judea) the village which David came from (John 7:42). It would appear confusing that no one knew where Jesus was from (John 9:29-30), while on the other hand, they knew where he is from (John 7:27). Maybe in the first context, to say no one knows where he came from is to dissociate them from Jesus. If they are not sure about who has sent him, they are free not to take him seriously. But when it suits them, they know where he came from. They know that he is from Galilee and hence he cannot be the Prophet-Messiah. The argument thus sets "Jerusalem off against Galilee" (Ashton 1991:301).

If Meeks (1966) is correct, what we encounter in these regional skirmishes are deep-seated theological conflicts on the Davidic Christ from Judea as opposed to the Prophet-King from Nazareth. He sees here the "Jewish eschatological traditions which were intrinsically connected with Judea and Jerusalem-Zion" pointing to "a Davidic royal Messiah" as opposed to the Galilean Prophet-king in the likeness of Moses (1966:159). The Davidic Messiah was therefore supposed to be born in Bethlehem while the Prophet-King would be proved by his word coming true according to Deuteronomy 18:15-18. In

[115] Even though these could have been conceived as different expectations in the Fourth Gospel, they have now been combined and seem to be inseparable.

Deuteronomy 18:15-18, the promise was that a prophet in the order of Moses would be raised "from among you" referring to the people of Israel.

The Samaritans held an expectation on the One to come as "Moses *redivivus*" (Isser 1999:591). But parallel to this Moses-like prophet to come was also one expectation of someone like Joseph, especially from the anti-priestly group (Isser 1999:591). This latter position claimed that Joseph had been buried on Mount Gerizim. The Moses and Joseph expectations in Samaritan theology were not mutually exclusive as Joseph was seen more as a political figure than Moses who was seen as the giver of the Law (Isser 1999:591). Along with these expectations was a 'vague figure' like the 'Son of Man', the *Taheb*, who was expected, mainly from the synagogue circles, whose main call was for the repentance of the people and not necessarily "cultic restoration" (Isser 1999:591). In the first century though, the expectation of the Moses-like prophet was most dominant. "A passage concerning this Prophet (Deut. 18:18-22) is even appended to the Decalogue in the Samaritan Pentateuch (after Exod. 20:21a = MT 20:18): 'I (God) shall raise up a prophet like you (Moses) from among their (the Israelites') brothers for them, and shall put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I shall command him'" (Isser 1999:592). In this view, the original Israel is seen as one that included the Samaritans. By corollary, the whole of Israel would be constituted by Samaritans, Judeans, Galileans and the scattered children of God in the nations. There was also the possibility of a Prophet-King being born in Galilee (Isaiah 9). In this case, Galilee would qualify as the origin of the coming king and still the Johannine Jesus would qualify.

From the statement that "Surely the Messiah does not come from Galilee," it can be concluded that Jesus is presented as being a Galilean (John 7:41).[116] We have already noted above the way Galilee is presented in the Fourth Gospel is reflective of regional conflicts influencing the Jesus tradition in John (Ashton 1991:301-2). When Nathaniel is told about Jesus and especially that he was from Galilee he responded mockingly (John 1:46), "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" "As Galileans were frequently

[116] This must of course be taken with a pinch of salt as labels are also used in John to discredit and not necessarily to state a fact.

despised by people from Judea, so it appears that even fellow Galileans" despised each other (Carson 1991:160). Even when Nicodemus tries to come to speak in defence of Jesus, he is mocked by saying "Surely you are not also from Galilee, are you?" (John 7:52). His submission to the intimidation by remaining quiet suggests the seriousness of this spatial label. He is challenged; "Search and you will see that no prophet is to arise from Galilee" contrary to allusions from Isaiah 9. Hence, the statement, "Surely the Messiah does not come from Galilee" (John 7:41) is not based on the search of scripture referred to here but to mere despising of this place.[117] It is thus deliberate that the Fourth Gospel presents the Judean rejection of Jesus as faulty since it cannot be supported on the basis of the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is in this light that Jesus performs his signs in Judea, a hostile place.

4.7. The Healing of the Paralysed Man (John 5:1-18)

The healing of the paralysed man is the first of the Judean signs. At the appropriate time, close to the feast of the Jews, Jesus is again at the right place, Jerusalem (John 5:1). That he goes up (ἀνέβη) to a familiar Johannine sacred space, Jerusalem, which is inextricably connected to the sacred times, the feast (ἑορτῇ) (John 5:1) and the Sabbath (John 5:9) is important to note. After this introduction, there is a detailed spatial description of the arena in which Jesus is going to perform his sign (John 5:2). The name of the place is, however, complicated by the confused manuscript evidence which requires the supply of a word. Brown has added another 'pool' so that we have two pools (1966:206). As with most spaces in John, its Hebrew name is given in the Aramaic dialect[118] with its attendant disparate manuscripts (John 5:2). Whether it was *Bethesda* ('house of two springs') (C A Θ) or *Bethzatha* (with many possible meanings) (א 33 e l), the allusion to the 'house' from the prefix 'Beth' is obvious.[119] The point is that next to the 'house' of God, there are houses outside which the Temple system has neglected, but which suddenly have

[117] In the Fourth Gospel the titles of Prophet and Messiah seems to be interchanged.
[118] Maybe also in John 19:13, 17,20; 20:16 the word Ἑβραϊστί means Aramaic (see Barrett 1955:211).
[119] The text critical analysis of these differences cannot be conclusive (*cf.* Lindars 1970:212).

received divine visitation in the person of Jesus.[120]

If it is the same place, that is, the pool with its 'five porticoes' (John 5:2)[121] discovered "on the property of the White Fathers near St. Anne's Church" (Brown 1966:207 *cf.* Jeremias 1949), within its porticoes lie those incapacitated physically—the blind, the lame, and the paralyzed (John 5:3). The omission of John 5:3b-4 as a "gloss' by most authoritative manuscripts is probably correct considering the paucity of external witnesses, the use of "asterisks" to mark those words considered to be "spurious" in most witnesses that have the readings, the "presence of non-Johannine words or expressions", and also the "wide diversity of variant forms" whose parentage cannot be ascertained (Metzger 1971:209). In any case, the man who is the focus of this story is also at this place, not inside the porticoes but outside, waiting for someone to 'throw' (βάλῃ) him in (John 5:7). From this story, the issue is not being thrown inside the pool, but the willingness to be well (θέλεις ὑγιὴς) (John 5:6). Jesus thus offers him wellness by commanding him to take his mat and ***go out***. This contrasts with the man's conception of this healing space in which he must ***get into***. His understanding is such that one needs to hang around this place until they are thrown into the healing pool. Jesus' suggestion is quite the opposite. It is in taking one's belongings and leaving this place that healing is experienced.

The contrasting conceptions of space spill over into contrasting conceptions of time as the Jewish authorities do not expect anyone to carry their mat on the Sabbath, even if they are doing so in order to receive healing (John 5:10). The Jewish authorities see the upholding of sacred time as superior no matter what place one find themselves. Contrary to this position is the view of Jesus that sees no significance of sacred time if people are ***at the wrong place***. For Jesus, the time (Sabbath) is meaningless if it is not coupled with places or spaces of freedom. To change the spatial location (hence social and religious

[120] Despite the scepticism of some scholars, John (sometimes) uses the etymology of names for theological purposes although there is no proof that he comes up with non-existent names (Barrett 1955:210).
[121] The way Gospel of John uses the Old Testament makes it unlikely that he may be thinking here of the Pentateuch which are now considered "ineffective for salvation" as he sees some continuity between Moses and Jesus and not a replacement (*cf.* Lindars 1970:213; Barrett 1955:211).

location), Jesus subverts the sacredness of time by commanding the man to carry his mat and walk.

This man does not move to freedom as expected by Jesus. Draper has noted the man's movement from his place of physical paralysis to a place of religious paralysis (the Temple) (1999). The man was found by Jesus at the Temple (John 5:14), possibly seeking to be restored into society through various "purity" rituals "now that he has been healed" (Draper 1999:45). Even though in John, Jesus rejects the retributive theology suggested by his disciples on the man born blind in John 9:2ff; here Jesus uses it on this man who seems not to have found his freedom by moving from one oppressing place to another. Jesus says to him, "See, you have been made well! Do not sin any more, so that nothing worse happens to you" (John 5:14). The sign of the man's bondage to this place of oppression is that he goes and sells out Jesus to the authorities (John 5:15). The place of bondage seems to be beyond the porticoes of no healing, or the Temple place of religious oppression, but inside the man. The narrative presents him as one who incarnates bondage as opposed to Jesus who incarnates freedom, because "if the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed" (John 8:36). This is true for John where true freedom comes when one is expelled from the religious system which paralyses as will be shown in the next sign. Maybe the 'real' physical place does not bind them internally, but instead they experience they are not free in their internal spaces?[122]

4.8. The Healing of the Blind Man (John 9:1-41)

There has been already some discussion as to whether this Johannine form is meant to be a miracle story or a pronouncement story (Staley 1991:64ff). Staley would prefer the latter because of the 'pronouncement' Jesus makes in John 9:3-5 in his response to the disciples' theological question, whether it was because of the personal sin of the man or

[122] Jeffrey Staley (1991) is sympathetic in his positive valuation reading of the crippled man's response; David Rensberber (1987:29-47) is not. Staley sees the Jerusalem environment of the man as making believing in Jesus difficult. Rensberger on the other hand shows the differences of discipleship traits between Nicodemus and the blind man as selling out to the Jewish authorities, in contrast to the man born blind. In the light of the black and white categories of discipleship identity in John, the present researcher is persuaded by Rensberger's reading.

his parents that the man was born blind (John 9:2) (Staley 1991:65). If *halakah* and *haggadah* formed the basic forms in Jewish tradition, one would take the quest for the neat categorisation of forms as a modern construction with limited applicability. A very simple example would be to look at how Martin Dibelius (1934) and Rudolf Bultmann (1972) gave different names for different forms. What is now called the *Pronouncement Story* (Taylor 1933) has been called a *paradigm* by Dibelius (1934:24-25, 37-38) and an *apophthegm* Bultmann (1972:61ff). There are possibilities also of having a miracle story with pronouncement in it (Matt. 8:5-13). Methodologically, the task of form criticism is to isolate the smallest unit with the hope of identifying their function in the communities that used the form. On the other hand, the narrative approach that Staley uses sees the unity of a pericope and reads it for what it communicates. In the final analysis, what Staley names as the form of the pericope in John 9:3-5 is immaterial for his interpretation. Actually, his reading of the story shows that whether this pericope was a miracle or a pronouncement story would not affect its role in the narrative. In any case, the use of such *form-geschichtlich* categories in Johannine literature whose relationship to the Synoptic is debatable is problematic.[123] Since this argument is a digression, we go back to the focus of this work.

In this narrative, the Johannine community is presented as mobile, following Jesus from one place to another. The opening words state that Jesus was 'walking along' or 'passing by' (παράγων) when he saw a man blind from birth (John 9:1) shows the significance of moving from one place to another. The disciples think that he was blind either because his parents or he himself sinned, but Jesus sees his condition as an opportunity for God's mighty deeds to be "manifest" (φανερωθῇ) (John 9:3). The use of the words "to manifest" in the contest of blindness is deliberate here. After Jesus makes several pronouncements, he goes on to heal the man by spitting on the ground, making mud with his saliva and spreading the resultant mud on the man's eyes and sending him off to go and wash in the pool of Siloam (John 9:6-7). The spatial significance of this man's movement can be

[123] This is not to say historical critical tools cannot be used for the Fourth Gospel, let alone other material. Form criticism for example has already been used by Jacob Neusner in his treatment of the rabbinic writings (1980). The argument here is that form criticism is built on the presupposition of the Synoptic relationship of the first three Gospels and that their literary relationship with the Fourth Gospel is not yet agreed upon— at least it does not enjoy unanimous support.

noted especially if the followers of John are seen to be always on the 'move'. The later significance of Siloam in the church as symbolising place of entrance into the church through baptism is also noted here (Suggit 1993:90). Suggit locates the movement from one place to the other as demonstration of obedience in being 'sent' by Jesus just as Jesus was obedient in being sent by the father (1993:90). While Jesus was sent from the presence of the father to the world, Jesus sends this "marginalised" man (Stibbe 1994:80) from his place of confinement to a place of freedom.

The day or time this happens is the Sabbath (John 9:14). The terminology used about breaking the Sabbath law would be λύω. Jesus is thus accused for "breaking (ἔλυεν) the Sabbath" (John 5:18). The same word is used by John to refer to being freed or let loose. Hence, when he comes from the grave, Lazarus is let loose (λύσατε) (John 11:44). Whether John wants the reader to see the two occasions in the same light, though suggestive, is unclear.

The Pharisees interrogate the man, who has been blind and now sees, as to how he received his sight. Even the parents of the man are interrogated as to the healing of their son. They are not willing to vouch for the authenticity of their son's healing "for the Jews had already agreed that anyone who confessed Jesus to be the Messiah would be put out of the synagogue" and such a clear recognition of Jesus would appear as such (John 9:22). In their interrogation, there is an accusation that Jesus' healing is evil because it had been done on the Sabbath. The man stands his ground that Jesus cannot be a sinner if he heals, otherwise God would not hear him (John 9:31). His insistence that Jesus is not a sinner results in him being thrown out (ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω) (John 9:34). This is significant spatial reference characteristic of true discipleship in John as will be shown below.

Several issues could be addressed here, but the spatial elements are significant for this study. That Jesus and all those who are with him in John are on the move is implied from the beginning by the use of παράγων. This movement from one place to another is a manifestation of freedom. In this chapter, it is freedom from blindness and darkness. The

blind man had been bound stationary in one place, maybe 'sitting' there begging (if Codex Bezae's insertion of καθήμενον in John 9:1 is correct, although it looks weak without any other support) until Jesus arrived. In any case, the man's blindness, like any other first century CE disability, would have confined him to one place where he could sit and beg (John 9:8).[124] The man's disability had one extra confining effect. His social and religious mobility would have been hampered by the demands of the purity laws that did not allow the lame and the blind to participate in the worship of the Temple or at least confined them to the chamber of lepers (Neusner 2002:141).[125] While the rest of the community would have been confined on this particular day because it was a Sabbath (John 9:14), this man would have had perpetual confinement in one place, a place of dependence.

It is therefore interesting that Jesus' begins the process of healing by first loosening the soil on which the blind man is sitting. Jesus mixes the soil with his saliva and smears it on the eyes of the man (John 9:6). The man is told to go (ὕπαγε) (John 9:11) and wash. When he does so, he comes back seeing. It seems as if he came back to his original place of begging, for his neighbours came to inquire (John 9:8). Unlike the crippled man who leaves one place of bondage and goes to another, this man only comes back to testify that it is Jesus who made him well (John 9:11). He not only testifies to his own people but also to the Pharisees that it is Jesus who made him see (John 9:15). The Pharisees cannot take the fact that this man understands Jesus as one coming from God, so they throw him out (ἐξέβαλον).[126] Unlike the crippled man in John 5, Jesus does not meet him in the Temple, we are simply told that he meets him and gives him his final disclosure that he is the Son of Man (John 9:35). This is redefinition and re-arrangement of space and place in John. Those who remain inside the synagogue are out of place in Johannine discipleship while those who are thrown out are insiders to the community.

---

[124] See also (Gleeson 1998:1) on the relationship between space, disability, and mobility.

[125] It was said that "no one of your offspring throughout their generations who has a blemish may approach to offer the food of his God. For no one who has a blemish shall draw near, one who is blind or lame, or one who has a mutilated face or a limb too long, or one who has a broken foot or a broken hand, or a hunchback, or a dwarf, or a man with a blemish in his eyes or an itching disease or scabs or crushed testicles (Lev. 21:17-20). Neusner identifies twelve groups of people who could be excluded from the pilgrimage, including the lame and the blind.

[126] The allusion of the word ἐκβάλλω to the Diaspora is treated in detail in subsequent chapters.

4.9. Samaria

Several approaches and areas of focus have been adopted in reading the story of Jesus' contact with the Samaritan women at the well (John 4:1-42) and the other women in the Gospel. In reading the Samaritan woman's story, some scholars have seen mission and evangelism concerns as central to the story (Wyckoff 2005; Moloney 2003). Others see the relevancy of the story to inter-religious and intercultural studies (Nwaigbo 2006; de Wit 2004). Because the story of John 4 is rich as a piece of literature, some scholars have sought to read it from a literary perspective (Marie-Eloise 1993). The call to worship in 'spirit and truth' has signalled some to read the story from the point of view of spirituality (Scaer 2003). The Church Fathers used the story of the Samaritan women in many different ways and, for some scholars who want to ascertain how the Fathers did theology this has been their entry point (Farmer 1996; Lee 2004). Several theological insights have been gathered by those who have seen this story as a mine for theology (Mlakuzhyil 2006; Swartley 2006).

Of late, the most prominent way of reading, not only the Samaritan story, but also several stories about women in John has been a feminist reading (Irudaya 2006; Hartenstein 2005; Kim 2004; Luter and McReynolds 2003; Brown 2004; and Fehribach 1998). This makes sense in that it yields fruit for the critical feminist reading strategies as summarised by Sandra Schneiders (1991), one of the leading feminist and Johannine scholar. Schneiders proposes a number of reading strategies that can liberate women readers (and men) through the liberation of women in the text. In addition to gender sensitive translations, she proposes that effective feminist reading should focus on (not in isolation) 'women texts' (1991:183). Feminist readings, she suggests, should raise the visibility of the hidden feminine element in biblical texts. Such readings should reveal the 'secrets' about women that are buried beneath its male-centred surface and discern the challenges of "the androcentric, patriarchal, sexist, and misogynist interpretations" (Schneiders 1991:183-186). Schneiders thus uses the story of the Samaritan women and

the other women in John, especially those from Bethany and those at the resurrection, in John to demonstrate how this methodology can be used.

A close examination of Schneiders' and other feminist scholars will reveal some significant findings (see also Fehribach 1998). Schneiders suggests that John 4 is a 'type story' which follows a recognised biblical pattern, for example, the stories of the messenger of Abraham who met Rebecca at the well of Nahor, Jacob's meeting with Rachel at the well in Haran and Moses' defence of Zipporah, who later becomes his wife, at the well in Midian (1991:187). As such, the story cannot be read as a historical story (Schneiders 1991:186ff). The story's theological focus is the legitimation of mission to Samaria, where the apostleship of the Samaritan woman is contrasted with Nicodemus' unbelief (Schneiders 1991:188ff). The woman is symbolic of the betrothal of Samaria—previously an adulterous bride—to faithful discipleship (Schneiders 1991:189-192; Fehribach 1998:49ff). What this means for the modern reader is that the text calls the reader into a world of universal inclusiveness.[127] Disciples are called to be active participants in the establishment of this universal reign of the Saviour of the world (195-197).

The importance of feminist readings of John 4 notwithstanding, it is appropriate to raise some challenges to this significant approach, especially to the Johannine Samaritan story. The first critique has to do with the insistence of the use of categories like 'unfaithful bride' in reference to Samaria. This weakness arises from the feminist reading that seeks to redeem the Samaritan woman without redeeming her fellow Samaritans from negative labelling spawned from some Old Testament traditions, Josephus, rabbinic literature and of course some modern scholars. Constructions of Samaria as a place of idolatry and infidelity to the true Yahweh of Israel have already been seen to be problematic.[128] If

[127] This is the position taken by O'Day and Hylen (2006:57).

[128] Any Samaritan study that does not recognise the dependence on the use of "anti-Samaritan polemic of the Jerusalem priest Josephus" will not take caution in describing the identity of first century Samaria (*cf.* Freyne 2000:115ff). It is not only Schneiders' reading that takes this denigrating view of the Samaritans. Richard Horsley (1995:8ff) also suggests that the religious purity was corrupted by the 'native' elite as compared to Galilee whose local officials had also been carried away. Hence, whether it is a feminist or socio-economic reading of Samaria, if it solely depends on Josephus, it compromises a fair analysis of who the Samaritans really were.

Schneiders would use the Samaritan woman as comparable to Nicodemus such that the woman's discipleship is accepted, why does she think Jesus 'vindicates' the "claim of the Jews to be the legitimate bearers of the covenant tradition"? (1991:189). It does not actually seem as if Jesus 'legitimates' Jerusalem because he finally says "neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (John 4:21). The feminist reading would be incomplete and incoherent in rescuing the Samaritan woman without rescuing her own countrypersons from negative representation in the process.[129] If the contribution of feminist readings of John 4 are going to comprehensive, they should critically look at the representation of Samaritans in the 'primary' literature they use as evidence.

Musa Dube and other postcolonial readers have attempted a reading that seeks to redeem Samaritans together with the Samaritan woman. The postcolonial reading "for decolonising" the story of the Samaritan woman utilised by Dube has shown good possibilities of rescuing Samaria as well as the Samaritan woman (2002). Her important contribution is significant in that it seeks to reveal 'colonial' domination tendencies in the narrative. Dube however, puts too much emphasis on the "imperial ideology" so that she strains the historical material for her convenience thereby taking the narrative at her disposal as historical data from which one can reconstruct first century Palestine history. For example, she says that the "mention of Pharisees, Jesus and John the Baptist highlights an intense struggle for power directly related to imperialist occupation" resulting from the creation of a vacuum upon the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE leading to "an intense inter-group competition for power" (2002:61). This seems to be a mixture of epochs, the era of Jesus and the Baptist and that of the post-70 CE period. This does not mean that one can not use the Fourth Gospel as a "window" into the world of John's community. The contention here is that, such generalisations about these periods create an impression that the Jesus of history is also a religious player in post-70 CE period. She never seeks to demonstrate insufficiency of evidence to the existence Pharisees after 70 CE. It is not clear which period reveals the imperial tendencies she is discussing. The mere presentation of Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman as

[129] Feminist scholars can benefit from the contribution of Nnaemeka (1997) in describing possibilities of taking on a feminist struggle within wider ethnic struggles.

“ideology of expansion” seems anachronistic not taking seriously both the narrative and the possibly historical insights from the narrative.

One possible way of looking at the Samaritan woman and the Samaritans as spaces under external domination would be to use the sociological analysis proposed in this work. This approach would recognise, in agreement with Schneiders, the sexist tendencies influencing the reading of John 4. It would go further in also locating this sexist reading within a wider dominating tendency common in the representation of the Samaritans, ethnically and religiously. This would be taken as the historical experience of the Samaritan people. This would require investigation ‘behind the text’ that Schneiders proposes. But this ‘behind the text’ would be recognised as not an innocent exercise. The material used to reconstruct the Samaritans are fraught with ideological tendencies to despise the Samaritans in comparisons to their Judean counter parts. This would be noted so that in the reading of the Samaritans and the Smaritan woman would be seen as a narrative representation. Once careful historical reconstruction or the ‘first space’ of the Samaritans is ascertained, then the ‘second space’ of looking at the Samaritans in the Johannine narrative becomes clearer but never simple. Dube’s focus on the present experiences of the colonial or neo-colonial domination would be follow from the comparison of the ‘first space’ and ‘second space’. The ‘option for the marginalised’ as an ethic of reading such spaces would not only redeem the Samaritan woman but her and her fellow Samaritans. The historical Samaritan experience of being despised and being labelled as ‘unfaithful bride’ both in ancient documents and in modern scholarship does not allow for a sustainable creation of the ‘third space’ or space of transformation for the Samaritan woman.

5. Gendered Spaces in the Johannine Narrative

It is likely that within this story we have an opportunity to see how once negative labels have been assigned to a people, they can easily fossilise and therefore require critical reading to reveal their true identity. This story, like that of the anointing at Bethany and of the resurrection of Jesus, cannot be read without taking seriously the agency of women

in them. When places and spaces exhibit gender differentiations, they can be analysed as gendered spaces. A critical analysis of such spaces in patriarchal antiquity becomes crucial because it allows the disclosure and possible emancipation of such places and spaces. Such 'critical spatial' analysis reveals these alternative spaces or what can be called the 'third spaces' in the narrative.

In his discussion of place and gender, Moxnes begins by showing that "Jesus grew up and lived in gendered place" (2003:16). He observes that in such an understanding, place was not only gendered, but gender itself was also spatial. For him, 'male spaces' will be characterised by "occupation" and domination (2003:16). Such male spaces are not here meant to legitimise "modern, Western notions of masculinity" but are used as a "heuristic tool" useful in analysis of conceptions of space in first century Palestine (Moxnes 2003:16).

In looking at the nature of this gendered space, Spain shows that "domestic" architecture was the key infrastructure designed so as to mediate "social relations" "between women and men" (Spain 1992:140; see also Meyers 2003:44-69). As such, houses and all other domestic spaces were gendered in that they were "contexts within which the social order" reflected the "ideals and realities about relationships between women and men within the family and in society" (Spain 1992:7, 140).

But construction of gendered space was not limited to the binary social construction of the home based on male and female differentiation as suggested by Spain. In patriarchal societies, this gendering could take various forms of power and domination, where in such cultures male dominates female. Umiker-Sebeok observes that the construal of space in this understanding was tilted against the female where male spaces are those exhibiting "repeated instances of (or …the potential for) exerting force over animate and inanimate objects and overcoming obstacles, resulting in an increase in the size of territory controlled" (Umiker-Sebeok 1996:4ff). On the other hand, feminine spaces are constructed through "submission to force and avoidance of or submission to obstacles, with a resultant decrease in the size of territory controlled" (Umiker-Sebeok 1996:4ff).

This gendered space cannot be absolutised and universalised, but as a historical trope, opens our understanding into those regional process which would use such gendering categories to conceive of their spaces in relationship to other spaces. Claudia Card has observed that apart from female and male rape by penetration and male castration being a race issue in a war situation, it has a "history of symbolising (male) domination" (2005:136). Penetrating the population will then be a sign of conquest of this place there by gendering as feminine (Card 2005:136).

Such definitions are problematic in constructing gendered spaces in patriarchal antiquity as it may seem to legitimate dominant contemporary oppressive gendered spaces. However by understanding them within their context and analysing how they are being subverted in the narratives it is possible to move from their 'first space' dominating and oppressing effect to their 'third space' transformative value. This is the way Samaria is read in John 4. While many gender readings of the Samaritan woman rescue her from many years of denigrating patriarchal scholarship (Schneiders), it has not rescued Samaria herself as a place of domination. The reading that recognises Samaria as feminine space in terms of the patriarchal view in antiquity would seek not only to rescue the Samaritan woman, but Samaria as well.

The patriarchal understanding of God in first century Palestine would have seen God as male and God's people, Israel, as God's bride. The covenant relationship would be construed in the language of marriage and fidelity (Brown 1988:35).That this understanding is foregrounded in John can be observed. John the Baptist can rejoice when he hears the voice of the groom because the one "who has the bride is the bridegroom" (John 3:29). This comes after John 2 where the image of the wedding and the preparation required has been demonstrated in Cana of Galilee. The readiness of Israel to receive the groom is seen in their reception of Jesus. The rejection of Jesus as the husband is infidelity. Since in Cana of Galilee Jesus is accepted in faith (John 2:11), she proves to be a 'faithful bride' and hence a positive gendered space in relationship to God who is only Bridegroom in this view.

Judean authorities take a different position. When they say "we have no king (husband) but the emperor" (John 19:15), they are presented as unfaithful to God, according to John. As a result God will:

> Gather all your lovers, with whom you took pleasure, all those you loved and all those you hated; I will gather them against you from all around, and will uncover your nakedness to them, so that they may see all your nakedness. I will judge you as women who commit adultery and shed blood are judged, and bring blood upon you in wrath and jealousy. I will deliver you into their hands, and they shall throw down your platform and break down your lofty places; they shall strip you of your clothes and take your beautiful objects and leave you naked and bare (Ezek.16:37-39).

Rejection in this understanding is the exposure of the country to external domination and finally, Exile and expulsion from the land.

Samaria as part of Israel has a long history of contested dominations, both in its representation in biblical texts and in scholarship. As 'first space', that is historically, the northern kingdom of Israel suffered domination by the Assyrian invasion which saw the capture of its city, Samaria in 722 BCE (Miller and Hayes 1986:314). The place was again under domination of the people of the South when John Hyrcanus destroyed its Temple on Mount Gerizim (Freyne 2000:115). These invasions did not necessarily make all Samaritans lose their identity as part of 'Israel'. The misleading nature of the Samaritan representation in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah even contrary to evidence from archaeological findings of "communal *mikwaoth* as various sites" similar to those found among the Judeans (Freyne 2000:122). More historically plausible evidence seems be coming out at the discovery of Samaritans living together with other Israelites in the diaspora from the excavations at Delos (Kraabel 1992:331-334). The insistence by some scholars to use the isolated Old Testament narratives to conclude that Samaritans were apostate as the basis of reading 'marital infidelity to Yahweh' seems to be groundless in the light of this evidence. Marianne Sawicki's conclusion is useful here:

> Spatial constructions are keys to interpreting the textual construction of certain social realities that come down to us in our religious traditions and still are quite powerful today (1997:9).

Schneider is partly accurate in seeing (in agreement with Cahill 1982) the "type story" after a "recognised" Old Testament "biblical pattern" in which "future spouses who then play a central role in salvation history" meet at the well (1991:188). She also identifies the "Cana to Cana" *inclusio* "pervaded by the marital motif" developing in John 2-4 (1991:187). What she and many other scholars do not look at is the detail of the pattern for its gender spatial workings and how these work in a wider diaspora frame. The arrangement appears clear:

a) There is a divinely destined meeting at the well between a man from afar off who should find a wife because the people among whom he stays cannot provide a suitable wife: Abraham cannot find a ethnically suitable wife for Isaac among the Canaanites, so he sends a servant to his people (Gen. 24:3). So the servant's meeting at the well of Nahor with Rebecca, who is going to be the future wife of Isaac, is in answer to the servant's prayer (Gen. 24:2-15). He is from afar off in the diaspora among the Canaanites and is now in Aram-naharaim (Gen. 24:3). Although Jacob appears to be fleeing from his brother Esau, it seems as if the real reason is that he must go and look for a wife from where his mother and father originate (Gen. 27:46). So his meeting at the well in Haran with Rachel, who is going to be his wife, is divinely coincidental as she comes just at the time when he is inquiring concerning the home of and the welfare of his uncle Laban (Gen. 29:2-7). Moses (who is from Egypt) is sitting at the well as if waiting for Zipporah, who is going to be his wife. (Exod. 2:16). In John, Jesus is just waiting alone at the well when the woman of Samaria arrives at the well (John 4:1-7). If the above pattern is correct, it is the meeting of the bridegroom with an ethnically suitable bride.

b) Some struggle, tension or conflict precedes the long-lasting relationship: Abraham's struggle is first with his servant, to whom he says should under no circumstances take Isaac to Haran, in case the wife-to-be refuses to come (Gen. 24:3ff). His second tension is with God in prayer that God should provide this woman (Gen. 24:12-14). Jacob has to contend with the stone (Gen. 29:10) and his canny father-in-law who cheats him (Gen. 29:23). Moses has to contend with

the rowdy man stopping the girls from watering the sheep (Exod. 2:17).[130] Jesus has to contend with the ethnic tensions between Jews and Samaritans (John 4:9-14).

c) The man is taken home where he is given a wife: Abraham's servant was taken into Rebecca's home (Gen. 24:31). Jacob was taken home and given his wife (wives) (Gen. 29:28ff). Moses was given his wife Zipporah as soon as he went to stay with Reuel and his family (Ex. 2:21). Jesus is accepted, first by the Samaritan woman who says "Sir, I see that you are a prophet" (John 4:19) the entire city who ask him to stay with them (John 4:40).

d) The man must return with his wife to the country where he came from: The servant of Abraham took the Rebecca home to Isaac (Gen. 24:58ff). Jacob also has to return to his family (Gen. 31:3). After some days (Exod. 2:23), there is a need for Moses to leave (Exod. 3:5ff). Jesus can only stay with them for a few days and move on (John 4:40).

In each of the above examples, the woman plays a role of the ethnically pure bride chosen to perpetuate the ethnically pure Israel. If the "Judeans considered the Samaritans' Israelite pedigree to have been bastardised" (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:98), such a position is refuted in John. The 'first space' reveals domination and subjugation of Samaria. The 'second space' is the representation in narratives such as 2 Kings 17, Josephus' negative portrayal, and the rabbinic negative portrayal, which are used in academic representations of Samaria as the unfaithful bride (see Coggins 1998:73). But the 'third space' is the transformative identity of Samaria as a bride of Yahweh according to John's portrayal. The Samaritan woman plays the role of a "go-between like the man Abraham sent" according to Kamitsuka's reading of the story (2007:130). Samaria is presented as a believing people, as a place of faith like Cana of Galilee (John 4:40-41). When Samaria invited Jesus to stay (μεῖναι) with them, in John, this signals the highest level of communion (John 4:40).

[130] The use of the Hebrew word גרשׁ (translated by the LXX as ἐξέβαλον) to refer to the way the shepherds chased Zipporah and her sisters is highly suggestive of Diaspora (Exod. 2:17) as will be discussed in detail in the subsequent chapters.

The covenant blessings of such betrothal fidelity are announced. The first is a plenteous harvest. They shall see fields "ripe for harvesting" (John 4:35). Actually, they shall harvest that which they have not sown (John 4:38). Samaria, in this primitive spatial gender construction, is the blessed bride, faithfully betrothed to God, who will, because of her faithfulness, harvest where God has laboured. The second blessing is that of joy. It has been seen in John 3:29 that the friend of the bridegroom 'rejoices' to see the groom with the bride. Even here, the one who has sown (God) and the one who reaps (the faithful bride-Israel) rejoice together (John 4:36).

The image of a masculine God who relates to the church as his bride, has been challenged by modern day scholarship and rightly so. Both feminine and masculine traits of God should allow for a deeper understanding of who God is. At a level of appropriation, the 'third spacing' of the above reading would be necessary. It should be recognised that in the text world and the world behind the text, the masculine God's relationship with Israel as God's bride was understandable. Such an idiom would have been useful in the Johannine appraisal of Samaritan believers as being equally faithful as a bride of Christ. Infidelity towards God would be represented by unbelief in Jesus. Unfaithful Judea represented by the leadership resistant to Jesus would have made sense. Samaria would constitute a part of all that were '*his own'* (τὰ ἴδια)—i.e. faithful bride, true Israel..

6. The Spatial Location of 'His Own'

While in the previous section we saw how people's claims of superior identity based on their region of origin is undermined, in this section we will try to explore the spatial location of those who are said to belong to Jesus in John.

Lindars suggests that the phrase can be used in reference to "one's belongings, one's affairs, or one's home" (1972:90). Jesus is said to have come to 'his own', literally 'his own things', that is, what belonged to him (τὰ ἴδια) but his own people (οἱ ἴδιοι) did not receive him (John 1:11). The sense here is that while Jesus came into his own creation, his own people (according to flesh and blood, the Israelites) did not make him welcome

him. This is contrasted with a strong bond and relationship between Andrew and his own (τὸν ἴδιον) brother Simon whom he introduced to Jesus (John 1:41). This rejection of Jesus is explicit in him being rejected by his own because a prophet has no honour in his own homeland (πατρίς) (John 4:44). But here there is some confusion as to what constitutes his homeland. To this we return later.

Jesus would have loved his own people to have the same relationship he shares with his own (ἴδιον) Father (John 5:18). Jesus does not come on his own authority, nor his own name, but that of the Father; yet these people are not ready to receive him, but they will receive anyone who comes in his own name (John 5:43). Jesus is not like those who come in their own name, praising themselves (John 7:18). His opponents are those who speak their own (τῷ ἰδίῳ) father's, the devil's language (John 8:44). Jesus knows his own and calls them by name; his own (τὰ ἴδια) sheep hear his voice and follow him (John 10:3-4). Jesus protects the sheep because they are his own and he is not a hired hand (John 10:12). When the time comes for Jesus to leave his own (τοὺς ἰδίους) whom he has loved, he loved them to the end (John 13:1). The world loves its own (τὸ ἴδιον), but these follow Jesus because he has chosen them from the world (15:19). During times of persecution, each of his disciples will be scattered (σκορπισθῆτε) to his own home (John 16:32). To his 'beloved' disciple, Jesus assigned the care of his mother, who took her into his own (τὰ ἴδια) home (John 19:27).

From the above, we can see that 'his own' is largely used in John to refer to relationships and locus of habitation, more than that of mere property ownership. It is in this light that John 4:44 may be read:

> When the two days were over, he went from that place (i.e., Samaria) to Galilee (for Jesus himself had testified that a prophet has no honour in the prophet's own country). When he came to Galilee, the Galileans welcomed him, since they had seen all that he had done in Jerusalem at the festival; for they too had gone to the festival (John 4:43-45).

Different propositions have been made regarding this complication of Jesus' narrative movement from Judea to Galilee (John 4:3) via Samaria (John 4:4) and to Galilee (John 4:43) (see Westcott 1908:77-78; Hoskyns 1954:259-260; Dodd 1963; Meeks 1967:40;

Ashton 1991:301).[131] In terms of narrative space, the process appears quite clear. The narrative shifts from its Judean setting due to hostilities there and heads to Galilee. Samaria, even geographically is on the road, so it is not a detour to go through it. The symbolic departure from Judea is expressed in John 4:3 with the word 'leave' (ἀφῆκεν) as opposed to the positive 'remain' (μένω). In John, if Jesus does not 'remain' he 'leaves' (ἀφῆκεν), that is he rejects that place. In this sense, the place that he leaves is negatively represented in the narrative. Hence, the movement of Jesus from Judea is in the negative sense. He had rejected Judea, not the whole of it, but the Pharisees and the Judean authorities who would not believe (John 4:1). This rejection is understandable in the light of John 12:38-40:

> Lord, who has believed our message, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?" And so they could not believe, because Isaiah also said, "He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn and I would heal them.

If Jesus is leaving Judea as someone leaving his own (τῇ ἰδίᾳ) (John 4:44), then 'his own' are the Judeans and all the Jewish people who do not believe him. For many scholars, this raises not a literary, but historical problem. They will ask, "Is it not that Jesus is from Galilee?" As will be discussed in coming chapters, in John, 'his own' are all Israel even those who do not yet believe. These are the ones he came to and they rejected him. In the Fourth Gospel, they are initially situated in different regional spaces in and out of Palestine. Jesus takes abode in some of these places.

There are several indications in the Fourth Gospel that Jesus is from Nazareth in Galilee. Nathaniel is told by Phillip that they have found the one promised by Moses, Jesus from Nazareth (John 1:45). The first disciples also seem to be Galileans, hence likely to be known to Jesus because they come from the same area (John 1:43; 12:21; 21:2). When those who wanted to arrest Jesus on his last night came, they said they wanted Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus said "I am" (John 18:5-7). Even on the cross, Pilate put the inscription: "Jesus of Nazareth" and also "king of the Judeans" (John 19:19). Pilate's inscription could be explained as a colonial attitude that paints all indigenous groups with one brush.

[131] Other scholars think different sources have been put together (Fortna 1970:38-40).

Pilate knows that Jesus is from Nazareth but deliberately calls him the king of the Judeans (or Jewish people).[132] So the protest by Judeans that Pilate corrects his inscription could be read in the context of the Judeans not wanting to have king from Nazareth but from Judea.

At the beginning of his ministry in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus moves between Judea and Galilee, even though he may go to other places. He starts off in the Judean outskirts where John was baptising. From there, Jesus goes to Galilee for the wedding in Cana. After the wedding, he goes to Capernaum (only for a short time) on the shore of the Sea of Galilee. Jesus only leaves Galilee for the Passover in Jerusalem (John 2:1). After the Passover, he spends most of his time in the Judean countryside baptising with his disciples. He then leaves for Galilee when the Pharisees hear that he is becoming popular within the vicinity of Judea thereby threatening their control at the Temple (John 4:1-3). There is a necessity (”εδει) however for him to pass through Samaria (John 4:4) where has a very successful mission.

What we establish from this summary is that John 4:44 implies Jesus' home town to be Judea-Jerusalem. However, reading it from the perspective of the entire narrative raises new questions. If this implies that he was accepted in Galilee but rejected in Judea, it will contradict the reason of him leaving Judea (that he had started making many disciples) (John 4:1). There is evidence that there were people who saw the miraculous signs he did and also believed in Judea (John 2:23). Among these were of course Galileans (John 4:45). One reason to believe that those who put their faith in his name were also Judeans is the statement by Nicodemus “Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher who has come from God; for no one can do these signs that you do apart from the presence of God” (John 3:2). There were many Judeans-Jerusalemites who believed in him, but not those from among the leadership. In the Judean countryside, Jesus is so successful that the Pharisees become unsettled (John 4:1; 7:31). What they are afraid of is that the “authorities” or some of the “Pharisees” will believe in him (John 7:48).

[132] This is interesting when one looks at how the American approach to Iraq never anticipated tribal differences within the population. For them, Iraq was one country.

The suggestion that Judea is the Johannine Jesus' home cannot be strongly supported from the Gospel as Jesus seems to be constantly going to Galilee and only to Judea when there are religious festivals. It is not clear here, whether it was the Judeans grumbling in Capernaum, or it was just some Jews who were in Capernaum who did not want what Jesus was saying (John 6:41, 52). It seems as if in Galilee, especially in Capernaum, Jesus is also abandoned (John 6:66). If the disciples that abandon him in Capernaum are from Judea then we could be closer to some tentative solution. As it stands however, we can see that the only place where belief is consistent is Cana in Galilee and in Samaria. In Capernaum and in Jerusalem, there are many who believe but are afraid to go public because of the authorities.

Is this confusion not deliberate in the narrative? It seems to be. In John, when people claim to know something, they are always proved not to know it. Hence, if they say they know his "father and mother" (John 6:42), they will only end up proving that they neither knew him, or his father (John 8:19). If they think that they know "where this man is from" (John 7:27) he would say to them "you do not know where I come from or where I am going" (John 8:14). The confusion of the crowd and Judean authorities of claiming to know where Jesus is from (John 9:29), while at other times they claim not to know where he comes from (John 7:27) could easily have been picked up by John's implied audience who knew that Jesus was not from any regional location. They would have quickly understood Jesus' mockery of the Judean authorities (John 3:10): "Are you a teacher of Israel, and yet you do not understand these things?" This understanding becomes an indictment on any particular regional place claiming Jesus' πατρίς. His home is wherever there are Israelite people who believe, especially in Galilee, Samaria and Judea and the diaspora. His own, who rejected him are those in Galilee, Samaria and Judea who do not put their faith in him. He cannot find his home (μένω) in them.

When the first disciples asked Jesus where he was staying, it is said that they "came and saw where he was staying, and they remained with him that day" (John 1:38-39).[133] It is not however made clear where this place was and why they only remained in this place for a single day. There is a background suggestion that the Johannine Jesus does not have a local or regional home. Jesus' native home is as elusive as the description that the, "wind blows where it chooses, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know *where it comes from* or *where it goes*" (John 3:8). Like this wind, no one knows where Jesus is from. Jesus says to the Judeans "you do not know where I come from" (John 8:14). They also admit that they do not know where Jesus comes from (John 9:29-30). On the other hand, Nicodemus, "a teacher of Israel", says, "we know that you are a teacher who has come from God" (John 3:2). Other Judeans concur with him when they say, "we know where this man is from" although they mean his earthly homeland, maybe Galilee (John 7:27). Jesus presents himself as one who comes from the Father (John 3:31; 6:62; 13:3).[134] The *patris* of Jesus is obviously de-localised in the Gospel of John. The shape of his homeland shapes the theology of the Gospel. Those who follow Jesus in John should look forward to this place.[135] This is descriptive of the Johannine Jesus. But what would be the significance of this spatial construction for the community of John?

7. Significance of Space and Place of Jesus' in Constructing Identity in John

It has already been observed that regional locations are used to identify disciples in John. At the same time, we see this being subverted by calling all disciples Israel, which is a spatial image that cuts across the present geographical boundaries. Some who belong to Israel are geographically located in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, and the diaspora. Although some regions (like Judea) may have feelings of superiority over others (like Samaria)—

[133] In this sentence, ἔμειναν is in aorist, suggesting a once-off activity.

[134] We return to a full treatment of this in the coming chapters. It is not only the place of origin that is hinted at in John, but the destination of the Johannine Jesus. Jesus says that "you do not know where I come from or where I am going" (John 8:14). Where Jesus goes, the Judeans cannot come (John 8:21-22) even his disciples cannot come (John 13:33), at least for now, but later (John 13:36). Jesus says that he is the one from God (John 6:46) and will go back to God where he came from (John 6:62). His disciples know this place and the way to it (John 14:4). But Thomas submits that he and the other disciples do not know the place Jesus is talking about (John 14:5). The Judeans speculate that he will go to "the Dispersion among the Greeks" (John 7:35).

[135] Further detailed discussion is given in ensuing chapters.

constructing them as feminine spaces that are invaded—the new construction reverses such positions. Jesus has no home in either of these locale lest some may see themselves as more privileged than others in having better access to him.

We have also seen that in performing the signs, Jesus transforms ordinary spaces by 're-enchanting'[136] them with ritual and potent objects as a means of ensuring the productivity and progeny of the people of God. This can be demonstrated in the changing of water into wine at Cana and the meeting of the Samaritan woman at the well. The waters of the well and the ritual pots cannot be completely divorced from the birth waters of John 3:5 and the bubbling waters of John 7:38.

Jesus in John uses spatial imagery of movement from spaces of confinement and bondage to freedom. The relationship of the Temple and Sabbath as the sacred space-time under the control of the Judean authorities constitute an oppressive category. The expulsion from such space-time facilitates an experience of true freedom.

If this summary is reflective of what is going on in John, then it can tell us something about the setting of the life of the community itself.

7.1. Subversion of Traditional Space-Time Arrangements

If the community of John is now living in the diaspora, as all indications have shown, and as will be discussed in detail in the coming chapters, then the traditional dominating Judean space -time arrangements presented as oppressive are being subverted in John. The community of John, if it is now outside of Palestine, hence always from the Temple which has been destroyed, can start to reorient themselves to a new space-time free from the obligations of the synagogue or Temple tradition.

[136] This term is borrowed from Anthony Balcomb's title of a paper presented at the Theological Society of Southern Africa, June 20, 2008.

1. It would seem as if for John the detailed and exaggerated description of the geographical places looked at above serves a special purpose:
    a. Such exaggerated presentation of space is reflective of spatial and social dislocation. It shows that this community has lost its physical and social space, both as a result of the destruction of the Temple, and the later experience of being expelled from the synagogue. Such tendencies are common among diaspora communities where homeland cultural traditions are exaggerated.
    b. The details of place names serve claims to the truth. If detailed geographical details about the homeland are given as validations, then there is no need for questioning the authenticity of all other truth claims.
    c. More than thirty years after Jesus is dead, continuity between the Jesus tradition and the community of John would legitimate the community. Interpreting this tradition as continuous from the Old Testament up to the community of John would legitimate the group's existence. The same purpose is served by the use of Semitic names. The use of Semitisms and Aramaic words for place names would also prove solidity of tradition, showing that the Johannine community has authentic connections with ancient traditions, a typical practice of diaspora people.

2. It would seem that John suppressed and contested regional oppositions by weakening those with strong traditions and strengthening those with weak historical traditions:

    a. By the time Jerusalem is destroyed by the Romans, the regional divisions are stark. This works well for the occupying Romans since a united region is difficult to control. Once the city is destroyed together with the Temple and many people have fled to join the ever growing diaspora community, it becomes apparent that maintaining sharp regional differences does not serve any Jewish interest. What is important is to revive the Israelite restoration theology. This can only be done by weakening strong regional

claims. This is achieved by first, showing that the historical Jesus did not have a permanent earthly home. He did not have any permanent place of origin. His home is wherever he resides or abides with the Father among those who receive him in faith. Further, there is a rejection of the claim that Capernaum is the home of the first disciples. Actually, the role of the apostolic generation is minimised at the exaltation of the beloved disciple and of the Paraclete (in the place of the historical Jesus). Hence, any member of the community who has contact with the Paraclete is proved as authentic as the first disciples who related with the physical Jesus.

b. It also becomes apparent that in foreign and hostile lands, strict regional identities would weaken a minority Christian community. What is required is forging identity alliances that transcend regionalism. This can be done by resorting to the traditional construction of the people of God called Israel. Hence, the greatest religious experience is to see Jesus as the King of Israel. This removes any earthly identities of Jesus as coming from Judea, Samaria or Galilee since this would privilege those members of the Johannine community coming from the same regions. Hence, the new identity is Israel and the new locale is the father's place.

8. Conclusion

In this chapter it was observed that there were historical regional divisions in first century Palestine that threatened the unity of the Johannine Christian communities in the diaspora. To address this challenge, regional identities are subverted, all under the title of Israel. In Israel, all those who believe in Jesus find their identity. Israel is presented as the true bride of God who has the privilege to 'see' God. This delocalising and spiritualising of identity weakens those who hold strongly to their local traditions which could have emerged from Old Testament traditions or the Jesus tradition. Israel covers all believing Galileans, Samaritans, Judeans, as well as all the Jewish people scattered throughout the diaspora. Among the contentious issues is the role of the Land of Palestine and the

sacrality associated with it and its holy place, the Temple. This will be further investigated in the chapter which follows.

CHAPTER 5

SACRED SPACE AND PLACE

Es spunkt hier (Rudolf Otto 1958:131)[137]

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, an effort was made to demonstrate how historical regional divisions in first century Palestine affected and even threatened the unity of the Johannine Christian communities in the diaspora.[138] One such contentious regional feature was the Temple which was situated in Judea-Jerusalem. In the Gospel of John, the Temple represented contested constructions of sacred space. If the Fourth Gospel was produced when the Temple was no longer standing as has been suggested above, this investigation should seek to find out how its absence is handled by the Community of John. By examining Temple-related pericopes, a satisfactory explanation could be achieved. Since several works have been produced on the Temple, the focus of this section will be to examine how the sacred space in general is constructed in the Gospel of John and what cues such construction can give us into the operations of the Johannine community. Since the concern for sacred space is hinted at in several sections of the Gospel of John, it constitutes such a significant element of space construction that it becomes an important focus of this present research. As a result, this chapter will seek to give a detailed examination of the wider construction of sacred space as presented in the Gospel of John.

[137] This is Otto's German translation of Jacob's experience of God in the night (Gen. 28) (Otto 1958:131).
[138] Johannine scholarship is not conclusive of the community's location in Diaspora. What has been proposed is the author's provenance which is traditional associated with Ephesus (Lindars 1872:43). Alexandria has also been suggested. Palestine itself is also proposed as the place of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. The other strong proposal, also adopted by this thesis is Syria because of its close proximity to Palestine "whose language and customs John knows well; (b) Ignatius was Bishop of Antioch; (c) the pre-Christian Gnosticism which lies behind the Mandaism flourished in Syria" (Lindars 1972:43). Various sociology models of space seem to find more resonance with Syria than other places proposed.

2. Jewish Developments in the Construction of Holy Place and Space

There were divergent Jewish conceptions and articulations concerning access to the presence of God in first century Palestine. As Renwick (1991:25) has described it, the question asked, although not always explicit, was, "Where is God?" That God could be met at the central Temple did not always go unchallenged in both Testaments, hence the ongoing emergence of several "renewal movements" in first century CE Palestine (Theissen 1978; Horsley and Hanson 1985). It is assumed here, in agreement with a wide scope of Johannine scholars today, that at the finalisation of the Fourth Gospel, the Herodian Temple had been destroyed by the Romans in 70 CE (Draper 1997).[139] However, it is the considered position of this present study, in contrast to one section of Johannine scholarship (e.g., Köstenberger 2005) that the Fourth Gospel is not responding to the destruction of the Temple *per se* but to the plethora of challenges to do with community life in the diaspora (Draper 1997:264). Before the diaspora thesis is discussed in the next chapter, it is appropriate here to trace some highlights in the various understanding of the Sacred.

2.1. Setting the Scene: The Holy Place from Old Testament Times

The use of Old Testament narratives to verify the centrality of the Temple in first century CE Palestine is problematic (Howard and Grisanti 2003:34-41).[140] These narratives would draw on "re-used old stories, adapted" which were reflective of the Exile, nostalgia of the distant past and replete with visions of the future (Schofield (1964:9). But the subtext from these narratives gives some hints to help correct some presuppositions on the centrality of the cultic centre. For example, there are hints that Solomon's desire to centralise the Temple as the sole place for encountering Yahweh was never fully realised. The building narrative, written well "after the Temple had been destroyed" (Goldhill

[139] This decision is reached despite John Robinson's proposition of an earlier date (1976).
[140] These authors have shown that the challenge is not with the complexity of the history itself but also the historian.

2004:19) in 1 and 2 Kings is illuminating.[141] In this narration, David is presented as the hero who, after winning Jerusalem from the Jebusites, makes it his capital and brings the ark of God's presence there. His intention is now to build the house for the ark of the presence there since the ark cannot "dwell in a tent" while David is staying "in a house of cedar" (2 Sam. 7:2). This house of the ark was also going to be the 'only' "dwelling" of God's presence under the control of the king (McKelvey 1969:3). The subversive traditions though reveal the resistance to this "staggering gesture of religious politics" (Goldhill 2004:25). One objection was that David could not build the Temple because he had been a "man of war", but Solomon his son could do so (1 Chron. 28:3). In Samuel however, David does not have to build a house for the ark because *God has never dwelt in a house* and so does not need one now (2 Sam.7:1ff).[142] One observes here that not only was the tradition of the monarchy contested, but also centralisation of the place of worship (see also Turner 1979:73-75).

There is strong evidence that the building of a centralised place of the presence for Yahweh did not necessarily get rid of the other sacred places in Ophrah, Nob, Mizpah, Ramah Gilgal, Bethel or Shechem, Hebron, and Shiloh (Gen. 12:6-8; Gen. 28:10-22; 1 Sam. l 1:7, 1:9, 1:24; 3:3). Some of these places, such as Shechem in Samaria seem to have had a very long tradition of worshiping communities well before the centralising project of the Jerusalem Temple, contrary to anti-Samaritan scholarship that uncritically paints Samaria as apostate (See Freyne 2000:115ff). The possibility that the people from the north did not necessarily value the Temple in Jerusalem more than the places where they had always been worshiping is high (More 1971:24).[143] For the people of Shechem, it was Gerizim and not Zion that "was the place which God had chosen for his habitation" (1971:24). It therefore becomes clear that the building of the Temple next to Solomon's palace in 953 BCE does not necessarily mean the centralisation of the cult was automatically and unanimously accepted.

---

[141] The identity of Yahweh seems to have been blurred in Elijah's conflict with the house of Omri against the worship of Baal (1 Kings 16:17).

[142] This idea seems to be alive in the New Testament period as manifest in Stephen's speech in Acts 8.

[143] This could be the basis for the continued claims made by the Samaritans that spill over into the New Testament period. More suggests that Shechem was one of the "most venerable religious sites in the land," being a "place of worship, with a priesthood of its own and a cultus not unlike that in Jerusalem" (1971:24).

The traditions of God meeting people in the mundane activities of the day is well established, e.g., Adam and Eve in the cool of the day (Gen. 3:8); Abraham "by the oaks of Mamre" (Gen. 18:1). God could be met at some semi-central places. Additionally, God could be encountered at the "high places" (*bamoth*), "sacred pillars" and "Asherah" poles (2 Kings 18:4).[144] The Hebrews encountered God "upon the hills and under every green tree", altars, sacred stones, sacred wooden poles, grooves (Deut. 12:2-3) (Manson 1956:435).[145] The local deities and shrines provided a theology that God could be accessed locally (Schofield 1964:11). Most of these local sites did not require "resident priesthood" and the "multiplicity of places of worship was never felt to violate the will of Jehovah until the publication" of the reforms of Josiah in 621 BCE which commanded "every shrine of Jehovah except the Temple in Jerusalem" to be destroyed according to Deuteronomy 12, if this account can be accepted as entirely factual, rather than a subsequent legitimation of the Deuteronomic code (Verhey 2002:261).[146] Elijah lamented the destruction of these "altars of Jehovah" though (1 Kings 19:10, 14) (Pfeiffer 1961:90).

This multifarious God was sometimes presented as impossible to see face-to-face lest one should die (Exod. 3:6; 33:17-33; 1 Kings 19:13). Ezekiel even advised the Levitical priests to take off the garments they would have used for ministry lest these garments would get into contact with people and endanger them (Ezek. 44:15-19). This view of God is not the "primitive" notion which would latter develop into some relational notion as people's understanding developed, as suggested by Schofield (1964:51) and Snaith (1951: 34).[147] Manoah, Samson's father, sees the angel of God and is terrified that he is

---

[144] The tree of life in Eden is also related to the Asherah as a "mythical conceptualisation of the sanctuary" of the Temple in the ANE Baal worship (Wyatt 1986:363).

[145] If the Deuteronomic history (covering Deuteronomy through 2 Kings) "received its final form during the Exile" then it is possible to interpret cultic institutions from the exilic perspective (Nickelsburg 1981:11).

[146] Baruch Halpern states that, "denying the historicity of Hezekiah's and Josiah's reform has been a reliable cottage industry" (1988:26).

[147] Of course this categorisation is influenced by Rudolf Otto's book, *The Idea of the Holy* (1924), where he distinguishes God's presence into the "numinous" and the "rational", categories that are useful, but not fully descriptive, of the Old Testament presentation of God. The notion of a developing understanding of the Jewish conception of the presence of God has also been attended to by Hans Wenschkewitz (1932). He has concluded that there were two poles of understanding. One is influenced by "spiritual piety" expressed

going to die, after which his wife corrects his theology by pointing out that if God wanted to kill them, God would not have "done all he has done for us" (Judg. 13:22ff).

Even among the prophets, the experience of God is diverse. Isaiah speaks of theophanies at the Jerusalem Temple in relationship to the hegemony of the kings over this sacred space. Isaiah sees Yahweh in the year of king Uzziah's death as all along his access was obscured by the king's presence (Isa. 6:1-3).[148] In this vision, Isaiah experiences the heavy presence of God and hears and sees seraphim making it "tempting to associate this aspect of the vision scenario with the cult object in the Jerusalem Temple known as *Naheshtan*, a bronze serpent with healing powers of Mosaic origin to which incense was offered (2 Kings 18:4 *cf.* Num. 21:6, 8-9)" (Blenkinsopp 2000:225). This is a significant note, since the worship of this bronze serpent is seen as idolatry (2 Kings 18:4), yet in the context of the Temple it is the highest form of encounter with God. The reference to this serpent as encounter with God in John is also unmistakable (John 3:14).

2.2. Holy Place and Space Following the Exile

After the "fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE, the North and the South seem to have been drawing together" (Hoehner 1972:53). The reason could be that local spiritual resources

---

in "prayer and ethical conduct", while the other leans towards "cultic piety with its emphasis on sacrifices, priests, and the Temples" on the other (in Koester 1989:2). This distinction is rejected by Georg Klinzing (1971) who sees the "reinterpretation" of the Temple cult as socially located. Using the example of the Qumran community's reinterpretation of the Temple, Klinzing sees it as a response to the dissatisfaction with the Temple administration. Schüssler Fiorenza (1976:164), though in agreement with Klinzing, has challenged the *Religionsgeschichte* upon which Klinzing's methodological frame of investigating these "theological differences" was based. She notes for example that the New Testament writers do not "reinterpret the cultic institutions and terminology but express a new reality in cultic language" (1976:162 n. 2). Cullmann (1975:39-56) and Brown (1983:74-79) agree that a tendency among certain groups (Jewish, Samaritan, Hellenists in Acts 6 and the Johannine community) against the Temple cult is evident. Our investigation will also take seriously Klinzing's analysis modified by Schüssler Fiorenza. The different usage of cultic terminology in relationship to the presence of God is always socio-politically located. It will be argued that the absence or threat to the existence of the physical Temple and Temple system is usually the reason for the exaggeration of its significance and its subversion and substitution by the alternative conception of the presence of God without the Temple. It is a rich Jewish mechanism to cope with extreme loss of space relied upon for generations as the Jewish nation always had to deal with this inevitability. A brief investigation of such Jewish traditions could shed more light in investigation the same issue in the Fourth Gospel.

[148] In the Old Testament, the term (בַּיִת) regularly used to refer to the house of God, that is, Temple. See Blenkinsopp (2000:225) for further discussion of this text.

from the North became handy in the absence of the centralised cult in Jerusalem. However, after they returned from exile, the 'remnant' began to doubt "the purity of the Hebrew stock among the northerners" (Hoehner 1972:53). One can thus conclude that if the destruction weakened the theology of centralised cult, what revived it is the contact of the Exiles with the Babylonian centralised cult (Meyers 1997:324; Hanson and Oakman 1998:135).[149] In captivity, God's presence had to be reformulated and modelled after the Babylonian worship system of a centralised cult. This fertility cult gave both monarchic and priestly powers to the king, who was also the son of the god responsible for the fertility of the land, hence responsible for receiving gifts on behalf of the gods. This conception of the Temple seems to be influenced by later narratives on the Temple. For the tribes that remained, they had no choice other than to "turn to local sanctuaries and cult centres in order to express their belief in the powers that determined life and death" (Freyne 1980:261). It is therefore not surprising that these conflicting images concerning the cult are reflected in the narratives of Ezra-Nehemiah (Schofield 1964:11).

The returning elite had had almost fifty years of interaction with such Babylonian cultic thinking. It obviously influenced their theology which was different from the theology of those who had remained behind.[150] It is not surprising therefore that the generation of people coming from the exile (called the 'Remnant' in Haggai, Zechariah, and in Ezra-Nehemiah) had the urge to rebuild the Temple as opposed to the people who had remained behind (called 'the people of the land' in Ezra-Nehemiah) (Oesterley 1957:82). The 'people of the land' were presented as an inferior and impure race, holding to some "impure Jewish faith" (Oesterley 1957:82). This theory in Ezra-Nehemiah, that populations left "at home slipped away spiritually (becoming idolaters) and physically (through intermarriage) so that in 550 there were no true Jews outside Babylon" since the "real Judah was in captivity" (Pfeiffer 1961:200) is patronising and cannot be accepted. Of note, is the fact that 'the people of the land' continued to use the religious resources they had always had without seeking Jerusalem approval, such that even when the

[149] The historical nature of Solomon's Temple is never easy to ascertain since the narratives present it in hindsight after the Exile, hence its nature is highly systematised. Is is by reading the subtext however that the competition from the other holy places becomes apparent.

[150] The Ezra-Nehemiah narratives are illuminating in this regard. Here, those who return from Exile presume to have rights to systematise religion over those who remained behind. They are however resisted.

Temple was finally rebuilt, they continued since no one could monitor their practices in the remote rural areas such as Galilee (Freyne 1980:261). Haggai and Zechariah, who are contemporaries of Ezra-Nehemiah, do not share in the view that when the 'remnant' returned with the desire to build the Temple, the 'people of the land' disturbed them. What they reveal is that what was resisted was the rebuilding of a central place of worship, and not worship itself (Haggai 1:2). Following further appeal, the Second Temple is then restored and dedicated by Zerubbabel and Joshua (Hag. 1:2, 2:2-9; Ezra 3:2) some time between 515 and 520 BCE.[151] Oesterley and Pfeiffer note the theological bias of historical events in Ezra-Nehemiah as well as the final resistance against the centralising tendency of the Judeans before the arrival of the Maccabees (Oesterley 1957:88; Pfeiffer 1961:200-8).

2.3. The Case of Samaria

In order to understand the sacred space in first century CE Palestine, one needs to investigate Samaria, although not extensively due to the limitation of space in this present study. Pfeiffer thinks that in Ezra-Nehemiah one has the beginnings of the "Samaritan Schism" as the "people of the land" are said to be led by Sanballat, the governor of Samaria (1961:201).[152] If this is true, it would expose all the negative representations of Samaria as apostate by most literature on the Samaritans, most of which was either produced by Christians or Hellenistic Jews, closely connected with the Jerusalem Temple (Pummer 2002:1-3). In what is a penetrating study, Pummer shows that most Samaritan scholarship still confuses the 'Samarians' (all the people residing in Samaria, whether pagan, Jew, gentile or Christian) and 'Samaritans' (the members of the "religio-ethnic group that has its roots in Judaism, but split off from the latter, rejected the Temple in Jerusalem and regarded its own Temple on Mount Gerizim as the only legitimate sanctuary") (Pummer 2002:1). Pummer's definition is also weakened in that he defines Samaritanism from the perspective of first century Jerusalem Temple "Judaism" as if the

[151] There are varying dates with some saying it was 515 BCE (Hayward 1996:1), while others posit 516 BCE (Meyers 1997:324), or 520 BCE (Hanson and Oakman 1998:135). For further discussion see Oesterley (1957:82) who puts it at 516 BCE.

[152] It is interesting that when the Elephantine Jews in Egypt wrote of their persecution in 408 BCE, both the Samaritans and the Jerusalemites recognised them as one people (Cowley 1923:108-122).

Samaritan tradition emerges from this kind of "Judaism". As has already been shown above, the construction of the holy site on Gerizim is no longer considered to be as late as scholarship once assumed (Freyne 2000:120-123). What we see in Samaritan religious life is a continuous commitment to Yahweh in the midst of pluralistic interpretations of the Pentateuch current in the first century CE. Samaritan resistance against the religious South's domination of the North demonstrated by their maintenance of their Temple which was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 128 BCE (Freyne 1980:274; 2000:115) or in 111 BCE (Pummer 2002:2). What does become evident when the Hasmoneans take control of Palestine is their mission to centralise the sacred place in order to consolidate political power. That this drew some theological backing from the Jerusalem religious system is apparent.

2.4. After the Hasmoneans

The bulk of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, "written during the Hasmonean dynasty", emerged at an interesting period because of the relative prosperity and the particular novel views on the accessibility of God which emerged (McKelvey 1969:15). The Maccabean revolt used the desecration of the Temple and the plundering of its holy vessels as a way of rallying the masses (1 Macc.1:20-28). Nothing would rally people together more than in response to what is perceived as a national call to defend national integrity against the insult by Antiochus Epiphanes (168 BCE), who had erected the altar "to the Olympian Zeus", by desecrating the Temple (Russell 1976:28). Hence, this defilement of the Second Temple raised fervent nationalistic energies under the leadership of the Maccabees. In this light, the building of the Temple as a central place of worship is not surprising (Hanson and Oakman 1998:135; Meyers 1997:324). Jonathan, who was based in Jerusalem, began to command the people to build and renew the city (1 Macc.10:10ff) and rebuild the Temple and separate it from the city so that no business transactions could be done there (1 Macc. 12:36ff). The process of re-establishing the Temple during this period is accompanied with destroying any other competing religious centres, a sign that they were in existence. Jonathan is said to have destroyed the Temples

of Dagon and all those who had hid in it as he pursued and defeated Apollonius (1 Macc. 10:83-83).

The Maccabean family used the centralisation of the Temple system to rally all the people around themselves and to consolidate their power at the expense of the local shrines, especially in the north. This, in a way forced 'conversion', an expression of the unequal power relations between the margins in the North and the centre in the South. The setting up of new Temple festivals to commemorate its cleansing (e.g., the festival of Hanukkah or Dedication) and the appointment of Jonathan as the high priest is a demonstration of how politics and religion were inextricably connected, such that the only god who could be worshipped was that of the rulers (1 Macc. 10:15-20) (Horsley 1995:34-35).

The mention by Josephus of several cult centres in the North where Herod built a Temple to Augustus is also reflective of the commitment to the ancient sacred sites by the people in this area against one centralised place of worship in the South (*Ant* 15:363; *War* 1:404). This site and many other sites in the area have been linked with ancient sacred sites such as Dan (Freyne 1980:273). Freyne also demonstrates that this low commitment to the Temple system is also evident in other groups even in Judea such as the Qumran Essens, the Baptist circles and other groups that were offering possibilities of attaining ritual purity through systems not connected to the Temple (Freyne 1980:276).[153] Those who recognised the Temple as one sacred place among many possible others would have even found legitimation of their views due to the well known corruption prevalent at the Temple, the collaboration between the aristocracy with the Romans and the economic burden this produced on the ordinary people (Horsley 1985:34-46).

The Protestant, and modern reader of the Old Testament, inclined to think about God in terms of the refined Trinitarian formulae of Nicaea would be appalled by this messy theology. The God(s) in the Old Testament cannot be thought of in terms of the history of

[153] This understanding can be seen even later when a the new "coin of the First Revolt from Gamala with the inscription, 'For the Redemption of Jerusalem, the Holy'" pointing to "some concern with purity and holiness as represented by the Jerusalem Temple" (Freyne 1997:136)

religions school model which sees a progressive evolution of the understanding of God in time culminating with the coming of Jesus. The truth of the matter is that the stories about God "were preserved in different ways to meet the needs of different people in different *places* rather than at different *times*" (Schofield (1964:11, Italics added). The Old Testament's (and maybe even the New Testament) image of God and God's presence(s) defy the neat categorisation sought by some theologians.

2.5. The Destruction of the Temple and Jewish Experience

Before attending to an assessment of the texts, a re-examination of two positions assumed by the generality of Johannine scholarship on the Temple is required. The first is that the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE was a universal catastrophe for all Jewish people (Kerr 2002:47; Renwick 1991:41). Second, as a result of the above, that the Gospel of John is responding to the absence of the Temple and presenting Jesus as its replacement (Kerr 2002:47; Köstenberger 2005: 215-216).

The first critique of the previous scholarship on the subject is the assumption that the 70 CE destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem was a catastrophe for all Jewish people (Renwick 1991:41). That the "destruction of the *Second Temple* by the Romans in A.D. 70 is an indisputable historical datum" does not make the event a "universal" catastrophe for all the "Jews in both Palestine and the diaspora" as suggested by some scholars (Köstenberger 2005: 215-216; Köstenberger 2006:78; Kerr 2002:47). The suggestion that this 'universal' trauma necessitated the writing of the Fourth Gospel to foster a 'replacement' cannot be supported from a fair analysis of all the Johannine material (to this we return below). As has already been discussed above, the relationship between Jerusalem Temple and the communities on the geographical outskirts was "ambivalent" (Draper 1997), hence, it is likely that there were various reactions to its destructions (Draper 2003:86).

Although Draper (1997:264) emphasises economic "exploitation of the peasantry" as the reason for different attitudes, the background study above demonstrates that some

unresolved theological tensions also presented reasons for the opposition to the Temple system. What one can be sure of is that the destruction of the Temple "constituted a relief in the economic burden for the Galileans" whose taxes would be reduced from three to one (Horsley 1995:279). This can be seen by the fact that when the "Galilean peasants briefly did control the Jerusalem and the Temple in 69 CE, they were responsible for the burning of the debt records" (Draper 1997:264). The Galileans' attachment to the Temple on the basis that God's presence at the Jerusalem Temple would effect the well-being of the land only if "faithful worship" was taking place there (Freyne 1980:294). The Galileans' refusal to "sow their crops as long as any threat continued to the sovereignty of the God in Jerusalem (*War* 2:200)" was maybe not a sign of patriotism so much as was it a way of protesting against the taxation which both the Romans and the retainer class benefited from. In all likelihood, the stance was a reaction against the double taxation that the rural population would suffer on their surplus from the both the Romans and the Temple system (*contra* Freyne 1980:294).

Apart from these economic factors, Galileans were also suspicious of the way the Jerusalem priests conducted the Temple business if the anger manifested at the Temple when an insurrection came up is any thing to go by. First, the increased influence of the Temple on all Palestinians after the Maccabean conquest should not be taken uncritically as a renewed commitment to the Temple system, especially after the unpopular appointment of a "high priest" "not from the ancient line of Zadok" (Ehrman 2004:38-39). This appointment confirmed the Galileans' feeling that the theological values of the Temple were being sacrificed for political ends, hence their deposition of the "aristocratic (non-Zaddokite) high priest" during the war with Rome and replacing him with "an illiterate, peasant (Zaddokite) high priest" when they took charge of the Temple around 67 CE (Ehrman 2004:46; Draper 1997:264; Horsley and Hanson 1985:216-259). In other words, what Galilean adherents to the Temple and the other "non-elite" people would have wanted and even anticipated was its "destruction" as a means of its restoration and purification (Draper 1997:264). This ambivalent relationship with the Temple has been described in Hanson and Oakman (1998) as follows:

> The non-elite "depended upon the Temple and priests for regulating their lives with God and for ensuring the fertility of the land. On the other hand, the Temple held power for them. Only if the priests satisfied God's demands would things be well with weather, soil, and crops" (1998:153).

For the Galileans and those on the receiving end of the corruption:

> The Jerusalem Temple was not the centre of messianic hope but the source of their confidence in the ongoing struggle for the necessities of life, and this 'attenuated' understanding of the Temple and its symbolism may have been the ultimate reason for their continued faithfulness to the Yahweh shrine through the centuries, despite the vicissitudes of history (Freyne 1980:295).

This kind of relationship does not come out clearly in Temple scholarship. The un-problematised centrality of the Temple ignores the known feelings of dissatisfaction with the Temple system on the part of the poor members of the Palestinian society, but particularly for those from the north, that were marginalised simply because the Temple was physically far away.

2.6. The Problem of Sources

One major challenge to the position assumed by many scholars on first century CE Temple is that of sources. Where do these scholars get the indication that all Jews everywhere were traumatised by the destruction of the Temple such that literature like the Fourth Gospel emerged to address this trauma?

It can be shown that most of the material presented as evidence of lament over the destruction of the Second Temple is late and responding to later events. It can also be shown that sometimes the Temple being referred to is actually the First Temple. The credibility of the first source, Josephus' *Jewish war*, is questioned for the reasons given below. The use of the Gospels, especially by Matthew, has been shown to be problematic because these are Jewish Christian documents trying to legitimate the emergence of a new movement. The second century CE Pseudepigrapha, 2 Baruch (Syriac), 3 Baruch (Greek), 4 Ezra, and the Apocalypse of Abraham, are too late and not detailed enough to show whether they are referring to the Second Temple (Kirschner 1985:27-28). The use

of the eighteenth-century Talmudists such as Jonathan Eibschutz, the Yiddish folk song,[154] or material from Jewish Merkabah mysticism as do some scholars (e.g., Smith 1978) will give reinterpreted concerns for the Temple system of later time, but not necessarily the experiences of the first century CE Palestine Jews in response to the destruction of the Temple.

Some of these sources will now be examined for their historical reliability and value.

2.7. Josephus and Philo

Josephus and Philo are not looked here under the same headline because they see the sacred place and space the same way, but because of their Hellenistic tenor and their attitude biased towards the priestly class.

2.7.1. Josephus

The significance of Josephus as a major source for historical reconstruction for the period just before and during the emergence of Christianity has been well-documented (Feldman 1987:13-14). The use of Josephus as 'proof' for the authenticity of Christian history can also be seen at work until the middle ages and even beyond, so much so that scholars can be tempted to take his account as history (Feldman 1987:13-14). It is therefore unsurprising that Clyde Pharr could state:

> So much of the early history of Christianity is wrapped in obscurity that additional evidence from any source is always welcome. Apart from the writings of the New Testament and the other early Christian literature, the most important single author is Josephus (1927:137).

Apart from being useful for Christianity, Josephus is also the "chief guide for the archaeologist in recreating the economic, social, political, and cultural life of Judea,…before the destruction of the Second Temple" (Feldman 1987:14).

[154] Especially that the song is thought of emerging in the fourteenth century in response to situations completely different from the first century experience (Slobin 1982).

Chyutin also observed that since Josephus "served within the Temple bounds as a priest, and also witnessed its destruction when he acted as an advisor to Titus" his description should be "reliable" (2006:144). He therefore suggests that one can "say almost with certainty that Josephus is a reliable historical source for the description of Herod's Temple" (2006:144).

With all the usefulness of his narration notwithstanding, Josephus' work is also fraught with 'ideological' tendencies (like any literature) which those using him as evidence should take note of (Kreissig 1989:265ff). Horsley and Hanson have already noted the problematic nature of Josephus' biased "sympathies for the upper levels of Judean society" in his account of 'what really happened' (1983:xix). In his penetrating analysis of Josephus, Kreissig notes that scholars of Josephus regard it as sufficient "to establish the fact that he (Josephus) was a priest and then begin the work of analysis" of his work on the assumption that by so doing they now know "the author and his work" (Kreissig 1989:266). He sees the weakness of this approach evident in the work of Buehler and Helgo Lindner who take Josephus' mythical historiography as fact and never critique Josephus' misrepresentation of his opponents (Kreissig 1989:266). In order to get the best from Josephus, Kreissig suggests that the scholar cannot only consider what Josephus is saying without taking "notice of his origin and social position, the society in which he lived, and all his actual relationships to the history of his time" (Kreissig 1989:266; see also Horsley and Hanson 1983:xix).

If one takes Kreissig's caution seriously, some startling issues that compromise Josephus' testimony concerning the destruction of the Temple begin to emerge. It becomes apparent that he "descended all along from the priests" (*Life* 1:1), therefore with "considerable holdings" of land (Kreissig 1989:267). In the first century CE, only a small percentage of the population had access to productive land which had been confiscated from those who had not managed to pay off their debt. Josephus would not have concerned himself with the fact that in this society there was a division of the people "into few wealthy men, who had the power, many paupers, who had no power" since for him this had been "ordained by God and thus completely obvious and unworthy of literary mention" (Kreissig

1989:267). For Josephus, the destruction of the Temple is the "outcome of, and divine penalty for, folly and wickedness" of the people of Israel (Lampe 1984:155). As Dennis Groh has observed:

> Tensions and great differences of practice between Judean and Galilean Jews are demonstrably absent from Josephus' writings. Popular unrest based on socio-economic incompatibility of various classes in Palestine is absent, because, for Josephus, all this is 'irrelevant' (1997:32).

Josephus was not only a member of the elite in Jerusalem, coming as he does where from a priestly family; he was also connected as "an Imperial protégé" and "protected favourite of the Flavian dynasty" in Rome where he spent most of his time writing the literature we are dependent upon for this historical reconstruction of the Roman subjects (Millar 1993:70, 338). According to Horsley and Hanson, Josephus was writing for the "Roman victors and their upper class" (1983:xix).

The above discussion does not seek to label Josephus' account of the attitudes to the destruction of the Temple completely unreliable, but to point to the danger of using this alone as evidence of such a huge event. Other first century literature need to be consulted to ascertain how various people, not only the aristocracy but also those on the social margins, felt about the absence of the Temple. Of course, as has been correctly put by Horsley and Hanson, those on the margins of society "left no literary remains, except, (…) their influence" that can only, with much effort, be gleaned from the works that precede and are contemporary with Josephus (1983:xviii). Some works before the destruction of the Temple can give us a picture of various attitudes to the Temple. Though all these texts are written from the perspective of the powerful, something could hopefully be 'third spaced' from their subtext.

2.7.2. Philo

Philo of Alexandria (20BCE-50CE) was interested in Jewish identity and therefore included the Jerusalem city and the Temple in his reflections (Niehoff 2001:34; Fuglseth 2005: 188). He was writing before the destruction of the Temple and therefore gives us insight into how some diaspora Jews viewed the Temple. Jerusalem for Philo was the

"mothercity" of all Jewish people (Niehoff 2001:33). Philo argued that unlike other peoples of other nationalities, Jewish people were not defined by a "dwelling-place set apart" and a "land cut off from others" (*Mos.* 1:278). They were spread out in the whole *oikoumene* although Judea played and important symbolic role as the centre (Niehoff 2001:33). Of special importance in this regard was the Temple as it was viewed by Jews in the diaspora.

> For so populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them. Therefore they settle in very many of the most prosperous countries in Europe and Asia both on the islands and on the mainland, and while they hold the Holy City where stands the sacred Temple of the most high God to be their mothercity… (*Flac.* 46).

Philo therefore expected Jews in the diaspora to go on pilgrimages to the Temple in Jerusalem as he did himself (*Prov.* 2:64). He noted that this was acceptable practice even among the diaspora Jews in Rome (*Leg.* 155-156).

For Philo the Temple was seen as the house of the one God (*Spec.* 1:46).

> Shall we be allowed to come near him [Gaius] and open our months in defense of the houses of prayer to the destroyer of the all-holy place? For clearly to houses less conspicuous and held in lower esteem no regard would be paid by one who insults that most notable and illustrious shrine whose beams like the sun's reach every whither, beheld with awe both by East and West. And even if we were allowed to approach him unmolested, what have we to expect but death against with there is no appeal? Well so be it, we will die and be no more, for the truly glorious death, met in defense of the laws, might be called life. But if our decease brings no advantage, is it not madness to let ourselves perish as well… (*Leg.* 192-3).

For Philo there was a close relationship between the local synagogue and the Jerusalem Temple as this fitted in his model of the cosmos as Temple (Fuglseth 2005: 191). This led Philo to see any part of the earth as potential place to encounter God. In Egypt where he was resident, he should have seen the Leontopolis Jewish Temple to be a place holy enough to cater for all the diaspora Jews' religious needs.

Philo's theology concerning the sacred space was evident in his allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament that 'spiritualised' the sacred space. For example, Goshen the Israelites stayed during Pharaoh's time was now replaced by the site where the Jewish Temple of Onias was built (Niehoff 2001:68). The holy places, including the Temple in Jerusalem reflected a "superior reality" which went beyond what could be seen with human eyes, according to Philo (Fuglseth 2005: 218). He saw the tabernacle on earth as

the copy of the heavenly Temple in line with neo-Platonic understanding of copies (*Mos.* 2:67ff). If the Temple would have been destroyed during his time, Philo would have been disturbed like other Jews, but his theology could do without the Temple since it was just a physical copy of the 'real' spiritual Temple in the heavenly realm.

2.8. Second Century CE Pseudepigrapha

Second century CE Pseudepigrapha have also been used as proof that the destruction of the Temple was traumatic for all Jewish people (Kirschner 1985:28). If one begins with a brief look at *4 Ezra*, one encounters, in the opening two chapters, the "divine call to Ezra, a man of priestly descent (*4 Ezra* 1:1-3), to reprove the Jewish people for their waywardness despite God's repeated mercies (*4 Ezra* 1:4-2:32)" (Metzger 1983:517). After this rejection, Ezra goes to the gentiles, who respond positively, and he is shown a vision of them receiving crowns from the "Son of God, whom they confessed in the world" (2:42--48). This is obviously a Christian framework around which the main text (vv. 3-14) is built (Metzger 1983:517). Even though the visions of the main text are the work of a Jewish author, they are easily useful for Christian interpretation. The first vision (*4 Ezra* 3:1-5:19) raises questions of theodicy followed by another vision (*4 Ezra* 5:21-6:34) where *4 Ezra* raises a complaint to God for abandoning the Israelites for the Gentiles. These visions are followed by similar concerns to those in Paul's letters to the Thessalonians, where *4 Ezra* is asking about the fate of those who die before the dawn of the new eschatological age. The last visions relate to the final judgement and its severity and the promise of a messiah who would punish the Romans for "persecuting" God's elect (*4 Ezra* 12:10-34) (Metzger 1983:517).

One could observe that this book, though written with the knowledge of the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, presents this destruction in the light of the destruction of 586 BCE. As such, it does not provide any historical proof of the traumatic feelings of the generality of Jewish people other than to theologise around this destruction.

Just as with *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* (or *2 Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*) reflects on the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE in the light of the one in 586 BCE. By so doing, it enriches itself with the "lamentations, prayers, questions with answers, apocalypses with explanations, addresses to the people, and a letter to the Jews in the Dispersion" (Klijn 1983:615). The similarity between the two works has suggested some inter-dependence (Klijn 1983:617). For *2 Baruch*, it is significant that the utensils of the Temple were removed by the angels before the destruction of the Temple (*2 Baruch* 1:1-8:5), since he looks forward to the restoration and inauguration of the new Temple (*2 Baruch* 32:2-4; 68:5). Differing traditions concerning the Temple's restoration (*2 Baruch* 6:8) and that of replacement with the one that had already been built (*2 Baruch* 6:4) are evident. This is true of the period before 70 CE, where differing traditions concerning the Temple's future coexisted (Klijn 1983:617). As such, *2 Baruch* is not necessarily a demonstration of the widespread concern for the Temple, but part of the diverse Temple discourses of the time before and after the Temple's destruction. In *2 Baruch*, the destruction signalled the time of God's judgement on Israel (Lampe 1984:155).

It is likely that *3 Baruch* is a "Christian composition that has made use of Jewish traditions", or a Jewish work that has undergone Christian reworking beyond recognition. As such, it cannot be used as proper historical material useful for ascertaining the Jewish responses to the 70 CE destruction of the Temple (Gaylord 1983:656). Its emphasis on the "apocryphal and mystical (Merkabah)" experiences of the heavenly thrones presupposes the absence of the Temple and its replacement by the true Temple, the heavenly throne(s) of God. If the punishment of those who build towers to heaven references the desire to rebuild the Temple (*2 Baruch* 2:7; 3:6, 8), then the Temple is presented as something now obsolete.

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* is based on covenant theology and contains a very short pericope (*Apocalypse of Abraham* 27:1-3) of the destruction of the Temple which is understood in this light. The Temple is in this case, justifiably destroyed due to the "infidelity of Israel toward the covenant with God and the opportunistic politics of some leaders" (Rubinkewicz 1983:685).

The relationship between these above texts to the book of Revelation is striking. But Revelation provides another dimension to the idea of Temple. In his book, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*, Gregory Stevenson has demonstrated the frequency of Temple cultic language in Revelation (2001). However, he could be wrong in thinking that this frequency is because the Temple image communicated powerfully to the people of different cultures who in the past had had Temples in their religious tradition (2001:2). On the contrary, Revelation gives detailed Temple imageries only to set them off by, "And I saw no temple in it, for the Lord God, the Almighty, and the Lamb, are its temple" (Rev. 21:22). If Etienne Charpentier is correct in suggesting that apocalyptic literature emerge from times of crisis, then Revelation could have emerged at a time when the 'first space' experience of its recipients was that of spatial constriction (Charpentier 1982:89). This situation required, not only a 'second space' account or narrative, but also a 'third spacing' that would reject any significance of Temples and all buildings that allowed human power to be seen on them. This 'third spacing' becomes a vision or imagination, which should not be confused with historical presentation. If this is the case with regards to the works discussed above, their use to account for the attitudes of the people to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE becomes problematic. As will be seen in the next section, other views on the Temple before its destruction in 70 CE paint a picture that could be approximated to be closer to the various experiences and reaction to this destruction. Of course all this remain guesses, albeit intelligent ones.

2.9. The Psalms of Solomon (Pss. Sol.) as Reflecting a Crisis

From the many references from the Pseudepigrapha cited as reflective of crisis in Palestine, the first century BCE *Psalms of Solomon* could be considered closest to what could be the experience of Jewish people at the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. The *Psalms of Solomon* emerges as a critical reflection of the events from the arrival of Pompey up to the mismanagement of the Temple by the Hasmonean dynasty (Wright 1985:640-642). Its main criticism is of the "sinners" who are the Hasmoneans who

"despoiled the throne of David with arrogant shouting" and did not "glorify" God's "honourable name" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:5-6). God thus overthrew them by sending a "man alien to our race" who "hunted down their descendants" and destroyed them "according to their actions" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:8-9). Those who were righteous fled into the "wilderness" and others into "exile" and "were scattered over the whole earth" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:17-18). God's presence also departed, the rain stopped falling and "springs were stopped" since there was no righteous person to enjoy these blessings of God (*Pss. Sol.* 17:18-19). There is hope in the Psalms of Solomon for the messiah who will "gather a holy people" who will "glorify the Lord in a place prominent above the whole earth" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:26, 30).

With the Psalms of Solomon there is a covenantal threefold formula: "I will be your God; you will be my people; I will dwell in you midst" (Pate 2004:278). The blame is put on the religious leaders, the Hasmonean family, as the sole cause of the desecration of the Temple by foreigners (Vanderkam 2001:129). The rebellion of the Temple leadership against God is seen to be the cause, not only of the destruction of the Temple, but other calamities befalling the national politics as well. This picture demonstrates more of a holist self-understanding of the Jewish people than is sometimes drawn by scholars in their analysis of the Temple. The Temple was only central to Jewish people as long as the 'right' people presided over it. When corrupt people mismanaged it, the only way for its restoration would begin with its destruction. This hope of renewal would require the building of a proper building, in some quarters, and the replacement of the corrupt priests (Horsley 2001:13). Lampe sees the available evidence as pointing to the fact that the "early Jewish reaction to the event of 70 scarcely suggests that it was seen as the totally catastrophic end of an age" (1984:155). It was a fulfilment of what always happened if Israel rebelled against God. God would punish them and then restore them. This restoration was more than just the rebuilding of a new Temple, but the renewal of the covenant in which the presence of God was more important than the Temple. The sacred place was nothing without the sacred 'presence' (Draper 1997:274-275).

2.10. Attitudes from the Mishnaic, Rabbinic and Qumran Literature

The use of the mishnaic and rabbinic literature to measure the attitudes of the rabbis' attitude to the Temple destruction may be considered problematic due to the nature of the literature itself as already discussed in previous chapters. The disparity of the literature in terms of time and geography has been pointed out above. The same could be said of the Qumran material which can only be tentatively dated between 150 BCE to 70 CE (Vermes 1962:xiv). One major problem of using the Qumran material is that some of them were preserved and used by the early church for apologetic purposes compromising their "textual reliability" (Vermes 1962:xv). Having pointed to these challenges, the possibility remains that from both wide-ranging rabbinic literature and the Qumran literature, one could estimate Temple attitudes before and after its destruction.

The rabbis produced a number of scriptural reflections (*Mishnah*) and several works, particularly the Palestinian Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud between the second and the sixth century CE (Cohen 1987:214). In these, the rabbis who comment on the 66-70 and 132-135 wars saw the revolutionaries who fought the Romans to protect the Temple as "misguided fools or wicked sinners. The righteous Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai fled the city of Jerusalem during the siege and hailed Vespasian as the emperor and conqueror" (Cohen 1987:216). The rabbis believed that they could collaborate with the Romans if they (Romans) had been "granted dominion by God and if the enemy's Jewish opponents were themselves sinners" (Cohen 1987:216).

The Mishnah and the rabbis of the second century were also unconcerned about the destruction of the Temple. They "certainly did not react to the absence of the Temple" that is found in *Fourth Ezra* and the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (Cohen 1987: 218). When they reacted to this destruction in the fourth through the sixth century CE, they did not "write apocalypses, engage in detailed eschatological speculations, or attribute the dominion of this world to the forces of Satan. Instead they told stories about the horrors of the wars and marveled, in the manner of the psalmist, at God's forbearance", just like the *Psalms of Solomon* (Cohen 1987:219). In trying to answer the question why the

rabbis' response was so "moderate", "restrained", and late, Cohen thinks that the "piety of *Second Temple* Judaism had prepared the rabbis for a Temple-less world" because they had their mantle from the Pharisees who had an ambivalent attitude towards the Temple when it stood (Cohen 1987:219). If the Pharisaism entailed a "regimen of daily prayer, Torah study, participation in synagogue services, and observance of the commandments sanctified life outside the Temple" and even in competition with it, then Cohen's argument is strong (Cohen 1987:218). Cohen sees this replacement motif advanced in the two "Talmudim and various other works" e.g. the tannaitic commentary on Deuteronomy which says that "love God and serve him" has an addition of "Torah study and prayer, as well as the sacrificial cult" (Cohen 1987:219).

On the other hand, more than "half of the Mishnah is devoted to one aspect or another of the Temple and its cult" (Cohen 1987:219). Cohen thinks that this is because the Mishnah is "confidently awaiting the time of their restoration, or because the Temple cult had been ordained by God and the study of its regulations saw now the equivalent of their implementation, of because the rabbis were attempting to create in their minds an idea and perfect world to which they could escape from the imperfect world around them" (Cohen 1987:219). The Mishnah says very little about prayer and almost nothing about the synagogue.

What becomes clear about the Temple from the rabbis is their mystical reflections where they talk about the heavenly Temple. Some rabbis[155] who saw visions, instead of writing apocalyptic literature or eschatological speculations, wrote about their heavenly journeys to the seventh heaven "in order to see God sitting on his throne and hear the angels singing the Qedushah" (Cohen 1987:220). These works are known as the hekhalot ("chambers" of heavenly palace) or the merkabah (the "throne chariot" of God) literature (Cohen 1987:220). Klawans in his recent work (2007) has shown that a "significant number of rabbinic traditions speak of some sort of heavenly Temple" (Klawans

[155] This was considered a risky business such that only a few rabbis had taken the risk but only one had come out unscathed (m. Hagg.).

2007:138). He notes this prevalence especially in the Talmud (e.g. *b. Hagigah 12b; b. Sanhedrin 94b; b. Menahot 110a; y. Berakhot 4:5, 8c/40-41*) and also in the better known midrash collections (e.g. *Gen. Rabbah 55:8, 69:7; Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael Shirah 10*). He observes that the traditions of most of the material cannot all be "reliably dated to the rabbinic period" although a "number of them are at least amoraic, not tannaitic, and parallels for the idea" which go back to the *Second Temple* period (Klawans 2007:138).

Klawans notes that the traditions differ as to the details of this heavenly Temple. In the Talmud (*b. Hagigah 12b*) the heavenly Temple is located in the fourth heaven while in the *Hekhalot* literature it is located in the seventh heaven (139). In some rabbinic literature it is said that the eschatological Temple is already finished and awaits descending to the earth "at the appointed time" (e.g., *Sifre Deut. Sec*. 352). Some rabbinic sources suggest that the heavenly Temple was constructed at the same time as when the earthly Temple was constructed: "said Rabbi Simon: When the Holy One, blessed be He, told Israel to build the tabernacle, he hinted to the angels that they too should build a tabernacle. So when the tabernacle was constructed below, one was constructed above") (*Num. Rabbah 12:12*). This earthly correspondent is also reflected in the Talmudic tradition (*b. Ta'anit 5a*).

It can be seen from the wide spectrum of the rabbinic and mishnaic literature, that it is not obvious that the rabbis bemoaned the absence of the Temple. Either they were spiritualizing its absence or they simply saw the destruction of the Temple as necessary return to access to God through the study of the Torah as suggested strongly by Thettayil (2007:346). He sums up,

> That the Rabbis replaced the temple with the Torah piety and transferred the temple rituals to homes is evident from their response to the destruction of the temple. The Rabbis replaced the pre-war Judaism with a Judaism where the Rabbis took the place of the priests, the study of the Torah took the place of the temple cult and the deeds of loving kindness too the place of the sacrifice (Thettayil 2007:346).

The Qumran community had abandoned the Temple system well before its destruction because they considered it corrupt. They only hoped for a Temple built according to the sect's laws described in the Temple Scroll, written in the "second half of the second

century BCE, i.e. in the Hasmonean period" (Chyutin 2006:114). Klawans could be right in saying that "there is strong evidence to suggest that they explicitly saw their own community as an alternate for the temple" although they did not see this 'third spacing' as "ideal" but "provisional" (Klawans 2007:147). The promise was:

> I shall accept them and they shall be my people and I shall be for them forever. I will dwell with them forever and ever and will sanctify my sanctuary by my glory. I will cause my glory to rest on it until the day of creation on which I shall create my sanctuary, establishing it for myself for all the time according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob in Bethel (11QT 29.7-10 from Vermes 1994).

The reference here is not of the Temple in Jerusalem but the eschatological Temple. The hope is that the God would judge the Jerusalem Temple before constructing one to be built according to the standards revealed to the Qumran community. If this reflects the period before the destruction of the Temple, it cannot tell us much about the Temple. But the fact that the Qumran community had separated themselves from the Temple, shows that they could not mourn it after the destruction and had already developed strategies for living without access to the Jerusalem Temple.

If this major strand of Judaism in the first century and before had such mixed views concerning the Temple, it is important to try and understand how each group legitimated its position. Was there any appropriate theology which these competing groups would use to legitimate their positions?

2.11. Sacred Presence as Sacred Space

Smith suggests a view of sacred space according to Jewish "cosmic orientation" albeit with modifications that emerged with changing situations that illuminate sacred texts (1978:106). He suggests that by grasping the analogous structures of spatial conception from the history of religions and analysing them through the sociology of knowledge, one can draw lessons from the Jewish-Christian literature's presentation of sacred space and sacred time in myths, rituals, initiations and the liturgical year (Smith 1978:108).

We have already seen from the discussion above that notions of the sacredness of Jerusalem were exaggerated, especially in times of the possible loss of the land. This quotation from the later rabbis, some years after the conquest of the Romans on the land was complete, is instructive:

> Just as the navel is found at the centre of a human being, so the land of Israel is found at the centre of the world…and it is the foundation of the world. Jerusalem is at the centre of the land of Israel, the Temple is at the centre of Jerusalem, the Holy of Holies is at the centre of the Temple, the Ark is at the centre of the Holy of Holies and the Foundation stone, is in front of the ark, which spot is the foundation of the world (*R. Tanhuma*).[156]

This imagination of the sacred emerged from the prevalent triadic cosmology of the heavens, earth, and the netherworld, sheol (Chyutin 2006:217). These three spaces have three different levels of holiness. On the earth, which is the macrocosm of the others, these spaces are represented in different ways. In this construction, the heavens were the most holy place, the place of the throne of God in fellowship with the angelic host; the earth is holy and the abode of all the living creatures, each creature with its different level of holiness (Chyutin 2006:217). On this earth, some parts were holier than others. In this conception, Eliade's binary dichotomy between the *sacred* and the *profane* is inaccurate (Smith 1978:91ff). The sacred is not simply the opposite of the profane since profanity is only one level of the sacred. The sacred space would then be "irruptive" presence of some aspect of the heavenly, while sacred time is the "repetitive" participation in that 'irruption' (Smith 1978:94). Sacred space "implies a hierophany, an irruption of the sacred that results in detaching a territory from the surrounding cosmic milieu and making it qualitatively different" such that it becomes "a point of communication" between the gods and people in a repeatable way (Smith 1978:94-5).

The centre of the sacred space on earth is the most significant space in which access to the heavens is mostly possible. In some religions, accessibility to this centre is emphasised, while in others, inaccessibility of this centre is emphasised (Smith 1978:95). By performing certain rituals at the sacred space in the sacred time, humans are drawn

[156] R. Tanhum bar Abba or Berabbi Abba is a fifth generation Palestinian Amora (320-350 CE). The popular saying "when a non-Jew, goi, salutes thee, answer: Amen" is said to come from him (Strack 1980:130-132; Smith 1978:112; see also Jeremias 1926).

into the sacred centre of contact with the divine, hence recreated to the original form of permanent presence with the divine. This sacred time is thus "reversible" and "circular" in that within its festivals, the retelling of the myths of origin, are performed during a particular geometric position of the heavenly bodies, stars, moon or sun (Smith 1978:96).

The traits of such views of space are also present in the symbolic universe upon which the Gospel of John draws. First, the land of Israel is holier than any other land; its inhabitants are holier than those living outside it, hence the need for pilgrimage for outsiders to partake of some of its holiness during the sacred festival times. Second, there is usage of the image of the human body in speaking about the land of Israel. Theodore Gaster calls this 'topocosm' (1961:17). This conception of the land "as a living organism" is also—as will be shown below—present in the Fourth Gospel (Smith 1978:106). This is—especially in reference to the sacred place—reflected in the imagery of the Temple as the body of Jesus in John 2. Third, the land is present as a covenant gift conditionally given by God to the people of Israel. In this view, the Israelites, on condition of fidelity to God, can lose or possess it (Wilde 1958:18-26). To possess the land is to enjoy the presence of God. In other words, the presence of God is not necessarily seen in the Temple, but rather on how God provides sustenance and protection to God's people. Only those who benefit from the Temple forge a discourse that exalts the Temple above the presence of God. In the Gospel of John this priestly discourse is rejected in favour of one which promotes the presence of God. This is how the Johannine narrative is 'third spacing' the existing dominant discourse from the Temple.

2.12. The Conception of the Sacred Space circa 70 CE

Before one can look at the Temple proper, it is necessary to look at its city as in many "cultures of antiquity, the city and the Temple were thought of as a microcosm, a miniature model that represents the entire cosmos" (Chyutin 2006:4). Scholars do not

agree whether first century CE Jerusalem should be classified as a Greco-Roman polis.[157] The polis conferred special privileges upon its inhabitants. It can be shown that Jerusalemites viewed outsiders with contempt simply because they were not from the margins (John 7:52). The centrality and sacrality[158] of Jerusalem as the city whose centre was the dwelling place of God, made its inhabitants to assume special status conferred upon them by the city's status.

Several references to such attitudes have been noted.[159] In the Greco-Roman period, Jerusalem was not in fact inferior to other cities in spite of the wide Hellenistic influences brought by pilgrims. It was still the "navel of the world" (*Jub.* 8:18).[160] In rabbinic times, such notions of the sacredness of Jerusalem had even become exaggerated. The Mishnah would say, "The land of Israel is holier than all other lands" (*M. Kelim* 1.6 in Hertzberg 1963:145). As one is journeying up to Jerusalem, "he is undergoing what must be described as mystical ascent. He is ascending to the centre, to that one place on earth which is closest to heaven, to that place which is horizontally the exact midpoint between the upper world and the lower world," so it was believed (Smith 1978:113). Once in Jerusalem, one would be in the sphere of a strong magnetic zone of purity and wisdom because of the presence of the Temple. Also the rabbis would say, "Before the Temple was constructed evil spirits used to trouble the people in the world, but since the Tabernacle was built, the evil spirits have ceased from the world" (*R. Yohanan Ben*

---

[157] "In archaic and traditional societies, the surrounding world is conceived as microcosm" says Eliade (1961:37). Outside of this 'bounded' cosmos "begins the domain of the unknown, of the formless. On this side there is order— because inhabited and organised—space; on the other, outside this familiar space, there is unknown and dangerous regions of demons, the ghosts, the dead and the foreigners—in a word, chaos or death or night" (1961:37-38).

[158] For similar views see Lundquist (1993:5-17). For Turner, a place is "designated as sacred" in terms of its function as the "centre" or "meeting-point" of humankind with the divine (1979:19). Maybe this could be thought of as the Jerusalem Temple and the many ritual festivals that people attend there. In this worldview, every "microcosm, every inhabited region has what maybe called a "Centre"; that is to say, a place that is sacred above all" (Eliade 1961:39; Eliade 1961:41-42; Turner 1979:20-21). It was at this 'centre' that the people, practiced the rituals of renewal; "occasion for the recovery of the *realia* narrated in the myths" (Smith 1978:96). It is the "responsibility of priests and kings" to carry out this task which attunes "human order" to this cosmic order (Smith 1978:133).

[159] It must be pointed here that there has been an ongoing debate as to whether Jerusalem was a polis in the Greek sense or not (e.g., Tcherikover 1964:61-78). As is pointed out by Levine however (1998:84ff), the nature of a Polis never fully followed the Greek model because of local influence and other outside factors over a period of time.

[160] See also *1 Enoch* 26:1; *Sib.Or*. 5:250.

Zakkai, 30 BCE- 90CE). It was in the Hellenistic and Roman period that the views on Jerusalem became more eschatological (*1 Enoch* 85-90) and increasingly so after the destruction of the Second Temple (4 *Ezra*; *2 Baruch*).

Those who resided in Judea and particularly Jerusalem in the first century CE were conscious of their superior position compared to those who lived in smaller towns outside of Jerusalem. Many people, particularly the elite, moved to the city from the smaller towns outside Jerusalem. They were not merely "motivated by the belief that the *Shekina* resided in Jerusalem" situated in direct access to the open heavens, but also in order to access there power and wealth (Safrai 1996:68). The "leaders of the priests and the leaders of the Temple" who constituted the aristocracy also lived in Jerusalem (Safrai 1996:68). Even when Judea became a Roman province with the Roman commissioner living in Caesarea, the preference for Jerusalem by writers such as Josephus reveals that it remained a place of pride for many Judeans as shown by the failure to mention Caesarea in his writings. It is said that the "inhabitants of Jerusalem enjoyed the image of those whose place of origin imparts them with rights and skills" (Safrai 1996:68). Hence for example, Josephus would brag as "someone who" was "entitled to rule Galilee" on the grounds that he was from a priestly family, he had the knowledge of the Torah, but more especially because he was born in Jerusalem (Safrai 1996:68). In other words, while the Judeans had a special view of themselves derived from the status of Jerusalem, their hypocrisy was also evident in that Josephus "assisted the Romans in reconquering his own people" so as did many a "Jewish notable or chief priest" as will be shown below (Horsley and Hanson 1985:43).

Herod's Temple formed one significant feature, the most central in Jerusalem. Known also as the 'Second Temple', it had gone through renovations and extensions of the previous Temple that had been rebuilt by the 'remnant' from Babylonian exile and then expanded by the Hasmoneans, who had appointed themselves as its priests (Chyutin 2006:150). In order to understand the reception of the Temple system in first century CE Palestine, one needs to look at how it was treated in the war between the Jews and the Romans. People's dissatisfaction with the Temple system can be seen by how they let the

rebels set on fire the "palaces of Ananias the High Priest" and murdered him the following day and by the destruction of Agrippa and Berenice's palace (Schürer 1973:486-7).[161] The regional shape of the attitudes towards the defence of Jerusalem Temple is seen in how John of Gischala resisted the leadership of Josephus, a Judean aristocrat who had come to Galilee to organise the army against the Romans (Schürer 1973:490; Horsley and Hanson 1985:44). It was not mere insubordination that led John of Gischala to resist Josephus. The arrogance of Josephus was plain for all to see. On one occasion, he ordered the youths from the village of Dabaritta to give him the loot they had taken from King Agrippa's servant, leading to a public insurrection against Josephus (Schürer 1973:490-1).

The focus of local resistance against the Romans was initially the attack on all the Temple authorities sympathetic to the Roman cause (Horsley and Hanson 1985:44). Some managed to escape, but the rest were killed. In the place of the high priest, an uneducated stonecutter, Phannias from Aphthia, who was from the "genuine Zadokite family", was chosen by lot (Horsley and Hanson 1985:43). It was even easy for the 'rebels' to mobilise people even in Idumaea as reinforcement against the Romans and their collaborators. Once in the city of Jerusalem, they began to forcibly take the possessions of the aristocracy and even murdered some. The focus of this brutality was towards the "prominent, respected, and well-to-do" and all the "friends of Rome" (Schürer 1973:497). This clearly indicates that the struggle was against the exploitation of the poor by the Jerusalem Temple aristocracy in connivance with the Romans. This had created frustration among the poor from the rural areas led by John of Gischala. John was later joined by a certain Simon Bar-Giora, who, even though he had had conflicts with John, also agreed with John in that the rich people who connived with the Romans were the common enemy (Schürer 1973:500). It was also this internal conflict that weakened the Jewish resistance leading to the destruction of the Temple and the city in

[161] Schürer's dependence on Josephus calls for caution in using him. For example, the generalisation by Josephus that the conflict was largely between Jews and Gentiles in every city as far as Alexandria (Schürer 1973:487) could be an exaggeration since Jews in the Diaspora continued to dwell in these cities and since in some places the war in Jerusalem was not even heard about (Simon 1948:54; Lampe 1984:154). Also the suggestion by Josephus and accepted by Schürer that Titus wanted to save the Temple (Schürer 1973:506) is likely to be Josephus' propaganda of presenting Titus as a sensitive man.

70 CE. It was during these tumultuous times that the Christian communities in Jerusalem fled the city to find refuge in the diaspora. One can imagine that the theology that would have made sense at this point was that Israel was being punished for its sins. This can be seen from what Rabbi Johanan ben Torta could say:

> But as to recent Temple, we acknowledge that they were diligent in the Law and attentive in the payment of tithes; why then were they exiled? Because they lusted after money and hated one another (*T. Menahoth* 13:22, third generation Tanna and contemporary of Rabbi Akiba).

It cannot be ascertained how different people responded to the destruction of the Temple. What can be said with some level of certainty is that the destruction of the Temple meant the loss of power to the Temple aristocracy and the cessation of the Temple sacrificial system. Many members of the priestly families had been killed or had fled; the rest sought other ways to deal with the Temple's absence from their traditional theological resources. It is not surprising therefore, that in the Mishnah, R. Joshua could state:

> I have heard that one may offer sacrifice even though no Temple is there; that one may eat the Most Holy Things even though no curtains (around the outer court) are there; that one may eat less holy things and the second tithe even though there is no wall; for the first consecration (of the Temple) sanctified for the future as well as for its own time" (*m.Pes.* 7:2).

Without the organised Temple system, it cannot be ascertained how much voluntary payments to the priests were lost (Safrai et al. 1974:698-699).

The emergence of the Pharisees and the rabbis was the result of this localisation of worship. This development of the rabbinic tradition with its centre at Yavneh provided a rigorous and enthusiastic reflection on the different theological positions on Jewish rituals, "rules concerning Temple and sacrificial worship" even if the Temple was no longer there (Schürer 1973:525). Hence in the Tractate *Middot*, there were discussions on the topography of the Temple, while in the Tractate *Tamid*, descriptions of the daily duties of the priests were given (Chyutin 2006:144-5). These writings are however unreliable, as they reflected on the Temple cult from the perspective of the sacred texts describing the First Temple (Chyutin 2006:144-5). Even though some of the rabbis were

young when the Temple was destroyed, with time they could simply no longer remember how it operated. It is not surprising therefore that Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob would say, "I forget what was its use" in reference to the Temple (*m. Middot* 5:4). These Tractates are however important in reflecting the interpretations of the Temple after its destruction.

The above discussion seeks to show that every Jewish person and Jewish region had some relationship with the Temple. As Petri Luomanen has said, the Temple played a 'parent role' for every Jew. No one was able to avoid "dealing with it, that is, with its loss after 70 CE" (2002:124). What was however different was how different people related and hence responded to the Temple's destruction. Was it a catastrophe? Yes it must have been for some, maybe even most. Was it nevertheless 'good riddance' for others? Most likely, especially for those who were no longer living in the Land and those who had always been on the receiving end of the Temple system. This latter group did not miss the Temple in the same way the rest of the people did. Due to the general significance of the Temple though, one would need a relevant theology to sustain their justification that the Temple could be done away with after all. In the Fourth Gospel we have this tension playing itself out.

3. Sacred Space and Place and the Gospel of John

Two representative theologies contesting for prominence seem to be present in the Johannine narrative. The first is the traditional and dominant one. This sees God as accessible through the Temple mediated by the priest and hence the need for the rebuilding of the Temple if the Israelites are to meet God. The second is a small but ancient tradition. It says that God has always revealed Godself wherever there were God's people, for example, "Abraham's call in Mesopotamia, Joseph's reception of divine favour in Egypt, the burial of the Fathers in Shechem, Moses' deliverance of the people in Egypt, and the tabernacle worship in the wilderness" (Evans and Porter 1987:236). The latter position seems preferred in John. Its 'third space' nature becomes apparent once read in the light of the first place of the first century discussed above the 'second space' in the Johannine narrative. The positions are discussed below.

3.1. Contestation over the Sacred Places in John

Unlike the Synoptic Gospels, where Jesus visits Jerusalem one time towards his death, in the Gospel of John he visits Jerusalem three times (John 2:13; 5:1; 12:12). In these visits it is not only Jerusalem as a place that is the focus, but the Temple specifically. He goes up to the three Jewish feasts: the Passover, one unnamed feast and the feast of Tabernacles. Jesus is at the holy place at the sacred time of the festivals (John 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2; 11:55). This is reflective of the inextricable connection of sacred space and sacred time in the Fourth Gospel. The purpose of such visits is to celebrate Israel's deliverance and sustenance by God and point to its origin and fulfilment in Jesus.

3.2. John 1:1, 14

John's Prologue begins by setting the scene in the "beginning" (ἐν ἀρχῇ) where the Word (λόγος) is at one location called "with the Father" (John 1:1). The λόγος in the beginning (ἐν ἀρχῇ), recalls the primeval beginnings of Genesis 1 as has been observed by most Johannine scholars (e.g., Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:31). That the Word is with God is mentioned again in John 1:2 as it sets the scene for understanding the pivotal spatial changes that are going to follow in the narrative in John 1:14. John uses the notion of the λόγος which in Jewish understanding is the equivalent of Wisdom, and then later the Old Testament Targums, *memra* (Barrett 1955:128). The λόγος is from the beginning sharing in the nature of God (John 1:1). From this Hebrew tradition, the λόγος would reflect God's representative "thought, or self-expression" (Lindars 1972:77). The same idea sometimes is understood as Wisdom (חָכְמָה) which can have an "independent existence in the presence of God" and sometimes attains a "personal being standing by the side of God over against, but not unconcerned with, created world" (Barrett 1955:128). In the culturally syncretistic Greco-Roman world, this idea would be combined with Hellenistic thought.

The most dominant Greek ideas from which the λόγος would be developed by John would be those of Middle Platonism where the human soul is viewed as pure at the level of ideas, but has now fallen into the realm of tangible things. The task for life then would be then to "purify the soul" through philosophy so as to "return to a disembodied life in which" to enjoy the "vision of true reality" (Allen 1985:70). In this understanding, the concrete world is a copy of the pure ideas and hence lesser in reality. The 'Supreme Being' or 'Supreme Mind' (the so-called Highest Good) is the highest reality "past finding out" except for a few philosophers and some "after a lifetime of effort", and for the rest, in the "next life" (Allen 1985:71). Although the 'Supreme Mind' is so removed from the material world, he is still the "head of the hierarchy of Forms (Plato *Timaeus* 28c; also Allen 1985:71). As such, there is need for intermediaries if this highest Good is to be reached. Hence, the need of lesser beings that "fill the gap between him and the visible world" (Allen 1985:71-72).

In Philo of Alexandria (20 BCE-50 CE), we have a Hellenistic Jewish mind that tries to relate this Middle Platonic cosmology in reading Jewish Scriptures. He saw the Jewish God as one "active in creating and ruling the cosmos" but at the same time being transcendent and hence the need to act in the material world "through various intermediary powers" (Allen 1985:72). One such intermediary is the λόγος who would be considered a "principle of life and intelligence or the "rational principle in accordance with which the universe existed" (Barrett 1955:128) whose formative form is the "fire" (Allen 1985:72). The LXX would then translate the Old Testament Word (דָּבָר) preparing the continuity of ideas that Philo wanted to relate. Hence, Philo's λόγος is the creative word of God through whose mediation God creates the world (Allen 1985:73). This creation however does not exclude God from creation but makes God ever present in the creation through the Word in the midst of the people of God Israel. As the rabbis would say:

> If two sit together and words of the Law [are spoken] between them, the Divine Presence rests between them, as it is written, *Then they that feared the Lord spake one with another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name* [Malachi]. Scripture speaks here of 'two'; whence [do we learn] that if even one sits and occupies himself in the Law, the Holy One, blessed is he, appoints him a reward? Because it is

> written, *Let him sit alone and keep silence, because he hath laid it upon him* [Lam. 3:28]" (*Mishnah Abbot* 3:3).[162]

Philonic views are developed in John even though we will never know if John knew Philo. The intermediary λόγος is now the creative word, through whom all things were made (John 1:3). His fiery light as the foundational fire of Middle Platonism sets this creative action into motion (John 1:4-5). But just as the line of intermediaries is long, so there is one lesser intermediary named John who should introduce a higher intermediary, the λόγος (John 1:6). His lesser role is emphasised as the one who only points to the higher intermediary which was yet to come (John 1:7-9).

The climax and parting of ways between Hellenistic and Johannine thinking takes place when the intermediary mutates and even 'degenerates' into the world of matter: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτου (John 1:14). In this spatial relocation and transformation of the λόγος the Hebrew and Hellenistic ideas are given new thrust. The Hebrew nuance seems to have taken the upper hand. The idea of dwelling (ἐσκήνωσεν) is embedded in Hebrew thought, where God's relationship with Israel is one of dwelling. In rabbinic thought, the relationship between God and Israel was in such a way that "wherever Israel was exiled, the Shekinah—if one may speak so—went with them into exile…And when at the end of days they returned, the Shekinah will return with them" (*Y. Mekhilta* to Exod. 12:41; see also Jenson 2001:76). The λόγος becomes physical and personal by coming down to dwell (ἐσκήνωσεν) among the people (John 1:14). The idiom of σκηνόω relates to the noun σκηνή which is "a transliteration of סכה" (Draper 1997:279). Draper further notes this as one of the "various Hebraisms" used by John (1997:279). The use of Sukkah would also be interesting for John who seems interested in this feast as that "feast of theophany" (m. Sukkah 3:9; see Draper 1997:280). The Aramaic meaning of Sukkah meaning 'see' or 'vision' seems useful for John for whom 'seeing' forms his basic theology (Draper 1997:280). In Jewish tradition, this vision is closely related to God's self-revelation or the revelation of God's δόξα (*Shekinah*) 'to see' which is the desire of every Israelite. The quest to see God runs from

[162] This is taken from Draper's paper presented at the SBL meeting in Santiago (2007).

the Old to the New Testaments (Job 19:26; Psa. 17:15; Matt. 5:8; 1 Cor. 13:12; Heb. 12:14; 1 John 3:2; and Rev. 22:4).

Francis Peters understands the notion of *Shekinah* as representing God's covenantal presence among God's people (2003:168). Where the *kabod* or *Shekinah* is, God dwells "among the Israelites" (Peters 2003:168). In the theological history of Israel this *Shekinah* had been localised in the cloud (Exod. 40:36-38), on the ark and then the Temple (Peters 2003:169). The Johannine usage of this theology borrows from the idea of God's presence that was not fixed in one locality but was revealed as in the mobile tabernacle of the wilderness tradition (Barrett 1955:128; Draper 1997:274-275). The transition from no spatial location to the localisation of the *Shekinah* is a journey of diminution and not improvement. By seeing the Word or Jesus as the "site of God's localised presence on earth" (Lindars 1972:94 in Draper 1997:275), scholars may be tempted to see this as important for John. While this would be the case in the historical understanding in which John is writing from, in his narrative representation of this space, a critical spatial reading will reveal that this *Shekinah* that has been incarnated in Jesus, has to be reconfigured into its original state, that of spacelessness through his death. Unless the "grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; but if it dies, it bears much fruit" (John 12:24). Incarnation locks the presence into a body thereby localising and limiting it; only death and resurrection can release it, and this the reason why death in John is glory.

This is the notion that John takes up. That the Word became flesh in Jesus means that the glory was incarnated and hence localised and diminished. The glory of the Word in the beginning with the Father was lost by Jesus becoming flesh and at his death it shall be regained (John 17:5). Only through death would the glory of God be released again because the localisation of the glory in his body is as the localisation of God's glory in the Temple. To be released (freed), the physical Temple must be destroyed. Hence, the death of Jesus is a moment of glory (John 17:1). The limitation of the physical presence of Jesus will be replaced by his *Shekinah* presence in every believer: "You know him, because he abides with you, and he will be in you" (John 14:17). The main characteristic

of the *Shekinah* presence is not localisation but presence or abiding or dwelling with the people of God.

The "*Shekinah*," "*Memra*," and "glory of the Lord" are "intermediary" terms referring to God (Langston 2006:48). It can be seen from the rabbinic tradition that the localisation of the *Shekinah* was not considered to be very common. In the collection of Rabbi Nathan's commentary of the early Fathers we read that:

> Ten descents did the Shekinah make to the world:
> Once in the Garden of Eden, as it is said, *And they heard the voice of the Lord God walk in the garden* (Gen. 3:3).
> Once in the generation of the Tower of Babel, as it is said, *And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower* (Gen. 11:5).
> Once in Sodom, as it is said, *I will go down now and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come to Me* (Gen. 18:21).
> Once in Egypt, as it is said, *And I came down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians* (Exod. 3:8).
> Once on the Red Sea, as it is said, *He bowed the heavens also, and came down* (II Sam. 22:10).
> Once at Sinai, as it is said, *And the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai* (Exod. 19:20).
> Once in the pillar of the cloud, as it is said, *And the Lord came down in a cloud* (Num. 11:25).
> Once in the Temple, as it is said, *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be open…for the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered by it* (Ezek. 44:2).
> And one will take place in the future, in the days of Gog and Magog, as it is said, And His feet shall stand that day upon the mount of Olives (Zech. 14:4) (Obermann 1955:140-141).[163]

In the same text, the *Shekinah* is also said to have had ten ascents, the last one being from the "Temple mount to the wilderness, as it is written, *It is better to dwell in a desert land* (Prov. 21:19). And once when it withdrew upward on high, as it is written, *I will go and return to my place* (Hos. 5:15)" (Obermann 1955:140-142). It is worthy to note that while the Proverbs 21:19 citation is not given in full, the sense is nevertheless captured. The full citation would be "It is better to live in a desert land than with a quarrelsome and fretful woman". Israel would be seen as the 'woman' and the bride of God, as will be discussed below. That the departure of the *Shekinah* is because of Israel's sin is presupposed. Such departure would be the worst thing that could happen to Israel. If

[163] The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan is a collection of "extracanonical Minor Tractates of the Talmud", which is a commentary "and amplification of the renowned mishnaic tractate" or the early form of that tractate covering the first five centuries of Talmudic Judaism (Obermann 1955:xvii-xviii).

God's glory is not with Israel, Israel will be vulnerable. John resolves this by showing the possibility of seeing God's glory through the promise given to the disciples.

3.3. John 1:38-39, 51

When John the Baptist commanded his disciples to 'look' at Jesus as the Lamb of God they followed him (John 1:36). When he turned and saw them, he asked them what they sought and they wanted to know where he was staying (ποῦ μένεις) (John 1:38). They did not want to know anything apart from where he was staying. This sounds strange if one does not see the spatial significance of the ποῦ in their seeking. Jesus invites them to "come and see" (ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε) and they went and stayed (ἔμειναν) with him that day (John 1:39). In John 1:46, Nathanael is called by Phillip to 'come and see' (ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε). Nathanael is a true Israelite because he will see. Jesus promises him that he will "see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (John 1:51). While Israel in the past used to see God's glory as mediated through the cloud and fire, through the Temple, this time the promise is not through such intermediaries. It is an invitation to become the intermediary since only the human intermediary has the opportunity to look into the heavens. This makes the disciples agents of God who have the privilege of peeping into the heavens and the resurrected and ascended Jesus as their means of accomplishing this. This would make sense in the light of John 10:34 where they are told, "I said you are gods" (see Neyrey 1989). They see the heavens open and can steal a glace at the throne of God itself.

The disciples are presented as belonging to a heavenly hierarchy of agents or intermediaries although Jesus is the "lesser Yahweh" (Alexander 1983:243). Just as in Enochic mysticism, Jesus has the full view of the throne of glory where God dwells in invisible light with a curtain that separates the divine presence and the agent (Alexander 1983:243). This gazing "on God's manifestation in the heavenly Holy of Holies was part of the worshipping programme as well as the transformative process" among Jewish mystics (DeConick 2001:58). The mystical nature of the promise to 'see' has been noted by a number of scholars (DeConick 2001; Draper 1997, 2002). Among the ideas that

make up this "complex of early mystical traditions" include the "visionary nature", the belief of the adherent to "ascend through the heavenly Temple", that this ascent being dangerous for ordinary people required special preparation by "ascetic behaviours like celibacy, fasting, and other dietary restrictions" (DeConick 2001:52-53). In the Gospel of John, the vision is promised on the grounds of Jesus' death which removes the need for individual ascetic preparation. They will not need to ascend to heaven but heaven will be accessed on earth through the mediation of Jesus.

We can see before proceeding that the narrative is here presenting the community of disciples in John as the only ones who have a special spatial location from which God can be seen. This spatial location is the Johannine Jesus, who has died and risen and gone back to the father. Why is it necessary to present Johannine identity in such an exclusive way? Why is such narrative presentation using images of mystical spatiality (going, abiding, and seeing)? If the background of the 'true' experience is that of spatial dislocation, as will be argued, this representation is meant to 'third space' it by spiritualising it.

The promise to the disciples recalls Jacob's experience where the play between the 'house of God' and God's presence is a deliberate spatial image (Draper 1997:279). Jacob identifies the place where he has a vision of God as the "house of God" and "the gate of heaven" and called the place Beth-el, house of God (Gen. 28:17-19). The idea of the 'house of God' as providing a view into the heavens is significant here. It is not the place and its fixity that is being foregrounded but its function, which in John is being played by Jesus. The "gate of heaven" (שַׁעַר) symbolises the blessings of God on Israel.[164]

The promise made to Nathanael in John 1:51 uses this Jacob tradition that knows of the mobile presence of God which could burst open at particular sites but never to be

[164] Apart from the literary sense of the 'gate', the word is also used in the Old Testament in the context of covenantal blessings (Gen. 22:17; 24:60). This makes sense in the description given by Smith on the conditions of the blessing of the sacred place. People who want the blessings must "ceaselessly labour to sustain, strengthen, and renew the blessing, to keep the walls under repair" (Smith 1978:111). The same observation has been made by Freyne. He says that the Galileans' attachment to the Temple was not on the basis that God's presence was exclusively at Jerusalem, but on the belief that proper care of any local Temple would effect the well-being of the land only if "faithful worship" was taking place there (Freyne 1980:294).

confined to them. Here, there is no suggestion to uphold the Temple as the medium through which to experience God. Rather, it is through the means, not of Jesus in his earthly life, but when he has arisen and in heaven there he will be the ladder upon which angels will ascend and descend. In this sense, Jesus like the Temple serves as the means to an end of experiencing God, but the experience of God, who is not limited to particular locations of manifestation, is what is being emphasised. That in his earthly life, in his incarnation of the presence of God, Jesus' value is reduced or diminished is shown by John.

As this 'third spacing' trend continues in our investigation, we will see the subordination of the 'house of God' under the 'household of God' so as to emphasise the immaterial over against the material.

3.4. John 2:13-25

The arrival of Jesus at the Temple and the disruption of the activities there create the setting for his pronouncements that are central to our investigation. This incident which forms the end of the Synoptic Gospels forms the beginning of the Fourth Gospel because of the centrality of the debate over the sacred space and place in John. The Temple is described as the ἱερόν (John 2:14, etc)[165] and also as 'my Father's house' (τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου) (John 2:16,17). Jesus also accuses those selling at the Temple for making it a 'house of merchandise' (οἶκον ἐμπορίου) (John 2:16).[166] Jesus also tells the Jewish authorities to destroy the model of the shrine (τὸν ναόν) and he would raise it in three days (John 2:19, 20). This deliberate distinction between the ἱερόν and ναόν in reference to the Temple has already been observed by Draper (2003). Draper further notes that while *hieros* is used to refer to the Temple as "sacred site/place, Jesus points to the *naos*

[165] Brown says that the "*hieron* means the outer court of the Temple, the court of the Gentiles." The *naos* is therefore the Temple proper or "sanctuary" (1966:115).
[166] Using the common Johannine irony, Jesus says that the Temple priests should destroy the Temple which he will raise in three days (John 2:20). The Temple will not be destroyed by the Romans, according to Jesus, but by the desecration of the holy place by the Temple leaders. Hence, his action of driving out people and animals is a sign of cleansing that it required if the Temple is going to avert destruction. Destruction was understood to be the beginning of cleansing (Draper 1997:264).

of his body as the true Temple" (2003:86). In John's current understanding of the presence of God, and which he also critiques, are the "claims of the Temple building in Jerusalem to be the place where the Name or Glory of God are to be found, where God's presence dwells (2 Kings 8). This royal Temple tradition is opposed by another and older tradition that God cannot dwell in a house made with hands and has always accompanied his people as the "tented" presence of the wilderness wanderings (2 Sam. 7)" (Draper 2003:86). Draper also notes the "continuing influence of this tradition from the Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g., 4Q174) and other Christian sources (e.g., Acts 8:42-50; Heb 7-10)" (2003:86).

Draper's reading of the preference the ναός in place of ἱερός in describing the presence of Jesus clearly fits the spatial argument being suggested in this discussion. The dominant 'first space' understanding of Temple is that which sees the ἱερός as the place where God is encountered. This position is acknowledged in John's narrative space or 'second space'. Jesus always goes to the ἱερός according to the dominant expectations (John 5:14; 7:14, 28; 8:2). According to this dominant tradition, Jesus can even teach from the 'Temple treasury' (γαζοφυλάκιον) (John 8:20). This could actually be coming from some well known Jesus tradition if the reference of the same place is true (Mark 12:41). A critical spatial reading will reveal that there is a subversion of this dominant tradition. John uses both Jewish and Hellenistic ideas of the presence versus place to achieve his goal.

The inadequacy of the sacred place is exposed in that once the Temple is destroyed, the presence of God departs from it and would take too long to rebuild (John 2:20). In contrast, the destruction of the body of Jesus and his subsequent departure will usher in an opportunity of seeing God's presence among them (John 16:7). The disciples will have the power to do the works that Jesus does if he goes (John 14:12) and for this they should rejoice (John 14:28). In this latter sense, Jesus as the intermediary is not the ultimate place. His body is to be buried in the ground as a seed in order to allow the release of the presence of God. The 'real' place of encountering God is not a place, but the Spirit.

3.5. John 4:1-22

Jesus' encounter with the unnamed woman of Samaria is a key pericope from which the sacred place and sacred presence are clearly contrasted. The setting made explicit by the narrative is that of Jesus' departure (ἀφῆκεν) from Judea (John 4:3). It can be seen that this notion of departure or leaving from Judea is symbolic of rejection as it is in this verse that the word (ἀφίημι) is used for the first time in John. Where it is used in this technical sense in John, it is the opposite of remain (μένω). Hence, the Father who sent Jesus never leaves (ἀφῆκέν) him alone (John 8:29) just as Jesus will not leave (ἀφήσω) his disciples as orphans (John 14:18). He is not like the hired servants who are not true shepherds of the sheep who leave (ἀφίησιν) the sheep alone (John 10:12). True discipleship is not to leave (ἀφῆτε) Jesus in times of persecution (John 16:32). The spatial departure from Judea to Samaria in this spatial sense means rejection of Judea.

Jesus' departure from Judea is to Galilee, yet it was necessary (Ἔδει) that he goes through Samaria (John 4:4). It is interesting that δεῖ is used in John in the context of the restoration of Israel. It is used at the coming of Nicodemus who is the teacher and representative of Israel. It is necessary (δεῖ) that he and all Israel (ὑμᾶς) should be born from above (John 3:7) by looking at the Son of Man who must be lifted up. Jesus must (δεῖ) gather all the scattered sheep so that they are under one shepherd (John 10:16). At the coming of the Greek-speaking Jews it is emphasised that the Son of Man must (δεῖ) be lifted up, because when he is lifted up, he would draw all people to himself (John 3:14, 30; 12:19, 32, 34). The passing through Samaria, though historically it would create the risk of ritual impurity, is being employed in John to show its necessity in the wider scheme of Israel's restoration. While some Judeans have rejected him and he has departed from them, now Jesus must go to Galilee, a 'journey' however that is not complete without going through Samaria.

In a city called Sychar, Jesus sat at a well which Jacob had given to Joseph (John 4:5). We have already seen in the previous chapter that among the sectarian movements in Samaria, there was one that was based on the Joseph traditions. We also noted that this

group was anti-priestly and believed that Joseph had been buried on Mount Gerizim (Isser 1999:591). We have also seen that in later developments this position was not in opposition to the main Moses tradition which acknowledged Moses as the lawgiver and Joseph as the political figure (Isser 1999:591). We cannot know for sure if this Samaritan background is known to John, but it is likely if Samaritans constitute the Johannine community as has been suggested by some Johannine scholars (Brown 1979:37; Flanagan 1989:987; Schneiders 1992:194; see also Carson 2002:106).

What seems to be important for John is that the Jacob or Israel tradition creates a meaningful bridge between Judea, Galilee and Samaria. Jacob gave the Samaritans the well from which "his sons and his flocks drank" (John 4:12). John however wants to present Jesus as that well of Israel from which all his *sons, daughters and flocks* will drink (John 4:12). This recalls the holistic nature of the covenant of God's presence which makes the life of both humankind and nature to be satisfactory. Abundant food, drink and the general welfare of God's people and their livestock were the hallmark of God's presence. All those who drink this physical water however will become thirsty again (John 4:13) in as much as all those who ate the physical bread are dead (John 6:58). It is not in the physical representation where God dwells but in the spiritual presence. The physical representation of God kills, but his spiritual presence gives life (John 6:63). So did anyone see God's presence in the Temple?

As recent as 36 CE, many Samaritans had been killed *en masse* while on their way to Mount Gerizim following their strong desire for the physical presence of God at the Temple there. They were purported to be planning a revolt when they had gone at the instruction of a self-styled Messiah who had promised to reveal to them the hidden vessels supposedly kept there (Connolly 1999:52). Only thirty years or so after this incident the Temple in Jerusalem was also destroyed by the Romans and many Jewish people died in the process. Hence, the Samaritans, Judeans and Galileans had experienced 'real' death as a result of the quest for the physical representation of the presence of God. By the time John writes, the Mount Gerizim Temple and the Jerusalem

Temple, both symbols of God's presence were no longer standing and John discourages everyone who still holds on to these holy places in their eschatological hopes.

The experience of God without the physical Temple had been the experience of many prophets from the north. Hence, in identifying Jesus as the prophet, the woman, like Nathanael, is now beginning to really 'see' (John 4:19). But the world "neither sees him nor knows him" (John 14:17). The central point of the conversation between Jesus and the woman turns out to be that of true worship (προσκυνέω). She begins to see because their problem has been to worship (προσεκύνησαν) on "this mountain" and on "Jerusalem" (John 4:20). The turning point is when those whose attention of worship was upon the temple are changed. Even the Greek-speaking Jews had come to worship (προσκυνήσωσιν) at the Temple, but the moment of glory arrives when they seek to see Jesus (John 12:20). Jesus speaks prophetically in rejecting worship, "neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (John 4:21). The Johannine community has to resolve this potentially divisive issue of proper location of worship by providing a rejection of Jerusalem and Samaria sacred spaces through the utterances attributed to Jesus. When in the diaspora, Johannine Christians can find a persuasive argument for the rejection of the Temple using the theology of the mobile tabernacle which assures all Israel wherever they are of God's accompanying presence. He is not a God of localities, but of presence among God's people. If then the dominant leadership of this diaspora community are Judeans, they need also to restrain their compatriots from continually despising their fellow Israelites from the north. It is within this context of restraint that the debates about the place of origin of the Messiah in John 7 could be situated.

3.6. The Replacement Motif Reconsidered

Even though Cullmann is not the originator of the replacement motif,[167] he has articulated it well and synchronised it with other material to build a case for the construction of a separate group of Christians in the early church that can be associated

[167] The replacement motif appears in several shades which can be put together as a showing that the Jewish Temple is rejected and replaced by Jesus. Earlier, the Church Fathers were bold enough to say the Temple was replaced by the church, a position taken by most scholars in a subtle way. See the argument below.

with the idea. Simply put, the replacement motif as articulated by Cullmann, and later by other scholars, is that the Johannine community like the Hellenists of the Acts of the Apostles preached the Christian Jesus as taking the place of the Jewish institutions, of which the Temple was the ultimate. This group of Christians, Cullmann says, emerges from the minority group of Judaism he calls the 'non-conformists' (1959-60:40). Their theology is represented by the preaching of Stephen in Acts. He suggests that this theology sees Jesus as the replacement articulated in the pseudo-Clementines (1959-60:40). For Cullmann, the Fourth Gospel then shows that, since God rejected both Jerusalem Temple and that of Mount Gerizim:

> Christ takes the place of the Temple, realised in the events of the life of Jesus. This question of worship is one of his principal preoccupations. He tries to show through the life of the incarnate Jesus that from now on the question of worship must be asked differently since the coming of Jesus. Jesus Himself takes the place of the Temple. God has revealed His presence in the life of the incarnate Jesus, after His resurrection He will continue to manifest His presence there, where Christ, raised to the right hand of God, is present" (1959-60:41).

Brown, who also briefly attends to the subject only to confirm it, thinks that the Fourth Gospel shows the importance of "Jesus' replacement of Jewish institutions like the ritual purification, the Temple, and worship in Jerusalem (chs. ii-iv) and of Jewish feasts like the Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles, and Dedication (chs. v-x)" (1966: LXX). Thus in Brown, the replacement does not end with the Temple, but with all the Jewish religious institutions.

More recently, John Lierman has edited a book with contributions from some of the most renowned modern Johannine scholars (2006).[168] Most contributions address the Temple theme from the 'replacement' perspective after Cullmann (Köstenberger 2006:97). In the introduction, David Wenham sets the scene by showing that the replacement motif is favoured (2006:6). The Christology of John is thus seen as a response to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, where Jesus is seen as a replacement (Wenham 2006:6; Köstenberger 2006:77-79, 89-99; Thettayil 2007). The same position is taken by Steve

[168] These scholars are David Wenham, Peter Ensor, Richard Bauckham, Andreas J. Köstenberger, Andrew Gregory, Charles Hill, Mark Stibbe, Steve Motyer, John Lierman, Gary Burg, Gabi Renz, and Bill Salier. In the bibliography they are not recorded with separately listings.

Motyer who sees the "Temple-replacement theme so important for the Fourth Gospel" (2006:205).[169]

Scholars who subscribe to the replacement theology see Jesus as the replacement of Jewish institutions and his ministry, death and resurrection making them obsolete (Collins 1990:176). As Collins can state:

> Jesus has come to replace the institutions of Judaism. The Temple is replaced by the risen body of Jesus (John 2:13-22). The rabbinate is replaced by the only teacher who came from heaven (John 3:3:1-15). The account of Jesus and the Samaritan announces that worship in spirit and truth (John 4:23) replaces both Samaritan worship on Mount Gerizim and Jewish worship in Jerusalem. The Sabbath rest gives way to the work of Jesus (John 5:9, 17; *cf.* 9:14). The manna come down from heaven is replaced by the bread of life. The lights of the feast of the Dedication give way to him who is the light of the world (John 9:5)" (1990:176-177).

Collins understands the corollary to this replacement to be the "birth of the church" (1990:179). This symbolic reading sees Mary Magdalene as representing the "entire church" which is "a faithful searcher" of the risen Jesus (1990:122).

Another supercessionist reading has been offered by Williford, in his unpublished dissertation, in which he argues that the Fourth Gospel in its use of the feasts intends to show how "Jesus fulfils or replaces Jewish expectations or institutions" (1981:11, in Daise 2007:59). He states that the "person and ministry of Jesus represent the fulfilment and supercession of the greatest truths found in the feasts" (Daise 2007:60).

Thettayil sees Jesus in John as the Messiah who "reveals the right 'place' to worship—a 'place' alternative to the Jerusalem Temple and Mount Gerizim" (2007:231). This should be read in the light of Jewish coping mechanisms after the destruction of the Temple since for the "majority of Jews in the first century, Judaism without the Temple was unthinkable" (Thettayil 2007:235). As Thettayil states, the "Pharisees at Jamnia turned to the Torah, while in answer to the same questions the Christian community looked to Jesus" (2007:343).

---

[169] Here I have not included a PhD dissertation that has been written to 'show' that the Johannine Jesus is the replacement of the Temple (Hoskins 2002).

3.7. A Response

It is possible to narrow down the position taken in Johannine scholarship. There are three key issues that these scholars have not addressed, which if attended to could lead to the replacement of the 'replacement motif' entirely, or at best, radically nuance it. These are:

i. There is no adequate discussion or understanding of sacred place and sacred presence in John;
ii. There is a wide disparity of views on the Temple present in John;
iii. The significance of this discussion in relation to diaspora allusions in the Fourth Gospel is neglected, ignored or unappreciated.

3.7.1. No Adequate Discussion in the Understanding of Sacred Place and Sacred Presence in the Gospel of John

That the Johannine Jesus replaces the Jewish institutions in the Fourth Gospel is not clearly explained. There are several questions that remain:

- Have the institutions replaced by Jesus been playing the role the Johannine Jesus is purported to now be playing?
- Is this replacement metaphoric or progressive revelation of God which has reached its climax in Jesus?
- Which Jesus in John is being meant?
- Is it the risen or ascended Jesus, or even the one who heals people who is involved in conflict?

The understanding that emerges from a detailed spatial reading of the Gospel of John reveals that in John, the physical is incapable of containing the presence of God. But this assumption seems incorrect. Whereas Thetayil sees Jesus as the new 'place' of true worship, in the Gospel of John all places have been rendered useless for true worship. Worship is to be in spirit and truth. The Jesus who makes this worship possible is not the risen one, but the one who has gone to the Father and who returns as the Spirit to indwell

believers. When he arises from the dead, his body is not yet glorified because he has not yet ascended to the Father (John 20:17). This position is against Collins who sees the risen Jesus as the replacement of the Jewish institutions. For John, the physical signs do not carry the same weight as the Christological revelation that come with the signs themselves. Hence, the blindness that concerns John is not that of the blind man in John 9 but the spiritual blindness of the Jewish leaders (John 9:39-41). The sight that matters for John is not the physical sight but the sight that leads to the belief in the "Son of Man" (John 9:35). At the very end of Jesus' ministry, the blessed ones (μακάριοι) are those who believe without seeing (John 20:29).

Once we understand the subjugation of the physical, we can clearly see that the risen or sign-performing Jesus in John is not the replacement of the Jewish means of encountering God because he remains flesh. What are rejected in John are not only the Jewish and Samaritan Temples; even the "Temple of his body" must be ascended to the Father in order for the presence of God to be released to effect worship in spirit and truth. Sloyan thinks, and maybe correctly, that neither Paul nor the Gospels teach this supercessionism (2008:50). The risen and ascended Jesus, the one who has no physical place, the one who does not have a physical body, the one whose tomb is empty, the one whom Mary Magdalene cannot even touch, is the presence of God which used to be experienced by Israelites in the wilderness, at the various local shrines, at the Temple and its feasts. It was such presence which is now absent from the Jewish rituals because of the corruption of the priests. It is such corruption that in the past led to *Ichabod*, the departure of the glory (1 Sam. 4:21). Even its "idolatrous priests shall wail over it (the nation), over its glory that has departed from it" (Hosea 10:5). In this Jewish understanding, the presence can be located at the Temple, but the effect of the presence is far beyond the Temple, reaching to the fields and to the households. The presence of God in John cannot be understood in the light of the Temple or the rituals which have been replaced by Jesus.

How does this view find Jewish people who believe it? The answer lies in the oldest Jewish traditions of God's presence. This is how God's presence has always been understood before the priestly caste confined it to one place, the Jerusalem Temple. The

minority of voices who dared to speak against such a representation of God's presence are heard in the Qumran Community and in the preaching of Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles. Its revival is of course easier in the absence of the Temple owing to its destruction in 70 CE. Unlike the suggestions by the scholars above, this is not a novel invention by Christians, just as the Torah is not an invention by the Pharisees at Jamnia. By synthesising the Hellenistic notions of the *Logos* and the Aramaic *Memra*, John is releasing a Johannine representation of the glory of God in a way that sets Jesus, not as a new Temple, but Jesus as the restoration of the original presence of God as has been discussed above (pages 186-188). He is the presence of God in his spiritual presence in believers, not limited to a particular location or time. Once present among his people, this presence can produce not multiplied bread, but spiritual bread from heaven, not water from the well but water that wells up to eternal life, not physical sight but spiritual insight into the presence of God.

3.7.2. Disparity of Views of the Temple in the Gospel of John

Cullmann, specifically, and other scholars in general, put the replacement motif together with other positions that rebel against the running of the Temple in the first century CE such as the Qumran community. Cullmann (1959-60:39) states that scholars do not "pay enough attention to the revolutionary character of Stephen's speech. Is this polemic found already in Qumran?" He says it is not likely that this is from Qumran but that the polemic was "prepared for by the attitude of the Qumran sect" (1959-60:39). He sees the idea in the pseudo-Clementines, among the Hellenists in Acts, in the Johannine community itself and even in the book of Revelation (1959-60:38-43). Nevertheless, Cullmann does not see how disparate the views on the Temple as a sacred place are between the various groups he proposes.

Some Jewish people did not think of the replacement of the Temple at all apart from its reform and purification through its destruction and its restoration (see *11QTemple*).[170] The Qumran Community was only protesting against the corrupt running of the cultus.

[170] This is in spite of the argument of many scholars who argue for a variety of dates of origin for the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The hope was for the future Temple but with pure priesthood and hence pure sacrifice. They still believed in a fixed presence of God in the eschatological Temple although they speak approvingly of a Temple "not made by hands" in reference to their own community (Draper 1997:281; see also Klawans 2007:147). The understanding in the Letter to Hebrews could represent another group that could be labelled the 'replacement model'. In Hebrews, Jesus is directly related to the Jewish Temple and its institutions and presented as a fulfiller and replacement of both as they have now become obsolete (Heb. 8:13; see also Eakin 1998:35).

Yet there was also another strand that is represented in the speech by Stephen in Acts of the Apostles (John 7:1-53). Stephen saw the Temple as a sign of disobedience (See Evans and Sanders 1997:292-297). This understanding saw God from the beginning never choosing to be housed and confined in a place. As Draper notes, "2 Samuel 7 has had a major role to play in the formation of the thinking of" this strand of Palestinian Judaism (Draper 1997:274). This position "stands in the tradition of the desert wanderings and the presence of God in the Tent of the Presence, in opposition to the claims of the Temple and priesthood in Jerusalem" (Draper 1997:274). The influence of this tradition among other Jewish groups can be detected in some sections of the Qumran Community (see *4Qflor*) (Draper 1997:272-273). This tradition is known and utilised by John's community where the "Name bearing angel", like the intermediary in the Neo-Platonism is an important figure in this understanding (Draper 1997:283). The Gospel of John does not see the need for the Temple, and along with Stephen's sermon, the presence of God is accessed in the presence of the person of the ascended Jesus. This is not replacement but restoration of the lost significance of the presence of God which had been subordinated to the locus, the Temple.

3.7.3. Significance of this Discussion in Relationship to the Diaspora Allusions in the Gospel of John

To speak about the Temple and the sacred outside the brute experiences of spatial dislocation through diaspora as a result of the 70 CE event would be to ignore vital information. The question of the presence of God has become central for the community

of John not only because the Temple has been destroyed, but because the people of God are no longer in the land, a sign that the covenant has been broken. Why has God forsaken God's people leaving them vulnerable to their enemies? It is because the priests have defiled the physical location of the presence of God. The Jewish people are now in a foreign land. The question therefore is whether God is still with them while in a foreign place. Should they hope with all the other Jewish people and Samaritan people for the rebuilding of the Temple? Should they even think of pilgrimages to the Holy Land? Some diaspora Jews, just like some post-70 CE Jews in Palestine, would have hoped for the restoration of Israel where a new Temple would be a feature. But the composition of the Johannine community in diaspora was made up of people from Samaria and some from Galilee. Would it not have been fitting for the Samaritans to imagine the rebuilding of such a Temple on Mount Gerizim and the Jerusalem for the Judeans? Could such hopes sustain fragile diaspora communities? Not likely. So in answering all these questions John is also trying to build the unity of his congregation by de-localising the presence of God and rejecting any hopes for the restoration of such centres in the future. These are the questions John is answering, and they will be answered in the subsequent chapters. What can be said tentatively here is that for John, God has always been present with God's people wherever they are. Wherever "Israel went in exile, the Shekhina was exiled with them" (Matt 2004:296; see also Jacobs 1973:62).

3.7.4. A Disclaimer

A disclaimer must be put in place after all these categorisations. First, it does not mean there can be no overlaps between one view and another. Second, this does not mean that John's view did not have some kind of replacement theology. Indeed, this could have been there, not only for nascent Christianity, but even for rabbinic Judaism to emerge. Instead, it is the supercessionism related to the replacement motif that makes such a view defective. It can thus be observed that the replacement motif is easily and uncritically appropriated by Christians because of the privileged position it gives towards Christianity.

3.7.5. Reasons for the Popularity of the Replacement Motif

A number of reasons could be suggested as to why there has been such unanimous and uncritical acceptance of the 'replacement motif', while the above analysis has raised important problems against it. One reason is that the 'replacement motif' appears quite 'obvious' and hence provides a comfortable interpretation. Behind this comfort is the familiarity with which many scholars feel in this interpretive tradition. This is an interpretation that has been greatly influenced by views held by the history of religions. This is actually understandable in the shadow of the important article by T. Witton Davies, "Milestones in Religious History: Or Tent Temple, Tabernacle, Synagogue, and church" (1897). Here, faith begins as a primitive and local affair and gets centralised in the Temple in Judaism after the monarchy. This evolves into the synagogue and then the Christian church. Even this Christian church develops into a rational European Protestantism as the climax of its religious development. In presenting the Johannine Jesus as replacing the Temple, many scholars, it becomes, albeit unconsciously for some, but quite deliberately for others, a process of self-affirmation. As a result, some modern Christians would see themselves as the climax of biblical revelation and religious development. The tabernacle motif rejects the prevalent 'replacement' motif held dearly in Johannine scholarship's reading of the Temple and other Jewish institutions.

4. Conclusion

In the previous chapter, an effort was made to demonstrate how historical regional divisions in first century CE Palestine continued to affect and even threaten the unity of the Johannine Christian communities in the diaspora. One such contentious regional division was the monopoly of access to God. This can become exaggerated in the context of displacement from the land. In the Fourth Gospel, the Temple becomes the centre of this contest for the control of sacred space. In examining the history and nature of contestation over sacred space in Jewish tradition, a picture was painted for our reading of the Fourth Gospel. What became clear was the use of the restoration motif in providing an alternative theology of sacred space from the theological reservoirs of Judaism. Such spiritual worship lends itself easily to the ongoing debates. In the chapter which follows,

the question of diaspora as it relates to the wider spatial arrangement of the Fourth Gospel will be explored.

CHAPTER 6

DIASPORA AND RESTORATION AND THE COMING OF THE GREEKS IN JOHN 12

Along with renewed interest in sacred space, some scholar in the near future will undertake a study of exile as it has appeared in the history of religions (a study which would include both texts which reflex an exile from a sacred land on earth and those which report an exile from primeval or heavenly home

(Smith 1978:119).

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, the focus was on the contestation of the Temple's hegemony as the ultimate sacred place. In the Fourth Gospel, Temples, both as they stood in Samaria on Mount Gerizim and in Jerusalem are rejected in place of the presence of God as understood from the ancient Jewish wilderness wandering tradition. This position takes advantage of the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, and is situated within the first century CE diaspora experiences of the Johannine community. It is not the Temple destruction as such but the catastrophe of being dislocated from the land that reawakens old traditions of conceiving the sacred in the context of the entire covenant status of Israel. The rejection and subordination of the Temple system to that of the spiritual presence of the ascended Jesus is not replacement of the Temple idea with the person of Jesus. The risen and ascended Jesus is seen as the sacred presence of God from the Old Testament wilderness wanderings which the Johannine community is now reanacting.

It is this notion of 'wandering' and dislocation that is central to the self-understanding of the Johannine community. Just as God's presence did not leave Israel while in wandering in the desert during the Exodus, so also God did not leave Israel when Israel was in the Babylonian and Assyrian exiles. This exile or diaspora motif becomes central in understanding the Johannine community's relationship with God, within itself and with outsiders. The urge to return to the Land, the Land as the covenant gift, becomes central also to this self-understanding. It is the function of this diaspora motif that is investigated in this chapter. It will be necessary to look at the history of the exile from the perspective of both the Old Testament and Old Testament Apocrypha. The rabbinical literature will also be consulted in order to ascertain how the phenomenon is understood following the Temple's destruction. Different understandings of exile and diaspora will be evaluated in the light of this material and a hypothesis will be developed as to how the issue is being understood and utilised in the construction of space in the Fourth Gospel. While the coming of the Greeks in John 12:20-36a will be the main pericope for looking at the diaspora in John, other allusions to the subject will also be examined.

2. Diaspora as a Phenomenon[171]

Steven Bowman understands the concept of diaspora as denoting a "community that has emigrated from ancestral community yet maintains linguistic and cultural (i.e., religious), if not political, connections with the mother city" (ED 2004:193). Although diaspora is closely associated with the scattered Jewish presence outside of Palestine, it has a wider connotation which covers the experiences of diverse peoples (Smith 1978:119; Gafni 1997:12; Gruen 2002:1). It is important to note here that Gafni is mistaken in his view that the "broad-based yearning for a reverse process", that is, to 'return', was unique to the Jewish people (1997:12).[172] Diaspora is a concept "encompassing the contested

[171] While the word 'Exile' is used interchangeably with 'Diaspora' some scholars suggest that the former is negative and the later positive. Diaspora or Exile is that state of being out of one's home country while one maintains some contact and affinity for that home country. It is the 'first space' reality for John's community as will be argued. Dealing with this being away from the homeland is the process of 'third spacing' and this is investigated here. The degree of this contact with homeland and dealing with the desire to return is central to this investigation (see Scott 1997:177).

[172] The only weakness of a phenomenological analysis of Diaspora or one done from the perspective of history of religions (as Smith does) is that you lose the historical peculiarities of each Diaspora experience.

interplay of place, home, culture and identity", hence an experience of dislocation and hope for restoration (Blunt 2005:10). The assumption is that a people had a homeland from which they have been scattered and to which they seek to return (Smith 1978:119). Modern day Palestinian exile scholars such as Edward Said see diaspora (*manfa* or *ghurba* in Arabic) as the "loss of home and hearth, of a nurturing tradition, of the cultural horizons associated with continuity and rootedness" and a state which cannot be "recuperated" (Hussein 2002:3). This is a state of dispossession, banishment and "estrangement" (Hammer 2005:60-61). The same experience is articulated in the following way from the Gabon pygmies:

> The night is black, the sky is blotted out
> We have left the village of our Fathers,
> The Maker is angry with us…
> The old ones have passed away,
> Their homes are far off, below,
> Their spirits are wandering,
> Where are their spirits wandering?
> Perhaps the passing wind knows.
> Their bones are far off below (quoted in Smith 1978:119).

This sense of despair and internal conflict is not always shared among diaspora communities depending on how they explain their situation. Even Palestinian exiles such as Said would admit that although they are in exile, their condition of life is not worse off than if they were in their homeland (Schulz and Hammer 2003:195). Sometimes, these writings and narratives were meant not necessarily to reveal the pain of exile, but also to try and explain it, as well as to express other ideological functions (Blunt 2005:13). Whichever position is held, the writings try to give the most convincing explanation of the exile experience. They may fan into flame the embedded desires for return or discourage such thoughts by offering an alternative explanation of reality to the exile community. The notion of returning to a 'homeland' is not a fixed, but a dynamic symbol that is continually being redefined. The desire to return comes from the understanding that the homeland is the cosmological 'center' and hence the closest place to communicate with the divine. As has been noted by Matsuoka and Sorenson:

This becomes apparent when Smith equates the first century diaspora experience to that of fifteenth century Spain (1978:122). Even though these experiences draw from the same mythic tradition, their peculiarities need to be taken seriously.

> Diasporas are haunted by myths of return. In 1991, the war's end in Eritrea and the establishment of a new government in Ethiopia opened possibilities for this long-imagined return. Those in diaspora had to assess their situation and make choices about the future. A few did return immediately; some insisted they would return after certain other conditions (related to education, children, finances, and so on) had been met. Others came to see their situation as one of permanent displacement, which led to reflection on the future of their communities in diaspora (2001:233).

How then do Diasporas represent this lack of possibility to return? How do they negotiate this reality? From previous writings, Gruen observes that different Jewish groups "lamented" or "justified" or "dismissed or grappled with it, embraced it or deplored it" (Gruen 2002:232). In other words, the diaspora is a concrete or brute experience in history. It is the 'first space'. These tangible experiences enter the writings, art, and narratives of those in the diaspora. This would constitute 'second space'. The inquiry here is how the diaspora creates their 'third space'. It is the 'third spacing' that produces alternatives that can be compared with the diaspora 'third spacing' taking place in the Gospel of John. Diaspora communities re-represent or negotiate their spaces by developing a number of strategies. Although the present researcher cannot be exhaustive here, it can be observed that ritualisation[173] is the major way through which diaspora people deal with their exile experience.[174] While these categorisations are not always either over-describing or under-representing, ritualisation, as will be explained below, seems to address the negotiations diaspora communities bring out in their dealing with the exile experience.

2.1. Ritualisation

Smith explains exile as a "descent into chaos, death and unreality" which is only healed by the ritual performance of 'returning' or creating one's miniature homeland in exile

[173] Barclay (1996:92) uses assimilation, acculturation and accommodation to describe the levels of Hellenistic influence on the Jewish diaspora. The present researcher finds ritualisation more comprehensive in describing how the diaspora communities deal with their urge to return. Ritualisation also allows for the diaspora communities understanding of the self, not only in relationship with the host population, but also in relation to the absent homeland.

[174] For some people, the experience of diaspora is not permanent and a return programme can often be forged and implemented. These are the people for many reasons who do not wish to assimilate or ritualise the return and homeland. We could put *repatriation* as one category of dealing with the diaspora experience but as far as we know, especially from the Jewish diaspora, this became a strong phenomenon much later (e.g., early twentieth-century Zionism).

since concrete return is, most of the time, impossible (Smith 1978:126). Ritual is not here understood as those "special activities inherently different from daily routine and closely linked to the sacralities of tradition and organised religion", a definition current in "modern Western society" (Bell 1997:138). Here, it is used to refer to all those "flexible and strategic ways of acting" that may or may not include religious symbols but are done to achieve wider quests for identity (Bell 1997:138). Ritualisation involves "collective ceremony" which "gives certain meanings to" the contents of its performance (Moore and Myerhoff 1977:8) although this does not cancel "out individual idiosyncratic unpredictability, or group anarchy" (Moore and Myerhoff 1977:133). As such, it contains many aspects of "social life, any aspect of behaviour or ideology" (Moore and Myerhoff 1977:8). "Ritualisation may have both purposive and communicative properties though it is not exhausted by these descriptions" (Moore and Myerhoff 1977:15). Parkin has identified the close relationship between ritualisation and spatiality. He states that "Ritual is formulaic spatiality carried out by groups of people who are conscious of its imperative or compulsory nature and who may or may not further inform this spatiality with spoken words" (Parkin 1992:18). Parkin sees ritualisation as a means to remember place when places are constricted. He gives examples of movements people can imagine, for example, in divination where movement is an indicator of "implied spatial references" (Klingbeil 2007:163).

Ritualisation is the most common way to deal with exile and dislocation. This is normally done through the creation of a miniature or model homeland in the diaspora. Diaspora is not made up of individuals but by communities of people who share some cultural commonalities, such that even people who have different cultural backgrounds may emphasise their shared attributes if they find themselves in a foreign location (Lohse 2004:146). While in a foreign land, the diaspora people develop and share in the collective memories of the homeland, by finding ways to extend their ethnic ties while in exile (2004:193). Although these memories are not always homogenous, they find compromise in order to recreate the homeland in a foreign land.

Diaspora residents are not always abreast with the dynamic and continually evolving nature of the homeland and its culture, and therefore tend to invest their imaginations and recreations of the homeland on ancient, but not necessarily obsolete, ideas. In other words, diaspora communities tend to exaggerate the homeland culture if compared with the homeland itself, although people from the homeland tend to think that the Diasporas have lost the homeland culture. Some early Jewish rabbis would say: "He who lives outside of the land is in the category of one who worships idols" (*b. Ket*. 110b-111a; see also Smith 1978:120; Attias and Benbassa 2003:97).[175] As has rightly been observed, such "an assertion has major consequences; it seems to threaten the principle of the universality of the Divine Presence and *a priori* to deprive Jewish life in the diaspora of any legitimacy whatsoever" (Attias and Benbassa 2003:97).[176] Additionally, there seems to be some level of tacit communication between the homeland and exile. Those in the homeland tend to think highly of themselves, in terms of cultural preservation in comparison to those who are in diaspora; although in reality it is not always the case. As has been observed in Gibney and Hansen:

> One distinctive feature of diasporic Indians is that they ostensibly adhere to their culture. Overseas Indians, especially the recent migrants, are haunted by a feeling of guilt at having left India, a nation with ancient cultural traditions that they perceive as richer than any of the New World cultures. Particularly when children have to be brought up in the diaspora, the issue of cultural and religious preservation comes to the foreground. Indians see their own traditions threatened by the individualism in Western societies and the attraction that the Western culture might have for their children. Pride in belonging to an ancient culture is one reason for cultural conservatism; the sense of security that cultural preservation offers in alien surroundings is another (2005:298).

From this one can see that diasporas feel that by preserving the homeland culture, they are also preserving themselves. Through narratives, writings, and arts they invoke particular "sites and landscapes of memory" that get planted in this foreign land (Blunt 2005:13-14).[177] Barbara Ehrenreich has observed that people do not "swiftly and completely" relinquish their cultural traditions, even during slavery, imperialism, and

[175] This is attribute to attributed to Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi (between 135 and 219 CE) and it is very likely to be an early saying discouraging people from going out into Exile especially to Syria (Davies 1996:54).
[176] So some of the writings from the diaspora are a response meant to dispel the offensive from the homeland whether overtly or covertly stated or suggested.
[177] In the Jewish context, the building of synagogues during the diaspora could be a way of dealing with the possibility of not returning home.

diasporic dislocation (2007:164). She sees this as a form of "cultural resistance" where in most cases, "Africans of the diaspora" carry out "this work of cultural preservation under cover of European institutions" (Ehrenreich 2007:164).

The process of ritualising the homeland, although it tends to preserve the homeland culture also results in transformation. Such transformation is an effort to harmonise with the local cultures, without which it would (at least to a certain extent), be impossible to live in the host country. Ritualisation will in time use some host-nation symbols and cultural resources. Through this, the diaspora community will manage to live some part of their life based on the homeland culture but in forms that are not too different from the host culture.

2.2. The Awakening of the Urge to Return

Ritualisation can suppress the urge to return but cannot suffocate it completely. Even among the generations born in diaspora, the myth of return always constitutes their identity. Particular scenarios in the homeland usually trigger the urge to return resulting in the need to increase the scale of suppressing it. This desire to return is however easily awoken by the catastrophes and extreme achievements that take place in the homeland or the pain experienced in the host land. For diaspora people to keep abreast with what is happening in the homeland, they normally participate in pilgrimages. Such pilgrimages are not necessarily as religious as they may always appear. Sometimes they serve to satisfy the diaspora people that they are in solidarity with the homeland while at the same time assuring them that they are in the right place wherever they are, especially if the livelihoods seem scant in the homeland. Developments in the homeland create an ambivalent feeling for the diaspora communities. If there are catastrophes the diasporas have a sense of satisfaction with their new location outside the homeland while positive developments in the homeland heighten the desire to return.

2.3. Jewish Diasporas

In the first century CE, after almost sixty years as a Roman province, "Judea revolted against Rome in 66 CE" but finally fell after "a bitter war, which lasted until 70 CE" (Pasachoff and Littman 2005:82). This was a national disaster in many ways:

i. Many Jews were killed;
ii. The nation state of the Jews disappeared;
iii. The Temple, which had been a 'contested' symbol of unity for the Israelites, was razed to the ground.

For some three years a group of Zealots stood against the Romans at the Masada Fortress. In the face of imminent defeat, they committed mass suicide before the Romans could massacre them (Pasachoff and Littman 2005:90). After some sixty years later, following the recovery of the remnant Jewish population, they "rebelled against the Romans in 115-117 CE" around Cyrenaica, Egypt, and Cyprus and some little involvement in Judea (Pasachoff and Littman 2005:95). Under the leadership of Bar Kokhba, in 132 CE, a broader revolt ensued. Following some initial success, the rebellion was finally defeated in 135 CE (Pasachoff and Littman 2005:95). Those who survived fled to other parts of Palestine where they could find refuge. Others fled outside of Palestine to increase the number of the many Jews who were already in the diaspora

2.4. Responses to the exile

The responses to diaspora experiences were diverse and varied between different Jewish groups. The meagre information available makes it difficult to ascertain with any certainty the 'real' experiences of those who participated in the exile. Some scholars on the exile have called the entire area of study, "a historical lacuna" due to the absence of a continuous and clear historical presentation of the exile in the Bible (Albertz 2003:3). Since most of the diaspora was a result of war and violence, one can safely conclude that the general initial experience was that of trauma. Theologically, physical dislocation from

the land of promise was seen as a reversal of the two promises of Yahweh to Abraham: "progeny and land" (Sanders 1997:37). What we can glean from the Psalms and the prophets—if reflective of their experiences then and not theologising after the event—that trauma, shame, and helplessness was indeed their lot. Hence, we read in the Book of Psalms:

> By the rivers of Babylon—there we sat down and there we wept when we remembered Zion. On the willows there we hung up our harps. For there our captors asked us for songs, and our tormentors asked for mirth, saying, "Sing us one of the songs of Zion!" How could we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land? If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither! (137:1-5).

Additionally, according to the Book of Jeremiah, 'mourning rituals' took place:

> On the day after the murder of Gedaliah, before anyone knew of it, eighty men arrived from Shechem and Shiloh and Samaria, with their beards shaved and their clothes torn, and their bodies gashed, bringing grain offerings and incense to present at the Temple of the Lord. And Ishmael son of Nethaniah came out from Mizpah to meet them, weeping as he came (41:4-6).

While the experience of trauma could have been 'real' among some Jewish Exiles, for others, life continued unabated, whereby they could experience God's favour wherever they were. This can be seen from Jeremiah's message to the Exiles:

> Build houses and live in them; plant gardens and eat what they produce. Take wives and have sons and daughters; take wives for your sons, and give your daughters in marriage, that they may bear sons and daughters; multiply there, and do not decrease. But seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to the Lord on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare (29:5-7).

That the diaspora experience was always thought of and represented as a "theological issue" has been noted by most scholars (Kraabel 1992:28; Albertz 2003). Kraabel is mistaken though in thinking that the theology of the exile turned from being negative to that of positive as a result of 'voluntary' exile (1992:28). Exile has never been voluntary since whatever motivates people to leave their home place and go to another is evidence of dissatisfaction. People do not *move* into exile, they are *moved*, either by people or by circumstance. Of course, subsequent generations were born in to families in exile; these shared in the 'myth' of return although 'real' return would not be easy.

2.5. The Myth of Return and Restoration

> For the Jew, the people, the land, the law as *Derek Eretz* ("the way of the land"), and YHWH are in inseparable. [It] is only in this context that one can understand the full, tragic of the exile, which had been the characteristic mode of Jewish people for 1,900 years. While the exile is an event which can be located chronologically as after A.D. 70, it is above all a thoroughly mythic event: the return to chaos, the *decreation*, the separation from the deity analogous to the total catastrophe of the primeval flood (Smith 1978:119).

The "belief in *Kibbutz Galuyot* ("Ingathering of the Exiles")" forms the myth of the self-identity of the Jewish people in the diaspora (Rubinstein 1974:2; see also Sanders 2002:57). Being away from the land and experiencing the lack of productivity (both of land and human progeny) was always thought of as being inseparably connected. Hence, in the curses and blessings in the Book of Deuteronomy, the Israelites were told:

> You shall carry much seed into the field but shall gather little in, for the locust shall consume it. You shall plant vineyards and dress them, but you shall neither drink the wine nor gather the grapes, for the worm shall eat them. You shall have olive trees throughout all your territory, but you shall not anoint yourself with the oil, for your olives shall drop off. You shall have sons and daughters, but they shall not remain yours, for they shall go into captivity (28:38-41).

The dream of return and restoration was always coupled, not only with return to the land, but with productivity of the land as well. The promise had been made that after the "destruction and exile" God would have compassion on them and would return them and "gather" them from all the nations God would have scattered them (Deut. 30:1ff, Ezek. 28:26). This myth of return and restoration is seen as the strength of both the Torah and the Prophets since in them is a clear articulation of the survival of the Jews, says Sanders (1997:39). Sanders sees this use of narrative being adopted by the Christian writers of the Gospels and Acts as they demonstrate a successful explanation of the "ignominious arrest and crucifixion of Jesus as well as his "survival," albeit in a muted (or resurrected) form" (1997:39).

This return was on condition that they would have learnt their lesson. When God would restore them he will also bless them with abundance. This restoration element of this return was seen in that God would multiply them. As the Book of Deuteronomy states:

> Return to the Lord your God, and you and your children obey him with all your heart and with all your soul, just as I am commanding you today, then the Lord your God will restore your fortunes and have compassion on you, gathering you again from all the peoples among whom the Lord your God has scattered you. Even if you are Exiled to the ends of the world, from there the Lord your God will gather you, and from there he will bring you back. The Lord your God will bring you into the land that your ancestors possessed, and you will possess it; he will make you more prosperous and numerous than your ancestors. (30:2-5).

Material abundance on the land and multiplication of progeny was the best promise the Israelite could ever receive from God. If they would receive their land again and the land would be fruitful, and their wives would give birth to many children, God would have shown remorse. Yet, as many Jewish people remained in the diaspora, their experiences became almost a permanent one. They were now becoming people of the diaspora and hence they had to develop a theology which offered convincing affirmation of their existence away from the land (Sanders 1997:39). They needed to 'third space' their experiences. The 'first space' would explain exile as punishment, 'second space', an explanation of exile as mission. We will look at these rationalisations in this order.

2.6. The Exile as Punishment

The oldest and basic understanding of exile was that of punishment as a result of sin. This initial experience of banishment had its prototype in the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden (e.g. Gen. 3:24) followed by that of Cain (Gen. 4:14). In both cases, the Hebrew word used is גרש. The sending off of Hagar and Ishmael is also described as גרש (banish) (Gen. 21:10). In most cases, the word is translated ἐξέβαλον in the LXX (Gen. 3:24; Exod. 2:17). In this later sense, it was also used in reference to divorce (Ezek. 44:22). The two senses are descriptive of Israel's relationship with Yahweh. They are children of God and God can throw them out of the household if they are not obedient to him as a father. In another sense, Yahweh's covenant relationship with Israel is that of husband and wife. Worship of other gods is tantamount to marital

infidelity that will lead to divorce or expulsion (Ezek. 16:25). Fidelity on the part of Israel will determine co-existence between God and Israel in the land. The promise in the Deuteronomic tradition makes it plain that disobedience and unfaithfulness would result in exile. The Lord would expel or uproot (ἐξέβαλεν) "them from their land in anger and in fury and in great wrath, and cast them into another land, as it is this day" (Deut 29:28). Among the sins leading to exile according to this exile theology from Deuteronomy 29-31 would be Jewish idolatry (Kraabel 1992:29). The prophets told the Jewish people that they were sent into exile as punishment for their disobedience (Dan. 9:7; Ezek. 20:23ff) (see Klawans 2000; 2007).

Another sense in which punishment was effected is that of the scattering (זָרָה or פוּ) of Israel among the nations. God had promised that for their sins, Israel would be scattered among the nations (Lev. 26:33; Neh. 1:8). This notion of scattering is known in the LXX by the word διασπείρως, which is a translation of זָרָה, or from διασκορπίζω which is a translation of פוּ, although the LXX is not consistent in its translation of these words. The initial Old Testament account seems to be coming from a scattering that results when humankind wants to build a city in its own name and hence are "scattered (פוּ) (διασπαρῆναι) abroad upon the face of the whole earth" (Gen. 11:4, 8). The prophetic tradition uses this notion more than the banishment (גרשׁ) idea. "I scatter (פוּ) (διασκορπιῶ) them among nations that neither they nor their ancestors have known; and I send the sword after them, until I have consumed them" (Jer. 9:16). "I scatter (פוּ) (διασπείρω) you like chaff driven by the wind from the desert" (Jer. 13:24).

The inconsistency in the translation of the LXX is evident. The LXX διασκορπίζω is used in reference to God's action of dispersing his people and casting them away from the land God has given them (e.g. Deut. 30:1, 3; Neh. 1:8; Tob. 3:4; Psa. 106:27). Since the LXX is fully aware of the notion of *diaspora*, it uses all three words ἐξέβαλεν, διασπείρω, and διασκορπίζω interchangeably to describe the same experience of divorce, banishment and scattering. Hence, in the LXX, diaspora experience is reflected in the

translation of the Hebrew שלך (to throw, fling, cast, Deut 29:28), זרה (spread, Jer. 15:7), פו (disperse or scatter, Jer. 18:17) and נדח (banish, drive away Jer. 39:37).[178]

This same position is held also in the Second Temple period. We thus read from the second century BCE LXX translation of *Sirach*:

> For all this the people repented not, neither departed they from their sins, till they were spoiled and carried out of their land, and were scattered (διεσκορπίσθησαν) through all the earth (48:15).

The understanding is that exile was a result of sin and not heeding the warning of the prophets. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* which can be dated with little certainty around 150 BCE with many later redactions says that Israel will be a "disgrace and a curse" as she will be "scattered as captives among the nations" because "Jerusalem cannot bear the presence of your wickedness" (*TLevi* 10:3-4). In the *Testament of Asher*, it is said:

> I know that you will sin and be delivered into the hands of your enemies, your land shall be made desolate and your sanctuary wholly polluted. You will be scattered to the four corners of the earth, in the dispersion you shall be regarded as worthless" (7:2-3).

The *Psalms of Solomon*, discussed in detail above, takes a different route. The reason for the exile is not the sin of the people but that of the priestly class (*Pss. Sol.* 1, 8, and 17). As Klawans observes, this text provides a warning as if "God's presence has not yet departed (7:1)" from the Temple (2007:153). The same position is held in all the other literature in varying degrees up to the Hellenistic and Rabbinic periods.

The understanding of exile as punishment for sin persists to the Hellenistic period. Hellenistic Jews also saw exile as punishment and therefore a condition to be reversed. As expressed in the second century BCE Hellenistic work, *Letter of Aristeas*:

[178] The different usages of words from the same book demonstrates the fluidity of the ideas carried by these words in Hebrew (see Klawans 2007:291).

> Keep in mind that it is good to live and die in one's country. Residence abroad brings contempt upon poor men, and upon rich–disgrace, as though they were in exile for some wickedness (*Let. Aris.* 249).

Also Philo of Alexandria (20 BCE- 50 CE), sees banishment as a "penalty second only to death for those who have been convicted of the greatest crimes" (*Abr*. 64).

Although the "midrashic collection" has some scattered reference to exile, the subject "does not greatly occupy" the earlier rabbinic collections like the *Sifre*, *Sifre Numbers*, *Sifre Deuteronomy*, or *Mekhilta* (Porton 1997:249).[179] There is evidence that the sages from Palestine dissuaded people from fleeing the land after Bar Kokhba (Porton 1997:249). We read that the "exile comes into the world because of the worship of idols, fornication, and bloodshed" (*m. Avoth* 5:9). The aforementioned sins were also the causes of the destruction of the First Temple (*b. Yoma* 9b). In this sense, exile is presented in a negative way. The things God created but repented of, include, "exile, the Chaldeans, and the Ishmaelites, and the Evil Inclination" (*b. Sukk.* 52b). Hence, the ultimate "goal of Judaism is the return of all Jews to the land of Israel" (Feldman 1997:162). Since however the exile is the only way for the atonement of the moral sins of Israel, exile is seen as Israel's purification. When Israel goes into exile, God also goes with her. Israel's exile is a "participation in the divine pathos, and is itself, by a daring interpretation, a salvific experience. The exile of Israel is her initiation, is her experience of a death which will be followed by a rebirth, and it becomes necessary to experience death or exile in its fullest so that rebirth and restoration may more quickly come" (Smith 1978:123).

Klawans has shown that Hebrew description of the diaspora or exile experience as punishment was based on their understanding of sin and defilement. Impurities that can lead to the banishment out of the land were those that had to with contact sins, namely, idolatry, incest or "sexual sin", and murder, all of which were considered to be moral and not ritual impurities (2000:27; 2007:150). It is a result of moral impurity or abominations that defile the sinners that also defile the land of Israel and the sanctuary of God leading to the "expulsion of the people from the land of Israel" (Klawans 2000:26). Ritual

[179] The difficulty of dating and the disparities within the wide rabbinic corpus are discussed in earlier chapters.

impurity can be atoned for by performing particular rituals on land and on the body. However, "moral impurity contracted is conveyed to the land" so that the "defilement of the land" cannot be resolved by ritual purity laws but by the expulsion of the people into exile (Klawans 2000:26).

2.7. Positive Views on the Exile

Bruce Chilton has observed that the representation of exile in the Isaiah Targum is salvific in that it is at the "devastating arrival of the Gentiles" that the Messiah is crowned to begin his judgement of the nations (1997:239-240). In this understanding, exile is the "prelude to messianic vindication, and is to that extent eagerly anticipated" (:240). This understanding was not very strange to Jewish Hellenistic writers living in exile themselves. Although elsewhere he presented the exile as something to be hated, Philo is known to have tried to ease the stigma associated with it by either giving it a spiritual meaning or by alluding to the Jewish communities in exile as 'colonies' (ἀποικία) (*Vit. Mos.* 2.232; Gafni 1997:29). Those who had gone to the diaspora, according to Philo, had "moved to better residence" (*Spec. Leg.* 4.178). The promise for Israel, according to Josephus, was to inhabit all the 'habitable world…as an eternal habitation" (*Ant*. 4.115). In this sense, the people of Israel already in the diaspora are living according to God's plan for them, says Josephus (Gafni 1997:29). Philo, on the other hand, saw the movement into diaspora as a sign of growth of the Jewish nation although there would be an ingathering of God's people in the future (*Vit. Mos*. 2.232; *Praem. Poen*. 115). In this sense it becomes clear that one finds a segment of Jewish population that sought to understand the exile as helping to achieve God's plan for Israel.

2.8. The Ritual of Return

The debate between Kraabel and Scott (Scott 1997:177) as to whether or not the Jews in the diaspora desired to return makes the diaspora experience homogenous and voluntary. Different Jewish groups in the diaspora had different experiences there. The fact remains

however that all of them knew of a place which could be thought of as the 'centre', thus enabling them find ways to deal with their trauma.

The above rationalisations served to account for the different diaspora experience. The two views are not necessarily contradictory in their 'third spacing' of the brute diaspora experience. The one that sees it as punishment legitimises it. There should be no complaining since they are in exile as a result of, either their own sins, or the sins of the temple authorities. The punishment was seen to be achieving the required atonement and the hope of restoration deferred to some unknown future. Because the future of restoration is unknown, there is no need to worry and wait for it. For those who see the exile as salvific and mission, their presence in Gentile territory is a means of bringing the light of salvation to otherwise dark nations. Hence, restoration would be thought of as coming only when the entire Gentile world has come to the light. The likelihood though is that this mission is initially focussing, not on the Gentiles *per se*, but on the scattered children of God who must all be gathered together before final restoration. By going into exile, the mission is to call all Israel to repentance at the coming of the Messiah.

It would be an oversimplification to suggest that all diaspora Jews wanted to relocate to the holy land. For many, the diaspora experience had provided enough resources not to warrant a desire to return. The 'return' was a myth in that it formed part of the self-understanding of the Jews who saw themselves as always about to enter the promised land but also about to lose it. As Neusner has put it, for the Jew, "the land is not a given, but promised; the promise to Israel is conditional; the land is there to be lost and the people there to lose it and to cease to be—all because of what they do or not do" (Neusner 2002:58; see also Brueggemann 1982:355). While for others, the investment in the diaspora prohibited them from desiring to return to their original homeland, the pilgrimages and rituals of return satisfied the incipient desire for return by either sending gifts to Jerusalem or reciting the cultic observances in the diaspora synagogues and homes, offered solace for the heart and resolved tensions of solidarity with the call to aspire to return. By attending the local Sabbath meetings while in exile, the ritual for the return to the Temple was satisfied, although this did not completely replace the hope of

‘return’, albeit in the long distant future (Barclay 1996:417ff). This, in Soja’s terminology is ‘third space’ in which the objective is “to encourage” those displaced to think “differently about the meanings and significance of space and those related concepts that compose and comprise the inherent spatiality of human life: place, locations, locality, landscape, environment, home, city, region, territory, and geography.” Rather than encourage them to discard their “old and familiar ways of thinking about space and spatiality”, this caused them to “question them in new ways… aimed at opening up the expanding scope and critical sensibility of already established spatial or geographical imaginations” (Soja 1996:1). In the categories of Lefebvre, this would be the third category of space called ‘*espace veçu*’ or ‘lived space’ (1991:38). This is space in which potential and utopian possibilities are present. This was space sometimes transformed by marginalised people as they found their way of negotiating the limitations of the ‘capitalist’ control of space. One could say this is the space of dreams or visions. For Jewish people in exile, this was space of taming the urge for ‘real’ return, while giving it new meaning and a new outlet. By performing particular rituals, the urge to return would be pacified and this could be done over and over again. It is such ‘third spacing’ attitude that is investigated in the Fourth Gospel. The several allusions to the diaspora in John make this investigation necessary so as to understand how space and place configurations in John’s Gospel work.

3. Johannine Allusions to the Exile

3.1. The Incarnation of the Word as Exile

As has been suggested in previous chapters, the Word’s appearance in the cosmos is a dislocation suggested by the Fourth Gospel in the Prologue. Some further details may need to be given here, including how this dislocation continues to the expressed throughout the Fourth Gospel.

The descent from heaven to earth is a qualitative spatial movement according to the Fourth Gospel:

> He who comes from above is above all; he who is of the earth belongs to the earth, and of the earth he speaks; he who comes from heaven is above all (John 3:31).

The heavenly bread gives life to the world which is full of death (John 6:33). This spatial movement is expressed in the transformation of being made into flesh (σὰρξ) (John 1:14). John is explicit that this transformation was degradation since that which is born of the flesh "is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6). Hence, it is "the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life" (John 6:63). Even though he is said to have come "to his own," "his own did not received him" (John 1:11). 'His own' here does not refer to 'his own home' but his own possession of the earth as its creator. Jesus does not belong to this world (John 17:14, 16) just as those who are his own do not belong to this world (John 15:19). He is not in the world out of his own choice. As he says: "I came from God and now I am here. I did not come on my own, but he sent me" (John 8:42b). Jesus "had come from God and was going to God" (John 13:3).

This identity of alienation and of being 'out of place' is the Johannine Jesus' experience. When the disciples ask where he was staying, we are never told that they saw the place. What we are told is that they stayed with him that particular day (John 1:39). From here on, Jesus and those who follow him have no permanent place. After the wedding in Cana, only Jesus and his family stay in Capernaum for "a few days" (John 2:12). In Samaria, he alone stayed for two days (John 4:40). He has no 'home' in the world. Even the synagogue and the Temple are places of alienation for Jesus. He has to leave the Temple for fear of his life (John 8:59; 10:39).

3.2. The Passion as Exile

The exegesis of the entire passion pericopae would be too long for the purpose of this section. It will thus be the arrest of Jesus (John 18:1-11) and some few elements of his trial that demonstrate the use of the exile structure that will be examined here. The common approach that begins with a comparison between John's rendering and that of

the Synoptic tradition, is based on the premise that assumes the Synoptic tradition as the source behind the Johannine rendering (although this is not always declared beforehand). It is however almost a futile exercise since we will not know with certainty which sources were at the disposal of those who composed the Fourth and Synoptic Gospels.

For our spatial concern, we note that after the priestly prayer of John 17, Jesus went out on the other side of the winter-flowing Kedron with his disciple (John 18:1). In Luke, Jesus went to the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39), while in Mark and Matthew Jesus went to Gethsemane (Matt. 26:36; Mark 14:32). Where Jesus went with his disciples in John there was a garden (κῆπος) (John 18:1). This garden becomes a reference point when the woman at the trial of Jesus identifies Peter (John 18:26): "Did I not see you in the garden with him?" It is also mentioned that at a place where Jesus is crucified there is a garden or "orchard" or "plantation (John 19:41) (Barrett 1955:432). There is a gardener (κηπουρός) who tends this garden (John 20:15). Both words meaning 'garden' and 'gardener' are also found in Luke although ἀμπελουργόν is used for 'gardener' (Luke 13:7). By omitting the garden agony which is central in the Synoptic tradition, John wants to create Kedron as a 'home space', Eden revived. Unlike in the Synoptic tradition where Jesus takes some few disciples, in John all the disciples go with him to form the image of whole united family under God (John 18:1). In the Synoptic tradition, Judas provides the tip of how to single Jesus out from his disciples and the crowed. In John, Judas plays the role of selling out the 'home space', that is, he discloses Kedron place because he knew the place (παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον) since Jesus used to get together (συνήχθη) there with his disciples (John 18:2). He is like a family member who has not only gone astray, but one who has chosen to endanger the family in addition to that.

We have seen that in the context of restoration and 'return' in John, συνάγω would show that Kedron is a place of special fellowship, it is a home. The arrival of foreign Roman soldiers and officers from the Chief Priest together with Judas all armed at night is contrasted with the picture of the homely place Kedron had been beforehand (John 18:3). This combination, read in the light of the exile is a demonstration of foreign force and internal collaboration. Jesus' place of fellowship with his disciples is invaded due to local

betrayal. This makes sense in the backdrop of the understanding of exile as being caused by the priests as they collaborate with foreigners. For this reason, on the eve of the Roman invasion of 66 CE, "the Zealots seized the Temple, killing the incumbent high priest as a Roman collaborator, and thousands of other collaborators as well" (Bennett 2001:40).

That the Kedron valley replays the first exile of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden is very suggestive (Gen. 2:10). Two clear similarities are the presence of a river and a garden (κῆπος) (John 18:1; 19:41) (see Evans 1997:299-305).[180] Eden was the ideal home for these first people of God. The treachery of Judas mimics that of the snake that led these proto-humans astray (John 18:2). Just as Adam and Even were escorted out of the Garden, Jesus is also led out by the "officers from the chief priests and the Pharisees" who have connived with the Romans to have Jesus arrested (John 18:3). The violence exerted upon the early Exiles as they were deported from their land is here being replayed as seen through the use of violence attending the arrest of Jesus. Just as in every exile God leaves a remnant, so also here Jesus does not lose any of those entrusted to him by the Father (John 18:9).[181]

The trial scene also has all the signs of exile. The ritual defilement that is likely to be experienced in exile is also seen in the trial scene. The Jewish leaders "led Jesus from the house of Caiaphas to the praetorium" but "did not enter the praetorium, so that they might not be defiled" (John 18:28). The Jewish authorities cannot enter the court yard of Pilate because they would become ceremonially unclean. Ritual purity law "prohibited sacrifice outside the borders of the Promised Land, as all other lands were considered "unclean" (defiled by idolatry)" (Coogan 2001:217) although we have seen that the defilement that would lead to exile was moral and not ritual defilement (Klawans 2000:27; 2007:150). They live in a sacred land and cannot enter profane places although they are profane

[180] Evans gives examples of many who had led revolutions who offered their followers many "confirming signs in keeping with traditions of the exodus" (Evans 1997:302). These brigands always found followers because "many Jews regarded Israel as in a state of bondage, even Exile" (Evans 1997:305).

[181] The presence of gardens (*paradeisoi*) in Syria in the first and second century CE is very interesting if seen in the light of the above discussion. It was in these gardens, with "large groves of trees, fountains, and streams" where many festivals where held (Gleason 1997:386). If the community of John is telling the story of Jesus through this prism of these gardens, then the Diaspora effect is evident within the narratives.

themselves because of the way they have mismanaged the Temple. But Jesus has to go into exile on their behalf as prophesied by Caiaphas. His final journeys to the cross and to the tomb are experiences of his ultimate 'descent' and alienation from "his own" land and his own people.

3.3. The Exile and the Disciples

The identity of Jesus and that of his disciples is from the outset one of alienation. Hence, when they suffer direct expulsion they are only living according to their identity. Discipleship was exercised in an environment fraught with the danger of being expelled from the synagogue (ἀποσυνάγωγος) (John 9:22). Such expulsion was the sign of hostility to be received by disciples because they were alien to the world. Such an experience is seen from the man born blind who was thrown out (ἐξέβαλον) for having believed that Jesus was the prophet (John 9:34, 35). We saw a similar use of ἐκβάλλω in our analysis of the exile in the Old Testament. Being expelled is the identity of all those who seek to follow Jesus. They will be alienated. The blind man is now alienated and yet in John this is the ultimate mark of discipleship. Brown suggests that at the writing of the Fourth Gospel:

> Johannine Christians had been expelled from the synagogues (John 9:22; 16:2) because of what they were claiming about Jesus. Such an expulsion reflects the situation in the last third of the first century when the teaching center of Judaism was in Jamnia (Jabneh)—a Judaism that was dominantly Pharisee and thus no longer so pluralistic as before 70 (1979:22).

Robert Kysar is close to our understanding when he says that the "Johannine community finds itself cast out of the synagogue. The result, we have suggested, is a serious and traumatic social dislocation" (1993:129). This metaphoric perspective enriches our argument although it lacks any allusion to diaspora as the 'first space' experience of the Johannine community into which the narratives of being expelled from the synagogue are subordinated. The social dislocation is the brute reality, the 'first space', but it is not the final word. This alienation would not end in expulsion but in restoration. In the community's 'third spacing', this restoration has already begun.

> They will put you out of the synagogues (ἀποσυναγώγους). Indeed, an hour is coming when those who kill you will think that by doing so they are offering worship to God (John 16:2).

Just as being thrown out of the local community is an expression of exile for Jesus, so it is for his disciples. Since for Jesus the ultimate exile is death, so it will be for his disciples. There are interesting parallels here with first century CE Roman law. Roman law allowed prisoners a choice between "permanent exile" and the "death penalty" (Murphy-O'Connor 2004:233). If this is the understanding shared in John, then the presentation of exile as death makes sense.[182] In this understanding, death is joining the rest of the Exiles and is something to be admired. It is probably in this context that Thomas' enigmatic words should be read: "Let us also go, that we may die with him" in which understanding death is the precursor of resurrection (John 11:16).[183] As such "unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; but if it dies, it bears much fruit" (John 12:24; *cf.* 18:14).

The priests and the Temple authorities are accused of being responsible for this exile condition of the people of God. Israel is scattered (σκορπίζει) because the shepherds (Jewish leaders) have been negligent (John 10:12). As Vanderkam puts it, the "exile is a punishment for priestly malfeasance" and punishment "meted out to the defiling priest" (1997:102). Just as in the time of Jesus, some Jewish people were in the land, while others were in the diaspora, Jesus says in John:

> I have other sheep, which are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock with one shepherd (John 10:16).

In his ignorance, but through God's prophetic utterance, Caiaphas, the High Priest that year, says that instead for the whole nation to perish, "Jesus was about to die for the nation (ἔθνους), and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the dispersed children

[182] For the Hellenistic background of the relationship between death penalty and Exile, one can look Plato's views on Crito's reflections on the options that Socrates had in order to avert his death penalty, one being Exile (Weiss 1998:77). William Horbury has also convincingly shown how, in the second Temple period, "exclusion was a surrogate for, or preliminary to, the death penalty" (1985:16).

[183] The other known interpretations of Thomas' words that suggest his ignorance and unbelief are based only on a single incident.

of God (τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἕν)" (John 11:50-52).[184] The belief in special prophetic abilities associated with the priestly office was still current in Jesus' time (Lindars 1972:407). Josephus also attests to such a gift in relationship to John Hyrcanus (*Ant.* XII.299). While the words from Caiaphas are meant to legitimise his condemnation of Jesus, in John they are used to confirm the Messianic responsibility of Jesus to gather in not only Palestinian Jewry but also diaspora Jewry.[185] While the reference could have been used for Gentile mission in the later Christian era, it seems in John's context the reference is still confined to the *ethnos* or Israel in and outside of Palestine. They are the sheep scattered by the wolf because shepherds were negligent.

The idea of διεσκορπισμένα has already been noted in the allegorical reference in Ezekiel 34 to Israel as the sheep of God, although the word διεσπάρη is used. Contrary to Voorwinde (2005:133), this is possibly because John is not necessarily using the LXX. From our analysis of the understanding of exile and diaspora in the Old Testament, we have seen that these words are used interchangeably to refer to the same experience. In Ezekiel, the deplorable condition of the sheep and their ultimate scattering is the fault of the shepherds (Ezek. 34:2-10). These shepherds look after their own interests just as does the hired shepherds in John 10:12-14. As the thief comes to steal, kill and destroy (John 10:10), the shepherds in Ezekiel are only interested in killing and eating the sheep (Ezek. 34:3-4). Other scholars have also noted this relationship (Lindars 1972:407-8; Quast 1991:80; Carson 1991:381) but they have not noted that the scattering referred to here is that of exile.[186] If the Ezekiel *Vorlage* is followed thoroughly, it becomes apparent that the Israelite people are in mind here although the inclusion of Gentiles could not be ruled out in later Christian interpretations.

---

[184] The death of Jesus in the light of Israel's Exile seen as her "participation in the divine pathos" and being initiated in the "experience of a death which will be followed by a rebirth, and hence it becomes necessary to experience death or Exile in its fullest so that rebirth and restoration may more quickly come" (Smith 1978:123). As will be suggested below, it is this understanding that becomes useful in John's reversal or legitimization of Exile.

[185] This interpretation is contrary to Lindars and other scholars who see this as legitimation of "Gentile mission" (1972:407).

[186] Carson alludes to Diaspora in reference to John 7:34-36 but concludes, as with most scholars that the "Gentile proselytes are in view" (1991:320). With regard to John 11:51-52, he again sees a legitimation for Gentile mission (1991:388).

Another allusion to the diaspora in John is the vision of those who will be reached out to in the future whom Jesus had not reached himself. Jesus had reached out to Samaria and Galilee, that is, the whole of Ephraim. He had also reached out to Judea, in Jerusalem, Bethany, that is, the whole of Judah. What had not been reached was the scattered children in the diaspora (John 17:20).[187] Jesus thus exclaims, "I have other sheep that do not belong to this fold. I must bring them also" (John 10:16).[188] Jesus is presented in John as having come to reach out to all the children of Israel and his North-South movements have allowed him to reach parts of Israel, namely in Palestine, but he has not yet reached those outside the Land of Promise. He must therefore seek the 'other sheep', in reference to the scattered peoples of God in the diaspora.

The scattering of the sheep that is a result of the striking of the shepherd in Zechariah 13:7 is significant in our understanding of the incident in the Kidron garden. Here, Jesus protects his disciples as the good shepherd who sacrifices for the sheep. He did this so as to "fulfil the word that he had spoken, 'I did not lose a single one of those whom you gave me'" (John 18:9). This scattering is not to be resisted the way Peter is doing (John 18:11). Scattering is the prelude to gathering, so it must not be resisted.

These allusions to the diaspora in the Fourth Gospel are a reflection of the exile being experienced by the community of John. It is the 'first space'. They are couched in the language of Jesus' incarnation, his alienation by 'his own' people, and his final exile through the passion as exile drama. The final descent into exile is his burial and the closure of the tomb with a stone. The same applies to the disciples. By virtue of being his followers, their 'real' experience, their 'first space' is that of exclusion and alienation.

[187] It must be pointed out here that the schism between the Samaritans and the other Jewish groups has sometimes been exaggerated. Evidence emerges to the contrary from the Diaspora. The excavations at Delos have revealed a synagogue in which the Jews and Samaritans have very close relationship. Actually, the Samaritans here called themselves 'Israelites' (Kraabel 1992:331-334). In trying to distinguish between Jewish and Samaritan synagogues in the Diaspora, Kraabel is missing the point because for those living outside the homeland it is their restoration identity that matters. They see themselves as Israelites and rarely as Jews (i.e., Judeans) or Samaritans. The fact that in John, all regional identities find acceptable expression in the name 'Israel', as argued above, makes for an interesting discovery.

[188] As has already been noted in our reading of John 11:51-52, the reference to the 'other sheep' is not a call for Gentile mission as has been generally been thought in Johannine scholarship. Scholars who taken this position (the majority), have not given sufficient evidence to support such a position (see Hoskyns 1947:379, 505; Barrett 1975:231, 427; Westcott 1881:155, 245; Carson 1991:320,388).

They are experiencing exile couched in the language of expulsion from the synagogue. Expulsion from the synagogue is only a confirmation of their current state of being away from the homeland. Appropriating it as something positive though is their 'third spacing' of their circumstances. By ritualising the return from exile, they subvert the 'real' need to go back. By spiritualising the return and couching it in the language of reversal of their exile, they inoculate against the effects of exile.

4. Restoration in John

Before looking at some allusions to restoration ritualisation in John it is appropriate to briefly look at some scholarly work on restoration in John. Recently, John Dennis (2006) has observed that the Fourth Gospel exhibits the 'restoration motif'. Through the use of John 11:47-52, Dennis has tried to show that the death of Jesus—foreshadowed as it is by the death of Lazarus—is explained by the restoration of Israel to her God. Dennis sees the special role played by the Temple in restoration theology since at the restoration of Israel, the restoration of the Temple will also be included (2006:68). Hence, the "implied restoration of the "place" by means of Jesus' death in John 11:52b (*cf.* John 11:48c) is at the centre of Johannine restoration theology" (2006:68). Dennis thinks that John is using first century CE Jewish understanding in that Israel was going through some "protracted exile" (2006:80). According to this reading of Jewish restoration theology, all Israel will be gathered together, including from the diaspora, the Temple will be restored and rebuilt, deliverance will come from Gentile domination, there will be covenant renewal, and Satan will be defeated (2006:86).

Dennis' discussion is significant for this study although some contentious points need to be addressed. First, the understanding of what would constitute restoration would not be homogeneous among the Jewish people if there were many Judaisms in first century CE Palestine, as is now generally accepted. That Dennis tries to produce some kind of harmonised theology of restoration is questionable in that light. The harmonisation proves unstable as Dennis tries to use apocryphal texts from after the second or even third century CE and accord them same status as data sources with the canonical prophets in

reconstructing what he thinks is restoration theology in first century Palestine. Dennis is quick to realise the criticisms poured on Wright for generalisations but still uses Wright's rejected position for his own work without giving them any new reinforcement (2006:81).

Another weakness in Dennis' significant contribution is the abstracting of exile as mere imagination in first century CE Palestine. Would people in Palestine *en masse* find the luxury of imagining exile when so many of the Jewish people were living in exile? Was this concern for exile not a commentary on 'real' and contemporary issues? No wonder therefore that Dennis cannot locate the Johannine community as a community in exile itself. Without locating John in the diaspora, it becomes a disjointed commentary on various Old Testament allusions to exile. His proposal that the Fourth Gospel reveals the "salvific effects of Jesus' death" which "mediates eschatological life" and the "final defeat of Satan" makes sense as a Christian systematised theology, but it skirts around many difficult issues posed by John.

Sean Freyne (2004) has also attended to the restoration question from conflicting Jewish positions to portray a different picture from that of Dennis. He shows that the characteristic of restoration in some prophetic circles, especially Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and Amos, was the "abundance of the harvest" and the correction of the pollution of the land (2004:33). The understanding of restoration from the Major Prophets is that of the "Eden-like quality", says Freyne (2004:34). This 'utopian imagination', as will be seen in coming chapter, does not look at some future fulfilment of God's promises, but looks back hoping for the restoration of the lost 'Eden' from the past primal traditions. A similar kind of hermeneutic that gives older traditions more authority in interpreting disputable matters can be seen in Jesus' encounter with the teachers of the law in the Synoptic tradition on issues such as marriage and divorce.[189] Jesus refers his enquirers, not to Moses' law as they would prefer, but to the creation, an Eden-like imagination. Restoration in the wider context of the Fourth Gospel draws from what would have been a holistic concept emerging from the restoration of creation. In John this begins with the

[189] See Mark 10:6 and the previous verses for the context.

Prologue where darkness is replaced by light, as in the first creation story. The entire ministry of Jesus would then be understood in the context of that primal restoration. Jesus' statement, "My Father is still working, and I also am working" recalls the creation myth (John 5:17). Restoration would then be seen in the great quantity of wine (John 2), the plenty of agricultural output (John 4, 10, and 15), and the bringing together of the scattered children (John 6, 10, 15) as will be shown below.

4.1. The Rituals of Return

The Ezekiel *Vorlage* to the sheep-shepherd motif in John, if followed strictly, will show that while the scattering is a reference to the exile and diaspora, its emphasis on the 'gathering', and 'feeding' are also reflective of the myth of return. When God has relieved the shepherds of their duties as shepherds of Israel, God will personally go out to seek the sheep that are lost (Ezek. 34:11). God will:

> Bring them (συνάξω) out from the peoples and gather them from the countries, and will bring them into their own land; and I will *feed* them on the mountains of Israel, by the watercourses, and in all the inhabited parts of the land" (Ezek. 34:13).

In the Fourth Gospel, the myth of return is ritualised both in the rationalising and dramatisation of 'real' return. It is understood in the eschatological language of *gathering* and *feeding* with plenty of food. For example, the coming together of the Samaritans around Jesus is considered as the moment of the "gathering (συνάγει) of fruit for life eternal" (John 4:36). It is important to note that in the language of restoration of the Exiles, God would gather the scattered children of Israel wherever they are scattered among the nations. In John 4 the Samaritans are gathered. The same terminology of in-gathering is used in the context of the feeding of the five thousand. The gathering of the twelve tribes of Israel seems referred to in the instruction given to the disciples, "gather up (συναγάγετε) the leftover fragments (κλάσματα) that none may be lost (John 6:12). Israel is constituted by the scattered 'fragments' (κλάσματα) that must be brought together (συνάγω). The imperative, aorist, active (συναγάγετε) would suggest a once-off act of bringing the scattered people of God at the coming of the messiah and not a continuous

mission to the Gentiles as suggested by some scholars. This is seen to be the case because when the disciples gather the fragments, "they filled twelve baskets" (John 6:13). The usual Gentile mission driven interpretation sees in the 'twelve baskets' that "after all have been satisfied there is more left over than there was at the beginning" hence, the abundant supply of God's grace is enough for Jews and Gentiles (Bultmann 1970:213; see Carson 1991:271). Chilton has seen that the twelve baskets are a hint that the Lord would supply the needs of the "all twelve tribes" of Israel (1997:45). Recently in citing Sanders, Brunson has noted the significance of the twelve baskets in John, "The expectation of the reassembly of Israel was so widespread, and the memory of the twelve tribes remained so acute, that *'twelve' would necessarily mean 'restoration*'" (Sanders 1985:98, *italics original*). Brunson concludes that through "his symbolic actions, Jesus is consciously announcing the regathering of Israel" (2003:163). In utilising this miracle feeding story, Jesus is seen as recreating the "exodus miracle, feeding "Israel" and providing "manna" in the wilderness" (Brunson 2003:163).

There are three main weaknesses to Brunson's important contribution. First, while Brunson sees a "return-from-exile theme of gathering God's people", he does not see the "exile" theme which precedes it. John does not talk about return without first demonstrating the condition of exile. Second, Brunson (2003:164) is quickly tempted to see a "gathering of true Israel", the "gathering of God's people into a new community of faith" in "continuity with and is in fact the true Israel" (2003:166). Brunson's understandable desire to have the New Israel include modern day Christians, though a noble quest, is defeated in his use of the 'twelve baskets' in the context of restoration. If he were faithful to John, Brunson would see that the 'twelve' baskets are the twelve tribes whose faith in Jesus is sought as a condition of their being restored. The Gentiles cannot be restored because in this understanding they were never in a covenant with God. Whether this text is potentially useful 'third spacing' for modern-day communities of faith, the answer is a definite yes. Whether modern-day 'new Israel' is identical with the Israel being referred to in John is another question. Third, Brunson does not say how this usage functions in the 'real' community of John. His last conclusion would of course

suggest that this pericope suggests legitimisation of Gentile mission because God is creating a new Israel in which Gentile Christians are sought.

John 11:51-52 is the most explicit reference in the Fourth Gospel to Israel's restoration and return. While the discussion of the same pericope above focused on its allusion to exile, it should here be noted that the notion of return and restoration is also carried in the word συνάγω. Caiaphas spoke of the death of Jesus as necessary for the gathering together (συναγάγῃ) the "nation" (ἔθνος) of Israel which is currently scattered (διεσκορπισμένα). The word συνάγω and its several derivatives is used in the LXX in reference to the work of shepherds tending their sheep (Gen. 29:3, 8). This "gathering" (συνάγω) and protection of the scattered children of Israel seems to be starting among the Exiles. In both the Shepherd and Feeding pericopes of John, the eschatological era of the future restoration of the children of God will be attended to with blessings of food and plenty (see also *Testament of Moses* 3-4). The leftovers in the feeding story can be seen as a "sign of the abundance of food, and this is no doubt the motive in the underlying tradition" (Lindars 1972:243). The gathering of the fragments in John 6, replayed in the gathering of the sheep in John 10, is repeated in the gathering of the disciples at the washing of the feet, as well as the gathering to experience the risen Lord in John 20. In this experience, the "dining room" is "transformed through this ritual activity into, at one and the same time, the lost Temple of Jerusalem and the celestial Tabernacle. The angels from on high enter the room…and are pacified with prayer" (Smith 1978:124). The tendency to associate the 'gathering of the fragments' with Christian mission entirely misses the underlying concern, which is the gathering of the scattered children of Israel John. [190]

While trial and the crucifixion as rituals are memories of Jesus rejection which can be identified by the Johannine community—which is itself in exile and alienated by other Jewish groups—remembering Jesus' resurrection allows the creation of a 'third space', a

[190] In this light, even the "gathering" is read in the light of the "gathering of the church" (Barrett 1960:231 *cf.* Brown 1982:234). Bultmann rejects any allusions of the 'gathering' to "the Church" or to the "Jewish people" because the "Gnostic undercurrent in this conception is unmistakable" (1971:374). The eschatological inferences have also been noted (Lindars 1972:243).

space of subversion which speaks of the reality of rejection and alienation. It begins with sacred time, the "first day of the week" (John 20:1) at the sacred place, the proto garden (John 20:15). It is early in the morning as opposed to the darkness of the night when Jesus is crucified or the evening of the expulsion of Adam. The stone closing shut the grave of Jesus—representing as it does the bondage of exile—is now removed and the closed tomb is open. The corpse of Jesus is no longer there. The burial cloths that bound him are loose. This is freedom. The place of bondage in the tomb that was occupied by a physical being is now occupied by spiritual beings, the angels. It is the angels that guided Tobias, Daniel, and all the angelic mysteries that were known to have accompanied the children of Israel into freedom from captivity. No spaces can now hold him captive. No closed door can stop him from entering.

In this understanding the key word becomes ἀνίστημι. Everything that was buried in the ground is now raised up for the last day (John 6:39). He would raise (ἀναστήσω) all those who had seen (ὁ θεωρῶν) the Son of Man and believed in him (John 6:40). It is in this context that the raising of Lazarus should be read. Jesus was never too early or too late to save Lazarus. Lazarus' death multiplies those who believe and hence is like the seed that falls into the ground that will produce much fruit.

At this point it can be seen that the exile motif is a reference to the 'real' experiences of alienation being experienced by the community of John. The negative effects of this difficult experience are catered for, not by denying the situation by the use of apocalyptic language. Exile is embraced as a necessary process towards restoration. Restoration is also de-localised. The people are not going to be restored to the land of Palestine. They are going to be restored to God wherever they are. As they celebrate the resurrection of Jesus, the empty tomb, his multiplication of food, they begin to find their own restoration. They are being restored spiritually to God so that spatial displacement cannot continue to deny them their access to God. All those in the diaspora who still feel the urge to go to Jerusalem and hope for the rebuilding of the Temple should realise that God is summoning God's people, Israel, to gather around Jesus, the one who bears the name of

God. In Jesus, they can have uncontrolled access to God. It is in this context that the coming of the Greeks should be read.

4.2. John 12:20-36a

Before this pericope, there are several references to the raising of Lazarus (John 12:1-2, 9-11). Lazarus' raising from the dead is the cause of many people's faith (John 12:17-18). This becomes a threat for the Pharisees and the Temple authorities because they can see that the "world has gone after Him" (John 12:19). The arrival of the Greek-speaking Jews serves to confirm that indeed that the 'whole world has gone after him'.

4.3. Teaching the Greeks (John 7:35-36)

Our reading of the presence of the Greeks in John is in line with John Robinson's (1962) and later Jonathan Draper's (2000) position that "John's Gospel was written by a Palestinian Jew to evangelise diaspora Jews among whom he found himself in exile after the fall of Jerusalem in 68 CE" (Draper 2000:347). Draper goes on to see the vision of Isaiah 6 being read targumically by John in reference to 'the hour' of the glorifying of the Son of man in John 12:23. While Draper's reading of the Greeks is brief, it is significant in that it locates the entire discussion in the Johannine context of the identity of "the Jews", "the Samaritans", and "the Galileans", although he does not go beyond merely alluding to this (2000:347). While the targumic readings of Isaiah 6 are fruitful in the light of the inter-textual usage of the Old Testament in John, such a reading becomes an exegesis of the Targum of Isaiah and not of John itself if it is not taken as background and not foregrounded in the exegesis.

As has already been dealt with extensively in the previous two chapters, the Samaritans, Galileans and Judeans constituted the people of God, the all Israel of promise. Jesus has already taught among the Judeans (John 7:14, 28), Samaritans (John 4:34, 41), and Galileans (John 6:59). The fourth group which is absent that makes up the people of God

complete are the scattered children of Israel living in the diaspora. Draper sees here a possibility that:

> Jewish teachers or thinkers who got into trouble with Judean authorities in Jerusalem would seek refuge, hearing and sympathy among the diaspora Israelites abroad, particularly since we know from Hellenistic Jewish writings that they were much more open to exploring new ideas and even syncretisms than were Judean Israelites. Where would they go? (2000:354).

Draper addresses the core of the issue when he raises the question to Dodd on the issue of race since controversy of identity is not in racial, i.e., genetic issues, but to do with perceptions of ritual or ethnic purity. Dodd, like many Johannine scholars after him, sees the Greek in John as signifying "persons of non-Jewish race" (1953:371), a position not assented to here. It is suggested here that the Greeks should be seen in the same light the Samaritans are presented in John and both groups to be juxtaposed to the Galileans and Judeans. This position takes the characteristic regionally based labelling that seems to be going in the whole gospel, as discussed in the second chapter (see also Draper 2000:355). Thus, as Draper suggests:

> Israelites settled in diaspora would soon have ceased to identify themselves with a particular region of Palestine, and probably would not have fussed as much about racial purity issues as we imagine, and probably calling themselves what people in their adoptive country call them (2000:355).

First, the present researcher is not sure if people can get used to derogatory labels simply because they are in a foreign country. Second, while people may accept generic labels that do not distinguish between their regions of origin and that of their host population, they will not accept such labels from their own country people who, most of the time, know the power relations that attend to such labels. For example, to call a person from Zimbabwe, a Zimbabwean is not a problem for Zimbabweans living in a foreign country such as South Africa. But to call such a person a *Mukwerekwere* which is a derogatory term used for all foreigners by South Africans would never be comfortable. It will be the same if, simply because Shona people are a dominant group to call any Ndebele person a *Mushona*. They would not accept it at all, whether it be a Zimbabwean or South African making such a call. Of course, a different scenario can arise when language designations

start to disappear because the Diasporas do not know their language any more. But in John it seems we encounter a community or communities trying to maintain their language by constantly referring to Aramaic explanations since there are members in the community who may not be familiar with the this Palestinian language. If this diaspora is Syria, its proximity to Palestine makes language and customs not to quickly forget (Lindars 1972:43).

It is in this context of labelling as inferior anyone who is not from Judea, that Jesus is being asked by the Pharisees if he intends "to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks and teach the Greeks" (John 7:35). This must be understood in the context of mocking that is related to 'real' circumstances under which a 'teacher' would not have wanted to be associated with teaching those who were in the diaspora unless if they had trouble at home (Draper 2000:354). This kind of mocking should also be understood in the light of a similar mockery in John 8:48 where the Jews mock Jesus by saying to him: "Are we not right in saying that you are a Samaritan and have a demon?" It should also be viewed in the light of many other region related mockeries prevalent in John. Nathanael (John 1:46) says about Jesus, "can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" The Jewish authorities from Judea ask Nicodemus (John 7:52), "You are not also from Galilee, are you?" It seems clear then. The question concerning the Greeks in the diaspora should be understood in the light of the regional denigration meted out by the Judeans to fellow Palestinians from the northern regions. It can be observed that apart from a number of references to the Samaritans in John 4, there is only one other place where the reference to the same group of people can be found (John 8:48) where they are mentioned in mockery of Jesus. There are only two places where the Greeks are mentioned directly and in one of these they are mentioned as a destination of mockery where Jesus is said to be going to teach (John 7:35).

In a recent paper on ritual and purity and its connection to quareels in the community, Jonathan Draper (2008:244) gives an example of a situation where "Rab offended R. Hanina b. Hama on a trivial matter in the school and the latter refused his petition for forgiveness on the thirteen eves of the Day of Atonement. The Talmudic account

suggests that the later was motivated by professional jealousy and eventually forced Rab to leave for Babylon." He gives other examples suggesting that such exiled teachers might not have been such an uncommon affair. The evidence is, of course, from the period later than John's gospel and not conclusive, but Draper's suggestion that Jewish rabbis that caught trouble in Palestine would go to the diaspora is plausible. The evidence we do have suggests that some leading rabbis from the first century CE saw exile in a negative light. As Yohanan Ben Zakkai (1-80 CE) said:

> God is just, but we have sinned, we, but mostly our fathers before us. Therefore all that has come upon us,—the famine, the exile, the slavery to pagans—these are just recompense for our own deeds (Neusner 1970:12).

4.4. The Coming of the Greeks (John 12: 20-22)

Among those who came to the festival are those called the Ἕλληνες (John 12:20). These have been mentioned before when Jesus' enemies were mocking him as to whether he would leave Judea to go to the "Dispersion among the Greeks and teach the Greeks" (John 7:35). Besides these two references in John, we do not see this group of people again. It has already been noted that Jewish people in the diaspora were referred to as 'Greeks' by the Jewish people in Palestine (Malina and Pilch 2006:364) and were generically labelled Barbarians by the Greeks in exile.[191] In the Mediterranean of first century CE there "was no region or nation called Greece". As such, the term "Greek" when used by Jews in Palestine almost always refers to someone's "social status" or language in this case, someone not resident in Palestine (Malina and Pilch 2006:364). Scholars are not sure why many diaspora Jews continued to be attached to the Temple system back home even though they were looked upon by the homeland with some level of suspicion. But Neusner (1975:34-49) has shown that views towards the Temple were varied in the diaspora so much so that for some this pilgrims' visit to the Temple "was almost the only means of purification" (Safrai et al 1974:877). Nevertheless those

[191] Josephus notes that Apollonius states that the Israelites "are the weakest of all the barbarians" (*Against Apion*, II 15). Josephus also includes the Israelites among the barbarians (*On Life of Moses* II, IV, 15). This is especially interesting in that the Zulu people would label foreigners as *amakwerekwere* based on the 'strange' language the foreigners speak just as the Greek speaking people would label the other peoples based on the 'strange' languages they spoke which to the Greek ear just sounded brr brr (see Gera 2003:192).

diaspora Jews who continued to be attracted, while representing a large number, did not represent all Jews living outside Palestine.

It has been noted that diaspora Jews who continued to associate with the Temple also sponsored the Temple generously. It is therefore safe to assume that the Greeks in John who had come to the Temple could have been wealthy people (Alon 1989:248; Rutgers 1998:15-44). Yet, with all their economic status, by virtue of the fact that they lived outside Palestine and probably could only speak Greek, these Jews would have been considered inferior in terms of their ritual purity as viewed by the Jews living in Jerusalem (Safrai and Stern 1974:137; Bultmann 1971:12).[192]

These Greeks had come up (ἀναβαινόντων) to worship (προσκυνήσωσιν) (John 12:20) at the feast. The technical usage of ἀναβαινόντων is associated with pilgrims ascent to encounter God at the Jerusalem Temple (Barrett 1955:164, 351), whereas προσκυνήσωσιν would recall the central concerns of all Israelites, the right place and the right way of worship, as addressed in John 4:20-24. God would seek to be worshiped by those who worship in spirit and truth and not those who seek a specific place of worship. This scenario shares much in common with the on-going discussions among the Jews as reflected in Stephen's preaching (John 11:19-30). [193] These Greek-speaking Jews came and told Philip that they were willing to see Jesus.[194] John is now showing the

[192] The closeness of these places to Palestine is also attested in rabbinic Judaism where their nearness to Babylonian Jewish and Hellenistic traditions could have enriched their Exile theology. *M. Halah* 4:11 "He that owns [land] in Syria is as one that owns [land] in the outskirts of Jerusalem" (in Safrai and Stern 1974:137-138).

[193] Maybe we should note Draper's (2000:353) warning here when he cautioned that we "know very little about the population of the area" to enable us to make "confident assertions" concerning the identity of the 'Greeks' or say with Carson (1978:429) that this is mere "probing agnosticism".

[194] The 'willingness' of the Greeks is discussed by many scholars from a theological perspective. Their 'will' should be thought of in the light of others who were not willing to come to Jesus. The question with which Jesus confronts the paralysed man: "do you wish (θέλεις) to be well" (John 5:6) is the same question he confronts his disciples with to find out if they are willing (θέλετε) to go away from him (John 6:67). The paralysed man's willingness soon proved to be weak. The Jewish authorities search the scriptures hoping to find eternal life, yet they are not willing (οὐ θέλετε) to come to Jesus, the one sent by God (John 5:40). In John, only those who are willing to do the will of God are able to know if what Jesus is teaching comes from God (John 7:17), yet the Jewish leaders are willing to do the desire of their father the devil John (John 8:44). In this sense possibly Bultmann (1971:131) is accurate in characterising the coming of Jesus as the κρίσις of the world, by which he means both "judgment" and "division" (1971:111). It is the willingness to be a follower of Jesus in John that joins together those who are scattered or the lack of it that scatters God's

significance of these people's presence since initially they had came to Temple but now they want to see (ὁράω) Jesus (John 12:21). Neusner says that when Israel came to the pilgrimage, Israel "is seen by God, or, in accord with the writing out of the Hebrew letters for the same passage, Israel sees God" (Neusner 2002:140). Hence, for the pilgrim who came wanting to see Jesus, there is a redefinition of the central focus of the festival theophany. It is no longer through the Temple that one can 'see' or be seen by God, but through Jesus.

Cullmann has seen some similarities between the Ἑλληνιστής in Acts 6:1 and the Greeks in John. These were Greek speaking Jewish Christians from Jerusalem, largely made up of diaspora Jews who had to flee Jerusalem when persecutions began while the rest of the Jewish Christians remained (Cullmann 1959/60:10). Stephen, the martyr was one of them and in his speech in Acts 7 he reveals some of the beliefs of these Christian groups. They see the Temple as representing the "infidelity already within the history of Israel" or as resisting the Holy Spirit (1959/60:41-2). When they left Jerusalem they were as Cullmann asserts, "forgotten relatively soon…the Fourth Gospel rehabilitates them" (1959-60:11). These are the "others" in John 4:38 who began the mission in Samaria upon which the disciples are now reaping, Cullmann says.

Cullmann's proposal is significant although it also has some problems as is discussed here. The existence of such a group in the early church, as suggested in Acts, is however to be taken seriously. That the Greeks in John had actually come to the "Temple to worship" does show us that initially their theology was focused towards the Temple. In John, it is likely that the Greeks who came to the Temple were not locals but visitors from outside Palestine. If they were locals it might not have been necessary to single them out as people who had come to worship. If God was supposed to be 'seen' during the festival (Neusner 2002:140), it is interesting that Stephen, while being stoned, "gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7:55). Also in John, the Greeks came wanting to see God in the Temple, while later they

---

people away (John 9:27). When those who were scattered come back and are willing to see Jesus, it is the climax of the revelation of the Messiah. Now is the moment of judgment of the world (νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου) (John 12:31).

came wanting to "see Jesus". To this, Jesus says "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified" and there is a voice from heaven saying that the name has been glorified (John 12:20-28). There are other striking similarities in these pericopes that raise interesting comparisons. As such, it is possible that there could be some similarities between them, although their contact with each other cannot be confirmed with certainty. If Stephen's group looked forward to the restoration of spiritual worship without the Temple, that could be a contact point with the Fourth Gospel.

4.5. Philip, Andrew and Jesus (John 12:22)

That Philip had a Greek name is normally used as the reason why the Greeks approached him (Lindars 1972:427) although we know that at the time of Jesus there is an "increasing prevalence of Greek names among Jews" (Feldman 1997:15). If the diaspora is thought of as mission, it is only through the mission of Jewish people that the mission to the Jews in the diaspora is fulfilled. It therefore makes sense that just as the initial disciples have been called through other disciples that the diaspora mission is through the agency of other disciples. The disciples found by Jesus are the ones introducing others to Jesus, Philip and Andrew. These two have not been called by anyone but Jesus himself (John 1:40, 43), hence, the subordination of Peter and other traditionally significant disciples is deliberate.[195]

The diaspora is presented here as mission. The disciples point all the seekers of God at the Temple to Jesus. This marks the breaking point and culmination of the disclosure of God through Jesus to Israel. But as can be seen in reference to the body of Jesus which must fall to the ground in order to multiply (John 12:24), the reference is to the spiritual presence of Jesus through the ministry of the Spirit who only gets released when Jesus goes back to the father.

[195] This point will be discussed in greater detail later in this study.

4.6. The Hour of Glory (John 12:23)

The honour of Jesus which is heightened at the arrival of the diaspora Jews subverts the mockery of the diaspora meted out upon him in John 7:35-36. In ascribing glory to the moment of death, death's hold on Jesus is neutralised. This is the hour for the Son of Man to be honoured or glorified (δοξασθῇ) (John 12:23) and for God's name to be honoured (John 12:28). The 'glory' motif's centrality to the Fourth Gospel has already been observed (Caird 1968; Cook 1984). The Hellenistic-Jewish background seems to inform the motif's usage in John. The deliverance of Israel from the hand of Pharaoh is Yahweh's gaining of glory (כָּבוֹד) over Pharaoh (Exod. 14:18). The glory of God becomes central in the wilderness wanderings. The name of Yahweh cannot be separated from God's glory and God's glory cannot be separated from God's covenant relationship with the people of Israel:

> Therefore say to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord God: It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name, which you have profaned among the nations to which you came (Ezek. 36:22).

In this sense, God's glory represents the presence of God. The dominant view of such glory has more to do with the self-revelation of God through theophanies and angelophanies (Brown 1986:45). To limit such a meaning to this theological view alone however is to miss another important facet. The Qumran community hoped for the inheritance of the glory of Adam (1QS418-23). The Qumran community's angelic figure of light leads the children of light to all truth. It resonates with angelic powers, the Cherub in Ezekiel 9 who is the bearer of δόξα (Kittel 1964:251).

The participation of human beings in the כבד of God as in the Qumran Community is very rare in the rabbinical writings with the exception of Moses (Exod. 34:29). All other human beings can profane the *Shekinah* of Yahweh. Hence, while Rabbi Aqiba (*b. Chag*. 14a) speaks of David sitting on the divine throne, Jose the Galilean accuses him of profaning the *Shekinah* (Thayer 1982:156). The rabbis suggested that before the 'fall', the first man (Adam) had the *Shekinah* of God intermingled with his humanity. The rabbis thus describe salvation as beholding God's glory (Brown 1986:45).

The Hellenistic δόξα and τιμή are used interchangeably without losing the Hebrew texture as can be seen from the usage in John 8:49-50, and in the LXX of Deuteronomy 5:16 τίμα (present imperative active) is used for the Hebrew כַּבֵּד (imperative). In this translation, the imperative for the social honour (τίμα) of one's parents is a translation of the Mesoretic כַּבֵּד and the Targumic יַקַּר which are both generally understood theologically.[196] The usage which brings God's revelation in God's covenant relationship with Israel is implied in John. As has been observed by Kanagaraj, glory in John refers to "God's love, generosity and saving power" (1998:221). In God's covenant with God's people, the honour and glory of God is maintained when the people of God do not worship other gods and when they do not defile themselves through moral defilement (Klawans 2000:27; 2007:150). To dishonour God leads to the departure of God's glory. If the glory of God disappeared, then the people of God become vulnerable and they can be taken into exile because God can no longer protect them. God's name would be glorified again when the people of God have been restored to their normal relationship with God where God provides for them and where they honour God. Klawans (2007:69-70) has observed that the notion of the "tabernacle serves to symbolise the notion of God's presence" with them which could be maintained by a "proper performance" of the religious rituals and proper relationships among the people of God.

In John, Jesus prays for the Father's name to be glorified, to which the voice answers, "I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again" (John 12:28). Here again there is a close connection between the name of God and God. The mission of Jesus is to reveal the glory of God or to bear God's name (John 17:6, 26). All the people who believe in his name

[196] In first century CE Mediterranean honour-shame culture, one had to earn one's name and through such gain the public recognition of one's social standing. The gain or loss of honour came in one of two ways: The basic honour level, usually termed *ascribed* honour, was inherited from one's family at birth. Each child took on the general honour status that the family possessed in the eyes of the larger community, and therefore ascribed honour came directly from family membership. It was not based on something the individual would have done. The second was honour conferred on the basis of virtuous deeds. This was called *acquired* honour. By its very nature, acquired honour could either be gained or lost in the perpetual struggle for public recognition. Since the community or group was so important for the identity of a Mediterranean person, honour status came primarily from *group* recognition (Malina and Neyrey 1991, Moxnes 1996).

receive the position of being the children of God (John 1:12) and can have life through his name (John 20:31). Indeed, when Jesus was in Jerusalem, many believed in his name (John 2:23) and hence avoided judgment (John 3:18). Jesus had come in his Father's name (John 12:13). While some would not believe in him, they would believe others who came in their own name (John 5:43). Finally, all that Jesus did was done in the Father's name (John 10:25).

If this name has been glorified in John, how has this happened? One way the name of God (ἐγώ εἰμι)[197] has already been revealed by Jesus was when he used it in reference to performing signs. Scholars are not in full agreement as to whether Jewish mysticism, as represented in Kabala (קַבָּלָה), can be dated back to first century CE Palestine (Draper 1997:275). Gershom Scholem argues that the main elements of Jewish mysticism are already present by the first century BCE (Scholem 1955:83; Draper 1997:275). A few scholars see that the Gospel of John evinces an understanding of Jesus sharing in the "name of the Father" in line with this mystical worldview (Scholem 1955; Draper 1997; Gieschen 2003:135). Instead of seeking to explain John "solely in Wisdom tradition", it can also be explained using the "angelomorphic traditions where the theophanic figure who possesses the Divine Name is called "the Word" or the Word of God"" (Gieschen 2003:137-138; Fossum 1995: 135-151).

From this mystical reading, Jesus' claim to honour draws on the Targumic tradition that envisages a Name-bearing angel, representing the glory of God on earth. As Rowland avers:

> Indeed, one could say that the goal of the heavenly ascent, the sight of the throne of God and the glory of God upon it, so cherished by the Jewish apocalyptic seers, is, in the eyes of the Fourth Gospel reached only in Jesus (1984:499-500).

The Jewish authorities however would see such claims as being extremely blasphemous (John 20:11-18). The name of God finds its glory and honour once the one God has sent,

[197] John 4:26; 6:20, 35, 41, 48, 51; 8:12, 18, 24, 28, 58; 9:9; 10:7, 9, 11, 14; 11:25; 13:19; 14:6; 15:1, 5; 18:5f, 8.

that is Jesus, summoned all the children of God from where they have been scattered and brought them all into one fold.

By mystifying death as a moment of the glory of the name of God, the experience of alienation as a result of death is given a positive spin. God's presence is accompanying Jesus even in this moment of death as God's glory is synonymous with the divine name. Jesus, as God's presence, also accompanies God's people even in the diaspora where they are scattered.

4.7. The Seed that Falls to the Ground (John 12:24-27)

With regard to the image of the seed that falls (ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου) to the ground in order to multiply, Draper may be correct in pointing out that the author of the Fourth Gospel understood the holy seed of Isaiah 6 to "refer to the time when the calamity of the destruction of the holy land and the diaspora of its people" would be "reversed" (2000:351). If so, the allusion to the "grain of wheat" that falls to the ground refers to the diaspora Jews who are drawn to Jesus as the last of the Israelite people that Jesus has reached to. Jesus alludes to his death as the falling of the seed into the soil so that it can multiply (John 12:24).[198] For Jesus, "Those who love their life lose it, and those who hate their life in this world will keep it for eternal life" (John 12:25). Even though he sees the advantage of his death, he is at the same time troubled by it (John 12:27). His death is supposed to bring all the scattered children of God together, but he fears that some may not pay heed to the messianic call as already demonstrated by the Jewish leaders. This is what makes him anxious. In the light of exile, the fear and the sorrow that the exile

[198] It is very possible to interpret this usage of fertility language from a "mystery initiation" perspective. "The meaning of the Eleusinian Mysteries is often named as one of the best secrets of history. It has often been interpreted as an agricultural myth in which the Corn Goddess alternately withholds and guarantees the fertility of the earth. The mythic cycle of Persephone, the Corn Maiden, parallels the annual cycle of grain. For two-thirds of the year, corresponding to the times in which the fields of the Thriasian Plain are fertile, the Corn Maiden may be with her mother, Demeter. But for the remaining one third of the year, from June to October, when the sun-scorched fields of Greece are barren and the seed grain is stored in subterranean silos, the Corn Maiden is with Hades, the Lord of the Underworld. This assumes that the agricultural meaning of the myth later evolved an allegorical significance in which the annual sprouting of the new crop is taken as a symbol of eternal life" paralleling the use of the seed in John 12 (Martin 1987:67-68).

experience can bring is to be acknowledged, yet it is from this experience that the people of God can be gathered together and restored.

It was common that the return of the Exiles was followed by God's blessings of good harvests just as exile was accompanied with famine (Hos. 2:9). These blessings were evidenced by the abundance of grain (σῖτος) (Joel 2:24). The blessings of return are the fruitfulness of the land and the fruitfulness of the people.

> [God] will love you, bless you, and multiply you; he will bless the fruit of your womb and the fruit of your ground, your grain and your wine and your oil, the increase of your cattle and the issue of your flock, in the land that he swore to your ancestors to give you" (Deut. 7:13).

In John, this has already happened by the death and rising of Lazarus. Many people believed because of him (John 12:1-2, 9-11). In this understanding, exile is like dying and punishment from which comes life. The same image is used in John 15:2, "Every branch that bears fruit he prunes to make it bear more fruit." The use of φέρω for 'bearing' in John 12:24 and John 15:2 seems deliberate and typically Johannine since ποιέω could have been used in a related context in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 3:10; Luke 3:9). Fruitfulness of the branch is related to its link with the tree just as the fruitfulness of the believer has to do with the believer's connection to Jesus (John 15:5). The Father is glorified (ἐδοξάσθη) when God's people bear fruit (John 15:8). The bearing of fruit that results from exile should be seen as responding to the commission by Jesus:

> I appointed you to go and bear fruit, fruit that will last, so that the Father will give you whatever you ask him in my name (John 15:16).

The exile and return of Jesus should be emulated by the disciples. Just as Jesus was willing to loose his life, thereby losing his place with the Father and be exiled to the cosmos, so shall those who follow him (John 12:25). Following means following into dishonour so that at the end one can attain honour (τιμήσει) (John 12:26). Though facing the ultimate exile, going to the cross and being buried, is an intimidating experience, it is the only way to 'return' to the Father (John 12:27). So the way to the restoration is through exile.

We have already seen that the presence of the Jewish people in exile was seen as an opportunity to increase the people of God. The use of death as something that is painful, though necessary, is part of the paradoxical function of the exile-return motif. The use of the seed is even more symbolic in that at the gathering and restoration of Israel there would be an abundance of harvest. In that case, the exile is something to be cherished as it is the harbinger of greater blessings to come.

4.8. The Voice of the Angel (John 12:28-29)

The restoration of Israel as narrated in Jeremiah 50-51 is where God promises destruction on Assyria and Babylon for the way they treated Israel during times of captivity. It is in the context of such warning that God promises that when God "utters his voice there is a tumult of waters in the heavens, and he makes the mist rise from the ends of the earth" (Jer. 51:16). It is also promised in this time of judgment, restoration, and return, that the:

> Lord roars from Zion, and utters his voice from Jerusalem, and the heavens and the earth shake. But the Lord is a refuge for his people, a stronghold for the people of Israel (Joel 3:16).

In the diaspora book of Tobit, the angel Raphael as an intermediary helps Tobias, Tobit's son on his way to Media to make sure his marriage with Sarah is fruitful (Gruen 2002:148ff). In 2 Maccabees the angel on a white horse defends Israel's Temple treasure from being taken into exile by stopping Heliodorus from entering the Temple (Gruen 2002:174ff). This almost replays the angels sent to guard the Garden of Eden to stop Adam and Eve sent to exile from getting back in. In John, it is the voice 'from heaven' that is thought of as an angel. This voice is a confirmation of the finality of the restoration of Israel. It is the moment of glory (John 12:28). Those who hear the voice think that it is a thunder but others understand that an angel has spoken and Jesus tells them that this voice is for their sake and not for his own (John 12:29-30). This is the voice of the good shepherd who will lead all the sheep into one flock in one fold (John 10:16). This is the voice that calls for the restoration of Israel as if calling those in the grave, who if they hear it, they may rise and live again (John 5:25, 28; 11:43).

The promise to Nathanael and all Israel was that they would see the angels of God going up and down upon the Son of Man. The angels have already spoken as a demonstration and confirmation of the status of Jesus as the one sent from the Father. The voice of Jesus is the final voice that will call upon all Israel wherever they are scattered.

5. Summary of Findings

We have seen that there are a number of indications in the text that the coming of the Greeks forms a turning point in the Fourth Gospel. From the time Jesus is asked to intervene because of the shortage of wine at the wedding at Can of Galilee, Jesus said that his hour had not yet come (John 2:4). To the Samaritan woman, he said that the 'hour is coming' (John 4:21, 23). He saw the hour still coming when the dead would hear the voice of God and rise from the dead (John 5:25, 28). Even those who wanted to arrest him could not because his hour was not yet (John 7:30; 8:20). The hour only arrives when the Greeks came and sought to see Jesus (John 12:23). The development is clear that the Johannine Jesus begin in Judea, goes on to Galilee, comes to Judea and then on to Galilee again via Samaria and then comes back to Judea for the closure of his ministry. Reading the narrative according to how the author of the Fourth Gospel arranged the traditional material available, the arrival of the Greeks brings to closure his ministry to Israel, comprising of those from Galilee, Samaria, Judea and Jews in the diaspora.

At the level of the community itself, there is something else at play. First, this pericope is a self-reflection of the Johannine community on its location in the diaspora. Exile and diaspora are still fresh experiences for some members of the community of John. Others are still deeply affected by the destruction of the Temple whose rebuilding they seek to assist. The community of John must find a way to explain this scenario. First, the brute facts of exile are acknowledged and packaged in the story of Jesus and his alienation. Jesus' alienation and exile begins the moment he assumes a human body. The exile is seen in him being rejected by his own through unbelief. He is expelled from the Temple and the Synagogue. The ultimate alienation is his passion which is dramatised in the

Kedron valley with all the allusions to Eden, the prototype of exile. This same experience of alienation and rejection is also reflected in the life of his disciples. They are also rejected by their own people and ejected from the Synagogue by the Jewish community. This 'real' experience is the 'first space' of John's community. It is represented in the telling of the story of Jesus and his earthly ministry where it is given a 'second space' representation. In the narrative, there are various allusions to the scattering of the people of Israel. There are also some muted suggestions that Jesus is interested in these scattered peoples. In some place they are called the 'other sheep' while in others they are called the 'dispersion'. In his prayer, Jesus prays for 'those who will believe'. Whichever term is used, the narrative is laden with allusions to some missing component to make the ministry of Jesus to the Jewish people complete. It is proposed that the missing component has been the Samaritans and the Jewish diaspora whose coming is the moment of glory.

In this representation of the 'real' experience of the Johannine community, the paradoxes ingrained in the narrative supply a reversal of the negative aspect of the pain of exile by creating spaces of transformation. The juxtaposition of exile next to restoration is the way the 'real' exile of the Johannine community is dealt with through enactment of return. As such, that the 'third space' is only made sense because of the magnitude of the 'first space' which can be gleaned from the narrative 'second space' medium. Jesus identifies with both Samaritans and Greeks as a means through which they will be incorporated in the fold. Their exclusion was their mockery but by identifying with them, Jesus takes away their mockery. Samaritans and Greeks (spaces of mockery) are presented as special spaces of God's final revelation. This defining moment of 'third spacing' is the glorifying of the Son of Man at the arrival of the Greeks.

6. Conclusion

The focus of this chapter has been to investigate the function of exile and diaspora, as alluded to in the Fourth Gospel. Having first described the diaspora phenomenon itself as presented by the Jewish diaspora tradition, several diaspora allusions were analysed. The

exile-return motif was seen as dominating the function of diaspora in John. Its function as the *Sitz im Leben* of John's community was also proposed. It was observed that diaspora notions are used to subvert the effects of the feeling of alienation being experienced by the community of John. The arrival of the Greeks, seen in this light, forms the climax of this self-understanding.

The diaspora motif here alluded to as a key feature of the Johannine community will be examined in detail through a spatial reading of the Farewell Discourse in the chapter which follows. The task will be to establish from the language of the Farewell Discourse, the social arrangement of the Johannine community through the sociology of utopian sectarianism.

CHAPTER 7

THE μοναὶ OF THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE:[199] UTOPIAN SECTARIANISM[200] IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL[201]

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter we investigated the function of exile and diaspora in the Fourth Gospel. The predominance of the diaspora phenomenon was observed to permeate the entire Gospel, most probably as a reflection of the *Sitz im Leben* of John's community. Finally, it was observed that the exile-return motif was used to create the 'third space' or 'utopia' for the Johannine community. In this chapter, following a sociological analysis of the Farewell Discourse (*hereafter,* FD), a utopian construction will be investigated as a means of reading the FD as an expression of the inner workings of a displaced community. It is proposed in this chapter that utopian sectarianism can fully account for the social arrangement the Johannine community was living in diaspora. It is also the proposal of this chapter that the utopian construction was the ultimate 'third spacing' that helped the Johannine community to cope with many external and internal pressures while living in diaspora.

---

[199] Utopia here is not used in any pejorative sense such as day-dreaming, or ideals that never reach fulfilment. Rather, it is used in a technical sense as a socio-anthropological category and a literary genre that emerge in a context of restriction and spatial dislocation.

[200] In this present study, sectarianism is not confined to the 'sect-denomination' dichotomy as per the tradition of Weber (1864-1920) and Troeltsch (1865-1923), which has also been perpetuated in Wilson's work (1959). Recent sociology of religion scholars prefer the 'interior-exterior' or *etic-emic* models as this takes seriously the self-understanding of the insiders which can be critically evaluated by outside observers who are deliberately conscious of their limited 'objectivity' (Partridge 2005:24).

[201] As has correctly been pointed out by Saeed Hamid-Khani, we are not assuming here that 'sectarianism' is "a unique concept to the Johannine and New Testament Christians", but can also be related to "other contemporary religious groups" (2000:208). Although the use of utopia to analyse texts has already been done in Old Testament studies (see Boer 1996), it has not yet, as far as the present researcher is aware, been used in the reading of New Testament texts.

2. What Do Scholars Say about the Farewell Discourse?

Even though Johannine scholars are generally in agreement that there is something called a FD in John, they are not in agreement as regards its *terminus a quo* and *ad quem*, or whether it consists of a single source or several sources, especially because of the '*aporia*' of John 14:30-31, "Arise, let us depart from here" (Woll 1981:9; Segovia 1991:61-62; Keener 2003:891; Kellum 2004:2).[202] Because of this lack of clarity in the nature of the FD it has not been easy to pinpoint the central message(s) of the FD, particularly the significance of the "Father's house" with "many rooms" in John 14:2, which forms the focus of this chapter. Keener notes that the farewell "discourse section is difficult to outline because it is more concerned with developing repetitive themes than with following precise arrangement" (2003:891).

By naming the material of John 13:31-17:26 a 'Farewell Discourses', scholars have implicitly suggested what generic tradition it should follow i.e., a farewell 'Testament' (Käsemann 1968; Ashton 1991:446). As a result, Keener rules out other generic forms for the FD. He concludes that it is neither a Hellenistic "symposium" genre nor a traditional Jewish Passover discourse due to its monologue nature (Keener 2003:896). He also rules out the "speeches for battle" genre since "Jesus' passion is not a military encounter *per se*" (Keener 2003:896). He proposes the FD to be a "Testament" containing "special instructions before dying", a "standard biblical and early Jewish form" (Keener 2003:897). He follows Ashton who also thinks that the FD is a 'Testament' in line with Jewish writings, hence his comparison of the FD with the Testament of Moses (Ashton 1991:446). As a Testament, the FD functions to interpret the "meaning of Jesus' passion for his disciples: they will share both his sufferings and his resurrection life", underlining the theme of Jesus' continuing presence with his people" (Keener 2003:893,898).

[202] Several explanations for the disjuncture have been given and the following stand out as summarised by Woll (1981:9-10): (a) that chapters 15-17 historically took place on the way to the garden, (b) that 14:31 is a secondary insertion, (c) that 14:31 should be read metaphorically, where chapters 15-17 reflect the condition of the church after the historical Jesus and chapter 14 reflect the time of the historical Jesus and 14:31 is a summons to the transition for the disciples from one era to the other. Woll's position and other subsequent scholars see John 15-17 as secondary interpolation inserted between John 14:31 and 18:1. Since no convincing rearrangement of the material has been forthcoming, Kellum's (2004:10-14) literary unity and redefinition of 'unity' will be adopted here.

Ernst Käsemann was among the earliest proponents to suggest that John 13-17 could be read in the light of a literary "device of the farewell speech of a dying man" (1968:4). The Jewish antecedents of this particular form was found in the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" and in the New Testament in Paul's farewell speech to the elders of Ephesus in Miletus (Acts 20), in 2 Timothy, 2 Peter, and Mark 13 among other texts (Käsemann 1968:4). John chose this form to present Jesus as a dying patriarch leaving instructions for his disciples, suggests Käsemann (1968:5). In a way, it is not "a Testament in the sense of a last will and bequest, but rather in the sense of a final declaration of the will of the one whose proper place is with the Father in heaven and whose word is meant to be heard on earth" (Käsemann 1968:5-6). As such, it is given only to the inner circle of disciples, the ones who are enlightened enough to grasp what Jesus is doing.

From Käsemann's references we note that he takes his cue from Ethelbert Stauffer (1955) who sees John as belonging to the "priestly tradition" and as an "apocalyptist cast in a levitical-liturgical mould", a "'thinker' *sui generis*" (1955:41-42). Before Jesus dies in the Fourth Gospel, he gives valedictions and farewell speeches, all of which are recorded by Stauffer in a parallel synopsis with the other proof texts forming the appendix of his 'Theology of the New Testament' (1955:344-345). The structure of these farewell speeches are as follows:

Heaven reveals the approach of death (John 12:23, 28; 13:1, 3; 17:1, 27)
The one prepared for death calls together those who are left behind (13:1ff)
He announces his forthcoming ascension (John 12:32ff)
He will then be beyond their ken, and it is better so (John 13:33; 8:21)
He performs a final foot washing (John 13:5)
He takes a last meal with his friends (John 13:2ff)
He says farewell to friends or foes as he give:
    Revelation about the future (John 14:29; 16:4, 12)
    Warnings and final injunctions (John 15:22)
    Exhortations to keep his words and instructions (John 14:21, 23)
    Commandment to love (John 13:34)
    Comfort and promise (John 14:1; 18:27)
Departing one prays for those he leaves behind (John 21:17)
He appoints a successor (John 21:15)
He blesses those remaining (14:27; 20:21)
He is transfigured before them (John 13:31; 17:1)
He rejects earthly food (John 21:5, 12)
He parts from those remaining (John 20:17)

This long citation has left out all the sub-headings with citations outside of the Gospel of John. Also left out are the numerous citations from other different sources from the Old Testament and its apocrypha, the various rabbinic writings and the Hellenistic writings from different periods, all arranged to produce a harmonised New Testament theology.

There are clear problems with Stauffer's proposition. First, Stauffer does not limit the Testament form to the Farewell Discourse but to the entire Fourth Gospel, including the disputed addition of John 21. As such, he does not argue for the generic characteristics of a 'Testament' as implied by Käsemann but rather sees it as a broad theme through which salvation ideas in John and other books can be put together. Second, at close examination, some texts referred to as 'Testaments' according to Stauffer's classification have very little resonance with John. For example, Acts 20—which Stauffer suggests is a Testament and is also cited by Käsemann—differs from John significantly despite some apparent similarities. While the Ephesian elders grieve that they would not see Paul again, in John the entire FD deals with the future life together. It is the farewell of someone coming again soon. Even if one contends that Acts 20 is similar to John's FD, it is not clear how that makes it a Testament genre.

What makes the proposal of a Testament genre problematic is that even the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which are used as a basis for such a contention are not clearly classified as Testaments in terms of their genre.[203] Charlesworth, an expert scholar in apocryphal literature is also hesitant to assign a "binding genre" to such writings (1983:773). He feels strongly that the Testaments "do not represent a well-defined genre" (1983:773). He, of course, sees some loose characteristics descriptive of these writings:

> The ideal figure faces death and causes his relatives and intimate friends to circle around his bed. He occasionally informs them of his fatal flaw and exhorts them to avoid certain temptations; he typically instructs them regarding the way of righteousness and utters blessings and curses. Often he illustrates his words—as the apocalyptic seer in the apocalypses—with descriptions of the future as it has been revealed to him in a dream or vision (1983:773).

[203] See Ludlow's (2002) discussion on the disputes over the Testament of Abraham as testament genre.

A closer look at this description seems to suggest something other than John's FD:

- Jesus' death is not a forbidding moment that requires sympathy from those being left behind although his heart is troubled because of the betrayal by one of his disciples (John 13:21).
- The disciples actually need sympathy and comfort (John 14:1).
- Jesus does not have any flaws to confess, but declares his death a victory and promises his disciples that they also will be victors (John 16:33).
- Jesus' knowledge about the future is because he is from heaven and knows everything (John 3:11).

While the focus of the Testament is upon this world of the living, the focus of the FD is upon the other world, the world above (see Tan 2006:173). There is absolutely no reason therefore why the FD should be classified as a Testament. Since the FD is not considered a Testament, the proposals made concerning 'the Father's house' have not only been varied, but are also inconsistent with the entire content of the Fourth Gospel.[204]

3. The Father's House with Many Rooms

The presence in John 14:2 of the 'Father's house with many rooms' has long been the subject of much debate within Johannine scholarship where it has been seen to be an "extraordinarily difficult" section appealing "not so much to the superficial intellect as to a deeper level of understanding" (Brodie 1993:460-1; Brown 1982:625). Keener sees John 14:2-3 as "ambiguous" but not necessarily a reference to future eschatology but as emphasising "the eschatological presence of Jesus" which provides the "foretaste for his community's future expectations" (Keener 2003:932).

[204] Ernst Bammel has clearly noted how the FD has "exercised its influence on other parts of the Gospel as well" (1992:1). He also suggested the FD to be a "Christian genre of the Speeches of the resurrected Lord" embedded in the Jewish tradition: "Das jüdische Material ist teils verwendet wie die Steine eines Steinbruchs und anderenteils auf ein Substratum reduziert worden, im Vergleich mit dem, ja im Gegensatz zu dem ein neues Verhältnis, das von den physischen Banden von Blut und Erbe verschieden ist, angezeigt wird" (Bammel 1992:12).

Different scholarly positions on the meaning of John 14:2-3 can be summarised under the following headings.

3.1. Future Life in Heaven

This is a view held traditionally by scholars who see the promise of a blissful future habitation for all believers (Strachan 1941:280; Holwerda 1959:20; *cf.* Irenaeus *Haer.* 5.36.2). This view holds the promise of a future mansion, where the faithful will receive each a house the size of which will match the extent of her or his good works. This view was current in the Jewish diaspora as can be seen on funerary inscriptions where it was common for the deceased to be said to have inscribed their "eternal house" (Keener 2003:934). In this understanding, believers hope for "compartments, or dwelling-places, in heaven (1 Enoch 39:.4; *cf.* 2 Enoch 61.2)" (Barrett 1955, 1975:381).[205] This understanding finds some resonance within the Fourth Gospel although the understanding of 'heaven' as such is absent after John 12 except when Jesus is said to have looked up to heaven to pray in John 17:1. If the references in chapter 6 are not counted where 'bread from heaven' appears ten times, the remaining references to heaven, except maybe one, are merely generic references to looking in an upward direction. It is thus important that while John does not refer to the 'kingdom of heaven', Jesus' kingdom is nevertheless seen as being not of "this world" (John 18:36).

3.2. The Temple

This view sees the promise of the Father's house as alluding to the Temple as it stood in Jerusalem or alternatively, the Temple of the future (Pass 1935:66-68; Sanders 1968:321; Michaels 1984:252). In this understanding, it is also possible to see the earthly Temple as a metaphor for the true heavenly Temple, since the earthly Temple is but a copy of the eternal (as in neo-Platonism). This eschatological Temple is seen as the 'Father's house'

[205] Other references from the rabbinic writings that show this view include *Sipre*. 32:4; *Zebah*. 13.6, *Sukkah* 4:3; *4 Ezra* 7:80-85, 101; *2 Enoch* 65:10;*1 Enoch* 91:13 (see also Keener 2003).

since it is sometimes spoken of as a place to be prepared. Such preparation was completed on the cross when Jesus exclaimed, "it is finished" (Keener 2003:936-7). This interpretation is informed by the use of "Father's house" in John 2:16. In John 2:16 however, the masculine οἶκον is used in place of the feminine οἰκίᾳ used in John 14:2. It is thus unlikely that John is talking about the same thing in the two places within the texts as will be seen in the distinctive usage of οἶκον and οἰκία in John.

3.3. The Church and Community of Faith at the Coming of Jesus

This view sees the Father's house as referring to the church or its members, whose bodies are the abode of the Holy Spirit (Gundry 1967; Ellis 1984:220; Oliver and Van Aarde 1991:379ff; Whitacre 1999:348). This is also understood as the "traditional language of the Church's eschatology" (Dodd 1953:404), and Jesus' abode in the life of the believer (the "interiorisation of the cult") (Ashton 1991:465; see also Hoskyns 1947:460). In this sense the μοναὶ are, "places on earth, coming in a cult or mystical manner" (Ashton 1991:466; see also Aune 1972:130). The μοναὶ should be understood in the light of the verbal root μένω (Barrett 1955, 1975:381; see also Hoskyns 1947:454). The idea of 'abiding' in reference in God's abode in the community of John is quite likely. The promise that "we will come to him and make our home (μονὴν) with him" (John 14:23) referring to an individual room for God, is not the same promise that Jesus is going to prepare a place in his Father's house with many rooms.

3.4. A Mandaean Myth

Bultmann sees the use of "mythological language" in the Mandaean writings where there is the "house of life" or the "house of perfection" (1971:600 n. 4) as important here. In John, there is 'life' but no 'house of life'. The 'house of the Father' would obviously have life in John's understanding, but here John does not seem to be referring to life in the house. Also, the Bultmann's Mandaean hypothesis has widely been questioned in light the Dead Sea Scrolls.

3.5. Redactional Aporia

Jürgen Becker feels that John 14:2-3 is an unsuccessful redaction by the "evangelist upon an earlier tradition", hence its clumsiness (1982:466). This pericope however does not make sense in this context. As will be attempted below, this pericope makes sense in a wider spatial structuring of the entire Gospel. Hence, its reading within such a spatial frame should be attempted before giving up on the unfounded grounds that John's Gospel is a patchwork whose identity is unclear.

4. Eschatology and the monai.

A closer examination of the different opinions on the FD in general and John 14:2-3 in particular will reveal that eschatological questions are foregrounded within the various investigations. The scholarly contestation for or against a future or realised eschatology seems also to be central in the discussion of the μοναὶ (Ridderbos 1997:490-91; Keener 2003:937-939; Burge 1987:145; Gundry 1967:69-70; Hoskyns 1947:454). Dodd sees the FD as meant to "interpret the death and resurrection of Jesus as the eschatological event...and in doing so to reinterpret the eschatological beliefs of the early Church" (1953:399; see Bultmann 1951:257).

John Ashton strongly alludes to problems associated with an uncritical eschatological interpretation which does not take seriously the apocalyptic language in John (1991:383). He observes an uncritical association of apocalyptic language with "futuristic eschatology" founded upon apocalyptic writings either of the Synoptic Gospels or the Book of Revelation (1991:384). He thus problematises Käsemann's definition of 'apocalyptic' to mean "the expectation of an imminent Parousia" which is generally used as the basis for the understanding of eschatology (1991:384). He also notes the limitation of the definition by John Collins which sees the apocalyptic genre as "revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it

involves another supernatural world" (Collins 1998:4). Ashton sees limitations with this because of its use of the category of the "transcendent", the absence of eschatology in some apocalyptic literature, its lack of the "milieu of apocalyptic writing" and its overly broad scope. Understanding this to be inappropriate, Ashton thus seeks to introduce a new definition of apocalyptic:

> Narrative, composed in circumstances of political, religious, or social unrest, in the course of which an angelic being discloses heavenly mysteries, otherwise hidden, to a human seer, either directly, by interpreting a dream or a vision, or directly, in which case the seer may believe that he has been transported to heaven in order to receive a special revelation" (1991:386).

Ashton's contribution is significant because of the social milieu of the apocalyptic imagination. Not that the FD is fully apocalyptic, but that it contains some apocalyptic language whose social milieu can be found when reading it against the background of a utopian imagination. There are communities which share this apocalyptic imagination with the Fourth Gospel. The role of the revealer is played by the Qumran Community's Teacher of Righteousness when he interprets the prophets Habakkuk and Nahum. Daniel's "explanation of the vision of the ram and the goat" also fits into this frame (Dan. 8:26). It is also most evident in the preaching of Jesus in Paul and the Johannine Jesus' discourses. One fundamental trait of such apocalyptic revelation is that it is "transmitted through the writings of the prophets—the scriptures—it must have been somehow contained in these beforehand", and hence does not completely reject tradition but instead redefines it (Ashton 1991:388).

There are however some gaps in Ashton's analysis. First, what is glaringly absent are the "circumstances of political, religious, or social unrest" he alludes to as the milieu of apocalyptic even though he says that "form (*Gattung*) and life-situation (*Sitz-im-Leben*)" should be mutually "illuminating correlatives" (1991:386, 444). It is this absence that the use of the anthropology of utopia below hopes to address. Second, because Ashton's analysis lacks the social location of the genre he is analysing, he presents the FD's command to love in John 14:15 as a commission similar to other Testaments as a "virtue"

which the "the dying man has exemplified" (1991:457). This is a forced explanation not supported by the Testaments he is using as has already been discussed above.

5. Sociological Analysis of the Farewell Discourse

According to many scholars, one way of understanding the Fourth Gospel in general and the FD in particular, is to try to reconstruct the nature of the Johannine group itself.[206] The interest here is to identify the "social organisation of the group and the dynamics of the social situation reflected in the Gospel" (Woll 1981:112). It can be observed from the above that a mere literary and theological reading of the FD is insufficient since it assumes that no "specific community…provided the sociological" basis of the text (Domeris 1991:266). A purely historical reading of the FD is hampered by the absence of enough evidence to open up the social organisation of the community receiving the FD. This is why a few scholars at least have proposed the use of socio-anthropological readings of the FD (Meeks 1972; Domeris 1991; Draper 1992). This suggestion however does not come without its pitfalls. One of the greatest weaknesses with a socio-anthological approach to the FD has been the absence of an attempt to relate the "form (*Gattung*)" of the FD to the corresponding "life-situation (*Sitz-im-Leben*)" so that they could form mutually "illuminating correlatives" in the light of a coherent anthropological model (Ashton 1991:386, 444). Anthropological categories have simply been used to confirm the theological categories already produced from the theology of the Fourth Gospel. This observation receives confirmation in the use of "high Christology" (Brown 1979; Painter 1980; Rensberger 1987), and "realised eschatology" (Bultmann 1970) by scholars using anthropological models (Neyrey 1988; Domeris 1991).

It is the proposal of this sociological reading that utopian sectarianism possesses particular characteristics that could provide us with more explanatory width than the other models that seek to fit in Johannine material in already existing theological

[206] Here Bruce Woll (1981:112ff) uses a number of sociologists including that of Michael Hill (1973). Quite illuminating for the FD, although not utilised by Woll is Worsley's *The Trumpent Shall Sound* (1968), in which the community of Tsek instituted many internal reinforcement regulations, most of which have spatial connotations.

categories. What is being attempted here is to use utopian sectarian sociology to construct the *Sitz im Leben* which also constitutes the 'first space' according to our model through the 'second space' representation in the narrative of the FD. By definition, a utopian response to the world is already 'a third spacing' undertaking. So by using the utopian model, the hope is to see how the Johannine community has already rearranged its own existence by redefining their 'real' circumstances of diaspora and other socially dislocating experiences (e.g. being expelled from the synagogue). This utopian response will be noted as transformative in that it allows this community to cope with its circumstances. This approach assumes that religious communities can be analysed sociologically by creating their social profile through the analysis of their literature they produce. This literature, though not designed to explicitly describe the group, is highly reflective of the group's ideals and expectations.

5.1. Sociology of Utopia and the Farewell Discourses

The initial process of this investigation will be an explanation of utopia, both as a socio-religious and literary construction. This will then be tested against the material emerging from the FD with special emphasis on those spatial categories such as the μοναὶ in John 14:2, thereby helping us approximate the sociology of the Johannine community.

In his 1912 discussion of *Social Foundations of Religion*, Durkheim stated that all "known religious beliefs, whether simple or complex, present one common characteristic: they presuppose a classification of all the things, real and ideal" (1969:42). The ideal comes to express "our more or less obscure aspirations towards the good, the beautiful and the ideal" (1969:50). The ideal is dialectically, yet inextricably, linked to the experiences of the people. In other words, notions of the ideal are informed by concerns derived from people's existential questions. This ideal has been presented in various ways as utopia.

5.2. What is Utopia?

Although Thomas More's famous *Utopia* of 1516 is the basis for the common definition of utopia, he was not the founder of the utopian idea itself (Kateb 1967:212; Borgatta and Borgatta 1992:2211; Kumar 2005:858). By separating '*Topos*' from '*ou*', More defined utopia according to its Greek etymology of 'no place'. He further suggested that there could be a '*Eutopos*', meaning 'good place' by separating '*eu*' from '*Topos*' (Kateb 1967:212; Trompf 2005:9491). More's work was presented in the form of a novel containing the story of a politically egalitarian society on an island in the Atlantic Ocean. From this, all literature employing the "imaginary to project the ideal" became known as utopian literature (Kateb 1967:212). With time, the concept evolved to encompass various ideas some of which included "either the imaginary or the ideal or to both". Sometimes utopia was employed as a means of deriding those ideas that were seen as being "farfetched or implausible" or "unacceptably different from the customary or radical in its demand" (Kateb 1967:212-213).

5.3. The Background of the Utopia of Thomas More

Lurking behind the utopia of More and utopian literature in general are the "fables and myths" from antiquity, "the golden age, the Garden of Eden" (Kateb 1967:213; Kumar 2005:858). In this ancient material, utopian imagination is not about some hoped for, yet to be experienced, distant future, but a nostalgic yearning for the past that influences the imagination (Kateb 1967:213). It was present in the Homeric and Hesiodic poems that in the beginning "the immortals who have their homes on Olympus created the golden generation of mortal people" during the reign of Cronos (Dawson 1992:13). People lived:

> As if they were gods, their hearts free from all sorrow [John 14:1, 27], by themselves, and without hard work or pain; no miserable old age came their way; their hands and feet, did not alter. They took their pleasure in festivals (Passover and other festivals), and lived without troubles [John 16:6]. When they died, it was as if they fell asleep [John 1:11-14].

> All goods were theirs [John16:15]. The fruitful grainland yielded its harvest to them of its own accord [John 4:38]… (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 109-119, in Dawson 1992:13.[207]

This comfort for the *golden race* continued through the benevolent spirits or *daimones* especially in the plains of "Elysion or the Islands of the Blessed, a paradise for departed heroes located at the ends of the earth" (Dawson 1992:13). In later times, a number of harvest festivals were held in memory of those good old days. At these festivals "masters and slaves exchanged places, apparently to recall the primitive equality of Cronus' time" (Dawson 1992:14).[208] What was important in these later comedy versions was that reality and utopian existence were not separated in time but in space. This good life was seen as happening in some "distant country or in the underworld" (Dawson 1992:14).

The Cronus myth was viewed by later Hellenists as fiction but at the same as inspiring them to imagine spaces and places of the good life. Pythagoreans proposed the "koinos bios" (common life) which was then adopted by Plato in his *Republic* (Dawson 1992:16). Plato's *Republic* became a general Hellenic model in "literary genre of devising the ideal city" (Kumar 2005:859). This design was not meant to be an egalitarian society in today's terms. The arrangement in Plato's *Republic* was a community of the likeminded and those of the same social class. They formed communities in a city which was also the centre of worship. With the Greek homeland becoming overpopulated, around 750 BCE there were movements (*apoikia*) or 'emigrations' or 'Exiles' to create new settlements or cities around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. The founders of such cities, men called *oikists*, became leaders of the cult of the *oikistes* (Dawson 1992:22). Appointed by the Delphic oracle, the *oikist* was a man of "unique authority, during the period of settlement, and after his death he would receive a hero's cult in the new city. He would mark out the site, divide the land into plots for the settlers, and set aside sacred places for the gods" (Dawson 1992:22). Written codes of laws (*nomoi*) would govern all those who settled in the new city although there would be debates over the merits of the codes as a result of people coming from different places. The specialist in giving the law (*nomothetai*) would, together with the *oikist*, preside over the giving of laws (Dawson

[207] Parallels with John are suggestive as indicated by the Johannine versification inserted in the citation.
[208] Parallels with Jesus' washing of his disciples feet and the promise to them that they are no longer slaves but friends (15:15) are suggestive.

1992:22). The spread of this thinking in the Hellenistic and later in the Greco-Roman world cannot be confirmed with certainty. What is known, though, is that such utopian constructions would find new interpretations and syncretistic usages in the culturally mixed environment of the Greco-Roman world of the first century CE.

5.4. Utopia as a Literary Genre[209]

The foregoing discussion has emphasised the content of utopian imagination and its social origins and make-up. Only by implication has utopia been discussed as a literary genre. It is necessary therefore to briefly show that the utopian ideal usually found its way into literature, either to maintain the 'original' vision, or to venerate the founding leader. As a literary genre, utopia was on the margins of literary analysis until the sixteenth century writings of Thomas More. More emphasis on More's work focused more on its political implications than its literary identity, although it was among the first to be identified with what has become a popular field of study (Fausett 1993:8). This kind of writing was not known as a specific genre apart from the fact that material falling into such a category could be identified as such. One hallmark of this literature, says Fausett, was its focus on the "geospatial configurations and their cultural significance" (1993:9). This was therefore the kind of literature that influenced geographical imagination of the early geographers. Such writings reflected the "embedment" of imaginary societies "in a historical and geographical context" which are usually described in detail (Fausett 1993:9; Borgatta and Borgatta 1992:2213).[210] As has already been noted before, "*geographia* represented a literary genre more than a branch of physical science" in antiquity (Romm 1992:3).

Capps notes that in utopian imagination as literature "the first thing we encounter in most cases is a story" (2001:96). It is a story in which one person, from another place in time,

[209] By genre is meant the possibility of drawing a literary pattern of this writing with other similar literature emerging from similar milieus. This genre, like the Gospel genre, depends more for its description on its content than on its structure. What has not been discussed here, but is relevant are the several utopian literary works emerging from contexts where space was threatened, e.g., post-Hiroshima and Nagasaki Japan and post-war German literature (Rimer 1988; Harada 2000; Taberner 1998).

[210] See for example, Charles Fourier's utopia (e.g., the Phalanx) had detailed "architectural specifications" of buildings, "work schedules" and other detailed rules of relationships (Borgatta and Borgatta 1992:2213).

arrives to disclose the hidden truths of that universe sometimes with a special use of cosmic and apocalyptic language (2001:96). Utopia, the place imagined in the narrative, was thus "inseparable from the voyage to it" (Fausett 1993:9), it forming a narrative explaining 'how to get there and what to enjoy when one gets there'.

Social ideals of the utopian destination form the basis of utopian literature. The most interesting aspect of the genre is that it usually reflected the social location of the authors or their 'real' audiences. The utopian genre could thus be used to analyse the social arrangement of its producers and recipients. For example, one can observe that Plato's *Republic* is a utopia "shaped by his economic and social background." Members of Plato's family were large landholders and saw the rise of commerce as a "threat to their economic positions" (Borgatta and Borgatta 1992:2212).

The utopian narrative is told as if it is historically true, based on the assumed veracity of the one who tells it. Hence, what Plato says about the Greek world is supposed to be 'true' because it has been "learnt from Egyptian sages by Solon, the lawgiver of sixth-century B. C. Athens" (Fausett 1993:29). So it must be believed. What the seer in the Book of Revelation sees must have nothing added to it because it is a pure and true revelation from the throne of God (Rev. 21:18-20). Even the Fourth Gospel's testimony is true because Jesus has come from God and sees what God is doing (John 5:19) and such will be the experience of the Johannine community (John 1:51). The apocalyptic nature of the message then privileges the revealer and the recipient sect who can comprehend the special truth.[211]

[211] Here, apocalyptic is what Ashton has defined as a "narrative, composed in circumstances of political, religious, or social unrest, in the course of which an angelic being discloses heavenly mysteries, otherwise hidden, to a human seer, either directly, by interpreting a dream of a vision, or directly, in which case the seer may believe that he has been transported to heaven in order to receive a special revelation" (Ashton 1991:386).

5.5. *The Sociology of a Utopian Sect*

Bryan Wilson, a prominent sociologist of religion in his magisterial, *Magic and the Millennium* (1973,) in what is an extensive study of the emergence of new religious movements, proposed seven sectarian responses to evil in the world:

5.5.1. The Conversionist Sect

This sectarian response holds that the "world is corrupt because men *[sic]* are corrupt: if men *[sic]* can be changed then the world will be changed" (Wilson 1973:22). The aim here is to transform the corrupt world by changing individuals (Hall et al. 1995:405). What is sought is not "simply recruitment to a movement, but with the acquisition of a change of heart" (Wilson 1973:23).

5.5.2. The Revolutionist Sect

This sectarian response looks forward to the destruction of the world through supernatural means as a means of attaining salvation (Wilson 1973:23). The destruction and passing of the present order by divine forces ushers a new dispensation of the rule of God (Wilson 1973:23; Hall et al. 1995:405; Saldarini 2001:72).

5.5.3. The Introversionist Sect

This sectarian response sees the world as irredeemably evil. In order to attain salvation, a person must withdraw from the world as much as they can (Wilson 1973:23). As a result, individual members of the sect must retire from the evil world to seek the security of personal holiness within a purified community (Wilson 1973:23; Hall et al. 1995:405; Saldarini 2001:72). More people with the same vision will come together to establish a separate community "preoccupied with its own holiness and its means of insulation from wider society. Even if the ideology posits only its future realisation, in practice, salvation is sociologically a present endeavour. The community itself becomes the source and seat of all salvation. Explicitly this salvation is only for those who belong" (Wilson 1973:23-4).

5.5.4. The Manipulationist or Gnostic Sect

This sectarian response claims to have acquired the "right means and improved techniques" of dealing with evil (Wilson 1973:24). Such a claim is based on the understanding that with special knowledge and techniques for attaining goals generally pursued by the society at large, right desires can be met (Hall et al. 1995:405; Saldarini 2001:72).

5.5.5. The Thaumaturgical Sect

This sectarian response is made up of members who come to someone in order to facilitate personal contact with the supernatural as a means to relieve them of specific ills (Wilson 1973:25; Saldarini 2001:72; Hall et al. 1995:405). Salvation is seen in terms of, "healing, assuagement of grief, restoration of loss, reassurance, the foresight and avoidance of calamity, and the guarantee of external" life even after death (Wilson 1973:25).

5.5.6. The Reformist Sect

This sectarian response is normally in its later stage of development, providing a critique and an ethic to a society to which it is no longer hostile or indifferent with the hope of a gradual, divinely revealed alteration in society. This approach is close to some "attitudes of secular men *[sic]* who seek only rational justification for their advocacy" (Wilson 1973:25; Hall et al. 1995:405; Saldarini 2001:72).

5.5.7. The Utopian Sect

The last group that Wilson deals with is the sectarian response the present researcher proposes could be descriptive of the Johannine community. The utopian sect, according to Wilson, seeks to:

> Reconstruct the world according to some divinely given principles, to establish a new social organisation in which evil will be eliminated. This response differs from the demand that the world be overturned (revolutionist), in insisting that men *[sic]* re-make it, even if they do this work strictly at divine behest. It is much more radical than the reformist response in insisting on complete replacement of social organisation. It is more active and constructive than the introversionist response of simply withdrawing from the world" (1973:225-6; see also Clarke and Linzey 1996:745).

Even though the members withdraw from society at large into what they consider a society living in communal life, they still have an ambiguous relationship with the world they hope to transform according to divine principles without revolution (Hall et al. 1995:405; Saldarini 2001:72).

Wilson did not give much further detailed attention to this type of sectarian response until 1975, when John Whitworth took up a major study of three utopian sects. One of the things observed by Whitworth was that Wilson never looked in detail into the circumstances of the origin of the utopian sect (Whitworth 1975:6).[212] One important characteristic observed by Whitworth about utopian sectarianism was that while it was a rare phenomenon, it was also "complex and hitherto scarcely differentiated and largely unexplored for a sect" (Whitworth 1975:1). Of the three groups that Whitworth classified as utopian, two are of particular importance for this study, namely, the Shakers—who derived from English seventeenth century Quakerism, and were otherwise known as The United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing—who emigrated to New York in the late eighteenth century, and the Bruderhof, who emerged in Germany following the First World War (Whitworth 1975:1). One major characteristic for this present study is that both groups had a heightened sense of space as a result of the experience of dislocation because of migration and war. Capps suggests that the utopian idea "originates in deep-seated anxiety about home" and the dangers associated with being at

[212] It is the opinion of the present researcher that Wilson's footnote 18 on utopia is extensive enough for any initial study (1973:26).

home (2001:93). Wilson also notes that utopian sects generally emerge from "migrant groups adjusting to a new social location" (1973:26, n. 18). This is an important trait for the utopian sect. Other key characteristics observed from the three groups that Whitworth investigated included:

i. The members believed the "God had revealed to them the essential nature of His *[sic]* Kingdom, and that it was their task to establish this Kingdom throughout the earth" (Whitworth 1975:1).
ii. The possession of a "distinct conception of how an infinitely better world is to be brought into being" (Whitworth 1975:1).
iii. They did not believe that the kingdom of God would be established on earth by some divine miracle, but that "such an establishment is conditional upon human action performed under divine tutelage and surveillance" (Whitworth 1975:1).
iv. The sectarians must "establish a nucleus of the Kingdom of God on earth" (Whitworth 1975:1-2).
v. The aim of a utopian sect was not to remain a small group living "permanently on the margins of depraved society", but, to possess the conviction that "once the prototype of the new order of society has been established, the mass of mankind will quickly come to realise its superiority and divine provenance and will abandon the institutions and vices of the world" (Whitworth 1975:2).
vi. The vision of a utopian sect, while gradualist, was nevertheless a radical one which sees the world as being transformed and "inhabited by that portion of mankind *[sic]* which is capable of the spiritual rebirth necessary for participation in the new and final order of society" (Whitworth 1975:2).
vii. The relationship between the utopian sect and the outside world is "peculiarly equivocal" in that the world and its institutions are regarded as corrupt and as fostering the corruption of individuals and their "estrangement from God" (Whitworth 1975:2).
viii. The members seek to "isolate themselves from its influence in order to construct a new, perfect society according to God's blueprint" but at the same time wanting to

"demonstrate the perfection and joy of their lives to persons in the world" (Whitworth 1975:2).

ix. The members of the utopian sect see themselves as "chosen elite—the first settlers of the new earth" (Whitworth 1975:2).

x. The formation of the colony while crucial does not discourage evangelising and trying to attract outsiders.

xi. This "religiously inspired commitment to the maintenance of communal isolation and to evangelism creates a high degree of ambivalence in the response to the world of a utopian sect" (Whitworth 1975:3).

6. Relating Utopian Sectarianism to the Farewell Discourse

While the use of utopia, as discussed here to read the FD sociologically is new, it should be pointed out that the use of Platonic idealism as the likely background to the Fourth Gospel eschatology was already suggested by Bultmann in 1956. In his view, the "ideal state, the archetypal image of the city state", "though existing only in heaven" must be an "object of contemplation for all true statesmanship" (1956:147). This state needed laws and justice in order to function. This utopian dream would culminate in the "heaven and earth and gods and men" held together "by communion and friendship, by orderliness, temperance, and justice" and the name of this order would be called Cosmos (1956:147). Bultmann hints that these Platonic views are syncretistically combined by Gentile Christians to form the basis of their eschatology (1956:209-211). Maybe 'syncretistic' is not the right word to use since the first-century CE Greco-Roman world was an environment of giving and taking of ideas, of movements and contacts, taking place especially within urban areas. There were no pure Jewish ideas that were then mixed with Hellenistic ideas in first-century CE Palestine, everything was a mixture already.

The above analysis of the emergence of a utopian imagination, its composition, and its literary representation can be used to analyse the FD as reflective of John's closeness to a utopian sectarian provenance in exile. While many features resonate, due to limitation of space, only a few will be tested here.

Whitworth raised some methodological issues that must be noted here before one proceeds. First, what information from the literature left behind by a utopian sect can illuminate our understanding of the sect? Whitworth says that if "it exists, the literature published by sects is frequently of an ephemeral nature and may be extremely hard to trace" (1975:9). If however, the members of the sect were of "a literary turn, and especially if literary evangelism was among their activities, the investigator may well be daunted by the volume of their work. Sheer bulk aside, the sociologists may have to struggle through literally hundreds of pages of closely written and obscure exegesis before finding a single illuminating fact, or a statement betraying some significant modification of social practice" (1975:9). This is made difficult by the fact that utopian sects like most other sects would try to "deliberately keep aspects of their beliefs and social attitudes secret from the world, and sometimes even from the less senior members of the group" (1975:9). Methodologically, it follows that the nature of our enquiry will require more of an "eclectic approach" than a "sustained exegesis of a single, continuous passage from the Gospel" so that we can glean through a 'thick exegesis' of the Fourth Gospel any utopian characteristics emerging from the FD (Ashton 1991:445).

Second, as has already been noted above, it has become characteristic in recent sectarian studies to investigate the 'interior-exterior' or *etic-emic* relations between the sect and the outside world (Partridge 2005:24). As such, it will be appropriate methodologically, to analyse the Johannine material in terms of how it reveals internal relations and governance, internal self-understanding, and perspectives on the outside world.

6.1. **Emic Analysis:**

6.1.1. A High Sense of Exclusivity

The members of a utopian sect see themselves as a "chosen elite—the first settlers of the new earth" (Whitworth 1975:2). Forming a colony of like-minded members assists them in maintaining their self-identity. In the Fourth Gospel, the followers of Jesus see themselves as the chosen ones, "I do not speak of all of you. I know the ones I have

chosen" (ἐξελεξάμην) (John 13:18). They did not choose Jesus, he chose them (John 15:16). They were graciously chosen from the dirty world (John 15:19). They are a clean community (καθαροί), though of course not all, since some are leaving (John 6:66; 13:10, 11). They are cleaned by the word that they have directly received from Jesus (John 15:3).

The utopian sect sees itself as the nucleus of the presence of God upon earth. While Jesus was present in the flesh they were living with God's presence. Now that he is going, Jesus is not going to leave them as orphans but will send them the helper (παράκλητος) (John 14:16, 18). This helper or Spirit is God's exclusive gift to the community. This gift the "world cannot receive, because it does not behold him or know him" but the members of the community of John knows the Spirit because at the present moment Jesus abides with them but at the departure of Jesus, this gift of the Spirit will be in them (John 14:17). God's presence in the members will grow exponentially. He promises them: "you will know that I am in my Father and you in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). This self-disclosure of God to the group is on condition that they are obedient to God's commands (John 14:21). God will not only reveal who God is but will even make God's home (μονήν) in the community (John 14:23).

The utopian sect believes in the possibility of transforming the world through human agency in obedience to God's clear commandments. We have seen that in the Hellenistic utopia, rules of the community were given by the law givers (*nomothetai*) in consultation with the *oikist* (1992:22). These laws determined the internal relationships that kept the community together and also attracted outsiders to join (Dawson 1992:22). As Draper notes, the function of these laws served to maintain the internal cohesion of the group (1992:21). In the FD, it is central to realise that the laws, commands or words, though given by Jesus and later taught by the Spirit (John 14:26), are actually from God. Jesus says to the disciples, the "word that you hear is not mine, but is from the Father who sent me" (John 14:24). This gives the community rules of divine origin that are extremely binding and unchangeable.

The command (ἐντολή) is love. Keeping the commands of the founding leader is a demonstration of the member's love for the leader and veneration of him in his death. So Jesus says that "whoever does not love me does not keep my words" (John 14:24) or "If you abide in me, and my words abide in you" then you are my disciple (John 15:7). The major rule and regulation to maintain the internal cohesion within the FD is therefore one of love. To be effective, this mutual love among the members (John 13:34ff; 15:12-17) should be based on the mutual love of Jesus with his Father (John 14:21ff). They should be obedient to Jesus just as Jesus was obedient to God's commands. It is love for the insiders that will sustain the utopian vision. The ultimate love for Jesus—the leader of the utopian imagination—is to keep his commandments (ἐντολὰς) (John 14:15). Since they may forget what Jesus taught, another helper will be sent who will remind them of everything that Jesus taught them (John 14:16, 26) because his commands are fundamental to the success of the utopian vision. Because in service and obeying his commands Jesus is revealed to the members (John 14:21-22), it is the strict adherence to the commands that will elevate members to the new status from being slaves of the master to being friends of the master (John 15:14).

Love is supposed to produce the unity required to maintain the community (John 17:11ff). This unity would be proof that Jesus is the true revealer sent from the Father to disclose the truth (John 17:23). The loss of a single member weakens the claims made by the leader of the community, thereby discrediting the utopian vision itself (John 17:23). This love is a commitment one to another in which the members should even be ready to die for one another (John 11:16; 13:37; 15:13). In this sense, the utopian imagination has reached levels at which violence could be expected from the outside against the effort to maintain the utopian vision. Any member who decides to disconnect from this special group will cease to bear fruit (John 15:5) and will finally die (John 15:6).

The love command is expressed spatially in terms of proximity and connection. Whitworth shows that in the three utopian sects he studied, all "forms of unnecessary contact between the sexes were forbidden, as was any kind of conduct which was thought conducive to the development of particular affections, as distinct from the spiritual love

which all were required to feel for their co-religionists" (1975:29). The first contact we see between males and females in John is when Jesus meets the woman from Samaria in John 4. Although the conversation sounds purely theological, one can hear aspects that could have affected a sect in terms of contact between males and females especially if there were unresolved ethnic issues. The other contact we know is when Jesus is anointed by Mary using her hair to wipe his feet (John 12:1-4). We cannot know with certainty if Judas' complaint is purely economic as presented, or whether there were some who questioned Jesus' contact with this woman. The response of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene when she wanted to touch him raises similar questions. When she discovered it was him, she rushed to him. Jesus response was immediate, "do not touch me" (μή μου ἅπτου) because "I have not yet ascended to the Father" (John 20:17).

The relationship between the members and Jesus is also described in terms of closeness of space. As branches are connected to the vine so the members are connected to Jesus. This interconnectedness involves the Johannine community, Jesus and the Father. This inextricable connection with Jesus and the Father privileges them to know many hidden truths (John 15:21).[213] This special knowledge will be helpful when they try to deal with a hostile world (John 16:4). As they grow in this knowledge of God, they will have power to achieve more than even Jesus did when he was in the flesh (John 20:29).

6.1.2. Leadership and Rank

The major reason for a utopian sect to form a colony is so that the realised social organisation can become a template upon which the transformation of the outside world can be modelled. Its leadership, which is usually chosen on the basis of its strong connection with the founding principles or teachings, wields conditional power. One reason for internal schism within utopian sectarianism could be the dissatisfaction with leadership who may be considered to have lost the original vision or to have become more elitist than other members resulting in a rebellion. One reason for dissension against

[213] This has normally been read as Gnosticism. Nevertheless, privilege to special knowledge characterises many utopian sectarian groups.

leadership is the rebellion against elitism that sometimes develops among the leaders (Boguslaw 1992:2212).

The Johannine rank and leadership arrangement has already been observed to be quite unconventional for the first century CE church where contestation for positions was prevalent (Käsemann 1968). Käsemann wonders why a community with such a high Christology would seem to neglect traditional ecclesiological arrangements (1968:28). He thinks that to understand this anomaly one has to explore the relationship between the Jesus tradition and the Johannine Christology. What becomes apparent for Käsemann is that the members of the Johannine community are a conventicle designated as a circle of mutual friends and "friends of Jesus" (Käsemann 1968:28). What he observed is the absence of the "concept 'church'" and the leadership titles that ordinarily go with it. Such an ecclesiology characterised be the presence of women in leadership, the absence of apostleship and the privileges that go with it, together with a weakened presence of the Petrine tradition is very unusual in in the first century (Käsemann 1968:28). This contrasts with the norms of the church of the post-apostolic period with its concerns for church order.

Utopian sectarianism survives through the delicate arrangement of power and rank. As an οἰκία (household), every member knows her or his place. While a number of scholars have proposed that the FD reveals a strained contest for leadership in the Johannine community after the death of the Beloved disciple, the data in the FD, in conformity with other utopian arrangements, reveals that leadership is settled through the implicit ordering of ranks in some predictable way. To think of individualism in such sectarian societies is highly anachronistic and reflective of modern individualism.[214] Members in a utopian community are supposed to exhibit the egalitarian ideals of their society. The rank of

[214] See for example the criticism given by Woll (1981:112ff). The theories on charismatic leadership derived from Max Weber give an impression that it is the leader's individual predisposition against "rational" bureaucracy, authority etc that drives his community (Eisenstadt 1968:51ff). I think this may be true for charismatic leadership in general but I am not sure if it is the right model for the highly communitarian Johannine community. While in this model the charismatic leader is "irrational in the sense of being foreign to all rules", it would appear that a utopian arrangement allows quite substantial continuity with existing traditions, only giving them novel interpretation using potent 'archaic symbols' (e.g., from the Old Testament) for legitimation.

each member, although not openly communicated, is known.[215] For example, the role of the Beloved disciple is clear in the Fourth Gospel:

- He is the one who should tell the rest who is going to betray Jesus (John 13:23ff).
- He is the one who is given the responsibility over Jesus' mother at the cross (John 19:26ff).
- He outran Peter to the tomb (John 20:4).
- He is the one who saw the burial linen wrappings in the tomb of Jesus, a testimony that Jesus had risen (John 20:5ff).
- Though Mary saw the open tomb first, it is the Beloved disciple who saw the evidence of the resurrection—the burial linen in an empty tomb. Even though Peter also entered the tomb, it is only the Beloved disciple who "saw this and believed" (John 20:8).
- He is the one of whom Jesus is alleged to have said he would live forever and not die (John 21:2ff).

The rank of this Beloved disciple is assumed in the community. This rank is no small thing for as "Jesus in the bosom of the Father, so the Beloved Disciple lies in the bosom of the Son; thus the concrete position of the disciple marks the verity that the true disciples are in Jesus as Jesus is in the Father" (Hoskyns 1947:443). Those who want to contest his position are always returned to their place.

While the rank of the members is not explicitly communicated but known, the position of the leader is well-communicated and reinforced just as the *oikist* was to be honoured in life and "after his death" to "receive a hero's cult" (Dawson 1992:22):

[215] This is obviously in stark contrast to Käsemann's characterisation of Johannine ecclesiology which he presents as having no rank due to absence of ranks familiar in Pauline ecclesiology (Käsemann 1968:28ff). This community has rank and hierarchy, only that the utopian ideals do not allow public disclosure of such. But everyone is expected to find their place. This does not mean that there is no competition although it is highly discouraged since positions are 'fixed'.

- The leader and the leader's rules are to be regarded highly in the leader's presence or absence;
- The leader has achieved such leadership through certain exploits;
- The leader has earned the position;
- It is the leader's 'works' which testify as to the leader's worth;
- The leader has special powers conferred on those "who dwell" on the "boundaries" or margins of the norms of society (Smith 1978:114).

From the beginning of the Gospel, Jesus' superior position is emphasised:

- John the Baptist is not the light but bears witness to the light (John 1:7ff);
- Jesus has higher rank than John (John 1:15);
- John is not the Christ but one who prepares his way for him (John 1:20-7);
- Jesus must increase but John must decrease (John 3:30);
- John's testimony is less than the testimony of Jesus' works (John 5:33-36).

Jesus' role as leader of the Johannine household (οἰκία) is quite explicit and his honour and glory demanded:

- All judgement has been given to him (John 5:22) so that just as people honour (τιμῶσι) the Father, so shall they also honour the Son (John 5:23);
- The one who does not honour the Son, the one having been sent by the Father, does not honour the Father who sent him (τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν);
- All those who serve Jesus and follow him get an honour from God (John 12:26).

Apart from the shared honour between the Father and the Son, there is also God's glory, God's presence that is revealed in Jesus:

- When the "Son of Man" is glorified, God is also "glorified in Him" (John 13:31);

- The exalted identity of Jesus is put next to that of God, transforming simple honour of humans into the glory of a deity;
- The glory of the Father is inextricably connected to the achievements of the Son since the Father is "glorified in the Son" (John 14:13).

Even the work of the Paraclete is that of caretaker:

- The Paraclete will bring to remembrance what Jesus has taught;
- The Paraclete will not speak on his own accord;
- The Paraclete is going to be sent from the Father and the Son;
- Such representation by the Paraclete makes adherence to Jesus and his commands in his physical absence possible (Käsemann 1968:37);
- When Jesus comes back he will take all his people to the place he has gone to prepare (John 14:23).

Although the rhetorical dualism of 'above' and 'below' needs to be analysed as a geo-spatial utopian literary feature as mentioned above, its social significance in the FD requires that it be examined in the light of rank and leaderships, as has already been identified by some scholars (Woll 1981:39ff).

- The use of 'above' and 'below' with special reference to the exalted rank of Jesus can be detected in John 3:31 where "The one who comes from above is above all; the one who is of the earth belongs to the earth and speaks about earthly things. The one who comes from heaven is above all";
- The overarching "belief of the Gospel is that all men are in darkness" simply because they are from below but have a potential through faith by being 'born from above' to assume new status (John 1:12ff) (Charlesworth 1972:89-90);
- The new spatial location of the Johannine believers is from 'above' since they have been born from above (John 3:16);
- This new spatial location gives them a new and higher rank than those from below who live outside the Johannine community. This is also the same self-

understanding of the Qumran community (1QS 3:15).[216] This new rank from this spatial relocation is presented as superior to the rank one could have by being born from the ancestry of Abraham (John 8:44);

- By being born from above Jesus says that "I have given them your word, and the world has hated them because they do not belong to the world, just as I do not belong to the world" (John 17:14, 16) although they are not going to be taken out of the world yet, only that they should be protected "from the evil one" (John 17:15);
- Jesus' subordination and obedience to the Father epitomises submission and subordination for the members of John's community;
- The Paraclete will also submit to Jesus and the Father as the Paraclete proceeds from them;
- On his own, Jesus can do nothing but only as he sees the Father do so he does (John 5:30; 8:28);
- Jesus did not come to do his own will or to speak on his own behalf but to do the will of the Father who sent him and to speak as he is instructed (John 6:38; 7:28; 8:42; 12:49). For this reason Jesus does not seek his own glory but the glory of the Father (John 8:50).

Adherence to this arrangement of rank and order of community prevents it from dissentions and schisms. If everyone knows their place, the aspiration for power is minimised except for the 'spiritual' promotion of being recognised by Jesus.

Even members within the group can sometimes be confused or lose faith in the leader about his promise as seen by the questions they raise (e.g., Peter in John 13:8ff, 37; Thomas in John 14:5; Philip in John 14:8; Judas in John 14:22). This is a literary ploy in a utopian narrative to disclose the secret claims of the community leader. The ignorance of some members is an occasion for the leader to prove his identity:

[216] This does not mean that John borrowed his ideas from the Qumran Community but that the use of spatial categories reflects a typical response to outsiders by those communities that possess a utopian disposition.

- Thomas' ignorance becomes an opportunity for Jesus to disclose a fundamental truth that he is the "way, the truth and the life" (John 14:6);
- Philip's ignorance is also an opportunity for Jesus to reveal his relationship with the Father (John 14:8-13);
- Judas' interest in outsiders is harshly rebuked, and finally Judas goes outside where he belongs.
- Peter's failure allows Jesus to point to the Beloved's role (John 21).[217]

The ignorance of these members is readily 'corrected' by showing that the leader is to be believed because his claims are true and those who ask such questions have some weakness that will be exposed in the near future. Peter will deny Jesus (John 13:38) and Thomas will not be there when Jesus is revealed as risen (John 20:24ff).

6.1.3. The Social Status of the Group

Wilson has suggested that one reason a utopian sect comes together as a colony is not an end in itself. Instead, they come together, because as a migrant society, they can "re-fabricate the benefit and security of the kinship relations that they had surrendered in migrating" (1973:26. n. 18). As a group therefore, they can preserve the "distinctiveness of language", assist in the acquisition and protection of their property, and use this new community as a substitute for "blood kinsfolk" through 'endogamy, fictive and biological kinships' (1973:26. n. 18). To make all this work, there must be some concessions and redrawing of socio-economic boundaries. In the Hellenistic utopian myth of the 'golden race' there are a number of harvest festivals held in memory of the good old days, where "masters and slaves exchanged places, apparently to recall the primitive equality of Cronus' time" (Dawson 1992:14). The washing of the disciples' feet can thus be seen as a preamble to the construction of such a utopian community. Jesus himself as master changes his role and washes the feet of his disciple (John 13:1-20). The internal dissention to such role-reversal is important to note:

[217] The possible value of John 21 has been discussed above.

- Is Peter's reaction (13:6) a demonstration of the internal discomfort with the radical proposals given?
- Is the call for the well off in John's community to take care of the underprivileged and serve them (13:14) a contested call?
- Finally, is this (15:15) a call to get rid of all place, and hence to create an *ou topos*?

From this ongoing discussion we can pick some particular societal characteristics from the Fourth Gospel FD with striking similarities with the *oikistes* utopian sectarianism discussed above. The brute social arrangement where the slave (δοῦλος) and master (κυρίος) have an unequal relationship is stated (John 13:16) is subverted by a proposition of role reversal. The Johannine community seeks to redefine the slave-master relationships (John 13:17). In the 'first space' experience known to John, a "slave does not have a permanent place in the house or household (οἰκίᾳ)" but the Son has a place there forever (John 8:35). It is the 'first space' experience for the community of John that a slave "is not greater than their master" (John 15:20). Slavery is negatively presented as servitude to sin (John 8:34). Within the household code of the utopian arrangement given by the master (κυρίος) (i.e., Jesus) to his followers, even though some are literally slaves (δούλους), in him they are no longer slaves but friends (φίλους) (John 15:15).

If the community of John has slaves—and there could have been many who had fled from Jerusalem with nothing—the utopian arrangement of the community was suggesting that they be given statuses of friends, hence have them redeemed (see Gruen 2004:130; Safrai et al. 1974:701; Ferguson 2003:429-430). This was also in agreement with Jewish law that a Jewish slave, "must be treated like free persons and their status in law and religion similar to that of and ordinary Israelite" (Falk 1974:511). In calling for the freedom of slaves and naming them friends, the community would be one without positions of power, thereby comprised of people with no place (*ou topos*). This proposal would have been attractive to members of the lower classes but would have been resisted by those members who were slave owners themselves; hence the compromise that even without freeing the slaves, they could be called friends.

It will be necessary here to take a short detour to briefly check if we can estimate the socio-economic status of the Johannine community from the text itself.

6.1.4. The Socio-Economic Status of John's Community: A Proposal

If the ongoing discussion and analysis are correct, a proposal could be made regarding the socio-economic status of the Johannine community. The dominant sector of the community of John which emerged from a well-off background can be estimated with a high probability of accuracy. Jesus promises that he goes to prepare of place for his disciples in a house with many rooms. This is a promise for those who have lost their many-roomed mansions (μοναὶ) and not the poor, of whom most would come from single roomed houses.[218] Once people have been displaced from their homes, their imagination centres on what they have lost and not what is above their original status. In his archaeological work, Eric Meyers (2003) has shown that by looking at the types of archaeological remains, the social location of the people who resided in those remains can be ascertained. Building upon the earlier work of Hirschfeld (1995) and Galor (2000), Meyers has shown that the "most commonly found domicile in Roman-period Palestine is the single-room structure" and that the "majority of the population lived in such houses also" (2003:45). On the other hand, the "courtyard house" was a bigger house and likely to have been utilised by the "well-to-do" people (Meyers 2003:54).[219] If the Johannine community's imagination of utopian domicile is a 'house with many rooms', a clear possibility is that these could be the houses they lost during the devastation of 70 CE. A cursory glance through the Fourth Gospel will actually confirm the proposal of the well-to-do status of the larger dominant sector the community of John:

i. Invitation to a wedding: If the Synoptic tradition—especially Luke's suggestion of the invitation to banquets— was reciprocated by the rich (Matt. 22:3; Luke 12:36),

[218] This is contrary to Timothy Ling's suggestion that the Johannine community's social status should be read in the light of a pietistic spirituality of renunciation (2006). There is a strong concern for the poor however, in the sense of patronage. The conclusion that Ling makes concerning the 'ascetic' nature of the Fourth Gospel is not based on the Gospel material, but upon the model he uses (2006:197-203).

[219] Notable "courtyard" houses included the "Great Mansion (600 square meters)" and the "Herodian House" (200 square meters) located in the Upper City. Similar houses were also found in Capernaum, Korazin and on the "western acropolis at Sepphoris" (Meyers 2003:51).

the invitation of Jesus and his family, together with his disciples, could be suggestive of their social status (John 2:1, 10). In Luke's rendering, it is the master coming from the wedding and the slaves at home waiting for him. In the rare occasion where the poor are invited, they must sit on the margins as all the higher seats are reserved (Luke 14:8).

ii. Expensive 'Jesus': In the Gospel of John, Jesus lives like a king and is buried like one. Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea brought a "mixture of myrrh and aloes, weighing about a hundred pounds" (John 19:39). In the Synoptic rendering, Jesus is buried by his relatives with just a few herbs (Mark 16:1).

iii. They can afford and feel obliged to give to the poor (John 12:5, 8; 13:29): It is known that after the destruction of 70 CE, the diaspora received many exiles which "imposed a certain financial burden upon existing diaspora communities that felt duty-bound to redeem Jewish slaves" (Safrai et al. 1974:701). The patronage role assumed by John's community is evident in their concern for the poor as well as slaves and their redemption.

iv. Agricultural language indicating that they are likely to have owned land (John 4:35ff; 10:1ff; 12:24; 15:1ff). There is evidence of "various types of tenures on Jewish land" suggesting that "some Jews held large estates" in Syria in the first and second century, hence the "numerous halakic rulings relating to Jewish cultivation in Syria" at this time (Safrai et al. 1974:712). The agricultural language used here could come from those who owned large estates.

v. The feeding of the five thousand is just a 'test' of the disciples and not to address a critical need (John 6:1ff). This is unlike the Synoptic tradition where the feedings are to meet the actual needs of people who are hungry.

vi. The Johannine Jesus could afford to attend all three annual Temple festivals (John 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2; 11:55; etc). Only the rich could afford attending all three festivals.

vii. The Johannine community could supply their own food and replenishments (John 4:8) unlike in the Synoptic tradition where they need the support of rich women (e.g., Luke 8:1-3).

Although further investigation is required that goes beyond Ling's (2006) work, these pointers are very suggestive of a community which is financially well-off. From the way the Gospel of John uses the Jesus tradition, there is an indication that:

- Some of the well-to-do members of the sectarian group being called to subscribe to the Jesus tradition find that it is too radical for their comfort;
- They will need to comply if they are to be fully integrated;
- Riches and property are spiritually understood in John;
- Their lost belongings as a result of the rebellion in Jerusalem, houses, vineyards, and farms, and those that some have now, should not be used to gain status (Potter 2006 :582);
- True riches as a true position of honour is one's closeness to the κυρίος of the οἰκία.[220]

6.2. An Etic Analysis: Ambiguous Views

Whitworth has observed that the utopian sect had an ambiguous relationship to the outside world. The members of the sect were supposed to "isolate themselves from its influence in order to construct a new, perfect society according to God's blueprint" while at the same time wanting to "demonstrate the perfection and joy of their lives to persons in the world" (Whitworth 1975:2). While the outside world is presented as hostile, at the same time it must be transformed. Such transformation takes place through some level of contact:

- The world (κόσμος) is ignorant of the truth (John 1:10);
- The world is in darkness due to it being under the rule of "the ruler of the world" (ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων);

[220] Capps has observed that unlike the 'reformist' sect, the 'utopian'sect seeks to "reconstruct the world" according to the "divinely given principles of reconstruction" in which human beings must play a significant role (2001:94).

- The ruler has no power over the community's Jesus (John 14:30), and has already been condemned (John 16:11);
- Jesus came as the light into the world but the world chose darkness (John 3:19);
- Jesus did not love the world (John 3:16) but loved his own people in the world (John 13:1);
- The world is so depraved in lies that it cannot receive the spirit of truth (John 14:17);
- The world is hostile to the utopian sect in John (John 15:18-19; 17:14) and it will persecute them (John 16:33);
- Even in his prayer, Jesus makes it clear that he is not praying for the world, but only for the elect of God (John 17:9);
- Unlike the introversionist sect, the utopian sect should not be taken out of the world. As Jesus prays: "I am not asking you to take them out of the world, but I ask you to protect them from the evil one" (John 17:15);
- Even though they do not belong to the world (John 17:16), they must stay in it so that they can transform it through their defeat of the ruler of the world;
- They are commissioned to go into the world just as Jesus came into the world as God's messenger (John 17:18);
- Just as the believers are the μονάι for the Father and the Son (John 14:23), Judas is the physical housing of the "prince of this world" (John 13:27). This labelling technique is useful in reinforcing internal cohesion as well as making distinct the separation with the outside world;
- Hatred of the world and the persecution it produces strengthens the internal cohesion of the community (John 15:20);
- The more the leader, Jesus, is revealed to the community of insiders, the more he is hidden to the outsider (Käsemann 1968:35-36).

Attendant to the hatred of the world is the strong recruitment drive which is however done with restraint for a number of reasons:

- The witnesses must always be conscious of the leader to whom they witness so that they do not witness concerning themselves;
- It is not witnessing that legitimises the member, but adherence or belief in the subject of witness, Jesus (Käsemann 1968:38);
- There is danger when the witness begins to compete with Jesus for glory. Hence, John the Baptist insists that Jesus "must increase as" John decreases (John 3:30). At times, Jesus would even refuse to testify for fear of appearing to be seeking his own glory (John 5:36);
- The works of Jesus should be better testimonies hence the reason the members of the community will be given power to do greater works so that they can testify for him. In this utopian era which begins at the coming of the Paraclete, these members of the community will be "endowed with powers greater even than those of the Lord Himself when He was with them on earth" (Hoskyns 1947:457);
- The place of focus of witness will not be the individual or the community, but the subject of witness, Jesus.

A second threat is the danger from outside that may be brought inside by new converts:

- New converts serve the purpose of making the utopian dream new and alive but may also divert and weaken it;
- The members must always be recruiting but at the same time be on their guard;
- Judas' concern that Jesus reveals himself to the world (John 14:22) is rejected just like the concerns of Jesus' brothers that he must show his work in public, that is, to win public attention (John 7:4-5);
- The prayer for the community embraces the future membership that will be recruited through the witness of the members of the Johannine community (John 17:20).

7. The Difference between Utopian and an Introversionist Sect

Now that we have tried to relate the sociology of utopia to the Johannine material, we

need to explore the difference between this approach and that which sees the Community of John as an introversionist sect. The difference between utopian and introversionist sects is important for two reasons:

i. While the two have some similarities which an uncritical investigation may take for granted, they nevertheless conceal many important differences;
ii. Some scholars have already proposed the introversionist category for the Johannine community (Draper 1992; 1997; 2002).

7.1. Is the Community of John an Introversionist Sect?

The utopian sectarian analysis should be located within the other sectarian approaches suggested by Johannine scholars. Of note is the proposal made by Draper, who in using the thought of Max Weber as well as Wilson's seminal work referred to above, concludes that John is an introversionist sect (1992:14-22;1997:266-270).

While there are many areas of convergence between this work and Draper's, for the present we can only point out a few areas of discontinuity. Draper's use of the sectarian conceptions starting with Troeltsch, Niebuhr and ending with Wilson has been challenged for its sect-orthodox dichotomy, without the whole characterisation being rejected.

A careful examination of the foundation of this sect-denomination dichotomy which was inherited from Weber will reveal some weaknesses. Weber's methodological presupposition employed the "the tool of the ideal type—a mental construct based on relevant empirical components, formed and explicitly delineated by the researcher to facilitate precise comparisons on specific points of interest" (Christiano et al. 2002:94). One ideal religious type was that of the Roman Catholic Church which could be compared with other smaller religious groupings which Weber calls sects. Michael York sarcastically says that this "dichotomy had been near the heart of Catholic theology for some time before" (1995:238). In the case of the Johannine community, Draper would see it as a "religious community as a sect over against Judaism" (1992:14) as if there was

some Orthodox Judaism to which other Jewish groupings could be called sects in comparison. Even if one concedes that this is in fact Temple Judaism (which was also known to be diverse if the conflicts between the Sadducees and the Pharisees are to be taken seriously) there is yet another difficulty. While the Johannine community could have been a Jewish sect, it could not be a Christian sect also, for as Käsemann has pointed out, "no universal church organisation" existed "at the end of the first century" (1968:39). Again, as Draper has pointed out, the "literary form of the *Testament* in late Judaism" is seen as influencing "the evangelist" (1992:15). This idea has already been rejected above and will not be repeated here.

While our analysis of Draper above was methodological, here one can investigate his conclusions and findings from the point of departure of the sociological reading of introversionist sects and the FD that he proposes:

- In Draper's view, the Johannine community exhibits characteristics classified by Wilson as 'introversionist' and 'Gnostic' (2002:17; 1997:266).
- According to Wilson, introversionist sects direct their attention "away from the world and to the community and more particularly to the members' possession of the Spirit" (1959:6).
- The introversionist sect is "largely indifferent to the world and to people in it, its members shun the world in order to cultivate their spirituality.
- The utopian sect cares passionately about the plight of persons suffering in a corrupt world and offers them a panacea, a world reconstructed according to the model revealed by God to his elect" (Whitworth 1975:6).
- The introversionist sect "develops a particular *Weltanshauung* and considers itself an "enlightened elect" and thereby admits "no spiritual directors or ministers" (Wilson 1959:6) yet in John spiritual leadership is accepted in mission where both men and women are commissioned.
- Although providing a detailed profile of the introversionist sect, Draper does not show from specific material gathered from the Gospel of John how this profile is confirmed or rejected.

- Instead of explaining the material through the sociology of introversionist sectarianism, Draper goes on to explain the material through Merkabah mysticism (1997:247-285).
- While Draper suggests that John's Gospel is an introversionist response, he draws no data from the Gospel of John to support this claim (1997:270).
- Draper does not say whether he suggests that the experience of Merkabah mysticism resonates with Gnostic sectarian enlightenment or not.
- Draper suggests that Johannine sectarianism is a response to a "failed millenarian revolutionary movements" (1997:267). If by this he means a response to "the irretrievable loss of the Temple building after 70 CE and of the destruction of ritual and national culture which this entailed", (1997:270) then it could be quite problematic at two levels.
    - If the Johannine community is a sect in relation to that of Judaism and the Temple, then this scenario becomes self-contradictory. How can they be traumatised when the main movement they hate has had its symbol of power destroyed? In the view of the present researcher, this only becomes a real possibility if John is able to separate the Temple system from the Temple aristocracy, something which does not look likely from our reading.
    - The introversionist sect does not, according to Wilson, concern itself with spatial location. In John, we have already argued that spatial concerns are a result of spatial dislocation. Wilson has shown the prevalence of utopian sectarianism in dislocated and migrant communities (1973:26). Whitworth's major work (1975) showed that of the three groups studied, two were spatially traumatised. The Hellenistic Cronos utopian myth emerged from the context of migration as well as the literature of utopia. As to the question whether the utopian sect characteristically converges at some point with the introversionist and Gnostic sects, the answer is yes (Wilson 1973:26). Our analysis of the FD in the light of utopian sectarianism seems to confirm that the Johannine community could indeed be classified as a utopian sect.

8. What is the 'Father's House with Many Rooms'?

In classical Greek usage, the two words (οἶκος and οἰκία) have been used interchangeably according to Strauss (1993:33-36; also Cox :130-141; *contra* Burke in Bromiley 1988:749). This interchange comes to mean house as a building, household as in family and wealth as in property or goods. This meaning is also inherited by the LXX (Rogerson and Lieu 2006: 149, 153). In other New Testament usage, the words are also used interchangeably (Barth and Blanke 2000:263; see also Johnson and Harrington 1992:182). In John, there is a discernible pattern, however.

The initial usage is the masculine οἶκος, which is used strictly in reference to the Temple only (John 2:16, 17). The LXX rendering of Psalm 69:9 from which John 2:17 is taken also uses the masculine form. On the other hand, where οἰκία is used in John, it refers to a house only in the context of a household. The following examples can be cited:

- The man believed with his household (οἰκία) when his son was healed by Jesus (John 4:53);
- The slave has no permanent place in the household (οἰκίᾳ) although the son has (John 8:35);
- When Martha heard that Jesus had come, she left to meet him while Mary stayed in the house (ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ) (11:20). This use of οἶκος instead of οἰκία is deliberate here if one takes the motif of departure as positive in John. That Mary stayed is negatively represented by the use of οἶκος. It is interesting that the moment Mary also stood up to go and meet Jesus, the place where she is, is no longer an οἶκος but an οἰκίᾳ (John 11:31). Although both references allude to the building, the Johannine difference between οἶκος and οἰκία that is intended to show the insignificance of the former and to highlight the significance of the latter is apparent. The οἰκία is preserved as a locus of a caring community as opposed to a mere solid structure where there is exploitation as in the Temple. So the moment

people leave their houses to meet Jesus, their houses are transformed into households.

- The same implication of household is meant when the fragrance is said to have filled the house (οἰκία) when Jesus was being anointed by Mary (John 12:3).

It is in this literary context that John 14:2 should be read. In the household of Jesus' Father (ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου) there are many rooms (μοναὶ πολλαί). How therefore can this be reconciled with 14:23b which states: "καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα?"

The many rooms in the Father's household would be the place of the Father. As the Father's place is not limited to a single location, there are many rooms for the disciples. Since however the community of John is not located in a single place, God dwells with them wherever they are. Therefore, they get the promise:

> The one who loves me will keep my word, and my Father will love him or her, and we will come to him or her and make a dwelling place (μονὴν) with him or her (John 14:23).

With regard to the ascension of Jesus, all places in the Fourth Gospel become irrelevant. Instead, God's spiritual presence will be accessed at every place. The original place at the bosom of the Father was only for Jesus (John 1:18). When Jesus was still in the flesh, only the Beloved disciple was found at the bosom of Jesus (John 13:23). When Jesus goes to the Father he prepares a place for all. If they love, they can live in these many spaces in the presence of both the Father and the Son.

9. Summary of Findings

From the above reading of the FD, we realise that the diaspora experience with all its sense of alienation, having been excluded from the Jewish community at home takes its toll of the Johannine community. Sectarian imagination and the articulation of their experience help them to cope. While other Christian groups hope for the return of Jesus in the face of alienation and persecution, the community of John dematerialises all its

experience. In so doing, the community relies on the Jesus tradition in order to maintain a consistent Christian position. Jesus' departure is the beginning of unfathomable access to the God of the Spirit. According to this teaching, all physical locations such as Synagogues are without God. God is not in a house but in the household. The only place where God is found is the οἰκία and not the οἶκος. This household is not in a physical location for it has been displaced and rejected from all such places. The hope therefore is not for a good or better place (*eutopia*). Rather, the ultimate place is no place (*outopia*). For this *outopia* to function effectively it must:

- Maintain its absolutist and exclusivist claims
- Maintain good internal relations by keeping the commandment to love
- Uphold the leadership of the Spirit who leads to all truth

By moving from the material realm with its limitations to operate in the spiritual realm with all its freedom, the 'first space' of material dislocation and displacement is transformed into the 'third space', thereby resulting in no limitation associated with this 'first space'. By positing the presence of God as accessible now in the community, the movement creates a new community alternative to the one the Johannine group has been expelled from. Since the spirit is leading this community at the behest of Jesus, it means that Jesus is still with them. What it means is that the community must relate to one another just as Jesus related to them when he was still in the flesh and as he presently relates with his Father. Materially, what it means is that those who are well-off have a responsibility over those who are poor. Masters who have slaves must treat them as friends, even to the extent of washing their feet. Materiality should not determine rank, hence the absence of rank in the community.

10. Conclusion[221]

In the previous chapter the focus was to investigate the diaspora allusions in the Fourth Gospel which have been affirmed, not only by the constant references to the 'dispersion' but by the arrival of the 'Greeks' as the climax and turning point of the narrative. Through a sociological analysis of the FD it has become more apparent that the Johannine community's experiences of alienation are being rationalised denying any concrete location at all. The distinction of οἶκος from οἰκία has been seen to show household (οἰκία) as significant for the self-understanding of the community in place of οἶκος, which is the house of God. The transition from the οἶκος in John 2 to οἰκία in John 14 is a movement from concerns for concrete place to unlimited access to God without any place or location but within the household of the spirit of love. 'No-place' is the ultimate place in John. There is no dream for *eutopia* (good place), but *utopia* (no place). Utopia is the 'third space' for the community of John.

[221] As this chapter was being concluded, the present researcher discovered that Steven James Schweitzer had submitted a doctoral dissertation entitled *Reading Utopia in Chronicles* to the University of Notre Dame in 2005. His observation of the utopian nature of spatial representation in the biblical narratives was found to be in agreement with the conclusions set out here. The difference is that Schweitzer does not take the sociological elements of utopia seriously hence the use of the day-to-day usage of utopia as an imagination that does not correspond to reality. This does not represent biblical narratives whose construction of reality is produced in a complex matrix of sacred history (all history) and future dreams and visions in the light of present experiences.

CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. Where it all Began

The initial impulse for this research began as the awakening of a postgraduate Johannine student from Zimbabwe studying in a foreign country, South Africa. My consciousness being outside my own country which was going through crisis and the sense of being 'out of place' or dislocated, easily identified with the markers of dislocation and placelessness alluded to in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. The terminology of diaspora became central to my thinking for these reasons. Jonathan Draper's article, "Holy Seed and the Return of the diaspora in John 12:24" (2000) enriched my thoughts and articulation of the diaspora experience. Finally, participating in Halvor Moxnes' lectures at the University of Natal where he launched his book, *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom* (2003), broadened my perspective of diaspora as a 'space-place' issue.

1.1. The Need for Definition

Once it became clear that 'diaspora' was a spatial category, the methodology of reading the Gospel of John was decidedly a spatial one. The major contribution of this study then became methodological. In order to explore a wide spectrum of the spaces in the Gospel of John, it was first necessary to define what these spaces and places were that this study sought to investigate. The resultant definition showed that, as a phenomenon, space was, dialectically, a social construct in that, while it is socially constructed, it also constructs those who construct it. As such, space and place are identity markers. For example, Galilee as a location in first-century CE Palestine could have shaped those who came

from it, but it was being shaped by these people and other peoples also. While its fertile fields would have awakened agricultural perceptions for the peasantry, for Herod it could have revealed possibilities of its topology altered through buildings. Once in the narrative called John, Galilee also served other purposes for the author and his audience.

During the research, it became clear that as human beings organise spaces and places in their 'real' lives or in telling their stories, they exercise power; hence, space is inextricably related to power. But since power is gendered, it also became clear that space is gendered. Varying from culture to culture, masculinity and femininity are normally inscribed in space and place, not always as binary opposites, but many times as mutually enriching.

It was also observed in this study that space and place are changing concepts, hence their close relationship to time. Events and people are always located in space and time. Hence, to think of the festivals in the Gospel of John, one should think about the Temple. These festivals would become redefined at this interaction and intersection of space and time.

From the above observations it can be seen that although sometimes space and place are spoken of as different entities, in this work, space and place were seen to be interchangeable. Place, as space, has inscribed social significance and space, as place, can be concrete or imagined. Only where their difference enhanced the discussion, was this difference highlighted.

2. Locating the Present Study within the Analysis of Spaces and Places in Johannine Scholarship

In order to locate this study within Johannine scholarship, it was necessary to investigate how previous scholarship had approached the subject of space and place and what the main findings had been. It was discovered that most Johannine scholars had alluded to

something spatial in John but did not see any need to pursue it. Their approaches can be placed in three specific analytical categories.

2.1. The Historical Worth of Spaces and Places

The few Johannine scholars who have pursued space in the Gospel of John were largely interested in how space, especially geographical space, could aid their historical pursuits. As a result, most researchers within the last ten years or so have focused their research on the historical worth of places in John (Charlesworth 2006), with particular emphasis on those places that are not mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels (von Wahlde 2006). Some scholars (e.g. Richardson 2002) in this category used the Johannine topography as evidence to the existence of local Christian traditions in these places. One could conclude that the major concern of the majority of these scholars, apart from pure historical concern, is to vindicate the historical worth of the Fourth Gospel.

2.2. The Symbolic Value of Spaces and Places

There are those Johannine scholars who, while not necessarily giving up on the historical worth of the Fourth Gospel, see it as combining history and theology in a complex way. Johannine space and place is seen to be drawn from the Jewish and Jesus tradition being used symbolically, theologically or even ideologically. They would use the Judea-Galilee regional dichotomies as carrying some symbolic or theological meaning (Brodie 1993). Most scholars in this category would consider John's Gospel as not having historical value but rather symbolic value. This is not to say that there is no history at all in the Gospel of John, but that it is not enough to warrant historical research. While Freyne sees history in John's Gospel as reflective of some regional antagonism, he also sees the theology of restoration being represented in these spatial representations (2001:304).

Even though these scholars see space as central to John and hence the need to map it, they were operating in the 'historical-non-historical' or 'history-theology' dichotomy (Neyrey 1994; 2002). Hence, as Neyrey observes, "there is relatively little geographical

or topographical space of concern in the Fourth Gospel. 'Galilee' and 'Judea' are not real places, but code names for welcome or rejection" (2002:71). As a result, in general, this group of scholars see the Gospel of John using topography and geography teleologically and theologically (Riesner 2002; Meeks 1966.).

2.3. The Literary Function of Spaces and Places

Some Johannine scholars view the spatial allusions in John's Gospel as being merely literary devices meant to aid theological expression, while others understand that John was using well-known Hellenistic literary techniques such as the *Bios* (Burridge 1992). A slightly nuanced, but similar position views John as a skilled author in terms of ancient historiography (Bauckham 2006; 2007). For still others, this literary arrangement was reflective of the contestation of local traditions, for example the Cana-to-Cana or Galilee-to-Galilee arrangement (Smit 2007; Richardson 2002).

Finally, it should be noted that there are scholars who see in John's Gospel no spatial allusions useful for its interpretation. Bultmann is an outspoken exponent of this position. Of course, Bultmann is responding to the dominant historical concerns of his time. Hence, he is not interested in any spatial references, especially those that may encourage historical speculation.

2.4. Transcending the Level of Debate

From the above it is clear that Johannine scholarship is still influenced by an out-dated 'theology-history' dichotomy. This work sought therefore to transcend the current level of debate by allowing history and theology to co-exist, while at the same time allowing these categories to act as 'windows' into the social analysis of the Community behind the Fourth Gospel. At the same time, this work sought to emphasise the influence exerted on the reading of historical evidence and the Fourth Gospel itself as a result of the social location of readers. Although not working in the Fourth Gospel directly, scholars such as Moxnes (2001; 2003) and Sawicki (1997; 2000) have demonstrated the spatial

significance to the understanding of the 'wholeness' of 'works' like John. They pointed to the importance of identifying the social location of the reader as a vital methodological issue, both at the level of analysing the evidence and appropriating the meaning of the text.

3. The Need for a New Methodology

Having defined the concepts being dealt with, it was necessary to develop a methodological tool that could be useful in reading space and place in a narrative such as the Fourth Gospel.

The Johannine narrative, as with the other Gospels, was read as a 'religious history' in that it was a story about Jesus told for religious purposes in line with the life experiences of the community for whom it had been written, or from whom it had emerged. As such, space and place in a text of this nature was investigated the three levels of space (first, second, and third spaces) utilising:

i. The narrative analysis of characterisation developed by Kari Syreeni;
ii. Historical-critical approach to John
iii. The human geography of Edward William Soja;
iv. The sociology and philosophy of Henri Lefebvre.
v. The sociology of utopian sectarianism of Brian Wilson and John Whitworth.

3.1. The Focus on Historical and Concrete Spaces and Places

The first level of analysis focused on the historical and concrete spaces and places alluded to in the narrative. At this level of analysis, the point was made to investigate through historical means, not only the historical veracity of places and spaces alluded to in the text, but also how such places and spaces were conceived in first century CE Palestine from which the Fourth Gospel emerged. When, for example, John mentions the "fig tree" (John 1:48) the first level analysis sought to find out what constituted the

understanding of the "fig tree" in first century CE Palestine. Such spaces at this first level of analysis were not looked at in isolation from one another, but instead how they interacted in their wider spatial relationships within the narrative. For example, it was necessary to look at Nathanael sitting under the fig tree to understand the spatial significance of this particular tree. This is what Soja calls *first space* or as West and Schneiders have described as reading *behind the text*. Lefebvre would call this *space as perceived*.

3.2. The Functionality and Structural Ordering of Spaces and Places

The second level of analysis developed for reading space in the Fourth Gospel was the level of looking at spaces and places as they function in the narrative. While spaces and places could be mentioned in a narrative as mere reporting (*local setting*), closer examination will see that some places are given special description linked to narrative characterisation (*focal space*) (von Aarde 1991:118). This study however sought to show that the distinction between space as mere local setting or as focal space was difficult to make. It was further observed that in narratives, space is deliberately ordered and through space, narratives are also structured. At this level of analysis the most important issue was to detect any structural ordering of space in the narrative and how such ordering could help in the overall reading of the narrative. This is what is called the *first level of analysis* by Syreeni or what West and Schneiders describes as *reading the text itself*. While Soja calls this *second space,* Lefebvre calls this *space as represented*. The way I have used these categories is not the same way they were designed by the scholars I am using. I have combined them to produce a tool relevant for the present research.

3.3. The Transformation and Redemption of Spaces and Places

Since space, at the first level of analysis, both, in the narrative and in its concrete existence, is laden with 'ideological' and 'theological' interest, it was necessary to have a *third level of analysis* where these ideologies or theologies could be disclosed, analysed

and even, where necessary, 'neutralised'. This is what can be called, a 'transformative' and redeeming level of analysis.

At the first level of analysis, the historical representation of space, whether geographical or mental, is already laden with what Moxnes has called the "major cultural ideas" of the period (2001:26). Any journey to the past is mediated through the contemporary interests of the producers of that particular history whether they are aware of it or not. At this level of analysis the aim was to see how the authorial voice represents the spaces—as they are known from first level of analysis—to push the authorial agenda. It was at this level of analysis that the present researcher as a reader whose socio-spatial location has been attuned to particular spatial arrangements in the narrative, evaluated his own 'objectivity' in reading space in the text so that he would not impose any of his own spatial interests upon the texts uncritically. Indeed, the major aim of this third level of analysis was to redeem the spaces of those on the margins and bring them to prominence. In reading the Gospel of John it was at this level of analysis that pejorative spatial representations of the Samaritans in both history and scholarship were critiqued and redeemed. This third level of analysis is called *space as lived* by Lefebvre; *reading in front of the text* by West and Schneiders or *third space* by Soja.

3.4. Spatial Analysis: Reconstructing the Community behind the Fourth Gospel

These categorisations of analysis were not necessarily used in this work according to the way they were originally designed for by the scholars who originated them. They were specifically chosen because of their particular strengths in order to develop such a critical tool for spatial analysis. Syreeni, West and Schneiders' approaches allowed for both narrative and historical analysis. Their categorisations recognised the historical and narrative natures of a biblical text. West and Schneiders' deliberate interest in liberative ethics of reading also allowed for the development of the third level of analysis. Soja and Lefebvre allowed the location of investigation into its geographical, philosophical and sociological dimensions to come out. As such, the three levels of analysis were not seen as steps for doing exegesis but rather as important checks through which a text can be

approached. For this reason, the analysis was never done in any particular order; rather, the three levels of analysis informed each other as the analysis of a particular text was being undertaken. A combination of these three levels of analysis enabled the approximation in the reconstruction of the community behind the Fourth Gospel.

4. Findings of the Present Study

This research identified four main findings as central in the comprehension of Johannine spatiality:

i. The identity of Johannine characters was closely linked to the places of origin or the social spaces they occupied.
ii. Spatial conceptions concerning 'the sacred' were central to the understanding of space in the Gospel of John.
iii. The notion of displacement and dislocation encapsulated in the concept of diaspora proved central in approximating the spatial location of the community behind the Fourth Gospel.
iv. Utopian imagination or rejection of concrete place in preference to spiritual location was seen as the solution to the social and physical dislocation of the community behind the Fourth Gospel.

5. Overview of the Four Main Findings of the Present Study

A brief treatment of each of the four findings of this present study will now be given:

5.1. Finding 1. The identity of Johannine characters was closely linked to the places of origin or the social spaces they occupied.

It became clear from reading the early chapters of the Fourth Gospel that most of the characters presented are given significance in the world of the text depending on where they come from. While most of the disciples of Jesus in John came from Galilee, and

Cana of Galilee is presented as producing faith (John 2:11), Nathanael cannot come to Jesus because nothing good can come from Nazareth (John 1:46).

There appears a deliberate intention in the Fourth Gospel to present most characters hostile to Jesus as coming from Judea by calling them Ἰουδαῖοι (John 7:35). They even come to Galilee and oppose Jesus there (John 6:41). Sometimes these hostile people are called Jerusalemites (Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν) (John 7:25). The religious authorities—particularly the Pharisees—seem to encapsulate the wide spectrum of this body of people hostile to the Johannine Jesus (see Saldarini 2001:196). There are of course some Ἰουδαῖοι who believed in Jesus (John 11:45; 12:42). But in general, this title encompasses people from Judea who are opposed to Jesus and one reason they oppose him being that he is from Galilee (John 7:41- 52).

The sympathetic presentation of the Samaritans (John 4:4, 40; 8:48) and Greeks, argued in this study to be part of the Jewish diaspora, (John 7:35; 12:20) was also noted. In the Gospel of John, Jesus crosses all gender and ethnic boundaries in order to speak to a Samaritan woman whose faith and the faith of her people is noted in typical Johannine fashion, "…they asked him to stay (μεῖναι) with them" (John 4:39-40).

There are other spatial allusions that reveal how space and value is intended in the Gospel of John. For example, the Beloved Disciple is so close to Jesus that he can recline on the bosom (κόλπῳ) of Jesus (John 13:23). All other special privileges are also associated with spatial proximity. The Beloved disciple is the one who can have direct access to Jesus and then to disclose to the other disciples what Jesus is talking about (John 13:23-26). The Beloved disciple is also the one given responsibility over the mother of Jesus at Jesus' death (John 19:26). The closeness of Jesus to his Father is also described spatially as the one who is in the bosom (κόλπον) of the Father (John 1:18).

While space, especially physical space, is used as an identity marker in the Gospel of John, it is always being subverted by creating new identities that transcend existing regional markers. For example, Jesus does not see in Nathanael a Galilean who was

sitting under the fig tree, but a true Israelite (John 1:47). Israel is used to subvert all prominent persons from regional categories such as Samaria, Galilee and Judea. Jesus is only considered king of the Jews (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων) by those who mock him (John 18:33). Only those who reject Jesus' spiritual revelation manoeuvre to making him an earthly or a local king (John 6:15; 18:36-40). Jesus is even called a Samaritan or a diaspora Rabbi by those who mock him (John 8:48). Even though Jesus does not reject this regional label, in John these spatial categories are replaced by non-regional identity labels like Israel. Jesus is can idenitify with Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or the diaspora. But at the end his true home is the place of the Father, which is no place as such, making placelessness a virtue. If anyone is going to be a disciple of Jesus in the Gospel of John, then they must be delocalised. Removal or expulsion from place is the mark of ultimate discipleship in John.

5.2. Finding 2. Spatial conceptions concerning 'the sacred' were central to the understanding of space in the Gospel of John.

The Fourth Gospel gives a lot of thought to the Temple. Whether the Temple is in existence or no longer standing (this study assumes the Temple is no longer standing), the centrality of the Jerusalem Temple as a sacred place in the lives of Jewish people and that of Mount Gerizim for the Samaritan people is presented as 'first space' reality. The centrality of the Temple system and the Johannine Jesus' attitude to it is seen in the way the 'cleansing of the Temple' is placed at the beginning of the narrative in the Gospel of John while it is at the end in the Synoptic tradition.

In John, the exploitive business of the Temple is prophetically condemned. At a deeper level, the Temple as a physical space where the presence of God is supposed to be located is also rejected. The Johannine Jesus, in alluding to the destruction of the Temple (John 2:18-22), signals that a new experience of God will soon be ushered in or rather is being experienced in the community of John. Both the Temple in Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim in Samaria are rejected, not necessarily because of some supersessionist theology. They are rejected because they missed God's original purpose of God's

presence, in which God can be accessed anywhere and any time. The dichotomy is not between the sacred and profane as suggested by Neyrey (2002). In John, what really matters is the dichotomy between physical located-ness and spiritual un-located-ness. It is even not the body of Jesus which replaces the Temple because it is "fluid" as suggested by Neyrey (2002:71). In John, even the body of Jesus will be destroyed and only when it is destroyed and has been glorified does it cease to be a physical location but a spiritual presence that produces worship acceptable by God. It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh profits nothing (John 6:63).

5.3. Finding 3. The notion of displacement and dislocation encapsulated in the concept of diaspora proved central in approximating the spatial location of the community behind the Fourth Gospel.

It has already been noted above that notions of displacement and dislocation were seen as characterising ideal being. This notion is represented in direct and indirect ways. Indirectly, the incarnation of the Logos is presented as the spatial dislocation from the place of the Father to the cosmos (John 1:14). Although the people saw his glory, they did not realise that it was not the entire glory, they were still going to see, not the Word-made-flesh, but "heaven opened (τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα) and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (John 1:51). The flesh is not comparable with the spirit. That which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of spirit is spirit (John 3:6). By the Word leaving the placeless abode with the Father, the Word became dislocated. Whether John is here using neoplatonic ideas of *ideals* and *forms* consciously and deliberately or whether he draws on general Hellenistic ideas widespread in his context, we cannot be sure. This dislocation is confirmed by Jesus being rejected by his own (τὰ ἴδια), that is, those of the flesh and located in physical geographies (John 1:11; 4:44). His rejection and alienation reached its climax in his passion. The entire exile drama of Adam and Even being chased from the Garden of Eden was rehearsed by Jesus as if being led into exile (John 18). His entrance into the Praetorium is a clear entrance into Gentile territory, whereas the Temple authorities did not enter into the Praetorium "so as to avoid ritual defilement and to be able to eat the

Passover" (John 18:28). The alienation and exile of Jesus is also experienced by his followers in the Gospel of John as they are expelled from the Synagogue as the symbol of community of Israel. Johannine discipleship is characterised by being exiled (ἐξέβαλον and ἀποσυνάγωγος) from Jewish community (John 9:22, 34, 35). That this could be reflective of the 'first spaces' of the Johannine Community has also been argued in this thesis.

There is direct allusion to diaspora. Just as Jesus was accused of being a Samaritan, which he does not reject, he is also accused of planning to go into the diaspora of the Greeks (Διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων) to teach the Greeks (John 7:35). This is a direct allusion to the Greeks. Some Greeks arrived to worship at the Temple, but when they arrived they sought instead to see (ἰδεῖν) Jesus (John 12:20-21). This is not the mere mention of people as flat characters in a story. It is clear that at their arrival, the climax of the narrative is reached. All along Jesus would say 'the hour is coming' but now he can say the 'hour has come' (John 12:23). This turn of the narrative shows that the Greeks and the diaspora Israelites form a Johannine focal space, such space possibly being reflective of the location of the Community of John itself.

In terms of a 'first space' level of analysis, many Israelites were known to live in the diaspora among the gentiles in first century CE. Among some of them there lingered thoughts of 'return' and at different levels the eschatological restoration back to Palestine. In reality, only a few ever returned. Two questions thus came to the fore:

- How then did the majority of the diaspora deal with such hopes even if they did not share in them?
- How did they deal with these hopes within their communities?

Smith's work on the ritualisation of return was useful in understanding this complex scenario. By participating in rituals of return, the diaspora Jews dealt with the perpetual urge to return without necessarily returning.

If our assessment is correct, we can see that the Community of John also ritualised their return as a means of 'third spacing' their experience of exile. This was expressed through different metaphors of restoration traditionally associated with the eschatological restoration of Israel at the coming of the messiah. The abundant supply of food at the feeding of the five thousand signified by the twelve baskets of fragments (κλάσματα) was understood in such terms (John 6:5-15). According to the Gospel of John, the twelve baskets were seen to represent the gathering of the twelve tribes of Israel who had erstwhile been scattered. The expected ingathering would be made possible by the death of Jesus (John 11:51-52). The Greek diaspora was then seen as the "other sheep" that Jesus must bring under one shepherd (John 10:16). This was seen to make sense as the Johannine Jesus had already 'called in' the Galileans, Samaritans, and Judeans. It is no wonder therefore that Jesus exclaimed the 'hour had come' when he saw the Greek-speaking Jews arriving.

Apart from the ingathering of the people of God and the abundance of food in this eschatological age, the ritual of return could also be dramatised by the rehearsal of the resurrection stories, both the one of Lazarus and that of Jesus. While Jesus' passion and burial reflected diaspora, his resurrection would reflect return and the gathering of many. The grain of wheat must fall into the earth and die, or else it remains alone (John 12:24). It is not surprising therefore that at the raising of Lazarus many Jews who had come to console Mary "believed in Him" (John 11:45). As a result of Lazarus' rising from the dead, "the crowd went to meet him" (John 12:18) because they heard he had performed this sign, such that the authorities said "the world has gone after him!" (John 12:19). It is within the context of the coming of the Greek-speaking Israelites that the ritual of restoration is richly expressed. Through this ritualisation of return, there would be no need to be restored to Palestine if God's covenantal presence could be experienced anywhere. The physical place called 'home' becomes obsolete through this ritualisation of return. This 'third spacing' is so effective that in John's Gospel it is the moment of glory. Since the glory had departed from the Temple and hence from Palestine when the Temple was destroyed, now is the moment of the return of the glory, but not necessarily at the Temple in Palestine. Wherever God's people are even if it means in the dispersion

among the scattered Jews in the wider Mediterranean God is with them and his glory does not leave them. The same *Shekina* who had accompanied them was actually Jesus. It was the one whose day Abraham rejoiced to see (8:56) and the one they search for from the scriptures (5:39), the true word of God which they must eat and drink so that they will not die. In this sense Jesus is not replacing the Temple, but since he precedes it, he is only restoring true and original worship, according to John.

5.4. Finding 4. Utopian imagination or rejection of concrete place in preference to spiritual location was seen as the solution to the social and physical dislocation of the community behind the Fourth Gospel.

Sociologically, the Johannine Community was seen to be living within a utopian construction, where all places are rendered insignificant in comparison to no place. Reading the FD through the sociology of utopia, it was concluded that the Johannine Community exhibited characteristics of a utopian sect. As a utopian sect, the Johannine Community saw their existence juxtaposed to that of the 'world' marked with clear distinctions. To use the words of Whitworth, as a utopian community, the Johannine Community would have regarded the world as "a place in which corrupt social institutions almost inevitably foster the corruption of individuals and their estrangement from God" (1975:5).

As a utopian sect, the community of John claim to have received special and exclusive revelation of God's will for all people. Instead of hoping for the establishment of some good place somewhere in the near or distant future, they already had a programme in place. They knew the 'way', the 'truth', and the 'life' (John 14:6). On condition of following this 'way' and this 'truth', a utopian existence could be established as 'life' in the here and now. By being members of the utopian sect, they knew the truth, but they were also required to live it (John 13:17). No one could come to the Father except through knowing the truth about Jesus (John 14:6).

The FD is replete with the conditional 'if'. If Jesus as the master (ὁ κύριος) has washed the feet of the servants, they must wash one another's feet in order to establish the utopian sect, (John 13:14). Foot washing signifies submission one to another. This satisfies one internal requirement of the sectarian arrangement, that they should serve one another in love. Just as Jesus loved the Father and obeyed the Father, so this community should love one another so as to show the world that they are the disciples of Jesus (John 13:35). Although utopian sects view the outside world with abhorrence and hence seek to insulate themselves from its contamination, at the same time they intend to "demonstrate the perfection and joy of their lives to persons in the world" (Whitworth 1975:2). The Johannine Community thus seeks to demonstrate that it is the nucleus of the presence of God, not as an *oikos* or physical building, but as an *oikia,* the household, and the wealth of the presence of God. This is possible because the utopian establishment is dependent upon human agency under God's spiritual leadership. Leadership is not offered by the fleshly persons including Jesus but by the presence of the Spirit who proceeds from Jesus and the Father. The era of the Spirit is an era of no place (*outopia*), which is the true place. This becomes the ultimate answer to the dislocation of John's Community. It is located in no-place. No place is the ultimate place.

6. Implications of this Present Study

This present study is applicable to many different situations. In the contemporary world, this study provides a critique of the current obsession with physical locations and places, otherwise labelled 'territory'. The Gospel of John rejects identities that are fixed on regional locations for purposes of marginalising the 'other'. In the Johannine understanding, margins and centres are highlighted, only to be exposed and subverted. Place-less-ness means no centres and hence no margins and no peripheries. This understanding in reference to access to the divine substantially reduces those supposed divine powers centralised to institutions and individuals. The Gospel of John would say, even though the divine is accessed at particular concentrations of that presence, the divine is accessed equally wherever the conditions of washing one another's feet takes place, i.e., where there is a mutuality of subordination. By creating centres at the margins for

those who are rejected and alienated, agency is exercised in their own emancipation. If they allow the exile to constrain them, they remain exiled. If the concrete return is prolonged, it is by seeing possibilities of 'being at home' while in exile that emancipation will be experienced. However, utopian imagination is not life in denial. Rather, it is founded in the ability to tap into that ideal whose realisation is conditioned upon human agency "under divine tutelage and surveillance" to use the words of Whitworth (1975:2).

7. Suggestions for Further Research

Within this present study, the gendering of space was alluded to in reference to the tomb and the well as evidently spaces that women in the Gospel of John occupy. Although some scholarly work has been done, especially concerning the well, there seems to be much still to be accomplished so that it can be seen how these spaces fit into the entire Gospel narrative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abram, D. 1996. *The Spell of the Sensuous*. New York: Vintage Books.

Abrams, M. H. 1953. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition.* London: Oxford University.

Achtemeier, P., J. Green, and M. Thompson. (eds). 2001. *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology.* Cambridge: Grand Rapids.

Achtner, W., S. Kunz, and T. Walter. 2002. *Dimensions of Time: The Structures of the Time of Humans, of the World, and of God*. Translated by Arthur H. Williams, Jr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Adamson, R. 1903. *The Development of Modern Philosophy.* Volumeume. 1. London: William Blackwood.

Adjaye, J. K. (ed). 1994. *Time in the Black Consciousness: Contributions in Afro-American and African Studies*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Aharoni Y. and Michael Ari Yonah. 1968, 1977. *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*. London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Albertz, R. 2003. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century BCE.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Allen, D. 1985. *Philosophy for Understanding Theology.* Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Alexander, P. 1983. 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch. In James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volumeume 1.* New York: Doubleday.

Alexander, P. H. et al (eds). 1999. *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies.* Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Applebaum, S. 1977. Judea as a Roman Province. Pages 355-396. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms in Spiegel der Neueren Forschung II.* Edited by Temporini, H. and Haase, W. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Ashtekar, A. 2005. Space and Time: From Antiquity to Einstein and Beyond. Unpublished Paper Presented at the Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Utrecht.

Ashton, J. 1991. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Attias, J. and E. Benbassa. 2003. *Israel, the Impossible Land.* Stanford, Stanford University Press: Stanford University Press.

Attrige, H. W. 2002. Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121/1, 3-21.

Aune, D. E. 1972. *The Cultic Setting of Realised Eschatology in Early Christianity.* Leiden: Brill.

Baird, W. 2003. *History of New Testament Research. Volume Two: From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Baltzer, K. 1971. *The Covenant Formulary.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Bammel, E. 1992. Die Abschiedsrede des Johannesevangeliums und ihr Jüdischer Hintergrund. *Neotestamentica* 26/1, 1-12.

Barash, M. 2000. Apocalyptic Space. Pages 306-326 in *Apocalyptic Time. Studies in the History of Religions* 86. Edited by Albert I. Baumgarten. Leiden: Brill.

Barclay, J. M. G. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE- 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Barker, M. and Christensen, K. 2008. Seeking the Face of the Lord: Joseph Smith and the First Temple Traditon. Pages 143-174 in *Joseph Smith Jr: Reappraisal after Two Centuries.* Edited by Neilson, R. L. and Givens, T. L. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barrett, C. K. 1955-60. *The Gospel according to St John*. London: SPCK.

Barth, M. and H. Blanke. 2000. *The Letter to Philemon: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bassler, J. 1981. The Galileans: A Neglected Factor in Johannine community Research. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43, 243-257.

Bauckham, R. 2006. Messianism According to the Gospel of John. Pages 34-68 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. [WUNT 2/ 219]. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2007. Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John. *New Testament Studies* 53/1, 17-36.

Bediako, K. 1995. John Mbiti's Contribution to African Theology. Pages 367-390 in *Religious Plurality in Africa: Essays in Honour of John S. Mbiti*. Edited by Olupona, J. K. and Nyang, S. S. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Becker, J. 1982. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. 2 Volumeumes. ÖTK 4/1-2. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Bell, C. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, C. 2001. *In Search of Jesus: Insider and Outsider Images.* London: Continuum.

Berger, P. and T. Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality.* New York: Anchor Books.

Bergmann, S. 2007. Theology in its Spatial Turn: Space, Place and Built Environments Challenging and Changing the Images of God. *Religion Compass* 1/3, 353-379.

Berquist J. L. 1999. Theories of Space and Construction of the Ancient World: Constructs of the Social and Cultural Worlds of Antiquity Group. Unpublished Paper Presented at AAR/SBL Annual Meeting November 20.

Best, S. and D. Kellner. 1997. *The Postmodern Turn.* New York: Guilford Press.

Beth N. A. 1994. What's a Bamah? How Sacred Space Functioned in Ancient Israel. *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/3, 18-29.

Bimson, J. J. et al. 1977. *The New Bible Atlas*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Blenkinsopp, J. 2000. Isaiah 1-39: *A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

Bloch-Smith, E. 2002. Solomon's Temple: The Politics of Ritual Space. Pages 83-94 in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Edited by Barry M. Gittlen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Blunt, A. 2005. *Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian Women and the Spatial Politics of Home.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bochner, S. 1973. Space. Pages 295-307 in *The Dictionary of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas.* Volumeume. 4. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons.

Boer, R. 1996. Decentred and Utopian Politics: 3 Reigns 11-14 and 2 Chronicles 10-13. *Semeia*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 198-285.

———. 2000. Sanctuary and Womb: Henri Lefebvre and the Production of Space. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series* 39, 24-48.

———. 2003. Sanctuary and Womb: Henri Lefebvre and the Production of Ancient Space. Pages 162-184 in *Redirected Travel: Alternative Journeys and Places in Biblical Studies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series* 382. Edited by Roland Boer and Edgar W. Conrad. London: T. and T. Clark.

Boguslaw, R. 1992. Utopian Analysis and Design. Pages 2211-2216 in *Encyclopedia of Sociology.* Volumeume 4. Edited by E. F. Borgatta and M. L. Borgatta. New York: Macmillan.

Borgen, P. 1986. God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel. Pages 83-95 in *The Interpretation of John.* Edited by J. Ashton. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Boudon, R. and F. Bourricaud. 1982. *A Critical Dictionary of Sociology*. Translated by Peter Hamilton. Chicago: Chicago Press.

Braatvedt, H. P. 1949. *Roaming Zululand with a Native Commissioner.* Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.

Branham, J. R. 1995. Vicarious Sacrality: Temple Space in Ancient Synagogues. Pages 319-345 in *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery.* Volume. 2. *Studia Post-Biblica* 47. Edited by Dan Urman, and Paul V. M. Flesher. Leiden: Brill.

Brinkman, J. 1992. *The Perception of Space in the Old Testament: An Exploration of the Methodological Problems of its Investigation, Exemplified by a Study of Exodus 25 to 31.* Kampen: Kok Pharos.

Brodie, T. L. 1993. *The Quest for the Origin of the John's Gospel: A Source-oriented Approach.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1993. *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological* Commentary. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bromley, S. 1999. The Space of Flows and Timeless Time: Manuel Castells' The Information Age. *Radical Philosophy* 97, 6-17.

Brown, J. K. 2002. *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective: The Portrayal and function of the Matthean Disciples.* [Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 9]. Leiden: Brill.

Brown, J. P. 1986. The Templum and the Saeculum: Sacred Space and Time in Israel and Etruria. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98, 415-433.

Brown, R. E. 1979. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple.* New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1982. *The Anchor Bible: The Gospel According to John (i-xii): A New Translation and Commentary.* New York: Doubleday.

———. 1983. Not Jewish Christianity or Gentile Christianity, but Types of Jewish/ Gentile Christianity. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45, 74-79.

———. 1988. *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary.* Collegeville: Liturgical Press

———. 2004. Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel. *Theological Studies* 36, 688-699.

Brownowski, J. and B. Mazliah. 1960. *The Western Intellectual Tradition.* New York: Harper and Row.

Bruce, F. F. 1994. *The Gospel of John Introduction, Exposition and Notes.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Brueggemann, W. 1997. *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile and Homecoming.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

———. 1982. *Genesis: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching.* Atlanta: John Knox Press.

———. 1998. *Isaiah 40-66.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

———. 2003. *An Introduction to the Old Testament:The Canon and Christian Imagination.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press

Brunson, A. C. 2003. *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Bultmann, R. 1951. *Theology of the New Testament.* Volume. I. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

———. 1955. Theology of the New Testament. Volume. 2. London: SCM Press.

———. 1956. *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

———. 1963 (Revised 1972). *The History of Synoptic Tradition.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1971. *The Gospel of John: A commentary.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1984. *New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Burge, G. M. 1987. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Burridge, R. A. 2004. *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Second Edition. Dearborn: Dove Booksellers.

Caird, G. B. 1968/69. The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics. *New Testament Studies* 15, 265-77.

Camp, C. V. 2002. Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple. Pages 64-80 in *Imaging' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honour of James W. Flanagan. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series* 359. Edited by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Campenhausen, H. 1964. *The Fathers of the Latin Church*. London: A. and C. Black.

Capper, B. J. 2005. To Keep Silent, Ask Husbands at Home, and Not to Have Authority Over Men. Part II (I Corinthians 14:33-36 and I Timothy 2:11-12). The Transition from Gathering in Private to Meeting in Public Space in Second Generation Christianity and the Exclusion of Women from Leadership of the Public Assembly. *Theologische Zeitschrift* 61, 301-319.

Capps, D. 2001. Melancholia, Utopia, Psychoanalysis of Dreams. Pages 85-104 in *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion.* Edited by R. K. Fenn. Malden: Blackwell.

Card, C. 2005. *The Atrocity Paradigm: A Theory of Evil.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carson, D. A. 1978. Current Source Criticism of the Fourth Gospel: Some Methodological Questions. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97/3, 411-429.

———. 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

———. 2002. *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Castelli, E. A.2004. The *ekklesia* of Women and/as Utopian Space. Locating the Work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in Feminist Utopian Thought. Pages 36-52 in *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds. Essays in Honour of*

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. Edited by Jane Schaberg, Alice Bach and Esther Fuchs. New York: Continuum.

Charlesworth, J. H. (ed) 1972. A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13-4:26 and the Dualism Contained in the Gospel of John. Pages 76-106 in *John and Qumran.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. London: Geoffrey Chapman.

———. 2006. Jesus Research and Archaeology: A New Perspective. Pages 11-63 in *Jesus and Archaeology.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

———. 2007. Can we Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch? Pages 450-469 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*,. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Charpentier, E. 1982. *How to Read the Old Testament.* London: SCM Press.

Chilton, Bruce D. 1997. Salvific Exile in the Isaiah Targum. Pages 239-247 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions.* Edited by J. M. Scott. Leiden: Brill.

———. and C. A. Evans. (eds). 1994. *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research.* Leiden: Brill.

Childs, Brevard. S. 2001. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Christiano, K. J., W. H. Swatos, Jr. and Kivisto, P. 2002. *Sociology of Religion: Contemporary Developments.* Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Chyutin, M. 2006. *Architecture and Utopia in the Temple Era*. London: T. and T. Clark.

Clarke, P. and A. Linzey. 1996. *Dictionary of Ethics, Theology and Society*. London: Routledge.

Clines, David J. A. 1998. Sacred Space, Holy Places and Suchlike. Pages 542-554 in '*On the Way to the Postmodern': Old Testament Essays, 1967-1998*. Volume.2. *Journal for the study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series* 293. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Coggins, R. 1998. Jewish Local Patriotism: The Samaritan Problem. Pages 66-78 in *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period.* Edited by S. Jones and S. Pearce. *Journal of the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series* 31.

Cohen, S. J. D 1987. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Cohen, R. and P. Kennedy. 2000. *Global Sociology*. London: Macmillan.

Coloe, M. 2001. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel.* Collegeville: Liturgical.

Collins, J. 1998. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, R. F. 1990. *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel. Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs.* Leuven: Peeters Press

Conzelmann, H. 1960. *Theology of St. Luke.* London: Faber.

Coogan, M. D. (ed). 2001. *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, W.R. 1984. The "Glory" Motif in the Johannine Corpus. In JETS 27 (1984), 291-7.

Cornelius, S. and P. J. Venter. 2000. (Cyber) Space... "The final frontier". The Future of Ancient Studies in the Digital World. *Journal of Northwest Semitic languages* 26/1, 153-169.

Connolly, P. 1999. *The Holy Land.* Oxford : Oxford University Press

Cousins, E. H. (ed). 1973. *Hope and the Future of Men.* London: Garnstone Press.

Cowley, A. 1923. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cox, C. A. 1998. *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Crampton, J. W. and S. Elden. (eds). 2007. *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography.* Burlington: Ashgate.

Crang, M. and N. Thrift. (eds). 2000. *Thinking Space*. London: Routledge.

Crone, G. R. 1953. *Maps and their Makers*. London: Hutchinson.

Crown, A. D. 1989. The Samaritan Diaspora. Pages 195-217 in *The Samaritans.* Edited by A. D. Crown. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Cullmann, Oscar. 1951. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History.* London: SCM Press.

———. 1959-60 A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. *Expository Times* 71: 8-12, 39-43.

———. 1975. *The Johannine Circle: Its Place in Judaism, Among the Disciples of Jesus, and in Early Christianity.* London: SCM Press.

Culpepper, R. A. and C. C. Black. (eds). 1996. *Exploring the. Gospel of John in Honour of D. Moody Smith.* Louisville: John Knox Press.

D'Agapeyeff, A. and C. C. R. Hadfield. 1942. *Maps*. London: Oxford University Press.

Daise, M. A. 2007. Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus' "Hour" in the Fourth Gospel. [WUNT 2.229]. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Daneel, M. L. 1971. *The Background and Rise of Southern Shona Independent Churches.* Leiden: Mouton.

Davies, P. R. 2002. Space and Sects in the Qumran Scrolls. Pages 81-98 in*'Imaging' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honour of James W. Flanagan. Journal for the study of the Old Testament.* Edited by David M. Gunn, and Paula M. McNutt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. *Supplement Series* 359.

Davies, T. W. 1897. Milestones in Religious History: Or Tent Temple, Tabernacle, Synagogue, and Church. *The Biblical World* 10/1, 1-23.

Davies, W. D. 1974. *The Gospel and the Land*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1996. Reflections on Aspects of the Jewish Background of the Gospel of John. Pages 43-64 in *Exploring the Gospel of John in Honour of D. Moody Smith.* Edited by R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black. Louisville: John Knox Press.

de Jonge, M. 2004. The Conflict between Jesus and the Jews and the Radical Christology of the Fourth Gospel. *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 20:341-355.

Dawson, D. 1992. *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.

DeConick, A. 2001. Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament.* Supplement Series 157.

Dennis, J. A. 2006. *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel: The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology of John 11.47-52.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Dever, W. G. 1997. Biblical Archaeology. Pages 315-319 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East.* Volume. 1. Edited by E. M. Meyers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

de Wit, H. (ed). 2004. *Through the Eyes of Another: Intercultural Reading of the Bible.* Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.

Delaney, D. 2005. *Territory: A Short Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dewey, W. J. 1986. Shona Male and Female Artistry. *African Arts* 19/3, 64-84.

Dibelius, M. 1934. *From Tradition to Gospel.* New York: Scribner.

Dilke, O. A. W. 1985. *Greek and Roman Maps*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Dobschütz, E. V. 1922. Zeit und Raum im Denken des Urchristentums. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 12, 223.

Dodd, Charles H. 1963. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

———. 1970. Some Considerations upon Historical aspects of the Fourth Gospel. Pages 82-96 in *In Search of the Historical Jesus: A Source Book*. Edited by H. K. McArthur. London: S.P.C.K.

Domeris, William R. 1991. The Farewell Discourse: An Anthropological Perspective. *Neotestamentica* 25/2, 233-272.

———.1991. Sociological and Social Historical Investigations. Pages 215-233 in *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament.* Edited by Hartin, P. J. and Petzer, J. H. Leiden: Brill.

Douglas, M. T. 1970. "Introduction: Thirty Years after Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic." Pages xiii-xxxviii in *Witchcraft Confessions and Accusations.* Edited by M. Douglas. London: Tavistock Publications.

———. 1982. *Natural Symbols: Exploration of Cosmology.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Dozeman, T. B. 2007. Biblical Geography and Critical Spatial Studies. Pages 87-108 in *Constructions of Space 1: Theory, Geography, and Narrative.* Edited by J. L. Berquist and C. V. Camp. London: T. and T. Clark.

Drake, S. 1978. *Galileo at Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Draper, Jonathan A. 1992. The Sociological Function of the Spirit/Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses of the Fourth Gospel. *Neotestamentica* 26/1, 13-29.

———. 1997. Temple, Tabernacle and Mystical Experience in John. *Neotestamentica* 31/2, 263-288.

———. 1998. Weber, Theissen and the Wandering Charismatics of the Didache. In *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6/4, 1998, 541-576.

———. 1999. "My Father is Working until Now and I am Working" (John 5:17): Reflections on a Theology of Work and Rest. *Bulletin for Contextual Theology* 6/3, 43-47.

———. 2000. Holy Seed and the Return of the Diaspora in John 12:24. *Neotestamentica* 34/2, 347-359.

———. 2002. What did Isaiah See? Angelic Theophany in John 20:11-18. *Neotestamentica* 36/1-2, 63-76.

———. 2003. "The Closed Text and the Heavenly Telephone: The Role of the *Bricoleur* in Oral Mediation of Sacred Text in the Case of George Khambule and the Gospel of John". Pages 57-89 in *Orality, Literacy and Colonialism in Southern Africa.* Semeia Studies 46. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper. Leiden/Pietermaritzburg: Brill/Scholars Press/Cluster Publications.

Dube, M. W. and Staley, J. L. (eds). 2002. *John and Postcolonialism. Travel, Space and Power.* London: Sheffield Academic Press.

———. 2002. Reading for Decolonisation (John 4:1-42). Pages 51-75 in *John and Postcolonialism. Travel, Space and Power. The Bible and Postcolonialism* 7. Edited by Musa W. Dube and Jeffrey L. Staley. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

———. and Jeffrey L. Staley. 2002. Descending from and Ascending into Heaven: A Postcolonial Analysis of Travel, Space and Power in John. Pages 1-10 in *John and Postcolonialism. Travel, Space and Power. The Bible and Postcolonialism* 7. Edited by Musa W. Dube and Jeffrey L. Staley. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Dunderberg, I. 2006. *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict?: Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas.* Oxford. : Oxford University Press

Durkheim, E. 1969. The Social foundations of Religion. Pages 42-54 in *Sociology of Religion.* Edited by R. Robertson. Baltimore: Penguin.

du Toit, C. W. 1998. *Reading the Universe through Science, Religion and Ethics: The Evolving Science and Religion Debate.* Pretoria: Research Institute for Theology and Religion.

Eakin, F. E. 1998. *What Price Prejudice? Christian Anti-Semitism in America*. New York: Paulist.

Edwards, D. R. 1999. Jews and Christians at Ancient Chersonesus: The Transformation of Jewish Public Space. Pages 158-173 in *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress.* Edited by Howard Clark Kee and Lynn H. Cohick. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Ehrenreich, B. 2007. *Dancing in the Streets: A History of Collective Joy.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

Ehrman, B. D. 2004. *A Brief Introduction to the New Testament.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eliade, M. 1958. *The Rites and Symbols of Initiation*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Eliade, M. 1959, 1961. *The Sacred and the Profane*. New York: Harvest House.

Elior, R. 2000. Breaking the Boundaries of Time and Space in Kabbalistic Apocalypticism. Pages 187-197 in *Apocalyptic Time. Studies in the History of Religions* 86. Edited by Albert I. Baumgarten. Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S. N. 1968. *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elliott-Binns, L. E. 1956. Galilean Christianity. London: SCM Press.

Ellis, P. F. 1984. *The Genius of John: a Composition Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.* Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Estes, D. C. 2008. *The Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel: A Theory of Hermeneutical Relativity in the Gospel of John.* Leiden: Brill.

Evans, C. A. and S. E. Porter. 1987. *New Testament Backgrounds: A Sheffield Reader.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

———. and J. A. Sanders. 1997. *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. [JSNTS 148].

Falk, Z. W. 1974. Jewish Private Law. Pages 504-533 in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Volume 1. Edited by S. Safrai, M. Stern, D. Flusser, and W. C. van Unnik. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Farmer, C. S. 1996. Changing images of the Samaritan Woman in Early Reformed Commentaries on John. *Church History* 65/3, 365-375.

Fausett, D. 1993. *Writing the New World: Imaginary Voyages and Utopias of the Great Southern Land.* New York: Syracuse University Press.

Fehribach, A. 1998. *The Women in the Life of the Bridegroom: A Feminist Historical-Literary Analysis of the Female Characters in the Fourth Gospel.* Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Feldman, L. H. (ed). 1987. *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1993. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1997. The Concept of Exile in Josephus. Pages 145-172 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conception.* Edited by J. Scott. Leiden: Brill.

Ferguson, E. 2003. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fiddes, P. S. 2003. The Canon as Space and Place. Pages 127-149 in *Die Einheit der Schrift und die Vielfalt des Kanons/The Unity of Scripture and the Diversity of the Canon. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 118. Edited by John Barton, John and Michael Wolter. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter .

Fitter C. 1995. *Poetry, Space, Landscape: Towards a New Theory*. Cambridge: University Press.

Fitzmyer, J. A. 1981. *The Gospel according to Luke.* Garden City: Doubleday.

Flanagan, N. M. 1989. John. Pages 481-1020 in *The Collegeville Bible Commentary: Based on the New American Bible with Revised New Testament.* Edited by D. Bergant and R. J. Karris. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Flanagan, J. W. 1999. Ancient Perceptions of Space/Perceptions of Ancient Space. *Semeia* 87, 15-43.

Fossum, J. 1995. The Son of Man's Alter Ego: John 1:51, Targumic Tradition and Jewish Mysticism. Pages 135-151 in *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology.* Edited by Fossum, J. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Freed, E. D. 1968. Samaritan Influence in the Gospel of John. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30, 580-587.

Freyne, S. 1980. *Galilee: From Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

———. 1997. Archaeology and the Historical Jesus. Pages 117-144 in *Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation.* Edited by J. R. Bartlett. London: Routledge.

———. 2000. *Galilee and Gospel: Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2001. The Geography of Restoration: Galilee-Jerusalem Relations in Early Jewish and Christian Experience. *New Testament Studies* 47, 289-311.

———. 2002. *Texts, Contexts and Cultures*. Dublin: Veritas.

———. 2004. *Jesus, a Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus-Story.* London: T and T Clark.

Fuglseth, K. S. 2005. *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 volume 119). Leiden: Brill

Furley, D. 1989. *Cosmic Problems.* Cambridge: University Press.

Gafni, I. M. 1997. *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Gager, J. C. 1982. 'Shall we marry our Enemies? Sociology and the New Testament'. In *Interpretation* 36, (1982), 256-265.

Galor, K. 2000. The Roman-Byzantine Dwelling in the Galilee and the Golan: 'House' or 'Apartment'? Pages 118-119 in *Miscellanea.* Edited by R. R. Holloway. Providence: Brown University Press.

Gardner J. L. (ed). 1987. *Reader's Digest Atlas of the Bible*. Fourth Printing. New York: Readers' Digest Association

Gardner, H. 1983. *Frames of the Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.* London: Heinemann.

Garrard, A. 2001. *The Splendor of the Temple: A Pictorial Guide to Herod's Temple and its' Ceremonies.* Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

Garsiel, M. 1991. *Biblical Names: A Literary Study of Midrashic Derivations and Puns.* Jerusalem: Bar-llan University Press.

Gaster, T. H. 1961. *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East.* New York: Anchor

Gawlikowski, M. 1982. The Sacred Space in Ancient Arab Religions. Pages 301-303 in *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan*. Edited by Adnan Hadidi. Amman: Department of Antiquities.

Gaylord, H. E. 1983. Greek Apocalypse of Baruch: A New Translation and Introduction. Pages 653-679 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Volume 1. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Gelfand, M. 1966. *An African's Religion, the Spirit of Nyajena: Case History of a Karanga People.* Cape Town: Juta and Company.

Gera, D. L. 2003. *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language, and Civilization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gertoux, G. 2002. *The Name Of God Y.E.H.O.W.A.H Which Is Pronounced As It Is Written I_EH_OU_AH: Its Story.* New York: University Press of America.

Gibney, M. J. and R. Hansen. 2005. *Immigration and Asylum.* Oxford: ABC-CLIO.

Gieschen, C. A. 2003. The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology. *Vigiliae Christianae* 57/2, 115-158.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gill, S. 1998. Territory. Pages 298-313 in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies.* Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gitin, S. 2002. The Four-Horned Altar and Sacred Space: An Archaeological Perspective. Pages 95-123 in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Edited by Barry M. Gittlen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Gleason, K. L. 1997. Gardens of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. Pages 385-386 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*. Volume. 2. Edited by E. M. Meyers. Oxford: Oxford University.

Gleeson, B. 1998. *Geographies of Disability.* London: Routledge.

Glouberman, M. 1986. *Descartes: the Probable and the Certain.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Gold, V. R. 1958. The Mosaic Map of Madaba. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 21/3, 49-71.

Goldhill, S. 2004. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. London: Profile Books.

Goldstein, J. H. 1980. *Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Gorman, F. H. Jr. 1990. The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series* 91. Sheffield: Journal of the Study of the Old Testament.

———. 1993. Priestly Rituals of Founding: Time, Space, and Status. Pages 47-64 in *History and Interpretation. Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes*. *Journal for the study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 173. Edited by M. Patrick Graham, William P. Brown and Jeffrey K. Kuan. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Gundry, R. 1967. In My Father's House are many Monai' (John 14:2). *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 58, 68-72.

Green, J. B. (ed). 1995. *Hearing the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

Green, W. S. 1992. A. T. Kraabel: An Appreciation. Pages xv-xvi in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honour of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel.* Edited by A. Overman, and R. MacLennan. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Gregory, D. 2000. Edward Said's Imaginative Geographies. Pages 302-348 in *Thinking Space.* Edited by M. Crang and N. Thrift. New York: Routledge Publishers details?

Groh, D. 1997. The Clash between Literary and Archaeological Models of Provincial Palestine. Pages 29-37 in *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods.* Edited by D. R. Edwards and C. T. McCollough. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Gruen, E. 2004. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gunn, D. M. 2000. Entertainment, Ideology, and the Reception of "History": "David's Jerusalem" as a Question of Space. Pages 153-161 in *A Wise and Discerning Mind: Essays in Honour of Burke O. Long.* Brown Judaic Studies 325. Edited by Saul M. Olyan, Saul M. and Robert C. Culley. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. and P. M. McNutt. 2002. *Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honour of James W. Flanagan*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Gurevitch, Z. 1994. Aran, Gideon: Never in place: Eliade and Judaic Sacred Space. *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions* 39/87, 135 -152.

Hakola, R. 2005. *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness.* Leiden: Brill.

Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D., and Thompson, K. 1995. *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies.* Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Halpern, B. 1988. *First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Hammer, J. 2005. *Palestinians Born in Exile: Diaspora and the Search for a Homeland.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hamid-Khani, S. 2000. *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: An Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck

Han, K. S. 2002. *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement: The Q Community's Attitude toward the Temple.* London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Hanley, E. A. 1909. The Destruction of Jerusalem: Mark, Chap. 13. *The Biblical World* 34/1, 45-46.

Hanson, K. C. and D. E. Oakman. 1998. *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Harada, H. 2000. *Aspects of Post-war German and Japanese Drama (1945-1970): Reflections on War, Guilt, and Responsibility.* Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Hargrove, B. 1984. Religion and Sociology of Knowledge: An Introduction. Pages 3-14 in *Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge: Modernisation and Pluralism in Christian Thought and Structure.* Edited by B. Hargrove. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Hartenstein, J. 2005. Women in John's Gospel. *Theology Digest* 52/2, 127-131.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The Condition of Post Modernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hasel, G. 1978. *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Heim, M. S. 2006. *Saved From Sacrifice: A Theology of the Cross.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Helgeland, J. 1980. Time and Space: Christian and Roman. Pages 1285-1305 in *Religion.* Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Verhältnis zu römischem Staat und heidnischer Religion. Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.23.2. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hengel, Martin. 1989. *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM Press.

———. 2000. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. Transl. by John Bowden. London: SCM Press.

Hertzberg, A. 1961. J*udaism*. New York: G. Braziller.

Herzog, W. R. 2000. *Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God: A Ministry of. Liberation.* Louisville: John Knox Press.

———. 2005. *Prophet and Teacher: An Introduction to the Historical Jesus*. Louisville: John Knox Press.

Hezser, C. 2001. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine. Tübingen* :Mohr Siebeck

Hill, M. 1973. *A Sociology of Religion.* New York: Basic Books.

Hinckfuss, I. 1975. *The Existence on Space and Time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hitchcock, T. and J. Esposito. (eds). 2004. *The Geography of Religion: Where God lives, where Pilgrims walk.* Washington D.C.: National Geographic.

Hirschfeld, Y. 1995. *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman Byzantine Period.* Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press and Israel Exploration Society.

Hoehner, H. W. 1972. *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holm, J. and J. Bowker. (eds). 1994. *Rites of Passage.* London: Pinter Publishers.

Holwerda, D. 1959. *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John: A Critique of Rudolph Bultmann's Present Eschatology.* Kampen: J H Kok.

Holt-Jensen, A. 1980. *Geography: Its History and Concepts*. London: Harper and Row.

Hope, V. 2001. The Perception of Space. Pages 19-25 in *Space and Crossings: Literary and Cultural Theory.* Edited by R. Wilson and C. von Maltzan, C. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Horbury, W. 1985. Extirpation and Excommunication. *Vetus Testamentum* 35/1, 13-38.

Horsley, R. A. 1995. *Galilee. History, Politics, People.* Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

———. 2001. *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel.* Louisville: John Knox Press.

———. and J. S. Hanson. 1985. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Horton, M. S. 2005. *Lord and Servant: A Covenant Christology.* Louisville: John Knox Press.

Hoskins, P. M. 2002. *Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John.* Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

Hoskyns, E. C. 1947. *The Fourth Gospel.* Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber and Faber.

———. 1996. *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee.* Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

Houtart, F. 1976. Palestine in Jesus' Time. *Social Scientist* 4/6, 14-24.

Howard, D. M. and M. A. Grisanti. 2003. *Giving the Sense: Understanding and Using Old Testament Historical Texts.* Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

Hubbarb, P. 2005. Places on the Margin: The Spatiality of Exclusion. Pages 289-316 in *Contested Worlds: An Introduction to Human Geography.* Edited by M. Phillips. Burlington: Ashgate.

Hudson, D. M. 1996. From Chaos to Cosmos: Sacred Space in Genesis. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108/1, 87-97.

Hugget, N. ed. 1999. *Space from Zeno to Einstein: Classic Readings with a Contemporary Commentary*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Hussein, A. A. 2002. *Edward Said: Criticism and Society.* London: Verso.

Inge, J. 2003. *A Christian Theology of Place.* Burlington: Ashgate Publishing

Ingraham, C. 2006. *Architecture, Animal, Human: The Asymmetrical Condition*. New York: Routledge.

Irudaya, R. 2006. Significance of Jesus' Mission with the Marginalised Samaritan Woman: A Feminist Reading of John 4, 1-42. *Bible Bhashyam* 32/2, 154-182.

Isaacs, M. E. 1992. *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. Supplement Series 73.

Isser, S. 1999. Samaritans and their Sects. Pages 569-595 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism, Volume. 3, The Early Roman Period.* Edited by W. Horbury, W. D. Davies and J. Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, L. 1973. *A Jewish Theology.* Springfield: Behrman House.

Jammer, M. 1954. *Concepts of Space: The History of Theories of Space in Physics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jenson, R. W. 2001. *Systematic Theology. Volume 1: The Triune God.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jeremias, J. 1926. Golgotha und die heilige Felse. Pages 74-128 in *Angelas* 2 (93). Leipzig: Pfeiffer.

———. 1949. *Wiederentdeckung von Bethesda.* Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Johnson, L. T. and D. J. Harrington. 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Sacra Pagina Series. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Julian, P. 2000. *Jesus and Nicodemus: A Literary and Narrative Exegesis of John 2, 23-3, 36.* Berlin: Peter Lang.

Kahera, Akel I.: Gardens of the Righteous: Sacred Space in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. *Cross Currents* 52/3, 328 - 341.

Kamitsuka, M. D. 2007. *Feminist Theology and the Challenge of Difference.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kanagaraj, J. J. 1998. *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into Its Background.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Käsemann, E. 1968. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17.* London: SCM Press.

Kateb, G. 1967. Utopias and Utopianism. Pages 212-215 in *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. Volume. 8. Edited by P. Edwards. London: Collier- Macmillan.

Keener, C. S. 2003. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Volume. 1 and 2 Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Kellum, S. L. 2004. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13.31-16.33.* London: T. & T. Clark.

Kennedy, J. B. 2003. *Space, Time and Einstein: An Introduction*. Chesham: Acumen Publishing Limited.

Kerr, A. R. 2002. *The temple of Jesus' body: the temple theme in the Gospel of John.* JSNTSup. 220. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press

Killebrew, A. E. et al. (eds). 1995. A "Talmudic" house at Qasrin: On the Use of Domestic Space and Daily Life during the Byzantine Period. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 66/1-2, 59-72.

Kim, J. K. 2004. *Woman and Nation: An Intercontextual Reading of the Gospel of John from a Postcolonial Feminist Perspective.* Leiden: Brill.

King, R. 1996. *Emancipating Space: Geography, Architecture, and Urban Design*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Kirschner, R. 1985. Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70. *Harvard Theological Review* 78/1-2, 27-46.

Klatt, W. 1969. *Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Klawans, J. 2000. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism.* Sheffield: Phoenix Press.

Klijn, A. F. 1983. 2 (Syriac of) Baruch: A New Translation and Introduction. Pages 615-652 In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Volume. 1. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Klingbeil, G. A. 1995. Ritual Space in the Ordination Ritual of Leviticus 8. *Journal of Northwest Semitic languages* 21/1, 59-82.

———. 2002. “Up, down, in, out, through and back”. Space and Movement in Old Testament Narrative, Ritual and Legal Texts and their Application for the Study of Mark 1:1-3:12. *Estudios Bíblicos* 60/3, 283-309.

———. 2007. *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Klinzing, G. 1971. *Die Umdeutung des Kultes in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament.*[WUNT 7]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Knight, D. A. 2002. *Joshua 22 and the Ideology of Space.* Pages 51-63 in Imaging’ Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honour of James W. Flanagan. Journal of the Study of the Old Testament. Edited by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. Supplementary Series 359.

Köstenberger, A. J. 2005. The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Composition of the Fourth Gospel. *Trinity Journal* 26 (NewSeries), 205-242.

———. The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Compositon of the Fourth Gospel. Pages 69-107 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John.* Edited by Lierman, J. [WUNT 2/219]. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Koester, C. R. 1989. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Monograph Series 22.

———. 1995. Topography and Theology in the Gospel of John. Pages 436-448 in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman*. Edited by Bartelt, A., Beck, A., Franke, C., and Raabe, P. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

———. 2003. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Kraabel, A. T. 1992. The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions. Pages 1-20 in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honour of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel.* Edited by A. Overman and R. MacLennan. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Kreissig, H. 1989. A Marxist View of Josephus' Account of the Jewish War. Pages 265-277 in *Josephus, the Bible, and History.* Edited by L. H. Feldman and G. Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Krieger, N. 1954. Fiktive Orte der Johannestaufe. *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 45, 121-123.

Kugel, J. L. 1998. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kumar, K. 2005. Utopia. Pages 858-861 in *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* Volume. 2. Edited by G. Ritzer. London: SAGE Publications.

Kümmel, W. G. 1975. *Introduction to the New Testament.* London: SCM Press.

Küng, Hans. 1984. *Eternal Life.* Transl. by Edward Quinn. London: Collins Publishers.

———. 1989. Paradigm Change in Theology: A Proposal for Discussion. Pages 3-33 in *Paradigm Change in Theology.* Edited by Hans Küng and David Tracy. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Kuhn, Thomas. S. 1962; 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Third Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kundsin, K. 1925. *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe in Johannes-Evangelium*. Göttingen: Dandenhoek and Ruprecht.

Kunin, S. D. 1998. *God's Place in the World: Sacred Space and Sacred Place in Judaism.* Cassell Religious Studies. London: Cassell.

Kysar, R. 1993. *John, the Maverick Gospel.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Lampe, G. W. H. 1984. A.D. 70 in Christian Reflection. Pages 153-171 in *Jesus and the Politics of his Day.* Edited by E. Bammel and C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langston, S. M. 2006. *Exodus through the Centuries.* Blackwell Bible Commentaries. Oxford: Blackwell.

Laor, E. 1986. *Maps of the Holy Land: Cartobibliography of Printed Maps, 1475-1900.* Amsterdam: Merian Publishing.

Lapin, H. 2001. *Economy, Geography, and Provincial History in Later Roman Palestine.* Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Lategan, B. 1993. Textual Space as Rhetorical Device. Pages 397-408 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Journal of the Study of the Old Testament Press.

Lee, D. 2004. In the Spirit of Truth: Worship and Prayer in the Gospel of John and the Early Fathers. *Vigiliae Christianae* 58/3, 277-297.

Lefebvre, H. 1974. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Levine, A. J. 1992. Diaspora and Metaphor: Bodies and Boundaries in the Book of Tobit. Pages 105-117 in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honour of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*. Edited by A. Overman and R. MacLennan. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Levine, L. I. 1998. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence*? Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lewis, T. T. 1995. The Power of Mantra: A Story of the Five Protectors. Pages 227-234 in *Religions of India in Practice.* Edited by D. S. Lopez Jr. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Lierman, J. (ed). 2006. *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*.. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. WUNT 2/219.

Lightfoot, R. H. 1938. *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels.* New York: Harper.

———. 1956. *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*. Edited by C. F. Evans. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lindars, Barnabas. 1972. *The Gospel of John.* London: Oliphants. New Century Bible Series.

Ling, T. J. M. 2006. *The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Cambridge University. . SNTS 136.

Lloyd, M. (Transl.) 1979. *Journey to Gubulawayo: Letters of Frs H. Depelchin and C. Croonenberghs, S.J.* 1879-81. Bulawayo: Books of Rhodesia Publishing Company.

Loew, C. 1967. *Myth, Sacred History and Philosophy*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Lohse, R. 2004. Africans in a Colony of Creoles: The Yoruba in Colonial Costa Rica. Pages 130-154 in *The Yoruba Diaspora in the Atlantic World.* Edited by T. Falola and M. D. Childs. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Long, B. O. 2007. Bible Maps and America's Nationalist Narratives. Pages 109-125 in *Constructions of Space 1: Theory, Geography, and Narrative*. Edited by J. L. Berquist and C. V. Camp. London: T. and T. Clark.

Low S. and Lawrence-Zuniga D. (ed). 2003. Locating Culture. Pages 1-37 in *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture.* Edited by S. Low and D. Lawrence-Zuniga. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ludlow, J. W. 2002. *Abraham Meets Death: Narrative Humor in the Testament of Abraham.* London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Lundquist, J. M. 1993. *The Temple: Meeting place of Heaven and Earth.* London: Thames and Hudson.

———. 2007. *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, and Future.* Westport: Praeger.

Luomanen, P. 2002. The "Sociology of Sectarianism" in Matthew: Modeling the Genesis of Early Jewish and Christian Communities. Pages 107-130 in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen.* Edited by H. Räisänen et al. Leiden: Brill.

Luter, B., McReynolds, K. 2003. *Women as Christ's Disciples: Models in the New Testament Church for Courageous Women Today.* Tain: Christian Focus.

MacEachren, A. M. 2004. *How Maps Work: Representation, Visualisation, and Design.* London: Guilford Press.

Magness, J. 2004. Communal Meals and Sacred Space at Qumran: Ancient Jewish Asceticism and the Essenes. Pages 81-112 in *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on its Archaeology. Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion* 4. Edited by J. Magness. Leuven: Peeters Press.

Magness, J. 2005. Ossuaries and the Burials of Jesus and James. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/1, 121–154.

Malbon, E. S. 1991. Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark. *The Biblical Seminar* 13. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press.

Malina, B. J. and R. Rohrbaugh. 1998. *A Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Malina, B. J. and Pilch, J. J. 2006. *Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Malpas, J. E. 1999. *Place and Experience: A Philosophy of Topography.* Cambridge: University Press.

Manson, T. W. (ed). 1956. *A Companion to the Bible.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Martin, L. H. 1987: 67-68; *Hellenistic Religions: An Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marty, M. E. 1989. The Social Context of the Modern Paradigm in Theology: A Church Historian's View. Pages 174-201 in *Paradigm Change in Theology* .Edited by Hans Küng and David Tracy. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Martyn, J. L. 1968/1979/2003. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Matt, D. C. 2004. *The Zohar: Pritzker Edition, Volumeume I.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Matsuoka, A. K and J. Sorenson. 2001. *Ghosts and Shadows: Construction of Identity and Community in an African Diaspora.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mbiti, John. 1975. *Introduction to African Religion.* New York: Praeger.

———. 1992/1990 (originally 1969). *African Religions and Philosophy*. Oxford: Heinemann.

McArthur, H. K. (ed). *In Search of the Historical Jesus: A Source Book*. London: SPCK.

McCown, C. C. 1941. Gospel Geography, Fiction, Fact and Truth. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 60, 1-25.

———. 1932. The Geography of Jesus' last Journey to Jerusalem. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51:107-129.

McKelvey, R. J. 1969. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. London: Oxford University Press.

McNutt, P. M. 2002. *'Fathers of the Empty Spaces' and 'Strangers Forever'. Social Marginality and the Construction of Space.* Pages 30-50 in Imaging Biblical

Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honour of James W. Flanagan. Edited by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. JSOTSS 359.

Meeks, Wayne A. 1966. Galilee and Judea in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966), 159-169.

———. 1967. The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology. Leiden: Brill. pp 286-319.

———. 1972. The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91/1, 44-72.

Meier, J. P. 1991. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volumeume One: The Roots of the Problem and the Person.* London: Doubleday.

Menken, M. J. J. 1996. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form?* Kampen: Kok Pharos.

———. 1997. The use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in the John: Jn 10, 34; 12, 38; 19, 24. Pages 367-393 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Tuckett, C.M. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Merenlahti, P. and R. Hakola. 1999. Reconceiving Narrative Criticism. Pages 13-42 in *Characterisation in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism.* Edited by David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni. [JSNT Sup. 184].

Merenlahti, P. 2002. *Poetics for the Gospels? Rethinking Narrative Criticism Studies of the New Testament and Its World.* New York: T. and T. Clark.

Metzger, B. M. 1971. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* Stuttgart: United Bible Society.

———. 1983. The Fourth Book of Ezra: A New Translation and Introduction. Pages 517-559 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Volume. 1. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Meyers, E. M. and J. F. Strange. 1981. *Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity*. London and Nashville, TN: SCM Press and John Knox.

Meyers, E. M. et al. 1978. "The Meiron Excavation Project: Archaeological Survey of Galilee and Golan, 1976. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 230 (1978), 1-24).

Meyers, E. M. ed. 1975. Galilee Regionalism as Factor in Historical Reconstruction. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 220/221, 93-101.

———. 1977. The Cultural Setting of Galilee: A Case of Regionalism and Early Judaism. Pages 687-702 in *ANRW* II 19/1. Edited by W. Haase and H. Temporini. Berlin: de Gruyter.

———. 1985. Galilean Regionalism: A Reappraisal. Pages 115-131 in *Approaches to ancient Judaism Volumeume V: Studies in Judaism and its Greco-Roman Context.* Edited by W.S. Green. [Brown Judaic Studies 32], Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

———. 2003. The Problems of Gendered Space in Syro-Palestinian Domestic Architecture: The Case of Roman-Period Galilee. Pages 44-69 in *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue.* Edited by D. L. Balch and C. Osiek. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Michaels, J. R. 1984. *John: A Good News Commentary.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Miller, M. and Hayes, J. H. 1986 (2006). *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah*. Louisville: John Knox

Millar, F. 1993. *The Roman Near East: 31 BC-AD 337*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mlakuzhyil, G. 2006. The Gospel of John: Believing (Faith) in John's Gospel. *Vidyajyoti* 70/10, 775-785.

Moloney, F. J. 2003. The Gospel of John and Evangelisation. *Josephinum Journal of Theology* 10/1, 19-32.

Moore, S. F. and Myerhoff, B. (eds). 1977. *Secular Ritual.* Assen: Van Gorcum.

Moore, D. S. 2005. *Suffering for Territory: Race, Place and Power in Zimbabwe.* Harare: Weaver Press.

More, G. F. 1971. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era.* Volume. 1. New York: Schocken Books.

Moreland, J. P. and W. L. Craig. 2003. *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview.* Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.

Morris, L. 1995. *The Gospel According to John.* [The New International Commentary on the New Testament Series]. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Moxnes, H.. 2001. The Construction of Galilee as a place for Historical Jesus – Part I. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31/1, 26-37.

———. 2001. The Construction of Galilee as a place for Historical Jesus – Part II. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31/2, 64-77.

———. 2003. *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Mtata, K. 2005. "Glorify your name…": Names and Naming and the Discourse of Power in the Fourth Gospel in Relationship to African Names and Naming Practices. Unpublished MTh. Dissertation. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. 2004. *Paul: His Story*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neusner, J. 1970. *A Life of Yohanan Ben Zakkai ca. 1-80 C.E.* Leiden: Brill.

———. 1975. *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in Religion, Literature, and Art.* Leiden: Brill.

———. 1980. *Form Analysis and Exegesis: A Fresh Approach to the Interpretation of Mishnah.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2002. *Judaism when Christianity Began: A Survey of Belief and Practice.* London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Newsom, C. A. 2004. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran: Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52.* Leiden: Brill.

Neyrey, J. H. 1988. *An Ideology of Revolt. John's Christology in Social-Science Perspective.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1989. "I Said: You Are Gods": Psalm 82:6 and John 10. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108/4, 647-663.

———. 1994. What's wrong With This Picture? John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24, 77-91.

———. 2002. Spaces and Places, Whence and Whither, Homes and Rooms: Territoriality in the Fourth Gospel. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 32, 60-74.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 1981. J*ewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah.* London: SCM Press.

Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Niehoff, M. R. 2001. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Nnaemeka, O. 1997. Fighting on all Fronts: Gendered spaces, Ethnic Boundaries, and the Nigerian Civil War. *Dialectical Anthropology* 22/3-4, 235-263.

Nobilio, F. 2008. *Le souffle de l'Esprit dans l'évangile de Jean : Influences culturelles, art littéraire, visés initiatique.* Bruxelles : Université Libre de Bruxelles.

Nwaigbo, F. 2006. Church in Africa and Interreligious Dialogue in the Third Millennium: Jesus and the Samaritan Woman as a Paradigm. *Third Millennium*, 9/4, 38-57.

Obermann, J. ed.. 1955, 1983. *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan.* Transl. Judah Goldin. New Haven: Yale University Press.

O'Day, G. R. and S. Hylen. 2006. *John: Westminster Bible Companion.* John Knox Press.

Oesterley, W. O. E. 1953. *The Psalms: Translated with Text-critical and Exegetical Notes*. London: SPCK.

———. 1957. *A History of Israel: From the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C. to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt, A.D. 135*. Volume. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Okur, N. A. 1993. Afrocentricity as a Generative Idea in the Study of African American Drama. *Journal of Black Studies* 24/1, 88-108.

Ortiz, A. 1969. *The Tewa World: Space, Time and Being in a Pueblo Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Oruka, H. O. 1995. Pages 391-396 in *Religious Plurality in Africa: Essays in Honour of John S.Mbiti.* Edited by J. K. Olupona and S. S. Nyang. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Otto, Rudolf. 1924, 1958, 2004. *The Idea of the Holy*. Transl. John W. Harvey. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oulton L. E. J. and H. Chadwick. (eds). 1954. *Alexandrian Christianity.* London: SCM Press.

Painter, J. 1980/81. *The Farewell Discourse and the History of Johannine Christianity.* New Testament Studies 27, 525-543.

———. 1991. The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Palmer, R. 1969. *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Park, C. 2005. Religion and Geography. Pages 439-455 in *The Routledge Companion to the Study of Religion.* Edited by J. R. Hinnells. London: Routledge.

Parker, P. 1955. Bethany Beyond Jordan. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74, 257-261.

Parkin. D. (1992). Ritual as Spatial Direction and Bodily Division. Pages 11-25 in *Understanding Rituals.* Edited by D. de Coppet. London: Routledge.

Partridge, C. 2005. *The Re-Enchantment of the West Alternative Spiritualities, Sacralisation, Popular Culture, and Occulture* Volume. 2. London: T. and T. Clark International.

Parry, B. 2004. *Postcolonial studies: A Materialist Critique.* London: Routledge.

Pasachoff, N. E., and R. J. Littman. 2005. *A Concise History of the Jewish People.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Pass, H. L. 1935. *The Glory of the Father: A Study in Saint John Xiii-Xvii*. London: A. R. Mowbray.

Pate C. M (ed) 2004. *The Story of Israel: A Biblical Theology.* Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press.

Peet, R. 1998. *Modern Geographical Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Perkins, P. 2001. The Gospel According to John. Pages 942-985 in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary.* Edited by R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India.

Peters, F. E. 2003. *The Monotheists: Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Conflict and Competition, Volumeume I: The Peoples of God.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Pfeiffer, R. H. 1961. *Religion in the Old Testament: The History of a Spiritual Triumph.* London: A. and C. Black.

Pharr, C. 1927. The Testimony of Josephus to Christianity. *American Journal of Philology* 48/2, 137-147.

Porton, G. G. 1997. The Idea of Exile in Early Rabbinic Midrash. Pages 249-264 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions.* Edited by J. M. Scott. Leiden: Brill.

Potter, D. S. ed 2006. *A Companion to the Roman Empire.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Prinsloo, G. T. M. 2005. The Role of Space in the שירי המעלות (Psalms 120-134). *Biblica* 86, 457-477.

Pummer, R. 2002. *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism: Texts, Translations and Commentary.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Quast, K. 1991. *Reading the Gospel of John: An Introduction.* New York: Paulist Press.

Rabe, M. D. 1995. Royal Temple Dedications. Pages 235-243 in *Religions of India in Practice.* Edited by D. S. Lopez Jr. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Räisänen, H. 2000. *Reading the Bible in the Global Village: Helsinki*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

———. Dunderberg, I., C. M. Tuckett, and K. Syreeni. (eds). 2002. *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*. Leiden: Brill.

Ranger, T. 1996. Great Spaces Washed with Sun: The Matopos and Uluru Compared. Pages 157-171 in *Text, Theory, Space: Land, Literature and History in South Africa and Australia.* Edited by K. Darian-Smith, L. Gunner and S. Nuttall, S. London: Routledge.

Rasmussen, C. G. 1989. *The NIV Atlas of the Bible*. Michigan: Zondervan.

Ray, B. 2000. African Shrines as Channels of Communication. Pages 26-37 in *African Spirituality: Forms, Meanings and Expressions.* Edited by J. K. Olupona. New York: The Crossword.

Rausch, T. P. 2003. *Who is Jesus? An Introduction to Christology.* Louisville: John Knox.

Reed, L. J. 2000. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence.* Harrisburg: Press International.

Reim, G. 1974. *Studien zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrung des Johannesevangelium.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Renwick, D. A. 1991. Paul. *The Temple and the Presence of God.* Georgia: Scholars Press.

Reim, G. 1974. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums.* [SNTS Monograph 22]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rensberger, D. 1987. *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Richards, D. 1985. The Implications of African American Spiritual. Pages 207-233 in *African Culture: The Rhythms of Unity.* Edited by M. K. Asante and K. Welsh-Asante. Westport CT: Greenwood.

Richardson, P. 2002. *What has Cana to do with Capernaum*? New Testament Studies 48, 314-331.

Ridderbos, Herman. 1997. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Riesner, R. 2002. *Bethanien Jensits des Jordan: Topographie und Theologie in Jahannes-Evangelium.* Basel: Brunnen

Rimer, J. T. 1988. *A Reader's Guide to Japanese Literature.* Tokyo: Kodansa International.

Robinson, John A. T. 1962. The New Look on the Fourth Gospel. Pages 94-106 in *Twelve New Testament Studies*. *Studies in Biblical Theology* 34, Edited by John A. T. Robinson. London: SCM Press.

———. 1976. *Redating the New Testament.* London: SCM Press.

———. 1985. *The Priority of John*. London: SCM Press.

Romm, J. S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rosenblatt, M.-L. 1993. (Book Review) Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55/ 3, 569-570.

Rowland, C. 1982. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity.* London: SPCK.

Rubinkiewicz, R. 1983. Apocalypse of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction. Pages 681-705 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Volume. 1. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Rubinstein, A. ed. 1974. *The Return to Zion*. Jerusalem: Keter Books.

Russell, D. S. 1976. *Between the Testaments.* London: SCM Press.

Rutgers, L. V. 1998. *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*. Leuven: Peeters Press.

Sack, R. D. 1980. *Conceptions of Space in Social Thought: A Geographic Perspective*. London: Macmillan.

Safrai, C. 1996. The Centrality of Jerusalem: A Retrospect. Pages 217-229 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives.* Edited by M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safari. Kampen: Pharos.

Safrai, S., M. Stern, D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik. (eds). 1974. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Volume. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Safrai, S and M. Stern. (eds). 1974. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions.* Volume. 1. Assen: Van Gorcum and Company.

Safrai, Z. 1996. The Role of the Jerusalem Elite in National Leadership in the Late Second Temple Era, Pages 65-72 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives.* Edited by M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safari. Kampen: Pharos.

Saldarini, A. J. 2001. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

Sanders, E. P. 1985. *Jesus and Judaism.* Augsburg: Fortress Publishers.

Sanders, J. N. 1968. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John.* London: A. and C. Black.

———. 1997. *The Exile and Canon Formation*. Pages 37-61 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conception*. Edited by J. Scott. Leiden: Brill.

Sawicki, M. 1997. Spatial Management of Gender and Labor in Greco-Roman Galilee. Pages 7-28 in *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods.* Edited by D. R. Edwards and C. T. McCollough. Atlanta: Scholars.

———. 2000. *Crossing Galilee: Architectures of Contact in the Occupied Land of Jesus.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Scaer, P. J. 2003. Jesus and the Woman at the Well: Where Mission Meets Worship. *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 67/1, 3-18.

Schmidt K. L. 1919. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung.* Berlin: Trowizsch.

Schnelle, U. 1992. *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

———. 1996. *The Human Condition: Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, and John.* Translated by O. C. Dean, Jr. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Schneiders, S. 1992. *The Revelatory Text: A Feminist Hermeneutical Reading.* San Francisco: HarperCollins.

Schofield, J. N. 1964. *Introducing Old Testament Theology*. London: SCM Press.

Schulz, H. L. and J. Hammer. 2003. *The Palestinian Diaspora: Formation of Identities and Politics of Homeland.* London: Routledge

Schürer, E. 1973. *The History of the Jewish people in the Age of Jesus Christ.* Volume. 1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

———. 1979. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ.* Volume. 2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. 1976. Cultic Language in Qumran and the NT. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38, 159-177.

———. 2000. Defending the Centre, Trivialising the Margins. Pages 29-48 in *Reading the Bible in the Global Village: Helsinki.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Schwartz, D. R. 1996. Temple or City: What did Hellenistic Jews See in Jerusalem? Pages 114-127 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives.* Edited by M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safari. Kampen: Pharos.

Scott, J. C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, J. M. 1997. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions.* Leiden: Brill.

———. 2002. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*. [SNTS Monograph 113]. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segovia, F. F. 1981. The Love and Hatred of Jesus and the Johannine Sectarianism. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43, 258-272.

———. 1991. *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Segovia, F. F. and Tolbert, M. A. (eds). 1995. *Reading from this Place* (vol.1)*: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Shalev, Z. 2002. Mapping the Holy Land, Mapping Sacred Scholarship. *Religious Studies News/ SBL Edition* 3, 1-3.

Sharma, A. 2004. Hinduism. Pages 70-131 in *The Geography of Religion: Where God Lives, Where Pilgrims Walk.* Edited by T. Hitchcock and J. Esposito. Washington D.C.: National Geographic.

Schwarz, M. T. 2001. *Navajo Lifeways: Contemporary Issues, Ancient Knowledge.* Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Shilling, C. 2003. *The Body and Social Theory.* Second Edition. London: SAGE Publications.

Silberman, N. A. 1997. Ideology and Archaeology. Pages 138-141 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East.* Volume. 3 Edited by E. M. Meyers. Oxford: Oxford University.

Sklar, L. 1995. *Philosophy of Physics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, M. (ed. and transl.) 1982. *Old Jewish Folk Music: The Collections and Writings of Moshe Beregovski.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sloyan, S. G. 2008. *Jesus: Word Made Flesh.* Collegeville: The Liturgical Press

Smit, P. B. 2007. Cana-to-Cana or Galilee-to-Galilee. *Zeitschrift fur Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die kunde der Alteren Kirche* 98, 143-149.

Smith, J. Z. 1969. Earth and Gods. *Journal of Religion* 49, 103-27.

———. 1978/1993. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1987. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual. Chicago Studies in History of Judaism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith-Christopher, D. L. 2002. *A Biblical Theology of Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Snyman, G. 1994. Old Testament Theology: Fabulous Dreams of the Other Side of Time and Space. *Old Testament Essays* 7/3, 453-465.

Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern Geography: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory.* New York: Verso.

———. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and*-Imagined Places. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Spain, D. 1992. *Gendered Spaces.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina

Staley, J. L. 1991. Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light: Reading Character in John 5 and 9. *Semeia* 53, 55-80.

———. 1995. *Reading with a Passion: Rhetoric, Autobiography and the American West in the Gospel of John*. New York: Continuum.

Staples, P. 1993. The Cultural Management of Space and Time in the Narrative of the Gospel of Mark. *Forum* 9/1-2, 19-45.

Stevenson, G. 2001. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation.* Berlin: Gruyter.

Stewart, E. 2005. Gathered around Jesus: An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. University of Notre Dame.

Stewart, R. A. 1961. *Rabbinic Theology: An Introductory Study*. London: Oliver and Boyd.

Stibbe, M. W. G. 1994. *John's Gospel.* London: Routledge.

Story, C. I. K. 1989. The Bearing of Old Testament Terminology on the Johannine Chronology of the Final Passover of Jesus. *Novum Testamentum* 31/4, 316-324.

Strachan, R. H. 1941. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment.* London: Student Christian Movement Press.

Strauss, B. S. 1993. *Fathers and Sons in Athens: Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Suggit, J. 1993. *The Sign of Life: Studies in the Fourth Gospel and the Liturgy of the Church.* Cape Town: Galvin and Sales.

———. 1997. *The Gospel and the Gospels.* Cape Town: Celebration of Faith.

Sugirtharajah, R. S. (ed.). 1991. Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third world. London: SPCK.

———. 2008. Still at the Margins: Biblical Scholarship Fifteen Years after the Voices from the Margin. London: T & T Clark.

Swartley, W. M. 2006. *Covenant of Peace: The Missing Peace in New Testament Theology and Ethics.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Syreeni, K. 1999. Peter as Character and Symbol. Pages 106-152 in *Characterisation in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Edited by David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni. [JSNT Sup. 184]. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Taberner, S. 1998. *Distorted Reflections.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Tan, Y. 2006. The Johannine Community: Caught in "Two Worlds." Pages 167-179 in *New Currents through John: a Global Perspective.* Edited by F. Lozada Jr. and T. Thatcher. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Taylor, V. 1933 (1964). *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.* London: Macmillan.

Tcherikover, V. 1964. "Was Jerusalem a 'Polis'?" *Israel Exploration Journal* 14, 61-78.

Theissen, G. 1978. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Thettayil, B. 2007. *In Spirit and Truth: An Exegetical Study of John 4:19-26 and a Theological Investigation of the Replacement Theme in the Fourth Gospel.* Leuven: Peeters Press.

Thiselton, Anthony C. 1980. *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein.* Exeter: Paternoster Press.

Thompson, M. M. 2001. *The God of the Gospel of John.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Tiemeyer, L. 2006. *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage: Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tillich, Paul. 1951. *Systematic Theology*. Volume. 1. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.

———. 1968. *Systematic Theology.* Combined volume. London: James Nisbet.

Tippler, F. J. 1994. *The Physics of Immortality: Modern Cosmology, God and the Resurrection of the Dead.* London. Macmillan

Torrance, Thomas. F. 1974/1995. The Relation of the Incarnation to Space in Nicene Theology. Pages 343-373 in *Divine Meaning. Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*. Edited by Thomas F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

———.1992/1995. The Greek Conception of Space in the Background of Early Christian Theology. Pages 289-342 in *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*. Edited by Thomas F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Trompf, G.W. 2005. Utopia. Pages 9491-9494 in *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Second Edition. Edited by L. Jones. Detroit: Thomson Gale.

Tsuchido (1990) Ἕλλην in the Gospel of John: Tradition and Redaction in John 12:20-24. Pages 348-356 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by R. Fortna and B. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tuckett, C. 1987. *Reading New Testament: Methods of Interpretation.* London: SPCK.

Turner, H. 1979. *From Temple to Meeting House: The Phenomenology and Theology of Sacred Space.* The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Turner, V. 1967. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual.* London: Cornell University Press.

Umiker-Sebeok, J. 1996. Power and the Construction of Gendered Spaces. *International Review of Sociology/Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 6/3, 389-403.

Van Aarde, A. G. 1991. Narrative Criticism Applied to John 4:43-54. Pages 101-128 in *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament.* Edited by Hartin, P. J. and Petzer, J. H. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Host, P. W. 1990. *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity.* Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Vanderkam, J. C. 1997. Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature. Pages 89-110 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions.* Edited by J. M. Scott. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2001. *An Introduction to Early Judaism.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Verhey, A. 2002. *Remembering Jesus: Christian Community, Scripture, and the Moral Life.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Vermes, G. 1962, 1964, 1994. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, (3rd edition). London: SCM Press.

Voorwinde, S. 2005. *Jesus' Emotions in the Fourth Gospel: Human or Divine?* London: T. and T. Clark.

Van Aarde, A. G. 1991. Narrative Criticism: Narrative Criticism Applied to John 4:43-54. Pages 101-128 in *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by P. J. Hartin and J. H. Petzer. Leiden: Brill.

von Wahlde, U. C. 2006. Archaeology and John's Gospel. Pages 523-586 in *Jesus and Archaeology* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Waldner, K. 2006. Letters and Messengers: The Construction of Christian Space in the Roman Empire in the Epistle of Ignatius of Antioch. Pages 72-86 in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity and other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*. Edited by Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema. [Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 2]. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus .

Wands, J. W. 1950. *The Greek Doctors.* London: The Faith Press.

Warf, B. 2008. *Time-Space Compression: Historical Geographies*. London: Routledge.

———. and S. Arias. (eds). 2008. *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Weiss, R. 1998. *Socrates Dissatisfied: An Analysis of Plato's Crito*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Welsh-Asante, K. 1985. Commonalities in African Dance: An Aesthetic Foundation. Pages 71-81 in *African Culture: The Rhythms of Unity*. Edited by M. K. Asante and K. Welsh-Asante. Westport CT: Greenwood.

Wenschkewitz, H. 1932. Die Spiritualizierung der Kultusbegriffe Temple, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament. *Angelos* 4, 70-230.

Wertheim, M. 1998. Space and Spirit. Pages 140-149 in *Reading the Universe through Science, Religion and Ethics: The Evolving Science and Religion Debate*. Edited by C. W. du Toit. Pretoria: Research Institute for Theology and Religion, UNISA.

West, Gerald O. 1991. *Biblical Hermeneutics of Liberation: Modes of Reading the Bible in the South African Context.* First Edition. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.

———. 1991. *Biblical Hermeneutics of Liberation: Modes of Reading the Bible in the South African Context.* Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.

———. 1993. *Contextual Bible Study*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.

———. ed. 2007. *Reading Other-Wise: Socially Engaged Biblical Scholars Reading with their Local Communities.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Westcott, B. F. 1881, Reprinted 1971. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Michigan: Eerdmans.

———. 1908. *The Gospel according to St John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes.* London: John Murray.

Whitacre, R. A. 1999. *John. The IVP New Testament Commentary Series*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.

White L. M. 1987. *The Delos Synagogue Revisited: Recent Fieldwork in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora.* Harvard Theological Review 80/2, 133-160.

Whitworth, J. M. 1975. *God's Blueprints: A Sociological Study of Three Utopian Sects.* London: Routledge.

Wilcox, M. 1979. *The Promise of the 'Seed' in the New Testament and the Targumim.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament 2/5, 2-20.

Wilkinson, J. 1971. *Egeria's Travels.* London: SPCK.

Wilson, B. R. 1959. *An Analysis of Sect Development*. American Sociological Review 24/1, 3-15.

———. 1969. A Typology of Sects. Pages 361-383 in *Sociology of Religion.* Edited by R. Robertson. Baltimore: Penguin.

———. 1973. *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples.* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Winkel, H. L. 2000. *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wolfe, G. 2002. *Inner Space as Sacred Space. The Temple as Metaphor for the Mystical Experience.* Cross Currents 52/3, 400-411.

Woll, B. D. 1981. *Johannine Christianity in Conflict: Authority, Rank, and Succession in the First Farewell Discourse.* Michigan: Edwards Brothers.

Worsley, P. 1968. *The Trumpet Shall Sound*. New York: Schocken.

Wright, P. H. 2001. *The Holman Quick Source Bible Atlas: Introduction and Geography of the Bible lands*. Tennessee: Holman Bible Publishers.

Wyatt, N. 1986. The Significance of the Burning Bush. *Vetus Testamentum* 36/3, 361-365.

Wyckoff, E. J. 2005. *Jesus in Samaria (John 4:4-42): A Model for Cross-Cultural Ministry.* Biblical Theology Bulletin, 35/3, 89-98.

Wylen, S. M. 2000. *Settings of Silver: An Introduction to Judaism.* New Jersey:Paulist Press.

Wright, R. B. 1985. Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction. Pages 639-670 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Volume. 2. Edited by J. H. Charlseworth. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

York, M. 1995. *The Emerging Network: A Sociology of the New Age and Neo-pagan Movements.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Zetterholm, M. 2005.*The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity*. London: Routledge.

Zevit, Z. 2002. Preamble to a Temple Tour. Pages 73-81 in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archaeology and The Religion of Israel.* Edited by B. M. Gittlen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.