IRONY, HUMAN NATURE AND HUMAN DIGNITY IN PORTRAYING THE BLIND MAN IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Rev. Lect. Teodor-Ioan COLDA, PhD
Vice Dean, Baptist Theological Institute of Bucharest
teocolda@yahoo.com

Abstract:
In this paper, "Irony, Human Nature and Human Dignity in Portraying the Blind Man in the Fourth Gospel," the author discusses irony as a literary device and as an ancient characterization technique frequently used by the Evangelist in the Fourth Gospel. He brings forth an episode in which irony, sarcasm and humour are quite obvious to any reader, but they are also expressed in relation to the human nature and the human dignity. The unnamed blind man in chapter 9 of the Fourth Gospel, though one of the minor characters of the narrative, plays an important role in regard to these aspects. The purpose is to show that there is more to irony in the Fourth Gospel than one might expect.
Keywords: *John 9, irony, human dignity, characters, Fourth Gospel.*

M. Doss very convincingly states that "involvement with justice and human rights is integral to the proclamation of the gospel," because "Jesus makes his mission as one of restoring the dignity of the human person."[1] He also observes that "in the society in which Jesus exercised his ministry, the blind, lame, leprosy patients, the bonded, etc., were considered to be persons of diminished human worth," but "Jesus makes them whole and also restores their place in the society."[2] These aspects can be easily identified in a very intriguing episode of the Fourth Gospel. The unnamed blind man in chapter 9, though one of the minor characters of the narrative, plays an important role in regard to these aspects. The Evangelist uses irony to highlight the story and its characters: Jesus, the blind man, the disciples, the neighbours

1 Jacob Kavunkal, "Word-Inspired to Inspire the World", in *Led by the Spirit: Mission, Spirituality and Formation*, ed. Mohan Doss, Delhi, DWS/ISPK, 2008, p. 48.
2 *Ibidem.*

of the blind man, his parents, and the Jewish authorities. In the end Jesus is intentionally associating himself with this man who was again marginalised, not because of his affliction, for he was cured by Jesus, but because his allegiance to Jesus. While approaching chapter 9 of the Fourth Gospel is important to consider that "Jesus Christ is central to Christian reflection on rights"[3] and that "rights of the marginated was understood by Jesus as the prime factor in human rights. As Jesus was siding the poor he was siding the human rights."[4] The purpose of the following pages is to explore the link between irony, human nature and human dignity in portraying the blind man in chapter 9 of the Gospel narrative.

Irony as a Literary Device in the Fourth Gospel

Irony seems to be a very important aspect in the Fourth Gospel. Since the middle of the last century, the topic received a quite considerable scholarly attention in Johannine studies.[5] Scholars have noticed that the fourth evangelist is a 'master of irony'.[6] Based on D. C. Muecke's observations, that irony "(1) is a double-layered or two-storied phenomenon, (2) presents

3 George Newlands, *Christ and Human Rights. The transformative engagement*, Aldershot, Burlington, Ashgate, 2006, p.15.

4 M. Stephen, *Human Rights. Concepts and Perspectives*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company, 2002, p. 41.

5 The most extensive study was made by Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, Atlanta, Georgia, John Knox Press, 1985. Other studies: Henri Clavier, "L'ironie dans le quatrième Evangile", in *Studia Evangelica* I /1959, pp. 261-276; David W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, Theologischen Dissertationen, IV, Basel, Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionverlagen, 1970, pp. 47-68; George W. Macrae, "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel", in *The Word and the World*, ed. Richard J. Clifford & George W. Macrae, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Weston College Press, 1973, pp. 83-96; Allan R. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983, pp. 165-180; Debbie Gibson, "Nicodemus: Character Development, Irony and Repetition in the Fourth Gospel", in *Proceedings* 11/1991, pp. 116-128; T. Thatcher, "The Sabbath Trick: Unstable Irony in the Fourth Gospel", in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 76/1999, pp. 53-77; János Boliky, "János evangéliumának iróniája" in *Pannonhalmi Szemle*, 4/2004, pp. 9-20.

6 Culpepper, *cit.*, p. 166; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 357; Wayne Meeks, "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel", in E. S. Fiorenza, editor, *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1976, p. 59.

some kind of opposition between two levels, and (3) contains an element of 'innocence' or unawareness,"[7] P. D. Duke comes out with a definition of irony: "irony as a literary device is a double-leveled literary phenomenon in which two tiers of meaning stand in some opposition to each other and in which some degree of unawareness is expressed or implied."[8] Based again on Muecke's study and adding the one made by Booth, R. A. Culpepper summarises the defining of components of irony slightly different: 1) a contrast of appearance and reality; 2) a confident unawareness (pretended in the case of the ironist and real in the case of the victim of irony) that the appearance is only an appearance; and 3) the comic effect of this unawareness of a contrasting appearance and reality.[9]

Probably the small difference in defining the essential components of irony is due to Culpepper's somewhat more pronounced focus on character study. He is also concerned with the themes or objects of irony in the Fourth Gospel, identifying the following: 1) the rejection of Jesus; 2) the origin of Jesus; 3) Jesus' identity; 4) Jesus' ministry; 5) Jesus' death; and 6) Discipleship.[10] It is easy to notice that the traces that Culpepper proposes and fallows deal basically with irony that occurs in the relation between Jesus and the Jews. The only exception is the last one, the theme of discipleship. But probably in the context of character study it would be better to focus the attention on the Fourth Gospel's characters, on the manner in which they produce irony and how they become victims[11] of irony, victims of the narrator's irony, of Jesus' irony and of their own irony.[12] Nevertheless

7 Duke, *cit*., p. 13. See D. C. Muecke, *The Compass of Irony*, London, Methuen & Co., 1969; Idem, *Irony*, The Critical Idiom, 13, London, Methuen & Co., 1970.

8 Duke, *cit*., p. 17.

9 Culpepper, *cit*., pp. 166-167. See also: Muecke, *The Compass*, pp. 19-20; Wayne C. Booth, *A Rhetoric of Irony*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1974, p. 35.

10 Culpepper, *cit*., pp. 169-175.

11 "Although irony does not always require a victim, John's irony usually has three participants: the ironist, the victim, and the observer or reader." *Ibidem*, p. 177. According to Duke "some characters of in Jon's Gospel are never ironized: Jesus, the Beloved Disciple, Lazarus, John the Baptist, and the *basilikos* of 4:46-54, to name a few." Duke, *cit*., pp. 95-96. In Jesus' case Duke is not quite accurate. It is true that he is not ironized by the Evangelist through means of situational irony, but he is the victim of his brother's irony (cf. 7:3; irony regarding his miracles), of the Pharisees (cf. 8:19; irony regarding his origin, his birth) of the Jews (cf. 8:41; again irony regarding his birth).

12 Duke does this in his study.

a thematic study in terms of the use of irony in the Fourth Gospels proves to be very useful in systematizing the Evangelist theological and literary thinking.

Johannine scholars who studied irony are completely aware that to produce an exhaustive list of types of irony is an endeavour impossible to realize because "the types and shades of irony are countless"[13] and "they face in and out of each other like colours of a spectrum."[14] Yet some broad categories can be still indicated: 1) stable (intended, covert, fixed, and specific) and unstable irony (unintended, overt, unfixed, general), or, in other words, intended and unintended irony;[15] 2) verbal irony (referring to situations when an ironist speaks ironically, because he knows more than may be apparent, and the intended meaning of the spoken words is different from what is apparently asserted);[16] 3) dramatic irony (when the speaker knows less than what he asserts and the produced irony is unintentional); 4) situational irony (when characters and situations develop ironically "without an absolute dependence of the superior foreknowledge or memory of the audience"), which can have subcategories: irony of events, irony of self-betrayal, and irony grounded in imagery.[17]

Culpepper believes that in the Fourth Gospel irony is "always stable and usually covert."[18] This means that for the reader it can be both easy and difficult to detect, but the context, the dialogue, the characters can provide sufficient information to grasp and understand the irony. An even important observation is that "the most common device employed by the Evangelist, however, is the unanswered question, often based on a

13 Duke, *cit*., p. 18. Or, in Culpepper's words "each of the passages in which irony can be detected has its own individuality, its own subtleties." Culpepper, *cit*., p. 176.

14 Duke, *cit*., p. 18.

15 Duke believes that one must be aware of an important distinction that comes together with this first type of irony, the distinction between communicated and perceived irony, because "absolute certainty concerning the intentionality behind an irony perceived in a text may not always be possible." Ibidem, p. 19.

16 According to Duke, the simplest form of verbal irony is sarcasm, explaining that "sarcasm's most obvious feature is that its 'higher' level of meaning is hardly covert at all. The listener, particularly the victim, is left in no doubt at all as to the speaker's meaning." *Ibidem*, p. 21.

17 Duke explains and exemplifies at length all these types of irony in his study. *Ibidem*, pp. 18-27.

18 Culpepper, *cit*., p. 168.

false assumption, in which the character suggests or prophesies the truth without knowing it."[19] This method of producing irony is quite ingenious, because in this way characters are involved in dialogue with Jesus and they give voice to many questions that probably many of the original readers of the gospel would have had. In a sense, in this way the Evangelist uses the characters in a manner that suits the apologetic purpose of the gospel.

Irony and Characters in the Fourth Gospel

One must not look in depth in the text of the Fourth Gospel to observe that almost every character has a talent in producing irony. Irony is a sign of wisdom and understanding or a sign for complete ignorance (usually the Jews fall in this category). In a sense irony it is opposite to misunderstanding, but sometimes they go hand in hand (this is true in the case of the Jews and sometimes in the case of the disciples). The best example for this is the dialogue between the Jewish officials and the man who was born blind, one of the minor characters of the gospel and also one of those who remain unnamed. As stated earlier, it would be fruitful to view irony in regard to characters, rather than types of irony or the objects of irony. This does not mean that these aspects can be dismissed. The purpose is to view the heroes of the narratives through the way in which they produce irony or they become victims of irony. In a sense this kind of approach employs a psychological analysis of the characters.

Probably some examples and remarks would be welcomed at this stage of the discussion. Peter is a victim of irony. When Jesus asks his disciples if they were to leave too, Peter is the spokesmen of the group, reaffirming in a sense their allegiance to Jesus (6:68), but he is the one who is going to leave Jesus and deny him. Ironically Peter boasted that he was going to follow Jesus even in death (13:36-38), but he showed that he was not committed to do that. At the end the reader understands that Peter is going to die for his Lord and probably even Peter understood that this is expected of him (21:18-19). Again, ironically Peter was right when he said he was to follow Jesus in death, but the timing was not right.[20]

19 Culpepper provides a list with the questions that characters raise: 1:46; 4:12; 6:42, 52; 7:20, 26, 35, 42, 48; 8:22, 53; 9:40; 18:38. *Ibidem*, p. 176.

20 For a more complete treatment of irony in Peter's case see Duke, *cit.*, pp. 95-100.

Jesus is also a victim of irony. The most striking irony is in regard to his origin. It is interesting that the Jews question his legitimate birth (8:19) and his mother's virtue (8:41), virtually suspecting him of being a bastard, yet the implied reader should find in this irony hints about Jesus' supernatural birth and divine origin. Jesus always understands irony and sometimes even appreciates it; for example Nathaniel's irony regarding Jesus being from Nazareth (1:46-47). It is quite obvious that irony, as a double-layered phenomenon, has a double-layered means of qualitative evaluation. Irony is negative *per se*, but has rather positive implications or outcomes.

There are a few characters that have a predominantly ironical purpose. Obviously they tend to be minor characters of the gospel: Caiaphas (11:49; 18:14), Barabbas (18:40), Pilate (19:12-16) and probably even Joseph of Arimathea (19:38). The character that actually produces irony and has most obviously an ironical purpose is Pilate. Traditionally, at least at a popular level, Pilate is viewed with sympathy, based on the information from 19:12 that he tried to release Jesus. A more careful reading of the text may suggest that Pilate tried to make the most of Jesus' trial and condemnation in terms of reaffirming the authority of Rome in Judea. Because the Jewish officials were so keen to get rid of Jesus, Pilate decided to toy with them, especially after they subtly threatened him (19:12). Pilate brings Jesus out to the Jews, saying "Behold your King!" (19:14) and not "Behold the man!" (19:5) as he had previously said. The King of the Jews was flogged, beaten and humiliated. In other words, Pilate associates the image of the helpless Jesus, who was given the title King of the Jews, with the image of the Jewish nation, assessing Rome's absolute authority and power. Pilate knew what their reaction would be: "They cried out, 'Away with him, away with him, crucify him!'" (19:15a). The Jewish officials wanted something from Pilate and Pilate was not willing to satisfy their wish without receiving something in return. After asking them "Shall I crucify your King?" Pilate managed to make the chief priest say "We have no king but Caesar" (19:15b). His statement was a public recognition of Rome's authority in Judea. Even more ironical is that they rejected Jesus as their King, and virtually rejected God as their King (Judges 8:23), and recognized Caesar as their ultimate authority. They accused Jesus of blasphemy (19:7), but the high priest proved to be a blasphemer himself dismissing both Yahweh's kingship and Israel's monotheism. This reading of the text is confirmed by the reaction of the Jews towards the inscription that Pilate commissioned

for Jesus' execution, which seemed too much for them: "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews" (19:19). Their protests for changing the text of the inscription suggests that they were almost saying: "This was not part of the bargain."[21] Pilate couldn't be persuaded.[22]

Irony and the Narrator of the Fourth Gospel

Irony is produced also by the narrator. His irony is sometimes subtle, almost unnoticeable. One can easily notice that he narrator is committed to leave no doubt that Judas is a negative character and that Peter is often a victim of irony. But the narrator does not stop here. He has other disciples in view that are victims of his irony. It seems that he has something against those who, at a certain level, betray Jesus. Judas is clearly the betrayer. Peter is a betrayer, but a lesser one if compared with Judas. But the narrator has other two candidates for the positions of Jesus' betrayers, who are yet lesser betrayers than Peter: Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea. Interestingly in 19:39 Nicodemus is mentioned in the narrative and he is presented as the one who previously came to see Jesus at night. If compared with similar comments made in the case of other characters, for example Caiaphas who is mentioned as the one "who had advised the Jews that it would be expedient that one man should die for the people" (18:14), this detail about Nicodemus is not to be viewed as something laudable. It seems that the narrator is making a reproach, rather than confirming Nicodemus' identity.[23] He is the only Nicodemus mentioned in the gospel, so the reader was in no situation of mistaken him with a different Nicodemus. His lack of courage is viewed as a sort of betrayal of Jesus. Nicodemus' action, like Caiaphas action, becomes in a sense a *stigma* in the eyes of the narrator and also in the eyes of the reader. Joseph of Arimathea is mentioned just once in the gospel and the narrator explains that he too was a disciple of Jesus, but in secret, because he was afraid of the Jews (cf. 19:38). He is in the same po-

21 Some scholars assume that there really was an agreement between Pilate and the Jewish officials. Warren Carter, *John and Empire*, New York, London, T&T Clark, 2008, p. 192.

22 For a detailed argumentation of this understanding see David Rensberger, *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, The Westminster Press, 1988, pp. 91-100. Duke has a more indulgent view regarding Pilate's position in Jesus' trial. Duke, *cit*., pp. 126-137.

23 "The irony of this scene is aimed at least in part, at the reader." Gibson, *cit*., p. 122.

sition as Nicodemus. But because irony has both a negative and a positive aspect the fact that the two men were involved in Jesus' burial quite in the open while all the other disciples were hiding, is rather to be appreciated. Both Nicodemus and Joseph overcame their fear and decided not to leave the devoted women to deal alone with Jesus' burial.

It is important to specify that irony in ancient literature is different than irony in modern literature, because it generally lacks in the element of laughter or comedy. G. W. Macrae argues that "irony in the Fourth Gospel is not that which we usually associate with humour or with satire, whether humorous or biting"[24], but also admits that one cannot "exclude humour entirely from the gospels,"[25] yet "the Fourth Gospel, though often heavily ironical, seems singularly humourless."[26] C. H. Dodd would probably disagree with Macrae's assessment that humour is entirely excluded in the Fourth Gospel. He notices that in the narrative of the Miracle of Cana "there is even a touch of homely humour"[27] in the remark of the master of the feast (2:10).

Irony, Human Nature and Human Dignity in Chapter 9 of the Fourth Gospel

This is not a singular occasion in the Fourth Gospel when irony has a touch of humour. Another obvious example can be drawn from the narrative of chapter 9. Here the narrative brings forth one of the minor characters of the Fourth Gospel, a man who was born blind, who, in the end, "meets his doubters with a pleasantly flat-footed humour."[28]

The Evangelist offers few details about the man's identity: he is unnamed, blind from birth and a beggar in the proximity of the Jerusalem Temple (8:59-9:1; 9:8), though his access in the temple and his participation in worship were restricted by Jewish regulations. He is probably a young adult, the phrase "he is of age" (9:21) suggesting he had the age of

24 G. W. Macrae, "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel", in *The Gospel of John as Literature*, ed. Mark W. G. Stibbe, Leiden; New York; Köln, Brill, 1993, p. 104.

25 *Ibidem*, p. 105.

26 *Ibidem*.

27 Dodd, *cit*., p. 297.

28 Reynolds Price, *Three Gospels*, New York, A Touchstone Book, Published by Simon & Schuster, 1996, p. 141.

legal responsibility (at least thirteen).[29] C. Bennema summarizes his condition in the following words: "the associations between blindness and sin probably left him stigmatized as a sinner (9:2, 34). In short, this blind beggar was an economic, social and religious outcast, living on the periphery of society."[30]

Regarding the condition of the blind beggar, Jesus' disciples share the common understanding of the day that the man was blind because either he or his parents had sinned.[31] Their question addressed to Jesus in 9:2 is proof to the prejudice that characterized the society in regard to those who were suffering. Marie-Jo Thiel further explains their question: "This question reflected prevailing attitudes: for it was not about whether or not the blindness is related to sin (since this was considered obvious in the minds of the listeners), but only about accountability; in other words, who was it that sinned for this man to be born blind?"[32]

Jesus rejects the common understanding and offers a different reasoning, emphasising a divine opportunity rather than a divine judgement (9:3). His response "shattered the social-anthropological system."[33] The disciples were focused on the stigma of the blind man and could not foresee that Jesus would not subdue to erroneous norms. Rather Jesus "breaks down this stigma, restoring the identity and dignity of the man as a human person."[34] Or in Thiel's words: "fragility and vulnerability not only do not affect the equal dignity of all, but may instead become an occasion of God's grace."[35]

The blind man is healed by Jesus, but he does not know the whereabouts of his benefactor (9:12). He only knows the name of the one who

29 George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 36, Waco, Texas, Word Books, Publisher, 1987, p. 157.

30 Cornelis Bennema, *Encountering Jesus. Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, Milton Keynes, Colorado Springs; Hyderabad: Paternoster, 2009, p. 137.

31 See Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 2, New York, Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982, pp. 240-241.

32 Marie-Jo Thiel, *Ethische Fragen der „Behinderung." Ethical Challenges of Disability*, Symposion, Anstöße zur interdisziplinären Veständigung / Towards an Interdisciplinary Understanding, Band / Volume 13, Münster, Lit, 2014, p. 10.

33 *Ibidem*, p. 11.

34 Elia Shabani Mligo, *Jesus and the Stigmatized. Reading the Gospel of John in a Context of HIV/AIDS – Related Stigmatization in Tanzania*, Eugene, Oregon, Pickwick Publications, 2011, p. 262.

35 Thiel, *cit.*, p. 11.

healed him. Though he does not know much else about Jesus, this does not prevent the religious authorities to question him rigorously in regard to Jesus and his healing powers. The formerly blind man will be caught in the middle of the animosities between the Jewish authorities and Jesus. As Bennema correctly observes "the real offence is not that Jesus performed a miracle but that he did so on the Sabbath."[36]

The man is interrogated twice by the Jewish authorities who manifest no regard to his previous condition and suffering. Their lack of compassion and empathy is astonishing. They reject him because of his allegiance to Jesus, but they "do not simply reject the former blind man. In rejecting him they have rejected Jesus who is more than a man."[37] The hostile attitude of the Jewish authorities is also shared by the malicious neighbours (9:8-13) of the man who received his sight.[38] His parents are also interrogated by the Pharisees, but because they feared the consequences of testifying about Jesus, they decided to leave their son on his own in his debate with the Jewish authorities (9:18-22).

Also it seems that both the Jewish authorities and his neighbours treat him based on the common understanding regarding those who have an affliction in their bodies; he is considered to be a sinner (9:34). But they also consider Jesus to be a sinner (9:24). They presume to be experts in terms of knowing the human nature based on their own spirituality, but their prejudice, their lack of empathy and their unwillingness to grant human dignity to those who oppose them reveal their sinfulness (9:41) and their spiritual blindness (9:40). The man cured by Jesus "lashes back with biting sarcasm that uncovers their orotundity."[39] Playing the part of the *eiron* (the comic ironist),[40] he satirically replies to his interrogators: "I

36 Bennema, *cit.*, p. 139.

37 Gilbert Soo Hoo, *From Faith to Faith: Blindman's Bluff*, Eugene, Oregon, Wipf & Stock, 2012, p. 128.

38 See J. L. Staley, "Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light: Reading Character in John 5 and 9", in *Semeia* 53/1991, pp. 55-80; Matthew D. Montonini, "The Neighbors of the Man Born Blind: A Question of Identity" in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois & Ruben Zimmermann, Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2016, pp. 439-445.

39 James L. Resseguie, "A Narrative-Critical Approach to the Fourth Gospel" in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, ed. Christopher W. Skinner, London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013, p. 6.

40 See Terri Bednarz, *Humor in the Gospels. A sourcebook for the Study of Humor in the*

have told you already, and you would not listen. Why do you want to hear it again? Do you also want to become his disciples? (9:27)."[41] This unanswered question is the climax of irony in this episode. As B. Leslie observes: "The author of the Fourth Gospel places the best 'zingers' on the lips of the man born blind. Sarcasm, irony, humour, and wordplay fill the man's speech to the Pharisees in the second interview (9:24-34)."[42]

Conclusion

In the end it can be concluded that in this episode the Evangelist uses irony not just to show the unbelief and hostility of Jesus' opponents, but also to emphasize that those who associate with Jesus and believe in him will share a similar treatment. They would not recognize the divine identity of Jesus and they refused to recognize that each human being has worth and dignity. Yet Jesus has a totally different approach. As R. Bauckham is stating, "In his crucifixion Jesus identified himself unequivocally and finally with the victims. He suffered their fate of being made nothing in order to restore their humanity as people who are something. He joined the forgotten, but he himself and the story of his crucifixion were remembered."[43] Irony is also associated with misunderstanding and judgement. In the dialogue with the man born blind the Jewish authorities show their lack of understanding again and again and they are judged by Jesus because of their sinful attitude. Ironically, their only solution is to become disciples of Jesus, which proves to be impossible for them.[44] Indeed "Johannine irony is more pragmatic than theological."[45]

New Testament, 1863-2014 , London, Lexington Books, 2015), p. 165.

41 Culpepper believes that "the evangelist's power and craft as an ironist are fully displayed in the delightful figures woven into the carpet of chapter 9." Culpepper, *cit*., p. 175.

42 Britt Leslie, *One Thing I Know. How the Blind Man of John 9 Leads an Audience Towards Belief*, Eugene, Oregon, Pickwick Publications, 2015, p. 24.

43 Richard Bauckham, *The Bible in Politics*, Louisville, Kentucky, Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989, p. 148.

44 "The blind man hopes that the Pharisees may become disciples of Christ, but ironically his hopes are unfulfilled." David W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel – Revised and Expanded Edition*, Eugene, Oregon, Wipf & Stock, 2018, p. 85.

45 Gail R. O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: And Eight Johannine Essays*, Johannine Monograph Series, 9, Eugene, Oregon, Wipf & Stock, 2021, p. 4.

Bibliography:

- Bauckham, Richard, *The Bible in Politics*, Louisville, Kentucky, Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989.
- Beasley-Murray George R., *John*, Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 36, Waco, Texas, Word Books, Publisher, 1987.
- Bednarz, Terri, *Humor in the Gospels. A sourcebook for the Study of Humor in the New Testament, 1863-2014*, London, Lexington Books, 2015.
- Boliky, János, "János evangéliumának iróniája", in *Pannonhalmi Szemle*, 4/2004, pp. 9-20.
- Booth, Wayne C., *A Rhetoric of Irony*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1974.
- Carter, Warren, *John: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*, Peabody, Massachusetts, Hendrickson Publishrs, 2006.
- Clavier, Henri, "L'ironie dans le quatrième Evangile", in *Studia Evangelica*, I/1959, pp. 261-276.
- Culpepper, Allan R, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design*, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1983.
- Dodd, C. H., *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- Duke, Paul D, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, Atlanta, Georgia, John Knox Press, 1985.
- Gibson, Debbie, "Nicodemus: Character Development, Irony and Repetition in the Fourth Gospel" in *Proceedings*, 11/1991, pp. 116-128.
- Kavunkal, Jacob, "Word-Inspired to Inspire the World", in *Led by the Spirit: Mission, Spirituality and Formation*, ed. Mohan Doss, Delhi, DWS/ISPK, 2008, pp. 34-49.
- Leslie, Britt, *One Thing I Know. How the Blind Man of John 9 Leads an Audience Towards Belief*, Eugene, Oregon, Pickwick Publications, 2015.
- Macrae, George W., "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel", in *The Word and the World*, edited by Richard J. CLIFFORD & George W. MACRAE, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Weston College Press, 1973.
- Meeks, Wayne, "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel", in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by E. S. Fiorenza, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.

- Mligo, Elia Shabani, *Jesus and the Stigmatized. Reading the Gospel of John in a Context of HIV/AIDS – Related Stigmatization in Tanzania*, Eugene, Oregon, Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- Montonini, Matthew D.,"The Neighbors of the Man Born Blind: A Question of Identity", in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois & Ruben Zimmermann, Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2016.
- Muecke, D. C., *The Compass of Irony*, London, Methuen & Co., 1969.
- _____, *Irony*, The Critical Idiom, 13, London, Methuen & Co., 1970.
- Newlands, George, *Christ and Human Rights. The transformative engagement*, Aldershot, Burlington, Ashgate, 2006.
- O'Day, Gail R., *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: And Eight Johannine Essays*, Johannine Monograph Series, 9, Eugene, Oregon, Wipf & Stock, 2021.
- Price, Reynolds, *Three Gospels*, New York, A Touchstone Book, Published by Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Rensberger, David, *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, The Westminster Press, 1988.
- Resseguie, James L.,"A Narrative-Critical Approach to the Fourth Gospel", in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, edited by Christopher W. Skinner, London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *The Gospel According to St. John*, Vol. 2, New York, Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982.
- Soo Hoo, Gilbert, *From Faith to Faith: Blindman's Bluff*, Eugene, Oregon, Wipf & Stock, 2012.
- Staley, J. L., "Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light: Reading Character in John 5 and 9" in *Semeia*, 53/1991, pp. 55-80.
- Stephen, M., *Human Rights. Concepts and Perspectives*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company, 2002.
- Thatcher, Tom,"The Sabbath Trick: Unstable Irony in the Fourth Gospel", in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 76/1999, pp. 53-77.
- Thiel, Marie-Jo, *Ethische Fragen der „Behinderung." Ethical Challenges of Disability*, Symposion, Anstöße zur interdisziplinären Veständigung / Towards an Interdisciplinary Understanding, Band / Volume 13, Münster, Lit, 2014.
- Wead, David W., *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel – Revised and Expanded Edition*, Eugene, Oregon, Wipf & Stock, 2018.