

Is John's Gospel Anti-Semitic?

Dr. John H. Niemelä **M**essage **o**f **L**ife Ministries (John **3:16**)

www.mol316.com

For the Honor's Forum, San Diego Christian College

Monday, February 2, 2009

Introduction

For those who use John's Gospel in evangelism, the following quotes may come as a shock. *The Jewish Encyclopedia* characterizes John as "a gospel of Christian love and Jew hatred."¹ Samuel Sandmel says, ". . . John is widely regarded as either the most anti-Semitic or at least the most overtly anti-Semitic of the Gospels."² Francis A. Evelyn says,

We all know that a religion of race-consciousness is being propagated in Germany, involving the glorification of one race—the Teutons, and the vilification of another—the Jews. All do not know and many may be shocked to learn, that a favorite text-book of anti-Jewish propaganda is the Gospel according to St. John. Here, say the Nazis, is a piece of Scripture which needs no editing to bring it into line with our [rather, *their*] views. In it Jesus and the Jews confront each other in antagonism and hatred. The feud between them brought Him to death.³

A good place to start is with Martin Luther. He wrote a diatribe called *On the Jews and Their Lies*. He read certain passages in John as indicting all Jewish people forever.

Our Lord also calls them [Jews] a 'brood of vipers'; furthermore, in John 8 [vv. 39 and 44] he states, 'If you were Abraham's children, you would do what Abraham did. . . . You are of your father the devil.' It was intolerable to them to hear that they were not Abraham's but the devil's children, nor can they bear to hear this today. If they should surrender this boast and argument, their whole system which is built on it would topple and change.

I hold that if their Messiah, for whom they hope, should come and do away with their boast and its basis they would crucify and blaspheme him seven times worse than they did our Messiah. . . .⁴

Bultmann says that John called unbelievers *Jews*; one ceases being a *Jew* upon belief.

The term *hoi Ioudaioi* [the Jews], characteristic of the Evangelist, gives an overall portrayal of the Jews, viewed from the standpoint of Christian faith, as the representatives of unbelief (and thereby, as will appear, of the unbelieving 'world' in general). The Jews are spoken of as an alien people, not merely from the point of view of the Greek readers, but also, and indeed only properly from the standpoint of faith; for Jesus Himself speaks to them as a stranger and correspondingly, those in whom the stirrings of faith or of the search for Jesus are to be found are distinguished from the 'Jews' even if they are themselves Jews. In this connection therefore even the Baptist does not appear to belong to the 'Jews'. This usage leads to the recession or the complete disappearance of the distinctions made in the Synoptics between different elements in the Jewish people; Jesus stands over against the Jews.⁵

¹ *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "New Testament," 9:251.

² Samuel Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 101.

³ Francis A. Evelyn, "The Supra-Racial Gospel," *ExpTim* 49 (June 1938): 419.

⁴ Martin Luther, "On the Jews and Their Lies," in *The Christian in Society*, vol. 4, ed. Franklin Sherman, trans. Martin H. Bertram, Luther's Works, vol. 47, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971): 141–42. The brackets around the verse references are part of the original cited text.

⁵ Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray (gen. ed.), R.W.N. Hoare, and J.K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 86. He wrote this in 1941, while Hitler was in power.

Walter Gutbrod wrote the article on Israel in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT), a translation of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (TWNT), a German work dating to the 1930s. Nazi Germany would certainly welcome scholarly assessments that John was anti-Semitic. Gutbrod's assessment is that John uses *Jew* for Jewish unbelievers: a believing descendant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob would be a Christian.

. . . John's use of *hoi Ioudaioi* [has] an emphasis which obviously did not lie in the name previously, but was made possible by the fact that it denoted the religious attitude of those who were thus designated. *Hoi Ioudaioi* is a name for those who reject the claim of Jesus to lordship, and who remain Jews because they do so.

On the other hand, we must insist that there is no detachment of the name from the national foundation. A man is not called a *Ioudaios* simply because he does not believe and rejects Christ. He has first to be a Jew by nationality. In fact, Jn. never uses *Ioudaios* for a proselyte.⁶

Severino Pancaro's volume in the prestigious Supplements to Novum Testamentum series is a kinder-gentler statement of the same view.⁷

A contrast is obviously being drawn between "true Israelites", of whom Nathanael is the typical figure, and "false Israelites". The name "Israelite" is reserved for those who are like Nathanael; those who are not may *call themselves* "Israelites", but have no right to do so. Those who are unlike Nathanael are obviously the "Jews". It is they who refuse to acknowledge Jesus and maintain the skepticism Nathanael showed at the outset, hardening it into opposition and hatred.

This view of John can easily push theologians to a replacement view of Galatians 6:16, seeing the Church as the *Israel of God*.

And as many as walk according to this rule, peace and mercy be upon them, and upon the Israel of God. (NKJV)

The Israel of God refers to Jewish believers. It does not include Gentile believers. It is not a reference to the universal Church (which includes Gentiles), but is restricted to Jewish believers within the larger universal Church. Clearly, this is not a view that Luther, Bultmann, Gutbrod, or Pancaro would accept.

Thus far, this paper has presented statements by Jews claiming that John's Gospel is foundational to anti-Semitism within Christendom. The representative responses by Luther, Bultmann, Gutbrod, or Pancaro openly assert their view that John uses *Jew* as a pejorative term.

Most Johannine scholars would agree with the following:

John reserved the term Jew for Jewish unbelievers and did not regard himself as a Jew, even though he was a descendant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

As a result, the commentary literature on John generally has (in the opinion of the speaker) much difficulty understanding the seventy-one passages in which John uses the term *Ioudaios*. Many of these passages are quite strategic, so users of commentaries often are blindly led into views that the Apostle John did not intend.

⁶ Walter Gutbrod, s.v. "Israēl," TDNT, 3:379.

⁷ Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 42, ed. W.C. Van Unnik, et al. (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1975), 293.

A Lexical Issue

The term *Ioudaios* is analogous to the term *Yankee*. For the purposes of this paper, consider three definitions of *Yankee*:

1. Someone from New England,
2. Someone from north of the Mason-Dixon line,
3. Someone from the United States.

Assume that someone says, *Yankee, go home*. If the speaker and listener are in Iran, Yankee refers to an *American citizen*. If the speaker is in Mississippi, it means *northerner*. If the speaker is in Pennsylvania, he probably is telling a New Englander to go further north, to New England.

If one wants to have a fistfight, just try calling a Mississippian (who descended from a Confederate soldier) a Yankee. That same man would be more gracious to Parisian shouting *Merci, Yankees* to the Americans liberating Paris from the Nazis.

In like manner, the term *Ioudaios* could refer to geographic areas:

1. Someone from the tribal area of Judah,
2. Someone from the Roman province of Judea (a larger area than the tribe of Judah)
3. Someone from Judea, Samaria,⁸ or Galilee.

It also could be an ethnic term:

4. A descendant of Judah (a member of the tribe of Judah),
5. A descendant of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob.

By far, most Jewish people living in the Roman province of Judea were from the tribe of Judah. It is probably also safe to say that most Judeans lived in Judea. There is evidence in John that he applied the term to Judean émigrés who lived in Galilee. Furthermore, evidence shows that a sizeable Judean populace lived in Galilee. My take is that John reserves the term *Ioudaios* for residents of Judea and for former residents who regarded themselves as aliens from Judea.

The Basis of a Judean Approach

After these things Jesus moved about in Galilee, since He did not want to travel in Judea because the Judeans were trying to kill Him. (John 7:1, Logos21 Version).

This translation renders *Ioudaioi* as *Judeans* (not as *Jews*), because the verse identifies them as residents of Judea. Many other translations render it as *Jews*, but this does not seem likely. Consider also, John 4:45a.

Therefore, when they entered Galilee, the Galileans welcomed Him. . . . (Logos21 Version).

If Galileans are the residents of Galilee, what term would John use for residents of Judea? I propose that *Ioudaios* means *Judean* in John's Gospel.

Were Jesus and His Family Judeans or Galileans?

The genealogy of Joseph (Matthew 1:1–17) identifies him as from David's lineage, so he is of the tribe of Judah. Similarly, Mary's genealogy (Luke 3:23–38) shows her to be of the same tribe.

⁸ It is not my plan to go into the issue of God regarding Samaritans as Jews, but am prepared to do so.

Even though they were ethnically Judean, they both lived in Nazareth (in Galilee) even before they were married (Luke 1:26–27).

²⁶ *Now in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth,*
²⁷ *to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. The virgin's name was Mary.* (NKJV)

They traveled to Bethlehem for a census, at which time Jesus was born. Roman censuses were taken for the purposes of taxation, so this is often seen as evidence that Joseph had an interest in some land near Bethlehem. After Jesus was born, the family fled to Egypt, before returning to Nazareth. Matthew 2:22 says that Joseph was afraid to go to Judea, but God revealed that it was safe to return to Nazareth.

Although Jesus (the eldest child) was the only one born in Judea, his half-brothers regarded themselves as Judeans. Consider the advice they gave to Jesus, after He had avoided Judea for a year.⁹ In John 7:3, after Jesus had lost many disciples (John 6), they said,

Leave here and go up to Judea so your disciples will see the works which you are doing. (Logos21)

Jesus' half-brothers' true loyalties were to Judea. Although born in Galilee, they identified with Judea.

The Problem Passage

John 6:41–42 is the biggest single reason why many reject the Judean approach. John 6:59 indicates that these words were spoken in the synagogue in Capernaum (in Galilee). Although this passage has dissuaded many, the objection is not weighty.

⁴¹ *Then the Jews started grumbling about Him, because He said, "I am the Bread that came down from Heaven."* ⁴² *And they were saying, "Isn't this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? So how can this man say, "I have come down from Heaven?"* (Logos21)

The objection to the Judean approach is this: Jesus and His family resided in Galilee since Jesus was a very little boy. How would we expect residents of Judea (1) to know Jesus and His family and (2) to travel all the way to a synagogue in Capernaum to raise this objection? The normal approach has been to say, *Ioudaios* means *Jew*, not *Judean*.

However, Jesus and His family are not the only Judeans in Galilee. John gives a few clues. In the wedding at Cana that Jesus attended, Mary mentioned the lack of wine (John 2:3). His reply that His *time has not yet come*, indicates that she wanted Him to fix the problem. After conversing with Jesus, she told the servants *Do whatever He tells you* (John 2:5). The fact that she asked Jesus to fix the problem plus the fact that she gave orders to the servants tells us that she was in charge of the kitchen. Yet, Cana is an hour from Nazareth. Why would a poor woman be in charge of food in a wedding so far from home? It would be a wedding of friends or family.

The fact that Joseph (before he married) and Mary (while she was single) both lived in Nazareth argues that they both had family in Galilee. This would especially be true of Mary, because a single woman would not have moved on her own.

⁹ I regard the unnamed feast in John 5 as the Feast of Booths for chronological reasons. It was then (in John 5) that religious leaders in Jerusalem sought His death.

A Geo-political Resolution to the Problem Passage

A few miles from Nazareth was the city of Sepphoris (Zippori). Although unmentioned by the New Testament, Herod the Great made it his first Galilean capitol. The fact that the Romans enslaved and deported all the residents of that area when they conquered it allowed Herod to make a fresh start. Josephus says that Herod made it into the crown jewel of Galilee. As his Galilean capitol, he had many monumental building projects there. However, the area was devoid of population. The creation of a new city worthy of the accolade crown jewel of Galilee required that many skilled artisans move there. For Joseph, a carpenter, to live in close proximity to Sepphoris would mean that much work was available. Economic opportunity drew many from other places. Surely, one would expect a contingent of skilled artisans from the vicinity of Jerusalem to find their way to the area around Sepphoris. It is quite plausible for that region to contain many émigrés from Judea. Such people would have a Judean accent, carry on Judean customs, be more interested in going to Jerusalem for feasts (than their Galilean neighbors). Luke 2:44 indicates that Joseph and Mary traveled in a large contingent of *relatives and acquaintances* back and forth to Passover when Jesus was twelve years old. Judeans would have predominated this group of pilgrims.

Matthew 17 also gives clues that many Judeans lived in Galilee.

²⁴ When they had come to Capernaum, those who received the temple tax came to Peter and said, "Does your Teacher not pay the temple tax?" ²⁵ He said, "Yes." And when he had come into the house, Jesus anticipated him, saying, "What do you think, Simon? From whom do the kings of the earth take customs or taxes, from their sons or from strangers?" ²⁶ Peter said to Him, "From strangers." Jesus said to him, "Then the sons are free. ²⁷ "Nevertheless, lest we offend them, go to the sea, cast in a hook, and take the fish that comes up first. And when you have opened its mouth, you will find a piece of money; take that and give it to them for Me and you." (NKJV)

We note that the tax collectors are in Galilee (Capernaum), but the Temple is in Jerusalem. They approach Peter, rather than Jesus, and ask whether Jesus pays the tax. Then, in verse 27, Jesus refers to non-payment as offending the tax collectors, rather than leading them to try to arrest Him. This is in keeping with the fact that these tax collectors had no way to enforce the payment of the tax in Galilee. How many would voluntarily pay such a tax? Few Galileans paid. There was a lot of history going back to Old Testament times when northern tribes resented the Temple being in the south. Hence, Samaria encouraged worship at Shechem and at Mt. Gerizim. Galileans had no great love for Jerusalem and did not support the Temple financially.

However, a question must be asked: Why would temple-tax collectors go throughout Galilee, trying to collect a voluntary tax, unless there were sufficient numbers of Judeans (who were more likely to pay the tax)?

My contention is that many Judeans lived in Galilee, while identifying themselves as Judeans. (Jesus' half-brothers exemplify this in John 7:3). Luke 2:44 spoke of a large group of people (mainly Judeans) who knew Joseph and Mary that traveled from Galilee to Jerusalem for the Passover. John speaks of Judeans in a Capernaum synagogue who knew Jesus' family. This does not constitute an objection to the Judean approach to *Ioudaios* in John. Many Judeans resided in Galilee. Some of them would have known Jesus' earthly family.

The Passage that Seems to Use *Ioudaios* as a Pejorative

John 7:10–8:59 occur in the Temple during the Feast of Booths. John 7:37–8:1 occur on the seventh day (*the last and great day of the feast*). John 8:2–59 happen on the eighth day, which was a high Sabbath appended to the seven days of the feast. During each of the seven days, there were animal sacrifices, a water ceremony, the lighting of the Court of the Women. For six of the seven days, people lived in booths. (From this evidence comes a strong internal argument for the authenticity of John 7:53–8:11, but that is a topic for another time).

Consider John 8:20, which places Jesus in Treasury (within the Court of the Women) on the eighth day of the feast.

Jesus spoke these words in the treasury, while teaching in the temple courts. Yet no one seized Him, because His time had not yet come. (Logos21).

No text that has yet been discovered specifies directly the location of the Treasury. However, a wide consensus exists that it was within the Court of the Women.

Excursis on the Location of the Treasury

The fact that a woman (the poor widow who gave her two mites in Mark 12:43) was in the Treasury means that it cannot be in a place inaccessible to women. This limits the location to the Court of the Gentiles or to the Court of the Women.

Vendors of animals and moneychangers occupied such a large proportion of the Court of the Gentiles that Gentile worship was precluded during Passover. *He taught, saying to them, “Is it not written, ‘My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations’? But you have made it a ‘den of thieves.’”* (Mark 11:17, NKJV). The word *nations* is regularly translated *Gentiles*. On the basis of Mark 11:17, it would seem unlikely that the Treasury would be located within the Court of the Gentiles.

Another argument solidifies this conclusion. The *Antonia*, a fortress occupied by the Romans, overlooked the Court of the Gentiles. Roman soldiers were free to enter the Court of the Gentiles. However, signs were posted (one of which still survives) that warn Gentiles against entering the Court of the Women on the pain of death. Logically, the Treasury should be inside the Court of the Women, where Temple police could use deadly force and where the Romans could not enter. Thus, the consensus is that the Treasury was in the Court of the Women.

End of Excursis; Resumption of Argument

John 8:20 says that Jesus spoke in the Treasury, but was not arrested, because His time had not yet come. The reason for mentioning that He spoke in the Treasury is because that was a high-security area. Despite many police, no one arrested Him.

A further implication is that everyone present was Jewish. Now, remember that most students of John’s Gospel say emphatically that *Ioudaios* in John 6:41 must mean *Jew*, not *Judean*. (John 6:42 is where *Ioudaioi* at the synagogue in Capernaum who knew Jesus’ family denied that Jesus had a heavenly origin). Those same scholars reject—based on their understanding of John 6:41–42—the idea that John 8 could speak of Judeans. They insist on translating *Ioudaioi* in John 8 as *Jews*.

Let us look at the pertinent verses in John 8:

So Jesus said to those Jews who had believed Him, “If you abide in My word, you are really My disciples.” (John 8:31, Logos21)

So in reply the Jews said to Him, “Aren’t we right in saying You are a Samaritan and have a demon?” (John 8:48, Logos21)

Then the Jews said to Him, “Now we know that You have a demon! Abraham died, and so did the prophets; yet You say, ‘If anyone keeps My word he shall never taste death’?” (John 8:52, Logos21)

Then the Jews said to Him, “You aren’t yet fifty years old, and have You seen Abraham?” (John 8:57, Logos21)

Let us see the problem, through a paraphrase of each verse:

John, a Jew, wrote that a Jew said to the Jews in a place where only Jews were present. . . . (8:31)

John, a Jew, wrote that the Jews said to a Jew in a place where only Jews were present. . . . (8:48)

John, a Jew, wrote that the Jews said to a Jew in a place where only Jews were present. . . . (8:48)

John, a Jew, wrote that the Jews said to a Jew in a place where only Jews were present. . . . (8:57)

It is not natural for a narrator to keep mentioning the name of a group to which all participants belong. Therefore, many interpreters have concluded that John means Jewish unbeliever, when he uses the term *Ioudaios*.

Raymond Brown says in his remarks about John 8:31,

viii 31. *those Jews who had believed in him*. That the remarks that follow are directed to believers is very hard to reconcile with the sharp disagreement uttered by these “believers” in vs. 33 and their desire to kill Jesus in vs. 37. Some have pointed out that it is said that these “Jews” believed *him* (dative); it is not said they believed *in him* (*eis* with the accusative, which is a stronger expression).¹⁰ Yet Dodd, *rt.cit.*, p. 6, insists that the variation is meaningless here; and even if a partial faith is meant, this can scarcely be reconciled with a desire to kill Jesus a few lines later. Almost certainly the words of Jesus in this section were addressed to the same type of disbelievers we have been encountering all along.¹¹

For all intents and purposes, most interpreters regard the term *Ioudaios* in John as a codeword for Jewish unbeliever. Therefore, it is quite common for them to regard the Jews who believed in Him (8:31) as a signal from John that they did not really believe. However, we need to understand something about the difference between John and the Synoptics.

Most Synoptic events occur in Galilee, because Jesus spent most of His time there. We learn in John 7:1 and in John 4:1 (after studying the context of John 1–3) that Judea was a place of organized opposition to Jesus (as it had been for John the Baptist) by the religious authorities.

Yet, John’s Gospel devotes most of its attention (other than portions of John 1–4 and 6–7) to His ministry in Judea. Why is this? John seeks to prove that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus must stand up to the scrutiny of the religious authorities in Jerusalem.

Most (if not all) of the original twelve disciples were Galileans (or residents of Galilee). [It is quite conceivable that James and John were Judean resident of Galilee, but that is another paper]. In any event, the fact that John wrote from a Galilean perspective, he often spoke of Judeans. He occasionally spoke of Galileans.

In John 8, which was the eighth day of the Feast of Booths, the booths in which people stayed had been dismantled on the seventh day. Many of the pilgrims went home on the seventh day. Therefore, the bulk of the people were Judean that were in the Treasury. A little drama will demonstrate how the passage works.

¹⁰ Though a common viewpoint, it is a specious argument. *Pisteuō* takes a double object, though usually one is implicit. Cf. BDAG, s.v. “*Pisteuō*,” 1st ed. on page 817a, “w. pers[on]. And thing added *p[isteuō]* *tini ti* believe someone with regard to someth[ing]. , , , J[ohn] 14:11a. Cp. 4:21; Ac 27:25.”

John 14:11a Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me. Jesus told Philip to believe certain content: *that I am in the Father and the Father in Me*. What does His use of Me tell us? Philip was supposed to believe Jesus, when He says *I am in the Father and the Father in Me*.

John 4:21 is similar. A speaker utters content. The woman is to believe the speaker, when He speaks certain content. *Jesus said to her, “Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father.”*

Acts 27:25 follows the same pattern. Paul believed the content that God revealed to him. *Therefore take heart, men, for I believe God that it will be just as it was told me.*

Confirmation that *pisteuō* plus the dative is not a substandard kind of faith appears right in the context. Consider John 8:45–46. Yet, because I tell the truth, you don’t believe Me. Which of you convicts Me of sin? But if I do tell the truth, why don’t you believe Me? Clearly, Jesus has as His goal that they believe Him (*pisteuō* + dative). Brown is wrong in claiming that (*pisteuō* + dative) is substandard.

¹¹ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (i–xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. AB, vol. 29. 2nd ed. Gen. eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 354.

***Ioudaios* Is Not a Pejorative Term in John**

Consider John 12:9–11:

⁹ Now a large crowd of the Judeans learned that He was there. They came not only because of Jesus, but also to see Lazarus, whom He had raised from the dead. ¹⁰ However the chief priests decided to kill Lazarus too, ¹¹ because he was the reason many of the Judeans were falling away and believing in Jesus.

Consider John 4:9, where Jesus accepted the Samaritan woman's characterization of Him as a Judean:

So the Samaritan woman said to Him, "How is it that You, a Judean, ask a drink from me, a Samaritan woman?" (For Judeans do not associate with Samaritans).

Evidence that He accepted the identification as a Judean comes in John 4:22:

You [Samaritans] worship what you do not know. We [Judeans] worship what we do know, because salvation is from the Judeans.

If John regarded *Ioudaios* as a pejorative term, why did he not append an editorial remark to what Jesus said? Or another way of stating this, why would he assign a pejorative meaning to a term that he acknowledges that Jesus used positively?

My Take on *Ioudaios* in John

Some Judeans were religious leaders; some were not. Some Judeans were believers; others were not. Some Judeans were opponents of Jesus; others were not. Some Judeans lived in Judea; others lived elsewhere.

One cannot assume that *Ioudaios* always refers to opponents of Jesus any more than one can assume that German always refers to Nazis, or Cuban always means a member of the Communist party, or American always refers to a rich capitalist. Unfortunately, biblical scholarship has been marred by uncritical labeling and libeling according to stereotypes. John was not anti-Semitic.

Many issues hinge on this. An anti-Semitic portrayal of John's Gospel puts an additional stumbling block in front of Jewish people reading the book designed to give the message of life. Such a view plays into the hands of replacement theology. It also would put John at odds with Jesus, who did not regard *Ioudaios* as a pejorative term. It is vital that we correct this.

Appendix: Uses of *Ioudaios* in John (NKJ as base)

Now this is the testimony of John, when Judeans sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, "Who are you?" (1:19)

Now there were set there six waterpots of stone, according to the manner of purification of Judeans, containing twenty or thirty gallons apiece. (2:6)

Now the Passover of Judeans was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. (2:13)

So Judeans answered and said to Him, "What sign do You show to us, since You do these things?" (2:18)

Then Judeans said, "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple, and will You raise it up in three days?" (2:20)

There was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a ruler of Judeans. (3:1)

After these things Jesus and His disciples came into the land of Judea [Judean countryside], and there He remained with them and baptized. (3:22)

Then there arose a dispute between some of John's disciples and a Judean about purification. (3:25)

He left Judea and departed again to Galilee. (4:3)

Then the woman of Samaria said to Him, "How is it that You, being a Judean, ask a drink from me, a Samaritan woman?" For Judeans have no dealings with Samaritans. (4:9)

"You worship what you do not know; we know what we worship, for salvation is of Judeans. (4:22)

When he heard that Jesus had come out of Judea into Galilee, he went to Him and implored Him to come down and heal his son, for he was at the point of death. (4:47)

This again is the second sign Jesus did when He had come out of Judea into Galilee. (4:54)

After this there was a feast of Judeans, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. (5:1)

Judeans therefore said to him who was cured, "It is the Sabbath; it is not lawful for you to carry your bed." (5:10)

The man departed and told Judeans that it was Jesus who had made him well. (5:15)

For this reason Judeans persecuted Jesus, and sought to kill Him, because He had done these things on the Sabbath. (5:16)

Therefore Judeans sought all the more to kill Him, because He not only broke the Sabbath, but also said that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God. (5:18)

Now the Passover, a feast of Judeans, was near. (6:4)

Judeans then complained about Him, because He said, "I am the bread which came down from heaven." (6:41)

Judeans therefore quarreled among themselves, saying, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" (6:52)

After these things Jesus walked in Galilee; for He did not want to walk in Judea, because Judeans sought to kill Him. (7:1)

Now Judeans' Feast of Tabernacles was at hand. (7:2)

His brothers therefore said to Him, "Depart from here and go into Judea, that Your disciples also may see the works that You are doing. (7:3)

Then Judeans sought Him at the feast, and said, "Where is He?" (7:11)

However, no one spoke openly of Him for fear of Judeans. (7:13)

And Judeans marveled, saying, "How does this Man know letters, having never studied?" (7:15)

Then Judeans said among themselves, "Where does He intend to go that we shall not find Him? Does He intend to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks and teach the Greeks? (7:35)

So Judeans said, "Will He kill Himself, because He says, 'Where I go you cannot come'?" (8:22)

Then Jesus said to those Judeans who believed Him, "If you abide in My word, you are My disciples indeed. (8:31)

Then Judeans answered and said to Him, "Do we not say rightly that You are a Samaritan and have a demon?" (8:48)

Then Judeans said to Him, "Now we know that You have a demon! Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and You say, 'If anyone keeps My word he shall never taste death.' (8:52)

Then Judeans said to Him, "You are not yet fifty years old, and have You seen Abraham?" (8:57)

But Judeans did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind and received his sight, until they called the parents of him who had received his sight. (9:18)

His parents said these things because they feared Judeans, for Judeans had agreed already that if anyone confessed that He was Christ, he would be put out of the synagogue. (9:22)

Therefore there was a division again among Judeans because of these sayings. (10:19)

Then Judeans surrounded Him and said to Him, "How long do You keep us in doubt? If You are the Christ, tell us plainly." (10:24)

Then Judeans took up stones again to stone Him. (10:31)

Judeans answered Him, saying, "For a good work we do not stone You, but for blasphemy, and because You, being a Man, make Yourself God." (10:33)

Then after this He said to the disciples, "Let us go to Judea again." (11:7)

The disciples said to Him, "Rabbi, lately Judeans sought to stone You, and are You going there again?" (11:8)

And many of Judeans had joined the women around Martha and Mary, to comfort them concerning their brother. (11:19)

Then Judeans who were with her in the house, and comforting her, when they saw that Mary rose up quickly and went out, followed her, saying, "She is going to the tomb to weep there." (11:31)

Therefore, when Jesus saw her weeping, and Judeans who came with her weeping, He groaned in the spirit and was troubled. (11:33)

Then Judeans said, "See how He loved him!" (11:36)

Then many of Judeans who had come to Mary, and had seen the things Jesus did, believed in Him. (11:45)

Therefore Jesus no longer walked openly among Judeans, but went from there into the country near the wilderness, to a city called Ephraim, and there remained with His disciples. (11:54)

And the Passover of Judeans was near, and many went from the country up to Jerusalem before the Passover, to purify themselves. (11:55)

Now a great many of Judeans knew that He was there; and they came, not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might also see Lazarus, whom He had raised from the dead. (12:9)

because on account of him many of Judeans went away and believed in Jesus. (12:11)

"Little children, I shall be with you a little while longer. You will seek Me; and as I said to Judeans, 'Where I am going, you cannot come,' so now I say to you. (13:33)

Then the detachment of troops and the captain and the officers of Judeans arrested Jesus and bound Him. (18:12)

Now it was Caiaphas who advised Judeans that it was expedient that one man should die for the people. (18:14)

Jesus answered him, "I spoke openly to the world. I always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where Judeans always meet, and in secret I have said nothing. (18:20)

Then Pilate said to them, "You take Him and judge Him according to your law." Therefore Judeans said to him, "It is not lawful for us to put anyone to death," (18:31)

Then Pilate entered the Praetorium again, called Jesus, and said to Him, "Are You the King of Judeans?" (18:33)

Pilate answered, "Am I a Judean? Your own nation and the chief priests have delivered You to me. What have You done?" (18:35)

Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to Judeans; but now My kingdom is not from here." (18:36)

Pilate said to Him, "What is truth?" And when he had said this, he went out again to Judeans, and said to them, "I find no fault in Him at all. (18:38)

"But you have a custom that I should release someone to you at the Passover. Do you therefore want me to release to you the King of Judeans?" (18:39)

Then they said, "Hail, King of Judeans!" And they struck Him with their hands. (19:3)

Judeans answered him, "We have a law, and according to our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God." (19:7)

From then on Pilate sought to release Him, but Judeans cried out, saying, "If you let this Man go, you are not Caesar's friend. Whoever makes himself a king speaks against Caesar." (19:12)

Now it was the Preparation Day of the Passover, and about the sixth hour. And he said to Judeans, "Behold your King!" (19:14)

Now Pilate wrote a title and put it on the cross. And the writing was: JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF JUDEANS. (19:19)

Then many of Judeans read this title, for the place where Jesus was crucified was near the city; and it was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. (19:20)

Therefore the chief priests of Judeans said to Pilate, "Do not write, 'The King of Judeans,' but, 'He said, "I am the King of Judeans.'" " (19:21)

Therefore, because it was the Preparation Day, that the bodies should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath (for that Sabbath was a high day), Judeans asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. (19:31)

After this, Joseph of Arimathea, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, for fear of Judeans, asked Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus; and Pilate gave him permission. So he came and took the body of Jesus. (19:38)

Then they took the body of Jesus, and bound it in strips of linen with the spices, as the custom of Judeans is to bury. (19:40)

So there they laid Jesus, because of Judeans' Preparation Day, for the tomb was nearby. (19:42)

Then, the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled, for fear of Judeans, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and said to them, "Peace be with you." (20:19)