

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

26

## Exegetical Critical Investigation

on

the Origin of Gospel Harmony.

---

The harmony of our gospels presupposes as its origin either a written type or a non-Christian standard of agreement that was somehow given to the authors in oral speech. Both conditions are set here as possible at the same time. Before we come to writing, we must speak of that condition which, if it existed, either made writing superfluous as a special norm, or preceded it; and after this the investigation to be made is divided into two main parts.

### Part One.

#### Data in relation to a non-written standard of agreement of the Gospel Accounts

The presupposition first described here as possible is above all to be brought into connection with the nature of the matter, to be discussed, and the content to be expanded or limited in such a way that data can be selected and tested according to these determinations. We will therefore open the consideration with a series of general propositions that emerge one after the other.

#### General statements:

**First proposition:** the Gospels refer partly to spoken speeches, partly to historical acts. The two must be distinguished as a different kind of material.

They provide speeches, especially the speeches of Jesus, and these are presented in different ways. In some sections of the narrative these speeches occur as certain intermediate moments belonging to a deed, so that the main purpose of the account is

not based on them, but rather on the deed; in others, on the other hand, they constitute the main content, behind which the historical recedes as a mere trigger. In the relationship of the first kind they stand in the pericopes

- n. 6 (where a deed is made clear by the interspersed speeches)
- n. 7 (where the words are only used to explain a decision that Jesus made and carried out)
- n. 17. 18. 22. (23. 26.) 30. 38. 54. (Mark. 14, 43 f. (the negotiations with Jesus, as far as they are parts and premises of the last story).

The pieces of the second genre, in which the speeches make up the main content, are

- n. 1. (2. 3.) 8. (words, especially communicated, because with them a success is to be contrasted)
- n. 9 -12. four pieces (with short, sententious, answers, with which Jesus rejects certain reproaches)
- n. 14. (likewise a self-defence of Jesus)
- n. 15. (again a short sententious answer)
- n. 16. (a doctrinal piece) n. 19. 19. (words to characterise the attitude of the speaker)
- n. 20. (words of commission) n. 24. (rebuke against the Pharisees) n. 25. (an interchange)
- n. 27. (a judgement on words spoken)
- n. 28. (a particular, detailed explanation of Jesus)
- n. 29. (a fact, but the main purpose is to refer to words, partly instructive for the disciples, partly the utterances of the same)
- n.31 (an explanation of Jesus)
- n.32 (words of instruction)
- n. 33. (a given answer)
- n. 34. (again an explanation of Jesus)
- n. 35. (an exchange)
- n. 36. (an explanation of Jesus)
- n. 37. (instructive moth)
- n. 39. (words of commission)
- n. 40. (an utterance of Jesus, which becomes strange through consequences)
- n. 42 - 47. (the speeches in the temple)
- n. 48. (a remark of Jesus which is shared)
- n. 49. (a long teaching speech)
- n. 51. (an explanation of Jesus)
- n. 53. (words of remembrance)
- n. 54. (conversations and exhortations)

n. 55. (explanatory answer).

The following is history, in which speeches also occur, but only as intermediate acts. - The pieces, on the other hand, whose sole or proximate purpose is the narration of events, are as follows: n. 2. 4. (5.) 6. 7. 17. 18. (19. 21.) 22. (23. 26.) 30. 38. 39. 41. 50. 54. 55.

27

b) The speeches and events must all the more be regarded as a different subject if an attempt is to be made to determine the content and form of the Gospel relations from a non-written source, i.e. from the source of a merely oral tradition.

α) If we think about how the relations of both got their first origin, it becomes immediately clear that the first narration of a spoken speech is always just a re-narration, reproduced from memory and recollection, while the original description of events after the summary of their moments and the connection of the perceptions, from which the picture of the whole is composed, must be produced by the narrator's own activity. The speeches, when they were heard, were already meaningful, articulated, and conceptually ordered, but the events had to be grasped according to their connection with causes and effects, and according to their importance in relation to other circumstances, and the parts of their content had first to be ordered into a whole by means of abstraction and combination. -

β) For the reproduction of the speeches it was important to have a faithful memory, as we may well presuppose, insofar as it is based on our own recording of the matter, in those who, whenever they had to hear speeches from Jesus' mouth, without a doubt will have listened to with attention and interest. And even if autonomy in reproduction was claimed; nevertheless, this was facilitated by what had stuck in the memory, and what was accomplished always remained under the power of something given, so that different narrators, if they were ear witnesses to what was said, even if they each put themselves back in their memories in their own way, or they also filled in gaps here and there themselves, but were always able to reproduce something that was the same on the whole. But the situation is not the same at all, but quite different with regard to what first had to be put together in one's own observation and by means of one's own reflection. Several independent narrators, even if they have looked at the same event and looked at it with the same attention, will never give a report of it with the same words, and will not present the individual perceptions in the same sequence and connected in the same way because everyone looks at things from a different point of view, chooses the points of reference according to their own discretion, and combines ideas in their own way.

γ) Let us further expand what falls within the realm of our gospel representations of reflection to its proper extent, so that it includes the connection of all information into a whole and the plan of the entire gospel narrative. Even if we succeed in deriving a large part of the material from the reservoir of memory, as the primary source, we still do not have an explanatory basis for the harmony of the Gospels as a whole. Furthermore, another difference should be noted here,

δ) that the presenter of spoken speeches, if they intend to transmit them faithfully, is always dependent. Therefore, it is not their responsibility if the given material lacks the necessary completeness since they should not even add to what was originally shorter. However, when we attribute historical accounts to a contemporary informant of the depicted event, it cannot be so indifferent whether the presentation has been sufficiently expanded or, while one might expect more elaboration, has been reduced to a striking brevity. Finally, what still belongs here is

ε) this. Other sayings - and here we specifically refer to the speeches of Jesus - could be recounted with the same lively interest and implanted in memory as if they were heard and experienced firsthand by the initial transmitters. The focus had to be on specific details and precise wording. However, descriptions that are not reported speeches appear to be mere representations, where the content is the main focus and the form of expression is considered incidental and secondary. These descriptions are usually understood based on their main content, and those who listen to them or repeat them do not intend to appropriate the form of presentation or unlearn it from the previous narrator. Instead, their interest lies in the subject matter, to which they attribute whatever enjoyment the form may bring. Therefore, when they retell the accounts themselves, they will express them according to their own individual preferences. We have only highlighted some differences between the material of memory and reflection in our evangelical narratives in order to shed light on the harmony of our evangelical accounts. If the preliminary remarks were correct, the following discussion will gain interest.

30

**Second proposition:** Not only in the aspect of memory but also in the aspect of reflection, our evangelists are in almost complete agreement in their accounts, with the exception of incidental variations in expression.

Some samples of this agreement

a) from the speeches:

<p>n. 10 Matth. 9,15. μή δύνανται οἰκίσαι τὸ ὕψωμα. — ἐφ' οὖν μετ' αὐτῶν ἴσιν ὁ νυμφίος; ἐλευσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, ὅταν ἀπαρτήσῃ ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσι.</p>	<p>Mark 2,19 μή δύνανται .... ἵνα ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστί, νηστεύουσιν; — ἐλευσονται δὲ ..... νηστεύσουσι ἵνα ἐκεῖναι ταῖς ἡμέραις *)</p>	<p>Luke 5,34 μή δυνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς ..... ἐστί, ποιήσαι νηστεύουσιν; 35. ἐλευσονται δὲ ..... καὶ τότε ..... ἐν ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.</p>
<p>n. 11 Matth 12,3. οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησε δαβὶδ, ὅτε ἐπεινάουε αὐτός κ. οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; 4. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Φεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσθέσεως ἔφαγε, οὓς οὐκ ἔξον ἢν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν κ. τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μή τοῖς ἱερεύσιν ἁποστέλει;</p>	<p>Mark 2,25 οὐδέποτε ..... ὅτε (χρεῖαν ἐσχε καὶ) ἐπεινάουε αὐτός κ. .... 26. πῶς ..... — καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους .... οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μή τοῖς ἱερεύσιν κ. ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτοῖς;</p>	<p>Luke 6,3 οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ἐποίησε ..... ὡς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ..... τῆς προσθέσεως ἐλαβε κ. ἔφαγε κ. ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἐξεστι νόμῳ φαγεῖν, εἰ μή μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;</p>
<p>n. 30 Matth 17:17. ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος κ. διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἴσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἕως πότε ἀνέχομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετε μοι αὐτὸν ὡδε.</p>	<p>Mark 9,19 ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος, ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἴσομαι, ἕως πότε ..... φέρετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με.</p>	<p>Luke 9:41 ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος κ. διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἴσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς κ. ἀνέχομαι ὑμῶν; προσάγαγε ὡδε τὸν υἱόν σου.</p>
<p>n. 39 21,2: πορευθεὶς εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν κ. εὐθέως εὐρήσετε — πῶλον— λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετέ μοι.</p>	<p>11,2. υπάγετε εἰς τὴν ..... ὑμῶν" κ. εὐθέως εἰσπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς — ἐ- κάθισε" λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.</p>	<p>19:30 υπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην ἢ ἐν ἢ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πωποτε ἐκάθισε" λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.</p>
<p>3. καὶ ἐάν τις ἰμῖν εἴπῃ τί, ἐρεῖτε" ὅτι ὁ κύριος — χρεῖαν ἔχει, εὐθέως δὲ ἀποστέλει —</p>	<p>3. κ. ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ ἢ τί ποιεῖτε τούτο; εἶπατε ἢ ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ... κ. εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀποστέλει ὡδε.</p>	<p>31. κ. ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ διατί λυεῖτε ; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ἢ ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει.</p>
<p>n. 28. 16,24. εἰ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν, ἀπαρνήσασθω ἑαυτὸν κ. ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ κ. ἀκολουθήτω μοι. 25. ὅς</p>	<p>8,34 εἰ τις .... μου ἀκολουθεῖν ἀπαρνήσασθω ἑαυτὸν, κ. ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ κ. ἀκολουθήτω μοι. 35. ὅς</p>	<p>9,23 ἑαυτὸν, κ. ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ κ. ἀκολουθήτω μοι. 24. ὅς γὰρ ἢν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσει, ἀπολέσει</p>

γάρ αν θέλη την ψυχὴν αυτού σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εὐρήσει αὐτήν. 26. τί γὰρ ωφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἔάν τον κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;	γάρ αν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν" ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν εαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ, (-) σῶσει αὐτήν. 36. τί γὰρ ωφελήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἔάν κερδήσῃ τον κόσμον ὅλον κ. ζημιωθῆ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; 37. ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρ. ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ;	αὐτήν' ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐνεκενέμον, σῶσει αὐτήν. 25. τί γὰρ ωφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κέρδη σας τον κόσμον ὅλον εαυτόν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθεῖς;
28. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν · εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστώτων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι—	9,1 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστήχότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι —	27. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς, εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστότων, οἱ οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι —

\*) S. Fritzsche's commentary on Markus d. der St. But in Matthew too, for the same reasons, πενθεῖν must be read instead of νηστενεῖν if the writer is not to have forgotten himself completely. Because the formula! καί τότε νηστενσουσιν amply shows that not a πενθεῖν but the word νηστενεῖν, must have preceded it.

32

b) From the reflective (that which is the narrator's own creation):

π. 17. b. Math 8:32 κ. Ἰδοῦ, ὠρμησεν πάσα ἡ ἀγὼλὴ κατὰ τον κρημονού] εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν κ. ἀπέθανον ἰν τοῖς ὕδασι.	Mark 5,13 και ὠρμησεν ἡ ἀγελὴ κατὰ του κρημονου εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν — και ἐπνιγοντο ἐν τῇ θάλασσῃ	Luke 8,33 και ὠρμησεν ἡ ἀγελὴ κατὰ του κρημονου εἰς τὴν λιμνην και ἀπεπνιγη
33. οἱ δὲ βάσκοντες ἐφυγον κ. ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πάλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα —	14. οἱ βοσκόντες αὐτοὺς ἐφυγον και ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν και εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς etc.	34 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βοσκόντες τὸ γεγονός ἐφυγον και ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν και εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς etc.
π. 24. 14,19 και λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους κ. τοὺς δύο ἰχθύες, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τον ουρανόν, εὐλόγησε ἔ και κλάδας ἄδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ	6,41 αἱ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους και τοὺς δύο ἰχθυας ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον ουρανὸν εὐλογησεν και κατεκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους και ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς	9,16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους και τοὺς δύο ἰχθυας ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον ουρανὸν εὐλογησεν αὐτοὺς και κατεκλασεν και ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι

δε μαθητα'ι τοῖς οχλοῖς.	ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς.	τω οχλω
20. κ. εφαγον πάντες κ. ἐχορτάσθησαν κ. ἦσαν τό περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις.	42 και εφαγον παντες και εχορτασθησαν 43 και ησαν κλασματα δωδεκα κοφινων πληρωμα.....	17 και εφαγον και εχορτασθησαν παντες και ηρθη το περισσευσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κοφίνοι δωδεκα
π. 55 Matth. 26, 75 κ. εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. 75. κ. ἐμνήσθη ὁ πέτρας τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκᾶτος αὐτῷ · ὅτι πρ'ἰν ἀλέκτορα φωνή-σαι, τρις ἀπαρνηση με. κ. ἐξελθῶν ἐξω ἐκλαυσε πικρῶς.	Mark 14,72 κ. (-) ἀλέκτωρ ἐφαίνησε· κ. ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος οὐ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς' ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι (-) ἀπαρνήση με τρίς. κ. ἐπιβαλῶν ἐκλαυε.	Luke 22,60 κ. παραχρήμα — ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ 61. κ. — κ. ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ πέτρος τοῦ λογου τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ' ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι ἀπαρνήση με τρίς. 62. κ. ἐξελθῶν ἐξω ἐκλαυσε πικρῶς.
π. 17. α. 8,24 κ. Ἰδοῦ, σεισμός μέγας ἰγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, ὥστε τό πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπό των κυμάτων·	4,37 κ. γίνεται λαίλαψ ἀνεμου μεγάλη, τα δέ κύματα ἐπέβαλεν εἰς τό πλοῖον, ὥστε αὐτό ἤδη γεμίξεσθαι	8,23 (πλεόντων δε αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσε) κ. κατέβη λαίλαψ ἀνεμου εἰς τήν λίμνην κ. συνεπληροῦτο*) τό πλοῖον καί ἐκινδύνευον.
αὐτῷς δέ ἐκάθευδε. 25. προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηται ἠγείραν αὐτον, λέγοντες· κύριε, σώσον ἡμάς, ἀπολλύμεθα. 26. β. τότε ἐγερθεῖς ἐπετίμηϋε τοῖς ἀνέμοις κ. τῇ θαλάσῃ' κ. ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη και λέγει αὐτοῖς' τί δειλοί — 27. οἱ δέ ἀνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες' ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος ὅτι —	38. κ. ἦν αὐτός — καθεδῶν' καί ὁ ἰεγ εἶρουσιν αὐτῷ· τόν κ. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ' διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι οτι ἀπολλυμεθα; 39. κ. ὁ ἰεγ ερθεῖς ἐπετίμησε τῷ ἀνέμῳ κ. εἶπε τῇ θαλάσῃ· σιώπα — κ. ἐκοπασεν ὁ ἀνεμος, κ. ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. 40. κ. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' τί δειλοί — 41. κ. ἐφοβήθησαν φοβον μέγαν κ. ἐλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους" τίς ἀρα ἐστιν οὗτος ὅτι —	24. προσελθόντες δέ διήγειραν αὐτον, λέγοντες· ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα! ὁ δέ ἐγερθεῖς ἐπετίμησε τῷ ἀνέμῳ κ. τῷ κλύβωνι τοῦ ὕδατος' κ. ἐπανσαντο κ. ἐγενετό γαλήνη. 25. εἶπε δέ αὐτοῖς — φοβηθέντες δέ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους' τίς ἀρα οὗτος ἐστιν οτι —

\*) So we read instead of συνεπληροῦντο.

We also find coincidences in expression here. Among these we may count

- a) the word for concepts and thoughts that were capable of very different expressions,
- b) the quantity of words in the expression of the thought and the division of the same into several sentences,
- c) the relationship of the expression as one actual or figurative or hebraic,
- d) the special construction of differently construed words,
- e) the same words in an affective speech, the same definiteness and detailedness of speech in insignificant subparts and the like.

It does not matter whether this agreement on such points takes place everywhere, but it is enough that it takes place here and there on these points, and that there are examples of such agreement everywhere in all sections. But even where the harmony does not extend to complete word identity, the resemblance is always marked in general features, with regard to the construction, the sequence and the content of the sentences. What directly follows from this for the hypothesis of an oral tradition as the source of the Gospel news will immediately emerge.

34

**Third proposition:** It follows directly from this that

- 1) if this uniformity and agreement is to have flowed from the oral tradition, this tradition must have included the entire apparatus of the unanimously given reports in individual representations completed by means of reflective use, that
- 2) if our Narrators are said to have drawn directly from this tradition, without any other influence passing over their representations, this tradition must have been duplicated and disseminated in the one identical form, finally
- 3) if it is not to be attributed to the first narrators themselves achieving their uniformity through a written medium, then it must have unintentionally emerged through repeated reiterations of the narrative.

If our writings, as far as they agree, are to be the imprint of oral tradition, they provide us with the yardstick by which the extent of the latter as a whole, and its development in detail, can be estimated. We thus obtain a tradition that is to be distinguished from



tradition, or in other words: a tradition of a special kind. It is well known that tradition very soon develops from stories and incidents, which at first, establishing or maintaining itself in the narrower circle of mutual exchange, gradually widens this circle, and when it has perhaps even become the talk of the day, gradually withdraws again into the narrowness, until it finally disappears again. It is just as well known that the writer and historian, if he is supposed to have drawn what he describes neither from his own observation and experience nor from writing, could have used no other medium than oral tradition. Even in our Gospels we have narratives which we must derive from such a source, because the authors of them were not eyewitnesses of the fact described, and therefore the information could only have come to them through the rumour emanating from the fact, or through the narration of the eyewitnesses. (Where, for example, belong the news of the beheading of the Baptist (n. 21.), the account of the baptism of Jesus at the Jordan and certain circumstances connected with it, and other reports). However, the tradition that arises freely from the events and is passed on orally is not the type of tradition we are assuming here. It is rather the so-called "legend" which is subject to various changes and rarely remains free from distortions for long. Even if it does remain intact, it assumes a different expression in every mouth and can never be as distinguished as it presents itself. If it is to be recorded as history in writing, it must first be cleansed, examined, and dressed in the attire suitable for written accounts, with various additions. However, a tradition as assumed here—a structured one that served as the model for our scriptures and provided a standard for the choice of expression used by the harmonizing authors—could only have been the product of a specific institution \*). We have just mentioned the conditions under which it could have arisen, if it ever existed, and how our evangelists, drawing from it, obtained the same material to harmonize with one another.

\*) A kind of school.

35

The tradition is conceived here

1) as the possession of many, spread and multiplied to such an extent that it could become accessible to our authors individually and to all of them collectively through more than one avenue. Thus, there must have been an institution where the giving and receiving were constantly maintained and continued. This can only be understood as a connection between the donors and recipients through a mutual need, and this need was precisely satisfied through the assumed mode of communication. It is

2) presupposed that tradition did not first acquire the quality which it must have had in order to be able to explain the harmony of our evangelical reports, namely its uniformity

and firmness, through the rule of a written text. For, supposing this to be the case, the concept of an oral tradition, effective to the extent described, would again be annulled, and we would grasp a shadow instead of the living essence. On the contrary, the only thing that seems to fit together is that the aforementioned tradition, through the very manner in which it reproduced and maintained itself, also formed and organised itself more and more into a solid shape. Assuming this, we still remain within that one institute, and as soon as there are only historical traces of the existence of the latter, what we have inserted into it also seems to rest on a firm basis. Finally,

3) it is necessary that the emergence of such a tradition, which has become a model for our Gospels, or its introduction into that institution, should become probable as a historical success. But it must have been introduced by the need by which it was obtained, and this need must have caused that precisely what our Gospels contain as memorials and historical accounts must either necessarily remain a part of the presentation, or that the tradition must proceed from and be directed by those who, above all others, could feel moved to endow it with their special memories from Jesus' life. From all this it is evident that we must look for that institution in the circle of the apostles, and must therefore derive from them the origin of a Gospel legend directed to specific things. We must now look more closely at what corresponds to the hypothesis that is founded in the factual situation.

36

**Fourth proposition:** The origin of such a tradition is in itself conceivable, and there is no lack of special reasons, not even of details, which justify the fall back on it as the reason for the explanation of the agreement of the Gospels.

We want to cite for the hypothesis everything that, in our opinion, can be cited as well-founded \*).

\*) It was especially recommended by Gieseler in the writing: "Historically p. 86 f.", who, however, does not quote what we want to bring to the subject. Scholl also accepted Gieseler's hypothesis according to individual provisions: *Isagoge in libros N. F. Jenae 1830.*

37

**a)** In itself, it is probable that the need for a clear presentation or a lively visualisation of Jesus' most remarkable speeches and actions was first felt in the circle of those to whom he was close before others in earthly circumstances, and whom he himself exhorted in many ways to preserve his memory, and especially to keep his words in

mind - that is, in the circle of his disciples. It is easy to imagine

α) what love and respect for the transfigured teacher must have done for them, that it became a need and a pleasant business for them to collect all the individual features of his image by means of the memory of his spoken speeches, and therefore to hold the latter all the more firmly as soon as they were recalled to memory. But

β) the apostles were also compelled by subsequent historical events to go back into the past of Jesus' life and, by the thread of remembrance, to seek out the past, whose relation to the present could become clearer. And how should they not have thought about the words of Jesus more often, since they knew that many a thing had been obscure to them that Jesus had announced to them in advance, sometimes in a teaching, sometimes in a hint? But if a brighter light had dawned on them, how natural was their desire to enlighten themselves about other things that still lay in the dark region of memory!

γ) Some of Jesus' utterances were just indications of the future; conditions of the present called these back to the memory of the disciples themselves,

δ) In the circumstances of life they were probably more listeners to Jesus than his observers; so they will also later have had the tendency to put together the spoken speeches of Jesus from memory.

ε) The master had also given them practical lessons; they had to remember this if they wanted to continue to act in his spirit as patrons of his work. What furthermore

ζ) must be presupposed as a condition for the development of such a tradition as is spoken of here, namely, communication to others, was precisely the business and office of the apostles, and this in such a way that the development of special relations according to the character that our Gospel narratives bear, also becomes comprehensible. For just as the apostles' own faith in Jesus was a result of historical premises, so they will also have developed these premises in order to bring forth faith in others. They will have told many remarkable things about Jesus, and among these there will have been many things that became especially remarkable through the connection with Jesus' words and the explanations given by him, and, if the apostles in general succeeded in instilling in others respect for the person of their venerated one, they will also have been eager to hear words that the celebrated one should have spoken from the former comrades of his company. If we put ourselves in the position of the apostles, we can easily imagine the emergence of an evangelical tradition in such a way that it is based on precisely that which we have distinguished above in the content of the Gospels as the traditional material. But there are also certain traces of what is

thus presupposed as possible

b) in the evangelical writings themselves. It is expressly noted that after Jesus' resurrection the disciples thought about some things that had happened earlier; that they later discussed together some of the utterances heard from Jesus' mouth (John 21, 22.), and that they only later discovered the meaning and purpose of many a word and fact that had remained hidden from them (John 2, 17.12.16 ), which explains how the reminiscences of the apostles went back to particular things and clung to particular things. And when Jesus promises them the Spirit who will remind them of all that he has said to them (Jn. 14:26), the fact of communal meditation is alluded to in advance of the point at which the object is pointed out which this meditation will address \*). The evangelical messages themselves also bear the traces of apostolic memory. They all have in mind the image of the One to be glorified, as it was in the apostles' souls. The individual only acquires meaning in the whole, and this, by subordinating everything to a main point of view up to its conclusion in order to leave a total impression on the reader, is characterised just as much by its purpose and plan as the communication of certain persons who are of particular interest to the hero of the story. But even in the description of the individual, one notices the narrator's particular point of view. What is emphasised with visible interest is what, when Jesus spoke instructive words, or what attracted attention in actions, related especially to the disciples, and was strange for them. The relationship between Jesus and the disciples, and between the disciples and Jesus, is an essential part of the description. It is told how Jesus gathered disciples around him, chose some of them, made them comrades in his company; how he took special account of them in his public lectures, and taught them in secret, - how he sent them out, - how, when enemies opposed him, he confined himself to the hopes he could entertain of his disciples, - further, with what entreaties, admonitions, and expressions of love and confidence he addressed them, his beloved friends, when the most fatal time of his life approached, - what rules of conduct he prescribed for them for the future, - how he stood among them as an arbitrator in case of mutual misunderstandings, — as the news of the resurrection of Jesus first reached them, and Jesus did not leave the Earth forever without bidding them a solemn farewell — All these accounts, as narrated by other authors or witnesses who were not particularly interested in Jesus' work, even though they could have provided some individual reports based on eyewitness testimony, would not have been expected, primarily because they were not so concerned about Jesus' specific relationship with the disciples. - After the mention we made above of certain practical teachings which the disciples later had to remember in their own circumstances, we still have to point out that in the Gospels there really are such practical principles which the Christian school holds against Judaism, so that also in this respect the materials are recognisable as outpourings from the apostolic tradition. And does not Luke in his preface, in commemorating the apostolic paradosis, say expressly or clearly enough in Luk 1, 2, that the Gospel stories were really arranged

according to this paradox? - So far, then, we have traces of the presupposed fact. But what about the uniformity of such a tradition, and how is it supposed to have originated? The hypothesis is that it was not achieved by a special agreement among the apostles and was not based on a written draft, for enthusiastic teachers could not bind themselves to such a fetter, nor could independent eye-witnesses want to have the communication of their experiences determined by such a measure of testimony, but it is supposed to have arisen gradually under the frequent repetitions of the communication. We have no further trace of this in the Gospels, for their uniformity is itself a result, in regard to which it remains to be investigated how it came about. - Nevertheless, many things that are assumed to be factual in order to derive this uniformity from the apostolic tradition can be imagined as conceivable.

α) Frequent repetition of the lecture is assumed; the apostles were undoubtedly prompted to do so as more and more disciples gathered around them. This repetition could also be explicitly requested by some who felt the need to familiarize themselves with the apostolic narrative style. It could be deliberately undertaken or occur by chance during ordinary conversations.

β) The uniformity is said to have gradually emerged in this way, and under certain conditions, this can be conceivable. As we have seen, the words of Jesus were particularly the means of recollection for the apostles. If these words were important to them, they would have made efforts to preserve and transmit them faithfully; otherwise, they would not have kept them in their memory. However, it is true that Jesus' words and speeches constitute the core and main content of most of the information we have received about his history. Many of the remarkable events have gained prominence precisely because of them or their connection to them. Very often, when these words are reported, the external circumstances that prompted them fade into the background as a minor detail, and almost everywhere the narrative presents facts, Jesus' speeches stand out—a clear indication that these speeches held special importance for the authors of the accounts. Therefore, it can be inferred that they would have endeavored to transmit them unchanged through oral tradition. Furthermore, we notice—or we must anticipate the more precise proof of this—that the accounts in the Gospels, concerning their uniformity, harmonize much more in the words of Jesus than in the other parts encompassed by the narrative. Thus, these words constituted the main subject of repetition, and it is not surprising that they should have reappeared in the same form. If the uniformity of our accounts arose from repeated repetition, then the subject matter that was being repeated helps us understand the manner of repetition, and thus, at least in a sense of the gospel content, this can be easily explained. The rest of the question pertains only to the presentation of facts and the typology of reflective formulas. But if the narrators could reproduce the words of Jesus, it must also be the case that they found the occasion on which they were spoken. If the words were repeated in a uniform

manner, then these accounts could also become uniform. Hebrews, who were familiar with the narrative style of the Old Testament historical books, were accustomed to a specific way of storytelling. And as they pre-narrated in this spirit, they could be confident that others accustomed to the same style would also internalize both the substance and the form of the communication. Thus, with repeated repetition of the subject matter, the form of presentation could easily converge, as even independent accounts, if they were representations of the same thing and steeped in the Hebrew mindset, had to have some agreement in expression. Therefore, it is conceivable how a typology could form among the apostles through tradition and multiply numerically, while remaining the same in its reproduction. However, we have no further essential information to provide

\*) Other, but not appropriate, f. in Gieseler p. 97. D. cited script.

41

The question now is whether the hypothesis supported in this way corresponds to the phenomenon to be explained and whether it can be fully explained from it. Before we answer the question, let us consider what this answer requires. It is acknowledged that a uniform tradition could have developed among the eyewitnesses of Jesus' life and the early proclaimers of Christianity. This would be the first point. But:

42

**Fifth proposition:** We assume, by seeking its traces, the existence of such a tradition, or we demand from it:

- 1) that it demonstrates knowledge of what it had to convey to be a tradition;
- 2) that it could not be based on the principle of inequalities;
- 3) that it displays the characteristics of a living tradition; and
- 4) that it contains the sufficient and sole explanatory basis for the harmony of our writings.

These are the postulates on which we base the more detailed examination of the hypothesis. In themselves, they do not require any special justification, and are justified in the matter itself.

- 1) A tradition that seeks to convey information to satisfy curiosity or to present facts

would not withhold what must be asked first or primarily, according to a completely natural assumption, in order for the narrative to be somewhat vivid or understandable. It would either not understand its own interest or would contradict itself. Similarly, it would be highly unlikely for a communication to be attributed to it that revealed a deficient or outright lack of knowledge about the objects undoubtedly within the sphere of vision of the original narrators. Many of the principles of evaluation come into play here, which the so-called higher criticism typically employs to examine the origins and authenticity of historical accounts and other written works.

2) We have found the alleged fact of a uniform tradition to be conceivable. However, if what should be derived from it, and what it could only contain in a specific form if it did indeed contain it, is nevertheless present in different forms, or if there is diversity and contradiction instead of agreement in those parts of the Gospel accounts that should have contained the preceding tradition in the first place and could only have presented it in a specific form, then that uniformity must also be questioned as a fact. What is undermined on one side cannot be assumed on the other side as an explanatory basis for what can be explained differently.

3) The tradition, which is said to have gradually formed its uniformity and excludes any use of writing, must manifest itself as a living tradition in the productions directly derived from it. We contrast the living transmission with the written one, and therefore, we consider anything in such productions that, due to its form and composition, suggests a written composition and appears to be more intended for readers than listeners, as evidence against the former. Finally,

4) it is demanded that the harmony of the Gospels be comprehensible solely from the hypothetically assumed tradition. For if there were a need for any written foundation somewhere to connect our writings with that tradition, such as a guide for organizing the material or even just a written Greek translation, then the hypothesis would cease to be necessary. Because once writing entered as a mediator, it could have contained the conditions for that harmony in every respect.

43

After these general preliminary discussions, we now want to develop the data for deciding the matter from the text itself.

### **The individual data one by one.**

**First Datum:** Although the speeches communicated in the consistent accounts all have

the characteristic of being prompted speeches, the historical occasions for these speeches are either not mentioned or not specified sufficiently, or sometimes even given differently, which goes against the nature of a tradition aiming for clear expression of its own.

Our reports have the peculiarity of letting Jesus speak only in relation to occasions that occur and to circumstances of the present. Sometimes he is forced to speak by being called upon to answer, sometimes he is drawn into interchange, sometimes he expresses himself in rebuke of what seems reprehensible, sometimes he gives certain hints to the disciples in present experiences, sometimes he has to correct their expressed opinions - his speeches usually develop out of private relationships and out of the various changes in his surroundings. The mode of narration, then, which as a type placed what was to be communicated in such a form of relationality, gave itself the law of going into particulars and specifics. Now it would be marvellous if the statements of such narrators, who could hardly go into the details without touching the connection that had taken place between what was to be narrated and their own circumstances, should have stopped only at half-measures and not have communicated the whole, as was necessary for vividness. If a narrative, which is concerned with vividness, refers to relevant speeches by a person, it also makes definite statements about the when? and where? and about the immediate circumstances, and, if it is important to it to make itself credible, then it involuntarily follows the necessity of presenting what has had reference to circumstances, and has occurred among them as something noteworthy, in a clear natural connection with the same. This, however, is conspicuously not found in our Gospels, or by far not everywhere, and not in the way that can be expected from a narrative that goes into specifics and flows from memory. The report begins to share individual details, but prefaced are the vague formulas, what is now being told happens "sometime" Ἰν ἐκεῖνω τῷ καιρῷ, τότε, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐν τόπῳ τινί, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων and so forth. "No one is richer in these formulas than Luke, for whom ignorance about the time and place circumstances to be linked with the narrative seems to be characteristic. (He cannot specify the places: Chapter 11, 37. 12, 13. 13, 1. 10, 23. 14, 1. 15, 1. 9, 52. 10, 20. He doesn't even seem to know the place where Mary and Martha lived.) But we don't need to say that such indeterminacy is not characteristic of an oral narrative, but we can flatly assert that it is impossible that narrating men, who had the scene of Jesus' actions and his entire life's interaction from Jerusalem so close and as if in front of their eyes, should have expressed themselves like this: then, at that time, (the same time that was not determined in the preceding) the now-to-be-told happened, or, as Jesus was in a city, the following happened. Just this, we say, cannot be imagined. But just as little can we imagine how contradictory determinations could have been derived from a regulated tradition in the same point and there, where time and place details are added to the narrative, and we find these in our gospels as well, and indeed in the pieces of the first table. We must cite the cases individually because



we have the speeches especially in view here."

— n. 28 Jesus asks the disciples who they believe he is, and now, as they explain themselves, for the first time gives the until then withheld, unexpected information about the direction he will take towards his goal. Where does this happen now? A new epoch enters for the description here, and more detailed determinations about when? and where? are to be expected. Mark says it happened on the way during a journey to Caesarea Philippi. Matthew takes the participle of the past tense, and says, Jesus asked as he had arrived there. Luke, however, does not want to know anything about a trip to that region at all, and so, still narrating from the same question, gives the report that both the question and the conversation unfolded as Jesus "was in some place and prayed." We also have to look elsewhere for the mountain on which Jesus was transfigured after the completion of that journey, following Luke, than according to the guidance of the other parallel reports. Luke names us τὸ ὄρος and means the mountain often mentioned in Galilee. Should tradition, if it contained the differently located story, have given no further determination? — But we miss such an explanation again in the soon following story. All our reports unanimously report that Jesus repeated for the second time the revelation about his impending fate, which was so striking and strange to the disciples the first time. The agreement in this narrative must be conditioned by tradition and indeed one which provided specific words. But in what different contexts our narrators present the same explanation! With one (Matthew), it lies there disjointed, with the others (Mark and Luke), it is indeed woven into a context, but in a very different way (see n. 36); because with Mark, the explanation is repeated as the reason why Jesus does not want to attract attention on the return journey through Galilee. With Luke, who knows as little about a journey to Caesarea or a return journey from there, this explanation indeed receives the same place after the healing of the epileptic boy, but at the same time the special moment, as if it were to disturb the pleasant hopes of the disciples, which the favorable mood of the people, brought about by that deed, could arouse in them. How can such a variety in the linkage of the speech flow from a tradition from which the content of the speech is borrowed, and indeed with such precision binding to the prescription, that the majority of copies do not change anything in this content, but all agree therein?

Another example! The healing of Peter's mother-in-law (n. 7.) is unanimously narrated by all three evangelists, and must therefore have belonged to the content of the tradition just like other things that are given in a consistent form. The fact now probably happened at some time, and this time will have been somehow more precisely determined, especially if other remarkable things were associated with the fact. Now Mark and Luke aim that is a decisive moment, as with the immediate consequences it has, something new and remarkable emerges again. And yet the reports differ about that questioning, put into causal context with words and things.

Matthew and Mark say that Jesus was interrogated immediately after his arrest in the night, during which he spoke the aforementioned words, and also that witnesses were confronted with him. At least we know that the story took place on the day when Jesus first associated with the fishermen and made his first stop in Capernaum. However, Matthew completely tears away this determination by presenting the piece, as he gives it in shorter form, in a completely different connection, in which all time determination disappears. And yet, the determination that Mark and Luke really give is still far too indefinite for a portrayal that grabs the matter from life.

To cite another example, — the cleansing of the temple, the first remarkable fact after Jesus' last entry into Jerusalem, is told in all our Gospels; the words Jesus spoke on this occasion are consistently mentioned. Could there have been any uncertainty about the tradition that knew and gave these words, about when the fact occurred, whether on the same day as Jesus' entry or the day after? And yet our reports contradict each other when specifying the day. Mark sets it on the second, Matthew and Luke on the first day (of Jesus' stay in Jerusalem). But there are other ambiguities and contradictions of this kind, where we least expect them. If at any time events in Jesus' life have claimed the attention of his friends and companions, then it was certainly the last ones, those from his history in Jerusalem. Here, of all places, major appearances will have remained unnoticed the least, and what one had not seen oneself through consequences that had become important, one could inquire about, or rather, one will have inquired.

Now, from this period, in a report turning to the main act of Jesus' last history, the significant words spoken by Jesus in the presence of the high priest and the Jewish elders are handed down to us: "from now on you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the power of God," with the news that Jesus made this solemn statement under questioning. The words themselves were well suited to give significance to the moment to which they belong, or to be linked to a certain moment in the original narrative. They fall at a time at the same nocturnal questioning. The diverging report of Luke says, the priests themselves arrested Jesus, and the next morning, before he was brought to Pilate, he was interrogated, but the presence of some witnesses, questioned in the matter, is not mentioned. With the difference, this is another inaccuracy that could not have remained in a report designed or gradually composed by the apostles as founders of the Gospel legend. We will say no more about the scarcity of the gospel notes from Jesus' last period of life, a period that was certainly fresh in the apostles' memory with all the fullness of notable things at the time when tradition was supposed to have developed from their memory; but we cannot imagine a narrative originating from such reliable men that would have conveyed notable things, without knowing or specifying more closely in which context the conveyed belong; that would have been precise in one thing, and imprecise in another, and

indeed precisely imprecise and indefinite, in which the eyewitness testimony could have documented itself first. — If one says to all this, the criticized inequality in the statements is only based on the individual presentation of our reporters; then we are precisely offended by the presupposed tradition having left room for such deviations through uncertainties and gaps.

48

**Second Datum:** Some of the relations given unanimously occur elsewhere in examples that differ from them in form or content or both at the same time, or are even contradictory to them, regardless of their claim to be derived from tradition.

A piece of data, from which it can be inferred that there may not have been a tradition, expressed in detail to a specific, prescribed expression - as is assumed here to explain uniformity in expression. We collect the evidence - first in relation to such partial reports, where our synoptic gospels coincide simultaneously. Here, the first report no. 1 must be invoked immediately on the first table (about the words of the Baptist). As for its form, the parallel texts themselves agree in characteristic expressions.

49

<p>Matth 3,11 ο οἶ ὅτι ἰ βωμόν ἰρ χόμενος ἰβχυρότερος μου εβτίν, ου ουκ εἰμι ικανός τα υποδήματα βαζάσαι' αυτός υμάς βαπτίσει εν πνευματι ἀγίω κ. πυρί.</p>	<p>Luke 3:16 ἐρχεται δε ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, ου ουκ εἰμι ικανός λῦσαι τον ἰμάντα των υποδημάτων αυτοῦ' αυτός υμάς βαπτίσει εν πνευματι ἀγίω κ. πνρί.</p>	<p>Mark 1,7 ε'ρχεται ο ἰσχυρότερος μου οπίσω μου, ου ουκ εἰμι ἰκανός ὅς λῦσαι τον ἰμάντα των υποδημάτων αυτοῦ' αυτός υμάς βαπτίσει ἰνπνεῦματι ἀγίω κ. πυρί.</p>
---	--	---

Indeed, the same can be found expressed differently, even in Luke, chapter 13, verse 25. τίνα με υπονοεῖτε εἶναι; ουκ εἰμι εγώ, ἀλλ' ἰδοῦ, ἐρχεται μετ' ἐμέ, ου ουκ εἰμι ἀξίος, το υπόδημα των υποδημάτων λύσαι, and again with John Ch. 1,27 αυτός εστιν ὁ ὀπίσω μου ερχόμενος, ος εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν, οὔ εγώ ουκ εἰμι ἀξίος ἰνα λῦσω αυτοῦ τον ἰμάντα τῶν υποδημάτων as evidence that the expression was not determined by a model - The Johannine accounts are even more strikingly contrasted against other representations. One can observe the narrative of Jesus' baptism (first table, n. 2). While here the synoptic reports already differ in their main formulas and one presents itself as more deficient than the other, John's account is characterized by circumstances that contradict both the shared account and the specific one in Matthew 3:14-15. According to John's account, the baptist, following a divine hint given to him in advance, was supposed to observe on which of the baptised the spirit would descend, so that this

descent of the spirit would be the sign that this was the Messiah (Joh. 1, 33). And just as this characteristic, according to the forewarning, was supposed to be sufficient alone, so too the factual proof that the Baptist received of Jesus' Messiahship at his baptism is reported from the Baptist's own statement merely as the circumstance of this descent of the Spirit, without thinking of the accompanying more explicit explanation by a heavenly voice. So, those other reports that include the heavenly voice with its expression as part of the fact, introduce something into the narrative that the Johannine, given its limitation, cannot accept. But the announcement that the Baptist really did wait for the divine sign, and noticed on whom the Spirit would come, is particularly inconsistent with Matthew's note that the Baptist wanted to keep Jesus from baptism. Therefore, a consistent report cannot be composed here from John and the other evangelists. - As with our synoptic gospels, the Johannine also tells of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand (see above, p. 22. compare John 6, 3 - 15). But the presentation here is also very different, and this piece may provide the proof that even Hebrews, or narrators limited to their circle of ideas and their language poverty, did not necessarily have to agree in their descriptions because one, like the other, had seen or experienced what was to be described, and that the uniformity of the narrative in Hebrew language and thought was not as easily conditioned by the equality of perception as one might like to imagine\*)

<p>Matt 14:13 κ. ανεχωρησεν Ικειθεν εν πλοίω εις έρημον τοπον κατ Ιδιαν, κ. ακούσαντες οί όχλοι ηκολοϋθησαν αντώ πεζή από τών πόλεων.</p>	<p>Mark 6,32 κ. απήλθον εις ερημ. τόπον τω πλοία κατ ιδίαν. 33. κ. είδον αντους υπάγοντας κ. ίπέγνωσαν πολλοί" κ. πεζή από παθών τών πόλεων αννέδραμον κ. προήλθον αυτούς κ. απήλθον προς αυτόν.</p>	<p>Luke 9:10. και — ύπεχώ ρήσε κατ ιδίαν εις τόπον έρημον οί δέ όχλοι γνόντεςηκολου- θησαν αυτώ.</p>	<p>John 6:1 μετα ταϋτα απήλθεν ό Ιησούς πέραν τής θαλάσσης τής τιβεριαδος 2. κ. ήκολοϋθει αυτώ όχλος πολύς, ότι έωρων αυτου τά σημεία, ά έποίηι επί τών άσθενούντων.</p>
<p>14. κ. Ιξελθών</p>	<p>34. κ.έξελθών</p>		<p>3. άνήλθε δέ εις τό όρος όΐησούς κ.έκάθητο εκεί μετά τών μαθητώναυτου. 4. ήν δέ εγγύς τό πάσχα, ή</p>

είδε πολύν όχλον"	είδε πολύν όχλον		εορτή τών Ίουδαίων.
			5. επάρασούν ό Ιησ. τούς οφθαλμούς κ. θεασαμενος ότι πολύς όχλος έρχεται προς
κ. έσπλαγχνίσθη επ αυτοίς	κ. έβπλ. Ιπ αυτοις οτι ησαν ώς πρόβατα μη έχοντα ποιμένα· κ. ήρξατο διδάσκειν αυτούς πολλά.	κ. δεξάμενος αυτούς έλάλει αυτοίς περί τής βασιλείας τ. θεού	αυτόν,
κ. έσπλαγχνίσθη Ιπ αυτοίς	κ. έβπλ. επ αυτοις οτι ησαν ώς πρόβατα μη έχοντα ποιμένα· κ. ήρξατο διδάσκειν αυτούς πολλά.	κ. δεξάμενος αυτούς έλάλει αυτοίς περί τής βασιλείας τ. θεού	
χ. έθεράπευσε τους αρρώστους αυτών·		κ. τούς χρείαν έχοντας θεραπείας ΐατο '	
15. όψίας δέ γενομένης	35. κ. ήδη ώρας πολλής γενομένης	12. ή δέ ημέρα ήρξατο κλίνειν.	
προσήλθον αύτώ οί μαθηται αυτού, λέγοντες" έρημός έστι ο τόπος χαι ή ώρα ήδη παρήλθε, άπόλυσον τους οχλουςΐνααπελ- θόντες εις τάς κώμας αγορα- σωσιν εαυτοίς βρώματα.	προσελθόντες αυτώ οί μαθηται αυτού λέγουσιν' ότι έρημος .... κ. ή ..... ήδη πολλή. 36. άπόλυσον αυτούς, ΐνα απελθόντες εις τούς αγρούς κ. κώμας αγοραΰωΰιν εαυτοίς άρτους, τί γάρ φάγωσιν ουκ έχουσι.	προσελθόντες δέ οί δώδεκα ειπον αύτώ"  άπόλυσον τον όχλον ΐνα πορευθέντες εις τάς κύκλω κωμας κ. τους άγρούς καταλυαωσι κ. ευρωσιν επισπισμόν" οτι ώδε έν τή ίρήμφ έσμέν.	πόθεν αγορά- σομεν άρτους ΐνα φάγωσιν ουτοι; 6. τούτο δέ έλεγε πειράξων αυτόν" αυτός γάρ ήδει τί έμελλε ποιείν.

16. ο δέ Ιησούς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς" οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν' δότε αὐτοῖς υμεῖς φαγεῖν.	37.ο δέ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς" δότε αὐτοῖς υμεῖς φαγεῖν.	13. εἶπε δέ πρὸς αὐτοῦς" δότε αὐτοῖς υμεῖς φαγεῖν.	
17. οἱ δέ λεγούσιν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔχομεν ὧδε εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.	κ. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους κ. δώμεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν; 38. ὁ δ'ε λέγει αὐτοῖς" ποσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε καὶ ἴδετε. κ. γνοντες λέγουσιν πέντεκ. δύο ἰχθύας.	οἱ δέ εἶπον" οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι κ. δύο ἰχθύες, εἰ μὴτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα.	7. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ φίλιππος· διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἄρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχὺ τι λάβῃ 8. λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς τῶν μαθητῶναυτοῦ, ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς σίμωνοςπέτρου· 9. ἐστὶ παιδάριον ὧδε ὁ ἔχει πέντε ἄρτους κ. δύο ὀψάρια, ἅλλα ταῦτα τί ἐστὶν εἰς τοσοῦτους;
18. ο ὁ εἶπε" φέρετε μοι αὐτοῦς ὧδε.			
19. κ. κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι.	39. κ. ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιναὶ παντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. 40. κ. ἀνέπεσον πρᾶσαι πρᾶσαι ἀνά ἑκατόν	14. εἶπε δέ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ κατακλίνατε αὐτοῦς κλισίας ἀνά πενήτηκοντα. 15. κ. ἐποίησαν οὕτω κ. ἀνέκλιναν ἀπαντας.	10. εἶπε δέ ὁ Ιησούς· ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. ἦν δέ χόρτος πολὺς ἰνὰ τὰ τόπων. ἀνέπεσον δέ οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι.
καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους κ. τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησε" κ. κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δέ μαθηταὶ τοῖς	κ. ἀνά πενήκοντα. 41. καὶ λαβὼν νοὺς, .... εὐλόγησε" κ. κατέσλασε. τοὺς ἄρτους κ. ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραδῶσιν αὐτοῖς" κ.	16. λαβὼν δ'ε τοὺς πέντε .... εὐλόγησεν αὐτοῦς" κ. κατέκλασ ἐκ. ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παρατεθῆναι τοῖς ὄχλοις.	11. ἔλαβε δέ τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησούς κ. εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δέ μαθηταὶ τοῖς

όχλοις.	τούς δύο ίχθύας έμέρισε τάσι.		άνακειμένοις' ομοίως δέ εκ τών όψαρίων όσον ήθελαν
20. κ. έφαγαν πάντες κ. έχορτασθησαν·	42. κ. έφαγαν έχορτάσθηδαν.	17. κ. έφαγαν κ. έχορτάαθησαν πάντες	12. ως δέ ένεπλήσθησαν λέγει τοίς μαθηταίς ' συναγάγετε τά περισσεύδαντα κλάσματα, ίνα μή τι αποληται.
κ. ήραν τό περίσσευαν τών κλασαοτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις.	43. κ. ήραν κλασμάτων  δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις.	κ. ήρθε τό περισσέυσαν αυτοίς κλασμάτων, κοφίνοι δώδεκα.	15. συνήγαγον δέ κ. έγέμισαν δώδεκα κοφίνους κλασμάτων έκ τών πέντε άρτων τών κρίθινων , ά έπερίσσευσε τοίς βεβρωκόσιν.
21. οί όέ Ισθίοντες η σαν άνδρες ώσει πεντακισχίλιοι χωρφ γυναικών κ. παιδιών.	44. κ.ήσαν οί φαγοντες πεντακιδχίλιοι άνδρες.		

53

There is no mistaking the fact that there are some similarities in expression, in the arrangement of the sentences and in the remarks of the narrative, which are unexpected in view of the diversity of the presentation.

There is no mistaking the fact that there are some similarities in expression, in the arrangement of the sentences and in the remarks of the narrative, which are unexpected in view of the diversity of the presentation.

a) One account presupposes what the other literally expresses, that the call of Jesus' healings gathered the people around him;

b) the narratives all introduce themselves in such a way that it is said that Jesus saw the

people as they were gathered.

c) A supply of food is remembered, which was already present, but according to an explicit estimate was not sufficient.

d) The quantity of the supply is expressly stated,

e) It is said that the feeding was to take place, and that the multitude of those to be fed caused embarrassment.

f) It is stated that Jesus wanted to surprise the disciples,

g) The reports agree that Jesus asked for the people's food and

h) that he then took the bread and after the prayer of thanksgiving gave it first to the disciples, and then they shared it with the fish.

i) That after the feeding, the people were fed. That after the feeding the leftover pieces of bread were collected. (The characteristic word *περίσσευαν* is in John, as in the in John, as in the rest, just so the words: *κλάσματα, κύφινος, αἶρειν*).

k) The quantity of abundance is the same. Finally,

l) all narratives indicate the quantity of those fed.

Nevertheless, there are major differences that would not have arisen if the narrative had received its first form through an agreement between the eyewitnesses. Already

α) the confluence of the people, as mentioned by the common narrative as a circumstance, is derived in various ways. According to John, a distant cause (perhaps even the main cause) was the proximity of the Passover; the synoptic reports, however, regard the appearance as something quite ordinary, without putting it in a special temporal context; rather, they say, the gathering was aroused by the observation that Jesus was distancing himself. (Of course, we do not rule out John's statement as something untrue, but we only insist that the story is different.)

β) According to John's narrative, it is Jesus who first thinks of the feeding and pretends to be perplexed in order to test the disciples; but in the other reports, only the disciples think of it, and Jesus, not worrying about this, is only disturbed in his work by this reminder. — Although stories taken from hearsay and passed on so easily could lead to confusion, the difference is crucial for a narrative derived from eyewitnesses. Certain



aspects are closely tied to a specific understanding of the entire event, to the extent that one should not believe a story has been regulated without establishing one of the two options and presenting the circumstances in a definite manner. —

γ) One can see, the synoptic relations are, compared to the Johannine ones, formed according to a special layout, but they are also individually developed in various parts, and a complete equality is not present among them. However, in regard to this pericope, we have another proof that there must have been a difference in tradition. There is, in fact, another anecdote, about the feeding of a number of four thousand men (1st table n. 26), according to a relation which is already suspected, due to the way it is repeated after the former one and by other, its distinct, features, to be nothing more than a special recension of that first one. One compares the representations: (See the previous piece.)

55

n. 22. Mark 6:34 κα'ί ἐξελθων εἶδε πολὺν ὄχλον,	n. 26 Mark 8:1 Ἰν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος	n. 26 Matth 15:24 κ. μεταβας ἐκεῖθεν — ἦλθε παρά την θαλασσην τῆς γαλιλαίας κ. ἀναβάς εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ.	n. 22 John 6:2 κ. ἠκολοῦθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς — 3. ἀνήλθε δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος — κ. ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.
---	--	---	---

Mark n. 22	Mark n. 26	John n. 22
	κ. μή ἐχόντων τί φάγωσι προσκαλεσαμένος ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτοῖς ·	ν. 5 ἐπάρας οὖν — τους ὀφθαλμοῦς κ. θεασαμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἐρχεται προς αὐτόν, λέγει προς τον φίλιππον"
κ. ἐσπλαγχνίσαι ἐπ αὐτοῖς. —	2.σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τον ὄχλον —	
35. οτι Ἐρημος ἐστιν ο τόπος — ἀπόλναον αὐτονς ·— ἵνα ἀγορά σωσιν εαυτοῖς ἄρτους.--	4. (κ. ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτὰ οἱ μαθητῆται αὐτοῦ·) πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεται τις ὡδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐν ἐρήμῳ;	πόθεν ἀγοράσομε ν ἄρτους, ἵνα φάγωσιν οὔτοι;

38. ὁ δὲ ελεγεν αὐτοῖς· πόσους ἄρτους εχετε; — κ. γνόντες λέγουσι· πέντε—	5. και ἐπηρωτα αὐτοῦς· πόσους εχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπον" ἐπτά.	
39. κ. ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντας — ἐπι τὰ χλωρά χόρτω. 41. κ. λαβών τους πέντε ἄρτους — ἐυλογησε' κ. ἐκλασε τους ἄρτους κ. ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραδωσιν αὐτοῖς. —	6. κ. παρήγγειλε τὰ ὄχλω ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπι τῆς γῆς. κ. λαβών τους ἐπτά ἄρτους κ. ευχαριστησας ἐκλαυε κ. ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραθώσιν (κ. παρέθηκαν τω οχλω'.	10. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς" ποιήσατε τους ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. — 11. ελαβε δὲ τοῦς ἄρτους ο Ἰηβούς, κ. ευχαριστησας —
(cf v. 38 — καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.) — cf. v. 41. — και τοῦς δύο ἰχθυας — ευλόγησε" -----κ. τοῦς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισε πασι.	v. 7. κ. εἶχον ἰχθύδια ολίγα· κ. ευλογήσεις εἶπε παραθεῖναι κ. αὐτα.	
42. κ. εφαγον πάντες κ. ἐχορτάβθηβαν. 43· κ. ἦραν κλασμάτεον δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις. —	8. εφαγον δὲ κ. ἐχορτα σθησαν' κ. ἦραν περισσευματα κλασμάτων, ἐπτά σφυρίδας.	
44. κ. ἦσαν οἱ φαγοντες — πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.	9. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι.	
45. κ. ευθέως ἠνάγκαβε τοῦς— ἐμβήναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.	10. κ. ευθέως ἐμβάς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν.	

56

The second story is so similar to the first in the sequence of sentences, in the description of individual moments and circumstances, that for the sake of this formal similarity one must regard both as special attempts to present one and the same wonderful fact. And yet there is a significant difference in certain statements.

a) In the second story, the necessity of feeding is explained by the fact that the people have already been gathering around Jesus for three days, and the food supply for those present has therefore run out. Out of pity, Jesus therefore decides to organize the feeding himself, without being asked, and then, after staying in the isolated region for several days, sets off again on board the ship with the disciples. But the first story tells us that on the day when he reached the destination of his journey, Jesus met the crowd that had gathered at the place where he got off. He devotes himself to the people and

continues his business under him until evening, so that the disciples first have to remind him to dismiss the people so that the people still have time to look for board and lodging. Whereupon Jesus arranges the miraculous feeding on the same day in the evening, and then departs from the place, not setting out with the disciples by ship, but making the journey by land alone. — Individual words ring out from one story into another, but are brought into quite different connections. Compare

57

(Mark 6:36- and Matth.) ἀπολυσον αυτούς -- v .34. εσηλαγχνίαθη επ αύτοϊς	Mark. 8, 3 καϊέάν ἀπολύσω αυτούς κ. τ. λ. – 2. σπλαγχνίξομαι επί τον όχλον κ.τ.λ.
---	--

b) The number of those fed is given differently, as is the number of loaves available. The first story forms the number seven from five loaves and two fish; the second by setting seven loaves and leaving the number of fish indefinite. In the first story, twelve baskets are filled with the fragments left over—as many as the disciples had baskets; in the second seven baskets—as many baskets as there had been loaves of bread. Now, if these are deliberate changes, in order to make the fact more credible or admirable, both here and there, according to its course of events and its connection with external circumstances, it is impossible to see how art and arbitrariness could take their own leeway in a relation which the eyewitnesses of the fact themselves had already given a definite form. If they are unintentional confusions that have passed from tradition itself into writing, or special formations of the original writers with which they attempted to restore the extinct features of the original saga, then we lose the idea of a tradition planted in such a way as we have presupposed, and how thereby the inviolate rule is supposed to have been preserved elsewhere from the uniform reports given here and there. - But there are several other narratives that John reads differently from the synoptic reports. The news of Jesus' interrogation and of the denial of Peter n. 55 (cf. John 18:12-28), yes, already that of Jesus' arrest, also presents itself as such. The first three narrators say that Judas agreed with his party that he would distinguish the one to be arrested from the others by a kiss, and thus kissed Jesus (Mark. 14, 44. and the parallel locations); John's narrative contradicts this. Jesus, it says, went out of the garden to meet the approaching guard, and identified himself to prevent some of his disciples from being arrested.\*) In that common report it says: as Jesus was seized, all the disciples deserted him and fled (Mark. v. 50. compare the parallel locations), and only Peter followed him from afar (Mark. v. 54.) into the High Priest's palace. John, however, knows that along with Jesus, one of the disciples entered the High Priest's palace, and it was this disciple who first obtained Peter's permission to enter the courtyard (John 18, 15.). The palace was also the place of Jesus' trial and the place where Peter's denial occurred. But the reports do not agree in the designation of this

place. Matthew and his co-narrators locate everything in the palace of Caiaphas (Matthew 26, 57.), but according to John the scene was in the palace of Annas. Annas interrogated Jesus and then, as a prisoner proven guilty in interrogation, sent him bound to Caiaphas, from there to be taken to the Praetorium. — It is hard to imagine how a report emanating from the apostles themselves could have turned out differently on such a point, or could have deviated, if it existed. — The given descriptions of Peter's denial do not show any attempt to express the words to be reported uniformly, and the circumstances are also stated differently, as the comparison shows:

\*) Both reports take care, each in its own way, that the right person is prevented from being confused with others.

59

a) Mark 14:66 καὶ ὄντος του πέτραν ἐν τη αὐλῇ ἐρχεται μία τῶν παιδίσκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, λέγουσα" (compare Matth and Luke.) —	a) John 18,16. ἐξήλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος — καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ — καὶ εἰσῆγαγε τον πέτραν. 17. λέγει οὖν ἡ παιδίσκη ἢ θυρωρὸς τῷ πέτρῳ —
67. καὶ σύ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τον ναζαραίου ἦσθα.	μη καὶ σύ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;
68. ὁ ἰὲ ἠρνήσατο, λέγων · οὐκ οἶδα, οὐδέ ἐπίσταμαι τί σύ λέγεις (Luke οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν).	λέγει ἐκεῖνος" οὐκ εἰμί.
b) 70. κ. ἐξήλθεν ἐξω εἰς τό προαύλιου — 69. κ. ἡ παιδίσκη Ἰδούσα αὐτόν πάλιν, ἤρξατο λέγειν τοῖς παρεστηκόσι · καὶ οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν.	b) 25. ἦν δὲ σιμῶν πέτρος ἐστῶς κ. θερμαινόμενος" εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ * μή καὶ σύ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ;
c) 70. κ. μετὰ μικρόν παλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ πέτρῳ" ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ κ. γάρ κ. τ. λ.	c) 26. λέγει εἰς ἐκ τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως' — οὐκ ἐγώ σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ' αὐτοῦ;

The difference is noticeable enough here without requiring special proof. So we move on to something else. The Gospel of John mentions, like the others, the celebration connected with the last entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (see 1st table n. 39. compare John 12, 12 -18), but the descriptions are here again, notwithstanding similar traits, very different from each other, but even more so is the classification of the matter in time and circumstances. The common account of the first narrators first reports,

α) that Jesus, even before his approach to Bethany and the Mount of Olives, had sent

some disciples ahead with the task of fetching a donkey's colt from the place lying ahead of them for his entry into Jerusalem, and corroborates this note with the detailed and precisely matching account of the words used by J

esus on this occasion. However, if we listen to John, Jesus was not even in the process of entering the city on the day that the other evangelists have in mind, but was staying with his friends in Bethany, and the entry into the city using a riding donkey did not occur until the following day.

β) The day before, the meal is said to have been held in Bethany, at which Jesus was anointed by Mary, but which banquet, according to the other speakers, has a later date.

γ) The enthusiasm for Jesus, which is expressed on the day of the entry in the greetings of those coming to meet him from the city and in the rejoicing of those accompanying him, is said to have arisen mainly through the raising of Lazarus, of which, however, the first three speakers mention nothing at all. — Therefore, that fact, narrated by all, is connected in John's report by entirely different threads than in the others. But doesn't this force us to doubt either the uniformity of tradition among the apostles on one hand, or the descent of our messages from it on the other? — So far, we have sought differences against such pericopes, in which the authors of the synoptic Gospels agree at the same time.

But now we must also mention

2) the accounts that exist in entirely different versions within these Gospels themselves, particularly in Luke. The list of the passages that have such different versions has already been given above in the notes to the third table. We should only look at these passages individually, and compare them with the parallels to convince ourselves that each one is a completely different interpretation of the fact discussed in the opposing relations. — The first one (Luke 4, 16—30.) tells, like the pieces mentioned under n. 19, of Jesus' first appearance in Nazareth. The narrative in Luke is expressly intended to describe this first appearance, both in content and in its position, and the other two do not presuppose any earlier event before the one they describe, as is evident from the astonished question: ποθεν τοντω ή σογία αυτή (Where did this wisdom come from?). \*) The differently developed narrative also has identical features, which are best made visible by juxtaposing them:

\*) So Paulus's commentary 1 Th. p. 380 is wrong.

Mark 6:1 καϊ ήλθεν εις την πατρίδα αυτού.	Luke 4,16 κ. ήλθεν εις την ναζαρετ, — κ.
---	--

<p>2. κ. γινομένου σαββάτου ήρξατο ἰν τή συναγωγῇ διδάσκειν ·</p>	<p>εἰσήλθε κατά τό εἰωθός αὐτά ἐν τή ἡμέρα των σαββάτων εἰς τήν συναγωγήν" κ. ἀνέστη ἀνα- γνάναι. 17. κ. ἐπέδοθη αὐτρί βιβλίον — 20. κ. πτύξας τό βιβλίον — (κάθισε — 21. ήρ- ξατο δέ λέγειν προς αὐτοῦς' ὅτι σήμερον πεπληρωται ἡ γραφή αὕτη (ν τοῖς ωσ'ιν ὕμων (compae Luke 19,9).</p>
<p>καί πολλοί ἀκοῦοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο</p>	<p>22. κ. πάντες ἐμαρτυροῦν αὐτά κ. (θαύμαζαν ἐπί τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,</p>
<p>λέγοντες" πόθεν Χούτω ταῦτα; και τις ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτά, και ὅτι δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διά των χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται ;</p>	<p>και ελεγαν"</p>
<p>3. οὐχ ουτό ς ἐ στ ιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός κ. Μαρίας, ἀδελφός δέ Ιακώβου — και οὐκ εἰσῖν αἱ ἀδελφαί αὐτοῦ ὡδε προς ημάς;</p>	<p>οὐχ ουτος ο υἱός 'ίωσήφ;</p>
<p>(και ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτά).</p>	<p>23. και εἶπε προς αὐτοῦς · πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τήν παραβολήν ταυτην" Ιατρέ, θεράπευσαν σεαυτόν' ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα ἐν καπερναῦμ, ποιήσον και ὡδε ἐν τή πατρίδι σου.</p>
<p>4 ελεγε δέ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς' οτι οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης ἀτιμος, εἰ μή ἐν τή πατρίδι αὐτοῦ κ. ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι κ. ἐν τή οικία αὐτοῦ. 5. κ. ουκ ἠδύνατο ἐκεῖ οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν ποιήσαι, εἰ μή ὀλίγοις ἀήρώστοις ἐπιθεις τās χειρας (θεράπευσε. 6. κ. (θαύμαζε δια τήν ἀπιστίαν αὐτάν.</p>	<p>24. εἶπε δέ" ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ουδ εἰς προφήτης δεκτός (στιν ἐν τή πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.</p>

Another feature of the similarity, if it should be overlooked, is that both narratives presuppose an earlier stay of Jesus in Capernaum and seem to want to make it explainable why Jesus did not appear earlier and above all in Nazareth. -- But Luke's story is very different in the specifics. Not only does it develop the discourse of Jesus in a completely different way from the former, but by taking it upon itself to present Jesus'

attempt to work in his native city as the first and at the same time as the only one on which not easily another could be repeated, it even tells us of tumultuous scenes which arose from Jesus' speech and in which he himself endangered his life; — a piece of news for which the other story gives no support, since according to it everything proceeds very calmly. — However, the account of Luke is much different in specifics. Not only does it formulate Jesus' speech quite differently from the other, but, as it seeks to present Jesus' attempt to work in his hometown as if it were the first, and at the same time the only one after which another could not easily be repeated, it even reports tumultuous incidents that arose after Jesus' speech, during which he himself was in danger of his life; — a piece of news for which the other account, where everything goes quite calmly, provides no support. But even if we assume, as there is much to suggest, that the unique character of the other narrative was largely imprinted by Luke himself, Luke also had to shape his account according to a certain tradition, and if this gave him the fact as he describes it, even only in essence, the first account can only be an inaccurate one, far from being a tradition itself, it likely shaped the traditional report in a particular way.

— The second of the passages pertaining here (Luke 5, 1 —12.) provides the account of the calling of the four fishermen on the Sea of Galilee, like the narratives of 5., and one only needs to first convince oneself again that the representations refer to the same fact. However, this can be concluded not only from the same result with which they end and from the position they occupy in the sequence of Gospel accounts, but there are also certain specific similarities here again.

a) Jesus encounters a group of fishermen at the Sea of Galilee, — two pairs of brothers: — one account sets up the same as the other, only that the Lucan one does not explicitly mention Peter's brother, whose presence as an assistant to Peter it probably also assumes. —

b) Jesus finds the fishermen, each pair of brothers near their ship — at some distance from each other\*) busy with the cleaning and repairing of their nets (Luke 5, 2. οί δέ άλιείς άπ αυτών άποβάντες άπεπλυναν τά δίκτυα. Matth. 4, 18. βάλλοντας άμφίβληστρον έν τή θαλάσση Ιίηδ V. 21. και αυτούς έν τω πλοίω καταρτίζοντας τά δίκτυα).

c) Peter is called before the Zebedee's in both accounts, and

d) both accounts express the call with the characteristic speech formula that fishermen are to become fishers of men:

Mark 1:17 δεύτε όπίσω μου, καί ποιήσω ὑμας γενέσθαι άλιεῖς ανθρώπων.	Luke 5:10 μή φοβού' από τού νύν ανθρώπους εση ζωγρών. (από τούνύν ven compare Chap. 22:69)
--	--

But the similarities are hard to find among the differences. The fishermen's decision to follow Jesus is prepared here, in Luke, in a completely different way and introduced much more laboriously than in the other story, where he reacts without any preparation to Jesus' call: Follow me! by itself. The narratives also give a different picture insofar as, according to them, Jesus, after calling one of the brothers away from the first ship to the other ship, calls away the fishermen there as well, but according to Luke's account the fishermen come together in one place, and as witnesses of one and the same wonderful event, are determined to follow Jesus by the impression it makes on them. The same applies to the difference in this piece of the story as we remarked in relation to the previous one. The one account, that of Matthew and Mark, held against that of Luke, if this latter is true, seems far too superficial and imprecise to be considered part of a tradition diligently formed and often repeated by eyewitnesses. Just as little was it possible for one representation to develop from the other. Either the tradition goes back to different, equally original beginnings, which annuls the presupposed uniformity, or the deviations are based on the one hand on artificial, literary modifications, and then the cases arise here that either one narrative has more features were entered from reality, or the other, in the pursuit of brevity, was content with just a very general statement. Both cases are against the premise. In the first, what is corrected does not seem to be a tradition, at least not a formed tradition; in the second it is not the correction or modification itself.

— The third part of the anointing of Jesus exists in three different forms. From the common account of Matthew and Mark, the Johannine account is the first, and from this the Lukan account differs again as from the former. John (12:1-8) agrees with the common account of the first that the anointing was disapproved of as a waste, and that Jesus excused the woman for it. However, the disagreement is already expressed in words of different wording or in different positions:

\*) Mark, 1, 19. πρόβας ολίγον — καί αντονς έν τώ πλοίω, compare Luk. 5, 2. δυο πλοία, v. 7. κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις τοῖς έν τω ετίρω πλοίω compare v. 10.

64

Mark 14,4 (compare Matth 26,8f) εἰς τί ή απώλεια αυτή του μόρου γέγονε; 5.	John 12,6 διατί τούτο τό μύρον ουκ έπρα&η τριακοσίωv δηναρίωv και έδό&η
--	---



ήδυνατο γάρ τούτο πραθήναι έπανω τριακοσίωv δηναρίωv, και δοθήναι τοίς πτωχοίς.	πτωχοίς;
6. ό δέ 'ίησούς είπεν' άφετε αυτήν * τί αυτή κόπους παρέχετε; καλόν Έργον είργασατο έν έμοί.	7. είπεν ούν ό'ίησούς' άφες αυτήν.
7. πάντοτε γάρ τους πτωχούς εχετε μεθ' εαυτών κ. όταν θέλητε δνναϋθε αυτούς ευ ποιήσαι, έμέ δέ ου πάντοτε εχετε.	b. v. 8. τους πτωχούς γάρ πάντοτε έχετε μεθ' εαυτών, έμέ δέ ου πάντοτε εχετε.
8. ό δέ έ'σχεν (ίσχυεν ?) αυτή, έποίησε" προέλαβε μυρίϋαι μου το υώμα είς τον ενταφιασμόν (Matth. v. 12. προς τό ίνταφιάσαι με έποίησεν).	a. v. 7. είς τήν ημέραν του ενταφιασμού μου τετήρηκεν.

but also the one identical report is changed by the Johannine, in that in the last on the one hand the description of a circumstance goes into more detail - namely only one of the disciples, namely Judas, is said to have expressed his disapproval , — on the other hand, however, words of Jesus are omitted from the counter-speech, which nonetheless make up the main words for the whole narrative, since they are words which the inclusion of the piece in the circle of the gospel saga, like an authentic explanation from Jesus' own mouth, himself justify, namely the words (Mark. 14, 9. Matth. 26, 13): where my gospel is preached in the whole world, what she did shall be told in her memory. How is it that the favorite disciple of Jesus, among the words of the master, of which he wants to tell us what he has heard, keeps silent precisely those through which the narrative itself first acquires its full importance as an evangelical one? But even less than John does Luke seem to know or want to know about such an explanation of Jesus, who even presents the fact of that anointing in a completely different context of time and from a completely different point of view than that it had any relation to Jesus' death at all, and therefore it could have been declared important.

65

Luke's account is transformed from the ground up, as if to represent a completely different thing. And yet, despite the heterogeneity of the accounts, one cannot doubt that they are based on one and the same incident. Jesus could have been anointed two different times. But that this should have happened in different places, the one time as the other by a woman, and in houses where the host was called Simon, and each time at a banquet, and that the disciples, if Jesus defended the anointing the first time, should have objected to it the other time, this would be improbable in itself. One has

already noticed that \*). However, there are also certain hidden parallels between the pieces that we should not completely ignore. Firstly — the anointing is criticized, so that, as it is explicitly here, there it is insinuated and hidden, Jesus is blamed for letting himself be anointed. Then: Jesus justifies the act as a demonstration of reverence and an act of love. Furthermore: the value of the action is emphasized by juxtaposing it with something else. There, the compared act is a demonstration of love, which one might equate to or even prefer to this act, — the generosity towards the poor; — here, it is a lack of what could be demanded, which stands out even more next to that act. Finally, in both narratives, Jesus takes into account the motive behind the action to such an extent that he ascribes the best to it. There, the anointing is supposed to be the anticipation by a friend's hand of the anointing of his body, here, in Luke's account, it is considered as a token of gratitude for the forgiveness of a large debt. But the latter is also the main point on which the difference is based. In accordance with the principle: ελαιον αμαρτωλού μή λιπανάτω την κεφαλήν μου, in Luke's account, a Pharisee judges the action itself, insofar as it is supposed to be the work of a sinner, and Jesus wants the forgiveness of sins to be inferred from the evidence of love that accompanies that act. — The speeches and conversations occurring in the other narratives are excluded, which is why the piece is placed quite differently. But now — are we perhaps to believe that one narrative contains factual material just as well as the other? Those parallels that we have just pointed out make this unlikely, or let us suspect that, if the Pharisee's criticism belongs to the fact just as much as the disciples' criticism does, nevertheless the art of storytelling may have formed the depiction of one based on the outline in which the story of the other was framed, and now we do not know which of the two different representations is the older one. It is clear that one completely deviates from the subject of the other, and it is difficult to understand how Luke, if he had known an apostolic tradition of the kind as the Mark-Matthew narrative is structured, should in this case have placed it after the other narrative form chosen by him. . — As a side piece to another narrative, we have also designated the pericope Luk. 10, 25 — 37 (cf. n. 45.) above (p. 14).

\*) S. Schleiermacher's Writings of Luke p. III.

67

Firstly, we must recognize the kinship of the compared. The question expressed in one piece (in Matthew and Mark): which is the greatest commandment? can easily be reversed into the other (in Luke): what must I do to be saved? since the answer, which is the main commandment in the law, can just as easily be viewed as a practical guide on how to achieve salvation by satisfying the law. Particularly suitable for this perspective is the first presentation given by Mark and Matthew, because it equates the commandment of neighborly love with that of love for God, and thus seems to

pronounce this equality as a doctrine. And indeed, in Luke, the emphasis is on reinforcing this doctrine. In both recensions, the same answer appears, in one certainly as Jesus' answer, in the other as the answer of the questioning scribe himself; but Jesus is always the instructor, here by answering the question himself, there by further explaining and applying the content of the answer given by the scribe. The dual report, at least as provided by Mark, which stands in contrast to Luke, also agrees with Luke in that the correctness of the given answer is explicitly attested: Luke 10:28. ὀρθῶς ἀπεκρίθη. Mark. 12, 32. καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, επαλήθειας εἶπας, ὅτι κ. τ. λ. But the difference is, on the whole, the most striking thing here too, and it is the same case in this account as it was in all the previous ones, that the relation in Luke is more developed in specifics, and is directed towards a particular side. The scribe who speaks receives instruction about love for one's neighbour, which is neither sought nor given in the other account. But if Luke's report adheres as well to fact as that secondary report, it has the same right to be traced back to tradition as the latter, and it can hardly be supposed that it was excluded by a certain form of the latter. - There is one more thing to which we must draw attention, and that is the argument about the rank of the disciples in n. 37. cf. Luk 22, 24 - 30 (3rd table). The difference is striking. In the narrative of Mark and Matthew, the Zebedees are mentioned as those who wished to retain the first places on the future throne of the Messiah, and for this reason addressed an explicit request to Jesus Himself, whereupon they received the necessary rebuke because of the boldness of their wish, and the other disciples, who were angry with the brother and mother who were striving higher, After a description of the matter such as Luke does not give, who only mentions in general terms that a contest had arisen among the disciples as to who among them could lay claim to the rank of leader, Jesus also sometimes lets Him speak quite different words, and only has words as an address to all the disciples, not, as there, to some in particular. - However, there are certain similarities in the statements of Jesus referred to:

68

<p>Mark 10:42 οἰδατε, ὅτι οἱ δοκούντες ἀρχεῖν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιαζουσιν αὐτῶν. 43. οὐχ' οὕτω δὲ ἔσται ἰνὸν υἱῶν" ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλη γενέσθαι μέγας ἐν υἱῶν, εὔται υἱῶν διάκονος. 44. καὶ ὅς ἂν θέλη υἱῶν γενέσθαι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δούλος.</p>	<p>Luke 22:25 οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. 26. υἱῶν δὲ οὐχ οὕτως" ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἰνὸν υἱῶν γενέσθαι ὁ νεώτερος.</p>
<p>45. καὶ γὰρ ὁ οἶλος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ</p>	<p>27. τις γὰρ μείζων; ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ</p>

ήλθε διακονηθήναι, αλλά διακονήσαι και δούναι την ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτραν ἀντί πολλῶν (cf Matthew)	διακόνων; ἰγὼ δὲ εἶμι ἰν μέσω υμῶν ὡς ο διάκονος.
---	---

But there is another thing that seems to have its origin in admixtures and confusions, namely the following:

Mark 10:38 δύνασθε πιεῖν τό ποτήριον, ὁ ἐγὼ πίνω, καί τό βαπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι; 39. οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ" δυναμεθα. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' τό μὲν ποτήριον, ο ἐγὼ πίνω, πίεσθε, καί τό βάπτισμα, ο ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι,	Luke 22:29 κα'γὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθὼς διέθετό μοι ο πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, ἵνα ἰσθίητε καί πίνητε ἰπί τῆς τραπέξης μου καί καθίσησθε
βαπτισθήσεσθε · τό δὲ καθίοαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου και ἐξ ευωνυμων. οὔκ ἔστιν ἔμον δούναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἠτοίμασται (compare Matthew)	ἐπί θρόνων κρίνοντες τάς οὔδεκα φυλάς τοῦ ἰσραηλ.

69

Both pericopes speak of sitting on thrones, of eating and drinking in communion with the Messiah, but after quite different turns of phrase. In Mark, a completely different communal drinking is understood than in the passage opposite. Sitting on thrones is promised to all the apostles in Luke, whereas there it is spoken of seats that could only be occupied by two, but no one is given a definite prospect of this. - Luke cannot have formed his deviating report himself - at least not entirely - even if he should have assigned the place to him according to his own choice. For already for the first time, in linking his account to the other account of the Last Supper, he had followed certain pre-drawn outlines, to which the Mark-Matthew account also gives a hint. For it is strange that Jesus also speaks of his διακονία, which he is willing to prove by sacrificing his life for others, and that he calls the life he gives a λήρον ἀντι πολλῶν just as he declares at the Last Supper, by offering the drink as a symbol of his blood, that he sheds his blood for many (Mark 14:24, Matt. 26:26). 14, 24. Matth. 26, 28.), so that both pieces, the one about the Lord's Supper and the one about the dispute over rank, in this way enter into a factual connection for themselves. Luke could have made the connection even more identical and put more analogies to the story of the Last Supper into the words with which Jesus reminds the disciples of His own example, if he had wanted to shape the report as he saw fit. We therefore come back to something given, and thus, as it seems, to an original twofold, from which it cannot be seen how it can be dissolved into a

general, which nevertheless remains a definite, or how it could have emerged from a definite formed under mixtures and confusions.

70

Let these examples of differences be enough. We have proved what we wanted to prove, that there are several completely different specimens of several constituent parts of the evangelical relation, and from this difference we have — so that we can once again clearly compile the results drawn from the individual examples — concluded that that either

1) if the different representations coexisted as narrative modes, the tradition was not uniform, or that,

2) if they were based on the same factual foundations, and developed in the same way originally from certain embryos, and the evangelical speakers were able to choose between them, there was no type that measured the narrative, or

3) if they arose from an original narrative, then both

a) in the case where the difference was due to confusion, and

b) if they came from different attempts to shape the narrative into a particular form, the original narrative itself had no particular form, or

4) if the authors of the written record were left free to make artificial arrangements or deliberate alterations, in which case no external tradition based on the reputation of the eyewitness could be assumed.

Now, of course, one could say that there are several copies of some pieces; but what is true of some is not true of all, and we do not consider this objection unimportant. But before we consider it more closely, let us strengthen our premise.

**Third Datum:** Even of the final life story of Jesus, despite it being presented in the Gospels as a cohesive narrative, and this having to be considered the main subject of a traditional communication encompassing the life of Jesus, one cannot presume a preceding tradition, articulated in a specific form, before our written Gospels.

If a tradition emerged, where, as hypothetically assumed here, the focus was on communication, it would not have stopped at fragments, but would have striven for a connection \*). Many narrative pieces are indeed of such a nature that once they had gained a place in the realm of vivid communication about Jesus' history, they necessarily had to attach to other material from the same history. For example, how

would the selection of the four fishermen have been narrated as it happens in our Gospels, especially the first three, if not more was to be told about these disciples - as in all Gospels about their other relations to Jesus and in the first three about their instruction, dispatch, etc.? or about Jesus' reception in Nazareth, if the striking thing about it wasn't to be noted in contrast to other things? not to mention the relativity of other pieces. But no period of Jesus' life has been described to us in the Gospels with more consistency of reporting and a closer connection of the main circumstances than the last one. Therefore, the description provided by it could at least be regarded as the most careful imprint of tradition in terms of completeness, we mean the deliberately and thoughtfully formed tradition. And this is precisely the reason why we now turn our gaze specifically to it, despite having already considered some things belonging to its circle. - The last period of Jesus' history, we say, is presented as a whole in the Gospels, but it is not done in the same way. But we do not object to that. But in the various gospels there are inequalities that do not go together at all, contradictions, mutually exclusive reports, which at least bear no testimony to the liveliness of the memory, unless they are counter-testimony to its faithfulness and correctness, but in this as in that case, it is all the more striking, because the last story of Jesus naturally divided itself into individual peculiarities, and these, one after the other, had to appear brighter and clearer to the traditional painters than other earlier stories. Here again we have the synoptic reports under one another, and with them we can also compare John. However, we are not put off by this. But here in the different Gospels, there are inconsistencies that cannot be reconciled at all, contradictions, mutually exclusive reports, which at least do not bear witness to the liveliness of the memory, if they are not a counter-witness against their faithfulness and accuracy, but in this as in the other case they are all the more striking because the last story of Jesus naturally divided itself according to individual peculiarities, and these, in order, had to present themselves brighter and clearer to the makers of tradition than other earlier ones. Here again we have to compare the synoptic accounts among themselves, and with them again John.

\*) Although this does not mean that what is coherently formed, like our gospels, must have consisted of several details that can be separated from one another, but only that it must have been finished, self-contained, something that allowed a total view, and that the communication will not have produced anything incomplete, not, as it were, beginnings without continuation to the end.

72

The mentioned story begins with the betrayal of Judas and the preparations for it (Matthew 26:1, see Mark 14:1, and Luke 22:1, which serve as the introduction). Before Judas offers himself to the chief priests (Matthew 26:14-16), Jesus expresses his certainty about his impending death during a meal (Matthew 26:17 and the parallel

passages). Then he celebrates the Passover in Jerusalem. During this meal, he is in the same state of mind as before, where he sees symbols of his death (Matthew 26:28, compare 26:12). In that instance, it was symbolized by the woman who anointed Jesus, while here it is symbolized by Jesus himself. Additionally, he mentions that among those who eat his bread, there is a traitor \*) , as indicated by the preceding remark from the narrator. Jesus then predicts what will happen to the other disciples as they depart for the garden - their flight and Peter's denial (Matthew 26:31, 34) - a foreshadowing of the subsequent events. Matthew 26:56 refers back to the first event, and the description in 26:60-61 refers to the second. The story of the arrest, which was previously identified as Judas' plan and is now described as his accomplished act in collaboration with others (Matthew 26:47-56), serves as the connecting link between these events. Jesus' cross is alluded to again in response to the false witnesses' slanderous statement in Matthew 26:61, and this is further referenced in chapter 27, verse 40. The condemnation to crucifixion and then the crucifixion itself are described in the ongoing report, up to the moment of Jesus' death in chapter 27, 1 - 54. At Jesus' death and burial, women are mentioned as spectators, the same women who first approach the tomb again after Jesus' burial, and at the opened tomb, they receive the first news of the already occurred resurrection of the sought among the dead. The angel who appears there and speaks reminds of the information given earlier by Jesus (Matthew 26:32), where he would be found and would gather the scattered disciples again (Matthew 28:7). Thus everything in the entire report is connected. But now for the details!

\*) This is the main purpose for the form of the piece, by no means to provide a documentary report on the institution of the Last Supper.

1) In the introduction, when the discussion is supposed to be guided towards Judas' plan, the joint report draws attention to the importance of Judas' intervention, by hinting that the high priests, out of fear of causing a tumult, did not want to seize Jesus during the festival \*) (Matthew 26:5, Mark 14:2). John, however much he might remember Judas' act with indignation, does not focus on the moment that makes its wickedness even more apparent. - We should not attach any weight to this; - but John, if the report that has become known under his name really originates from him, must have had a share in the formation of the alleged tradition, or have allowed one he knew or approved of to influence his own presentation of the matter. But we really do not want to attach any weight to this. **But as for**

2) the anointing at the hands of Mary, as we have already noted, two reports stand against the double report (of Matthew and Mark), the Johannine, which dates the feast differently, and the Lucan, which does the same, not only setting both, feast and anointing, much earlier, contradicting the first relations at the same time, but also making the latter fact the basis of completely different conversations than the first two

reports. - But where does the difference or deviation of three reports concerning the same fact come from, since the same must have had a definite position in the traditional cycle of narration, once it was formed? For even if we attribute originality to one or the other report before the others; it is not explained why the organizer of the other, especially the one who should otherwise have adhered to the prescribed order of the original, - why this one, like the other, deviates.

3) In the piece that follows immediately, the difference regarding the main issue comes to the fore again, namely between John and the others. John wants to illustrate through his report from the evening of Passover, how Jesus loved his own to the end (John 13:1), and he tells according to this theme, that Jesus washed his disciples' feet before the meal, and at the same time set this act of love as an example for them to imitate; but the words, under which Jesus breaks the bread at the table for the disciples, and then presents the cup, - those words, which the other evangelists emphasize as main parts of their reminiscence, - he does not mention, which is striking in every respect, both if these words have the meaning to express also a proof of love, as well as if a peculiar meaning is to be attributed to them. But strangely, the other reporters do not mention the foot washing either, and it thus seems as if we here do not really have the double narration of a historically given double, but only the individual presentations of the originally one, as they have occurred to us above in the narration of the anointing of Mary, and just as in the one about the dispute about rank among the disciples. There is here also a secret parallelism of the seemingly different, as it was there. — The Last Supper report symbolizes a *διακονεῖν* (diakonein, service). Jesus serves the disciples at the table, offering them food and drink, and this offering is the symbol of the offering of his body and blood. — So the action at the Last Supper (the offering) is the sensual representation of the *διακονεῖν*, as it is characterized by its demonstration (as the giving of life for others) in the pericope of the dispute about rank in Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, and other reports now say (in Paul and Luke) that Jesus wanted the symbolic action to be repeated in remembrance. But this is precisely the basis for the parallelism with what is portrayed by John.

\*) Their plan was to legally arrest him and then have him executed — which was not supposed to happen during the festival. The *εν δόλω* [Mark 14:1 “by stealth] in Mark is not authentic, only inserted from Matthew, and in the text of Matthew it is one of the insertions, of which this Gospel has many, as will be shown elsewhere. Luke does not have it, and his words are to be understood as follows: as the Passover was approaching, the high priests were deliberating on the most appropriate way to get rid of Jesus, because they feared the people (and wanted to prevent an uprising), so the plan seemed unfeasible during the festival.



For the act of washing the feet is also a διακονία, and figurative, and Jesus sets it up as an act to be repeated, or as a pattern to be imitated (John 13:15 \*). So we have a confusion, and it speaks for our opinion that the speakers only mention the one sensual fact with the exclusion of the other, and also this, that John follows his description with the same table talks and statements of Jesus, namely those that point to His betrayer (Joh. 13, 21. Matth. 26, 21. Mark. 14, 18. Luk. 22, 21), as the others also mention.

\*) The call on the disciples to love one another as their Lord had loved them is called a new commandment (καινή έντολή Joh. 13, 34), just as the symbolic presentation of the blood is called a new covenant (καινή διαθήκη), with which cf. Joh. 15, 12. 13.

But aren't the relations always very different? However, they are also different in other parts of this piece. How unequally, for example, is not Jesus' conversation with Peter reported!

<p>Matth 26:31 πάντες υμεις σκανδαλισθήσεσθε έν έμοι έν τή νυκτί ταύτη · γέγραπται γάρ — 33. άποκριθεις δέ ό πέτρας είπεν αυτώ' εί και παντες σκανδαλισθήσονται έν σοί, έγώ ουδέποτε (σκανδαλισθήσομαι). 34 εφη αυτώ ό Ιησοϋς' αμήν λέγω υιοι, ότι έν</p>	<p>Luke 22:31 σίμων, σίμων, ίδου, ό σατανάς έξητήσατο υμάς, του σινιασαι ώς τον σίτον32. έγώ δέ έδεήθην περί σου, ίνα μη εκλείπη ή πίστις σου, κ. σύ ποτέ έπιστρέψας, στήριξαν τους αδελφούς σου. 33. ο δέ είπεν αυτώ ' κύριε, μετά σου έτοιμος είμι και είς φυλακήν κ. είς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι.</p>	<p>John 13:36 λέγει αυτώ σίμων πέτρος' κύριε, που υπάγεις; άπεκρίθη αυτώ ό 'ίησοϋς' όπου υπάγω, ου δυνασαί μοι νύν ακολουθήσαι' ύστερον δέ ακολουθήσεις μοι. 37. λέγει αυτώ ό πέτρος' κύριε, διατί ου δύναμαι σοι ακολουθήσαι άρτι; την ψυχήν μου υπέρ σου θήσω.</p>
<p>ταυτη τή νυκτί, πριν αλέκτορα φωνήσαι, τρις άπαρνήσημε. 35. λέγει αυτώ ό πέτρος' καν δέη με σύν σοι αποθανείν, ου μή σε άπαρνήσομαι.</p>	<p>34. ό δέ είπε · λέγω σοι, πέτρε, ου μή φωνησει σήμερον αλέκτωρ, πριν ή τρις άπαρνηση μή είδέναι με.</p>	<p>38. άπεκρίθη αυτώ ό Ιησοϋς' την ψυχήν σου υπέρ έμού θήσεις; αμήν αμήν λέγω σοι' ου μή αλέκτωρ φωνησει, εως ου άπαρνήση με τρις.</p>

All of the individual relationships try to bring Peter's words into a specific context, which, as you can see, is tied together quite differently in each one than in the other; the words themselves only seem to have been reconstructed from conjecture or from indefinite

memory , — there is no trace of a firmly regulated tradition, — least of all in the reflective transitions (e.g. Matthew 26:30). If one comes

4) to the following piece (1st table n. 54.) about Jesus' soul struggle in Gethsemane, one does not really know how to proceed with the tradition. John also remembers a sorrow in which Jesus was immersed, and at the same time a prayer of Jesus, which is completely clothed in the same words as the one spoken by him in the Garden of Gethsemane, according to the other accounts. Compare

Matth. 26:38 (cf Mark 14:34). περίλυπος ἔστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου εἰς θάνατον.	John 12:27. νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τεταρακταί.
καὶ προσηύχето, ἵνα, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστί, παρέλθῃ ἡπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα. 36. κ. ελεγε · αββὰ, ὁ πατήρ, — παρένεγκε το ποτηριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τούτο' ἀλλ' οὐ, τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σὺ.	καὶ τί εἶπω *); πάτερ, σώσον με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης' ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθαν εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταυτην.

\*) cf. Luk. 12, 49. 50

The circumstance mentioned by John, that some heard thunder and others said an angel was speaking to the praying party, is reminiscent of what Luke mentions about the events in Gethsemane, that an angel from heaven strengthened Jesus (John 12 , 29. compare Luke 22, 43). But the context of time and matter is quite different in the case of John. — What he describes happened before Passover, and he presents the matter as if Jesus had wavered between different resolutions before Judas' plan came to fruition, and as if he had to fight against himself at a time when since he himself could change the direction of his destiny, which was rushing towards development, by free decision. Let us now also admit that the other point in time to be distinguished from this, namely the one immediately preceding, when Judas and his companions proceeded to execute their plan \*), was also a critical one, during which Jesus could pray again that he would be saved from this hour; so it seems that, - according to the identity of the speeches, and judging by the fact that the reporters here again exchange one fact for another, - two similarly critical points in time have been confused with each other, despite we cannot decide which of them the spoken actually belongs to. - Only the general remains: Jesus had a struggle with himself to go through before his fate was decided. - But that is not the entire difference in the reports yet. If we read the verses immediately preceding in John; so we come across an expression of Jesus again, which the other gospels also cite, but again from a different time." Compare:

\*) The point in time that the synoptic reports speak of.

John 12:25 ο φιλών τήν •Φυχήν αυτού, απολέσει αυτήν' και ό μισών τήν ψυχήν αυτού έν τώ κόσμω τούτω, εις ζωήν αιώνιον φυλάξει αυτήν.	Mark 8:35 ός γάρ άν θέλη τήν ψυχήν αυτού σώσαι, απολέσει αυτήν' ός ό'άν άπολέση τήν εαυτού ψυχήν ενεκεν εμού — σώσει αυτήν.
26. εάν έμοϊ διακονή τις, έμοϊ ακολουθείτο" και όπου είμι Ιγώ, Ικεϊ και ό διάκονος κ. τ. λ.	— 34. ει τις θέλει όπίσω μου ακολουθειν, απαρνησασθω εαυτόν, καϊ αρατω τον σταυρόν αυτού και ακολουθείτωμοι. (cf Matthew and Luke)

Here, once again, is a remarkable parallelism. The other gospels also have the words in the place where Jesus, for the first time, reveals to the disciples their unexpected decision that he intends to go to his death and, — which appears as a second aspect, — where this decision is seen as a renunciation of all the advantages promised by popular favor, just like in John, where Jesus expresses his intention to go to his death when the Greeks present in Jerusalem requested a conversation with him (Jn. 12:20-23. with which cf. Jn 2, 23-25). So John combines in one account what is distributed in different places in the other gospels. Now, although Jesus could have repeated certain literal expressions, — like that of the prayer and this decision, — on multiple occasions and under similar situations; it is however not likely that he should have expressed his emotions or decisions in the same way every time where the situation seemed to require a struggle and a decision, and thus not likely that he, at the critical point in time intended by John, made his self-decision for death upon the announcement of the Greeks just as earlier on the news of the judgments of the Galileans, and again, the prayer for salvation spoken by John at the time of the crisis later in the Garden of Gethsemane. So either John made a mix of homogenous parts, or the other reporters artificially multiplied and separated what in reality belonged together at one and the same time. Neither in this nor in that case can we assume a specific and constant tradition as the root of the gospel accounts. For the separate could not be mixed, and the related could not be separated, if the form and expression for the contract of history had already been given in a typical manner \*).

\*) According to the first three Gospels, soon after Jesus first made known his decision to walk the path of death, the so-called transfiguration took place on the mountain. This story has

a) much in common with the description of the events in the Garden of Gethsemane. Jesus has the same disciples around him here as there. The

disciples sink into sleep (the same expression Luk. 9, 32. Matth. 26, 43. ηῦαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβαρημένοι), they do not know what to answer. (The same expression Mark. 14, 40. οὐκ ἤδεισαν τί ἀντὶ ἀποκρῆναι and Mark. 9, 6. ὃν γὰρ ἤδει τί λαλήβη comp. Luk. 9, 33. μή εἰδῶς ὁ λέγει) The other disciples kept at a distance. Jesus prayed and fasted on the mountain (Mark 9:29). He is encouraged in His decision to sacrifice Himself for the good cause (Luk. 9, 31.) - A voice is heard from heaven (Matth. 17, 5) just as in the decisive moment in John (v. 12, 28).

b) But the transfiguration itself, as described by the synoptic accounts - does it not have the meaning of being the model of a future transfiguration? Then the matter coincides with the expression of the voice in John. This is also the case in 2 Peter 1:16-18.

c) But what is the "holy mountain" mentioned in the last passage the scene of the phenomenon? is it not the Temple Mount?

5) The next section of the story describes the taking of Jesus as a prisoner. Of course, the Gospels all tell the fact; but the description, where it is specifically portrayed, is different, just like the scene in the garden, as we have already mentioned above. We do not want to say anything here about the peculiarity of Luke's account in relation to Matthew and Mark, but draw the conclusion from the difference between John and the others. They want to say that Jesus, in the fatal night at the place where he was waiting for the betrayer, was only with three disciples, separated and distant from the others, and it seems as if a main emphasis is to be laid on this circumstance, which is introduced by them, as according to the prediction, by a type contained in the Old Testament story. Compare the story of the arrangements for the sacrifice of Isaac:

79

Matth 26,37. και παρέλάβε τον πέτραν ζ. τούς δύο ζεβεδαίους.	Gen. 22,3. ἀναστάς δέ ἀβραάμ τό πρῶί — παρέλαβε δέ μεθ ἑαντον ὄνο παιδῆς κ. ἦλθεν ἐπι τον τόπον. κ. εἶπεν τοῖς παισ'ιν αὐτον' καθίσατε αν τ ον, ἔγω δε — διελενσώμέθα εως ὡδε κ. προσκνησαντες αναστρέψομεν.
Luke 22,40. γινόμενος δέ ἐπι τον τοπον.	
Matth 26.36. κ. λέγει" καθίσατε αυτου, εως ου ἀπελθων προσεύξωμαι ἐκεῖ.	

But John does not present the matter in this way; rather, Jesus is said to have wanted to protect his disciples, in order to fulfill an Old Testament dictum, so that he would not lose any of them, which should rather contain the implication that he had them together

without being separated. John also knows nothing about the Judas kiss, but the others again know nothing about the fact that at the word of Jesus: I am he! the crowd that had come retreated and fell to the ground. —

6) The difference in the reports concerning the place to which Jesus was taken after his arrest has already been discussed above. It is all the more noteworthy since it admittedly cannot be reconciled, and no such explanation can be found for it that would match our assumption. For even if one were to say that the confusion found in the synoptic reports is not surprising, since the news that reached the other apostles (who, unlike Peter and John, were not eyewitnesses of the described event) on that night of terror were only fragmentary, and the non-native Peter in Jerusalem perhaps did not really know into what kind of high priestly palace he had unfortunately come (Paulus Komment. 3. Th. S. 644.); the question remains: why did the creators of the tradition, which is supposed to have originated and been preserved in the apostolic circle in Jerusalem, not inquire about the true circumstances of the matter in order to know it as well as John, with whom they simultaneously told of it? — If, therefore, John's account is the more precise and correct one, we cannot believe that the tripartite other constituted the original report, or that it was copied according to it.

7) Regarding the questioning of Jesus, as already noted, there are also deviations. Luke shifts the night-time questioning, which the other accounts describe, to the following morning. This could indeed be an intentional alteration, but the words reported from this questioning are also different, and in John they are completely different from the others. It's as if the Johannine report wants to make us suspect that the reality may have been quite different in many places than what the first three gospels tell us. Like them (Mark. 14, 65 and the parallels), he mentions that Jesus received slaps in the face, but he places his remark in a completely different causal context, John 18, 22.

8) The accounts differ again, as if flowing from an indefinite legend, about Peter's denial. All the reports assert the threefold repetition of the denial, but either the acts are confused, or other people are brought in, and the denials are arranged according to different occasions. — There follows

9) the story of Jesus' interrogation and condemnation before the judgment seat of Pilate. In this story, one notices the same basic lines in all accounts, but the drawing of the picture is executed differently. The common elements are:

- a) Jesus is asked by the governor if he is the king of the Jews, and he affirms this,
- b) Pilate finds nothing punishable in the accused, and wants to designate him, according to the custom, to be one of the prisoners to be released to the people at the

festival,

c) The Jews, however, demand Barabbas instead.

d) Pilate objects but ultimately has to give in.

e) The soldiers mockingly dress Jesus as a king and vent their capriciousness on him.

— These are elements that almost each of the narrators fills with special content, or points of division between which various things are inserted. Before the first, John places the preliminary conversation of the accusers with the judge. Matthew and Mark have nothing of this. Luke wants to introduce the negotiation by explicitly determining the point of accusation. However, what follows shows in relation to the parallel texts that he only wants to fill a gap. If Jesus was handed over to Pilate with the words cited by Luke, then Jesus himself must have heard the accusation; according to John 18, 33, however, he did not hear it \*). As the first three narrators present it, Jesus unconditionally affirmed Pilate's question. How could they immediately follow this with Pilate finding Jesus innocent and acquitting him outright? John fills the gap. — We already consider this supplementation as a counter-proof against the above hypothesis, which assumes that our narratives have obtained their uniformity through frequent repetition. For with frequent repetition, one would probably have become more attentive to the gaps and not left them. — Pilate wants, it continues, to use to Jesus' advantage the observance of releasing a prisoner at the festival. The other reporters, Mark and Matthew, make a new act of the drama with the reminder of this observance: The people come and formally ask for a prisoner to be released, and behind this people, the high priests hide, so that it should ask for Barabbas to be released but absolutely reject Jesus. In Luke, on the other hand, the reference to the mentioned custom is only a remark by the narrator (Luke 23, 17). But John puts it into the mouth of Pilate himself (John 18, 39). We do not know here whether one has supplemented or embellished, or the other has omitted. — The account of Matthew and Mark seems to have something studied, and John's words (18, 39.): "ἔστι δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν κ.τ. λ." are nevertheless not likely as words of Pilate, although they may be based on a real speech. According to Luke, Pilate declares that he wants to treat Jesus (even if he allows him to benefit from that existing custom \*) as someone arrested not without reason and have him flogged (Luke 22, 16. 22.). However, it is not said whether this really happened (as an attempt, namely, to bring about the release of the accused). According to the immediate following (Luke v. 18 and v. 23.), it did not happen. — The Jews did not accept the offer. — Nevertheless, Luke seems to assume that the flogging happened here, since he mentions nothing of the flogging after the truly pronounced death sentence. his corresponds to the Johannine account, to which Luke's account relates as the indeterminate to the determined. Pilate, says John (chapter 19, 1.), indeed had Jesus

flogged, and afterwards still made attempts to enforce his release (chapter 19, 4. 5., verses which would fit between Luke's verses 17. and 18., if not followed by Luke verse 22). However, if we consider the accounts of Mark and Matthew, these statements are based only on a confusion of moments. The flogging mentioned by John and the mocking disguise of the prisoner carried out by the soldiers only happened after his condemnation, which is more probable, partly because it was the usual order that those to be crucified were first flogged before the pronounced sentence was executed on them, partly because the soldiers would hardly have committed mischief on someone who was still to be released, let alone take the matter for mockery from an accusation not yet proven. — Nevertheless, the contradictory accounts always behave like opposed assertions, especially since they lie within one and the same outline, and a twice occurrence of the narrated matter is not credible. For if one were to assume that the flogging had been carried out twice, one would also have to assume the same with respect to the mocking crowning, and this is unlikely to be easily accepted by anyone. The fourth point was: Pilate makes objections. — So his speech would have caused counter-reminders, and the Proprietor would only then have been persuaded to give in. This is how John also presents the matter - quite probably. According to the first three Gospels, however, which bring the mob onto the scene with the request for Barabbas and make him the instrument of Jesus' enemies, the matter does not pass without tumult. The only response is the repeated cry: crucify, crucify him! and the judge must yield to the increasing outcry. So here again is an addition from the contribution of the fourth narrator, and in the first three Gospels a lack that one cannot presume in an original report, consisting of often repeated stories, and supposedly based on authentic traditions made on site (in Jerusalem). It is now

\*) The words in v. 33, σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (you are the king of the Jews) must be removed from the questionable, so that they do not seem similar to an assertion, otherwise Jesus' answer does not fit. The conversation goes like this: You are the king of the Jews! Response: Are you expressing your own judgment, or is that what others say? Pilate: How can I, as a Roman, seriously confer this title on anyone? Your people have handed you over to me, and my expression refers to the charge, to hear from you what you have done, and whether you yourself claim to be the king of the Jews. Different from Lücke's commentary on John, see part. Bonn 1824, p. 478.

\*) Although this is not explicitly expressed in Luke 22, 17, it is probably implied in the text.

10) described how Jesus, after the death sentence has been pronounced and the flogging suffered, is led away to crucifixion. John expressly says (chapter 19,17): Jesus carried his cross himself, - the others, on the contrary, give the just as explicit report that

it had to be carried for him, and name the man who was compelled to this service. Intentional omission of the actual course of events cannot be suspected in John. For why would he then have made the statement at all that Jesus carried his cross? If he did not know the matter precisely, and if such ignorance can still be considered possible for him at the time he wrote, then it is not easy to come to the idea of deriving our Gospel accounts and their uniformity from certain tales or communications that have been conformed after frequent discussions of the matter. For this circumstance is just one of the things that tend to be discussed most frequently and earliest in public, and the more precise indication of the circumstance was not insignificant for the written narration either. — The description now comes

11) to the crucifixion itself. The description mostly gathers individual circumstances following the guidance of Old Testament predictions — for example, Matthew 27:34 (Mark 15:23) -- John 19:29, compare Psalms 69:22. Further: Matthew 27:35 (and the parallel verse John 19:24, compare Psalms 22:19. Further: Matthew 27:39 (and the parallel verses) Luke 23:35, compare Psalms 22:8 (from which Luke takes the word: ἰκμυκτηρίζιiv) Further: Matthew 27:46 (Mark 15:34), compare Psalms 22:1. — But the details also diverge on main points here. First and foremost, Matthew (27:34), and with him Mark, mention a drink offered to Jesus before the crucifixion, while the former clearly implies that this fulfilled an Old Testament prophecy. John, who indisputably has the same Old Testament verse in mind as Matthew, and speaks explicitly of scripture fulfillment (John 19:28), identifies only the last drink, which was given to Jesus shortly before the moment of death, as the drink to be mentioned in accordance with that verse, and does not mention the first one. Furthermore, Matthew and Mark do not know of any words that Jesus would have spoken at the moment of his passing. Luke cites such words in chapter 23:46, but according to John (19:30), the spoken words were different. Here, especially, the difference stands out, considering that the words spoken by Jesus at this moment must have been particularly memorable to sympathetic listeners as his last words. If not here, where else should we expect the original narrators' endeavor to establish the authentic word? But even in the following circumstances, the narratives do not entirely agree. Joseph comes on the eve of the Sabbath to ask Pilate for Jesus' body. Everyone agrees on this. But John notes: before Joseph came, the Jews asked for the removal of the crucified, and now soldiers were sent to break the legs of those who had not yet died, and these dispatched soldiers wanted to also carry out the order on Jesus, but realized that Jesus had already passed away. At least, this does not agree with the report given by Mark, that Pilate, having been urgently entreated by Joseph, had inquired of the centurion on duty — undoubtedly the same one who had seen Jesus die — whether Jesus had already died; unless, in order to reconcile both accounts, one were to infer possibilities from the text that are nowhere expressed. Luke only indicates what Joseph did after he had removed the body, and leaves it to us to infer the permission he received to do so, as well as the preparations that must have



preceded it, from his narrative. Matthew, however, when he says that Pilate immediately granted the requested permission, makes the gap in the account tangible, insofar as he provides no explanation of how Pilate immediately acceded to the request. Mark fills in the gap, noting that the praetor had previously ascertained the reality of Jesus' death, only he fills in this gap differently than John does. We thus see at least that the original account, if it needed to be supplemented by Mark and John, did not go as far as it should have, and this leads us to doubt whether the deficient account is really the oral original account that should be assumed. —

12) The conclusion of the overall knowledge is the resurrection of Jesus, the most important of all evangelical facts. The first two reporters follow a very brief outline and seem, according to their original text, to know nothing of what Luke has drawn from tradition, and John's reports sound different from the specific accounts of all three. Should the more detailed accounts here be the later ones, and the shorter ones the earlier ones — at least this has been found to be in accordance with the circumstances — it should be remembered, among other things, firstly this: if the originators of the tradition had the purpose of telling a story in their individual reports from Jesus' history, they could also form separate narratives about the way in which they gradually became more and more convinced of Jesus' resurrection, especially if such facts as are given by Luke and in the additions to John had occurred within their sphere of experience — they could, we say, also form separate narratives about these facts, just as well as about others, and such particular or specific mentions could not have been outside their purpose, if such notes are to be traced back to them, like those given by the experiences of the women, which also goes into specifics. The exclusion on the one hand and the incompleteness on the other hand provides the proof that there was no specific and firm tradition on this point. And so, in the whole we have gone through, we have not encountered a single piece that would not have been given under differences. At the end, we would like to summarize the series of observations we have made once again in an overview. The basis of our argument is this: the relations of the first three gospels are identical even in parts that, if they had been parts of a preceding oral tradition, would have testified to the elaborateness and definiteness of the same down to the smallest detail. Now, however, a tradition of such character, which could have become the prototype of uniform copies, was not present according to several traces. We infer this from the nature of those reports that are available to us from the last epoch of Jesus' life in John and the rest. In them we find

1) Contradictions (e.g., about the scene before Jesus' arrest, about the location of Peter's denial, about the interrogation before Pilate, about the scourging of Jesus, and the mockery of him, about carrying the cross at the execution of Jesus, about the drink he received twice), and news that mutually exclude each other from the whole to which they belong as special formations of the same thing (e.g., the washing of feet and the

Last Supper, the information about the acts of Peter's denial).

2) Some facts and speeches are put in a different context (e.g., the anointing of Jesus by Mary, Peter's assurance of his loyalty and steadfastness).

3) Some commonly shared stories are superficial and incomplete (e.g., about the way in which Jesus' condemnation is carried out, about the removal of his body from the cross, even about the resurrection of Jesus).

4) Some seem to be based on confused memories, or have been artificially expressed in different ways (e.g., Jesus' struggle with himself before his resignation to prolonging life).

5) Often, where the first three narrators agree, John changes or contradicts, even though he does not always outweigh them in credibility.

6) There is not a single particular note in the whole considered that is not either given differently by John, or that one of the first three does not provide with special news.

87

And now we ask, if Jesus' last story has not received a definite form, how should the earlier one, which, according to the arrangement of our Gospels, serves as the introduction to that one? It too will not have received a specific expression. If it were also the case, as some scholars have assumed, that John wanted to correct the other gospels, then these would be even less valid for the reprint of the apostolic tradition.

**Fourth Datum:** The selection of the communal pieces depicted on the first table is also interconnected in such a way that a whole is formed, from which not only a large number of specific reports emerge, but also certain remarkable details are excluded, which could hardly have been absent in an oral proto-gospel.

88

The third table shows us the passages that belong exclusively to the individual evangelists. That these are separated from what is common is not doubted; Most of them are, however, because in the case of the individual evangelist they stand between pieces which in the case of the others are placed in a direct connection or in an uninterrupted sequence. Boundaries are thus drawn and an apparatus enclosed, from which both pieces that John has and pieces that belong to the supplies of the first three evangelists themselves are excluded. With regard to these excluded passages one

might ask: from where did our writers borrow this special material, if they already had a delimiting tradition descending from the apostles, and what are the original sources from which the peculiar news flowed? However, we do not raise the question to this extent here, partly because we have already addressed it above regarding some of these pieces—namely, those that are other versions of certain shared accounts—and have duly acknowledged their significance. Additionally, in regards to others, the answer is possible: the authors of our Gospels utilized not only what was given to them through apostolic tradition but also other information obtained through inquiry or communication, or they made use of existing written documents alongside the orally transmitted material. Lastly, there are indeed some of these accounts that appear to be entirely of apocryphal origin (among which are some found in Matthew and Luke). But some of these reports deserve special attention for two reasons, partly because, in addition to their remarkableness, they have the authority of eyewitness evidence, partly because the writer himself wants them to be given special attention. As an example of the first kind we may without hesitation cite the news given to us by John about the raising of Lazarus. Raising the dead was, in general, strange enough to teachers and students of Christianity, and one would think that as many of them as the apostles or the evangelizers knew would have mentioned them. John does not mention the raising of the daughter of Jairus, nor that of the youth at Nain, and an argument against himself could be drawn from this. But it must be remembered that John does not relate this fact either because of its nature as a miracle work, but rather partly because of the speeches of Jesus spoken at the time, and partly because of the connection that this miraculous act has with the last story of Jesus. As the only action of this kind mentioned by him, it need not be the only one he knew. Just as it was known to him, and the news of it can be traced back to his knowledge, it will also have been just as well known to the fellow apostles and have remained just as remarkable, especially if it really had a connection with Jesus' last story, like John introduces him. It may therefore be conjectured that the apostolic tradition did not conceal this fact, even if it was not a firmly established tradition, or we shall say it may be conjectured, if it aimed for consistency, that it would have excluded this fact. Our first three evangelists do not seem to have known it. For their collective account introduces the final story of Jesus in a different way, regardless of their own lack of intention to suppress the mention of miraculous acts, but rather to include such mentions in specific places—as in Matthew 21:15 and Luke 19:37. The other remarkable detail we had in mind earlier is the account found in Luke regarding the one thief who rebukes his fellow crucified companion for mocking Jesus and expresses feelings of reverence towards him. The first authorities on evangelical lore would hardly have left unmentioned the word of justification for Jesus, which was spoken with emotion, since the common report derived from them also handed down the confession of the pagan centurion to memory. Now, however, Luke expressly asserts the fact and, it seems, even sets it up against the other relation with deliberate contradiction. Precisely for the sake of this deliberate contradiction, it is

impossible to consider it fictional. But is it a fact; so one cannot reasonably assume that the contrary assertion, that both thieves mockingly advanced Jesus' helplessness, would have continued as a tradition among the apostles at Jerusalem, in order to come to our evangelists. — Through the unity of the type, however, some other material, especially of didactic content, is separated from what is given, which, if it depends on tradition, can just as little be considered purely singular as it lacks importance in terms of content. If one takes the Gospel of Mark for oneself, one misses many things. For example, it is not at all clear why Jesus chose disciples and what he actually appointed them to do, whether they were only to be his assistants in healing the sick or also his representatives with the intention of spreading the teachings when he himself would no longer be able to do so. Indisputably, Jesus will have given the specific explanations about this, and so there is also a piece of this kind in Luke chap. 12, 1-9.; but this piece does not belong to the basis of the three gospels, but rather is singled out by the pre-existing type of agreement. Because

a) For after n. 32 (Luke 9:48), in both Matthew and Mark, immediately follows n. 33 with n. 34 (Luke 18:15-17), the departure from Capernaum for the final journey to Jerusalem through Perea. Therefore, both Matthew and Mark exclude the intermediate journeys mentioned by Luke, to which this passage belongs, as has already been noted on the tablet.

b) The words with which the piece opens the speech (Luk. 12,1.), are in Mark (Ch. 8,11.) and Matthew (Ch. 16, 6.) so connected to a certain occasion, and with other, to them directly related, words, that the Lukassian execution can gain no place in this context.

c) Fragments from the speech of Luke has also Matthew, as seen on the second plate, above C. 9, but he has them in the wrong place, as an addendum to a piece, the original addition to which can be judged from the united account of Mark and Luke n. 20.

— Phenomena which amply justify our assertion. Normally, of course, no consideration is given to this demarcation of the type, and then it is certainly easier to claim that our evangelists all drew from tradition. \*) On closer examination of the matter, however, one becomes aware of something else. One sees that tradition very often cancels itself out against tradition, and that which is definitely bounded, which could only have received its common boundary through tradition,\*\*) is much too narrow to allow one to think of a really existing original tradition of analogous narrowness. — After these discussions, the association of ideas leads us to another point. Up to now we have spoken of inequalities, contradictions, variations and exclusions; now we shall speak of intercalations and amalgamations, insofar as in them again a datum arises against our

hypothesis.

\*) Gieseler p. 117.

\*\*\*) For we speak here everywhere of the above hypothetically assumed, formed, - of an oral primal gospel.

91

**Fifth Datum:** While in our Gospels there is a distinct entity that separates itself from the rest of the material, Matthew in particular engages in mixtures and amalgamations, small and large insertions, especially to merge similar speeches that do not belong together into a cohesive whole.

These mentioned insertions must be carefully demonstrated, as some commentators of Matthew have made great efforts to make them invisible through various exegetical illusions. If they are misunderstood, it not only causes confusion in the main investigation here but also in other places. They are considered as such because they are inserted or added to a self-contained text and do not organically connect with it, even though they are supposed to form a unity with it. Without needing to examine the internal incongruity of the connected elements, these insertions are already recognizable by their external relationship to parallel texts. They separate words that are together in those texts and modify these words, sometimes at the beginning, sometimes at the end. By sequentially highlighting these insertions, we aim to illustrate this influence.

92

Mark	Luke	Matthew
b. n. 11. 2:27. και ελεγεν αυτοις' 28. ωστε κυριος εστι — σαββατου.	6:5. και ελεγεν αυτοις· οτι κυριος — σαββατον.	12 (insert v. 5-7) 8. κυριος γαρ εστι σαββατον (κ. ελεγεν αυτοις missing)
2:23. και εγενετο παραπορευεσθαι κ. τ. λ.	6:1. εγενετο δε διαπορευεσθαι ατιον etc.	(insert 11:28-30.) 12:1. εν εκεινω τω καιρω επορευθη κ. τ. λ.
a. n. 10. 2:17 – οι κακως εχοντες· ουκ ηλθον καλεσαι κ. τ. λ.	5:31. – ως εχοντες. 32. ονκ εληλυθα καλεσαι κ. τ. λ.	9:12. οι κακως εχοντες (insert v. 13.) ου γαρ ηλθον καλεσαι κ. τ. λ.
n. 16. 4:11. εκεινοις δε τοις εξω εν παραβολαις.	8:10. τοις δε λοιποις εν παραβολαις.	13:11. εκεινοις δε (ου δεδοται κ.τ.λ. (insert— v. 12.) 13. (δια τουτο) εν

		παραβολαῖς (κ.τ.λ. Insert twice v.17.)
13. ουκ οἶδατε τὴν παραβ. ταύτην;	11. ἐστὶ δὲ αὐτὴ ἡ παραβολή.	18. ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπειρόντος (in contrast to v. 24-30. entered παραβολή τῶν ζιζανίων compare v. 36.
n. 20 —	—	Insert : (10:5-8.) therefore:
6:8. ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσι εἰς ὁδὸν κ. τ. λ.	9:3. μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς ὁδὸν κ. τ. λ.	μὴ κτησησθε χρυσόν κ. τ. λ. (Reversal of the things mentioned).
v. 11. καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ.	9:5. κ. ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ.	Insert. v. 12-13. Therefore: καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξηται.
n. 28. 8:29 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός. 30. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ.	9:20. τὸν χριστὸν τὸν θεοῦ. 21. ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας κ. τ. λ.	16:16 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός (insert of ο υἱός κ.τ. λ. twice v. 19. therefore): v. 20. τότε ἐπετίμησε κ. τ. λ.
n. 30. 9:28. ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; 29. — τοῦτο τό γένος κ. τ. λ.		17:19. ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; (Insert v. 20. therefore v. 21. τοῦτο δὲ τό γένος κ. τ. λ.
n. 32. 9:37. καὶ ὡς ἐάν ᾿εν τῶν τοιοῦτων παιδιῶν δέξηται κ.τ.λ	9:48. ὡς ἐάν δέξηται κ. τ. λ.	(Insert 18:3-4. therefore v. 5. καὶ ὡς ἐάν δέξηται κ. τ. λ.
n. 35. 10:29. οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὡς ἀφήκεν κ. τ. λ.	18:29. οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὡς ἀφήκεν κ. τ. λ.	(Insert 19:28) therefore v. 29. καὶ πᾶς ὡς ἀφήκεν.
n. 47. 12:1. ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγειν.	20:9. ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβ. ταύτην.	21. (Insert 2-32. therefore): v. 33. ἀλλὴν παραβ. ἀκούσατε.
12. καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κράτησαι.	20:19. καὶ ἐζήτουν κ. τ. λ.	21: (insert v. 43-44) 45. καὶ ἀκούσαντες εἰς — ἐγνώσαν κ.τ.λ.
n. 49. 13:1. καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ — καὶ ἐξελθῶν ἐπορευῆτο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ		(Insert 23:2-39. therefore with regard to v. 39.) 24:1. καὶ ἐξελθῶν ἐπορευῆτο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (i.e., away

		from the temple forever. *)
24. ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις κ.τ.λ.		Insert v. 26-28. Comparison with lightning. Therefore): v. 29. εὐμέως δέ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν —
π. 54. 14:46. οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον κ. τ. λ.		(Insert 26:50.) τότε ἐπέβαλον κ.τ. λ.
48. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε etc.	22:52. εἶπε δὲ —	(Insert 26:52-54.) ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπε —
π. 55. 15:32 καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι ὠνεῖδιζον αὐτόν.		27. (Insert v. 43.) 44. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λησται ὠνεῖδιζον αὐτόν.

\*) ἀπό does not belong to ἐξελθῶν, as Fritzsche's commentary would have us believe, but to ἐπορεύετο (cf. Matt. 19:1.)

93

As can be seen, what immediately follows is usually assimilated to what is introduced by means of a copulative or relative particle, or by expressing the simultaneity of what is separated, or the other relationship of belonging together. — With these insertions we compare the smaller ones occurring in other places:

94

Mark	Luke	Matthew
π. 20. 6:11. ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν.	9:5. ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης.	10:14. ἐξεργόμενοι τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης.
π. 28. 8:28. ἄλλοι δὲ ἑνατῶν προφητῶν.	9:19. ἄλλοι δὲ, ὅτι προφήτης τις — ἀνάστη.,	16:14. ἕτεροι δὲ ἱερεμίαν ἢ ἕνα τῶν προφητῶν.
33. ὑπάγε ὀπίβω μου, σατανά, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς —		23. ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανά, σκάνδαλόν μου εἶ ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς etc.
π. 29. 9:5. ποιήσωμεν —.		17:4. (εἰ θέλεις,) ποιήσωμεν —

ν. 13. και έποίησαν αυτώ		ν. 12. και (ουκ έπέγνωσαν αυτόν, αλλά) έποίησαν έν αυτώ —
ν. 49. 13,18. χειμώνος		24:20. χειμόνας (μηδέ σαββάτω).
ν. 26. και τότε όψονται —	21:27. και τότε όψονται —	ν. 30. κ. τότε (κόψονται πάσαι αί φυλαι τής γής και) όψονται —
ν. 53. 14:24. τό — έκχυνόμενον.		26:28. τό — έκχυνόμενον (είς άφεσιν αμαρτιών).
ν. 54. 14:53. προς τον αρχιερέα.	22:54. εις τον οίκον του αρχιερέως.	26:57. προς (καϊάφαν) τον αρχιερέα.
ν. 57. 16:6 'Ιησοϋν ζητείτε.	22:54	28:5 (οΐδα γάρ ότι) 'Ιησοϋν ζητείτε.
ν. 7. ότι προάγει υμάς —		ν. 7. ότι (ήγγερθη από των νεκρών" καϊ ιδού,) προάγει υμάς --

So the last ones leave the text completely unchanged. The author behaves as if he wants to fill in ellipses. One discovers the analogy between the smaller and larger insertions, that just as the former aim at completing the expression in the sentence, so do these aim at completing the speech, according to the totality of the sentences. In other places, historical notes are included, but we shall pass over these. If one were to deny that these are interpolations, regardless of the fact that the methodical procedure noticeable in the index already gives evidence of this, even if one does not yet enter into the inner textual relationship; at least this much would be clear, that both texts, the extended one of Matthew and the shorter one of the secondary speakers, could not be two original concepts of one and the same heard speech, the one a more complete one, the other a more deficient one, so that Matthew, therefore, had reported according to a more faithful memory than the author of the other report \*). —The auxiliary texts are self-contained, but their words often appear in a completely different context within the larger text, which we will briefly illustrate with an example. For instance, in passage 11, the meaning of the smaller text is as follows: just as David, in times of need, disregarded the prohibition to provide for himself, so in similar circumstances, a person as such can even disregard the Sabbath. The second sentence forms the conclusion and ending. However, in the larger text in Matthew, before the speech addresses



humans, an intermediate element is inserted: the temple with its privileges. Just as the temple, due to its significance as a place of worship, exempts itself from the Sabbath law, even more so does the one who is here before you, as he is of greater importance  
\*\*)

\*) It is well known that people believed this and still believe it.

\*\*) — as a human. The correct reading is not μίξιον, but μείζων. One wants to translate: hic est templo quidquam angustius, nempe ignoratis, quid sibi velit illa vox etc. (Fritzsche's commentary on Matthew at the St.). But it cannot be specified what is meant by μείζων. Fritzsche translates: This is about something more important - namely the clearing away of your prejudgments. This explanation would be quite absurd. Because

a) why should the expressed simplicity and the instruction to be countered with it be set against the temple as a μείζων?

b) The temple is mentioned as that whereby work on the Sabbath receives an excuse. The higher thing must be something, which makes this excuse even more grounded and irrefutable. And what is that now?

c) μείζων is also not generally: what is more important, but: what is to be respected more.

d) The alleged μείζων is not opposed to the sacrifices in the temple (as if the meaning were: here is something that is more important than all holy customs), but to the temple itself. (According to Fritzsche's explanation it should also be: ει γαρ ἐγνώχαιτε etc.)

96

But if you had considered that compassionate empathy for human suffering surpasses sacrifices, you would not have condemned the innocent, and your human sympathy would have been demonstrated through silence, for humanity is master of the Sabbath." Here, the latter statement appears as the basis for another conclusion or utterance, instead of being the conclusion itself, namely that the accusers should have remained silent (because humanity is master of the Sabbath). Other examples of different relations of the same words are the passages cited from n. 10. and n. 20. However, one can hardly consider the words of the shorter text as fragments of the longer one, just as one would not consider the previously mentioned smaller insertions in Matthew, where they occur, as fillers for ellipses. For example, in verse 28 (Mark 8:33), the placement of

οτι (that) is deemed incorrect since it should not originally have expressed the reason why υπαγε (go) is uttered, but rather the reason for attributing the predicate σκανδαλον (stumbling block) or in verse 28 (Mark 8:28), the ενα (any) in the original speech was connected to words that meant: any other (Matthew 16:14). Even less can it be assumed that the longer text represents a more developed form of the tradition or narrative, while the shorter one represents an underdeveloped form. When the narrative includes excerpts from speeches and creates its own structure for the retained material, it is not concerned with preserving the words in the grammatical relationship they had in the original speech. Furthermore, if it expands, it is not so meticulous that it only changes the first words or adds a particle to maintain the old while introducing something new, with a different intended meaning. So it remains the case that we have compositions of various speech elements here. It can even be demonstrated that some of the insertions are fragments from other similar speeches, as they appear in completely different places in Luke as parts of speeches. For example, compare verse 35 (Matthew 19:28) with Luke 22:28-30; also compare verse 20 (Matthew 10:5-8) with Luke 10:9, Matthew 10:7-8. Furthermore, compare Matthew 10:12-13 with Luke 10:5-6, and Matthew 13:16-17 with Luke 10:23-24. These occur in passages in Luke that are excluded from the first tablet and they relate to many of the pieces found on this table as entirely different forms of the same material. An example of this is the insertion in verse 35 (Matthew 19:28) compared to Luke 22:28-30, which corresponds to a parallel section in passage 37 on the first table. — In other places, the Matthean textual augmentations appear as appendices and addendums to a completed, shorter text or as collections of the similar under similar, and the material is again fragments from speeches that originally stood in a different time or subject connection, as can be seen from the results of a comparison with Luke. In the Gospel of Matthew, the following sections of the common type or the first table in particular are used as collection points for such compilations:

n. 14 Jesus' answer to the claim that he drives out the demons through Beelzebul (supplement: Matth. 12, 33 - 45), and

n. 20 the sending out of the disciples. — and

n. 32 the instruction in relation to the dispute over the position of the disciples (addendum: Matt. 18, 10 — 35).

n. 47 the warning against the Pharisees (Matth. 23, 2 - 13. 15 - 38). —

n. 49 the prophecy of the destruction of the temple (Matth. 24, v. 26 to 28. compare Luk. 17, 23. 24. Matth. 37 — 42. 45 — 51. Ch. 25, 1 — 46) .

With regard to the so-called Sermon on the Mount taken up by Matthew, we do not want to decide here whether it actually belongs in the plan of his gospel or not. But this sermon is also enriched with borrowed material, and the second table gives us some references to this as well as to other parallels in the other sections. But this raises special difficulties against the acceptance of an oral Ur-Gospel. For supposing that the interpolations are from Matthew, they give us

a) the proof that even the apostles were not exact in conformation of the sayings of Jesus, and that therefore such a repetition of the same thing, from which a uniformity resulted, differs from hardly let them expect or suspect.

b) Matthew wrote his Gospel only after the oral Gospel, from which the harmony of our Gospels is to be explained, had been settled. This had been completed with his collaboration, under his influence it had taken shape; at least this is what our hypothesis demands. How, then, could he have wished to increase the material which previously had only been limited by selection and separation and reduced to a certain quantity? Furthermore, how could he, if he used written essays and borrowed words of Jesus from these essays, then disdain the historical information about the external causes on which the borrowed words were based, as if they were incorrect, and nevertheless use the speeches as if they were correct, but place them in places that already had their specific discourses, as if those discourses had to be completed by them, which belonged elsewhere? - that Jesus, for example, at the sending forth of the disciples (n. 20), is said to have said words which he could not have said on that occasion, and which the original report did not want him to say?

c) If one were to ascribe such importance to these objections that one believed for their sake that those interpretations had to be denied their origin in Matthew, and assumed that the amalgamation had come into being according to a silenced tradition, by a compiler-writer, then the demonstrable addition of a type against the Lukan interpolations would always be the main argument on which we rest, and then the hypothesis of the oral original Gospel would lose its support anyway. For precisely because Matthew, as an original writer and alleged author of these enrichments, so closely coincides with Luke and has the same material with him, the source of these materials, which even with differences are similar, has been sought in an oral tradition, whereas otherwise, going back to another author, one could have assumed that he had made extracts from other writings. —

Whichever assumption we accept, whether those amalgamations were made by Matthew or not, both are equally unfavorable to our hypothesis. We have reached a pivotal point here. From existing disparities and contradictions, as well as from the diversity of the domains to which the materials given in the Gospels belong, we have

concluded that there was no uniform tradition—a tradition from which uniformity could have originated. However, to demonstrate this, we have only compared the type of the first tablet with what lies outside it and juxtaposed elements that, belonging to different domains, should not be amalgamated. Now we need to search for data within the type itself, i.e., in the relationship between the parallel accounts found on the first tablet. The following observations emerge:

99

**Sixth Datum:** Within the framework that our synoptic Gospels themselves establish for their materials, deviations can be observed, even on a larger scale, in the accounts of Jesus' speeches—material that is primarily based on tradition—and these deviations cannot be attributed to the tradition itself, but only to the writer's arbitrary choices. These deviations also present evidence against the aforementioned hypothesis.

Here, then, we must take into account the mutual relationship of the parallel relations belonging to the synopsis itself. The differences and deviations that are noticeable in them, despite the agreement, can be distinguished as deviations on a small and a large scale. By the first we mean the variations in the position, construction and expression of individual sentences, whereby the identity of the thoughts and the relation of the sentences to one another remain intact. Those on the whole, however, will be those in which one or the other of the parallel representations has either assumed a special tendency, or in certain places has become mixed up with a quite different substance of thought, or the form of the piece has been so lengthened or shortened that this difference has an influence on the view of the whole, or where the statements are set in contradiction to each other, and so on. Here we are concerned only with the latter type, with the deviations on the whole. We shall cite the most important examples of these, and it will be evident from them that they can only be derived from the will of the writer, if only because they cannot derive from legend or tradition. We count among such deviations

1) those pieces which, as historical narrative wholes, contain more moments in one of the parallel relations and fewer in the other, according to an abbreviated form, according to which speeches with their external causes are sometimes included in one relation which are absent in the corresponding one \*). Such pieces are in the first table n. 7 and 8, n. 17 b. n. 18, n. 22, of which Matthew has the shorter form. Further, n. 15, n. 28, 29, 30, 54, 55, of which the shorter form is in Luke. (Of the passages where Mark has the shorter text, only n. 1, 13, 14 can be distinguished, but they are only shorter speeches.) Let's take a closer look at these passages first.

\*) We are thinking here only of those pieces that are free of interpolations and

have not only received a longer form through these, as so many in Matthew, but whose several parts are organically connected.

— In n. 7, it is immediately evident that the section did not end with Matthew 8:16, namely, not with the observation that Jesus healed the sick in the evening. Although this refers back to the mentioned (but omitted) circumstance at the beginning of the passage, where Jesus had come from the synagogue (Matthew 8:14), it only leaves a trace of a connection to a preceding section. Therefore, one cannot consider the extension of the current passage beyond the limitation set by Matthew as an addition that developed in the narrative. Moreover, it is even less likely that the narrative later only continued the passage until Matthew 8:16 and omitted the rest, even if the author, who added the phrase "that it might be fulfilled" in verse 17, could be suspected of abbreviation.

— n. 8. Assuming this piece had been part of oral tradition; then it would not only have been limited to Matthew 8:4, but would have also specified how the healed person behaved. So, it could be assumed that even here in Matthew, there is an arbitrary abbreviation.

— n. 17 b. Here, there is not only a difference in line measurement, but also a contradiction. In Matthew, two speak and act, while in others, only one does. If one considers that the motivation for the demons' plea, the presentation of the same, and what followed the granting, is told in the same words in all relations; then one cannot imagine a tradition that, while holding onto these words, only made a change with the preceding and should have transitioned from one relation to another. One will also not find such a transition from one form to another plausible at n. 18. The tradition would have had, if the Matthean form had been its original, to relocate Jesus to the sea before Jairus asked him, and to first surround him here with a crowd of people, so it would become apparent how the woman with the issue of blood could have touched him, then it would become understandable how, due to such a caused delay, messengers could have encountered Jairus and Jesus, etc. However, the transition from the longer form to the shorter would be even less conceivable because this one really only resembles an extract (see Matthew 9:20. 21), in which the visual was deliberately destroyed, and for this reason other words were even put into the mouth of Jairus (Matthew v. 18). For the relation would then have retained that which could not be noteworthy if it were not made vivid by something like what was left out. — Among the pericopes that appear shorter in Luke, the first is in n. 15. But we will speak more about this piece below.

— n. 28. Here, the literal parallelism of verses Luke 9:22 and 23 (between which the omitted part falls) with the corresponding passages in the parallel relations already

shows that a change through tradition or legend cannot be considered.

— n. 29. The prohibition by Jesus not to speak of the appearance, and the conversation that develops from it while descending from the mountain, is missing in Luke. If we were to assume that this piece belonged to the gospel story, we would have to simultaneously assume that it was connected with what immediately follows in n. 30. But now, no one who wants to tell in vivid speech that someone on a certain day saw or learned something, if the narrative is to be continued and something about the following day is to be added, would place before this continuation the remark: but in those days he said nothing about what he had seen, as if several days lay in between that day and the following day. The remark of Luke then (9:36) is undoubtedly only an abstraction, which the writer has made at this place from the opposing detailed narration.

— no. 30 the disciples' question why they could not have cast out the demon is missing. But Luke may have left it out because it already seemed to be answered in 9:41, and we shall see from other examples that this conjecture is well founded.

— n. 54. We also refer to this passage as an example of simplification, several of which are to be demonstrated in Luke below, and indeed such an example is also n. 55 (about which also below). Deviations on a large scale show

2) those cases where, after augmentation or abbreviation, the same discourse acquires a different tendency or relation, and the whole is placed from a different point of view. So n. 1 (in Mark), n. 15, 16, n. 32. Let's take a closer look at these passages as well.

— n. 1 Mark delimits the text where the others continue it (Matth. 3, 12 f. Luk. 3, 17 f.). What is common are the words with which the Baptist explains his relationship to the Messiah. In the longer form of the text, the words are a threat: the mightier will punish the incorrigible; coupled with *πυρί*, the *εν πνεύματι αγίω* itself acquires a frightening emphasis. In the shorter form in Mark the words contain no threat, but the comparison of the mighty to do good with the weak Baptist, and *πνεύμα ιγιον* without *πυρ* is a higher one in the pleasant sense. Be it that the shorter text there is lengthened or that the text here is shortened; we do not have forms of tradition here, but of literary processing.

— n. 16. The parable of the sower in Mark serves the purpose of being an exercise piece for the disciples chosen shortly before, which also corresponds to the form of the pericope with its appendages. The parable itself is a symbolic contract, the secret meaning of which is important; it follows the presentation with the explanation for those who should look deeper than others, and the explanation is shared with them

with the reminder that they should test their comprehension on similar presentations in the future (Mark. 4:13. 21 — 25). And just like Mark, Matthew holds the theoretical point of view of the piece. He not only follows the presentation of the parable with an explanation but also adds a parable spoken again to the people after this explanation, with the same concluding remark: thus Jesus spoke to the people in parables, but gave the explanation afterwards to the disciples (Matt. 13:34). Yes, he even denotes the purpose of the piece more clearly than Mark by adding the explanation of the second parable, and letting Jesus provide further attempts at explaining parables in private conversation with the disciples. But from this form, Luke's representation completely deviates. Apart from the fact that Luke (8:1) assigns a much later date to the piece, he also focuses only on the practical content of the parable. One should hold onto the word, like the good ground the seed, and let it bear fruit. Therefore, the parable of the light intended to shine (8:16-18) is interpreted in this way, whereby the same parable, which is also found in Mark, is given a different meaning than there, in that there it is intended to give the disciples the hint to distinguish themselves from the incompetent by using their powers of comprehension, more in a theoretical than in a practical respect. \*) The other parable to the people is missing in Luke, as is the concluding remark referring to the teaching of Jesus. So we have here the same thing from different points of view. The Lukan speaker, however, extends his methodological procedure even further. He relates the pericope n. 15 (the arrival of Jesus' relatives) and makes it an appendix to the parable. Of course, it fits in with it. For it also speaks of those who hear and do God's word (in Luke, instead of τῷ θέλῃμα τοῦ θεοῦ, it says τον λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ), and so are comparable to the good field of the land. But in Matthew and Mark the same words of Jesus have a different meaning, and the anecdote itself a different form. In response to the news received that his relatives were there - whose intention, according to Mark, was to fetch him away from the scene of his activity - Jesus replies that he has his relatives precisely in those who do God's will and work together with him, as do his disciples.

\*) Mark 4:21 looks back to v. 13 and does not belong to v. 20.

— Also in n. 32, Luke's shorter text seems to give the words a different relationship. According to the reports, Jesus, at the instigation of a quarrel that arose among the disciples, places a child under them and links this symbolic action to the explanation: ος εἶν — ἀποστειλαντά με (Matth. 88, 5. Mark. 9, 37. Luk. 9, 48). The true meaning of Mark's words is this: You see this child standing here among you as if it were your fellow apostle. Now I say: who this child \*) because it belongs to your circle and to me (ἐπί τῳ ὀνόματί μου cf. Mark v. 40. ὅτι χριστοῦ εἰστε), that is: — who receives the least Christian (doing good deeds to him), he receives me (cf. Matth. 10, 41-42). So you all have great dignity. In Luke, however, Jesus seems to be demanding of the disciples that they themselves, in order to be great, should place themselves even among the

least among them and prove themselves to be his servants (receiving him and serving him). After which the same words enter into a completely different relationship! - Tradition may well have presented the material for such (differently related) words, also, as one may imagine, leaving room for deviations and variations; but both things could not take place at the same time, that the identical words were given and the insertion of the meaning left completely free, as if they had no definite meaning at all. If so, anywhere, it is here in the prevailing differences that literary arbitrariness is evident. - Among the deviations on a large scale we further count

3) the cases where the referents make completely different speeches at the same point in the piece. The examples are

n. 16, where after the parable of the sower, parables [by the sea?] follow in the same way as a continuation, but of these (in Mark and Matthew) completely different examples are given.

— Further n. 49, where Luk. 21:21 symmetrically contrasts the parallel texts with completely different words, -- and at the end of the piece, where admonitions to be vigilant are indeed in all texts, but in each according to a special form and with different sentences,

— further n. 12, where the speech of Jesus is reported quite differently for one and the same case.

— n. 44, where the argumentation of Jesus is formulated quite differently in Luke than in the others.

— n. 53, where Luke's Last Supper report differs almost entirely from the other reports.

\*) τούτο παιδίον in Luke (i.e. the child here, now representing the least Christian) is more correct than in Mark: ἰν τῶν παιδιῶν τούτων. But maybe originally Mark used the other word instead of παιδιῶν: μικρῶν, which would be more correct insofar as we are not talking about children in the true sense here.

— If we dwell a little on these passages, it can be seen that if the writers had the norm of presentation in the tradition, this must have extended as far as the equality of the reports extends to the point where the speakers diverge. But it could not be accidental that e.g. n. 16 the two writers, each at the same place in the passage, introduced a parable as a continuation of Jesus' discourse. It is true that one could assume that the oral relationship itself did not go so far, and that the coincidence was due to the fact that



one writer had the other in front of him. But then we entangle ourselves in new difficulties and abandon our traditional hypothesis altogether. Let us not assume that, but say: it was really tradition that determined the coincidence; it is also clear that the difference arose from the whim of a writer. For the tradition would either have had a specific parable - in which case one of the two would have deviated from the norm - or it would have had the parables adduced by our speakers both at the same time; the writing would have deviated more steeply from the norm, provided that each chose only one, which the other did not. The argument is even more plausible in those places where the deviation is partial within the piece, or in parts of the whole, as in n. 49. Did the oral tradition give this long piece of speech; so at the point where all three referees add admonitions to be vigilant, it must have had such a definite admonition; this could only be one, and consequently the deviations can only be attributed to the writers. It was impossible for tradition, which was the condition of uniform representation through such a long series of propositions, to allow such differences to break out of the unity as

106

<p>Matthew 24:16 τότε οι εν τή Ιουδαίῳ! φευγίτωβαν εις τά ὄρη- 17. ὁ ἰπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ ἀναβαινέτω ἀραι τά ἐχ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ! 18. καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω, ἀραι τά ἐμάτια αὐτοῦ. (cf Mark)</p>	<p>Luke 21:21 τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τά ὄρη, καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἰχχωρεῖτωβαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν.</p>
--	---

The sentences are here divided into three members as there. The symmetry is maintained, only something different should have been said. - We see works of art here and it cannot occur to us to assume that the saga is self-correcting. This is also not the case with the other passages. As far as Luke's account of the Last Supper is concerned, it is of course quite different from the other passages. But

- a) because he rearranges sentences (the words of the questioning disciples 22:23) in order to connect other things with them (the contest of the disciples v. 24); since
- b) Luke's report of the preparations for the Passover agrees completely with Mark and nothing is more certain than that both reports are written as a whole at the same time;
- c) since Luke, by acknowledging Mark and Matthew, begins to Hebraize as never before; we can therefore all the more safely look for the root of the difference in scriptural processing, and this is especially the case in n. 44.

However, it is a fact that the gospel authors wrote about the transmitted material, that

they omitted certain parts and expanded others according to their specific purposes, that they exchanged words here and there, interpreted the given material differently, separated connected elements here and combined separate ones there. It is therefore difficult to assume a reliable tradition to such an extent that the convergence of the accounts, even in minor details and incidental matters, could be predetermined by them.

Firstly, the variations, differences, and deviations among the writers prove how little they were accustomed to relying on something orally transmitted, and how little they worried about being criticized by their readers for the arbitrary treatment of their material.

b) From the comparison of their accounts, it becomes indisputably clear that they were not concerned with the form and expression of the speech, but only with its overall meaning and content, which they considered to be something modifiable. However, this contradicts the fidelity and adherence to the word that we must imagine to be factual if we want to establish a principle of a tradition gradually organizing itself into a fixed expression without a written norm. The time when this was supposed to have originated was not so far behind our writers. If they were the first to put into writing what the tradition presented, then they were closer to that time. Or if the authors of the deviations were predecessors who received from the tradition, then they were the ones, and one must imagine that a different spirit should have been passed down to the recipients—whether they were this or that—if they, who also ensured the endurance of the transmitted material through writing, had been accustomed to such a faithful mode of communication, or if they had to derive the received material in such a manner.

c) However, if one were to say that our authors drew from certain articles copied according to tradition and from written records of the same, apart from the fact that such an assumption contradicts our hypothesis directly, those mentioned variations still remain unexplained. Because

α) how could the authors modify something that they knew had already received its form, not just the general content, in a regulated manner through tradition? Or

β) did they find these articles in need of modification? That could be assumed if one could also speculate that they, the gospel writers, only modified what they changed in accordance with tradition.

But that is precisely not the case. Their deviations are methodical (based on a specifically adopted manner) and aimed at achieving their own literary purposes, which, although not yet proven here, should come to light in future investigations.

The disputed hypothesis has so far allowed us the advantage of being able to characterize our Gospels in contrast to it with a bit more precision. We can continue this characterization and complete it even more, which again has the advantage that we increasingly satisfy our striving to destroy from the bottom up a hypothesis which we previously believed to be true would have distracted us from a closer examination of the Gospel relationship. But before that, an intermediate link needs to be inserted into the discussion.

**Seventh Datum:** Luke himself distinguishes the written and orderly narrative from the oral tradition of the apostles and the initial servants of the Word. He clearly indicates that the construction of a life story of Jesus was a later endeavor by other men apart from those mentioned.

We refer here to the remarkable prologue that Luke has placed at the beginning of his Gospel, and we analyze it with even greater interest since it has often been misunderstood \*).

\*) By no one more than Paulus (Conservator. p. 168.) and Hug (Instructions 2nd volume, p. 127.).

Luke's introductory statement contains several notable points which, if we want to arrange them in order to facilitate understanding, are as follows:

1) Luke explains the plan he pursued in composing his work. According to verse 4, he had set out to present everything (this can stand absolutely, everything pertaining to it, or it can be inferred from the preceding verse) from the beginning (that is, starting from what is chronologically the first in the narrative) in an orderly manner, following a logical sequence and with a focus on the overall coherence) and to record it in succession \*). Here, Luke expresses the same idea as indicated by the parallelism of his sentences, where the phrase "ἀναταξιῶσαι ὀρίγησιν" (to set forth in orderly sequence) in the other clause conveys the same meaning.

\*) The grammatical resolution of the construction is well known: "εδοξί χαμοί — ηρακολονθήροι καί καθεξής γράψαι"

Then he mentions

2) the occasion or cause that led him to compose such a narrative of Jesus' events in an orderly and connected manner. This cause is that, once (επειδή, similar to the Latin quondam or quandoquidem, indicating something that has occurred at some point, even though it may not have been necessary) many have undertaken to compile a narrative (διήγησι, not την διήγησι) of the events (facts) that have been fulfilled among

us—this must mean specifically among the Jewish people, as indicated in other passages (e.g., Acts 2:22)—from the beginning (ἀνητάξασθαι, to arrange in a sequence, starting from the beginning). Therefore, Luke states

a) that he is not the first to undertake such a work, and from this it becomes evident

b) that what he intends to do is analogous to what others before him have undertaken—not only does this imply an arrangement that could be a matter of doubt as to whether it was oral or written, but it specifically indicates a written arrangement, which Luke himself intends to attempt. This is also indicated by the use of ἐπιιδήηερ in the construction of the introductory clause, which is meant to remove any surprise or doubt and suggests that, because one thing has happened, the other can now happen in the same way, both referring to written arrangements.

— However, we need to pay even more attention to the coherence of these sentences, as it can easily be shifted through exegetical maneuvers in favor of the hypothesis we are contesting \*) — if one wishes to interpret ἀνατάξασθαι as borrowing from oral narratives.

\*) *Paulus Conservator*. 1st edition p. 169.

However,

a) even if the sentence structure in Luke's writing does not decisively determine the meaning of the interrelated clauses, it is important to note that Luke, in order to clarify his own intentions, would not have referred to the example of many if those many had done something different from what he himself intended. Likewise, in the other case, if he wanted to convey that he intended to surpass those many through a different, more perfect work, he would not have expressed it as "it seemed good to me" (ἐδοξε χαμοί). I mean to say that even if the sentence structure does not determine the meaning, the use of the expression ἀνατάξασθαι, to arrange or to start a series that should be continued, is indication enough that it is not about the absurdity of an oral arrangement, but rather about a written one. When someone sets out to arrange narratives, they either do so in writing if they are capable of it, or they do not attempt it at all. Because arranging narratives in one's memory, creating them in such a way that they can be linked together, and forming them without starting on each individual representation until the end is considered, would not only be an enormous undertaking, but also a self-destructive endeavor from the outset. It is a true psychological absurdity for the mind. And also

b) it is incorrect what the illegitimate interpretation, in an attempt to create an appearance of reasonability, artificially inserts into the sentences, claiming that Luke has juxtaposed his γράψαι (to write) against the ἀνατάξασθαι (to arrange) of the

many, when there is no trace of such a juxtaposition. On the contrary, Luke, emphasizing the *χαθεξής* (in orderly sequence) and *άνωθεν* (from the beginning), equates his intention of writing (*χαθείς γράψαι*) in the same manner as the example of the many. Therefore, from Luke's words, if we guard against misinterpretations, it follows that those *πολλοί* (many) he refers to were writers, just like himself, the compiler of his Gospel.

And now, Luke continues, those individuals had undertaken (attempted) to compile the narrative

—3) to arrange it in a sequence. Therefore, before the written attempts, what was first created through these attempts, the organized or arranged narrative, did not exist, and it was only realized through these endeavors. How was it realized? Luke says: Many undertook to make an arrangement—each one their own, that is, the one for which they were the author, just as the arrangement itself was their product. This information is again not insignificant, as will soon become apparent. Let us reflect on the expression "undertake." We can assume that if the work of the many had consisted merely of transcribing what they had already organized in their memory, then a term implying effort and a plan whose success was uncertain would not be necessary. Luke, therefore, excludes the possibility that the expression he used would apply to such an effortless task, which would render his expression meaningless. Furthermore, when it is then stated

4) that the many attempted or undertook to compile a narrative of the fulfilled events (facts) just as they had been handed down by the first eyewitnesses, it may appear doubtful as to the extent to which the "*καθώ*" should apply, whether it should determine the form or merely the subject matter, and in the latter case, whether that transmission would provide more authority for the "*πληροφορονμιτα πράγματα*" (fully assured matters). However, we are compelled to accept the latter. The author

a) cannot mean to say: Many undertook to compile the narrative exactly as it had been handed down by the eyewitnesses, implying that it already existed. For in that sense, it would have been written as *την παραδιάομίνην*.

b) Moreover, if Luke had intended to refer to the *παραδιάομίνην* in relation to the form, it would have been necessary to say: *καθώς παρίδοσαν αυτήν* (exactly as they handed it down). Thus, regarding the subject matter and content, the narrative accounts were structured according to the transmission, but not according to the form. The form was the work of the many (*πολλοί*), and the *άνκηϊξίς* (arrangement) - this follows immediately - was added to the apostolic *παράδοσις* (tradition). As the *άνκηϊξίς* was attempted through writing, the *παράδοσις* is clearly contrasted with it, as something preceding written attempts, thus implying a purely oral transmission. Therefore, Luke clearly states here that the apostles themselves did not write a life story of Jesus, and he distinguishes the *πολλοί* (many) from them as the authors of such a work. The oral transmission is also characterized

5) by the contrast with the written form. It was not organized. But what does this mean? It means that it did not consist of a series of interconnected individual narratives in relation to one another. The Gospels present the individual narrative pieces as parts of a whole, interconnected with each other, and it is precisely because of this interconnection that they have acquired their distinct form and expression. While we have not yet proven this explicitly, we have acknowledged the Passion narrative, in particular, as a connected whole. Additionally, in the foreground of the Gospels, there are also narratives that are interconnected through thematic arrangement and quantified according to this connection (specifically, n. 9-12). Therefore, considering that the substance of these narrative pieces is not produced without regard to the form of their coherence, it can be inferred that the statement "the apostolic tradition was not a mere compilation" also implies that it did not consist of individually defined and shaped narratives. This leads to a conclusion that contradicts the aforementioned hypothesis. Are we perhaps jumping to conclusions too quickly? Let us illuminate this explanation from another perspective. It is believed that while it may not have been the apostles themselves, the early believers did arrange a narrative in their memory, and this is historically plausible according to some views. For these believers were none other than the "evangelists" mentioned elsewhere (Ephesians 4:11, 2 Timothy 4:5), whose service and work most likely consisted of recounting such rhapsodies, similar to the individual narrative accounts found in the Gospels. \*)

\*) Paulus Conservator. 1st edition p. 124.

This interpretation of Luke's words would have merit if Luke

a) had stated that those men collectively shaped and arranged the oral tradition—the proclamation of the Gospel in general—and not that each of them had created their own separate narrative, which Luke undeniably affirms. However,

b) if the narrative (Diegese) mentioned by Luke was intrinsically linked to the oral proclamation of the Gospel and inseparable from the preaching of the evangelists, how could Luke have used the expression "because, once" (επειδήγερ), which is typically used for something incidental? Wouldn't the statement then imply that the author is saying: "Because there were evangelists, I not only want to be one of them, but perhaps even more, I want to write?" That cannot be Luke's intention. However, when understood in the way Luke himself understood these words, they fit together quite well. The work of the ἀγγελιστῆς (evangelists) was just as incidental to the work of the Gospel as it was a private endeavor, similar to the work of Luke himself. For it becomes clear from Luke's own words that his writing was not strictly necessary even for Theophilus, to whom it is dedicated and intended to benefit. Luke mentions earlier writings as products that came about incidentally, and he assumes that Theophilus already had some knowledge, likely received as a proselyte along with the Christian Gospel \*\*). Therefore, there is no mention anywhere of an oral compilation of the Gospel.

\*\*\*) That Theophilus was a Christian proselyte can be concluded from the fact that

Luke credits him with a special interest in knowledge of Christian prehistory and its truth, and also speaks of a lesson that Theophilus received.

Furthermore, now

6) through the dedicated writing, according to Luke's intention, Theophilus should gain conviction of the ασφάλεια (certainty) of what he had already heard. Let us examine these words more closely, as an interpretation has also taken root that appears to be a misunderstanding and can give rise to erroneous conjectures. The common belief is that Luke intended to present his compiled narrative as opposed to other existing oral or written accounts, containing the ασφάλεια (certainty) that Theophilus should come to know through Luke's account. \*) However, this explanation lacks grammatical correctness.

\*) This opinion is even found in Credner's: Einleitung in das neue Testam. 1st Th. I. Abth. Halle 1856, p. 154, § 64: "Luke wrote his Gospel, according to his express (?) declaration, with the intention of delivering a critical treatment of Gospel history," and p. 156, H. 65: "Luke was prompted to this critical treatment partly (?) by the existence of many written accounts, which altogether (?) lacked either inner truth or chronological treatment, and partly (?) by the deceptive nature of oral tradition. Hereby is inserted into Luke's words what is demonstrably not contained in them. It is already

α) is not exactly expressed when it is said that the existence of the existing writings gave Luke cause to compose his own. Luke took the occasion for his writing from the needs of Theophilus, whose interest he wanted to satisfy. He mentions other writings only for the sake of modesty, in order to remark that he was not the first to make such a literary attempt.

β) Luke does not declare that he wants to improve those writings mentioned by him, but he also wants to produce an exact writing, as those writers had already produced writings.

γ) If Luke had wished to improve other Gospels, he would have given his writing a more general purpose (not merely the particular one for Theophilus).

δ) Luke, if he had had this intention, would have had to presuppose Theophilus' knowledge of those writings. But there is no trace of this presupposition, nor of Theophilus having been instructed from deceptive writings,

ε) A double purpose (to improve those writings, and at the same time to correct the saga) cannot be imputed to Luke as little as it can be shown that the deceptive saga (which is probably supposed to be those λόγοι) was connected with those writings.

α) Does "ἵνα επιγνώσ" (Luke 1:4) not mean "so that you may know" (ut cognoscas) here, rather than "so that you may acknowledge" (ut agnoscas) as expressed by the use of επί? This implies that Theophilus would find certainty in my account (ut agnoscas) rather than contradicting the ασφάλεια (certainty) in the information he already received (ut cognoscas). This explanation harmonizes

β) with the grammatical construction of the words, as the ασφάλεια (certainty) must be understood as an attribute of what Theophilus had been instructed in. Therefore, Luke's words simply mean: ἵνα επιγνώσ, ὅτι οἱ λόγοι, περί ὧν κατηχήθης, εἰς'ἰν ασφαλείς (so that you may know that the words you have been taught are certain).

γ) The words cannot be understood as if the ασφάλεια were separate from the λόγοις (words), suggesting that Luke intended to provide the ασφάλεια (which they themselves did not yet possess) to Theophilus regarding those λόγοι he had already heard.

αα) η ασφάλεια and το ασφαλές mean "the certainty," something that can be relied upon. For example, in Acts 21:34, it is stated that the chiliarch could not ascertain το ασφαλές (the certainty) due to the commotion. (By the way, it is not written as την ασφάλειαν here, as it is linked with a genitive in our passage.) If those λόγοι (words) were something that did not provide certainty, they would have been empty rumors. However, the term κατηχηθης (instructed) would not be suitable for empty rumors, as empty rumors and instruction about them cannot be easily connected.

ββ) If one were to assume that Theophilus, being far away from the scene of the events described in the Gospel, could not have known the certainty, and that Luke intended to provide it to him, then Luke could not have expressed himself in such a way, stating that he was doing it because others had already written before him, as if he would not have done it otherwise. If the author had

cc) assumed instruction of λόγοις without any prior knowledge, he would have written: ἵνα επιγνώσ περί — το ασφαλέστερον (so that you may know about the most certain), but he did not write that way. Therefore, it remains that the ασφάλεια belongs to the λόγοις that Theophilus had heard as their quality, and Luke's words are far from denying the certainty of these λόγοις; rather, he aims to reinforce this certainty through his writing. Luke does not cast a critical glance at the works of his predecessors; instead, he intends to do what they have done, using the means available to him now as he engages in writing. The common interpretation is incorrect, even though it has become traditional through the influence of Origen and his followers. Why should it necessarily follow that Luke had a critical or polemical purpose? Rather,

dd) just as Luke, according to his words, attributes certainty to the knowledge of Theophilus, he also states that those writings, whether in terms of form or content, were arranged according to the tradition of the apostles. He presupposes correct writings here, just as he does correct knowledge there.



ee) He wants to write because he already has those predecessors. If his writing were to provide the ασφάλεια that those writings did not provide and if his writing contained the ακρίβεια, then in the clause preceding it, he would have labeled the writings of the πολλοί as unreliable and likely would have had to warn Theophilus about them. However, that did not happen.

ff) While he gives the assurance that he intends to proceed with the utmost accuracy as a historian, it does not follow that his predecessors did not also strive for accuracy in their own way. And when he adds that he wants to proceed from the beginning with everything \*) (his work demonstrates how this is done in the preceding preface), it does not imply that the perhaps narrower scope of earlier writings must have contained errors and unreliability.

— The main point, however, is that the assumption of Luke's polemical or critical purpose is based on a misinterpretation of his words, as previously mentioned. So much for the meaning of the expression used by Luke.

— From it, properly understood, it follows that Luke is not repeating an already preformed oral tradition; otherwise, he could not have attributed to his writing the merit of highlighting the reliability of the orally transmitted information. What the author provides, therefore, is supplementary, and it is quite plausible to consider it as such. Theophilus may have had knowledge only of the main facts of Jesus' story, which are also the basis of the Christian teachings expounded in the Pauline epistles, or he may have had specific knowledge of some miraculous acts, teachings, etc., of Jesus. However, he may not have had a comprehensive overview of such a travel narrative, the full context of Jesus' teachings, or a specific account of what was spoken in different locations, and so on. And this is what Luke's individual and orderly account aimed to present, in order to make the sequence of the main events more comprehensible. We can infer that others, like Theophilus, also had some knowledge of the story of Christ that made them capable of believing, despite lacking the same level of detailed information.

\*) In a smaller font: C. G. KÜchler: de simplicitate scriptorum sacrorum Lips. 1821. p. 26. is noted: Nec potest argumentum pro fontibus scriptis, quos Lucas in rem suam contulerit recte peti ex prooemio Ev. eius, quod multa fraudem fecit quum leges scribendi (?) et interpretendi poscont, ut dat πααιν (παρακολουθηκότι άνωθεν πάσιν άκριβώς) referantur ad subiectum proxime praecedens: οί απ άρχής αυτόπται κ. υπερήται γενόμενοι του λόγου). According to the grammar, however, this is not the case at all, and we must make a note of it here, because the author who constructs the words as he states them even wants to find in them a support of the original oral gospel - the one we dispute -

aa) The author is wrong in that he tears the participle: παρακολουθηκότι (as Hug also did) from the compound sentence and translates: qui secutus sum. Only the

participle, although belonging to καμοί, is to be connected with and signifies, as in every such construction, the condition of what is necessary for the act of what is expressed with the verb that follows, and is at the same time connected with the completion of the last verb, so that one has to translate: to follow all of them penau first and (see above) — to write. Compare the passage Acts 15:24., which bears a striking resemblance to our prologue, and which we want to contrast with the words of the prologue as being interesting in another respect.

Actx 15:24. επειδή ήχονααμεν ότι κ. τ. λ.	Luke 1:1. επειδήπερ πολλοί έπεχείρησαν ανατάξααθαι κ. τ. λ.
v. 25. εδοξεν ήμίν γενομένοισ όμοθνμαδόν	3. έδοξε χαμοί παραχολουθηκότι πάαιν άχριβώς
εχλεξαμένους ά δρας πέμιβαι προς νμάς.	καθεξής σοι γράψαι.

If Act. 15, 25. the codices may vacillate between επλεξαμένονσ and έχλεξαμένοισ; that's how the participle is to be translated: it seemed good to us (we decided) to go together, and to choose from among us — rc. (By the way, one should probably be allowed to consider the reading εχλεξαμένοισ to be the correct one). According to the other explanation, τω παρηχολουθηκότι would also have to stand. — So the παραχολουθειν happened by Luke in the act of writing, and for the sake of it, and what should it mean now when it should be said that Luke followed the authors when writing, if not then the writings should also be understood by them?

bb) One cannot translate: (so decided) I, who accompanied the authors from the beginning and with care, or had rc, so that the παραχολονθήβαι would be understood from the earlier dealings with them. Neither does the word άνωθεν permit this—for what should that mean: from the beginning? it would stand: άπ αρχής, which Luke, however, avoided saying because he would have spoken an untruth, - nor the word: άχριβώς, which is probably said of accompanying a writer or a series of events that one does not want to overlook can, but is not said of accompanying a walker or a traveller. Therefore, there is nothing else left but to take "πααι" as neuter, and

cc) the words "άχριβώς" and "άνωθεν" point to our explanation that Luke's "παραχολονθήροι" took place during writing or for the purpose of writing.

dd) To the "άνωθεν" corresponds the "χαθείσ." In order to write "καθεξής," the

author had to follow everything from above.

ee) If one interprets "πάσι" as referring to "πράγμασι" (things), it is easy to find the object that needs to be supplied for "γραψαι" (to write). However, if "πάσι" is understood as related to "αντόπται" (eyewitnesses), it is not at all clear what object should be supplied. Finally

ff) if Luke understood "πάσι" to refer to the eyewitnesses, he would probably not say that he followed "πάσι" (all of them) - it would have been enough to follow some of them. However, the word was necessary if Luke had the "πράγματα" (events) in mind. For in order to be able to set occurrences and occurrences one after the other in their order, the historian had to follow the occurrences of all without neglecting anything important. But how he would have had to follow up on all the authors when dealing with them early on, one does not see.

118

So far, the preface of Luke. It is the most remarkable document against the hypothetically assumed oral Gospel. However, what he states or implies also agrees with other accounts. For example, how could Papias (Eusebius, Church History, Book III, Chapter 39) have preferred to inquire about the words of the Lord through oral communications from the apostles in order to expand his knowledge, and explicitly expressed that he hoped to gain more from those than from writings (he was well acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew and Mark), if the oral and written tradition were the same? In the same passage where Eusebius mentions Papias, he also mentions what Papias wanted to convey about the origin of the Gospel of Mark, namely, that the material for this Gospel was supplied by oral accounts of an apostle (Peter), but they were not arranged in the form of a proto-Gospel, rather they were free and adapted to the circumstances and needs of the listeners. (— Πέτρον, ος προς τας χρείας εποίειτο τας διδασκαλίας, άλλ' οὔχ ὡσπερ σύνταξιν των κυριακων ποιούμενος λόγων.) Doesn't Luke want to be understood as referring to such accounts as well when he mentions the oral παράδοσις (tradition) of the apostles?

119

We have developed the prologue of Luke, which we will revisit at another time, to the extent that it establishes a distinction between oral tradition and writing. Now we want to delve further into this distinction, and thus, for our discussion thus far, a turning point is reached. Until now, we have disputed the existence of an oral proto-gospel (mind you, an organized one) with its specificity and stereotypical consistency to the point that we have even suspended it as a fact. The reasons against assuming its existence were as

follows: if such an oral gospel as a form of presentation had truly been in progress, the reports in the Gospels would have been more specific in terms of time and place; there would not have been a variation in different versions of individual accounts; the final story of Jesus, in particular, would have been presented more consistently in the Gospels; Matthew, or whoever the author of his compilations is, would not have amalgamated various recensions here and there; the narrators would not have dared to modify what was given for literary purposes; finally, Luke explicitly states that the arrangement of a life of Jesus was not the work of the original transmitters but had its origin in the literary attempts of others. From all of this, it follows that what did not exist cannot be assumed as a factual basis for something else contrary to the evidence of its nonexistence. If it is argued against this that the crucial factor is whether the other elements themselves, by virtue of their nature, necessarily presuppose this first element as their basis, then it is precisely this objection that compels us to confirm the distinction made by Luke in our own Gospel writings. Thus, we find ourselves led to the second point of discussion: to demonstrate that even if an oral proto-gospel had existed in the postulated manner, our written Gospels could not be derived from it.

We have developed the prologue of Luke, which we will revisit at another time, to the extent that it establishes a distinction between oral tradition and writing. Now we want to adhere even more precisely to this distinction, and therefore, for our discussion thus far, a turning point shall now occur. Until now, we have disputed the existence of an oral proto-gospel (mind you, we understand here an organized one) with its specificity and stereotypical consistency to the point that we have even suspended it as a fact. The reasons against assuming its existence were as follows:

a) If such an oral gospel as a form of presentation had truly been in progress, the accounts in the Gospels would be more specific in terms of time and place.

—b) It would not have resulted in variations of individual accounts among different copies.

— c) The final story of Jesus, in particular, would be presented more uniformly in the Gospels.

— d) Matthew, or whoever the author of his compilations is, would not have amalgamated various recensions from different sources.

— e) The narrators would not have dared to modify the given material for literary purposes.

— f) Finally, Luke explicitly states that the arrangement of a life of Jesus was not the work of the original transmitters but had its origin in the literary attempts of others.

— From all of this, it follows that what did not exist cannot be assumed as a factual basis for something else in contradiction to the evidence of its nonexistence. If it is argued against this that the crucial factor is whether the other elements themselves, by virtue of their nature, necessarily presuppose this first element as their basis, then it is precisely this objection that compels us to confirm the distinction made by Luke in our own Gospel writings. And thus, we find ourselves led to the second point of discussion: to demonstrate that even if an oral proto-gospel had existed in the postulated manner, our written Gospels with their distinct features could not be derived from it.

120

**Eighth Datum:** Like the narratives of facts given in our gospels, the speeches referred to in them also bear the stamp of written composition. They are formed according to literary plan, and not compositions of legend or oral tradition.

We can ignore the narratives of the facts here, if what is stated is only confirmed by the traditional speeches. However, it would not even be a question whether they bear the marks of written composition or not, since they are really available to us in our Gospels as parts of a written account, if it were not asserted that they, insofar as they are given by our speakers with the same expression, had already been part of the oral tradition with just this expression and in just this form and composition - not something composed by the art of writing, but something formed in oral speech. But can this judgement really be justified in this way without being blamed for a misjudgement of characteristic differences?

121

We have, to the extent of agreement in our texts, here and there, long series of sentences derived from traditional speech, even self-contained and complete in terms of content and form, so that there exists a substrate on which criteria of differentiation can be applied when a question like this is raised. The composition of writing undeniably has certain characteristics that are uniquely its own, such that when it is necessary to distinguish its product from another one that originated from oral communication with the same content, and vice versa, the judgment cannot waver. It is not a matter of constructing a theory here, but only to establish those characteristics of literary production which, when they become visible, are never denied, while oral expression is not accustomed to assuming them, even in terms of content, and then making comparisons with the particular matter presented here for assessment.

a) Firstly, it is understood that the writer, when the task is to convey spoken words, selects, organizes, and edits. They provide only as much as is sufficient for their

purpose or as seems sufficient to convey the essentials completely and understandably. In this regard, living communication never observes the law of economy to the same extent and does not show such careful separation of the main issue from secondary matters. Moreover, if oral communication were to express only as much as fits into the outlines of a plan systematically designed in advance for the reception of several such narratives, it would become unintelligible to those it intends to address and would fail in its purpose. The purposeful selection of words and sentences from a speech, which, judging by the way it developed under specific circumstances in life, undoubtedly contains various elements, is, especially when the speech itself is not sufficient for understanding, also elsewhere a purpose of the narrator, from which the selection depended, and thus becomes a more certain characteristic of literary editing.

b) Since the writer must first make conceivable to the reader what the reader is supposed to perceive as communicated, the inclination to arrange according to the laws of comprehensibility and reflection prevails. Therefore, the rules of logical connection extend through the written text as an organizing principle, as far as the communicated whole of the speech reaches, and they govern it with a rigor to which oral communication, especially when it is more or less driven by emotion, never submits and cannot follow in this case. Now, if we have a longer speech before us that is logically ordered and structured, and unfolds under the laws of thinking in such a way that even the conclusion remains connected to the beginning, then the suspicion is justified that it is the product of special meditation. It is all the more certain to be considered a work of literary art if it is given the appearance of being something merely spoken incidentally, and the same as what was actually spoken by the speaker from whose words it could only have been selected.

c) The writer, as they have the laws of logical thinking before them and must aim for conciseness and completeness in their explanations, may easily be led into another realm of thought when describing factual events or dramatic sequences with embedded speeches. In order to make their description coherent and complete, they must add to the information from their own reservoir of thoughts what was not given; they must insert complementary sentences into the reported speech, as well as separate unnecessary elements from it, and bring together things that were more distanced from each other in the live speech. Thus, it may happen that they narrate less naturally, albeit in accordance with their purpose, and that they give the speech a definiteness, thoughtfulness, and moderation that it likely did not possess in the mouth of the speaker, whose creation it is supposed to be, judging by their emotional state, the circumstances under which they spoke, and their mental abilities. With this, written composition distinguishes itself from oral discourse, both from the one assumed to be the original creation and from that which is supposed to consist of recounting something heard.

[d)?] Oral tradition, especially when it relays something from fresh memory, will not show the inclination to put words into the alleged speaker's mouth that are only made-up developments of devoted sentences or intermediate elements according to stylistic

or logical rules, in order to establish coherence between different parts. Rather, it will differentiate its own contribution from what was received, and this manner is so natural to it that if one notices evidence to the contrary in a written account, it can be certain that it is not pure oral tradition, but rather, if it is the foundation, it has been altered by the copyist. However, if several reporters, such as our evangelists, agree on such written additions or consolidations and abbreviations, the basis for attributing the rest of what is part of the same account to a different organizing principle than the act of writing disappears, and some can be attributed to legend or tradition, while others can be ascribed to literary editing.

e) In addition to all of this, there are special rhetorical and oratorical devices that written expression tends to utilize to its advantage over oral communication, such as word positioning, sentence connections, transitions, and so on. Also

f) it can be noticed quite well that there are aspects that appear to be more geared towards readers than listeners. We can consider the case when the presenter, in order to be understood, introduces combinations or abstractions, for which, however, the necessary premises are not provided in this communication, but rather elsewhere in their work. Furthermore, it is also

g) not the habit of legend or oral communication in general to move from the specific to the general as if the former were meant to be an example or proof of the latter, and after presenting the specific, the narrator would have to return to the general, as if to the predetermined theme. Least of all should we believe that such a transition is observed in oral tradition when this general statement with which it ends is merely a formula that, in order to acquire meaning, must await the continuation of the speech and its connection with something else. However, when we finally observe

h) masses of narratives, as arranged side by side in our written works based on the similarity of their content, forming cohesive wholes, and these wholes, in turn, forming historical periods in relation to each other, we have a definite characteristic of written organization or a form that is not present in the manner of oral tradition. —

124

After these preliminary remarks, it will not be difficult to judge the alleged relationship of our writings to tradition. We will apply those criteria only to a few cases. If the contrast between live speech and written composition is likened to that between nature and art, and we can proceed from this premise as a general principle, then we can first bring to mind examples of speech transmission found in our Gospels where it is noticeable that words are attributed to the alleged speakers—Jesus and other individuals—that, while not contradicting the factual truth, do not fit as naturally into the circumstances of the speaking characters as they do into the narrator's plan, and cannot be derived from those narrators who would have had the image of the setting and the context in which the reported word was spoken imprinted upon them. However, we will only provide a

few examples of such cases. In n. 22, Jesus' disciples, according to our reporters, say the following words in order to justify their request for Jesus to dismiss the crowd gathered around him:

<p>Matth 14:15. ερημός ἔστιν ὁ τόπος χ. ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθε, ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα χ. τ. λ.</p>	<p>Mark 6:36. οτι ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος κ. ἡ ὥρα ἤδη πολλή, ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα κ. τ. λ.</p>	<p>Luke 9:12. ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα — ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἰρήμῳ τόπῳ εσμέν.</p>
---	--	--

One may well ask: should Jesus' disciples, when Jesus was in the desolate place, the place chosen especially for them, have suggested to him that it was a desolate place as the reason why the people were to be dismissed? Hardly. It is only the writer who, because he needed a reason for the request, introduces into what is said, for the sake of representation or dressing, what in his opinion must have been a reason for Jesus to dismiss the people, although this word will not have occurred in reality in this way, and could not have occurred without appearing affected. To mention another example, Jesus could hardly have said what he said in n. 18, Luk 8, 46: "Someone has touched me, for I feel that a power has gone out from me. It is only the writer who wants to support the assurance of Jesus by a reason, and sets up this reason according to the conjecture which he forms of Jesus' knowledge of the touching that has taken place (Paulus's Commentary, 1 Thess. p. 564). It is not likely that Jesus said to His disciples that the scriptures must be fulfilled by what they did to Him (Matth. 26, 56.). One would more likely believe that Jesus had said this to Peter, who was striking with the sword, as Matthew 26:24 also presents it, but only as an insertion into the original text, as can be seen from the fact that a few lines later Matthew, together with the others, retains this reference to Scripture in the same place (although he now turns it into a comment by the narrator). Luke gives other words, in that he seems to want to substitute the appropriate ones for those given earlier in the narrative (Luk. 22:53. ἀλλ' αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους) and this may be presumed to be his intention; so he confirms what we mean. Our narratives also report that Jesus, on his approach to Jerusalem to enter the city, demanded a riding animal. — There is nothing incredible about this. However, if it is added that he requested something on which no one has ever sat, then once again, something is inserted into the original speech that a particular reflection deemed appropriate to the circumstances of Jesus and himself. However, this reflection is something we can hardly imagine to have arisen so early, nor can we think of it as being of such importance that it could have influenced the formation of the initial account of the matter. — Critical evaluators of the Gospel narratives have pointed out that the prediction of Jesus' future resurrection, as reported to have come from his own mouth, can hardly be considered factual based on other historical data, — namely, the astonishment of his disciples at the disappearance of his body from the grave and owing to their reluctance to suppose anything miraculous in it — could hardly be taken as factual, and that therefore later a greater certainty was We mention this only in passing because we recognize that this transformation from the indefinite to the more definite, while granted, does not necessarily relate to written composition. However, there is also no authentic evidence that the presumed creators of the hypothetically assumed tradition themselves had already made this interpretation and the



corresponding transformation. Moreover, examples of self-generated speech

b) occur individually among our writers. It is likely that Luke himself forms the words in Luke 23:37 when he reports that the Roman soldiers mocked Jesus on the cross, saying, "If you are the King of the Jews, save yourself," as if the Romans believed that a Jewish king could free himself from the cross. At least we cannot imagine this speech flowing from the source of a tradition transcribed by eyewitnesses. In Matthew, there are several examples of such speech formations, specifically those based on the narrator's own way of presenting things. Matthew, for example, in n. 16 gives two parables with interpretation, one of the sower (τον σπειρόντος), the other of the tares (των ζιζανίων). Just as he distinguishes these parables himself, he also allows them to be distinguished by the persons whom he introduces speaking. The disciples must say to Jesus (ch. 13, 36.): φράσον ημῖν τὴν παραβολὴν των ζιζανίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ indeed Jesus himself, in expounding the first of these parables, must say with the writer distinguishing (ch. 13, 18.): νμείζ ονν ἀχοῦσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τον σπειρόντος. v. 13. words which are not natural in the mouth of Jesus, because the parable which the disciples asked him to interpret was at that moment the only one so just presented, and had as yet no relation to other parables, that it should have been expressly distinguished from them as a parable of the sower. - In Mark, too, there are examples of his confusing the standpoint of the speaker with that of the writer. This happens e.g. when Jesus is supposed to call his disciples the twelve (Mark 14:20), or when Jesus is supposed to use the expression: this gospel (14:9). Let us give another example

c) of writerly consideration for the plan of the narrative and for the needs of readers, as such consideration is sometimes found in the common relation. For example, "the Sadducees came, those who deny the resurrection" (Matt. 22:23). As a preparation for what follows in the narrative, this statement was entirely in its place. But now, as we shall see later, it is entirely in the spirit of the narrative style that is found throughout our Gospels. We may therefore regard it all the more as a literary one, and in it we would already have an example, just as what is spoken in common does not yet have its source in tradition because it is what is expressed in agreement by all three speakers. But even if analogies did not determine our judgement here, would one believe that oral tradition took the care to make this explanatory addition? — Elsewhere, again, as we have noted,

d) the measured brevity of speech is the more certain a characteristic of literary composition, the less it can be assumed, according to the circumstances which are supposed to have prompted the speech, that the latter should have been confined to so small a volume, or included in so narrow a circle of thought. Examples of this kind are found in the relations from n. 9. too(? bis) n. 12. and n. 14., where the speech is more precise than it is clear, and the narrator giving the account seems to be careful not to give more than the subject necessarily requires, but rather not even that much. For here, especially in n. 11, there even seems to be a lack of sense-explaining interjections \*). Again, we cannot look for the creative principle in the oral tradition, since the plan to string together several eclectic accounts, as they follow one another here, and yet to give each one the form of a story, cannot be subordinated to it. Other examples of short

versions, which we cannot derive from oral tradition, but only from the writer, are n. 28 (Matth. 8, 35. 36. 38. cf. the parallels), where, by means of a thrice-applied elliptical γάρ, sayings that stand in succession are placed in mutual dependence, so that the more strenuous reflection required to understand the words can only be presupposed in readers. Furthermore, in Mark 20, where Jesus gives his disciples a brief instruction on how to go from place to place, from which instruction we learn little more than the fact itself that Jesus sent out the disciples without giving them a specific travel direction. Matthew is more verbose, but as will be noted on another occasion, he is merely compiling. In other instances, the reporters themselves express themselves as if they want the reported content to be considered the quintessence of what was spoken. For example, in Mark 47, where the introductory remark in Mark 12:38 (compare the parallels) suggests a longer discourse, yet only a few words from the speech are cited without it being clear how the selection of these words was determined by the context. Matthew provides more here as well, but again, it is only compiled material. Other examples of excessively short accounts, as we have already noted above, can be found in the Passion narrative. It seems as if everything has been laboriously pieced together. Within the reported material, we also find segments of a different nature

\*) It is missing in n. 11 before the sentence: the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath, the middle link that David, by taking the showbread, placed and was allowed to place the needs of man above the prohibition. —

e) —carefully crafted didactic speeches consisting of closely connected and lengthy series of sentences. These speeches would have had to be written down before the initial transmitter could have memorized them in order to become part of the oral tradition. Among them are many of the longer parables and passages such as in Mark 44 and Mark 49. However, certain distinctive characteristics betray that these are products of literary artistry and by no means creations born solely through reproduction from memory. This category includes the so-called Sermon on the Mount, the Gospel's explanation of the purpose of the parable of the sower (Mark 16), which will be discussed elsewhere regarding its artful construction, and others. Just as there are elements in the historical accounts of our consistent Gospels that are unlikely to have been part of an orally transmitted Gospel tradition, such as the listing of the apostles, there are also instances where events and their accompanying speeches are mentioned

f), serving only the purpose of being parts of a historically unfolding written whole intended for readers. Such references could only be deemed necessary by a historian writing with a view to a complete historical narrative. We can include in this category the narratives of Jesus' instructions for the preparation of the Passover and the sending out of the disciples, among others. —

129

It was mentioned earlier that the writer, by subjecting themselves to the obedience of reflection and artistic rules, easily becomes estranged from the natural way of presenting things, especially when it comes to depicting specific details, or they may

overlook what is of primary concern to someone aiming for a vivid representation. This case often occurs with our writers, in fact, it is the rule. They select, condense, and only link concrete details together as examples, and when they have briefly touched upon or summarized the specifics, they return to the general, only to move on to something else from there. This gives the individual details a fragmentary appearance, so much so that almost the entire sum of what is presented can be contrasted with the manner of oral transmission in terms of comprehension and connection. The individual details do not exist in isolation; they are detached from the context of reality, and their connection to circumstances is incidental and made only temporarily as a transition to what the writer usually wants to highlight according to a planned arrangement. Both the arrangement of the masses and the presentation of the individual details indicate a writer's plan. Since there is a tendency nowadays, when the question of the origin of Gospel harmony arises, to attribute everything that seems comprehensible or puzzling in this regard to oral tradition, it is not inappropriate to demonstrate that the pieces do not possess the form that would be expected under this assumption, but rather, they are arranged according to literary calculations. We will attempt to provide this demonstration here, but we will also strive for conciseness in doing so.

130

Let us begin with Mark 1:40-45 (compare the parallels) n. 8. We have here a short narrative that is based on a factual event. The details of the event remain hidden, and only the words spoken by Jesus emerge as the main purpose of the account. These words contain nothing more than the prohibition given to the healed leper not to disclose the miracle. It is immediately evident that this small passage could not have been formed solely in oral tradition or for the purpose of transmission. For if the narrator considered it important to highlight the words of that prohibition, they must have calculated its significance in relation to other elements and intended to connect the spoken words with something else so that the importance of the notice and the information about whether this prohibition was observed or violated, and what impact each of these cases had, would be evident in some way. Therefore, assuming it was the work of tradition as its creator, it would have formed a single piece of information with the intention of not stopping at the individual incident—which we would more readily attribute to a writer. However, the fact that the story is told as an individual incident does not necessarily follow from the different position given to it by Matthew.

131

Matthew does not mention whether the healed person observed the prohibition or not; he only focuses on Jesus' words, almost as if he places primary importance on Jesus' statement that the healed person should show himself to the priests and offer the prescribed sacrifice. However, even if this information were taken alone, it would have no significance unless it were connected to other elements in the Gospel narrative. We

also notice the absence of the customary details that oral transmission tends to provide when conveying an isolated account of a remarkable speech, namely, specifying the time and place where the remarkable words were spoken. Furthermore, it is even less clear why the narrative, as presented by Matthew, would have been included in an apostolic tradition or an oral proto-Gospel designed for teaching purposes, unless it was associated with a particular reflection on Jesus' spoken words. Everything becomes more understandable if we assume that the writer, who aimed to present a complete historical narrative, incorporated this account as a transitional element in their progressively unfolding exposition. Since the central aspect of this narrative is the spreading of Jesus' reputation against his will, the question arises as to who would have been more likely to intend to begin with the gradual dissemination of Jesus' reputation or make it the subject of their narrative interest: oral tradition or a writer. —

The subsequent narrative of the paralytic (n. 9) is not traditional but presents itself, as indicated by its precision and the application of stylistic techniques (as seen in Matthew 9:6 and parallel passages), as well as its placement amidst other narratives, which suggests that it is a written composition. What is lacking here is precisely what a specific narrative would have compiled from individual moments of observation in order to create a coherent historical account and provide a clear narrative of a particular event. We are not informed why Jesus' presence was hastily utilized on this occasion to bring the paralyzed man before him, regardless of the means, or how it came about that the Pharisees and scribes, whose dialogue with Jesus is supposed to be the main focus of the narrative, happened to be gathered near Jesus and in the house where the healing took place. It is only in the subsequent narratives that the connections become clearer. In the immediately following passages, the Pharisees once again engage in dialogues with Jesus, and their criticism goes even further than here, although here they merely express suspicion, which, it seems, is suppressed once again. Thus, our narrative is intended to initiate Jesus' interaction with Pharisees and scribes, and it contains nothing more than the occasion taken by the latter to regard Jesus with suspicion. From this perspective, the actual triggering event or causal circumstance is not described in detail, but rather summarized in relation to the narrative, and the Pharisees are assembled here, as if by agreement, to witness an event that prompts words, particularly words that would have stood out to these observers but not to others, although the account also mentions others. This convergence of events (clearly apparent in Mark and Luke, at least) occurs during the period from which the writer must begin in order to make sense of Jesus' later experiences with Pharisaic opposition. — All of this appears to be the composition and arrangement of literary artistry. While Matthew presents the passage differently from Mark and Luke, he still includes it as part of the subsequent narratives, and he is far from providing a traditional account (i.e., one that seeks to inform another person about what they must know in order to make sense of the remarkable aspects). Furthermore, Matthew even deprives the narrative of the

poverty account, which the others still possess as part of their storytelling. —

132

n. 10. As the passage is presented by all the narrators in connection with the previous one, it must have originally had this connection. The factual event (the calling of the tax collector) once again takes a backseat, and only the banquet is mentioned as the occasion, and dining with tax collectors is mentioned as the catalyst for the speeches Jesus delivers in relation to the Pharisees' remarks. This is similar to the previous passage, as Jesus is compelled to expose their pettiness. We must consider this a more artificial compilation, especially when it is difficult to imagine that between the healing of the paralytic and this banquet, many other noteworthy events of a similar nature would have occurred, and that the Pharisees, if they wanted to criticize Jesus for his participation in the banquet, would not have waited for a more opportune time instead of making the host's house the scene of the dispute. —

133

In n. 11 and 12 (Mark 2:23ff), the Pharisees appear again, and once more, they display a petty mindset, which is promptly exposed by Jesus through short and incisive answers, as indicated briefly in the narrative. Mark and Luke have correctly grouped these passages together because they share the same spirit. Additionally, Matthew confirms the connection between n. 9 and 10, as well as n. 11 and 12, and he cannot deny the validity of this grouping. However, this compilation is designed with a purpose and asserts a certain progression. In the first passage (n. 9), the Pharisees only harbor suspicions about Jesus, while in the second and third passages, they confront him directly, and in the final passage (n. 12; Mark 3:1-6), they lay in wait for an accusation against him. As they are once again put to shame, they now plot hostile schemes against him. A narrator who arranges the events in this manner must have intended to conclude a specific period, to which other developments would be linked. And could this narrator be attributed to tradition? We believe not, even if it was not an invention. But what period is being concluded, and how is it being concluded? The goal is not to provide a historical account but rather to highlight the character of the Pharisees and their futile attempts to incriminate Jesus. The period being concluded is not defined by a specific timeframe; rather, the simple fact that the Pharisees began to pursue Jesus at some point is portrayed as an unfolding development, presented through a series of events that may not even be arranged chronologically. — Undeniably, this is a structure suited for writing, not for live communication. —

134

The piece n. 14 (Mark. 3, 20 - 30. compare the parallels) is again an artificial composition. The fact that Jesus defends himself against blasphemies is connected with the news of the arrival of Jesus' relatives - in Mark, when we first look at the latter, it is obviously a deliberate connection. For first of all he starts from a general point, namely that Jesus' healings in general gave rise to certain judgments (Mark 3:10). The parties, as his report puts them together, unite, regardless of their completely different attitudes, in the purpose of hindering Jesus in his work. On the part of the Pharisees, this is done by blaspheming his healing power out of evil intentions; on the part of the relatives, it is done out of good intentions, in order to remove him from the scene of an activity that would take up too much of his strength. These parts do not come together at the same time in Mark (for Mark 3:22 makes a distinction), but precisely because the historical aspect of the connection is nevertheless completely subordinate, the combination is intentional, as if the relatives had to be there for the sake of the parallelism of the narrative. – Matthew does not link them in the way Mark does, but he has the result. The relatives and the blasphemers stand side by side. According to him – this is his distinguishing feature -- the blasphemy does not refer to the demons driving out Jesus in general (as it must be the case with Mark, if the arrival of the relatives was to be given a motive), but to a specific case. This would seem traditional. But since the casting out of demons is said to have been a common thing among the healings of Jesus (Matth. 8, 16), we do not see why this blasphemy should have been promoted by only one specific case. Be that as it may, it is said that the Pharisees had heard of this case (καί ἀκοῦσαντες Matth. 11, 24). Time must have passed, then, and yet the Pharisees are there to be dealt with before the relatives; indeed it is said that Jesus, knowing their thoughts, replied, etc., as if they were direct spectators of that action, as if they had been direct spectators of that act, and were now to bear the shame of it for their thoughts, and to this the relatives are also to come, while Jesus is still talking with them v. 64. - This is a compulsive connection, in which the lost thread is first sought again, not tradition, but aberration, - I say aberration from Scripture. What is said of Matthew's account is also true of Luke's, who, though he improves some things by conveying the presence of the blasphemers in a different way, yet makes of the Pharisees mere τίς (chap. 11, 15), excludes the arrival of the relatives (because he has placed the piece quite differently \*), and yet also mentions Jesus' mother, and does so in such a way that Jesus replaces the happily praised mother with others who are to be praised even more happily (v 27 and 28). - The reply of Jesus to the blasphemers is longer in Matthew and Luke than in Mark, but, as can also be seen, artificially prolonged, and in the following the reports of both speakers diverge. --

\*) That Luke himself changed the position will be proved elsewhere.

n. 16. We have already noted earlier as an artistic creation, and we will reserve the details for another place. —

136

n.17. 18. and 19. are more reports of facts, thus to be excluded here. -

n. 20. has already been mentioned for its brevity. - Of the common pieces, 22 (Feeding of the 5000) is again the description of a fact, to be excluded here. We now first come to o. 28 (Mark. 8, 27 - 9, 1. cf. the parallel passage). In this passage we have already described the precision, the elliptical 7" that follows three times, as a characteristic of written composition. But as for what belongs here, the connection of the whole speech with the circumstances that caused it, we believe that an oral narrator, if he stated that Jesus had asked the question (for whom he was thought to be) on the journey to Caesarea Philippi, which he had begun or completed, could not possibly have made the statement without also eliciting a question from the hearers as to what could have induced Jesus to ask the question in this way only now and just here. But there is silence about this. One gets the idea that, because the Gospel account of the whole story is coming closer and closer to the end of the story, that is, to the sad fate of Jesus, and that this approach is to be preceded by Jesus' own explanation, -- that first of all this latter explanation should take its place, and then, if it is to be introduced by an answer of the disciples, that it should introduce it, and finally, and finally, if this introduction is to take place by means of a question of Jesus sent before it -- which, again distinguishing between two things, first asks for the opinion of others before it becomes a questioning of the disciples about their own opinion -- that then also the question of Jesus that precedes it has received its origin through art, and the whole thus formed has received its arrangement and interconnection under scriptural calculations. This view is also confirmed when we go back to n. 21 (Mark 6:14-16 and the parallel passages), where the various judgments about Jesus are first mentioned by the writer, just as they were given here by the disciples, in order to begin a new period, and then go forward again to the piece to which we now come. --

n. 29. of the Transfiguration, where the mentioned names, Elias and John, come up again, and the disciples receive different instruction regarding the appearance of both, which is noteworthy. This instruction was meant to reconcile them with Jesus' declaration, which had struck them, about going to his death. Also, the "irov "xoä«rk" (This is my beloved Son) which resounds as a heavenly voice to the disciples, and one can see that the piece is intended for the disciples' instruction. — It was necessary to encourage them during this period, as Jesus' revelation could have caused them to waver in their loyalty (as had happened to others according to John 6:16). Composition and placement here also indicate a writer's plan. —

n. 30. Another description of a fact. —

n.31. Jesus returns here to his earlier explanation of which goal he had to pursue. We find this statement remarkable here. For we do not see how oral tradition could have arrived at such a repetition without making divisions in the manner of a writer, and without the need to establish a connection, that is, without having the rule of a connecting presentation before it. Only writers make such divisions and beginnings; there is no place for them in oral tradition. It is just as difficult to see how it could have been taken from life that, after Jesus' declaration of his death, which put down all vain hopes, a dispute arose among the disciples, as is reported in

n. 32. If we were to think of this dispute more as a competition between the disciples in their devotion to their Lord, and imagine that Jesus' declaration had demanded special tests of devotion, and thus the dispute had arisen, then the way in which Jesus attempted to instruct the disputants would not fit in, as it was calculated to reject the unfounded hopes of a vain conceit, and to cut off privileges such as only pride demands. Here, too, the connection is not a chronological one, but a factual one - namely, the speeches occurring in one and the other of the connected pieces are what prompted the combination of the two. It is all the more worthwhile to put the context into perspective, since two very similar pericopes, n. 36 and 37 (Matth. 20, 17-19 and 20-28, cf. Mark), also occur below, connected according to subject order, but where the real context is different from that here. Here the disciples, after what they must fear according to Jesus' declaration, that they would soon lose their Master and have to stand alone as orphans, should learn to feel the necessity of joining together all the more closely, and thus, instead of one of them asserting privileges over the other, they should learn to feel that they are the only ones who have the right to be separated and separated, which brings about segregation and separation, they should ascribe to each other, as equally beloved friends of the Messiah, the same dignity, and each of them should show his self-respect in the respect of the least among them, even if he were as small as a child. This is the context of the present passage. Further on, however, in 36 and 37, it is connected by the fact that humility is first recommended to the disputants, and therefore the example of their Lord is presented to them, who, as their servant, only carries out what he declared he was willing to do in the previous passage (Matth. 20, 17-19) for the good of others. Thus the instruction in one piece refers back to the other here as well. — If, however, the parallel duplicity of the two whole parts is thus connected by subject order, and occurs twice in this way, and both times in a special way, we should think that this would be proof enough of a literary arrangement, as it is distinguishable from a traditional connection. For oral narration will neither repeat itself in this way after different paragraphs, nor will it delve into such systematicity, least of all



if it does not itself want to distinguish the similarity to be distinguished according to place and time relations. –

n. 34 (Blessing of children) offers us no special remark for our purpose other than that, if we should have to think of the communications of tradition as particularised and individualised, it would have to be disconcerting if it had not added to what it once emphasised as strange, the determination of place that is missed here. --

139

n. 35. tells us how Jesus makes the abstraction of the particular case in which a rich young man, called upon to follow him, cannot make up his mind to leave his possessions: the rich will hardly enter the kingdom of heaven, and that this very remark was particularly noticeable to the disciples. But should such examples not have occurred to the disciples several times, and much earlier? or should special examples have been needed at all, in order to confirm what Jesus states here as a rule of experience? and how can such a statement about the rich still strike the companions of Jesus, who were separated from others precisely according to such existing world conditions, and should have heard the praise of the rich praised long ago with words such as they occur in the so-called Sermon on the Mount: Woe to you rich, you have lost your comfort? (Luk. 6, 24. 25.) If, however, the words of the disciples point back to a long time of continued contact with Jesus, then we see here again nothing but scriptural arrangement and artificial combination. --

The account describes Jesus' journey to Jerusalem from here to n. 39. To make a general remark, we cannot convince ourselves in any way that the oral Gospel of the first Jesus could have consisted of a travelogue, if we put any purpose to it. But all our first three Gospels are in fact such travelogues. It is therefore incomprehensible to us how a primal gospel could have been made their model. It may be said that the Gospel and its contents were not so arranged; the material was in it, but the form was given to it from elsewhere. - Good; but I maintain again that even the material, if we consider its individualisation in individual pieces, everywhere where it appears as a detail, in Luke as in the others, - is so composed that from it messages were formed which are parts of a travelogue. One only has to go through the Gospels to find this!

140

And so we cannot admit that originally the form lay apart from the material. \*) But further. - From the arrival of Jesus in Jerusalem, that is, from n. 40, through the whole history of the Passion to the end of the facts, the Synoptic account continues on one thread. We have already proved this above, and could now conclude from this

perception that the accounts preceding the Passion, in spite of the fact that they are details, have constituted as few isolated pieces, given to different treatment, as the constituent parts of the Passion. But as this must be admitted, so also under the hands of the whole, and the individual merges again into a whole, that the then visible calculation of the whole upon the individual, and of the individual upon the whole, cannot be taken for a plan laid down by oral tradition, still less by the fetterless moving saga. And so it may have arisen with what right Luke distinguishes the παραόουνοι of the first revelators from the ἀναταξασθαι διήγησιν, as he himself attempts it according to certain patterns, and as it is brought about in our Gospels. But before we go further, we have still one objection to remove.

\*) This is also to be noted against Credner, who, in contradiction to himself, also assumes a stereotypically strict oral Gospel, "since" it is said to have been even more comprehensive in the whole and more exact (?) in detail, but yet formless at the same time (Introduct. p. 192.), about which "several" further below.

-----

140

#### Notes:

If we take an argument against tradition on the basis of the precision or brevity of the passages, we could nevertheless hold up to us an account which, though briefly written, was demonstrably a part of tradition, or could with great justification be regarded as such. This is Paul's account of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:23-25), which is quite similar in form to Luke's, and which the apostle likewise places behind him as something received, and which also seems to consist of received formulas. But this report does not disturb our opinion. It is even more in favour of it than against it. Let us examine it more closely. Paul wants to say in the passage quoted: "What I have ordained (παρίδωκα) among you (the Corinthians) as a rite, to partake of bread and wine in remembrance at the Lord's Supper, is a precept which has its confirmation in the example of the Lord Himself. He also took bread and wine, and, distributing both among His disciples, expressed the desire that they should in future repeat the common partaking of both, and as often as this happened, make this partaking a celebration of His memorial. Thus says Paul. What he thus adds, going back to what he knows of Jesus, is an eclectic excerpt to justify the reference, and is intended only to give sanction to the form of what he has ordered. Paul's relation briefly mentions what Jesus did, in so far as it is an example of what is to be done. But that is all our evangelical reports want to mention, and we always have only the brevity of written drafts, but not

the pre-suppositional comprehensiveness of oral tradition. -- But whence, one may reasonably ask, is the striking similarity between the two accounts of Luke and Paul? We take the liberty of making an assumption about this, which may seem bold, but which, we believe, is not unworthy of examination.

a) The ὡσαῦτως καί τό ποτήριον most likely received its excerpt-like, summarizing expression at the same place where it is quite visibly part of an excerpt-like, summary statement - that is, in the writings of Paul, and it is therefore, if it is found elsewhere, especially if it is found in a Gospel which the ancients believed they had to reduce to Paul, it was in all probability taken from the Pauline passage, and only later transferred to where it moreover deviates from parallelism. But just like that,

b) the words Luke 22:19. τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τήν ἐμήν ἀνάμνησιν and not only these words, but the whole of v. 20 from the Pauline passage, and the following reasons may speak in favour of this assumption.

α) If what we borrowed according to our assumption is omitted in Luke, then verse 19 connects better with verse 21. Because the phrase ἐπί τῆς τραπέζης undeniably fits better for the meal that has not yet been concluded (which should be concluded precisely at the cup, according to μετὰ τό δειπνήσαί); it is also not clear why Jesus should speak about his betrayer only after the meal, at the cup, and not earlier during the bread, especially since it is mentioned that the betrayer was with him at the table (verse 21). But

β) the chalice is not omitted in this way; on the contrary, it is striking that Luke, unlike the others, should double the chalice because this is what he himself does not seem to have wanted. Because

γ) he has the same testamentary words that the others cite for the cup, also for the first cup v. 17. λάβετε τούτο κ. διαμερίσατε ἑαυτοῖς (cf. Matt. 26, 27. πῖετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες). Likewise he also has the foreboding statement of Jesus that he will never again drink from the fruit of the vine like this, and just like that also the εὐ/αριστήσας. What can but do you conclude from this? The second cup does not belong in Luke's account at all. And so the difference between Luke's report and the ancillary reports is based only on the rearrangement of the moments, and what he has in common with the words found in Paul is an insertion and later assimilation. However, in this examination, we do not rely solely on our own criticism. It is certainly a very remarkable circumstance that even a critical authority supports this examination, namely codex Rhediger \*), which includes the words "Hoc est Corpus meum" from verse 19 until the end of verse 20. And then v. 21 continues: verumtamen ecce manus tradentis me mecum etc., what a remarkable phenomenon we are referring to want to draw attention to here at the same

time. So let us return to our context. The ἀνάταξις (arrangement) that was mentioned includes, as a secondary condition, the linguistic form. Let us now discuss this aspect as well. We have reason to talk about it because assuming an oral Aramaic original of the Gospel, it is indeed an important question how the transition of its content from Aramaic to our Greek Gospels should be understood and how the formation of the latter should be envisioned if the mediation through writing is excluded.

\*) S. David Schulz in the Scripture: on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Second edition Leipzig 1831.

---

143

**Ninth Datum:** Gradually a formed tradition had established itself as the original oral gospel among the apostles; so this gospel would first have had to be translated into Greek, and this translation, according to the above hypothesis, should either not have been a written one at all, or, if one was made, it should not have been published. But now it is the date that our Greek type is just as little a translation made from the Ur-Gospel in Jerusalem as it could have come directly from the Ur-Gospel if it were a translation.

The original oral gospel is said to have gradually developed into the type of our written gospels before all written records and without a written basis from the repeated lectures of the first narrators. That was the premise. So the apostles, whom we then think of as teaching in Jerusalem, will undoubtedly have used their native language idiom in their informal communication. According to reliable sources, this was the Aramaic or Syriac-Chaldean language. For more information on this, refer to Pfankuche's work on the Palestinian vernacular language during the time of Jesus and the Apostles, found in Eichhorn's Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur, Volume VIII, pp. 365-480. Additionally, you can consult J.D. Michaelis' Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1762, pp. 26-32, as well as Credner's Introduction, Volume 1, pp. 186-187. The apostolic original Gospel would therefore have been in Aramaic and would have needed to be translated in order to serve as a model for our Greek Gospels. -- Now, according to our hypothesis, all use of Scripture through which the agreement of our evangelists could be mediated should remain excluded. So, as far as that translation is concerned, it will have to be assumed that it was not a written one. This assumption is necessary anyway if the original oral gospel is to be preserved. For if the need for a Greek script as a translation had to be acknowledged, we could immediately put an original Greek work as a gospel at this point, i.e. instead of an oral Ur-Gospel, a written Ur-Gospel, which would also give us less time than it would take to produce one no

such protracted elaboration of uniformity in monotonous repetitions was needed. For the very same reason we will not be allowed to give any space at all to a written translation, not even with the restriction that we assume that this translation, although a written one, was not published but was in the hands of the apostles or the first preachers of the word left for their private use. For it would always have to be recognized as a joint work, the production of which would require a special association, an association which, assuming it, would be no less strange than an association for the draft of a written Ur-Gospel. There is nothing to be assumed but that the translation was oral, i.e. it was the property of the preachers of the Word, so that where they had to communicate the Gospel in Greek, they had at their disposal an acquired or established Greek expression of what was to be communicated, just as they were accustomed to a uniform presentation of the Gospel content in the original language. Did the apostles or the first proclaimers of the word need to communicate the gospel in Greek? Here is the least doubt about this, since it is well known that Hellenists very soon became interested in the new teaching of the witnesses to Jesus. But that is the only historical thing on which the hypothesis can be based if it wants to make a transition from Aramaic to Greek. But this transition does not succeed at all.

1) There is nothing to prove, or even to make it probable, that the apostles had to translate in order to communicate Jesus' life story to the Hellenists - converting an Aramaic into Greek, so that this would have had the quantity of the first. Then

2) the uniformity in the use of the Greek translation and its stability can never be explained unless Scripture is called to help. But

3) our Gospels and their Greek are not translations from Aramaic. If they were, their language would be of quite a different hue, as can be inferred by comparing with them the Alexandrian translation and the passages in it, which are translations from the Chaldean. We do not find in our Gospels the Hebraisms and Aramaisms which are frequent there. What is Hebrew in it, in the expression, in the association of ideas, in the connection of the sentences - it has already been remarked by many that this does not make them translations from the Hebrew and shows nothing more than the origin of these Scriptures from the Hebrew spirit, and from the acquaintance of their authors with the spirit of the Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament. We shall be able to stand all the more firmly with this view, because - if it is admitted that what is found in our Gospels as a common and consistent expression is not a translation from the Hebrew but a free copy with independent use of the Greek language, — then it is also not foreseeable how the corresponding Greek gospels, according to the degree of their agreement, must necessarily be preceded by an equally quantified Aramaic gospel. And so we refer to the fact that our writings

α) have nothing more Hebraic about them than those whose original language is recognized as Greek, e.g. the gospel of John and the Pauline writings, and furthermore

β) that the same linguistic relationship can also be noticed in those evangelical parts which one will not count as part of that traditional gospel, in the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, and just so now also

γ) in the sections of the first table, at those places where Luke employs Hebraic rhetoric alone (e.g., n. 49, Luke 21:14, 23-24, n. 53, Chapter 22:15, 21, and others), as well as finally in those sections that are excluded here and are found on the second table.

Furthermore,

δ) where our authors appeal to Scripture and use the words of Scripture to draw conclusions, they have drawn from the source of the Greek translation of the Bible; But, what is particularly to be noted, they used the words of this translation not only for quotations, but also to dress up their lecture and to lay out their historical descriptions, and we regard this in particular as proof that their writings are not translations from a different idiom, but originally conceived in Greek. We have already quoted a passage of this kind (allusion to the sacrifice of Isaac) above, p. 79. But there are still several places like this, e.g. Matt. 21, 33 εφύτευσεν αμπελώνα κ. φραγμόν περιέθηκε κ. ώρουξεν ---ληνόν. See page 70. Jerem. 5, 2., also Matth. 24, 20. (Mark. 13, 24.) cf. Isa. 13, 10. Ο ήλιος σκοτισθήσεται there: οί αστέρες του ονρανοῦ — τό φώς ού δώσουσι κ. σκοτισθήσεται του ήλιον ανατέλλοντος κ. ή σελήνη ού δώσει τό φως αυτής to Mark. 13, 19. εσονται αί ημέραι — θλέπισ οϊα ου γέγονε τοιαντη άπ αρχής κτίσεως 'έως του νυν cf. Dan. 12:1 εσται καιρός θλίψεως, θλίπισ οϊα ού γέγονε αφ ου γεγένηται έθνος επί τής γης, έως του καιρού εκείνου. Further:

147

Mark 1:6 ήν δέ Ιωάννης ένδεδυμένος τριχάς καμηλού κ. ζώνην δερματίνην περί τήν όαφύν αυτόν.	2 Kings 1:8 άνήρ δασός και ζώνην δερματίνην περιζωβμένος (in a similar passage but Dan. 10, 5. ένδεδυμένος) τήν οσφυν αντου.
---	--

In particular, Luke takes formulas and phrases from the translation of the 70 —  
Furthermore

4) the agreement of our Greek Gospels in the expression is to be explained. If the translation presupposed for the Hellenists is not to be a complete fiction, then our Gospels must be the imprints of this translation, imprints, that is, of a translation made

in Jerusalem. But they cannot be, and that is what we want to urge here. For the time being, there is not enough likelihood that the Syriac-Chaldean model of our Gospels should have originated in Jerusalem, because it is not quite believable that such easily misinterpretable narratives, so suspiciously dangerous for the originators of the Gospel tradition, as the prophecy of the impending desolation of the Temple, should have been written there in the midst of the enemies and the Levites, should have been passed on orally as parts of the Gospel of Jesus by means of methodically renewing tradition, or that the faithful should always have been told there how Jesus described the scribes and Pharisees according to their corrupt customs - this, I say, is not probable enough in itself before a translation is thought of. But just as the content of the discourse here shows a disproportion to the locale, so the translation itself, when one looks at its form, in the way in which it gives its interpretations of certain subjects that are sufficiently known in Jerusalem, is not characterised as a communication that has become customary there between teachers and listeners. Let us highlight a few passages. It is said, for instance, that Jesus was led away to be crucified - in Matthew (27, 33.) to a place called Golgotha (εις τόπον λεγόμενον γολγοθά), and this name is translated, as in the parallel passage of Mark (15, 22.), into Greek. ), then translated into Greek, - two speakers at the same time give the explanation of the name, we must believe, according to the predetermination of their original, that is, of that original translation; for Luke also, though he does not first mention the Hebrew name, but immediately the Greek, yet also says that the place was so called. But now we ask: was not the place in Jerusalem well enough known, that a narrator there should have mentioned it by name only, in order to make it known where Jesus was led away to? - Gethsemane, moreover, which is mentioned before, was, according to all supposition, as the very name implies, a piece of field named by purpose and use, and therefore sufficiently suggestible by its mere name. \*) Mark and Matthew both describe it as speaking to those who do not know this place, which is very close to Jerusalem, or who cannot assume the name of the place as something known in the city. They choose the expression: εις χωρίον, not the expected one: εις τῷ χωρίον, εις γεθημανη (Matt. 26, 36. Mark. 14, 32.). As here for listeners who are present on the spot too little knowledge of the location is assumed, or not the proximity of the scene; similar examples also occur in relation to other objects. For example, the questioning Sadducees are remembered in the account of the temple negotiations of Jesus (Matth. 22, 23. s. and the parallel texts), and with regard to them it is mentioned by all three speakers that they were the party that denied the resurrection of the dead. A remark which, as an introduction to the question put in their mouths, may indeed be in its place, if it is a matter of literary accuracy, but when set back in living speech and on this scene of communication, it becomes unnatural. For those who heard the gospel in Jerusalem were undoubtedly familiar enough with the Sadducees as a sect distinguished by special opinions, namely as deniers of the resurrection. Because the sect still existed back then. Why then for such hearers in lively speech a remark that was superfluous for

them? How could it be expected from narrators who could not consider such instruction necessary? \*) — If the habit of the authorities, mentioned in the story of Jesus' condemnation, of releasing one of the prisoners to the Jews on the feast, was based on the recognition of Jewish law, according to which it should have been something very well known (as it is according to Luk. 23, 17 . it seems); this note, which is woven into the common relation, would also refer to other time and place conditions than the hypothetical assumptions here, and would be an example of those. -- Finally we ask: would the apostles, if they were telling the story in Jerusalem, designate Judas as εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, like our three speakers, would use this designation in the same place? (Mark. 14, 10. and the parallels.) Actually, however, we do not even need to get involved with such individual proofs that one might consider to be quibbling. The idea of a Greek translation arising from the Aramaic is in itself untenable, however we may conceive the latter to have arisen. For if we assume that the apostles or their like made a Greek translation of individual stories, this must have been done for the sake of a mechanical recitation (for what else could it have served?), and this assumption would probably have enough of the improbable. But the improbability is not lost if, in order to obtain something more natural, one tries to imagine the origin of such a translation without writing as something unintentional that happened by itself. Because one does not arrive at the standing form, and one does not see how the precipitation of a specific normative expression should have emerged from the creative process among self-renewing reproductions. Rather, what must remain is this: if, in order to satisfy a need, a translation was made of the apostolic communications, it was also set down in writing, but it cannot have been intended to serve as a scheme for mechanical recitations. And accordingly, if our evangelists are said to have had their standard of agreement in a translation taken from the apostolic tradition, we would rather look for its origin in the Jewish foreign countries among the Hellenists, and we would therefore have to imagine that the gospel saga first found its way here among the Greeks dressed in Greek garb. But then again we miss

a) the mediation with the apostolic tradition, in that neither it could be demonstrated that it was the original of this translation, nor that it had to be its copy,

b) In that case, there would be a lack of an institution that could preserve such a transplantation into the Greek idiom as a living tradition, which, through repeated replication, could have become a collective memory for our evangelists, accessible to them as a source of concordance. (For they are said to have written independently of each other, not utilizing one another.) Therefore, we would only come to a translation in writing, and specifically, as the written work of a single translator. From this writing, parts would have then passed into other accounts, and from those, further similar parts would have been added, thus becoming the foundation of our Gospels. In short, we would move away from the oral tradition in this way. Let us, however,



c) allow several Greek translations of the Palestinian tradition to come about among the Hellenists abroad, independently of one another, so that our evangelists could have drawn from several translations and yet from one the same thing as from the other; - so with such independently made translations we will never get such equality, which explains the agreement of our evangelists also in the Greek expression, to which everything depends. It should be noted here that the second and third tables we have set up should not be mixed up with the first. If one does that, and derives the whole apparatus of all three tables from one source, or wants to sink into a whirlpool; thus one can easily obtain not only a rich treasure trove of tradition, oral and written, but also various translations. If, however, as will perhaps be shown later, the first table represents a complete work in itself, then the question is how the same is true in our Gospels, when they were emanations from translations that arose independently of one another, despite the majority of the sources, could have repeated, namely as that whole which excludes from itself the additions of Matthew and Luke on the second table, and also those on the third. So, to briefly summarize what has been said, with the assumption of a Greek translation we come to the dilemma: either this translation was the work of an individual; then, if it is the source for our evangelists, there is no longer any oral source to think of, or it was the work of many; then the inference also takes place, and what is more, the agreement in the Greek expression is not explained. —

\*) Χωρίον is not first of all villa, commonly, when it is called so, the genitive (of the owner) stands with it.

\*) Fritzsche's commentary on Matth, noted at the point: etsi enim satis constabat, tollere Sadducaeos mortuorum in vitam rellitum, tamen aptissime nos commonefecit ea de re Matthaeus, ut quid potissimum sermone suo obscuriore sibi vellet, nos non (leg. ne ) praeteriret. But the oral gospel legend in Jerusalem was not composed in usum nostrum.

---

Note 1.

The previous discussions will be clear and detailed enough to leave us in no doubt about the result. The uniformity of our Gospels, which, once again, extends far more often than one should suppose, down to the most specific expressions of speech, as a uniformity of expression, cannot be deduced from an oral source. There was no type of oral tradition so formed that our Gospels could have received their uniformity as an expression of this type, but we must go back to a determining writing.

Thus the phenomenon to be explained demands it, if we wish to infer its causes backwards from the data which lie in it, and not, by diverting our gaze from certain possibilities, lose sight of the point of view under which the whole is to be gathered. But perhaps one now asks: if this is the result, where then remains the truth of that from which above the existence of an oral primitive gospel was to be made probable, in that the hypothesis was put forward? (p. 36.) But there we were speaking of that which in itself would have been possible, whereas here we are dealing with reality. Nor do we deny that the apostles preached the Gospel orally, and we readily believe that they interspersed their discourses with historical notes from the life of Jesus. But what is claimed regarding the form of their discourses according to that hypothesis is what we consider nothing more than a fiction. The apostles delivered spontaneous discourses according to the needs of their listeners. These could not have existed in a mere historical narrative. If the speakers interwove historical notes or more detailed narratives into their speeches, they would not have repeated the same narrative with the same words, even if it had recurred in other speeches, and even if this had happened, the narration could not have had the same position and relationship and connection with others. The historical part should have been separated out for itself, and whoever was concerned with obtaining a whole of such notes could have done nothing else than what Mark, according to one statement, is said to have done with the Petrine lectures, namely to make an excerpt from such lectures and to give this a historical version from one point of view. At least we cannot imagine the matter any other way, and it is quite unbelievable to us that the apostles, or anyone else who taught the gospel alongside them, should have limited themselves to recounting certain anecdotes from Capernaum and the like and kept repeating them, e.g. how it happened at Gadara, how the paralytics were let down through the roof, how Jesus chastised the Pharisees and scribes in speeches, and other such individual things.

153

But perhaps we are too limited in our point of view and do not go back far enough in the sources to be sought, translating the space within which the oral Gospel could nevertheless find its place. In order to reject this reproach, we will take into account a more recent attempt to give the oral Gospel a position. Credner, in his aforementioned introduction to N. T., is also of the opinion that there was no oral, ordered Ur-Gospel (in Gieseler's sense), but he wants to take as a basis an informal one, which consisted of details that were not yet strung together (p. 192). This unformed Aramaic primitive gospel is said to have come into being through frequent repetition, discussion, mutual recollections of the narrators, etc., just as we have indicated above in relation to the allegedly ordered one (p. 187). After the entry of the Hellenists among the believers, thought was given to translations, namely oral ones; however, each of the gospel

teachers did the translation for themselves as best they could! However, the same thing is said to have come about - and this is explained by the fact that the lack of words on the part of the translators promotes the uniformity of the translations, and each translator has appropriated what was given by others in this way. Only later, and only after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the tradition gradually became poorer in genuine content and began to become more legendary, did written records of evangelical history come into being because it was only now that people felt the need to shackle the legend in writing, although the first products of this kind were only private experiments. The additions, embellishments, etc., by which our evangelical relations differ from one another, despite all agreement, should now be regarded as excrescences of the legend. — According to these sketches, we are presented with a picture which we cannot admit to be true, and we therefore take the liberty of making the following counter-recollections:

154

1) The author himself admits that the apostolic discourses were free, mostly practical, in which only occasionally, when the opportunity presented itself, individual aspects of Jesus' life were discussed (p. 192). But then we do not see how a translation could have come about for the Hellenists if they had not wanted to translate the entire discourses themselves (which was probably not possible); for why should only the biographical fragments and details from the messages have been excavated for translation, and by several translators at that? Further, if the apostolic sermons wove such notes only occasionally, how could there be uniformity through frequent repetition, and if one collected the biographical notes for oneself as the material to be translated, how does the disordered and formless primordial gospel exist?

2) The author wants to explain partly the variations of the expression that degenerate into distant parallel relations, and partly the interpolations and additions, namely, the former from the individuality and majority of the translations, the latter from the degenerations of the legend. Now we can affirm that the interpolations or additions, as they occur in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke, do not derive from the saga: but those in Matthew, as we have already seen, do not either. So it was only a question of the pieces of the second table, which, according to the verse, are supposed to be based on the original writing of Matthew, and thus do not bear witness to the legendary character of the excellent news. If the contents of the third tablet are to be considered legend, it must be at least acknowledged that not everything is legend, and that what a historian or biographer writes does not necessarily have to be legend. As far as the word varieties are concerned, they are demonstrably not distinct translations, as will be shown in the future. With the majority of translations we find that either their unity or their difference is not explained. If the translators were supposed to come to an

agreement, why didn't they agree completely to include the other parts that were part of the original translation? The one would have to have made individual additions to the work of the other, which he had to express first. But according to our author, the additions are supposed to be derived from the degenerate legend! — Even if the variations in expression were really different translations; so we would rather try to explain it by anything else than by the translators duplicating an original which did not exist in writing.

155

We do not find any degeneration of the saga as a whole in our gospels. Because

a) we see that the first table is held fast by all referents. This would have preserved the legend faithfully. What is added to the pieces was not given to them by the legend, but only by the writer. — The special news that Luke intersperses in the passion story can be private information. They are as little as what is on the second table, the degenerate general,

b) If degeneracies of the legend were to be presupposed; then the first table would not exist at all as separable, which it demonstrably is. Either the legend had not degenerated, or the common type of the first table was not in the legend at all.

3) The author has to bring some deviations in the parallel texts into account of the several translators at that time. He must therefore believe that these translators - even if only in their heads - translated such texts, i. H. such developed ones as they are in our gospels. But if they did, then it is all the more difficult for us to imagine that the alleged primeval gospel was something so amorphous. (As we shall see in his place below, the pieces are worked with art.) But overall we have a disorderly gospel, consisting of details which, as such, are always related to something else, and in more ways than one To have relativity to one another, we say, is an absurdity for us. 4) The date that our written gospels are said to have arisen out of the need for criticism or polemics is also incorrect. At least that does not follow from Luke's prologue; on the contrary, it leads to other views of the matter, and we therefore refer to what has been said above about this prologue. But so that we can 5) explain at all what we think about the so-called Aramaic oral Ur-Gospel and its invention, the whole hypothesis seems to us to be nothing other than the modified Eichhorn's of the written Ur-Gospel, in that what the latter has as writing, those misplaced in the mouth. We will therefore take the trouble to draw the parallel and show that Eichhorn's hypothesis still stands before the latter.

3) The author must attribute certain discrepancies in the parallel texts to the multiple translators of that time. Therefore, he must believe that these translators - even if only in

their minds - had such texts, i.e., formulated in the way they appear in our Gospels. But if they had these texts, then we can even less imagine that the alleged primitive oral Gospel was something formless. (As we will see below in its proper place, the pieces are crafted with skill.) In general, an unorganized Gospel consisting of individual details, which always relate to something else and have multiple aspects of relativity to one another, such a thing, let's say, is inconceivable to us.

4) Moreover, the claim that our written Gospels were created out of the need for criticism or polemics is not correct. At least, this does not follow from the prologue of Luke; on the contrary, it refers to other perspectives on the matter, and we refer to what has been said above about this prologue. However, in order to

5) explain our thoughts on the so-called Aramaic oral primitive Gospel and its invention, the entire hypothesis seems to be nothing more than a modified version of Eichhorn's hypothesis of the written primitive Gospel, wherein what the latter has as writing is transferred to the spoken word. Therefore, we will make the effort to draw a parallel and show that Eichhorn's hypothesis is even more valid than the former.

156

1) Eichhorn's basis is a Hebrew (or Aramaic) primitive Gospel; likewise, that hypothesis also assumes such a basis, with necessary modifications.

2) Eichhorn requires Greek translations to explain the agreement in wording in our texts; similarly, that hypothesis also requires them.

3) Just as Eichhorn's hypothesis is burdened by difficulties, so is the other hypothesis, no less so.

a) The former, it is said, assumes a fact - the origin and foundation of an original evangelical document - of which there are no historical traces. - The emergence of an oral gospel that has become stereotypically fixed is just as little historically probable. Indeed, if one compares the two hypotheses, the advantage is on Eichhorn's side. The latter, by taking a written type as its basis, posits a gospel of a definite extent, such as the delimited nature of our tables indicates, since it in itself had to be the necessary result of written composition; — However, the former hypothesis cannot explain the emergence of a limited type either comprehensibly, or it must leave the disorganized mass of oral tradition to the revisions and plans of later writers \*), and is just as compelled to seek the condition of Gospel harmony in writing as the other explanatory approach, which starts directly from writing. It is said

\*) de Wette Introduction p. 157. "The relationship between the two gospels (of Matthew and Luke) in the structure of the whole, especially in the limitation of the story of Jesus before the last Passover to the area of Galilee, cannot be excluded from the common use of the oral gospel lecture, because it always had to be limited to individual stories and sections, and uniformity in the entire scope of evangelical history is improbable."

b) that the first proclaimers of the word were not bound by a written constraint. If that is the case, they would not have accustomed themselves to a uniformity in their discourses. They would not have repeated in the same way what was fresher in their memory and more vivid in their imagination, especially if they delivered spontaneous discourses, which made it impossible for them to have the same exact wording. And if there was no uniformity in their discourses, there can also be no expectation of uniformity in multiple oral translations. How could there be room for such consistency and execution in this regard?

c) It is said that the hypothesis of the written Ur-Gospel, because it calls for help from several translations, presupposes a blissful writing ability that is not to be expected at that time. We do not know, however, whether the desire to translate, which is supposed to be given scope in the other hypothesis, fits more naturally into the time and circumstances. Oral translations from an oral original have no place here. — Apart from the material itself, which, according to an unthinkable notion, would have had to consist precisely in the biographical fragments that our Gospels connect—apart from the fact that these translations should have been repeatedly renewed based on this material, for an unknown purpose (since they could never have existed in the original by themselves); why, moreover, would there be multiple translators? To account for differences? But wouldn't the majority on the one hand and the freedom of the translator on the other, more than difference, not have created confusion? But if one accepts written translations, then one has the same with all the bliss of writing, which Eichhorn also wants. — And written translations of a written original are more conceivable than oral translations of an oral one.

d) The interpolations and additions to the texts are, according to Eichhorn, enrichments of the written Ur-Gospel, according to the other hypothesis they are supposed to be outgrowths of the saga carrying the oral Ur-Gospel around. That is more conceivable than this. In that notion it explains how, notwithstanding the interpolations and additions, the basis of a common text remained; in the case of the second, however, this is not explained. For the saga, once it strays and changes, does not keep a definite measure in its modifications and is no longer binds itself to a fetter; one would then have to make something that has been learned into its foundation, something that is just as unhistorical as it is psychologically untrue. - To this must be added the nature of these

interpolations and additions, that, if not all, yet most, are connected with literary considerations, and one can see in them how their authors had in mind in writing the series of texts to which they added and other things. (See, for example, the insertions in Matthew listed above in order.) But this also includes shortenings of the text, which, as soon as they can only be shown, should not be mistaken as modifications of written models.

e) The hypothesis of the written Ur-Gospel is said to be contrary to history, but that is also contrary to the text, and if one wants to research it, one has to be careful about it. For once everything is reduced to the word of mouth and the legend is given scope, then one loses the desire to take a closer look at the interrelationship of the corresponding texts. One considers the harmony, which is the first to pose the riddle and which is to be explained, to be accidental, and one takes delight in the difference as the main thing, because precisely this is what one expects.

f) An argument has been raised against the hypothesis of the primitive oral Gospel based on the originality of the Greek text of our Gospels. The validity of this argument will remain unexamined here. However, if the Greek text is indeed the original, then the assumption of the primitive oral Gospel is cornered, making it difficult to find the intermediate stages that would facilitate the transition from one original to another. In short, while the often mentioned hypothesis aims to dispense with a written norm, it fails to compensate for the loss thereof.

---

159

#### Note 2

What can be explained at all in our gospels, insofar as they consist of parallel relations, and which makes it easier to explain the hypothesis of the original oral gospel, is substance and form. The form, by which we mean here primarily equality and literal parallelism, cannot, as we have seen, explain it satisfactorily. It merely explains differences and inequalities. But it is also not necessary for deriving the substance. One could say:

a) the individual stories could not have become the object of the recording without first being discussed and going through the oral speech. However, even if this is acknowledged, it can easily be countered from experience that much talk about a fact, even if it gains further dissemination soon after, can quickly fade away or be retained only in the memory of a few. In the former case, before it fades away, it can be

entrusted to paper, and in the latter case, it can be transferred from the memories of the few to writing, without requiring oral retelling and the preservation of the information through recounting for this purpose. – However, for the latter case, even when we refrain from historicizing, the types of their genesis are often inferred from actual events and facts. what the data explains is put together from data. Written narration and oral narration are therefore different in form. For example, many historians report as spoken words what was not actually heard, and it is particularly known that in Hebrew narrative, where we, inferring from actions to intentions and attitudes, speak only summarily and indirectly about the latter as narrators, indirect speech is transformed into direct speech, creating spoken speeches, monologues,\*) and dialogues. Therefore, just as it happens among us, it could also have happened there that certain facts, when transitioning into writing, took on a narrative form that neither preserved nor could have preserved its type in legend. If one says

\*) Compare e.g. Matt. 21, 25. 26. οί δε δίδελογίσαντο παρ' εαντοιζ' εάν είπωμεν ' εξ ουρανον, ερεϊ ήμϊν· διατί κ. τ. λ.

c) the first proclaimers of Christianity, as soon as they taught, had to come back to individual events of the life of Jesus and give their memories of individual things a specific expression; so may this also be conceded on the whole. But it does not follow that this often had to be done for the sake of a written record, nor that oral referencing had to have taken on a fixed form before such a distinction was made, nor finally that the form of the written presentation had to conform to the form of the oral one had. The original oral gospel, apart from its inner improbability, is therefore not in the proportion to be the necessary explanation for the harmony of our gospels, even if we only want to consider the material. Finally,

d) the fact that the apostles knew more about the history of Jesus' life than we find in our gospels (Credner, p. 191.) does not yet prove that they had what we call the gospel (an expressed narrative) to a greater extent, and of which our Gospels could be considered a part. So many a person who has had a lot of experience knows exactly how it happened (if asked) without having formed any special representations about it or having spun the genetic connection in their thoughts.



inferred from the fact that in our Gospels, a type of communal narrative stands out against various other elements that, due to their importance and credibility, could hardly be excluded from the realm of a primitive oral Gospel. However, when one becomes familiar with the explanations that are supposed to lend historical plausibility to the primitive oral Gospel, it is easy to overlook those, already weakly drawn, distinctions and instead derive from the same murky source what we claim does not belong together. \*) Therefore, to fully justify the transition to writing, we have once again drawn attention to the difference between the disparate elements.

So we are now leaving an area we have traversed fruitlessly and preparing to move our investigation to another field that promises us more fruit than the one we have already explored.

\*) As did de Wette (introduction, pp. 146-153), who takes what Matthew and Luke have in common on the first and second plates for different representations of one and the same legend.

-----