

James W. Barker, *John's Use of Matthew* (Emerging Scholars; Fortress: Minneapolis 2015). Pp. XIX + 150. \$59.00. ISBN 978-1-4514-9027-5

BARTOSZ ADAMCZEWSKI

Faculty of Theology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
e-mail: b.adamczewski@uksw.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-7847-0203

James W. Barker is assistant professor of New Testament at Western Kentucky University in Bowling Green, KY (USA). In 2014, he received the Paul J. Achtemeier Award for New Testament Scholarship. His monograph, which is a reworked version of his 2011 PhD dissertation at Vanderbilt University, is devoted to the perennial problem of the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels. Since, as Barker rightly notes in the introduction to his book, the Gospel of Matthew has been considered the least likely of the Synoptic Gospels as a possible written source of the Fourth Gospel (p. xv), the choice of precisely the Matthean Gospel as a point of comparison to the Fourth Gospel is an ambitious project, worthy of a good New Testament exegete.

The first chapter of the monograph (pp. 1-14) sketches the history of the investigations concerning the problem of the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels. Barker aptly summarizes the first seventeen hundred years of research, with their diverging opinions concerning the historical reliability of the Gospels in light of the evident discrepancies and contradictions between their descriptions of Jesus' life and death. Then he rightly argues that although in the last two hundred years the hypothesis of John's use of oral traditions prevailed, currently there is no firm consensus for explaining John's relation to the Synoptics.

In the second chapter (pp. 15-36), Barker discusses methodological and hermeneutical questions. In order to discern dependence on a written text from dependence on oral tradition, Barker adopts Helmut Koester's redaction-critical criterion of dependence on clearly redactional words or phrases. Accordingly, he tries to find examples of John's dependence on Matthew's modifications to Mark, Matthew's characteristic vocabulary, and Matthew's distinctive sequence of pericopes.

The first two categories are not particularly compelling because oral-tradition theorists could also argue for John's dependence on a pre-Matthean version of oral tradition, as it turns out from Barker's comparison of Jn 12:25 with Mt 10:39

parr. (p. 20-22) and his discussion of Anderson's argument concerning oral relationships between Mt 16:19; 18:18 and Jn 20:23 (p. 47-48). For the same reason, Barker's adoption of Neiryneck's argument concerning John's use of 'brothers' in Jn 20:17 in agreement with Mt 28:10, but in difference to 'disciples' in Mk 16:7 (p. 24-25), is not compelling in itself, unless it is highlighted that John elsewhere favoured the term 'disciples' (cf. Jn 20:18 etc.).

On the other hand, the argument from the use of a longer series of pericopes clearly favours the hypothesis of dependence on a written text over that of dependence on some orally transmitted stories and sayings. In fact, Barker rightly highlights the importance of the redactional context of the gospel sayings and stories (p. 20). Accordingly, he convincingly adopts Boismard's argument for John's use of the statement concerning the fever miraculously leaving someone (Jn 4:52; cf. Mt 8:15), a statement which in the Matthean Gospel appears in the context of the story Mt 8:5-13 (par. Lk 7:1-10), which was used in Jn 4:46b-54 (p. 23).

On the analogy of post-synoptic apocryphal gospels, as well as the widespread ancient practice of literary *aemulatio*, Barker argues that John intended his Gospel to imitate, reinterpret, and surpass that of Matthew, but not to replace it.

The third chapter (pp. 37-61) is devoted to the case of the bipartite Johannine formula concerning forgiving and retaining sins (Jn 20:23). In Barker's opinion, this formula is a reworking of the thematically related, likewise bipartite Matthean formula concerning binding and loosing (Mt 18:18). In order to demonstrate his thesis, Barker first linguistically invalidates Emerton's hypothesis that both Mt 18:18 (binding and loosing) and Jn 20:23 (forgiving and retaining sins) rely on Jesus' orally transmitted Aramaic saying concerning opening and shutting, as well as the hypothesis that the in both Greek and Aramaic the verbs used for binding and loosing (Mt 18:18) can also have the meaning of retaining and forgiving sins (Jn 20:23). With the use of the same linguistic argument, Barker invalidates Anderson's hypothesis of secondary orality and interfluentiality as an explanation of the relationship between Mt 16:19; 18:18 and Jn 20:23.

Having disproved the arguments against his thesis, Barker argues that the Johannine saying concerning forgiving and retaining sins (Jn 20:23) is dependent not only on the isolated Matthean saying concerning binding and loosing (Mt 18:18), but also on its Matthean redactional context, with both the negative teaching concerning expulsion of recalcitrant sinners (Mt 18:15-17) and the positive teaching concerning forgiving sins (Mt 18:21-35). However, Barker does not discuss the possibility of John's linguistic conflation of Mt 18:18 with the thematically related Lucan texts concerning forgiving sins, so that they are forgiven (perf. *apheōntai*: Lk 5:20-24; 7:47-49), although he elsewhere rightly argued for the possibility of such micro-conflations in the Gospels (*JBL* 135 [2016] 109-121).

The fourth chapter (pp. 63-92) is devoted to the case of the scriptural quotation in Jn 12:15. In Barker's opinion, this quotation was in fact borrowed from Mt 21:5 because of the common pattern of similarities and dissimilarities of Mt 21:5 and Jn 12:15 in comparison to Zech 9:9 LXX. The scholar first discusses the meaning of *pōlos*, which occurs in all four Gospels and in Zech 9:9 LXX. He concludes that this noun could refer to various animals, not necessarily a donkey, so that Mk 11:2-7 par. Lk 19:30-35 do not necessarily allude to Zech 9:9 LXX. Therefore, Matthew's and John's ideas that Jesus rode a donkey, and that he thus fulfilled the prophecy of Zech 9:9 LXX, which is explicitly quoted in the gospel story, constitute important agreements between Matthew and John against Mark and Luke.

Barker then analyses Justin's and Irenaeus's use of Zech 9:9 LXX, and he comes to the conclusion that these Church Fathers borrowed their idea of Jesus riding a donkey not from a hypothetical collection of early Christian scriptural *testimonia*, but from the texts of Matthew and John. Accordingly, the Johannine idea of Jesus riding a donkey (Jn 12:15) must have originated from Mt 21:5, and not from any hypothetical *testimonia*.

Comparing the texts of Zech 9:9; Mt 21:5; and Jn 12:15, Barker rightly argues that Matthew's and John's shared omissions of the Zecharian exhortation, 'Preach, O daughter of Jerusalem', as well as the phrase 'righteous and salvific is he' is difficult to explain on the hypothesis of John's independence from Matthew.

However, Barker's conclusion that the sole source for the quotation of Zech 9:9 in Jn 12:15 was Mt 21:2.5.7 (p. 89) is not entirely convincing because John could have conflated Mt 21:5 with the parallel Marcan text (Mk 11:7), with its use of the non-compound verb *kathizō*, as well as the scriptural prophecy concerning Judah (Gen 49:11 LXX), with its use of the phrase *pōlon... onou*.

The fifth chapter (pp. 93-106) deals with the case of Matthew's and John's different attitudes to the Samaritans. In Barker's view, John must have reinterpreted the Matthean prohibition of evangelizing in any Samaritan city into an account of spending some time in a Samaritan city. The scholar himself admits that his argument that John must have consciously disagreed with Matthew, so that he intentionally reversed his prohibition, is counterintuitive (p. 93). In fact, Barker's idea is based on his overall understanding of the Fourth Gospel as a reinterpretation, but not replacement of the Gospel of Matthew, so that these two Gospels can be harmonized with each other. Therefore, the scholar can claim that John harmonized the Matthean prohibition, directed to the disciples, with Jesus' own example of evangelizing in Samaria.

In order to substantiate his claim, Barker argues that John's metaphor of a ready harvest and of the disciples being sent out to work in it (Jn 4:35-38), which justifies the mission in Samaria (Jn 4), was borrowed from Mt 9:37-38,

which occurs just prior to the prohibition of evangelizing in Samaria (Mt 10:5). However, as Barker himself notes, the linguistic connection between Jn 4:35-38 and Mt 9:37-38 is limited to the noun *therismos*. In fact, Jn 4:35-38 is linguistically closer to the likewise metaphorical, evangelistic text Mk 4:29, with its combination of the words *therismos*, *karpos*, and *apostellō*. Therefore, the argument from John's alleged contextual use of Mt 9:37-38 in Jn 4:35-38 is not compelling.

Barker's supporting contextual argument from the placement of the texts concerning Samaria (Mt 10:5; Jn 4) before the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand (Mt 14:13-21; Jn 6:1-13) is likewise unconvincing. Contrary to the redaction-critical criterion of common distinctive sequence of pericopes, which was discussed in the second chapter of the book (p. 19), Matthew's and John's location of the texts concerning Samaria is greatly distanced from the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand, so that they cannot be regarded as being in a distinctive sequence with each other.

Barker's conclusive argument that John composed the entire story of the mission in Samaria (Jn 4) in response to Mt 10:5 has another major weakness. While discussing the origin of Jn 4 in terms of social memory theory, the American scholar does not take into consideration the possibility of John's use of the Acts of the Apostles, in which the mission in a Samaritan city (Acts 8:5-25) is an important element of the Lucan story (cf. Acts 1:8; 9:31).

The monograph is supplemented with a conclusion (pp. 107-114), which summarizes the contents of the five preceding chapters and points to numerous other positive and negative agreements between Matthew and John against Mark and Luke.

In sum, Barker deserves great praise for his reinvestigation of the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Matthew. Although some of his arguments are not entirely convincing, his case for John's use of the Matthean Gospel is certainly worth taking into serious consideration by other scholars.