

THE ANCHOR BIBLE

THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO
JOHN

VOLUME 2

(xiii-xxi)

INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES

BY

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN
LONDON

61. THE PASSION NARRATIVE:
—DIVISION ONE (UNIT ONE)
(xviii 1–12)

The Arrest of Jesus

xviii 1 After this discourse Jesus went out with his disciples across the Kidron valley to where there was a garden, which they entered together. 2 This place was also familiar to Judas, his betrayer, for Jesus had often gone there with his disciples. 3 So Judas took a detachment of soldiers, together with police supplied by the chief priests and the Pharisees, and went there equipped with lanterns and torches and weapons.

4 Knowing fully what was to happen to him, Jesus came out to them and asked, "Whom are you looking for?" 5 "Jesus the Nazorean," they replied. He told them, "I am he." (Now Judas, his betrayer, was also there with them.) 6 When Jesus said to them, "I am he," they stepped back and fell to the ground. 7 So he asked them again, "Whom are you looking for?" "Jesus the Nazorean," they repeated. 8 "I told you that I am he," Jesus answered. "And if I am the one you want, let these men go." (9 This was to fulfill what he had said, "I have not lost even one of those whom you have given me.")

10 Then Simon Peter, who had a sword, pulled it out and struck at the servant of the high priest, cutting off his right earlobe. (The servant's name was Malchus.) 11 But Jesus told Peter, "Put back that sword. Am I not to drink the cup the Father has given me?"

12 At that the soldiers with their tribune and the Jewish police arrested Jesus and bound him.

3: went; 4: asked; 5: told. In the historical present tense.

NOTES

xviii 1. *After this discourse.* Literally "Having said these things." De la Potterie and others see the connotation of purpose or preparation in this phrase, so that the Passion Narrative that follows represents the culmination of Jesus' words. For instance, the crucifixion would be the glorification spoken

of in xvii 1-5. The connection is possible, but elsewhere in John the phrase is purely sequential (xiii 21, xx 20).

went out with his disciples. Virtually the same words appear in the Synoptic accounts of the end of the supper. Mark xiv 26 (Matt xxvi 30) has: "They went out"; Luke xxii 39: "And going out, he went . . . and his disciples followed him." All the Gospel accounts imply that Jesus intended to spend the night in the environs of the city rather than in the city itself. This would agree with what we know of the crowded conditions of the city at Passover time (see NOTE on xi 55). Jewish custom demanded that Passover night (Synoptic chronology) be spent in Jerusalem—this was the contemporary exegesis of Deut xvi 7. But to solve the problem of accommodations, the city district had been enlarged for Passover purposes to include the environs as far as Bethphage on the Mount of Olives. Bethany, Jesus' usual place of residence in the Jerusalem area (NOTE on xi 1), lay outside the legal limit. See Jeremias, EWJ, p. 55.

As for the designation of those with Jesus as "his disciples," Jeremias, EWJ, p. 95, points out that in the primitive, pre-Markan passion account the word "disciples" is not used in the scene of the arrest, but only the vaguer designation "those who stood by."

across the Kidron valley. Literally "the winter-flowing Kidron" (or Kedron if one follows the Greek spelling). The Kidron, not mentioned by the Synoptics, is a wadi that has flowing water only in the rainy or winter season. John's use of the correct terminology for the Kidron is not necessarily a proof that the Gospel is drawing on an authentic Palestinian tradition (vol. 29, p. XLII), for "winter-flowing" is the usual designation of the Kidron in LXX (II Sam xv 23; I Kings xv 13). Loisy, Lagrange, and others think that John is subtly alluding here to the story of David's flight before Absalom in II Sam xv (14: "Arise and let us flee" [John xiv 31]; 23: "And the king crossed the Kidron valley"). Guilding, p. 165, relates the Johannine narrative to I Kings ii, read as a *haptarah* two months before Passover in the first year of the triennial cycle of synagogue readings (vol. 29, pp. 278-80). In particular she points to the warning of Solomon to Shimei: "On the day you go out across the Kidron valley, know for certain you shall die" (I Kings ii 37; also see NOTE on Malchus in vs. 10 below). The fact that the waste blood of the temple sacrifices was disposed into the Kidron is mentioned by StB, II, 567. However, the reference to the Kidron is not obviously symbolic.

to where there was a garden. Some detect here a note of finality: because there was a garden there. The word *kēpos* refers to a plot of land where vegetables or flowers are planted, and sometimes trees as well. Only John gives the site this name. D. M. Stanley and B. P. Robinson (*art. cit.*), following an ancient tradition (Cyril of Alexandria, Aquinas), think that in setting the struggle between Judas (the tool of Satan) and Jesus in a garden, John is alluding to the theme of the Garden of Paradise in Gen ii-iii. Some of the proposed Paradise motifs (Tree of Life) emerge from combining this garden with the garden mentioned in xix 41-42, where Jesus was crucified, buried and rose; but nothing in John suggests that the same garden is involved in both episodes. Moreover, John does not use the word *paradeisos* found in the Genesis story, even though that word is known elsewhere in the Johannine writings (Rev ii 7). Thus the symbolic exegesis is hard to justify. Mark xiv 32 and Matt xxvi 36 mention "a piece of land [*chōrion*] with the name

Gethsemane (above), is John. It is a designation of the Mount of Olives appearing in the general idea of the Gospel slopes of the Mount and this is the century. In the Olives in the Lord. By the Synoptics (cf. also Mark we may not the "agony" *agōnia*); on entered.

xxvi 36) entered together

2. his over"; see Judas as the and in 5: necessary, the passion account scene of the In the story is called "the with a kiss?"

often gathered in the synagoga; in instance, the garden, rather than that Jesus (xxi 37) alone draws to find him.

3. Judas ment as a is necessarily contention was in character a Roman overlooked a detached distinguished figure in John. In the cohort

Gethsemane. This name, which comes from the B source of Mark (see p. 788 above), is not found in Luke (who speaks simply of "the place") or in John. It means "oil valley" or "oil press," and was not an inappropriate designation for a site on the Mount of Olives. (Note that while *the Mount of Olives* appears in the A source of Mark and in all three Synoptics, even this general identification of the locale is absent from John.) One may combine the Gospel information and think of the site as an olive grove on the lower slopes of the Mount of Olives, just across the Kidron valley from Jerusalem; and this is where Christian tradition has localized the site since the 4th century. In Zech xiv 4 (one of the two explicit references to the Mount of Olives in the OT) the Lord stands on this Mount for the final battle against the nations and after this battle come the blessings of the day of the Lord. By placing the agonized struggle of Jesus on the Mount of Olives, the Synoptic Gospels may be exploiting the theological symbolism of Zechariah (cf. also Mark xiii 3-4), a symbolism that John does not draw upon. Finally we may note that the customary title "Jesus' agony in the garden" is a *mélange*: the "agony" is described in the Synoptics (Luke xxii 44, alone, has the word *agōnia*); only John mentions the "garden."

entered. The verb *eiserchesthai* (= *erchesthai* . . . *eis* of Mark xiv 32; Matt xxvi 36) evokes the image of an enclosed area; so also "came out" in vs. 4. *together.* Literally "he and his disciples."

2. *his betrayer.* Literally here and in 5: "the one who was handing him over"; see NOTES on vi 64, 71. In the Book of Glory John has already identified Judas as the betrayer three times (xiii 2, 11, 21), and the instances here and in 5 are usually thought to reflect the hand of the editor. Caution is necessary, however, in judging the present verse—in the primitive pre-Gospel passion account there may well have been a need to identify Judas in the scene of the arrest of Jesus, for this would have been the first time he appeared. In the story of the arrest in Mark xiv 42, 44 and Matt xxvi 46, 48, Judas is called "the betrayer"; cf. Luke xxii 48: "Would you *betray* the Son of Man with a kiss?"

often gone there with his disciples. Or "stayed there with"; the verb *synagēsthai* normally means "meet together" (cf. Acts xi 26). In the present instance, however, and perhaps previously, Jesus' disciples went with him to the garden, rather than meeting him there (Reynen, *art. cit.*). John's information that Jesus frequented the garden may be compared to Luke's information (xxi 37) that Jesus used to spend the night on the Mount of Olives; but John alone draws the logical inference that Jesus' habit enabled Judas to know where to find him.

3. *Judas took.* Here the participle "taking" implies little more than accompaniment as a guide (BAG, p. 465^{1a}; cf. BDF, §418^b); no particular authority is necessarily attributed to Judas. Thus, we do not find convincing Winter's contention (*Trial*, pp. 44-45) that here John erroneously implies that Judas was in charge of Roman soldiers and thus contradicts vs. 12 which mentions a Roman military officer. We are hesitant in supposing that the final editor overlooked such a discrepancy within a few verses.

a detachment of soldiers. Literally "the cohort." That soldiers (as distinguished from police) were involved in the arrest of Jesus is mentioned only in John. In the NT "cohort" always refers to Roman soldiers, describing either the cohort of 600 men or the maniple of 200. Perhaps the mention here

of a cohort instead of a smaller detachment came by way of confusion with the cohort mentioned in the crucifixion accounts. (Mark xv 16 mentions the calling together of "the whole cohort" for the mockery of Jesus, and some scribes have copied that reading into this verse in John.) The reference to a tribune in vs. 12 confirms the impression that John is thinking of Roman soldiers (*pace* Blinzler, *Trial*, pp. 64-70; Benoit, *Passion*, p. 46). An appeal to LXX where Roman military terms were used anachronistically for non-Roman troops does not throw light on the present situation. A writer living under Roman domination would scarcely use a technical Roman military term for a Jewish force when he intends to mention alongside the cohort and distinct from it "the police supplied by the chief priests and the Pharisees." If the mention of Roman troops is historical, then we must assume that they were placed at the disposal of the priests or the Sanhedrin by Pilate, perhaps because he feared the danger of another insurrection (cf. Mark xv 7; Luke xxiii 19). This may also explain the difficulty of the large number of soldiers, if we are to take "cohort" literally. From a few years after Jesus' time (Acts x 1) until mid-2nd century the Roman prefect or procurator in Palestine had at his disposal troops of a cohort (*Cohors Secunda Italica*) consisting of troops mustered in Italy and complemented by recruits from Samaria and Caesarea (Josephus *Ant.* XIX. ix. 2; §365). While the Synoptic account of the arrest of Jesus does not mention Romans, some see a reference to them in Mark xiv 41 (Matt xxvi 45): "The Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners [i.e., Gentiles?]."

police supplied by the chief priests and the Pharisees. For these temple police (*hypēretai*) see NOTE on vii 32. Literally they are the police "of the chief priests"; and in 12 they are called "the Jewish police" in distinction from the (Roman) cohort with its tribune. The Synoptic descriptions of the group involved in the arrest of Jesus are more general, with Luke being the closest to John. Mark xiv 43 (Matt xxvi 47) speaks of "a (great) crowd . . . from the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders (of the people)"; Luke xxii 52 places the chief priests and the elders themselves in the scene along with "the officers of the Temple" (from Acts v 22-24, 26 we may conclude that Luke's *stratēgoi* are the officers over the *hypēretai* of the Temple).

Turning to John's expression "the chief priests and the Pharisees," we note that it has occurred four times before (vii 32, 45, xi 47, 57). In itself, the combination offers no great difficulty (it occurs in Josephus *Life* 5; §21), but some would see here an amalgamation of the priests of Jesus' time and the Pharisees of the evangelist's time. Let us consider each term. The plural usage "high priests" occurs some ten times in John (five times in the Passion Narrative) and is very frequent in the Synoptics and Acts. It does not necessarily indicate that the NT writers did not know that there was only one official high priest at a time, for the plural is an accepted idiom found in Josephus and the Mishnah. Under the rubric of chief or high priests were included the incumbent high priest (John and Matthew mention Caiaphas in the Passion Narratives), former high priests who had been deposed but were still living (e.g., Annas), and members of the privileged families from whom the high priests were chosen. See Schürer, II, 1, 203-6. Perhaps the rubric also covered holders of priestly offices (so Jeremias, as cited in BAG, p. 112). All the Gospels give the chief priests the most prominent role in the action

against Jesus. Mark and Matthew frequently mention the elders, while Luke (xxiii 13, 35, xxiv 20) mentions the rulers as well as the elders (xxii 52; cf. 66).

In the Passion Narratives proper John alone mentions the Pharisees, and then only in the present instance (Matt xxvii 62 involves them in the setting of the guard at the tomb—certainly a late addition to the narrative). However, John probably means to include them elsewhere in the Passion Narrative under the rubric of "the Jews," as do the Synoptists when they refer to the whole Sanhedrin (Mark xv 1) and to the scribes (all three Gospels). Some scholars think John guilty of error here in speaking of the temple police supplied by the Pharisees who actually had no authority over such police. However, John may mean no more than that the police were sent by the Sanhedrin in which priests, Pharisee scribes, and elders had a voice (Mark xiv 43). Historically, it is impossible to determine just how involved in the action against Jesus were the Pharisees or the *whole* Sanhedrin (seemingly twenty-three of the seventy councilors were enough to form a quorum); but one may plausibly surmise both that the Pharisees were too important to have been ignored by the priests and that they had no love for Jesus after his public statements about them.

Lanterns and torches. Mentioned only by John, this detail may have been included in the narrative to emphasize the theological theme that it was night (see COMMENT). This does not rule out the possibility that the detail is factual. The objection that lanterns would not have been needed for this was the time of the nearly full paschal moon is weak: common sense indicates that an olive grove would have had dark corners in which a man might hide. Haenchen, "Historie," p. 59⁹, thinks it unrealistic that 600 or even 200 men would have come carrying lanterns and torches, but one need not interpret John to mean that *all* carried these.

weapons. Mark xiv 43 and Matt xxvi 47 mention swords and clubs. P. Winter, "The Trial of Jesus" (mimeographed lecture, February 19, 1964, p. 10), contends that the Jewish police carried batons (clubs) and the Roman soldiers carried swords; implicitly, then, for him the Marcan/Matthean account would acknowledge the presence of the two groups.

4. *Knowing.* There is weaker textual support for "seeing," a reading that is less theological. Jesus' foreknowledge is a strong Johannine theme (vi 6, xiii 1). In Mark xiv 42 (Matt xxvi 46) Jesus knows that his betrayer is at hand before Judas appears on the scene.

came out. Only in John does Jesus take the initiative in going to meet Judas; for John, Jesus remains in full control of all that happens.

5. *Nazorean.* We may distinguish three designations of Jesus: (a) *apo Nazareth*, "from Nazareth": Matt xxi 11; Mark i 9; John i 45; Acts x 38. (b) *Nazarēnos*, "Nazarene": four times in Mark; twice in Luke; a Western textual variant in this verse of John. (c) *Nazōraios*, "Nazorean": twice in Matthew; eight times in Luke-Acts; three times in John's Passion Narrative (here, xviii 7, xix 19). This third term has been the subject of scholarly discussion. By the time Matthew's Gospel was written, *Nazōraios* was interpreted as a reference to Jesus' coming from Nazareth (Matt ii 23). In the story of Peter's denial after the arrest of Jesus, Mark xiv 67 mentions Jesus the Nazarene while Matt xxvi 71 speaks of Jesus the Nazorean. It is true that M. Black, p. 144, and others have questioned the derivation of *Nazōraios* as a gentilic from *Nazareth*, but most scholars still support this derivation as

plausible and it remains the best working hypothesis. (See G. F. Moore in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. by K. Lake and F. J. Foakes-Jackson [London: Macmillan, 1920], I, I, 426-32; W. F. Albright, JBL 65 [1946], 397-401.) It is perfectly logical that a party sent to arrest a man would wish to identify him fully by name and locale. There is no reason here to think that a reference to Nazareth as Jesus' hometown would contain a note of contempt as in i 45-46 (cf. vii 41, 52). Some of the other hypotheses for explaining *Nazōraios* include: (a) The name designates a pre-Christian Jewish sect ("Observants" from the root *nṣr*), perhaps the followers of John the Baptist. The Mandeans, who claim descent from the Baptist's movement, occasionally call themselves *naṣorayya*. Church Fathers, like Theodoret and Epiphanius, knew of a heretical Jewish-Christian sect called *Nazōraioi*, but Epiphanius (*Haer.* xviii, xxix; GCS 25:215, 321) distinguishes between them and the pre-Christian *Nasaraioi*. (b) The name is to be related to the ancient Nazirites (Heb. *nāzîr*) who were consecrated to Yahweh by a vow; see Judg xiii 5, and the argument of E. Schweizer in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche* (J. Jeremias Festschrift; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960), pp. 90-93. (c) The name designates Jesus as the "messianic branch" (Heb. *nēšer*) of Isa xi 1. (d) The name is related to the passive of the verb *našar*, "to preserve," thus *nāšûr*, "the preserved," with connotations of the messianic remnant—Jesus is the one who has been set aside and kept for the messianic task; his followers are the remnant. B. Gärtner, *Die rätselhaften Termini Nazoräer und Iskariot* (Horae Soederblomianae 4; Uppsala: Gleerup, 1957), p. 14, thinks that the passages Isa xlii 6 and xlix 6, which contain this verb, are the prophecies referred to in Matt ii 23 as the basis for calling Jesus a Nazorean. Gärtner also brings into his explanation the cognate Isaian noun *nēšer* mentioned above. For a survey of views, see H. H. Schaefer, TWNTE, IV, 874-79.

"I am he." Literally "I am" (*egō eimi*). Codex Vaticanus, which reads "I am Jesus," preserves a scribal attempt to clarify. An *egō eimi* occurs in the Marcan Passion Narrative (xiv 62) as Jesus' answer to the high priest's question about his being the Messiah. Moreover, in Mark xiv 44, in the arrest of Jesus, Judas says, "Whomever I shall kiss, it is he [*autos estin*]."

(Now Judas . . .). This seems to be a very awkward editorial insertion: not only has Judas' presence already been mentioned, but he has no further role that would warrant his being mentioned again. Bultmann, p. 493, thinks that this was the first reference to Judas in the garden scene of the passion account used by the evangelist, while the reference to Judas in vs. 3 represents an introductory addition composed by the evangelist. Winter, *Trial*, p. 45, thinks that all references to Judas in this scene are secondary. Is the second mention of Judas an echo of the Synoptic tradition where Judas has a more important role? For the possibility of minor additions from the Synoptic tradition see vol. 29, p. xxxviii.

6. *they stepped back*. The Synoptic accounts do not report any hesitancy in arresting Jesus. However, elsewhere in John there are reports of difficulty in arresting or harming Jesus (vii 30, 44, viii 20, 59, x 39, xii 36; also Luke iv 29-30). J. H. Hingston, ET 32 (1920-21), 232, has made an attempt to solve the difficulty by interpreting the words to mean: "they went behind [him]," an interpretation that requires the omission of the next phrase, *and fell to the ground*. Mein, *art. cit.*, is perfectly correct in rejecting Bernard's interpretation (II, 586-87) that the words imply no more than that

1
t
f
n
b
ev

thi
ver
solu
p. 5
plēn
"wh
"the
fulfill
Such
Script
recogn
basis
by Go
Moses
there is
"I
however
citation
have give
is closer
your nam
12.) Bult
that I sho
present ve
In any cas
comment, a
cite the OT.

the men who came to make the arrest were overcome by Jesus' moral ascendancy and so were "floored." But Mein's own thesis is not convincing either, namely, that this is an echo of LXX of Isa xxviii 13b: "... that they may go and fall back and be crushed and be in danger and be destroyed." Mein combines this with the mention of the chosen cornerstone three verses later in Isaiah, so that in John's imagery Jesus the cornerstone becomes a stone of stumbling, as in I Pet ii 6-8. But there is nothing else in the Fourth Gospel to suggest that this cornerstone symbolism played a role in Johannine thought. Lagrange, p. 457, who takes the Johannine account literally, says that one must not exaggerate the miracle, for relatively few soldiers would have heard the words and fallen down! S. Bartina, *art. cit.*, who also takes the scene literally, thinks that the Jews out of habit prostrated themselves on the ground when Jesus spoke the divine name "I AM." The latter theme is involved (see COMMENT), but we have here a Johannine theological construction rather than a historical reminiscence. Haenchen, "Historie," p. 59, makes the suggestion that the Psalms, which played such an important role in the reflection of the early Church on the passion, also entered Johannine thought in this scene, for example: Pss xxvii 2: "When evildoers come at me to devour my flesh, my foes and my enemies themselves stumble and *fall*"; xxxv 4: "Let those be *turned back* and confounded who plot evil against me." See COMMENT for even more pertinent Psalms.

9. *This was to fulfill what he had said.* As often in John (NOTE on xv 25), this is simply a *hina* purpose clause, and we have had to supply the governing verb "This was" (MTGS, p. 304). Other interpreters offer the less plausible solution of an imperatival *hina*: "What he had said must be fulfilled" (MTGS, p. 95—"doubtful"). Elsewhere (Matthew, John, and Acts especially) the verb *plēroun* is used to describe the NT fulfillment of OT passages: to fulfill "what was said by the Lord"; "what was said through the prophet"; or simply "the Scripture." Only here and in xviii 32 do we have the verb used for fulfilling the words of Jesus (yet see Freed's theory in the NOTE on xvii 12). Such usage implicitly puts Jesus' words on a level with the words of the Jewish Scriptures and is the beginning of an attitude that would lead toward the recognition of canonical Christian writings alongside the Jewish ones. The basis in John for this usage is that Jesus' words have been given to him by God (xvii 8) and that Jesus' revelation surpasses the Torah given through Moses (i 17). We note that in the Gethsemane scene of Matt xxvi 54 there is a reference to the fulfilling of Scripture but in a different context.

"*I have not lost even one of those whom you have given me.*" In fact, however, Jesus has not said this verbatim previously in John. Is this a free citation of the import of xvii 12: "I kept them safe with your name which you have given to me. I kept watch and not one of them was lost"? (The resemblance is closer if we take the alternative reading of that verse: "I kept safe with your name those whom you have given to me"—see NOTES on xvii 11 and 12.) Bultmann, p. 495, thinks of vi 39: "It is the will of Him who sent me that I should lose nothing of what He has given me" and maintains that the present verse was added by a redactor who misunderstood the passage in vi. In any case the final editor seems to be the one who supplied the parenthetical comment, and he may be citing Jesus' words as freely as the other NT authors cite the OT. Notice the implication that Judas, who was lost, was not really given

by the Father to Jesus. Judas is explicitly listed as an exception to the general rule in xvii 12 but not in vi 39.

10. *Simon Peter . . . Malchus*. All four evangelists mention the incident of the servant's ear, but only John gives the names of those involved. For the assailant Mark xiv 47 has "one of those who stood by"; Matt xxvi 51 has "one of those with Jesus"; Luke xxii 50 has "one of them." All four evangelists describe the victim as a servant of the high priest (thus not one of the temple police, for the servants and the police are distinct in vs. 18). Some scholars think that the presence of the names in John reflects the evangelist's imaginative attempt to lend plausibility to his narrative. However, since the tendency of legend-makers is to identify anonymous figures with better known ones, this explanation will work for Peter's name but not for that of Malchus. The latter name is not uncommon in the era; it is found five times in Josephus and is known from Palmyrene and Nabatean inscriptions (whence the suggestion that Malchus was an Arab). Some have tried to discover a symbolism behind John's use of the name. Guilding, p. 165, sees a reference to Zech xi 6, read as a *haphtarah* some months before Passover in the first year of a triennial cycle (vol. 29, pp. 278-80): "I will deliver . . . each into the hand of his king [*malkô*]." Krieger, *art. cit.*, suggests that Judas was the servant of the high priest struck by Jesus' disciple. Such imaginative explanations are not less demanding on one's credulity than the possibility that John's tradition preserved accurate information. (Also see NOTE on 26 below.) As for Peter, the action fits his impetuous character (John xiii 37). Lagrange and Taylor, in discussing the Marcan description of the disciple who assailed the servant, find a hint that this disciple was known to Mark. This would not be unfavorable to John's identification, for tradition associates Mark with Peter.

sword. The group possessed two swords according to Luke xxii 38. The unforeseen action of Peter suggests a weapon about the size of a dagger that could be concealed.

pulled it out. John uses *elkein*; Mark xiv 47 and Matt xxvi 51 also mention the drawing (*[apo]span*) of the sword.

cutting off. John uses *apokoptein*; the Synoptics use *aphairein*.

right earlobe. Mark and the best textual witnesses of John use *ōtarion*, a double diminutive, hence our "earlobe." Matthew, Luke xxii 51, and John xviii 26 use *ōtion* (read in the present verse of John by P⁶⁶, Alexandrinus, and the Byzantine tradition), also a diminutive. Luke xxii 50 uses *ous*, "ear," an Atticization according to BDF, §111³. Benoit, *Passion*, p. 37¹, understands the diminutive as designating the external part of the ear.

Only John and Luke designate the *right* ear, and this detail seems to be supplied independently, for the two Gospels use different words for "ear." Benoit, *Passion*, p. 43, thinks that Peter deliberately chose the right organ, the more valuable according to the indemnity laws of the time, as a mark of defiance. Some ingenious interpreters, observing that a right-handed man will normally strike at the left ear of an opponent who is facing him, have drawn from this episode the vital information that Peter was left-handed—unless Peter was a cowardly right-hander who struck at a man whose back was turned!

11. *Put back that sword*. Literally "Put into the scabbard." Among the Synoptics Matthew alone mentions this command, but the wording is different.

Am I not . . . ? Abbott, JG, §2232, thinks that literally this is a negative

exclamation: "I am, of course, not to drink it [according to your desire]." Most interpret the phrase as a rhetorical question with an affirmative implication (BDF, §365⁴).

cup. Or "chalice." The symbolism is of a cup of suffering, also mentioned by the Synoptics in the Gethsemane scene (Mark xiv 36 and par.: "Remove this cup from me").

12. *the soldiers.* Literally "the cohort" as in 3.

tribune. The Gr. *chiliarchos* is literally a captain or officer over 1,000 men, but the term was used to translate the Roman *tribunus militum*, a commander of a cohort of 600. Winter, *Trial*, p. 29, suggests that John's account has upgraded the officer and that he was more likely a *decurio* or corporal over ten men.

arrested Jesus and bound him. According to Mark xiv 46 and Matt xxvi 50, they had seized (*kratein*) Jesus before the incident of the servant's ear; John and Luke xxii 54 describe the arrest (*syllambein*) as taking place after the incident. The latter is the more logical order. Mark xiv 48 and Matt xxvi 55 use the verb *syllambein* when Jesus asks, "Have you come out to arrest me as if I were a bandit?" Only John mentions that Jesus was bound at this time.

COMMENT

The Structure of Division One of the Passion Narrative

The passion begins with the account of the arrest of Jesus in the garden across the Kidron. A transition to the Passion Narrative from the Last Discourse is made in xviii 1. We have seen that there is an ending of a more original form of the Last Discourse in xiv 31 where Jesus says, "Let us leave here and be on our way," and that the present arrangement where this ending is followed by three chapters of discourse is a product of editing (pp. 586-87 above). Thus many would suggest that once xiv 31 immediately preceded xviii 1. This is possible but the history of these chapters is probably more complicated than we can reconstruct today. And we must remember that the Passion Narrative may well have been an entity before it was joined to any form of Last Supper Discourse.

The first division of the Passion Narrative covers xviii 1-27. As we have mentioned (p. 803 above), Janssens de Varebeke would impose here a pattern of seven subdivisions. For instance, he makes xviii 1 a subdivision by itself, separated from 2-3. More plausibly in our judgment vss. 1-3 belong together as a setting for the two episodes in 4-8 and 10-11. Again Janssens de Varebeke treats 12-16a as a subdivision, but we would consider 12-13 a transitional passage between the scene in the garden and the scene in the palace of the high priest. To split 15-18 at 16a also seems to upset the structure. The Johannine writer surrounds the interrogation of Jesus with two halves of a scene where Peter denies Jesus (15-18 and 25-27). Part of Janssens de Varebeke's argument is

based on what we judge to be accidental assonances between words (e.g., *hestōs* in 18 and 25 and *parestēkōs* in 22). Part of it is based on the numerical usage of certain words (*erchesthai*) in the various divisions. He also invokes some inclusions that we can only characterize as farfetched, for example, an inclusion between Peter's blow in cutting off the servant's earlobe in Division One and the blow the soldier struck with a lance at Jesus' side in Division Three. As is evident in the outline we have given on p. 785 above, we detect a less complicated structure in Division One. It consists of two units: the arrest of Jesus in the garden (vss. 1-11), and the interrogation of Jesus by Annas in the high priest's palace (vss. 14-27). The transition between the two units is smoothly effected in vss. 12-13. (By putting 12 with the first unit and 13 with the second, we are subdividing for practical convenience; the author meant the two to go together.)

Notice how well the two units balance each other: in each Peter's behavior is implicitly contrasted with that of Jesus. Jesus shows that he can thwart the arrest with divine power (vs. 6), but he allows himself to be arrested and bound. Peter tries to resist the arrest with human power (the sword), but this is ineffectual. Jesus bravely defends himself before Annas by appealing to the forthright character of his teaching. Meanwhile, Peter, who has heard that teaching, denies that he knows Jesus. In the first verses of each unit we find Jesus' disciples loyally following him; but at the end of each unit we find Peter, a representative disciple, incapable of handling the situation in which Jesus has proved himself. Here is exhibited the Johannine sense of dramatic organization at its best.

The Historicity and Independence of the Johannine Account of the Arrest

In even a very critical evaluation of the Gospel evidence there can be little doubt that Jesus was arrested somewhere on the Mount of Olives shortly before his crucifixion and brought back to the city for trial. This basic fact has undergone theological interpretation in all the Gospels; as we shall see below, the Johannine orientation is different from that of the Synoptics and fits in with the peculiar theological interests found elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel. If we leave aside for a moment the theology of the scene, we note that two major points of difference from the Synoptic accounts require attention, namely, that John omits the scene of the agony in Gethsemane and that John attributes a role to Roman troops in the arrest of Jesus.

First, the absence of an agony scene. This is often dismissed as an obvious effect of Johannine theology. Bultmann, p. 493, says that John had to omit this scene because Jesus had already been described as "glorified." However, we note that in ch. xii, after Jesus had proclaimed that the hour of glorification had come (xii 23), he went through a troubling of soul (27) similar to that of the Synoptic agony scene. Thus it is not certain that glory and anguish are mutually exclusive. Nevertheless,

one may theorize that in the flow of Johannine thought the note of anguish was best put as a prelude to the hour (xii) rather than halfway through it (xviii).

But even then the question is not so easily settled. Most critics agree that the scene of the agony in Gethsemane was missing from the primitive consecutive passion account (the Marcan A source—p. 788 above). Therefore its absence in John may not be the result of an editorial omission or rearrangement but may stem from the fact that in this detail the Johannine pre-Gospel tradition was similar to the Marcan A source. The historicity of the agony scene is a problem for Synoptic study and does not concern us here. (The present Marcan account may well be a conflation of two forms of the story, only one of which is preserved in Luke [cf. K. G. Kuhn, *EvTh* 12 (1952-53), 260-85].) Its most difficult feature is what Jesus is supposed to have said in his agony, sayings for which there were no witnesses (the three disciples were asleep). Have the Marcan B tradition and the Lucan tradition (if independent) filled out the agony scene with sayings that once had another setting in Jesus' ministry? This would perhaps explain why John contains scattered sayings similar to the sayings of the Synoptic agony scene; see vol. 29, pp. 470-71 and p. 656 above; also T. Boman, "Der Gebetskampf Jesu," *NTS* 10 (1963-64), 261-73.

Second, the presence of Roman soldiers in the garden. We have mentioned in the NOTE on vs. 3 some of the objections of detail against John's information and have shown that these objections are not unanswerable. The real problem concerns the likelihood of Pilate's involvement with Sanhedrin in the arrest of Jesus. Such cooperation could have been mutually beneficial if Pilate wanted Jesus temporarily out of the way (see p. 798 above) and if the Sanhedrin wanted Roman support in the event that Jesus' followers caused an uproar over his arrest. There is no clear Synoptic evidence for Pilate's deep involvement from the beginning, as implied in John. H. Conzelmann (*The Theology of St. Luke* [New York: Harper, 1960], pp. 90-91) thinks that in Acts iii 13-14, iv 27, and xiii 28 we have evidence of pre-Lucan formulae that attributed to Pilate great responsibility in the death of Jesus. He suggests that in his own Gospel Luke failed through misunderstanding to reproduce this theme. In Mark xv 2 and Matt xxvii 11, Pilate, without having been informed, knows what Jesus is accused of. However, this does not necessarily mean that Pilate played a role in the arrest; abbreviation of a longer account or common knowledge about Jesus would be sufficient explanation. In the pre-Markan tradition of passion predictions (Mark viii 31, ix 31, x 33-34) there is no hint of Roman involvement in the arrest.

Many critics suggest that John introduced Roman soldiers into the garden scene for theological purposes (so Loisy, Bultmann, Barrett, Lohse). The presence of Roman troops alongside the Jewish police might be symbolic of the whole "world" being lined up against Jesus. Barrett

reminds us of the opposition between Rome and Christianity in the Book of Revelation. Some suggest that the participation of Roman authority in the arrest is meant to prepare the way for the dramatic confrontation of Jesus and Pilate which dominates the Johannine account of the passion. One must admit, however, that the Gospel itself does not draw any attention to the symbolic value of the Roman soldiers as representative of "the world"; in fact, the presence of the soldiers is not emphasized even as constituting the presence of Rome—it is only by deduction that we realize that Pilate and thus the Roman authority must have been consulted. Nor does the arrest scene really prepare the way for the confrontation of Jesus and Pilate. The information that Pilate had a part in the arrest of Jesus runs contrary to the picture of Pilate in the trial where he is sympathetic to Jesus and thinks that the Jewish case against Jesus is not convincing. Now if one of these two contrary pictures (Pilate plotting to have Jesus arrested; Pilate plotting to have Jesus released) is true and the other has been reshaped by theological motives, the Pilate of the trial is more likely the theological creation. It is not easy to write off a picture of Roman involvement in Jesus' arrest as the evangelist's invention; and Goguel, Cullmann, Winter, and others may well be right in thinking that here John has preserved a historical detail suppressed in the other Gospel accounts. (Cf. NOTE on "weapons" in vs. 3.)

We find, then, that in the two major points where John differs from the Synoptic Gospels in the account of the arrest, John's information or approach has considerable plausibility as representing older tradition. Let us turn to an incident that John shares with the Synoptics but where there are peculiar Johannine details. In the NOTES on vss. 10–11 we have pointed out the similarities and dissimilarities between the Johannine and Synoptic accounts of the cutting off of the servant's ear. Of course, no one can establish the veracity of the details narrated by John alone (Peter, Malchus, right earlobe [Luke also has *right* ear]); but they are not implausible, and the theories of the invention of these details are not altogether convincing.

This leads us to the question of the extent to which the Johannine Passion Narrative is dependent on the Synoptic Gospels or their sources. We discussed this in general above (pp. 787–91), but promised to back up our conclusions by individual studies. The scene of the arrest gives us a chance to test Buse's theory that John is related to the Marcan B source. John lacks almost all the material found in B: the agony in Gethsemane and the incidents of Mark xiv 49–51. (Mark xiv 49 has some similarity to John xviii 20, but there can be no question of dependency.) In fact, John shares with B only the incident of the cutting off of the servant's ear; and except for words like "strike" and "earlobe" the two accounts are not at all close. In the incidents narrated John is somewhat closer to the Marcan A source (the primitive passion account). Benoit thinks that Matthew has an independent account of the arrest; many think that Luke has an independent source. It is worth noting, however, how much

xviii 1–12

John differs of the arrest and torches Olives and Borgen's t fused and Mark and servant be details in the discipline presence o have the d sayings of these caus

The Mean

If Jol from that theology. account of or pre-Syn of materia we treated complexitie independen

Verse where Jesu But John r In xiii 27, and had g had warnen they have bearing lar world, and may be cor (Rev xxii : be their liq Lucan scen is your hou Lucan acc inexplicable

The d narrated w goes out to

John differs from all three (Mark A, Matthew, Luke): John's description of the arresting forces is different; John includes the detail of the lanterns and torches; John omits Judas' kiss; John does not mention the Mount of Olives and describes the locale differently. In face of these differences, Borgen's theory that details from several Synoptic accounts have been fused and added to John seems unlikely. If John agrees with Luke against Mark and Matthew in placing the disciple's attack on the high priest's servant before the arrest of Jesus, John has virtually none of the other details in which Luke differs from Mark and Matthew (the question by the disciples in Luke xxii 49; the healing of the servant's ear in 51; the presence of the chief priests in the arresting party in 52). Nor does John have the details in which Matthew differs from Mark and Luke (e.g., the sayings of Matt xxvi 52-54—see NOTE on vs. 11). Differences such as these cause us to favor the theory of Johannine independence.

The Meaning Given to the Scene in Johannine Thought

If John does draw on older independent tradition, the material from that tradition has been reworked in the interests of Johannine theology. In a recent article Richter has argued that the Johannine account of the arrest is simply a theological elaboration of the Synoptic or pre-Synoptic account, but he draws his main arguments from the type of material that we are going to discuss below and not from the details we treated above. In our judgment, in order to do justice to all the complexities of the Johannine account, one must allow for both a reliable independent tradition and a highly theological elaboration.

Verse 2 implies that Judas' treason consisted in telling the authorities where Jesus could be arrested secretly at night without danger of riots. But John may be more interested in the symbolic value of Judas' presence. In xiii 27, 30, when we last saw Judas, he had become the tool of Satan and had gone off into the night. This was the evil night of which Jesus had warned in xi 10 and xii 35, the night in which men stumble because they have no light. Perhaps this is why Judas and his companions come bearing lanterns and torches. They have not accepted the light of the world, and so they must have artificial light. This moment of darkness may be contrasted with the final triumph of Jesus in the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev xxii 5) where the blessed will need no lamps for the Lord God will be their light. There is an echo of this same type of symbolism in the Lucan scene of the arrest (xxii 53) where Jesus says to his captors: "This is your hour and the power of darkness." (If John were drawing from the Lucan account, the omission of such an appropriate saying would be inexplicable.)

The direct confrontation of Jesus and the forces of darkness is narrated with dramatic instinct. Jesus knows what is going to happen and goes out to meet his opponents. We have heard him say: "No one has

taken it [my life] away from me; rather, I lay it down of my own accord" (x 18). Jesus had given Judas permission to leave the Last Supper to betray him (xiii 27); now he will permit Judas and his forces to arrest him. For John the passion is not an inevitable fate that overtakes Jesus; he is master of his own fate. (Richter, *art. cit.*, may well be right in arguing that this Johannine picture of Jesus is meant to answer the type of Jewish objections encountered later in Origen *Celsus* II 9; GCS 2: 135: If Jesus were divine, how could men have taken him prisoner and killed him?) In John there is to be no physical contact between Judas and Jesus, no kiss as in the Synoptic account. (Is the kiss a symbolic addition to the original story?) The two sides are divided in warfare. Jesus asks of the forces led by the renegade disciple a question similar to that which he had posed to his first disciples ("What are you looking for?" [i 38]). Those disciples had followed him looking for life; Judas' party has come looking for Jesus' death.

On the level of ordinary conversation the phrase by which Jesus answers, "I am (he)," serves simply to identify Jesus as the one sought, the function played by the kiss of Judas in the Synoptic tradition. But the reaction of falling back in confusion at Jesus' answer is not simply spontaneous astonishment. The adversaries of Jesus are prostrate on their face before his majesty (Bartina, *art. cit.*), and so there can be little doubt that John intends "I AM" as a divine name (see vol. 29, App. IV). Falling down is a reaction to divine revelation in Dan ii 46, viii 18; Rev i 17. Perhaps Ps lvi 10(9) may have entered the formation of the scene: "My enemies will be turned back . . . behold I know that you are my God." Even better background would have been available if the legend was already in circulation that when Moses uttered before Pharaoh the secret name of God, Pharaoh fell speechless to the ground (Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* IX. xxvii. 24-26; GCS 43¹:522, attributes it to Artapanus, a writer who lived before the 1st century B.C.; see R. D. Bury, ET 24 [1912-13], 232-33). The Johannine scene illustrates that Jesus has God's power over the forces of darkness because he has the divine name. It reinforces the impression that Jesus could not have been arrested unless he permitted it. The attitude will be put into words before Pilate in xix 11: "You would have no power over me at all were it not given to you from above."

But this time Jesus does not choose to leave his enemies powerless. In the agony scene in the Synoptics it is clear that Jesus does not wish to resist his Father's will; so in John, Jesus permits himself to be arrested provided that his followers are not harmed. Jesus does not use the protection of the divine name for himself but for those whom he loves. The sparing of the disciples fulfills the theme of xvii 12 which had proclaimed the protective power of the divine name.

[The Bibliography for this section is included in the Bibliography at the end of §62.]