■論　文■

Compound Irony and “True Passover” in John 18:28–19:16

Jonathan A. Blanke *

The trial of Jesus before Pilate, as recorded in the Gospel of John (18:28–19:16), is well-known as containing two texts (18:28 and 19:14) considered important for understanding the historical chronology of the Last Supper and the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth. The present study argues that this focus on chronology within the first part of the trial (18:28–32), though important, is ultimately insufficient for determining what this text has to say about first-century Passover and the significance of Jesus' person and work for readers today. Supplementing the insights of historical-critical analysis with a narrative-critical approach, the present study demonstrates that compound irony was likely encountered by first-century readers of this text who were familiar with Jewish customs of ritual purity, traditions surrounding the Passover, and the expectation of a coming Messiah. Such irony critiques the familiar power structures of the world, both in the first century and today. It points to a new Christian Passover in which the crucified Jesus gives life and is present with those who suffer.

Keywords : Passover, ritual purity, irony, Son of God, Gospel of John

Introduction

Though the role of modern narratological approaches for understanding the text of the New Testament Gospels has been a topic of debate in New Testament studies, the contribution of these approaches has been emphasized over the course of at least the last thirty years.[1] Narrative-critical studies focus upon the immediate narrative world of the text and do not make any claims about the historical world behind the text. But this does not mean that narrative studies are disinterested in historical issues or attempt to overthrow the insights of historical criticism. Indeed, narratological studies supplement or bring new insights to studies that are based on historical analysis alone.[2] For narratological studies of the Gospel of John (or “Fourth Gospel”… hereafter “FG”) what have proved especially helpful in this regard are studies that elucidate FG's motif of misunderstanding, symbolism, and irony.[3] Irony in the trial episode of

*ブランキ，ジョナサン・A.
Associate Professor of New Testament,
Japan Lutheran College and Theological Seminary

FG (18:28–19:16) elucidates and is elucidated by insights from the historical background of the text.[4]

Much has been written about the likely historical chronology of the Last Supper and Jesus' death in light of all four Gospel accounts, and it is not my purpose to reproduce that body of work.[5] Instead, I would like to show that 18:28, no matter what it may indicate regarding the historic Last Supper and the timing of Jesus' death, offers up more than mere data related to that chronology. Verse 28 begins a section of narrative that reinforces and brings to a climax what the implied reader[6] in FG recognizes about Jesus and Jesus' relationship to many of those who are called "the Jews" in this gospel. I will argue that, similar to what may also be found in John 9,[7] the trial scene of Jesus before Pilate contains compound irony[8] intended to be observed by real readers of FG. This irony results in a series of indirect speech acts for "observers" of the irony in which Jesus' accusers are "victims."[9] In the trial scene, verse 28 introduces the necessary components of this irony with a focus on the perceived need for ritual purity to participate in the Passover. As a result, actual readers of this text may be led to critique the actions of "the Jews" throughout the verses of the trial scene and see their celebration of Passover and interpretation of *νόμος* in contrast to the Passover "hour" of Jesus and his testimony as true King of the Jews. The irony depicted is associated with Jesus' accusers and the resulting theological emphasis in the text regarding Jesus' identity and work is apparent even without analysis of the historical context of Passover and the first-century concern for purity. Considered together, however, insights from historical and narratological analysis highlight the theological emphases in the text and suggest concerns that link actual first-century readers of FG with readers today.

Irony and the Gospel according to John

In discussing irony in FG it is important to understand what is at stake. I want to understand irony in the trial scene of FG both according to the wider use of irony in the Greco-Roman world of the first century and the specific narratological context of the Prologue of FG.

Actual readers of the trial episode in 18:28–19:16 who read the entire gospel will have likely already encountered irony in the gospel's Prologue (cf. 1:10-11): "[The Logos] was in the world, and the world came into being through him, yet the world did not know him. He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him." The world which the Logos created did not know the Logos, and the Logos' "very own people" (*οἱ ἴδιοι*) did not accept him. Two aspects of this text warrant attention: 1) The Prologue generalizes what FG says about the people who encountered Jesus in part because of its unique eschatological orientation, and 2) the irony in question here is paradoxical rather than sarcastic. I will now examine each of these two facets of Johannine irony in greater detail.

First, the recurring conditions for irony in FG include repeated generalization regarding Jesus' own people, "the Jews," who are its most frequent target. FG can even be said at times to create a caricature in its presentation of the Jews that serves its own theological interests. Though 1:10–11 states that the Logos' "very own people" did not accept him, in actuality all of Jesus' early disciples and most of those who follow Jesus in FG are Jews (e.g., 1:47) and so to some extent representatives of the Old Testament people of God. These are Jesus' own people, for Jesus himself is characterized as a Jew/Judean

(4:9). When the Prologue states that Jesus' own people did not accept him, it is therefore painting with broad brush strokes and speaking of the nation Israel, These are "the Jews" who accuse Jesus and turn him over to be crucified (e.g., 18:31–32). But FG, in understanding Jesus as Logos and therefore as the life and light of mankind, depicts Jesus' earthly ministry as a time when Jesus calls people to align themselves with one of two antitheses: light or dark; life or death; belonging to Jesus and receiving his Word or rejecting him. Some scholars have identified an antithetical worldview in FG and understand it to reflect a conversation with the radical cosmic dualism of either incipient Gnostic traditions beginning to appear already in the early first century at places like Qumran, or syncretistic Hellenistic religions primarily prevalent outside Palestine. Whatever the historical context, in FG there is indeed a profound contrast, both between Jesus and the Jews who reject him and between Jesus' life-giving Word and the Jewish authorities' interpretation of their Law. Though FG is also capable of offering a more nuanced portrayal of Jews who are drawn to Jesus such as Nicodemus (3:1–14, 7:50–52; 19:38–42) and disciples who deny him such as Peter (18:15–18, 25–27), irony observed in the Prologue typifies what readers encounter in the trial scene and elsewhere in FG where "the Jews" accuse Jesus of blasphemy and eventually put him to death.

Second, when we speak of irony in FG that arises from the inability of characters in the narrative to recognize Jesus for the person he truly is we are primarily concerned with what might be best described as paradox rather than sarcasm. John 1:10–11 passes on important information about the Logos and his rejection by the world but it also hints at an attitude behind the words of the Prologue that sees what the world didn't know and what the Logos' people didn't do as tragically unexpected.[10] What should not have happened actually happened. This paradox will elicit an indirect speech act from many of its actual readers. It will direct their attention to a discrepancy between what is and what should have been, and in so doing cause them to be drawn to the Logos and to sense the yearning of God for the people of the world. But this thing that should not have happened also resulted in the "lifting up" of Jesus, the glory of the Logos (1:14). Now "as many as who received" Jesus are given authority to be children of God. So the ultimate irony of the Prologue and the Gospel as a whole is that God's love for the world is able to triumph over the tragedy of the world's misunderstanding (3:15–16). The paradox that underlies the entire Gospel culminates in the arrest, trial and lifting up of Jesus Christ, the hour of Jesus and the moment that his glory is revealed.

To be sure, the text of FG itself and the Prologue in particular provide the crucial hermeneutical key for understanding the irony of FG, but this gospel exists within the larger Greco-Roman world in which the tradition of Greek tragedy would have made irony familiar for many of its first- and second-century recipients. Though far removed from the heyday of classical Greek literature in the 5th century BCE, the Gospel of John, likely written for Gentiles and Jewish Christians immersed in the Hellenistic world, seems cognizant of several aspects of Greek drama. This includes the convention of irony, especially dramatic irony. Not only the ancient Greeks, but most ancient peoples were sensitive to unexpected reversals of fortune. The Greek philosopher Aristotle famously identified these reversals in ancient drama, which were often accompanied by moments

when their characters made important discoveries, as *περιπέτειαι* (Aristotle, *Poet.* 10.3). *Peripeteiai* are the jolting turns of events that form the foundation of both tragic and comedic narrative…when the mighty are brought low and the humble are exalted. Dramatic irony occurs when an audience or congregation experiences these reversals in the narrative and therefore has prior knowledge of an outcome not privy to the characters in the narrative themselves.

In the Scriptures, dramatic reversals either occur or are predicted to occur as real events guided and controlled by Yahweh. For example, in the Hebrew Bible Joseph is sold into slavery (Gen 37:28). But through the rescue of Yahweh—an important *peripeteia*—Joseph, the youngest brother, becomes a success in Egypt. He is promoted by Pharaoh as a royal official by the time his older brothers come to Egypt to buy food (Gen 41:39–45). This scene from the book of Genesis, where Joseph's brothers, not knowing that Joseph is in fact the royal official before whom they stand helpless, is a moment in which people hearing the text are invited to experience dramatic irony. They know what Joseph's brothers do not: that Joseph is the royal official before whom the brothers tremble. So both ancient Greeks and Jews, in different ways, invited audiences to grieve and be humbled by the fall of the mighty, to rejoice in the elevation of the humble, and to learn something about the divine through the use of dramatic irony.

The trial and crucifixion in FG is narrated in line with a similar interest. The authorities who seek the death of Jesus are unaware of who Jesus truly is. They succeed in having him tortured and even put to death. Jesus' disciples are scattered and hide, fearing for their lives. But a wonderful *peripeteia*…Jesus' resurrection...is in store. The Jewish authorities' misunderstanding of Jesus' person and work focuses attention on Jesus' death as the revelation of who Jesus is and what he came to accomplish.

With this brief introduction to Johannine irony, we now turn our attention to the use of irony in the trial episode in FG.

The Trial of Jesus before Pilate in John and the Synoptic Gospels

Jesus' trial before Pilate is recorded in all four canonical Gospels (Matt 27:1–2, 11–26; Mark 15:1–15; Luke 23:1–5, 13–25) and underlies two of the most fundamental ecumenical Christian creeds.[11] Difference of opinion exists among scholars about the precise nature of the relationship between the passion narratives of John and the other gospels and the extent to which either a common tradition or source would have been available to all four. Brown,[12] Bultmann,[13] and Dodd[14] argue that the passion narrative in FG is ultimately independent of the present form of the Synoptics whereas Zahn,[15] and more recently Barrett[16] and Neirynck,[17] make the case that John is in some measure dependent on a written form of Mark. But no matter what determination is made regarding the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels and John, the high concentration of similar material in all four gospels argues in favor for what is often overlooked: much of Jesus' trial before Pilate in all four gospels is the same. In FG, as in the Synoptics, Jesus is led to Pilate in the early morning (Matt 27:1–2; Mark 15:1; John 18:28), and is accused before Pilate of calling himself "king of the Jews" (Matt 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 22:2–3; John 18:33). Jesus neither immediately confirms nor denies this with the ambiguous reply, "You say so" (*σὺ λέγεις*: Matt 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:3; John 18:37). In all four accounts Pilate is reluctant to sentence Jesus to death, finding him guilty

of having done nothing wrong (Matt 27:23–24; Mark 15:14; Luke 23:4, 14, 22; John 18:38, 19:4, 6). In all four accounts an insurrectionist named "Barabbas" is considered for release in place of Jesus, but the crowd clamors for Jesus' crucifixion anyway (Matt 27:15–18, 20–23; Mark 15:6–15; Luke 23:18–25; John 18:39–40, 19:6–7). In all four accounts Pilate orders Jesus to be flogged (Matt 27:26; Mark 15:15; Luke 23:22,[18] John 19:1) and in all four accounts he ultimately succumbs to the crowd in ordering Jesus to be crucified (Matt 27:26; Mark 15:15; Luke 23:24–25; John 19:16).

Still, the unique features of the trial before Pilate in FG are important not only for understanding details surrounding the historic crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth in the early first century CE, but for recognizing the confession of the resurrected Christ by early Christians who emerged as a movement within Judaism of the Second Temple Period. 1) In FG Jesus' accusers defer from entering the Praetorium where Pilate interrogates Jesus (cf. 18:33, 19:9) lest they contract ritual impurity (18:28), whereas in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus' accusers are present during Pilate's interrogation (contrast Matt 27:12–14; Mark 15:2–5; Luke 23:2–5). 2) FG alludes by name to the Passover celebration that coincides with Jesus' trial three times (18:28, 39, and 19:14) while Matthew and Mark indirectly mention Passover only once and Luke not at all (contrast *κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν* (Matt 27:15 and Mark 15:6). 3) FG contains two extended dialogues between Jesus and Pilate (18:33–38 and 19:9–11) that build upon the more taciturn Jesus in the Synoptics (contrast Matt 27:11, Mark 15:2, Luke 22:3). 4) In FG, Pilate's interrogation of Jesus is woven into several scenes between Pilate and Jesus' accusers. As the episode in FG progresses, Pilate becomes more and more convinced of Jesus' innocence (18:38; 19:4, 6, 12) and Jesus' accusers put increasing pressure on Pilate to hand Jesus over to death (18:30; 19:7, 12). 5) The soldiers' mocking of Jesus is moved up into the trial scene in FG (19:1–3), whereas in the Synoptic Gospels it appears immediately following the trial scene (contrast Matt 27:27–31 and Mark 15:16–20). 6) FG contains historical details regarding the location of the trial that are missing from the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus' interrogation inside the Praetorium (18:28, 33, 19:9) and Pilate's sentencing of Jesus at "Gabatha" (19:13).[19] Finally, 7) in FG Jesus' sentencing accompanies the cry by his accusers that their king is the emperor (19:15), a detail not found in other gospels.

Since the focus here is especially on irony that victimizes Jesus' accusers in the trial episode, features 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 in FG's three-part treatment of the trial pertain. The trial is often analyzed according to a six- or seven-part structure defined by Pilate's interaction with Jesus on the inside of the Praetorium and his interaction with Jesus' Jewish accusers on the outside.[20] While this proposed division of the text is helpful for understanding the interaction between Pilate and either Jesus or his accusers as a series of distinct scenes, my purpose is to hone in on Jesus' accusers and understand how their unfolding character in this portion of narrative propels the action of the trial scene forward. The seven scenes of 18:28–19:16 may therefore be divided into three main sections of approximately 9 verses each corresponding to 1) three mentions of "*τὸ πάσχά*," 2) three distinct stages in Pilate's deliberation, and 3) three replies or groupings of replies of the Jews to Pilate in which the former are victims of compound irony.[21] I divide the text as follows: 18:28–38a, 38b–19:7, and 19:8–16.[22] Though an extended study of the entire trial would be revealing, due to limited space I will highlight the first instance

of compound irony in 18:28–32 and consider its implications for the unique presentation of Jesus and his mission found in the trial episode in FG.

Compound Irony in 18:28–32

Irony in the trial before Pilate in FG is nothing new. Actual readers of FG have identified situational irony throughout the trial episode since at least the time of the Church Fathers. Contemporary readers of FG need not be conversant with the traditions of early Judaism to perceive this irony. Those who encounter this irony are invited to critique both Jesus' accusers and their understanding of their institutions.

Further study of this irony, however, elucidates the dynamic of the trial scene in particular and highlights the Christology of FG. First, contemporary narratological studies have classified various types of irony in the drama and narrative of the ancient world. Two varieties of irony that pertain here are the irony of "self-betrayal" and "dramatic irony."[23] The irony of self-betrayal is a subset of situational irony in which someone, by what s/he says or does, "exposes unawares his [/her] own ignorance, weakness, errors, or follies."[24] Dramatic irony, by contrast, is not focused exclusively on victims of irony that incriminate themselves by their words or actions, but on victims of irony and their relationship to others in light of events that swirl around them and happen *to* them, events of which an audience or reader may be aware but the victim is not.[25] Ito notes that the combination of these two types of irony is not uncommon in John and refers to their occurrence together in John 9:16 as "two sides of the same coin."[26] Second, contemporary narratological studies suggest that irony encountered by actual readers of the trial scene today can be further elucidated once the likely historical background to the celebration of Passover, the laws of ritual purity, and Messianic expectations in the first century lying behind 18:28–19:16 are examined. Doing so draws a sharp contrast between the appearance of matters that concern Jesus' accusers with the truth of matters associated with Jesus and his testimony.

We therefore turn our attention to a brief historical investigation of the likely first-century context of ritual purity before examining the irony of self-betrayal in this text and its significance for Jesus' person and work in the trial episode as a whole.

Purity, Passover, and the Irony of Self-Betrayal

The trial scene of Jesus before Pilate opens with two details not found in the Synoptic Gospels. First, we read that Jesus' accusers "did not enter the Praetorium in order to avoid ritual defilement and be able to eat the Passover" (18:28). Second, when asked by Pilate why they are turning Jesus over for trial, Jesus' accusers refuse to provide a direct answer saying, "If this one were not [guilty] of wrong-doing we would not have handed him over to you" (18:31).

Since the irony of self-betrayal in 18:28–32 concerns both ritual purity and customs associated with Passover in the first century CE, a brief consideration of the likely historic background of both will enable the irony of self-betrayal in this text to come alive for readers today.

Flavius Josephus, a first-century historian and hagiographer, interpreting Ezra 6:19–22 (cf. 1 Esdras 7:10–13) records that the people of Israel celebrated Passover early in the second temple period while purifying themselves (*ἁγνεύοτας*) and mentions that they gathered in great crowds to the feast on the "eighth day of

the month Xanthicus" [Nisan] (*Ant.* 11.109–110). At the opposite end of the second temple period in 70 CE, he writes that "on the 14th of Xanthicus" Eleazar admitted people into the temple court who were armed, though specifically mentions that many of them were not purified (ἄναγνοι) (*J. W.* 5.98–100). First-century readers familiar with these customs would have understood that Jesus' accusers in the text have already performed the necessary rituals of purification prior to Passover (cf. 11:55–57) and do not want to now become liable to defilement. The precise nature of impurity that would have prevented them from entering the temporary residence of the Roman prefect in Jerusalem at Passover is unclear for us today[27] and may have eluded many of the gospel's first recipients as well. The Jews' apprehension could be seen as connected with the prospect, however limited, of corpse impurity.[28] Gentiles were thought to bury aborted fetuses in their homes, and so by completely avoiding the interior of the Praetorium the chief priests are depicted observing a precaution against contamination that might have barred them from festival events for a lengthy seven-day period.[29] There is also the possibility that Jewish leaders in FG were understood by first-century readers as wanting to limit their contact with Gentiles whom they believed to be morally impure through idolatrous practices.[30] No matter the precise understanding of the purity law in question, Jesus' trial is characterized from the beginning by a concern for ritual purity believed by Jesus' accusers to be necessary for the proper observance of the Passover feast.

The association between this concern for ritual purity and irony in the FG comes into sharp relief once we probe the first-century concern for ritual purity a bit further. Managing the sacred and profane, clean and unclean was important in Jesus' day. Scholars have debated the extent to which Jesus either reinterprets or abolishes the distinction between ritually clean and unclean outside FG (cf. Mark 7:15 and parallels; Matt 23:25; *Gos. of Thom.* 14; and Fragment Oxyrynchus 840), but most agree that the purity *logion* recorded in Mark is original[31] and all understand that Jesus prioritized moral or ethical purity over ritual or cultic purity. In FG we do not find Jesus openly debating the Pharisees over matters of ritual purity as he does in the Synoptics. But Jesus does, at times, use the customary symbols of Jewish ritual purification to work a miraculous sign, such as the water at Cana (2:6) or the pool of Siloam (9:7, 11).[32] Elsewhere in FG we see that it is Jesus' word that purifies and consecrates (15:3; 17:17, 19; cf. 13:10). In the context of Passover, this purifying and consecrating stands in opposition to what the Jews do to make themselves ritually clean (ἁγνίσωσιν; 11:55–57). Notable also for the first century reader of FG is that in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Exod 23:1–8), the Temple Scroll of Qumran, and later rabbinical literature, judicial judgments made deceitfully or without due process are specifically denounced.[33] As a form of prohibited impurity, unjust judgments were even tied to Israel losing the land of its inheritance, and death.[34] Lest actual readers of FG be unaware of this historical background to the trial of Jesus, the text of FG actually underlines the injustice of a rush to judgment against Jesus through the leader of the Jews, Nicodemus: "*μὴ ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐάν μὴ ἀκούσῃ πρῶτον παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ γνῷ τί ποιεῖ*" (7:51). Sentencing an innocent man to death, as the implied reader of FG perceives Jesus' accusers to be doing, was for many of the gospel's first-century readers, a crime, an act of "prohibited impurity,"[35] whereas ritual impurity, unlike the immoral act, could at

times be set aside.

The brief historical inquiry above has elucidated the irony of self-betrayal that many first-century readers of the trial scene were likely to encounter. Jesus' accusers actually avoid permitted impurity in order to violate the laws of prohibited impurity. To the extent that FG offers up a critique of unbelief and a polemic against specifically Jewish institutions of the first century, it is highly likely that this irony was intentional on the part of the Gospel's author, the "ironist." Jesus' accusers are the victims or target of the author's irony. The irony results in an indirect speech act that causes some readers, especially those familiar with the Christian priority of ethical over cultic purity to critique the actions of Jesus' accusers at the outset of the trial before Pilate. Not only are the priorities of Jesus' accusers misplaced. Their observance of Passover appears a sham. Their interpretation of their *νόμος*, demonstrated by their concern with maintaining ritual purity in the face of committing an injustice, is wrong.

How does the portrayal of Jesus' accusers in 18:28 match what the implied reader in FG already recognizes about many of those referred to as Jews in the narrative of FG? We might say that the irony of self-betrayal to be encountered in 18:28 and the image it gives of Jesus' opponents in the trial before Pilate is like a musical theme in the finale of a symphony. Here, where the theme of Jesus' true identity in FG swells, the discordant notes played by the self-incriminating opponents of Jesus likewise rise in crescendo one last time. The implied reader recalls how there are some among the Jews who misunderstand Jesus and repeatedly attempt to kill him (cf. 5:17–18; 7:1; 8:59; 9:22; 10:31, 33, 39; 11:8; 11:47–54; 12:9–11). In 18:28–32 Jesus' Jewish accusers follow up on what the implied reader knows is their plan to kill Jesus. Despite their concern for ritual purity before Passover, their inability to produce an accusation against Jesus in this stage of the proceedings (18:30) demonstrates the injustice at the root of the trial. As a result, the *πάσχα* in 18:28 which the implied reader knows the Jews will eat but Jesus will not marks the tragic and inevitable rupture between Jesus and his accusers. It echoes the theme regarding the Logos' own people already described in the Prologue (1:10–11).

In this way, the gospel's actual readers, understanding the gap between the ignorance of Jesus' accusers and the truth of Jesus' testimony, are invited to see what the Jews in the narrative cannot: that Jesus is king of Israel and his word is true. Jesus, and no longer the *νόμος* of Israel alone, is the true source of life.

Passover, Messianic Expectations and Dramatic Irony

Related to, yet distinct from this irony of self-betrayal, dramatic irony may also be encountered by actual readers of 18:28–32. Such dramatic irony arises out of what the implied reader already knows about Jesus' true identity. As was the case with the irony of self-betrayal, this irony again works against its victims (the Jews), but it also whispers something about the hidden identity of the defendant in this trial which is hidden to Jesus' accusers yet known to the implied reader in FG. Jesus' identity becomes increasingly clear as events in the trial unfold. But already a hint of Jesus' identity in 18:28–32 is given in this text: "[This was] in order that the word of Jesus might be filled up when [Jesus] spoke indicating by what death he was about to die" (18:32).

To more fully appreciate the contribution of dramatic irony in illustrating Jesus' identity

and work I will once again consider the likely first-century observance of Passover, only this time it is necessary to first understand what aspect of Jesus' identity remains unknown or unrecognized by Jesus' accusers in the trial episode. Once that picture begins to develop we will then be in a position to consider what the first recipients of FG might have believed and confessed about Jesus and how this confession could have been shaped by the early Christian understanding and celebration of Passover.

The implied reader knows what Jesus' accusers in the narrative do not: Jesus and others have given testimony that Jesus is the Son of God (1:34, 49; 3:16, 18; 5:19–26, 6:40, 10:36, 11:4, 27; 14:13, 17:1, cf. 20:31). FG even suggests that "king," properly conceived, may also be applied to Jesus (1:49; 12:13, 15; cf. 18:36). But those who judge according to appearances misunderstand the nature of Jesus' kingship (6:12; cf. 18:33, 19:3, 14, 19–21) and Jesus does not embrace the term (e.g., contrast 18:37 with 4:26). All of this underlies the important observation that 18:28–32 introduces dramatic irony that recurs throughout the trial of Jesus and victimizes Jesus' Jewish accusers again both in their desire to release Barabbas (18:38–40) and forswear allegiance to any king but the emperor (19:15). This dramatic irony ultimately leads up to Pilate's declaration that Jesus is "King of the Jews."

Jesus' identity as king, and therefore as "Son of God" (19:7), has important theological ramifications in the New Testament gospels, and this is especially so for FG. Space does not permit a detailed investigation of the term here.[36] Suffice it to say that "Son of God" in FG is not an exclusively Messianic title, at least in so far as "Messiah" had likely come to be understood in Jesus' day. In FG it appears to have connotations of both envoy/servant of God as well as some sort of shared identity with God beyond what an ordinary envoy would have enjoyed. In using the formulaic words "this was in order that the word of Jesus might be filled up," the author of FG is setting Jesus' word alongside Scripture and the word of God the Father through the prophets (compare 12:38, 13:18, 15:25, 17:12, 18:9, 19:24, 36). The *νόμος* of the Jews, though Jesus' accusers misunderstand it and do not recognize what it says, is one with Jesus' own testimony that he is the Son of God (19:7; cf. 5:39). The Father's will and purpose that events should unfold the way they do is therefore one with that of Jesus.

Two prior scenes in FG may be briefly mentioned as setting the stage for the dramatic irony associated with the trial episode. They concern details that the implied reader recognizes as related to Jesus, identified as king or Son of God, at the Passover. The first scene is the feeding of 5,000 in Galilee (6:1–15) which in FG is said to occur at a time that is "near the Passover" (6:4). This setting evokes the image of Sinai with the mention of a mountain that Jesus ascends (6:3). The sign is narrated prior to a sermon of Jesus in John 6 where Jesus speaks of the food that was multiplied as symbolic of true bread that the Father will give (6:32), which is, of course, Jesus himself. After the multiplication, distribution, and gathering of the remains of the loaves and fishes, the crowd believes Jesus to be "the prophet coming into the world" and attempts to take him by force, to "make him king" (6:14–15). Jesus flees to prevent this from happening, for he is not to be a king who merely provides food that perishes (6:21) as they think. He and his words are for eternal life (6:62–69). A second episode of interest in FG that sets the stage for dramatic irony in the trial episode is Jesus' triumphal entry to Jerusalem just prior to

the Passover feast and the acclamation of him as king by the crowd (12:12, 15). The kingship of Jesus in this text is even more obvious in FG than in any of the other gospels, for only John includes the words *ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*. The addition is likely an allusion to Zeph 3:15 (LXX).[37] Only in FG is Jesus' triumphal entry associated with the raising of Lazarus, where Jesus has overcome death and the impurity of the tomb just before the Passover (11:39–40; 12:1), and only here is he welcomed to Jerusalem as king for having done so (12:18). Consequently, for the implied reader of the trial episode, Jesus, in the context of Passover, has already been demonstrated to be a king who has overcome death and impurity and whose word is life-giving in a way that Torah is not.

How might actual first-century Christian readers have understood the dramatic irony encountered in 18:28–32 that culminates in the proclamation of Jesus as king by Pilate at the Passover? This is impossible to know for certain. Still, rabbinical instructions recorded after the first century, even though they cannot be used as authoritative for understanding the historical background of New Testament gospels produced near the end of the first century, underscore clues to the confession of the early church revealed in New Testament texts that we might otherwise miss. First, we find that in the later rabbinical literature an association is made between Passover and the eschatological reign of God that appears to be borne out in the Synoptic tradition and emphasized in the episode of Jesus' entrance to Jerusalem in FG. This association between Passover and the *eschaton* is already visible in Mark (14:12–16, 25) and to an even greater extent in Luke (22:15–16, 18).[39] As Joachim Jeremias argues,[40] already in the Christian New Testament of the first century there is evidence that prayers sung at the close of the Passover meal (cf. Mark 14:26, Matt 26:30) were being interpreted in light of the *eschaton* and were finding their application in the coming Messiah. All four evangelists report that one of these Passover hymns, Psalm 118:25–29, was used to welcome Jesus to Jerusalem as king. As demonstrated above, in FG this aspect of the Jerusalem entry is highlighted. Second, Wayne Meeks points out that the hour of noon on Nisan 14 is recognized in the rabbinical literature as the time when all leaven must be destroyed and the Passover proper begins.[41] The rabbinical prescription to remove leaven before the sixth hour is not found in the Hebrew Bible. Here leaven is merely to be removed on "the first day" of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod 12:15). However, in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, the removal of leaven is clearly linked to the Passover lamb having been already sacrificed. Paul writes: "Clean out the old leaven in order that you might be new dough, even as you are (*καθώς ἐστε*) a batch of unleavened dough, for our paschal lamb Christ has been sacrificed" (1 Cor 5:7). It therefore seems entirely possible that from early on instructions about completing the search for leaven before the sacrifice of the Passover lamb had commenced would have been in place, and that the sixth hour would have served as that deadline. Yu Ibuki's suggestion that the time reference in 19:14 marked the conclusion of the Roman working day gives added emphasis to the notion that noon marked an important turning point from one activity to another. So it seems reasonable to conclude that in the first century and in FG, "the sixth hour" marks what would have been the deadline for matters pertaining to Passover preparation and official beginning of the paschal feast.[42]

Briefly summarizing, dramatic irony in 18:28–32 highlights Jesus' identity as king of the Jews and his word as that which aligns him with the life-giving work of the Father. The Messianic expectation associated with the celebration of Passover in the early church highlights the declaration of the crucified Jesus as "king of the Jews" to be not only the climax of the trial episode but the arrival of Jesus' hour and the moment of his greatest revelation. The tension between the Jews and Jesus, false Passover and true Passover in 19:14 is clearly foreshadowed in 18:28–32, as a result.

We now consider what, if any, the impact of these two colliding worlds of the Jews and followers of Jesus, elicited from the compound irony in the trial episode, might have on our understanding of the Christology and anthropology of FD.

False Versus True Passover: A Two-Level Narrative (18:28–19:16)

Irony in art and narrative has been said to invite readers to perceive a two-level reality. Not only is there a readily visible, familiar world in the narrative where the usual rules of power are taken for granted and the-powers-that-be continue to reign as if no other reality exists. Irony can sometimes invite readers to dwell in a less obvious realm where genuine and lasting truths are encountered. Ito describes the contrast between the Pharisees and the man born blind in John 9 as pointing to just such a "gap." The Pharisees' words imply that they have come from God and are equipped to evaluate or judge others to obey God's law. But the implied reader, aware of the content in the Prologue and everything leading up to the trial episode, knows otherwise. To the extent that a relationship exists between this implied reader in the text and the real reader of the text, the author is able to use what the real reader knows to suggest that the Pharisees are blind and ignorant of their own identity.[43] If such a two-level world of irony in the narrative world of FG does indeed exist, then another place it becomes apparent is in the trial of Jesus before Pilate. Here, the paradox does not become apparent by contrasting the vision/blindness of the Pharisees with the blindness/vision of a man born blind. In the trial episode irony manifests itself in 18:28–32 when the innocence/guilt of Jesus' accusers is contrasted with the guilt/innocence of Jesus himself. This contrast between one realm and another, this gap between what is genuine and false surrounds not only true purity prior to the Passover, but the guilt and innocence associated with the judgment of Pilate. As a path to understanding the Christology and anthropology of FG, we turn our attention at last to the narrative of the entire trial.

The three references to Passover in the trial before Pilate, the central "triptych"[44] of the entire passion narrative, are the only explicit references to Passover in the arrest, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus narrated by FG. They cluster in the scene of Jesus' trial. The trial begins with a *πάσχα* not yet eaten (18:28), it is briefly interrupted by Pilate's attempt to release Jesus in connection with an apparently Jewish custom[45] (18:39a) of freeing a criminal *ἐν τῷ πάσχα* (18:38b-40), and reaches a climax with Pilate finally handing Jesus over to be crucified, yet presenting him as king of his accusers, at around noon on the *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* (19:14). Aside from the fact that each of these three references to Passover is unique to FG, the manner in which each appears is significant. The reference to a *πάσχα* not yet eaten in 18:28 is the first

explicit chronological detail regarding Passover since the nearness of the feast was mentioned in 13:1. As I have demonstrated in this paper, compound irony in this passage apparent to the implied reader of FG—and highlighted by a historical investigation of the gospel's intended readers—indicates that the concern of Jesus' accusers for ritual purity prior to the Passover actually reveals a transgression of true purity that coincides with their celebration of the feast. The Jews' rejecting Jesus when Pilate offers to release a criminal in association with the Jewish custom (*συνήθεια ὑμῖν*) at Passover (*ἐν τῷ πάσχα*), is also rife with irony. That a robber is released on Passover to the Jews by the prefect of a foreign occupier may remind some readers that even though Jesus' accusers might succeed in having Jesus crucified, their celebration of Passover is morally bankrupt. Finally, as I have demonstrated, nothing in the text explicitly indicates why the narrator has chosen to mention the time and day in conjunction with Pilate's declaration that Jesus is king of the Jews (19:14). The specific time reference of "the sixth hour" prompts the reader to consider various symbolic possibilities.[46] Real readers of FG might sense a climactic epiphany in this text that Jesus' accusers, in their inadequate celebration of Passover, completely miss. Again the focus is on the invalid Passover of Jesus' accusers, coupled with the increasing awareness of the crucified Jesus as the focus of all that is valid and genuine in this text.

Second, these three explicit Passover references occur in tandem with three important stages of Jesus' trial. As I have indicated above, Jesus' accusers, the Jews, are forced at first to try Jesus according to a Roman court because they are unable to judge Jesus according to their *νόμος* (18:31).[47] At this stage, Pilate, though reluctant to take on the case, appears to be merely gathering information and to be neutral to either the prosecution or the defense. Everything begins to move into a higher gear when it becomes clear that Pilate does not believe Jesus is guilty (18:38) and the Jews counter, first with the supposed authority of their Law and ultimately with the reminder of imperial disfavor. At this middle stage of the trial, Pilate first attempts to end the matter with no loss of face for Jesus' accusers by invoking what he calls the Jewish custom of releasing a prisoner (18:39). When that does not work, he has Jesus tortured for the purpose of eliciting sympathy from Jesus' countrymen. Neither plan succeeds. When the matter of the Jewish *νόμος* is invoked (19:6) the Jews inform Pilate that Jesus is already guilty because he has made himself "Son of God" (19:7; cf. Lev 24:16), a term with both governmental and theological implications. This pronouncement ushers in a third and final stage where Pilate's final judgment is impaired by fear (19:8). It has become clear that his decision either to release or to crucify Jesus is ultimately controlled by forces outside the courtroom. No longer addressing the question of whether or not he has found a charge against Jesus, Pilate simply declares Jesus to be the king of the Jews (19:14; cf. 19:19, 21) and turns him over (19:16) to be crucified. Talk of the Jewish law has been abandoned in favor of a focus upon Caesar and the loyalty of Jesus' accusers to Caesar alone (19:15).

Finally, the three stages of trial scene can be further delineated according to the repeated occurrence of compound irony that targets the Jewish authorities in each of its parts. To be sure, the passion narratives of all four Gospels contain irony[48] in which the Jewish authorities are victims. FG is notable in that the same

combination of dramatic irony and irony of self-betrayal that targets Jesus’ accusers is developed in multiple scenes during Jesus’ trial and is closely associated with the celebration of Passover. Because irony is composed of a contrast between appearance and reality, a gap between a lower level of meaning and a higher level of meaning, tension between what is true and not true,[49] the compound irony in Jesus’ trial before Pilate repeatedly victimizes Jesus’ Jewish accusers and pits their understanding of law (*νόμος*), their celebration of Passover against the true testimony of Jesus and the arrival of his hour. Stage one of the trial begins with irony that targets the Jews and their concern for ceremonial purity in association with the Passover (18:28). It ends with the picture of the Jewish authorities unable to follow through on the death penalty for Jesus that they claim their *νόμος* requires (cf. 5:18; 8:59; 10:30-1) because Jesus’ word (18:31) has triumphed over them. The reader understands this. They do not. Stage 2 of the trial scene begins with Pilate’s offer to release Jesus because of the Passover and the ironic cry of Jesus’ accusers for Barabbas, “a robber” (18:39-40). It ends with the assertion by Jesus’ accusers that Jesus is guilty as charged because he has made himself “Son of God” (19:7). Again, the implied reader realizes what Jesus’ accusers do not: Jesus truly is the Son of God, and by their law they are incapable of putting him to death. By the time we reach the third and final stage of the trial, the irony is obvious and its affective charge[50] has reached its peak. Here it becomes clear that the death of Jesus does not follow from the judgment of Pilate, but from the will of the Father (19:11). Varying shades of compound irony throughout the passage now reach their crescendo in the words of the high priests who answer Pilate’s question about whether or not he should crucify their king. They reply, “We have no king but Caesar!” The height of this irony coincides with Pilate’s declaration of Jesus as king at 12:00 noon on *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*.

So the events of the trial episode unfold in association with recurring elements that include the mention of Passover, developing tension between Pilate and Jesus’ accusers that is resolved with Pilate’s declaration of Jesus as king, and compound irony that targets Jesus’ accusers. 18:28-32, which stands at the beginning of this text, contains the first two of these three elements and fires the initial volley of irony that establishes a two-level world in the narrative: a world where on one level true Passover focused on Jesus Christ is celebrated, but on another level a false Passover is observed that coincides with Jesus’ deth.

Concluding Thoughts

John 18:28-32 plays an important role both within the trial episode in particular and the narrative of FG as a whole. Its various ironies establish a contrast which is of crucial importance for understanding the trial before Pilate and its ensuing Christology. It teaches the listeners/readers of FG that appearances can be deceiving. Jesus’ accusers are neither truly clean nor do they celebrate the true Passover. The text works subversively to critique their interpretation of *νόμος* and their institutions related to Passover. But what they celebrate is not what matters in the end. What matters is that for FG the revelation of Jesus, king of the Jews, is the beginning—the beginning of true Passover, and of life itself.

There is much that could have been examined in this text, but I have focused exclusively on compound irony that targets Jesus’ accusers.

As I have demonstrated, this irony was already foreseen in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. It is a reflection of a paradox: The very world that the Logos created, the very people to whom the Logos belonged, Israel, rejected him. If we only take these words at face value and don't see the irony or paradox in them, we miss their true intention. They point to the longing of God for the world that culminates in the cross of Jesus Christ. The shortcomings of the people narrated in the trial of Jesus…their prioritizing of permitted impurity over prohibited impurity, their misunderstanding of Torah, their choosing of an insurrectionist over the One through whom the kingdom of God would draw near to all humanity…these are important aspects of the trial, but they are only one side of the story. More important is what remains unspoken but merely hinted at: Jesus Christ is the eschatological true King of Israel, and as one who was tortured, crucified, and risen dwells among his own as the hero of all that are similarly oppressed. His kingdom is not of the world and does not function according to the rules of human warfare and power struggles. It is in the apparent weakness of the cross that his power and glory…and the power of his own…are to be found.

Though the specifics of the early Johannine communities remain unknown to us, the type of material preserved in the Gospel of John indicates that the Johannine community may have experienced a traumatic rupture with the Jewish synagogue. If this is so, portions of the Gospel that contain extensive irony, such as the trial before Pilate and the Jewish interrogation of the man born blind (John 9), may constitute portions of the Gospel that could reflect this development. As I have demonstrated in the case of the trial before Pilate, the details presented in John accord with the Synoptics and with historical circumstances of the first century AD. But in the presentation of Jesus' accusers in particular where irony comes to the fore and the trial of Jesus becomes the frame through which the interrogation of Jesus' disciples (cf. John 9) is viewed, we see the reliance of the church on its crucified king, where ultimately glory is to be found in the shame of trial and persecution.

"My kingdom is not of this world," Jesus says. If what is heard in those words is a kind of aloof disassociation with the world and the people who struggle there every day, Jesus is misunderstood. Jesus calls the church to radical engagement with the world...especially to giving a voice to the oppressed and overseeing the needs of those who are most vulnerable in society. But where the efforts of the church and the society within which the church continues to function are not enough, where the vulnerable continue to be victimized and people continue to experience physical and spiritual trial, the cross of the risen Christ gives life, hope, and power. The subversive ironies in the trial of Jesus point to the sufficiency of that power, the power of the cross, to overcome. That is the irony, the central paradox of the Christian faith: the love of God for an unlovable people, the glory of God amidst the abject shame and trial of human suffering. Jesus is the hero of all who experience trials in life...even the ultimate trial of death. But the paradox of the cross brings life. Irony in the Gospel of John points to that truth time and time again.

Notes

1 For helpful resources, see Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1981) and Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth*

Century Hermeneutics (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1974). For introductions to the methodology, see especially 太田修司著「文学批評」木田献一と荒井献監修『現代聖書講座第2巻 ── 聖書学の方法と諸問題』日本基督教団出版局，1999年，233–50頁；原口尚彰『新約聖書概説』教文館，2004年，33–40頁；R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983) (R. A. カルペッパー著，伊藤寿奏訳，『ヨハネ福音書 ── 文学的解剖』日本キリスト教団出版局，2005年).

2 For an excellent treatment of FG as an object of both literary and historical study, see Francis J. Moloney, S. D. B. "Who Is the Reader In/Of the Fourth Gospel?" *Australian Biblical Review* 40 (1992): 20–33. See also 伊藤寿奏「文学的方法による福音書のアイロニーの分析」『新約学研究』37号（2009年）43. (Hisayasu ITO, "Analysis of the Irony of the Gospel of John according to a Literary Methodology," *Shinyakugaku Kenkyu* 37 [2009]: 43 [in Japanese].)

3 Referred to by Culpepper as "implicit commentary." See his *Anatomy*, 151–202.（『文学的解剖』217–89 頁）.

4 Regarding the likely history-of-religions background to FG, see my article, "The Meaning of 'Life' in the Gospel according to John," *Theologia – Diakonia* 44 (2010): 45–61. See also Paul N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered* (2nd ed.; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 38–39.

5 Representative of recent treatments of the passion chronology in FG is Mark A. Matson, "The Historical Plausibility of John's Passion Dating," from *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, S.J., and Tom Thatcher), 291–312.

6 "Implied reader" is a construct defined as the reader required to understand and make sense of a narrative work in its totality. According to Moloney ("The Reader," 20–21) it is "not a person but a heuristic device used to trace the temporal flow of the narrative." Implied readers are for this reason distinguished from "intended readers" or "actual readers" who receive the narrative in either oral or written form at a specific point in time (e.g., "first-century readers"). What follows in this paper concurs with Moloney that "the Christian tradition of reading the Bible and the community of readers that produced the Bible, presupposes that a relationship is established between the implied reader *in* the text and the real or intended reader *of* the text" (p. 21, emphasis his).

7 Since the perception of irony is so often a cultural phenomenon, I am using Hisayasu Ito's article (cf. note 2, above) as a blueprint for determining what aspects of 18:28–32 could be largely understood as ironic for readers other than myself. Ito suggests a three-step process for identifying irony: 1) Preparatory steps for identifying irony based on answering "yes" or "no" to 7 guiding questions; 2) verifying steps for identifying irony, which include identifying ironist, observer, and victim, categorizing the type of irony involved, etc.; 3) either identifying the perlocutionary act elicited by the irony or explaining the function of the irony for the larger text in which it appears. See Ito, "Analysis,"（「文学的方法」）59–61.

8 I understand "compound irony" as a combination of dramatic irony and the irony of self-betrayal. For a definition of both terms, please see further, below.

9 "Observers" in this instance are readers/recipients of FG and the "victims" of the irony are Jesus' Jewish accusers. The principle irony under discussion is irony in which the "ironist" is not a character in the narrative (contrast Pilate's arguably sarcastic reference, at the Jews' expense, to Jesus as "your king" [19:15]). Compound irony targeting Jesus' accusers can be distinguished from less complex "dramatic irony," of which Pilate is also a victim. Again, cf. Ito, "Analysis,"（「文学的方法」）46.

10 See D. C. Muecke, *Irony* (London: Methuen & Co., 1970), 63–64. David Wead, in his *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970), 49 suggests an illocutionary force of irony in FG primarily intended not to produce a comic response but to be a "statement…or an action by which the author or character intends to convey another meaning than that which the words normally carry. This latter meaning is the truth." George Parsenios sees a connection between Greek/Roman forensic rhetoric and tragic drama in FG. See his *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif* (WUNT

258; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 28–33. R. Alan Culpepper also emphasizes the tragic element of Johannine irony. See his *Anatomy*, 169–70 (『物語的解剖』239–41頁).

11 That is, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

12 Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1994) 1:75–85.

13 Rudolph Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster: 1971), 635–6.

14 C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), 120.

15 Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. John Moore Trout, et. al.; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909) 3:270–73.

16 C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 21.

17 Frans C. Neirynck, "John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990," in Adelbert Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL 101; Leuven: University Press, 1992), 3–62.

18 However, in Luke the flogging of Jesus is anticipated by Pilate prior to his sentencing of Jesus rather than being reported by the gospel's narrator. For that reason, the flogging in Luke is, as in John, characterized as an action intended to placate the crowd rather than a measure merely to be associated with Jesus' sentencing.

19 However, the Praetorium is said to be the scene of Jesus' mocking by the Roman soldiers in Mark 15:16 (cf. Matt 27:27).

20 Bultmann, who identifies the flogging, mocking, and display of Jesus as a single event, divides the text into six parts (18:28–32; 18:33–38; 18:39–40; 19:1–7; 19:8–12a; 19:12b–16a; see his *Gospel of John,* 648). Raymond E. Brown (*The Gospel according to John* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1966–1970], 2:858–859) cites A. Janssens de Varebeke ("La structure des scènes du récit de la passion en Joh., xviii-xix," *ETL* 38 [1962], 504–22) in identifying seven parts. This is roughly identical to Bultmann's divisions.

21 Compound irony in all four gospels that depicts Jesus' accusers as victims centers on the release of Barabbas (cf. Mark 15:6–15 and parallels) and is the second of three instances of compound irony in the trial scene of FG.

22 For a somewhat different, yet similar approach to the text, see Ernst Haenchen, *John 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 7–21* (trans. Robert Funk; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 185.

23 This classification of types of irony employs the second of Ito's "verification steps" to analyze 18:28. Cf. his "Analysis,"(「文学的方法」) 60.

24 Cf. D. C. Muecke, *The Compass of Irony* (2nd ed.; New York: Methuen & Co., 1980), 107.

25 I am understanding dramatic irony according to the definition of Paul D. Duke, citing M. H. Abrams: "Dramatic irony involves a situation in a play or narrative in which the audience shares with the author knowledge of which a character is ignorant." Cf. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox, 1985), 24.See also D. C. Muecke, *Irony* (1970), 73: "We call it Dramatic Irony when we see a man serenely unaware that the situation as he sees it is the contrary of the real situation." In *Compass of Irony*, 105, Muecke elaborates: "Dramatic irony is pre-eminently the irony of the theatre, being implicit in the very nature of the play, 'the spectacle of a life in which…we [the audience] do not interfere but over which we exercise the control of knowledge…. But Dramatic Irony is also found outside the theatre, as when Joseph, unknown to his brothers, entertains them in Egypt."

26 "Analysis,"(「文学的方法」) 48.

27 Even if the Mishnah is taken as a document that has some measure of historical significance for the first century, difficulty exists in determining whether the impurity at issue concerned corpse impurity lasting seven days (possibly contracted by merely entering Gentile dwellings where it was believed that aborted fetuses were buried; cf. *m. Ohal.* 18:7), and so prevented the eating of a Passover meal after sundown, or a lesser form of impurity that would have disqualified worshippers from entering the temple and so sacrificing or eating offerings associated with worship ceremonies later that same day. The point at issue surrounds the interpretation of rabbinical documents such as *m. Ohal.* 1:1– 3, 18:7–10 and *m. Pesah.* 7:6, 8:8. Restrictions applying even to what might be considered the most rigorous interpretation of *m. Ohal.* 18:7 make it seem unlikely to many that mere entrance to an area such as the Praetorium would have resulted in a seven-day period of uncleanness. Although lesser impurity that passes at evening could be contracted through indirect as-

sociation with a corpse, seven-day corpse impurity seems to have been limited to direct contact (cf. Num 19:11) or with a utensil that had touched a corpse (*m. Ohal.* 1:1-3). But as Barrett points out, varying interpretations of Mishnaic prohibitions can be reconstructed today, and association with Gentiles could have been seen by some as equivalent to corpse impurity. Perhaps in the end it is best to conclude, as Barrett does, that the words of J. B. Segal are appropriate: "We do not know how the laws of ritual cleanness were interpreted at the time of Jesus." Cf. *The Gospel according to St. John*, 532.

28 See *m. Kelim* 1:4: "On a higher plane than a leper was a bone the size of a barley grain, for this defiles a person for a full seven days."

29 For example, Peter's association with Cornelius in Acts 10:22–29. Though it is not certain that the earliest traditions recorded in the Mishnah about Hillel are historically accurate, reconstructed traditions associated with that school liken contact with Gentiles to contact "with a grave." Again, see Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 532.

30 See Richard Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," pages 91–142 in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity* (ed. by Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

31 See Roger P. Booth, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7* (JSNTSup 13; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 46; Jonathan Klawans, "Moral and Ritual Purity," from *The Historical Jesus in Context* (edited by Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison Jr., and John Dominc Crossan; Princeton, NJ: University Press, 2006), 277 (ジョナサン・クラワンズ「道徳上および儀式丈のきよめ」土岐健治と木村和良訳, A. -J. レヴァイン、D. C. アリソンJr. , とJ. D. クロッサン編 『イエス研究史料集成』教文館, 2009年); H. Hübner, H, "Unclean and Clean, New Testament (R. B. Thomas, Jr., Trans.)," in *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (D. N. Freedman, Ed.), New York: Doubleday, 1992.

32 For recent archeological evidence that the pool of Siloam was used for ritual bathing in the first century, see Urban C. von Wahlde, "The Pool of Siloam: The Importance of the New Discoveries for Our Understanding of Ritual Immersion in Late Second Temple Judaism and the Gospel of John," pages 155–73 in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, S. J., and Tom Thatcher; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009). For other less obvious texts concerning Jesus and the realm of the impure or profane in the context of Passover, see Jesus' resurrection of Lazarus at Bethany (11:39–40; cf. Acts 2:31, 13:34–37) and Jesus' occupation of the Jerusalem temple while "the Passover was near," disrupting the sale of animals of sacrifice being conducted in the temple precinct likely for the purpose of ritual purification (John 2:13–17).

33 See *Sifra, Qedoshim*, Perek 4:1 on Lev 19:15 and Temple Scroll L1:11–16, cited in Klawans, "Moral and Ritual Purity," 277.

34 In addition to the sources cited in the note above, see Ezra 3:20, 18:24–26, and 28:18.

35 *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo, Vol. 2* (London: Routledge, 2003), 6.

36 Scholars have debated how Jesus' relationship to God as "Son" would have been understood by first-century readers of the Gospel of John. John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 318, notes the importance of distinguishing "Son" in the Gospel of John from the Messianic title "Son of God." Once Jesus' self-designation as "Son" is no longer seen as exclusively Messianic, the question may then be asked: would the term have expressed a certain function that Jesus fills (i.e., Jesus as "Son" of the Father carries out God's will)? Or would it have demonstrated Jesus' affinity with the Father (Jesus as Son of the Father reveals God)? Scholars have often emphasized one or the other. Those who have understood Jesus' role in John as functional have tended to highlight the Son as the faithful servant sent by the Father, the envoy or representative of God. Robert Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), 202, listed J. A. T. Robinson, J. Riedle, and H. Schlier among those who interpret Jesus primarily in terms of his function, or work. Since the publication of Kysar's book, Juan Peter Miranda again examined the Son as envoy of the Father in the Fourth Gospel in his *Die Sendung Jesu im vierten Evangelium: Religions- und theologie-geschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den*

Sendungsformeln (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 87; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977). Miranda concluded that the Father-Son relationship does not express identity between the sender and the one sent, but rather congruence in action (p. 90). More recently, G. M. Beasley-Murray has also focused on Jesus as servant or slave of the Father: "The messenger was commonly a slave. Such a person, however, belonged to the house of the master, and the honor and esteem in which the household was held was represented by the slave.... The messenger was identified with his master's 'house' and the 'house' was an extension of the master's personality, so that in his messenger, the sender himself acted" *(Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991], 18). By contrast, interpretations that have focused on Jesus' identity with the Father have more strongly emphasized Jesus as revealer and God incarnate. This interpretation emphasized Jesus' statement that to see him is to see the Father (cf. 14:9). Miranda identified K. H. Rengstorf, R, Bultmann, W. G. Kümmel, and F. M. Braun as scholars who have essentially argued in favor of this latter model (*Die Sendungssformeln*, 10–11). Since the 70s, Ashton (Understanding *the Fourth Gospel*, 320) has considered the possibility that the beloved son of Mark 12:6, sent by the Father, best explains how FG presents Jesus as Son: "Important are (1) the special status of the son within the owner's household; and (2) the general circumstances which would make his mission—as a son, indeed, an only son—not just an adventitious conjunction, but a natural consequence of his privileged position." But while many scholars emphasize Jesus as either son or envoy, others have approached the issue as a "both/and" rather than an "either/or" proposition. See, for example, Jan Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium: Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (WUNT 2/2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977) and Andreas Köstenberger, *Missions of Jesus according to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 11.

37 Wayne A. Meeks, who understands the text in John to be from a separate tradition from that behind the Synoptic accounts, points to the direct application of the title "King" to Jesus (as in Luke), and the citation of Zachariah with its "your king" (as in Matthew). See *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 86.

38 See, e.g., Midrash on 1) the Book of Exodus, *Mekhilta de-rabbi Ishmael*, Pischa 14 and Exodus Rabbah 18:12; 2) Psalms 116 and 118, sung antiphonally after the Passover meal. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans. Norman Perrin; London: SCM Press, 1966), 258–9.

39 See D. E. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 106/4 (1987): 628.

40 Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 255–62.

41 *m. Pes.* 1.5–6.

42 伊吹雄著『ヨハネ福音書註解』（第３巻，知泉書館，2009年）3:333（Yu IBUKI, *Commentary on John* [3 vols.; Kommentar zum Johannesevangelium; Tokyo: Chizenshokan, 2004–2009], 3:333 [in Japanese]）.

43 See Ito, "Analysis"（「文学方法」）47.

44 Andrew Lincoln, *The Gospel according to St. John* (New York: Hendrickson, 2005), 458.

45 That the prisoner release was customary for Jesus' accusers and seems to originate with them in FG may be contrasted with some parallel accounts, especially Matt 27:15 (cf. Mk 15:6). In Luke the origin of the custom remains unspecified.

46 Bultmann argues that reference points to Passover lamb imagery since the sentencing and crucifixion of Jesus would have occurred at the same time that Passover lambs were slaughtered in the Jerusalem temple (*The Gospel of John*, 677). Others see the time designation not as a reference to Passover lamb imagery but as the climactic moment of Jesus' designation as "king" when he is sentenced to die by crucifixion, therefore the time designation becomes his true "hour" and revelation of his glory. Yu Ibuki, in explaining the theological significance of the time reference, sees the text as following other time references throughout the narrative ("it was night," 13:30; "it was early in the morning," 18:28) and so suggestive of the moment that Jesus' glory is revealed. See his *Commentary on John*（『ヨハネ福音書註解』）3:334. Also Christine Schlund, ("*Kein Knochensollgebrochen warden*"—*Studien zu Bedeutung und Funktion des Pesachfests in Texten des frühen Juden-*

tums und im Johannesevangelium [WMANT 107; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2005], 122) understands the reference to be to the climax of Jesus' "hour" because of Pilate's proclamation of him as king, and therefore the beginning of true Passover in FG.

47 For a helpful explanation of the theological issues involved with the depiction of "the Law" in the trial before Pilate, see Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 310–12.

48 Various classifications of irony are grouped together by Duke as "subspecies of stable irony." He understands verbal irony according to its narrow sense as a "statement in which the implied meaning intended by the speaker differs from that which he ostensibly asserts." This is contrasted by Duke and D. C. Muecke (cf. *Compass of Irony*, 42) from situational irony, which Muecke defines as implying "a 'condition of affairs' or 'outcome of events' which ... is seen and felt to be ironic." With verbal irony the speaker is the "ironist," whereas with situational irony that occurs in literature "we have an ironist being ironical by showing us something ironic happening." In contrasting stable and unstable ironies, Duke reformulates the treatment of Wayne C. Booth (cf. *A Rhetoric of Irony* [Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974], 240–77) in order to highlight irony that is "fixed," "covert," and "intended". According to Duke, it is this type of irony that is typically found in FG. See *Irony*, 21–27.

49 See Ito, "Analysis"（「文学方法」）47.

50 See Linda Hutcheon, *Irony's Edge* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 41–42.

アイロニーを込めてイエスの裁判を物語る

―ヨハネ福音書18：28-19：16における『真の過越祭』を考慮して

ブランキ，ジョナサン・A.

「ピラトによるイエス裁判」のエピソード（ヨハネ18:28-19:16）は，最後の晩餐とイエスの十字架刑の歴史的日付（ニサンの月の14日か15日か）を理解するのに重要だと見なされている過越祭と結び付いた二つの細部（18:28と19:14）を含むテキストとしてよく知られている。この歴史的日付の特定に焦点を合わせることは，１世紀の過越祭と今日の読者にとってのイエスの人格と業の意義についてこのテキストが何を語っているかを決定するには，もちろん重要ではあるが，結局は不十分であることを本論文は論じる。歴史批評の分析を補うためにナラティブ（物語）批評を用いつつ，一つの言い回しの中にいくつかの側面が含まれているアイロニーはユダヤ人の祭儀上の清浄の習慣，過越祭をめぐる諸伝承，来たるべきメシヤへの期待などに馴染みのある１世紀のこのテキストの読者と出逢っていた可能性が高いことを実証している。そのようなアイロニーは，１世紀と今日のどちらもの，乱用される権力構造を批評する。それは，その中で十字架につけられたイエスが命を与え，苦しんでいる人々と共にいる新しいキリスト教的な過越祭を指し示す。

Keywords：過越祭，儀式上の清め，アイロニー，神の子，ヨハネによる福音書