

3-5-1969

The Literary Relationship Between the Gospels of John and Luke with Special Reference to John 20:1-18

Thomas Niermann

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, tom.niermann@ni.lcms.org

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Niermann, Thomas, "The Literary Relationship Between the Gospels of John and Luke with Special Reference to John 20:1-18" (1969). *Master of Divinity Thesis*. 83.
<http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/83>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE LITERARY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
GOSPELS OF JOHN AND LUKE WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO JOHN 20:1-18

A Paper presented to
the department of Exegetical Theology
in fulfillment of the requirements
for EN-505, Research Elective

by

Thomas Niermann

March 5, 1969

63925

Approved by: Robert Smith
Advisor

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES | 1 |
| II. THE PROBLEM IN GENERAL | 4 |
| Parallels between John and Luke | 4 |
| The Traditional Opinion Regarding Lucan and Johannine Parallels | 7 |
| Dissenting Opinion | 8 |
| Present State of the Problem | 10 |
| III. A PROBLEM IN PARTICULAR: JOHN 20:1-18 AS A TEST CASE | 14 |
| Introductory | 14 |
| Agreements in Detail between John 20:1-18 and Luke 24 | 15 |
| Peter and John's Visit to the Empty Tomb | 22 |
| The Appearance to Mary Magdalene | 27 |
| Divergences | 37 |
| IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION | 41 |
| FOOTNOTES | 48 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 55 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

A problem that has long captured the critical attention of New Testament scholars has been the so-called Synoptic problem, which seeks to identify and explain the literary relationships that exist among the first three Gospels. A similar and no less vexing problem is that of the literary relationship between the Synoptics and the Gospel of John. Of the three Synoptics, Mark offers perhaps the most striking parallels with the Fourth Gospel and therefore the strongest evidence of literary dependence on the part of John.¹ Matthew, on the other hand, offers the fewest parallels and hence the least compelling evidence for such a dependency.² But Luke, in many ways, offers the most interesting parallels, and it is partly for this reason that his Gospel has been chosen for special study in this paper.

In scenes shared by John and several Synoptics the parallels between John and Luke are by and large not impressive. Rather, it is with the peculiarly Lucan material that John exhibits the important parallels. These parallels, which lie both in minute detail and in the broad sweep of the narrative, have suggested the strong possibility that the author of John knew and used the Gospel of Luke in the composition of his Gospel. This traditional view, however, has been sharply challenged by many critics, most of whom

regard the difficulties imposed by the many differences between the two Gospels as too great to admit the possibility of literary dependence. Progress in answering this question, of course, can only be made by examining each of the pericopes in detail in which parallels occur. If the position is taken that John knew and used the Gospel of Luke, then the critic must be prepared to explain the differences as well as the similarities that exist between the pericopes. Conversely, if the position is taken that John did not know or use Luke, the critic must then offer a reasonable explanation for such parallels that do exist.

The results of such an investigation, whether positive or negative, will bear important implications for the way in which one views the Gospel of John. If it can be reasonably demonstrated that John did not know or use Luke, then this would comprise an important argument for the relative independence of the Johannine tradition. But if the evidence favors such a dependency, then the critic may legitimately draw inferences for an exegesis of Johannine parallels. He may ask such questions as why did John use this detail and not this? What motives, literary or theological, underlie his use of Lucan material? Does an understanding of Lucan material contribute to a better understanding of Johannine material?

This paper is intended to be an exercise in such an investigation. First it will present a brief survey of the problem in general, especially as it has been treated by

various representative scholars. This is done partly to place the problem in perspective and partly because the arguments advanced by these critics must be taken into consideration in any further study of the problem. And secondly it will examine one pericope in detail as a test case, with a view to determining what literary relationships might exist between this pericope and the Gospel of Luke. During the course of examining the parallels which seem to indicate such a literary connection, attempts will be made to relate them to an exegesis of the Johannine passage.

The pericope chosen for detailed investigation is John 20:1-18, the resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene interwoven with the account of Peter and John's visit to the empty tomb.³ The conclusion arrived at in the course of this study is that John did know and use Luke. This statement does not claim, of course, that John used Luke in the same way, for instance, as Luke used Mark. All that is claimed is that John was fairly well acquainted with Luke's Gospel, and was influenced both positively and negatively at some points in the composition of his own Gospel.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM IN GENERAL

Parallels between John and Luke

At this point it is perhaps well to give a broad characterization of the kinds of parallels found between the Gospels of John and Luke that raise the question of literary relationship. The following list is adapted in a large measure from a study by J. M. Creed.¹ It is by no means exhaustive, but it does demonstrate that there are parallels to be found both in minute detail and in the broad sweep of the narrative.²

a. The figures of Mary and Martha are common only to John and Luke, both of whom characterize Martha as "serving" and Mary as devoting her attention to Jesus. Compare John 12:1-8 with Luke 10:38-42.

b. In the story of the anointing (John 12:1-8) John appears to be much closer to Mark 14:3-9 than to Luke. But in recording that Mary wiped Jesus' feet with her hair, he is reproducing with close verbal similarity the action of the sinful woman in Luke 8:38.

c. In describing the betrayal of Jesus only John and Luke record the fact that Satan entered into Judas, John 13:27 and Luke 22:3.

d. Similarly, in the narrative of the arrest only John and Luke specify that it was the right ear of the High Priest's

servant that was cut off, John 18:10 and Luke 22:50.

e. In the trial scene, both John and Luke record a total of three "not guilty" statements issued by Pilate, John 18:38; 19:4,6 and Luke 23:4,14,22.

f. In the trial before the Sanhedrin Luke alone records a double question put to Jesus regarding his Messiahship and divinity. This recalls a similar situation in John where Jesus in a totally different context is confronted by his Jewish antagonists with a twofold accusation regarding his Messiahship and divinity. Compare John 10:24-25,33 and Luke 22:67-70.

g. In the resurrection narratives John and Luke agree in saying that there were two angels at the tomb, John 20:12 and Luke 24:4. Furthermore, if the longer ending of Mark is disregarded, only these two evangelists record an appearance to the eleven on the evening of Easter day, John 20:19-23 and Luke 24:36-43.

h. Both evangelists report a miraculous catch of fish, though again not in the same context, John 21:4-8 and Luke 5:1-11.

i. Besides Mary and Martha mentioned above, there are certain personal names common only to John and Luke. Among these are Judas (not Iscariot; John 14:22 and Luke 6:16); Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31 and John 11:1ff.); and Annas (John 18:13 and Luke 3:2).

In addition to the above parallels in which a certain measure of verbal similarity evinces itself, there are certain

other characteristic features in which the two Gospels approximate one another. For instance, both record only one multiplication of loaves and fish. Both record a ministry in Samaria, which is not mentioned in Matthew or Mark. And both lay heavy stress on the Jerusalem appearances of the Risen Christ. Indeed, Luke confines all of the appearances to Jerusalem and its environs. This agrees with John 20, although John 21, which appears to be an appendix to the original ending, returns to a Galilean tradition.

On the basis of the above illustrations, several significant observations can be made about the nature of the parallels found between John and Luke. First of all, it is obvious that they are of a totally different sort than those which are encountered among the Synoptics. In most cases the points of contact are confined to small details, and seldom do the verbal similarities run concurrently for more than a few words or a phrase. And yet the details are often striking enough so that mere coincidence does not seem adequate to explain them. Secondly, significant parallels are not necessarily confined to parallel pericopes or even similar subject matter. Note, for instance, points f and h above. And finally, all of the parallels listed above, which represent the most important, are found in material that is peculiar to Luke, that is, in parts of his Gospel which he did not derive from Mark or from the hypothetical source which he shared with Matthew. Furthermore, with few exceptions these

parallels are confined to material connected in some way with the passion narrative.

The Traditional Opinion Regarding Lucan
and Johannine Parallels

The traditional way of explaining the points of contact between John and Luke is that John was acquainted with Luke's Gospel, knew its contents, and consciously or unconsciously reflected this knowledge in the composition of his own Gospel. Indeed, well before the advent of modern critical scholarship it was generally assumed that John was acquainted with the contents of Luke's Gospel as well as that of the other Synoptics. Already in the early fourth century Eusebius quotes Clement of Alexandria to the effect that John, divinely moved by the Holy Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel, having observed that the physical facts had been made plain in the three previous Gospels.³

In the era of modern critical scholarship, B. H. Streeter is perhaps the best representative of this traditional position.⁴ After carefully examining the points of contact, he reluctantly jettisons his former opinion that John knew only Mark and states that his study decidedly favors the view that John is dependent on Luke as well.⁵ He concludes that the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John form a series, Luke being dependent on Mark and John on both the others.⁶ Streeter's argument, it should be noted, is based almost exclusively on

the points of contact between the two Gospels. In other words, he makes no effort to explain the dissimilarities and contradictions between the two Gospels.

Dissenting Opinion

The traditional view, however, that John knew and used Luke, has been sharply challenged by many critics. Foremost among them are Julius Schniewind, Percival Gardner-Smith, and C. H. Dodd. All of them argue that John did not know Luke's Gospel and that another explanation for the agreements must be found.

Schniewind in his monograph, Die Paralleelperikopen bei Lukas und Johannes, was the first of these to examine the problem extensively.⁷ His study, first published in 1914, was limited to those pericopes in which a certain measure of verbal similarity could be shown. On the basis of a rather detailed examination, in which he discussed each apparent point of contact individually, he concludes that the evidence is not strong enough to demonstrate that John was dependent on Luke in a strictly literary way. Rather, he proposes that the relationship between the two Gospels is to be explained on the basis of a common oral tradition. Furthermore, he points out that wherever verbal agreement can be shown, it always appears in the "high point" of the situation as a salient, memorable feature. This observation, he argues, substantiates his conclusion, because it is precisely this

sort of thing which would be expected to happen in oral tradition.⁸

However, it was not until the appearance of Gardner-Smith's influential book, St. John and the Synoptic Gospels, that an explanation of Synoptic and Johannine parallels on the basis of oral tradition became popular and widely accepted.⁹ Like Schniewind he maintains that John did not know or use Luke (or any of the other Synoptics, for that matter) in the composition of his Gospel. But his method of argument is quite differently conceived than that of Schniewind. Instead of confining himself to Lucan parallels, he treats all of the Synoptics; and instead of examining the points of contact, he emphasizes the differences, inconsistencies, and contradictions that must be explained if one posits a knowledge and use of the Synoptics on the part of John.¹⁰ Nevertheless, he reaches the same conclusion as Schniewind, namely that there is very slender evidence on which to base a theory of literary dependence and that a much more satisfactory explanation is that John was merely drawing upon a common store of Christian tradition.¹¹ Where agreements in words and phrases occur, this agreement derives from the rather fluid stage of oral tradition when there was much intermingling of facts and details.¹² Gardner-Smith has found wide support for his views since the publication of his book in 1938. Among scholars who have been materially influenced by his argument are A. J. B. Higgins,¹³

T. W. Manson,¹⁴ and F. C. Grant.¹⁵

Finally, the most recent critic to argue extensively for the independence of the Johannine tradition is C. H. Dodd in his monumental work, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel.¹⁶ The conclusion he reaches in this study is that behind the Fourth Gospel lies an ancient tradition independent of the other Gospels and meriting serious consideration as a source for historical facts concerning Jesus Christ. Crucial to the defense of this thesis is the presupposition that John is not dependent on any of the Synoptic Gospels, including Luke.¹⁷ Like Gardner-Smith, he maintains that in cases where verbal similarities show themselves, these are to be attributed to the process of oral transmission, in which cross combinations of different features and details are incidental to the process of shaping individual units of narrative out of the primitive, unformed tradition.¹⁸

Present State of the Problem

In spite of the illuminating and weighty arguments of Schniewind, Gardner-Smith, and Dodd, the question of whether or not John knew and used Luke is still far from claiming a unanimous consensus among New Testament scholars. At the present time there seem to be at least three general hypotheses to account for the parallels between the two documents. One of these has been described in the previous section, namely that John did not know and use Luke, and that such parallels

as occur between the two evangelists are to be attributed to the use of similar but not identical oral tradition. This method of transmission would permit considerable variation while it would at the same time preserve salient details and memorable features. But there remain at least two other plausible explanations that merit consideration. The first is simply and obviously a return to the traditional position, that John did know and use Luke. The second is a variation of this, that John was acquainted with traditions behind Luke but not with Luke's Gospel itself.

Among recent critics who favor the traditional opinion that John knew and used Luke are C. K. Barrett, W. G. Kümmel, and J. A. Bailey. In his recent commentary on John, Barrett cites the study made by Creed¹⁹ and summarily affirms that there is no good reason why John should not have read Luke's Gospel or some early draft of it.²⁰ Kümmel offers his own, but unfortunately short, analysis of the problem and concludes that the literary connection between John and Luke is indisputable. He regards the account of the anointing in John 12 as the chief support for this conclusion and claims that in this pericope a knowledge of Luke by John is certainly to be supposed.²¹ Bailey, however, is the most recent critic to offer an extensive defense of this position. In his monograph, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John (1963), he maintains that John knew Luke's Gospel in its present form, that it was accessible to him, and that he

could consult it when he wished.²² Significantly, though, he does not attribute all of the similarities between Luke and John to literary dependence. At a large number of points he concludes that John and Luke were reproducing traditions which, though related, came independently to the two of them.²³

Bailey's reservation in regard to certain parallels suggests a variation to the theory that John knew and used Luke, namely that John did not know Luke but knew the traditions behind Luke. J. N. Sanders and Ivor Buse can be cited to illustrate this position.²⁴ Taking note of the fact that the important points of contact between John and Luke occur in material that is peculiar to Luke, Sanders suggests that Luke's tradition was in part dependent on that used by John, rather than the fact that John used Luke.²⁵ Buse, however, has worked through this possibility more carefully. In his study of the problem he has confined himself to the passion narrative, in which, incidentally most of the Johannine and Lucan parallels are found. He maintains that the most likely explanation of the agreements is that John and Luke were both sharing knowledge of the same passion source, certain elements of which they both incorporated into their own passion narratives.²⁶

In summary it can be said that there is still no general agreement among scholars on the question of the relationship between John and Luke. The fact that some sort of relationship exists is generally accepted in view of the many verbal

similarities and other evident affinities between the two documents. But whether these parallels are to be attributed to the use of common oral tradition, to the employment of common sources, or to direct literary dependence is still a matter open to further investigation.

CHAPTER III

A PROBLEM IN PARTICULAR: JOHN 20:1-18 AS A TEST CASE

Introductory

If nothing else, the previous chapter has shown that the question of whether or not John knew and used Luke in the composition of his Gospel is still ripe for investigation. The following chapter is an exercise in such an investigation. In order to arrive at a reasonable conclusion in the matter, it is obvious that a detailed examination is called for of individual pericopes in which parallels are found. Since it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine each of these pericopes, one of them has been chosen more or less as a test case. This pericope is John 20:1-18, the resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene interwoven with the account of Peter and John's visit to the empty tomb. The reasons for choosing this particular pericope are several. First and primarily, it is not the pericope which has been generally used as the main support for the theory of literary dependence between the two Gospels. Therefore it is likely that it has not been as exhaustively examined from this viewpoint as it might be.¹ Secondly, the parallels in this pericope are not exceptionally obvious, and yet in their totality they seem to be more than the product of mere coincidence. And thirdly, if these parallels are the result of John's having known and

used Luke, then certain interesting relationships can be seen between them and an exegesis of the Johannine passage.

The method which will be used in examining this pericope is as follows. First, an initial comparison will be made between John 20:1-18 and Luke 24 with an attempt to isolate individual points of agreement and to evaluate their weight as evidence for literary dependence. Then, after a reasonable probability has been established on this basis that John could have used Luke, an attempt will be made to discover and examine other similarities in which John might reflect his acquaintance with Luke. And finally, the important matter of differences and divergences will be discussed. For as R. Brown rightly points out, if a theory of literary dependence is posited, then a reasonable explanation must also be offered to explain the discrepancies.²

It is the opinion of this writer that a fairly convincing case can be made in favor of literary dependence and that the most satisfactory explanation of the agreements is that John knew Luke's Gospel, was conscious of its contents, and reflected this knowledge in the composition of this pericope.

Agreements in Detail between John 20:1-18 and Luke 24

An initial comparison of John 20:1-18 with Luke 24 reveals the following points of agreement which are common only to Luke and John. By and large, they represent the agreements most frequently cited to demonstrate John's knowledge of Luke

and provide perhaps the most convenient starting point for an examination of this pericope.³

a. Both John and Luke agree against Mark and Matthew in placing the women's visit to the tomb before sunrise.

Luke 24:1 reads *τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθείως* in agreement with John 20:1, *τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων... πρωὶ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης*. Both of these are in contrast to Mark 16:2, *λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων... ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, and Matthew 28:1, *ὄψε δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*.

b. Both John and Luke record that the stone had been removed from the tomb, while prior to this there had been no mention of a stone, John 20:1 and Luke 24:2.

c. Both evangelists record the appearance of two angels at the tomb, John 20:12 and Luke 24:4.⁴

d. In both accounts the angels' message is cast in the form of a question rather than a statement, as in Mark and Matthew. Compare John 20:13 and Luke 24:5 with Mark 16:6 and Matthew 28:5.

e. Mary's report to the disciples in John 20:18 is parallel to the women's report to the disciples in Luke 24:9-11 and could possibly represent a revision and correction of Luke.

f. That Mary did not recognize Jesus, John 20:14, is parallel to Luke 24:6 which records that the Emmaus disciples were kept from recognizing him.

g. Finally, there is an important negative agreement

in the fact that Luke 24:6 omits the instructions to the disciples to go to Galilee, in contrast to Mark 16:7 and Matthew 28:7. Thus, both John and Luke agree in the fact that the first appearance of Jesus before the disciples takes place in Jerusalem, John 20:19ff. and Luke 24:36ff.

How are these parallels to be evaluated? Obviously, they are not all of the same caliber nor do they carry equal weight as evidence for literary dependence. Julius Schniewind, for instance, notes the absence of exact verbal correspondences, and therefore sees no compelling evidence in them at all for positing a theory of direct literary dependence. The most that they indicate, he maintains, is that John and Luke were employing a common oral tradition.⁵ But perhaps a closer look is warranted. We may begin by discussing those parallels which appear to be the most tenuous and then proceed to those which offer more substantial evidence of literary connection.

The fact that both John and Luke record the message of the angels in the form of a question (d above) is perhaps the most tenuous of these parallels. Schniewind is undoubtedly correct when he says that in John the interrogative form follows naturally from the context.⁶ Hence there is no indication that John in this instance was relying on Luke, and the parallel appears to be coincidental. Similarly, not too much weight can be attached to the fact that both evangelists omit reference to the stone prior to the arrival of the women (b above). This could also be the result of

coincidence and, in any case, is an argument from silence.

That Mary's report to the disciples in John (e above) is parallel to the women's report in Luke and represents a conscious revision and correction of Luke appears at first sight to be somewhat better evidence in favor of John's use of Luke. But on closer examination this parallel is rather weak also. As Schniewind rightly observes, the verbal connection between the two verses is too loose to demonstrate a direct literary revision.⁷ A closer parallel, which will be discussed later in more detail, seems to lie between Mary's report to the disciples and the report of the Emmaus disciples in Luke 24:35. Admittedly, verbal agreements are lacking in this case also, but the function of the report within its immediate pericope is the same. In both cases the report of Mary and the Emmaus disciples serves to complete a resurrection appearance story revolving around the dominant motif of non-recognition.

Closely connected with this parallel is point f above. Both Mary and the Emmaus disciples do not recognize Jesus when he first appears on the scene. Schniewind again disagrees with the opinion that John derived this idea from Luke and maintains that the most this parallel indicates is that John and Luke share the same conception of Jesus' glorified body, namely that he can remain unrecognized when he wills.⁸ But while it is true that this parallel in itself does not demand an explanation of literary dependence, nevertheless, if the

probability of literary dependence can be established on other grounds, it could serve as supporting evidence. This parallel will also be discussed later in more detail.

A parallel that is more immediately striking is John and Luke's agreement in omitting the angels' reference to an appearance of Jesus in Galilee, with the result that both John 20 and Luke speak only of Jerusalem appearances of the Risen Christ (g above). Since this parallel involves a good deal of material which lies outside the pericope under study, it will not be discussed in detail. It may be suggested, however, that if John is following Luke in his report of the first resurrection appearances, this would offer a ready explanation why John speaks only of Jerusalem appearances in chapter 20 and does not return to the Galilean tradition until chapter 21, which incidentally has all the marks of a later appendix. In addition, Luke's exclusive emphasis on the Jerusalem appearances would appear to be especially appealing to John, who in contrast to the Synoptics emphasizes the Judean ministry of Jesus.⁹

Finally, there remain two other parallels which offer perhaps the most substantial evidence of literary connection. These are the placing of the women's visit to the tomb before sunrise and the mention of two angels at the tomb (a and c above). Again, Schniewind notes the absence of exact verbal agreement in these parallels and attributes them to the product of a common oral tradition.¹⁰ But on closer examination

one wonders whether this is not dismissing the evidence too lightly. B. H. Streeter attaches much more significance to them. "To prove literary dependence," he submits, "we must find examples of the use of language more or less identical, where the resemblance is of a kind not readily explicable by coincidence; or we must be able to detect additions or modifications of quite minor details of a kind not likely to have been preserved apart from the context in which they are embodied."¹¹ He considers the statement of the two angels in Luke 24 and John 20 to be of such a kind.¹² And to that might also be added the notice that the visit of the women occurred before sunrise. Both of these are rather minor details, and both look as if they were in fact derived from Luke. One could take issue with Streeter that such details "prove" literary dependence, but at least they establish a rather strong possibility that this might be the case.

Their weight as evidence for literary dependence is further increased when the following observations are made. In Luke the phrase which denotes the time before sunrise is the rather sophisticated rendering ὄρθρου βαθείως, which according to Liddell and Scott means "in the early dawn, just before daybreak."¹³ John, however, has the completely clear phrase πρῶτῃ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, "early, while it was still dark," which looks very much like a clarification and simplification of Luke's notice. This would also explain why this parallel agrees in substance but not in exact wording.

But of more decisive significance is the mention of two angels at the tomb in contrast to Mark and Matthew's mention of only one. In both John and Luke this is a rather minor modification. But in Luke it can readily be accounted for on the basis of his fondness for pairs, which he exhibits in numerous places.¹⁴ In John no such motive is apparent. Furthermore, a glance at the concordance reveals that in Luke's Gospel angels play a rather extensive role, but in John's Gospel their role is not at all prominent. In fact, apart from this particular occurrence John mentions angels only three other times and one of these is textually uncertain.¹⁵ All of the indications seem to point to the fact that John adopted the mention of the two angels from another source, and on the basis of the number "two" the most likely source appears to be Luke. Furthermore, to say that the doubling of the angels was a natural development of oral tradition and came to each of them independently is to overlook a simpler and more adequate solution, namely that John was simply reflecting his knowledge of Luke.¹⁶

In summary, it can be stated again that not all the parallels cited above have equal weight as evidence for a theory of literary dependence. At least two of them appear to be no more than coincidental, and others can only be used in a limited way as supporting evidence. However, the last two agreements discussed above offer enough evidence to establish at least a reasonable probability that John knew Luke's

account of the empty tomb and drew upon it in the composition of his own account. Once this probability is established, it then becomes legitimate to look for other ways in which John may have reflected his knowledge of Luke.

Peter and John's Visit to the Empty Tomb

Following Luke 24:11 the Authorized Version includes the following verse, "Then arose Peter and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." The resemblance between this verse and John 20:3-10 is remarkable, both in content and in verbal agreements.¹⁷ On the basis of this similarity it has been proposed that John constructed his fuller account of Peter and John's visit to the tomb by borrowing and expanding on details belonging to Luke's summary of the incident. This would indeed be a persuasive argument for John's dependence on Luke, if it were not for the fact that the Lucan text is highly doubtful. In spite of its excellent attestation (omitted only by D, it, and Marcion among the major witnesses, and therefore classified by Hort as a "Western non-interpolation") it is deleted by Nestle-Aland's text and generally regarded as spurious.¹⁸ On the whole the evidence points to an early interpolation on the basis of John's account.¹⁹

But if by general agreement Luke 24:12 is regarded as

spurious there still remains Luke 24:24 with its notice of what appears to be the same incident, "Some of those who were with us went to the tomb, and found it just as the women had said; but him they did not see."²⁰ In one respect this agrees even more closely with John 20:3-10 than does Luke 24:12, since it mentions more than one individual who goes to the tomb on the basis of the women's report.

But assuming that both Luke 24:24 and John 20:3-10 refer to the same incident (and there is no good reason not to), the question still remains, could John have constructed his account on the basis of this single verse? Noting the brevity of Luke 24:24 and the dissimilarity of language, Schniewind concludes that this is inconceivable. Rather he sees Luke 24:24 and John 20:3-10 as merely reflecting the same tradition, which in John shines through clearly but in Luke appears only in summary fashion.²¹ Bailey follows him in this explanation.²² On the other hand, Streeter maintains that "the visit of Peter and another disciple to the tomb recorded by John gives detail and precision to the Lucan statement."²³ As for John's motive in doing this, Streeter suggests that this account represents an attempt on John's part to provide names for the anonymous disciples in Luke, comparable to other instances in which John provides names for persons or places left nameless in the Synoptics. By way of example he cites such instances as the naming of Peter and Malchus in John 18:10 and the naming of Bethany as the home of Mary and Martha in

John 11:1.²⁴

Streeter's argument is not without its weak points. For one thing, it could be objected that these are not really analogous cases. Assuming for the moment that John on occasion does supply names for otherwise anonymous persons and places which he encounters in the Synoptics, in the case of John 20:3-10 he would be supplying not only individual names but an entire incident to identify these disciples! But granting this objection, is there anything else that would commend Streeter's view that John was creating an account to give detail and precision to the Lucan statement? On closer examination several things can be said in his support. For one thing, John 20:2-10 has all the appearances of an artificial account created by the evangelist and inserted into the account of Mary Magdalene, John 20:1, 11-18. This is indicated by the marked unevenness which is evident between the two accounts. For instance, for some inexplicable reason Mary doesn't meet the two disciples as she is returning to the tomb and they are coming from it. Indeed, her return is not so much as mentioned and in verse 11 she is suddenly standing at the tomb again. Furthermore, her message to Peter and John is identical to her response to the two angels in verse 13. Thus, verse 2 looks like an editorial attempt to integrate the two stories. Because of this unevenness, Bultmann concludes that these two accounts had obviously never formed an original unity and that the story of Peter

and the Beloved Disciple is without a doubt the product of the evangelist.²⁵

In the second place, if John did create this story and if he did create it on the suggestion of Luke 24:24 as Streeter maintains, this would not be the only place in John's Gospel where such a phenomenon appears to take place. For instance, Creed points out that the scene of the foot washing in John 13:1-17, which is peculiar to John, recalls the saying found in Luke 22:27, "I am among you as one who serves," which is peculiar to Luke, and suggests that this saying is perhaps the original source of the Johannine narrative.²⁶ This view is also shared, incidentally, by Bultmann²⁷ and Strauss.²⁸

And finally it can be said in support of Streeter's view that if John knew Luke (and a probability of this has already been established) then it is entirely reasonable to assume further that the notice in Luke 24:24 may have suggested his creating and inserting of the account. His motives for doing this may have been several. Indeed, as Streeter suggests, he may wish to clarify the identity of the anonymous disciples. But more than this! Behind his account may lie a desire to make disciples and not just women the first to examine the empty tomb and therefore be the first and chief witnesses of the resurrection.²⁹ In this sense he would be correcting the impression that Luke gives. Furthermore, it is not just any disciples but Peter and the Beloved Disciple who serve this function, and significantly it is the Beloved Disciple

who apparently is the first to come to faith, verse 8. In this connection it is interesting to note how this account conforms to other accounts in John's Gospel where Peter and the Beloved Disciple are juxtaposed. Here as elsewhere, the story redounds to the credit of the Beloved Disciple.³⁰ He outruns Peter, reaches the tomb first, sees the linen clothes first and as verse 8 suggests is the first to believe.³¹ This not only supports the view that the whole incident was created by the evangelist but gives an insight into his motive. It is the Beloved Disciple who is the first and chief witness of the resurrection. He is the ideal representative of seeing and believing at its best.

To summarize. The similarity between Luke 24:24 and John 20:3-10 is not such as to provide conclusive proof of literary dependence. But on the other hand, a theory that John knew and used Luke, and specifically that Luke 24:24 suggested to John the creation of his account, appears to be the simplest and most adequate way of explaining the similarity between the two accounts in a way that a recourse to common tradition does not. For if it were granted that only a common tradition lay behind both of these accounts, then the tradition which is discoverable with any certainty in John's account amounts only to the mention of more than one disciple's going to the tomb on the basis of what a woman told them.³² This corresponds exactly to what Luke states in verse 24, with the exception that Luke mentions women in the plural. Again, to

resort to a common tradition to explain this similarity is to overlook a far simpler and more adequate solution, namely that John was reflecting his knowledge of Luke, and in part reacting negatively to it by transferring the examination of the empty tomb and therefore the first witness of the resurrection from the women to Peter and the Beloved Disciple.

The Appearance to Mary Magdalene

A closer look at John's account of the resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene also reveals other significant similarities to Luke's Gospel, which may be a reflection of John's knowledge and use of Luke. These parallels may be discussed under the broad headings of form and detail.

In regard to the form of the narrative C. H. Dodd has included this pericope in an essay of his on form criticism of the Gospels, dealing specifically with the appearances of the Risen Christ.³³ Before entering upon a discussion of this particular pericope, it may be helpful to review his findings in general. In his essay Dodd distinguishes between two clearly discernable types of resurrection appearance stories analogous in form to stories found elsewhere in the Gospels. The first of these is the concise type, similar in form to "Pronouncement-stories" or "Miracle-stories." It can be described as an extremely economical style of narrative, with few or no extraneous details, in which everything leads up to and is subordinate to a saying. It is characteristic of

folk tradition, "in which an oft repeated story is rubbed down and polished, like a water-worn pebble, until nothing but the essential remains, in its most arresting and memorable form."³⁴ In this concise type of appearance narrative the following common elements can be distinguished: (a) the situation: Christ's followers bereft of their Lord; (b) the appearance of the Lord; (c) the greeting; (d) the recognition; and (e) the word of command. As an example of this type Dodd cites Matthew 28:8-10, Jesus' appearance to the women coming from the tomb.³⁵

The second type of appearance story is the circumstantial type, similar in form to "Novellen" or "Tales." These types allow more room for the taste and ability of the individual author and are closer to the "unformed," or free, body of reminiscences which must have floated about in early Christian circles. They trace the course of an incident from stage to stage with heightening interest and make it vivid to the reader by means of arresting details and traits of character in the actors and speakers.³⁶ In general they follow and expand on the outline characteristic of the concise type, although, as Dodd cautions, it is not to be supposed that they are conscious developments of the concise type. Rather, they represent the freer and more individual treatment of still "unformed" tradition which has not yet been stereotyped and abbreviated into the concise type.³⁷ As an example of this type of appearance story, Dodd cites the

appearance to the Emmaus disciples.³⁸

Besides these two clearly distinguishable types, there remain several resurrection narratives which do not conform in all respects to either type, and which appear to be mixed or intermediate types. Perhaps the most baffling of these, which Dodd cites and discusses, is the appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene, John 20:11-18. At first sight, Dodd says, it appears natural to include it among the class of concise narratives. It is told briefly and with great economy of words. Moreover, the basic pattern is clearly recognizable: (a) Mary stood by the tomb; (b) Jesus appeared; (c) He greeted her; (d) She recognized him; and (e) He gave her a command. But beyond this brevity and economy of words the resemblance to the concise type of narrative ceases. Instead, the narrator has succeeded in conveying a rather profound character portrait of Mary Magdalene, replete with psychological traits, arresting details, and a subtle, delicate approach to the depths of human experience, all of which is quite alien to the naivete characteristic of the concise type of narrative. In this respect the pericope conforms more closely to the circumstantial type. On the basis of these observations, Dodd concludes that this story, with its marked individuality, never came out of a common stock of tradition, either "formed" or "unformed." Instead, he sees only two alternatives. Either the story is a free, imaginative composition based upon a bare tradition of an appearance to Mary Magdalene, or else it came through

some highly individual channel directly from the source.³⁹

A comparison of this pericope with the resurrection appearance to the Emmaus disciples in Luke 24:13-35, however, reveals a surprising similarity which may shed some light on its admittedly enigmatic character. Both of them, of course, conform to the skeleton outline of elements which is common to both concise and circumstantial types of narrative. But the agreement goes much deeper than this. In both accounts, the story is developed on the basis of this outline in a remarkably similar fashion, in a way that other resurrection stories are not.

The stories begin by explicitly emphasizing the sadness on the part of the principal characters. Mary stood weeping, John 20:11, and the Emmaus disciples stood still, looking sad, Luke 24:17. Then, when Jesus suddenly appears on the scene he is not recognized. Mary saw Jesus standing but she did not know that it was Jesus, John 20:14, and in the case of the Emmaus disciples their eyes were kept from recognizing him, Luke 24:16. This emphasis on the element of non-recognition, in fact, strikes the dominant note of similarity and provides the central point of dramatic tension around which both stories turn.⁴⁰ Next, while Jesus remains unrecognized, profound skepticism is expressed on the part of the characters. Mary supposed that the gardener had taken Jesus away, John 20:15 and the Emmaus disciples pessimistically confided to the stranger, "But we had hoped that he was the

one to redeem Israel," Luke 24:21. Then, after the suspense of non-recognition has been sufficiently heightened, the denouement comes. Jesus reveals himself through a familiar action. In Mary's case it is the simple pronouncement of her name, John 20:16, and in the case of the Emmaus disciples Jesus took bread and their eyes were opened, Luke 24:31. Finally, both Mary and the Emmaus disciples hurry off to tell their news to the rest of the disciples, John 20:18 and Luke 24:35.

How are these similarities in the development of the story to be accounted for? It is conceivable, of course, that they are the result of a happy coincidence. After all, the motif of non-recognition is something that any good story teller is likely to seize upon and develop to its fullest. If that is the case, we would be no closer to solving Dodd's dilemma concerning the uniqueness and individuality of the Johannine story, that is, whether it is the evangelist's own imaginative composition or a story that came through some highly individual channel directly from the source. But on the other hand, is it too wild a leap of academic speculation to suggest that John may have patterned his account after Luke's memorable treatment of the Emmaus disciples? This would, in the first place, explain the marked similarity in development and, secondly, solve Dodd's dilemma by indicating that John's appearance narrative is indeed his own composition based upon a common tradition about Mary Magdalene.

The explanation sounds attractive but are there any observations that would tend to corroborate it? A closer examination of the pericope reveals traces of rather pronounced editorial activity which may indicate that the author did in fact compose this story rather freely out of an existing tradition, rather than reproduce it from some highly individual source. Bultmann, in his form critical analysis of John 20:1-18, indicates that the tradition which lay behind John's account was originally quite different from the way in which John presents it. As was noted above, the story of Peter and John's visit to the empty tomb appears to be the composition of the evangelist. But in the creation of this story, Bultmann suggests that the evangelist may have woven into it certain elements which originally belonged to the Mary Magdalene story, for instance the finding of the grave clothes. Furthermore, a comparison of the angels' function in John's account with the angels' function in the tradition represented by the Synoptics reveals that something is amiss. In the Synoptics the angels announce the resurrection and commission the women to take this news to the disciples. But in John Jesus takes over their function and the angels are really superfluous. Because of these discrepancies, Bultmann suggests that John has quite completely remolded a tradition which originally was similar to the Synoptic stories of the women's visit to the empty tomb. In the Synoptic stories the visit to the empty tomb affords an opportunity for the angels' interpretation

and commission. John, however, has reworked the story so that Jesus himself appears and gives the commission.⁴¹

If Bultmann is correct, then the story of Mary Magdalene was originally no resurrection appearance story at all, but an empty tomb story that has been recast to form an appearance story. This would go far in explaining why it conforms to neither of Dodd's types. Furthermore, if John did completely rework this story, the question may be asked, where did he get the idea to develop it in the manner he did? Again, in view of the many similarities is it too unreasonable to suppose that he patterned it after Luke's memorable treatment of the Emmaus disciples? The theme of non-recognition which is so prominent in Luke's story would certainly have appealed to John. Just as in the story of Peter and John's visit to the tomb he presents the ideal witness who "sees and believes," so also in this story he presents another character essay, as it were, on the theme of seeing and believing, revolving around the motif of non-recognition. Mary sees the Lord, and yet does not see him until it is given her to see.

In addition to the marked similarities in the narrative development between John 20:11-18 and Luke's account of the Emmaus disciples, there are also certain individual details in this pericope which are reminiscent of Luke's Gospel. These come to the fore when we examine the character of Mary Magdalene as John presents her.

In spite of the penetrating character portrait which the

evangelist paints of her, Mary Magdalene still remains a rather enigmatic figure. From about the sixth century it was a widely accepted view in the Western church that she was to be identified with Mary of Bethany and the unnamed sinner of Luke 7:36-50. As E. P. Blain points out, this identification probably arose because of the similarities in the anointing stories of Luke 7:36-50 and John 12:1-8, and the unfounded supposition that Mary Magdalene's seven demons, Luke 8:2, were demons of unchastity.⁴² However, P. Ketter in his book The Magdalene Question has rather conclusively disproven this view on the basis of the Gospel record and the church fathers. He shows that in all probability these women were originally and historically three separate individuals.⁴³

But be that as it may, it is interesting to note how this identification came about, especially between the unnamed sinful woman of Luke 7 and Mary of Bethany in John 12. In the latter passage it appears that John has made a rather unhistorical use of detail which originally belonged to Luke's story of an anointing. He records that Mary wiped the feet of Jesus with her hair, John 12:3, the same action which Luke predicates of the sinful woman in Luke 7:38. Thus it is that John virtually identifies her with the sinful woman of Luke's Gospel.⁴⁴

If this is correct, and a rather strong case can be made for the fact that John was actually drawing upon Luke's account in this case,⁴⁵ could it also be possible that John is echoing

certain details from the same account in his character portrayal of Mary Magdalene in John 20:11-18? A closer look at the details reveals some haunting similarities. In John Mary comes on the scene weeping. At once this is reminiscent of the woman in Luke 7:38 who is also weeping. Then, when Jesus appears on the scene, he is standing behind Mary, a pose that is exactly opposite to Luke's scene in which the woman stands behind Jesus. In John Mary addresses Jesus as teacher, the same designation which is applied to Jesus in Luke 7:40. And finally in John's account Mary attempts to touch Jesus, just as in Luke 7:39 the sinful woman is described as touching Jesus.

These similarities, of course, are not offered with the intention of obscuring the fundamental difference between the two stories. They are obviously quite differently conceived in content, purpose, and character portrayal. In Luke the woman is plainly a repentant sinner. In John there is no such hint about Mary. But assuming for the moment that Luke's story of the sinful woman did come to John's mind as he was composing his account of Mary Magdalene, what would have appealed to him about this story? Another look at the similarities may provide a clue. In this connection one thing stands out more than anything else. By and large the similarities are reversed. In Luke the woman is standing behind Jesus, while in John it is Jesus who is standing behind. In Luke Jesus permits the woman to touch him, but in John he

does not. In Luke Jesus permits himself to be called teacher, but in John there is an implication in the mild rebuke, "Do not touch me," that the old relationship of teacher and follower is not to be resumed.

If John did know Luke's story of the sinful woman, as the evidence of John 12:2 seems to indicate, is it too unreasonable to suggest that he was consciously or unconsciously using certain elements belonging to it as a foil to emphasize the fact of a new relationship between the Risen Lord and his followers? Indeed, the motif of a changed relationship is certainly prominent in this account, even apart from the apparent similarities to Luke 7. As Bultmann points out, Mary's address, which differs significantly from that of Thomas in John 20:28, shows that she had still not fully recognized Jesus as the Resurrected One. Instead she misunderstands him, as if he would again be what he was before, simply the Teacher. In short, she wants to renew the old relationship and embrace Jesus as a long lost friend. And so Jesus must first of all preclude that by the words, "Do not touch me," signifying that a new kind of relationship was henceforth to be in effect.⁴⁶ But the question can still be raised. Could John, as he conceived of this new, changed relationship, have mentally compared it to the old relationship exemplified in Luke 7? And could he have betrayed his comparison by echoing certain details from this story?

This is a case, however, in which the similarities

between John and Luke can in no sense be advanced as positive evidence for literary dependence. But if it can be shown on other grounds that John knew Luke's Gospel, then this may indeed be an instance in which he has reflected this knowledge.

Divergences

Finally, the important matter of divergences must be briefly discussed. For if the parallels seem to indicate that John was reflecting his knowledge of Luke, then some explanation of the differences must also be offered before a convincing case can be made for literary dependence. It is the opinion of this writer that such differences as occur between John 20:1-18 and Luke's Gospel can be adequately explained as the result of either a deliberate omission or a conscious revision on the part of the evangelist, for motives that are either theological, apologetic, or literary.

Before examining the differences, however, one thing should be kept in mind. Just as the parallels between John and Luke are not analogous to the parallel passages among the several Synoptics, so also the differences are not analogous either. In other words, it is not claimed that John is following Luke in the sense of revising a written "Vorlage." Therefore one cannot examine the differences by laying the stories side by side and discussing every diverging word and statement. Rather, the only differences that can meaningfully be discussed are those that deal with factual

details, that is, instances in which Luke makes or implies a statement of detail, which John then contradicts, either by omitting it or by saying or implying something contrary to it.

We may begin by listing the differences to which Gardner-Smith calls attention. These can be summarized as follows:

(a) John speaks of only one woman who goes to the tomb, while Luke mentions several by name; (b) The examination of the empty tomb which Luke ascribes to the women is transferred by John to Peter and the Beloved Disciple, while Mary remains outside; (c) In Luke the angels rebuke the women for their failure to anticipate the resurrection and remind them of the prophecy of Jesus while he was still in Galilee, while in John all of this is omitted.⁴⁷ These differences are essentially the same ones that are cited by Dodd in a somewhat different form.⁴⁸ To this list might also be added the following two differences: (d) In Luke the women come with the intention of anointing Jesus' body, while John gives no reason for Mary's coming; and (e) The report of the women in Luke 24:11 meets with incredulity, whereas Mary's report in John 20:18 is apparently accepted.

How are these differences to be explained? Most if not all of them can be accounted for as the result of John's deliberate treatment of his material, rather than by appealing to his supposed ignorance of Luke. We may examine them by taking John 20:1-18 as it stands. First, John does not mention the fact that Mary came to anoint Jesus' body

precisely because he had already recorded in 19:38-42 that Joseph and Nicodemus had performed this rite. Indeed, behind the latter account may lie an apologetic motive to correct the Synoptic impression that Jesus was hastily and irreverently buried. Secondly, it may very well be that John speaks of only one woman who goes to the tomb, precisely because he is going to focus upon the experience of this one woman as an example. Therefore, he has no need to mention the other women, although in 20:2 the plural verb *οἶδμεν* may betray his knowledge of more than one woman. In the third place, we have already alluded to the reason why John may have transferred the examination of the empty tomb from the women to Peter and the Beloved Disciple. As was pointed out above, behind this transferral may lie a desire to present the Beloved Disciple as the first and ideal witness of the resurrection, who believes on the very slenderest of evidence, that of the empty tomb. Furthermore, there is the strong possibility that John has reedited a story which originally did speak of Mary examining the tomb, ascribing this element of the story instead to Peter and the Beloved Disciple for the reason given above.⁴⁹ Fourthly, if John did rework the story rather extensively, this would explain why the angels' function in Luke is largely ignored. For John in effect transfers the function of the angels to Jesus himself. It is Jesus' own presence which interprets the meaning of the empty tomb, rather than the message of the angels. Hence they need play

no real part. And finally, in regard to how the disciples received the report about the Risen Christ, John cannot include an element of incredulity on the disciples' part as Luke does, precisely because he has recorded that two disciples had already come to faith on the basis of the empty tomb.⁵⁰ In this sense, then, he is consciously revising Luke's account for rather obvious reasons.

The divergences, therefore, that exist between John 20:1-18 and Luke's Gospel do not necessarily demonstrate that John was ignorant of Luke's account. Such divergences as there are can be traced to John's deliberate treatment of his material.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As chapter two demonstrated, the question of whether or not John knew and used Luke in the composition of his Gospel has by no means claimed a unanimous consensus of opinion among present day scholars. In that connection it became evident that a good deal more discussion was called for of individual pericopes in which parallels occur. Chapter three represented an attempt to contribute to that discussion by examining one pericope in detail, John 20:1-18. At this point it is perhaps well to summarize the findings and to suggest with more precision a possible conclusion to which the evidence seems to point.

An initial comparison of John 20:1-18 with Luke 24 reveals several points of agreement in individual details, not all of which, however, have equal weight as evidence for literary dependence. Some of these agreements are no doubt the result of coincidence and others are perhaps questionable. But the strongest single piece of evidence that John knew and used Luke is the mention of two angels at the tomb on Easter morning. All of the indications point to the fact that John reproduced this from a source, and the most likely source, it was suggested, appears to be Luke. If this does not prove literary dependence, at least it establishes a rather strong possibility that this might be the case and, at any rate,

legitimizes the search for other parallels in which John might betray his knowledge of Luke.

A further examination of the pericope does indeed reveal several other parallels between the two Gospels. First of all, there is the important agreement between John 20:3-10 and Luke 24:24, both of which passages record a visit to the empty tomb by certain disciples. This agreement becomes even more significant when it is observed that John's fuller account appears to be for the most part his own creation, designed for the purpose of having Peter and the Beloved Disciple be the first to examine the empty tomb and therefore be the first and chief witnesses of the resurrection. And since the tradition which is discoverable with any certainty behind John's account amounts only to what Luke mentions in 24:24, it was suggested that perhaps John did construct his account on the basis of Luke's fragmentary notice. In effect he would have been using Luke as the factual basis and documentation for his fuller account.

Examining the pericope further, one also finds a marked similarity in the way John and Luke develop their first resurrection appearance stories. The story of Mary Magdalene in John and the story of the Emmaus disciples in Luke both revolve around the central dramatic motif of non-recognition. Again this agreement becomes even more significant when it is observed that John's account appears to be a rather free reworking of a tradition which originally spoke only of Mary's

visiting the empty tomb. If indeed John did rework this tradition in order to make an appearance story out of it, it was suggested that perhaps Luke's story of the Emmaus disciples provided him with a pattern on which to develop it, a pattern that certainly would have appealed to him and in which he would have seen significant possibilities. For in John the motif of non-recognition is central not only to the development of the story but also to its purpose. In effect he has made out of this story a "character essay" on the theme of seeing and believing, revolving around the motif of non-recognition.

And finally some intriguing similarities can be seen between John's character portrait of Mary Magdalene and the story of the anointing woman in Luke 7. The significant thing to be noted in this regard is that by and large the points of similarity are reversed. The pose, the attempt to touch, the address "teacher" are all handled oppositely in both accounts. Since John elsewhere appears to betray his knowledge of Luke 7 (cf. the anointing story in John 12), it was suggested that perhaps he is echoing Luke's account in this instance also. In that case he would be using these elements more or less as a foil to emphasize the fact of a new relationship between the Risen Lord and his followers.

What are we to make of these parallels? The evidence is by no means absolutely conclusive. If it were then the question of literary dependence would have been settled long before this. But if the evidence is not conclusive, at

least it is cumulative. It appears that the most satisfactory explanation of the parallels is that John was fairly well acquainted with Luke's Gospel, knew its contents, and reflected this knowledge at some points in the composition of his own Gospel.

If that explanation is correct, then at least two other questions are immediately in order. First, exactly what kind of literary dependence is claimed in this statement? It is obvious, of course, that John is not following Luke in the sense of revising a written "Vorlage," as for instance Luke had used Mark. This has been pointed out before. The kind of literary dependence that is indicated, however, is a very loose one and a very selective one. In fact, when one compares the two Gospels in their totality, it is evident that very few Lucan elements have actually found their way unaltered into John's Gospel. And in cases where John does seem to be employing Lucan elements, as in the pericope just studied, he has so thoroughly incorporated them into his own presentation, both linguistically and theologically, that little if any of their original intention remains.

This apparent disregard for the original context and purpose of the incorporated material suggests that John may well have used Luke from memory. C. Goodwin has clearly demonstrated this possibility by his study of the manner in which John freely and often loosely quotes the Old Testament. He shows that in cases where John does use the Old Testament

he is apparently using it from memory. This is indicated by the way in which he often conflates two or more passages, distorts their meaning and hides their original context, while at the same time accommodating such material to his own purposes regardless of its original intent. If John used his only explicitly acknowledged source in this way, Goodwin argues, may it not also be possible that he is using his unacknowledged sources in the same way, specifically the Synoptics?¹ This is a plausible argument, and such a theory would agree well with the findings of this paper. If John was using Luke from memory then the notice of the disciples' visit to the tomb, the motif of non-recognition, and certain elements from the anointing story in Luke 7 would appear to be precisely the sort of elements that John could have remembered and which would have appealed to him for purposes of his own. And true to his characteristic use of the Old Testament, he obviously ignores the original context and meaning of these Lucan elements and accommodates them to his own presentation.

Be that as it may, however, a question that is ultimately of more importance is this. What implications does this literary dependence have for an exegesis of John's Gospel? When parallels are found between John and Luke, it is obvious that they cannot be used for an exegesis in the same way that Synoptic parallels are used. Since John so often ignores the original context and intent of his imported material, it

would be a fruitless task in most cases to compare his handling of the material with the original source in hopes of detecting illuminating differences and gaining exegetical insights. Rather the value of these parallels for an exegesis of John's Gospel lies in another use of them. When parallels can be discovered, they are usually a strong indication that John is rather freely composing the particular account in question. One may then ask, why did he compose it in the way he did? What was his purpose and intention? In most cases the answers to those questions will come from the context in John. But in some cases a comparison of the parallels can yield valuable insights and corroborating evidence. For instance, the fact that both evangelists mention certain disciples who visit the empty tomb on Easter morning suggests that perhaps John borrowed this element from Luke. The exegete may then ask, why did he reproduce and enlarge upon such a minor detail mentioned only in passing by Luke? By turning to the context in John and noting John's characteristic treatment of the Beloved Disciple, the answer becomes evident. John wanted to make the Beloved Disciple the first and chief witness of the resurrection and present him as the ideal type of seeing and believing. Again, the fact that both evangelists construct their first resurrection appearance stories around the motif of non-recognition suggests that perhaps John patterned his story after Luke. The exegete may then ask, why would John have seized upon this particular element?

Again by turning to the context one sees a possible answer. Just as the Beloved Disciple is a type of one who sees and believes, so also Mary is another type, who sees and yet does not see until it is given her to see. Likewise, in noting the reversed similarities between Mary and the woman in Luke 7 one may ask what would have appealed to John about these particular elements? And looking at the context one sees a possible answer in the theme of a new relationship between Master and disciple. In the final analysis it is such insights as these that justify the search for Johannine and Lucan parallels.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

¹For an example of a recent scholar who posits such a dependency between John and Mark see C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: S. P. C. K., 1967), pp. 34-45.

²Few scholars, in fact, claim that John knew and used Matthew. In the few passages that are parallel between the two Gospels, one could just as well suppose John's dependence upon Mark as upon Matthew, since such parallels are found in Mark also. See W. G. Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament, founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm and translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. (14th revised edition; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 144-145.

³For the sake of convenience only and without making any judgment as to the identity of the Beloved Disciple in John 20:2, he will be referred to variously in this paper as John or the Beloved Disciple.

CHAPTER II

¹The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 318-321.

²For a quite exhaustive list of possible parallels between John and Luke see H. Gausson, "The Lucan and the Johannine Writings," The Journal of Theological Studies, IX (1908), 562-568. Gausson lists parallels under six headings: (a) parallelisms in the treatment of the same subject matter; (b) parallelisms in the treatment of different subject matter; (c) resemblances of form or subject matter in discourses; (d) phrases; (e) words; and (f) names. Many of these parallels are perhaps questionable, but in their totality they do demonstrate a remarkable affinity between the two Gospels.

³Eusebius Church History VI, 14. 7.

⁴The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan and Company, 1927), pp. 395ff. Streeter, it should be noted, stated his position several years before the appearance of Gardner-Smith's influential book, St. John and the Synoptic Gospels, discussed below. Streeter is cited merely to illustrate what at one time was a commonly accepted view.

⁵Ibid., 396.

⁶Ibid., 424-425.

⁷Die Parallelerikopen bei Lukas und Johannes (2nd unrevised edition; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958).

⁸Ibid., pp. 95-96.

⁹St. John and the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: University Press, 1938).

¹⁰Ibid., pp. X-XII.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 88-92.

¹²According to Gardner-Smith, pp. 47-49, a good example of such intermingling of facts and details in oral tradition can be seen in the various anointing stories of Mark 14, Luke 7, and John 12.

¹³The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel (London: Lutterworth Press, 1960), p. 13.

¹⁴"The Life of Jesus: A survey of the Available Material; The Fourth Gospel," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXX (May 1947), 324.

¹⁵The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 157.

¹⁶Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1963).

¹⁷Ibid., p. 423.

¹⁸Ibid. p. 172. Specifically, Dodd offers this hypothesis to explain the agreements among the various anointing stories, as does Gardner-Smith, supra, note 12. It is illustrative, however, of the way in which Dodd approaches other verbal similarities between the Synoptics and John.

¹⁹Creed, pp. 318-321.

²⁰C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: S. P. C. K., 1967), p. 37.

²¹Introduction to the New Testament, founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm and translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. (14th revised edition; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 144-145.

²²The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John, vol. VII of Supplements to Novum Testamentum (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 4, note 2.

²³Ibid., p. 115.

²⁴At one time a similar position was held by F. C. Grant in his article, "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 285-307. There he maintained that John had access to the tradition contained in Luke's special source, commonly designated by L. But in his book, The Gospels, pp. 157-158, he seems more inclined to accept the view of Gardner-Smith.

²⁵"John, Gospel of," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), II, 937.

²⁶"St. John and the Passion Narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke," New Testament Studies, VII (1960-1961), 76. Buse maintains that this same source was also used to a limited extent by Mark. The elements common only to Luke and John, however, are due to the use by the third and fourth evangelists of material which Mark did not choose to incorporate into his Gospel from this source.

CHAPTER III

¹The pericope which is usually used to support the theory that John knew and used Luke is the story of the anointing in John 12, where John, in recording that Mary wiped Jesus' feet with her hair, reproduces with close verbal similarity the action of the sinful woman in Luke 7:38. Both J. A. Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John, vol. VII of Supplements to Novum Testamentum (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 1, and W. G. Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament, translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. (14th revised edition; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 144-145, offer this parallel as the clearest and most convincing evidence that John knew and used Luke.

²The Gospel According to John I-XII, vol. 29 in The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1966), p. XLV.

³The following list is adapted in a large measure from Julius Schniewind, Die Paralleelperikopen bei Lukas und Johannes (2nd unrevised edition; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958), pp. 85-88.

⁴That the two *ἀγγελοι* in Luke are angels is made clear by Luke 24:23.

⁵Schniewind, pp. 95-96.

⁶Ibid., p. 87.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Schniewind, pp. 87-88, maintains of course that John is not following Luke here in a relationship of literary dependence, but that both Luke and John are following the same tradition independently. Against Schniewind, however, it can be argued that concentrating on Jerusalem appearances is specifically Lucan and not traditional. It appears that Luke intentionally transferred all the resurrection appearances to Jerusalem for theological reasons of his own. Hence, the most likely place that John could have gotten the idea to place his initial appearances in Jerusalem would be from Luke. cf. Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of Luke, translated by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 93.

¹⁰Schniewind, p. 86.

¹¹The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan and Company, 1927), p. 404.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (ninth edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), ad loc.

¹⁴Robert Morgenthaler, Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1949), II, 9. Morgenthaler suggests that behind Luke's fondness for pairs may lie a desire to strengthen the evidence which he presents to Theophilus. For further lists of pairs in Luke's Gospel see Morgenthaler, I, 97-98, 180-182.

¹⁵These occurrences are John 1:51; 5:4 (textually uncertain); and 12:29.

¹⁶Peder Borgen, for instance, maintains that das Gesetz der Zweizahl, or the principle of doubling, which is often operative in oral tradition, explains the agreement between John and Luke in the mention of the two angels. "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," New Testament Studies, V (1958-1959), 258. Cf. also F. C. Grant, "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 300. Grant takes a similar position.

¹⁷For instance, Luke 24:12 includes the following words:
 Ἐσραμεν, μημεῖον, παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα,
 ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτόν. All of these have their counter-
 part in John 20:3-10 as follows: ἔτρεχον (προέδραμεν),
 μημεῖον, παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια, ἀπῆλθον
 οὐδὲν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτούς. Cf. Bailey, p. 85, note 3.

¹⁸For the attestation of this passage see Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, editors, Novum Testamentum Graece (25th edition; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963), ad loc.

¹⁹So also Bailey, p. 85; Grant, "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" p. 300; and J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan, 1965), p. 294.

²⁰Grant, p. 301, maintains that Luke 24:24 is also an interpolation on the basis of John's account, probably by the same hand that interpolated verse 12. But since there is no textual warrant for this, it is better to regard this verse as genuine.

²¹Schniewind, pp. 88-91.

²²Bailey, p. 91.

²³Streeter, p. 406.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Rudolph Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer (12th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952), p. 528.

²⁶Creed, p. 320.

²⁷Rudolph Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 48-49.

²⁸D. F. Strauss, The Life of Jesus Critically Examined, translated by George Eliot (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1898), p. 625.

²⁹Gardner-Smith admits that this motive may well lie behind this story as it was first conceived in tradition. But the evidence indicates that this story was not the product of tradition but the creation of the evangelist. Therefore this motive would have to be ascribed to him. P. Gardner-Smith, St. John and the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: University Press, 1938), p. 75.

³⁰Cf. for example John 14:23-24; 18:15-16; and 21:7. In all of these instances Peter and the Beloved Disciple are placed side by side and in each case the Beloved Disciple is cast in a decidedly more favorable light.

³¹Bailey, p. 91, sees a difficulty in this scheme, however, in the fact that Peter is the first to enter the tomb. On the basis of this incongruity he proposes that John is here revising an existing tradition according to which Peter coming to the tomb was the first of the disciples to enter it and presumably the first to come to faith. Hence he concludes that John 20:3-10 and Luke 24:24 represent variants of the same tradition that came to each evangelist independently. Against this, however, it can be said that Peter's entering the tomb first does not necessarily redound to his credit at the expense of the Beloved Disciple, nor does it necessarily suggest that he was the first to believe. But quite the opposite may be the case. This may simply be another instance in which Peter's impetuosity is emphasized, similar to the foot washing incident, John 13:6; his bold affirmation that he would never forsake his Lord, John 13:37; and his rash action of cutting off the servant's ear, John 18:10.

³²Bultmann, Evangelium, p. 528, suggests that certain elements which originally belonged to the Mary Magdalene account may have been woven into John 20:3-10. He mentions specifically the examination of the empty tomb and the finding of the grave clothes, verses 6b and 7. Since the rest of the passage can be accounted for on the basis of John's special motive in making Peter and the Beloved Disciple the first and chief witnesses of the resurrection, it follows then that the tradition which is discoverable with any certainty behind John's account amounts only to what Luke states in 24:24. Therefore Schniewind is not entirely correct when he maintains that Luke 24:24 and John 20:3-10 merely reflect the same tradition which in John shines through clearly, but in Luke appears only in summary fashion. Schniewind, p. 89.

³³"The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels, edited by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 9-35.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 9-10.

³⁵Ibid., p. 11.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 9-10.

³⁷Ibid., p. 22.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 13-14.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 18-20.

⁴⁰It is true that the element of non-recognition is also found in other resurrection narratives, but in no other narrative besides Luke 24:13-35 and John 20:11-18 does it occupy such a central position in the development of the story.

⁴¹Bultmann, Evangelium, pp. 528-529.

⁴²"Mary," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), III, 289.

⁴³The Magdalene Question, translated by H. C. Koehler (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1935).

⁴⁴See F. C. Burkitt, "Mary Magdalene and Mary, Sister of Martha," The Expository Times, XLII (January 1931), 157-159.

⁴⁵Kümmel, pp. 144-145.

⁴⁶Bultmann, Evangelium, p. 532. Cf. also Gustaf Dalman, Die Worte Jesu (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965), pp. 279-280. According to Dalman, the context in John implies that by using the form of address, "Rabboni," Mary desires to resume the old attitude toward the Master which is not permitted by Jesus, whereas the appeal of Thomas, John 20:28, is accepted. He sees in this an illustration of the important fact that the primitive community never ventured to call Jesus "Our Teacher" after he had been exalted to the throne of God. Henceforth he was to be known as Lord, in Aramaic רַבִּי. Cf. I Cor. 16:22.

⁴⁷Gardner-Smith, pp. 74-78.

⁴⁸C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), pp. 140-141.

⁴⁹Bultmann, Evangelium, pp. 528-529.

⁵⁰Ibid., 529.

CHAPTER IV

¹Charles Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 61-75.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Aland, Kurt, editor. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. 3rd edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Translated and revised by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Liddell, Henry G. and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Ninth edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden, editors. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Revised fourth edition by H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963.
- Nestle, Erwin and Kurt Aland, editors. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

B. Secondary Sources

- Bailey, John Amedee. The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John. Vol. VII of Supplements to Novum Testamentum. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John. London: S. P. C. K., 1967.
- Blair, E. P. "Mary," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick. III. New York: Abingdon, 1962. Pp. 288-290.
- Borgen, Peder. "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," New Testament Studies, V (1958-1959), 246-259.
- Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to St. John, I-XII. Vol. 29 in The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Das Evangelium des Johannes. In Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer. 12th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952.

- . The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated from the German by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Burkitt, F. C. "Mary Magdalene and Mary, Sister of Martha," The Expository Times, XLII (January 1931), 157-159.
- Buse, Ivor. "St. John and the Passion Narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke," New Testament Studies, VII (1960-1961), 65-76.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan, 1965.
- Dalman, Gustaf. Die Worte Jesu. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965.
- Dodd, C. H. "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 9-35.
- . Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Eusebius of Cesarea, Church History V-VII. Vol. 41 of Sources Chretiennes. Greek text edited by Gustave Bardy. Paris: Les Editions Du Cerf, 1955.
- Gardner-Smith, Percival. Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.
- Gausson, H. "The Lucan and the Johannine Writings," The Journal of Theological Studies, IX (1908), 562-568.
- Goodwin, Charles. "How Did John Treat His Sources?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 61-75.
- Grant, F. C. The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- . "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 285-307.
- Higgins, A. J. B. The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel. London: Lutterworth Press, 1960.

- Ketter, Peter. The Magdalene Question. Translated from the German by H. C. Koehler. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1935.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm. 14th revised edition. Translated from the German by A. J. Mattill, Jr. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Manson, T. W. "The Life of Jesus: A Survey of the Available Material; The Fourth Gospel," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXX (May 1947), 312-329.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis. 2 vols. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1949.
- Sanders, J. N. "John, Gospel of," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick. II. New York: Abingdon, 1962. Pp. 932-946.
- Schniewind, Julius. Die Parallelerikopen bei Lukas und Johannes. 2nd unrevised edition. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958.
- Strauss, David Friedrich. The Life of Jesus Critically Examined. Translated from the fourth German edition by George Eliot. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1898.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan, 1927.