

Scripture and Social Justice

Catholic and Ecumenical Essays

Edited by Anatheia E. Portier-Young
and Gregory E. Sterling

LEXINGTON BOOKS/FORTRESS ACADEMIC
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Chapter Ten

Johannine Ethics and Ethical Discourse

Harold W. Attridge

One of the long-standing critiques of the Fourth Gospel is that it lacks any but the most general level of ethical teaching. The Gospel does forcefully articulate a fundamental ethical obligation, to love. That principle obligation is presented both as a new commandment (John 13:34) and a proverbial expression (John 15:13). The former evokes the delivery of the Torah on Mount Sinai;¹ the latter is abundantly paralleled in Greco-Roman moral literature.² The Gospel thus presents a basic moral norm in generic forms of the cultural traditions that it cleverly interweaves. The Gospel is also structured as a kind of drama that drives home the significance of that moral norm by presenting an example of the “greatest love” in the action of Jesus, who gave himself for his friends. It is, therefore, clear that the Gospel has an interest in ethics at some level, but what that fundamental obligation entails in terms of individual obligations or social ethics is not made explicit.

The absence of the articulation of more particular obligations, of the exploration of any casuistry that might flow from those norms, or of the naming of any virtues that followers of Jesus should pursue has all been viewed as a problem.³ Other examples of the Gospel genre famously provide examples of various forms of ethical expectations, requiring non-violence,⁴ a radical commitment to truth,⁵ the virtue of compassion,⁶ and a willingness to forgive.⁷ These and all the other evidence of particular ethical concern seem to be lacking, at least on the surface of the Gospel.

Recent discussion of the issue has raised the possibility that there is some form of “implicit ethics” in the Gospel,⁸ perhaps in the form of an embedded community “ethos”⁹ or in the virtues and vices displayed by characters interacting with Jesus. Such an ethos may embrace a strong sense of community solidarity, a firm faith in Christ, a sense of mission,¹⁰ and, of course, a commitment to loving service, of the kind Jesus displayed in the footwashing

at the Last Supper, which is a foreshadowing of the cross. One might also find an implicit ethics in the Gospel's stance toward Roman imperial power, represented most concretely in Pilate. In suggesting the kind of community gathered around Jesus, who chases out merchants, feeds the hungry, cares for the lame and the blind, and even raises the dead, the evangelist may suggest a way of life that deliberately defines itself against the actions of an empire designed to benefit its rulers.¹¹

Fundamental theological virtues are certainly embedded in the narrative and we shall have to return to them in due course, but moving beyond them to any more detailed ethical instruction is difficult. Though perhaps promising in principle, the ethical implications of character portrayal in the gospel remain rather tenuous. What makes characters positive in the Johannine framework is usually their "belief" or acceptance of Jesus, however partial or grudging that acceptance may be. Yet another approach to Johannine ethics is to situate the Gospel within a larger context. What is perceived to be lacking in the Gospel may then be supplied by reference to the Johannine epistles.¹²

Working with the Johannine epistles also expands the ethical repertoire. Whatever their temporal relationship,¹³ the epistles sound some of the same notes as the Gospel, insisting on fulfilling the commandments that Jesus gave and following his example: "Whoever says, 'I have come to know him,' but does not obey his commandments, is a liar and in such a person the truth does not exist. But whoever obeys his word, truly in this person the love of God has reached perfection. . . . Whoever says, 'I abide in him,' ought to walk just as he walked" (1 John 2:4-6).

But then the epistle spells out in somewhat more detail what the mysterious "commandments" require: love is supposed to manifest itself "not in word or speech, but in truth and action" (3:18). The ethical life involves the rejection of the "love of the world," or slightly more specifically, "the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, the pride in riches" (2:16). Loving one another is the antithesis of hating and committing murder (3:12). This is all somewhat more specific, but I emphasize "somewhat."

Taking account of the epistles may be useful in exploring the historical reality of the Johannine version of early Christianity, and it may have something to say about Johannine "ethos," but it also highlights the fact that the main Johannine text, the Gospel, does not seem to have much to say about ethics.

JOHANNINE "ETHICS" IN CRITICAL DIALOGUE

It may be that while the evangelist is not overtly interested in developing particular ethical teaching, he is interested in issues addressed by first-century

thinkers who worried about ethical matters. In an earlier essay I explore possibility that the evangelist was in some conversation with philosopher ethics, particularly of a Stoic character.¹⁴ The challenge that he confronts the claim that a person of perfect virtue, the ideal Stoic sage, would not be a person driven by passion. His life would not be subject to emotions, in the technical Stoic sense of mental assents to pre-passions or stirrings of the sorts of things moderns tend to think of as emotions. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is depicted as experiencing what one might take to be emotions, of a sort tinged with anger (11:33, 35, 38) or mental anxiety (12:27), but in the latter case, he responds to this stirring of his soul with a list of reasons to overcome it (12:28-33). The apparently emotional display in the first is embedded in a chapter where Jesus offers reasons not to be so distressed (11:25-26), and in the end the reality behind the words of Jesus dramatically overcomes the cause of sorrow when Lazarus emerges from his tomb. The way to understand what goes on in both of these chapters is to see the Gospel not so much teaching ethics, but probing the conceptual foundations of ethical theory of his day. In doing so the evangelist presents an alternative rationale for a foundational ethical principle, that right reason, not emotion should guide life. His alternative is that reason must be grounded in accordance of the revealed truth that Jesus teaches and embodies.

The approach to a conceptual problem involved in the Fourth Gospel handling of "emotion" is hardly unique. Other strands of this Gospel gage, somewhat obliquely perhaps, with first-century conceptual debates and lead an attentive (re)reader¹⁵ through a process of reflection on the issues, resolving them in a new and surprising form. A prime example of the phenomenon, and the evangelist's psychagogic technique, is the theme of divine sovereignty and human responsibility, or determinism and freedom that runs through the first half of the Gospel. Once again, Stoic discourse affirms human responsibility in the decision to accept or reject the divine gift of belief.¹⁶

Yet another example of the evangelist's weaving into his narrative a reflection on a topic much on the mind of religious philosophers of the first century is his reflection on how it is that God is known.¹⁷ He seems to agree with the fundamental principle of Philo, that God is in essence unknowable, or as the evangelist puts it, "no one has ever seen God" (John 1:18). Philo maintains that God has, nonetheless, made something of himself known through the name that he revealed to Moses on Mount Horeb, but that revelation, in the declaration "I am who I am," amounts only to an affirmation of God's existence, not a disclosure of his essence. For the evangelist, Jesus identifies himself as the name of God (8:58). By disclosing that name to his disciple

Jesus has done more than Philo claims can be achieved by learning the biblical name. Jesus has taught the disciples the reality of who God is and united them to that reality in love (John 17:8, 22–23). In working out this theme, the evangelist made creative use of the theory found in Philo, but inspired by the discussion of “natural names” in Plato’s *Cratylus*. These are names that capture and disclose the reality of the thing named. Although such names might be rare, if present at all, in human discourse, they would, according to Socrates, at least be present when gods name themselves.¹⁸ One early reader of John, the author of the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*, seemed to grasp the play on the Platonic intertexts and on the semiotic theory involved in them.¹⁹

In each of these cases, there is a complex play on an important theme, worked out over the course of the Gospel’s narratives and dialogues, in a kind of literary “arabesque,”²⁰ that invites readers into a process of reflection on the significance of Jesus and belief in him. There is a similar process at work in the Johannine reflection on ethical issues that appeared in his wrestling with Jesus’s emotions in chapters 11 and 12. This strand of the arabesque continues the interplay with Stoic themes and, finally, is relevant to the concerns of this Festschrift.

As noted in my essay on emotions in John, there is further discussion of what seems to be an emotion in the Fourth Gospel, when Jesus tells his disciples that his joy would be in them, and their joy would be complete (John 15:11). Joy in fact is in Stoic theory one of the “positive emotions” (*euthetata*), distinct from passions, those movements of the soul that can lead reason astray. A “positive emotion” is something that a virtuous, rational sage would legitimately experience, something that supervenes on a life lived well, a life that moves in accord with reason. To take proper delight in the assurance of self-controlled virtue was thus no vice.²¹ Some scholars have suggested that the evangelist makes use of Stoic principles,²² but I suspect that there is more to his reflection on joy than an affirmation of its coincidence with a life guided by reason.

The verse cited is one small part of the Johannine arabesque that runs through Jesus’s farewell discourses of chapters 14–17.²³ Joy appears at 14:28; 15:11; 16:20–24, 33; and 17:13.²⁴ Outside of these texts it appears only once, at 20:20, an important final appearance of the theme. To see what the evangelist does with joy, one must follow the tendrils of the arabesque. The process begins (14:28) with Jesus declaring that the disciples would rejoice if they loved him, because he is going to the Father. This suggests that joy is a state that finds its ground in properly understood good news. The news that Jesus is departing, like the news of the departure of any beloved one, is hardly an ordinary source of joy, but, since it involves return to the Father, the departure of Jesus ought to be a source of joy. Why? The presence of the

Father is where Jesus is most at home, the “bosom” where he resided from all eternity and from which he came to earth (John 1:1). At the Father’s side is where Jesus belongs and so those who love him might take joy from the knowledge that he has returned home. But what does that news about Jesus have to do with the lives of his disciples? Does it have any connection with their life going well or being lived well, the ordinary sources of human joy?

The next reference to “joy” in Jesus’s discourse might in fact answer that question. After presenting his image of the vine and the branches, with the claim that he is the True Vine, Jesus unpacks the imagery in behavioral terms. “Abiding” as branches on the vine symbolizes “abiding” in his love (John 15:9). That abiding in turn is equivalent to “keeping his commandments” (15:10), of which this Gospel famously mentions only one (John 13:34). Immediately following his appeal to abide in love Jesus says, “I have spoken these things to you so that my joy may be in you and your joy may be full-filled” (15:11).

To follow the Johannine chain so far: the news that Jesus is departing to be with the Father is a cause for joy because it means that he is going to where he belongs, but it also means that he is not really going away after all! Precisely by departing in the flesh it is possible for him to “abide” in spirit with his disciples. That abiding presence, expressed in and consisting of the love that the disciples share, is a cause of joy. It is a matter of a fundamental relationship with others of all sorts, but first and foremost with the ground of all relationships.

But the Gospel does not end its reflection on joy at this stage. The point that it has made so far is not all that different from what a first-century Stoic might say, making, for instance, the paradoxical claim that one can be happy on a rack. What the evangelist has said so far suggests that joy and grief can coincide, if there is something else that undergirds life, a relationship that makes grief irrelevant. Joy may be present *in spite of* its antithesis, grief or sorrow, not because it flows from a serenely rational mind, but because it is grounded in a transcendent and secure source of joy. The evangelist is not unique in making such a claim. Paul’s affirmations about joy in the midst of suffering have similar contours.²⁵

The next iteration of the theme strikes a decidedly non-philosophical note. At John 16:20–22, our evangelist in fact sounds very apocalyptic,²⁶ as he reports Jesus saying that his disciples will weep and lament, while the world, the inimical, oppressive realm outside the beloved community, rejoices (*καταστετε και θρηνησετε υμεις, ο δε κοσμος χαρησεται. υμεις λυπηθησθε, John 16:20*). But that situation will be reversed and the evangelist calls upon a familiar image²⁷ to refer to the transition, a woman in childbirth who forgets her pain when enveloped by the joy of welcoming a new son (John 16:22).

The image will appear in another "Johannine" work, Revelation 12:2, to symbolize the decisive moment when victory is won over the forces of evil. John 16 presumes a similar eschatological framework, although the point of transformation from sorrow to joy is identified in a different way, as the time when Jesus will see his disciples again (John 16:22). That vision is, in the most obvious sense, something that happens after his resurrection, when his disciples will see him and rejoice (John 20:20, ἐχάρησαν ὅτι οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς εὗρεν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήσαμεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμεῖς).

The presentation of joy in this portion of the Farewell Discourse is thus somewhat more conventional than in the previous chapter. There, as noted, joy is something that may be experienced *in spite of* sorrow; here it is something that is experienced *in place of* sorrow. Jesus, however, promises that the joy to be experienced is in some way permanent. It is something that no one can take away (John 16:22b: καὶ τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αἴρει ἀπὸ ὑμῶν).

The final passage on joy in the Farewell Discourse is part of the prayer of Jesus in chapter 17 that ties together the elements that have been at play in the previous chapters, a phenomenon that appears with other chains of motifs in the Gospel. Speaking to his Father, Jesus declares that he is coming to him. He has spoken about that departure so that his disciples might have his complete joy within them (John 17:13: ἵνα ἔχωσιν τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν περιηρημένην ἐν ὑμῖν). Both the discussion of departure to the Father and its connection with joy recalls chapter 14. The notion that the joy that the disciples are supposed to have is "his" joy and that it is "complete" or "perfect" evokes the treatments of joy in chapters 15 and 16. Joy is a quality that should pervade their lives if they understand their master and teacher. It is something that comes from him and is grounded in the ongoing loving relationship that they share with him, one another, and the source of all, a relationship soon to be reaffirmed (John 17:21-23). As such, joy is something that exists *in spite of* whatever sorrow they may feel. Yet joy also transforms and supplants the sorrow associated with death because it is grounded in the vision of the Resurrected One, with all that such a vision entails. The joy of abiding relationship and the joy of victory over death are intimately bound together, two sides of the same sparkling coin.²⁸

This brief survey of the Johannine treatment of joy highlights some important things about what the joy of the Gospel might mean. Joy is founded in and gives expression to a relationship. Its antithesis is sorrow or grief, but it relates to its opposite in complex ways. The Johannine treatment also hints at another important dimension of joy. Joy does not exist in a vacuum but is intimately connected with other dimensions of the life of a disciple, living in the situation to which Jesus's Farewell Discourse points. This connection

of joy with something else appears most clearly in the Gospel's reference to a future when joy is to be fully realized. The joy that is experienced in the contemporary relationship is, at least in part, sustained by the hope that is implied in the reference to the future (17:21-23). But if hope is at least part of the story of joy, so too are the other cardinal "theological" virtues. The relationship with Father and Son that grounds joy in the present is itself based on the faithful acceptance of the words of Jesus. Jesus invites other characters in the Gospel to believe and trust those words and the Gospel itself invites its readers to do the same. And, as shown both by the initial reference to Jesus's command (15:10) and by his final reference to the unity of Father, Son, and believers, the joy of which Jesus speaks is an expression of shared love. For the evangelist, then, joy is not isolated, but instead is implicated in a larger pattern of life in community.²⁹ What defines that life is not the material apertinances of quotidian existence, or the confidence of a rational mind in control of the self, but the triad so often praised by early Christian writers of faith, hope, and love.³⁰

CONCLUSION

While it is intriguing to tease out the ethical implications of Johannine characterization and explore the ethics implicit in the Gospel's portrayal of Jesus and his disciples, the contribution to practical ethics remains rather thin. The evangelist simply is not interested in developing a theory of or instruction about particular virtues and obligations. The Gospel is interested in questions of the foundation of ethics and that interest is best understood in critical dialogue with another major framework for thinking about matters ethical. In addition to staking a claim about how ethical life is to be grounded—that is, in response to the revealed command and commanding example of self-giving love, the evangelist provides an alternative account to one of the most interesting claims of the alternative position about what characterizes the ethical life. While a Stoic offers an account of the positive emotion of joy that supervenes on a life of self-controlled reason, the evangelist invites reflection on a joy that also defies sorrow and grief but does so on the basis of a relationship in a community defined by its faith and hope in a God of love.

NOTES

1. See Johannes Beutler, "Das Hauptgebot im Johannesevangelium," in *Das Gesetz im Neuen Testament*, ed. Karl Kertelge, QD 108 (Freiburg: Herder, 1986),

222–236; repr. in idem, *Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften*, SBAB 25 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998), 107–120; idem, “Das Hauptgebot im Johannesevangelium,” in *Das Gesetz im Neuen Testament*, ed. Karl Kerlgele, QD 108 (Freiburg: Herder, 1986) 222–236; Raymond F. Collins, “A New Commandment I Give to You, That You Love One Another . . .” (John 13:34),” in Raymond F. Collins, *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel*, Theological and Pastoral Monographs 2 (Louvain: Peeters, 1990), 217–256; D. Moody Smith, “The Love Command: John and Paul?” in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*, ed. E. H. Lovering, Jerry L. Sumney (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 207–217.

2. On this verse, see especially Andreas Dettweiler, “Umstrittene Ethik: Überlegungen zu Joh 15, 1–17,” in *Johannes Studien: Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum Johannes-Evangelium*, ed. Martin Rose, Publications de la Faculté de théologie de l’Université de Neuchâtel, Suisse 6 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991), 175–190; and Klaus Schottissek, “Eine grössere Liebe als diese hat niemand, als wenn einer sein Leben hingibt für seine Freunde” (John 15,13),” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive*, ed. Jörg Frey and Udo Schnelle WUNT 175 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 413–442.

3. See e.g., Wayne Meeke, “The Ethics of the Fourth Evangelist,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996), 317–326. That essay has generated considerable discussion, including D. Moody Smith, “Ethics and the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel,” in *Word, Theology, and Community in John*, ed. John Painter, R. Alan Culpepper, Fernando F. Segovia (St. Louis: Chalice, 2002), 109–122. For a useful survey of the continuing discussion of the issue, see Michael Labahn, “It’s Only Love—Is That All? Limits and Potentials of Johannine ‘Ethic’—A Critical Evaluation of Reseñch,” in *Rethinking the Ethics of John: ‘Implicit Ethics’ in the Johannine Writings: Kontexte und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik/Contexts and Norms of New Testament Ethics*, Vol. 3, ed. Jan van der Watt and Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 291 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 3–43.

4. Cf. especially Matt. 5:21–26.

5. Note the prohibition on swearing oaths at Matt. 5:33–37 echoed in Jas. 5:12. In John the truth in which God is worshipped (4:23), the truth that sets free (8:32), and the truth that so puzzles Pilate (18:38) is not what humans have to say to one another, but the message that Jesus brings.

6. Cf. Luke 10:37, a theme that dominates the third Gospel.

7. Cf. Matt. 18:22 and Luke 15:20–24 and 23:34, at least in some witnesses.

8. J. J. Kanagaraj, “The Implied Ethics of the Fourth Gospel: A Reinterpretation of the Decalogue,” *TynBul* 52 (2001): 33–60, as well as the other essays in van der Watt and Zimmermann, *Rethinking*. (See n. 3 above).

9. See Johannes Nissen, “Community and Ethics in the Gospel of John,” in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives: Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel Artus*, 1997, ed. Johannes Nissen and C. Pedersen, JSNTSup 182 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 194–212; Jan

van der Watt, “Ethics and Ethos in the Gospel according to John,” *ZNW* 97 (2006): 147–176; idem, “Preface,” in idem, ed., *Identity, Ethics and Ethos in the New Testament*, BZNTW 141 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2006), iv–ix.

10. As argued for John 4 by Kobus Kok, “As the Father Has Sent Me, I Send You: Towards a Missional-Incarnational Ethos in John 4,” in *Moral Language in the New Testament*, ed. Ruben Zimmermann and Jan G. van der Watt, WUNT 296 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 168–193.

11. This case has been most forcefully argued by Warren Carter, *John and Empire: Initial Explorations* (New York, London: T&T Clark, 2008).

12. See Dirk G. Van der Merwe, “A Matter of Having Fellowship? Ethics in the Johannine Epistles,” in *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, BZNTW 141 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2006), 535–563; Jörg Frey, “Ethical Traditions, Family Ethos, and Love in the Johannine Literature,” in *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Joseph Verheyden, *Studies in Theology and Religion* 17 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 167–204, here 174–185.

13. Most commentators find the epistles reacting to interpretations of the Gospel. See Raymond Brown, *The Epistles of John*, AB 30 (New York: Doubleday, 1982), 90; and Hans-Josef Klauck, *Der erste Johanesbrief*, EKKNT 23/1 (Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1991), 31. For the view that the first Johannine epistle precedes the Gospel, see Udo Schnelle, “Die Reihenfolge der johan-neischen Schriften,” *NTS* 57 (2010): 91–113.

14. See Harold W. Attridge, “An Emotional Jesus and Stoic Traditions,” in *Stoicism in Early Christianity*, ed. Tuomas Rasimus, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Ismo Dunderberg (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2010), 77–92; repr. in Harold W. Attridge, *Essays on John and Hebrews*, WUNT 264 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 122–136.

15. That the Gospel was designed to be re-read and studied may be obvious, but it is certainly a corollary of the way its riddling narrative is structured. There have been various efforts to make some sense of the Johannine style, including Herbert Leroy, *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums*, BBB 30 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1968); Stefan Schreiber and Alois Stimpfle, eds., *Johannes aemigmaticus: Studien zum Johannesevangelium für H. Leroy*, BU 29 (Regensburg: Pustet, 2000); Tom Thatcher, *The Riddles of Jesus in John: A Study in Tradition and Folklore*, SBLeMS 53 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000); and Paul Anderson, *The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011). For the way in which the identity of the Beloved Disciple functions as an enticing riddle, see Harold W. Attridge, “The Restless Quest for the Beloved Disciple,” in *Early Christian Voices: In Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon*, David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, and David W. Pao, BIS 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 71–80; repr. in idem, *Essays on John and Hebrews*, 20–30.

16. See Harold W. Attridge, “Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Revealed Wisdom: Studies in Apocalyptic in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, ed. John Ashton, *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* 88 (Leiden, New York: Brill, 2014), 183–199.

17. See Harold W. Attridge, "Philo and John on Naming God," in Joel Baden, Hindy Najman, Eibert Tigchelaar, eds., *Sibylls, Scriptures and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 85–95; and idem, "Stoic and Platonic Reflections on Naming in Early Christian Circles: Or, What's in a Name," *From Stoicism to Platonism, The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 277–295.
18. For the key texts, see Philo, *Abr.* 121, and Plato, *Crat.* 400D.
19. See Harold W. Attridge, "Gnostic Platonism," *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquy on Ancient Philosophy 1991* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1992), 1–29.
20. Not the type of dance, but the kind of decorative scheme found in ancient art, such as the apse of the church of St. Clemente in Rome, a floral pattern with intricately interwoven tendrils.
21. For an insightful description of a Stoic sense of "joy," see Martha Nussbaum, *Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, Martin Classical Lectures 2 (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1994), 400–401.
22. See, for example, Gite Buch-Hansen, "It Is the Spirit That Gives Life": A Stoic Understanding of Pneuma in John's Gospel, BZNW 173 (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2010).
23. For another analysis of the ethical implications of Jesus's final hour, see Horst R. Balz, "Johanneische Theologie und Ethik im Licht der 'letzten Stunde,'" in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments: Festschrift für H. Greeven*, ed. Wolfgang Schrage, BZNW 47 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 35–56.
24. For purposes of this essay, I treat the Farewell Discourse as a whole. Much scholarship on the chapters has worried about its diachronic development and many commentators see at least two stages in the compositional process. For some recent literature on the chapters, with references to other studies, see Klaus Scholtissek, "Abschied und neue Gegenwart: Exegetische und theologische Reflexionen zur johanneischen Abschiedsrede 13,31–17,26," *ETHL* 75 (1999): 332–358; Wayne Brouwer, *The Literary Development of John 13–17: A Chiasmic Reading*, SBLDS 182 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000); L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); George Parsenios, *Departure and Consolation: The Johannine Farewell Discourses in Light of Greco-Roman Literature*, NovTSup 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2005); and Ruth Sheridan, "John's Gospel and Modern Genre Theory: The Farewell Discourse (John 13–17) as a Test Case," *THQ* 20 (2010): 287–99. While not excluding the possibility of such a compositional history, I argue that the result is shaped into a coherent whole.
25. See especially 2 Cor. 6:10; Phil. 1:18–19.
26. On the various ways in which "apocalyptic" themes appear in the Fourth Gospel, see Carin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland, eds., *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013).
27. The use of a childbearing woman as a potent image begins with Isa. 26:17, although Isaiah does not focus on the positive, joyful outcome.
28. The relationship between more "philosophical" and more "apocalyptic" forms of joy evident in the Johannine Farewell Discourse is hardly unique. The whole com-

plex tapestry of those chapters blends temporal and cultural perspectives in surprising and enticing ways. For a treatment of some analogous moves, see Harold W. Attridge "Temple, Tabernacle, Time, and Space in John and Hebrews," *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 261–274.

29. On the importance of relationships in the Johannine reflection on ethics, see Jörg Frey, "Love-Relations in the Fourth Gospel: Establishing a Semantic Network," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Gilbert van Belle, Michael Labahn, and Petrus Maritz, BETL 223 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 171–198.

30. See 1 Thess. 1:3; 1 Cor. 13:13; Heb. 10:22–24.