BLAKE WASSELL

John 18:28–19:22 and the Paradox of Judgement

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
543

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber/Associate Editors
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

543

Blake Wassell

John 18:28–19:22 and the Paradox of Judgement

Mohr Siebeck

Blake Wassell, born 1991; 2019 PhD in Theology, University of Otago; currently sessional lecturer in the School of Theology, Australian Catholic University.
orcid.org/0000-0002-8193-5304

ISBN 978-3-16-159928-6 / eISBN 978-3-16-159929-3
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159929-3

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2021 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This monograph revises the doctoral thesis I submitted to the University of Otago in 2019. Paul Trebilco was a tireless primary supervisor who guided and trained me at every turn. James Harding was the secondary supervisor who exposed problems and possibilities in my writing when I could not see them. Stephen Llewelyn was my advisor who shared everything from consoling conversations to cuttings of his plants. Francis Moloney, John Painter, and Derek Tovey engaged with the examination process in the most thorough and generous ways. Michael Tilly welcomed me to try out some of the research at his Universität Tübingen colloquium, as did Emmanuel Nathan at the joint Australian Catholic University and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven seminar. Catrin Williams and an anonymous *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* reader sharpened some of the research. And I am grateful to Jörg Frey for accepting my study into this series, and to the editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck for finalising the manuscript with me. I benefitted from various funding awarded by the University of Otago. The library services there and at the Australian Catholic University never failed. Dermot Nestor offered me my own desk in Strathfield. Gareth Wearne is the reason I had an opportunity to teach university students in the first place. Cathy Kleemann likewise invited me into the Sydney College of Divinity network. Bruce Albiston always reminded me that biblical studies is indispensable, and with Alison enriched New Zealand visits. Alyson and Andrew Tong supplemented my income when I was looking after Isaac and Ellie. Andrew Wassell, as well as Joan and David Tong, helped me pay for an initial year in Dunedin. Timothy Engelbrecht opened his office to me countless times. Gai and Kevin McCaffrey opened their home – and family – to me. Tayla, Jenna, Michelle, and Ken Wassell humoured me in every rant, and encouraged me in every milestone. And Jay met, married, and lived with me during the writing of this book. Her contribution to what follows is in innumerable, untraceable ways entangled with mine.

Sydney, October 2020 Blake Wassell

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ABS	Approaches to Biblical Studies
AC	*L'Antiquité Classique*
ACS	American Classical Studies
Acta Ant. Hung.	*Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*
AE	*L'Année Épigraphique*
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AIIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AJS Review	*Association for Jewish Studies Review*
ANEM	Ancient Near East Monographs
Arion	*Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*
ASP	American Studies in Papyrology
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BBC	Blackwell Bible Commentaries
BCAW	Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World
BDAG	*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed.
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHL	Brill's Handbooks in Linguistics
BHR	Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
Bijdr	*Bijdragen, tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie*
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BP	The Bible and Postcolonialism
BRLJ	Brill Reference Library of Judaism
BRS	The Biblical Resource Series
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

CAHS	Clarendon Ancient History Series
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
CCS	California Classical Studies
CCT	Classics and Contemporary Thought
CGLC	Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics
CH	*Church History*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CJ	*The Classical Journal*
CQ	*The Classical Quarterly*
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
ECIL	Early Christianity and Its Literature
EJIL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
EKS	Essential Knowledge Series
EBib	Études Bibliques
ExpT	*The Expository Times*
FAS	Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
GRTC	Greece and Rome: Texts and Contexts
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
Historia	*Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*
HONME	Handbuch der Orientalistik: The Near and Middle East
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTCNT	Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
I. Knidos	*Die Inschriften von Knidos*, ed. W. Blümel.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
INR	*Israel Numismatic Research*
Int	*Interpretation*
ISACR	Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion
JBibleRecept	*Journal of the Bible and its Reception*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCP	Jewish and Christian Perspectives
JCTS	Jewish and Christian Texts Series
JGRChJ	*Journal of Greco-Roman Judaism and Christianity*
JJMJS	*Journal of the Jesus Movement in its Jewish Setting*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*

JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KKNT	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KTAH	Key Themes in Ancient History
KWJS	Key Words in Jewish Studies
LBS	Linguistic Biblical Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	*A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. 9th ed.
LXX	Septuagint
MBPR	Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte
MM	*The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*, ed. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan.
MT	Masoretic Text
NA28	*Nestle-Aland: Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger. 28th rev. ed.
NC	*The Numismatic Chronicle*
NCB	New Century Bible Commentary
NEA	*Near Eastern Archaeology*
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NETS	*A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title.*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTA	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTT	New Testament Theology
OCG	Oratory of Classical Greece
OCM	Oxford Classical Monographs
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
OGIS	*Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, ed. W. Dittenberger.
ORCS	Oxford Readings in Classical Studies
OSACR	Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture & Representation
OSLA	Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTT	Old Testament Theology
OWC	Oxford World's Classics
PACS	Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series
PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*
PBNS	Pragmatics & Beyond New Series
PCNT	Paideia Commentary of the New Testament
PRR	Princeton Readings in Religion
PSup	Phoenix Supplementary Volume

RB	*Revue Biblique*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RDGE	*Roman Documents of the Greek East.* Senatus Consulta *and* Epistulae to the Age of Augustus, ed. R. K. Sherk.
RevExp	*Review & Expositor*
RFCC	Religion in the First Christian Centuries
RGDA	*Res Gestae Divi Augusti*
RIC	*The Roman Imperial Coinage*, ed. H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, et al.
RIDA	*Revue Internationale des droits de l'Antiquité*
RPC	*Roman Provincial Coinage*, ed. A. Burnett, M. Amandry, and P. P. Ripollès.
RTR	*Reformed Theological Review*
SB	*Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
Scr	*Scripture: The Quarterly of the Catholic Biblical Association*
SHJ	Studying the Historical Jesus
SJS	Studia Judaeoslavica
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	*Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPNT	Studies on Personalities of the New Testament
SR	*Studies in Religion / Sciences Religieuses*
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TENTS	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TKNT	Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
VCSup	Vigiliae Christianae Supplements
VetT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VetTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WGRW	Writings from the Greco-Roman World
WLAW	Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*
Zutot	*Zutot: Perspectives on Jewish Culture*

Introduction

To those critics who questioned the understanding of ambiguity in the first edition of his work on the topic, William Empson wrote the following response:

> We call it ambiguous, I think, when we recognise that there could be a puzzle as to what the author meant, in that alternative views might be taken without sheer misreading. If a pun is quite obvious it would not ordinarily be called ambiguous, because there is no room for puzzling… Thus the criterion for the ordinary use of the word is that somebody might be puzzled, even if not yourself.[1]

Empson uses the idea of ambiguity to describe something that puzzles someone. By itself, a pun, for instance, which can be obvious, would not do. However, an obscure pun might. Michael Wood concedes "one consistent, fairly precise meaning of ambiguity in Empson's work: it marks the presence of a puzzle or a difficulty, an uncertainty on a reader's or a listener's part."[2] So Empsonian ambiguities are puzzles, difficulties, and uncertainties. These ambiguities may occur to the reader, or they may not. And if they do, they may or may not be one type of ambiguity. The "comedy," as Wood calls it, is that the seven types of ambiguity Empson delineated bleed into each other. The types are themselves ambiguous. By delineating them in such a way, Empson demonstrated that ambiguity itself is ambiguous.

In his "Seventeen Types of Ambiguity in Euripides' *Helen*" Matthew Wright attempts an "Empsonian reading" of his own.[3] *Helen* "constitutes an alternative to the version of 'truth' represented by Homeric epic, as well as a provocative response to the mythical tradition more generally."[4] The tragedy is thus ambiguous. Because he considers the seven types of ambiguity to be "oddly constructed," Wright takes Empson as "a suggestive starting-point

---

[1] William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (2nd ed.; repr.; London: Chatto and Windus, 1949), x.

[2] Michael Wood, *On Empson* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 32.

[3] Matthew Wright, "Seventeen Types of Ambiguity in Euripides' *Helen*," in *Truth and History in the Ancient World: Pluralising the Past,* ed. Lisa Hau and Ian Ruffell (London: Routledge, 2017), 55–80.

[4] Wright, "Ambiguity," 55.

rather than a model to be imitated in so many words."[5] He amasses seventeen types of ambiguity, among which are repeated words and *Leitwörter*, paradox, euphemism, and plurality and openness.[6] Wright defines these ambiguities in the following ways. *Leitwörter* can take on different senses throughout a work, adding nuance and complexity. Paradoxes treat distinct or opposite meanings as synonymous, combining them together and enabling them to coexist. Euphemisms are straightforward expressions that can imply something coarse or unpleasant. Openness makes different meanings appear to be equally true and therefore challenges the reader to reconsider what makes something real.

Because it is crucial to the reading of John I will propose, and because it is itself ambiguous, the notion of paradox needs to be discussed here.[7] A paradox, though it seems true, goes against intuition, in "anything from a tough problem or a counterintuitive opinion or conclusion to a visual sleight of hand."[8] According to Margaret Cuonzo, "paradoxes involve some type of contradiction among claims that, at least on the surface, have nothing wrong with them… An inconsistency among seemingly innocuous elements is thus central to the idea of paradox."[9] Paradoxes start with contradiction and inconsistency, and they are moreover everyday phenomena:

> One common misconception that I hope will be shown to be mistaken is that paradoxes are puzzles that – although they are interesting – remain removed from everyday life. Nothing could be further from the truth. Paradoxes emerge in everyday sources, in the newspapers, in religious texts, in conversations, and in practical dilemmas that must be faced in one's life.[10]

Paradoxes are puzzles – or, ambiguities – that emerge and take on significance in everyday life, as texts do in religious traditions and communities. Furthermore, paradoxes reorientate reality, in the sense that they problematise everyday intuition and common sense.

> Paradoxes force us to rethink the way things seem to us, because they expose two or more common-sense beliefs that contradict each other and suggest that seemingly perfectly good reasoning can lead us to contradiction or obvious falsity. In other words, paradoxes force us to question whether our intuitive understanding of the world is really accurate… Our intuitions about the world, then, are central to what it means to be a paradox.[11]

---

[5] Wright, "Ambiguity," 56.
[6] Wright, "Ambiguity," 59–61 (no. 2), 61–63 (no. 3), 65–66 (no. 6), 74–75 (no. 17).
[7] I will use "John" for the gospel, not the author.
[8] Margaret Cuonzo, *Paradox* (EKS; Cambridge: MIT Press, 2014), 2.
[9] Cuonzo, *Paradox*, 6.
[10] Cuonzo, *Paradox*, 12.
[11] Cuonzo, *Paradox*, 17–18.

Just as paradoxes are contingent on the way we tend to see the world, they also mean to transform it. A paradox may problematise judgement according to our senses.[12] A paradox may juxtapose superficial judgement with right judgement.[13] A paradox may lead to questions such as, "What is truth?"[14]

1. Johannine ambiguity and judgement

Johannine ambiguity crystallises in the verb ὑψόω ("exalt").[15] The euphemism for crucifixion, John repeats it in three contexts: when Jesus is exalted (ὑψόω), he will function as the serpent sign did in the wilderness (John 3:14), reveal to the Ἰουδαῖοι his divinity (8:28), and draw everyone to himself (12:32).[16] The first instance of ὑψόω recalls the wilderness tradition. Because the people complain (Num 21:5), Yahweh sends serpents to bite them (v. 6).[17] The people confess their sin (v. 7), and Yahweh tells Moses how to respond (v. 8). Moses makes a serpent and displays it on a pole (or "sign," LXX σημεῖον), so that those who were bitten may look at it and live (v. 9). The serpent is judgement, and the image of it is salvation. By the serpent, Yahweh brings both death and life. And by this paradox, John foreshadows the death of Jesus: "just as Moses exalted (ὕψωσεν) the serpent in the wilderness, so the Son of Man must be exalted (ὑψωθῆναι)" (John 3:14). Second, Jesus tells the Ἰουδαῖοι, "you will exalt (ὑψώσητε) the Son of Man" (8:28). E. Richard recognises that the ambiguity of ὑψόω is amplified there.[18] The use of the verb assigns the Johannine Ἰουδαῖοι agency in the

---

[12] John 7:24.

[13] John 8:15.

[14] John 18:38a.

[15] The verb ὑψόω has royal connotations. Whereas the law of kingship commands that the king does not exalt himself above others in Israel (LXX Deut 17:20), the Lord exalts Joshua before Israel to establish him as the successor of Moses (LXX Josh 3:7). David exalts God (LXX 2 Sam 22:47), and God exalts David (v. 49). Much later, the Romans, so Judas Maccabaeus learns, are exalted (1 Macc 8:13).

[16] I will not translate Ἰουδαῖοι. In a similar way, Robert L. Brawley, *"*The Ἰουδαῖοι in the Gospel of John," in *Bridging between Sister Religions: Studies of Jewish and Christian Scriptures Offered in Honor of Prof. John T. Townsend*, ed. Isaac Kalimi (BRLJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 105–27 (105–06) uses Ἰουδαῖοι to sidestep the debate about translation (to "Jews" or "Judeans"), as well as to avoid the hasty identification of Jews from other eras with the Johannine Ἰουδαῖοι. For my explanation, see further below.

[17] Wright, "Ambiguity," 73 includes intertextual echoes among his types of ambiguity: "in effect, one is reading two separate works, the old and the new, simultaneously, and a certain sense of dissonance or doubleness results."

[18] E. Richard, "Expressions of Double Meaning and their Function in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 31 (1985): 96–112 (102).

earthly crucifixion and the heavenly exaltation of Jesus. The third use of ὑψόω (12:32) locates the hope of humanity in the cross. Yet the preceding v. 31 highlights judgement: "now is the judgement of the world." Thus ὑψόω integrates destruction and restoration in the one event. Then, finally, the crowd asks in v. 34, "How can you say that the Son of Man must be exalted (ὑψωθῆναι)? Who is this Son of Man?" The Johannine characters themselves struggle with the ambiguity of ὑψόω. Taken together, the Johannine uses of ὑψόω merge two poles: judgement and hope, destruction and restoration, death and life. "Each occurrence is enhanced with a double meaning… the paradoxical union of these two events."[19] John concludes the ὑψόω thread by conveying that the solution to the paradox resists unbelievers: according to v. 37, the crowd speaking in v. 34 did not believe Jesus.

The paradox of ὑψόω bears on the role Rome has in John. The third (John 12:32) and fourth (v. 34) occurrences of ὑψόω surround an aside: "now he said this to signal which kind of death he was about to die" (v. 33). When the setting has changed to the praetorium of Pilate, John 18:32 repeats the note, "to signal which kind of death he was about to die." Of course, "the kind of death he was about to die" refers both times to the crucifixion of Jesus. Because 12:33 anticipates 18:32, the Johannine ὑψόω thread enters the episode featuring the Roman prefect.[20] Is this episode when Jesus is crucified-exalted for death and life (3:14)? Is this when the Ἰουδαῖοι crucify-exalt the Son of Man (8:28)? Is this when the world's judgement and hope coincide (12:32)? When Pilate delivers Jesus to them, and when they take Jesus, 19:16 presupposes those interacting with Pilate in v. 15, the chief priests of the Ἰουδαῖοι. So v. 16, where the chief priests crucify Jesus, agrees with 8:28, where the Ἰουδαῖοι exalt the Son of Man. John assigns agency to the Ἰουδαῖοι and the chief priests in the death of Jesus, the Son of Man. And yet, according to 19:23, the soldiers crucified Jesus.[21] The openness of v. 16 is thus problematic. It leads the reader into paradox.

Nearby ambiguities suggest that this manner of openness in John 19:16 is neither odd nor isolated, but part of an intricate pattern.[22] Two other instances

[19] H. Hollis, "The Root of the Johannine Pun – ΥΨΩΘΗΝΑΙ," *NTS* 35 (1989): 475–78 (475).

[20] For delimitation, see below.

[21] Before John 19:23, the soldiers appeared in vv. 2–3. And before that, 18:36 anticipated the possibility that Jesus may be "delivered to the Ἰουδαῖοι." See later Chapter 3.

[22] Richard, "Expressions of Double Meaning," 102 suggests that John uses some words to "insist upon both meanings rather than choose one over the other." John neither selects nor removes one of the two meanings, therefore making it "possible to conclude that John intended both" (p. 103). Robert G. Hall, "The Reader as Apocalypticist," in *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*, ed. Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 254–73 (267) exploits the ambiguity of what Jesus says to

occur in the same episode of the narrative. A well-known case is the form ἐκάθισεν ("sit") in v. 13, which may function intransitively or transitively, so that Pilate either sits on a judgement bench or seats Jesus on it.[23] A more esoteric instance is the unspecified subject of λέγει in v. 5, which allows the reader to imagine either Pilate or Jesus as the one saying "behold the human."[24] The reader is also responsible for specifying who, according to v. 16, crucifies Jesus. John offers two options, with no clear criteria by which to choose between the Ἰουδαῖοι and the soldiers.[25] But although the gospel is incomplete, John does not abandon readers to complete it in any way imaginable. The gospel rather seems to challenge its reader to solve how two strangely inconsistent possibilities may be able to work together.[26]

But John's reader is unsurprised, having been primed to deal with such puzzles from the very beginning. John 1:14 says that the λόγος became human flesh and therefore revealed divine glory.[27] According to the paradox,

---

Nicodemus, in particular the words ἄνωθεν (John 3:3) and πνεῦμα (v. 5): "Understanding ἄνωθεν as 'from the beginning' and πνεῦμα as 'wind', yields an image of re-creation: 'unless one is born from the beginning, born from water and wind [think Gen 1.2], one cannot enter the Kingdom of God'. Understanding ἄνωθεν as 'from above' and πνεῦμα as 'spirit' yields an image of new life in the Spirit: 'unless one is born from above, born from water [water of life flowing from Jesus who comes from above, John 4.10–15] and Spirit [water from Jesus is the Spirit, John 7.38-39], one cannot enter the Kingdom of God'. 'Water' as death (Lam 3.53; Ps 69.14–15), ἄνωθεν as 'again' and πνεῦμα as 'breath' would yield an image of resurrection: 'unless one is born again, born from water [death] and breath [Ezek 37.9] one cannot enter the kingdom of God'."

[23] See later Chapter 11. In his comments on John 19:13 Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John* (BNTC; London: Continuum, 2005), 469 notes, "although the narrative is characterized by various double meanings, nowhere else do these depend on a grammatical ambiguity." However, I will take another position.

[24] See later Chapter 9.

[25] See later Chapter 3.

[26] On this type of literary openness, see, for instance, Umberto Eco, *The Open Work* (trans. Anna Cancogni; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 4; originally *Opera aperta* (Milan: Bompiani, 1962). Eco (p. 9) sees in modernist literature the current that recognises "symbol as a communicative channel for the indefinite, open to constantly shifting responses and interpretative stances." The example of *Finnegans Wake*, by James Joyce, is both finite and unlimited (p. 10). Yet its openness leads less to "indefinite suggestion" than to "solution," which "is seen as desirable and is actually anticipated" (p. 11).

[27] C. K. Barrett, "The Dialectical Theology of St John," in *New Testament Essays* (London: SPCK, 1972), 49–69 (65) describes the incarnation as the basis of dialectical theology in John. Ambiguity is one important literary strategy that enables dialectical theology. Gail R. O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 8 sees Johannine irony in a similar way. She emphasises that dualities interact in the gospel. In this, she goes beyond Paul Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 146–47 and R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth*

the revelation of glory appears nowhere apart from the flesh, and the flesh reveals nothing apart from the glory. As C. K. Barrett explains, Johannine dualism is dynamic, not static, which means that it creates paradox, not contradiction.[28] Rudolf Bultmann famously described the incarnation as paradox:

> But this is the paradox which runs through the whole gospel: the δόξα is not to be seen *alongside* the σάρξ, nor *through* the σάρξ as through a window; it is to be seen in the σάρξ and nowhere else… The revelation is present in a peculiar *hiddenness*.[29]

Elsewhere in his commentary, Bultmann recognises not only that the incarnation determines the cross, but also that the cross displays the incarnation.[30] So in this way, the incarnation is, in Hans-Ulrich Weidemann's

---

Gospel: A Study in Literary Design (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 167, who do not allow Johannine dualities to interact. Jan van der Watt, *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and Letters* (ABS; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 108–09 overviews Johannine irony and paradox together: "There is constantly a story behind the story, a playfulness with irony and paradox, imageries and metaphors opening the transcendent world in a simple, but nevertheless complex way, enticing the reader with wordplay to intellectually partake in the narrative, correcting misunderstandings, recognizing *double entendre*, or the different meanings of the same word." The paradigm in John is not dualism but paradox, according to Douglas Estes, "Dualism or Paradox? Rethinking the Worldview of John's Gospel in 'Light' of a Rhetorical Approach" (paper presented in the *Johannine Literature* group at the annual meeting of the SBL, Boston, November 20, 2017).

[28] C. K. Barrett, "Paradox and Dualism," in *Essays on John* (London: SPCK, 1982), 98–115 (106–07).

[29] Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 63, italics original. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 165 endorses Bultmann: "The whole of Bultmann's profound exposition should be read." D. Moody Smith, "Theology and Ministry in John," in *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (London: T&T Clark, 1987), 190–222 (211) remarks that "Bultmann comprehends and expresses the nature of this paradox perhaps better than John does. But it is not a sheer imposition on the text. The same Jesus who tells the Samaritan woman all she has done also grew weary from a journey and sat down at the well to rest." In his discussion of Bultmann on the incarnation, Tim Labron, *Bultmann Unlocked* (Theology; London: T&T Clark, 2011), 13 writes, "the paradox is muted and the offensive nature of 1:14a is dulled if the glory (incarnation) is denied or if the flesh is denied."

[30] Bultmann, *John*, 468, 631, 632. In the same vein, C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 165, 402 proposes that the cross consummates the incarnation. Craig R. Koester "Progress and paradox: C. H. Dodd and Rudolf Bultmann on history, the Jesus tradition, and the Fourth Gospel," in *Engaging with C. H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Catrin Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 49–65 (55) distinguishes Bultmann from Dodd: "Where Dodd stressed the revelatory aspect of history,

terms, the "metatext" of the narrative.[31] As metatext, the paradox is not part of the narrative, because it contains the narrative. The incarnation reveals glory as of the μονογενής from the Father (1:14), and the cross is where the Father glorifies his Son (17:1).[32] The glory of the incarnation contains a gift that is truth (1:14), and Jesus came into the world to witness to the truth (18:37).[33] The incarnation therefore anticipates the glorification of Jesus, when he is crucified.[34]

If incarnation means revelation, it also means judgement.[35] In the λόγος was the life, the light of everyone (John 1:4) that the darkness did not overcome (v. 5). This λόγος came into the world (v. 9), but it was

---

Bultmann stressed its enigmatic quality." However, Bultmann and Dodd may not be so different on the incarnation. On either emphasis, as Koester puts them, some people are blind to the revelation of Jesus, and some are not. It is hidden to some, and not to others. The revelation is veiled, and it is not. As James L. Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John* (BIS 56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 30 notes, "Nowhere is the tension between hiddenness and revelation more apparent than in John 1:14."

[31] Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, *Der Tod Jesu im Johannesevangelium: Die erste Abschiedsrede als Schlüsseltext für den Passions- und Osterbericht* (BZNW 122; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 29. He also calls the incarnation the "christological reading instruction" ("christologische Leseanweisung").

[32] As Isa 52:13 pairs δοξάζω with ὑψόω, it may be the precedent for John using both verbs in relation to the cross; see further Chapter 5. On the shared royal connotations of the Johannine exaltation and glorification threads, see Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 497: the "crucifixion that must now follow will be a moment of royal glory, a lifting up (3:14; 8:28; 12:32), a glorification (12:23)." On the glorification theme in particular, see Martinus de Boer, "Johannine History and Johannine Theology: The Death of Jesus as the Exaltation and the Glorification of the Son of Man," in *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. G. Van Belle (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007), 293–326; Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, "Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine δόξα-language," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. G. Van Belle, M. Labahn, and P. Maritz (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 511–22.

[33] On reading truth as the content of the gift in John 1:14, see Bultmann, *John*, 73–74; Moloney, *John*, 39, 45; idem, "The Use of χάρις in John 1:14, 16–17: A Key to the Johannine Narrative," in *Johannine Studies 1975–2017* (WUNT 372; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 283–305. If the καί is epexegetical, the ἀλήθεια explains the χάρις.

[34] Also Jörg Frey, "Joh 1,14, die Fleischwerdung des Logos und die Einwohnung Gottes in Jesus Christus: Zur Bedeutung der *Schechina*-Theologie für die johanneische Christologie," in *Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes zur Schechina-Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Enno Edzard Popkes (WUNT 318; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 231–56 (256).

[35] On the incarnation as judgement, see George W. MacRae, "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Word in the World, Essays in Honor of F. L. Moriarty*, ed. R. J. Clifford and G. W. MacRae (Cambridge: Weston College, 1973), 83–96 (88); D. Moody Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 97.

unrecognised (v. 10) and rejected (v. 11). Later John 3:17–19 develops the implications of these images with respect to judgement:

> For God did not send the Son into the world so that he may condemn the world, but so that the world may be saved through him. Those who believe in him are not condemned; but those who do not believe are already condemned, because they have not believed in the name of the One and Only Son of God. And this is the judgement, that the light has come into the world, and people loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

What is ambiguous in the passage is the identity of who exercises judgement. Those who reject the λόγος and do not believe Jesus are condemned – so do they condemn themselves? Jesus says that he does not judge the world, because he came to save it (12:47) – so who judges instead?[36] John also says that Jesus judges no one (8:15), that he has true judgement with the Father (v. 16), that the Father gives the Son all judgement (5:22), and that the Father gives the Son of Man authority to execute judgement (v. 27). Taken with Johannine incarnation, Johannine judgement is paradoxical.

At the praetorium, too, Jesus both judges and does not judge, and those who accuse and judge Jesus bring judgement on themselves.[37] As the accusing Ἰουδαῖοι are judged, so the accused Son of Man judges.[38] On the Johannine cross, the Son of Man is both "the place where human beings can see the revelation of God" and "the place where humankind faces self-judgement."[39] The cross integrates divine self-revelation with human self-judgement. The incarnation of λόγος is light and judge when at his trial – a connection C. H. Dodd makes in his comments on what Jesus says to Pilate about witnessing to the truth:

> It is however significant that the pronouncement we are considering (xviii. 37) is placed in the context of a trial scene. Where ἀλήθεια is, there men are judged, as we may learn from iii. 18–21: ἀλήθεια and φῶς are closely akin… So once again we have, as in ix. 13–41, the theme of judgment treated with Johannine irony. As there the 'Pharisees' sat in judgment upon the claims of Jesus, and in the end found the tables turned and sentence pronounced against them, so here Pilate believes himself to be sitting in judgment on Jesus, while he is actually being judged by the Truth.[40]

---

[36] In some places the λόγος that Jesus speaks judges. The λόγος Jesus speaks will judge those who reject him (John 12:48), but those who hear it and believe the one who sent Jesus escape judgement (5:24).

[37] Bultmann, *John*, 651; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 352; Craig R. Koester, *The Word of Life: A Theology of John's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 179.

[38] Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 137.

[39] Francis J. Moloney, "The Johannine Son of Man," in *Johannine Studies*, 223–32 (230, 231); originally in *BTB* 6 (1976): 71–86.

[40] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 436.

I agree with Dodd, except for his inference that Pilate ends up on the wrong side of the judgement paradox. What if, rather, the Ἰουδαῖοι push Pilate into the light, much as the Pharisees did to the blind man earlier?[41]

The respective episodes featuring the blind man and Pilate illuminate each other. According to Dorothy Lee, "form and meaning belong together" in John – and she means that in both literary and theological terms.[42] This paradox of form and meaning maintains "literary form as both the conveyor and the expression of meaning."[43] Lee claims that narrative meaning and incarnation theology "belong to the same order of reality."[44] In John 9:39 Jesus says, "I came into this world for judgement, so that those who do not see may see, and those who do see may become blind." As Lee observes, the man and the Pharisees move in opposite directions: from blindness to sight, and from sight to blindness.[45] And similarly to Dodd, Lee relates the episode to John's opening:

> The Pharisees' rejection of the light exemplifies the world in its willful blindness and destructiveness (1.10–11), which, in an ironical way, can open the eyes of τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ to the world's darkness and the saving power of the light.[46]

The agency lies with the Pharisees, though they are blind. They show the healed man the judgement that Jesus, the light, symbolises.[47] As they attempt to judge Jesus, the Pharisees not only bring judgement on themselves, but also show the man born blind the way to salvation.[48]

---

[41] I intend some ambiguity here, and throughout this entire study, in the spirit of recent studies in ambiguous Johannine characterisations – so Colleen M. Conway, "Speaking through Ambiguity: Minor Characters in the Fourth Gospel," *BibInt* 10:3 (2002): 324–41; Susan Hylen, *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009).

[42] Dorothy A. Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning* (JSNTSS 95; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 23.

[43] Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*, 33–34.

[44] Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*, 24: "The incarnational nature of John's theology is paralleled by the way in which theological meaning is formed and carried by the literary structures of the Fourth Gospel… Just as σάρξ cannot be discounted in John's theology, neither can narrative or symbolic form be discarded in favour of a detachable view of meaning. In this sense, form and content, in literary terms, parallel the theology of incarnation in the Fourth Gospel. Indeed they belong to the same order of reality."

[45] Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*, 162.

[46] Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*, 184.

[47] Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*, 183.

[48] John 9:18 refers to the Ἰουδαῖοι, not the Pharisees, as elsewhere in the episode.

2. Delimiting John 18:28–19:22

John 9:1–41 and 18:28–19:22 share the same structure.[49] Both episodes use seven scenes, each of which represents dialogue between two character groups.[50] The difference in 18:28–19:22 is the emphasis on the praetorium. The episode introduces the praetorium before Pilate, who swaps dialogue partners (accused, accusers) and stages (inside, outside) throughout. Pilate, the accusers, and the accused share one stage in the synoptics. But as he goes between the accusers outside and the accused inside, the Johannine Pilate initiates scene changes. If Johannine form and meaning do operate together, the constant crossings between the two stages recall the Johannine dualism between what is below and what is above. What occurs outside would be from this world, then, and what occurs inside would not be from this world. Thomas Brodie likewise connects the inside versus outside structure of the episode to the idea of revelation.[51] For Brodie, the notion of revelation makes sense of the contrast between inside and outside: Jesus reveals to Pilate inside, but the Ἰουδαῖοι remain "outside the praetorium and outside the

[49] J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (3rd ed.; NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 38 compares the blind man episode to the praetorium episode in passing. Martyn (p. 37) demarcates seven scenes in John 9:1–41: vv. 1–7 (Jesus, his disciples, blind man), 8–12 (blind man, his neighbours), 13–17 (blind man, Pharisees), 18–23 (Pharisees, blind man's parents), 24–34 (Pharisees, blind man), 35–38 (Jesus, blind man), 39–41 (Jesus, Pharisees). Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*, 165 splits scene one into two (vv. 1–5, 6–7), with the result that the episode has eight, not seven, scenes. John 9:6, however, does not make any change in setting or characters.

[50] For the delimitation of seven scenes, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah. From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 758; Helen K. Bond, *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation* (SNTSMS 100; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 169.

[51] Thomas L. Brodie, *The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 521, italics original: "It is possible to regard these exits and entrances as superficial details, but the systematic way in which they are emphasized suggests that they are important, and this suspicion is heightened when something of the same pattern is found in the drama of the arrest and interrogation: Jesus *goes out* with his disciples and *goes in* to the garden; then he *goes out* to meet the arresting force (18:1, 4); another disciple *goes in* with Jesus to the court of the high priest and then *goes out* and leads in Peter (18:15–16)." Also on John's use of superficial details, Charles Homer Giblin, "Confrontations in John 18,1–27," *Bib* 65:2 (1984): 210–32 (218), italics original: "The slight inconsistency in the two opening scenes of the passion narrative, namely, that Jesus confronts his adversaries *outside* the garden (18,4) whereas Peter is addressed as having been seen *in* the garden, supports this interpretation. For it seems odd that a writer who makes so much of 'ins' and 'outs' in his concise narrative, as John does, would have been unaware of this discrepancy."

Index of References

Old Testament

Apocrypha

New Testament

Greek and Roman literature

Documentary sources

Philo

Josephus

Dead Sea Scrolls

Jewish literature

Early Christian literature

Index of Subjects and Names