

2006

Interfluent, Formative, and Dialectical - A Theory of John's Relation to the Synoptics (Part III of The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered)

Paul N. Anderson

George Fox University, panderso@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Paul N., "Interfluent, Formative, and Dialectical - A Theory of John's Relation to the Synoptics (Part III of The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered)" (2006). *Faculty Publications - College of Christian Studies*. 273. <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs/273>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Christian Studies at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - College of Christian Studies by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

PART III
INTERFLUENTIAL, FORMATIVE AND DIALECTICAL-
A THEORY OF JOHN'S RELATION TO THE SYNOPTICS

'In addition to the material drawn from this independent tradition, John has a few elements that seem to suggest a more direct cross-influence from the Synoptic tradition.'

Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*
(ed. by Francis J. Moloney; New York: Doubleday,
2003, p. 104)

While John's tradition is pervasively autonomous and independent of the Synoptics, the Johannine tradition shows evidence of engagement with various aspects of the Synoptic Gospels and traditions. Multiple non-identical similarities with Mark suggest an 'interfluent' set of relationships between the pre-Markan and the early Johannine tradition. At least three dozen times Luke departs from Mark and sides with John, suggesting that Luke has drawn from the Johannine tradition, probably within John's oral stages of development. Even Q shows evidence of Johannine influence, and this fact demands investigation. Matthean and Johannine traditions appear to have engaged similar issues related to their local Jewish communities, and they also evidence an intramural set of discussions regarding the emergence of structure and matters of egalitarian and Spirit-based aspects of leadership. Within this theory of John's relation to the Synoptics, John's tradition is assumed to have been both early and late. While John's tradition appears to be finalized latest among the Gospels, it is neither derivative from alien (non-Johannine) sources nor any of the Synoptic traditions. Rather, the Fourth Gospel represents an independent reflection upon the ministry of Jesus produced in at least two editions, and these factors will be drawn together in suggesting an overall theory of Johannine-Synoptic relations.

John's relation to the Synoptic Gospels has been a fascinating area of study over the last century or more, and yet many studies fall prey to errors that affect adversely the quality of one's analysis. One fallacy involves the notion that John's relation to Matthew, Mark and Luke would have been uniform rather than tradition-specific. Whatever their degree and character, contacts between John and each of the gospel traditions probably had its own particular history, and these factors probably extended to differing traditional forms as well as content-related issues. A second fallacy is the notion that the lateness of John's finalization implies necessarily John's dependence upon Synoptic traditions as the primary option for consideration. John's tradition was early as well as late, and it may be more suitable to view the Johannine tradition as having had an effect on other traditions instead of viewing Synoptic influence upon John as the only possibility. A third fallacy involves the uncritical assumption that the tradition histories and editorial processes operative between the traditions and workings of the first three evangelists are necessarily indicative of those of the Fourth. John's tradition appears *not* to have been transmitted or gathered in disparate formal categories or units as does the pre-Markan material, and evidence that the Fourth Evangelist employed alien (non-Johannine) written sources, as did the First and Third Evangelists, is virtually nonexistent.

An adequate theory of John's relation to the Synoptics must bear these potential pitfalls in mind, seeking to move ahead on the basis of the most plausible inferences to be drawn from the best evidence available. The Fourth Evangelist was probably aware of written Mark and may even have done some patterning of his written account after Mark's gospel genre. It is less likely that the Fourth Evangelist knew Luke or Matthew in their written forms, and yet

traces of Johannine material can also be found in Acts. This is an interesting and provocative fact. The Johannine and Matthean traditions appear to have shared a common set of goals in reaching local Jewish communities with the gospel of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, but their communities apparently had also endured hardship within the process. With the rise of further problems with Gentile Christians and issues related to church maintenance and organization, these traditions appear to have been engaged in dialectical sets of explorations regarding apologetics, ecclesiology and Christocracy- the effectual means by which the risen Lord continues to lead the church. In these and other ways, John's relation to the Synoptic traditions appears to have been interinfluential, formative and dialectical.

The present discussion is necessitated, among other things, by the pervasive failure of the last century's leading critical approaches to the tradition-history of the Fourth Gospel. AS a critical scholar, one is entirely pleased to accept and assimilate any theory of John's composition that is sound and plausible. However, the soundness of an argument depends on the veracity of the premises and the validity of its reasoning. In addition, the plausibility of an overall view must be considered as it relates to other constellations of issues. On these matters, the best of the twentieth century's investigations into the history and development of the Johannine tradition produce a dismal set of prospects when trying to find something solid on which to build. One can understand why the last three decades of Johannine studies have seen the near abandonment of historical/critical investigations altogether by some scholars, opting instead for analyses of the literary features and artistry of the Johannine text. Indeed, investigations of John's rhetorical design and capacity to elicit particular responses from the reader are worthy of consideration, and they are genuinely helpful to interpreters regardless of what can be known or inferred of John's authorship, composition or tradition-history.

On the other hand, the genre of John, while it was indeed a rhetorically oriented composition, is not that of an imaginative fiction. While narrative features are definitely intrinsic to the composition of John, these narratives presuppose actual events, claiming at times to be reflections upon them – wrongly or rightly- and even these narrations must be considered in the light of other traditions internal and external to the Jesus movement. These findings, while argued in greater detail elsewhere, now become the starting place for further investigations of the epistemological origins of the Johannine tradition. 'While this tradition appears to have been finalized the latest among the gospels, it is by no means devoid of its own claims to autonomy, and even primacy. In fact, the Johannine tradition comes across as the most complete and self-assured of the four canonical traditions, and yet it probably enjoyed at least contact with the other gospel traditions along the way. Ascertaining those relationships will be the primary task to which the rest of the present investigation is dedicated.

A. John's Relation to Mark: Interfluent, Augmentive, and Corrective

Because Johannine source-critical hypotheses by and large lack sufficient evidence to convince (although the venture itself is not misguided), and because John was completed around the turn of the first century CE, many scholars have moved back toward a view of Synoptic dependence, against the previously accepted judgement of P. Gardner-Smith that John's was a pervasively independent tradition. While many of these studies have rightly identified similarities – and therefore possible connections – between John and the Synoptics, the assumption that John simply knew one or more *Of* the Synoptics in written form and 'did his own thing' with earlier material is often wielded in unrestrained and unsubstantiated ways. John is also very different from Mark, and this fact must be accounted for. Connections identified, however, are not redactions demonstrated, and adequate judgements require more considered and examined measures. The Johannine tradition appears to have intersected with each of the Synoptic Gospels, but in different ways, suggested by the frequency and character of contacts with each. In no case are the similarities identical, so as to suggest direct dependence on a written text. In all cases, the contacts appear to have occurred during the oral stages of both Synoptic and Johannine traditions, but these contacts appear also to have developed in different ways and at different times. The following proposals reflect an attempt to weigh and explain the particular evidence adequately.

1) John and Mark: An 'Interfluent Set of Relationships' during the Oral Stages of their Respective Traditions

While Barrett and others have identified dear connections between John's and Mark's vocabulary and ordering of material, huge differences also exist. As demonstrated elsewhere (Anderson 1996, pp. 97-104), there are at least 21 points of similarity between John 6 and Mark 8, and 24 points of similarity between John 6 and Mark 6, but *none* of these are identical contacts. The same sort of phenomena are found between John's and Mark's Passion narratives and at other points of contact -albeit somewhat unevenly- and John's and Mark's outlines of Jesus' ministry show many similarities, but again, no identical ones.¹ This fact is extremely significant as it pertains to the issue of Johannine/Markan relations. It suggests, nay demonstrates, that the Fourth

1. See C.K Barrett (1978, pp. 42-66). Besides the similarities between the events of John 6 and Mark, see, for instance, parallels between Mark and John regarding the ministry of John the Baptist (Jn 1.6-8, 15, 19-34; Mk 1.2-11), the calling of the disciples (Jn 1.35-51; Mk 1.16-20; 3.13-19), the cleansing of the Temple (Jn 2.13-22; Mk 11.15-19, 27-33; 14.57-8; 15.29), the journey into Galilee (Jn 4.1-3, 43-6; Mk 1.14-15), and the dishonoring of the home-town prophet motif (Jn 4.39-45; Mk 6.4-6). In the later periods of Jesus' ministry we have plots to kill Jesus, (Jn 11.45-57; Mk 14.1-2), the anointing of Jesus (Jn 12.1-8; Mk 14.3-9), the entry into Jerusalem (Jn 12.12-19; Mk 11.1-10), the last supper (Jn 13.1-20; Mk 14.17-25) and Jesus' prediction of Peter's betrayal (Jn 13.36-8; Mk 14.26-31), the promise of the Holy Spirit's help during times of trial (Jn 14.15-31; 15.26-7; 16.1-15; Mk 13.11), the garden scene and the arrest of Jesus (Jn 18.1-13; Mk 14.26-52), the

Evangelist did *not* use Mark as a written source, at least not in the ways Matthew and Luke did. Otherwise, there would be at least several identical connections rather than a broad similarity of some words, themes and patterns. Conversely, due to the large numbers of Johannine/Markan similarities, contacts probably did exist between the oral renderings of John's and Mark's traditions, and yet because it is impossible to determine which direction the influence may have gone, the relationship may best be considered one of 'interfluentiality'. It is also unlikely that it only went in one direction between two formative-yet-independent traditions.

It is also a fact that the kinds of material common to John and Mark alone are often conspicuously the same types of material omitted by Matthew and Luke in their redactions of Mark: non-symbolic, illustrative detail (apparently considered superfluous by later redactors of a written narrative source), and *theological asides* (either omitted, perhaps as digressions, or replaced by common-sense conjecture about what Jesus intended or would have done – usually showing marks of the later evangelist's theological inclinations). These two sorts of material are also most prevalent in John and Mark, suggesting proximity to the oral stages of their respective traditions. Luke and Matthew add their own units of material, some of which has these sorts of details and asides, but they by and large do not add details for the sake of embellishment, and when they do add theological points they reflect the commonsense conjecture of the First and Third Evangelists. For instance, Matthew might add something about the fulfilling of all righteousness, and Luke might add something about Jesus' emphasizing prayer or teaching about the Kingdom of God. Neither of these moves need represent particular knowledge of traditional material which Matthew or Luke felt essential to be added. Rather, they offer narrative bridges or punctuating remarks and short commentaries as transitional asides along the way.

Another feature prevalent in Mark and John, but missing from Luke and Matthew, is the 'translation' of Aramaisms into Greek and the 'explanation' of Jewish customs.² The answer to the audience-related question here is

denials of Peter (In 18.15-18, 25-7; Mk 14.66-72), the Jewish trial (In 18.19-24; Mk 14.55-65) and the Roman trial (In 18.28-19.16; Mk 15.1-15), the crucifixion and death of Jesus (In 19.17-37; Mk 15.22-41), the burial of Jesus (In 19.38-42; Mk 15.42-7), and the resurrection and appearance narratives (In 20.1-21, 24; Mk 16.1-8, 9-20).

2. See, for instance, Mark's 'translation' of Aramaic terms (Mk 3.17; 5.41; 7.11, 34; 15.22) and explanations of Jewish customs (Mk 7.2-4; 15.42). John also does the same sort of thing, but even more so. See the Aramaic Greek words for 'teacher' (Jn 1.38; 20.16), the Anointed One (Jn 1.41; 4.25), Peter (Jn 1.42), and the translation into Greek of such Hebrew names of places connected to events in the ministry of Jesus as the pool by the Sheep Gate in Jerusalem, which is called in Hebrew *Bethzatha* (Jn 5.2), the pool of *Siloam* (meaning 'sent', Jn 9.7), the Stone Pavement on which Pilate's judgement bench rested is called in Hebrew *Gabbatha* (Jn 19.13), and 'the Place of the Skull' (which in Hebrew is called *Golgotha*, Jn 19.17). Likewise, the Fourth Evangelist 'explains' Jewish customs for non-Jewish audiences (Jn 2.6, 13; 4.9; 5.1; 6.4; 7.2; 11.55; 19.31, 40, 42) suggesting an intentional bridging of the oral narration of events with later audiences of the written text, which would have included Gentiles.

obvious. Mark and John are intended to be understandable to Gentile members of their audiences, which is why they translate Jewish terms and customs. The tradition-related question, however, is a catalysing one: *Why* do Mark and John distinctively preserve Aramaisms and Jewish names of people and places if they were not connected to earlier Aramaic or Hebrew traditions? Were these details simply 'concocted' (using Bretschneider's term), or do they suggest the *primitivity* of Markan and Johannine traditions? Inferring an earlier Aramaic rendering of John need not be performed here to identify an acceptable answer. Interestingly, both the Matthean and Lukan traditions omit these details, and possibly for different reasons. Matthew may have had fewer Gentile members of its audience, whereas Luke may not have felt the traditional need to pass on this sort of material from his utilization of written Mark, although Luke does indeed utilize other material with Aramaic origins. Thus, the possibility is strong that the pre-Markan material and the early Johannine tradition reflect the use of primitive material characteristic of independent oral traditions.

If this were so, insights into some of the contacts between the pre-Markan and early Johannine traditions become apparent. While the presence of apparently non-symbolic, illustrative detail is not in and of itself a sure marker of primitive orality, the particular contacts between Markan and Johannine renderings precisely on these matters of detail (the grass at the feeding, 200 and 300 *denarii*, for instance) suggest the sorts of catchy details preachers would have used and picked up from one another. While it may be finally impossible to know who these preachers were, the presentation of Peter and John preaching throughout Samaria (Acts 8) -especially if there is anything at all to the Papias tradition's connecting of Peter with the production of Mark and John with the testimony of the Beloved Disciple- may legitimate the designation of these early traditions as 'Petrine' and 'Johannine'. These designations will stand, though, *whoever* might have been connected to them as human sources of traditional origin and formation. Early Gospel 'traditions' were *human beings*, and these human beings were firstly preachers. Then again, certainty on these matters finally evades the modern exegete, but the character of the material seems to cohere with the testimonies preserved by Irenaeus and Eusebius and the bulk of second-century opinion.

What is also conspicuous is that as well as peculiar agreements throughout the narratives, these two traditions also differ considerably at nearly every step of the way. Such a phenomenon, however, may imply the traditions' confidence and sense of authority rather than illegitimacy. The Matthean conservative borrowing of written Mark seems less of an approach by an apostolic authority figure (although much of the M and Q traditions probably went back to Jesus) than the bold, trail-blazing path carved out by the Fourth Evangelist. His independent swath reflects the autonomy and confidence of a tradition seeking to present a bold portrait of the Master's ministry, and even more importantly, the original intentionality of Jesus for the emerging needs of the church.

2) *John's Augmentation of Mark*

John also shows evidence of augmenting the contents of Mark, and a comparison/contrast between the first edition of John and Mark suggests something about what such an interest might have been. First, however, the two editions of John must be distinguished. While there may indeed have been many stages in the composition of each of these 'editions', a bare minimum of speculation that accounts for the major aporias³ in the most plausible way possible is one that infers two basic editions of John. As mentioned above, the first edition probably began with the witness of John the Baptist (On 1.6-8, 15, 19-42) and concluded with Jn 20.31. For the final edition the editor then added such passages as the worship material of the Prologue, chapters 6, 15-17 and 21 and the Beloved Disciple and eyewitness passages. What is also likely is that the author of the Johannine Epistles was the editor of the finalized Gospel (impressive stylistic convergences exist between the material in the Gospel's supplementary material and the style of the Epistles). Then 1, 2 and 3 John were probably written between the gathering of the first edition (ca. 80 CE) and the finalization of the Gospel around 100 CE after the death of the Beloved Disciple. This being the case, several things become apparent about the character and inclination of the first edition of John with respect to Mark.

First, John shows considerable similarity to the macro-pattern of Mark, suggesting that the Fourth Evangelist sought to do the sort of thing Mark had done, albeit in a very different way. The beginning of Jesus' ministry is associated with the ministry of John the Baptist, although John's rendering sketches a more realistic presentation of their ministries being contemporary with each other, and to some degree they appear to have been in competition with each other. Jesus returns to the site where John had been baptizing several times, even after the Baptist's arrest, and this seems a more realistic portrayal than a cut-and-dried Markan sequentialism. A few other aspects of John's presentation of the beginning of Jesus' ministry also seem parallel to those in Mark, such as the calling of the disciples, Jesus' coming again into Galilee, and the rejection of the home-town prophet. Toward the end of Jesus' ministry, John and Mark follow a very similar pattern between the entry into Jerusalem, the last supper, the garden scene and arrest of Jesus, and the two trials of Jesus, followed by his death, burial, resurrection and appearances. The middle parts of John and Mark are extremely different, but their beginnings and endings show a broad similarity of pattern.

3. Such 'aporias' as the individuality of the Prologue (Jn 1.1-18), the positioning of chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7, the odd transition of John 14.31, and the apparent first ending of John 20.31 are explained by this theory with a minimal amount of speculative reconstruction. As mentioned above, this theory builds most centrally on the two-edition hypothesis of Barnabas Lindars, and it is the most plausible and least speculative among extensive source-dependence and rearrangement hypotheses. See also Appendix I, below.

Second, from this set of similarities some scholars have argued that John copied Mark's larger pattern, if not Mark's gospel narrative; but John is also extremely different, even in terms of these closest similarities. For instance, the actual baptizing of Jesus is not narrated in John, and there are very few close similarities in the presentation of John the Baptist other than his being the voice crying in the wilderness from Isa. 40.3, the Holy Spirit descending as a dove, and John's being unworthy to unstrap the sandals of Jesus. The location of these connections, however, would probably have been the sort of thing preached and remembered from the oral stages of traditions, and given the vastly different presentation of every other aspect of John's ministry, Johannine dependence on written Mark for the material itself seems highly unlikely. These differences are even more pronounced regarding the other aspects of the beginnings of Jesus' ministry.

The Passion material shows a far closer pattern, at least in the outline, but even here, John's tradition departs from Mark's at nearly every turn. The suppers are on different days, neither John nor Peter go to prepare the supper, Jesus does not offer the words of the institution at the last supper, there is no Gethsemane anguish in John, and the Markan apocalypse, the cursing of the fig tree and the final teachings of Jesus in Mark are completely missing in John. Further, Peter's denials in John are far more pronounced, Pilate's incomprehending dialogue with Jesus and the crowd is far more detailed, and there is no Markan cry of dereliction in John. While the Fourth Evangelist may possibly be inferred here to be following the larger pattern of the Markan Gospel narrative, John's dissimilarities at every turn make a dose following of Mark, let alone a Markan-dependence hypothesis, implausible in the extreme.

Nonetheless, several alternative explanations for the similarities and differences are as follows: the first is that an actual sequence of events, roughly similar to the Markan and Johannine Passion narratives, may indeed have occurred, and we may thus have two perspectives on those largely similar sets of events. In that sense, these similar-yet-different connections bolster arguments for the basic authenticity of John and Mark as the two hi-optic Gospels, producing complementary perspectives on the last week of Jesus' ministry. A second possibility is that the early Christian narration of the Passion events may have been fairly well set, even before Mark was written, and the same source from which Mark's material was derived could have played a role in the formation of the Johannine presentation. Conversely, the Johannine narration may have provided the backbone for other traditions, including the pre-Markan. One more fact, however, deserves consideration here. The order of the Passion material could not possibly have assumed any other order. Try placing the resurrection *before* the supper, or the trials *after* the crucifixion, or the appearances *before* the arrest of Jesus, or the arrest *before* the triumphal entry, or even reversing the two trials. None of these transpositions, nor any others, could possibly be made to work! Thus, similarities between the Johannine and Markan Passion narra-

tives do not imply dependence, one way or another, and this is why Bultmann was forced to infer an independent Passion narrative for the Fourth Gospel. The material appears to have been traditional rather than concocted, and while plausibly familiar with Mark, John is not dependent upon written Mark.

A third point here follows, and in several ways, John's first edition appears to augment and complement Mark's Gospel. The first two signs done in Cana of Galilee are probably included to fill out some of the early part of Jesus' ministry felt to be missing from Mark. The first two signs in John thus provide a chronological complement to Mark. It is also possible that the more public ministry of the wedding miracle and the healing of the royal official's son may seem preferable introductions to the miracle-working ministry of Jesus than the more obscure curing of Simon Peter's mother-in-law and the exorcising of a demoniac. Likewise, the signs in John 5, 9 and 11 fill out the Judean part of Jesus' ministry as a geographical complement to Mark's Galilean presentation. Most telling, however, is the fact that *none* of the five signs in the first edition of John are included in Mark! This fact is highly suggestive of the Fourth Evangelist's intention. He apparently wanted to fill out some of the broader material not included in Mark (as Luke and Matthew have done) but did so without duplicating Markan material proper. The five signs also may have been crafted rhetorically in the five-fold pattern of the books of Moses, as Jesus is presented to convince a Jewish audience that he is indeed the prophet like Moses anticipated in Deuteronomy 18. The Fourth Evangelist thus drew on his own tradition as his source, which he himself may largely have been. Then again, a tacit acknowledgement of Mark's material (also explaining why he did not make fuller use of it) may be implied in the ending of the first edition: 'Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, *which are not written in this book*. But these are written in order that...' (On 20.30-1). Thus, in a subtle way, Jn 20.30 seems to defend the fact, perhaps against some criticism, of John's intentional non-inclusion of familiar Markan material.

Such a complementary intent would also account for considerable problems regarding major disagreements between Mark and John, especially the Markan material omitted by John, and at this point one must differ with some of the inferences of Gardner-Smith. While he finds it inconceivable that the Fourth Evangelist's knowledge of Mark could have resulted in omitting so much of what is in Mark, he does not allow for the possibility that John might have been written as something of a complement to Mark. Non-dependence is not the same as total independence. The Transfiguration, exorcisms, Jesus' parabolic teachings on the Kingdom of God, the Markan apocalypse, and other significant works and teachings may have been omitted from John precisely because it was felt that they were already included among the 'many other signs Jesus did in the presence of his disciples, which are *not written in this book*' (On 20.30). Likewise, including controversial debates with Jewish leaders and the Johannine 'I-Am' sayings,

and emphasizing Jesus' divine commissioning within the Deuteronomy 18 agency schema appear to have furthered the acutely apologetic interest of the evangelist. This interest of leading the reader to believe in Jesus as the Jewish Messiah (Jn 20.31) may thus explain the desire to include some of the Johannine traditional material that had been crafted within its own dialectical relationships with local Jewish communities. This material reflects distinctively Johannine paraphrase of the teachings of Jesus, and the crafting of Jesus in the pattern of Elijah and Moses typologies was also an integral part of this apologetic agenda. Therefore, the 'problem' of John's omission of Markan material and inclusion of distinctively Johannine material coincides with the likelihood that the first edition was intended as an augmentation of and complement to Mark.

3) *John's Correcting of Mark?*

Interestingly, the first edition of John, while following the Markan macro-pattern, also seems intent upon *setting the record straight* regarding Mark's ordering of some of Jesus' ministry and some of Mark's theological nuance.⁴ As well as augmenting the early ministry of Jesus and adding other material as a complement to Mark, John's narrative appears at times to provide an alternative presentation of events with knowing intentionality. Does this imply a conscious correcting of Mark's presentation of Jesus, or are the differences due to Johannine 'mistakes' or lack of familiarity with Mark? Contrary to many discussions of the issue, considering John as disagreeing with the presentation of Jesus' ministry in all three canonical gospels misrepresents the issue here. At the time of the production of the first edition of John, Mark was probably the only finalized gospel, and thus the Johannine target need not be construed as broader than Mark's Gospel. Further, the very fact of Matthew's and Luke's expansions of Mark suggests the likelihood that Mark may not have been regarded as the final written word on Jesus' ministry. They sought to improve on Mark, as did the second ending of Mark, and perhaps John did too. If taken in this way, some of John's departures from Mark may indeed be considered in a slightly corrective light as well as in an augmentive light. The narrating, for instance, of the first two signs Jesus performed in Cana of Galilee may have been designed not only to fill out the earlier portrayal of Jesus' ministry, but they may also have served the function of wresting the inaugural ministry of Jesus away from the household of Simon Peter's mother-in-law and the exorcism of the demoniac. For whatever reason, these two miracles may not have seemed to the Fourth Evangelist to have been the best ways to get the gospel narration going, and the numeration devices in Jn 2.11 and 4.54 may have functioned as a corrective to the Markan presentation rather than a numeration device within an alien signs source. Indeed, Eusebius even preserves a tradition declaring that one of John's interests was to present

4. These differences with the Markan ordering can be seen clearly in the chart by Peter Hofrichter (1997, p. 188).

a portrayal of the early ministry of Jesus (*Hist. Eccles.* 3.24.7-13), and such an opinion may have some basis in reliable memory.

Another striking difference between Mark and John involves their presentations of the Temple cleansing. Mark places it at the culmination of Jesus' ministry, of course, and most historical-Jesus scholars assume such was the correct chronology. John's presentation at the beginning of Jesus' ministry is thus assumed to have been motivated by 'the theological interests of the evangelist', but such inferences are often fuzzy and unsubstantiated. Several times hence, the disruptive sign in Jerusalem is commented upon as an event that caused other ripples in the Johannine narrative (Jn 4.45), and these imply reflections upon events rather than theologizations. Why, for instance, do the Jerusalem leaders *already* want to kill Jesus after an apparently inane healing of the paralytic? A prior Temple disturbance seems assumed. Conversely, an unlikely move to have been concocted (thus applying the criterion of dissimilarity) is the Johannine rendering of the reason for the Jewish leaders' wanting to kill Jesus as being his raising Lazarus from the dead. It would be perfectly reasonable to have conjectured that the religious leaders wanted to get rid of Jesus because of his having created a demonstration in the Temple, and while Matthew and Luke follow Mark unquestioningly here, this does not imply three testimonies against one. It may simply reflect common-sense conjecture, the very procedure Mark would have followed if he had listed all the Jerusalem events at the end of the narrative, which he dearly did.

On the other hand, Jn 2.20 contains an odd and unmotivated clue to chronology suggesting the historical superiority of the Johannine presentation. Here the Jews claim the Temple has been under construction for 46 years, and, as it was begun around 19 BCE, this would imply a date for that saying of around 27 CE - closer to the beginning of Jesus' ministry than the end. Also, the presentation of Jesus going back and forth from Jerusalem and ministering over the length of three Passovers seems more realistic than the Synoptic view that Jesus attended Jerusalem only once during his ministry, and during that visit, he was killed. Also, some of the motif in Jn 2.13-22 is more unified than its counterparts in Mark 11 and 14. These and other factors, such as Jesus' ministry in Samaria and contemporary engagements with the followers of John the Baptist, cause one to suspect John may have intended to correct some of Mark's presentation of Jesus' ministry, and amazingly such an opinion is echoed by a second-century witness. *None other than John the elder*, according to Papias through Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 3.39.15), is recalled to have asserted that Mark preserved Peter's preaching accurately, but *in the wrong order!* The Elder may thus be representing an authentic Johannine opinion and motivation for producing another gospel narrative as an alternative to Mark's contribution. This possibility may seem unacceptable to scholars holding a harmonizing view of the Gospels, but the textual evidence seems to support such a theory, and so does a striking second-century witness. Thus, the Johannine perspective upon the Markan project may also lend valuable insights into the sort of compilation Mark may have been - a gathering of traditional units into a progressive

denouement, with some chronological knowledge present- rather than a strict chronology proper.

As well as matters of chronology, the Johannine project may have wanted to set the record straight on the meaning of miracles (they reveal who Jesus was as the Mosaic agent sent from God), the character of the Kingdom of God (it goes forward by means of the work of the Spirit and is associated with truth), the compassionate and loving trademarks of authentic ministry (versus power orientations), a de-emphasis on the special place of 'the Twelve' (elevating Nathanael, Martha and others, for instance), and the inclusion of women and Samaritans in Jesus' circle of friends. Some of these theological proclivities come into their fullest development in the supplementary material, but they were already at work in the first edition of John. In doing so, John's tradition stakes a claim right alongside the Markan tradition as an authentic interpretation of the ministry and intentionality of Jesus for his followers. It is also not inconceivable that two or more disciples of Jesus, even leading ones, may have seen things differently regarding central aspects of Jesus' ministry. What we appear to have in Mark and John is two hi-optic perspectives on the events and implications of Jesus' gospel ministry. Therefore, John's relation to the Markan tradition appears to have been interfluent in their oral stages, and augmentive, complementary and corrective in their written stages.

B. John's Influence upon Luke: Formative, 'Orderly' and Theological

A terrible error among interpreters of gospel traditions is to assume that because John was finalized late, all contacts between John and the other gospel traditions must imply John's dependence upon the Synoptics. This view is nowhere defended as sloppily as it is with regards to the relationship between the Gospels of Luke and John. Many of the great themes and passages most characteristic of Luke are not included in John, whereas at least three dozen times, Luke appears to depart from Mark and to side with the Johannine rendering of an event or teaching. For instance, such great Lukan passages as the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son are missing from John, as are such themes as concern for the poor and the presentation of Jesus as a just man. On the other hand, Luke sides with John against Mark in significant ways, and this fact is best accounted for by assuming Luke had access to the Johannine tradition, and that he used it. Assuming there may have been a common-yet-unknown source is entirely conjectural, and it serves no purpose better than the more solid inference that a source Luke used was the early Johannine tradition.⁵

5. The analyses of Lamar Cribbs (1973, 1979) are far more convincing than those of J.A. Bailey (1963), who simply guesses that there must have been a common source for Luke and John. When cast in the light of Luke's multiple departures from Mark and siding with John, the likelihood of Lukan dependence on the Johannine tradition becomes a much stronger case.

1)John's Formative Influence upon Luke

Time and again Luke appears to be siding with John against Mark, and it must be concluded that John's tradition must have been formative in the development of the Lukan Gospel. For one thing, Luke includes a variety of details that are peculiar to John but are not found in Mark. For instance, people question in their hearts regarding John the Baptist (On 1.19-25; 3.28 → Lk. 3.15; Acts 11.16) who has a more extensive itinerant ministry (On 1.28; 3.23; 10.40 → Lk. 3.3) than in Mk 1.4, double questions are asked regarding Jesus' Messiahship and Sonship (On 10.24, 36 → Lk. 22.67, 70), the beholding of Jesus' glory (doxa) is added to the Transfiguration scene (On 1.14 → Lk. 9.32), Mary and Martha are mentioned as sisters and are presented as having similar roles (On 11.1; 12.1-3 → Lk. 10.38-42), a man named Lazarus is presented in both John and Luke and in both cases is associated with death and the testimony of after-death experiences (On 11.1-12.17 → Lk. 16.19-31), the crowd acclaims Jesus as 'King' at the triumphal entry (On 12.13 → Lk. 19.38), Jesus extols and exemplifies the greatness of servant leadership at the table (On 13.1-17 → Lk. 12.37; 22.24-30), the disciples question who would be the betrayer (On 13.22-4 → Lk. 22.23), Satan enters Judas at the last supper (On 13.27 → Lk. 22.3), Peter's denial is predicted in the upper room (On 13.36-8 → Lk. 22.31-4), only John and Luke mention a second Judas – not Iscariot (On 14.22 → Lk. 6.16; Acts 1.13), the Holy Spirit will teach believers what they need to know and say (On 14.26 → Lk. 12.12), the 'right' ear of the servant was cut off (On 18.10 → Lk. 22.50), the court/house of the High Priest was entered by Jesus (On 18.15 → Lk. 22.54), Jesus answers Pilate's question (On 18.33-8 → Lk. 23.3) whereupon Pilate claims to 'find no crime in' Jesus, the crowd desires to give tribute to Caesar after three assertions of Jesus' innocence and their double demand for his crucifixion (On 19.1-16 → Lk. 23.20-33), the tomb is one in which no one had ever been laid (On 19.41 → Lk. 23.53), and the day was the day of preparation (On 19.42 → Lk. 23.54), it is said that Peter arrived at the tomb and that he saw the linen cloths lying there (On 20.5 → Lk. 24.12), likewise Mary Magdalene becomes a link between the risen Lord and the Apostles (On 20.18 → Lk. 24.10), two men/angels are mentioned at the empty tomb (On 20.12 → Lk. 24.4), the ascension is mentioned (On 20.17 → Lk. 24.51; Acts 1.9-11), Jesus suddenly appears to his disciples standing among them (On 20.19 → Lk. 24.36), he invites his followers to touch his wounds (On 20.27 → Lk. 24.39-40), bestows peace upon his followers (On 20.19, 21 → Lk. 24.36), and eats fish with them after the resurrection (On 21.9-13 → Lk. 24.42-3), the Holy Spirit is presented distinctively as 'wind' (On 3.8 → Acts 2.2), and the great catch of fish is climactically mentioned (On 21.1-14 → Lk. 5.1-11), which in turn becomes associated with the calling of Peter.

How Luke came by this material and not other Johannine material is difficult to assess, but it does appear that Luke has had access to John's oral tradition, and on more than one score. If Luke had had access to written John, the placement of the great catch of fish probably would have been different,

although Luke appropriately still includes it as part of the calling (and recalling) narrative. Likewise, if Luke had access to written John, he might have moved the Temple cleansing to the early part of the narrative, included longer I-Am sayings, presented an alternative Lazarus narrative, and shown Jesus going back and forth from Jerusalem and doing other miracles not included in Mark. Both in matters of inclusion and exclusion, John's material appears to have played a formative role in the development of Luke's Gospel, and that influence seems to have taken place during the oral stages of the Johannine tradition.

2) Does John Provide a Basis for Luke's 'Orderly' Account?

What is meant by Luke's declaration that he seeks to produce an 'orderly' account? Does such a reference imply a penchant for historical detail, or is Luke referring to something broader in its meaning? Again, such an interest is impossible to ascertain, but it does coincide with the fact that several times in his narration of events, Luke appears to change the sequence or to alter the presentation of something in Mark precisely where Luke coincides with John. For instance, Luke only includes one sea-crossing narrative, as does John, and Luke only includes one feeding (the feeding of the 5,000), similar to John (Jn 6.1-15→Lk. 9.10-17). Luke moves the servanthood discussion to the last supper, where it is in John (Jn 13.1-17→Lk. 22.24-30), and he also performs a rather striking reordering move in that he relocates the confession of Peter after the feeding of the 5,000 as a contrast to its following the feeding of the 4,000, as it does in Mark. Notice also that Luke begins and ends Jesus' ministry in ways reminiscent of John's rendering: the opening of Jesus' ministry is in the 'hill country near Nazareth' (Jn 2.1-11→Lk. 4.14-16), and his post-resurrection appearances begin in Jerusalem (Jn 20.19→Lk. 24.13-49). A certain explanation may elude the theorist, but one fact is clear: in all of these moves, Luke indeed departs from Mark and sides with John.

Luke also appears to *conflate material* between Markan and Johannine presentations, suggesting he saw his work to some degree as bridging these two traditions. For instance, the confession of Peter conflates Mark's 'You are *the Christ*' with John's 'You are the Holy One of God', leading to 'You are *the Christ of God*' (Mk 8.29 and Jn 6.69→Lk. 9.20). Most conspicuously, however, Luke departs from Mark's presentation of the anointing of Jesus' *head*, and presents the event as the anointing of Jesus' *feet*—siding with John (Jn 12.1-8→Lk. 7.36-50). Movement in the other direction, towards a more elevated and royal anointing, might have been imaginable, but moving to a more modest foot anointing would have been extremely unlikely without a legitimating reason. John's rendering, however, provides a traditional basis for this unlikely move, and it also may account for Luke's conjectural addition of the gratitude motif. In John, the anointing is performed by Mary, the sister of Lazarus, but Luke may have misunderstood the narration due to his aural access to it. Luke may have heard 'Mary' and have thus associated her with another Mary (Mary Magdalene?), which would explain his conjectural

addition that the motivation for the anointing was the woman's prolific gratitude in return for the forgiveness of her prolific sinfulness. This may also suggest the oral form of the Johannine tradition to which Luke had access.

Another interesting point made by Lamar Cribbs is that many times where Luke *omits* a Markan narrative or presentation of something, he does so precisely where the Johannine tradition seems to go against such a narration. As an argument from silence, this is a weak form of demonstration, but it coheres with the larger pattern of Luke's rearranging his material to fit the Johannine presentation over and against the Markan. Does all of this cast any light upon Luke's declaration to Theophilus that he is writing an 'orderly account' after having investigated everything, including the consulting of eye-witnesses and servants of the *Logos* (Lk. 1.1-4)? Such an inference indeed is supported by the corollary facts, although certainty will be elusive. Whatever the case, the Johannine tradition appears to have influenced the Lukan at many turns.

3) *Did the Johannine Tradition Contribute to Luke's Theology?*

Again, this question is finally impossible to answer with certainty, but Luke does show remarkable similarities with several Johannine theological motifs as well as details along the way. For instance, John's favourable treatment of Samaritans comes across dearly in Luke in the parable of the Good Samaritan as well as Jesus' treatment of Samaritans in Luke's narrative. Likewise, the favourable treatment of women in both John and Luke appears to be no accident. Not only are particular women mentioned distinctively in these two gospels, but their apostolic functions are also highlighted, and this connection is impressive. Luke believes women to be included in the new work that God is doing in the world, and Luke probably acquired at least some of this perspective from the Johannine tradition. Another example of theological influence is the common importance placed upon the ministry of the Holy Spirit. Obviously, this theme represents Luke's own theology, but particular connections with the Johannine narrative make it likely that John's tradition may even have contributed to this development within Luke's own theology, apart from the tradition he used from John. These same connections can be seen to contribute to Luke's presentation of the growth of the church in Acts, confirming this hypothesis.

Indeed, one of the most impressive similarities between Luke and John is the way Luke presents the ministry of the post-resurrection Jesus. On the road to Emmaus in Luke we find several Johannine contacts not only suggesting traditional borrowing from John, but motifs reflecting John's theological influence upon Luke's understanding of the ministry of the resurrected Lord. The risen Christ stands among the disciples, speaking peace to them and offering courage. Likewise, the corporate fellowship of believers is enhanced by the sharing of table-fellowship with the Lord- even after the resurrection- in continuity with the historical ministry of Jesus. The evidence of spiritual encounter with Christ is declared as an experiential reality, and the ongoing

ministry of the Holy Spirit is held to fulfil the promise of Christ's return. Luke also sides with John in emphasizing the efficacy of prayer; and this is both taught and modelled by Jesus in both Gospels. In these and other ways, Luke appears to be indebted theologically to John's theological presentation of Jesus' ongoing ministry as the risen Lord.

4) Acts 4.19-20- A First-Century Clue to Johannine Authorship?

A further connection which raises a striking set of implications is the fact that Luke unwittingly provides a clue to Johannine authorship which all sides of New Testament studies have apparently missed until now. Scholars are entirely aware of the view represented by Pierson Parker (1962, p. 35) several decades ago: the 'one assured result of biblical criticism' is that 'John, the Son of Zebedee, had nothing at all to do with the writing of this Gospel'. Indeed, present scholars have pervasively been taught that the earliest known connection between the son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel was Irenaeus, who confronted Marcion around 180 CE by citing references to John as the author of the Gospel that now bears his name. Therefore, given John's lateness, spiritual tone and differences from the Synoptic Gospels, most scholars have largely agreed with Parker despite the fact that none of his 21 points are compelling, either individually or collectively. What we have in Acts 4.19-20, however, may be a clue to Johannine authorship that moves the connection a full century earlier than Irenaeus. This finding could be highly significant and deserves scholarly consideration.

In Acts 4.19 Peter and John are mentioned as speaking. This, by the way, is the only time John is mentioned as speaking in the book of Acts, and he normally is presented as following in the shadow of Peter: The narration is then followed by two statements, and each of them bears a distinctively associative ring. The first statement, 'Judge for yourselves whether it is right to listen to you rather than God', is echoed by Peter in Acts 5.29 and 11.17, and it sounds like a typically Petrine leveraging of a human/divine dichotomy. On the other hand, the statement that we cannot help speaking about what we have 'seen and heard' (v.20) is clearly a Johannine logion! A similar statement is declared by the Johannine Elder in 1John 1.3, 'We proclaim to you what we have seen and heard from the beginning', and in Jn 3.32 Jesus declares what he has 'seen and heard' from the Father. A fitting question to ask is whether such a reference simply betrays Luke's conjectural way of presenting something. Certainly, Luke presents many people who have seen things or heard things, and this could quite possibly represent a Lukan convention. Upon examining the textual results, however, only a few times does Luke present hearing and seeing words together and in this sequence, and the only other time seeing and hearing verbs are used together and in the first person plural, as they are in Acts 4.20, is 1John 1.3.⁶ The first-century connecting of John the apostle with

6. See 'The Papias Tradition, John's Tradition and Luke/Acts' (Anderson, 1996, pp. 274-7).

a Johannine saying here approximates a fact. Luke may have been misguided, or even wrong, but this identification moves the apostolic association of the Johannine tradition with the disciple John a full century before the work of Irenaeus. Given Luke's dependence upon the Johannine oral tradition, and given the formative role John's material apparently played upon Luke's theological developments, this finding could be highly significant!

C. Contacts between John and Q?

Could it be that there were also contacts between the Johannine tradition and the Q tradition? This exploration is the most speculative, both in terms of the existence of Q and the question of whether similarities between Matthew, Luke and John imply some sort of contact between hypothetical Q and John. While there are several interesting connections between the Q tradition and John,⁷ the most fascinating contact is what has been called 'the bolt out of the Johannine blue'- Mt. 11.25-27 and Lk. 10.21-22. What is fascinating is that this passage, in Matthew and Luke but not in Mark, sounds very Johannine. Explanations assuming that John has employed Q do not suffice here. The best explanation is to infer that the Q tradition included a significant saying that sounds very Johannine. Consider these similarities between Matthew, Luke and John:

Table 3.1

Contacts between Jesus Sayings in John and Q

Mt. 11.25-7. At that time Jesus said, 'I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.'

7. See especially Jn 12.25, 'Those who love their life lose it, and those who hate their life in this world will keep it for eternal life', and its parallels in Mt. 10.39: 'Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it', and Lk. 17.33: 'Those who try to make their life secure will lose it, but those who lose their life will keep it'. See also the following connections between Q and John: a) Mt. 3.11a; Lk. 3.16a; Jn 1.26a; b) Mt. 3.9; Lk. 3.8; Jn 8.39; c) Mt. 9.37-8; Lk. 10.2; Jn 4.35; and d) Mt. 10.17-25; Lk. 12.11-12; Jn 13.16; 16.2; 14.26.

Lk. 10.21-2. At that same hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, 'I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father; for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows who the Son is except the Father; or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.'

Jn 3.35. The Father loves the Son and has placed all things in his hands.

Jn 7.28-9. Then Jesus cried out as he was teaching in the temple, 'You know me, and you know where I am from. I have not come on my own. But the one who sent me is true, and you do not know him. I know him, because I am from him, and he sent me.'

Jn 10.14-15. I am the good shepherd. I know my own and my own know me, just as the Father knows me and I know the Father. And I lay down my life for the sheep.

Jn 13.3-4. Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going to God, got up from the table, took off his outer robe and tied a towel around himself.

Jn 17.1-3. After Jesus had spoken these words, he looked up to heaven and said, 'Father; the hour has come; glorify your Son so that the Son may glorify you, since you have given him authority over all people, to give eternal life to all whom you have given him. And this is eternal life: that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent'.

Jn 17.22-5. 'The glory that you have given me I have given them, so that they may be one, as we are one, I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me. Father, I desire that those also, whom you have given me, may be with me where I am, to see my glory, which you have given me because you loved me before the foundation of the world. Righteous Father, the world does not know you, but I know you; and these know that you have sent me.'

(NRSV)

From these examples it can be seen that the Q tradition shows remarkable similarities with a prevalent Johannine motif. But what are the implications of such a connection? Either Q and John have a common origin in a tradition earlier than Q (perhaps going back to Jesus?), or we have a Johannine motif that has been apprehended and used extremely early, even by Q. The primitivity of the Johannine tradition thus is confirmed by either possibility, although the latter is

the most likely. Like the Lukan tradition, the Q tradition has apparently drawn on the Johannine tradition, probably during its oral stages of development. It is not assumed, however, that the bulk of Johannine tradition was available to the Q tradition, as some of it was still in the process of formation. The passages above may suggest Johannine familiarity with some of the content represented in the Q tradition, but more likely is the hypothesis that the Q tradition has drawn from the Johannine rendering of Jesus' ministry. Of course, it is also a possibility that Q and the early Johannine tradition represent independent primitive reflections upon the ministry of Jesus and/or some sort of interfluentiality, parallel to the Johannine and pre-Markan tradition. Because these themes are more pervasively Johannine, however it is most plausible to infer that Q has incorporated an early Johannine motif.

D. John's Relation to Matthew: Reinforcing, Dialectical and Corrective

John's relation to the Matthean tradition appears the most indirect among the canonical Gospels, and it seems to have involved a history of dialogical relationships between at least two sectors of the early church on important institutional and ecclesial matters. In some ways, the Matthean and Johannine sectors of the church were partners in the growing dialogues with local Jewish communities, especially along the lines of evangelizing the Jewish nation to accept its own Messiah: Jesus. These traditions also sought to preserve their own material and to make it accessible for later generations. In doing so, they may even have engaged each other, as well as other Christian traditions, regarding key matters such as discipleship, leadership and the ongoing work of the risen Christ within the community of faith.

1) Matthean and Johannine Sectors of Christianity: Reinforcing Each Other's Missions and Tasks

Several of the contacts or parallels between Matthew and John reveal growing Christian communities which are trying to demonstrate that Jesus was indeed the Jewish Messiah, who is also needed in the world beyond Judaism. Particularly strong are the parallels between their uses of Scripture and showing from the Law and the Prophets ways in which Jesus fulfilled the Scriptures as the Messiah/Christ. They also had considerable pedagogical works they were involved in, and the Matthean and Johannine sectors of the church probably had within their purview the task of discipling Christians, making their communities something like a 'school' or a centre for discipleship and training. Teaching interests and community maintenance concerns can be inferred most extensively in these two Gospels, and such communities may even have reinforced each other in their travelling ministries between fellowships and correspondence otherwise.⁸

8. A particularly interesting connection is the way Matthew and John both expand the passage from Isa. 6.9-10 (Mt. 13.14-15; Jn 12.37-40) as an explanation of why the Jews refuse

A particularly important task that both communities appear to have been sharing involved the managing of outreach to and tensions with the respective local Jewish presence. In the Matthean and Johannine settings alike, one or more Jewish Synagogues must have commanded a significant presence in the community (especially for those seeking to follow a Jewish Messiah), although such was an ambiguous presence. It may be that the *Birkat ha-Minim*, a ban excluding professing Christians from some Synagogues, may have been instrumental in followers of Jesus being excluded from Synagogue life in both settings, but the tensions need not have followed from such a particular development. Nor does the fact of its uneven application imply that things were not difficult for Jewish-Christian relationships in these settings. A possibility just as likely is that these communities probably experienced a mixed reception of openness and hostility from the local Jewish communities, and this ambivalence may even have precipitated the call for an exclusion clause, which the Twelfth Jannian Benediction was designed to accommodate. Whatever the case, Matthean and Johannine Christians shared a good deal of solidarity with one another. In seeking to evangelize Jewish family, friends and neighbours, they probably received mixed receptions and challenges to the authenticity of Jesus' mission, which led to their continuing emphases upon Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, sent from God after the pattern of the Mosaic prophet of Deut. 18.15-22.

2) Dialectical Relations between Johannine Christianity and Intramural Centralizing Tendencies

As tensions with Jewish sectors of communities grew and then subsided (they appear less acute in the supplementary Johannine material), tensions with Gentile Christians increased. In particular; debates over discipleship and what it meant to come 'out of' the world were acute concerns for the early Christian movement in the later part of the first century CE. These issues were exacerbated by the stepping up of Roman Emperor worship as a broad requirement under the reign of Domitian (81-96 CE). During this era in particular, subjects of the Roman Empire were expected to declare their loyalty openly to Rome by offering public Emperor laud (either declaring 'Caesar is Lord!' or by offering incense to Caesar – an act of worship – or both). This sort of practice had been the custom of Mediterranean residents for centuries, especially in Asia Minor; and it is likely that Gentile believers felt it was far less problematic than Jewish-Christian believers. A further impact of Synagogue exclusion was that those who were not deemed to be part of the Jewish faith would not have been covered by the Roman dispensation for Jews in deference to their peculiar monotheism, and they would then

to believe in their own Messiah. Such a passage was probably used within the worship and/or teaching settings of Matthean and Johannine Christianity. See also the similar Matthean and Johannine presentations of Jesus as one who was 'sent by the Father' as a typical feature of the Jewish agency motif rooted in Deuteronomy 18 (Anderson, 1999a).

have been expected to show loyalty to Rome or to suffer for the consequences of refusing to offer Emperor laud.

These issues led to a variety of further tensions as some Gentile/Christian leaders began preaching that one need not suffer for one's faith, and that it was not a problem to be a member of Roman society outwardly and still be a Christian. At this, the Johannine leadership probably responded, 'We must be willing to follow Jesus to the cross, ourselves, if we expect to be raised with him in the afterlife. Jesus suffered and died for us; can we do any less?', to which the docetizing leaders responded, 'No he did not! He was divine, not human.' In these sorts of ways, Docetism began to gain ground as a movement and as a threat to Christianity from within. It is a mistake, however, to confuse Docetism here with Gnosticism proper. The latter developed more fully in the second century, but it was not full blown in the first-century situation. The great initial appeal of Docetism was simply its implications for an assimilative and less costly view of discipleship. This was the reason it was opposed so vigorously by early Christian communities, especially the Johannine ones, and this explains the emphasis on a suffering and incarnate Jesus so rife in its presentation in the second-edition material and in the Johannine Epistles.

However, not all sectors of the Christian movement responded to these tensions in exhortative ways. Some sought to stave off the threats by means of imposing hierarchical structures of leadership, calling for submission to authoritative church leaders, thereby challenging alternative claims and movements. This can be seen explicitly in the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch, who sought to stave off docetizing defections by calling for adherence to one bishop and one worship service as expressions of one's loyalty to one's Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. In doing so, Ignatius built upon the Petrine model of Matthew 16.17-19 and 18.15-20, and he was probably not the only one to have done so. The occasion of the Johannine Elder's writing 3John to Gaius was that Diotrephes who 'loves to be first' had excluded Johannine Christians and had been willing even to expel members of his own congregation who were willing to take them in (vv. 9-10). Some scholars see the only issue here as having been hospitality, but inhospitality was a symptom of the problem, not the problem itself. The Elder describes writing to the *ecclesia* (the centralizing church?) about Diotrephes (whence he probably has drawn his positional authority), and he shows signs of also wishing to speak with him directly (Mt. 18.15-17). While this dialogue may not have been between Johannine and Matthean leadership directly, all it takes is one bad example for the Johannine leadership to feel this structural innovation may not have been an improvement after all.

On the matter of leadership, hierarchies and the role of the present Christ in the meeting for worship, the Johannine and Matthean leadership (as well as other Christian groups in the sub-apostolic era) must have invested a good deal of discussion together. At times, however, they may also have disagreed with one another, and such dialogues can be inferred within the dialectical set of relationships between Johannine and Matthean Christianities. For instance,

when asking why Diotrephes excluded Johannine Christians to begin with, it may have been due to their egalitarian and Spirit-based ecclesiology -and well he should have been threatened, because such a position would have undermined his very approach to holding his own church together, which was what the hierarchical innovations were designed to effect.

2) *The Finalized Gospel of John: A Corrective to Rising Institutionalism in the Late First-Century Church*

While the Beloved Disciple was alive and ministering authoritatively, the extending of his witness to the rest of the church may not have seemed as pressing. After his death, however, the compiler of the Fourth Gospel sought to gather and disseminate his witness within the broader Christian movement. In doing so, there was obviously interest in getting his story of Jesus out there where it could do some good, but part of the 'good' it was intended to effect was to outline the original intentionality of Jesus for his church. In John's final-edition material, one can see several impressive developments that confirm such a view. First, as an antidocetic corrective, this later material emphasizes the fleshly humanity of Jesus and the importance of the Way of the Cross for normative discipleship. Second, a great deal of emphasis has been placed in the accessibility and present work of the Holy Spirit as the effective means by which the risen Lord continues to lead the church. Third, the juxtaposition of Peter and the Beloved Disciple, especially clear in this supplementary material, reflects the presentation of the Beloved Disciple as the ideal model for Christian leadership in contrast to that which is represented by the miscomprehending Peter. All of this together suggests an interest in providing an apostolic corrective to rising institutionalism in the late first-century church in the name of Jesus' last will and testament.

Most strikingly, at least seven ways can be identified in which Matthew 16.17-19 is treated in parallel ways in John, but each of these parallels is different. Do these differences suggest a *corrective* interest? Quite possibly. For instance, consider the following:

Table 3.2

Matthew 16.17-19 and Corrective Echoes in John

- Peter's 'correct' confession is considered inspired (Mt. 16.17), but in John 'blessedness' is equated with serving others (13.17) and believing without having seen (20.29). The Johannine Macarisms are not all that striking a contrast to this one in Matthew 16, although the Johannine references to that which is blessed dearly call for a greater spirit of servanthood as far as Peter (and those who follow in his wake) is concerned and they include those who have not seen (beyond the apostolic band) and yet believe. These are both counter-hierarchical themes.

- The 'apostles' and leaders are not only men in John, but they also include women (4.7-42; 20.14-16; 12.1-8). John's presentation of women ministering to and on behalf of Jesus would have gone against the grain of emerging patriarchalism as the church entered the sub-apostolic era. This move (against innovation) suggests John's primitivity and traditional reasons for presenting women in the egalitarian ways it did. In the presentation of women as partners with Jesus in the furthering of God's work, John restores a set of insights -if not traditional memories -reminiscent of what may be assumed about the historical Jesus.
- The confessions of faith in John are reserved for Nathanael (1.49) and Martha (11.27), *not* members of the Twelve. The co-opting of 'the Twelve' in directions hierarchical may have been opposed by the Johannine tradition not because of its non-apostolicity, but precisely *because* of it. It is highly likely that not all members of the apostolic band felt equally enthusiastic about the emerging primacy of Peter, especially if the coinage were used to bolster the authoritarian leadership of some over others. Showing such persons as Nathanael and Martha making confessions, as well as Peter, must have functioned to broaden the base of Christian authority beyond the purview of 'the Twelve', and emerging leaders and others would have felt encouraged in such presentations.
- 'Flesh and blood' cannot recognize that kingly Messiah in Matthew, but in John, the flesh profits nothing (6.63) as discipleship leads to the cross (6.51). The connections here may not be all that close, but it is interesting to note that John's emphasis on assimilating the flesh and blood of Jesus refers to the costly discipleship of being willing to ingest the 'bread' of Jesus' flesh given for the life of the world. The reference is to the 'Way of the Cross' rather than the making of a correct confession, and the practical implications of such a presentation would have been significant.
- The image of the 'church' in Matthew is more 'petrified', while in John it is more fluid ('flock' - ch.10; 'vine and branches' - ch. 15) and exemplified by the Beloved Disciple. Peter is not entrusted with institutional keys in John, but the Beloved Disciple is entrusted with the mother of Jesus, a symbol of familiarity and relationality as bases of authority. In both cases a particular disciple is given an entrustment by Jesus, and these actions and images must have borne with them implications for carrying forward the ongoing work of Jesus. The relationality of the Johannine image, however, strikes against the institutional character of the Matthean image, although familial images within Matthew also abound. John's egalitarian ecclesiology thus appears to be in dialogue with more hierarchical ecclesiologies emerging within the late first-century church.

- Jesus gives Peter authority in Matthew, but in John (6.68-9) Peter gives authority to Jesus. Does John thereby present Peter as returning the keys of the Kingdom back to Jesus, where they belonged all along? This may be overstating it a bit, but the contrast is striking. Peter is portrayed throughout John as miscomprehending Jesus' teachings about servant leadership (chs 6, 13,21), and yet the Beloved Disciple always does it right. The point of John's rendering, however, is to emphasize the importance of Christ, through whom the Holy Spirit continues to lead the church with his life-producing words. It is highly significant ideologically that Peter is portrayed as affirming the immediacy of the ongoing work of the resurrected Lord. Likewise, while Peter is reinstated in John 21.15-17, it is with the proviso that his service be shepherding and nurturing, a contrast to the self-serving shepherds of Ezekiel34.
- Authority (responsibility) to loose and bind is given to *all* followers of Jesus in John (20.21-3), not just a few, and Jesus' 'friends' include those who know what the Master is doing, and those who do his work (On 15.14-15). John 20.21-3 is the passage most similar to Matthew 16.17- 19 and 18.15-20, and the threefold content here is highly significant. In this passage, the priesthood of all believers is laid out with stark clarity. Jesus first pneumatizes his disciples in ways that could not be dearer; he breathes on them and says: 'Receive the Holy Spirit!' Next, he apostolizes them and emphasizes that as the Father has sent him, he also sends them as apostolic envoys in the world. Finally, Jesus *sacerdotalizes* his disciples by giving them the responsibility to be forgivers of sins in the world. Here we see the expansion of apostolicity rather than its constriction, and such a movement would have been at odds with proto-Ignatian autocratic modes of governance if they were emerging by this time. Again, while similarities with Matthew 18.18-20 are striking here, it is doubtful that the Fourth Evangelist had a particular text in mind. Rather, the sort of centralizing work of some leaders, carried out by the likes of Diotrephes, 'who loves his primacy' (3 Jn 9-10) may have catalyzed the Johannine corrective in the name of the original intention of Jesus for his Church.

How long the Johannine and Matthean traditions may have been engaged in such dialogues is impossible to say. They may have been engaged dialogically for several decades, although the material in the M tradition referenced most directly in John appears to be the institutionalizing and organizing inclinations of the post-Markan set of Matthean concerns. It is fair to say that within Matthean Christianity there appear to have been a fair number of correctives to the sharper edges of institutionalization, as Matthew is also familial and is deconstructive- as well as bolstering- of Peter's image.⁹The M tradition

9. See Graham Stanton's excellent critique and my response to it in *IBR* 1, 1999, pp. 5.3-69.

eschews judgementalism and discourages uprooting the tares among the wheat for the good of the community, and while Peter receives the keys of the Kingdom, it is also Peter who is asked to forgive 7 times 70. Thus, the functionality of Matthean organization is typified by its capacity to be gracious and relational as well as structural. All it takes, however, is one strident example- such as Diotrephes and his kin- for hierarchical wieldings of Petrine authority to be experienced adversely within Johannine Christianity and beyond. These allergies to a 'new and improved' approach to organizational church life would have been all that was needed to have elicited a Johannine correction to perceived innovations and departures from the more charismatic and less formal way of Jesus. And, from what we know of the historical Jesus, the Johannine corrective was indeed grounded in authentic historical insight on that matter.

Findings

John's relation to the Synoptic Gospel traditions involved complex sets of relationships, and no monofaceted theory will suffice to account for the multiplicity of evidence and perplexities that present themselves for consideration. While John's Gospel may have been finalized last, its tradition did not originate late, and much of it represents an authentic reflection on the ministry of Jesus and its ongoing implications. But just as the Johannine tradition was not derivative from the Synoptic traditions, this does not mean its pervasive independence was the result of isolation or disengagement. Quite the contrary! The Johannine tradition engaged the pre-Markan tradition in the oral stages of their developments and sought to augment and complement the Markan written Gospel. John's oral tradition was a formative source for Q, and of Luke's two-volume project, and Luke has also left us an unwitting clue to Johannine authorship which has hitherto been completely undiscussed in the literature. John's relationship with the Matthean tradition was a dialectical one, and it posed an alternative answer to the most pressing issue of the church, in the late first-century and always. John's final edition points the way forward in terms of Christocracy: the effective means by which the risen Lord intended and intends to lead the church. In these ways, John's relation to the Synoptic Gospels was independent but not isolated, connected but not derivative, individuated but not truncated. In relation to the other Gospels John's was an engaged autonomy, and an overall theory of Johannine-Synoptic relations must include factors that were interfluent, formative and dialectical.

Table 3.3

A Charting of Johannine-Synoptic Interfluential Relations

