

Jesus, Judas, and Peter: Character by Contrast in the Fourth Gospel. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (1996) 435-448.

Jesus, Judas, and Peter:  
Character by Contrast in the Fourth Gospel

The symbolic potentials of the Johannine Peter and Beloved Disciple have been thoroughly discussed, particularly as they contribute to discussion on the relationship between the Johannine community and the Great Church.<sup>1</sup> Comparison of these two figures does not, however, exhaust the Fourth Gospel's (FG) complex relational network. The present study will explore the narrative relationship between three key figures in FG: Jesus, Judas, and Peter. As these characters interact with and mutually define one another, patterns of contrast gradually emerge. In this case, the patterns reveal more about the Christology of the Fourth Evangelist (FE) than his community.

A literary character is the sum of external signs presented by a text which correspond to and reveal an otherwise hidden inner nature.<sup>2</sup> Literary characters are therefore complexes of personal traits which correspond to the reader's experience of persons in the real world. Wayne Booth's influential Rhetoric of Fiction discusses two basic means of revealing character traits in narrative, telling and showing.<sup>3</sup> Showing occurs when the narrator offers selective information about the actions of characters and allows the reader to draw conclusions from them. Telling occurs when the narrator makes direct evaluative statements or provides information which is not normally available in the reader's experience of persons. By combining telling and showing the author allows the reader to develop both intrinsic and contextual knowledge of characters.<sup>4</sup> While the narrative characters of FG may also correspond to actual persons, this does not affect the reader's developing knowledge and experience of them through the text.<sup>5</sup>

The kind of telling which a narrator can offer is related to the narrator's perspective on the story. The narrator of FG is omniscient, which is important here in relation to the narrator's knowledge of the characters' inner life.<sup>6</sup> Modern historical narratives

generally note the internal processes of characters only as these may be deduced from their actions, giving an aura of greater objectivity. An author may, however, grant the narrator access to the minds of the characters, allowing direct exposition of their thoughts and motives. FG exercises the latter option, and his narrator is heavily intrusive, frequently stopping the action to specify the nature or significance of events in asides, direct statements to the audience.<sup>7</sup> This invites the audience to evaluate characters' actions based on the internal thought processes which provoked them.

The narrator reinforces direct telling statements by showing the reader how characters respond to one another and to various situations. Wayne Booth and W. J. Harvey provide a matrix for analyzing the actions of characters by contrast. Booth describes the affect of distance :

In any reading experience there is an implied dialogue among author, narrator, the other characters, and the reader. Each of these can range, in relation to each of the others, from identification to complete opposition, on any axis of value.<sup>8</sup>

In terms of characterization, the reader may thus learn about characters by observing the kind and degree of distance between them. Harvey suggests a paradigm for defining such distance. Three broad character types interact in narrative, background characters, protagonists, and ficelles. Background characters are anonymous voices, present only to perform some necessary plot function and generally typifying the social environment. In FG, this category would include the crowd and the Jews. The protagonist is consistently elevated above this group as a developing individual who interacts with others to achieve reality,<sup>9</sup> that is, to receive sufficient depth to be perceived as a person in the real world would be perceived. Jesus is the protagonist of FG, defined via interaction with other characters of varying depth. The audience will tend to empathize with the protagonist Jesus and distance themselves from those characters who are distant from Jesus.

Peter and Judas are ficelles. Ficelles serve as personal contact points between the protagonist and the anonymous background world. This contact is achieved in various ways.

A ficelle may, for example, typify conventional wisdom or morality, highlighting the protagonist's insight or moral or spiritual being. The protagonist's uniqueness is thus typified through the commonness of the ficelles, who are members of the ordinary, bread-and-butter life in which the otherwise remote experience [of the protagonist] . . . is set.<sup>10</sup> The Jesus of FG is a character of unfathomable depth, so the narrator filters his luminous brilliance through the responses of characters near him. At the same time, the way in which they refract Jesus' light establishes their own nature. Jesus, Judas, and Peter are thus mutually defined as they encounter one another.

This essay will first examine what FG explicitly tells about the minds and motives of Jesus, Judas, and Peter. It will then be possible to examine those passages of FG which show these motives played out in interactions between Jesus, Judas, and Peter. The conclusion will summarize the emergent representational value of each character.

### Telling

#### Jesus

FE's narrator uses telling asides in a number of ways to characterize Jesus' thinking. Primary among these is a group of telling asides which indicate that Jesus does not follow a human agenda. A pattern is established at 2:23-25, as many in Jerusalem, marveling over Jesus' powerful signs, believed ( ) on his name. But the narrator, revealing Jesus' mind, states that Jesus did not entrust ( ) himself to them; in fact, Jesus has no desire for anyone to testify about him because he knew what was in a person. At 6:14-15, after Jesus feeds the 5000, the crowd, seeing the sign, acclaims him the Coming Prophet. This prompts Jesus to withdraw to the wilderness because, according to the narrator, he knows that they seek to make him king, a human agenda he specifically avoids.

This refusal to follow a human agenda is perhaps most explicit in those asides where the narrator tells about Jesus' personal human interests. At 11:5, after Martha has urged Jesus to save her brother Lazarus (11:3), the narrator suddenly reveals that Jesus loved

( ) them. But the odd transition from 11:5 to 11:6 implies a connection between Jesus love and his delay in coming to Lazarus.<sup>11</sup> Although Jesus has a deep personal interest in going to Lazarus, he represses this human concern so that God may be glorified. After Martha, Mary, and the Jews appear before him in confusion and tears, the narrator tells that Jesus was moved in spirit and disturbed ( , 11:33), so much so that he weeps (11:35). The narrator reiterates this sentiment as Jesus arrives at Lazarus tomb amidst the Jews exclamations that he could have saved his friend (11:38). Jesus is distressed because he could have used his power to prevent his friend s suffering, but realizes that this desire arises from a human, rather than divine, imperative. FE gives his audience a similar impression at 13:21, where the narrator says that Jesus, after citing Scripture to predict his betrayal, was disturbed in spirit ( ). Again, a human desire to stop Judas conflicts with the divine plan, but Jesus must fulfill his mission.

FG s Jesus controls interactions with other people because he knows both their thoughts and his own plans at every point. At 6:5, Jesus asks Philip where they will find food for the massive crowd. Before Philip can respond, the narrator quickly intrudes to tell the audience that Jesus is not seeking Philip s advice but is testing him, as he already knows what he will do (6:6). Jesus control of situations is sometimes linked to the fact that he knows hearts. Hence at 6:15, after the miraculous feeding, Jesus withdraws knowing that they would make him king ; the narrative, however, has indicated no such intention, and the people have only connected Jesus with the Prophet. After the Bread from Heaven speech in the Capernaum synagogue, many grumble because Jesus words are hard to understand (6:60). This provokes Jesus to expose the disbelief of some (6:61-64a), which prompts the narrator to immediately explain that Jesus knew from the very beginning that there are some who do not believe and who is the one betraying him (6:64b). The traitor motif which develops around Judas resonates with a number of asides which tell that Jesus is aware of, and has control over, what Judas will do. Thus 6:70, Have not I chosen you? And one from among you is a devil ; the narrator tells that Jesus refers specifically to Judas, the direct object of (6:71). At the footwashing, Jesus refuses

Peter's request for a bath by informing him that he is clean, but not all are. The narrator tells that Jesus said this because he knew the one betraying him (13:11), by now an epithet for Judas Iscariot. More positively, Jesus also knows that Peter will be fully restored and will glorify God by his death (21:19).

An important aspect of Jesus' resistance to human agendas and control of other characters concerns his hour, which the narrator associates with his death. Jesus knows his hour and cannot be stopped until it comes. Hence at 7:30, after Jesus has claimed that he is from God and knows God, the Jews seek to seize him but cannot because, the narrator tells, his hour had not yet arrived. This explanation recurs at 8:20b, where the Pharisees cannot silence Jesus' offensive claims. 13:1 is significant in this light, as the narrator tells that Jesus knows his hour has finally come, and that he has loved his own even until the very end/hour. Here Jesus' hour is explicitly the hour that he should be lifted up, again in accordance with the divine agenda.

Because Jesus has a divinely appointed time to die, and because Jesus has complete control over everything he does and everything done to him, the narrator feels free to state that Jesus has complete control over his manner of death as well. As early as 12:33, after Jesus mentions that he will be lifted up and thus draw all people to himself, the narrator states that he said this signifying by what manner of death he was about to die. The Gethsemane scene of FG is actually a voluntary surrender, as Jesus faces the mob knowing all that was coming to him (18:4). He displays power, knocking the posse to the ground, in order to fulfill the promise of 6:39 (see 17:12) that none of those entrusted to him would be lost (18:9). When the Jews insist that Pilate try Jesus because they cannot execute him, the narrator postures their complaint in terms of Jesus' control (18:32): the Romans must kill him because he has stated that he will be lifted up on a cross. Jesus' power over death makes the events of his execution almost mechanical. The soldiers who cast lots over his garments have little choice in the matter because they do this, as the narrator explains, so that Scripture would be fulfilled (19:24). Sometime later, when Jesus knows that already all has been fulfilled, he decides to

fulfill one more prophecy for good measure by saying 'I thirst' (19:28). That the soldiers do not break Jesus' legs and pierce him with a spear are explained as further prophetic fulfillment at 19:36-37: they could not do the former and must do the latter. FE's audience is thus given the impression that Jesus has a list of things to do before he dies.

Jesus' utter sovereignty may be explained by the narrator's insistence that Jesus is, and knows himself to be, divine. During the controversy over the healing at Bethesda, Jesus remarks that 'my father always works and I work,' which provokes the Jews to kill him. The narrator explains their fury by stating that Jesus has violated Sabbath and 'made himself equal to God.'<sup>12</sup> Before the footwashing and Farewell, the narrator tells that Jesus knows God has put all under his power, and that he is 'from God and was returning to God' (13:3). Jesus knows who he is and what he will do.

### Judas and Peter

FG's narrator provides many telling asides about Judas, all of which work to characterize the paradox of the \_\_\_\_\_ who is from the beginning \_\_\_\_\_. At 6:70, after the 'Bread from Heaven' speech, Jesus enigmatically reveals a devil in his entourage, and the narrator intervenes to nominate Judas (6:71), the first reference to Judas in FG. In Lazarus' house at 12:4-6, Judas objects to the anointing of Jesus' feet, and the narrator contextualizes this by telling three things about Judas: Judas is the group treasurer, a trusted position; Judas has betrayed this trust by embezzling funds; Judas actually does not care about the poor. In both references, however, Judas is also described as a disciple, in fact one of the 12. At 13:2, before the symbolic foot washing, the narrator tells that the devil has already entered Judas' heart to betray Jesus, but repeats the claim at 13:27 in connection with the sopped bread. Here the narrator's desire to connect Judas with Satan confuses the claim, as it is impossible to determine exactly when Satan entered him.

Unlike Judas, Peter's mind is apparently closed to the narrator, as his inner thoughts and motives are almost never revealed. The references to the disciples at 13:22, 28-

29 apparently include Peter, who acts as their spokesman and shares their ignorance of Judas intention. At 20:9 the narrator tells that Peter and the BD did not understand the empty tomb, although the BD, apparently contra Peter, believed. Other than this, however, the audience is left to evaluate Peter's actions without the narrator's aide.

### Showing

Three passages in FG include Jesus, Judas, and Peter together: 6:59-71; 13:21-26; 18:1-11. Four scenes portray interaction between Jesus and Peter without Judas: 1:42; 13:4-17; 18:12-27; 21. One scene describes an encounter between Jesus and Judas without Peter: 12:1-8. The contrasts between these characters in these scenes will be analyzed in three dimensions. The first is space, which includes all aspects of staging. The second is direct discourse, as identity is often revealed by the way characters communicate with one another. The third dimension is control, the amount of authority which a character exercises in a human context. Control is a less obvious category, but since the narrator consistently tells that the protagonist Jesus is notable for his control over every situation, it becomes an important factor in his interactions with other characters.

### John 1:42

Peter is introduced during his first encounter with Jesus. Andrew leads his brother to Jesus for examination. Simon says nothing, but Jesus makes two statements with emphatic : you are ( ) Simon ; you shall be called ( ) Cephas. By changing Simon's name, Jesus specifies their relationship. Primary oral cultures generally associate naming with power over the named. Even in the Old Testament, the giving of a new name has a direct relation to the role the [wo]man so designated will play.<sup>13</sup> Simon's new name is therefore not so much a merely predictive utterance as what Jesus will make of him.<sup>14</sup> Whether or not Simon will live up to the title is not intimated. It is clear from the beginning, however, that Jesus desires priority in their relationship.

### John 6:59-71

This passage includes two attempts to control Jesus via discourse. At 6:59, the narrator interrupts Jesus preaching to situate him in a Capernaum synagogue. A number of disciples in the audience are scandalized and seek to minimize Jesus by implying that no-one could understand such difficult teaching; perhaps Jesus should consider changing his presentation style (6:60). Jesus, however, is not surprised by their grumblings, and exposes their unbelief. Rather than repenting, the chastised disciples turn their backs ( , 6:66) on him. This posture reflects their defiant inability to accept. While they cannot control Jesus, they will not be controlled by him, either.

The crowd lacking faith, Jesus turns to challenge the 12: you do not also desire to leave, do you? Jesus knows the minds of the 12, even the betrayer, so no response is necessary. Peter, however, supposes a certain pathos in Jesus question. He seeks to comfort Jesus by assuring him that he and the others will remain because they realize that Jesus is the Holy One. Jesus emphatically rejects Peter's confession on two counts (6:70). First, the 12 must not suppose that they have chosen to follow Jesus, because he has chosen them. Second, Peter is unaware that a devil lurks in their midst. Jesus has control over rejection and acceptance of his message, and consequently does not patronize Peter's encouraging perspective.

Peter's confession, though genuine, is imperceptive. He is unable to please his master because he does not understand the control structure of the relationship. Judas, on the other hand, makes his first appearance in FG at 6:71 as the epitome of the general rejection which has just occurred. Not only the synagogue disciples, but even one of the chosen 12 will turn away from Jesus proclamation. Ironically, however, Judas will yield to the scandal which Jesus uses to drive away the unfaithful and will live up to the epithet Jesus has given him.

### John 12:1-8

Jesus is in Lazarus' home for a banquet, where he, Lazarus, and apparently also



Judas recline at the table. The hostess, Mary, positions herself on the floor below Jesus and begins to anoint his feet with a fragrant perfume. Mary's posture, emphasizing her humility and devotion, is a touchstone for the contrasting responses she provokes.

Judas challenges Mary but directs his criticism to Jesus: why has the master allowed such excess? Judas seeks to control both Jesus and Mary by forcing the former to rebuke the latter. The narrator, as noted above, intervenes to expose Judas' hypocrisy to the audience. Jesus, however, refrains from exposing Judas to the guests at the banquet but clarifies his authority over both Judas and Mary (12:7). The curt imperative is singular, directed to Judas: Leave her alone! ( ). Mary's excess is justified because she has saved the ointment for the special occasion of Jesus' burial anointing. Since Mary is apparently unaware of Jesus' impending death, the statement shows Jesus' authority to reinterpret her devotion. Mary's faith, if imperceptive, is genuine; Judas is imperceptive and hypocritical. Both Mary and Judas will prepare for Jesus' burial, and Jesus understands their respective roles much better than they.

#### John 13:4-19

The spatial aspects of the footwashing are carefully noted and intensified by a shift from present to past tense at 13:12. As the scene opens, Jesus reclines at the table with his disciples. He then rises, undresses, moves to the basin, draws water, places himself below each disciple to wash their feet, then returns to his original position of honor at the table. Brown suggests that this is the only reference in ancient literature to the footwashing of a client by a patron.<sup>15</sup> Peter's reaction to this unusual sequence of events prompts a dialogue which emphasizes Peter's ignorance and Jesus' understanding of the approaching hour.

Peter's first two comments (12:6, 8) intend to prohibit Jesus. combines a vocative with in the emphatic position, creating urgency: the master cannot wash Peter's feet; rather, he must wash Jesus. Although Peter's response reveals a genuine concern for Jesus' honor, it also exposes his resistance to Jesus' control and threatens to ruin the illustration..

Since he does not know what will happen to Jesus (13:7), he cannot accept this symbolic precursor. He then unwittingly verifies Jesus' response, 'you do not understand now,' by commanding, 'Never ( . . . ) shall you wash my feet' (13:8).

Remarkably, Jesus' submissive posture does not diminish his control of the disciple who sits above him, and Peter's obstinacy is met with a threat (13:8). 'No part with me' builds on a Jewish eschatological inheritance motif.<sup>16</sup> The footwashing carries a deeper promise of kingdom blessing, which Jesus has power to withhold. Peter, however, believes such blessing is under his own authority, as indicated by his third response (13:9). If washing secures eschatological blessing, Peter demands the fullest blessing possible. But whereas he could not stop Jesus from washing his feet, neither will he compel him to wash his hands and head. Jesus assures Peter that, despite his misguided attempt at usurpation, he is 'clean' (13:10); one of them, however, will reject his inheritance. Having returned to his seat, Jesus explains the washing in terms of his authority over them as 'teacher, lord, and master' (13:12-20). Jesus retains full control in both spatial positions, that of the servant and that of the master, and thus defines the connection between service and authority.

### John 13:20-36

This complex sequence involves two significant exchanges, one between Jesus and Judas and one between Jesus and Peter. Jesus opens with an 'amen' saying which predicts that one of those at the table will betray him. The disciples are stunned, as the offender is not obvious to them (13:22). Peter seeks to interrogate Jesus through the BD, but apparently cannot hear the answer. After whispering to the BD, however, Jesus' words to Judas are loud enough for all to hear: 'What you do, do ( ) quickly' (13:27). is imperative, a command. By having Judas depart from the Supper only after Jesus has told him to leave, John stresses Jesus' control over his [own] destiny,<sup>17</sup> and over the destiny of Judas as well. Jesus commands Judas to betray him, demonstrating his control at the crisis point. Having eaten Jesus' bread, Judas departs into the night (13:30). His treachery will not, however, endanger

Jesus; quite the contrary, it will lead to Jesus' glorification (13:31-32).

Having dispatched Judas, Jesus turns to the disciples to provide necessary information before he goes away. This begins with the new command that his followers must be remarkable in their love for one another (13:34). But Peter, unlike Judas, is not willing to receive a command from Jesus (13:36). As in the foot washing, Jesus contrasts Peter's now with later. The verbs shift from the plural at 13:33 to Peter alone at 13:36. Peter will, indeed, eventually follow Jesus in a very specific way. But again Jesus' first answer is not enough, and Peter calls this temporal distinction into question (13:37): why not now? Indeed, Judas can fulfill his role now, but Peter requires further preparation. Jesus first attempts to assert authority over Peter in light of the task: the disciple is not yet able to go where Jesus is going, whether willing to die or not (13:36). When Peter insists, Jesus levels his claim by exposing his ignorance (13:38). Not only does Peter misunderstand what Jesus and Judas will do, he does not realize that he himself will do the opposite of what he boasts.

Control in this pericope is associated with knowledge. Jesus knows what he himself will do, what Judas will do, and what Peter will do. Judas knows what he himself will do, although he does not know the significance of that act. Peter, by contrast, knows nothing of the future, neither what Jesus and Judas will do, nor what he himself will do. Consequently, he cannot respond properly. Judas will become the unwitting catalyst of Jesus' glorification, while Peter resists the very plan which will end in his master's exaltation. Peter's good intentions are thus worse than Judas' treachery.

### John 18:1-11

FG's arrest scene engages all three characters in a complex spatial matrix. Jesus and the disciples move across the Kidron and enter a garden, which seems to be a walled enclosure (see 18:4). As a defined space in which Jesus gathers with his disciples, the garden of FG indicates intimacy. The narrator tells that Judas knew this place because he had been there frequently with Jesus (18:2). Now, however, Judas, is outside, approaching the barrier in the

darkness with torches and lamps. He has come to meet Jesus at the garden, but no longer as a disciple.

The Synoptic garden is a place of grief and distress (Mt 26:36-44; Mk 14:32-39; Lk 22:41-44). The Jesus of FG, however, confidently leaves the enclosure to confront his attackers, suggesting conviction and control. In FG it is Jesus, not Judas, who approaches to initiate dialogue, interrogating the posse as to whom they seek (18:4; cf Mk 14:43-46). Judas does not kiss Jesus, and answered at 18:5 is plural, representing the mob. At the height of the drama, the narrator stops for a stage direction, telling that Judas the betrayer stood with them (18:5b). Just before the hour, Judas stands blatantly opposite Jesus with those who are knocked to the ground by Jesus' identification, (18:6). Jesus will suffer Judas to fulfill his intention, but only on Jesus' terms. These are defined after the second , indicating Jesus' desire and ability to protect his disciples even when he must not protect himself (18:8). Having secured their release, Jesus is ready to turn himself over. But Peter, who is ready neither to be released nor to see Jesus arrested, interprets the show of force as a call to arms. The Synoptics mention his attack (Mt 26:51; Mk 14:47; Lk 22:49-50), but only FG names Peter and Malchus. Remarkably, the soldiers do not move to punish Peter, but Jesus does, as he is again spoiling the plan. Jesus does not need Peter's help and does not want it. The rhetorical question which closes the scene (18:11) stresses his willingness to drink the cup, an unfortunate necessity in the Synoptics.

Judas makes his final appearance on the ground in the darkness at Jesus' feet. He has confronted Jesus with diabolical intentions, but thereby ironically presented him with the Father's cup. Peter also confronts Jesus, but his attempt to rescue Jesus threatens to ruin Jesus' mission. Neither Judas nor Peter will control Jesus with the sword, because Jesus has accepted the Father's task.

### John 18:12-27

This scene combines space and dialogue to contrast Peter and Jesus in terms of

control. Jesus is bound and taken to the home of Annas, and apparently remains bound throughout the episode (18:12, 24). Peter, by contrast, moves freely. He follows the mob and is not arrested as he moves about Annas' courtyard. His presence at the fire, however, suggests he is in the wrong place: the courtyard is cold (18:18) and dark, and Peter stands among the associates of the high-priest as Jesus is taken within. Peter's separation from Jesus and fellowship with the enemy situate him to fulfill Jesus' prophecy.

Both Jesus and Peter are interrogated about discipleship. Annas questions Jesus concerning his disciples and his teaching (18:19). But Jesus has determined the status of his followers at the arrest and sees no need to respond, moving instead to the doctrinal question. Rather than apologizing for his teachings, Jesus returns a command: ask ( ) those who heard me (18:21). Jesus has spoken openly, quite the opposite of their present tactic (18:20). He will not be controlled, even by a high-priest. This posture offends a nearby official, who attempts to silence Jesus by striking him (18:22). Jesus' response reveals his authority over the entire proceeding. Arrested, bound, in the dwelling of the leader of the Jews, now physically abused, Jesus turns to the offender with a command, bear witness ( , sing. imperative) if I spoke wrongly, and a counter-interrogation, if not, why do you strike me? (18:24). Annas, frustrated by Jesus' authoritative presence, sends him, still bound, to his son-in-law.

Jesus had ordered Annas to question those who heard, and such an interrogation is in fact going on in the courtyard. Immediately before and after Jesus' trial, Peter is asked if he has a relationship with this man (18:17, 25). Both questions open with , expecting the answer no. The first is offered by a slave girl who keeps the gate, the second by a group of the high-priest's servants who are curious about the trial inside and the identity of the stranger at their fire. Although neither question is explicitly hostile, Peter buckles and falls under control of the enemy. The form of his denial parallels the I Am sayings of FG. When asked if he is a disciple, Peter twice responds (18:17, 25), denying not what Jesus is but what he himself is. The third question, a repercussion of his rash act against Malchus, prompts the denial

that he was with Jesus in the garden, the place of fellowship (18:26-27). The Synoptic Peter's tears and grief (Mt 26:75; Mk 14:72; Lk 22:62) are absent from FG, eclipsed by the cockcrow which underlines the bare finality of denial. The bound Jesus denies nothing, while Peter, under the curse of Jesus' prophecy, must deny everything.

### John 21

Peter's spatial positions in 21:1-14 reflect shifting control. On land, he initiates action among the disciples by suggesting a fishing expedition. His leadership of the group in the boat, however, produces little result after considerable effort (21:3). Suddenly, a stranger appears and orders them to cast on the right. Obeying, the disciples are completely successful. The recognition of Jesus seizes Peter's attention, and he throws himself into the sea in a fit of exuberance. On shore, Jesus commands him to bring fish; he returns to the sea and the boat; back on shore he eats the meal which Jesus orders, afraid to ask who he is (21:12). But Peter's malleability in this episode only sets the stage for the next scene, as the narrator allows 21:15-22 to silence the encounter on the shore between Jesus and Peter at 21:8. Carson suggests that the sudden shift of focus there to the weighted boat is a small indication of eyewitness testimony.<sup>18</sup> Far beyond this, it serves to defer confrontation between Jesus and Peter until the critical dialogue which follows.

In sharp contrast to the clear staging marks of 21:1-14, the spatial structure of 21:15-22 is unusually difficult. Jesus and Peter are apparently still beside the sea, but are now alone and at some distance from the other disciples. They seem to be walking, and at one point Peter turns and observes that the BD is following them out of earshot (21:20). This dearth of stage direction dramatizes the exchange.

Jesus initiates dialogue with a question (21:15). His reference to Peter as Simon son of John returns to their initial encounter at 1:42. The old designation indicates a need to redefine their relationship, which is first explored in terms of degree: do you love ( ) me more than these? These is certainly masculine, referring to the other disciples, do you

love me more than they love me? But Peter does not want to answer in these terms; indeed, he cannot. Rather, he appeals to Jesus' knowledge: you yourself know that I love ( ) you (21:15). The Peter who once boasted above the others that he would lay down his life must now appeal to what Jesus knows in spite of what he has done. Jesus reiterates without reference to the others, as Peter prefers, but still with the old name: Simon son of John, do you love ( ) me? (21:16). The form of Peter's answer need not change because Jesus has adjusted the question.

Having allowed Peter the elision of more than these, Jesus permits Peter to select an appropriate verb. While it would be wrong to press the distinction between and in this context, the variation in terms is part of a gradual transformation of Jesus' questions into Peter's answer:

Jesus: Simon of John	more than these?
Peter: Lord	you know that -----.
Jesus: Simon of John	?
Peter: Lord	you know that .
Jesus: Simon of John	?

While the meanings may be synonymous, Jesus appropriates Peter's word for love. Now that Peter is willing to define himself in reference to Jesus' complete knowledge of him, he may contribute to the terms of the relationship. Peter's final answer is his first step toward restoration. At 21:17 the narrator opens Peter's mind for the first time, revealing that Jesus has grieved him. Grief motivates his complete submission. Jesus must know that Peter loves him because you yourself know all things. It is Jesus who knows, Peter who loves.

Peter's earlier confession, I am not this man's disciple, climaxed his resistance of Jesus' control. Now, having confessed both what Jesus is and what he himself is, he is ready to receive a commission. While Jesus' three commands exchange imperative verbs and accusative objects, the final my is constant (21:15-17). Peter will now take Jesus' place as shepherd of the master's flock. His responsibility is based on his loyalty to Jesus, not the sheep.

This high calling will terminate in the ultimate act of submission (21:18-19). The final command, Follow me (21:19), extends Jesus' control beyond the end of the story. The cost of discipleship will be high for Simon, but in its consummation he will show himself a true Peter, able at last to glorify God (21:19).

True to his old self, however, Peter attempts to move Jesus from this painful subject. Despite the vagueness of Jesus' prophecy (21:18), by 21:21 Peter has realized the implications of his words. Knowing that he will follow his master in death, he wonders at the fate of the BD. Jesus rebukes the attempt. He has already allowed Peter to rate his discipleship in terms of the BD and the others (21:15) and has closed the book on that option. Peter's fate will correspond to his role as shepherd, and the BD's fate will, presumably, be appropriate to his mission as well. Jesus' final command urges Peter to fulfill the task in reference only to himself: even to the point of death, you follow me (21:22).

### Patterns

FG's Judas is the consummate hypocrite. By consistently telling the true motives behind the apparently genuine actions of Judas, the narrator reveals a gross hypocrisy and indifference to Jesus and to the needs of others. Although a relationship with Jesus has offered him some financial benefit, he will ultimately become the epitome of those who reject the truth. Ironically, however, his schemes cannot harm Jesus. In fact, Jesus knows and controls everything Judas does and uses Judas as a tool for his own glorification. Hypocrisy in FG is dangerous only to the hypocrite, not the plan of God.

Unlike Judas, the audience knows almost nothing of Peter's inner life, and all judgements must be made on the basis of his actions. Because observation is the normal means of determining the motives of persons in the real world, this silence makes Peter a bit more real to the audience than Judas. Before Jesus' death, Peter is the pinnacle of ignorance: he does not suspect Judas, does not understand Jesus, and misjudges his own abilities. Consequently, contra Judas, every expression of his genuine devotion threatens to foil Jesus



plan. But despite his ignorance, he remains clean through sincere devotion, which overcomes even his rejection of the master. After Jesus' death, repentance leads to a new commission and calling. Like Jesus, the restored Peter can truly glorify God.

Jesus, like Judas, acts according to the divine plan; unlike Judas and Peter, he fully understands what the plan involves. Knowing the outcome of all things, he is able to fulfill the Father's will, often against his own. The most notable feature of FG's Jesus, however, is the control he displays over all persons and situations. Neither the treachery or stubbornness of his own disciples, nor the ridicule or machinations of the Jews, can hinder him from moving toward his hour on the cross. Jesus' hour, and his control over FG's narrative as it leads to that moment, becomes the reference point for all aspects of FG.

## Notes

1. See, for example, Raymond Brown, The Community of the Beloved Disciple (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1979) 82-84, 161-162; and R. Alan Culpepper, Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1983) 120-122.
2. J. Hillis Miller, Ariadne's Thread, Story Lines (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992) 31-32. This is Miller's description of the typical concept of character in literary-criticism, contra his own post-structuralist outlook.
3. The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961) 3-9.
4. W. J. Harvey, Character and the Novel (London: Chatto & Windus, 1965) 32.
5. It should also be noted that, because this is a literary-critical study, the text refers to the gospel [of John] as it stands rather than its sources, historical background, or themes (Culpepper, Anatomy 5). Consequently, John 21 will be included in this study, and FE will refer to the final redactor of the book, whomever that may be. John 7:53-8:11 will be excluded, however, for text-critical reasons.
6. The narrator is here distinguished from FE in that narrator is a literary feature of the text itself which the author, FE, utilizes in telling the story. R. Alan Culpepper's basic definition is convenient: the narrator is the voice that tells the story and speaks to the reader (Anatomy 16).
7. Tom Thatcher has recently argued that FE utilizes 193 telling asides to perform several narrative functions. Functions which involve characterization include character labels, reasons for or significance of discourse, and reasons for or significance of actions (A New Look at Asides in the Fourth Gospel, BSac 151[1994] 433-439).
8. Booth, Rhetoric 155. Other characters here means other than the narrator in cases where the narrator is fully dramatized.
9. Harvey, Character 56-57.
10. Harvey, Character 63-68.
11. Raymond Brown notes that as vss. 5 and 6 now stand, they offer a paradox (The Gospel

According to John, AB; New York, NY: Doubleday, 1966) 423.

12. In one sense, the narrator's remark here functions to explain the motive of the Jews. At the same time, however, the causal at 5:18 is not conditioned (because they supposed, etc.), and the aside introduces the sonship/equality topos in the speech of Jesus which follows (5:19-47).

13. Brown, AB 1.80; see Walter Ong, Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word (New York, NY: Routledge, 1988) 33.

14. D. A. Carson, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991) 156.

15. Brown, AB 2.564-565; also Carson, John 462-463.

16. Brown, AB 2.565-566.

17. Brown, AB 2.578.

18. Carson, John 671.