

JOHN'S USE OF MATTHEW

By

James W. Barker

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In

Religion

August, 2011

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Professor Amy-Jill Levine

Professor Susan Hylen

Professor Annalisa Azzoni

Professor J. Patout Burns

Professor David Petrain

Copyright © 2011 James W. Barker
All rights Reserved

In loving memory of my dear friend and mentor

David Laird Dungan

οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My undergraduate mentor David Dungan introduced me to the academic study of the Bible, encouraged me to think for myself, and supported me throughout my graduate studies; especially through warm friendship with Anne Dungan, David's memory continues to inspire my academic endeavors.

My dissertation committee members have provided inestimable expertise and encouragement. My director Amy-Jill Levine has guided me throughout my masters and doctoral programs, strengthened my research and writing skills, and provided me numerous teaching opportunities at Vanderbilt Divinity School; from the dissertation's inception, A.-J. has championed my idea and sharpened my focus. Susan Hylen has provided me several teaching opportunities in Vanderbilt's Religious Studies department as well as consistent feedback on chapter drafts that has encouraged me to clarify my positions and make my voice more prominent. My minor area advisor Annalisa Azzoni has cultivated in me essential research skills by her excellent teaching of Aramaic, Syriac, and rabbinic Hebrew. J. Patout Burns has been a model professor, and I am grateful for his support in my efforts to elucidate the Gospels through the interpretations of the early church fathers. I have benefited much from the interdisciplinary perspectives of Vanderbilt's Religion in the Greco-Roman World workgroup—especially that of classicist David Petrain, whose joining the committee has strengthened my philology.

I have also benefited from occasional correspondence and interaction with other scholars, and I extend special thanks to Paul Anderson, Guy Bar-Oz, Ram Bouchnik, Charles Hill, and Bronwen Wickkiser. Also, my second-cousin B. F. Barker graciously provided a wealth of zoological data regarding donkeys, horses, and mules, which contributed to my presentation of Chapter Three.

In Vanderbilt's Graduate Department of Religion, I am grateful for the administrative support of James P. Byrd and Marie McEntire throughout my coursework, qualifying exams, dissertation research, and scheduling the dissertation defense.

My parents James and Dianne Barker have taught Sunday School at Oak Grove Baptist Church (Gray, Tenn.) for my entire life, and I am blessed to have a family who so values the study of the Bible. Along with those of my parents, the love and prayers of my sister and brother-in-law Leanne and Rex Lewallen have given me constant motivation and strength. The same is

true with regard to my father- and mother-in-law Emil and Diana Attanasi as well as my sisters-in-law Jennifer Attanasi and Marie Lehman with her husband Justin.

Since our collaboration in religious studies and in campus ministry at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Donny Friederichsen has encouraged me in my studies and proved a stimulating conversation partner.

I am fortunate to have forged so many close friendships that made my years at Vanderbilt eminently enjoyable. My deep sympathies extend to Leah and Thomas Payne; Joe Blosser and Wilson Dickinson; Adam Fronczek, William Young, and Luke Smith; Melissa Petersen Smith along with Shane and Virginia Bartlett; Maria Mayo and Abigail Redman; Brad Peper, Mark DelCogliano, and Lee Jefferson; David Dault, his wife Kira, and my goddaughter Maggie; Emily and Burt Fulmer and Will Matthews.

My Koine Greek students at Vanderbilt Divinity School in 2009–2010 gave me much encouragement—especially Zachary Gresham, Christian Hawley, Siobahn Sargent, Kira Schlesinger, and Luke Townsend.

I wish to thank the following colleagues at Roanoke College for their friendship and support while I taught in the Religion and Philosophy department in 2010–2011: Brent Adkins, Jennifer Berenson, Mike Heller, Marwood Larson-Harris, Wendy Larson-Harris, Eric Rothgery, Monica Vilhauer, Ned Wisnefske, and my department chair Hans Zorn.

My wife and my best friend Katy Attanasi—whom I met on our first day of orientation to the Graduate Department of Religion—has loved and encouraged me beyond what I could imagine or describe. No one else could have listened or cared as much about this project from start to finish, and I am forever grateful for the daily sacrifices she has made to help me succeed—not the least of which involved painstakingly turning my footnotes into a bibliography. “Happy is the husband of a good wife, and the number of his days is double” (Sir 26:1). Zeus and Lenny have provided constant amusement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. <i>FORSCHUNGSBERICHT</i> , METHODOLOGY, AND HERMENEUTIC	4
<i>Forschungsbericht: John’s Relation to Matthew</i>	6
Eusebius of Caesarea (lived ca. 260–ca. 340).....	6
B. H. Streeter (1925).....	7
Hans Windisch (1926)	11
H.F.D. Sparks (1952).....	12
Nils Dahl (1955), Peder Borgen (1959), and Anton Dauer (1972).....	14
M.-É. Boismard et al. (1965–1977)	18
<i>John III’s use of Matthew</i>	19
<i>John II-B’s use of Matthew</i>	19
<i>Matthew’s use of John II-A</i>	22
<i>Analysis</i>	23
Frans Neirynck (1969–1995)	25
Bruno de Solages (1979).....	26
Gerhard Maier (1981)	28
Austin Farrer (1983, posthumous).....	29
Rosel Baum-Bodenbender (1984).....	30
George Howard (1992)	31
Thomas Brodie (1993)	32
Udo Schnelle (1994–2004)	34
Ulrich Wilckens (2000).....	34
Benedict Viviano (2004).....	35
Hartmut Thyen (2005)	38
Andrew Lincoln (2005).....	39
Urban C. von Wahlde (2010).....	42
Richard Bauckham (2011)	47
Summary	48
Methodology: John’s Use of Matthew.....	49

Hermeneutic: John’s Stance toward Matthew	54
Windisch’s Taxonomy and the Replacement Hypothesis	54
Reading John as an Apocryphal Gospel	58
III. ZECHARIAH’S DONKEY PROPHECY AND JESUS’ ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.....	63
Mark and Luke’s πῶλος	64
Walter Bauer’s Rejection of the Palmesel	65
H.-W. Kuhn’s Response to Bauer.....	68
Otto Michel’s Response to Bauer and Kuhn.....	69
In the Wake of Bauer, Kuhn, and Michel	71
Zechariah 9:9 and the Testimony-Book Hypothesis.....	75
Justin Martyr’s Transmission of Zech 9:9 in <i>1 Apol.</i> 35.10.....	78
Justin Martyr’s Transmission of Zech 9:9 in <i>Dial.</i> 53.3.....	80
Irenaeus’s Transmission of Zech 9:9 in <i>Epid.</i> 65	85
John’s Quotation of Zech 9:9 via Matthew.....	87
IV. BINDING AND LOOSING—FORGIVING AND RETAINING SINS	93
The Meaning of δέω and λύω in Matt 16:19; 18:18.....	94
The Relationship of John 20:23 to Matt 16:19; 18:18.....	99
Formal Similarities between Matt 18:18b (cf. 16:19) and John 20:23	100
Arguments for Independent Oral Tradition	102
Paul Anderson’s Argument:	
John’s Knowledge of Matthean Redaction (Matt 16:19).....	108
Counterargument: John’s Knowledge of Matthean Redaction (Matt 18:18).....	111
John’s Reinterpretation of Matthew.....	112
V. MISSION DISCOURSES AND EVANGELISM TO SAMARITANS.....	116
Previous Scholarship regarding Samaritans in the Fourth Gospel.....	116
Geography of Samaria in the Gospels	118
Samaritan Ethnicity according to Matthew.....	120
Harvest Metaphors in Matthew and John	121
Chronology of Mission Discourses in the Gospels.....	124
Overcoming Objections	127
Conclusions.....	129
VI: SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	130
Appendix	
A: BINDING AND LOOSING’ AND ‘FORGIVING AND RETAINING SINS’ FROM TERTULLIAN TO AUGUSTINE	133
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	144

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
2.1 Synopsis of Mark 16:6ab, 7; Matt 28:10	26
2.2 Synopsis of Gospel Sayings about Losing One's Life.....	46
3.1 Transmission of Zech 9:9.....	77
3.2 Irenaeus <i>Epid.</i> 65; Matt 21:5; John 12:15 in Armenian.....	86
3.3 Partial Quotations of the Decalogue in the Synoptics	88
3.4 Matthew and John's Quotations of Zech 9:9	89
4.1 Matthew and John on Disciples' Forgiveness of Others	114
5.1 Sequence of Mission Discourses and Notices Concerning John the Baptist in the Gospels	126

I. INTRODUCTION

The relationship of the Gospel of John to the Synoptic Gospels has been a perennial question since Clement of Alexandria described John's gospel as spiritual (πνευματικόν) and the Synoptics as corporeal (τὰ σωματικά; Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.7). John's literary dependence on the Synoptics constituted the consensus in the critical era and into the twentieth century. Hans Windisch then argued that John knew the Synoptics but intended to replace them.¹ Some years later Percival Gardner-Smith declared Johannine independence by arguing that John's synoptic parallels result from oral tradition rather than literary dependence.² Gardner-Smith's study marks "the turn of the tide,"³ for his thesis became the consensus when reinforced by monumental Johannine studies during the 1960s–1980s.⁴ Although there is a notable recent resurgence claiming Johannine dependence, such works tend to see John in relation to Mark and Luke.⁵ To date, there has been little sustained focus on John's connection to Matthew.

This dissertation argues both that the Gospel of John reflects knowledge of the redacted Gospel of Matthew and that John wrote his gospel so as to be read alongside Matthew's. The dissertation makes the following contributions to existing scholarship. First, it adduces heretofore undervalued points of contact between Matthew and John. Second, it puts forward lexical semantics as an underutilized control for evaluating whether alterations in gospel sayings result from oral tradition. Third, it addresses the role a preexisting gospel could play in a

¹ Hans Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: wollte der vierte Evangelist die Älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* (UNT 12; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1926).

² Percival Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).

³ Jos Verheyden, "P. Gardner-Smith and 'The Turn of the Tide,'" in *John and the Synoptics* (ed. Adelbert Denaux; BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 423–52.

⁴ E.g., Raymond Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1966–1970); Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971); 1st Ger. ed., 1941; C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963); Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John* (trans. Kevin Smyth et al.; 3 vols.; HTKNT 4; New York: Herder & Herder; Seabury; Crossroad, 1968–1982; repr. New York: Crossroad, 1990); Ger. ed. 1965–1975.

⁵ E.g., Manfred Lang, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Joh 18–20 vor dem markinischen und lukanischen Hintergrund* (FRLANT 182; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).

community that produced a newer one. Finally and most importantly, it posits a viable alternative to the prevailing consensus.

Chapter Two presents a *Forschungsbericht*. Regarding John's relation to the Synoptics, it will discuss Windisch's taxonomy of theories: supplementation, independence, interpretation, and replacement. I also draw an analogy to the relationship between non-canonical and canonical gospels, particularly the *Protevangelium of James* vis-à-vis Matthew and Luke, in order to show that John can stand as a self-sufficient narrative while providing supplemental details to the Synoptics as well as critical reinterpretations, none of which necessarily implies that John tried to replace his predecessors. Regarding John's specific points of contact with Matthew, the *Forschungsbericht* collects the parallels recognized up to now. Because most of those connections are short, scattered, and non-verbatim, most scholars explain the Johannine/Matthean relationship via oral tradition. The chapter then isolates tighter connections in which John interlocks with Matthew and even reflects knowledge of Matthean redaction. These findings establish a point of departure for the dissertation's case studies.

Chapter Three argues that John depends on Matthew for the quotation of Zechariah's prophecy about a king riding a donkey on the occasion of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. As distinguished from Mark and Luke, Matthew and John both name the species of animal and quote the Scripture. Contrary to widely held assumptions, I show that Mark's mention of a πῶλος (11:2, 4, 5, 7) does not signify a donkey. Scholars also widely hold that Zech 9:9 stood in a collection of Old Testament Testimony-books (a.k.a. *testimonia*), and so Matthew and John could have gained independent access to a preexisting interpretation of Jesus' entry as fulfilling Zechariah's prophecy. I review the arguments for a *testimonium* containing Zech 9:9 and find no evidence to support the claim. In the end I investigate whether John could have borrowed the proof from prophecy directly from Matthew. Although the evangelists' Zechariah quotations differ, I show that John's differences not only derive from Matthew's surrounding narrative but also correct Matthew's presentation, which seems to misunderstand the prophecy's synonymous parallelism.

Chapter Four argues that John's account of the risen Jesus' authorization of the disciples to forgive and hold onto people's sins (20:23) constitutes a reworking of Matthew's account wherein prior to the passion Jesus authorized the disciples to bind and loose (18:18; cf. 16:19). The Matthean and Johannine logia closely resemble each other in terms of structure, and scholars

have long accepted that they are related somehow. Regarding the sayings' different terminology, the consensus holds that 'binding and loosing' and 'forgiving and holding onto sins' are variant forms of one traditional orally transmitted saying. The consensus claims specifically that 'loosen' (λύω) morphed into 'forgive' (ἀφίημι) because λύω can in some instances signify forgiveness. The chapter demonstrates to the contrary that Matthew's notion of binding and loosing refers to what is prohibited and permitted within the church and that forgiveness does not pertain. Consequently a free-floating saying about binding and loosing would not connote forgiveness, and John's choice of forgiving and retaining sins results from his knowledge of Matthew's redactional transition from Jesus' binding and loosing saying (18:18) to Peter's question about forgiveness (18:21) and the ensuing parable about withholding forgiveness (18:23–35). Whereas Matthew emphasizes the disciples' obligation to forgive, John provides a counterbalance by stressing that at times the disciples also have the responsibility not to forgive. Corresponding to Chapter Four, Appendix A traces the history of interpretation of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 to illustrate the process set in motion by John's reinterpretation of Matthew.

Chapter Five examines the inclusion/exclusion of Samaritans during Jesus' ministry. The chapter argues that John harmonizes with Matthew when it comes to certain sayings about the harvest (θερισμός). In Matthew, Jesus intimates that the disciples are to be laborers in the Lord's harvest (9:37–38). Moments later he expressly prohibits them from evangelizing in Samaritan cities (10:5b). In John, Jesus and the disciples go to a Samaritan city, where many Samaritans believe in Jesus (4:40–42). Just prior to the Samaritans' profession of faith, Jesus referred to the disciples as working in the harvest (4:35–38). John's chronology allows his Samaritan mission (ch. 4) to occur simultaneously with Matthew's mission discourse (ch. 10). The simultaneity enables John to reverse Matthew's seeming Samaritan exclusion. Upon rereading Matthew 10 in light of John 4, Jesus would only tell the disciples not to evangelize Samaritans because he was in the very process of doing so himself.

Chapter Six summarizes the dissertation's findings.

II: FORSCHUNGSBERICHT, METHODOLOGY, AND HERMENEUTIC

“Special contacts between Matthew and John are rare and unimportant.”
—Rudolf Schnackenburg

The general question of John and the Synoptics has amassed sufficient *Forschungsberichte* that cover most of the last two centuries,¹ and so the *Forschungsbericht* in the first section of this chapter focuses on John’s particular relation to Matthew. Commentators frequently state the consensus that a Johannine/Matthean connection is improbable or at least very difficult to demonstrate,² but a number of scholars have explored that relationship. I summarize previous scholarship beginning with Eusebius in the patristic era and then turning to the last century of research in order to isolate the strongest points of contact that can provide a basis for this dissertation’s case studies.

In addition to isolating previously identified John/Matthew parallels, I also examine how scholars have explained those parallels; the second section of this chapter concerns methodology. Although oral and written sources are not mutually exclusive, studies of John and the Synoptics typically reach an impasse between theories of oral tradition and literary dependence. For example, Matti Myllykoski claims orality partly because he finds it “hard to imagine” John

¹ The most comprehensive overview is D. Moody Smith, *John among the Gospels* (2d ed.; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2001). For nineteenth- and early-twentieth century scholarship, see Hans Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Wollte der vierte Evangelist die älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* (WUNT 12; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1926). From that time on, continuous reports appear in the following: Josef Blinzler, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: ein Forschungsbericht* (SBS 5; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibel Werk, 1965); for 1965–1975, see Frans Neirynck, “John and the Synoptics,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie* (ed. M. de Jonge et al.; BETL 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 73–106; idem, “John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990,” in *John and the Synoptics* (ed. Adelbert Denaux; BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press), 3–62; repr. in idem, *Evangelica III: 1992–2000* (BETL 150; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001); Michael Labahn and Manfred Lang, “Johannes und die Synoptiker: Positionen und Impulse seit 1990,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums* (ed. Jörg Frey and Udo Schnelle; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 443–515.

² E.g., D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 51; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 43; J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 8; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*. (trans. Kevin Smyth et al.; 3 vols.; New York: Crossroad, 1968–1982), 1:30; Ben Witherington III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 7.

working from “two or three scrolls lying on his desk—or which are all the time in his mind.”³ From a different perspective, Maurits Sabbe finds Matthean, Markan, and Lukan *Sondergut* in John and concludes that the Fourth Gospel shows direct literary dependence on all three Synoptics.⁴ To move beyond the impasse, I intend to demonstrate John’s knowledge of Matthean redaction. To test previous arguments for oral tradition, I introduce lexical semantics as a means of determining whether one saying likely morphed into a variant form.

If the consensus of Johannine independence is correct, then John neither knew the Synoptics nor represents any viewpoint regarding them. If John’s use of Matthew can be determined, however, then John’s estimation of Matthew must be explained. The third and final section of this chapter takes up such hermeneutic questions. I return to Hans Windisch’s taxonomy of supplementation, independence, (re)interpretation, and replacement, and I reassess Windisch’s argument that John intended his gospel to be read instead of the Synoptics. By drawing upon scholarship that compares John to apocryphal gospels, I provide a model for John’s intention that his gospel be read alongside Matthew’s.

³ Matti Myllykoski, “The Material Common to Luke and John: A Sketch,” in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives* (ed. Petri Luomanen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 54; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 119 [115–56]; for a similar argument, see R. A. Derrenbacher, Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (BETL 186; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001).

⁴ Maurits Sabbe, “The Arrest of Jesus in Jn 18,1-11 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Evaluation of A. Dauer’s Hypothesis,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (ed. M. de Jonge; BETL 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 279–308; idem, “The Footwashing in Jn 13 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels,” *ETL* 57 (1982): 279–308; idem, “John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels,” in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context* (ed. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna; SNTSMS 67; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 75–93, 156–61; idem, “The Anointing of Jesus in John 12,1-8 and Its Synoptic Parallels,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al.; 3 vols.; BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2051–82; idem, “The Trial of Jesus before Pilate in John and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels,” in *John and the Synoptics* [BETL 101], 341–85; idem, “The Johannine Account of the Death of Jesus and Its Synoptic Parallels (Jn 19,16b–42),” *ETL* 70 (1994): 34–64; idem, “The Denial of Peter in the Gospel of John,” *LS* 20 (1995): 219–40. The essays published between 1977–1992 are reprinted in Maurits Sabbe, *Studia Neotestamentica: Collected Essays* (BETL 98; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991).

Forschungsbericht: John's Relation to Matthew

This section begins with Eusebius's list of John/Matthew parallels and then covers the major investigations of John's relation to Matthew from 1925–2011. Since this dissertation concerns literary relationships, I bracket those studies that explain Matthew and John's commonalities as arising from the evangelists' similar historical situations but not necessarily from shared texts or traditions.⁵ In order to avoid repetition, I delay engagement with studies of the test-cases used later in this dissertation, such as the connection between Matthew's binding and loosing saying (18:18; cf. 16:19) and John's saying about forgiving and holding onto sins (20:23). Also to avoid repetition, I have grouped together three Passion Narrative studies that cover many of the same John/Matthew parallels. Finally, I omit discussions of quadruple- and triple-traditions unless John is shown to be closer to Matthew than to Mark or Luke.

Eusebius of Caesarea (lived ca. 260–ca. 340)

While not advancing any theory of literary dependence, Eusebius of Caesarea compiled the earliest extant list of John/Matthew parallels. Among his canons and sections,⁶ Canon VII gives the following five parallels: (1) references to Capernaum and Galilee (Matt 4:13–16; John 2:12; 4:3, 43); (2) crowds questioning the identity of Jesus (as the Son of David in Matt 12:23; as the prophet and/or Messiah in John 7:40–41a); (3) references to Bethlehem as the birthplace of the Messiah (Matt 2:5–6; John 7:41b–42); (4) use of the donkey prophecy in Zech 9:9 at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Matt 21:4–5; John 12:14–15); (5) sayings about binding and loosing or forgiving and retaining sins (Matt 18:18; John 20:23).⁷

⁵ E.g., Klaus Berger, *Im Anfange war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums* (Stuttgart: Quell, 1997), 283–9 [Teil 4, §41 covers John and Matthew]; John Painter, "Matthew and John," in *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries* (ed. David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 66–86; D. Moody Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), esp. 179–80.

⁶ NA²⁷ includes the Eusebian canons and sections on pp. 84*–89*, with introduction on p. 78*; for discussion (along with a translation of Eusebius's explanation), see David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1999), 108–11.

⁷ Eusebius classifies Matt 16:19 as uniquely Matthean (i.e., Canon X), as is his tendency with Matthean doublets; e.g., he places Matt 19:9, the saying about divorce and remarriage equaling adultery, in Canon II alongside Mark 10:11–12 and Luke 16:18, whereas the similar saying in Matt 5:32 falls in Canon X.

It is sometimes puzzling why Eusebius groups certain texts together. For example, in Matthew Jesus withdraws into Galilee and relocates to Capernaum after John the Baptist is arrested (Matt 4:13–16); Eusebius draws parallels to three passages in John: Jesus’ first trip to Capernaum (2:12) and the two references to Galilee that bookend Jesus’ trip to Samaria (4:3, 43). In other words, the narratives in Matthew and John are unrelated, but Eusebius connects them through the catchwords Capernaum and Galilee. Eusebius could just as easily have moved those sections to Canon IV (the Matthew/Mark/John parallels) so as to include Mark’s references to Capernaum (2:1) and Galilee (1:14). Despite such inconsistencies, Eusebius’s canons and sections marked an advance in ecclesiastical investigation of the interrelations of the fourfold gospel canon, and two of his John/Matthew parallels are case studies in this dissertation.

B. H. Streeter (1925)

In his *magnum opus*,⁸ B. H. Streeter calls the evidence for John’s knowledge of Matthew “inconclusive.”⁹ Yet without exception Streeter himself concludes that John did not use Matthew. Especially given his use of textual criticism, not all of Streeter’s arguments prove convincing, however. Citing the conclusions by then-recent critics,¹⁰ Streeter was predisposed to see John in relation to Mark or Luke rather than to Matthew.

Streeter begins with three Matthew/Luke/John parallels. (1) John’s slave/master saying agrees with Matthew but not with Luke (John 13:16; cf. 15:20; Matt 10:24; Luke 6:40a), and Streeter concludes that the epigram comes through oral tradition.¹¹ (2) John’s saying, “The Father gave everything into his hands” (13:3; cf. 3:35) closely resembles Matthew and Luke’s verbatim saying, “Everything has been handed over to me by my Father” (Matt 11:27/Luke

⁸ B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins; treating of the manuscript tradition, sources, authorship and dates* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 408–16 [within ch. 14, “The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics,” pp. 393–426].

⁹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 415.

¹⁰ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 395; see Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate: A Series of Essays on Problems concerning the Origin and Value of the Anonymous Writings attributed to the Apostle John* (New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1910), 366–8; Eric R. Buckley, *Introduction to the Synoptic Problem* (London: Arnold, 1912), 271, 275; Vincent H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents, Vol. 3* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920), 214–20.

¹¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 409.

10:22). Because the saying occurs in Luke, Streeter denies John's use of Matthew here.¹² Streeter avers a literary connection between John and Luke's gospels, yet he does not discuss that parallel in his section on John and Luke.¹³ (3) John's story about Jesus healing the royal official's child results from oral tradition in Streeter's view, but if there were literary contact, then John could have learned it from Luke or Q rather than from Matthew.¹⁴ In these three cases, Streeter denies Matthew as one of John's sources.

Streeter then isolates eight Matthew/Mark/John parallels, and he prefers to see John in relation to Mark—including its lost ending—rather than to Matthew.¹⁵ Streeter also raises text-critical issues that could cast doubt on certain John/Matthew parallels. (1) Concerning the account of Jesus' walking on the sea, Mark says the boat was "in the middle of the sea" (6:47), and John says "about twenty-five or thirty stadia" (6:19).¹⁶ Streeter points out that according to the Old Syriac, *f*¹³, and B, Matthew says "many stadia from the land" (14:24); however, **S**, C, L, D, and the Old Latin read "in the middle of the sea."¹⁷ Since Peter does walk on water in Matthew's account but not in John's, Streeter considers it unlikely that John drew upon Matthew here, and so the seeming agreement results from text-critical assimilation.¹⁸ (2) Except for slightly varying word order, Matthew and John agree verbatim, "For the poor you will always have with you, but me you will not always have" (Matt 26:11; John 12:8); Mark contains the saying but inserts in mid-verse, "and when you want, you can do good to them" (Mark 14:7). Streeter considers Matthew and John's agreement against Mark a coincidental omission, and because the Johannine verse is missing in D and *sy*^s, Streeter again appeals to assimilation and

¹² Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 409.

¹³ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 401–8; nor does Streeter have a section on John/Q parallels.

¹⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 409.

¹⁵ Streeter devotes ch. 12 to "The Lost End of Mark" [*Four Gospels*, 333–60].

¹⁶ When Streeter cites John 6:19, he commits a scribal error of his own by omitting John's πέντε: "about twenty [*sic*] or thirty furlongs from the land" [*Four Gospels*, 410].

¹⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 410.

¹⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 410.

denies a connection between Matthew and John.¹⁹ (3) Matthew (21:5) and John's (12:15) different quotations of Zech 9:9 mean for Streeter that the two renditions are independent.²⁰

At Jesus' arrest, (4) a disciple cuts off the ear of the high priest's slave. In John 18:11, Jesus tells Peter, "Put your sword in its sheath;" in Matt 26:52 Jesus tells the unnamed companion, "Return your sword to its place." Since the essential word 'sword' is the only one in common, Streeter deems that point of contact "insignificant."²¹ (5) Matthew (27:29) and John (19:2) say that soldiers put the crown of thorns "on (Jesus') head," whereas (Mark 15:17) says they put it "on him." Streeter observes, "Since crowns are made to be worn on the head, the coincidence is not remarkable."²² He adds that John does not have a reed in Jesus' hand, a detail Matthew adds to Mark. (6) Matthew (27:60) and John (19:41) refer to the tomb as new (καινός), but Streeter considers that another text-critical assimilation. He prefers to read John's tomb as empty (κενός), citing ms. 69 and a supplemental folio added to Codex Bezae (D^s).²³ *Pace* Streeter, neither \mathfrak{P}^{69} nor 069 contains the verse, and the late reading in D^s undoubtedly represents an itacism for καινός: twenty-nine words later on the same supplemental folio, Mary Magdalene "comes," which D^s writes as ερχετε rather than ερχεται.²⁴ Also, in the burial pericope Streeter does not mention that only Matthew (27:57) and John (19:38a) make Joseph of Arimathea a disciple of Jesus. Thus the narrative connections are stronger and the text-critical evidence weaker than Streeter admits.

Unlike Mark's feeding miracles, (7) in Matthew's feeding of the 4000 (15:29) and John's feeding of the 5000 (6:3), Jesus ascends a mountain and sits there. Streeter hypothesizes that the

¹⁹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 411.

²⁰ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 411.

²¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 411.

²² Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 412.

²³ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 412; Swanson adds ms. 118: Reuben Swanson (ed.), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: John* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), 271.

²⁴ See folio 174b* of Paul Dujardin's facsimile: *Codex Bezae*, University of Cambridge, 1899. For John 19:41 NA²⁷ notes *ex itac.?* (i.e., by itacism, that ε and αι were pronounced the same), and Swanson attributes καινόν to D^{sup} in his main text and footnotes the actual spelling κενόν; in John 20:1 he does the same with ερχεται/ερχετε [Swanson, *John*, 271–2]. In his discussion of John 19:41, Streeter acknowledges: "The confusion of αι and ε is one of the commonest errors in MSS" [Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 412].

phrase originally stood in Mark's gospel, which would have served as John's source.²⁵ Undeterred by dearth of manuscript support, Streeter graphically depicts four lines of a majuscule having thirteen to fourteen letters per line in order to reconstruct the lost Markan phrase.²⁶ (8) In John (20:17b), the risen Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene and sends her to his brothers. The same command appears in Matthew (28:10), where Jesus appears to two Marys. Because the narrative details—especially the number of Marys—differ, Streeter doubts a literary connection and instead appeals to oral tradition or the lost ending of Mark as John's source; Streeter also expresses caution in even claiming the parallel because 157, 1555, and Cyril of Alexandria read “disciples” instead of “brothers” in Matthew.²⁷

Streeter utilized two important methodological considerations, even if he sometimes employed the criteria inconsistently or excessively. First, for signs of John's use of Matthew, Streeter looked for Matthean redaction. Since John leaves out Matthew's mock scepter, for example, Streeter doubts that John used Matthew for the qualification that soldiers placed the crown of thorn on Jesus' head. Yet when Matthew and John lack Mark's line about doing good to the poor whenever you want, Streeter deems the correspondence a coincidence rather than admitting John's knowledge of Matthew's editorial activity. Second, Streeter emphasized the relationship between textual criticism and source criticism. Simply put, it is better to err on the side of caution than to allow dubious evidence. That **Σ** and D line up against B, for example, does cast doubt on Matthew and John's stadia parallel. At the same time, Streeter errs in devaluing itacism in the new/empty tomb parallel, and he fancifully conjectures Mark's line about Jesus going up the mountain and sitting down. Streeter's *The Four Gospels* constitutes a landmark twentieth-century work, but he undervalued the several John/Matthew parallels he discussed, and he neglected to discuss many others.

²⁵ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 412–5.

²⁶ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 414.

²⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 415.

Hans Windisch (1926)

From Matthew/Luke/John triple-tradition, Windisch includes the following connections between Matthew and John:²⁸ (1) God uses the demonstrative “this” rather than the personal “you” to declare Jesus the son (Matt 3:17b; John 1:34); (2) Jesus names Peter (Matt 16:18; John 1:42); (3) crowds following Jesus precipitates his feeding the 5000 (Matt 14:13; Luke 9:11; John 6:2); (4) Jesus climbs the mountain before feeding the 4000/5000 (Matt 15:29; John 6:3); (5) although there are text-critical variants, at the sea-crossing Matthew mentions the boat’s distance from the shore in stadia (Matt 14:24; John 6:19); (6) Matthew and John cite Zech 9:9 when Jesus enters Jerusalem (Matt 21:5; John 12:15); (7) there are citations of Isa 6:9–10 (Matt 13:14–15; John 12:40–41), although John’s text is different; (8) Jesus commands a disciple/Peter to put away his sword (Matt 26:52; John 18:10–11); (9) Pilate sits on the βῆμα (Matt 27:19; John 19:13); (10) the depictions of Jesus’ crown of thorns are similar (Matt 27:29; John 19:2); (11) Joseph of Arimathea is a μαθητής (Matt 27:57; John 19:38); (12) Joseph “takes the body” (λαβεῖν τὸ σῶμα; Matt 27:59; John 19:40); (13) John’s parallel to the Matthean and Lukan Centurion episode mentions the simultaneity of Jesus’ word and the servant’s healing (Matt 8:13; John 4:53a).

As Matthean *Sondergut* Windisch identifies Jesus’ calling his disciples “brothers” when speaking to the women (Matt 28:10; John 20:17). Windisch notes a number of parallel sayings that show John’s use of Matthew, albeit in an “idiosyncratic and eclectic manner.”²⁹ Windisch lists the following “sayings that John could only have found in Matthew”: (1) the blindness of the Pharisees (Matt 15:14; John 9:39–41); (2) the authority to bind and loose or to forgive and retain sins (Matt 16:19; John 20:22–23); (3) the connection between judgment and life (ζωή; Matt 25:46; John 5:29); (4) Windisch duplicates the command to put away the sword (Matt 26:52; John 18:11). He then lists additional Johannine sayings showing some familiarity with Matthew: (1) slaves are not greater than their masters (Matt 10:24; John 13:16; 15:20); (2) God will answer disciples’ prayers (Matt 21:22; John 14:13–14; 16:23); (3) to receive Jesus is to receive the one who sent him (Matt 10:40; John 12:44–45; 13:20); (4) one must become like a

²⁸ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 49–50; Windisch considers Mark to be John’s source whenever those two gospels have parallels.

²⁹ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 51; see also n. 1 there.

child or be born again in order to enter the kingdom (Matt 18:3; John 3:3, 5); (5) Windisch duplicates the connection between judgment and life (Matt 25:46; John 5:29).

Although Percival Gardner-Smith did not respond directly to Windisch, Gardner-Smith's two resounding criticisms would apply nonetheless. That is, Windisch did not pay sufficient attention to the role of oral tradition in developing gospel traditions, and Windisch focused on the agreements between John and Matthew without explaining their significant differences.³⁰ For example, "many stadia" differs from "twenty-five or thirty stadia," and the text-critical evidence weakens the case. Windisch simply concludes that John was most likely familiar with both Matthew and Luke in order to have so much common material,³¹ but later critics would deem such conclusions too simplistic.

H.F.D. Sparks (1952)

H.F.D. Sparks argued that John derived from Matthew the sayings about slaves not being greater than their masters (Matt 10:24–25; John 13:16; 15:20).³² Sparks notes *inter alia* that Matthew and John line up against Luke, who lacks the slave saying (6:40); John's mention of apostles (13:16) as well as persecution (15:20) fits the Matthean mission context (ch. 10)—especially considering that the persecution is "on account of (Jesus') name" (Matt 10:22; John 15:21); finally, the sayings about sending and receiving are nearly identical (Matt 10:40; 13:20). Sparks said that "we are clearly not dealing here merely with two independent versions of an isolated popular saying: we are dealing with a whole complex of ideas and material, of which the saying itself forms but a part."³³ As such, Sparks moved beyond simpler catchword connections and found a greater density of Matthew/John parallels embedded in a similar context.

³⁰ Percival Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), x–xii.

³¹ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 52.

³² H.F.D. Sparks, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew: The Evidence of John 13:16 and 15:20," *JTS* 3 (1952): 58–61.

³³ Sparks, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," 61.

Gardner-Smith offered a point-by-point rebuttal.³⁴ For example, he explained the similar context of persecution as arising from the gospels' similar historical circumstances rather than literary dependence;³⁵ he also explains Matthew's and John's different Greek wording of the sending and receiving saying as representing independent translations of an orally transmitted Aramaic saying.³⁶ In so doing, Gardner-Smith reiterates the first of his two main criticisms of arguments for John's use of the Synoptics, namely inattention to oral tradition.

Gardner-Smith ended with the following caution: "To conclude from the common use of a single saying that St. John was acquainted with Matthew is hazardous in the extreme, for the two passages in John in which the saying is contained must be set against innumerable passages in which Matthew is ignored or contradicted by the fourth evangelist."³⁷ Gardner-Smith's book had first isolated John/Synoptic parallels and then assessed their similarities and differences; if the differences outweighed the similarities in those particular cases, then Gardner-Smith argued for Johannine independence. That establishes a fair standard, in my view; however, it is fallacious then to generalize John's independence of Matthew because the majority of John's pericopes do not agree with Matthew's. As Smith points out, the field of inquiry is complicated considerably by John's many differences from the Synoptics, but John's relation to the Synoptics is not an altogether different kind of inquiry than the Synoptic Problem.³⁸

³⁴ Percival Gardner-Smith, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," *JTS* 4 (1953): 31–5.

³⁵ Gardner-Smith, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," 34.

³⁶ Gardner-Smith, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," 34.

³⁷ Gardner-Smith, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," 35; cf., "The passages in which there are correspondences between St John and the Synoptists do not stand alone and should not be considered by themselves; indeed they form a small minority among the far more numerous passages in which the discrepancies are many and glaring" [Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels*, 92].

³⁸ Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 6.

Nils Dahl (1955), Peder Borgen (1959), and Anton Dauer (1972)

John's contacts with Matthew in the Passion Narrative figure prominently in studies by Nils A. Dahl,³⁹ Dahl's student Peder Borgen,⁴⁰ and Anton Dauer.⁴¹ All three conclude that John knew oral tradition rather than Matthew's gospel, but they also maintain the interrelation of oral and written sources. In what follows, I describe the parallels those studies have in common and then relate the connections proper to each scholar. Simply by enumerating so many parallels, Dahl, Borgen, and Dauer expanded the base for investigating John's relationship to Matthew. They also mark a methodological advance in seeing the compatibility of oral and literary traditions.

Among Dahl, Borgen, and Dauer, at least two of them claim the following fifteen John/Matthew parallels:⁴² (1) There is the verbatim phrase "Judas, the one who betrayed him" (Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν; John 18:2, 5; Matt 26:25; 27:3).⁴³ (2) Jesus commands the sword be put away (John 18:11a; Matt 26:52a).⁴⁴ (3) In the garden Jesus fully expects to drink from the cup (John 18:11b), but in Gethsemane Jesus prays not to have to do so (Matt 26:39, 42).⁴⁵ (4) Caiaphas is the high priest (John 18:24; Matt 26:57).⁴⁶ (5) John 18:25 and Matt 26:70 use the

³⁹ Nils A. Dahl, "Die Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus," *NTS* 2 (1955–1956): 17–32.

⁴⁰ Peder Borgen, "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," *NTS* 5 (1958–1959): 246–59.

⁴¹ Anton Dauer, *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 18,1–19,30* (SANT 30; Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1972); for discussion, see Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 122–7.

⁴² My enumeration differs slightly from Frans Neiryck, "John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990," 16–7 n. 69; on "The Borgen-Dauer Thesis," see Frans Neiryck, "John 5,1–18 and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to P. Borgen," in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard, W. R. Farmer, F. Neiryck: Jerusalem 1984* (ed. David L. Dungan; BETL 95; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 439–40.

⁴³ Dahl, "Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus," 32; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium*, 50–51.

⁴⁴ Borgen, "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," 249; Dahl, "Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus," 32; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium*, 51–2.

⁴⁵ Borgen, "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," 249; Dahl, "Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus," 32; Dauer, *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium*, 52–3.

⁴⁶ Borgen, "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," 256; Dahl, "Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus," 32; Dauer, *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium*, 52.

aoiŕst ἠρνήσατο as opposed to Mark’s imperfect ἠρνεῖτο (14:70a) at Peter’s second denial;⁴⁷ I would add, though, that all four canonical gospels use ἠρνήσατο at Peter’s first denial (Matt 26:72; Mark 14:68; Luke 22:57; John 18:27). (6) Regarding the ear of the high priest’s slave, John 18:26 and Matt 26:51 use the word τὸ ὠτίον for ‘ear’;⁴⁸ Borgen and Dahl do not point out, though, that Luke 22:51 uses the same word, albeit in the genitive, and John 18:10 agrees with Mark 14:47 in using the diminutive τὸ ὠτάριον.

At Peter’s denial, (7) the phrase “and immediately a cock crowed” (καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν) is verbatim (John 18:27; Matt 26:74).⁴⁹ (8) Pilate “customarily” (συνήθεια, John 18:39; εἰώθει, Matt 27:15) released a prisoner at Passover.⁵⁰ (9) Soldiers put a crown of thorns on Jesus’ head (John 19:2; Matt 27:27, 29).⁵¹ (10) Pilate sits on the βῆμα (John 19:13; Matt 27:19).⁵² (11) Jesus’ name is included on the *titulus* (John 19:19; Matt 27:37).⁵³ (12) In John Jesus gives up his spirit (19:30), and in Matthew Jesus’ spirit leaves him (27:50).⁵⁴ (13) Joseph of Arimathea is Jesus’ disciple (John 19:38; Matt 27:57), and he—along with Nicodemus in John—took (λαμβάνω) Jesus’ body (σῶμα) and put it in a new (καινός) tomb (John 19:40–41;

⁴⁷ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 256; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 96–7.

⁴⁸ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 249; Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32.

⁴⁹ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 256; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 97.

⁵⁰ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 254; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 154.

⁵¹ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 251; there Borgen also mentions that John 19:1 uses τότε as in Matthew 27:27; Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 154–5.

⁵² Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 254; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 155.

⁵³ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 253; Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 221.

⁵⁴ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 253; Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johanneŕevangelium*, 222.

Matt 27:59–60).⁵⁵ (14) The resurrected Jesus refers to the disciples as “my brothers” (John 20:17; Matt 28:10).⁵⁶ (15) Finally, neither gospel mentions plans to anoint Jesus’ body on Easter morning, although John has Joseph and Nicodemus do so at the burial.⁵⁷

From the story of Jesus’ anointing, Dahl mentions the expensive perfume that could have been sold for the poor (Matt 26:3–5; Mark 14:3–9; John 12:1–8); that detail is lacking in Luke 7:36–50. Dahl also mentions seven other John/Matthew connections that show somewhat less verbal correspondence:⁵⁸ (1) The two gospels use similar verbs to gather together (συνάγω) and counsel (βουλεύω, συμβουλεύω) in the plot to kill (ἀποκτείνω) Jesus (John 11:47, 53; Matt 26:3–4). (2) John mentions Judas stealing money (12:6), and Matthew has Judas betray Jesus for money (Matt 26:15). (3) In John, Jesus refers frequently to his hour (ῥα) and says that his time (καιρός) has not yet come (7:6) or been fulfilled (v. 8); Matthew includes one reference to the nearness of Jesus’ καιρός (26:18). (4) At the Last Supper, dipping (βάπτω) food indicates Judas as the betrayer (John 13:26; Matt 26:23). (5) Matthew and John group the chief priests with the Pharisees (John 7:45; 11:47, 57; 18:3; Matt 21:45; 27:62). (6) Both gospels refer to “the Jews” (Ἰουδαῖοι, *passim* in John; Matt 28:15; Dahl does not mention the Ἰουδαῖοι in the editorial gloss at Mark 7:3). (7) Regarding the resurrection, Dahl links Thomas’s unbelief (ἄπιστος; John 20:24–29) with the disciples doubting (διστάζω; Matt 28:17).

Borgen makes the grammatical point that when Jesus’ garment is divided (διαμερίζω), John 19:24 and Matt 27:35 use an aorist indicative as opposed to Mark’s present indicative (15:24) and Luke’s present participle (23:34).⁵⁹ Borgen also includes four more John/Matthew parallels:⁶⁰ (1) John 20:12 and Matt 28:2, 5 mention respectively one and two angels (ἄγγελος); inside the tomb Mark mentions a young man (νεανίσκος; 16:5), as compared with Luke’s two

⁵⁵ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 248; Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32.

⁵⁶ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 258; Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32.

⁵⁷ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 258; Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32.

⁵⁸ Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32.

⁵⁹ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 253.

⁶⁰ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 258.

men (ἄνδρες δύο; 24:4). (2) Matthew and John refer to “where” Jesus “was lying” (ὅπου ἔκειτο, John 20:12; Matt 28:6). (3) In John, Jesus commands Mary not to cling to him (20:17), which interlocks with the Marys grabbing Jesus’ feet in Matthew (28:9). (4) In John 20:18 Mary “was announcing to the disciples” Jesus’ resurrection, and in Matt 28:8 the women run “to announce to the disciples” Jesus’ resurrection. Finally, from triple-tradition Dauer also notes that Matt 27:33; Mark 15:22; John 19:17 include Golgotha along with its meaning “the place of the skull;” Luke 23:33 says “the place called ‘skull’” without mentioning the Aramaic name.⁶¹

Dahl concludes that the connections between Matthew and John do not indicate literary dependence but that both oral and written pre-Matthean and pre-Johannine traditions interwove.⁶² Dahl adds that his student Borgen has found instances of Johannine oral tradition overlapping with synoptic pericopes that were becoming fixed in writing.⁶³ Borgen says himself that synoptic elements have come down to John already fused together, which explains the “relative freedom with which John has reproduced the synoptic material.”⁶⁴ In effect, Dahl and Borgen take up Gardner-Smith’s challenge to pay due attention to the role of oral tradition and to account for John’s differences—not just the similarities—with the Synoptics. Because the differences outweigh the similarities, Dahl and Borgen find oral tradition more plausible than literary dependence.

Dauer also considers the interplay of oral and written sources, but his project isolates not just synoptic tradition but also synoptic redaction. That is, Dauer argues that the redacted gospels of Matthew and Luke have influenced the (oral or written) pre-Johannine Passion Narrative; such is the model known as secondary orality. Where others had seen John’s synoptic parallels as entering the final editorial stage of the gospel (for example, the work of Bultmann’s ecclesiastical redactor), Dauer reverses the field and claims that synoptic redaction entered Johannine tradition at a pre-compositional stage. While Dauer’s investigation into Johannine traces of synoptic redaction marks an important advance, the attribution of synoptic redaction to a hypothetical source does not ultimately resolve the issue. That is, the pre-Johannine Passion

⁶¹ Dauer, *Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium*, 221.

⁶² Dahl, “Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 22.

⁶³ Dahl, “Die Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus,” 32.

⁶⁴ Borgen, “John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative,” 247.

Narrative may be superfluous altogether, for the processes of drawing freely on oral and written Synoptic Gospels and synoptic tradition in the creation of a new Passion Narrative would presumably look the same whether conducted by a redactor, an evangelist, or even a pre-gospel traditor. In the end, though, the sheer number of Dauer, Borgen, and Dahl's parallels reopened the question of John's relation to Matthew, a question considered all but closed in Streeter's day.

M.-É. Boismard et al. (1965–1977)

M.-É. Boismard led one of the largest-scale inquiries into the composition of the Fourth Gospel.⁶⁵ The *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français* consists of three volumes: the synopsis proper;⁶⁶ a commentary on the synopsis that reconstructs each gospel's sources and redactional layers;⁶⁷ and a commentary on the Gospel of John that is keyed to the pericopes delineated in the synopsis.⁶⁸ Boismard posits numerous literary sources for John, but the basic formulation is that the gospel was composed in three stages: Document C or John I, John II, and John III.

Boismard initially held (in vol. 2) that the final redaction of Matthew is the only Synoptic Gospel used for the final redaction of John. Boismard later (in vol. 3) complexified John's relation to Matthew. John II is considered one author who made two redactions over the course of several decades: John II-A (60–65 C.E.) served as a source for the final redaction of Matthew; then the final redaction of Matthew—along with the final redactions of Mark and Luke—served as a source for John II-B (90–100 C.E.), a key characteristic of which is John's harmonization with all three Synoptics. The final redaction of Matthew also served as a source for John III

⁶⁵ For an overview of Boismard's project, see Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 141–7; for a book-length refutation, see Frans Neiryck et al., *Jean et les synoptiques: Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.-É. Boismard* (BETL 49; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979); see also Maurits Sabbe, "John and the Synoptists: Neiryck vs. Boismard," *ETL* 56 (1980): 125–31.

⁶⁶ Pierre Benoit and M.-É. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome I: Textes* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1965).

⁶⁷ Pierre Benoit and M.-É. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome II: Commentaire par M.-É. Boismard avec la collaboration de A. Lamouille et P. Sandevor* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972).

⁶⁸ Pierre Benoit and M.-É. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome III: L'Évangile de Jean; Commentaire par M.-É. Boismard et A. Lamouille avec la collaboration de G. Rochais* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977).

(early second century).⁶⁹ Simply put, Boismard claimed both that Matthew used John and that John used Matthew.

The following summary begins with Boismard's latest compositional stage and works backwards; parallels are presented in order of appearance in John. For the most part, I bracket discussion of triple- and quadruple-traditions as well as Boismard's hypothetical original and intermediate sources because those do not evince unequivocal Matthean or Johannine language. For example, John 19:1, 2 shares with Matt 27:26, 28; Mark 15:15, 17 details of Pilate having Jesus flogged and the soldiers dressing Jesus in purple, which Boismard attributes to John II-B's use of Synoptic tradition—with John no closer to Matthew or Mark;⁷⁰ similarly John 19:17; Matt 27:33; and Mark 15:22 all name Golgotha the place of the skull, which is simply listed as a John/Mark/Matthew parallel.⁷¹

John III's use of Matthew. Although John III would have had all three Synoptics in view, John III apparently made little use of Matthew. Boismard claims an existing five “in my name” sayings (14:13, 26; 15:16; 16:23, 24), and he thinks that John III added two (14:14; 16:26); those seven sayings were intended to parallel the seven requests of the Our Father in Matt 6:9–13.⁷² John III also picks up “and the prophets” in John 1:45 from the Matthean formula “the Law and the Prophets.”⁷³ Boismard does not say why those changes had to occur at John III as opposed to John II-B.

John II-B's use of Matthew. There are at least eighteen Matthean parallels attributed to the harmonizing work of John II-B. (1) John the Baptist's wordings “I baptize in water” (John 1:26) and “the one coming” (v. 27) come from Matt 3:11.⁷⁴ (2) God declares publicly, “*this is my beloved son*” (Matt 3:17; John 1:34) rather than privately telling Jesus “*you are my beloved son*” (Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22). (3) Regarding the royal official/centurion, Boismard asks whether the

⁶⁹ For a helpful comparison of the general schemata of volumes two and three, see Neiryneck et al., *Jean et les synoptiques: Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.-É. Boismard*, 9.

⁷⁰ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:433b; Boismard's pages are double-columned, and so I use 'a' and 'b' to denote respectively left-hand and right-hand columns on a given page.

⁷¹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:438a.

⁷² Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:48b.

⁷³ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:86b.

⁷⁴ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:83a.

royal official's "child" (παῖς) in John 4:51 comes from Matt 8:13b; Boismard concludes that "the fever left him" (ἀφῆκεν αὐτον ὁ πυρετός) in John 4:52 comes from Matt 8:15, which says "her" rather than "him" in reference to Peter's mother-in-law;⁷⁵ in John 4:53 the final about the man's son being healed "in that hour" comes from Matt 8:13.⁷⁶ (4) John's feeding the 5000 knows the setting of a mountain (6:3) from Matthew's feeding the 4000 (15:29), a doublet Boismard attributes to the final redaction of Matthew.⁷⁷ (5) John learned from Matthew that Caiaphas was the high priest (Matt 26:3; John 11:49).⁷⁸ (6) Boismard cites either Matt 26:12 or Mark 14:8 as the source for John's interpretation of Jesus' anointing at Bethany as preparation for burial (12:7b).⁷⁹

In his second volume, (7) Boismard attributes the explicit citation of Zech 9:9 (John 12:14b–15; Matt 21:4–5) to the final redaction of Matthew, through which it came into John;⁸⁰ in the third volume Boismard reverses his position (cf. #5 below under Matthew's use of John II-A). (8) When Jesus announces the betrayal of Judas, John's use of "dip" (βάπτω; 13:26b) could come from either Matt 26:23 or Mark 14:20.⁸¹ (9) The eschatological imagery of gathering/collecting and throwing into fire (John 15:6) comes from Matthew 13:40–42.⁸² (10) Within the Farewell Discourse, the hatred of the world section (John 15:18–16:4a) draws on the persecution sayings in Matthew 10 in at least two instances: the servant/master saying (John

⁷⁵ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:149a.

⁷⁶ Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:161a.

⁷⁷ Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:222a.

⁷⁸ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:295b; see also 2:319a.

⁷⁹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:302a; Boismard initially claimed Matthew alone [Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:373b], but then Neirynek argued that John was closer in wording to Mark than Matthew [Frans Neirynek, "John and the Synoptics," in *L'Évangile de Jean*, 92].

⁸⁰ Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:333ab.

⁸¹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:341b; in vol. 3 Boismard is more concerned to show John II-B harmonizing all three Synoptics in John 13:21–27a, but vol. 2 had listed five distinctive John-Matthew contacts—e.g., Jesus' explicitly indicating Judas (John 13:26; Matt 26:25) [Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:379b–380a].

⁸² Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:367b.

15:20b; Matt 10:24) and the use of “on account of my name” (John 15:21; Matt 10:22).⁸³ (11) Boismard raises the possibility of John’s use of Matthew for certain details in the arrest scene: John’s use of the technical term ‘sheath’ (θήκη; 18:11) is a “correction” of Matthew’s more generic ‘place’ (τόπος; 26:52),⁸⁴ and the reference to drinking the Father’s cup in John 18:11b comes from Matt 26:42.⁸⁵ (12) The explanation about Caiaphas in John 18:13b–14 relates to Matt 26:3, 57 (cf. #5 above).⁸⁶

In Matthew, (13) Peter is on the scene prior to Jesus’ trial, after which Peter denies Jesus (26:58c, 69–75); Boismard initially said that John splits Peter’s first denial (18:15–18) from his second and third (vv. 25–27) so as to conform with Matthew,⁸⁷ but Boismard later claimed Luke 22:56–62 as John II-B’s model for splitting up the denials.⁸⁸ (14) Boismard says that it is not impossible that John II-B took over Pilate’s (customary) release of a prisoner at Passover from Matthew (John 18:39a; Matt 27:15).⁸⁹ (15) The twisted crown of thorns being placed on Jesus’ head is nearly verbatim in Matt 27:29; John 19:2.⁹⁰ (16) Matthew 27:37 provided John II-B (19:19) three details concerning the *titulus*: Matthew’s active verb ἐπιτίθημι is equivalent to John’s τίθημι ἐπί; the perfect passive participle of γράφω; and naming Jesus explicitly.⁹¹ (17) There is a notice about Joseph of Arimathea being a disciple of Jesus (John 19:38; Matt 27:57),⁹²

⁸³ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:379ab.

⁸⁴ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:404a.

⁸⁵ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:404a.

⁸⁶ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:410b; see also 2:399b.

⁸⁷ Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:401b.

⁸⁸ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:416b.

⁸⁹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:423a.

⁹⁰ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:418b; πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:29); πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῆ κεφαλῇ (John 19:2).

⁹¹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:438b.

⁹² Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:447a.

and both gospels qualify that the tomb was new (John 19:41; Matt 27:60).⁹³ (18) Though not identical, John 20:12 and Matt 28:6 refer to where (ὄπου) Jesus was laid (κείμμι).⁹⁴ Finally, in vol. 3 Boismard omitted his previously mentioned possibility that John's having Jesus reference the disciples as "brothers" and command for Mary Magdalene not to touch him (20:17) come from Matt 28:9–10;⁹⁵ also, Boismard considers Luke 24:36–49 (rather than Matt 18:18; cf. 16:19) the principal source for John II-B's redaction of John 20:22–23.⁹⁶

Matthew's use of John II-A. In both Matthew and John, (1) Jesus renames Simon as Cephas/Peter (Matt 16:16ff.; John 1:40–42).⁹⁷ For Matthew's dependence on John II-A rather than the reverse, Boismard argues that Cephas is more archaic than Peter and that the double name Simon Peter only occurs here in Matthew but is prevalent throughout John. (2) Boismard points out that the Aramaic ܨܦܬܐ (cf. Heb. ܨܦܬܐ) in apposition with another verb signifies repetitive action. Accordingly Matthew's use of στρέφω would have Jesus say in Aramaic to "become again like little children" (Matt 18:3). For Boismard, then, John II-A's "born again" saying in Jesus' dialogue with Nicodemus (John 3:3) came from Matthew.⁹⁸ (3) The final

⁹³ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:448a; Boismard had earlier included as John-Matthew parallels Pilate's permitting Joseph to take Jesus' body (John 19:38b; Matt 27:58) and the repetition of τὸ σῶμα (John 19:40; Matt 27:58) [Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:435b–436a].

⁹⁴ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:460a.

⁹⁵ Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:446a; cf. 3:465b–466ab.

⁹⁶ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:470b–471a.

⁹⁷ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:96a; he notes that Jesus calls Simon "son of John" in Matthew, but Boismard does not point out the connection that—unlike Mark and Luke—John also knows Simon's father's name.

⁹⁸ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:118b (2aa); Boismard raises the possibility that that the Matthean saying stood already in Document A (Primal Matthew); he also mentions Mark 10:15 as a parallel but considers Matthew and John closer to each other than to Mark in this instance [M.-É. Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:118a]. Relatedly, Barnabas Lindars would later argue that the Matthean, Markan, and Johannine sayings are independent variations of an orally-transmitted Aramaic saying [Barnabas Lindars, "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case," *NTS* 27 (1980–1981): 287–94]. Later still, John Pryor would argue that John knew the tradition behind the Matthean saying but not the Gospel of Matthew or a separate Markan tradition [John W. Pryor, "John 3.3, 5. A Study in the Relation of John's Gospel to the Synoptic Problem," *JSNT* 41 (1991): 71–95]. Other arguments for a Semitic *Vorlage* to one or more of these sayings include the following: Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology I: The Proclamation of Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; New York: Scribner's, 1971), 155; Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), 253; P. Joüon, "Notes Philologiques sur les Évangiles," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 18 (1928): 347.

redaction of Matthew possibly used John II-A for the saying about the will of the Father (Matt 18:14; John 6:39).⁹⁹ (4) Boismard also considers the references to “the prophet” and “Galilee” in John 7:40–43 (John II) to have influenced Matt 21:11.¹⁰⁰ (5) John II-A related that the chief priests “decided” (βουλεύω) to put Jesus to death (John 11:53; cf. συμβουλεύω in Matt 26:4).¹⁰¹ (6) In vol. 2 Boismard had attributed the explicit citation of Zech 9:9 (John 12:14b–15; Matt 21:4–5) to the final redaction of Matthew, through which it came into John.¹⁰² In vol. 3 he reverses his position: the Zechariah citation is now credited to John II-A, which served as a source for the final redaction of Matthew; in turn, Matthew served as a source for John II-B, who only added the line about the disciples not understanding the significance of the event until Jesus’ glorification (John 12:16).¹⁰³

Analysis. To his credit, Boismard isolates numerous John-Matthew parallels that have largely been ignored both before and after his publications. He also takes painstaking effort to identify the stylistic vocabulary each of his sources.¹⁰⁴ However, his overall project has not proved compelling, and there are two main criticisms. First, the stratification of the Gospel of John is overly complex.¹⁰⁵ For example, there is hardly anything that distinguishes John II-A from II-B.¹⁰⁶ Second, there is practically no consideration of oral tradition.¹⁰⁷ That is, Boismard assumes

⁹⁹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:199a.

¹⁰⁰ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:307a.

¹⁰¹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:296a; on the previous page, Boismard says that the chief priests’ decision-making already stood in Document C (John I), which was known to Document A (Primal Matthew); either way, Boismard sees Matthew’s use of John in this instance.

¹⁰² Boismard, *Synopse*, 2:333ab.

¹⁰³ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:309b–310a.

¹⁰⁴ See Appendix 1: “Liste des caractéristiques stylistiques” (Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:491–514).

¹⁰⁵ Robert Kysar, review of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, with the collaboration of G. Rochais, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: Tome III, JBL* 98 (1979): 607 [605–7]; Raymond Brown, review of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *L’Évangile de Jean* (*Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français* 3), *CBQ* 40 (1978): 625 [624–8]: “When it is charted, it looks like a twelve-man football team with a lot of motion in the backfield;” Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 142.

¹⁰⁶ Kysar, review of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille (vol. 3), 607; the same goes for John III.

¹⁰⁷ Kysar, review of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille (vol. 3), 607.

a “scissors and paste” model, according to which every coincidence of verbal similarity among the gospels must result from literary dependence. Regarding the John-Matthew parallels in particular, Boismard posits Matthew’s use of John II-A, which Neiryneck considers Boismard’s biggest blunder;¹⁰⁸ I too find the argument untenable.

Despite certain shortcomings in Boismard’s endeavors, one of his conclusions holds enormous weight and shows great potential for the purposes of this dissertation. Matthew narrates that “the fever left her” (ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός; Matt 8:15; cf. Mark 1:31b) when Jesus touches the hand of Peter’s mother-in-law, and John has the royal official’s servants say in regard to the son that “the fever left him” (ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός; John 4:52).¹⁰⁹ Except for differently gendered pronouns, the sayings are verbatim. Regarding John’s royal official (βασιλικός; 4:46b–54), scholars have long noted the story’s commonalities with Matthew and Luke’s centurion (ἐκκτόνταρχος; Matt 8:5–13; Q/Luke 7:1–10); for example, Ulrich Wilckens claims that John used both Matthew and Luke.¹¹⁰ Yet the differences among the accounts have made the episode a classic case for form critics: the three gospel episodes not only follow the generic structure of a healing narrative (e.g., statement of sickness, request for healing, performance of healing, and response of crowd) but also emphasize that the healing is performed remotely. While being transmitted orally, the story underwent slight variations such that the boy’s exact sickness could alter: Matthew names paralysis (8:6); John says fever (4:52); and Luke says only that the slave was about to die (7:2). However, Boismard astutely read across pericopes and found an alternate explanation as to why John wrote that the boy had taken a fever: Matthew’s line about Peter’s mother-in-law’s fever leaving her occurs just two sentences after the conclusion of the centurion pericope. In other words, John appears to reflect knowledge of Matthew’s redactional transition from one pericope to the next.

¹⁰⁸ Neiryneck et al., *Jean et les synoptiques: Examen critique de l’exégèse de M.-É. Boismard*, 21: “sans doute pas plus qu’un faux pas dans l’ensemble de l’hypothèse de Boismard;” in Chapter 8, pp. 175–203, Neiryneck discusses “Jean II-A et les Synoptiques.”

¹⁰⁹ Boismard, *Synopse*, 3:149a.

¹¹⁰ Ulrich Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 89.

Frans Neiryndck (1969–1995)

Frans Neiryndck considers Matt 28:9–10 “sufficiently different from Mark to be taken as special material in Matthew, and sufficiently close to Mark to be accepted as Matthew’s editorial composition.”¹¹¹ That is, Matt 28:9–10 evinces both Matthean *Sondergut* and Matthean redaction, and Neiryndck has argued repeatedly that the two verses served as a source for John 20:11–18.¹¹²

With no Markan parallel, Matt 28:9c tells that the two Marys “grabbed (Jesus’) feet” (ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας), which interlocks with Jesus’ command for Mary Magdalene to stop clinging to him (μὴ μου ἄπτου; John 20:17b).¹¹³ In other words, Matthew tells that Mary took hold of Jesus but Jesus does not tell her to let go, whereas John has Jesus tell Mary to let go without having mentioned that she took hold. In that instance, John reflects knowledge of Matthean *Sondergut*.

Matthew 28:10 shows Matthew’s redaction of Mark 16:6–7. The main difference is that Matthew turned the angelophany into a Christophany, but the commands to the women appear nearly verbatim, showing mostly synonymous alterations.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Neiryndck, “John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990,” 34.

¹¹² Frans Neiryndck, “Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la rédaction Matthéenne,” *NTS* 15 (1968–1969): 168–90, esp. 176–84; repr. in idem, *Evangelica* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck; BETL 60; Leuven: Peeters, 1982); idem, “John and the Synoptics,” in *L’Évangile de Jean* [BETL 44], 96–8; repr. in *Evangelica*; idem, “John and the Synoptics: The Empty Tomb Stories,” *NTS* 30 (1984): 161–87, esp. 166–71; repr. in idem, *Evangelica II: 1982–1991* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck; BETL 99; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991); idem, “John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990,” in *John and the Synoptics* [BETL 101], 33–5; idem, “Note on Mt 28,9-10,” *ETL* 71 (1995): 161–5; repr. in *Evangelica III*.

¹¹³ The observation of which dates back at least as far as Augustine (*Tract. Ev. Jo.* 121.3).

¹¹⁴ For Neiryndck’s synopsis, see Neiryndck, “Les Femmes au Tombeau,” 183.

Table 2.1 Synopsis of Mark 16:6ab, 7; Matt 28:10

Mark 16:6ab, 7

ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς
μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε
ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἶπατε
τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι
προάγει ὑμᾶς
εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε
καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν

Matt 28:10

τότε λέγει αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
μὴ φοβεῖσθε
ὑπάγετε ἀπαγγείλατε
τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου
ἵνα
ἀπέλθωσιν
εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
κάκῃ με ὄψονται

Mark's related the command to go to Jesus' "disciples," which Matthew changed to "brothers." In John 20:17c, Jesus commands Mary Magdalene to go to his "brothers," and in v. 18 she tells the disciples that she has seen the Lord. John's use of ἀδελφούς reflects knowledge of Matthean redaction. In summary, Neirynek's exegesis of John's use of Matt 28:9–10 provides a substantial basis for the undertakings of this dissertation.

Bruno de Solages (1979)

Bruno de Solages conducted a statistical survey of John's contacts with the Synoptics, and he includes a chapter on "John and Matthew."¹¹⁵ He discusses twelve parallels, those taken from the synopsis he had published twenty years earlier.¹¹⁶ De Solages argues that John neither knew nor used Matthew.

De Solages divides the points of contact between Matthew and John into two groups, the first of which also show Markan (and sometimes Lukan) parallels:¹¹⁷ (1) Caiaphas is named as high priest (John 18:13; Matt 26:57); the high priest is unnamed in Mark 14:53 and Luke 22:54a, and Luke 3:2 refers to the joint high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas. (2) Soldiers put the crown of thorns on Jesus' "head" (John 19:2b; Matt 27:29), not just on "him" (Mark 15:17). (3) The *titulus* is attached to the cross (John 19:19; Matt 27:37), which de Solages says Mark implies; *pace de*

¹¹⁵ Bruno de Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), 99–113 (ch. 2).

¹¹⁶ Bruno de Solages, *A Greek Synopsis of the Gospels: A New Way of Solving the Synoptic Problem* (trans. J. Baissus; Leiden: Brill, 1959); Fr. ed., 1958.

¹¹⁷ De Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques*, 112; see pp. 100–102 for charts and statistics.

Solages, Mark 15:26 and Luke 23:38 do not include Jesus' name as in Matthew and John. (4) Mark says that Joseph of Arimathea was "expecting the kingdom of God" (Mark 15:43; Luke 23:51), which de Solages considers "quasi equivalent" to Matthew and John's naming him a disciple (John 19:38a; Matt 27:57). (5) Mentioning Jesus' body explicitly (John 19:40a; Matt 27:59) is the same as the pronoun "him" (Mark 15:46a; Luke 23:53a). (6) Matthew and John could have known independently that the tomb was new (John 19:41a; Matt 27:60). De Solages concludes, "Nothing in these texts betrays a literary dependence of John with regard to Matthew."¹¹⁸ For de Solages, Matthew and John added the above-mentioned details independently through the mediation of Markan tradition.

De Solages considers the second group to have no Markan (or Lukan) parallels:¹¹⁹ (1) In different contexts, Matthew and John include an eschatological saying that connects the themes of judgment and life (John 5:29; Matt 25:46). (2) Jesus goes up the mountain and sits down (John 6:3; Matt 15:29). (3) Jesus commands a disciple to put away a sword (John 18:11a; Matt 26:52). (4) To varying degrees Jesus seems willing to drink from the cup (John 18:11b; Matt 26:42). (5) Mary grabs Jesus' feet (Matt 28:9), which interlocks with Jesus' command to the Marys not to cling to him (John 20:17); also Jesus refers to his "brothers" (John 20:17; Matt 28:10). (6) Matthew's sayings about binding and loosing parallel John's forgiving and retaining sins (John 20:23; Matt 18:18; cf. Matt 16:19). For de Solages the first three raise some doubt about John's ignorance of Matthew, but then he reasons John should not have used so little of Matthew's gospel had he known it; the last three raise no doubt whatsoever, and de Solages rules out literary dependence with certainty.¹²⁰

The book includes no bibliography, and the work's greatest limitation is the abbreviated list of connections between Matthew and John. Compared with the lists previously compiled by Dahl, Borgen, Dauer, and Boismard, de Solages could have investigated a number of other parallels, which might have raised more doubts about John's ignorance of Matthew.

¹¹⁸ De Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques*, 112.

¹¹⁹ De Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques*, 112–3; see pp. 103–11 for charts and statistics.

¹²⁰ De Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques*, 113.

Gerhard Maier (1981)

Gerhard Maier addresses the inattention to Matthew in studies of John and the Synoptics,¹²¹ but Maier explicitly stops short of a detailed discussion regarding John's "use" of Matthew.¹²² Maier focuses instead on seven thematic similarities: (1) 'I am' sayings; (2) Jesus' role as the Son of God; (3) messianic debates; (4) the role of the Spirit; (5) the demand for a sign; (6) bread and food as figuring "spiritual life;" (7) and "John as Supplement of Matthew."

Regarding John's supplementation, Maier harmonizes the endings to Matthew's and John's narratives of Jesus' feeding the 5000. According to Maier, Jesus compels the disciples to leave (Matt 14:22) in order to protect them from the "messianic frenzy of the crowd"—that is, the people's ambitions to make Jesus king (John 6:15).¹²³ Here, as throughout the essay, Maier compares John to Matthew even if Mark or Luke barely differ; for example, Matt 14:22 agrees nearly verbatim with Mark 6:45, which Maier nonetheless brackets from his discussion of the feeding narratives' endings. In many cases, then, John lacks any special connection to Matthew.

In the end, Maier reaches five conclusions regarding John and Matthew: (1) there is more commonality than usually admitted; (2) their differences should not be overstated; (3) it is worth asking whether John is closer to Matthew than to Mark or Luke; (4) it is permissible to assume the historicity of common tradition between John and Matthew—so much so that one could cautiously supplement (i.e., harmonize) the four canonical gospels with one another; (5) John's stance vis-à-vis Judaism is similar to Matthew's.¹²⁴

Historicity appears to be Maier's main purpose. That is, Maier affirms the historical accuracy of John/Matthew parallels especially as it pertains to Jesus' "christological self-consciousness"—as shown through the 'I am' sayings, for example.¹²⁵ Maier did not seek to establish a literary relationship between the gospels of Matthew and John, and his thematic parallels connect only loosely, and yet he showed good instincts in examining the two gospels alongside one another.

¹²¹ Gerhard Maier, "Johannes und Matthäus—Zwiespalt oder Viergestalt des Evangeliums?" in *Gospel Perspectives, Vol. II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (ed. R. T. France and David Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 269 [267–91].

¹²² Maier, "Johannes und Matthäus," 270.

¹²³ Maier, "Johannes und Matthäus," 286.

¹²⁴ Maier, "Johannes und Matthäus," 286–7.

¹²⁵ Maier, "Johannes und Matthäus," 278.

Austin Farrer (1983, posthumous)

John Muddiman published a posthumous letter from Austin Farrer concerning John's use of Matthew—the order of John 5–6 in particular.¹²⁶ Matthew and John put the following parallel pericopes in the same order: healing the centurion's child (Matt 8:5–13) and royal official's son (John 4:46b–54); healing the paralyzed man in Capernaum (Matt 9:1–8) and the paralyzed man at the Pool of Beth-zatha (John 5:1ff.); and feeding the 5000 (Matt 14:13–21; John 6:1–15).¹²⁷

Oddly enough Farrer also thinks that the purported original order—ch. 6 preceding ch. 5—shows John's use of Matthew for the following parallel pericopes: Jesus and John the Baptist (Matthew 3; John 1); Jesus' relocation to Capernaum (Matt 4:12–16; John 2:12); the centurion/royal official (Matt 8:5–13; John 4:46–54); Jesus' feeding the 5000 and waking on water (Matt 14:13–32; 15:32–39; John 6:1–21); and Peter's confession (Matt 16:13–20; John 6:66–71).¹²⁸ Also, according to Matthew, Jesus ransacks the temple (21:12–13) and heals people immediately thereafter (v. 14); to Farrer that indicates why John placed the healing of the paralyzed man (ch. 5) after the temple incident (2:14–15).¹²⁹ As additional parallels, Farrer connected Matthew's denunciation of scribes and Pharisees as "blind guides" (23:16) to the Pharisees' blindness in John (9:40).¹³⁰ Muddiman added the suggestion that John took over the fever of the royal official's son from Matthew's transition from the paralysis of the centurion's child (8:6) to the fever of Peter's mother-in-law (8:14–15).¹³¹

Farrer's arguments from order prove less convincing since John would have omitted so much Matthean material—for example, Matt 9:9–14:12. More problematically, Farrer does not account for the many verbal differences between parallel accounts. Consequently Dale Allison has dubbed some of Farrer's exegesis as Typologicalmania.¹³² Yet the theme of pharisaic blindness

¹²⁶ John Muddiman, "John's Use of Matthew: A British Exponent of the Theory," *ETL* 59 (1983): 333–7.

¹²⁷ Muddiman, "John's Use of Matthew," 334; by contrast, Luke's account of the healing of the paralyzed man (5:17–26) precedes the healing of the centurion's slave (7:1–10) [p. 334 n. 12].

¹²⁸ Muddiman, "John's Use of Matthew," 335.

¹²⁹ Muddiman, "John's Use of Matthew," 335.

¹³⁰ Muddiman, "John's Use of Matthew," 337.

¹³¹ Muddiman, "John's Use of Matthew," 337.

¹³² Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 18–9.

and the line about the fever leaving him/her are somewhat stronger parallels, ones that others had also noticed—for example, Windisch and Boismard respectively.

Rosel Baum-Bodenbender (1984)

Rosel Baum-Bodenbender discusses synoptic parallels to John 18:18–19:16a.¹³³ For John 18:39–40, including Pilate’s Passover prisoner-release program (John 18:39; Matt 27:15), Baum-Bodenbender concludes that John shows literary dependence on all three Synoptics.¹³⁴ She concludes the same for John 19:1–3, which includes the nearly verbatim agreement with Matthew concerning the crown of thorns.¹³⁵ Baum-Bodenbender considers Matthew and Luke equally responsible for John’s reference to Caiaphas as high priest,¹³⁶ but Pilate sitting on the βῆμα (John 19:13a; Matt 27:19) represents Matthean *Sondergut*, which may or may not imply direct literary dependence.¹³⁷ Baum-Bodenbender ultimately attributes cases of John’s literary dependence on the Synoptics to secondary redaction (Schicht B).¹³⁸ Smith writes, “The analyses and results of many other commentators are, in effect, stood on their heads, in that Baum-Bodenbender holds what is distinctly Johannine as more primitive and what is less so as a later attempt to conform John to the broader traditions.” Whereas Dauer, for example, had isolated instances of synoptic redaction in John but attributed them to a pre-gospel stage, Baum-Bodenbender argues for direct literary dependence—albeit at a later stage of John’s composition—intended to conform John to the Synoptics.

¹³³ Rosel Baum-Bodenbender, *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit: Johanneische Christologie im Prozeß Jesu vor Pilatus (Joh 18,28–19,16a)* (FB 49; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984), 176–218; for discussion of the work as a whole, see Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 128–37.

¹³⁴ Baum-Bodenbender, *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit*, 191–2.

¹³⁵ Baum-Bodenbender, *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit*, 196.

¹³⁶ Baum-Bodenbender, *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit*, 203.

¹³⁷ Baum-Bodenbender, *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit*, 214.

¹³⁸ Baum-Bodenbender, *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit*, 218.

George Howard (1992)

George Howard argues that John depends not on the canonical Gospel of Matthew but on its lost Hebrew *Vorlage*.¹³⁹ Claims of Matthew's translation from Hebrew into Greek reach as far back as Papias in the late-first to early-second century (quoted in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16). Howard works toward recovering that text, but his arguments prove unconvincing on philological grounds.

In earlier research, Howard had reconstructed a Hebrew text of Matthew "from a fourteenth-century Jewish polemical treatise, entitled *Even Bohan* ["Touchstone"], written by the Spanish author, Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut,"¹⁴⁰ Howard had then sought to establish an early second century date for Shem-Tob's *Vorlage*.¹⁴¹ Howard's argument rests on the originality of "nondivergent parallels," a term he prefers to "harmonizations."¹⁴² That is, when the Gospel of John aligns with Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew, Howard denies that such parallels result from scribal harmonization. Text-critically, though, Howard cannot explain why scribes would later have altered such readings.

Howard's work has not gained wide acceptance, and I agree with William Petersen's conclusion that Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew must be a secondary work based on previously harmonized texts.¹⁴³ That solution adequately accounts for the fact that "Shem-Tob's text has numerous agreements with the Fourth Gospel in places where there is no agreement between the Greek Matthew and John."¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ George Howard, "A Note on Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of John," *JSNT* 47 (1992): 117–26.

¹⁴⁰ George Howard, "Note on Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of John," 119; see idem, *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text* (Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1987); Howard draws on another of his earlier publications: idem, "Harmonistic Readings in the Old Syriac Gospels," *HTR* 73 (1980): 473–91.

¹⁴¹ George Howard, "The Textual Nature of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew," *JBL* 108 (1989): 239–57; idem, "A Note on Codex Sinaiticus and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew," *NovT* 34 (1992): 46–7; idem, "The Pseudo-Clementine Writings and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew," *NTS* 40 (1994): 622–8.

¹⁴² Howard, "Textual Nature of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew," 250.

¹⁴³ William L. Petersen, review of G. Howard, *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text*, *JBL* 108 (1989): 726 [722–6].

¹⁴⁴ Howard, "Note on Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of John," 120.

Some of Howard’s John/Matthew parallels are also philologically suspect. For example, Shem-Tob Matthew’s נדנך (‘sheath’ in biblical Hebrew) agrees with John’s θήκη (‘sheath’; 18:11) against Matthew’s τόπος (‘place’; 26:52).¹⁴⁵ The usual Hebrew cognate for ‘place’ (Eng.) is מקום, which refers to topographic locations, stations, or dwellings but never to storage vessels. That is, when τόπος would signify the ‘place’ to which one returns a sword, the one Hebrew term נדנך would cover both Greek terms τόπος and θήκη; by comparison, Jastrow defines נדך as a “place where a thing is put” and lists the cognates ‘sheath’ and ‘case’. Regarding Matt 26:52//John 18:11, then, Howard has more likely identified a limitation of Greek to Hebrew retroversion than an unequivocal relationship between John and Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew. Overall, a relationship between Matthew and John will prove more convincing if based on the canonical texts as opposed to their hypothetical *Vorlagen*.

Thomas Brodie (1993)

Thomas Brodie includes a chapter on John’s use of Matthew in his source-oriented investigation of John.¹⁴⁶ Brodie’s examples usually lack close verbal agreement and focus instead on general themes. First, Brodie claims that John 7–8 constitutes a thorough reworking of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount (chs. 5–7).¹⁴⁷ For example, Matthew’s “You are the light of the world” (5:14a) becomes an “I am” saying in John (8:12b),¹⁴⁸ and Jesus’ teaching about circumcision in John 7:22–23 represents Jesus’ “deepening the law” as in the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:21–41).¹⁴⁹ Brodie also sees a general theme of “externalism” connecting John 8:31–59 to Matt 6:1–18; 23:13–36,¹⁵⁰ and he links John’s references to the

¹⁴⁵ Howard, “A Note on Shem-Tob’s Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of John,” 121; Hoard lists eighteen John/Shem-Tob Matthew parallels on pp. 120–121.

¹⁴⁶ Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 101–15 [ch. 9].

¹⁴⁷ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel*, 103–9.

¹⁴⁸ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel*, 106.

¹⁴⁹ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel*, 106.

¹⁵⁰ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel*, 107.

patriarch Abraham (8:33, 37, 39) to the Baptist's saying in Matt 3:9;¹⁵¹ Brodie does not explain why John had to use Matthew's text rather than the Baptist's verbatim statement in Luke 3:8b.

Second, Brodie finds points of contact between John's good shepherd discourse (ch. 10) and Matthew's apostolic discourse (ch. 10).¹⁵² For example, Brodie notes the verbal similarity of gate/door, sheep, and wolves in Matt 7:13–15 and John 10:1–21.¹⁵³ He also claims a looser connection: "The image of the disciples as being in the midst of wolves [Matt 10:16–17a, 26–31] has been converted into the image of Jesus as being surrounded by the Jews [John 10:22–30]."¹⁵⁴

Third, Brodie sees three stages of discipleship in John 13–17, for which he claims a broad correspondence to Matthew's church and apocalyptic discourses (chs. 18, 25).¹⁵⁵ In addition to such structural and thematic parallels, though, Brodie isolates a tighter verbal connection between Matthew's binding and loosing saying and John's forgiving and retaining sins saying (John 20:19–23; cf. Matt 18:15–20).¹⁵⁶ Brodie also parallels Jesus' Parable of the Slaves' Talents (Matt 25:14–30) with Jesus' servant saying when washing the disciples' feet;¹⁵⁷ Brodie does not mention that John 13:16 has a nearly verbatim parallel in Matt 10:24.

Urban C. von Wahlde has commented on the difficulty in appraising the work of Brodie, who admits to determining relationships between texts without dwelling unduly on their differences.¹⁵⁸ In my assessment, when Brodie isolates strong verbal connections, he does not go into detail regarding the texts' interrelatedness, and his claimed thematic connections would be difficult to verify. In other words, John's relationship to Matthew is more presupposed than demonstrated.

¹⁵¹ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 108.

¹⁵² Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 110–113.

¹⁵³ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 109.

¹⁵⁴ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 112.

¹⁵⁵ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 113–5.

¹⁵⁶ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 114.

¹⁵⁷ Brodie, *Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 115.

¹⁵⁸ Urban C. von Wahlde, review of Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*, *CBQ* 56 (1994), 582; the reference is to Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel*, 63.

Udo Schnelle (1994–2004)

Udo Schnelle lists several John/Matthew parallels, but he does not think that John knew Matthew. Aside from triple and quadruple traditions, Schnelle lists three John/Matthew parallels in his New Testament *Einleitung*.¹⁵⁹ Under the heading ‘Agreements in the sayings tradition’, Schnelle includes Mary and Peter’s respective declarations, “You are the Christ, the son of God” (John 11:27; Matt 16:16) as well as John’s parallel to Matthew’s binding and loosing saying (John 20:23; Matt 18:18); as one of Schnelle’s ‘Additional points of contact’, he says that “The Jewish leaders condemn Jesus to death” (John 11:47, 53; Matt 26:3–4). Schnelle also discusses John’s use of the Old Testament as a separate category from John’s contacts with the Synoptics, and so Schnelle does not indicate shared Johannine and Matthean citations. For example, he cites John 12:15 (the donkey prophecy from Zech 9:9),¹⁶⁰ but Schnelle does not connect that reference to Matthew’s use of the same prophecy (21:5); he tacitly implies John’s independent christological Old Testament exegesis. Schnelle concludes that John knew Mark and perhaps Luke but that John did not use them extensively;¹⁶¹ Schnelle does not think that John knew or used Matthew. Schnelle takes up the same position in his commentary on John.¹⁶²

Ulrich Wilckens (2000)

Wilckens notes the consensus of explaining John’s synoptic parallels by means of oral tradition, and he does not deny the continual influence of oral tradition on John—even after the writing of the gospel (e.g., John 7:53–8:11 entered the text in the third century).¹⁶³ However, Wilckens argues for John’s literary use of all three Synoptics, and he offers the analogy of “apocryphal” gospels that tend to construct new gospel narratives by reworking and harmonizing preexisting ones (e.g., Mark 16:9–20); Wilckens adds that John expected his readers’ familiarity

¹⁵⁹ Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 497–8; 1st Ger. ed. 1994.

¹⁶⁰ Schnelle, *History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, 496.

¹⁶¹ Schnelle, *History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, 500.

¹⁶² Udo Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (3d ed.; THKNT 4; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004).

¹⁶³ Ulrich Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 3.

with corresponding synoptic accounts.¹⁶⁴ For example, John knew and used both Matthew and Luke's accounts of Jesus' healing the centurion's child/slave;¹⁶⁵ for Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, John knew only the three Synoptic Gospels;¹⁶⁶ and Matthew's binding and loosing saying (18:18; cf. 16:19) stands in the background of John's saying about forgiving and retaining sins.¹⁶⁷ Wilckens claims John's free reworking of written sources and thus leaves much to authorial prerogative. As such, Wilckens lacks specific explanations of John's divergences, and ultimately he presupposes John's knowledge and use of the Synoptics because John evinces occasional parallels with each of the three. Wilckens's comparison between John and the apocryphal gospels is a helpful one, though, and his reading strategy can be validated by making a stronger case for literary dependence.

Benedict Viviano (2004)

Benedict Viviano studies "John's hypothetical but probable use of Matthew."¹⁶⁸ Viviano includes quadruple tradition, Matthew/Mark/John triple tradition, as well as John/Q parallels, but he focuses on John's reinterpretation of Matthew. Viviano considers Windisch's replacement hypothesis tempting but improbable,¹⁶⁹ and he opts for a more complex relationship between the first and fourth gospels.

Viviano explores twelve case studies. (1) Matthew tells of Jesus' human origins from a virgin (ch. 1), and John describes Jesus' heavenly origins from God (ch. 1), but the two views are not contradictory.¹⁷⁰ (2) Matthew emphasizes ethics and has Jesus tell the disciples that they are the light of the world (5:14), whereas John emphasizes Christology and has Jesus say that he is the

¹⁶⁴ Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, 4.

¹⁶⁵ Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, 89.

¹⁶⁶ Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, 188.

¹⁶⁷ Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, 313.

¹⁶⁸ Benedict T. Viviano, "John's Use of Matthew: Beyond Tweaking," *RB* 111 (2004): 235 [209–37]; repr. in idem, *Matthew and His World: The Gospel of the Open Jewish Christians: Studies in Biblical Theology* (NTOA 61; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007); similarly in Viviano's abstract he "presupposes direct Johannine knowledge of the synoptics" [p. 209].

¹⁶⁹ Viviano, "John's Use of Matthew," 212.

¹⁷⁰ Viviano, "John's Use of Matthew," 213–5.

light of the world (8:12); John may offer a corrective, but again the two views are compatible.¹⁷¹ (3) The evangelist John has John the Baptist say that he is not Elijah (1:21), which flatly contradicts Matthew's record of Jesus identifying the Baptist as such (11:14).¹⁷² (4) Viviano sees elements of the transfiguration (Matt 17:1–9; Mark 9:2–9; Luke 9:28–36) throughout John 7 and 8; for example, John's makes Sukkoth explicit (7:2) even though it lies behind Peter's statement about making tents (Matt 17:4c; Mark 9:5b; Luke 9:33b).¹⁷³ (5) Viviano cites C. K. Barrett's argument that John's subordinationist Christology holds the same function as the synoptic Messianic Secret.¹⁷⁴ (6) In Mark, Jesus defends healing on the Sabbath because it is permissible to do good on the Sabbath (3:4), to which Matthew adds that priests work on the Sabbath (12:5); John supplements Matthew by claiming that even God works on the Sabbath (5:17b).¹⁷⁵

Through engagement with Paul Anderson's work,¹⁷⁶ (7) Viviano concludes that—compared with Matthew—John demotes Peter but does not demonize him,¹⁷⁷ which amounts to “restrained criticism.”¹⁷⁸ (8) John possibly corrects the Q tradition about turning the other cheek (Matt 5:39b; Luke 6:29) when Jesus talks back to the high priest's underling (John 18:23).¹⁷⁹ (9) Viviano refers to ten fulfillment quotations each in Matthew and John, and when citing Zech 9:9 John only mentions one donkey upon Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (John 12:14–15), thereby

¹⁷¹ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 215–7.

¹⁷² Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 217–9.

¹⁷³ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 219–20.

¹⁷⁴ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 220–222; see C. K. Barrett, “‘The Father is greater than I’ (John 14:28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament,” in *Neues Testament und Kirche: Festschrift für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (ed. Joachim Gnilka; Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 144–59; repr. in idem, *Essays on John* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 19–36.

¹⁷⁵ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 222–3.

¹⁷⁶ Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in Light of John 6* (WUNT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996; repr. with a new introduction, outlines, and epilogue, Eugene, Or.: Cascade, 2010).

¹⁷⁷ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 223–9.

¹⁷⁸ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 235–6.

¹⁷⁹ Viviano, “John's Use of Matthew,” 229–30.

improving Matt 21:2, 5.¹⁸⁰ (10) With reference to W.R.G. Loader,¹⁸¹ Viviano cites John 3:31–36; 10:14–15; 17:25 as related to the Q saying about the Father’s transfer of authority to the Son (Matt 11:27; Luke 10:22).¹⁸² (11) John agrees with Matthew that Jesus has the power to judge (Matt 25:31–46), but John shifts the responsibility such that those who are judged have condemned themselves by not believing (John 3:17–18).¹⁸³ (12) John improves Matthew by having Jesus call the disciples friends (John 15:14–15) rather than slaves (Matt 10:24–25a);¹⁸⁴ elsewhere Viviano describes that example as John’s “subtle nuance and refinement” of Matthew.¹⁸⁵

Viviano’s case studies range from general themes (e.g., Jesus’ origins) to specific pericopes (e.g., quoting Zech 9:9 when Jesus enters Jerusalem), and some connections are stronger than others; for example, at the Transfiguration Peter’s comment about building tents does not necessarily indicate Sukkoth. Also, by presupposing John’s use of Matthew, the study lies open to Gardner-Smith’s criticism regarding neglect of oral tradition. As for Gardner-Smith’s other main criticism, though, Viviano does well both to explain John’s differences from Matthew and in so doing to avoid Windisch’s false dichotomies according to which John either supplemented, reinterpreted, or supplanted the Synoptics. In summary, while Viviano’s study lacks source critical foundations, it nonetheless constructs a working hermeneutic for John’s relatedness to Matthew.

¹⁸⁰ Viviano, “John’s Use of Matthew,” 230–231.

¹⁸¹ W.R.G. Loader, “The Central Structure of Johannine Christology,” *NTS* 30 (1984): 188–216.

¹⁸² Viviano, “John’s Use of Matthew,” 231–3; Viviano says that “Matt 11:27 is a/the germ from which all later Christology, including and especially the Johannine, develops” [p. 232]; he adds, “There is obviously no criticism by John of Matthew here. If there were one, it might be stated thus: why did you not develop the implications of your filial Christology yourself?” [p. 232].

¹⁸³ Viviano, “John’s Use of Matthew,” 233–4; the parenthetical references to 5:16, 17 at the top of p. 234 seem to have in mind John 3:16, 17.

¹⁸⁴ Viviano, “John’s Use of Matthew,” 234–5.

¹⁸⁵ Viviano, “John’s Use of Matthew,” 236.

Hartmut Thyen (2005)

Hartmut Thyen earlier accepted Neiryneck's demonstration of John's knowledge of Matthean redaction in the narrative of the risen Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene.¹⁸⁶ Thyen now has a commentary,¹⁸⁷ which Sean Winter's review describes as an exploration "in terms of intertextuality rather than sources."¹⁸⁸ Thyen explains:

It appears to me...very much more probable that aside from the Jewish Bible John not only knew an anonymous *tradition*—to him possibly only *orally* transmitted—similar to the Synoptics and had used it as *source*, but rather that he played intertextually with the Old Testament texts just as with the Synoptic Gospels in their transmitted redactional forms. And indeed not only with the Gospel of Mark but also with the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke.¹⁸⁹

Thyen adds that a reader familiar with the Synoptics would presuppose such Johannine intertextual play.¹⁹⁰

Thyen claims Matt 28:9, where the Marys grasp Jesus' feet, as the pretext behind Jesus' command not to touch him in John 20:17.¹⁹¹ Following Neiryneck, that would be the one clear instance in Thyen's commentary where John would have known Matthew's redacted gospel. In at least five other John/Matthew parallels, Thyen is less specific as to John's use of Matthew. (1) Thyen claims John's "free play" with Luke 7:1–10 in particular for John's story of the royal official;¹⁹² Thyen does not notice Boismard's connections between John 4:52–53 and Matt 8:13b–14, namely the hour of the healing and the malady of fever. (2) Jesus' going up the

¹⁸⁶ Hartwig Thyen, "Johannes und die Synoptiker: auf der Suche nach einem neuen Paradigma zur Beschreibung ihrer Beziehungen anhand von Beobachtungen an Passions- und Ostererzählungen," in *John and the Synoptics* [BETL 101], 105–6 [81–107]; repr. in idem, *Studien zum Corpus Iohanneum* (WUNT 214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

¹⁸⁷ Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

¹⁸⁸ Sean Winter, review of Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, *JSNT* 29 (2007): 74 [73–4].

¹⁸⁹ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 4.

¹⁹⁰ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 4.

¹⁹¹ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 763.

¹⁹² Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 288.

mountain and sitting down (John 6:3) relates not only to Matt 5:1 but to several other references to mountains throughout the Synoptics.¹⁹³ (3) Thyen does not parallel John and Matthew's light of the world sayings (John 8:12; Matt 5:14a).¹⁹⁴ (4) Thyen notes that when Jesus enters Jerusalem, John (12:14–15) has only one donkey as opposed to a she-ass and her foal (Matt 21:2), but Thyen also considers John's (12:14) diminutive ὄναριον as related to the never-before-ridden πῶλος in Mark 11:2; cf. Luke 19:30.¹⁹⁵ (5) For the forgiving and retaining sins logion (John 20:23), Thyen cross-references Matthew's binding and loosing sayings (16:19; 18:18) but does not claim an intertextual link.¹⁹⁶ In summary, Thyen claims one strong Johannine link to Matthew's redacted gospel, but overall Thyen's intertextual approach shows more what a reader familiar with the fourfold gospel canon could interpret than that the author of the Fourth Gospel knew and used all three Synoptics.

Andrew Lincoln (2005)

Andrew Lincoln does not deny that John could have accessed oral tradition that either influenced or was influenced by the Synoptics,¹⁹⁷ but in addition Lincoln claims the Fourth Gospel's use of all three Synoptics in written form. He gives two criteria for making such determinations: "similar content, sequence, vocabulary or style" and "a satisfactory explanation of the differences."¹⁹⁸ As Lincoln's examples show, though, "similar vocabulary" does not sufficiently differentiate oral tradition from literary dependence, and he generally appeals to John's creative use of the Synoptics without elucidating specific Johannine alterations.

Lincoln's strongest parallel involves John's healing of the official's son and Matthew's story of the centurion's child. The two gospels end with a report of the healing occurring "at that hour" (Matt 8:13; John 4:52–3). Lincoln also points out—as had Boismard—John's apparent

¹⁹³ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 336.

¹⁹⁴ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 422–3.

¹⁹⁵ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 555.

¹⁹⁶ Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 767.

¹⁹⁷ Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John* (BNTC; London: Continuum, 2005; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006), 32–3.

¹⁹⁸ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 32.

knowledge of Matthew's redactional transition from the centurion pericope to the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, which would explain John's statement that "the fever left him" (John 8:52; cf. Matt 8:14–15).¹⁹⁹

Lincoln's ten other parallels are somewhat weaker. (1) John's born again sayings (3:3, 5) constitute "reformulations" of Matt 18:3 and Luke 18:17;²⁰⁰ in that instance Lincoln does not mention the oft-reconstructed Semitic *Vorlage* whereby תרוב/שורב may account for ἄνωθεν, and so oral tradition could also explain the Johannine saying. (2) John's saying about eating Jesus' flesh and drinking his blood (6:53) comes closest to Matt 26:26–28, where Jesus commands the disciples to eat and drink rather than simply giving them the bread and wine identified with his body and blood (Mark 14:22–24; Luke 22:19–20);²⁰¹ at the same time, Lincoln explains the terms body (as in Matthew) and flesh (as in John) as "appropriate translations of the underlying Aramaic term,"²⁰² which implies oral transmission as would be especially plausible for a eucharistic saying. (3) Jesus' claiming to be the sheep's door (John 10:7) represents "John's Christological interpretation" of Jesus' saying about entering by the narrow gate (Matt 7:13–14; Luke 13:24);²⁰³ Lincoln does not explain whether John knew one or both gospel sayings or even Q—whether oral or written.

Regarding the citations of Zech 9:9, (4) Lincoln claims John's knowledge of Matthean redaction in the account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (John 12:15; Matt 21:5), but Lincoln does not explain the differences between Matthew and John's citations; Lincoln says only that John creatively reworked the Synoptics and that the Fourth Evangelist knew "all three accounts in some form."²⁰⁴ (5) There are related sayings about servants not being greater than their masters as well as sending and receiving (Matt 10:24, 40; John 13:16, 20).²⁰⁵ (6) The double amen

¹⁹⁹ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 35, 189–90.

²⁰⁰ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36, 149–50; he does not cite Mark 10:15.

²⁰¹ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36.

²⁰² Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 232.

²⁰³ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36, 295.

²⁰⁴ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 347.

²⁰⁵ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36.

prediction of betrayal (John 13:21) is the same except for adding an amen (Mark 14:18b; Matt 26:21b),²⁰⁶ and in that scene Matthew and John also have Jesus identify the betrayer (Matt 26:25; John 13:26).²⁰⁷ (7) Jesus' prayer in John 17:1–26 relates to Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer (6:9–15; cf. Luke 11:1–4);²⁰⁸ the thematic similarities between those prayers have a long history in the scholarship,²⁰⁹ but the burden of proof still lies with those who claim literary dependence since the Lord's Prayer appears in Matthew, Luke, and the Didache as well as Q hypothetically.

Without further elaboration, (8) Lincoln refers to “some similarities” between John 20:23; Matt 18:18; cf. 16:19.²¹⁰ (9) Lincoln relates Mary's holding onto Jesus' feet (John 20:17a) to Matthew's account of the women in Matt 28:9;²¹¹ in that instance Lincoln does not continue with Neiryck's demonstration of John's knowledge of Matthean redaction insofar as Jesus refers to the disciples as “brothers” (John 20:17b//Matt 28:10). (10) Finally in general terms Lincoln describes the Johannine notion of Jesus' divine sonship as a development of the saying in Matt 11:27//Luke 10:22.²¹²

Lincoln's overview of the Fourth Gospel's compositional history further complicates the delineation between oral and written sources. He posits three stages: the first edition (dated to the mid-80s) and second one (in the early 90s) represent the work of the same person writing in the same style;²¹³ another person is responsible for the third and final edition (in the late 90s), which

²⁰⁶ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36, 378.

²⁰⁷ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 380.

²⁰⁸ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36, 432–3.

²⁰⁹ E.g., Wm. O. Walker, Jr., “The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in John,” *NTS* 28 (1982): 237–56; J. C. Fenton, “Towards an Understanding of John,” *SE* 4 (1968): 30 [28–37]; there see n. 2 for arguments dating back to the late nineteenth century.

²¹⁰ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 500.

²¹¹ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 493.

²¹² Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 36.

²¹³ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 51–4.

only included “chapter 21, minor glosses and possibly material about the Beloved Disciple.”²¹⁴ Lincoln claims John’s use of the Synoptics at both the first and second compositional stages.²¹⁵

Lincoln initially considers the written Synoptics as a simpler explanation than oral tradition for John’s synoptic parallels; that is, scholarly reconstructions of John’s independent sources often end up sounding “very similar to” or “close to the version found in” one of the Synoptics.²¹⁶ Lincoln later undermines that appeal to Ockham’s razor, however. Even before the first version of the Gospel of John and before any contact with the Synoptics, Lincoln claims that the evangelist and his community “would also have been familiar with the same sort of traditions about the life and teaching of Jesus that lie behind Mark and are represented in the Q source.”²¹⁷ In other words, before John knew the written Synoptics, John knew their main sources. Consequently, apart from one instance of apparent synoptic redaction in John, there is little justification for Lincoln’s claim of John’s literary dependence on the Synoptics rather than John’s knowledge of enduring and intermingling oral tradition.

Lincoln nowhere mentions the term secondary orality, but he once mentions the idea, namely that the Synoptics themselves could have influenced continuing oral tradition.²¹⁸ He does not carry that idea through the commentary, and in individual pericopes he tends to consider oral and written sources an either-or proposition. Like others, Lincoln dissents from the consensus of Johannine independence and claims John’s use of the written Synoptics, but such a proposal needs to rest on stronger source- and redaction-critical foundations.

Urban C. von Wahlde (2010)

Urban C. von Wahlde has completed a monumental commentary on the Fourth Gospel,²¹⁹ in which he argues for John’s use of all three Synoptics. In what follows, I first provide an

²¹⁴ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 54.

²¹⁵ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 54.

²¹⁶ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 33.

²¹⁷ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 54–5.

²¹⁸ Lincoln, *Gospel according to Saint John*, 32–3.

²¹⁹ Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (3 vols.; Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

overview of von Wahlde's reconstruction of the gospel's composition whereby John ultimately imported points of contact with the Synoptics. I then point out previously identified Matthean parallels that von Wahlde does not claim as influencing John. Finally, by scrutinizing one purported case of John's direct use of Matthew, I find that von Wahlde does not establish a greater likelihood of literary dependence than oral tradition.

Von Wahlde meticulously reconstructs a three-stage composition for the Gospel of John. He dates the third edition between 88–92,²²⁰ which post-dates the first Johannine epistle,²²¹ and he claims that only the author of the third edition was aware of the Synoptics.²²² That is, the third author awkwardly stuck in parallels that make more sense when viewed in their synoptic contexts;²²³ all of von Wahlde's introductory examples involve Markan pericopes—either alone or with both other Synoptics.²²⁴ Throughout the commentary von Wahlde mainly compares John to Mark and Luke rather than to Matthew—even if there are Matthean parallels as in the story of Mary's anointing Jesus (John 12:3–8).²²⁵ Von Wahlde also refers frequently to synoptic tradition, by which he apparently means the gospels themselves rather than yet developing, unwritten traditions. Von Wahlde nowhere mentions secondary orality and says relatively little about oral tradition; for example, he does not attempt to reconstruct the oral prehistory of John's first written edition,²²⁶ but he does refer to “larger tradition”—such as Peter being the “rock”—that lies within the New Testament apart from the Synoptics.²²⁷ It is ultimately unclear how von Wahlde would distinguish oral tradition from literary dependence.

John's relation to Matthew is not clearly established, and von Wahlde does not refer to Matthew in the following eight (*inter alia*) previously identified parallels. (1) Von Wahlde

²²⁰ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 1:390.

²²¹ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 1:376.

²²² Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, esp. 1:369–74; as throughout the commentary (vol. 2), in 1:561–609 von Wahlde gives a translation of the gospel with typeface differentiating the three layers.

²²³ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 1:370.

²²⁴ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 1:370–373.

²²⁵ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:532–6.

²²⁶ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 1:38–9.

²²⁷ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 1:374.

attributes the bulk of the healing of the royal official's son (John 4:43–54)—including vv. 52–53—to the first edition, and so John's mentioning the “hour” of the boy's recovery and that “the fever left him” would have arisen independently of Matthew.²²⁸ (2) Jesus' going up the mountain and sitting down at the feeding of the 5000 also stood in John's first edition (6:3). (3) Von Wahlde attributes John's light of the world saying (8:12) to the third edition on account of dualistic language rather than any connection to Matthew.²²⁹ (4) The quotation of Zech 9:9 in John 12:15—assigned to the second edition—shows John and Matthew working “from the same general tradition,” namely “some common testimonial tradition.”²³⁰ (5) The saying about slaves not being greater than their masters (John 13:16; cf. 15:20) also stems from the third edition but without discussion of its close Matthean counterpart.²³¹

When dipping someone's food indicates Judas as Jesus' betrayer (John 13:26), (6) von Wahlde refers to the same tradition as in Mark 14:20.²³² (7) John 20:17ab appeared in John's second edition and so would not intentionally interlock with Matthew's account of the Marys holding onto Jesus' feet. The reference to “brothers” in John 20:17c enters into the third edition because of its characteristic terminology; von Wahlde does not invoke Neiryneck's argument for John's knowledge of Matthean redaction in John 20:17.²³³ (8) Not appearing until the third edition, John's forgiving and retaining sins saying (20:23) parallels Matthew's binding and loosing saying (18:18; cf. 16:19). Von Wahlde says that “it is probably correct...to conclude that the Johannine version is not an adaptation of the Matthean version but a variant form of the same tradition;”²³⁴ he adds that John 20:23 represents Johannine theology but echoes language in

²²⁸ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:203.

²²⁹ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:383.

²³⁰ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 3:308.

²³¹ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:588.

²³² Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:607; cf. 2:610 where he mentions the same tradition as in Matthew and Mark.

²³³ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:848; 1:244.

²³⁴ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:857.

Matthew's gospel.²³⁵ As a variant form, John's echo of Matthew appears to have been unintentional in that case.

By my count, there is only one instance in which von Wahlde claims that John intentionally drew upon Matthew's gospel.²³⁶ Regarding John's saying about losing one's life (12:25), which has five synoptic parallels, von Wahlde concludes: "it seems clear that the Johannine version is an attempt to incorporate a saying that the author was familiar with from the Synoptics and that he chose to echo Matt 10:39 in his own version."²³⁷ Table 2.2 provides the Greek sayings as von Wahlde orders them.

Of the five words in John 12:25a; Matt 10:39a, von Wahlde observes that only one word differs (viz. φιλω̄ν vs. ε̄ρω̄ν);²³⁸ of the remaining words, though, the finite verb differs in tense (ἀπόλλυμι: present in John vs. future in Matthew). The four words in common are also common to every other iteration of the saying, although John 12:25a; Matt 10:39a agree in omitting the conjunction γάρ. The most distinguishing characteristic of John 12:25; Matt 10:39 lies in the verses' grammatical structure: the phrase "whoever wants to save" (Matt 16:25a; Mark 8:35a; Luke 9:24a; cf. "whoever seeks to preserve" in Luke 17:33a)—consisting of a relative pronoun, conditional particle, subjunctive, plus infinitive—contrasts with Matthew and John's much simpler opening phrases. Grammatically John 12:25; Matt 10:39 begin each clause with a nominative articular participle, with which the Fourth Gospel is replete. In fact, "the one who loves" (ὁ φιλω̄ν) and "the one who hates" (ὁ μισω̄ν) in John 12:25 are only two of more than seventy such (nom. masc. sg. pres. act.) articular participles in the gospel. By contrast, 'whoever' constructions (ὅς ἄν or ὅς ἐάν with a subjunctive) occur only once in the entire gospel: "whoever drinks" (ὅς...ἄν πίη; John 4:14). The point is that John very well might have conformed the life-losing aphorism to his stylistically preferred articular participle even if he had encountered the saying otherwise. Consequently the case for John's dependence on Matthew is rather weak here.

²³⁵ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:865; see also "language that echoes the Synoptics" [2:861].

²³⁶ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:549–50.

²³⁷ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:550.

²³⁸ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:549.

Table 2.2 Synopsis of Gospel Sayings about Losing One’s Life

John 12:25a ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτήν
 Matt 10:39a ὁ εὐρῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν
 Luke 17:33a ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν

Matt 16:25a ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν
 Mark 8:35a ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν
 Luke 9:24a ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν

John 12:25b καὶ ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν
 Matt 10:39b καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν
 Luke 17:33b ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ ζωογονήσει αὐτήν

Matt 16:25b ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν
 Mark 8:35b ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν
 Luke 9:24b ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν

Von Wahlde reckons the differences between John 12:25b; Matt 10:39b to characteristic Johannine vocabulary (“this world” and “eternal life”),²³⁹ but that observation understates the structural differences between the sayings. The Matthean version presents a paradox, and the same antonymous verb pair occurs within each clause: the one who finds will lose, and the one who loses will find. That forms a simple chiasm (a b b’ a’), and the same structure holds for all the synoptic versions of the saying. By contrast, the Johannine version evinces antithetic parallelism (a b a’ b’), according to which the two clauses are antonymous with one another but no verbs are repeated: loving opposes hating and losing something contrasts with protecting it. Those structural differences further weaken the case for literary dependence.

Von Wahlde notes his main argument against oral tradition as lying behind John’s saying about losing one’s life: “It is possible that the author knew it independently of the Synoptics, but given the number of times he inserts material with Synoptic affinities, it is very unlikely that the similarity to the Synoptics here (and elsewhere) was accidental.”²⁴⁰ That is, von Wahlde assigns John 12:25 to the final edition of the gospel, the author of which inserted synoptic parallels in other instances; von Wahlde simply appeals to that cumulative evidence. The problem with his

²³⁹ Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:549.

²⁴⁰ Von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:550 n. 4.

argument is that John 12:25 would constitute the gospel's only direct use of Matthew. In other words, that the author of the third edition occasionally used Mark and Luke elsewhere proves less convincing—if not inadmissible—in the one case designed to establish whether John used Matthew.

In conclusion, several Matthean parallels enter into the third and final edition of John, at which point the author knew of the Synoptics, but von Wahlde does not claim that John adopted such material from Matthew. The one case for John's intentional echo of Matthew (John 12:25//Matt 10:39) cannot easily overcome objections that the parallel results from oral tradition, for the sayings' only verbal similarity involves "losing one's life," the notion common to several other iterations of the saying (Matt 16:24; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24; 17:33). Von Wahlde's greatest contribution lies in his analysis of distinctive Johannine vocabulary, but sometimes such analyses overshadow John's indebtedness to the Synoptics. Yet von Wahlde is part of a growing contingent willing to argue that John used the Synoptics, including Matthew.

Richard Bauckham (2011)

Richard Bauckham has previously argued that John presupposed his audiences' familiarity with Mark,²⁴¹ and in a recent essay on John and the Synoptics, he discusses the likelihood of John's use of Luke and Matthew.²⁴² Bauckham issues the following directive:

A case for John's knowledge of Luke and/or Matthew would have to explain the striking facts that (a) apart from the resurrection appearance stories... John has no narrative parallel to a Lukan or Matthean narrative that is not also a parallel with Mark; (b) virtually all the points of contact between John and these two Gospels that require explanation occur in the portions of John that run parallel to Mark.²⁴³

Among resurrection appearance stories, Bauckham's lone John/Matthew parallel is John 20:14–18//Matt 28:9–10, and Bauckham tacitly endorses Neiryneck's argument for John's use of

²⁴¹ Richard Bauckham, "John for Readers of Mark," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (ed. Richard Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 147–71.

²⁴² Richard Bauckham, "The Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem," in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008; Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* (Paul Foster et al., eds.; BETL 239; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 685–6 [657–88].

²⁴³ Bauckham, "Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem," 685–6.

Matthew in that instance.²⁴⁴ Regarding John’s forgiving and holding onto sins logion (20:23), Bauckham parallels John 20:19–23//Luke 24:36–49 but does not mention the Matthean logia in 18:18; 16:19;²⁴⁵ in line with Bauckham’s directive, then, I will argue in Chapter Four that although the Johannine logion (20:23) appears as part of a resurrection narrative, it depends on a Matthean narrative outside the Passion Narrative and without Markan parallel. In such instances, Bauckham would conclude that John incorporated details from Matthew’s gospel at a late stage of composition.²⁴⁶ Although Bauckham does not think that any of the Synoptics substantially influenced John’s gospel, his overarching argument is that John presupposes his readers’ familiarity with Mark but not with Matthew or Luke.²⁴⁷ Finally, from Bauckham’s earlier work, he allows for different conclusions regarding the interrelations and purposes of the gospels—for example, whether a later gospel intended to supplement or supplant its predecessor(s).²⁴⁸ Like Viviano’s work on John and Matthew, Bauckham’s work on John and Mark overcomes Windisch’s sharp division between supplementation, correction, and so forth.

Summary

For most of the last hundred years, a consensus has held that John shows little if any literary dependence on Matthew.²⁴⁹ Around forty years ago, Boismard and Neiryck’s dissent led to a “dissolution” of the consensus.²⁵⁰ Over the last twenty years, a growing number of scholars have averred John’s use of Matthew, but it has become increasingly common merely to presuppose a literary relationship. The problem with such recent studies is that they have not yet overcome the objections that brought about the original consensus. In other words, Gardner-Smith’s questions

²⁴⁴ Bauckham, “Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem,” 685; in close proximity, see n. 79 for Bauckham’s citation of Neiryck, “John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990.”

²⁴⁵ Bauckham, “Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem,” 685.

²⁴⁶ Bauckham, “Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem,” 686; the same goes for Luke, in addition to the possibilities that Luke knew John or that both used a common source [p. 685].

²⁴⁷ Bauckham, “Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem,” 673.

²⁴⁸ Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?” in *The Gospels for All Christians*, 47 [9–48].

²⁴⁹ E.g., Bacon, *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, 366–8 [1910].

²⁵⁰ Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 139–76 (ch. 6), esp. 141–58.

still apply, namely whether oral tradition could explain John's Matthean material and how John's differences from Matthew are to be explained.

Methodology: John's Use of Matthew

In light of the results of previous scholarship, this section provides an overview of the criteria and methods employed for determining John's relationship to Matthew. Those include the criteria of availability and verbal correspondence along with the methods of text-, source-, and redaction-criticism. The strongest case for literary dependence rests on detecting Matthean redaction within the Fourth Gospel. As an additional control, I introduce lexical semantics as a means for assessing whether similarities and differences result from oral tradition.

The criterion of accessibility or availability concerns the likelihood that John could have encountered the Gospel of Matthew.²⁵¹ Bauckham has argued that "the Gospels were written for all Christians, not specific churches."²⁵² As a first-century Christian in the Roman Empire,²⁵³ then, John would have been one of Matthew's intended readers. Bauckham presents an 'either-or' position that posits indefinite gospel audiences. While that position has not gained wide acceptance, Bauckham's work has propelled an emerging 'both-and' consensus, according to which each evangelist wrote primarily for specific communities while anticipating a wider readership.²⁵⁴

²⁵¹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–30; Dennis R. MacDonald, "Introduction," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (ed. Dennis R. MacDonald; SAC; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001), 2.

²⁵² Richard Bauckham, "Introduction," in *The Gospels for All Christians*, 2; Bauckham's student Edward Klink qualifies that historical and geographical limitations pertained [Edward W. Klink III, "The Gospel Community Debate: State of the Question," *CBR* 3 (2004): 62 {60–85}].

²⁵³ Bauckham, "Introduction," in *The Gospels for All Christians*, 1.

²⁵⁴ E.g., Craig L. Blomberg, "The Gospels for Specific Communities and All Christians," in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity* (Edward W. Klink III, ed.; LNTS 353; New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 111–33; Philip F. Esler, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's *Gospels for All Christians*," *SJT* 51 (1998): 235–48; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 264–5; Joel Marcus, *Mark* (2 vols.; AB 27–27A; New York: Doubleday; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2009), 1:25–8; David C. Sim, "The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham," *JSNT* 84 (2001): 3–27. Bauckham anticipated and rejected such a compromise,

Graham Stanton and Daniel Ulrich have argued for a wider audience of the Gospel of Matthew in particular.²⁵⁵ Stanton wrote about the evangelist’s communities (plural) and questioned whether Matthew would have written such an elaborate book for such a small group.²⁵⁶ Ulrich has studied Matthew’s references to missionary activity and has concluded that the author “very likely...expected a large and expanding audience for the Gospel.”²⁵⁷ For example, Jesus twice predicts the preaching of this gospel to the entire world (24:14; 26:13),²⁵⁸ and Matthew concludes with Jesus’ Great Commission (28:19–20).²⁵⁹ Applying the conclusions of Stanton and Ulrich, I accept that Matthew’s gospel could have been available to John.

Given a plausible explanation of Matthew’s accessibility, the investigation of John’s use of Matthew must also identify the gospels’ parallel material on the basis of verbal or structural similarities.²⁶⁰ Studies of John and Matthew’s thematic and structural commonalities—for example, those by Maier and Farrer respectively—prove less convincing than instances of verbal correspondence. Even more convincing is an accumulation or concentration of verbal agreements;²⁶¹ for example, Sparks had the right instincts to show that John appears to know

however [Richard Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?” in *The Gospels for All Christians*, 45–6].

²⁵⁵ Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 51; see also idem, “Revisiting Matthew’s Communities,” *SBL Seminar Papers, 1994* (SBLSP 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 9–23; Daniel W. Ulrich, “The Missional Audience of the Gospel of Matthew,” *CBQ* 69 (2007): 64–83.

²⁵⁶ Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 51; see 45–53 for “Matthew’s Communities.”

²⁵⁷ Ulrich, “The Missional Audience of the Gospel of Matthew,” 66.

²⁵⁸ Ulrich, “The Missional Audience of the Gospel of Matthew,” 66–7; τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον...ἐν ὅλη τῇ οἰκουμένῃ (Matt 24:14); τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ (Matt 26:13).

²⁵⁹ Ulrich, “The Missional Audience of the Gospel of Matthew,” 70–71.

²⁶⁰ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 30; see also Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 19–20.

²⁶¹ On the criterion “existence of additional parallels,” see Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (WUNT 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 13; regarding ‘recurrence’ see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 30. Some of Hays’s other criteria are somewhat less determinative. For example, ‘historical plausibility’ asks whether an audience could have understood an allusion, but Hays acknowledges that authors might have intended allusions that audiences failed to grasp [p. 30]. Also, ‘history of interpretation’ [p. 31] can be problematic in two regards: later

several elements within a single Matthean context, and studies of the Passion Narrative have compiled numerous John/Matthew parallels.²⁶² Ideally the range of purported parallels avoids excess and defect; for example, Streeter and De Solages did not consider enough points of contact, but there is also danger of “parallelomania.”²⁶³ Parallels based on dubious text-critical evidence should also be excluded, although Streeter’s excessive dismissal of parallels based on that criterion should also be avoided.²⁶⁴

Acknowledging that oral and written sources are not mutually exclusive, scholars such as Borgen, Dahl, and Dauer have tended to err on the side of caution by appealing to oral tradition in absence of verbatim agreements. As shown in examples by Baum-Bodenbender and Neiryck, the presence of Matthean *Sondergut* in John may increase the probability of literary dependence.²⁶⁵ Yet *Sondergut* alone constitutes insufficient proof, for it remains indeterminate whether John drew upon generally circulating tradition or Matthew’s written gospel. That being the case, Helmut Koester has offered a criterion that “actually offers assured results.”²⁶⁶ Koester writes: “How can we know when written documents are the source for...quotations and allusions? Redaction criticism is the answer. Whenever one observes words or phrases that derive from the author or redactor of a gospel writing, the existence of a written source must be

interpreters might have missed intended allusions; later interpreters also might have discovered some *sensus plenior* unintended by the author.

²⁶² Some scholars explain such synoptic parallels by reconstructing a hypothetical pre-Johannine Passion Narrative, the most comprehensive recent study of which is Frank Schleritt, *Der vorjohanneische Passionsbericht: Eine historisch-kritische und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 2,13-22; 11,47-14,31 und 18,1-20,29* (BZNW 154; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007); in that case, there would remain an onus to explain the relationship between the Synoptics and pre-Johannine Passion Narrative.

²⁶³ Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13; that paper was Sandmel’s presidential address at the annual SBL in 1961, and he defines parallelomania as “that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction” [p. 1].

²⁶⁴ For a general introduction, see Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

²⁶⁵ Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, 14.

²⁶⁶ Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, “Reflections on Method: What Constitutes Use of the Writings that later formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?” in *Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 75 [61–82].

assumed.”²⁶⁷ For that reason, I follow Boismard and Neiryneck in demonstrating Matthean redaction in John.

John’s knowledge of Matthean redaction entails three considerations: what counts as Matthean redaction; which direction dependence runs;²⁶⁸ and whether cognition of Matthew was visual or aural. First, determining Matthean redaction depends on Matthew’s modifications to Mark, on Matthew’s characteristic terminology, or on the distinctive sequencing of Matthean pericopes;²⁶⁹ I focus especially on Matthew’s order of sayings and narratives because such Matthean redaction would pertain even among adherents to the “Augustinian” and to the Griesbach hypotheses in lieu of Markan priority. Second, analogous to the text-critical principle of *lectio difficilior*, the direction of dependence can be discerned if John appears to correct Matthew; in such instances, source- and redaction-critical findings may coincide with studies of social memory, which investigate how John attempted to formulate and recast the collective identity of his audiences.²⁷⁰ Third, John could have used Matthew directly, via “visual contact;”²⁷¹ another possibility is secondary orality,²⁷² “the recall of traditions that an individual has encountered via the medium of a written text but now remembers without needing to have

²⁶⁷ Helmut Koester, “Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?” *JBL* 113 (1994): 297 [293–7]; the criterion originally appeared in his 1954 Marburg dissertation directed by Rudolf Bultmann: Helmut Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 3.

²⁶⁸ Gregory, “What is Literary Dependence?” in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008; Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* (ed. Paul Foster et al.; BETL 239; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 108–10 [87–114].

²⁶⁹ For a general introduction, see Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969).

²⁷⁰ E.g., Philip F. Esler and Ronald A. Piper, *Lazarus, Mary and Martha: Social-Scientific Approaches to the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006); Tom Thatcher, “Why John Wrote a Gospel: Memory and History in an Early Christian Community,” in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity* (ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher; SemeiaSt 52; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 79–97.

²⁷¹ Gregory, “What is Literary Dependence?” 87.

²⁷² Studies of the relationship between the *Gospel of Thomas* and the canonical gospels mirror Johannine methodological debates: e.g., for literary dependence, see Christopher M. Tuckett, *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986); for Thomasine autonomy/independence based on oral tradition, see Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Foundations & Facets Reference Series; Sonoma, Cal.: Polebridge, 1993); and for secondary orality, see Risto Uro, “‘Secondary Orality’ in the Gospel of Thomas? Logion 14 as a Test Case,” *Forum* 9 (1993): 3–4, 305–29.

continued visual contact with that text.”²⁷³ In either case, a redacted gospel would serve as the source text, and the thesis of this dissertation does not require a choice between visual and aural mediation.

In addition to the above-mentioned text-, source-, and redaction-critical methods, I also introduce lexical semantics as a control for making appeals to oral tradition; that is, appeals to oral tradition ought to include semantically valid descriptions of the changes a word, saying, or narrative has undergone. Lexical semantics is the theory of word meanings,²⁷⁴ and lexicography is the related practice of defining words.²⁷⁵ In a classic presentation, James Barr criticized biblical scholars for not keeping pace with the specialized field of linguistics.²⁷⁶ For example, Gerhard Kittel’s *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* showed “a failure to get to grips with the semantic value of words in their contexts.”²⁷⁷ That is, words do not hold intrinsic meaning but instead take on different meanings depending on their usage in particular instances. Barr critiqued *TDNT* for ignoring that lexical semantic axiom and consequently overloading

²⁷³ Gregory, “What is Literary Dependence?” 91; for secondary orality applied to John and the Synoptics, see Michael Labahn, *Jesus als Lebensspender: Untersuchungen zu einer Geschichte der johanneischen Tradition anhand ihrer Wundergeschichten* (BZNW 98; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999).

²⁷⁴ For a general introduction see D. A. Cruse, *Lexical Semantics* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); see also Part 2 [pp. 71–261], “Words and Meanings,” of Alan Cruse, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (3d ed.; Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); for a particular focus on biblical studies see Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (rev. and exp. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).

²⁷⁵ For a general introduction, see Bo Svensén, *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

²⁷⁶ James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961). For basic linguistic terminology, see Peter H. Matthews, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (2d ed.; Oxford Paperback Reference; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); for a general introduction to semantics, see John Lyons, *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995). There are various approaches to lexical semantics, and my purposes are best suited by the diachronic approach of historical philology; for an overview, see Chapter 1 [pp. 1–46], “Historical-philological Semantics,” in Dirk Geeraerts, *Theories of Lexical Semantics* (Oxford Linguistics; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); for New Testament philology, see Schuyler Brown, “Philology,” in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters* (Eldon Jay Epp and George W. MacRae, eds.; The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 127–47.

²⁷⁷ Barr, *Semantics of Biblical Language*, 231.

words with “interpretive suggestion.”²⁷⁸ For example, the totality of different meanings of the term ‘church’ (ἐκκλησία) in the New Testament should not be read into every single occurrence of the word.²⁷⁹ Such misinterpretations persist in studies of John and the Synoptics, and throughout the dissertation I check for semantic validity, explain key terminology, and offer correctives. In summary, the lack of verbatim agreement between Matthew and John complicates the case for literary dependence but does not constitute a sufficient condition for inferring oral tradition.

Hermeneutic: John’s Stance toward Matthew

This dissertation demonstrates John’s use of Matthew and thereby raises the question of whether John wanted his gospel to be read alongside or instead of Matthew’s. Windisch addressed that question and concluded that John wrote a new gospel in order to replace the Synoptics rather than to supplement them. Despite how long ago Windisch wrote, his taxonomy remains in use,²⁸⁰ and so it is elucidated below. I first describe Windisch’s categories and explain how the recognition of John’s narrative self-sufficiency led Windisch to argue for John’s intended replacement of his predecessors. Windisch was right about the Fourth Gospel forming a self-contained narrative, but Windisch’s replacement hypothesis is a *non sequitur*. I show herein that infancy gospels, especially *Protevangelium of James*, constitute self-sufficient narratives that nonetheless presuppose and supplement—rather than replace—the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. By way of analogy, this dissertation adopts the strategy of viewing John an apocryphal gospel that was intended to be read alongside Matthew.

Windisch’s Taxonomy and the Replacement Hypothesis

Windisch offered the following categorization regarding the purpose of John’s Gospel vis-à-vis the Synoptics: (1) John knew the Synoptics and intended to supplement them with historical material; (2) John did not know the Synoptics; (3) John knew the Synoptics and intended to

²⁷⁸ Barr, *Semantics of Biblical Language*, 234.

²⁷⁹ Barr, *Semantics of Biblical Language*, 218.

²⁸⁰ E.g., David C. Sim, “Matthew’s Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?” *NTS* 57 (2011): 176–92.

reinterpret them theologically; (4) John knew the Synoptics and intended to replace them altogether.

Windisch's first category is the supplemental hypothesis (*Ergänzungstheorie*), which can be theological and/or historical. Clement of Alexandria said that John wrote a spiritual gospel as opposed to a corporeal one like the Synoptics (Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.7); for Windisch, Clement's statement exemplifies theological supplementation. The notion of historical supplementation considers John a collection of paralipomena; that is, John knew the Synoptics and intended to narrate events that they omitted. When John and the Synoptics narrate the same events, adherents to the supplemental hypothesis often claim that John corrected his predecessors. Emphasizing John's role as corrector constitutes a "critical supplemental theory."²⁸¹

Windisch's second category is the independence theory (*Unabhängigkeitstheorie*), to which he consistently refers as (theologically) conservative. In Windisch's day, the Fourth Gospel's independence meant that John had preserved eyewitness testimony, which ensured the gospel's historical accuracy. Such a formulation had precedence in the patristic period; for example, Augustine did not think in terms of literary dependence and instead assumed that the gospels were written independently yet without contradicting one another. Windisch refers sporadically to John's use of "oral and written sources,"²⁸² but form criticism was in its earliest phases.²⁸³ Accordingly Windisch's conceptualization of Johannine independence differs from that which Percival Gardner-Smith would later popularize. That is, Gardner-Smith argued that the Fourth Gospel had accessed oral tradition, which need not entail eyewitness testimony. The independence theory would nonetheless apply to either type of gospel source material.

Windisch's third category, the interpretation theory (*Interpretationstheorie*), is simply a modern version of theological supplementation. As various church fathers had done, the interpretation theory holds that John does not represent a pure historical narrative but instead

²⁸¹ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 22–3 (there referencing Weizsäcker).

²⁸² According to Windisch, the argument for John's knowledge of oral gospel tradition but not the Synoptics dates as far back as Friedrich Lücke, *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes* (2d ed.; 2 vols.; Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1833–1834); i.e., vols. 1–2 of Lücke's four-volume *Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes* [1832–1834]; see Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 14.

²⁸³ Relatedly, Martin Dibelius wrote a letter to Windisch about *Johannes und die Synoptiker* [D. Moody Smith, *John among the Gospels* (2d ed.; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 33–4].

offers deeper theological meaning than what is found in the Synoptics. Terminologically, Windisch considers ‘interpretation theory’ a misnomer because John used so little of the Synoptics; accordingly the Fourth Gospel hardly amounts to a reinterpretation of the other three.²⁸⁴ So Windisch also uses the term surpassing theory (*Überbietungstheorie*).²⁸⁵ In Windisch’s view, the interpretation theory’s significance lies in its recognition of John’s distinctiveness when compared with the Synoptics, thereby carving out the critical space for scholars (e.g., Overbeck, Schwartz, Wendland, Bousset, Heitmüller, Meyer, et al.) to advance the thesis that John wanted to supplant the Synoptics.

Windisch’s fourth category is called the replacement hypothesis (*Verdrängungshypothese*). Although sometimes referred to as displacement,²⁸⁶ the notion is that John intended to supersede the Synoptics. Windisch synonymously refers to hypotheses of substitution (*Ersatzhypothese*) and elimination (*Beseitigungshypothese*). He concluded, “The replacement hypothesis—John adhered to the one gospel principle, and *his* gospel should have been *the* gospel—offers the most probable explanation of the facts.”²⁸⁷ *Johannes und die Synoptiker* represents Windisch’s attempt to reestablish the replacement hypothesis in opposition to a then-recent resurgence of the (historical) supplemental hypothesis.

The most enduring criticism of Windisch’s book pertains to its concession that John even knew the Synoptics.²⁸⁸ Gardner-Smith soon-to-follow argument for John’s use of oral tradition independently of the Synoptics would constitute the consensus throughout the second half of the twentieth century. So the fundamental issue is whether John knew the Synoptics, and the independence theory denies that John did. If it can be shown that John knew the Synoptics, then John’s opinion of them becomes an issue. Regarding that issue, Windisch strained the distinction between historical supplementation and theological reinterpretation, for interpreters from

²⁸⁴ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 133.

²⁸⁵ E.g., according to Keim, John surpasses the “elementary gospels” [Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 24]; the Tübingen School regarded John as a “higher synthesis” [p. 24]; and Wernle spoke of John’s “higher spiritual meaning” [p. 26].

²⁸⁶ E.g., Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 19.

²⁸⁷ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 132.

²⁸⁸ Windisch’s work has never been translated, and D. Moody Smith’s detailed summary is highly commendable: see Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 19–31 regarding Windisch;” pp. 31–7 on “Reactions to Windisch;” and pp. 38–43 on Gardner-Smith.

Epiphanius in the fourth century to Weizsäcker in the nineteenth century have interwoven those two understandings of John's relation to the Synoptics. The question thus reduces to whether John intended to be read alongside the Synoptics or instead of them.

Windisch did not think the Fourth Gospel intended to be read alongside the Synoptics, and he argued for the replacement hypothesis on the basis of the Fourth Gospel's originality, unity, and sufficiency.²⁸⁹ His fullest expression of Johannine self-sufficiency is as follows:

The *result* of our critical investigations can be clearly and easily summarized. The Fourth Gospel is no collection of paralipomena; it wants neither to supplement older accounts nor to be supplemented by them. Instead it is explicable all by itself, self-contained, sufficient, and—pushing all older, earlier writings to the side—provides description of the story of Jesus. Nowhere have there been detected positive references to the older writings and to the more abundant underlying tradition within them; in sharper focus, all observations of the way [John purportedly references the Synoptics] go up in smoke. Nowhere are there gaps in which one can insert the synoptic narratives John skipped over. Every attempt at harmonization and combination pits the Fourth Evangelist in the greatest opposition. Not one instance of specified recognition can be read. The opinion that John had the intention to correct the older tradition where it was necessary—that he thus wanted to validate everything else in them—has still up to now nowhere been proven with certainty. The few comments that *could* be understood as corrections to the synoptic narratives stand in the way of important cases where a clearer reference would have been required, but was spurned by the evangelist. And every place that one could understand as allusions to the Synoptics—so long as they are not glosses—can be completely explained much better based purely on the very structure of the Johannine narrative. The Fourth Gospel is a self-contained narrative; it presents a continuous narrative—much less is it open to anything so artificial as a harmony or a Diatessaron; it is *autonomous* and *sufficient*. Of the four explanations listed above..., the first [i.e., the supplemental theory] must in any case already be rejected based on the proofs thus far. The second theory [i.e., the independence theory] at least has the right understanding of the composition of John; only already its historical presupposition, that John presents a faithfully remembered historical report, has become doubtful to us. This reservation becomes unnecessary for the third hypothesis [i.e., the interpretation theory], regarding which the difficulty has already been emphasized that the older writings, which John should supposedly interpret, apparently do not appear at all on his horizon. So let us now push all observations to the elimination hypothesis already.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁹ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 126–7.

²⁹⁰ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 87–8; regarding that quotation, Smith noted, “One could scarcely imagine a stronger statement of the Fourth Gospel's independence, in the sense of self-sufficiency, than is found on pp. 87–88” [Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 25 n. 39].

According to Windisch, then, the Fourth Gospel's self-contained narrative means that John disregarded the Synoptics and desired to replace them.²⁹¹

Reading John as an Apocryphal Gospel

In order to test Windisch's claim that John's self-sufficiency entails the replacement hypothesis, I highlight the relationships of non-canonical gospels to canonical ones as an analogy to John's relation to the Synoptics. I reference scholars who have raised such issues, and then I adduce *Protevangelium of James* and *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* as self-standing narratives that both parallel and supplement the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; I also show that those infancy gospels cannot have been written independently of their canonical counterparts. Thus there are apocryphal gospels that refute the basis of Windisch's replacement hypothesis and provide a working model for John's having been written and read alongside Matthew. In particular, the synoptic parallels in apocryphal gospels most likely represent an effort to gain credibility by positioning themselves next to the eventual canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which must have been well established already.

Smith observes that Matthew and Luke relate so closely to Mark that they create the phenomenon of Synoptic Gospels.²⁹² Since John does not correspond in the same way to the Synoptics, Smith refers to the fourth canonical gospel as the first apocryphal gospel.²⁹³ He develops the analogy as it pertains to methodology: apocryphal gospels might have accessed independent Jesus traditions that were still developing, or the apocryphal gospels might have used canonical gospels to supplement them and align with them.²⁹⁴ Smith ultimately leaves the question open, and he mainly discusses the *Gospel of Peter*, Egerton Papyrus 2, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Secret Gospel of Mark*—gospels that evince synoptic parallels just as complex

²⁹¹ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 134.

²⁹² D. Moody Smith, "The Problem of John and the Synoptics in Light of the Relation between Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," in *John and the Synoptics* (ed. Adelbert Denaux; BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 156 [147–62].

²⁹³ Smith, "Problem of John and the Synoptics," 156; see esp. the concluding section: "Was John the First Apocryphal Gospel?" [pp. 156–62].

²⁹⁴ Smith, "Problem of John and the Synoptics," 152.

as those in John. By raising the question, though, Smith makes a breakthrough in conceptualizing Johannine/Synoptic interrelations.

Similarly Thomas Kazen calls attention to historical contingencies, and he compares John to an apocryphal gospel: “Had the Gospel of John been discovered under similar circumstances to the *Gospel of Thomas*, and without 1 John being present in the canon, it would have been seriously questioned by many and regarded as foreign when compared to the canonical (Synoptic) gospels, because of its abstract language, its metaphors and its ideology.”²⁹⁵ Kazen, along with Smith, overcome what could be called canonical prejudice, the tendency to presuppose and privilege the fourfold gospel canon while characterizing the initial composition and reception of eventual non-canonical gospels as derivative and inferior.²⁹⁶ For example, Oscar Cullmann contrasts Matthew and Luke’s “sober” use of legendary material with the “more unrestrained” legends in apocryphal gospels.²⁹⁷

Windisch knew of those apocryphal gospels that fill in the gaps in the life of Jesus left by the canonical gospels,²⁹⁸ and he mentions stories of Mary as well as Jesus’ childhood and trip to hell.²⁹⁹ Windisch adds that “here the canonical gospels were acknowledged from the start, and the new writings were actually written for *supplementation*.”³⁰⁰ He does not explain what he

²⁹⁵ Thomas Kazen, “Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts,” *NTS* 51 (2005): 566 n. 25 [561–78].

²⁹⁶ Kazen wrote in response to the measurable absence of apocryphal gospels in Richard Bauckham’s *The Gospels for All Christians*; Margaret Mitchell likewise observes that Bauckham’s “focus is solely on the four ‘canonical’ narratives” [Margaret M. Mitchell, “Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that ‘The Gospels Were Written for All Christians,’” *NTS* 51 (2005): 39]. The same critique would apply to Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), in which Bauckham does not explore why John 21:24 would count as authentic but *Gos. Pet.* 60 would not, even though both texts lay claim to eyewitness testimony.

²⁹⁷ Oscar Cullmann, “Infancy Gospels: General Introduction,” in Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha* (trans. R. McL. Wilson; 2 vols.; rev. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 1:415–6 [414–20].

²⁹⁸ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 166 n. 1.

²⁹⁹ Jesus’ trip to hell would not refer to an apocryphal gospel per se but to the *Apocalypse of Peter*, which according to Sozomen was as of the turn of the fifth century still being read annually in some of the churches in Palestine despite the book’s designation as *nothos* (*Hist. eccl.* 7.19.9).

³⁰⁰ Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 166; Windisch earlier cited Bardenhewer, who writes, “The so-called *Protevangelium of James* wants to narrate the earlier life of the mother of God and in this regard

means by “acknowledged,” but those apocryphal texts do lack the explicit reference to the eventual canonical ones that in Windisch’s estimation revealed John’s intended replacement—rather than supplementation—of the Synoptics.

Protevangelium of James comprises independent traditions, especially those pertaining to Mary—for example, her birth, childhood, marriage, ordeal, giving birth in a cave, post-partum virginity, and that she did not birth Jesus’ supposed siblings. In such matters, though, *Protevangelium of James* can be read alongside eventual canonical birth narratives as supplementing but not contradicting them.³⁰¹ The question then arises as to whether such supplementation was intentional, and indeed it must have been. Quintessentially *Prot. Jas.* 22 harmonizes Matthew and Luke to explain how the baby John the Baptist escaped Herod’s slaughter of infants.³⁰² Only Luke makes Jesus and John blood relatives born within six months of each other (ch. 1), and only Matthew has Herod slaughter the Bethlehem children two years and younger shortly after Jesus’ birth (ch. 2). When read together, the question arises as to how John the Baptist survived the slaughter. The infancy gospel resolves that seeming contradiction by constructing the angelic mountain rescue of Elizabeth and John.³⁰³

constitutes a supplement to the canonical Gospels” [Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, *bd. 1* (2d ed.; Freiberg: Herder, 1913), 503]. On the following page Bardenhewer classifies the *Gospel of Peter* as gnostic and places it in a different group than those that “fill in the gaps of the canonical gospels,” such as Jesus’ childhood. *Inter alia* Windisch does not discuss the *Protevangelium of James*, which was nonetheless available to him in Tischendorf’s collection [Constantin von Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Leipzig: Hermann Mendelssohn, 1876)], as cited by Bardenhewer.

³⁰¹ Jesus’ cave birth in the *Protevangelium of James* may seem contradictory to Luke, but οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι can be rendered, “there was no space in the place of lodging for them” (Luke 2:7), in which case *Protevangelium*’s deserted place three miles from Bethlehem does not necessarily contradict the Lukan nativity. In arguing for the more accurate, less specific ‘place of lodging’ (although he ultimately thinks Luke had in mind a relative’s house as opposed to an inn), Stephen Carlson also points out that καταλύμα once translates into a lion’s lair (Jer 32:38 LXX [25:38 MT]) [Stephen C. Carlson, “The Accommodations of Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem: Καταλύμα in Luke 2.7,” *NTS* 56 (2010): 332], which—I point out—could readily indicate a cave. The point is simply that the author of the *Protevangelium* knew a tradition of Jesus’ birth in a cave and did not consider the cave and manger at all contradictory (*Prot. Jas.* 21.3; 22.1); the same goes for Justin (*Dial.* 78.5).

³⁰² See Ronald F. Hock, *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas* (The Scholars Bible 2; Santa Rosa, Cal.: Polebridge, 1995), 9; idem, ed., *The Life of Mary and the Birth of Jesus: The Ancient Infancy Gospel of James* (Berkeley, Cal.: Ulysses Press, 1997), 15.

³⁰³ One could argue topographically that no real contradiction exists between Matthew and Luke. Herod commands the slaughter “in Bethlehem and in all its regions/boundaries/districts” (ἐν Βηθλέεμ καὶ ἐν πάσι τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς; Matt 2:16); Bethlehem’s boundaries go unspecified. To visit Elizabeth, though, Mary

Readers of the *Protevangelium* are by no means required to know Matthew or Luke or the seeming contradiction between those two.³⁰⁴ However, the story of Elizabeth and John’s miraculous deliverance only originates from an author’s self-conscious attempt to resolve the seeming contradiction. *Contra* Windisch’s reasoning, such self-sufficiency therefore implies neither the author’s intention for the *Protevangelium* to be read without recourse to other gospels nor the desire to replace predecessors.

The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* evinces similar intentions. The conclusion to the longer recension overlaps with Luke’s narrative of the twelve-year-old Jesus in Jerusalem (2:41–52), and even the shorter version narrates events transpiring when Jesus was five, six, and eight years old. Accordingly the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* particularly fill gaps in Luke’s gospel, which skips from Jesus’ day of birth (2:7) to day eight (2:21) to year twelve (2:42) to approximately year thirty (3:23). At the same time, the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*’s episodes neither require knowledge of Luke nor could they in any way replace Luke.

Simply put, non-canonical infancy gospels stand on their own, but they do not stand alone. Windisch argued that since John’s gospel does not require knowledge of the Synoptics, John did not intend to be read alongside them.³⁰⁵ Smith asked accordingly, “If the Fourth Gospel is intended to be supplemented by the Synoptics and to supplement them, why should it contain narratives that are parallel to the Synoptics at all?”³⁰⁶ The infancy gospels reveal the answer. Matthew and Luke must have been read alongside one another in the same communities, and *Protevangelium of James* gained credibility by sidling up to them and resolving a point of

goes “into the hill country...into a city of Judah” (εἰς τὴν ὄρεινὴν...εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα; Luke 1:39). Luke’s reference to the hill country would most likely locate John’s birthplace in a city such as Hebron, which lies farther south of Bethlehem than Bethlehem lies south of Jerusalem. In sum, Luke’s hill country was likely far enough from Matthew’s boundaries of Bethlehem for baby John to have stayed safe from Herod’s henchmen. However, considering that Elizabeth flees with John into the hill country to avoid the slaughter (*Prot. Jas.* 22.3), the author of the *Protevangelium* likely had no detailed knowledge of Judean geography. Thus, considering Matthew and Luke contradictory, the author constructed the harmonization.

³⁰⁴ Similarly Richard Bauckham points out that readers/hearers of John can understand the gospel even if they have not read/heard Mark [Richard Bauckham, “John for Readers of Mark,” 158]; Bauckham nevertheless assumes that the Fourth Gospel “presupposes that many of its readers/hearers will know Mark and will expect to be able to relate John’s narratives to Mark’s” [p. 159].

³⁰⁵ E.g., “Not a single one of the synoptic parallels in John is composed such that the synoptic account must be compared for its explanation and supplementation” [Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 96].

³⁰⁶ Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 25–6.

tension between the other two. Lacking any such recontextualization, the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* nonetheless supplemented the Gospel of Luke (perhaps also that of Matthew) and positioned itself beside it. Those non-canonical gospels can be read and understood without knowledge of their canonical counterparts, but the former cannot have been written independently of the latter. Building on Wilckens's suggestion,³⁰⁷ I propose a similar relationship between John and Matthew.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁷ Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, 4.

³⁰⁸ The notion of John's positioning itself alongside one or more Synoptics is not unprecedented, but scholars usually attribute such Johannine intention to later redactional stages, discussions of which I tend to bracket in this dissertation; e.g., conformity with the Synoptics is a characteristic of Bultmann's ecclesiastical redactor, Boismard's John II-B, Baum-Bodenbender's later Johannine redaction, and Urban C. von Wahlde's third and final edition of John; Ismo Dunderberg, however, has denied that John's synoptic parallels represent an attempt to gain acceptance for the Fourth Gospel [Ismo Dunderberg, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Studien zu Joh 1–9* (AASF Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 69; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1994)]; so too Raymond Brown [Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (ed. Francis J. Moloney; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 104].

III. ZECHARIAH'S DONKEY PROPHECY AND JESUS' ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM

Matthew (xxi. 5) and John (xii. 15) agree in connecting with the triumphal entry the passage in Zechariah ix. 9, "Behold, thy king cometh, sitting on the foal of an ass." Seeing that Christians were in the habit of ransacking the Old Testament for Messianic prophecies, concurrence in such an obvious instance proves nothing. What is significant is that the words as quoted by John are so different from Matthew that they must either represent a different translation of the Hebrew or be free quotations from memory.

—B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*

According to all four canonical gospels, Jesus rode or at least sat on a young animal when entering Jerusalem the week of the passion (Matt 21:1–9; Mark 11:1–10; Luke 19:29–38; John 12:12–19). Mark and Luke specify that the animal had never before been ridden (Mark 11:2; Luke 19:30). Matthew and John do not include that detail, yet they do specify the species as a donkey (Matt 21:2, 5, 7; John 12:14, 15). Also as distinct from Mark and Luke, Matthew and John interpret Jesus' actions by means of a prophecy from Zechariah about a king coming to Zion mounted on a donkey (Zech 9:9). This chapter raises three basic questions: How did John know that Jesus rode a donkey? How did John know that Jesus' riding a donkey related to Zechariah's donkey prophecy? What was John's source for Zech 9:9? My thesis is that John's knowledge of the redacted gospel of Matthew answers all three questions.

My discussion falls into three parts. First, I discuss the meaning of the word πῶλος. All four gospels use the word, and scholars who maintain Johannine independence claim πῶλος as a traditional element. Moreover, the word also appears in Zech 9:9, and so scholars claim that John could have located the prophecy independent of Matthew. I cast doubt on those arguments by correcting the widely held misperception that the word specifically refers to a donkey. The purpose is to show a closer connection between Matthew and John than is usually recognized.

Second, I examine the Testimony-Book Hypothesis, which claims that early Christians collected OT proof texts to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. If Zech 9:9 stood in such *testimonia*, then Matthew and John could have accessed the prophecy independently. I review the evidence for such claims and find no confirmation through the end of the second century—that is, in the works of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. Third, I reconstruct John's use of Zech 9:9 via Matthew. I show that John does not even look up the prophecy in an OT text but instead relies on

Matthew. John's main divergence from Matthew is easily explained as the elimination of Matthew's depiction of Jesus riding two donkeys at once.

Mark and Luke's πῶλος

Mark and Luke record that Jesus rode into Jerusalem on a πῶλος, which most scholars understand as denoting an ass. The definition of πῶλος illustrates the pitfalls of the Semitic background of biblical Greek, a major methodological concern in LXX lexicography.¹ Some scholars work from the perspective of translator's intent and presume that the LXX translators intended fidelity to their *Vorlagen*.² Considering "unintelligibility" an inherent characteristic of the LXX,³ these translators rely on the Semitic background to clarify certain English translations while being "particularly careful not to assign a Greek word all too quickly the meaning of its Hebrew counterpart."⁴ Other scholars work from the perspective of ancient Greek-readers/hearers who did not know Hebrew or Aramaic, and yet those scholars always compare the Greek to its Semitic *Vorlagen*.⁵ The lexeme πῶλος signifies a 'young animal' in general and

¹ Lexicons give the following definitions: 1) "foal, whether colt or filly" [vis-à-vis horses]; 2) "any young animal;" *et al.* [LSJ]; "foal, colt of an ass" [Moulton and Milligan]; "the young of a donkey—foal, colt" [Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988)]; "young male ass" [Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)* (Leuven: Peeters, 1993)]; 1) "young animal, foal;" 2) "horse" [BDAG]; "young ass" [Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002)]; "colt of a horse Jgs 10,4; foal of an ass Gn 32,16" [Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003)]; "any young animal" [Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009)].

² E.g., Johan Lust, "Introduction," in *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, xxi.

³ Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, "To the Reader of NETS," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xv; see also xvi–xvii: 'Translating a Translation'. Online: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/00-front-nets.pdf>.

⁴ Johan Lust, "Introduction," in *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, xvi; see also p. xvii for the explanation that in the vast majority of cases, Greek terms correspond to their normal usage.

⁵ Takamitsu Muraoka, "Introduction," in *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), viii. See also *idem*, "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontext, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr

most frequently refers to a horse, but in five of its seven LXX instantiations it stands in for the Hebrew term עֵיִר ('ass'; Gen 32:16; 49:11; Judg 10:4; 12:14; Zech 9:9); cf. also πῶλος τῆς ὄνου ('young of an ass') for בֶּן אִתּוֹן ('offspring of a she-ass'; Gen 49:11) and πῶλος for אֵילָה ('doe'; Prov 5:19). On the basis of that handful of attestations, occasionally both translator- and reader-oriented LXX lexicographers have inaccurately rendered πῶλος as 'young ass'.⁶

The majority of NT scholars work from the understanding that Mark and Luke's πῶλος denotes a 'donkey', and this interpretation results from a sequence of publications by Walter Bauer, H.-W. Kuhn, and Otto Michel in the 1950s. They adduced evidence that could have established the sense of πῶλος as a 'young animal' (of any number of species), and yet each scholar claimed a more restrictive meaning. In what follows, I show that Mark and Luke's πῶλος does not necessarily specify any species, and so Matthew and John's agreement that Jesus rode a donkey is a stronger connection than is usually admitted.

Irrespective of the meaning of πῶλος, scholars make several other arguments as to why a donkey is more likely the species Mark and Luke intended—for example, that donkeys were more common than horses. I also address those arguments in addition to questioning whether Mark intended an allusion to Zech 9:9. I find no supporting evidence for those claims, which appear to rest on scholars' unarticulated harmonizations of Mark and Luke with Matthew and John.

Walter Bauer's Rejection of the Palmesel

Bauer rightly begins by questioning whether Mark's πῶλος (11:2, 4, 5, 7) had to be an ass, as identified by Matthew and John based on their use of Zech 9:9. Rather than harmonize the gospels, Bauer points out that "in fact, (Mark) does not even allude to (Zech 9:9) in any way that

Siebeck, 2008), 221–35. See also Albert Pietersma, "Response to T. Muraoka, 'Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model,'" *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, 21 pp. [cited 4 May 2011]. Online: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/discussion/pietersma-re-muraoka.pdf>.

⁶ E.g., Lust et al., *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*; Muraoka's 1993 and 2003 editions made the same mistake before being corrected in the full edition in 2009.

would be understandable to anyone who did not already know Matt and John.”⁷ Bauer intends to show that πῶλος carried two meanings, either a young animal of no particular species or a horse of no particular age.⁸ For the generic rendering ‘young animal’, Bauer provides good examples of πῶλος either juxtaposed or in close proximity to the words for elephant, cattle, horse, donkey, gazelle, dog, dove, swallow, and grasshopper.⁹ These zoological terms designate the species of the young animal, and without such designation Bauer admits that the species would be indeterminable.¹⁰ For example, Bauer cites P.Oxy. 1222.1, a fourth-century private letter in which a man requests that his son send a πῶλος; the son most likely knew the intended animal, but Bauer says that “we must remain ignorant of what is meant.”¹¹

Bauer goes on to argue that “πῶλος is also used without any more specific zoological designation” and that such instances refer to a horse—not a specifically young one.¹² Bauer typically selects instances of πῶλοι (for which I would prefer the generic rendering ‘young animals’) that occur in proximity to ἵπποι (horses). As examples, I discuss here his references to the term πωλευτής and to Pausanias *Description of Greece*, and I submit a reference from Philo that Bauer does not discuss. A full semantic analysis of the lexeme πῶλος lies beyond the scope of this project, and my purpose is simply to caution against making strong claims for the species of an undesignated πῶλος. Bauer is correct that the term most commonly refers to horses, but in my estimation his examples do not establish that the term necessarily does so.

⁷ Bauer, “The ‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday (Der Palmesel),” *JBL* 72 (1953): 220 [220–229; see also BDAG, 900]; as supporting evidence, Bauer mentions that Luke uses ὄνος elsewhere (13:15; 14:5 v.l.) and yet repeats Mark’s fourfold πῶλος in this pericope [p. 220].

⁸ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 221; Bauer rejects the term ‘colt’, but he actually seems to argue against the term ‘foal’, since he refers to “an animal something like the one referred to in the language of horse-racing as having passed its ‘two-year test’” (222), which would still be considered a colt or filly in common parlance.

⁹ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 220–221.

¹⁰ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 222–3.

¹¹ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 222.

¹² Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 222.

Bauer claims that πωλευτής (adding -της to πωλεύω) necessarily has “something to do with the horse.”¹³ Indeed this is usually the case (e.g., Xenophon *Eq. mag.* 2.1), but I point out that the term elsewhere refers to someone who trains elephants (Aelian *Nat. an.* 8.17.20). That is, just as πῶλος can refer to multiple species, πωλευτής could refer to someone working with a species other than a horse.

Without describing the scene, Bauer cites Pausanias’s *Descr.* 5.8.10 as an instance wherein “πῶλος used alone means *horse*.”¹⁴ *Description of Greece* 5.8 gives an overview of innovations to the Olympian Games. The twenty-fifth Olympiad included “a (chariot) race of full-grown horses” (ἵππων τελείων δρόμον; 5.8.7). Eight festivals later came the “riding-horse” race (κέλης; 5.8.8). The ninety-third games initiated a race where “a pair of full-grown horses” (δύο ἵππων τελείων; 5.8.10) pulled each chariot. In the ninety-ninth there began “chariots (pulled by) colts” (πῶλων ἄρμασιν; 5.8.10), with a single horse to each chariot; later still came the chariot race for a “pair of colts” (συνωρίδα πῶλων) and the “riding-colt” race (πῶλων κέλητα; 5.8.11). I maintain that the πῶλοι in these passages are only understood to be horses because of their proximity to ἵπποι. Pausanias’s immediately ensuing section mentions races for “wagon-carts” (ἀπήνη) pulled by “a pair of mules as opposed to horses” (συνωρίδα ἡμιόνους ἀντὶ ἵππων; 5.9.1–2), which ran from the seventieth to the eighty-fourth games. The mule-cart-races were short-lived and, according to Pausanias, not a pretty sight. Had there been innovations to the mule races, though, one would expect subdivisions for colts and full-grown mules just as there were for horses. In Pausanias’s references, then, πῶλος only stands in apposition with horses, but such apposition does not entail that πῶλος means ‘horse’ exclusively. Furthermore, Pausanias’s contrasting πῶλος with τέλειος clearly shows that πῶλος denotes neither a foal nor a full-grown animal, which refutes Bauer’s insistence that πῶλος does not denote youth.¹⁵

In a passage that escapes Bauer’s notice, Philo once uses the word πῶλος:

¹³ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 225.

¹⁴ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 224.

¹⁵ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 224; Pausanias similarly describes the Pythian games at Delphi: the first “horse race” (ἵππων δρόμος) involved “chariots” (ἄρμη; 10.7.6); later “they yoked colts to a chariot” (πῶλους ἔξευξαν ὑπὸ ἄρματι; 10.7.7), with one horse per chariot; later still came the chariot race of “a pair of colts” (συνωρίς πωλικός) and the “riding colt” (πῶλος κέλης; 10.7.8).

Some prefer mules [ὄρεύς] over all other beasts of burden, since their bodies are sturdy and very muscular. And where horses are kept and in horse stables they raise huge donkeys [ὄνος]—which they refer to as stallions—so that they will cover the fillies [θηλείαις . . . πώλοις]; and they foal a hybrid animal, a half-ass [ἡμίονος]. Knowing their genesis to be contrary to nature, Moses strongly forbade [the practice] in a more general commandment not to breed between unlike species. (*Spec. Laws* 3.47)

Literally Philo could refer simply to “female young animals” (ταῖς θηλείαις πώλοις). The term indeed designates a horse in this instance, but I would suggest that the species is known only because this particular πῶλος produces a mule when covered by an ass.

In summary, I agree with Bauer that tacit harmonization of Matthew and John leads to the supposition that Mark and Luke’s πῶλος designates a donkey. Accordingly Bauer rightly takes issue with Liddell-Scott designating the πῶλος in Mark 11:2 alone as referring to the young of an ass.¹⁶ However, he overstates his case in concluding, “The word πῶλος in Mark and Luke can be understood only as *horse*, and it was nothing else either for these evangelists or for their readers.”¹⁷ I prefer to read the πῶλος in Mark 11:2, 4, 5, 7; Luke 19:30, 33, 35 more like the πῶλος in P.Oxy. 1222.1 and so to leave open the possibility of a species other than a horse. Bauer’s article hardly went unnoticed, but the respondents did not offer accurate correctives.

H.-W. Kuhn’s Response to Bauer

Kuhn begins by reviewing the seven occurrences of πῶλος in the Septuagint. He admits that in Gen 49:11αβ πῶλος simply means ‘young animal’ (Tierjunges).¹⁸ Kuhn marvels that פִּיִּזָּה— which Koehler rendered as ‘female ibex’ (Steinbockweibchen)—is translated simply as πῶλος in Prov 5:19.¹⁹ In the five remaining instances (Gen 32:16; 49:11αα; Judg 10:4; 12:14; Zech 9:9), Kuhn says that πῶλος stands alone as “the translation of the Hebrew word ‘male ass.’”²⁰ He avers that the word is not restricted to this meaning, and he agrees with Bauer’s conclusion that

¹⁶ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 225.

¹⁷ Bauer, “‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 229.

¹⁸ Kuhn, “Reittier Jesu,” 83.

¹⁹ Kuhn, “Reittier Jesu,” 83.

²⁰ Kuhn, “Reittier Jesu,” 83.

πῶλος was at times a last resort (*Verlegenheitsübersetzung*),²¹ given translators' occasional uncertainty regarding אִתְּ/אִתְּ—rendered βούς in Isa 30:24, for example.²²

Referring to a gloss in Jerome's Isaiah commentary, Kuhn supposes that Matthew and John's usage influenced an understanding of πῶλος as “young of an ass” among people who did not regularly speak Greek.²³ Kuhn claims second century evidence based on Justin Martyr's comment that “it is possible for the name πῶλος [i.e., ‘young animal’] to signify the πῶλος [i.e., ‘young’ in the sense of ‘offspring’] both of an ass and of a horse” (*I Apol.* 54.7).²⁴ Kuhn says that Justin could not have meant “that the bare πῶλος could mean the young of a horse as well as that of an ass” because in *I Apol.* 32.6 Justin used πῶλος by itself to signify a young ass. The problem with Kuhn's presentation is that in *I Apol.* 32.1, 5 Justin is discussing Gen 49:11, and he explicitly designates the young animal was an ass, which means that it is not an example of a “bare πῶλος.” *Pace* Kuhn, the statement in *I Apol.* 54.7 presents clear evidence that for Justin the term did not *ipso facto* denote a species.

Ultimately Kuhn favors a distinction between non-Christian usage of πῶλος as ‘(young) horse’ and the Christian meaning of πῶλος as ‘foal of an ass’.²⁵ His attempt at a compromise falters because he claims the denotation of two species for a term that did not necessarily denote a single one.

Otto Michel's Response to Bauer and Kuhn

Michel responded to Bauer and Kuhn. Arguing that in Egyptian and Palestinian usage πῶλος simply means ‘ass’, Michel points out that אִתְּ was translated πῶλος in Judg 10:4; 12:14; Michel says that both references have in mind a “young, strong ass” as opposed to a “foal of an

²¹ Bauer, “Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 227.

²² Bauer, “Colt’ of Palm Sunday,” 228–9; Kuhn, “Reittier Jesu,” 84.

²³ Kuhn, “Reittier Jesu,” 84–5.

²⁴ καὶ τὸ τοῦ πῶλου ὄνομα καὶ ὄνου πῶλον καὶ ἵππου σημαίνειν ἐδύνατο (*I Apol.* 54.7).

²⁵ Kuhn, “Reittier Jesu,” 91.

ass.”²⁶ The most problematic lexicographical issue is simply that Michel presupposes one-to-one correspondence between עִיר (also עִילֵא) and πῶλος based on translation patterns in the LXX.²⁷

One piece of Michel’s evidence does show the considerable overlap between עִיר and πῶλος, and yet that evidence serves to contradict Michel’s argument that עִילֵא means “young strong ass.” Michel cites *b. Šabb.* 155a–b, which contains two references to עִילֵא זוטרי. *Pace* Michel, I would translate the phrase as ‘young small animals’—not ‘young strong ass’.²⁸ The Mishnah states, “They crush neither young grain nor carob pods in front of livestock, whether small or large” (*m. Šabb.* 24:2); that is, making fodder is prohibited on the Sabbath. The Bavli questions whether soft (fresh) or hard (dried) grain or carobs are meant, and R. Huna is supposed to have in mind hard grain for use with young small animals (עִילֵא זוטרי). The next line elaborates, “Rabbi Judah permits (crushing) with regard to carobs with small (livestock)” (*m. Šabb.* 24:2). The antecedent of ‘small’ (דקה) is ‘livestock’ (בהמה), and the ensuing sections (24:3–4) discuss the permissibility of certain types of feeding for various creatures—e.g., a camel (גמל), young cow (עגל), chicken (תרנגול), beehive (דבור), dove (יונה), goose (אווז), and dog (כלב). Neither the Mishnaic nor the Talmudic passage has specifically equine animals in view. So in this case, if Michel is correct that עִיר and πῶλος convey the same basic meaning, then he is incorrect in defining עִיר as ‘young, strong ass’.

Also refuting Michel’s claim for a specific Egyptian usage of πῶλος as ‘ass’ is Philo of Alexandria, who—as mentioned above—used a standalone πῶλος to refer to a horse (*Spec. Laws* 3.47). While Philo’s literary Greek would unlikely admit Egyptian regionalisms, Michel’s only evidence for understanding πῶλος as ‘ass’ in Egypt is the LXX.

²⁶ Otto Michel, “Eine philologische Frage zur Einzugsgeschichte,” *NTS* 6 (1959): 81–2; see also *idem*, “πῶλος,” *TDNT* 6:959–61.

²⁷ The relation of עִיר/עִיל is hardly unexpected given the “mutation” of ר > ל from Hebrew to Aramaic; see M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927; repr., Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2001), 34 (§54).

²⁸ The term זוטרי can mean ‘small’ or ‘young’, and עִיל here simply refers to a young animal; Jastrow renders עִיל [p. 1069] and עִיר [p. 1075] as ‘foal’. If זוטרי is understood as ‘young’, then the construction would be redundant or perhaps emphatic: “very young animals;” cf. “very young foals” [Jastrow, 1069]. The context favors reading זוטרי as ‘small’, corresponding to דק in the Mishnah tractate—young small animals (e.g., sheep and goats) as opposed to young large animals (e.g., cows and horses).

In summary, in Bauer’s favor, the earliest usage of πῶλος (prior to Aristotle) pertained exclusively to horses, and even thereafter the word’s most common referent was a horse. I agree with Bauer that apart from harmonization with Matthew and John, Mark and Luke’s πῶλος would hardly signify a donkey. For early Christian understandings of the term, though, I place more weight on Justin’s description in *I Apol.* 54.7 whereby πῶλος refers to horses and asses. Accordingly I stop short of Bauer’s insistence that Mark and Luke’s readers would necessarily have envisioned a horse. At the same time, Michel and Kuhn are also incorrect to insist that Mark and Luke necessarily intended a donkey. I conclude that Mark and Luke leave the species undesignated, and so should their readers.

In the Wake of Bauer, Kuhn, and Michel

In spite of the semantically unstable basis for considering an unqualified πῶλος an ass, the vast majority of Markan commentators assume that meaning;²⁹ Moloney even says that Jesus specifically fetched a donkey rather than a horse.³⁰ Scholars cite Kuhn and/or Michel as authoritative,³¹ and they frequently claim that πῶλος meant ‘ass’ in Palestine.³² The notion is

²⁹ E.g., Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 517; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (CGTC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 349; James R. Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 334, 335; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 431; Morna Hooker, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (BNTC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 257; Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 391 n. 2; Mann, *Mark* (AB 27; Garden City: Doubleday, 1986), 435, 436; Joel Marcus, *Mark* (2 vols.; AB 27–27A; New York: Doubleday; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2009), 2:772, 778; Claus-Peter März, “*Siehe, dein König kommt zu dir...*”: eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Einzugsperikope (ETS 43; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1980), 36; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 217 n. 8; D. E. Nineham, *Saint Mark* (Pelican; London: SCM, 1963), 227; Robert Stein, *Mark* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 504; Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 308.

³⁰ Moloney, *Gospel of Mark*, 220; similarly Collins contrasts the significance of riding a donkey rather than a horse or mule [*Mark*, 518].

³¹ Those citing Kuhn and Michel include Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:116; Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 391 n. 2; Marcus, *Mark*, 2:772 [there Marcus mistakenly cites Justin’s *Dial.* 32.1, 5–6; 54.5–7; the references are to *I Apology*]; France, *Gospel of Mark*, 431. Those citing Kuhn alone include Catchpole, “The ‘triumphal’ entry,” in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 323. [319–34]; Collins, *Mark*, 517, n. 44; J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt,” *NovT* 13 (1971): 248 [241–58]; repr. in *Studies in the New Testament, Vol. 2* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 165–83; Brent Kinman, *Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem: In the Context of Lukan Theology and*

that Jesus rode a donkey because they were more common than horses.³³ Derrett even claims, “The ordinary villager would not know how to look after (horses).”³⁴ No one provides supporting evidence for such claims.

The literary and material evidence shows that assertions concerning horses’ scarcity are overstated. Regarding literary sources, the Mishnah incontrovertibly shows the use of horses, asses, and mules in Palestinian agriculture (*m. Kil.* 8:4–5).³⁵ Josephus, often preoccupied with military details, unsurprisingly mentions horses far more than asses, mules, or camels.³⁶ His attestations by no means imply that horses existed in greater abundance in first century Palestine (in all likelihood they did not), but it does guard against claiming their rarity.

Regarding archaeozoology, it is difficult to distinguish among horses, asses, their hybrids, and onagers, but all were present in first-century Palestine. Hesban, in modern-day Jordan, yields the most evidence for equids.³⁷ Stratum 14 dates to 63 B.C.E.–130 C.E., when Hesban was a small

the Politics of His Day (AGJU 28; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 92 n. 3; Jacques Nieuviarts, *L’Entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem*, 68; John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; Dallas: Word Books, 1989–1993) 3:924. Those citing Michel alone include E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (rev. ed.; NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 225; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:594; Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 178–9 n. 3.

³² E.g., P. M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1947), 288; Robert Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 626; France, *Gospel of Mark*, 431; Bas M. F. van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary* (trans. W. H. Bisscheroux; JSNTSup 164; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 353; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:7 n. 30.

³³ E.g., Collins, *Mark*, 517; Edwards, *Gospel according to Mark*, 335; Gundry, *Mark*, 629; Marcus, *Mark*, 2:772; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 712; Moloney, *Gospel of Mark*, 217 n. 8; Schweizer, *Good News according to Mark*, 227.

³⁴ Derrett, “Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt,” 248.

³⁵ There are six occurrences of horses (סוסים), seven of asses (חמורים), and two of mules (פרדים) in *Kil ayim*.

³⁶ Using *TLG*, in Josephus’s writings there are approximately eighty passages involving horses (ἵππος; excluding eight references to the city Hippos), twenty-three of asses (ὄνος), thirteen of mules (ἡμίονος [8x]; ὄρεύς [5x]), and fifteen of camels (κάμηλος); the passages involving horses would increase dramatically if including common chariotry and other horsemanship terminology.

³⁷ I extend special thanks to Professor Guy Bar-Oz and PhD candidate Ram Bouchnik, archaeozoologists at the University of Haifa, for sharing preliminary data from the Archaeozoological Digitized Database of Israel, a project of the Laboratory of Archaeozoology at the University’s Zinman Institute of Archaeology (cf. <http://arch.haifa.ac.il/labs.php?lab=lab3>).

village.³⁸ There were ten finds of equids at this stage, three of which were identified as asses; by comparison there were seven finds of camels.³⁹ Horses and mules were identified in the preceding stratum.⁴⁰ For the Hellenistic/Roman periods, the ratio of equids to camels was almost exactly 2:1;⁴¹ however, the 2:1 ratio misleadingly includes an influx of equids as Hesban was rapidly growing into a temple town in the period after the bar Kokhba revolt.⁴² More accurately, then, Strata 15–14 (198 B.C.E.–130 C.E.) reveal a camels to equids ratio of 3:2.⁴³ Granting for the sake of argument that Jesus would have ridden the more common animal, he thus would have ridden a camel rather than a horse, ass, or mule. The term πῶλος could refer to the young of any of these species, all of which were present in first century Palestinian villages.

Another way of getting Jesus on a donkey is to claim that travelers could pick one up at a donkey pool.⁴⁴ Yet there is no evidence for such pools. Rostowzew discussed the state-run donkey-driver position (δημοσία ὄνηλασία; *BGU* 1.15) and inferred that there might have been guilds of ass-drivers in Egypt.⁴⁵ Citing Rostowzew, Derrett then assumed not only that there were such guilds in Palestine but also that the Palestinian guilds formed in reaction to Roman requisition so that no one's business suffered too much when compelled to state service such as

³⁸ Øystein Sakala LaBianca et al., *Faunal Remains: Taphonomical and Zooarchaeological Studies of the Animal Remains from Tell Hesban and Vicinity* (Hesban 13; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1995), 70, Table 5.6.

³⁹ LaBianca et al., *Faunal Remains*, 72, Table 5.9; i.e., the species of the other seven equid finds could not be distinguished.

⁴⁰ LaBianca et al., *Faunal Remains*, 84, Table 5.20: Stratum 15 (198–63 B.C.E.) reveals a horse metacarpus, which was distinguished from a mule's metacarpus at the same stage.

⁴¹ LaBianca et al., *Faunal Remains*, 72, Table 5.10; of all the domestic animals, the percentage of horses/asses was 1.5% as compared with 0.8% for camels.

⁴² LaBianca et al., *Faunal Remains*, 70, Table 5.6; following the bar Kokhba revolt, finds of pig bones increase dramatically: 43 in Stratum 14 (63 B.C.E.–130 C.E.) as compared with 183 in Strata 11–13 (130–365 C.E.), which includes nearly a century of inoccupation due to an earthquake (Stratum 12: 193–284 C.E.).

⁴³ LaBianca et al., *Faunal Remains*, 72, Table 5.9.

⁴⁴ Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt," 244; Bock, *Luke*, 2:1553; Gundry, *Matthew*, 407; *idem*, *Mark*, 627–8; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 712.

⁴⁵ M. Rostowzew, "Angariae," *Klio* 6 (1906): 253 [249–58]; see Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt," 243.

hauling grain.⁴⁶ To the contrary, such a situation seems quite unlikely to have occurred in Palestine, where even one's rented ass could be requisitioned (*m. B. Meši 'a* 6:3; מִשֵּׁי אֶת הַחֹמֶר; cf. ἀγγαρεία).

Even if πῶλος be defined generically as 'young animal', the catchword still appears in Zech 9:9, and many claim that Mark intended an allusion. Nineham begins his exposition of 'The Entry into Jerusalem', "In studying this story it is particularly important to do two things which the original readers will have done automatically; to have in mind certain Old Testament and later Jewish expectations, and *not* to have at the back of one's mind impressions derived from the accounts of the incident in the other Gospels."⁴⁷ He adds, though, that the original readers would have assumed Zech 9:9.⁴⁸ I see that as a contradiction, for it is by harmonizing with Matthew or John that one most easily reads Zech 9:9 into Mark's narrative.

Nonetheless the allusion to Zech 9:9 is widely claimed among Markan commentators;⁴⁹ the same goes for most Matthean commentators, who claim that Matthew simply makes the Scripture explicit.⁵⁰ Lukan commentators likewise claim that Luke alludes to Zech 9:9.⁵¹ Zechariah 9:9 does not mention whether the animal was broken, and so Zechariah's νέος πῶλος

⁴⁶ Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt," 244.

⁴⁷ Nineham, *Saint Mark*, 291–3; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Mark* (trans. Donald H. Madvig; Atlanta: John Knox, 1970), 291.

⁴⁸ Nineham, *Saint Mark*, 291.

⁴⁹ M. Eugene Boring, *Mark: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 314; John R. Donahue and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark* (SP 2; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2002), *Gospel of Mark*, 321–2; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 429; see also *idem*, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 773; Van Iersel, *Mark*, 353; Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 393; Marcus, *Mark*, 2:778; Nieuviarts, *L'Entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem*, 68; Nineham, *Saint Mark*, 291–2 [according to Nineham, Mark does not spell out the prophetic significance because of the Messianic Secret]; Witherington, *Gospel of Mark*, 308.

⁵⁰ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:118; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP 1; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 294; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 835 n. 62; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel of Matthew* (trans. Robert R. Barr; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 200; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Matthew* (trans. David E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 404; Weren, "Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem," 119.

⁵¹ Darrell Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996), 2:1546; R. Alan Culpepper, *Luke* (NIB 9; Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 367; Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 682–5.

need not relate to Mark and Luke's never-before-ridden πῶλος.⁵² In my view, that Markan and Lukan detail functions as a nature miracle, that Jesus tames the unbroken animal. I side with the minority position doubting that Mark has in mind Zech 9:9.⁵³ Yet even if Mark does echo the OT, the options are hardly limited to Zechariah's text. Since πῶλος is not restricted to donkeys, Mark's text could also evoke David's mule on which Solomon rode at his accession (1 Kgs 1:33, 38, 44)—especially given the appellation “our father David” in Mark 11:10.⁵⁴

I conclude that the identification of Jesus' mount as a donkey constitutes a minor agreement between Matthew and John against Mark and Luke, an agreement that would not have arisen necessarily from the traditional element that Jesus rode a πῶλος into Jerusalem.

Zechariah 9:9 and the Testimony-Book Hypothesis

A number of scholars have argued that Zech 9:9 constituted a mainstay within hypothetical early Christian *testimonia*, collections of OT proof texts showing Jesus to be the Messiah. If so, then John did not necessarily depend on Matthew for the Zechariah prophecy. In addition to John and Matthew, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus cite the donkey prophecy, and these citations constitute key evidence for those who claim the existence of *testimonia* and the inclusion therein of Zech 9:9.⁵⁵ These sections show that Irenaeus drew directly on Matthew and John (and perhaps Justin)

⁵² Pace J. Blenkinsopp, “The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 55 [55–64]; Evans, “Zechariah in the Markan Passion Narrative,” 70; France, *Gospel of Mark*, 431; März, “*Siehe, dein König kommt zu dir...*” 36; Nineham, *Saint Mark*, 295; Andre Paul, “L'entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem: Mc 11,1-10; Mt 21,1-11; Lc 19,28-40; Jn 12,12-19,” *AsSeign* 19 (1971): 14; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 141; Weren, “Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997) 119–20.

⁵³ Evans, “Zechariah in the Markan Passion Narrative,” 70 [Evans, however, thinks that Jesus intended a fulfillment of Zech 9:9]; Hooker, *Gospel according to Saint Mark*, 257; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 493; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:5 n. 11; Moloney, *Gospel of Mark*, 220 n. 21; Kelli S. O'Brien, *The Use of Scripture in the Markan Passion Narrative* (LNTS 384; New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 123 n. 29.

⁵⁴ Marcus [*Mark*, 2:779] and Nolland [*Luke*, 3:928] claim such an echo, but they misidentify Solomon's mount as a donkey rather than a mule; cf. Gundry, *Mark*, 626: Gundry claims that Jesus rode a donkey as a contrast to Solomon's mule.

⁵⁵ For Irenaeus see Joseph P. Smith, “Introduction,” in *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* (trans. Joseph P. Smith; ACW 16; New York: Seabury, 1952), 31–4; for Justin see Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (Supplements to Vigiliae

and that Justin utilized Matthew and John as well as the LXX and its earliest recension. Isolating their actual sources dispels the need for hypothetical ones, and the consequence of my study is that there is no evidence for the inclusion of Zech 9:9 in *testimonia* up through the second century. *Testimonia* should therefore not be admitted as possible sources for Matthew and John's use of Zech 9:9.

Table 3.1 is intended as a reference for the ensuing discussion of the complicated transmission of Zech 9:9 down to the early third century when Origen preserved the witnesses to LXX recensions by Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the *Quinta* (*Comm. Matt.* 16.16.180–193). I have retroverted Irenaeus's quotation from Armenian into Greek.⁵⁶ I also include a line each from Isaiah and Zephaniah: Irenaeus and Justin respectively attribute Zech 9:9 to Isaiah and Zephaniah, which is somewhat understandable given the parallels Isa 62:11//Matt 21:5 and Zeph 3:14//Zech 9:9 LXX, and the misattribution to prophets is part of the criteria for detecting a *testimonium* source text.⁵⁷

Christianae 64; Boston: Brill, 2002), 160–161; Martin Albl, “*And Scripture Cannot Be Broken*”: *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (NovTSup 96; Boston: Brill: 1999), 101–6; Leslie W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 67–74; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 378, 396; *idem*, *Septuaginta und Synoptischer Erzählungsstoff im Schriftbeweis Justins des Märtyrers, Habilitationsschrift*, Heidelberg, 1956; Judith M. Lieu, “Justin Martyr and the Transformation of Psalm 22,” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 3; Boston: Brill, 2006), 200–201; Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 115; Bertrand de Margerie, *Introduction to the History of Exegesis, Vol. I: The Greek Fathers* (trans. Leonard Maruf; Petersham, Mass.: Saint Bede's, 1993), 38; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 111–9, i.e., ch. 9: “Text and Testimonies.”

⁵⁶ asac'ēk' dstern Siovni · aha t'agawor gay k'ez hez ew nsteal ī veray išoy yawanaki ordwoy išoy (*Epid.* 65).

⁵⁷ See Albl, “*And Scripture Cannot Be Broken*”, 66; for a *Forschungsbericht* of the Testimony-book hypothesis, see ch. 1, pp. 7–69; re criteria, see Rendel Harris, *Testimonies* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920), 1:8; Harris lists: (1) recurring peculiar readings; (2) recurring sequence of OT proof-texts; (3) recurring misattributed authorship; (4) recurring introductions and explanations; (5) hints for disputation; see also Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 27.

Table 3.1

Transmission of Zech 9:9

Cf. Zeph 3:14a LXX	χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ιερουσαλήμ
Cf. Zeph 3:14a MT	רני בת־ציון הריעו ישראל
Tg. J. Zech 9:9	בועי לחדא כנשתא דציון יבעי כנשתא דירושלם
Zech 9:9aα MT	גידי מאד בת־ציון הריעי בת ירושלים
Zech 9:9aα LXX	χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ιερουσαλήμ
Justin <i>Dial.</i> 53.3b	χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών ἀλάλαξον κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ιερουσαλήμ
Justin <i>I Apol.</i> 35.11b	χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ιερουσαλήμ
John 12:15a	μὴ φοβοῦ θυγάτηρ Σιών
Matt 21:5a	εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών
Irenaeus <i>Epid.</i> 65	εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών
Cf. Isa 62:11aβ LXX	εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών
Cf. Isa 62:11aβ MT	אמרו לבת־ציון
Tg. J. Zech 9:9	הא מלכך אתי לגויך הוא זכר ופריק
Zech 9:9aβ MT	הנה מלכך יבוא לך צדיק ונושע הוא
Zech 9:9aβ LXX	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς
Justin <i>Dial.</i> 53.3c	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἤξει σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς
Justin <i>I Apol.</i> 35.11c	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
John 12:15b	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται
Matt 21:5b	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
Irenaeus <i>Epid.</i> 65	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔρχεται σοι
Cf. Isa 62:11aγ LXX	ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται
Cf. Isa 62:11aγ MT	הנה ישעך בא
Tg. J. Zech 9:9	ענותן ורכיב על חמר ועל עילר בר אתן
Zech 9:9b MT	עני ורכב על־חמור ועל־עיר בן־אתנות
Zech 9:9b LXX	πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον
Aquila	πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνου καὶ πῶλου υἱοῦ ὀνάδων
Symmachus	πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὀνάδος
Theodotion	ἐπακούων καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνου
<i>Quinta</i>	πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνων
Justin <i>Dial.</i> 53.3c	καὶ πραῦς καὶ πτωχὸς ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον ὄνου
Justin <i>I Apol.</i> 35.11c	πραῦς ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου
John 12:15b	καθημένος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου
Matthew 21:5b	πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου
Matthew 21:5b [D]	πραῦς ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου
Irenaeus <i>Epid.</i> 65	πραῦς καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ὄνον πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνον

Justin Martyr's Transmission of Zech 9:9 in 1 Apol. 35.10

In *1 Apol.* 35.10 Justin attributes his quotation of Zech 9:9 to Zephaniah. In the opening line, Zeph 3:14a LXX = Zech 9:9aα LXX, and Justin quotes this portion verbatim, including “proclaim, daughter Jerusalem,” which Matthew and John omit. The rest of Justin’s citation does not necessarily come from the LXX. Justin’s divergences show no influence from Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, or the *Quinta*/καίγε—the last of which Justin uses years later in his *Dialogue with Trypho* but might not yet have encountered. For the next phrase, Zech 9:9aβ LXX, Matt 21:5b, and *1 Apol.* 35.11c are identical (ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταιί σοι); John 12:15 omits σοι but is otherwise identical. At this point *1 Apol.* 35.11c, Matt 21:5b, and John 12:15b line up against Zech 9:9aβ LXX, omitting δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτός. Thus Justin’s text shows a mixture of Septuagintal and Matthean elements but no distinctively Johannine ones as of yet. Next Justin uses the spelling πρῶος and omits καί, but then—like everyone except John—he says, “mounted on” (ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπί). The rest of the quotation consists of animal words.

Justin’s faunal terminology most easily derives from John and Matthew rather than the LXX and Matthew.⁵⁸ Justin has the rider mounted on “a young ass, a son of a beast of burden” (πῶλον ὄνον υἷον ὑποζυγίου), which combines John’s “a young of an ass” (πῶλον ὄνου) with Matthew’s “an ass and on a son of a beast of burden” (ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἷον ὑποζυγίου). Justin starts with John’s ending (πῶλον ὄνου) and changes the genitive ὄνου to an accusative. Then, omitting καί (ἐπί), he concludes with Matthew’s ending (υἷον ὑποζυγίου). Justin thus includes all of Matthew’s and John’s animal words while signifying only one donkey; John too signifies a lone donkey. The quotation of Zech 9:9, which he attributes to Zephaniah, represents a combination of Zeph 3:14a LXX with Matthew and John. Justin would have known that Matthew and John did not quote the first half accurately, and so he corrected it by recourse to Zephaniah, at which he arrived prior to Zech 9:9 in a scroll of the Twelve Prophets; from there he would have relied solely on Matthew and John.

A possible objection is that the combination of so many sources would be unfeasible;⁵⁹ another is that Justin encountered a pre-combined text. To overcome such objections I point out

⁵⁸ Pace Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, 120; Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 106 n. 2.

⁵⁹ E.g., R. A. Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (BETL 186; Leuven: Peeters, 2005).

that not long after Justin, Christian scribes were combining the same sources—sometimes more—within the same pericope; also, these later harmonizing transmissions differ from all other known Greek versions—including Justin’s—and thereby provide reasonable assurance that Justin did not draw upon a text that had already been harmonized in this episode. The Old Syriac witnesses provide such evidence, given the way they edit the gospels’ citations. The Zechariah citation appears in the Curetonian as, “Say to the daughter of Zion, ‘Look! your king comes to you, righteous and humble and mounted on an ass and on the young of a she-ass’” (Matt 21:5); a scribe has added ‘righteous’ to Matt 21:5 to align with Zech 9:9. For John 12:15 the Sinaitic not only changes “sitting” to “riding” but also adds “to you” and “son of” as in Matthew: “Do not fear, daughter of Zion; Look! your king comes to you, and riding on a young animal, a son of a she-ass;” the final term “she-ass” comes from Zechariah. Justin’s combination of the LXX, Matthew, and John thus requires less dexterity than the scribal activity that produced the Gospels in Old Syriac.

A larger objection concerns whether John could have drawn upon the Gospel of John, and there is a range of scholarly opinions: there are expressions of strong doubt,⁶⁰ arguments for Justin’s use of yet developing oral tradition,⁶¹ suggestions that Justin quoted John from memory,⁶² and strong support that Justin had read John.⁶³ A demonstration of Justin’s use of

⁶⁰ Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 12; Ernst Haenchen, *John* (ed. Robert W. Funk with Ulrich Busse; trans. Robert W. Funk; 2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 1:13; John Marsh, *Saint John* (SCM Pelican Commentaries; London: SCM, 1978), 26.

⁶¹ Arthur J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (NovTSup 17; Leiden: Brill, 1967); Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 361; Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (BHT 47; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973), 137.

⁶² George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987), lxxv; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 8.

⁶³ François-Marie Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l’Église Ancienne, Vol. 1* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959), 135–44; Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 13; Martin Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989), 13; Charles E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 312–51; Andrew Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John* (BNTC 4; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005), 18; John Romanides, “Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel,” *GOTR* 4 (1959): 133; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St. John*, 1:199; Skarsaune, “Justin and His Bible,” in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 53–76; Graham N. Stanton, “Jesus

John lies beyond the scope of this project, but I submit my conclusions regarding Justin’s quotations of Zech 9:9 as supporting evidence in the case for Justin’s literary dependence. I also accept the two prevailing examples of Justin’s use of John: Justin’s knowledge of the born again saying (*1 Apol.* 61.4; cf. John 3:3–5);⁶⁴ Justin’s harmony/harmonization of all four canonical gospels in describing Jesus’ baptism.⁶⁵

Justin Martyr’s Transmission of Zech 9:9 in Dial. 53.3

Turning to *Dial.* 53.3, Justin correctly attributes the prophecy to “Zechariah, one of the Twelve.” Justin breaks with Matthew and John by including “shout/proclaim daughter of Jerusalem” and “righteous and salvific is he” from Zech 9:9a, having looked up the verse in two Greek versions.

Justin definitely knew of Jewish recensions to the LXX. For example, four times in the *Dialogue* (43.7; 67.1; 71.3; 84.3) he says that Jewish teachers change “virgin” (ἡ παρθένος) in Isa 7:14 LXX to “young girl” (ἡ νεᾶνις),⁶⁶ a change unlikely necessitated prior to the Gospel of Matthew. Justin also knew a pre-Christian recension. Dominique Barthélemy identified

Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus,” in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 363 [353–70].

⁶⁴ “For even Christ said, ‘If you are not born again, you will not at all enter into the kingdom of the heavens.’ And yet that it is impossible for those being once born to embark into their birth mothers is plain to everyone” (*1 Apol.* 61.4–5); cf. “Answering Jesus also said to him, ‘Truly, truly I say to you: unless someone be born again/from above, it is not possible to see the kingdom of God.’ Nicodemus says to him, ‘How is it possible for a person who is old to be born? Is it possible to enter into his/her mother’s womb to be born a second time?’ Jesus answered, ‘Truly, truly I say to you: unless someone be born of water and spirit, it is not possible to enter into the kingdom of God’” (John 3:3–5).

⁶⁵ In *Dial.* 88.7 John is preaching a baptism of repentance (κηρύσσ[οντος] βάπτισμα μετανοίας; Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3); wearing a leather belt (ζώνην δερματίνην; Matt 3:4; Mark 1:6); eating locusts and wild honey (ἐσθί[οντος] ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον; Mark 1:6; cf. Matt 3:4, which lacks ‘eating’); saying, “I am not the Christ... (οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός; John 1:20; cf. 3:28) but a voice crying out” (φωνὴ βοῶντος; John 1:23b in the first-person; cf. Matt 3:3b; Mark 1:3a; Luke 3:4b; Isa 40:3aα); not being worthy to carry—rather than loosen the thong of—Jesus’ sandals (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι; Matt 3:11; cf. Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16b); it was supposed that Jesus was Joseph’s son, mentioned in proximity to Jesus’ baptism (νομίζω + Ἰωσήφ + υἱός; Luke 3:23); that Joseph was a carpenter (τέκτονος υἱός; Matt 13:55a); see also Jesus working as a carpenter making plows and yokes (ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά/ζυγούς; *Inf. Gos. Thom.* 13.1a).

⁶⁶ Irenaeus attributes this alteration to Theodotion and Aquila (*Adv. Haer.* 3.30.4).

8HevXIIgr with the *Quinta*,⁶⁷ and the recension has come to be known as *καίγε*, meaning ‘at least’, by which it translates $\square\aleph$ (e.g., Zech 9:2). Barthélemy showed sporadic examples of the *καίγε* lining up with each of the following against the LXX: Aquila,⁶⁸ Symmachus,⁶⁹ Theodotion,⁷⁰ Hebraisms in the Achmimic version Book of the Twelve,⁷¹ and instances where the *καίγε* matches Origen’s *Quinta*.⁷² George Howard and Natalio Fernández Marcos criticize Barthélemy’s general equation of the *Quinta* with the *καίγε*,⁷³ but the evidence does support the inference that Zech 9:9 in the *Quinta* attested by Origen would have matched the *καίγε* closely, if not exactly.

Barthélemy demonstrated that Justin used the *καίγε* for his extended quotation of Mic 4:1–7 in *Dial.* 109.2–3.⁷⁴ Justin and the *καίγε* use *μάχαίρα*, ‘short sword/dagger’, whereas the LXX has *ρόμφαία*, ‘long sword’;⁷⁵ the LXX uses each term in abundance to translate $\square\aleph$, ‘sword’ (of unspecified length).⁷⁶ Justin and the *καίγε* respectively use *ζιβύνη/σιβύνη*, ‘spear’, whereas the

⁶⁷ Dominique Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” *RB* 60 (1953): 18–29; repr. in Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 127–39; *idem*, *Les Devanciers d’Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); see also Emanuel Tov et al., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

⁶⁸ Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” 23–5.

⁶⁹ Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” 25–6.

⁷⁰ Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” 26.

⁷¹ Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” 26–7.

⁷² Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” 27–8.

⁷³ George Howard, “The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Septuagint Text?” *Bib* 55 (1974) 15–22; Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 157–8.

⁷⁴ Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” 20–21.

⁷⁵ The dagger represents the weapon of choice in 8HevXIIgr—even in Hab 1:17 where the LXX has a net (*ἀμφίβληστρον*). There is one long sword, though, since the rho of *ρόμφαία* (as in the LXX) is visible in Mic 5:5 (Eng. v. 6). Skarsaune [*Proof from Prophecy*, 121] prints *ρόμφαία* as standing in the *καίγε* at Zech 13:7, but the verse is lacking in 8HevXIIgr, and *μάχαίρα* is likelier.

⁷⁶ In the LXX there are over 150 short swords and over 250 long swords for the same Hebrew word; there are no confluences of short and long swords in the LXX.

LXX has the more common synonymous δόρυ; both stand for דָּוָד in the LXX.⁷⁷ Despite difference in number Justin (sg.) and the καίγε (pl.) use καθίζω (‘sit’) as opposed to ἀναπαύω (‘rest’) in the LXX. Where the LXX translates יהוה יהוה as κύριος παντοκράτωρ, without exception 8HēvXIIgr prints the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew followed by τῶν δυνάμεων.⁷⁸ Based on the close agreement within the Micah passage, Barthélemy generalized that Justin’s other non-LXX readings derive directly from the καίγε, including Justin’s use of Zech 9:9 in *Dial.* 53.3.⁷⁹ Barthélemy reasoned that whatever did not match Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion must have come directly from the *Quinta*.

For Zech 9:9 in *Dial.* 53.3, Justin’s differences with the LXX are as follows: (1) ἦξει rather than ἔρχεται; (2) the doublets κηρύσσω and the otherwise unattested ἀλαλάζω; (3) the doublets πραύς and πτωχός—with an extra καί;⁸⁰ (4) πῶλον ὄνου rather than πῶλον νέον. Although Zech 9:9 is not preserved in 8HēvXIIgr,⁸¹ I demonstrate that Justin did not copy the καίγε slavishly and that *pace* Barthélemy each of these changes owes to Justin’s own redaction.

The first point concerns Justin’s use of ἦξει. Morphologically ἦκω is in the present tense, but the sense is that of a perfect, ‘I have come’, and so Justin’s Zechariah quotation would predict that the king “will have come.” Even though Hebrew cannot represent it, such future perfects appear throughout the LXX. Justin sometimes encountered this form and reproduced it from his Greek text: “the Lord himself will have come (ἦξει; cf. יָבֹא, ‘he comes/will come’) into judgment” (Isa 3:13–14a LXX; *Dial.* 133.3b). On other occasions Justin alters his source to reflect this prophetic future perfect. For example, Justin calls John the Baptist a prophet who predicted that one stronger than he “will have come” (ἦξει; *Dial.* 49.3); Justin’s *Vorlage(n)* said

⁷⁷ Ζ/σιβύνη occurs three times in the LXX, two of which translate דָּוָד, as compared with thirty-four instances of δόρυ.

⁷⁸ Aligning more closely with the Hebrew, 8HēvXIIgr has τῶν δυνάμεων twice in Zech 1:4, whereas the LXX abbreviates the second יהוה יהוה as κύριος.

⁷⁹ Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, 211; cf. p. 221 where he says that πῶλον ὄνου comes from John but all else is from the *Quinta*/καίγε.

⁸⁰ The extra καί is related to the doubling of terms; oddly *1 Apol.* 35.11c altogether lacks καί here.

⁸¹ The Greek scroll breaks off after Zech 9:4, but Origen records half of v. 9 from the *Quinta* (*Comm. Matt.* 16.16.191–3).

either that someone “comes” (ἔρχεται; Mark 1:7b; Luke 3:16c) or “is coming” (ἐρχόμενος; Matt 3:11a; John 1:27). Therefore ἦξει can indicate Justin’s own redactional work.

The question arises as to whether Justin encountered ἦξει in his κείγῃ text of Zech 9:9, and the evidence suggests that he did not. The word ἦξει appears twice in 8HevXIIgr (Hab 1:9; 2:3), which does not differ from the LXX.⁸² In at least three places, 8HevXIIgr follows the LXX and passes up opportunities to use ἦξει for the arrivals of Yahweh and the Messiah. In Mic 1:3 Yahweh “will process out” (ἐκ[πορεύσε]ται) and “will come down” (καταβήσεται), and in Mic 5:1 the ruler “will come out” (ἐξ[ελεύσε]ται). The prophetic future perfect would be rhetorically effective in each case. I conclude, then, Justin himself changed ἔρχεται to ἦξει in Zech 9:9.

The second and third points concern what Barthélemy calls “doublets.” These represent quintessential cases of text-critical conflation, where a copyist preserves two variants instead of choosing between them. For example, in Matt 8:29 the Gadarene demoniacs ask Jesus why he has come: “to destroy” them (ἀπολέσαι; e.g., Sinaiticus) or “to torture” (βασανίσαι; e.g., Vaticanus); Washingtonianus includes both infinitives. In quoting Zech 9:9, I posit that Justin encountered the imperatives “proclaim” (κήρυσσε) in one copy and “shout” (ἀλάλαξον) in another and that Justin incorporated both; the same goes for “meek” (πραΰς) and “poor” (πτωχός). Excising the Septuagintal terms from the conflations in *Dial.* 53.3 yields the following: χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών ἀλάλαξον θύγατερ Ιερουσαλήμ· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἦξει σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς πτωχός καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πᾶλλον ὄνου. For Zech 9:9b the parent text matches Origen’s *Quinta* identically except for the last two words, which—along with ἦξει and perhaps θύγατερ—represents Justin’s own redactional work.⁸³

Several factors indicate that the κείγῃ did not contain these conflations. In general, the κείγῃ represents the earliest known recension of the LXX, and it intended to bring the LXX into closer conformity with the Hebrew. Accordingly the κείγῃ sometimes added words where the LXX had omitted them;⁸⁴ at other times the κείγῃ changed the wording of the LXX to be more accurate;

⁸² A third instance is reconstructed in Mic 4:8, as in the LXX.

⁸³ Although he cites Barthélemy, Menken misses the link to the κείγῃ, concluding generally, “It seems that more than one effort was undertaken to revise the LXX” [*Matthew’s Bible*, 114]. The particular differences between the κείγῃ and Matt 21:5 tell against Menken’s conclusion that “Matthew made use of an existing Greek translation of Zech 9,9, which is best characterized as a revised LXX” [p. 115].

⁸⁴ As noted above, see the double τῶν δυνάμεων in Zech 1:4.

for example, the subject in Mic 4:4a is אִישׁ , which 8HēvXIIgr renders ἀνὴρ as opposed to the generic ‘each one’ (ἕκαστος) in the LXX. More particularly, 8HēvXIIgr evinces no conflation: otherwise Mic 4:3–4 would have included short and long swords along with a synonymous pair of spears as men sat down and rested. Furthermore Origen’s *Quinta* for Zech 9:9b contains only πτωχός, which represents the Hebrew term עָנִי more accurately than does πραύς in the LXX. Finally Origen provides the animal words from the *Quinta*, ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον υἷον ὄνων, the accuracy of which vis-à-vis the Hebrew only Aquila exceeds by mentioning she-asses. Therefore synonymy with the LXX characterizes the καίγε; conflation does not.

In summary, as a synonym for κήρυσσε in the LXX, ἀλάλαξον must have stood in the καίγε; Justin conflates the two. Origen gives the adjective πτωχός for the *Quinta* (and Symmachus), and πραύς is in the LXX (and Aquila); Justin again conflates both. Fourth and finally, Justin would have drawn the ending πῶλον ὄνου from John 12:15. Justin’s omission of υἷος has Jesus ride on one young ass—as in John—as opposed to Matthew’s dam and colt.

Justin’s responsibility for the καίγε/LXX conflation has gone almost entirely unrecognized because Barthélemy overextended his initial insights and assumed that since Justin’s quotation from Micah 4 nearly identically resembled the καίγε, the other non-LXX Minor Prophets citations must do the same. Shortly after Barthélemy’s initial study, Köster actually classified καὶ πτωχός as Justin’s addition, paralleled by Symmachus and the *Quinta*, and Köster concluded that the quote in *Dial.* 53.3 “was taken from (or at least influenced by)” a Jewish recension of the LXX.⁸⁵ He did not develop this notion, however, and since then scholars have followed Barthélemy.⁸⁶ For *Dial.* 53.3 Skarsaune refers to “signs” of Barthélemy’s καίγε recension, and he even claims that Justin “looks up the text in a Biblical MS and quotes it accordingly.”⁸⁷ Justin’s quotation of Zech 9:9 in the *Dialogue* does derive from the καίγε but only in part: had Justin

⁸⁵ Köster, *Septuaginta und Synoptischer Erzählungsstoff im Schriftbeweis Justins des Märtyrers*, 93 n. 6.: “Auffallend ist bei diesem Zitat, daß es zweimal die genaue Übersetzung eines hebräischen Wortes neben der ungenauen der LXX wiedergibt: κήρυσσε = LXX/nur J.praem. ἀλάλαξον = עָרַר ; – πραύς = LXX/Just.add. καὶ πτωχός = עָנִי , vgl. πτωχός Symm.Qinta. Das Zitat in Dial.53,3 ist also sicher von der gleichen jüdischen nach MT rezensierten Quelle hergenommen (oder zumindest beeinflusst), die wir auch für andere Zitate des Dial. vermuteten.” Köster includes Barthélemy’s article in his bibliography.

⁸⁶ E.g., Pierre Prigent, *Justin et l’Ancien Testament: l’argument scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la première Apologie* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1964), 284.

⁸⁷ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 76.

quoted according to the *καίγε*, no conflations would appear.⁸⁸ For the quotation in *Dial.* 53.3, then, Justin simply conflated the LXX with the *καίγε* and borrowed John’s young donkey. This clarification refutes Howard’s argument that because Justin’s quotation of Zech 9:9 differs from Origen’s witness to Zech 9:9 in the *Quinta*, the *Quinta* ≠ 8HevXIIgr.⁸⁹ Justin’s quotation of Zech 9:9 in *Dial.* 53 thus results from his careful redaction of multiple, extant biblical texts—not from a *testimonium* and hardly from Justin’s “characteristic carelessness” as Lindars suggested.⁹⁰

Irenaeus’s Transmission of Zech 9:9 in Epid. 65

Some arguments for the inclusion of Zech 9:9 in a testimony book cite Irenaeus *Demonstration [Epideixis] of the Apostolic Preaching* 65, which survives only in Armenian: “Say to the daughter of Zion: Look, the king comes to you, meek and sitting on an ass, a colt, the son of an ass.”⁹¹ In all likelihood the text has been preserved intact since it does not line up with Matt 21:5 or with John 12:15 in the Armenian (see Table 3.2).⁹²

⁸⁸ In his more recent work, Skarsaune refers to the LXX and no longer mentions the *καίγε* in connection with this quotation; specifying Zech 9:9 in *1 Apol.* 35.11 as one of Justin’s “condensed non-LXX biblical quotes,” Skarsaune contrasts the *Dialogue’s* “good LXX texts taken directly from the primary sources, complete biblical manuscripts of the respective books” [Skarsaune, “Justin and His Bible,” 65].

⁸⁹ Howard, “The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Septuagint Text?” 21–2; following Barthélemy, 8HevXIIgr is called “R” in Howard’s article.

⁹⁰ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 115 n. 1.

⁹¹ In *Against the Heresies* Irenaeus only gives abbreviated allusions to Zech 9:9—e.g., *super pullum asinae sedens* (3.19.2); *in pullo asinae sedens* (4.33.1); *sedentem super pullum asinae* (4.33.12)—most likely via John 12:15 and not necessarily via Justin *Dial.* 53.3, as Skarsaune intimates [*The Proof from Prophecy*, 451].

⁹² E.g., the Armenian of Matt 21:5 omits “son” (as in *ℵ^c*, L, Origen *Comm. Jo.* 10.124), but Irenaeus includes *ordi*.

Table 3.2 Irenaeus *Epid.* 65; Matt 21:5; John 12:15 in Armenian

Matt 21:5	asac'ēk' dster Siovni ·
<i>Epid.</i> 65	asac'ēk' dstern Siovni ·
John 12:15	mí erknč'ir dowstr Siovni ·
Matt 21:5	aha t'agawor gay k'ez hez ew heceál y-ēš ew i yawanaki išoy
Irenaeus	aha t'agawor gay k'ez hez ew nsteal i veray išoy yawanaki ordwoy išoy
John 12:15	ahawadik [v.l.: aha] t'agawor k'o gay nsteal i veray yawanaki išoy

Like Matthew, Irenaeus begins his quotation with the wording from Isaiah, to whom he attributes the prophecy. Irenaeus's "the king comes to you" matches Matt 21:5 in the Armenian and the Bohairic.⁹³ Irenaeus follows Matthew in calling the king meek. At this point, Irenaeus diverges from Matthew's "riding on" (heceál with the locative) and takes "sitting on" (nsteal i veray with the genitive) from John;⁹⁴ although Latin texts almost always use "sitting" (redens) in Matt 21:5 and in John 12:15, "sitting" and "riding" are clearly distinguishable in Greek and Armenian, which shows that Irenaeus combined Matthew's quotation with John's;⁹⁵ Skarsaune does not notice Irenaeus's use of John here.⁹⁶ All the animal words are in the genitive (cf. ἐπί with the genitive in Greek); however, all but the last word are objects of the preposition. Irenaeus's phrase "an ass, a colt, the son of an ass" uses all of Matthew's terms in exactly

⁹³ In Matt 6:4, 6, 18, 23; 12:47; 15:28, 'your' (k'o) and 'to you' (k'ez) correspond exactly with σου and σοι respectively, and so k'ez should not be thought a dative of possession in Irenaeus's quotation, *pace* the Eng. translations by Bishop Karapet and S. G. Wilson [PO 12.5, 709] and John Behr [*On the Apostolic Preaching* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 82]; Smith translates accurately, "a king cometh to thee" [ACW 16, p. 90].

⁹⁴ One of the limitations of Armenian is that this participle is built from the aorist stem, which does not imply an aorist participle in the Greek *Vorlage*; for nsteal as 'sitting' cf. Robert W. Thomson, *An Introduction to Classical Armenian* (Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan Books, 1975), 70.

⁹⁵ Codex d at Matt 21:5 (ascendens) and Ambrose *ep.* 74.9 (ascendit) use the verb "mount" (cf. ἐπιβεβηκώς in Matthew), but all other Latin occurrences use a verb for "sitting" (i.e., riding); it is almost always the present participle sedens, which corresponds to John's καθήμενος. In other words, Matt 21:5 is indistinguishable from John 12:15 in Latin vis-à-vis the participle sedens.

⁹⁶ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 451: "the text largely following Mt 21:5."

Matthew's order,⁹⁷ and yet Irenaeus signifies only one donkey, which constitutes another point of contact with John's rendition.⁹⁸

Aside from Matthew and John's quotations of Zech 9:9, Justin and Irenaeus provide the only evidence for the donkey prophecy's having stood in a *testimonium*. Having shown the ways Justin and Irenaeus combined extant sources for their quotations eliminates, I have eliminated the need to appeal to hypothetical *testimonia*. In the following section I will take the same approach and demonstrate John's use of Matthew for the Zech 9:9 quotation.

John's Quotation of Zech 9:9 via Matthew

Because John and Matthew quote Zech 9:9 so differently, the consensus holds that the two gospels must have worked independently.⁹⁹ I begin with a word of caution against drawing conclusions of literary dependence among gospels based on their different OT quotations, for the Synoptic Problem shows numerous such divergences. For example, however one construes the directions of dependence, there is no doubt of literary dependence in the synoptic account of the rich man who asks Jesus about eternal life (Matt 19:16–30; Mark 10:17–31; Luke 18:18–30). The story quotes from the Decalogue, and here I isolate only three of the commandments listed in the story (see Table 3.3).

⁹⁷ Similar to ܐܝܫܘܝܢ in the Syro-Hexapla, the final išoy may very well represent ὑποζύγιον.

⁹⁸ In *1 Apol.* 35.11, which Irenaeus might have known, Justin combines John's animal words with Matthew's while representing a solitary donkey; Irenaeus's combination differs from Justin's, though.

⁹⁹ E.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (AB 29–29A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 1:460–461; Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 49; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:5; M.J.J. Menken, “The Quotations from Zech 9,9 in Mt 21,5 and in Jn 12,15,” in *John and the Synoptics* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 578; *idem*, “Do Not Fear, Daughter Zion...’ (John 12:15),” in *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, 79–97; trans. of “Die Redaktion des Zitates aus Sach 9,9 in Joh 12,15,” *ZNW* 80 (1989): 193–209; Moo, *Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 179–80; Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, 835 n. 62; Günter Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (SNTSMS 22; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 29–32; Herman Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary* (trans. John Vriend; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 421–2; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, 165; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St. John*, 2:376; Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 120; Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins; Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* (London: Macmillan, 1925), 411.

Table 3.3		Partial Quotations of the Decalogue in the Synoptics	
Ex 20:13–15	kill, adultery, steal	לֹא תרצח	לֹא תנאף
Deut 5:17–19	kill, adultery, steal	לֹא תרצח	לֹא תנאף
Matt 19:18c	kill, adultery, steal	οὐ φονεύσεις	οὐ μοιχεύσεις
Mark 10:19b	kill, adultery, steal	μὴ φονεύσης	μὴ μοιχεύσης
Deut 5:17–19	adultery, kill, steal	οὐ μοιχεύσεις	οὐ φονεύσεις
Luke 18:20b	adultery, kill, steal	μὴ μοιχεύσης	μὴ φονεύσης
Ex 20:13–15	adultery, steal, kill	οὐ μοιχεύσεις	οὐ κλέψεις

The same sequence of prohibiting killing, adultery, and stealing appears in Ex 20:13–15 MT; Deut 5:17–19 MT; Matt 19:18c; Mark 10:19b. A different sequence—adultery, killing, and stealing—appears in Deut 5:17–19 LXX; Luke 18:20b. None of the Synoptists utilizes yet another sequence, namely adultery, stealing, and killing (Ex 20:13–15 LXX). Grammatically, Matthew and the LXX use οὐ with the future tense throughout, which corresponds more literally to the imperfect aspect of the Hebrew, whereas Mark and Luke always use μή with subjunctive, which does not appear in the LXX. Within a single verse, then, each of the three Synoptists presents three successive commandments in a different fashion.

That John quotes Zech 9:9 differently than Matthew does not indicate *ipso facto* John's independence of Matthew. The differences do need to be explained, though. Table 3.4 compares the quotations. Appeals to *testimonia* do not attempt to account for the differences;¹⁰⁰ nor do appeals to a source such as the pre-Johannine Passion Narrative.¹⁰¹ Those who claim such hypothetical sources would still need to explain why the authors/compiler of the source texts altered Zechariah's prophecy.

¹⁰⁰ Those appealing to *testimonia* include Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 49; Smith, "John 12:12ff. and the Question of John's Use of the Synoptics," 63; those opposing *testimonia* include Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 107–8; Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 158; Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 215.

¹⁰¹ E.g., Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 417–8; Robert Tomson Fortna, *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 146–8; Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 85; Frank Schleritt, *Der vorjohanneische Passionsbericht: Eine historisch-kritische und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 2,13–22; 11:47–14,31 und 18,1–20,29* (BZNW 154; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 218; Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2:376, 379; Smith, "John 12:12ff. and the Question of John's Use of the Synoptics," 63.

Table 3.4	Matthew and John's Quotations of Zech 9:9
Zech 9:9	χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών κήρυσσε θύγαγερ Ιερουσαλήμ
Matt 21:5	εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών
John 12:15	μὴ φοβοῦ θυγάτηρ Σιών
Zech 9:9	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταιί σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς
Matt 21:5	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταιί σοι
John 12:15	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται
Zech 9:9	πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον
Matt 21:5	πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου
John 12:15	καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου

To explain the similarities and differences between Matthew and John's donkey prophecies, I build on the work of Edwin Freed, who called John 12:15 "a free artistic creation on the basis of Matt(hew)" and observed that John is closer to Matthew than to the Hebrew or Greek text of Zechariah.¹⁰² Freed wrote before the solidification of the consensus of Johannine independence, and his conclusions need to be confirmed. I concur that John took καθίζω and πῶλον ὄνου from Matthew. I drop Freed's assertions that some sort of poetic meter explains John's differences. I add to Freed's presentation that John's stylistic avoidance of reduplicated prepositional constructions explains some divergences from Matthew. I also add the interpretation that John's abbreviated "young of an ass" serves to eliminate Matthew's embarrassing seeming misunderstanding of Zechariah's synonymous parallelism.

The only similarity in John and Matthew's opening lines is that neither matches Zech 9:9, which begins, "Rejoice exceedingly, daughter of Zion." Matthew's quotation begins instead with the phrase, "Say to the daughter of Zion," a parallel to Isa 62:11a, which speaks of the arrival of Israel's "salvation" (צש) or "savior" (σωτήρ). John provides yet another introduction, "Do not fear, daughter of Zion." To account for "Do not fear," Lindars suggested that John deliberately combined Zephaniah and Zechariah.¹⁰³ Problematically, though, extant sources do not put the commands to rejoice and not to fear in proximity to one another: 'rejoicing' appears in Zech

¹⁰² Edwin D. Freed, "The Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John," *JBL* 80 (1961): 337–8 [329–38].

¹⁰³ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 26 n. 2; similarly Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 84; Menken considers it likely equally likely that Isa 40:9 figured into John's exegesis.

9:9α LXX = Zeph 3:14a LXX, but ‘not fearing’ is only in the Hebrew (Zeph 3:16b MT; cf. θάρσει in the LXX). Since “Do not fear” is such a common phrase (occurring over sixty times in the MT and over seventy in the LXX), I suggest that it be taken as a sign that John did not use an OT text at all when “quoting” Zechariah’s prophecy.

The LXX, Matthew, and John agree verbatim, “Look, your king comes;” John is the only one of the three to omit “to you” at this point, and he likely considered it redundant—that it goes without saying that “your king” would come “to you.” John also chooses not to describe the king as meek (πραΰς). Matthew and John’s strongest similarity in these verses, however, is that both omit “righteous and salvific is he.” The phrase is lacking in no other extant source for Zechariah, which presents a problem for those who hold to Johannine independence.¹⁰⁴ Stendahl and Menken consider the LXX the middle term between Matthew and John,¹⁰⁵ yet neither explains how the evangelists came to the same omission independently.¹⁰⁶

From this point on, the string of excisions ends, and John uses terms synonymous with Matthew and Zechariah. Matthew’s reduplicated preposition ἐπιβαίνω ἐπί is a construction that John characteristically avoided. That is, reduplicated prepositions with compound verbs appear less frequently in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics.¹⁰⁷ For example, when the crown of thorns is put on Jesus’ head (another John/Matthew parallel), John uses ἐπιτίθημι without reduplicating ἐπί (19:2) as compared with Matthew’s ἐπιτίθημι ἐπί (27:29). John still needed to put Jesus “upon” (ἐπί) the ass, and according to Homeric usage John could have separated the

¹⁰⁴ E.g., Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 162.

¹⁰⁵ Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 120; Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 82 n. 13; there in response to Neiryck, “John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990,” 26–8.

¹⁰⁶ Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, 119; Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 79.

¹⁰⁷ Not necessarily exhaustive, in John see ἄγω πρὸς rather than προσάγω πρὸς (John 1:42; 9:13; 11:15; 18:13); ἐρχόμενος ἐπί rather than ἐπερχόμενος ἐπί (John 18:4); ἐρχόμενος πρὸς rather than προσερχόμενος πρὸς (John 1:29, 47; 6:35, 37; 7:50; 11:45; 19:39; ἐρχομαι πρὸς rather than προσέρχομαι πρὸς (John 3:2, 20, 21, 26 [2x]; 4:30, 40; 5:40; 6:5, 17, 44, 45, 65; 7:37, 45; 8:2; 10:41; 11:19, 29; 13:6; 14:6b, 18; 16:7b; 17:11a, 13; 19:3; 20:2); μένω ἐπί rather than ἐπιμένω ἐπί (John 3:36); πέμπω πρὸς rather than προσπέμπω πρὸς (John 16:7).

preposition from βάλω to signify ‘mount’; however, in koine βάλω + ἐπί would have sounded as though Jesus were standing beside or stepping on the donkey.¹⁰⁸

John used the participle καθήμενος to signify Jesus’ sitting/riding on the ass, which Freed explains well as coming from Matthew. Matthew says that Jesus sat on (ἐπικαθίζω) the ass and colt,¹⁰⁹ and John had used καθίζω ἐπί just prior (12:14). As Freed observes, “John frequently uses synonyms instead of repeating the same word,”¹¹⁰ and he also points out that “sitting” shows up in Isa 19:1 as “riding” (רכב > κάθημαι).¹¹¹ The idea is that the rider simply sits while the vehicle moves.

Regarding the concluding words πῶλον ὄνου, Menken begins with the presupposition that Zech 9:9 (and Gen 49:11) already influenced Mark 11:1–10,¹¹² and he cites early Jewish and Christian sources that interpret the two passages in light of one another (Justin *Dial.* 53; Clement *Paed.* 1.15; *Gen. Rab.* 98.9; 99.8; *b. Ber.* 56b–57a).¹¹³ The earliest evidence is that of Justin, who explicitly connects the two passages: in *Dial.* 52.2 he quotes Gen 49:8–12 LXX nearly verbatim and attributes the Scripture to Jacob; in *Dial.* 53.3 he cites Zech 9:9 and attributes it to Zechariah. Justin’s extended and explicit citation contrasts sharply with the two words John has in common with Gen 49:11, and yet Menken concludes, “I presume that πῶλος ὄνου in John 12:15 has been taken from Gen. 49:11 LXX.”¹¹⁴ Menken’s full argument requires John to have drawn upon Gen 49:11; 1 Kgs 1:38, 44; Isa 40:9; Zeph 3:16; Zech 9:9—mostly in Greek but occasionally in Hebrew as well.¹¹⁵ I have found no evidence that John looked up any OT Scripture for the

¹⁰⁸ βάλω + ἐπί occurs three times in the LXX (Deut 28:56; 3 Macc 6:31)—all as either step on or stand at—and nowhere in the NT as compared with seventy-four occurrences of ἐπιβάλω ἐπί.

¹⁰⁹ In Matt 21:7, even if “atop them” (ἐπάνω αὐτῶν) refers to the clothes, the clothes are already on both animals (ἐπ’ αὐτῶν).

¹¹⁰ Freed, “Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John,” 333 n. 23; there referencing ὄναριον and ὄνος in John 12:14–15; see also p. 338 re καθίζω and κάθημαι.

¹¹¹ See also Rev 6:2, 4, 5, 8; 9:17; 14:14, 15, 16; 17:3; 19:11, 18, 19, 21.

¹¹² Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 80.

¹¹³ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 89 n. 35.

¹¹⁴ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 95.

¹¹⁵ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 97.

quotation in John 12:15, and so I find Menken's argument unsubstantiated and overly complicated.

A simpler solution begins with the observation that among the Synoptics only Matthew specifies the animal's species.¹¹⁶ Having introduced the animal by the diminutive (ὄναριον; John 12:14), John says "young ass" (πῶλος ὄνου) in the quotation. The word choice in John's quotation most easily derives from Matt 21:2, 7, the context surrounding Matthew's Zech 9:9 quotation.¹¹⁷ Matthew has Jesus tell two disciples to get him an ass (ὄνος) and a colt (πῶλος) with her (21:2), and so the disciples bring both animals (v. 6), on which Jesus sits (v. 7). The strangest detail in Matthew's story is that Jesus sits/rides on two donkeys at once in order to fulfill Zechariah's prophecy that literally depicted a king riding upon one donkey and upon another donkey (Zech 9:9b). I submit that Matthew's enigmatic seeming misunderstanding of Zechariah's synonymous parallelism led John to subtract a donkey. The Fourth Evangelist borrowed Matthew's πῶλος and ὄνος (Matt 21:2, 7) but then merged the two animals into one young ass.

I conclude that the sole source for the quotation of Zech 9:9 in John 12:15 was Matt 21:2, 5, 7. Apart from that, John simply had to know that Zech 9:9 did not begin with the word εἴπατε, and so he picked a generic introduction μὴ φοβοῦ. Following Matthew, John then omits "righteous and salvific is he." From Matthew, John omitted σοι as redundant and πράύς as perhaps out of line with his image of Jesus. In order to eliminate Matthew's prepositional and donkey redundancies, John looked to Matt 21:7 and found a verb for sitting and nouns for a young ass.

¹¹⁶ Neither Freed ["Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John," 333] nor Smith ["John 12:12ff. and the Question of John's Use of the Synoptics," 62] notes this point, and Smith claims ὄναριον as proof John uses a non-Synoptic source.

¹¹⁷ See Freed, "Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John," 338; he cites only Matt 21:2, 5.

IV. BINDING AND LOOSING—FORGIVING AND RETAINING SINS

According to Matthew, prior to the passion Jesus tells the disciples, “Whatever you bind on earth will have been bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will have been loosed in heaven” (Matt 18:18b; cf. 16:19).¹ According to John, the risen Jesus tells disciples, “If you forgive anyone’s sins, [the sins] have been forgiven them; if you retain anyone’s [sins], [the sins] have been retained” (John 20:23).² Interpreters have viewed Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 in light of one another at least as far back as Tertullian,³ and the Johannine and Matthean logia evince “similar syntactical patterns,”⁴ which indicate echoes and warrant further investigation.

The scholarly consensus explains the sayings as related via independent oral tradition. More particularly, ‘binding and loosing’ are presumed to convey the same sense as ‘forgiving and

¹ In Matt 16:19 the same saying refers singularly to Peter when Jesus promises to give him “the keys of the kingdom.” In this chapter I bracket the question of which binding and loosing saying may be older: on the primacy of Matt 18:18 see, e.g., Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* (trans. James E. Crouch; 3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001–2007), 2:449; on the primacy of Matt 16:19 see, e.g., Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; rev. ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 141; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 2:787; Rudolf Schnackenburg, “Das Vollmachtswort vom Binden und Lösen, traditionsgeschichtlich gesehen,” in *Kontinuität und Einheit: Für Franz Mußner* (ed. Paul-Gerard Müller and Werner Stenger; Freiburg: Herder, 1981), 151 [141–57].

² I bracket the Lukan parallels to this episode in John: the risen Jesus stands in the midst of the disciples, delivers an irenic greeting, and shows his hands and feet in John 20:19–20a//Luke 24:36, 40; Luke 24:40 is a Western non-interpolation. Showing less verbatim agreement, John 20:22–23//Luke 24:47 (cf. Acts 2:38; Matt 28:16–20) relates to whether John intended preaching, repentance, and baptism as the context for the disciples’ authority to forgive sins. Scholarly opinions run the gamut: John’s literary dependence on Luke [e.g., Pierre Benoit and M.-É. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome III: L’Évangile de Jean; Commentaire par M.-É. Boismard et A. Lamouille avec la collaboration de G. Rochais* (Paris: Cerf, 1977), 466–72]; John’s literary independence and knowledge of Lukan redaction [e.g., Anton Dauer, *Johannes und Lukas: Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Parallelerikopen; Joh 4, 46–54/Lk 7,1–10—Joh 12,1–8/Lk 7,36–50; 10,38–42—Joh 20,19–29/Lk 24,36–49* (FB 50; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984), esp. ch. 3, pp. 207–88 re “Joh 20,19–29 und Lk 24,36–49”]; common oral tradition [C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 144–5, 150–51]; historically accurate independent testimony [e.g., F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1983), 391]; Luke’s use of John [e.g., F. Lamar Cribbs, “St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 450].

³ Regarding ‘history of interpretation’ as a criterion for discerning textual echoes, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 31.

⁴ Which is part of Hays’s criterion of ‘volume’ [*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 30].

retaining sins' because 'loosen' sometimes means 'forgive' in Aramaic (ܫܘܘܢ) and in Greek (λύω). In this chapter I reveal the semantically shaky foundations of the consensus. I argue that a correct denotation of 'binding and loosing' rules out the connotation of forgiveness. To explain the relationship between the Matthean and Johannine logia, I argue that John reflects knowledge of Matthean redaction,⁵ in particular a binding and loosing saying (Matt 18:18) embedded within an extended discussion about convicting sin (vv. 15–17), whether to forgive sin (v. 21–22), and the consequences of withholding forgiveness (vv. 23–35). John then constructed the forgiving and retaining sins saying based on the structure of the binding and loosing saying, but John reinterpreted the Matthean discourse so as to emphasize the disciples' responsibility not to forgive in every instance.

The chapter consists of three sections. First, I establish the meaning of binding and loosing in Matthew. I accept that Matthew's usage parallels the rabbinic practice of determining what is prohibited and permitted. So understood, I argue that the expression does not entail forgiveness of sins. Second, I consider the possibilities for relating Matthew's binding and loosing to John's forgiving and retaining sins. Since the prevailing explanations mistakenly equate the meanings of the Matthean and Johannine expressions, I posit as an alternative that John knows the binding and loosing saying in its redactional position in Matthew 18. Third, I explore the hermeneutical implications of John's reformulation. I suggest that on account of the imagery of torturing unforgiving disciples (Matt 18:34–35) the church might have feared expelling recalcitrant sinners, which Jesus had also commanded (Matt 18:15–17). Read alongside Matthew 18, John 20:23 represents an effort to balance Jesus' commands to forgive some sinners and expel others.

The Meaning of δέω and λύω in Matt 16:19; 18:18

Whether John 20:23 relates to Matt 18:18 via oral tradition or literary dependence must be determined based on an accurate understanding of Matthew's juxtaposition of δέω and λύω. Literally the lexeme δέω signifies binding or tying up, and the antonymous λύω signifies loosening or untying. Matthew has Jesus tell Peter (16:19) and the disciples (18:18) that whatever (neuter accusative) things they bind and loose will have been respectively bound and

⁵ Pace J. H. Bernard, who concluded that Matthew more likely depended on John [*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (2 vols.; ICC 29; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928), 2:680].

loosed in heaven. The terms' general meanings are clear enough, but it remains unclear as to what Jesus authorizes in particular. In what follows, I discuss the Matthean logia in turn. I accept the long held explanation that Matthew presumes an understanding of binding and loosing as rabbinic prohibitions and permissions.⁶ As has not been previously acknowledged, though, I counter that such an understanding actually rules out forgiveness as pertaining to binding and loosing. These conclusions serve as the foundation for my argument that John 20:23 is not to be related to Matt 16:19; 18:18 via independent oral tradition.

The first of Matthew's two binding and loosing sayings attains almost no explication from the surrounding context. In Matt 16:13–19 Jesus and the disciples come to Caesarea Philippi, and Jesus asks them about the identity of the Son of Man. Jesus also asks who the disciples say he is, and Simon Peter answers that Jesus is “the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Jesus then calls him Peter—the rock upon whom Jesus will build the church—and gives him “the keys of the kingdom” and the power to bind and loose. Jesus then orders the disciples not to tell people that he is the Christ (Matt 16:20). Jesus' reference to keys connotes locking and unlocking, an analogous word pair to binding and loosing, but neither Jesus nor the narrator explains the meaning or the object of Peter's binding and loosing.

In Matt 18:15–17 Jesus tells the disciples how to regulate the church (ἐκκλησία). First they are to go and convict a church member—literally a brother—who sins.⁷ If the sinner listens (ἀκούω), in the sense of obeying, then she or he is regained or benefited (κερδαίνω). If not, then the disciplinarian should enlist another disciple or two as confirming witnesses. If the sinner still shows disregard (παρakoúω), then the matter goes before the church, and if the sinner refuses to

⁶ E.g., BDAG, 222; Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* (trans. D. M. Kay; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902; repr. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1997), 213–7; Str-B 1:738–41. I concur with Davies and Allison [*Matthew*, 2:635–9] that in Matt 16:19; 18:18 δέω and λύω do not pertain to the following: exorcism [*pace* Richard H. Hiers, “‘Binding and Loosing’: the Matthean Authorizations,” *JBL* 104 (1985): 233–50]; eternal judgment [*pace* Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (ed. J. Bowden; trans. W. Montgomery et al.; 1st complete ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 334–5; see also Ze'ev W. Falk, “Binding and Loosing,” *JJS* 25 (1974): 99]; vows [*pace* Falk, “Binding and Loosing,” 92–100]; “totality” [*pace* G. Lambert, “Lier—déliér, L'expression de la totalité par l'opposition de deux contraires,” *RB* 52 (1945): 91–103]; magic [*pace* F. C. Conybeare, “Christian Demonology III,” *JQR* 9 (1897): 468]; or the consummation of the kingdom [*pace* W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1907), 177].

⁷ Based on *lectio brevior* and *difficilior*, the qualification “against you” (εἰς σέ)—included in KJV, NIV, RSV, and NRSV but omitted in NASB and NJB—is a Western interpolation taken from Peter's specification “against me” (εἰς ἐμέ) in v. 21.

listen to the church, then Jesus says to let him or her be “just like a Gentile and a tax collector.” Jesus adds, “Truly I say to you: whatever you bind on earth will have been bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will have been loosed in heaven” (Matt 18:18), and then he reiterates the principle of having two disciples agree (συμφωνέω) in matters of church discipline (vv. 19–20). Peter then asks, “Lord, how many times will a brother sin against me and I forgive him? Up to seven times?” (v. 21b). Jesus says not seven but seventy-seven times, and he offers the Parable of the Unforgiving Slave as a cautionary tale for disciples who would refuse forgiveness (vv. 23–35).

The context surrounding Matt 18:18 suggests that the power to bind and loose pertains to the concept of sin. Through observing the Semitic cognates of the Greek terms, many scholars have understood binding and loosing in terms of begrudging and forgiving sins.⁸ The combination of δέω and λύω is equivalent to the Hebrew pair אָסַר and נָתַר (Hiphil) and to the Aramaic pair אָסַר and אָשַׁר, which is also spelled אָשַׁר. By extension of ‘loosening bonds’, λύω and נָתַר (Hiphil) can signify a person’s being released from prison, and λύω and אָשַׁר can signify forgiveness of sin. Regarding forgiveness, for example, Hillel says in the Talmud that Israel should not expect the Messiah since the Messiah already came during the days of Hezekiah, to which Yosef replies, “May his master [i.e., God] forgive [אָשַׁר] Rabbi Hillel” (*b. Sanh.* 99a). The LXX says that the Lord loosed [λύω; i.e., forgave] Job’s three friends’ sin on account of Job (Job 42:9), and the next verse reiterates, “concerning (Job’s) friends, (the Lord) forgave [ἀφίημι] them the sin” (v. 10).⁹ On the supposition that λύω signifies forgiveness in Matt 16:19; 18:18, the

⁸ E.g., George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987), 383; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (2 vols.; AB 29–29A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 2:1044–5; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:636 (iii); Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 348; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982), 369; Ernst Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (trans. Robert W. Funk; 2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2:21; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP 1; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 248, 269; Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. Francis Noel Davey; 2d rev. ed.; London: Faber & Faber, 1947), 547–8; Andreas Köstenberger, *John* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 575; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew* (3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007), 2:454; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 750; Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt; Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium* (3d ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960), 360; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Matthew* (trans. David E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 371.

⁹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:636 (ii); Job 42:9, 10 MT lack explicit reference to sin or forgiveness.

antonym δέω would signify the disciples' lack of forgiveness, which would fit the context of the rest of Matthew 18.

The interpretation of δέω and λύω as withholding and granting forgiveness unravels upon closer inspection. As shown above שרש and λύω sometimes denote forgiveness, but the antonyms שרש and δέω have not been shown elsewhere to denote lack of forgiveness. Moreover, the combinations of שרש and נתת (Hiphil) in Hebrew and שרש and שרש in Aramaic are widely attested among the Tannaim as signifying respectively rabbis' prohibition and permission of certain actions; perhaps the terms covered beliefs as well. For example, the house of Shammai permits [נתת Hiphil] levirate marriages of a deceased brothers' co-wives to the surviving brothers, but the house of Hillel prohibits [שרש] such marriages (*m. Yeb.* 1:4). I agree with those who have identified rabbinic prohibition and permission as Matthew's meaning of δέω and λύω.¹⁰ That recognition, I add, actually precludes understanding λύω in terms of forgiveness,¹¹ for there is no transgression in doing what is permitted. As in the example of levirate marriage, Shammai would not forgive men who marry their deceased brother's co-wives; instead Shammai declares such marriages permissible, and so there is no sin to forgive.

In Matt 18:18 the power to bind and loose indeed relates to the concept of sin, but the terms do not denote withholding and granting forgiveness when someone sins. Instead δέω and λύω mean that the disciples have the authority to determine what counts as sin in the first place. To regulate the church, the disciples individually convict sinners (Matt 18:15), but a supposed sinner could resist reproof by claiming not to have done anything wrong. In such instances, another disciple must concur that the church member really sinned (v. 16), and a conviction only holds if two or three disciples stand in agreement. Matthew does not clarify whether the disciples must be unanimous or if a majority two out of three would suffice. In either case, the difference from Matt 16:19 to Matt 18:18 is that Jesus initially grants to Peter alone the authority to determine permissible behavior but later explains the necessity of at least two disciples' concord in such determinations.

In later usage, the Hebrew and Greek word pairs for binding and loosing also denote decisions by political and religious bodies to expel and readmit people. Scholars debate whether

¹⁰ E.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:638–40; see also France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 626, 696.

¹¹ *Pace* Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:636.

such meanings apply already in Matthew 18,¹² and I endorse a moderate position. I grant that Matthew does not denote the binding of people, but I do not deny that such connotations arise. Moreover, the semantic extension of binding and loosing from prohibiting and permitting actions to expelling and readmitting people was already underway in the first century. For comparison, Josephus juxtaposes bind and loose (δέω and λύω) with banish and recall (διώκω and κατάργω) in a discussion of the Pharisees' political influence over Alexandra Salome, who ruled Judea 78–69 B.C.E.: “(the Pharisees) were also presently becoming administrators of everything—to banish and recall [διώκειν τε καὶ κατάργειν] whom they want, to loose and bind [λύειν τε καὶ δεσμεῖν]” (*B.J.* 1.111).¹³ Also, the Mishnah refers to the sages as loosening (i.e., readmitting; נהר Hiphil) someone who was previously expelled (נהר Piel; *m. Mo'ed Qat.* 14a);¹⁴ the Talmudic commentary records that a horn would sound when the sages expelled and readmitted a recalcitrant person who had been punished: “a toot binds; a toot releases” (טוט אסר טוט שר״; *b. Mo'ed Qat.* 16a).

As the rabbinic usage pertains to Matthew 18, whenever the disciples agree to prohibit some belief or practice, by extension they would bar from the church those who would indulge in such prohibitions. That explains why Jesus says to treat the obstinate sinner “just like a Gentile or a tax collector” (Matt 18:17b), the implication being expulsion from the church; Matthew shows no inclination toward readmission. The association of binding with expulsion already held in the early church, for Origen applied Matt 18:18 to binding people: “such a one who is bound” (ὁ τοιοῦτος δεδεμένος; *Comm. Matt.* 13.31.12–17). Strictly speaking, then, Jesus' authorization for the disciples to bind and loose meant for them to decide what counts as a sin, but thereupon Jesus further instructed the disciples to discipline sinners and to expel those who would not heed discipline.

¹² E.g., Friedrich Büchsel claims that Matthew already applies the terms to people [“δέω (λύω),” *TDNT* 2:60–61]; so too Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 348; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT 1; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 2:66; Davies and Allison object [*Matthew*, 2:639].

¹³ Matthew chose a fundamental Greek political term to signify the church (ἐκκλησία), and so Josephus' reference to political banishment could be related to Matthew's notion of binding and loosing.

¹⁴ For comparison, the concept of expulsion and readmission is also common in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but the language is different; e.g., the verbs ‘separate’ (ברל Hiphil) and ‘return’ (שוב) in 4Q258 VII, 1.

In summary, although λύω means ‘forgive’ when it takes ἁμαρτία (sin) as its object (e.g., Job 42:9), its antonym δέω has not been shown to take sin as an object, which casts doubt on interpretations of Matthew’s binding and loosing sayings in terms of withholding or granting forgiveness. In rabbinic usage, the Hebrew and Aramaic cognates of the word pair δέω and λύω adequately explain the Matthean logia as distinguishing prohibited practices (and perhaps beliefs) from permitted ones; the expulsion of people who indulge in such prohibitions should not be ruled out entirely.

The Relationship of John 20:23 to Matt 16:19; 18:18

Having established what Matthew’s concept of binding and loosing does and does not mean, I turn to a comparison with John’s notion of forgiving and retaining sins. I begin by showing the sayings’ formal similarities and then examine the two prevailing explanations of the transmission of these sayings. First, the consensus holds that the Matthean and Johannine logia are orally transmitted independent variants, but I call into question the semantic basis of the consensus. The consensus argument is that binding and loosing simply means withholding and granting forgiveness because in Aramaic and Greek the verb for ‘loose’ can also mean ‘forgive’; the preceding section has provided a refutation of that argument. The second possibility is that John 20:23 shows signs of Matthean redaction, namely Jesus’ granting Peter the authority to bind and loose in Matt 16:19. The attempt to read John as having at least indirect access to Matthew’s redacted gospel marks a step in the right direction, but unfortunately this argument too rests on equating binding and loosing with retaining and forgiving sins. In the end I offer an alternative explanation that John 20:23 shows signs of Matthean redaction, namely Matthew’s second binding and loosing saying (18:18), which appears in the context of an extended discussion of sin and forgiveness (18:15–35). That is, Matthew’s redactional transition from Jesus’ saying about binding and loosing (v. 18) to Peter’s question about forgiving sin (v. 21) explains how John took over the structure of the Matthean logion and imported the notion of forgiveness.

Formal Similarities between Matt 18:18b (cf. 16:19) and John 20:23

Whatever you bind on earth will have been bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will have been loosed in heaven (ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῶ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῶ; Matt 18:18b).

If you forgive anyone's sins, (the sins) have been forgiven them; if you retain anyone's [sins], (the sins) have been retained (ἂν τινῶν ἀφήτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφέωνται αὐτοῖς, ἂν τινῶν κρατῆτε κεκράτηνται; John 20:23).

The formal similarities between Matt 18:18 and John 20:23 are as follows: each saying contains two clauses; each clause depicts future more vivid conditions; introducing the subjunctives are ἂν (John 20:23), which is equivalent to ἐὰν (Matt 18:18; cf. 16:19); in each condition the same verb appears in the protasis and apodosis; the protases use the active voice, and the apodoses use the (divine) passive;¹⁵ whereas Matthew's apodoses use periphrastic future perfects, John's use only the perfect, which are nonetheless understood as future perfects since they involve future conditions.

The most striking similarity between Matt 18:18; John 20:23 is the repetition of verbs. For comparison, Prov 9:12a uses the same verb in the protasis as apodosis: “If you become wise [□□□ pf. as pres. of fut. condition], then you (will) have become wise [□□□ pf.] for yourself” (Prov 9:12a MT); although the proverb sounds somewhat tautological, the difference between the protasis and apodosis lies in the aspect of the verbs, which the Greek translation reflects: “Son, if you become [aor. subj. γίνομαι] wise, then you will be [fut. ind. εἶμί] wise for yourself” (Prov 9:12a LXX).

The passive verbs in Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 are rightly understood as divine passives, but there is a persistent misunderstanding of the meaning of the perfect tense/aspect. Following Julius Mantey, a number of scholars have supposed that the perfect—generally a past action, the result of which endures to the present—in those verses means that God has already decided whom or what to bind, loose, forgive, or retain and that disciples must simply adhere to God's

¹⁵ Except for the second protasis in John 20:23, each protasis uses an aorist subjunctive; to add consistency, Codex Bezae reflects a scribal alteration from κρατῆτε (pres.) to κρατήσητε (aor.).

prior declarations;¹⁶ arguing against sacerdotalism, Mantey insisted that God does not concur in humans' conclusions.¹⁷ Led by Henry Cadbury, others have corrected Mantey by pointing out that all three verses constitute conditional sentences and in each one the (future) perfect tense appears in the apodosis.¹⁸ Accordingly the action described in the apodosis does not precede the action of the protasis; for example, God had given Israel the Torah, but Peter was free to decide how much of Torah would be binding for Gentiles, and God would accept whatever Peter decided (Tertullian *Pud.* 21; cf. Matt 16:19; Acts 15). Although in Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 a future perfect such as “will have been bound/loosed” constitutes formal equivalence,¹⁹ it is not a mistranslation to use the dynamically equivalent present or future;²⁰ as Raymond Brown pointed out, scribes in antiquity readily interpreted the perfect in such ways, for variant readings of John 20:23 use ἀφίενται (e.g., B², W, and ℣) and ἀφεθήσεται (℞).²¹ The aspect of the perfect, then, conveys the continuing significance of whatever the disciples would determine, and the passive voice represents divine sanction; Brown accurately paraphrases, “When you forgive men’s sins, at that moment God forgives those sins and they remain forgiven” (John 20:23).²² *Contra* Mantey the syntax of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 does mean that God is the one who

¹⁶ Julius R. Mantey, “The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in John 20:23, Mt 16:19, and Mt 18:18,” *JBL* 58 (1939): 243–9; *idem*, “Evidence That the Perfect Tense in John 20:23 and Matthew 16:19 Is Mistranslated,” *JETS* 16 (1973): 129–38; *idem*, “Distorted Translations in John 20:23; Matthew 16:18–19 and 18:18,” *RevExp* 78 (1981): 409–16. See also a preponderance of evangelical scholars: R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 627; Gundry, *Matthew*, 334; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 430; *idem*, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), 2:1207; *idem*, “Exegetical Insight” in William D. Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2003), 121; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, 749–50.

¹⁷ Mantey, “The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense,” 246.

¹⁸ Henry J. Cadbury, “The Meaning of John 20:23, Matthew 16:19, and Matthew 18:18,” *JBL* 58 (1939): 252. See also Beasley-Murray, *John*, 366–7; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1024; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:638; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972), 612.

¹⁹ Mantey, “Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense,” 247.

²⁰ Cadbury, “Meaning of John 20:23, Matthew 16:19, and Matthew 18:18,” 253.

²¹ Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1024.

²² Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1024.

concurr, which led John Chrysostom to comment, “whatever the priests work out below, these things God above ratifies; the master confirms the verdict of the slaves” (*Sac.* 3.5).

Arguments for Independent Oral Tradition

As discussed earlier in this chapter, Matthew’s δέω and λύω are equivalent to Hebrew אָסַר and נָתַר (Hiphil) and Aramaic אָסַר and אָשַׁר. Since the verbs אָשַׁר and λύω can also denote forgiveness, a host of scholars understand Matthew’s binding and loosing as synonymous with begrudging and forgiving sins.²³ Such purported synonymy then constitutes the basis for most arguments that John 20:23 represents an independent variant of Matt 16:19; 18:18.²⁴ To advance my argument for John’s dependence on Matthew in this instance, I have observed that semantically the verbs אָשַׁר and λύω only signify forgiveness when taking ‘sin’ as an object, which is not the case in the Matthean logia. Matthew’s sayings instead accord to rabbinic usage and denote the disciples’ authority to decide what constitutes permitted and prohibited behavior. Accordingly there is no connotation of forgiveness, for nobody sins when doing that which is permitted. Although Matthew’s notion of permission and prohibition could have extended to persons who were allowed and disallowed into the church, neither would such a formulation connote forgiveness because Matthew only has in mind expulsion of sinners from the church; Matthew gives no proviso for readmission. Even if a sinner were expelled and later readmitted,

²³ E.g., Beasley-Murray, *John*, 383; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1044–5; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:636; Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 348; Gundry, *Matthew*, 369; Haenchen, *John*, 2:21; Harrington, *Gospel of Matthew*, 248, 269; Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, 547–8; Köstenberger, *John*, 575; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:454; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, 750; Schlatter, *Evangelist Johannes*, 360; Schweizer, *Good News according to Matthew*, 371. For a rare statement that Matt 16:19; 18:18 do “not necessarily” pertain to forgiveness, see J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Binding and Loosing (Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 29:23 [sic]),” *JBL* 102 (1983): 116 [112–7].

²⁴ See esp. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 347–9; those citing Dodd approvingly include C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 571; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1039; Schnackenburg, , 3:473 n. 87; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 693 n. 2; Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (3 vols.; Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 2:856–7. Some scholars deny a Semitic *Vorlage* to the sayings; e.g., since the Matthean vocabulary is attested in Greek by Josephus, Joachim Gnilka considers an earlier tradition superfluous, but he too understands binding and loosing according to rabbinic usage [*Das Matthäusevangelium* (2 vols.; HTKNT; Freiberg: Herder, 1986–1992), 2:66 n. 83]; Gérard Claudel deems the search for a Semitic *Vorlage* “not only useless but perverse” [“Jean 20,23 et ses parallèles matthéens,” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 69 (1995): 85 {71–86}].

such a one would not be forgiven a sin or (metaphorically) a debt; the person would have done just the opposite, namely to repay his or her debt.²⁵ So far, then, there is an unstable foundation for the argument that John's saying about forgiving and retaining sins represents an independent variant of Matthew's binding and loosing sayings, for the argument requires application of a secondary meaning of כָּשָׁא/λύω as forgiveness when the conditions do not permit it.

John Emerton posits an alternative explanation in his attempt to reconstruct a single Aramaic saying that could have morphed into Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23.²⁶ Emerton questions whether rabbinic binding and loosing establishes the proper starting point for a Semitic *Vorlage* to the Matthean and Johannine logia. Emerton argues instead for a prior stage, a logion about opening and shutting that echoes Isa 22:22 and gave rise to the rabbinic notions of prohibiting and permitting, Matthew's binding and loosing, as well as John's forgiving and retaining sins. Emerton's argument has found widespread approval among those who consider John and Matthew's sayings related through independent oral tradition.²⁷ Up to now Emerton's philological arguments have gone largely unchecked, and herein I show the difficulties lexical semantics pose to his presentation. In particular, the lynchpin of Emerton's argument requires stretching the meaning of the verb כָּשָׁא beyond what it can bear in Aramaic.

Matthew 16:19 mentions a set of keys and a pair of opposites, and Emerton claims an OT parallel: "I will put the key of the house of David upon his shoulder: he will open, and no one will shut; he will shut, and no one will open" (Isa 22:22). Emerton proposes the following as Jesus' original saying: "whatsoever thou shalt shut shall be shut: and whatsoever thou shalt open

²⁵ For the metaphor of debt as sin and for remittance as the opposite of repayment in matters of debts/sins, see Gary A. Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), esp. 31–3.

²⁶ John A. Emerton, "Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining," *JTS* NS 13 (1962): 325–31.

²⁷ E.g., Barrett, *Gospel according to St. John*, 571; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1039–40; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 392, 397 n. 19; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:640; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; WBC 33A–33B; Dallas: Word Books, 1993–1995), 2:473; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 2:1207–8; Köstenberger, *John*, 575; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, 612–3; Francis Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998), 535–6. To the contrary, Schweizer leaves Emerton uncited but rejects an Aramaic saying based on Isa 22:22 as underlying Matthew's binding and loosing [*Good News according to Matthew*, 343]. Others argue against related oral tradition by claiming that on different occasions Jesus likely uttered the related Matthean and Johannine logia; e.g., Carson, *Gospel according to John*, 655; Keener, *Matthew*, 430 n. 93.

shall be opened.”²⁸ Emerton then has to show how opening and shutting became binding and loosing in Matthew and forgiving and retaining sins in John. John 20:23 would represent an interpretation of key-wielding insofar as the kingdom is open to people whose sins are forgiven as opposed to the unforgiven who are shut out of the kingdom.²⁹ For Matt 16:19; 18:18, Emerton claims that opening and shutting engendered the (later) rabbinic concept of binding and loosing.

Although in Isa 22:22 the Hebrew words for open and shut are פתח and סגר, Emerton focuses on the pair’s Aramaic cognates פתח and סגר (Tg. J. Isa 22:22) because Jesus spoke Aramaic and because סגר (Aram.)—unlike סגר (Heb.)—can denote both shutting and holding.³⁰ Emerton considers סגר, in the sense of holding, the best explanation of John’s odd use of κρατέω for holding onto sins (John 20:23).³¹ In so doing, Emerton dismisses the long held explanation that John simply used κρατέω (hold onto) as the literal opposite of ἀφήμι (let go; forgive).³² Along the same lines, ‘keeping’ sins is not an unparalleled expression: “Is it not [the case that] if your work is good in this world, (your sin) will be remitted [שרי] and forgiven [שבבך] you in the world that is coming; and if your work is not good in this world, your sin is

²⁸ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 328.

²⁹ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 328.

³⁰ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 328. Emerton’s attraction to shutting/holding in the second half of John 20:23 [p. 329] results in part from Burkitt’s mistranslation of John 20:23 sy^s: “and whom ye shall shut *your door* against—it is shut;” [F. Crawford Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic evidence* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 1:529; Burkitt italicizes “your door” to convey that the words do not appear in the text; cf. “and he whom ye shall shut up, he is shut up” [Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, 2:316]. A more accurate rendering would be: “Whom you forgive him his sins, they are forgiven to him; and whom you hold [his sins] against him, he holds fast”. ‘Hold fast’ indeed sounds strange, but that is the meaning of the *pa’el* (D-stem) of ܫܘܪ, which Sinaiticus, the Peshitta, and the Harklean all use at this point in John 20:23. The only difference from Sinaiticus is that the Peshitta and the Harklean make ‘sins’—not the sinner—the subject (3 f. pl.) of ‘hold fast’, and in those versions ‘shut’ would not make sense. Also, the verb cannot be passive, as Burkitt translates, because it would have to be an *itpe’el* (Gt-stem). Ironically enough the translators into Syriac could not use the *itpe’el* for ܫܘܪ because that would have signified forgiveness of sins in the very clause intended to teach the withholding of forgiveness.

³¹ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 329.

³² Walter Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (3d ed.; HAT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 232; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 2:1024; Robert Kysar, *John* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 305.

kept [נטר] for the day of great judgment” (*Tg. Neof. Gen 4:7*).³³ Thus John’s expression is less problematic than Emerton claims, and his appeal to פתח (Aram.) creates more difficulties than it can resolve.

To explain more fully how a generic statement about ‘opening’ came to signify forgiveness of sins, Emerton stretches the meaning of פתח (Aram.). He lists instances of פתח as ‘loose’ or ‘release’ in Hebrew (Qal, Niphal, Piel, and Hitpael) and suggests that those who transmitted the Aramaic Jesus saying relied upon such OT usage.³⁴ Given that Emerton earlier preferred an original Aramaic logion to a Hebrew one because of the double meaning of פתח (Aram.), it is problematic that he sets out to explain the nuances of פתח in Aramaic by appealing to the lexeme’s Hebrew cognate. As further evidence, though, Emerton cites two Targumic texts (*Tg. Job 12:14b*; *Tg. Ps 105:20*), both of which plausibly render פתח as ‘to be released’.³⁵ The difficulties are that both texts reproduce פתח from their Hebrew *Vorlagen* and that neither Targum likely predates the fourth century C.E.³⁶

Emerton claims additional evidence in that פתח twice signifies ‘release’ in John 18:39, wherein Pilate would have set Jesus free. For these instances Emerton relies on Friedrich Schulthess’s dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic (CPA).³⁷ Although the dialect of CPA

³³ Those citing *Tg. Neof. Gen 4:7* include Davies and Allison [*Matthew*, 2:636 (ii)] and Boismard [*Synopse*, 3:472ab].

³⁴ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 329.

³⁵ *Targum Job 12:14b* could read either of two ways: “[If] he shuts [יסגר] a man in a grave, then it [i.e. the grave] will not be opened [יפתח];” also, “[If] he shuts [יסגר] a man in a grave, then he will not be released [יפתח].” The MT lacks the specific location of a ‘grave’ and could refer either to the man not being released or to whatever encloses the man not being opened; the Greek translation favors the containment vessel: “If he shuts out people, who will open [τίς ἀνοίξει]?” *Targum Ps 105:20* reads, “The king sent and released [פטר]; cf. פטר Hitpael in the MT] him; the ruler among the peoples set him free [פתח; cf. פתח in the MT].”

³⁶ Based partly on the reference to Rome and Constantinople in *Tg. Ps 108:11* David Stec tentatively dates *Targum Psalms* between the fourth and sixth centuries [David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*: (ArBib 16; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2004), 2]; Raphael Weiss did not date *Targum Job* earlier than Bavli [Frederick E. Greenspahn, review of Raphael Weiss, *The Aramaic Targum of Job*, *JAOS* 101 (1981): 452–3].

³⁷ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 329; see Friedrich Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalestinum* (Berlin: Georgii Reimer, 1903; repr., Amsterdam: APA, 1979), 165.

reaches back much earlier, the texts that read ܘܠܗ in John 18:39 are lectionary codices A (Vatican) and C (Sinai, 1893), which date to the eleventh and twelfth centuries.³⁸ Christa Müller-Kessler distinguishes early (fifth- to seventh-century) and middle period (eighth- to ninth-century) CPA manuscripts from late-period (tenth- to thirteenth-century) ones, which contain numerous “corrupted and doubtful forms.”³⁹ In other words, the lectionary texts are not simply late copies of CPA texts: they represent a late stage of CPA as a dialect.⁴⁰ Earlier Syriac texts do not read ܘܠܗ at John 18:39; the Peshitta gives ܘܠܗ, and the Harklean uses ܘܠܗ.⁴¹ In short, Emerton’s case is based on ܦܗܐ (Aram.) signifying ‘release’ in the first century, when ܫܪܝܐ would have been the normal term, and he is at a loss to demonstrate any such early attestation.

Nevertheless, Emerton rests on the supposition that ܦܗܐ meant ‘release’ in first-century Aramaic, and he further suggests that “the idea of releasing or setting free led to the thought of releasing or setting free from sin, and hence of forgiveness.”⁴² *Inter alia* he cites Rev 1:5, which refers to setting free (λύω) from sin (ἁμαρτία), to show that Greek verbs for ‘release’ come to mean forgive. Without a doubt λύω can signify forgiveness, but in instances such as Rev 1:5 the object ‘sin’ is clearly marked, and Emerton’s reconstructed saying about opening/releasing and shutting would lack any object. Thus it is circular to claim the connotation of sin. He also points

³⁸ Agnes Smith Lewis and Margaret Dunlop Gibson, eds., *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels: Re-edited from two Sinai MSS. and from P. de Lagarde’s edition of the “Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum”* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & co., 1899), 197.

³⁹ Christa Müller-Kessler, “Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Its Significance to the Western Aramaic Dialect Group,” *JAOS* 119 (1999): 632 [631–6].

⁴⁰ E.g., Müller-Kessler [“Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Its Significance to the Western Aramaic Dialect Group,” 633] criticizes Alain Desreumaux [*Codex sinaiticus Zosimi rescriptus: Description codicologique des feuillets araméens melkites des manuscrits Schøyen 35, 36 et 37 (Londres-Oslo) comprenant l’édition de nouveaux passages des Évangiles et des Catéchèses de Cyrille* (HTB 3; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 1997)] for intermingling readings from Lewis’s late-period lectionary texts in a reconstruction of the early-period Codex Sinaiticus Rescriptus.

⁴¹ George Anton Kiraz, ed., *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshittâ and Harklean Versions* (4 vols.; NTTs 21–4; Leiden: E.J. Brill), 4:326; John 18:39 is not extant in Old Syriac: Curetonianus preserves nothing past “And now, look...” (ܘܠܗܘܢ) in John 14:29, and Syrus Sinaiticus is broken from John 18:31–19:40 [E. Jan Wilson, ed., *The Old Syriac Gospels: Studies and Comparative Translations* (2 vols.; Eastern Christian Studies 1–2; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2002)].

⁴² Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 329.

out that שרש (Aram.), which signifies both loosening and forgiving,⁴³ sometimes stands for פתח (Heb.). That too is true, but it is unconvincing to use שרש (Aram.) to elucidate פתח (Heb. and Aram.) when Emerton began by rejecting אסר and שרש as underlying the sayings in Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23. On their own, then, Emerton’s terms פתח and אסר simply do not convey the meanings his argument requires because פתח is nowhere attested as ‘forgive’ in Hebrew or Aramaic.

For the Matthean logia, Emerton claims that the concept of opening and shutting actually gave rise to the rabbinic notion of binding and loosing. As supporting evidence he appeals to Strack-Billerbeck: *Sifre Deut 32:25* (Pisqa 321) quotes 2 Kgs 24:16, which mentions engravers and locksmiths.⁴⁴ The Midrash plays on the word engraver (חֲרָט) as being silent (cf. חֲרָט, ‘deaf’) in face of authoritative teaching, and the word ‘locksmith’ (מסגר) derives from the verb ‘shut’ (סגר), which prompts a quotation of the saying in Isa 22:22. Strack-Billerbeck also cites a chain of such 2 Kgs 24:16 wordplay (*b. Sanh.* 38a; *Gīt.* 88a; *Tanḥ. Noah* 3), but as Herbert Bassler observes, only at the latest stage is there any association with rabbinic declarations of what is permissible.⁴⁵ The rabbinic notion of binding and loosing was already established in the Mishnah, which *Sifre Deuteronomy* cites, and so there is no evidence whatsoever that opening and shutting was an earlier formulation for authoritative rabbinic teaching.

In summary, Emerton’s supporting evidence is far too late to establish first-century usage. He posits opening and shutting (Aram. פתח and אסר) in place of binding and loosing (Aram. אסר and שרש) as explaining Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23. However, he relies on particular meanings of שרש to interpret פתח without ever demonstrating his thesis that פתח itself morphed into loosing and forgiving.

Studies of John and the Synoptics show a strong tendency to claim oral tradition by default whenever sayings do not agree verbatim, and the relation of Matthew’s binding and loosing to John’s forgiving and retaining sins is a quintessential example. I maintain that it is

⁴³ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 330.

⁴⁴ Emerton, “Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining,” 330; citing Str-B 1:741.

⁴⁵ Herbert W. Bassler, “Derrett’s ‘Binding’ Reopened,” *JBL* 104 (1985): 298–9 [297–300]; following Bassler closely is John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 680.

methodologically insufficient to claim such independent transmission without demonstrating the morphology of a saying or complex of sayings; moreover, lexical semantics should serve as a control in such endeavors. Regarding the relatedness of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23, my conclusion is that the prevailing arguments for oral tradition rely on inapplicable meanings of key terms and thus fail to establish an independent origin to these sayings.

Paul Anderson's Argument: John's Knowledge of Matthean Redaction (Matt 16:19)

Paul Anderson reconsiders the relationships among John and the Synoptics. Anderson argues for a mixture of oral and written source material, and he proposes an interfluent model whereby the synoptic tradition not only influenced John but the Johannine tradition also influenced the Synoptics. The interrelation of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 proves an important test case. Anderson advances the scholarly discussion of these texts by claiming John's knowledge of Matthean redaction (Matt 16:19) via secondary orality—not just free-floating synoptic tradition.

Anderson's 1988 Glasgow doctoral thesis lays the groundwork for his interfluent model.⁴⁶ As it pertains to Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23, Anderson identifies a Matthean notion of Petrine authority as redaction to Mark (Matt 16:17–19; cf. Mark 8:27–30) and as taking written form within a few years of Peter's martyrdom.⁴⁷ Anderson claims that the Johannine tradition not only knew of Matthew's formulation of Petrine authority but also actively opposed it through oral preaching, and Anderson suggests that the Matthean tradition might then have produced Matt 18:18 in response to such Johannine opposition.⁴⁸ In Anderson's view, Matthew influenced John, but John might also have influenced Matthew.

⁴⁶ Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (WUNT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996; repr. with a new introduction, outlines, and epilogue, Eugene, Or.: Cascade, 2010); my thanks to Paul Anderson for sending me PDFs of the new introduction and epilogue.

⁴⁷ Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 235.

⁴⁸ Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 239; he qualified, “though this cannot be demonstrated.”

Anderson has since expanded his investigation of John's interfluent relations with the Synoptics, and he conveniently charts his results.⁴⁹ The written Gospel of Mark (70 C.E.) influenced the written Gospel of Matthew (90 C.E.). John's written gospel appeared in two editions: the first predated Matthew (80–85 C.E.) and was independent of all Matthean oral and written traditions; the second edition postdated Matthew (100 C.E.). In the meantime there was continuous oral preaching of the written Gospel of John. Out of that preaching, the Johannine epistles appeared in five-year increments: 1 John (85 C.E.), 2 John (90 C.E.), and 3 John (95 C.E.). Anderson also charts the continued Johannine preaching (80/85–100 C.E.) as not only influencing but also being influenced by the written Gospel of Matthew (90 C.E.).

Here are the ways Anderson's current model could account for his earlier argument for the interfluence of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23. The line from Matthew's gospel to John's continued preaching could carry the tradition of Matt 16:19, and the line from John's continued preaching back to Matthew's gospel could represent the critique of Petrine binding and loosing that became John 20:23. That Matthean-Johannine exchange could then have prompted Matt 18:18. If so, Anderson's model would need to add a second edition of Matthew's gospel sometime after 90 C.E. Another possibility would be to date the John/Matthew dialogue earlier and to chart the interfluence of early Matthean and early Johannine traditions; such a move would also require diagramming Markan influence on early Matthean tradition and/or dating Matthew's written gospel earlier than 90 C.E. Anderson occasionally implies some such redating by positing contact between the Johannine and Matthean traditions as of the 70s–80s,⁵⁰ but he tends to date the Johannine-Matthean dialogues to the 80s–90s,⁵¹ and if the John/Matthew interaction concerns Petrine authority, then Matt 16:17–19 needs to have appeared much earlier than 90 C.E. That late date complicates the attempt to carry Matthean tradition to John and from

⁴⁹ Paul N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered* (T&T Clark Biblical Studies; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 126; Table 3.3; see also Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, lxxiii.

⁵⁰ Anderson, *Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 133; see also p. 124. There Anderson says that the Johannine and Matthean traditions may have been in dialogue "for several decades;" his chart allows up to two decades: one for Johannine preaching to have influenced Matthew's written gospel (80–90 C.E.) and another for Matthew's written gospel to have influenced Johannine preaching (90–100 C.E.).

⁵¹ E.g., Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, xli.

John back to Matthew, and Anderson's subsequent research shows a willingness to let go of Johannine influence on Matthew.

With Matt 18:18 no longer necessarily representing a response to Johannine preaching, Anderson compares both Matthean binding and loosing sayings to John 20:21–23.⁵² Clarifying that the dialogue between John and Matthew more likely involved secondary orality than direct contact with a written gospel,⁵³ Anderson doubts that John had in mind a particular Matthean text.⁵⁴ Yet he refers to John 20:23 as correcting the Matthean tradition of granting authority to forgive sins to “one disciple alone,”⁵⁵ which must be the tradition encapsulated in Matt 16:19. Anderson accepts that binding and loosing is equivalent to forgiving and retaining sins,⁵⁶ and so Matt 18:18 would serve essentially the same function as John 20:23, namely to authorize a group of disciples—rather than an individual—to forgive sins.⁵⁷ On Anderson's terms, then, John still must not have known Matt 18:18.

Anderson's historical reconstruction posits that around 95 C.E. the Johannine community had a negative encounter with Diotrephes (3 John 9–10), who explicitly claimed the authority Jesus granted Peter in Matt 16:17–19.⁵⁸ The implications I draw from Anderson's reconstruction are as follows. Diotrephes had to have quoted Matt 16:19 closely enough that John 20:23 could evince structural parallels with Matthew's binding and loosing sayings. However, the Johannine community would not necessarily have known that Diotrephes claimed authority from a written

⁵² Anderson, *Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 124; Graham Stanton had mentioned that Anderson focused on John 20:23/Matt 16:19 to the neglect of Matt 18:18 [review of Paul Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*, RBL 1 (1999): 55 [53–6]; see Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 346 n. 28].

⁵³ Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, xli; Anderson defines the process somewhat loosely as “what was heard about what was written or said about what was heard or written” [*Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 187].

⁵⁴ Anderson, *Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 124.

⁵⁵ Anderson, *Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 124; Anderson adds “and those who follow after (Peter),” by which he means “proto-Ignatian autocratic modes of governance” [p. 124].

⁵⁶ Anderson, *Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 124; see also *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 239, where Anderson additionally relates Peter's teaching authority to binding and loosing.

⁵⁷ Anderson, *Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus*, 124; similarly *idem*, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 239.

⁵⁸ Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, xli, 244, 346.

gospel. They simply knew that Diotrephes acted in an authoritarian manner. Thereafter the final edition of John's gospel incorporated John 20:21–23 in opposition to rising ecclesial institutionalization. Had the Johannine community known Matthew 18, they could have convicted Diotrephes by claiming their own authority *qua* disciples to bind and loose and to discipline fellow church members.

In summary, Anderson makes an important contribution by exploring secondary orality and examining the ways John might have reacted to specific Matthean formulations. Anderson's work still focuses too much on Matt 16:19 to the neglect of Matt 18:18. That is, John is still seen as opposing the authority embodied a single individual, whether Peter or Diotrephes. Also, Anderson gradually moves John away from the written text of Matthew when an even closer acquaintance with Matthew's other binding and loosing saying could resolve the tensions Anderson highlights in John's gospel.

Counterargument: John's Knowledge of Matthean Redaction (Matt 18:18)

I accept the long established view that Matthew's binding and loosing is rightly understood in terms of rabbinic prohibition and permission. I have advanced the argument that such an understanding precludes the connotation of forgiveness in the sayings in Matt 16:19; 18:18. My purpose is to correct the widespread misperception that Matthew's binding and loosing expresses the same idea as John's forgiving and retaining sins. Such misperception underlies the prevailing attempts to explain the relationships among Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23—whether in terms of independent oral tradition or secondary orality. In what follows, I offer an alternative explanation according to which the saying about forgiving and retaining sins reveals John's knowledge of Matthean redaction, that of Matthew 18 rather than ch. 16.

If binding and loosing does not mean retaining and forgiving sins, then the language in John 20:23 requires another explanation. My solution is quite simply that John knows the context of Matthew 18, particularly the redactional transition from instructions for convicting a sinner (v. 15) to the binding and loosing saying (v. 18) and then to Peter's question about forgiveness of sins (v. 21).⁵⁹ My thesis requires jettisoning the notions that 'loosen' means 'forgive' and that

⁵⁹ Regarding the transition from Matt 18:18 to v. 21, Dodd once raised this very possibility, but he immediately rejected it as "far-fetched" and concluded instead that John had independent access to a special—i.e., variant—form of synoptic oral tradition [*Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 348–9].

John is reacting to Peter's authority in Matt 16:19. I argue that John 20:23 amounts to a reinterpretation of the entire redacted chapter of Matthew 18.

John's Reinterpretation of Matthew

Thus far I have shown that previous attempts to account for John 20:23; Matt 18:18; 16:19 via independent oral tradition and John's knowledge of Matthean redaction (Matt 16:19) encounter insurmountable difficulties. On philological grounds, John's forgiving and retaining sins (20:23) more likely depends on Matthean redaction in ch. 18 given the discussion of forgiveness that surrounds Matthew's second binding and loosing logion (18:18). This semantic conclusion sheds light on John's theology of forgiveness, which in a single saying (20:23) effectively rewrote an entire Matthean discourse (ch. 18). In what follows, I provide an overview of Matthew 18 and Matthew's theology of forgiveness to contextualize my argument for John's reinterpretation. Whereas Matthew admonishes disciples not to withhold forgiveness from the penitent, John reminds disciples of their authority and responsibility not to grant blanket forgiveness.

Matthew 18 comprises a carefully arranged unit, and I make the following summary.⁶⁰ In Matt 18:1–14 Jesus warns the disciples against causing anyone to stumble, and he commends the disciples to seek and save anyone who wanders from the faith. The remainder of the chapter concerns sin and forgiveness. When a church member sins, the disciples are to convict the sinner and to expel anyone who disregards the admonishment of the church (vv. 15–17). The binding and loosing saying (v. 18), I have argued, means that the disciples must agree as to what counts as sin (vv. 19–20). Peter then wonders how many chances he should give a sinner to respond in obedience to church discipline (v. 21), and Jesus says to forgive seventy-seven times (v. 22). In the ensuing parable, the unforgiving slave who is handed over to the torturers (v. 34) serves as a cautionary tale for disciples who would withhold forgiveness from an obedient admonished sinner. Matthew concludes, “And likewise [οὕτως] my heavenly father will do to you [pl.] if each of you does not forgive his brother from your hearts” (v. 35).

⁶⁰ For a more detailed description, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:750–751; i.e., “Excursus IV: The Structure of Chapter 18.”

Matthew's goal in church discipline, then, is the sinner's conviction and obedience, whether mediated by an individual, small group of disciples, or the entire church (18:15–17). In other words, Matthew considers obedience—figured as imploring the master (v. 32)—prerequisite to forgiveness: in the parable, the first slave falls down and implores patience whereupon the master grants forgiveness (vv. 26–27); the forgiven slave then called his co-slave to account for his debt and refused forgiveness even though the co-slave likewise fell down and implored patience (vv. 28–30). In decisions of whether to forgive, the torturer imagery likely encouraged Matthew's church to err on the side of caution.

The tortured slave illustrates Matthew's theology of forgiveness, which involves people's authority and obligation to forgive. Regarding human authority, all three Synoptics regard Jesus' healing of the paralyzed man (Matt 9:1–8; Mark 2:1–12; Luke 5:17–26) as proof that the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins (Matt 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24), but only Matthew's redaction of the miracle story extends such authority to people: “And seeing [the formerly paralyzed man walking], the crowds were afraid and glorified the God who gives such authority [i.e., to forgive sins] to humans [τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις]” (Matt 9:8).⁶¹ Regarding the disciples' obligation to forgive, Jesus teaches them to pray, “forgive us our debts, even as we forgive our debtors” (Matt 6:12). After the prayer concludes, Matthew reads, “For if you [pl.] forgive people their transgressions, your heavenly father will also forgive you; but if you do not forgive people, neither will your father forgive your transgressions” (Matt 6:14–15). Debts are metaphoric for sins,⁶² and one whose sins are not forgiven must repay the debt, which the Parable of the Unforgiving Slave depicts as physical torture.⁶³

I turn now to the context of John's forgiving and retaining sins logion so as to compare the Fourth Evangelist's and Matthew's theologies of forgiveness. Whereas Matthew's binding and loosing saying and forgiveness discourse occurs prior to the passion, the Johannine saying occurs after Jesus' resurrection, after his having appeared to Mary Magdalene, when he first appears to a group of disciples. Despite the doors being shut, he stands in their midst and greets them with a word of peace (John 20:19). Jesus then shows them his hands and his side to identify the marks

⁶¹ I agree with Luz [*Matthew*, 2:28–9] and Davies and Allison [*Matthew*, 2:96] that Matthew's point in 9:8 is that the authority to forgive sins will pass from Jesus to the church/his followers.

⁶² See Anderson, *Sin: A History*, 27–39; i.e., ch. 3: “A Debt To Be Repaid.”

⁶³ Anderson, *Sin: A History*, 32–3.

of his crucifixion, and the disciples rejoiced (v. 20). John writes: “So he said to them again, ‘Peace to you; as the Father sent me, even I send you.’ And having said this, he breathed on them, and he says, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit.’ If you forgive anyone’s sins, [the sins] have been forgiven them; if you retain anyone’s [sins], [the sins] have been retained” (John 20:21–23). In the forgiveness saying, the (divine) passive voice conveys that God concurs with the disciples’ decisions, and the perfect aspect signifies the lasting significance thereof.

As compared with Matthew’s theology of forgiveness, John’s saying seconds the disciples’ authority to forgive. However, John says nothing about God refusing the disciples forgiveness of their own sins if the disciples refuse others forgiveness. In other words, whereas Matthew’s discourse focuses on what happens to the disciples if they do not forgive, John’s saying focuses instead on what happens to the unforgiven sinners. Table 4.1 exemplifies Matthew and John’s respective foci; since Peter’s question concerns forgiving his brother (Matt 18:21) and since Andrew was Peter’s biological brother, I use their names in the example.

Table 4.1 Matthew and John on Disciples’ Forgiveness of Others

Matthew: If Peter does not forgive Andrew’s sins, then God does not forgive *Peter’s* sins.
 Cf. John: If Peter does not forgive Andrew’s sins, then God does not forgive *Andrew’s* sins.

According to my thesis, John copies the structure of Matthew’s binding and loosing saying while knowing that binding and loosing refer to declarations of prohibited and permissible beliefs and actions. John’s forgiving and retaining sins logion intimates a concern that unrestrained permissiveness vis-à-vis sinners in the church in effect declares their sin permissible. Read in this light, the operative concern in John 20:23 is not (*pace* Anderson) Matthean authoritarianism—e.g., someone like Diotrephes—but rather Matthean laxity. In other words, it appears that in John’s estimation, church authorities were not too harsh but rather too soft.

In conclusion, the consensus has assumed that John’s forgiving and retaining sins and Matthew’s binding and loosing are independent sayings that mean the same thing. I have shown instead that the sayings mean different things and yet that John is dependent on Matthew. John emphasizes the disciples’ authority to withhold forgiveness, concerning which Matthew had cautioned. Matthew and John’s respective theologies of forgiveness are nonetheless

complementary. That is, the main tension is not between Matt 18:18 and John 20:23;⁶⁴ the main tension stands already in Matthew 18, for the Parable of the Unforgiving Slave (Matt 18:23–35) presupposes the expulsion of recalcitrant sinners (Matt 18:15–17), but the imagery of torturing unforgiving disciples (Matt 18:34–35) could undermine attempts at church discipline. As a reinterpretation of Matthew 18, then, John 20:23 represents an effort to balance Jesus' commands to forgive some sinners and expel others.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ For the history of interpretation of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 from Tertullian to Augustine, see Appendix A.

⁶⁵ My thanks to J. Patout Burns, David Petrain, and Bronwen Wickkiser for their feedback on an earlier draft of this chapter presented at Vanderbilt's Religion and the Greco-Roman World workgroup.

V. MISSION DISCOURSES AND EVANGELISM TO SAMARITANS

Nowhere are there gaps in which one can insert the synoptic narratives John skipped over. Every attempt at harmonization and combination pits the Fourth Evangelist in the greatest opposition.

—Hans Windisch

This chapter's overarching question is why in John's gospel Jesus travels through Samaria and evangelizes Samaritans there (ch. 4), given that in Matthew's gospel Jesus avoids Samaria and tells the disciples not to evangelize there (10:5b). In this final test-case, I argue somewhat counterintuitively that John so differs from Matthew as to constitute conscious disagreement with the First Gospel. The resulting harmonization is that the harvest sayings in John 4:35–38 do not merely parallel but are intended to occur simultaneously with the harvest saying in Matt 9:37–38. Consequently John recontextualizes Matthew such that Jesus only told the disciples not to evangelize in Samaria because he himself was already doing so.

The discussion is in seven short sections. First, I review previous scholarship and assume a mediating position: some have argued that the Fourth Gospel comes from Samaritans and is addressed to them; others have denied any concern for Samaritans on the part of John. Second, I highlight John's distinctive explicit report of Jesus' travel through Samaria, which contrasts sharply with Jesus' travels in the Synoptics. Third, I underscore that Matthew's construction of ethnicity and mission excludes Samaritans, and so Jesus' self-revelation to Samaritans in John may seem to contradict Matthew. Fourth, I isolate the harvest metaphors in Matt 9:37b–38 and John 4:35b, and I suggest that John not only shares common language with Matthew but also appears to know the surrounding context of the Matthean saying. Fifth, regarding chronology I intimate that the mission discourse in John 4 is supposed to occur as part of the same discourse recounted in Matthew 10. Sixth, I engage possible objections to my argument before offering concluding reflections.

Previous Scholarship regarding Samaritans in the Fourth Gospel

Johannine commentators have pointed out the opposition between Jesus' telling the Twelve not to enter any city of the Samaritans (Matt 10:5b) and the disciples' accompanying Jesus to the

Samaritan city of Sychar (John 4).¹ Considering John and Matthew independent, few scholars have attempted to reconcile that opposition. For example, based in part on Matt 10:5, Barnabas Lindars finds Jesus' Samaritan mission unlikely historically, but Lindars does not consider John 4 a direct response to Matt 10:5.² Some of those who have harmonized John 4 with Matt 10:5 claim that Jesus' trip to Samaria occurred long before Matthew's mission discourse. For example, A. T. Robertson dated the events of John 4 a year or two prior to the events of Matthew 10.³ Thus for Robertson, John's account and Matthew's can both be historically accurate, even though a tension would remain between the two evangelist's perspectives toward Samaritans. The purpose of this chapter is to propose a new harmonization according to which the events John 4 and Matthew 10 occur simultaneously.

A related question concerns why John would depict an extended interaction between Jesus and Samaritans. Earlier scholarship answered that question by overstating John's Samaritan influence or audience. For example, George Wesley Buchanan concluded that the Gospel of John came from the Samaritan church.⁴ John Bowman later argued that the Fourth Gospel was addressed to Samaritans.⁵ More modestly Edwin Freed spoke of Samaritan influence on John,

¹ E.g., Raymond Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (2 vols.; AB 29–29A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 1:175; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 120 n. 23; Oscar Cullmann, *The Early Church: Studies in Early Christian History and Theology* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956), 189; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1972; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 175; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John* (trans. Kevin Smyth et al.; 3 vols.; HTKNT 4; New York: Herder & Herder; Seabury; Crossroad, 1968–1982; repr. New York: Crossroad, 1990), 1:458–9.

² Lindars, *Gospel of John*, 175.

³ A. T. Robertson, *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ: Based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised Version* (New York: George H. Doran, 1922). John 4:5–42 constitutes §35 and dates to 27 C.E., whereas Matt 9:35–11:1 appears in §70, the penultimate event of “The Great Galilean Ministry,” which concludes just prior to Passover in 29 C.E.

⁴ George Wesley Buchanan, “The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John,” in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 175 [149–75].

⁵ John Bowman, *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity* (trans. Alfred M. Johnson, Jr.; PTMS 4; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975), 89.

and Freed considered the gospel an attempt to convert both Samaritans and Jews.⁶ More skeptically Margaret Pamment held that John had no direct knowledge of Samaritan beliefs.⁷ Craig Keener followed Pamment's lead: "Few would argue...that the Samaritans are John's primary audience, and it is tenuous to assert that their presence in the Gospel makes them part of its original audience at all."⁸ While Pamment and Keener offer an important corrective, they ultimately understate the significance of Samaritans appearing in John's gospel. Granted the gospel as a whole was unlikely by or for Samaritans, I agree with Andrew Lincoln that there would be little reason to include ch. 4 aside from some attempt at Samaritan inclusion.⁹

Geography of Samaria in the Gospels

When reading John in light of the Synoptics, it is somewhat surprising to find Jesus in Samaria at all. In particular, Mark and Matthew depict Jesus as avoiding Samaria when traveling from Galilee to Jerusalem. From Capernaum (9:33) Mark says that Jesus went "into the regions of Judea and across the Jordan" (10:1).¹⁰ Since Judea lies on the same side of the Jordan as Capernaum, Mark's knowledge of Palestinian geography appears somewhat suspect; for example, elsewhere Jesus goes out of his way when returning from Tyre to the Sea of Galilee via Sidon (Mark 7:31). Mark 10:1 nonetheless signifies that Jesus crossed the Jordan and avoided Samaria. Later copyists made that point explicit by saying that Jesus went to Judea *via* Perea as shown by *διὰ* in Alexandrinus and Byzantine mss. as well as *ב* in the Harklean. Necessarily

⁶ Edwin D. Freed, "Did John Write His Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?" *NovT* 12 (1970): 256 [241–56].

⁷ Margaret Pamment, "Is There Convincing Evidence of Samaritan Influence on the Fourth Gospel?" *ZNW* 73 (1982): 225 [221–30].

⁸ Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:169–70; Keener cites Pamment approvingly [1:169 n. 292], yet Keener "cannot deny the possibility of some Samaritan Christian thought in the Johannine community or among those who influenced it" [1:170].

⁹ Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John* (BNTC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005), 181–2.

¹⁰ εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Mark 10:1); the absence of καὶ in the Western text most likely represents assimilation to Matt 19:1.

having re-crossed the Jordan, Jesus and the disciples' next location in Mark is on the road to Jerusalem (10:32), and shortly thereafter they arrive at Jericho (v. 46). Matthew follows Mark closely when reporting that Jesus leaves Capernaum in the Galilee and crosses to the other side of the Jordan (Matt 19:1), most likely via the Sea of Galilee. Jesus would then head South until past Samaria, at which point he could cross the Jordan into Judea, for in Matt 20:17 Jesus and the Twelve are on the road to Jerusalem, and as of v. 29 they have entered and departed Jericho.

At least since the early nineteenth century, scholars have observed that Jesus' travels in Matthew and Mark avoid Samaria,¹¹ but the two dominant scholarly explanations have been inadequate. For example, John P. Meier says that "in Mark, as in Matthew, this final journey apparently goes through Perea across the Jordan and up to Jerusalem by way of Jericho;"¹² Meier then explains the journey as "a common route for Jewish pilgrims wishing to avoid the hostility of Samaritans."¹³ Yet such Samaritan hostility first arose over twenty years after Jesus' ministry ended. Josephus records an attack on Galilean pilgrims passing through Samaria in 52 C.E., but he introduces the account as follows: "It was the custom among the Galileans coming to the festivals in the holy city to travel via the region of Samaria" (*Ant.* 20.6.1). Others such as Andreas Köstenberger and Leon Morris explain that Jews' piety kept them out of Samaria.¹⁴ However, as Craig Keener cites,¹⁵ the rabbis do not question the piety of Rabbi Jonathan, who talked to a Samaritan near Mount Gerizim (*Gen. Rab.* 32.10). *Mutatis mutandis*, in reporting Jesus' travels to Jerusalem, Matthew and Mark merely state that he bypassed Samaria without explaining why he did so.

¹¹ E.g., R. T. France, *Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 709; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Life of Jesus* (ed. Jack C. Verheyden; trans. S. Maclean Gilmour; Lives of Jesus Series; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 366.

¹² John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (4 vols.; A[Y]BRL; New York: Doubleday; Hartford, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1991–2009), 3:546, 602 n. 169.

¹³ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 3:546; similarly Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospels and Letters of John* (3 vols.; Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 2:170.

¹⁴ Andreas Köstenberger, *John* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 146; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 226.

¹⁵ Keener, *Gospel of John*, 1:590 n. 46; Keener cites p. 255 [*sic*; 226] of Morris's commentary.

Compared with Matthew and Mark, Luke remains silent as to whether Jesus ever entered Samaria. At the outset of the Travel Narrative, Jesus sent messengers who entered a Samaritan village (κώμην Σαμαριτῶν; 9:52). Jesus himself did not enter that village, and its inhabitants were unreceptive (v. 53), so Jesus and his disciples proceeded into a different village (ἑτέραν κώμην; v. 56); Luke does not specify whether the second village was a Samaritan one. The next geographic marker comes when Jesus encounters ten men having leprosy, one of whom was a Samaritan (17:12, 16b). That encounter took place in a village along the border between Samaria and Galilee (διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας; 17:11–12), but Luke does not clarify which side of the border. Later still Jesus is near Jericho (18:35) and then in Jericho (19:1), but Luke takes over those references from Mark. Unlike Matthew and Mark, though, Luke never has Jesus go east of the Jordan, and so the more reasonable inference is that Jesus enters Samaria at some point. Yet John remains the only gospel according to which Jesus explicitly does so.

Samaritan Ethnicity according to Matthew

Jesus' evangelism to Samaritans in John appears especially surprising considering Matthew's general ethnic delineations and his particular prohibition of evangelism to Samaritans, which occurs in no other gospel. In Matthew's mission discourse, Jesus commands the Twelve to proclaim that the kingdom of the heavens has come, and he authorizes them to perform miracles (10:7–8). The apostolic mission expressly excludes Samaritans, though: "Into a road of Gentiles you may not go, and into a city of Samaritans you may not enter. Go instead to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt 10:5b–6).¹⁶ From Matthew's standpoint, then, humanity divides into three groups: Gentiles, Samaritans, and the house of Israel.

Jesus reiterates that he was sent only "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"—a uniquely Matthean phrase—when he speaks to the "Canaanite" woman (15:24). As throughout the Old Testament, Canaanites would be included among the Gentiles (גֵּוֹיִם; ἔθνη). The question arises as to whether Samaritans could count as Jews or Gentiles. On the one hand, 2 Kgs 17:29 includes

¹⁶ Pragmatically Jesus issues commands in Matt 10:5b, and so the verbs are usually translated as imperatives; e.g., KJV, NASB, NIV, NJB, NRSV, RSV. Morphologically, though, the verbs are subjunctives, and so I prefer "may not." Regarding Matt 10:5b, see Amy-Jill Levine, *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14; Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen, 1988).

the Samaritans among the ἔθνη by referring to “the Samaritan people group” (οἱ Σαμαριῖται ἔθνη).¹⁷ On the other hand, the Samaritans could represent the Israelites of the former northern kingdom, who are more akin to the Judahites, Judeans, or Jews in the southern kingdom of Judah. In the Gospel of Matthew, only Jews constitute members of the house of Israel; for example, King of Israel (Matt 27:42b) is synonymous with King of the Jews (Matt 27:37), and Matthew never uses the term Israelite. For Matthew, then, Samaritans constitute a distinct entity, neither Jew nor Gentile.

In the end, Matthew has the risen Jesus lift the ban on apostles’ evangelizing Gentiles, for the Great Commission commands the Eleven to go and disciple “all the Gentiles” (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; Matt 28:19). Based on the explicit distinction between Samaritans and Gentiles in Matt 10:5b, the Samaritans remain excluded from Matthew’s evangelistic purview. Read in light of Matthew, John 4 would represent the Fourth Gospel’s efforts at Samaritan inclusion.

Harvest Metaphors in Matthew and John

This section examines Matthew and John’s harvest metaphors that occur in relatively close proximity to some reference to a city of Samaritans. I discuss the Matthean and Johannine sayings in turn and then summarize the comparisons. The purpose is to show a combination of common elements that may diminish the likelihood that John’s harvest sayings arose independently of Matthew.

Matthew has Jesus use a harvest saying as a rationale for the mission discourse (ch. 10). There is too much work for one person, and so Jesus commissions the Twelve to share the responsibility:

And Jesus was going around all the cities and the villages teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every sickness. And seeing the crowds he had compassion on them because they were troubled and tossed about like sheep without a shepherd. Then he says to his disciples, “The harvest is a lot, but the workers few. So ask of the Lord of the harvest that he send out workers into his harvest.” (Matt 9:35–38)

¹⁷ When used in the absolute, I prefer the rendering ‘Gentile’ for ἔθνος. In 2 Kgs 17:29 I use ‘people group’ since ἔθνος appears juxtaposed with a specific gentile; the term’s etymological derivative ‘ethnicity’ would also work in that instance, but I consider the widespread rendering ‘nation’ anachronistic. In Matthew, I maintain the separation of Samaritans from Gentiles as stated in 10:5b.

At that point Jesus summons the Twelve and gives them authority over unclean spirits (Matt 10:1), but he tells them to avoid Samaritan cities as they work miracles and preach the arrival of the kingdom of the heavens (10:5b, 7–8). Despite Jesus’ extensive instructions to the Twelve (10:5–11:1), Matthew never reports that they went out to preach and heal as Jesus instructed (cf. Mark 6:7–13; Luke 9:1–6; 10:1–17).¹⁸

The harvest metaphor conveys two main meanings in the Gospel of Matthew, namely proclamation and judgment. Because Jesus refers to the disciples as preachers and healers, in Matt 9:37b–38 the harvest symbolizes evangelistic work; similarly the Parable of the Sower (Matt 13:3b–9 par. Mark 4:3–9; Luke 8:5–8) allegorizes planting seed as preaching the gospel. Elsewhere in Matthew the harvest serves as a vehicle for eschatological judgment. For example, in the Parable of the Wheat and Tares (13:24–30) the person sows (v. 24) but has others harvest (v. 30), and there the harvest signifies the “consummation of the age” (συντέλεια αἰῶνος; 13:39) when angels will throw evildoers into the fiery furnace (vv. 40–42; cf. Rev 14:15, 16). Jesus later tells the disciples that they too will play a role in eschatological judgment (Matt 19:28b), but in the context of the mission discourse the harvest represents proclamation rather than judgment.¹⁹

In the Gospel of John, harvest language (θερισμός/θερίζω) appears only in the brief mission discourse Jesus delivers to the disciples in Samaria (4:35–38). When Jesus travels through Samaria, he is tired and sits by Jacob’s Well outside the city of Sychar (John 4:4–6). There he speaks with a Samaritan woman (vv. 7–26) while his disciples enter the city (v. 8). Just after they return (v. 27a), the woman leaves and enters the city (v. 28). Then Jesus says to the disciples:

Do you not say, “There are four months still and the harvest comes”? I say to you, lift up your eyes and look at the fields because they are white for harvest. Already the harvester receives pay and gathers fruit for eternal life, so that the sower may rejoice even with the harvester. For in this way the word is true: “One is the sower and another the harvester.” I sent you to harvest that for which you did not labor. Others have labored, and you have entered into their labor. (John 4:35–38)

¹⁸ Matthew 11:1 has Jesus preach in the disciples’ cities, perhaps implying that he was alone while they carried out his instructions, but Matthew does not say so explicitly.

¹⁹ Matthew’s only other uses of θερισμός/θερίζω are when Jesus says that birds neither sow nor harvest (6:26) and when the lead character in the Parable of the Talents harvests what he does not sow (25:24, 26).

Meanwhile the woman testifies about Jesus, and many Samaritans believe in him (v. 39), whereupon Jesus stays with the city-people for two days (v. 40), and many more come to believe that he is “the Savior of the world” (vv. 41–42). However, Jesus’ talk about sending the disciples to labor in the harvest never materializes: John never reports them as doing any agricultural or evangelistic work, and the Samaritans come to belief on the basis of the woman’s testimony and that of Jesus (vv. 39, 41).

John explains the harvest as a metaphor for eternal life (4:36). Throughout the gospel eternal life results from belief in Jesus and/or the one who sent him, and eternal life protects believers from judgment or condemnation (e.g., 3:16, 18a; 5:24); conversely those who do not believe are condemned (3:18b). Individuals’ eternal salvation and condemnation are thus present realities for John, and D. Moody Smith observes that the immediate readiness of a harvest still four months away “suggests the Johannine-realized eschatology.”²⁰ For John, then, proclamation and judgment are one and the same, and nobody has to wait until the end of the world to sort out the saved and the damned.

There are several similarities and differences between these harvest sayings: “The harvest is a lot, but the workers few. So ask of the Lord of the harvest that he send out workers into his harvest” (Matt 9:37b–38); “I say to you, lift up your eyes and look at the fields because they are white for harvest. . . . I sent you to harvest that for which you did not labor” (John 4:35b, 38a). Granting that the sayings are not identical, Raymond Brown calls Matt 9:37–38 (par. Luke 10:1–2) “the best Synoptic parallel” for John 4:35b.²¹ Both sayings refer to a ready harvest and to the disciples being sent out to work in it. Yet the two gospels use different words for ‘send out’ and ‘work’: Matthew uses ἐκβάλλω and ἐργάτης as compared with the synonymous terms ἀποστέλλω and κοπιᾶω/κόπος in John.²² Although in both gospels Jesus intimates the disciples’ evangelistic work, neither gospel records that the disciples did any such work at that time.

²⁰ D. Moody Smith, *John* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 120; similarly Rudolf Bultmann pointed out the paradoxical simultaneity of sowing and harvesting [*The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 197–8], and C. H. Dodd pointed out the tension between future expectation and present reality of the harvest [*Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 400–401].

²¹ Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 1:182.

²² John’s term for labor parallels his description of Jesus’ weariness at the beginning of the episode (κοπιᾶω; John 4:6).

Matthew's harvest saying occurs just prior to Jesus' prohibiting the disciples from entering any Samaritan city, whereas John's harvest saying occurs on the outskirts of a Samaritan city that the disciples have just entered. The greatest difference lies in the evangelists' respective stances toward evangelism to Samaritans, but I find it significant that in both gospels harvest metaphors for evangelistic work occur at all in proximity to discussions in or about Samaritan cities. I conclude that the combination of common elements meets a criterion for classifying the harvest in John 4 as an echo of the harvest in Matthew 9.²³

Chronology of Mission Discourses in the Gospels

John and Matthew's respective chronologies establish a connection according to which the harvest sayings in John's mission discourse (4:35–38) can occur simultaneously with Matthew's (9:37b–38). In other words, if a reader of Matthew asks *when* Jesus told the disciples not to evangelize the Samaritans, a reader of John could answer that Jesus did so when he was in the very process of evangelizing the Samaritans in Sychar. To establish such a Johannine harmonization with Matthew, I use as chronological reference points the notices concerning John the Baptist. Among the Synoptics only Matthew can align with John in this way.²⁴

According to Matthew, John the Baptist was still alive in prison (as of 4:12) when Jesus uttered the plentiful harvest saying (9:37b–38) and delivered the mission discourse that included the prohibition of evangelism to Samaritans (ch. 10). The Baptist had to be alive because he sent his disciples to Jesus just after he concluded the mission discourse (11:2). According to Matthean chronology, then, Herod Antipas executed John the Baptist sometime between the events recorded in ch. 11 and the Feeding of the Five Thousand in ch. 14. Matthew—along with Mark and Luke—uses the report of the Baptist's death to transition to the Feeding of the Five Thousand, which Augustine identified as a “meeting-point” of all four gospels (*Cons.* 2.94).

²³ On the criterion “recurrence” see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 30; similarly regarding “existence of additional parallels,” see Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (WUNT 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 13.

²⁴ I would not attempt to explain the many other discrepancies between John's chronology as compared with the Synoptics. For example, John's three Passovers extend Jesus' ministry beyond two years, as opposed to the single Passover reported in the Synoptics. Thus Jesus' ransacking the temple occurs in John (2:13–17) two years before the temple incident of passion week in the Synoptics.

According to the Fourth Gospel, John is still baptizing (3:23) and not yet in prison (v. 24) as Jesus and the disciples enter Samaria (4:4–5). The Gospel of John never again reports whether the Baptist was free/imprisoned or alive/dead. Yet, based on the unanimity of the Synoptists, any gospel harmony would infer the Baptist's death upon reading about the Feeding of the Five Thousand. John's account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (6:1–13) indeed occurs after the Samaritan mission. Even if ch. 6 originally preceded ch. 5,²⁵ John would still fit Jesus' two days in Sychar into the only possible position that could align with Matthew's chronology.

As shown in Table 5.1, John's mission discourse can harmonize with Matthew's in ways that do not hold for Mark and Luke. John's chronology concerning the Baptist is compatible with Mark's: Mark 1:14 tells that John was arrested, and Mark 6 relates the Mission of the Twelve (vv. 7–13), the report of the Baptist's death (vv. 14–29), and the Feeding of the Five Thousand (vv. 30–44). Yet Mark's mission discourse mentions neither Samaritans nor harvest, and so John 4 would not represent a response to a restrictive Markan mission. Luke's chronology cannot align with John's. Luke tells that John was imprisoned (3:20), and John later sends two of his disciples to question Jesus (7:18–23). Thereafter Luke relates the Mission of the Twelve (9:1–6), but there is no harvest saying and no reference to Samaritans. The notice of John's death (9:7–9) and the Feeding of the Five Thousand (vv. 10–17) follow immediately. Some time later a Samaritan village rejects Jesus (9:52–53), and Luke's rendition of the plentiful harvest saying (10:2b), which is verbatim with Matthew's except for inverting two words, soon follows in the context of the Mission of the Seventy. According to Luke, then, Jesus' mission discourse that included a harvest saying did not transpire until after the Baptist had expired, which means that the events of Luke 10 cannot have occurred simultaneously with the events of John 4.

In order for John to harmonize with Matthew such that the harvest saying in Matthew 9 occurred as part of the same discourse recorded in John 4:35–38, John the Baptist must still be alive, which would indeed be the case since Jesus had not yet miraculously fed the five thousand. When read together, then, John offers a recontextualization of Matthew's Samaritan exclusion, in effect explaining away Jesus' prohibition in Matthew: a Samaritan mission on the part of the

²⁵ Jesus leaves Judea for the Galilee via Samaria (John 4:3–4) and later heals the royal official's son at Cana in the Galilee (v. 46). It may make more sense for ch. 6 to come next, since Jesus would have been in Galilee and in position to cross the Sea (6:1). If ch. 5 then followed, Jesus would go to Jerusalem for a feast (v. 1), and after the Sabbath-healing controversy he would return to Galilee "because the Jews were seeking to kill him" (7:1).

disciples was altogether unnecessary since Jesus himself had evangelized the Samaritans, and Jesus told his disciples not to go evangelize the Samaritans at the very moment he himself was evangelizing the Samaritans. John composed a self-standing narrative that can also be read alongside Matthew within the same community—especially a community that included Samaritans, who might have taken offense to the exclusionary statement in Matt 10:5b. A final implication is that if John accessed Matthew in this instance, then there would be no multiple independent attestation for a mission discourse by Jesus or a mission by the disciples.²⁶

Table 5.1 Sequence of Mission Discourses and Notices Concerning John the Baptist in the Gospels

<u>John</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Mark</u>
John baptizing and not yet in prison (3:23–24)	John baptizing (3:15)	John baptizing (3:16)	John baptizing (1:9)
	John in prison (4:12)	John in prison (3:20)	John in prison (1:14)
Mission discourse with harvest sayings (4:35–38)	Mission discourse with harvest saying (9:37b–38)		Mission discourse <i>without</i> harvest saying (6:7–11) Mission accomplished (6:12–13)
	John still in prison (11:2)	John still in prison (7:19)	
		Mission discourse [70] <i>without</i> harvest saying (9:1–5) Mission accomplished (9:6)	
	John beheaded (14:2, 10)	John beheaded (9:7, 9)	John beheaded (6:14, 16)
Feeding the 5000 (6:1–15) [prior to ch. 5?]	Feeding the 5000 (14:13–21)	Feeding the 5000 (9:10–17)	Feeding the 5000 (6:32–44)
		Mission discourse with harvest saying (10:2) Mission accomplished (10:17)	

²⁶ So Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 405; see also Peter W. Ensor, “The Authenticity of John 4.35,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 72 (2000): 3–21.

Overcoming Objections

At least five objections could be raised against the foregoing presentation. First, the harmonization I have posited would align John with Matthew in one instance but require John's reordering of Matthew in another. M.-É. Boismard has argued that John's reference to the fever having left the royal official's son at the exact hour Jesus pronounced him healed (4:52) derived from Matthew's redactional transition across pericopes, namely from the centurion's child, who was healed at the hour Jesus declared so (8:13), to Peter's mother-in-law, whose fever left (8:15).²⁷ According to John, Jesus encountered the royal official immediately after leaving Samaria (4:43, 46), where he had delivered the mission discourse. According to Matthew, Jesus encountered the centurion prior to delivering the mission discourse. In other words, John would have reversed Matthew's order of the healing of the centurion's son and the mission discourse. Such rearrangement would nonetheless conform to the wider chronology whereby Jesus' mission discourse and his healing the official's son occur prior to the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The upshot is that John's knowledge of Matthew's placement of a harvest saying in the context of a discussion concerning evangelism to Samaritans would provide yet another example of John's knowledge of Matthew's redactional transitions within and across pericopes.

Second, Matthew has Jesus forbid the disciples from entering a Samaritan city, whereas John has the disciples do so. That the disciples entered the city to buy food (John 4:8) poses no difficulty for the harmonization I have posited because Jesus would not yet have issued the prohibition. That is, Jesus issued the prohibition after uttering the harvest saying, and the disciples had entered the city prior.

Third, Samaritans could have read themselves into Matthew's final mission by including themselves among the Gentiles in Matt 28:19, and so perhaps John did not need to respond to Matthew by accounting for the Samaritans. Indeed the term ἔθνος can function hypernymously when juxtaposed with the gentilic Samaritan (2 Kgs 17:29), and yet Samaritans would unlikely self-identify as Gentiles. They call themselves Samaritans (John 4:9), and Matthew calls them Samaritans (10:5b). John depicts the Samaritans as preserving the traditions of Jacob and the other patriarchs (John 4:12, 20a), and so John would not likely have associated the Samaritans

²⁷ Pierre Benoit and M.-É. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome III: L'Évangile de Jean; Commentaire par M.-É. Boismard et A. Lamouille avec la collaboration de G. Rochais* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977), 149a.

with the negative connotations of the term *goyim* located throughout the Tanakh, those of polytheism and idolatry in particular.

Fourth, if John sought to correct Matthew by including the Samaritans in Jesus' evangelistic purview, then John might be expected to have stated so more explicitly. To the contrary, I argue that the Gospel of Matthew likely held considerable authority already, which John would have taken into account when offering correctives. Also, the Fourth Gospel constitutes a self-standing narrative that does not require readers' knowledge of Matthew, and so John makes no explicit references to Matthew.

The final and strongest objection pertains to oral tradition. Since John's harvest sayings evince parallels with several synoptic harvest sayings but do not agree verbatim with any one, scholars such as C. H. Dodd have considered John 4:35–38 to have arisen independently of Matt 9:37b–38.²⁸ As a corrective, I point out that literary dependence and oral tradition are not mutually exclusive,²⁹ and so the Matthean logion need not constitute John's only source—written or oral—for harvest logia. I also submit that John's knowledge of the context surrounding Matt 9:37b–38 accounts for two details that Dodd is at a loss to explain: that John refers at all to (unfulfilled) missionary work by the disciples and that John even includes harvest sayings in ch. 4. Regarding the former, narrating a mission discourse without a mission evinces a minor agreement between John and Matthew against Mark and Luke. Regarding the latter, Jesus' conversation with his disciples concerning food (vv. 31–34) does not clearly relate to their ensuing discussion of the harvest (vv. 35–38), let alone to Jesus' preceding dialogue with the Samaritan woman about water,³⁰ but knowledge of Matthew's (restrictive) missionary discourse can explain why John has Jesus discuss the harvest while visiting Samaria. I conclude that John knows Matthean redaction either via secondary orality or visual contact; whether John 4:35–38

²⁸ C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 392–3, 400, 404–5; see also Smith, *John*, 120.

²⁹ See Andrew F. Gregory, "What is Literary Dependence?" in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008; Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* (ed. Paul Foster et al.; BETL 239; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 87–114.

³⁰ Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 391.

comes from a later redactor, as both Boismard and Urban C. von Wahlde have argued,³¹ lies beyond the scope of my undertaking, but the latter stages of those scholars' compositional histories of the Fourth Gospel allow for John's positioning his gospel alongside the Synoptics as I have attempted to show here.

Conclusions

If John be presumed independent of Matthew, then the two gospels simply represent different points of view toward Samaritan believers. Matthew's prohibition of a mission to Samaritans stands antithetical to John's two-day Samaritan mission and so presents an obstacle to any argument that John knew and used Matthew. Accordingly I have asked when and where Jesus talked about the harvest. Attempting to harmonize John and Matthew, I have found that John recontextualized Matthew such that Jesus commanded the disciples not to go evangelize the Samaritans (Matt 10:5b) while he himself was bringing to faith many Samaritans in Sychar (John 4). John 4:4, 35–38 provides subtle cues to Matt 9:37b–38; 10:5b—so subtle as to have gone unnoticed by even the most ardent harmonizers from Tatian to Robertson.³²

³¹ Boismard placed a visit to Sychar in Document C; II-A later added John 4:40, the two-day stay with the Samaritans; vv. 35–36 come from II-B; vv. 37–38 enter at stage III. Although he considers John II-B to have been influenced by Matthew, Boismard never refers to Matt 10:5b as a cross-reference/impetus for the story in John 4 [*Synopse*, 3:140–144]. Von Wahlde attributes John 4:35–38 either to the second or third (i.e., the final) stage [*Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:190, 193–4].

³² Following Louis Leloir's very helpful table, all versions of the Diatessaron place Jesus' trip to Sychar after the Mission of the Twelve and even after the Feeding of the Five Thousand [Louis Leloir, *Le Témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron* (CSCO 227; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1962), 4–7]. As noted earlier, Robertson did just the opposite by placing the trip to Sychar long before [*Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ*].

VI: SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

After introducing the project in Chapter One, Chapter Two provided a *Forschungsbericht*. In particular, two previous demonstrations of John's use of Matthew provided an impetus to this dissertation. First, M.-É. Boismard studied Jesus' healing a child (παῖς) of a centurion (ἑκατόνταρχος) in Matthew, which resembles John's son (υἱός) of a royal official (βασιλικός). John and Matthew specify the child's healing as taking place "in that hour" (John 4:53; Matt 8:13b), that is, at the moment Jesus remotely pronounced him healed. Since Matthew gives no description of the child's ailment, John's notice that the "fever left him" (John 4:52) is best explained by Matthew's order of pericopes. Immediately following the healing of the centurion's child, Matthew narrates Jesus' healing of Peter's mother-in-law, declaring that "the fever left her" (Matt 8:15). Boismard's observation established the likelihood that John reflects knowledge of Matthean redaction.¹ Second, Frans Neiryck connected Jesus' first resurrection appearances in Matthew and John. Jesus' command that Mary Magdalene not cling to him (John 20:17b) interlocks with the two Marys' grabbing Jesus' feet (Matt 28:9b). Immediately thereafter Jesus sends Mary(s) to his "brothers" (Matt 28:10b; John 20:17c), which shows John's knowledge of Matthean redaction (Matt 28:10; cf. Mark 16:6ab, 7).

Chapter Three argued that Matthew's redactional fulfillment citations serve as the model for John's. A lexical semantic analysis revealed that πῶλος does not signify 'ass', as is most commonly believed, and so Mark did not in fact specify the species of animal on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem. Given the one and only catchword, it is also unlikely that Mark intended a fulfillment of Zech 9:9. As for other ways of explaining how John and Matthew could have quoted Zech 9:9 independently, there is no evidence that the prophecy stood in a *testimonium*. I have shown John's quotation of Zech 9:9 to derive from Matthew's narrative of Jesus' entry. The most significant difference between John and Matthew's quotations is that John clearly signifies one donkey only, which corrects Matthew's seeming misunderstanding of the prophecy's synonymous parallelism.

Chapter Four demonstrated that John's saying about forgiving and holding onto sins (20:23) derives from Matthew's binding and loosing logion (18:18; cf. 16:19). The current consensus

¹ By contrast, Luke records that Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law (4:38–39) some time before encountering the centurion (7:1–10).

relates these sayings through oral tradition and supposes that over time Matthew's "loosing" could have morphed into John's "forgiving" due to the flexibility of the term λύω. This supposition falters on the recognition that λύω only means 'forgive' when it takes 'sin' as its object, which does not occur in the Matthean saying. Further, the binding and loosing saying refers to the disciples' authority to permit and prohibit any action. Accordingly it cannot connote forgiveness because someone does not forgive another for doing something permitted. Matthew's redactional transition from a binding and loosing saying (Matt 18:18) to Peter's question about the limits of forgiveness (Matt 18:21) best explains John's reworking of binding and loosing into forgiving and holding onto sins. The effect of John's reinterpretation is to reinforce Matthew's earlier admonishment to expel recalcitrant sinners (Matt 18:17).

Chapter Five showed that Jesus' Samaritan mission in John 4 constitutes a critical reinterpretation of Jesus' mission discourse in Matthew 10. The Matthean and Johannine sayings about sending workers into the ready harvest (Matt 9:37b–38; John 4:35, 38) are to be linked. The combination of elements—a harvest saying as a metaphor for evangelism in close proximity to the question of evangelizing Samaritans—may indicate John's knowledge of Matthean redaction and not merely John's acquaintance with orally transmitted harvest sayings from synoptic tradition. Read in tandem, John recontextualizes Matthew's Samaritan prohibition: Jesus himself had already evangelized Samaritans, thereby eliminating the need for the disciples to do so. This novel interpretation gains support when taking into account the gospels' wider chronology, specifically that Matthew's mission discourse had to occur prior John the Baptist's imprisonment and execution. In this regard, John's gospel syncs with Matthew's. Finally, this interpretation explains the inclusion of the harvest sayings in vv. 35–38 within the surrounding context of John 4.

In light of these case-studies, I recall a number of previously noted John/Matthew parallels compiled in Chapter Two. Scholars have typically described many of these as relatively minor and have drawn the conclusion that John either made independent inferences or drew upon common oral tradition. Having now established more solidly John's use of Matthew in other instances, I submit that a number of parallels result from John's knowledge of the redacted Gospel of Matthew—whether through visual contact or secondary orality. These include—but are not necessarily limited to—the following ten: (1) Jesus' renaming Simon son of John as Peter (John 1:42c; Matt 16:17b–18); (2) notice of Jesus going up the mountain and sitting there at the

Feeding of the Five Thousand and Four Thousand respectively (John 6:3; Matt 15:29); (3) specifying Caiaphas as High Priest (John 11:49; 18:13b, 24; Matt 26:3, 57); (4) the saying about slaves not being greater than masters (John 15:20b; cf. 13:16; Matt 10:24); (5) at his arrest, Jesus' command to put the sword in its sheath or place (John 18:11b; Matt 26:52b); (6) the customary Passover prisoner-release program (John 18:39; Matt 27:15); (7) Pilate's soldiers putting the crown of thorns on Jesus' head (John 19:2b; Matt 27:29); (8) Pilate's sitting on the βῆμα (John 19:13; Matt 27:19a); (9) placing Jesus' name on the *titulus* (John 19:19c; Matt 27:37b); (10) naming Joseph of Arimathea as a disciple who took Jesus' body and put it in a new tomb (John 19:38a, 41, 42; Matt 27:57, 59, 60).

In conclusion, in Percival Gardner-Smith's day, Mark was the synoptic gospel most accepted as a literary source for the Fourth Gospel. Gardner-Smith reexamined the Mark/John parallels, and his findings led to the consensus of Johannine independence.¹ Today the Gospel of Matthew is the least accepted as a Johannine source. This dissertation has reexamined the Matthew/John parallels, and its findings provide needed source-critical underpinnings to the growing contingent of scholars who are willing to view John in relation to the Synoptics in general and to Matthew in particular.

¹ Percival Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938); see also Jos Verheyden, "P. Gardner-Smith and 'The Turn of the Tide,'" in *John and the Synoptics* (ed. Adelbert Denaux; BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 423–52.

APPENDIX A: ‘BINDING AND LOOSING’ AND ‘FORGIVING
AND RETAINING SINS’ FROM TERTULLIAN TO AUGUSTINE

I will give you [i.e., Peter] the keys of the kingdom of the heavens, and whatever you bind on the earth will have been bound in the heavens, and whatever you loose on the earth will have been loosed in the heavens (δώσω σοι τὰς κλείδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὅ ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὅ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).
—Matt 16:19

Truly I say to you [i.e., the disciples]: whatever you bind on earth will have been bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will have been loosed in heaven (Ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν· ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῶ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῶ).
—Matt 18:18

If you [i.e., the disciples] forgive anyone’s sins, (the sins) have been forgiven them; if you retain anyone’s [sins], (the sins) have been retained (ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφέωνται αὐτοῖς, ἂν τινων κρατῆτε κεκράτηνται).
—John 20:23

Chapter Four argued that the Johannine logion concerning forgiving and retaining sins (John 20:23) represents a reinterpretation of the Matthean sayings about binding and loosing (Matt 16:19; 18:18). This appendix traces these sayings’ history of interpretation from the early third to the early fifth centuries. ‘History of interpretation’ is one of Richard Hays’s criteria for determining whether one text echoes another.¹ That criterion can be problematic, for later interpreters might have missed an author’s intended echoes or discovered some unintended *sensus plenior*. For example, Origen indirectly connected Matt 16:19//18:18 to John 20:23. Regarding Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, Origen allegorized the donkey colt—bound to its mother, which signifies the Jews—as the Gentiles who were bound (δέω) in their sins, and so Jesus’ command to untie (λύω) the colt echoed John’s saying about forgiving and retaining sins (*Comm. Matt.* 16.15.33–46).² Origen’s allegory doubtfully reveals Matthew’s or John’s intentions, and Origen probably would not have claimed to reveal (human) authorial intent. That is, early church fathers did not write about the gospels in terms of literary dependence and

¹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 31.

² The Jew:Gentile::dam:colt allegory of Jesus’ entry reaches back to Justin (*Dial.* 53.4b).

instead assumed that the gospels—especially Matthew and John, the two canonical ones attributed to Jesus’ disciples—reproduce independent eyewitness testimony. In itself, then, the criterion of history of interpretation remains inconclusive, but that Origen and others connected the Johannine and Matthean logia can be admitted as supporting evidence that John’s saying originally related to Matthew’s.

Herein I trace the history of interpretation of Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23 from Tertullian to Augustine. Among extant texts, Tertullian was the first to interpret Peter’s authority to bind and loose in light of John’s forgiving and retaining sins, and Augustine was the first to harmonize all three sayings (Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23). In between Tertullian and Augustine, Cyprian worked with the same texts and so allows for a detailed trajectory of an important facet of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins in North Africa.³ My work on Tertullian builds on that of William Tabbernee,⁴ and for Cyprian and Augustine I build on the work of J. Patout Burns.⁵ I also include Eastern fathers such as John Chrysostom in order to provide comparison for the doctrine’s development throughout the wider church. The main questions concern who could forgive which sins at what time. For these texts in particular, Jesus addresses the disciples (μαθηταί) in Matt 18:18; John 20:23, which raises the question whether priests in apostolic succession or laity could identify as disciples and thereby claim the authority to bind and loose and to forgive and retain sins. Tertullian and Cyprian took opposing sides of an either-or argument, which Augustine turned into a both-and.

Tertullian wrote the treatise *De pudicitia* (On Modesty) in opposition to a bishop’s edict claiming power to remit the sins of penitent adulterers and fornicators (*Pud.* 1.6).⁶ Early on Tertullian reproduced a litany of Scriptures concerning God’s mercy that could support forgiveness (*Pud.* 2). Tertullian objected by quoting 1 John 5:16, which admonishes believers not

³ Since Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine all wrote treatises on baptism, which is inextricably linked to forgiveness of sins, a broader study would delve more into baptismal theology and practice.

⁴ William Tabbernee, “To Pardon or not to Pardon? North African Montanism and the Forgiveness of Sins,” in *StPatr* 36 (ed. M. F. Wiles and E. J. Yarnold; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 375–86.

⁵ J. Patout Burns, “Confessing the Church: Cyprian on Penance,” in *StPatr* 36, 338–48; J. Patout Burns, Jr., *Cyprian the Bishop* (Routledge Early Church Monographs; New York: Routledge, 2002).

⁶ Following T. D. Barnes [*Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985)], Tabbernee considers Tertullian’s opponent a local Carthaginian bishop rather than Callistus, the bishop of Rome [Tabbernee, “To Pardon or not to Pardon?” 376].

to pray for forgiveness for a brother committing a mortal sin (*Pud.* 2). The Scripture in 1 John does not explain the difference between mortal and non-mortal sins, and so later church tradition made such determinations. For example, Tertullian said that daily (non-mortal) sins—such as anger, swearing, and lying *inter alia*—must be forgiven or else no one would be saved (*Pud.* 19). He also listed murder, idolatry, fraud, apostasy, blasphemy, adultery, and fornication as incapable of being forgiven; the list of murder, idolatry, fraud, and apostasy likely predated Tertullian, who objected to the list’s expansion. In other words, Tertullian and his opponents agreed on the general point that not every sin can be forgiven; the two parties disagreed on which sins those were, who could make such determinations, and on what basis.

Tertullian’s opponents claimed the authority to forgive adultery and fornication because they constituted the church derived from Peter, to whom Jesus had given the keys of the kingdom and the power to bind and loose (*Pud.* 21; cf. Matt 16:19).⁷ Tertullian objected to such a broad understanding and application of Peter’s power. Tertullian understood that binding and loosing literally refers to prohibiting and permitting certain beliefs and practices, as he illustrated by means of Peter’s determining what parts of Torah are not binding for Gentile Christians (*Pud.* 21; cf. Acts 15:7–11). Under the influence of Matt 18:18, 21–22; John 20:23, Tertullian also interpreted “loosing” figuratively as pertaining to forgiveness of sins. He called Peter the first to use the baptism of Christ to “loose” previous sins, using his keys to unlock the gate into the kingdom (*Pud.* 21). Given that others have “loosened” sins since the time of Peter, Tertullian presupposed the true Church’s instrumentality in forgiving sins by means of baptism.⁸ His main point was that Peter did not forgive post-baptismal mortal sins—the clearest example being the sin of Ananias, whom Peter “bound with the bond of death” (*Pud.* 21; cf. Acts 5:1–11). Exegetically, then, Tertullian argued that his opponents had transgressed the scriptural restraint placed on the power to bind and loose.

Tertullian also considered Peter’s question of how many times to forgive, which recalls Matthew’s other binding and loosing saying (18:18). Rather than read Peter as forgiving his

⁷ Defending apostolic tradition against heretics, Tertullian elsewhere drew on Matt 16:18–19 to refer to Peter as the rock upon which the church was built, the one having the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power to bind and loose (*Praescr.* 22.4).

⁸ Prior to Tertullian’s exposure to Montanism, cf. *Paen.* 2 regarding the eradication of previous sins as the first step of salvation; in *Paen.* 5–6 he said that one ought never sin thereafter, and §§7–12 deal with second (i.e., final) repentance.

brother each time he sins up to seventy-seven times (Matt 18:21–22), Tertullian cleverly intuited that Peter would have forgiven someone one time only for as many as seventy-seven past sins—never to forgive the person thereafter (*Pud.* 21).⁹ Again emphasizing the limits of willingness and ability to forgive, Tertullian qualified that Peter was only authorized to forgive sins committed against him—that is, not against God.¹⁰ Tertullian does not mention that Matthew 18 had already placed limits on ecclesial authority: church discipline involves convicting a “brother” of sin and seeing whether he listens (Matt 18:15–17; ἀκούω; i.e., obeys; cf. שמע). Tertullian apparently presupposed sinners’ obedience and penitence; he simply held to a stricter standard whereby humans could not forgive some sins even if they wanted to. His opponents were widening the scope of the church’s forgiveness, and Tertullian tried to narrow it.

On a related text-critical point, Tertullian’s text of Matthew must have included “against you” (εἰς σέ) at Matt 18:15, a Western interpolation based on Peter’s specification “against me” (εἰς ἐμέ) in v. 21. The *lectio brevior* and *difficilior* is that Jesus commands his disciples to convict a brother who sins at all. Consequently the disciples could then benefit or regain (κερδαίνω) the sinful brother rather than expel him (Matt 18:15, 17). Tertullian did not shy away from convicting sin, but he did restrict some sinners’ readmission to the church. Tertullian’s qualification “against his brother” would come from his (Western) text of Matt 18:15, and that textual variant was instrumental in Tertullian’s argument that bishops could not forgive sins committed against God.

Tertullian’s strongest link from Matt 16:19; 18:18 to John 20:22b–23 appears as an allusion: Tertullian glossed “binding” as “retain” and emphasized the Holy Spirit’s role in granting forgiveness (*Pud.* 21); John’s forgiving and retaining sins saying (John 20:23) immediately follows Jesus’ breathing the Spirit into the disciples (v. 22b). Tertullian’s opponents shared his belief that possessing the Spirit is prerequisite to forgiveness, but they differed as to the sign of the Spirit’s manifestation. For them, the disciples had passed down the Spirit through ordination, and so the bishops had the power to forgive whomever and whatever they wanted. Tertullian objected that “the Church will indeed pardon sins, but the Church which is spirit, through a

⁹ Tertullian did not discuss Luke 17:3–4, where Jesus commands his disciples to forgive those who sin against them and repent seven times in one day.

¹⁰ Tertullian had stated so explicitly earlier in the treatise: “The sins which are (thus) cleansed are such as a man may have committed against his brother, not against God” (*Pud.* 2; *ANF* 4:76; trans. S. Thelwall).

spiritual man, not the Church which is a collection of bishops. Law and judgement belong to the Lord, not to the servant, to God, not to the priest” (*Pud.* 21.16–17).¹¹ Throughout *De pudicitia* 21, Tertullian attempted to curb what he perceived as a recent excess of priestly power, but surprisingly he ended the section by denigrating the priests’ very claim to authority. Although never cited explicitly, John 20:23 stands at the center of Tertullian’s argument, which interpreted Peter’s authority in Matt 16:19 in light of Johannine texts pertaining to forgiveness of sins.

According to Tertullian, the New Prophets were the ones who truly possessed the Spirit, which John’s gospel also calls the Paraclete, and the New Prophets knew better than to forgive post-baptismal mortal sins. Tabbernee infers, “Whether or not the sinner received forgiveness from God in the afterlife would be God’s prerogative, but God’s alone.”¹² To explain the church’s withholding of forgiveness, Tertullian appealed to an oracle from a New Prophet empowered by the Paraclete: “The church has the power to forgive sins, but I shall not lest they should commit others also” (*Pud.* 21.7).¹³ That is, the Church has not only the capacity to forgive sins but also the responsibility to withhold such power so that clemency does not backfire and encourage people to sin. Although the oracle echoes John 20:23, Tertullian appealed to the authority of the New Prophecy rather than the authority of Scripture and perhaps as an affront to the authority claimed by the episcopacy.

In summary, Tertullian constructed a rigorist argument that connected Matt 16:19 (cf. 18:18) to John 20:22b–23 and denied everyone the power to forgive post-baptismal adulterers and fornicators.¹⁴ Tertullian’s opponents had claimed such power based on Peter’s apostolic authority to bind and loose (Matt 16:19). In the Johannine texts, Tertullian found pneumatic authority to withhold forgiveness (John 20:23), which Peter himself had wielded in his encounter with

¹¹ Jean Daniélou, *The Origins of Latin Christianity* (The History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, vol. 3; trans. David Smith and John Austin Baker; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), 439–40.

¹² Tabbernee, “To Pardon or not to Pardon?” 376.

¹³ Tabbernee, “To Pardon or not to Pardon?” 384.

¹⁴ Although mentioning the surrounding context, Tertullian suppresses Matt 18:18 itself by insisting on the singularity of Peter’s—expressly not the disciples’—authority to bind and loose (*Pud.* 21); that observation offers a slight correction to Tabbernee, who states, “The oracle’s acknowledgement of the church’s authority to forgive sins is undoubtedly based primarily on Matt 18:15–20, perhaps influenced by Matt 16:18–19 and certainly influenced by John 21:22–23 [*sic*; 20:22–23]...” [Tabbernee, “To Pardon or not to Pardon?” 384].

Ananias (Acts 5:1–11). Tertullian’s understanding of John 20:23 provided a counterbalance to his opponents’ interpretation of Matt 16:19. In so doing, Tertullian might well have recovered the general intention behind the Johannine saying about forgiving and holding onto sins.

Combining the same texts (Matt 16:19; cf. 18:18; John 20:23), Cyprian’s theology of forgiveness evinces similarities and differences as compared with Tertullian’s. Cyprian wrote concerning those who had lapsed during the Decian persecution, and his exegesis established a mediating position between bishops who too loosely offered forgiveness and those who too strictly denied it. Like Tertullian, Cyprian shared the belief that baptism forgives sins; unlike Tertullian, Cyprian defended the practice of granting peace to adulterers (*Ep.* 55.20.2, 55.21.1). Like Tertullian, Cyprian deferred to Christ’s ultimate authority and decision as to forgiveness of post-baptismal mortal sins; unlike Tertullian, Cyprian extended the rite of reconciliation to the penitent lapsed.¹⁵ Cyprian even warned bishops against the callousness and cruelty of not receiving back the penitent lapsed (*Ep.* 57.4.3).¹⁶ Whereas Tertullian preferred binding to loosing and retaining to forgiving, Cyprian worked out a moderate position of loosing sinners so as to present them to Christ for forgiveness.

Regarding the connection from binding and loosing to forgiving and retaining sins, Cyprian would have taken exception to Tertullian’s diminution of the bishops’ authority. In contrast to Tertullian’s preference for the New Prophecy, Cyprian’s interpretation of John 20:21c–23 stresses apostolicity and hierarchy:

But it is perfectly obvious where, in fact, and through whose agency forgiveness of sins can be granted, which is certainly granted in baptism. For Peter is the one upon whom the Lord built the Church, establishing him visibly to be the source of its unity; and it was to Peter in the first place that the Lord gave the power to loose whatever he loosed. And after the resurrection He spoke to the apostles as well, using these words: *As the Father has sent me, so I send you. When He had said this, He breathed on them and said: Receive the Holy Spirit. Whose sins you shall forgive, they will be forgiven them; whose sins you shall retain, they will be retained.* From all this we perceive that only those leaders who are set in authority within the Church and have been established in accordance with the law of the gospel and the institution of the Lord have the lawful power to baptize and to

¹⁵ See Burns, “Confessing the Church,” 345; see p. 347 for a summary of the change in “Cyprian’s understanding of the role of the church in the process of salvation” between the years 251–253.

¹⁶ I am following Burns’s explanation of binding and loosing in Cyprian’s theology; see Burns, “Confessing the Church,” 345–6 n. 46.

grant forgiveness of sins; outside the Church there can be neither binding nor loosing, for there is nobody who has the power either to bind or to loose.¹⁷ (*Ep.* 73.7.1–2)

For Cyprian, the connection between receiving the Holy Spirit and granting/withholding forgiveness of sins consists in catholic ordination, the laying on of hands in apostolic succession, which is the very position Tertullian had opposed. However, like Tertullian, Cyprian read Matt 16:19 in concert with John 20:23 such that “loosing” is related to “forgiveness.”

In *Epistle 75* Firmilian—the bishop at Caesarea—wrote to Cyprian and quoted Matt 16:19; John 20:22b–23. Regarding Matt 16:19 he said that Christ gave the power to bind and loose “to Peter and to Peter alone” (*Ep.* 75.16.1),¹⁸ which overlooks Matt 18:18. As with Cyprian, John 20:22b–23 nevertheless established for Firmilian that “the power to forgive sins was given to the apostles and to the churches which they, sent forth by Christ, established and to the bishops who have in turn succeeded those apostles, appointed to replace them” (*Ep.* 75.16.1).¹⁹ In general, Cyprian and Firmilian followed Tertullian in interpreting Matt 16:19 in light of John 20:23. In particular, though, Cyprian and Firmilian simply conferred the responsibility of withholding forgiveness (John 20:23) on the bishops alone, in effect co-opting and contradicting Tertullian’s argument.

Firmilian also agreed with Cyprian in requiring rebaptism for heretics, the logic being that heretical baptism could not forgive sins. Tertullian had actually taken a similar position in another of his references to John 20:23, namely that Marcion’s baptism could not forgive anyone’s sins since Marcion lacked the power to retain anyone’s sins (*Marc.* 1.28.2). Turning another of Tertullian’s arguments upside down, Firmilian identified Montanists as heretics who do not in fact possess the Holy Spirit (*Ep.* 75.7.3). That is, Firmilian and Tertullian agreed that heretics cannot forgive sins, but Tertullian would have disagreed that Montanists were heretics.

¹⁷ Cyprian, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage* (trans. G. W. Clarke; 4 vols.; ACW 43–44, 46–47; New York: Newman, 1984–1989), 4:58; similarly, after quoting Matt 16:18–19 in *Unit. eccl.* 4, Cyprian’s second edition qualified that the Church begins with Peter alone, even though Christ “assigns a like power to all the Apostles after His resurrection,” at which point Cyprian quotes John 20:21c, 22b–23 [Cyprian, *De Lapsis* and *De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* (trans. Maurice Bévenot; OECT; Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 61, 63].

¹⁸ Cyprian, *Letters*, 4:88.

¹⁹ Cyprian, *Letters*, 4:88.

In summary, Cyprian and Firmilian maintained Tertullian's combination of Matt 16:19 with John 20:23, but they offered a reinterpretation, for they also maintained episcopal authority and sought a middle path between Tertullian's rigorism and the laxist view that Tertullian had opposed.

Cyprian's interpretation held influence for over a century. The variously dated Pseudo-Cyprian text *De aleatoribus* presumed a combination of Matt 16:19 and John 20:23.²⁰ The text is quite rigorist, yet it asserted priests' authority to forgive sins:

We have a great concern for the whole brotherhood, O Christians, particularly because of the criminal audacity of those destitute men—the dice-players, who plunge souls into the pit of death. God, in his paternal benevolence, has bestowed upon us the leadership of the apostolate. In heavenly condescension, he has placed us upon the chair that we occupy in the Lord's place. By virtue of our predecessor, we bear the origin of the authentic apostolate, upon which Christ has founded his church. At the same time, we have also received the authority of loosing and binding and to remit sins. We are admonished by the doctrine of salvation lest by our unrestrained pardoning of sinners we should suffer a like torment with them.²¹ (*Aleatoribus* 1)

The text referenced Christ's building the church upon Peter and the power of binding and loosing (Matt 16:18–19); the gloss "to remit sins" connects to John 20:23, the Scripture that clarifies the disciples' authority and responsibility not to forgive, hence the treatise's caution of "unrestrained pardoning." Along the same lines, Ambrose—writing against Novatianism over a century after Cyprian—discussed Matthew's notion of binding and loosing (*Paen.* 1.7) and then quoted John 20:22b–23 (*Paen.* 1.8) to assert the priests' special right to forgive sins. Like Cyprian, Pseudo-Cyprian and Ambrose combine Matt 16:19; John 20:23 and extend the power of forgiveness only to clergy.

²⁰ Adolf von Harnack attributed the text to Pope Victor I at the end of the second century. More recently, Daniélou [*Origins of Latin Christianity*, 94] and Scott T. Carroll ["An Early Church Sermon against Gambling (CPL 60)," *Second Century* 8 (1991): 87] have favored a late second century date, but they overly rely on relative dating of the Muratorian Fragment to second century. According to Bruno Luiselli ["Il *De Aleatoribus* Pseudocipriano," *Augustinianum* 47 (2007): 259], other recent arguments date the text either sometime after Cyprian [Marcello Marin, "Problemi di ecdotica ciprianae: per un'edizione critica dello pseudocipriano *de aleatoribus*," *Vetera Christianorum* 20 (1983): 141–239] or late third/early fourth century [Chiara Nucci, *Pseudo Cipriano: Il gioco dei dadi* (Biblioteca Patristica 43; Bologna: EDB, 2006)]. My thanks to Mark DelCogliano, Lee Jefferson, and Brad Peper for fruitful discussion regarding the problems of dating of this text.

²¹ Carroll, "Early Church Sermon against Gambling (CPL 60)," 87–8.

Whereas the Western fathers emphasized Peter's power to bind and loose (Matt 16:19),²² Eastern fathers highlighted the authority later given to the group of disciples (Matt 18:18; John 20:23). Eastern ecclesiology nonetheless paralleled Cyprian's insistence on priestly authority. For example, concerning "what honor the Spirit's grace deemed the priests worthy" (*Sac.* 3.5.6), John Chrysostom wrote:

For those inhabiting the earth and spending their time therein have been entrusted with heavenly ministrations and received authority that God gave neither angels nor archangels. For it was not said to those, "Whatever you [pl.] bind on the earth will have been bound even in heaven, and whatever you loose on the earth will have been loosed in heaven" [Matt 18:18]. For even those who rule on the earth have binding authority—but only bodily; however, this other bond grabs hold of the very soul and crosses into the heavens: whatever the priests work out below, these things God above ratifies; the master confirms the verdict of the slaves. For what besides all heavenly authority did he give them? For it is said, "Those whose sins you [pl.] forgive, they have been forgiven; and those whose sins you retain, they have been retained" [John 20:23]. What would be greater authority than this? The father gave all judgment to the son [John 5:22]. Yet I see it all being handed over by the son. (*Sac.* 3.5.9–25)

Concerning Peter's purported primacy, a catena referencing Matt 16:19 had Cyril of Alexandria quote John 20:22b–23, saying that "the gift that was given to all binds together; therefore we consider the faith common to all the apostles and not solely to Peter." Chrysostom and Cyril respectively favored the authority bestowed on a collective group of disciples (Matt 18:18; John 20:23) over Peter's singular authority (Matt 16:19).

Rather than choose between Matt 16:19 and Matt 18:18, Augustine finally harmonized all three related sayings (Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23) in his treatise on the harmony of the Gospels (*Cons.* 2.119). He mentioned Peter's question about forgiveness (Matt 18:21) and noted that Luke includes no such teaching. Alluding to Matthew's second binding and loosing saying (18:18), Augustine observed that Matthew had already recorded Jesus speaking the same words to Peter (16:19). Augustine also pointed out that John introduces a similar teaching by the risen Lord: "(sins) should be remitted to him to whom the apostles remitted them, and that they should

²² Which does not necessarily imply primacy of the bishop of Rome; regarding Cyprian's use of Matt 16:19, e.g., Michael Fahey writes: "The text, as Cyprian uses it, is not cited to argue a form of jurisdictional primacy for the Roman bishop; rather it is cited to emphasize the oneness of the Church founded by Christ first upon the person of Peter in order to provide an effective symbol of its oneness" [Michael Andrew Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis* (BGBH 9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), 309].

be retained to him to whom they retained them, as spoken by the Lord after His resurrection” (*Cons.* 2.119; cf. John 20:23).²³ Augustine’s discussion exemplifies one of his fundamental principles of harmonization: Jesus said similar things on different occasions;²⁴ by grouping the Matthean and Johannine logia, Augustine implied another of his foundational principles: slightly different wording nonetheless conveys the same sense.²⁵ Simply put, Augustine deemed the three sayings equivalent.

Augustine elsewhere discussed the Johannine text in more detail:

“And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said unto them, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’” By breathing on them He signified that the Holy Spirit was the Spirit, not of the Father alone, but likewise His own. “Whose soever sins,” He continues, “ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever ye retain, they are retained.” The Church’s love, which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, discharges the sins of all who are partakers with itself, but retains the sins of those who have no participation therein. Therefore it is, that after saying “Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” He straightway added this regarding the remission and retention of sins.²⁶ (*Tract. Ev. Jo.* 121.4)

Here Augustine connected John’s account of Jesus bestowing the Holy Spirit to Paul’s statement regarding the Holy Spirit’s enabling the Church to love (Rom 5:5), the Scripture Augustine quoted more than any other throughout all his writings.

Burns has shown how, by connecting to Rom 5:5, Augustine sharply diverged from Cyprian’s understanding of the efficacy of forgiveness. Burns writes:

Finally, Augustine explained that the gift of the Holy Spirit which Christ bestowed upon his disciples in John 20:22–23 was given to the whole church, or more specifically to the true church formed by the society of saints within the

²³ *NPNF*¹ 6:156; trans. S.D.F. Salmond.

²⁴ E.g., in *Cons.* 2.29 Augustine concludes that John the Baptist said that he was unworthy not only “to carry” Jesus’ sandals (Matt 3:11) but also “to untie” them (Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16; John 1:27); see also the compatibility of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount with Luke’s Sermon on the Plain (*Cons.* 2.45) and that Matthew and Mark each record Jesus multiplying loaves and fishes on two separate occasions (*Cons.* 2.105).

²⁵ Regarding Jesus’ baptism, e.g., in *Cons.* 2.31 Augustine says that although the heavenly voice said either “You are my beloved son” (Matt 3:17) or “This is my beloved son” (Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22), the evangelists “reproduced the identical sense intended to be conveyed” (*NPNF*¹ 6:119).

²⁶ *NPNF*¹ 7:438; trans. John Gibb and James Innes.

visible church, and not to the episcopal college alone. Christ had empowered his true disciples to forgive sins and the saints performed this service by their prayer and intercession. The bishops acted as the agents of the true church, exercising a power which individual leaders may or may not have shared. Thus the standards of purity which Cyprian had applied to the bishops were more appropriately applied to the society of saints which constituted the true church than to either the entire assembly of the faithful or the episcopal college. The purity of the saints was itself maintained by the sharing of the Spirit's gift of charity, which covers and wins forgiveness for their sins.²⁷

Augustine interpreted the relatively small group of disciples as representing the church as a whole, which evinces the rule of synecdoche.²⁸ Although maintaining the priests' special role in granting forgiveness, Augustine established interdependence between priest and laity in order for forgiveness to take effect. In effect, then, Augustine established a mediating position between Tertullian and Cyprian.

Matthew had extended Peter's power of binding and loosing (16:19) to a larger group of disciples (18:1, 18). Matthew 18 required that sinners be obedient to ecclesial authority (vv. 15–17), but the text allowed for repeat offenders (vv. 21–22) and stressed that God would not forgive the disciples if they did not forgive sinners (v. 35; cf. 6:14–15). In Chapter Four I concluded that John reinterpreted Matthew so as to balance the disciples' right to forgive and their responsibility to withhold forgiveness (John 20:23). John's gospel did not explain how to determine whom, what, or when not to forgive; 1 John 5:16 introduced a distinction between mortal and non-mortal sins but did not explain how to distinguish between categories. Just as problematically for the early church, both priests and laity could identify as disciples and so exercise the rights and responsibilities of forgiveness however construed. Here I conclude that two centuries of doctrinal debate in North Africa are essentially a function of John's initial reaction to Matthew.

²⁷ Burns, *Cyprian the Bishop*, 173.

²⁸ E.g., in *Civ.* 20.9 Augustine interpreted that even though the martyrs alone are said to reign for a thousand years in Rev 20:4, "taking the part for the whole, we understand the Scripture to mean that the rest of the dead also belong to the Church, which is the kingdom of Christ" [Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans* (trans. R. W. Dyson; Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought; New York: Cambridge, 1998), 990]. Whether directly or indirectly, Augustine utilized Tyconius's fourth rule, namely the particular and the general [Tyconius, *Tyconius: The Book of Rules* (trans. William S. Babcock; Texts and Translations 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 54–89].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W. C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1907.
- Allert, Craig D. *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 64. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Allison, Jr., Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Anderson, Gary A. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in Light of John 6*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996. Repr. with a new introduction, outlines, and epilogue. Eugene, Or.: Cascade, 2010.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered*. T&T Clark Biblical Studies. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by R. W. Dyson. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. New York: Cambridge, 1998.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate: A Series of Essays on Problems concerning the Origin and Value of the Anonymous Writings attributed to the Apostle John*. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1910.
- Bardenhewer, Otto. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur, bd. 1*. 2d ed. Freiberg: Herder, 1913.
- Barnard, L. W. *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Barnes, T. D. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Father is greater than I' (John 14.28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament." Pages 144–59 in *Neues Testament und Kirche: Festschrift für Rudolf Schnackenburg*. Edited by Joachim Gnllka. Freiberg: Herder, 1974. Repr. pages 19–36 in *Essays on John*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

- Barthélemy, Dominique. “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante.” *Revue biblique* 60 (1953): 18–29. Repr. pages 127–39 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Basser, Herbert W. “Derrett’s ‘Binding’ Reopened.” *Journal Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 297–300.
- Bauckham, Richard. “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?” Pages 9–48 in *The Gospels for All Christians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bauckham, Richard. “The Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem.” Pages 657–88 in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008; Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*. Edited by Paul Foster et al. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 239. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Bauckham, Richard. “Introduction.” Pages 1–8 in *The Gospels for All Christians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bauckham, Richard. “John for Readers of Mark.” Pages 147–71 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bauer, Walter. “The ‘Colt’ of Palm Sunday (Der Palmesel).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953): 220–229.
- Bauer, Walter. *Das Johannesevangelium*. 3d ed. *Handbuch zum Alten Testament* 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933.
- Baum-Bodenbender, Rosel. *Hoheit in Niedrigkeit: Johanneische Christologie im Prozeß Jesu vor Pilatus (Joh 18,28–19,16a)*. *Forschung zur Bibel* 49. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. *Word Biblical Commentary* 36. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987.
- Bellinzoni, A.J. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Benoit, Pierre and M.-É. Boismard. *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome I: Textes*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1965.
- Benoit, Pierre and M.-É. Boismard. *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome II: Commentaire par M.-É. Boismard avec la collaboration de A. Lamouille et P. Sandevour*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972.

- Benoit, Pierre and M.-É. Boismard. *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: avec parallèles des apocryphes et des pères; Tome III: L'Évangile de Jean; Commentaire par M.-É. Boismard et A. Lamouille avec la collaboration de G. Rochais*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977.
- Berger, Klaus. *Im Anfange war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums*. Stuttgart: Quell, 1997.
- Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary 29. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928.
- Bingham, D. Jeffrey. *Irenaeus' Use of Matthew's Gospel in Adversus Haereses*. *Traditio exegetica graeca* 7. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Western Text in the Second Century." Pages 3–17 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. Edited by Barbara Aland and William Lawrence Petersen. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 55–64.
- Blinzler, Josef. *Johannes und die Synoptiker: ein Forschungsbericht*. *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 5. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibel Werk, 1965.
- Blomberg, Craig L. "The Gospels for Specific Communities and All Christians." Pages 111–33 in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*. Edited by Edward W. Klink III. *Library of New Testament Studies* 353. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. 2 vols. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996.
- Bock, Darrell L. "The Function of Scripture in Mark 15.1–39." Pages 8–17 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, Vol. I: The Gospel of Mark*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. *Library of New Testament Studies* 304. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Boismard, M.-É. and A. Lamouille. *Le Diatessaron: de Tatien à Justin*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1992.
- Borgen, Peder. "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative." *New Testament Series* 51 (1958–1959): 246–59.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *Mark: A Commentary*. *New Testament Library*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

- Bowman, John. *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Translated by Alfred M. Johnson, Jr. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 4. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Braun, François-Marie. *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église Ancienne, Vol. 1*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959.
- Brierre-Narbonne, Jean Joseph. *Exégèse talmudique des prophéties messianique*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1931.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Rev. ed. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave; A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Gospel according to John*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 29–29A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966–1970.
- Brown, Raymond. Review of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean*. *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français* 3. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 624–8.
- Brown, Schuyler. "Philology." Pages 127–47 in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and George W. MacRae. The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. "The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John." Pages 149–75 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Buckley, Eric R. *Introduction to the Synoptic Problem*. London: Arnold, 1912.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Rev. ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic evidence*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.
- Burns, J. Patout. "Confessing the Church: Cyprian on Penance." *Studia patristica* 36 (2001): 338–48.
- Burns, J. Patout. *Cyprian the Bishop*. Routledge Early Church Monographs. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "The Meaning of John 20:23, Matthew 16:19, and Matthew 18:18." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939): 251–4.
- Carlson, Stephen C. "The Accommodations of Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem: Καταλύμα in Luke 2.7." *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 326–42.
- Carroll, Scott T. "An Early Church Sermon against Gambling (CPL 60)." *Second Century* 8 (1991): 83–95.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel according to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Catchpole, David R. "The 'triumphal' entry." Pages 319–34 in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Claudiel, Gérard. "Jean 20,23 et ses parallèles matthéens." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 69 (1995): 71–86.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Colwell, Ernest. "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri." Pages 370–389 in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28–30, 1964*. Edited by J. Philip Hyatt. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Conybeare, F. C. "Christian Demonology III." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 9 (1897): 444–70.
- Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentaries. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

- Cribbs, F. Lamar. "St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 422–50.
- Cruse, Alan. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 3d ed. Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cruse, D. A. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Early Church: Studies in Early Christian History and Theology*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "Infancy Gospels: General Introduction." Pages 414–20 *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Luke. The New Interpreters Bible* 9; Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- Cyprian. *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage*. Translated by G. W. Clarke. 4 vols. Ancient Christian Writers 43–44, 46–47. New York: Newman, 1984–1989.
- Cyprian. *De Lapsis and De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate*. Translated by Maurice Bévenot. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Edited by H. Chadwick. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- Dahl, Nils A. "Die Passionsgeschichte bei Matthäus," *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955–1956): 17–32.
- Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902. Repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1997.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Études d'exégèse judéo chrétienne (Les Testimonia)*. Théologie historique 5. Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1966.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Origins of Latin Christianity. The History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*, vol. 3. Translated by David Smith and John Austin Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
- Dauer, Anton. *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 18,1–19,30*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 30. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1972.
- Dauer, Anton. *Johannes und Lukas: Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Parallelperikopen; Joh 4, 46–54/Lk 7,1–10—Joh 12,1–8/Lk 7,36–50; 10,38–42—Joh 20,19–29/Lk 24,36–49*. Forschung zur Bibel 50. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984.

- Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997.
- Derrenbacker, Jr., R. A. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 186. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. “Binding and Loosing (Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 29:23 [sic]).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 112–7.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. “Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt.” *Novum Testamentum* 13 (1971): 241–58. Repr. pages 165–83 in *Studies in the New Testament, Vol. 2*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Desreumaux, Alain. *Codex sinaiticus Zosimi rescriptus: Description codicologique des feuillets araméens melkites des manuscrits Schøyen 35, 36 et 37 (Londres-Oslo) comprenant l’édition de nouveaux passages des Évangiles et des Catéchèses de Cyrille*. Histoire du texte biblique 3. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 1997.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Donahue, John R. and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Gospel of Mark*. Sacra Pagina 2. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Dunderberg, Ismo. *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Studien zu Joh 1–9*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 69. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1994.
- Dungan, David Laird. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Edersheim, Alfred. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Volume 2*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel according to Mark*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Ehrman, Bart. *A Brief Introduction to the New Testament*. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Ehrman, Bart. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 4 ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *The Gospel of Luke*. Rev. ed. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

- Emerton, John A. "Binding and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining." *Journal of Theological Studies* New Series 13 (1962): 325–31.
- Esler, Philip F. "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's *Gospels for All Christians*." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51 (1998): 235–48.
- Esler, Philip F. and Ronald A. Piper. *Lazarus, Mary and Martha: Social-Scientific Approaches to the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Ensor, Peter W. "The Authenticity of John 4.35." *Evangelical Quarterly* 72 (2000): 3–21.
- Evans, Craig A. "Zechariah in the Markan Passion Narrative." Pages 64–80 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, Vol 1*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Fahey, Michael Andrew. *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Falk, Ze'ev W. "Binding and Loosing." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 92–100.
- Fenton, J. C. "Towards an Understanding of John." *Studia Evangelica* 4 (1968): 28–37.
- Fisher, Elizabeth. "Greek Translations of Latin literature in the fourth century A.D." Pages 173–215 in *Later Greek Literature*. Edited by John J. Winkler and Gordon W. Williams. Yale Classical Studies 27. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament." *Theological Studies* 18 (1957): 513–37. Repr. pages 59–89 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman, 1971. Repr. Pages 59–92 in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Fitzmyer, Joseph. *The Gospel according to Luke*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 28–28A. New York: Doubleday, 1981–1985.
- Fortna, Robert Tomson. *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Foster, Paul. "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 65–86 in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2003.
- France, R. T. "The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 233–51. Repr. pages 114–34 in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by G. K. Beale. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Freed, Edwin D. "Did John Write His Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?" *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970): 241–56.
- Freed, Edwin D. "The Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 329–38.
- Gaechter, Paul. *Das Matthäus-Evangelium: Ein Kommentar*. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1963.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gardner-Smith, Percival. *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Gardner-Smith, Percival. "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1953): 31–5.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford Linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 1. 2 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1986.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Greenspahn, Frederick E. Review of Raphael Weiss, *The Aramaic Targum of Job*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 101 (1981): 452–3.
- Gregory, Andrew F. and Christopher M. Tuckett. "Reflections on Method: What Constitutes Use of the Writings that later formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?" Pages 61–82 in *Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gregory, Andrew F. "What is Literary Dependence?" Pages 87–114 in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008; Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*. Edited by Paul Foster et al. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium* 239. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Gundry, Robert. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Gundry, Robert. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Novum Testamentum, Supplements 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Edited by Robert W. Funk with Ulrich Busse. Translated by Robert W. Funk. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 33A–33B. Dallas: Word Books, 1993–1995.
- Hagner, Donald A. “The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr.” Pages 233–68 in *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. Edited by David Wenham. Gospel Perspectives 5. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina 1. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Harris, Rendel. *Testimonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989.
- Hiers, Richard H. “‘Binding and Loosing’: the Matthean Authorizations.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 233–50.
- Hill, Charles E. “The Fourth Gospel in the Second Century: The Myth of Orthodox Johannophobia.” Pages 135–169 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. Edited by John Lierman. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hill, Charles E. “‘The Orthodox Gospel’: The Reception of John in the Great Church prior to Irenaeus.” Pages 233–300 in *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Thomas Rasimus. Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Hock, Ronald F. *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas*. The Scholars Bible 2. Santa Rosa, Cal.: Polebridge, 1995.
- Hock, Ronald F. ed. *The Life of Mary and the Birth of Jesus: The Ancient Infancy Gospel of James*. Berkeley, Cal.: Ulysses Press, 1997.

- Hooker, Morna. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Hoppe, K. and E. Oder. *Corpus hippiatricorum Graecorum, vol. 1*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1924.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. 2d ed. London: Faber & Faber, 1947.
- Howard, George. "A Note on Codex Sinaiticus and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew." *Novum Testamentum* 34 (1992): 46–7.
- Howard, George. "A Note on Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew and the Gospel of John." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992): 117–26.
- Howard, George. *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text*. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Howard, George. "Harmonistic Readings in the Old Syriac Gospels." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 473–91.
- Howard, George. "The Pseudo-Clementine Writings and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 622–8.
- Howard, George. "The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Septuagint Text?" *Biblica* 55 (1974) 15–22.
- Howard, George. "The Textual Nature of Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 239–57.
- van Iersel, Bas M. F. *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*. Translated by W. H. Bisscheroux. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 164. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *New Testament Theology I: The Proclamation of Jesus*. Translated by J. Bowden. New York: Scribner's, 1971.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Oeuvres complètes*. Edited by Théodore Reinach. Publications de la Société des Études Juives. 5 vols. Paris: E. Leroux, 1900–1929.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Jouïon, P. "Notes Philologiques sur les Évangiles." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 18 (1928): 347.

- Kazen, Thomas. "Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts." *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 561–78.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Keener, Craig S. "Exegetical Insight." Page 121 in William D. Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kinman, Brent. *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem: In the Context of Lukan Theology and the Politics of His Day*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 28. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Kiraz, George Anton, ed. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions*. 4 vols. New Testament Tools and Studies 21–4. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Klink III, Edward W. "The Gospel Community Debate: State of the Question." *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2004): 60–85.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982, 2000.
- Koester, Helmut. "Geschichte und Kultus im Johannes-evangelium und bei Ignatius von Antiochien." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 54 (1957): 63.
- Koester, Helmut. "Gospels and Gospel Traditions in the Second Century." Pages 27–44 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Koester, Helmut. "The History-of-Religions School, Gnosis, and the Gospel of John." *Studia Theologica* 40 (1986): 115–36. Repr. pages 105–21 in *From Jesus to the Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Köster, Helmut. *Septuaginta und Synoptischer Erzählungsstoff im Schriftbeweis Justins des Märtyrers, Habilitationsschrift*, Heidelberg, 1956.
- Koester, Helmut. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern. Texte und Untersuchungen* 65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century." Pages 19–37 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. Edited by Barbara Aland and William Lawrence Petersen. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989.

- Koester, Helmut. "Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 293–7.
- Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich. *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 24. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.
- Köstenberger, Andreas. *John*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Krauss, Samuel. *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum, Vol. 2*. Berlin: S. Calvary, 1899.
- Kuhn, Heinz W. "Das Reittier Jesu in der Einzugsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 50 (1959): 82–91.
- Kysar, Robert. *John*. Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- Kysar, Robert. Review of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, with the collaboration of G. Rochais, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français: Tome III*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 605–7.
- Labahn, Michael. *Jesus als Lebensspender: Untersuchungen zu einer Geschichte der johanneischen Tradition anhand ihrer Wundergeschichten*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 98. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Labahn, Michael and Manfred Lang. "Johannes und die Synoptiker: Positionen und Impulse seit 1990." Pages 443–515 in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Udo Schnelle. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 175. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- LaBianca, Øystein Sakala, et al. *Faunal Remains: Taphonomical and Zooarchaeological Studies of the Animal Remains from Tell Hesban and Vicinity*. Hesban 13. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1995.
- Lagrange, P. M.-J. *Évangile selon Saint Marc*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1947.
- Lambert, G. "Lier—déliar, L'expression de la totalité par l'opposition de deux contraires." *Revue biblique* 52 (1945): 91–103.
- Lane, William L. *The Gospel according to Mark*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lang, Manfred. *Johannes und die Synoptiker: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Joh 18–20 vor dem markinischen und lukanischen Hintergrund*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 182. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

- Leloir, Louis. *Le Témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron*. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientarium 227. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1962.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14. Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen, 1988.
- Lewis, Agnes Smith and Margaret Dunlop Gibson, eds. *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels: Re-edited from two Sinai MSS. and from P. de Lagarde's edition of the "Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum."* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & co., 1899.
- Lieu, Judith M. "Justin Martyr and the Transformation of Psalm 22." Pages 195–211 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 3. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel according to Saint John*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Continuum, 2005. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Oliphants, 1972. Repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980–1981): 287–94.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Loader, W.R.G. "The Central Structure of Johannine Christology." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 188–216.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Lücke, Friedrich. *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes*. 2d ed. 4 vols. Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1832–1834.
- Luiselli, Bruno. "Il *De Aleatoribus* Pseudocipriano." *Augustinianum* 47 (2007): 259–81.
- Lust, Johan et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001–2007.

- Lyons, John. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- MacDonald, Dennis R., ed. *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- Maier, Gerhard. "Johannes und Matthäus—Zwiespalt oder Viergestalt des Evangeliums?" Pages 267–91 in *Gospel Perspectives, Vol. II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- Mann, C.S. *Mark*. Anchor Bible 27. Garden City: Doubleday, 1986.
- Mantey, Julius R. "Distorted Translations in John 20:23; Matthew 16:18–19 and 18:18," *Review and Expositor* 78 (1981): 409–16.
- Mantey, Julius R. "Evidence That the Perfect Tense in John 20:23 and Matthew 16:19 Is Mistranslated." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16 (1973): 129–38.
- Mantey, Julius R. "The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in John 20:23, Mt 16:19, and Mt 18:18." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939): 243–9.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Marcovich, Miroslav. *Iustini Martyris: Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Patristische Texte und Studien 47. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Marcus, Joel. *Mark*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 27–27A. New York: Doubleday; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2009.
- de Margerie, Bertrand. *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis, Volume I: The Greek Fathers*. Translated by Leonard Maruf. Petersham, Mass.: Saint Bede's Publications, 1993.
- Marin, Marcello. "Problemi di ecdotica ciprianae: per un'edizione critica dello pseudocipriano *de aleatoribus*." *Vetera Christianorum* 20 (1983): 141–239.
- Marsh, John. *Saint John*. SCM Pelican Commentaries. London: SCM, 1978.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- März, Claus-Peter. "Siehe, dein König kommt zu dir...": eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Einzugsperikope. Erfurter theologische Studien 43. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1980.
- Matthews, Peter H. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. 2d ed. Oxford Paperback Reference. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- McNeile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Macmillan, 1915.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 4 vols. Anchor [Yale] Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday; Hartford, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1991–2009.
- Menken, M.J.J. “‘Do Not Fear, Daughter Zion...’ (John 12:15).” Pages 79–97 in *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Translated from “Die Redaktion des Zitates aus Sach 9,9 in Joh 12,15.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 80 (1989): 193–209.
- Menken, M.J.J. *Matthew’s Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004.
- Menken, M.J.J. “The Quotations from Zech 9,9 in Mt 21,5 and in Jn 12,15.” Pages 571–8 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by A. Denaux. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Menken, M. J. J. “The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 494–511. Repr. pages 167–186 in *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Metzger, Bruce M. “The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 70 (1951): 297–307.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Michel, O. “Eine philologische Frage zur Einzugsgeschichte.” *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959): 81–82.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. “Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that ‘The Gospels Were Written for All Christians.’” *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 36–79.
- Moloney, Francis. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina 4. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to John*. Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

- Moss, Charlene McAfee. *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 156. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1968): 293–320.
- Muddiman, John. "John's Use of Matthew: A British Exponent of the Theory." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 59 (1983): 333–7.
- Müller-Kessler, Christa. "Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Its Significance to the Western Aramaic Dialect Group." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119 (1999): 631–6.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and Twelve Prophets*. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Myllykoski, Matti. "The Material Common to Luke and John: A Sketch." Pages 115–56 in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. Edited by Petri Luomanen. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 54. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Neiryck, Frans. "John 5,1–18 and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to P. Borgen." Pages 438–50 in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard, W. R. Farmer, F. Neiryck: Jerusalem 1984*. Edited by David L. Dungan. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 95. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
- Neiryck, Frans. "John and the Synoptics." Pages 73–106 in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge et al. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977.
- Neiryck, Frans. "John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990." Pages 3–62 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Neiryck, Frans. "Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la rédaction Matthéenne." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968–1969): 168–90.
- Neiryck, Frans. "Note on Mt 28, 9-10." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 71 (1995): 161–5.
- Neiryck, Frans et al., *Jean et les synoptiques: Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.-É. Boismard*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 49. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979.

- Nieuviarts, Jacques. *L'Entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem (Mt 21,1-17)*. Lectio divina 176. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- Nineham, D. E. *Saint Mark*. Pelican. London: SCM, 1963.
- Nolland, John. *Luke*. 3 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 35. Dallas: Word Books, 1989–1993.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Nucci, Chiara. *Pseudo Cipriano: Il gioco dei dadi*. Biblioteca Patristica 43. Bologna: EDB, 2006.
- Osborn, Eric Francis. *Justin Martyr*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 47. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973.
- Painter, John. “Matthew and John.” Pages 66–86 in *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*. Edited by David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Pamment, Margaret. “Is There Convincing Evidence of Samaritan Influence on the Fourth Gospel?” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1982): 221–30.
- Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Foundations & Facets Reference Series. Sonoma, Cal.: Polebridge, 1993.
- Paul, Andre. “L’entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem: Mc 11,1-10; Mt 21,1-11; Lc 19,28-40; Jn 12,12-19.” *Assemblées du Seigneur* 19 (1971): 14.
- Pausanias*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones et al. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918–1935.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Pesch, Rudolf. “Eine alttestamentliche Ausführungsformel im Matthäus-Evangelium: Redaktionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Beobachten.” *Biblische Zeitschrift* 10 (1966): 220–45.
- Petersen, William L. Review of G. Howard, *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 722–6.
- Philo*. Translated by F.H. Colson et al. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
- Powery, Emerson B. *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus’ Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*. Biblical Interpretation 63. Boston: Brill, 2003.

- Prabhu, George M. Soares. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1–2*. Analecta biblica 63. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Prigent, Pierre. *Justin et l’Ancien Testament: l’argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la première Apologie*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1964.
- Pryor, John W. “John 3.3, 5. A Study in the Relation of John’s Gospel to the Synoptic Problem.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41 (1991): 71–95.
- Pryor, John W. “Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel.” *Second Century* 9 (1992): 153–169.
- Reim, Günter. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ: Based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised Version*. New York: George H. Doran, 1922.
- Romanides, John. “Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 4 (1959): 115–134.
- Rostowzew, M. “Angariae.” *Klio* 6 (1906): 249–253.
- Rothfuchs, Wilhelm. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 88. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1969.
- Sabbe, Maurits. “The Anointing of Jesus in John 12,1-8 and Its Synoptic Parallels.” Pages 2051–82 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. 3 vols. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Sabbe, Maurits. “The Arrest of Jesus in Jn 18,1-11 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Evaluation of A. Dauer’s Hypothesis.” Pages 297–308 in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977.
- Sabbe, Maurits. “The Denial of Peter in the Gospel of John.” *Louvain Studies* 20 (1995): 219–40.
- Sabbe, Maurits. “The Footwashing in Jn 13 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels.” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 57 (1982): 279–308.

- Sabbe, Maurits. "The Johannine Account of the Death of Jesus and Its Synoptic Parallels (Jn 19,16b–42)." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 70 (1994): 34–64.
- Sabbe, Maurits. "John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 75–93, 156–61 in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*. Edited by Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph 67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Sabbe, Maurits. "John and the Synoptists: Neiryneck vs. Boismard." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 56 (1980): 125–31.
- Sabbe, Maurits. "The Trial of Jesus before Pilate in John and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 341–85 in *John and the Synoptics*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 101. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Sand, Alexander. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986.
- Sanday, William. *The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled 'Supernatural Religion.'* London: Macmillan, 1876.
- Sanders, J. N. and B. A. Mastin. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Sanders, Joseph Newbould. *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin & Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1–13.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt; Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium*. 3d ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Life of Jesus*. Edited by Jack C. Verheyden. Translated by S. Maclean Gilmour. Lives of Jesus Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Schleritt, Frank. *Der vorjohanneische Passionsbericht: Eine historisch-kritische und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 2,13-22; 11,47-14,31 und 18,1-20,29*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 154. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Das Vollmachtswort vom Binden und Lösen, traditionsgeschichtlich gesehen." Pages 141–57 in *Kontinuität und Einheit: Für Franz Mußner*. Edited by Paul-Gerard Müller and Werner Stenger. Freiburg: Herder, 1981.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Translated by Kevin Smyth et al. 3 vols. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4. New York: Herder & Herder. Seabury, Crossroad, 1968–1982. Repr. New York: Crossroad, 1990. German edition 1965–1975.

- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by Robert R. Barr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. 3d ed. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 4. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004.
- Schnelle, Udo. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Schulthess, Friedrich. *Lexicon Syropalestinum*. Berlin: Georgii Reimer, 1903. Repr., Amsterdam: APA, 1979.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by J. Bowden. Translated by W. Montgomery et al. 1st complete ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News according to Matthew*. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- Segal, M. H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1927. Repr., Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2001.
- Senior, Donald. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazer, 1985.
- Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Rev. and enl. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Sim, David C. "The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham." *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 84 (2001): 3–27.
- Sim, David C. "Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?" *New Testament Studies* 57 (2011): 176–92.
- Skarsaune "Jewish Christian Sources Used by Justin Martyr and Some Other Greek and Latin Fathers." Pages 379–416 in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. "Justin and His Bible." Pages 53–76 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Smith, D. Moody. *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Smith, D. Moody. *John*. Abingdon Commentaries on the New Testament. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.

- Smith, D. Moody. *John among the Gospels*. 2d ed. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Smith, D. Moody. "The Problem of John and the Synoptics in Light of the Relation between Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels." Pages 147–62 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Smith, D. Moody. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- de Solages, Bruno. *A Greek Synopsis of the Gospels: A New Way of Solving the Synoptic Problem*. Translated by J. Baissus. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- de Solages, Bruno. *Jean et les Synoptiques*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- Sparks, H.F.D. "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew: The Evidence of John 13:16 and 15:20." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 58–61.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Stanton, Graham N. "Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus." Pages 353–70 in *The Biblical Canons*. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 163. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Stanton, Graham N. Review of Paul Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*, *Review of Biblical Literature* 1 (1999): 53–6.
- Stanton, Graham N. "Revisiting Matthew's Communities." Pages 9–23 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1994*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Stanton, Vincent H. *The Gospels as Historical Documents: The Fourth Gospel*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920.
- Stec, David M. *The Targum of Psalms*. The Aramaic Bible 16. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2004.
- Stein, Robert. *Mark*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Strecker, Georg. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*. 2d ed. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

- Strecker, Georg. *Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Horn. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.
- Streeter, B. H. *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins; treating of the manuscript tradition, sources, authorship and dates*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.
- Svensén, Bo. *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Swanson, Reuben, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985.
- Tabbernee, William. "To Pardon or not to Pardon? North African Montanism and the Forgiveness of Sins." Pages 375-86 in *Studia Patristica Volume 36*. Edited by M. F. Wiles and E. J. Yarnold. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Thatcher, Tom. "Why John Wrote a Gospel: Memory and History in an Early Christian Community." Pages 79–97 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. Semeia Studies 52. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Thesleff, Holger. *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis 30. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965.
- Thomson, Robert W. *An Introduction to Classical Armenian*. Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan Books, 1975.
- Thyen, Hartwig. "Johannes und die Synoptiker: auf der Suche nach einem neuen Paradigma zur Beschreibung ihrer Beziehungen anhand von Beobachtungen an Passions- und Ostererzählungen." Pages 81–107 in *John and the Synoptics*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 101. Repr. pages 155–181 in *Studien zum Corpus Iohanneum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 214. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Das Johannesevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 96. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Tov, Emanuel, et al. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)*. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 8. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.

- Tyconius. *Tyconius: The Book of Rules*. Translated by William S. Babcock. Texts and Translations 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Ulrich, Daniel W. "The Missional Audience of the Gospel of Matthew." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 69 (2007): 64–83.
- Uro, Risto. "'Secondary Orality' in the Gospel of Thomas? Logion 14 as a Test Case." *Forum* 9 (1993): 3–4, 305–29.
- Verheyden, Jos. "P. Gardner-Smith and 'The Turn of the Tide.'" Pages 423–452 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Viviano, Benedict T. "John's Use of Matthew: Beyond Tweaking." *Revue biblique* 111 (2004): 209–37. Repr. pages 245–69 in *Matthew and His World: The Gospel of the Open Jewish Christians: Studies in Biblical Theology*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 61. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- von Wahlde, Urban C. Review of Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994), 582.
- von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospels and Letters of John*. 3 vols. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Walker, Jr., Wm. O. "The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in John." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 237–56.
- Weren, Wilhelmus Johannes Cornelis. "Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem." Pages 117–141 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Wilson, E. Jan, ed. *The Old Syriac Gospels: Studies and Comparative Translations*. 2 vols. Eastern Christian Studies 1–2. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2002.
- Windisch, Hans. *Johannes und die Synoptiker: wollte der vierte Evangelist die Älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 12. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1926.
- Winter, Sean. Review of Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*. *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 29 (2007): 73–4.
- Witherington III, Ben. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Witherington, III, Ben. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville:
Westminster John Knox, 1995.