A Forensic Dialogue Develops from-Antithetical-to-Synonymous Mode (10:22–42)

Setting of the Dialogue

The introductory formula of the episode, i.e., Ἐγένετο τότε, functions in two different ways: first, as a connecting link with the previous episode; and second, as a narrative technique to introduce a new exchange/event/episode (cf. Strachan, 1941: 227–8). The section 10:22–42 develops at two different settings (cf. Powell, 1990: 69–83). The settings of the central exchange (i.e., vv. 22–39) and of the second exchange (vv. 40–42) develop progressively within the narrative framework. The narrator provides greater details about the setting of the central exchange at vv. 22–24a and of the second exchange at v. 40. The setting of the dialogue at vv. 22–39 overlaps as follows: religious and cultic, as it happens during the Festival of Dedication (τὰ ἐγκαίνια, v. 22a; cf. Resseguie, 2005: 113–4); geographical, as it mentions the place where the incident takes place (ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις, v. 22a; Resseguie, 2005: 87–120); architectural, as it happens in the temple (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, specifically ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τοῦ Σολομῶνος, v. 23; cf. Witherington, 1995: 190); and climatic/seasonal, as it unfolds during the winter season (χειμὼν ἦν, v. 22b). The second exchange is mostly developed in an

---

1 Robertson (1932: 184) is of the opinion that, "Tote does not mean that the preceding events followed immediately after the incidents in 10:1–21." What Robertson says has to be reckoned with considerable seriousness as there is a lapse between the events in 10:22–39 and 10:1–21, possibly nearly three months (from just after Tabernacles 7:37 to Dedication 10:22). Haenchen (1984: 2:49) states that, "Verse 22 opens a new segment that extends as far as verse 39. The temporal notices, ‘feast of Dedication’ and ‘winter,’ clearly separate this segment from the preceding." Schnackenburg (1980: 2:303; cf. Mlakuzhyil, 1987: 208) says that, "10:22–39, which takes place at the feast of the Dedication, while being closely tied up with the subject of shepherd and sheep (cf. vv. 26–29), can nonetheless be considered as a unity."

2 Refer to Dodd, 1960: 354–62.

3 In the Jewish year, Hanukkah, the "feast of dedication" (10:22), came soon after Sukkoth, the festival of Tabernacles, indicating another journey to Jerusalem. The Greek term here (ἐγκαίνια) means "renewal" and appears in the LXX for re dedications; it also vaguely resembles the sound of "Hanukkah," "dedication," also used of consecration in the MT. See Brown, 1966: 402; Schnackenburg, 1980: 2:304; Strachan, 1941: 228. Solomon’s ‘portico’ or ‘stoa’ was a
architectural and geographical setting, as follows: first, Jewish attempt to arrest Jesus in the temple and his escape to another setting (v. 39); and second, Jesus’ going away (ἀπῆλθεν) and staying (ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ) across the Jordan (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, vv. 40, 42; cf. Strachan, 1941: 229). Thus there is a transfer of setting from the previous exchange to the latter (see Figure 43).

The dialogue of the central exchange begins with a question from the part of the Jews (v. 24b) and a subsequent response from Jesus (vv. 25b-30). Painter (1993: 359) states that, “The disputation (10:22–39) has direct links with the situation of chap. 5 (and 7). . . . In both chaps. 5 and 10 Jesus’ words concerning his relation to the Father and his works are closely related, and the reported attempts to kill him in chap. 5 lead well into chaps. 7–10.” As in the case of chap. 5, the Jewish reactions toward Jesus are described here in v. 31 and v. 39; in v. 31, they took up stones to stone Jesus, and in v. 39, they attempt to arrest him and he escapes.6

---

**Occasion:** Festival of the Dedication  
**Location:** Jerusalem  
**Season:** Winter  
**Juncture:** While Jesus was walking in the temple  
**Spot:** In the portico of Solomon  
**Interlocutors:** Jesus and the Jews gathered around him

---

6 Carson (1991: 400) is of the view that, “However precious such teaching might be to later believers, it was further evidence of blasphemy to those who first heard it. But their attempt to seize him was as futile as the attempt recorded in 7:30, and doubtless for the same reason: his hour had not yet come.” Cf. Gaebelein, 1936: 190; Morris, 1995: 466; Lindars, 1972: 371; Barrett, 1978: 382–3; Robertson, 1932: 187.