

John 1-20 was written, a reinterpretation and authorization of FG by the identification of the Beloved Disciple as the author of the text seemed necessary (see John 21:24). Ultimately, however, unlike the Johannine Epistles, the historical situation behind John 21 remains largely unknown.

## SOURCES IN THE SHADOWS: JOHN 13 AND THE JOHANNINE COMMUNITY

Mary L. Coloe

"In John we are dealing with a man who is not piecing together written sources but placing his stamp upon the oral tradition of his community with a sovereign freedom. Indeed he is his own tradition. As Menoud puts it, it is as if he is saying to us from beginning to end: 'La tradition, c'est moi!'" (Robinson 1962b, 97-98)

The above quotation from John A. T. Robinson's "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel" reflects in part the trajectory of my own research and writing at the turn of the twenty-first century. If indeed it is possible to speak of a "source" for the Fourth Gospel, I look to the Johannine community as the primary *Ur*-text. But even in this pursuit, the questions of today are no longer the same historical-critical questions of a previous generation, since a new methodology, loosely called "literary criticism," has opened up a range of different approaches not only to the written text of the Gospel of John but also to understanding the processes that gave rise to that text.

The Fourth Gospel as we now have it is the narrative formulation of one community's insight into the person and ministry of Jesus. This theology developed over several decades of oral teaching, Spirit-guided recollection, and ongoing community praxis in changing historical circumstances. Underlying the theology that determined the particular narrative shape of the Fourth Gospel was a community's experience of the living presence of Jesus, mediated now through "another Paraclete" (John 14:16). In the words of Sandra Schneiders, "it was a particular *lived experience* of union with God in the risen Jesus through his gift of the Spirit/Paraclete within the

---

I am grateful for the support of the Australian Research Council, which provided a grant enabling time to pursue research for this essay.

believing community (spirituality) that gave rise gradually to a particular articulated *understanding* of Christian faith (theology). This theology was articulated in the Gospel text, and through it we gain access to the experience, the spirituality, that gives this gospel its unique character" (Schneiders 1999, 48).

Reading the Fourth Gospel, alert to its nuances and subtle forms of intra- and intertextuality, my research set out to discover aspects of the text's theology and then to ask what would be the living "spirituality," or sense of religious identity, of a community that would articulate its theology in this manner? *God Dwells with Us* (Coloe 2001) was the fruit of such an approach. In this book I traced the way the temple functions across the text of the Fourth Gospel and came to the conclusion that the temple was not only the major thematic image of the person and mission of Jesus but also an image of the identity and mission of the Johannine community.

A key text in the transformation of the temple symbol from the person of Jesus to the community of believers is the statement at the beginning of John 14, "In my Father's house are many dwellings (*monai*)" (14:2). The chapter then describes these "many dwellings": the Father dwelling (*menōn*) in Jesus (14:10); the Paraclete, who now dwells (*menei*) with believers and in the future will dwell in them (14:17); the Father and Jesus, who will make their dwelling (*monēn*) with believers (14:23); and Jesus, who dwells with the disciples (14:25). In other words, John 14 describes the divine indwellings in the Christian community, which can accurately be called a "living temple" or, in the terminology of the Fourth Gospel, can be named by Jesus as "My Father's household" (*oikiai tou patros mou*).

A second key text in appreciating the temple symbolism in the Gospel of John is the title applied to Jesus in his "lifting up" on the cross: "Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews."<sup>1</sup> Three times the Gospel of John identifies Jesus as "the Nazarene" (18:5, 7; 19:19), and John alone refers to the designation on the cross as a "title" (*titlon*). In Mark and Luke these words are termed an "inscription" (*epigraphē*; Luke 23:38; Mark 15:25), while Matthew calls them a "charge" (*aitian*; Matt 27:37). The background for the title "the Nazarene" can be found in two texts that were readily connected through first-century Jewish exegetical methods. Isaiah 11:1 identifies the future branch of Jesse as a *nēšer*, which is the root word behind the name "Nazareth," and Zech 6:12 identifies the future temple builder as a man called "Branch" (*šemaḥ*). According to rabbinic exegetical methods, it was acceptable practice to interchange two similar words in their interpretation

1. A detailed discussion of these two points can be found in Coloe 2000, 47–58.

of a passage.<sup>2</sup> Evidence from Qumran (4Q161; 4QIsa<sup>a</sup> line 18) shows that *šemaḥ* and *nēšer* were interchanged in a messianic interpretation in which the Davidic *nēšer* was to be the builder of a new temple, the *šemaḥ* of Zech 6 (Coloe 2001, 171–74). The unique way in which the Fourth Gospel uses "the Nazarene," the fact that this designation is called a "title," and the consistent use of temple imagery indicates that Johannine Christology presents Jesus as the Nazarene temple builder of Zech 6:12.

From the cross, Jesus' role as the temple builder is completed when he raises up the new temple in the scene where the relationship between his mother and the Beloved Disciple are changed (John 19:25b–27). In this moment the disciple becomes son to the mother of Jesus and thus brother to Jesus and child of God. The risen Jesus confirms this new identity when he commissions Mary Magdalene, "Go to my brothers and sisters (*tous adelphous mou*) and say to them, 'I am ascending to my father and your father, to my God and your God'" (20:17). On the cross, the words of Jesus in chapter 2 are realized: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (2:21).

This extremely brief description of some of the arguments presented in *God Dwells with Us* shows the steps I have taken in an attempt to discover the spirituality of the Johannine community, that is, the *Ur*-text or source behind the Fourth Gospel. Step one represents careful narrative-critical exegesis of those texts in the Gospel of John that focus on the temple. Step two is the formulation of a Christology coherent with the findings of the textual analysis, namely, that God has entered into historical experience through the humanity of Jesus. Jesus was the dwelling place of God (see esp. John 1:14; 2:19, 21). Step three is the articulation of the community experiences that lay behind the Fourth Gospel's particular theology and the narrative symbology of Jesus as the dwelling place/temple of the divine presence.

By the end of *God Dwells with Us* I concluded that the Johannine community saw itself as a living temple, participating in Jesus' divine filiation. But there was a problem. While the Fourth Gospel's narrative could express its theology through the symbol of the temple, in the post-70 C.E. experience of the Johannine community the temple was no longer appropriate as a means of expressing its "self-identity." The temple, along with its elaborate cult, no longer existed, nor were Christians identified as "Judeans" either by Rome or by emergent rabbinic Judaism. In this historical context another terminology was needed to describe the emergence of the community's new self-identity.

2. This method, based on similar, not necessarily identical terms, is known as *kayotse bo bemaqom aher*. For further details of rabbinic exegesis, see Manns 1991, 306–19; Scott 1995, 127–33; Hauser and Watson 2003.

In the Hebrew Bible the most frequent name for the Jerusalem temple was "the house of God" (*bēt yhwāh*), and it was appropriately furnished.

All of them [the temple furnishings] are shaped as furniture of a dwelling-place and testify that the house is really arranged as a habitation: the lamps for light, the tables for bread, the small altar for incense (an item which was not lacking in any luxurious residence in antiquity), the altars bearing the epithet of God's tables (Ezek 41:22; 44:16; Mal 1:7), the sacrifices being called God's bread (Lev 21:21-22; Num 28:2), the typical image of the gods as eating the fat of the sacrifices and drinking the libations of wine (Deut 32:38) and the like. (Haran 1969, 255)

When the Johannine Jesus calls Israel's house of God "my Father's house" (John 2:16; 14:2), he is speaking not only of a building in Jerusalem. In the Hebrew Bible, the expression "my father's house" never refers to a building but rather to those people considered part of the household group, those whom we would today call "the family" and even future descendants (see Gen 24:38; 28:21; 46:31; Josh 2:13). So the expression *en tei oikiai tou patros mou* (14:2) takes on a personal sense and can more accurately be translated, "in my Father's household." Rather than a self-perception as "temple," with all that this implies (such as sacrifices, cult, and a priestly hierarchy), I formed the hypothesis that the term "household of God" better expressed the self-understanding of the Johannine community.

In order to test this hypothesis—that the phrase "household of God" expressed the Johannine community's self-identity—my recent work has examined the "household" scenes within the Fourth Gospel (Coloe 2000; 2004). Is it possible to detect in these scenes any hints that we are dealing not only with "time past" (i.e., the time of Jesus) but also with "time present" (i.e., the time of the Johannine community)? Is the living "household of God" casting its shadow on those scenes in the Fourth Gospel where Jesus gathers his own? In these shadows, can we discover the real "sources" of this fascinating and elusive text? The rest of this essay will seek to answer these questions by examining John 13, the footwashing. Within the aims and the limitations of this essay I will focus on two aspects of John 13: (1) the act of footwashing within its first-century social and religious context; (2) what might lie behind the description of the footwashing as a *hypodeigma* ("model, example").

#### THE FOOTWASHING NARRATIVE

One of the critical tools used in recent narrative approaches is the attention given to the actual structuring of the narrative, with an awareness of some common narrative techniques used in ancient writing, both biblical and classical Greek and Roman. My discussion here will be based on a proposed

outline of John 13 that relies on antithetic parallelism in the discourse material (13:6-38) that follows the brief description of Jesus' act of footwashing (13:4-5). Since chapter 13 introduces the second major section of the Gospel of John—the "hour" of Jesus (chs. 13-20 [21]) and, in particular, his final meal with the disciples (chs. 13-17)—the footwashing story begins with a "mini-prologue" that recapitulates a number of themes present in the opening Prologue of chapter 1 (1:1-18). I have indicated references to these themes in italics in the outline below.

#### 1. Before the feast of the Passover (13:1)

Jesus, *knowing* that his hour had come to depart from this *world* to the *Father*, having *loved* his own, those in the *world*, he *loved* them to the end.

#### 2. During the supper (13:2-3)

The devil had already made up his mind that Judas Iscariot son of Simon should betray him. Jesus, *knowing* that everything had been given into his hands by the Father and that he came from God and was going to *God*...

Notably, several of these themes reappear in the closing verses of the Farewell Discourse at 17:25-26:

O righteous *Father*, the *world* has not *known* thee, but I have *known* thee; and these *know* that thou hast sent me. I made *known* to them thy name and I will make it *known* that the *love* with which thou hast *loved* me may be in them and I in them.

After this mini-prologue there is a very brief description of the footwashing (13:4-5), and the discourse and dialogue that follows (13:6-38) interpret the meaning of this action for the disciples. In this discourse/dialogue material there are two major sections, 13:6-20 and 21-38, with the first section moving from Peter to Judas and the second section moving in reverse from Judas to Peter. Central to both sections is Jesus' teaching and "gifts" of a model and a new commandment for the disciples. The passage may be outlined as follows.

#### A. Dialogue with Peter (13:6-11)

#### B. Teaching and "gift" (13:12-15)

#### C. The betrayer (13:16-20)

#### C'. The betrayer (13:21-30)

#### B'. Teaching and "gift" (13:31-35)

#### A'. Dialogue with Peter (13:36-38)

While most scholars conclude the footwashing story with the departure of Judas at verse 30, there are sound structural and thematic reasons for

including verses 31–38 within the footwashing pericope. The departure of Judas makes a break between verses 21–30 and what follows, but this break simply concludes the subunit (C' on the outline above). Judas's departure sets in process Jesus' arrest and crucifixion, which the Fourth Gospel presents as the "hour" of Jesus' glorification (12:23). Judas's departure is thus the catalyst for Jesus' exultant cry to the Father, "Now is glorified the Son of Man, and God is glorified in him" (13:31). It follows that Jesus' words to the Father, with their theme of glorification, are necessarily linked to Judas's betrayal and its consequences. Further, the discussion with Peter (13:36–38), where he queries Jesus' statement about "following" him, parallels the discussion in verses 6–11, where Peter queries Jesus' action in washing his feet. The language of "giving" a commandment (13:34) recalls the language of "giving" a model (*hypodeigma*; 13:15). Frederic Manns also argues for the unity of the entire chapter on the basis of the *inclusio* formed by the occurrence of *tithēmi* in 13:4 and 38 (Manns 1981, 151). The above structural reasons situate verses 31–38 within the footwashing narrative and make them the conclusion of the scene. Where verses 31–38 look back to the footwashing, 14:1 forms an *inclusio* with what follows, as marked by the repetition of the phrase, "Let not your hearts be troubled" (14:1, 27). Even though there is no change in scene, time or characters, 14:1 marks the beginning of a new stage in the discourse. Structurally, the entire chapter can be outlined as follows:<sup>3</sup>

- Prologue to the hour (13:1–3).  
 Washing of the feet: welcome to the final meal (13:4–5)  
 A. Peter's objection (13:6–11)  
   B. Teaching and "gift" (13:12–15)  
   C. The betrayer (13:16–20)  
   C'. The betrayer (13:21–30)  
 B'. Teaching and "gift" (13:31–35)  
 A'. Peter's objection (13:36–38)

#### ANCIENT FOOTWASHING

Footwashing was a common practice in ancient Mediterranean cultures as "(1) a part of daily cleansing, (2) an act of hospitality (washing the feet of guests), and (3) in various cultic settings" (Hultgren 1982, 541). According to Manns, footwashing had a particular significance within Judaism, as it recalled the hospitality shown by Abraham in welcoming his divine guests

3. For detailed arguments supporting this structure, see Coloe 2004, 401–6.

CBQ 66 (2004) 400–415

under the oaks of Mamre (Gen 18:4; Manns 1981, 160). While the original Hebrew text portrayed Abraham merely providing water for his guests to wash their own feet, the LXX suggests that someone else washed their feet (Thomas 1991, 35), and by the first century C.E. this tradition had developed to present Abraham himself washing the feet of the guests as an act of gracious hospitality. The table below illustrates the development of this theme.

Masoretic Text	Septuagint	Testament of Abraham
"Let a little water be brought to wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree" (Gen 18:4). <sup>4</sup>	"Let some water be brought and your feet be washed, and make yourselves cool under the tree" (Gen 18:4). <sup>5</sup>	"Then Abraham went forward and washed the feet of the commander-in-chief, Michael. Abraham's heart was moved, and he wept over the stranger" (T. Ab. 2:9).

Manns argues that *Targum Neofiti* has the same tradition as the *Testament of Abraham*, where Abraham is the one who fetches water and washes the feet, while the strangers are only the active subjects of the following verb "to rest" (Manns 1981, 160). His rendition of *Neofiti* reads, "I will go and get some water in order to wash your feet." Philo also notes an ambiguity about who does the footwashing in his comments on Gen 18: "Wherefore he [Abraham] does not give a command like a lord and master, nor does he presume to offer washing of the feet to freemen or servants but (regards) Him who has made Himself directly visible as the one who gives commands, saying, 'Let water be taken, and does not add by whom. And again (in saying) 'Let them wash (your) feet,' he does not make clear whom nor make it known exactly" (QG 1.4.5). While the targumic evidence may not be conclusive because of difficulties in dating, with the support of Philo and the *Testament of Abraham* (75–125 C.E.) there is evidence of this reading of the Abraham tradition within Judaism contemporary with the Johannine community.<sup>6</sup>

4. While the MT uses second-person plural imperative "you (pl.) wash," the consonantal text can also be read as a third-person plural (see Wevers 1993, 247). The third person would continue the sense of the first verb, as in the above translation (see Westermann 1985, 273). Both Westermann and von Rad note that Abraham's speech uses the third person, avoiding the use of "I," thus showing profound respect for his visitors (see von Rad 1972, 206).

5. In this version the first two verbs are in the third-person imperative form (*lēmiphthēto; nipsatōsan*) and only *katapsuxate* is in the second person, suggesting that the bringing of water and washing of feet be carried out by a third person. For further discussion of the text in its Masoretic and Septuagint form and also the *Testament of Abraham*, see Thomas 1991, 35–36.

6. For discussion of this dating, see Charlesworth 1985, 1:875.

These texts show that by the first century C.E. Abraham and his personal gesture of footwashing were established in Jewish tradition as the epitome of hospitality (Fitzgerald 2000, 522). Even though there is no explicit mention of Abraham in the Johannine footwashing story, there may be clues to indicate that there are intertextual echoes from Gen 18.<sup>7</sup> Both Genesis and the Gospel of John describe the host offering a small piece of bread, frequently translated as a "morsel": at Gen 18:5, Abraham says, "I will fetch a morsel of bread"; at John 13:26, following the footwashing, Jesus offers Judas a "morsel" (*psōmion*). The word *psōmion* is unique in the New Testament to the Fourth Gospel, where it appears four times in this brief unit (13:26–30) and may have been used deliberately because of its aural similarity with the verb for "take" at Gen 18:4 (*lēpsomai*, Gen 18:5 LXX). Further, both Genesis and John use the language of "master/Lord" and "servant" (Gen 18:3; John 13:16). Although the Targumim have dating difficulties and cannot provide conclusive evidence, *Neofiti* gives this scene a possible Passover context, as Sarah is told to make unleavened bread: "Hurry and take three seahs of fine flour, spread it and make unleavened bread" (*Tg. Neof. Gen 18:6*; see McNamara 1992, 104). The Passover setting of Jesus' final meal is clear from John 13:1. Culturally, and within Jewish religious traditions about Abraham, there is evidence to suggest that a first-century community would understand the Johannine footwashing primarily as a gesture of hospitality and welcome.

Footwashing also had a cultic purpose in Judaism, for it was necessary to wash one's feet before entering the precincts of the temple. The Mishnah records, "[A man] ... may not enter into the Temple Mount with his staff or his sandal or his wallet, or with the dust upon his feet" (*m. Ber.* 9:5). This cultic purpose predates the compilation of the Mishnah, for the first-century Jewish philosopher Philo offers a number of comments on the practice of footwashing prior to entering the presence of God. In commenting on Exod 12:3 and 6, Philo states, "he who was about to offer sacrifice should first prepare his soul and body ... for, according to the saying, one should not enter with unwashed feet on the pavement of the Temple of God" (*QE* 2.1.2;

7. In examining the possible scriptural echoes in the Pauline literature, Richard Hays (1989, 29–32) proposes seven criteria to test the likelihood that the author is using such a technique: availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, and satisfaction. Five of these seven criteria are satisfied in trying to assess if John 13 has possible echoes of Gen 18. The text was available; there are other points of contact with the Abraham scene; there is coherence and satisfaction in understanding the footwashing as a gesture of hospitality; and it is plausible that first-century readers would understand it in this way.

similarly *Spec. Laws* 1.207).<sup>8</sup> Philo's remarks indicate that footwashing was a customary gesture in the first century prior to entering the temple, as the Mishnah would later encode. This same conclusion is reached by Weiss with regard both to Hellenistic synagogue practice and also the Jerusalem temple: "the notion that in order to walk on the pavement of the temple disciples were supposed to have washed their feet was a well established and recognised one in the Judaism of the second temple" (1979, 305). The precedent for washing one's feet prior to entering the temple was established in Moses' instructions that Aaron and his sons should wash their hands and feet prior to entering the tent of meeting or approaching the altar (Exod 30:17–21; cf. 2 Chr 4:6; Ps 25:6).

In discussing footwashing as both a gesture of welcome into a house and also as the prelude to entering the temple, the artistry of the Fourth Evangelist is apparent, for these two aspects of "house" and "temple" come together in Johannine theology. As noted above, in *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* I examined the symbolism of the temple across the Johannine narrative. I argued that the temple is the major christological symbol within the Fourth Gospel, as it is identified with the person and ministry of Jesus (1:14; 2:19, 21). Not only does the temple function as a symbol of Jesus as "the dwelling place of God," but this meaning is transferred to the disciples, who, at the cross, are drawn into the household of God. In John 14:2, the expression "In my Father's house are many dwellings" introduces a description of God's dwelling within the disciples, enabling the community to be a living temple, or, in the language of the Fourth Gospel, to be formed into "my Father's house." Fittingly, before the disciples enter the Father's house (14:2), they are welcomed with the traditional gesture of having their feet washed (13:4–5).

In chapter 13, in his gesture of washing the disciples' feet, Jesus acts as the one sent and authorized by the Father to welcome his disciples into "my Father's house" (John 14:2). Since the term "my Father's house" carries the earlier sense of "temple" from 2:16, it is doubly appropriate that the disciples' feet are washed prior to entry, for they are being welcomed into the Father's household and so to become the living temple of God.

8. "By the washing of the feet is meant that his steps should be no longer on earth but tread the upper air. For the soul of the lover of God does in truth leap from earth to heaven and wing its way on high, eager to take its place in the ranks and share the ordered march of sun and moon and the all-holy, all-harmonious host of the other stars" (*Spec. Laws* 1.207).

FOOTWASHING AS A *HYPODEIGMA*

Peter initially objects to having his feet washed because he perceives this to be a degrading act for Jesus to perform (John 13:6–11). It is important to note that this is Peter's perception, not necessarily the perception of Jesus. While Peter understands the footwashing as an act of servitude, the Gospel of John frequently uses misunderstanding as a literary device; the reader should therefore be cautious before accepting Peter's view. Jesus even states explicitly that this action will not be understood until a later time (13:7). The following verses (13:12–15) develop a deeper understanding of the meaning of Jesus' action by describing it as a "model" for the disciples (*hypodeigma*). The term *hypodeigma* is rare in the New Testament and is only found here (John 13) and in Hebrews (4:11; 8:6; 9:23), 2 Peter (2:6), and James (5:10). In these other texts the term is usually translated "example" and is commonly understood in ethical terms as a good example of humility. Culpepper examines the use of *hypodeigma* in the Septuagint and relates it to the example of the martyr's death, which in turn links Jesus' "example" (the footwashing) with his subsequent death (1991, 143). I do not disagree with Culpepper on this link, but I wish to add a further element to understanding why the Fourth Gospel uses this term to describe Jesus' action. What is meant by saying, "I have given you a *hypodeigma*"?

In looking to the Old Testament background, it appears that *paradeigma* and *hypodeigma* are interchangeable (Schlier 1964, 74, 33). In the Septuagint we find *para/hypodeigma* used in two senses. First, these terms can be used to describe human behavior. Thus, Enoch is presented as an example of repentance (Sir 44:16); similarly, the Maccabean martyrs are held up as examples in their fidelity unto death (2 Macc 6:28, 31; 3 Macc 2:5; 4 Macc 6:19; 17:23). This is the meaning discussed by Culpepper. A similar sense relating to human behavior is found in Jer 8:2 and Nah 3:6, where the term is used in the sense of public shame or exposure. Second, *para/hypodeigma* can be used in the sense of a physical model or prototype from which something is to be copied. Thus, Moses is shown the "pattern" of the heavenly tabernacle: "In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern (*hypodeigma*) of the tabernacle and of all its furniture, so you shall make it" (Exod 25:9). Similarly, David gives Solomon the "plan" of the temple that he is to build: "Then David gave his son Solomon the plan (*hypodeigma*) of the vestibule of the temple, and of its houses, its treasures, its upper rooms, and its inner chambers, and of the room for the mercy seat" (1 Chr 28:11; cf. 28:12, 18, 19). Ezekiel is shown a vision of the temple as the "model" of the new house of God: "When he had finished measuring the interior of the temple area, he led me out by the gate that faces east, and measured the temple area (*to hypodeigma tou oikou*) all around" (Ezek 42:15).

I believe it is this latter meaning of *hypodeigma* as a prototype or model of the tabernacle and temple that lies behind the Johannine use of the term. Very early in the narrative Jesus describes his death as the destruction and raising up of a new temple (John 2:19, 21). These words of the divine Logos must be taken seriously. As the story develops, the symbol and rituals of the temple are part of the narrative flow, especially across chapters 7–10. It is within the context of the Feast of Tabernacles that Jesus reveals himself as the good shepherd who is able to lay down his life (John 10:11–18). The narrative of the footwashing recalls these words as Jesus lays aside and takes up his garments (13:12–14). Through these intertextual links the footwashing emerges as a symbolic anticipation of the crucifixion. This is why it is so critical that Peter, in spite of his objections, needs to have his feet washed by Jesus: "Unless I wash you, you can have no part (*meros*) with me" (13:8). According to Brown, the term *meros* "means to be drawn into my destiny," "share in my inheritance" (Brown 1966–70, 2:565). Footwashing is thus an invitation to the disciples to participate in Jesus' "hour."

The hour of Jesus in which the disciples may participate is an expression of the fullness of divine life. The cross will reveal that he loved his own to the end (*eis telos*; 13:1). The Fourth Gospel does not propose a theology of atonement, reconciliation, or forgiveness as its theological explanation of the cross. Consistently in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus' death is explained as a gift of love: "For God so loved the world he gave his son" (3:14); "greater love has no one than that he lay down his life for his friends" (15:13). As Dorothy Lee notes, "This love is the reason for the sending and dying of the Son: it is an act of self-giving love by the Father, whose will draws the world to its eschatological destiny, manifest in the restoration of the divine image. The language of love intensifies at the Last Supper, where it undergirds the meaning of the footwashing (13:1), the significance of Jesus' death and the vibrant centre of the believing community (13:34–35)" (Lee 2002, 100). In my proposed outline of John 13 (above), the gift of a *hypodeigma* in verses 12–15 (B) is reflected in the parallel unit at verses 31–35 (B'). Here Jesus "gives" (*didomi*) the disciples a new commandment of love. The love Jesus enacts is the model of love he proposes for his disciples: "love each other as I have loved" (13:35). The footwashing, understood as a symbol of his self-giving death, is but another way of demonstrating "love as I have loved." This is why the footwashing can be called a *hypodeigma*: not because it is a "good example of humility" but because it symbolically expresses Jesus' self-gift of love, which will be revealed on the cross. It is Jesus' total self-giving on the cross that is the paradigm of the love that is to exist in his Father's household. So the two expressions parallel each other: "wash each other's feet, as I have done" (13:14); "love each other as I have loved" (13:35).

Following the footwashing Jesus calls his disciples "little children" (13:33), recalling the promise from the Prologue that those who do believe will become "children of God" (John 1:13). The footwashing is already taking effect as the disciples take on a new identity as children of the Father. For these disciples, footwashing is a proleptic experience of the welcome into the Father's household, which will be accomplished at the cross.

John 13 symbolically anticipates the crucifixion, where one temple, that of Jesus' body, is destroyed, and a new temple, the household of the Father, is created. What is acted out in symbol in John 13 is realized at the cross. In his life and death, Jesus is the temple of his Father's presence (1:14; 2:21). After the resurrection, the disciples, as children of the Father, continue to be the dwelling place of God in history. What Jesus is *now*—the incarnation of the divine indwelling—the disciples will be *later*. This is why Jesus' act of footwashing can be described as the *hypodeigma* or "paradigm" of the future temple/house/hold of God. In welcoming disciples into his Father's household, Jesus proleptically draws them into his own divine sonship.

#### SOURCES IN THE SHADOWS

From the above analysis, I propose that the narrative of the footwashing is based on the living experience of the Johannine community, which understood itself to be God's household. This lived sense of community identity leaves traces in the text in the sustained metaphor of the disciples as "children of God."<sup>9</sup> Such a spirituality of temple/household gives rise to the unique Johannine language of mutual indwelling, where the Father, Jesus, and the Spirit dwell with/in believers (ch. 14) and believers dwell in Jesus (ch. 15) and participate in his filial relationship with God. The community's spirituality is therefore the primary "source" of this Johannine text. While previous generations of scholars have looked for the Fourth Gospel's documentary sources in earlier lost Gospels, the Synoptics, or gnostic writings (Robinson 1962b, 96-97), the rise of narrative criticism has led to a deeper sensitivity to the nuances of the text in its language, structure, symbols, and characterizations. In choosing the literary form of a narrative Gospel that focuses on telling Jesus' story, traces of the community, living some sixty years after the nar-

9. The metaphor of disciples as children in God's family is developed in detail in van der Walt 2000. I prefer the language of "household" rather than "family" primarily because the narrative itself speaks of "my Father's house/hold" (John 2:16; 14:2) and also because recent studies of first-century family structures point out that a twenty-first-century Western understanding of "family" and kinship is very different from first-century notions of "family" (see Balch and Ostek 2003; Hellerman 2001).

rated events, are necessarily faint, like a background wash across the canvas of a watercolor. The Fourth Gospel places in the foreground the figure of Jesus, his disciples, and a particular understanding of Jesus' ministry. But the community's spirituality—living as children in the Father's household—does cast its own shadow across the text, as I have shown in my analysis of John 13.

While the present essay has taken up the issue of the Fourth Gospel's sources, there are two other points raised by Robinson that are also evidenced in the above discussion of the footwashing. As my work has shown, "the background of the Evangelist and his tradition ... is not to be sought among the Gnostics or the Greeks" (Robinson 1962b, 98). Rather, the Gospel of John is thoroughly grounded in the theological traditions of Second Temple Judaism and in the same exegetical methods found in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the early rabbinic writings.<sup>10</sup> In a very distinctive manner, the Fourth Evangelist has written into the tragedy of 70 C.E., when Israel's temple was destroyed. He has developed his own Christology and ecclesiology by drawing on the meaning the temple held for Israel. While the rabbis were recasting their own traditions to reflect the loss of the temple and its sacrificial system, this Evangelist was recasting the Jesus story in the light of his absence but with the affirmation that God still dwells in the Christian community, for a new *bêt ʾēlohîm* ("house of God") has been raised up as disciples are born into the household of God.

Robinson's comments about the Fourth Gospel as a reliable witness to the historical Jesus, particularly in relation to John the Baptizer, have also been vindicated in recent scholarship (Brown 1979, 29, 69-71). The work of Christopher Niemand takes the proposal of Raymond Brown regarding the Fourth Gospel's polemic against disciples of John the Baptist even further. Niemand suggests that the narrative of the footwashing may well have been used as a means of initiating disciples of the Baptizer into the Johannine community (1993, 404-11). If so, this ritual accords honor to the Baptizer in recognizing the validity of his baptism so that his disciples need not undergo a second immersion. The Fourth Gospel therefore not only evidences the conflictual situation between disciples of Jesus and disciples of John in the time of Jesus (1:6-9, 19-34; 3:25-30), but in chapter 13 it may also offer a glimpse of the later history of a Johannine community still grappling with this conflict and working toward a resolution.

Writing almost fifty years ago, John A. T. Robinson identified five significant presuppositions of previous Johannine scholarship that his con-

10. For an example of a commentary which emphasizes John's relationship to Judaism, see Mammis 1991.

temporaries were calling into question. Scholars of the past five decades have fought against the "critical orthodoxy" expressed in the five presuppositions Robinson described, successfully opening the way for a new generation of scholars to address new issues and to employ new methodologies. This is not to say that earlier questions have been answered but rather to acknowledge that greater truth may be found by working within a horizon that allows uncertainty and with the realization that all our historical suppositions arise from our own reconstructions. By shifting the focus from the world behind the text to the world within the text and the world in front of the text, new landscapes have emerged for a new generation of scholars to explore.

## "SALVATION IS FROM THE JEWS": JUDAISM IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Brian D. Johnson

Jesus' comment to the Samaritan woman in John 4:22, "Salvation is from the Jews," seems to be a positive reflection upon "the Jews" (*hoi Ioudaioi*). Coming from the lips of the main character of the Gospel of John, this sentence seems to suggest that the viewpoint of the Gospel of John toward "the Jews" specifically and Judaism in general is not entirely negative. There are other statements within the Gospel of John that also suggest a more positive portrayal of "the Jews" (Keener 2003, 217). However, the presentation of "the Jews" in the Gospel of John is commonly understood as almost entirely antagonistic. The present essay will consider two questions relating to this issue. First, is it *necessary* to see the Gospel of John within a context of stiff dissension with "the Jews"? While the number of studies that take this approach might suggest that it is necessary, I will suggest that it is possible to imagine a more positive appropriation of the themes and symbols of Judaism. Second, how does the author utilize the practices, stories, and beliefs of Judaism within his presentation? I will attempt to show that these various Jewish themes are focused upon the person of Jesus. Of course, one might expect that a composition that explicitly seeks to inform about the person of Jesus and to engender belief that he is "the Christ" (John 20:30-31) would focus its major themes on him. However, it is less often noted that John's use of themes from Judaism is almost entirely positive. While some might immediately think that the appropriation of the language, symbols, and so forth of one group by another could arise *only* from a conflict between those two groups, I would argue that it is also possible to imagine a use of these same themes to present a particular interpretation of their properly understood focus. This essay, then, will examine the use of the themes of Judaism within the Gospel of John in order to understand if they can be seen positively rather than negatively.