

SEQUENCE 3

JESUS CLEANSSES THE TEMPLE

2:13-25

Sequence 3
2:13-25

CHIASTIC STRUCTURE FOR SEQUENCE 3

- (a) **Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover** (2:13).
- (b) His **disciples remember** the words of **Scripture** (2:14-17).
- (x) "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (2:18-21).
- (b') His **disciples remember** the words of **Scripture** (2:22).
- (a') **Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover** (2:23-25).

According to the Synoptic Gospels, the cleansing of the Temple took place shortly before the passion (cf. Mt. 21:2ff; Mk. 11:1ff; Lk. 19:45ff). John moves it up to the beginning of his Gospel to provide a chiasmic parallel with Sequence 19 (chs. 18--19), the story of the destroying of the temple of Jesus' body in the passion. Parallelism is achieved by way of the idea central to both sequences, the destroying of the body of Jesus, which is followed by the resurrection, so that henceforth the risen Jesus becomes the temple of the Messianic Age. What would be almost impossible to explain according to the principles of narrative composition becomes perfectly intelligible when the Gospel is read according to principles of parallelism.

It has been suggested that the prediction of Malachi 3:1, "Behold, I send my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the LORD whom you seek [interpreted to refer to Jesus] will suddenly come to His temple," may have influenced the Evangelist's placement of the cleansing immediately after the testimony of the Baptist in 1:19-34 instead of just before the passion, as it is in the Synoptics. Whereas this the probably reason, it should also be pointed out that the more correct

chronological order of the Synoptic Gospels thus gives way to John's chiastic structure and theological order (for further notes on the sequence of the miracle of Cana followed by the sequence involving the cleansing, see previous notes on pages 78-80).

As mentioned before, this account of Jesus cleansing the Temple is also presented in the Synoptics (Mt. 21:12f; Mk. 11:15-17; Lk. 19:45f.). The Markan account is the fullest, but even so it is shorter than this one by John. "John differs from Mark in the references to the oxen and sheep, the source of cords, the word for 'changers of money' in verse 14, the 'pouring out' of the money, and the command, 'Take these things hence.' John's word for 'overthrew' is different from that in any of the Synoptics, and whereas they tell us that Jesus quoted Isa. 56:7 followed by Jer. 7:11, John does not speak of Him as citing any Scripture. But he does say that the disciples remembered the words of Ps. 69:9, which none of the Synoptists recalls. He does not mention, as Mark does, Jesus' prohibition of carrying anything through the temple, i.e. making a short cut out of it. Mark says that Jesus overturned the seats of the sellers of doves, John only that He told them to take "these things" away. Finally, the most important difference is one of time. In this Gospel the cleansing of the temple is the first great public act of Jesus' ministry: in the other Gospels it is the last" (Morris, *Gospel of John*, pp. 188-89).

Finally by way of overview, just as Sequence 2 (2:1-12) and Sequence 3 (2:13-25) are inseparably linked, so Sequence 3 and Sequence 4 (3:1-21) are linked inseparably together. In John 2:13--3:21 the reader is offered the first of seven episodes that present the earthly Jesus as the one who supersedes Jewish worship. In turn these seven episodes are composed of two units, Sequence 3 (2:13-25) and Sequence 4 (3:1-21). They are related thematically by the issue of legitimation: what is it that legitimates Jesus? In 2:18 the Jews ask for a sign to legitimate Jesus' actions; 2:23 implies Jesus' miracles legitimate Him with many (cf. 9:16); 3:2 indicates Nicodemus was one of the many who regarded Jesus' signs as His legitimation. That Jesus cuts Nicodemus off and changes direction in 3:3 indicates that He is presenting a different ground for legitimation (e.g., the new birth by the Spirit enabled by Jesus' glorification) that is basically the same as that offered in 2:19 (his resurrection)! Since only like can know like, for one to see/enter the sphere of God's reign, one must be born of the Spirit, for God is Spirit (4:24). For these reasons, 2:13-3:21, which is made up of diverse pre-existing narratives, will be treated as one large thought unit for the Evangelist. And understanding Sequence 3 as the bridge between Sequences 2 and 4 by tracing his train of thought will support such an understanding of the Gospel.

(a) (2:13) And the **Passover** of the Jews was at hand, and **Jesus** went up to **Jerusalem**.

(b) (14) And He found in the temple those who were selling oxen and sheep and doves, and the moneychangers seated. (15) And He made a source of cords, and drove them all out of the temple, with the sheep and the oxen; and He poured out the coins of the moneychangers, and overturned their tables; (16) and to those who were selling the doves He said, "Take these things away; stop making My Father's house a house of merchandise." (17) **His disciples remembered** that it was **written**, "ZEAL FOR THY HOUSE WILL CONSUME ME."

(c) (18) The Jews therefore answered and said to Him, "What sign do You show to us, seeing that You do these thing?" (19) Jesus answered and said to them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." (20) The Jews therefore said, "It took forty-six years to build this temple, and will You raise it up in three days?" (21) But He was speaking of the temple of His body.

(b') (22) When therefore He was raised from the dead, **His disciples remembered** that He said this; and they believed the **Scripture**, and the word which Jesus had spoken.

(a') (23) Now when He was in **Jerusalem** at the **Passover**, during the feast, many believed in His name, beholding His signs which He was doing. (24) But **Jesus** on His part, was not entrusting Himself to them, for He knew all men, (25) and because He did not need anyone to bear witness concerning man for He Himself knew what was in man.

Anaylsis of the Chiastic Structure

As in 2:1-12, so in 2:13-25, John creates chiastic parallelism in the simplest possible manner. In (a) and (a'), he parallels the words "Jesus," "Jerusalem," and "Passover." In (b) and (b'), he parallels the words "His disciples remembered the Scripture." The center (c) deals with the significance of Jesus' words "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."

Sequence 3
2:13-25

Commentary

Our writer brings us to Jerusalem. He has rounded off, so as to speak, the call of the disciples and the first revelation of Jesus as the Messiah as confirmed in the Old Testament by the great abundance of wine; and now in 2:13 he leads up to the first appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem.

The faith of the disciples (2:11; cf. 2:22) contrasts sharply with the sceptical and unbelieving attitude of the (leading) "Jews" (2:18). The scene of the first revelation of Jesus' glory in Galilee changes to the place where danger threatens (cf. 2:17), which is Jerusalem, and in fact the Temple--an unmistakable signal of how the great drama will proceed.

This Sequence, like that of Cana, has some puzzling features. The presentation is similar, though covering very different ground. The narrative is remarkably succinct, though containing several concrete details. Both stories break off rather suddenly, the former with the innocent but evocative words of the headwaiter, the latter with the unintelligible but thought-provoking question of the Jews, to which, however, the Evangelist gives us a commentary. Both stories aim at throwing light on the self-revelation of Jesus as the Messiah, the former in Galilee, the latter in Jerusalem, but mark a strong contrast: in Cana it is a joyous festival, in Jerusalem a serious conflict, full of menace. Among His countrymen, there is no danger; the incident in the Holy City culminates in an interrogation which sounds a note of warning. Along with the believing disciples, the "Jews" now appear on the scene and will prove to be relentless and unbelieving opponents of Jesus.

The theme of "signs" is also continued. The lordly action of Jesus in the court of the Temple is not given this name, which is reserved for miraculous works; but the interrogators demand a "sign," here too the gulf of misunderstanding and unbelief is seen to open up between Jesus and the "Jews" (cf. 6:30, 36). In the end, only the disciples show faith. But again, as at Cana, all this is rather hinted at than described--a beginning only, but one which already prefigures the end.

What is about to take place is carefully described as to time and place, for both are important. The beginning and ending of Jesus' public ministry are associated with the Jews' Passover at Jerusalem. It is evident that part of John's plan is to show Jesus the Messiah as the complete and perfect fulfillment of the Law, the best and highest in Judaism. It is therefore appropriate that this opening public event in Jesus' ministry should be associated with the Passover, the greatest of feasts of the Jews.

(A) **Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover (2:13).**

2:13 And the Passover of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. John keeps meticulous track of Jewish feasts. In addition to other feasts, he mentions three Passovers (2:13; 6:4; 11:55), possibly a fourth (5:1). That he calls it **the Passover of the Jews** is taken by some to indicate that his readers are primarily Gentiles for whom the very elements of Judaism must be explained, and by others to indicate that, as a Christian toward the end of the first century, he is writing from a dismissive and censorious point of view, setting "the Jews" over against Jesus and His church. Neither view is satisfactory. It is hard to believe that John's readers are Gentiles so ignorant of Judaism that they do not know the Passover is Jewish, when at several scores of points John's argument depends on his readers' grasp of subtle and detailed points of Old Testament history and Scripture. It is equally unjustified to detect in this reference to "the Jews" a sweeping indictment of all things Jewish from the perspective of the late first century, when elsewhere John argues that salvation is from the Jews (4:22; ff. notes on 1:19) and uses various devices to portray Jesus as the one who fulfils the promise of Passover. It seems more likely in this instance that because Passover was celebrated in the Temple in **Judea**, and the residents of Judea were called "Jews" by both Galileans and diaspora Hebrews, the Passover is called **the Passover of the Jews**. This geographical approach to the expression fits the context, since the verse's purpose is to explain why Jesus went "up" to Jerusalem in Judea. (People went "up to Jerusalem," both because Jerusalem stood at a higher elevation than Galilee, and also because historically Jerusalem was the capital city--just as people go "up" to London from all over Britain.).

Sequence 3
2:13-25

The festival of Passover was celebrated on the 14th day of the lunar month of Nisan (full moon at the end of March or beginning of April). It commemorated the night when the Angel of death "passed over" the homes daubed with blood in the prescribed manner, killing the firstborn in all other homes. In the consternation and revulsion that followed,



THE PASSOVER

The Passover commemorated the great deliverance of the people from Egypt (Ex. 12). John mentions the festival much more than do the Synopists and this may well be part of his plan to bring out the Messianic significance of Jesus. What was foreshadowed in the great Passover deliverance in the Old Testament was brought to its consummation in the sacrifice of Jesus.

the Jews escaped from Egypt (Ex. 12--14). Passover was immediately followed by the seven-day Festival of Unleavened Bread (15-22 Nisan).

ONE OR TWO CLEANSINGS?

The primary objections to a double cleansing of the Temple are two. First, there is a deep-seated scholarly bias against doubles of anything in Scripture, primarily because of the desire to tease out trajectories of developments. If there was one event with two reports, then the differences between the reports provide evidence of the way the tradition developed. Most such trajectories are highly speculative; they remain uncontrolled as long as it is unclear what criteria distinguish this sort of interpretation from one that postulates two similar events with independent reports. On both sides appeal is made to John's distinctive language. Morris (pp. 188-189), for instance provides a list of distinctive vocabulary and narrative detail to support his view that there were two separate cleansings of the Temple. Others note similarities: in both John and the Synoptics, the event occurs near a Passover, Jesus overturns the tables of the moneychangers, and (at least within the proximate context) the question of His authority is raised. It is very doubtful if either argument proves very much. Against Morris, distinctiveness in detail and in vocabulary is so typical of John's handling of any event reported both by Synoptists and John that the independence of narrative detail and locutions in the Fourth Gospel can scarcely be called on to prove there were two events. Morris is on surer ground when he points out that all of John 1--5, apart from some material on John the Baptist, constitutes a great block of non-Synoptic material. Why or how an ancient editor managed to secure this pericope

Continued on next page

For those who read John's Gospel according to the principles of narrative, his Gospel appears to record at least three distinct Passover feasts: (a) the Passover mentioned here in 2:13; (b) another Passover mentioned in 6:4; (c) the Passover of Jesus' death mentioned in 12:1, 12, 20 and 13:1. On this basis, Jesus' public ministry is determined to have lasted at least two years. However, when the Gospel is read according to the principles of parallelism instead of the principles of narrative, the Passover in 2:13 may very well be the same as the Passover of Jesus' death mentioned in 12:1 and 13:1. The length of Jesus' public ministry cannot, therefore, be solidly based on the number of Passovers mentioned in John's Gospel.

(B) His disciples remember the words of Scripture (2:14-17).

2:14 in the Temple. From what follows, it is clear that the whole Temple area, which embraced many buildings and extensive courtyards and not just the Temple itself, is meant. The oxen, sheep and pigeons were used in the Passover celebration. Moneychangers did business changing foreign currency, forbidden in the Temple area, into the shekels and half-shekels required for tribute. This annual

alone and insert it into his material is hard to fathom. Against more sceptical interpretations, it is also hard to imagine two cleansings of the Temple without some similarities. That both should occur near a Passover festival is not too surprising, since only at the high feasts would we be likely to find Jesus in Jerusalem.

Second, it is often argued that if Jesus had cleansed the Temple once, the authorities would never have let him get away with it again. This is ingenuous. If there were two cleansings, they were separated by two years, possibly three. During that interval Jesus visited Jerusalem several times for other appointed festivals, without attempting another Temple-cleansing. The authorities could not possibly be expected to keep their guard up against Him indefinitely. If He was not arrested the first time, it may well be because a certain amount of public feeling sided with Jesus; is not that suggested by 2:23?

In short, it is not possible to resolve with certainty whether with principles of narrative only one cleansing of the Temple took place, or two. However, when this Gospel is read according to the principles of parallelism instead of the principles of narrative, the events of John 2:13-25 may well parallel those of the Synoptic accounts.

half-shekel was equal to half a Tyrian stater or tetradrachm, and so two Jews often joined together to pay the tax in one coin (cf. Mt. 17:27). In addition the tables of the money-changers were not set up all year round, but only around the time when the Temple tax was collected. In Jerusalem, this was from 25 Adar on (the lunar month before Nisan).

2:15-16 and drove them all out of the temple. Instead of solemn dignity and the murmur of prayer, there is the bellowing of cattle and the bleating of sheep. Instead of brokenness and contrition, holy adoration and prolonged petition, there is noisy commerce. Jesus' complaint is not that they are guilty of sharp business practices and should therefore reform their ethical life, but that they should not be in the Temple area at all!

Jesus' physical action was forceful, but not cruel; one does not easily drive out cattle and sheep without a whip of cords. Still, His action could not have generated a riotous uproar, or there would have been swift reprisals for the Roman troops in the fortress of Antonia overlooking part of the Temple complex.

Perhaps underlying Jesus' words is the accusation of Jeremiah: "Has this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?" (Jer. 7:11). The Synoptics record similar sentiments (cf. Mk. 11:17; Mt. 21:13; Lk. 19:46). Theologically, the cleansing of the Temple emphasizes the same theme as the miracle at Cana--the theme of replacement. What is new is John's linking of the Messianic Age with the death and resurrection of Jesus (cf. vv. 18-22).

2:17 ZEAL FOR THY HOUSE. The quotation is from Psalm 69:9 and contrasts Jesus' attitude toward the Temple with that of the Jews. The Old Testament reference finds the psalmist crying to God because of the implacable opposition he has endured from his foes. A major source of this enmity is their failure to understand or be sympathetic with the psalmist's profound commitment to the Temple. That is why he can say, ". . . zeal for your house consumes me," for it is his zeal for the Temple that has placed him in this invidious position. With other New Testament writers, however, John detects in the experiences of David a prophetic paradigm that anticipates what must take place in the life of "great David's greater Son." That explains why the words in 2:17, quoted from the LXX, change the tense to the future: *Zeal for your house will consume me*. Jesus' cleansing of the Temple testifies to His concern for pure worship, a right relationship with God at the place supremely designated to serve as the focal point of the relationship between God and man. But it is that very concern that is attracting opposition. For John, the manner by which Jesus will be "consumed" is doubtless His death. If His disciples *remembered* these words at the time, they probably focused on the zeal, not the manner of the "consumption." Only later would they detect in these words a reference to His death (cf. 2:22).

(C) "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (2:18-21)

2:18 What sign do You show to us, seeing that You do these things? Jesus' actions and His claim that the Temple is His Father's house presuppose extraordinary authority (cf. Mt. 21:23; Mk. 11:27) and call for proof supporting such authority. Since many false messiahs had arisen in the first century, the Jewish authorities rightly asked Jesus for a sign to confirm His authority. The sign Jesus will give is the sign of the resurrection (the sign that the Jews still refused to accept in John's time at the end of the first century). Jesus' words here are not unlike those of Matthew 12:38-40, where Jesus, when asked for a sign by the Pharisees, gives the sign of Jonah, who was returned to dry land after three days in the stomach of a great fish.

Interestingly enough, the Jews do not dispute the rightness of Jesus' action. They were not so much defending the Temple traffic as questioning Jesus' implied claim to be the Messiah. Thus their test for Jesus was, "Can you do the signs of the Messiah?" Paul could think of the Jews as seekers after signs just as typically as the Greeks were pursuers of wisdom (1 Cor. 1:22). In the Temple cleansing the Jews discerned a messianic claim and they demanded accordingly that He authenticate Himself by a sign. One should note again how faithfully John records anything that bears on Jesus' messiahship.

2:19 "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." All the words in this statement are subject to double meanings. "Destroy" can refer to destruction of a building or to the dissolution of a human life. "Temple" can refer to a material edifice or to a human body. "Raise" can refer to rebuilding or resurrection. The Jews take the first meaning in every case; Jesus, as John explains in verses 21-22, intends the second. This leads to a massive misunderstanding and at the same time focuses the reader's attention on what is central to the Evangelist's theological interests, namely, the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus, which will be the subject of Sequence 19 (chs. 18--19), the chiasmic parallel of Sequence 3!

On the face of it, Jesus was inviting the authorities to destroy the literal Temple, and was promising to raise it again within three days of its destruction. At the literal level, they were unlikely to call His bluff. They were nevertheless stymied, since he was offering them a powerful "miraculous sign" to justify His authority for cleansing the Temple. Indeed, it was a marvelously appropriate sign: anyone who could restore the Temple within three days of its complete destruction must be judged to have the authority to regulate its practices.

It is interesting that at the trial of Jesus one of the charges brought against Him was that He had said He would destroy the Temple and raise it up again (Mt. 26:60f; Mk. 14:57-59). The mockers flung the same accusation at the dying Sufferer on the cross (Mt. 27:40; Mk. 15:29). Even Stephen's opponents said, "we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us" (Acts 6:14; cf. Acts 7:48; 17:24). It is clear that the charge was persistent and repeated.

2:20 "It took forty-six years to build this temple" The Jews are naturally incredulous that a building under construction for forty-six years could be rebuilt in three days. Their misunderstanding arises because they focus on the purely material, the natural; they miss what Jesus is really talking about. Irony and misunderstanding are also reported in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g.. Mk. 7:15ff.; 8:15.), but they are prominent features in the Gospel of John (e.g. 3:3ff.; 6:41ff.; 11:4-53).

Herod begun his reconstruction of the Temple in 20 B.C., and it was not fully completed until 63 A.D. Presumably the major work was finished in the first forty-six years of construction. The fact that it was still not complete would heighten their amazement at a statement which they understood to mean that Jesus claimed the power to erect its like in a mere three days.

2:21 But He was speaking of the temple of His body. The Evangelist clarifies the Jews' misunderstanding by reminding his readers that Jesus was really talking about His death and resurrection. Explanations that clear away misunderstandings are common in John (e.g. 6:64, 71; 7:5, 39; 11:13, 51-52; 12:6, 33; 20:9). John explains that what Jesus was really referring to (in v. 19) was His own body, that body in which the Word became flesh (1:14). The Father and the incarnate Son enjoy unique mutual indwelling (14:10-11). Therefore it is the human body of Jesus that uniquely manifests the Father, and becomes the focal point of the manifestation of God to man, the living abode of God on earth, the fulfillment of all the Temple meant, and the center of all true worship (over against all other claims of "holy places," 4:20-24). In this "temple" the ultimate sacrifice would take place; within three days of death and burial, Jesus Christ, the true Temple, would rise from the dead.

Implicit in Jesus' words and in the Evangelist's clarification of what He meant is the replacement of the Temple as God's place of worship by the crucified and risen body of Jesus, which is to become the Temple of the New Covenant. In Him, as the Prologue so succinctly put this same truth, the Word "became flesh and tabernacled among us" (1:14).

(B') His disciples remember the words of Scripture (2:22)

2:22 When therefore He was raised from the dead, His disciples remembered that He said this; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had spoken. John is the first to admit that neither he nor the other disciples understood any of this at the time. With Jesus' resurrection came the wonderful gift of the Holy Spirit, the "Paraclete" (cf. chs. 14--16), who called to their minds what Jesus had said and enabled them to understand it (14:26; 16:14). After the resurrection, however, they understood the Scriptures in relation to Jesus in a way that was not possible before (cf. Lk. 24:44-45). Nonetheless, he wishes to testify to Jesus' foreknowledge of His death and resurrection, and in this he is in full agreement with Mark (8:31; 14:58; 15:29); Matthew (16:21; 26:61; 27:39; 28:63); and Luke (9:22).

John states that they **believed the Scripture** without citing any specific one (although it is possible we should link this statement with Jesus' citation of Psalm 69:9 in verse 16). Perhaps John is thinking of a number of passages that promise the vindication of the Messiah, or more specific ones (e.g. Ps. 16:8-11, cited by Peter in Acts 2:25-28) at which we can only guess.

(A') **Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover (2:23-25)**

2:23 Many believed in His name, beholding His signs which He was doing. We are briefly reminded of the wide-ranging ministry Jesus had already undertaken, even if relatively few individual narratives have been preserved for us (cf. 20:30-31). John's theological reflection, however, deals not so much with miracles or signs, as he calls them, but with the nature of the faith that flows from them. As he will indicate in a number of places (cf. 4:42, 48; 6:14-15; 9:39-41; 12:37-43; 20:29), faith based on signs alone is not always genuine faith in the Person for which purpose they are given. This is relatively clear in 4:48; 6:25-29; 6:60-67; 20:26-29. What was said by Jesus about the sower and the seed and different kinds of soil the seed falls on (cf. Mk. 4:3-20; Mt. 13:4-23; Lk. 8:5-15) is said in a different way in John's Gospel, but the teaching is the same, namely, not every faith-response to Jesus is a true faith-response!

2:24-25 But Jesus . . . was not entrusting Himself to them . . . because He did not need anyone to bear witness concerning man for He Himself knew what was in man. Sadly, their faith was spurious, and Jesus knew it. Unlike other religious leaders, he cannot be duped by flattery, enticed by praise or caught off-guard in innocence. His knowledge of men's hearts is profound, and accounts in part for the diversity of His approaches to individuals in the Gospels. He therefore **was not entrusting Himself to them** to these spurious converts. These cryptic words deal with the theme of genuine faith-response and prepare the way for much that follows in the Gospel, beginning with the Nicodemus episode (3:1-21).

The Greek text repeats the verb of "trusting," but with a slightly different meaning: we might paraphrase, "the people **trusted** in His name, but He did not **entrust** Himself to them."). By implication, Jesus wonderfully promises to entrust Himself to those who truly trust Him (cf. 10:14, 15).

One should not overlook the partial parallel of verse 25 to that of Jeremiah 17:10: "I the LORD search the heart and examine the mind." Even in this regard, then, Jesus, far from being limited like other human beings, does what God does (5:19).

THEMES

The central theme of Sequence 3 is the theme of replacement--the replacement of the Temple of Jerusalem and its sacrificial rites by the Temple of Jesus' body and the continuous feast of the Passover of the Lamb of God sacrificed on the cross and risen from the tomb.

The conclusion (vv. 23-25) heightens the theme of the Jews' negative response to Jesus insinuated in their reaction to Jesus' words "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (vv. 18-21), and at the same time foreshadows the mystery of the Jews' rejection of Jesus, which will become so much a motif of the Gospel in later sequences (cf. especially 5:16-18; chs. 7--8; 11:45-57; 12:37-50; 15:18--16:4).

The theme of witness is toned down from what it was in the first two sequences but surfaces in Jesus' own witness to his future resurrection and to His replacement in His own body of the sacrificial system of the Jews. This is perhaps why John places this Sequence in the chiasmic center of Part 1 (see page 25).



DISCOVER FOR YOURSELF

1. Anticipating next week's study on Sequence 4 (3:1-21), study the passage and determine its *a b c b' a'* chiastic structure. Hint: The center of the chiastic structure (c) is found in 3:10, the question which Jesus asks Nicodemus, "Are you the teacher of Israel, and do not understand these things?"
2. Read the corresponding chiastic sequence for Sequence 4 (Sequence 18: chs. 13--17). What common words and themes do you find in these parallel chiastically arranged passages?
3. Begin to read and reread the entire Gospel at one sittings. Record any chiastic patterns that you may discover.