

The Urevangelist or exegetical critical study on the relationship of the first three Gospels

Translated by Neil Godfrey with the assistance of ChatGPT, DeepL and  
GoogleTranslate - June 2023

The Original Evangelist

or

exegetical critical investigation

on

the relationship between the

of the

first three Gospels

by

Christian Gottlob Wilke,

former pastor of Herrmannsdorf in the Saxon Erzgebirge.

Dresden and Leipzig,

Published by Gerhard Fleischer.

1838.

Sr. Excellency

the

Royal Saxon. Minister of State and Chancellor of the Order

Bernhard August von Lindenau,

Knight of the Royal Sachs. Order of the Diamond Crown, Grand Cross of the  
C. V. Grand Cross W. F . Grand Cross of the Ducal Sachs.  
Ernest. House Order W. J.

in deep respect

Dedicated

Author

Foreword.

The difficulties associated with the undertaking of solving the problem contained in the interrelationship of the gospels, or even of giving the investigation to be carried out a planned design and systematic arrangement, need not first be explained to experts. I have been thinking about the problem and the plan of this work for more than ten years, and I am now giving the result of the studies that I have tirelessly continued in my parish life alongside the business of the ministry and since 1832 under the most bitter experiences. I am heartily pleased that after hard struggle I have regained and been able to maintain the peace of mind that was necessary for the elaboration of this work. Expert and impartial judges may judge whether the disputed question was decided by my efforts or whether it was brought closer to its decision; But, to be honest, I do not wish my work to be judged by those who have taken the view that Mark excerpted his gospel from the works of Matthew and Luke, because I just as little give these respectable men the necessary impartiality of judgment than I can be won over to their point of view. Although I have endeavored everywhere to use a correct and definite expression, here and there phrases have cropped up which I would now change; which is why I must wish that fair judges would consider the matter and the content rather than the form and the expression.

The result of the whole will — I have this conviction — assert itself before any criticism, and exhibitions that were made about individual things would only give me cause to increase the number of proofs, as I have done in this book I could have added a lot more anyway if I hadn't had to be as careful about brevity as I was about thoroughness.

A more detailed investigation still needs to be made as to where Luke borrowed the

materials with which he enriched Mark's gospel, what the purpose of each individual gospel was, and finally how and by what means the agreement between John and the type of the other gospels was mediated. I will also undergo these examinations if my situation improves, as I wish and hope. I don't know how soon I shall be able to carry out my project, or how long I shall have to postpone it; but my courage will increase, my diligence double, if what I present with the present writing to patrons and friends of critical investigations has found a favorable reception.

Dresden, April 12, 1838.

Ch.G. Wilke.

Index of the places in the work where the individual pericopes have been treated.

1) The pericopes of the first tablet.

- n. 1. p. 49. 102. 147. 17p. 345. 44s. 454 f. 460. 561. 583. 600. 642. 659.
- n. 2. S. 49.
- n. 3. S. 663.
- n. 4. S. 644.
- n. 5. S. 62. 575. 566. 618.
- n. 6. S. 589. 614. 627. 635.
- n. 7. S. 108. 434. 446. 497. 511. 530. 546. 589. 590. 602. 607. 614. 618. 627.
- n. 8. S. 100. 130. 180. 311. 420. 446. 497. 590. 608. 611. 615. 619.
- n. 9. S. 131. 182. 420. 464. 498. 562. 608. 612. 615. 628.
- n. 10. S. 132. 184. 309. 316. 334. 335. 348. 420. 424. 464. 498. 546.
- n. 11. S. 95. 133. 188. 336. 350. 420. 463. 499. 546. 591. 609. 629.
- n. 12. S. 191. 461. 499. 629.
- n. 13. S. 574. 583. f. 585. 612. 624.
- n. 14. S. 134. 192. 452. f; 574. 621.
- n. 15. S. 103. 198. 300. 340. 78. 508. 573.
- n. 16. S. 102. 105. 200. f. 309. 317. 337. 340. 351. 376. 378. 391. 420. 434. 435. 462. 502. 583. 595. 602.
- n. 17. S. 101. 512. 531. 603. 609. 613. 619. 628.
- n. 18. S. 515. 518. 533. 534. 609.
- n. 19. S. 60. f.
- n. 20. S. 128. 210. 328. 330. 355. 442. 461. 500. 622. 629,

n. 21. S. 434. 585. 596. 604. 611. 612. 623.  
n. 22. S. 50. f. 124. 506. 536. 569. 586. 610. 616.  
n. 23. S. 637.  
n. 24. S. 569. 577. 592. 677.  
n. 25. S. 569. f. 578. 592.  
n. 26. S. 567.0. 27. S. 570. f. 579.  
n.28. P. 77. 96. 101. 136. P13. 341. 3S8. 380. 425. 435. 469. 502. 586. 596. 604. 630.  
n.29. S. 101. 136. 438. 508. 537. 587. 596.  
n.30. S. 102. 509. 597. 661.  
n.31. S. 137. 217. 341. 503. 604. 663.  
n.32. S. 104. 137. 218. 332. 338. 341. 359. 377. 380. 392. 435.469. 505. 600. 601. 635.  
637. 663.  
n.33. S. 579.  
n.34. S. 138. 221. 338. 484.  
n.35. S. 139. 222. 317. 331. 360. 371. 464. 484.  
n.36. P. 229. 333. 342. 368. 48S. 593.  
n.37. S. 67.  
n.38. S. 510.  
n.39. S. 59. 231. 363. 449. 485. 638.  
n.40. S. 571. 580. 594.  
n.41.S. 233. 486.  
n.42 a. S. 234. 373. 425. 486.  
n.42 b. S. 126. 236. 295. 374. 425. 487.  
n.43. S. 240. 487.  
n.44. S. 242. 333. 368. 428. 488  
n.45. S. 67. 575. 590. 605.  
n.46. S. 245. 421.  
n.47. S. 247. 329. 365.  
n.48. S. 434. 635.  
n.49. S. 106. 249. 271. 301. 319. 330. 333. 339. 342. 366. 367. 368. 369. 374. 377.  
381. 422. 441. f. 463. 489.  
n.50. S. 540.  
n.51. S. 64. 73. 581. 595. 605.  
n.52. S. 638.  
n.53. S. 74. 106. 141. 272. 277. 334. 377. 414.  
n.54. S. 79. 125. 277. 343. 382. 423. 480.  
n.55. S. 81. 84. 280. 426. 437. 493. 587. 597. 605. 630. 632. 660.  
n.56. S. 84. f. 283. 423. 494. 639.  
n.57. S. 309. 463. 640. 647. f.

2) The pieces of the second table p. 685. f. 491.

- 3) The pieces of the third tablet:  
(a) those of Mark: pp. 492. 680. f.  
b) Matthew's: p. 637. f. 642. f. 648. 663.  
c) Luke's: pp. 566. f. 587 f. 599. f. 645. 648.

---

The Evangelist  
or  
Exegetically critical study  
of  
the family relationship  
of the first three gospels.

---

3

Introduction.

The Reciprocal Relation of the First Three Gospels in General.

§. 1. The first three gospels do not develop their historical material in continuous discourse, but in a series of individual small narratives, which are isolated from one another by their own beginnings and special closing formulas, as if they were small particular wholes already present before this connection been, and only collected and put together by the writers of the Gospels. As to the form of these narrations, they are structured in verses according to the Hebrew style of representation, and also for the most part Hebraicized in expression and phraseology.

§. 2. All three evangelists have a number of such narrative passages in common. Alongside these common passages are others peculiar to only two of the narrators; for some have together a) only Matthew and Mark (excluding Luke), others b) only Matthew and Luke (excluding Mark), still others c) only Mark and Luke (excluding Matthew). Each of the three evangelists, however, has a few passages of its own that are missing

from its two co-referees.

§. 3. The shortest gospel is that of Mark, and all this, with the exception of twenty-four verses, is contained partly in Matthew and partly in Luke.

§. 4. Within which region the common and the peculiar lie can be clearly shown by tables, and we can form three such tables. The first will show those parts of the narrative which all three evangelists have in common; it will also be possible to add to it those sections which Mark has in common with one of the other two evangelists, because one of them always goes parallel with him. — On the other panel will be the passages that belong to Matthew and Luke. The third will receive those who are only the property of an individual. We set up these tables at once, and provide each of them with special remarks.

4

#### First Table

Since Mark is always the one who is accompanied, so that the order he follows is always recorded by one of the two co-actors, it will be most appropriate for an overview of the material to place Mark first in the three-column contrast.

Nr	Mark	Luke	Matthew	
1	1:2-8	3:1-18	3:1-12	John baptizes in the Jordan. Costume of the Baptist.
2	1:9-11	3:21-22	3:13-17	Jesus is baptized.
3	..12-13	4:1-13	4:1-11	Jesus goes into the desert.
4	..14-15	.. 14-15	.. 12-17	He returns to Galilee.
5	.. 15-20	missing	.. 18-22	He takes four fishermen with him on the Sea of Galilee.
6	..21-28	.. 31-37	missing	In the school at Capernaum he heals a demon.
Note. So far the same order for all.				
7	.. 29-34	.. 38-41	8:14-17	He does healings in the house of Peter.

	.. 35-39	.. 42-44	missing	Towards morning he goes away.
8	.. 41-44  1:45 End	5:12-14  5:15-16	8:1-8  missing	He heals a leper, and forbids him anything known of the healing Close.  (The healed transgresses the prohibition.)
9	2:1-12  2	5:17-26  17	9:1-8  missing	Back in Capernaum he heals a paralytic.  (The patient is brought through the roof in front of him.)
10	..15-22	..27-39 End	..9-17	Jesus responds to the reproach that was expressed that he ate with tax collectors and sinners and that his disciples did not fast.
11	..23-28 End	6:1-5	12:1-8	Jesus excuses his disciples for the gathering of grain on the Sabbath.
12	3:1-6	..6-11	..9-14	He heals a dry hand on the Sabbath.
13	3:7-19	6:12-19	5:1 10:2	He separates twelve disciples from those with him.
14	..20-22	11:17-23	12:22-32	Blasphemy, that he should cast out devils by Beelzebul.
15	..31-35	8:19-21	12:46-50	Arrival of his relatives.
16	4:1-34  ..21-25  ..26-34	8:4-18  ..16-18  missing	13:1-34  Missing  ..24-35	Jesus teaches parables by the sea.  A Parable of Admonition to the Disciples.  parables to the people.
17a	..35-41 End	..22-25	8:18-27	Stormy crossing to Gadara.
..b	5:1-17  ..18-20	..26-37  ..38-39	..28-34  missing	Healing a possessed Gadarene.  The healed wishes to be included

				among the followers of Jesus.
18	..21-43	..40-56	9:18-26	Healing of the blood-soaked woman and raising the daughter of Jairus.
19	6:1-6	Missing here cf 4:16	13:53-58	Jesus found no faith in his hometown.
20	..7-13	9:1-6	10:1-14	sending out of the twelve.
21	..14-16 6:17-29	..7-9 missing	14:1-2 14:3-12	Herod's opinion of Jesus. history of decapitation of the Baptist.
Note: From here on Matthew runs parallel again.				
22	..30-44 ..30-31	..10-17 ..10	..13-21 missing	Feeding of the Five Thousand. Return of the disciples sent out.
23	..45-56	missing	..22-36	Departure of the disciples to Bethsaida.
24	7:1-23	missing	..22-36	Jesus censures the statutes of the Pharisees.
25	..24-30 End	missing	..21-28	Conversation with the Syrophenician.
26	8:1-10	missing	..32-39 End	feeding of the four thousand.
27	..11-21	missing	16:1-12	The Pharisees ask for a sign from heaven.
28	8:27-38 9:1 8:32-33	9:18-27 missing.	..13-28 ..22-23	Jesus forbids the disciples to say that he is the Messiah. Conversation with Peter.
29	9:2-13 ..9-13	..28-36 missing.	17:1-12 ..9-13	Transfiguration of Jesus on the mountain. Conversation with the disciples as they come down from the mountain.



30	..14-29 ..28-29	..37-43 missing	..14-20 ..19-21	Healing an epileptic boy whom the disciples could not heal.  Ask the disciples why they couldn't cast out the demon.
31	..30-32	..43-45	..22-23 End	Jesus speaks of the sufferings ahead of him.
32	..33-37 ..38-41 ..42-45	..46-48 ..49-50 missing	18:1-9 Missing ..6-9	Disputes among the disciples.  John prevented one who was casting out devils in Jesus' name.  Annoyance Warning.
33	10:1-12	missing	19:1-12	Question of the Jews about divorce.
34	..13-16	18:15-17	..13-15	Jesus blesses children.
35	..17-31	..18-30	..16-30	The rich young man
36	10:32-34	18:31-34	20:17-19	Jesus speaks of what awaits him in Jerusalem.
37	..35-45	missing	..20-28	The Request of the Zebedeeids.
38	..40-52 End	..35-43	..29-34	Healing of the blind at Jericho.
39	11:1-10	19:24-41	21:1-9	Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem.
40	..12-14	missing	..18-22	Curse of the Deceitful Fig Tree.
41	..15-19	..45-48	..12-17	Purification of the temple from buyers and sellers.
42a	11:27-33 End	20:1-8	21:23-27	The priests confront Jesus, and
..b	12:1-12	..9-19	..33-46	Answer of Jesus: Parable of the vineyard taken back.
43	..13-17	..20-26	22:15-22	Question from the Herodians about the bounty.
44	..18-27	..27-38	..22-33	Question of the Sadducees about the resurrection.

45	..28-34	missing	..34-40	Question of the teacher of the law about the greatest commandment.
46	..35-37	..41-44	..41-46	Ask Jesus how the Messiah could be David's son.
47	..38-40	..45-47	23:1-39	Jesus' warning to the Pharisees.
48	..41-44	21:1-4	missing	praise of the poor widow.
49	13:1-37	..5-36	24:1-36	Prophecy of Jesus about the destruction of the temple.
50	14:1-2	22:1-2	26:1-5	The arrest of Jesus is decided before the Passover.
51	..3-9	missing	..6-13	Mary in Bethany anoints Jesus.
52	14:10-11	22:3-6	26:14-16	Bribery of Judas.
53	..12-25	..7-23	..17-29	Jesus has the Passover meal with the disciples.
54	..26-51	..29-53	..30-56	Departure to Gethsemane. capture of Jesus.
55	.. 53-72 ..55-65	..54-60 (22:63-71)	..57-75 ..55-68	Denial of Peter, in between the interrogation of Jesus (with Luke in the morning, with the others at night).
56	15:1 - End	23:1 - End	27:1 - End	condemnation, crucifixion, burial of Jesus.
57	16:1 - End	24:1 - End	28:1 - End	resurrection of Jesus.

8

Notes about this table:

a) The starting point of the common relation is thus the beginning of Jesus' public life, insofar as John's baptism precedes it as a condition; the end point is Jesus' resurrection. Before this starting point, Matthew and Luke each place a special story of Jesus' birth and childhood, just as they each enrich the story of his public life with special news within the designated highlights..

b) There are

α) among the common passages, as the table shows, some which Mark supplies more fully, now with Matthew, now with Luke — with Matthew: n. 16. 28. 29. 82. with Luke: n. 7. 8. 9. 13. 22. (Matthew mentions nothing about the sending out and return of the twelve.)

β) Other sections that one of his two neighbors lacks, he owns with the one who has them. So he has according to the table

κ) with Matthew n. 5. 19. 23 to 27. 33. 37. 40. 45. 51.

ρ) with Luke: n. 6.45. Incidentally, it is shown here that Luke lacks far more of the apparatus of Mark than Matthew.

c) Luke is almost consistently in local harmony with Mark (except n. 14, 15), but in Matthew this order is interrupted by chap. 4, 23 on (after n. 5) to Ch. 14, 1 (n. 21), but then restored and continued to the end.

d) As the table also shows, Luke has several larger insertions (as we will call them for the time being), namely Ch. 6.20 (after n. 13) to Ch. 8.4 (n. 16); then a still more considerable one from Ch. 9.50 (see n. 32) to Ch. 18.14 (see n. 34.), and in these collections falls most of what he (according to the second table to be set up) exclusively with Matthew has in common.

9

Second Table:  
Matthew and Luke.

Luke	Matthew	
3, 7-9	3, 7-10	The Baptist's warning speech to the people (at n. 1 of the first panel).
16.17	11.12	The Messiah will baptize with fire.
4, 1-13	4, 1-11	The Temptation of Christ (I.Taf.n. 3).
6, 20-49	5:1-7:29	Sermon on the Mount (at u. 13) — greatly expanded in Matthew. Is equal to:
20-26	5, 1-12	

28-35	9-47	
36	48	
37.38	7, 1-2	
41.42	2-5	
43.44	16-19	
45	7.20	linked by Matthew to n. 14 of the 1st plate.
46	12:35	
47-49	24-28	
7, 1-10	8:5-13	Healing of the centurion in Capernaum (in Matth, after u. 8).
18-35	11:2-19	Embassy of the Baptist (in Matth, after n. 20).
9:57-60	8:19-22	Some ask Jesus to be included among his entourage (in Matth, placed before n. 17).
10:1-24		Instructional speech to the seventy to be sent out. From this speech Matth.
2	9, 37.38	in Matth, before n. 20 (the 1st plate).
3 5-7	10, 16 10-13	at Matth, linked to u. 20. there itself.
10-12	14.15	likewise.
13-15	11:20-24	at Matth, inserted into the piece about the embassy of the Baptist.
16	10, 40	at the speech n. 20.
21.22	11:25-27	S. the penultimate.
23.24	13:16-17	in Matt, in n. 16.
11, 1-4	6, 4-13	The Lord's Prayer, in Matth, in the Sermon on the Mount.
11:9-13	7, 7-11	Encouragement to prayer, in Matth, in the Sermon on the Mount.

11:14-18	12:22-32	Words from Jesus' response to the blasphemy that he had Beelzebul.
23	30	at n. 14.
24-36	43-45	.
11:29-32	12:38-41	The Pharisees demand a sign from heaven (also at n. 14)
11:37,53		Banquet with a Pharisee. Reprimands against this sect. From last Matthew has
39-41 42	23, 25.26 23	at n. 47.
44	27.28	
45.46	4	
47-53	29-36	
12:1-12		
2-9	10:26-33	at n. 20.
11.12	19.20	
12:13-35		Someone asks Jesus to be an arbitrator.
21-31	6, 25-33	in Matt, in the Sermon on the Mount.
12:33-48		
33.34	20.28	
12:39-46	24:43-51	in Matth, linked to n. 49.
12,49-53		The coming times of discord. Of that Matt.
51	10, 34.35	at n. 20.
12, 54-13,		
..1-9		One should pay attention to the signs of the times.
..54-56	16, 2-3	Matthew, at n. 27.

..57-59	6,25	in the Sermon on the Mount.
13,22-30		Question: whether a few will be saved. Of that
..24	7,13	Matt, in the Sermon on the Mount.
..26.27	22.23	
..24	8:11-12	Linked to Matth's story about the healed captain.
13, 31-35		Jesus' answer to the announcement that Herod was after him.
..34.35	25, 37.38	About this in Matth, in another parable as an addendum to u. 49.
14,25-35		Demand of Jesus to those who want to follow him.
..26.27	10:37,38	Matthew, at n. 20.
14,35	5, 13	
15,1-10		Why Jesus accepts sinners. Of that
4-6	18,12.13	Matt, after u. 32.
16,1-13		Parable of the unjust steward. Of that
16	11,12.13	Matthew, when telling the story of the Baptist's embassy
16, 17	5, 18	in the Sermon on the Mount.
18	31	
17,1-8		Annoyance Warning. Of that
2	18,6	Matthew, at n. 32.
3.4	15	
17, 20-37		When will the kingdom of God come?
23.24	24, 26.27	
26.27.30	37-39	

34-37	40.41	in Matth, linked to n. 49.
22, 24-36		Disputes among the disciples. (Appendix to n. 53.)
30	19,28	Matthew, at n. 35.

11

#### Remarks about this table.

a) What Matthew has in common with Luke consists far more in speeches and sayings than in actions. Of the actions, only the following reports appear as common reports:

α) the history of the temptation,

β) the healing of the servant in Capernaum (Luk. 7, 1 - 10),

γ) the sending of the Baptist to Jesus (Luk. 7, 14 - 35). ),

δ) the request of some to be accepted among Jesus' entourage (Luk. 9, 57 - 60),

ε) the healing of a demonic as a reason for the blasphemy that Jesus cast out demons by the power of Beelzebul.

But all these also find passages in which the teaching is the main thing. Incidentally, the historical bases of the speeches are missing in Matthew. We have pointed this out through gaps in the second column.

b) Let us compare this table with the first; there is an oddity in position and arrangement. Namely, the first collection of Luke Ch. 6, 20 - 8, 3 (compare n. 16 on the first table) makes a separation between the passage of the selection of the twelve on the mountain (n. 13) and between the parable of the sower (n. 16). Only Matthew, in agreement with Mark, does not recognize this separation; for before that parable he has the same passages as Mark (cf. Matth. 12, 24 f. of Beelzebul and v. 47-50 of the arrival of Jesus' relatives (cf. Mark. 3, 22 f. to n. 35). However, Matthew has something from this apparatus, namely two pieces, that of the centurion's servant and that of John's mission, and then a similar, but very extended, Sermon on the Mount, but all this is not placed as it is in Luke. The second, larger, aggregate of Luke's Gospel (chap. 9, 51-18,12) separates from each other the story of the hierarchy dispute that arose among Jesus' disciples (Mark. 9,33-50) and the story of the blessing of the children (Mark. 10,13 f.). But here too Matthew, again in agreement with Mark, does not recognise the separation. To all appearances, one would have to consider the Lukian material as intercalation. Now it must be added that what Matthew has in common with or related to this material, he also has in a completely different order, interwoven around the branches of the common trunk, as represented in the first table, and connected to them,

so that this order is as little acknowledged by Luke as by Mark. A circumstance which is very much in question in the whole relationship. Only what Matthew has in common in the baptismal story up to the temptation (from n. 1-6) is in the same place.

12

c) It is striking that in Matthew such Lukian material is in turn mixed with other similar material found in Luke in other places, as we have also noticed on the table.

### Third table:

Index of the passages peculiar to the individual evangelists.

#### 1) Mark.

1,1-3	entrance before n. 1. Plate 1.
4,26-29	Parable of the Fruitful Field (at n. 16).
7:12-37	Healing of a deaf mute (after n. 25).
8:22-26	Healing of a blind man near Bethsaida (after n. 27).
13,33-36	Parable of a traveling householder (at n. 49).
14,51.52	The young man fleeing when Jesus was arrested.
15,44.45	Pilate inquires whether the crucified Jesus has long since passed away.

13

#### 2) Matthew

At n. 1	3, 14. 15	John refuses to baptize Jesus; answer of Jesus.
n. 4	4:13-16	Jesus' dwelling in Capernaum, fulfillment an oracle.
	5,4-10	
	14-16	



	17. 19	Doctrine and Gnomes in the Sermon on the Mount.
	- 22	
	33-37	
	38.39	
	43	
	6,1-8	
	16-18	
	7,6	
	15-20	
n. 7	9,17	Jesus healing the sick fulfillment of a Prophecy.
n. 20	10, 5. 6	The disciples should stay away from pagan and Samaritan places.
	23	Jesus wants to come back before the disciples who were sent out have traveled through the cities of Israel.
	24.25	The disciple is no better off than the master.
	41.42	Whoever receives a prophet is entitled to a prophet's reward.
before n. 11	11:28-30	Encouragement to take on Jesus' gentle yoke.
n. 11	12, 5.6	How the priests in the temple do not break the Sabbath
	17-20	Old Testament quote.
n. 14	34-37	Punishability of loveless speeches and judgments.
n. 16	13,24-30 36-43	Parable of the weeds in the field with interpretation.
	35	Old Testament citation
	13,44	Parable of the Hidden Treasure.

	45.46	— from the pearl.
	47-50	— from fishing nets.
n. 23	14,28-31	Peter walks on the sea.
n. 24	15,13	The plants to be eradicated.
n. 28	16,17-19	Peter receives the keys of the kingdom of heaven.
n. 31	17,24-27	The starter in the mouth of the fish.
n. 32	18,16-18	as with d. Missing should be proceeded.
	23-36	Parable of the merciless debtor.
n. 33	19,10-12	The difference among the unmarried.
n. 35	20,1-16	Parable of the workers in the vineyard.
n. 39	20,4-5	Old Testament citation
n. 41	14-16	Jesus heals the lame and blind in the temple.
n. 42	28-32	Parable of two sons.
	21, 1-14	— from the guest with the non-nuptial dress.
n. 47	23,3, 5, 9, 11	reproof of Pharisaic pride.
	17-22	The falsely permitted oaths.
n. 49	25,1-13	Parable of the ten virgins.
	43-30	— from the talents.
	31-36	The sheep and goats once to be separated from each other.
n. 54	26,52-54	Jesus forbids Peter to use the sword.
n. 56	27,3-10	Judas returns the silverlings to the chief priests.
	19	Pilate is warned by his wife.
	27,24	Pilate washes his hands.

	51-54	earthquake at the death of Jesus.
	27,62-66	Jesus' tomb is guarded by guardians.
	28,2	It is opened by an earth tremor.
	4	The Guardians flee.
	11-16	You will be bribed.
	18-20	The Risen One gives the disciples his final orders.

15

### 3) Luke

3,1-2	Determining the time when the Baptist appeared.
10-14	Preaching of the Baptist.
4,16-30	Appearance of Jesus in Nazareth.
5,1-11	Peter's catch.
7,11-17	Raising the youth of Nain.
36-50	Banquet at Simon's house. anointing of Jesus.
8,1-3	Mention of the companions of Jesus.
9,51-56	You fail at a Samaritan. Spots of Jesus the inn.
61-62	Someone volunteers to follow Jesus.
10,17-20	sending out the seventy.
28-37	The Good Samaritan.
38-48	Mary and Martha.
11,5-8	The value of persistent requests. parable.
27-28	A woman praises the blessed mother of Jesus.

12,13-27	Jesus is asked to divide the inheritance.
47-48	Which servant must suffer double blows.
13,1-5	News of the Galileans murdered by Pilate's orders.
6-9	Parable of the barren fig tree.
13,10-17	Sabbath healing of a contracted woman.
31-37	Jesus' answer to the announcement that Herod was after him.
14,1-24	Sabbath healing of a dropsy. From the invited guests.
28-33	Anyone who wants to follow Jesus must renounce all possessions.
15,8-10	Parable of the recovered drachma.
17-32	— of the Prodigal Son«.
16,1-11	— of the unjust steward.
19-31	— of the rich man and poor Lazarus.
17,7-10	Wage addiction warning.
15-19	The Grateful Samaritan.
18,1-8	The unjust judge.
9-14	The Praying Pharisee and the Praying Publican.
19,1-10	Jesus stops at the tax collector Zacchaeus.
11-27	About a prince who travels far away to have his reign confirmed.
39-40	Jesus' answer to the request that he should stop the people's salutes.
41-44	Jesus weeps in front of Jerusalem.
22,24-30	Of the Disciples' Disputes.
22,35-38	Jesus advises the disciples to buy swords.
23,5-15	Pilate sends Jesus to Herod.
27-31	Jesus calls out to the women who are weeping for him.
23,39-41	The Repentant Chaser.

24,13-38	The Risen One and the Emmauntian Disciples.
36-51	The resurrected appears to the eleven disciples, leads them to the Mount of Olives and gives them their final orders.

16

#### Notes on the third table:

a) Through these peculiar passages, each of the three gospels differs from the others as a special work, despite all similarity and affinity. Each gives its supplements to the common apparatus in a special way. Luke's Gospel is the richest.

b) What Mark gives more is historical material, and thus differs from the Matthean addendums, which are almost entirely didactic in content. Only in the last story of Jesus of his condemnation, crucifixion and resurrection are actions woven into Matthew, as well as a few anecdotes from Peter. Matthew in particular is rich in very carefully worked out parables. The comparison of certain actions with Old Testament sayings is quite peculiar to him. These action are

α) that Jesus chose Capernaum as his abode (chap. 4:14-16),

β) that he was a doctor for the sick (8:17),

γ) that he wanted to work unknown and in secret (12, 17 — 22),

δ) that he taught in parables,

ε) that he entered Jerusalem riding on a donkey (21, 4. 5),

ζ) that a field was bought for Judas' pieces of silver (27, 9. 10).

– Luke has different accounts of some actions than the other two. Among them are

ch. 4, 16 - 30 the departure of Jesus in Nazareth (compare table 1. n. 19),

the election of the four fishermen ch. 5, 1 -11 (compare n. 5),

the anointing of Jesus ch. 7, 34 - 50 (compare n. 51),

the question of the teacher of the law about the most important commandment [in

Luke: about what one must do in order to be saved] Ch. 10, 25 - 37 (cf. n. 45),

about the hierarchy dispute that arose among the disciples Ch. 22, 24 - 36 (cf. n.

37).

What is particularly remarkable, however, is that he commemorates a sending out of the seventy, of which the other gospels know nothing. His account of Jesus' resurrection also fits into early Christian history differently than does the rest. For according to them it seems as if the apostles immediately went out into the whole world to announce what they had seen, which, according to other data, also lying outside of Luke, is not so. The evangelists, in spite of their additions, leave some historical circumstances in the dark.

§. 5. If we now look at those parts of the whole apparatus through which our writers individualise themselves, we easily find it founded in the nature of things that a life so rich in acts, a life drawn from so many sides into the sphere of legend, as was the life of Jesus, when it came to a shaping of his story, and the authors of such a story drew directly from the source of experience or from the tradition flowing from it, must become the material of manifold descriptions distinguished by special notes. Let us note the common ground depicted on the first two tables; thus one can understand how different representations of this one life, notwithstanding their originality and special features, could nevertheless coincide in certain main aspects and in the relation of certain oddities in order to resemble one another as representations of this one life. Just what possibilities we also set in this regard, and what we would like to deduce from them to explain the coincidence of our reports in the selection and linking of some individual materials; the actual harmony of our Gospels extends too far into the specifics, and the combination of matter which determines their extent is too evidently of special choice for us not to give a special rule or condition, outside the objective of the story being described, for the explanation of such harmony, i.e. the dependence of the evangelists on a narrative type that had already been formed. This judgement is already made by the tables, in that they note that several pieces, which the speakers deliver in the same order, are not linked to each other according to historical context, but by thematic order, and that, even if one of the narrators deviates from the order at his own will, it is always maintained by two of them.

§. 6. But even more than the equal arrangement of pieces of the same content, the sameness of these pieces themselves, considered in terms of their form and setting, proves this. We cannot yet characterize this sameness more precisely; but if we say that the pieces are arranged in verse form (see §1), we must add that these verses of the parallel representations also correspond in content and in the order of ideas, and not only in this, but often also in construction and expression. Indeed, the literal correspondence often continues through long paragraphs and contiguous periods of the text, and, even if it is partially interrupted, is always restored after the interruptions.

§. 7. This phenomenon stimulates research into its origins. It is marvellous how, in the striving for diversity, unity nevertheless takes place here and there, or how, with the intention of preserving and restoring unity, texts elsewhere, indifferent to it, nevertheless abandon it again; how they sometimes hold it in secondary points and drop it in main points. And since the places of agreement and disagreement change among the various writers, and the one sometimes holds the common text against the dissenting third, and

sometimes abandons it where the other two hold it against himself; it seems as if it must be possible for the combining acumen to detect at least a relationship of priority and posteriority among the parallel texts, whereby the alienating element is lost both in the harmony and in the difference between them. Every enigma has something that stimulates the desire to investigate, and this relationship is no exception, because one attempt to clarify it can at least surpass the other.

§. 8. However, we do not regard the problem presented here for solution merely as an exercise of acumen; it is a matter of science that it be resolved. According to the nature of their texts and the established tables, the authors of the Gospels were not independent and autonomous writers. But the judgment on not only the value of their products but also the purpose they had in mind when compiling their accounts depends on the extent to which they were not independent. If this purpose of the authors cannot be indicated or is determined inaccurately and with a misunderstanding of their relationship to preliminary work, then that is a deficiency that must be rectified before attempting to highlight the importance of their contributions. Whatever the causal factors of this disputed relationship may be, one thing is clear: it must be founded in the origins of the Gospels themselves. Therefore, we elucidate the history of the origins of these writings when that relationship is clarified. We can then correct the statements of the church writers, which we should regard with proper skepticism as historical accounts, and both endeavors are well worth the effort, just as it is worthwhile in general to expand knowledge and to distinguish deception from truth. The meaning and content of the books that present us with the riddle will always remain the subject of exegetical and critical research, so that even in the future, one commentator after another will seek to win the prize. However, errors in the exegesis of these writings and in the treatment of their texts will hardly be avoidable as long as their genetic relationship to each other remains unexplained or false determinations are adopted on the matter. The so-called Introduction to the New Testament already arouses suspicion when it cannot say anything substantial about the origin of the Gospels or when, as soon as it opens its mouth to speak about the first writings, it begins with assumptions that even existing data contradict.

19

§. 9. But how should or how can the relationship be clarified? The most general answer to the question is: by the fact that the corresponding reports are exactly—that's what matters—compared with one another. According to what is available, these reports will be the parts of the first table. For what the two evangelists, Matthew and Luke, also agree on, clearly separates itself from these parts into a sphere of its own, in that it is either included in the order of the same (in Luke) or braided around them and woven into them (in Matthew). If the latter, this addition, is also taken into consideration, as

indeed it must be, then only when a result has been obtained about the type of the first panel. The problem, to put it in one word, is this: was the content of the first table a work in itself or not? Everything depends on the answer to this question; it goes to the turning point of the whole phenomenon.

20

§. 10. Now it is possible that the first table will be destroyed. If we take a closer look, the bearer and holder of the same is, of course, Mark. It determines the starting point of the continuous series. What the one, Matthew, provides in abundance is excluded from two, because Mark joins the one who does not have it. The third divergent seems to deviate from the rule, because Mark maintains the same order with the other. — Now, whoever considers Mark to be the precursor of the others and regards his work as utilized by the others will affirm the question posed earlier, just as those who allow him to draw from the same source as the other two will also affirm it. However, those who consider Mark's work to be an excerpt — and it could indeed be due to its brevity — and thus an excerpt either from the other two Gospels or from a related work, will deny that question. This affirmation or denial is also the dividing point of all the different views and opinions that have been put forward regarding its origin since the Gospel relationship has been subjected to criticism. Other views that have not even reached this dividing point may not be worth mentioning.

§. 11. But if in this, whether this or that be, lies the word of the riddle; then one should believe that this must be able to be found. The preceding cause, unknown to us, brought about the effect that is before us—and that is the relationship of our texts: it must be possible to draw conclusions about the cause from the effect. The harmony and the way in which it is interrupted, the deviations and differences under the consensus itself, must lead to the track. You find both the premise of the investigation and the fact to be investigated at the same time. It is actually in the investigation of the relationship between the Gospels, provided that it becomes the subject of investigation through the material at hand, not a matter of research that we, a priori, based on certain assumptions, devise certain possibilities that more or less correspond to what we know from the Christian early history, from which the harmony of the Gospels could have arisen, or generally inquire how the history of the Gospels could have been shaped to incorporate elements of such harmony. That, we say, is not the subject of the research, but rather the question is: What does the textual relationship, as it exists, even if it has gone through numerous purification processes, presuppose according to critical and exegetical results? If this cannot be determined, then the whole investigation is in vain. However, even the fact that it is in vain is only a result when all necessary efforts have been attempted.



§. 12. Enough hypotheses have been put forward to explain the relationship in question, but the problem has admittedly not yet been solved. If we are to consider it unsolvable, the question is: has the fact to be explained really been investigated - that is, from all sides, precisely and without prejudice? We do not wish to accuse the men who have made this subject the focus of their investigations in any way that might offend their other merits; but this is certain, the relationship that poses the riddle to us has not yet been investigated completely and impartially. Often, instead of making observations about the text, one has only a prioriised it, or only dug out of it from time to time something that suited the hypotheses, and ignored and left aside what contradicted them. Yes, in order to establish hypotheses, one has not only neglected but also distorted what stood in their way. It must be painful to anyone who is sincerely interested in truth to see a relationship wrongly, on the investigation of which an important decision is based, or to have to notice that the true remains hidden because one does not want to see what is really there. However, one can see how a matter that cannot be recognized comprehensively without diligent study is judged solely based on its surface, without any effort to truly understand it. It becomes evident that in places where attempts are made to present research results, like pronouncements from a tripod, statements are confidently offered that have no basis in investigation. They contain obvious falsehoods, yet are presented as if nothing could be truer or more certain. In response, one feels the stirrings of a secret resentment, and a silent wish turns into a longing for the truth to be revealed and the error to be dispelled. Indeed, the matter could have been investigated long ago, but authoritative pronouncements do not determine it. The phenomenon does not change in the slightest just because we wish it to be different. Hypotheses that seek to recommend themselves by trying to blind us to the very text of the Gospel, interpreting here, linking there, in ways that are not meant to be interpreted and linked, naturally do not clarify anything. Moreover, perspectives on the matter from a distance, which do not even grasp the specifics, are even less likely to lead to a resolution.

§. 13. We are therefore firmly convinced that at a certain point there is still much to be done in the investigation, and we have therefore resolved to come to one with independent research, no matter how hard it may take, from the whirlpool of manifold contradictory judgments free and independent view of the object being judged, — to trace the mysteries of the text in order, if possible, to draw results from its own depths, as if they had not yet been searched, to answer our question. Let us not come, following the indications of the text, to the point where we wish to come after inquiring into the origins of the Gospels; in this way we will at least be certain of how far the investigation

has gone and that it cannot go any further. After all, it is meritorious to cut off wrong paths in investigations of this kind and to indicate the place from which the trace of the true can be further followed. — And now a word about the method we shall follow in treating the subject.

23

§. 14. We could first present the fact to be explained, the harmony and disharmony observable in our writings, and represent it in such a way that we first gather those passages where the agreement is unanimous among all three references. Then, those where it is only two-fold, either between Mark and Matthew, or between Mark and Luke, or between Matthew and Luke. And among these belonging to each category, we would separate those where the double agreement is verbal, and those where it is only real, and finally those where it is partly both. And perhaps even more specific classifications could be made within these classes. However, even if the schema were to take shape without difficulty, it would only repeat what the synopsis of the Greek texts also contains, except that it would be taken out of its connection and classified separately alongside other separate classifications. The phenomenon itself would not become more puzzling, and the explanation of its mystery would not be facilitated. Such a presentation cannot be our purpose. Instead, we must classify in a way that gradually brings out the problem together with the fact. And how should this be done? We believe in the following manner. Various explanatory hypotheses have been attempted regarding the phenomenon to be unraveled, which seemed justified by its nature. However, upon closer examination, these hypotheses were met with data in the text, and these data became remarkable and interesting precisely because of the contrast. Now, these data unquestionably belong to the fact. Therefore, the latter will be best presented in its significance by drawing forth one datum after another from it in response to possible attempts at explanation, and thus resolving one doubt after another until we reach the point where the truly problematic aspect lies and where the means to solve the puzzle must be primarily calculated, or we can also say until the sphere of investigation becomes so narrowed that a presupposition remains as the last possible one and thus requires a more precise justification. The justifying factors are once again data from the text, so that the phenomenon, as it is developed or described, gradually clarifies itself more and more, and as it gradually dissolves, reveals its character more distinctly. Therefore, the presentation of the fact coincides with the investigation itself, and the former cannot be separated from the latter, and vice versa. Furthermore, as noted, the data are taken from the text, which naturally allows for a more or less thorough examination. However, a primary distinction arises here according to the nature of the matter. Namely, when it comes to comparing the parallel passages with one another in order to investigate which representation expresses the original character most purely or to separate foreign admixtures from the original, the

logical relationship between the sentences of such a passage must be considered, and one part of the content must be assessed based on the other, and the quantity of the necessary must be estimated based on the actually existing, which will require specific criteria. And this would be the most precise and specific consideration of the text. However, before such a necessity arises, results can perhaps be obtained by considering the external relationship of the texts to each other, or their form in general. Indeed, we may already arrive at the main result in this way, such that further proof from the internal (logical) relationship of the text may not be necessary except to confirm this result. The following treatise will indeed provide evidence that this is the case. Initially, we will primarily focus our examination on the general form of the texts, without delving into their inner aspects, although this will also be done where necessary to reinforce the evidence and further secure what has been gained. However, the intended discussion of the subject of investigation will shed light on the difference between these two types of examination, even where they are not both simultaneously conducted. It will become apparent through this discussion at which point the proof from the other of the mentioned spheres must be incorporated into the whole. Certainly, we could have proceeded differently and subjected the sections of the text to a critical analysis individually, as they follow one another, in terms of their parallelism and specific form, in order to deduce results for the investigation from each individual section (a method followed, for example, in Schleiermacher's critical attempt on the writings of Luke, Berlin, 1817). However, on the one hand, we would have had to narrow the investigation to the detriment of thoroughness, and on the other hand, the readers would have suffered the disadvantage of hardly being able to remember or painstakingly gather the individual proofs and premises upon which the result was based, once they had reached it. In contrast, by following the plan we have adopted, they are enabled to easily follow our reasoning to the end and verify the correctness of each premise beforehand. It is not necessary to discuss other distinctions related to the form of the investigation at this point, as they can be best judged for their necessity and suitability within the investigation itself, where they will occur as measures. Without further delay, we proceed to the investigation itself.