

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

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

The Original Evangelist

or

exegetical critical investigation

on

the relationship

among

the first three Gospels

by

Christian Gottlob Wilke,

former pastor of Herrmannsdorf in the Saxon Erzgebirge.

Dresden and Leipzig,

Published by Gerhard Fleischer.

1838.

Sr. Excellency

the

Royal Saxon. Minister of State and Chancellor of the Order

Bernhard August von Lindenau,

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

in deep respect

Dedicated

Author

Foreword.

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

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

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

Dresden, April 12, 1838.

Ch.G. Wilke.

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

1) The pericopes of the first table.

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

n. 19. S. 60. f.  
n. 20. S. 128. 210. 328. 330. 355. 442. 461. 500. 622. 629,  
n. 21. S. 434. 585. 596. 604. 611. 612. 623.  
n. 22. S. 50. f. 124. 506. 536. 569. 586. 610. 616.  
n. 23. S. 637.  
n. 24. S. 569. 577. 592. 677.  
n. 25. S. 569. f. 578. 592.  
n. 26. S. 567.0. 27. S. 570. f. 579.  
n.28. P. 77. 96. 101. 136. P13. 341. 3S8. 380. 425. 435. 469. 502. 586. 596. 604. 630.  
n.29. S. 101. 136. 438. 508. 537. 587. 596.  
n.30. S. 102. 509. 597. 661.  
n.31. S. 137. 217. 341. 503. 604. 663.  
n.32. S. 104. 137. 218. 332. 338. 341. 359. 377. 380. 392. 435.469. 505. 600. 601. 635.  
637. 663.  
n.33. S. 579.  
n.34. S. 138. 221. 338. 484.  
n.35. S. 139. 222. 317. 331. 360. 371. 464. 484.  
n.36. P. 229. 333. 342. 368. 48S. 593.  
n.37. S. 67.  
n.38. S. 510.  
n.39. S. 59. 231. 363. 449. 485. 638.  
n.40. S. 571. 580. 594.  
n.41.S. 233. 486.  
n.42 a. S. 234. 373. 425. 486.  
n.42 b. S. 126. 236. 295. 374. 425. 487.  
n.43. S. 240. 487.  
n.44. S. 242. 333. 368. 428. 488  
n.45. S. 67. 575. 590. 605.  
n.46. S. 245. 421.  
n.47. S. 247. 329. 365.  
n.48. S. 434. 635.  
n.49. S. 106. 249. 271. 301. 319. 330. 333. 339. 342. 366. 367. 368. 369. 374. 377.  
381. 422. 441. f. 463. 489.  
n.50. S. 540.  
n.51. S. 64. 73. 581. 595. 605.  
n.52. S. 638.  
n.53. S. 74. 106. 141. 272. 277. 334. 377. 414.  
n.54. S. 79. 125. 277. 343. 382. 423. 480.  
n.55. S. 81. 84. 280. 426. 437. 493. 587. 597. 605. 630. 632. 660.  
n.56. S. 84. f. 283. 423. 494. 639.



n.57. S. 309. 463. 640. 647. f.

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

3) The pieces of the third tablet:

(a) those of Mark: pp. 492. 680. f.

b) Matthew's: p. 637. f. 642. f. 648. 663.

c) Luke's: pp. 566. f. 587 f. 599. f. 645. 648.

---

The Evangelist

or

Exegetically critical study

of

the family relationship

of the first three gospels.

---

3

Introduction.

The Reciprocal Relation of the First Three Gospels in General.

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

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

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

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

4

First Table

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

| Nr | Mark     | Luke     | Matthew  |                                                         |
|----|----------|----------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | 1:2-8    | 3:1-18   | 3:1-12   | John baptizes in the Jordan.<br>Costume of the Baptist. |
| 2  | 1:9-11   | 3:21-22  | 3:13-17  | Jesus is baptized.                                      |
| 3  | .. 12-13 | 4:1-13   | 4:1-11   | Jesus goes into the desert.                             |
| 4  | .. 14-15 | .. 14-15 | .. 12-17 | He returns to Galilee.                                  |
| 5  | .. 15-20 | missing  | .. 18-22 | He takes four fishermen with him on the Sea of Galilee. |
| 6  | .. 21-28 | .. 31-37 | missing  | In the school at Capernaum he heals a demon.            |

| Note. So far the same order for all. |                |                |          |                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7                                    | .. 29-34       | .. 38-41       | 8:14-17  | He does healings in the house of Peter.                                                                                            |
|                                      | .. 35-39       | .. 42-44       | missing  | Towards morning he goes away.                                                                                                      |
| 8                                    | .. 41-44       | 5:12-14        | 8:1-8    | He heals a leper, and forbids him anything known of the healing Close.                                                             |
|                                      | 1:45<br>End    | 5:15-16        | missing  | (The healed transgresses the prohibition.)                                                                                         |
| 9                                    | 2:1-12         | 5:17-26        | 9:1-8    | Back in Capernaum he heals a paralytic.                                                                                            |
|                                      | 2              | 17             | missing  | (The patient is brought through the roof in front of him.)                                                                         |
| 10                                   | ..15-22        | ..27-39<br>End | ..9-17   | Jesus responds to the reproach that was expressed that he ate with tax collectors and sinners and that his disciples did not fast. |
| 11                                   | ..23-28<br>End | 6:1-5          | 12:1-8   | Jesus excuses his disciples for the gathering of grain on the Sabbath.                                                             |
| 12                                   | 3:1-6          | ..6-11         | ..9-14   | He heals a dry hand on the Sabbath.                                                                                                |
| 13                                   | 3:7-19         | 6:12-19        | 5:1 10:2 | He separates twelve disciples from those with him.                                                                                 |
| 14                                   | ..20-22        | 11:17-23       | 12:22-32 | Blasphemy, that he should cast out devils by Beelzebul.                                                                            |
| 15                                   | ..31-35        | 8:19-21        | 12:46-50 | Arrival of his relatives.                                                                                                          |
| 16                                   | 4:1-34         | 8:4-18         | 13:1-34  | Jesus teaches parables by the sea.                                                                                                 |
|                                      | ..21-25        | ..16-18        | Missing  | A Parable of Admonition to the Disciples.                                                                                          |
|                                      | ..26-34        | missing        | ..24-35  | parables to the people.                                                                                                            |
| 17a                                  | ..35-41        | ..22-25        | 8:18-27  | Stormy crossing to Gadara.                                                                                                         |

|                                                 |                               |                         |                        |                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                 | End                           |                         |                        |                                                                                                     |
| ..b                                             | 5:1-17<br>..18-20             | ..26-37<br>..38-39      | ..28-34<br>missing     | Healing a possessed Gadarene.<br><br>The healed wishes to be included among the followers of Jesus. |
| 18                                              | ..21-43                       | ..40-56                 | 9:18-26                | Healing of the blood-soaked woman and raising the daughter of Jairus.                               |
| 19                                              | 6:1-6                         | Missing here cf 4:16    | 13:53-58               | Jesus found no faith in his hometown.                                                               |
| 20                                              | ..7-13                        | 9:1-6                   | 10:1-14                | sending out of the twelve.                                                                          |
| 21                                              | ..14-16<br>6:17-29            | ..7-9<br>missing        | 14:1-2<br>14:3-12      | Herod's opinion of Jesus.<br><br>history of decapitation of the Baptist.                            |
| Note: From here on Matthew runs parallel again. |                               |                         |                        |                                                                                                     |
| 22                                              | ..30-44<br>..30-31            | ..10-17<br>..10         | ..13-21<br>missing     | Feeding of the Five Thousand.<br><br>Return of the disciples sent out.                              |
| 23                                              | ..45-56                       | missing                 | ..22-36                | Departure of the disciples to Bethsaida.                                                            |
| 24                                              | 7:1-23                        | missing                 | ..22-36                | Jesus censures the statutes of the Pharisees.                                                       |
| 25                                              | ..24-30<br>End                | missing                 | ..21-28                | Conversation with the Syrophoenician.                                                               |
| 26                                              | 8:1-10                        | missing                 | ..32-39<br>End         | feeding of the four thousand.                                                                       |
| 27                                              | ..11-21                       | missing                 | 16:1-12                | The Pharisees ask for a sign from heaven.                                                           |
| 28                                              | 8:27-38<br>9:1<br><br>8:32-33 | 9:18-27<br><br>missing. | ..13-28<br><br>..22-23 | Jesus forbids the disciples to say that he is the Messiah.<br><br>Conversation with Peter.          |
| 29                                              | 9:2-13                        | ..28-36                 | 17:1-12                | Transfiguration of Jesus on the                                                                     |

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

|    |                     |                       |                    |                                                                                                              |
|----|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 43 | ..13-17             | ..20-26               | 22:15-22           | Question from the Herodians about the bounty.                                                                |
| 44 | ..18-27             | ..27-38               | ..22-33            | Question of the Sadducees about the resurrection.                                                            |
| 45 | ..28-34             | missing               | ..34-40            | Question of the teacher of the law about the greatest commandment.                                           |
| 46 | ..35-37             | ..41-44               | ..41-46            | Ask Jesus how the Messiah could be David's son.                                                              |
| 47 | ..38-40             | ..45-47               | 23:1-39            | Jesus' warning to the Pharisees.                                                                             |
| 48 | ..41-44             | 21:1-4                | missing            | praise of the poor widow.                                                                                    |
| 49 | 13:1-37             | ..5-36                | 24:1-36            | Prophecy of Jesus about the destruction of the temple.                                                       |
| 50 | 14:1-2              | 22:1-2                | 26:1-5             | The arrest of Jesus is decided before the Passover.                                                          |
| 51 | ..3-9               | missing               | ..6-13             | Mary in Bethany anoints Jesus.                                                                               |
| 52 | 14:10-11            | 22:3-6                | 26:14-16           | Bribery of Judas.                                                                                            |
| 53 | ..12-25             | ..7-23                | ..17-29            | Jesus has the Passover meal with the disciples.                                                              |
| 54 | ..26-51             | ..29-53               | ..30-56            | Departure to Gethsemane. capture of Jesus.                                                                   |
| 55 | .. 53-72<br>..55-65 | ..54-60<br>(22:63-71) | ..57-75<br>..55-68 | Denial of Peter, in between the interrogation of Jesus (with Luke in the morning, with the others at night). |
| 56 | 15:1 - End          | 23:1 - End            | 27:1 - End         | condemnation, crucifixion, burial of Jesus.                                                                  |
| 57 | 16:1 - End          | 24:1 - End            | 28:1 - End         | resurrection of Jesus.                                                                                       |

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

b) There are

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

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

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

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

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

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

9

Second Table:  
Matthew and Luke.

| Luke   | Matthew |                                                                          |
|--------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3, 7-9 | 3, 7-10 | The Baptist's warning speech to the people (at n. 1 of the first panel). |
| 16.17  | 11.12   | The Messiah will baptize with fire.                                      |

|          |                 |                                                                                    |
|----------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4, 1-13  | 4, 1-11         | The Temptation of Christ (I. Taf.n. 3).                                            |
| 6, 20-49 | 5:1-7:29        | Sermon on the Mount (at u. 13) — greatly expanded in Matthew.<br>Is equal to:      |
| 20-26    | 5, 1-12         |                                                                                    |
| 28-35    | 9-47            |                                                                                    |
| 36       | 48              |                                                                                    |
| 37.38    | 7, 1-2          |                                                                                    |
| 41.42    | 2-5             |                                                                                    |
| 43.44    | 16-19           |                                                                                    |
| 45       | 7.20            | linked by Matthew to n. 14 of the 1st plate.                                       |
| 46       | 12:35           |                                                                                    |
| 47-49    | 24-28           |                                                                                    |
| 7, 1-10  | 8:5-13          | Healing of the centurion in Capernaum (in Matth, after u. 8).                      |
| 18-35    | 11:2-19         | Embassy of the Baptist (in Matth, after n. 20).                                    |
| 9:57-60  | 8:19-22         | Some ask Jesus to be included among his entourage (in Matth, placed before n. 17). |
| 10:1-24  |                 | Instructional speech to the seventy to be sent out. From this speech Matth.        |
| 2        | 9, 37.38        | in Matth, before n. 20 (the 1st plate).                                            |
| 3<br>5-7 | 10, 16<br>10-13 | at Matth, linked to u. 20.<br>there itself.                                        |
| 10-12    | 14.15           | likewise.                                                                          |
| 13-15    | 11:20-24        | at Matth, inserted into the piece about the embassy of the Baptist.                |



|             |                 |                                                                              |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16          | 10, 40          | at the speech n. 20.                                                         |
| 21.22       | 11:25-27        | S. the penultimate.                                                          |
| 23.24       | 13:16-17        | in Matt, in n. 16.                                                           |
| 11, 1-4     | 6, 4-13         | The Lord's Prayer, in Matth, in the Sermon on the Mount.                     |
| 11:9-13     | 7, 7-11         | Encouragement to prayer, in Matth, in the Sermon on the Mount.               |
| 11:14-18    | 12:22-32        | Words from Jesus' response to the blasphemy that he had Beelzebul.           |
| 23          | 30              | at n. 14.                                                                    |
| 24-36       | 43-45           | .                                                                            |
| 11:29-32    | 12:38-41        | The Pharisees demand a sign from heaven (also at n. 14)                      |
| 11:37,53    |                 | Banquet with a Pharisee. Reprimands against this sect. From last Matthew has |
| 39-41<br>42 | 23, 25.26<br>23 | at n. 47.                                                                    |
| 44          | 27.28           |                                                                              |
| 45.46       | 4               |                                                                              |
| 47-53       | 29-36           |                                                                              |
| 12:1-12     |                 | Admonition to the Apostles to Bold Testimony. Of that                        |
| 2-9         | 10:26-33        | at n. 20.                                                                    |
| 11.12       | 19.20           |                                                                              |
| 12:13-35    |                 | Someone asks Jesus to be an arbitrator.                                      |
| 21-31       | 6, 25-33        |                                                                              |

|            |           |                                                                  |
|------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12:33-48   |           | in Matt, in the Sermon on the Mount.                             |
| 33.34      | 20.28     |                                                                  |
| 12:39-46   | 24:43-51  | in Matth, linked to n. 49.                                       |
| 12,49-53   |           | The coming times of discord. Of that Matt.                       |
| 51         | 10, 34.35 | at n. 20.                                                        |
| 12, 54-13, |           |                                                                  |
| ..1-9      |           | One should pay attention to the signs of the times.              |
| ..54-56    | 16, 2-3   | Matthew, at n. 27.                                               |
| ..57-59    | 6,25      | in the Sermon on the Mount.                                      |
| 13,22-30   |           | Question: whether a few will be saved. Of that                   |
| ..24       | 7,13      | Matt, in the Sermon on the Mount.                                |
| ..26.27    | 22.23     |                                                                  |
| ..24       | 8:11-12   | Linked to Matth's story about the healed captain.                |
| 13, 31-35  |           | Jesus' answer to the announcement that Herod was after him.      |
| ..34.35    | 25, 37.38 | About this in Matth, in another parable as an addendum to u. 49. |
| 14,25-35   |           | Demand of Jesus to those who want to follow him.                 |
| ..26.27    | 10:37,38  | Matthew, at n. 20.                                               |
| 14,35      | 5, 13     |                                                                  |
| 15,1-10    |           | Why Jesus accepts sinners. Of that                               |
| 4-6        | 18,12.13  | Matt, after u. 32.                                               |

|           |           |                                                          |
|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 16,1-13   |           | Parable of the unjust steward. Of that                   |
| 16        | 11,12.13  | Matthew, when telling the story of the Baptist's embassy |
| 16, 17    | 5, 18     | in the Sermon on the Mount.                              |
| 18        | 31        |                                                          |
| 17,1-8    |           | Annoyance Warning. Of that                               |
| 2         | 18,6      | Matthew, at n. 32.                                       |
| 3.4       | 15        |                                                          |
| 17, 20-37 |           | When will the kingdom of God come?                       |
| 23.24     | 24, 26.27 | in Matth, linked to n. 49.                               |
| 26.27.30  | 37-39     |                                                          |
| 34-37     | 40.41     |                                                          |
| 22, 24-36 |           | Disputes among the disciples. (Appendix to n. 53.)       |
| 30        | 19,28     | Matthew, at n. 35.                                       |

11

Remarks about this table.

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

- α) the history of the temptation,
- β) the healing of the servant in Capernaum (Luk. 7, 1 - 10),
- γ) the sending of the Baptist to Jesus (Luk. 7, 14 - 35). ),
- δ) the request of some to be accepted among Jesus' entourage (Luk. 9, 57 - 60),
- ε) the healing of a demonic as a reason for the blasphemy that Jesus cast out

demons by the power of Beelzebul.

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

b) Let us compare this table with the first; there is an oddity in position and arrangement. Namely, the first collection of Luke Ch. 6, 20 - 8, 3 (compare n. 16 on the first table) makes a separation between the passage of the selection of the twelve on the mountain (n. 13) and between the parable of the sower (n. 16). Only Matthew, in agreement with Mark, does not recognize this separation; for before that parable he has the same passages as Mark (cf. Matth. 12, 24 f. of Beelzebul and v. 47-50 of the arrival of Jesus' relatives (cf. Mark. 3, 22 f. to n. 35). However, Matthew has something from this apparatus, namely two pieces, that of the centurion's servant and that of John's mission, and then a similar, but very extended, Sermon on the Mount, but all this is not placed as it is in Luke. The second, larger, aggregate of Luke's Gospel (chap. 9, 51-18,12) separates from each other the story of the hierarchy dispute that arose among Jesus' disciples (Mark. 9,33-50) and the story of the blessing of the children (Mark. 10,13 f.). But here too Matthew, again in agreement with Mark, does not recognise the separation. To all appearances, one would have to consider the Lukian material as intercalation. Now it must be added that what Matthew has in common with or related to this material, he also has in a completely different order, interwoven around the branches of the common trunk, as represented in the first table, and connected to them, so that this order is as little acknowledged by Luke as by Mark. A circumstance which is very much in question in the whole relationship. Only what Matthew has in common in the baptismal story up to the temptation (from n. 1-6) is in the same place.

12

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

Third table:

Index of the passages peculiar to the individual evangelists.

1) Mark.

|         |                                           |
|---------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1,1-3   | entrance before n. 1. Plate 1.            |
| 4,26-29 | Parable of the Fruitful Field (at n. 16). |
| 7:12-37 | Healing of a deaf mute (after n. 25).     |

|          |                                                                         |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:22-26  | Healing of a blind man near Bethsaida (after n. 27).                    |
| 13,33-36 | Parable of a traveling householder (at n. 49).                          |
| 14,51.52 | The young man fleeing when Jesus was arrested.                          |
| 15,44.45 | Pilate inquires whether the crucified Jesus has long since passed away. |

13

## 2) Matthew

|         |           |                                                                 |
|---------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| At n. 1 | 3, 14. 15 | John refuses to baptize Jesus;<br>answer of Jesus.              |
| n. 4    | 4:13-16   | Jesus' dwelling in Capernaum, fulfillment an oracle.            |
|         | 5,4-10    | Doctrine and Gnomes in the Sermon on the Mount.                 |
|         | 14-16     |                                                                 |
|         | 17. 19    |                                                                 |
|         | - 22      |                                                                 |
|         | 33-37     |                                                                 |
|         | 38.39     |                                                                 |
|         | 43        |                                                                 |
|         | 6,1-8     |                                                                 |
|         | 16-18     |                                                                 |
|         | 7,6       |                                                                 |
|         | 15-20     |                                                                 |
| n. 7    | 9,17      | Jesus healing the sick fulfillment of a Prophecy.               |
| n. 20   | 10, 5. 6  | The disciples should stay away from pagan and Samaritan places. |

|              |                   |                                                                                                             |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|              | 23                | Jesus wants to come back before the disciples who were sent out have traveled through the cities of Israel. |
|              | 24.25             | The disciple is no better off than the master.                                                              |
|              | 41.42             | Whoever receives a prophet is entitled to a prophet's reward.                                               |
| before n. 11 | 11:28-30          | Encouragement to take on Jesus' gentle yoke.                                                                |
| n. 11        | 12, 5.6           | How the priests in the temple do not break the Sabbath                                                      |
|              | 17-20             | Old Testament quote.                                                                                        |
| n. 14        | 34-37             | Punishability of loveless speeches and judgments.                                                           |
| n. 16        | 13,24-30<br>36-43 | Parable of the weeds in the field with interpretation.                                                      |
|              | 35                | Old Testament citation                                                                                      |
|              | 13,44             | Parable of the Hidden Treasure.                                                                             |
|              | 45.46             | — from the pearl.                                                                                           |
|              | 47-50             | — from fishing nets.                                                                                        |
| n. 23        | 14,28-31          | Peter walks on the sea.                                                                                     |
| n. 24        | 15,13             | The plants to be eradicated.                                                                                |
| n. 28        | 16,17-19          | Peter receives the keys of the kingdom of heaven.                                                           |
| n. 31        | 17,24-27          | The starter in the mouth of the fish.                                                                       |
| n. 32        | 18,16-18          | as with d. Missing should be proceeded.                                                                     |
|              | 23-36             | Parable of the merciless debtor.                                                                            |
| n. 33        | 19,10-12          | The difference among the unmarried.                                                                         |
| n. 35        | 20,1-16           | Parable of the workers in the vineyard.                                                                     |

|       |                |                                                           |
|-------|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| n. 39 | 20,4-5         | Old Testament citation                                    |
| n. 41 | 14-16          | Jesus heals the lame and blind in the temple.             |
| n. 42 | 28-32          | Parable of two sons.                                      |
|       | 21, 1-14       | — from the guest with the non-nuptial dress.              |
| n. 47 | 23,3, 5, 9, 11 | reproof of Pharisaic pride.                               |
|       | 17-22          | The falsely permitted oaths.                              |
| n. 49 | 25,1-13        | Parable of the ten virgins.                               |
|       | 43-30          | — from the talents.                                       |
|       | 31-36          | The sheep and goats once to be separated from each other. |
| n. 54 | 26,52-54       | Jesus forbids Peter to use the sword.                     |
| n. 56 | 27,3-10        | Judas returns the silverlings to the chief priests.       |
|       | 19             | Pilate is warned by his wife.                             |
|       | 27,24          | Pilate washes his hands.                                  |
|       | 51-54          | earthquake at the death of Jesus.                         |
|       | 27,62-66       | Jesus' tomb is guarded by guardians.                      |
|       | 28,2           | It is opened by an earth tremor.                          |
|       | 4              | The Guardians flee.                                       |
|       | 11-16          | You will be bribed.                                       |
|       | 18-20          | The Risen One gives the disciples his final orders.       |

### 3) Luke

|          |                                                                 |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3,1-2    | Determining the time when the Baptist appeared.                 |
| 10-14    | Preaching of the Baptist.                                       |
| 4,16-30  | Appearance of Jesus in Nazareth.                                |
| 5,1-11   | Peter's catch.                                                  |
| 7,11-17  | Raising the youth of Nain.                                      |
| 36-50    | Banquet at Simon's house. anointing of Jesus.                   |
| 8,1-3    | Mention of the companions of Jesus.                             |
| 9,51-56  | You fail at a Samaritan. Spots of Jesus the inn.                |
| 61-62    | Someone volunteers to follow Jesus.                             |
| 10,17-20 | sending out the seventy.                                        |
| 28-37    | The Good Samaritan.                                             |
| 38-48    | Mary and Martha.                                                |
| 11,5-8   | The value of persistent requests. parable.                      |
| 27-28    | A woman praises the blessed mother of Jesus.                    |
| 12,13-27 | Jesus is asked to divide the inheritance.                       |
| 47-48    | Which servant must suffer double blows.                         |
| 13,1-5   | News of the Galileans murdered by Pilate's orders.              |
| 6-9      | Parable of the barren fig tree.                                 |
| 13,10-17 | Sabbath healing of a contracted woman.                          |
| 31-37    | Jesus' answer to the announcement that Herod was after him.     |
| 14,1-24  | Sabbath healing of a dropsy. From the invited guests.           |
| 28-33    | Anyone who wants to follow Jesus must renounce all possessions. |



|          |                                                                                                                       |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15,8-10  | Parable of the recovered drachma.                                                                                     |
| 17-32    | — of the Prodigal Son«.                                                                                               |
| 16,1-11  | — of the unjust steward.                                                                                              |
| 19-31    | — of the rich man and poor Lazarus.                                                                                   |
| 17,7-10  | Wage addiction warning.                                                                                               |
| 15-19    | The Grateful Samaritan.                                                                                               |
| 18,1-8   | The unjust judge.                                                                                                     |
| 9-14     | The Praying Pharisee and the Praying Publican.                                                                        |
| 19,1-10  | Jesus stops at the tax collector Zacchaeus.                                                                           |
| 11-27    | About a prince who travels far away to have his reign confirmed.                                                      |
| 39-40    | Jesus' answer to the request that he should stop the people's salutes.                                                |
| 41-44    | Jesus weeps in front of Jerusalem.                                                                                    |
| 22,24-30 | Of the Disciples' Disputes.                                                                                           |
| 22,35-38 | Jesus advises the disciples to buy swords.                                                                            |
| 23,5-15  | Pilate sends Jesus to Herod.                                                                                          |
| 27-31    | Jesus calls out to the women who are weeping for him.                                                                 |
| 23,39-41 | The Repentant Chaser.                                                                                                 |
| 24,13-38 | The Risen One and the Emmauntian Disciples.                                                                           |
| 36-51    | The resurrected appears to the eleven disciples, leads them to the Mount of Olives and gives them their final orders. |

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

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

- α) that Jesus chose Capernaum as his abode (chap. 4:14-16),
- β) that he was a doctor for the sick (8:17),
- γ) that he wanted to work unknown and in secret (12, 17 — 22),
- δ) that he taught in parables,
- ε) that he entered Jerusalem riding on a donkey (21, 4. 5),
- ζ) that a field was bought for Judas' pieces of silver (27, 9. 10).

– Luke has different accounts of some actions than the other two. Among them are  
ch. 4, 16 - 30 the departure of Jesus in Nazareth (compare table 1. n. 19),  
the election of the four fishermen ch. 5, 1 -11 (compare n. 5),  
the anointing of Jesus ch. 7, 34 - 50 (compare n. 51),  
the question of the teacher of the law about the most important commandment [in Luke: about what one must do in order to be saved] Ch. 10, 25 - 37 (cf. n. 45),  
about the hierarchy dispute that arose among the disciples Ch. 22, 24 - 36 (cf. n. 37).

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

17

§. 5. If we now look at those parts of the whole apparatus through which our writers individualise themselves, we easily find it founded in the nature of things that a life so rich in acts, a life drawn from so many sides into the sphere of legend, as was the life of Jesus, when it came to a shaping of his story, and the authors of such a story drew directly from the source of experience or from the tradition flowing from it, must become the material of manifold descriptions distinguished by special notes. Let us note the common ground depicted on the first two tables; thus one can understand how different

representations of this one life, notwithstanding their originality and special features, could nevertheless coincide in certain main aspects and in the relation of certain oddities in order to resemble one another as representations of this one life. Just what possibilities we also set in this regard, and what we would like to deduce from them to explain the coincidence of our reports in the selection and linking of some individual materials; the actual harmony of our Gospels extends too far into the specifics, and the combination of matter which determines their extent is too evidently of special choice for us not to give a special rule or condition, outside the objective of the story being described, for the explanation of such harmony, i.e. the dependence of the evangelists on a narrative type that had already been formed. This judgement is already made by the tables, in that they note that several pieces, which the speakers deliver in the same order, are not linked to each other according to historical context, but by thematic order, and that, even if one of the narrators deviates from the order at his own will, it is always maintained by two of them.

18

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

§. 7. This phenomenon stimulates research into its origins. It is marvellous how, in the striving for diversity, unity nevertheless takes place here and there, or how, with the intention of preserving and restoring unity, texts elsewhere, indifferent to it, nevertheless abandon it again; how they sometimes hold it in secondary points and drop it in main points. And since the places of agreement and disagreement change among the various writers, and the one sometimes holds the common text against the dissenting third, and sometimes abandons it where the other two hold it against himself; it seems as if it must be possible for the combining acumen to detect at least a relationship of priority and posteriority among the parallel texts, whereby the alienating element is lost both in the harmony and in the difference between them. Every enigma has something that stimulates the desire to investigate, and this relationship is no exception, because one attempt to clarify it can at least surpass the other.

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

19

§. 9. But how should or how can the relationship be clarified? The most general answer to the question is: by the fact that the corresponding reports are exactly—that's what matters—compared with one another. According to what is available, these reports will be the parts of the first table. For what the two evangelists, Matthew and Luke, also agree on, clearly separates itself from these parts into a sphere of its own, in that it is either included in the order of the same (in Luke) or braided around them and woven into them (in Matthew). If the latter, this addition, is also taken into consideration, as indeed it must be, then only when a result has been obtained about the type of the first panel. The problem, to put it in one word, is this: was the content of the first table a work in itself or not? Everything depends on the answer to this question; it goes to the turning point of the whole phenomenon.

20

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

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

§. 12. Enough hypotheses have been put forward to explain the relationship in question, but the problem has admittedly not yet been solved. If we are to consider it unsolvable, the question is: has the fact to be explained really been investigated - that is, from all

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

22

§. 13. We are therefore firmly convinced that at a certain point there is still much to be done in the investigation, and we have therefore resolved to come to one with independent research, no matter how hard it may take, from the whirlpool of manifold contradictory judgments free and independent view of the object being judged, — to trace the mysteries of the text in order, if possible, to draw results from its own depths, as if they had not yet been searched, to answer our question. Let us not come, following the indications of the text, to the point where we wish to come after inquiring into the origins of the Gospels; in this way we will at least be certain of how far the investigation has gone and that it cannot go any further. After all, it is meritorious to cut off wrong paths in investigations of this kind and to indicate the place from which the trace of the true can be further followed. — And now a word about the method we shall follow in treating the subject.

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

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



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.

28

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.

y) 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.

**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:

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| n. 10 Matth. 9,15. μή δύνανται οἰκιστὶ οὐ νυμφώνας. — ἐφ' οὖν μετ' αὐτῶν ἰσὺς ὁ νυμφίος; ἐλεῦσονται ὁὖν ἡμέραι, ὅταν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπαρῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσι.                                                                         | Mark 2,19 μή δύνανται .... ἵνα ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστί, νηστεύουσιν; — ἐλεῦσονται δὲ ..... νηστεύσουσι ἵνα ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις *)                                              | Luke 5,34 μή δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς ..... ἐστί, ποιῆσαι νηστεύουσιν; 35. ἐλεῦσονται δὲ ..... καὶ τότε ..... ἐν ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.                                                     |
| 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, οὐς οὐκ ἔξον ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν κ. τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μή τοῖς ἱερεῦσι μόνοις; | Mark 2,25 οὐδέποτε ..... ὅτε (χρεῖαν ἐσχε καὶ) ἐπεινάουε αὐτός κ. .... 26. πῶς ..... — καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους .... οὐς οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μή τοῖς ἱερεῦσι κ. ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτοῖς; | Luke 6,3 οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὁ ἐποίησε ..... ὡς εἰς-ἤλθεν εἰς ..... τῆς προσθέσεως ἐλάβε κ. ἔφαγε κ. ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐς οὐκ ἐξεστι νόμῳ φαγεῖν, εἰ μή μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς; |
| n. 30 Matth 17:17. ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος κ. διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἴσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἕως πότε ἀνέχομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετε μοι αὐτὸν ὧδε.                                                                                                                   | Mark 9,19 ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος, ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἴσομαι, ἕως πότε ..... φέρετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με.                                                                                         | Luke 9:41 ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος κ. διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἴσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς κ. ἀνέχομαι ὑμῶν; προσάγαγε ὧδε τὸν υἱόν σου.                                                                    |
| n. 39 21,2: πορευθεὶς εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν κ. εὐθέως εὐρήσετε — πῶλον — λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετέ μοι.                                                                                                                                 | 11,2. υπάγετε εἰς τὴν ..... ὑμῶν" κ. εὐθέως εἰσπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς — ἐ- κάθισε" λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.                                   | 19:30 υπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην ' ἐν ἣ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὐρήσατε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πωποτε ἐκάθισε' λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.                                           |
| 3. καὶ ἐάν τις ἰμῖν εἴπῃ τί, ἐρεῖτε" ὅτι ὁ κύριος — χρεῖαν ἔχει, εὐθέως δὲ ἀποστελεῖ —                                                                                                                                                         | 3. κ. ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ ' τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἶπατε ' ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ... κ. εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀποστελεῖ ὧδε.                                                                  | 31. κ. ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ διατί λύετε ; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ' ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει.                                                                                                |
| n. 28. 16,24. εἰ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν κ.                                                                                                                                                                             | 8,34 εἰ τις .... μου ἀκολουθεῖν ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν, κ. ἀρᾶτω τὸν                                                                                                                   | 9,23 ἑαυτὸν, κ. ἀρᾶτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ κ. ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. 24. ὅς                                                                                                                    |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>άρατω τον σταυρόν αυτού κ. αχο- λουθείτω μοι. 25. ός γάρ άν θέλη την ψυχήν αυτού σώσαι, άπολέσει αυτήν ' ός δ' άν άπολέση την ψυχήν αυτού ενεκεν έμού, εύρήσει αυτήν. 26. τί γαρ ωφελείται άνθρωπος, εάν τον κόσμον όλον κερδ ήση την δέ ψυχήν αυτού ξημιωθή; ή τί δώσει άνθρωπος αντάλλαγμα τής ψυχής αυτού;</p> | <p>σταυρόν αυτού κ. ακολουθείτο μοι. 35. ός γάρ αν θέλη την ψυχήν αυτού σώσαι, άπολέσει αυτήν" ός δ' άν άπολέση την εαυτού ψυχήν ενεκεν έμού, (-) σώσει αυτήν. 36. τί γάρ ωφελήσει άνθρωπον, εάν κερδήση τον κόσμον όλον κ. ξημιωθή την ψυχήν αυτού; 37. ή τί δώσει άνθρ. αντάλλαγμα τής ψυχής αυτού ;</p> | <p>γάρ άν θέλη την ψυχήν αυτού σώσαι, άπολέσει αϋτην' ός δ άν άπολέση την ψυχήν αυτού ενεκενέμον, σώσει αϋτήν. 25. τί γάρ ωφελείται άνθρωπος κέρδη σας τον κόσμον όλον εαυτόν δέ άπολέσας ή ξημιω&amp;είς;</p> |
| <p>28. αμήν λέγω υμῖν · είσί τινες των ώδε έστώτων οἵτινες οὔ μή γεύσωνται θανάτου εως άν ἴδωσι—</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <p>9,1 αμήν λέγω ύμῖν ότι είσί τινες των ωδε έστηχότων ο"τινες οὔ μή γεύσωνται θανάτου, εως άν ιδωσι —</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <p>27. λέγω δέ ὕμῖν ἀληθώς, είσί τινες τών ώδε έστότων, οἱ ου μή γεύσωνται θανάτου, εως άν ἴδωσι —</p>                                                                                                         |

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

32

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

|                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                      |                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>ν. 17. b. Math 8:32 κ. Ἰδοῦ, ὠρμησεν πάσα ή αγόλη κατά τον κρημονού] εις την θάλασσαν κ. απέθανον Ιν τοῖς υδασι.</p> | <p>Mark 5,13 και ωρμησεν η αγελη κατα του κρημνου εις την θαλασσαν — και επνιγοντο εν τη θαλασση</p> | <p>Luke 8,33 και ωρμησεν η αγελη κατα του κρημνου εις την λιμνην και απεπνιγη</p>                         |
| <p>33. οἱ δε βάσκοντες εφυγον κ. απελθοντες εις την πάλιν απήγγειλαν παντα —</p>                                        | <p>14. οι βοσκοντες αυτους εφυγον και απηγγειλαν εις την πολιν και εις τους αγρους etc.</p>          | <p>34 ιδοντες δε οι βοσκοντες το γεγονος εφυγον και απηγγειλαν εις την πολιν και εις τους αγρους etc.</p> |
| <p>ν. 24. 14,19 και λαβών τους πέντε άρτους κ. τούς δύο ιχθύος, αναβλέψας εις τον ουρανόν, ευλόγησε '</p>               | <p>6,41 αι λαβων τους πεντε αρτους και τους δυο ιχθυας αναβλεψας εις τον ουρανον ευλογησεν και</p>   | <p>9,16 λαβων δε τους πεντε αρτους και τους δυο ιχθυας αναβλεψας εις τον ουρανον ευλογησεν αυτους</p>     |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| και κλάδας άδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς τούς άρτους, οἱ δε μαθηταῖ τοῖς οχλοῖς.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | κατεκλασεν τους αρτους και εδιδου τοις μαθηταις ινα παρατιθωσιν αυτοις.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | και κατεκλασεν και εδιδου τοις μαθηταις παραθειναι τω οχλω                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 20. κ. εφαγον πάντες κ. έχορτάσθησαν κ. ήραν τό περισσεῦον τών κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις.                                                                                                                                                                                          | 42 και εφαγον παντες και έχορτασθησαν<br>43 και ηραν κλασματα δωδεκα κοφινων πληρωμα.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 17 και εφαγον και έχορτασθησαν παντες και ηρθη το περισσεουσιν αυτοις κλασματων κοφινωι δωδεκα                                                                                                                                                                               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| ν. 55 Matth. 26, 75 κ. εϋθέως αλέκτωρ έφώνησε. 75. κ. έμνήσθη ό πέτρας τού ρήματος τού Ιησού εἰρηκάτος αυτώ · ότι πρ'ιν αλέκτορα φωνή-σαι, τρις απαρνηση με. κ. έξελθών έξω έκλαυσε πικρώς.                                                                                                | Mark 14,72 κ. (-) αλέκτωρ έφάινησε· κ. άνεμνήσθε ό πέτρος τού ρήματος ού είπεν αυτώ ό ἱησούς' ότι πριν αλέκτορα φωνήσαι (-) άπαρνήση με τρίς. κ. έπι βαλών έκλαιε.                                                                                                                                                                                        | Luke 22,60 κ. παραχρήμα — έφώνησεν αλέκτωρ 61. κ. — κ. ύπεμνήσθη ο πέτρος τού λογου τού κυρίου, ως είπεν αυτώ' ότι πριν αλέκτορα φωνήσαι άπαρνήση με τρίς. 62. κ. έξελθών εξω έκλαυσε πικρώς.                                                                                |
| ν. 17. α. 8,24 κ. Ιδού, σεισμός μέγας ίγένετο έν τή θαλάσση, ώστε τό πλοιον καλύπτεσθαι υπό των κυμάτων·                                                                                                                                                                                   | 4,37 κ. γίνεται λαίλαψ άνεμου μεγάλη, τα δε κύματα επέβαλεν είς το πλοιον, ώστε αϋτό ήδη γεμίξεσθαι                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 8,23 (πλεόντων δε αυτών άφύπνωσε) κ. κατέβη λαίλαψ άνεμου εις τήν λίμνην κ. συνεπληροϋτο*) το πλοιον καί έκινδύ-νευον.                                                                                                                                                       |
| αϋτῷς δε έκάθευδε. 25. προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηται ήγειραν αϋτον, λέγοντες· κύριε, σώσον ημάς, άπολλύμεθα. 26. b. τότε έγερθεις επετίμηϋε τοῖς άνέμοις κ. τή θαλάσση ' κ. έγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη και λέγει αϋτοῖς' τί δειλοί — 27. οἱ δε άνθρωποι έθαύμασαν λέγοντες' ποταπός έστιν ουτος ότι — | 38. κ. ήν αϋτός — καθευδων' καῖ δ ιεγ εί ρουσιν αϋ-τόν κ. λέγουσιν αϋτώ' διδάσκαλε, οϋ μέλει σοι οτι απολλυμεθα; 39. κ. δ ιεγ ερθεις επετίμησε τώ άνέ-μω κ. είπε τή θαλάσση · σιώπα — κ. έκοπασεν ό άνεμος, κ. έγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. 40. κ. εἶ-πεν αυτοῖς' τί δειλοί — 41. κ. έφοβήθησαν φοβον μέγαν κ. ελε-γον πρός αλλήλους" τίς άρα έστιν ουτος ότι — | 24. προσελθόντες δε διήγειραν αϋτον, λέγοντες · έπιστάτα, έπιστάτα, άπολλύμεθα! ο δε έγερθεῖς επετίμησε τώ άνέμω κ. τω κλύβωνι τού ύδατος' κ. επανσαντο κ. έγ ενετό γαλήνη. 25. είπε δε αϋτοῖς — φοβηθέντες δε έθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρός αλ-λήλους' τίς άρα ουτός έστιν οτι — |

\*) So we read instead of συνεπληροῦντο.

33

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.

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

38

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 paradosis? - 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.

40

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.

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:

**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 ἐκείνῳ 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."

45

— 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?

46

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 at that as 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. Luke tells us 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.

**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

|                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth 3,11 ο οἷ ὅπ' ἰ βωμόν<br>ἰρ χόμενος ἰσχυρότερος<br>μου εβτίν, ου ουκ εἰμι ικανό<br>ς τα υποδήματα βαζάσαι'<br>αυτός υμάς βαπτίσει· ἐν<br>πνεύματι ἁγίῳ κ. πυρί. | Luke 3:16 ἐρχεται δὲ ὁ<br>ἰσχυρότερός μου, ου ουκ<br>εἰμι ικανός λῦσαι τον ἱμάντα<br>των υποδημάτων αὐτοῦ'<br>αυτός υμάς βαπτίσει ἐν<br>πνεύματι ἁγίῳ κ. πνρί. | Mark 1,7 ἐρχεται ο<br>ισχυρότερος μου ὀπίσω<br>μου, ου ουκ εἰμι ἰκανός ὅς<br>λῦσαι τον ἱμάντα των<br>υποδημάτων αὐτοῦ' αὐτός<br>υμάς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι<br>ἁγίῳ κ. πυρί. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Indeed, the same can be found expressed differently, even in Luke, chapter 13, verse 25. τίνα με υπονοεῖτε εἶναι; ουκ εἰμι ἐγώ, ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ, ἐρχεται μετ' ἐμέ, ου ουκ εἰμι ἅγιος, το υπόδημα των υποδημάτων λύσαι, and again with John Ch. 1,27 αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ὅς ἐμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν, οὐ ἐγώ ουκ εἰμι ἅγιος ἵνα λῦσω αὐτοῦ τον ἱμάντα 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 \*)

\*) Gieseler p. 93.

50

|                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matt 14:13<br>κ. ανεχωρησεν<br>Ικειθεν έν πλοίω εις<br>έρημον τοπον κατ<br>Ιδίαν, κ.<br>ακούσαντες οί όχλοι<br>ηκολοϋθησαν αντώ<br>πεζή από τών<br>πόλεων. | Mark 6,32<br>κ. άπήλθον εις<br>ερημ. τόπον τω<br>πλοία κατ Ιδίαν.<br>33. κ. είδον αντους<br>υπάγοντας κ.<br>ίπέγνωσαν πολλοί"<br>κ. πεζή από παθών<br>τών πόλεων<br>αννέδραμον κ.<br>προήλθον αυτούς<br>κ. άπήλθον προς<br>αυτόν. | Luke 9:10.<br>και — ύπεχώ ρήσε<br>κατ Ιδίαν εις τόπον<br>έρημον<br>οί δέ όχλοι<br>γνόντες ηκολου-θησ<br>αν αυτώ. | John 6:1 μετα ταϋτα<br>απήλθεν ό Ιησούς<br>πέραν τής<br>θαλάσσης τής<br>τιβεριαδος 2. κ.<br>ήκολοϋθει αϋτώ<br>όχλος πολύς, ότι<br>έωρων αυτού τά<br>σημεία, ά έποίει έπί<br>τών άσθενούντων. |
| 14. κ. Ιξελθών                                                                                                                                             | 34. κ. έξελθών                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                  | 3. άνήλθε δέ εις τό<br>όρος ό'ΐησούς<br>κ.έκάθητο εκεί μετά<br>τών μαθητών αυτού.<br>4. ήν δέ εγγύς τό<br>πάσχα, ή                                                                           |
| είδε πολύν όχλον"                                                                                                                                          | είδε πολύν όχλον                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                  | εορτή τών<br>Ίουδαίων.                                                                                                                                                                       |
|                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                  | 5. έπάρασούν ό<br>Ιησ. τούς<br>οφθαλμούς κ.<br>θεασαμενος ότι<br>πολύς όχλος<br>έρχεται προς                                                                                                 |
| κ. έσπλαγχνίσθη επ<br>αυτοίς                                                                                                                               | κ. έβπλ. Ιπ αυτοις<br>οτι ησαν ώς<br>πρόβατα μη έχοντα<br>ποιμένα· κ. ήρξατο                                                                                                                                                      | κ. δεξάμενος<br>αυτούς έλάλει<br>αυτοίς περί τής<br>βασιλείας τ. θεού                                            | αυτόν,                                                                                                                                                                                       |

|                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                      | διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                               |
| κ. ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἰπ αὐτοῖς                                                                                                                                            | κ. ἐβπλ. επ αυτοις οτι ησαν ὡς πρόβατα μη ἔχοντα ποιμένα· κ. ἥρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.                                                                                                          | κ. δεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τ. θεοῦ                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                               |
| χ. ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς αρρώστους αὐτῶν·                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                      | κ. τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰατο '                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                               |
| 15. ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης                                                                                                                                               | 35. κ. ἥδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης                                                                                                                                                                     | 12. ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἥρξατο κλίνειν.                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                               |
| προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες· ἔρημός ἐστι ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἥδη παρήλθε, ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους· ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα. | προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν· ὅτι ἔρημος .... κ. ἡ ..... ἥδη πολλή. 36. ἀπόλυσον αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς κ. κώμας ἀγοραῶσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους, τί γάρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσι. | προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπον αὐτῷ·<br><br>ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας κ. τοὺς ἀγροὺς καταλυσωσιν κ. ευρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν· ὅτι ὥδε ἐν τῇ ἰρήμῃ ἐσμέν. | πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι; 6. τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων αὐτόν· αὐτὸς γάρ ἤδει τί ἐμελλε ποιεῖν. |
| 16. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοὺς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν· δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν.                                                                                  | 37. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν.                                                                                                                                          | 13. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς· δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν.                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                               |
| 17. οἱ δὲ λεγουσιν αὐτῷ· οὐκ ἔχομεν ὥδε εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.                                                                                           | κ. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους κ. δώμεν αὐτοῖς                                                                                                                    | οἱ δὲ εἶπον· οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι κ. δύο ἰχθύες, εἰ μὴτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν                                                                              | 7. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ φίλιππος· διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχύ                    |

|                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                       | φαγεῖν;<br>38. ὁ δ'ε λέγει<br>αὐτοῖς" ποσους<br>άρτους εχετε;<br>υπάγετε και ἴδετε. κ.<br>γνοντες λέγουαΓ<br>πέντεκ. δυο ἰχθύας.                                                                       | εἰς πάντα τον λαόν<br>τούτον βρώματα.                                                                                                           | τι λάβη 8. λέγει<br>αὐτω εἰς των<br>μαθητωναυτοῦ,<br>ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφός<br>σίμωνοςπέτρου ' 9.<br>εστι παιδάριον ὡδε<br>ο εχει πέντε ἄρτους<br>κ. δύοὀψάρια, ἄλλα<br>ταύτα τί ἐστιν εἰς<br>τοσοῦτους; |
| 18· ο ὁε εἶπε"<br>φέρετε μοι αὐτούς<br>ὡδε.                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 19. κ. κελεύσας<br>τους οχλους<br>ανακληθῆναι.                                                                                                                                        | 39. κ. ἐπέταξεν<br>αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι<br>παντας συμπόσια<br>συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ<br>χλωρᾷ χόρτῳ.<br>40. κ. ἀνέπεσον<br>πρασιαῖ πρασιαῖ<br>ἀνά ἑκατόν                                                          | 14. εἶπε δέ προς<br>τους μαθητάς<br>αυτοῦ' κατακλίνετε<br>αυτούς κλισίας ἀνά<br>πεντήκοντα.<br>15. κ. ἐποίησαν<br>οὕτω κ. ἀνέκλιναν<br>ἅπαντας. | 10. εἶπε δέ ὁ<br>Ἰησοῦς · ποιήσατε<br>τούς ἀνθρώπους<br>ἀναπσεεῖν. ἦν δέ<br>χόρτος πολὺς ἰν τά<br>τόπῳ. ἀνέπεσον δέ<br>οἱ ἄνδρες τον<br>ἀριθμόν ὡσεῖ<br>πεντακισχίλιοι.                             |
| και λαβών τους<br>πέντε ἄρτους κ.<br>τους δύο ἰχθυας,<br>ἀναβλέψας εἰς τον<br>ουρανόν, ευλόγησε"<br>κ. κλασας εδωκε<br>τοῖς μαθηταῖς τους<br>ἄρτους, οἱ δέ<br>μαθηταῖ τοῖς<br>όχλοις. | κ. ἀνά πενή-<br>κοντα.<br>41. και λαβών νους,<br>.... ευλόγησε" κ.<br>κατέσλασε. τους<br>ἄρτους κ. ἐδίδου<br>τοῖς μαθηταῖς<br>αυτοῦ, ἵνα πα-<br>ρα&ωσιν αὐτοῖς" κ.<br>τούς δύο ἰχθύας<br>ἐμέρισε τάσι. | 16. λαβών δ'ε τοὺς<br>πέντε .... εὐλόγη-<br>σεν αὐτούς" κ.<br>κατέκλασ εκ. ἐδίδου<br>τοῖς μαθηταῖς<br>παρατεθῆναι τοῖς<br>όχλοις.               | 11. ελαβε δέ τοὺς<br>ἄρτους ο 'Ιησοῦς κ.<br>εὐχαριστη'σας<br>διέδωκε<br><br>τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δέ<br>μαθηταῖ τοῖς<br>ἀνακειμένοις'<br>ομοίως δέ εκ τῶν<br>ὀψαρίων ὅσον<br>ἤθελαν                     |
| 20. κ. ἔφαγαν<br>πάντες κ.<br>ἐχορτάσθησαν·                                                                                                                                           | 42. κ. ἔφαγαν<br>ἐχορτάσθηδαν.                                                                                                                                                                         | 17. κ. ἔφαγαν κ.<br>ἐχορτάαθησαν<br>πάντες                                                                                                      | 12. ὡς δέ<br>ἐνεπλήσθησαν<br>λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς '<br>συναγάγετε τά<br>περισσεύδαντα<br>κλάσματα, ἵνα μή τι<br>αποληται.                                                                            |

|                                                                                           |                                                             |                                                                   |                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                           |                                                             |                                                                   |                                                                                                                                               |
| κ. ήσαν τό<br>περίσσευαν τών<br>κλασαστων<br>δῶδεκα κοφίνους<br>πλήρεις.                  | 43. κ. ήσαν<br>κλασμάτων<br><br>δῶδεκα κοφίνους<br>πλήρεις. | κ. ήρθε τό<br>περισσέυσαν<br>αυτοῖς κλασμάτων,<br>κοφίνοι δῶδεκα. | 15. συνήγαγον δέ κ.<br>ἐγγέμισαν δῶδεκα<br>κοφίνους<br>κλασμάτων ἐκ τών<br>πέντε ἄρτων τών<br>κρίθινων , ἃ<br>ἐπερίσσευσε τοῖς<br>βεβρωκόσιν. |
| 21. οἱ ὅε ἰσθίοντες<br>ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ<br>πεντακισχίλιοι χωρὶ<br>γυναικῶν κ.<br>παιδιῶν. | 44. κ.ήσαν οἱ<br>φαγοντες<br>πεντακιδχίλιοι<br>ἄνδρες.      |                                                                   |                                                                                                                                               |

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,

54

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<br>καί ἐξελθὼν εἶδε πολὺν ὄχλον, | n. 26 Mark 8:1<br>Ἰν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος | n. 26 Matth 15:24<br>κ. μεταβας ἐκεῖθεν — ἦλθε παρὰ τὴν θαλασσὴν τῆς γαλιλαίας κ. ἀναβάς εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ. | n. 22 John 6:2<br>κ. ἠκολοῦθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς — 3. ἀνῆλθε δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος — κ. ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Mark<br>n. 22                                                                                                        | Mark<br>n. 26                                                                                                             | John<br>n. 22                                                                                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                      | κ. μὴ ἔχόντων τί φάγωσι προσκαλεσαμένους ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτοῖς ·                                       | ν. 5 ἐπάρας οὖν — τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κ. θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγει πρὸς τὸν φίλιππον"        |
| κ. ἐσπλαγχνίσαι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. —                                                                                        | 2. σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον —                                                                                          |                                                                                                                    |
| 35. ὅτι Ἐρημος ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος — ἀπόλναον αὐτοὺς — ἵνα ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους.--                                    | 4. (κ. ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτὰ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·) πόθεν τοὺς δυνήσεται τις ὥδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐν ἐρήμῳ;                          | πόθεν αγοράσωμεν ν ἄρτους, ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;                                                                      |
| 38. ὁ δὲ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς · πόσους ἄρτους ἐχετε; — κ. γνόντες λέγουσι· πέντε—                                           | 5. καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτοῦς· πόσους ἐχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπον" ἑπτὰ.                                                            |                                                                                                                    |
| 39. κ. ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντας — ἐπὶ τὰ χλωρά χορτῶ. 41. κ. λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους — ἐυλόγησεν· κ. ἐκλάσεν | 6. κ. παρήγγειλε τὰ ὄχλω ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. κ. λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους κ. ευχαριστήσας ἐκλαύεν κ. ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς | 10. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς" ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. —<br>11. ἔλαβε δὲ τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς, κ. ευχαριστήσας — |

|                                                                                                                   |                                                                              |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| τούς ἄρτους κ. ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραδωσιν αὐτοῖς. —                                                | αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραθώσιν (κ. παρέθηκαν τῷ οὐλῷ).                                 |  |
| (cf v. 38 — καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.) — cf. v. 41. — καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας — εὐλόγησε" -----κ. τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισε πασι. | v. 7. κ. εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· κ. εὐλογήσεις εἶπε παραθεῖναι κ. αὐτά.         |  |
| 42. κ. εἶφαγον πάντες κ. ἐχορτάβησαν. 43· κ. ἦσαν κλασμάτεον δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις. —                           | 8. εἶφαγον δὲ κ. ἐχορτάβησαν· κ. ἦσαν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, ἐπτὰ σπυρίδας. |  |
| 44. κ. ἦσαν οἱ φαγοντες — πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.                                                                  | 9. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι.                                    |  |
| 45. κ. εὐθέως ἠνάγκαβε τοὺς— ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.                                                               | 10. κ. εὐθέως ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν.                        |  |

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

|                                                                             |                                                                                      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Mark 6:36- and Matth.) ἀπολυσον αυτούς<br>-- v. 34. εσηλαγχνίαθη επ αύτοῖς | Mark. 8, 3 καῖέάν ἀπολύσω αυτούς κ. τ. λ.<br>– 2. σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπι 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 πέτρων ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, λέγουσα" (compare Matth and Luke.) —               | a) John 18,16. ἐξήλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος — καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ — καὶ εἰσῆγαγε τὸν πέτρων. 17. λέγει οὖν ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρὸς τῷ πέτρῳ — |
| 67. καὶ σύ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὸν νασαθαίου ἦσθα.                                                                                             | μη καὶ σύ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;                                                                                           |
| 68. ὁ ἰὲς ἠρνήσατο, λέγων · οὐκ οἶδα, οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι τί σύ λέγεις (Luke οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν).                                                  | λέγει ἐκεῖνος" οὐκ εἰμί.                                                                                                                   |
| b) 70. κ. ἐξήλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον — 69. κ. ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν πάλιν, ἤρξατο λέγειν τοῖς παρεστηκόσι · καὶ οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν. | b) 25. ἦν δὲ σιμὼν πέτρος ἐστὼς κ. θερμαινόμενος" εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ * μή καὶ σύ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ;                                            |
| c) 70. κ. μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστώτες ἔλεγον τῷ πέτρῳ" ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ κ. γάρ κ. τ. λ.                                             | c) 26. λέγει εἰς ἐκ τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως' — οὐκ ἐγὼ 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.

60

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.

61

|                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 6:1 καὶ ήλθεν εις την πατρίδα αυτού.<br>2. κ. γινομένου σαββάτου ήρξατο ίν τή<br>συναγωγή διδάσκειν · | Luke 4,16 κ. ήλθεν εις την ναζαρετ, — κ.<br>εισήλθε κατά τό είωθος αὔτά έν τή ημέρα<br>των σαββάτων εις την συναγωγήν" κ. |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <p>άνεστη ἀνα- γνάναι. 17. κ. ἐπέδόθη αὐτρὶ βιβλίον — 20. κ. πτύξας τό βιβλίον — (κάθισε — 21. ἤρ- ξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοῦς' ὅτι σήμερον πεπληρωται ἡ γραφή αὕτη (ν τοῖς ὡς'ιν ὕμων (compae Luke 19,9).</p> |
| καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκοῦοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <p>22. κ. πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτά κ. (θαύμαζαν ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,</p>                                                                                     |
| λέγοντες" πόθεν Χούτω ταῦτα; καὶ τις ἡ σοφία ἢ δοθεῖσα αὐτά, καὶ ὅτι δυνάμεις τοιαύται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται ;                                                                                                                                                        | <p>καὶ ἐλεγαν"</p>                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 3. οὐχ οὗτο ς ἐ σ τ ι ν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός κ. Μαρίας, ἀδελφός δὲ Ἰακώβου — καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὡδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς;                                                                                                                                                     | <p>οὐχ οὗτος ο υιός 'ίωσήφ;</p>                                                                                                                                                                               |
| (καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτά).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <p>23. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοῦς · πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταυτην" Ἰατρέ, θεράπευσαν σεαυτόν' ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα ἐν καπερναῦμ, ποιήσον καὶ ὡδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου.</p>                                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 4 ελεγε δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς' ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης ἀτίμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ κ. ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι κ. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. 5. κ. οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἐκεῖ οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν ποιῆσαι, εἰ μὴ ολίγοις ἀήρώστοις ἐπιθεις τὰς χεῖρας (θεράπευσε. 6. κ. (θαύμαζε διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτάν. | <p>24. εἶπε δέ" ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδ εἰς προφήτης δεκτός (στιν ἐν τῇ 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 o. 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. οἱ δὲ ἀλιεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἀπεπλυναν τὰ δίκτυα. Matth. 4, 18. βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ ἰῆδ V. 21. καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ 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 ὀπίσω μου, καί ποιήσω ὑμας γενέσθαι ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων.

Luke 5:10 μή φοβοῦ' ἀπό τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἐσθ' ὡγρῶν. (ἀπό τούνυν νεν 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 ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, compare Luk. 5, 2. δύο πλοία, v. 7. κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἐτίρῳ πλοίῳ compare v. 10.

|                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 14,4 (compare Matth 26,8f) εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῆ τοῦ μύρου γέγονε; 5. ἡδυνάτο γάρ τοῦτο πρᾶθῆναι ἑπᾶνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων, καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς. | John 12,6 διατί τοῦτο τό μύρον οὐκ ἔπραξεν τριακοσίων δηναρίων καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς; |
| 6. ὁ δὲ ἰησοῦς εἶπεν' ἀφετε αὐτήν * τί αὐτῇ κόπους παρέχετε; καλὸν ἔργον εἰργασάτο ἐν ἐμοί.                                                                | 7. εἶπεν οὖν ὁ ἰησοῦς' ἀφες αὐτήν.                                                |
| 7. πάντοτε γάρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἐαυτῶν κ. ὅταν θέλητε δυνάσθε αὐτοὺς εὐποιῆσαι, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.                                            | b. v. 8. τοὺς πτωχοὺς γάρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἐαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.     |
| 8. ὁ δὲ ἔσχεν (ἴσχυεν ?) αὐτή, ἐποίησε" προέλαβε μυρρίδιαι μου τὸ ὕμα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν (Matth. v. 12. πρὸς τὸ ἰνταφιάσαι με ἐποίησεν).                  | a. v. 7. εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ 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. 111.

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. ὁρθῶς ἀπεκρίθη. Mark. 12, 32. καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπαλήθειας 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 κατεξουσιαζοῦσιν αὐτῶν. 43. οὐχ' οὕτω δὲ ἔσται ἰν νμῖν" ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ γενέσθαι μέγας ἐν νμῖν, ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος. 44. καὶ ὁ ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ὑμῶν γενέσθαι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δούλος.</p> | <p>Luke 22:25 οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. 26. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως" ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἰν ὑμῖν γενεσθῶ ὡς ὁ νεώτερος.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 45. καί γάρ ο οίλς τού ανθρώπου ούκ ήλθε διακονηθήναι, αλλά διακονήσαι και δούναι την ψυχήν αυτού λύτραν αντί πολλών (cf Matthew) | 27. τις γάρ μείζων; ο άνακείμενος η ο διακόνων; ίγώ δί είμι ίν μέσω υμών ώς 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, ό εγώ πίνω, καί τό βαπτισμα, δ εγώ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθήναι; 39. οί δέ εἶπον αὐτώ" δυναμεθα. ό δέ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' τό μέν ποτήριον, ο εγώ πίνω, πίεσθε, καί τό βάπτισμα, ο εγώ βαπτίζομαι, | Luke 22:29 κα'γώ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθώς διέθετό μοι ο πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, ἵνα ἰσθίητε καί πίνητε ἰπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου καί καθίσησθε |
| βαπτισθήσεσθε · τό δέ καθίοαι έκ δεξιῶν μου και ἐξ ευωνυμων. οὔκ ἔστιν ἔμον δούναι, αλλ' οἷς ήτοίμασται (compare Matthew)                                                                                                           | ἐπὶ 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 άντι πολλών 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.



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.

73

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.

\*) Their plan was to legally arrest him and then have him executed — which was not supposed to happen during the festival. The *ev ὁλῶ* [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.

74

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.

75

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 ἐντολή 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!

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth 26:31 πάντες υμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἑμοί ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ · γέγραπται γάρ — 33. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ πέτρας εἶπεν αὐτῷ· εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε (σκανδαλισθήσομαι). 34 εφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμήν λέγω ὑοι, ὅτι ἐν | Luke 22:31 σίμων, σίμων, ἰδοὺ, ὁ σατανὰς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς, τοῦ σινιασαι ὡς τὸν σίτον32. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σου, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ἡ πίστις σου, κ. σύ ποτέ ἐπιστρέψας, στήριξαν τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου. 33. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, μετὰ σου ἑτοιμος εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν κ. εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι. | John 13:36 λέγει αὐτῷ σίμων πέτρος· κύριε, ποῦ υπάγεις; ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὅπου υπάγω, οὐ δύνασαί μοι νύν ακολουθήσαι· ὕστερον δεῖ ἀκολουθήσεις μοι. 37. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ πέτρος· κύριε, διατί οὐ δύναμαι σοὶ ακολουθήσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχὴν μου υπέρ σοῦ θήσω. |
| ταυτη τῇ νυκτί, πρὶν                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 34. ὁ δὲ εἶπε · λέγω σοι,                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 38. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |

|                                                                                                                             |                                                                                   |                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| αλέκτορα φωνήσαι, τρῖς<br>ἀπαρνήσημε. 35. λέγει<br>αὐτῷ ὁ πέτρος· καν δέη με<br>σύν σοι ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μή<br>σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. | πέτρε, οὐ μή φωνησῇ<br>σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ, πρὶν ἢ<br>τρῖς ἀπαρνησῇ μή εἰδέναι<br>με. | Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχὴν σου<br>ὕπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμήν<br>ἀμήν λέγω σοι· οὐ μή<br>ἀλέκτωρ φωνησῇ, ἐως οὐ<br>ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

76

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<br>ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ μου εἰς θάνατον.                                                                                                           | John 12:27. νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τεταρακταί.                                                              |
| καὶ προσηύχετο, ἵνα, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι,<br>παρέλθῃ ἡπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα. 36. κ. ελεγε·<br>αββὰ, ὁ πατήρ, — παρένεγκε το ποτηριον<br>ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· τοῦτο' ἀλλ' οὐ, τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ<br>τί σὺ. | καὶ τί εἶπω *); πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς<br>ώρας ταύτης· ἄλλα διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθαν εἰς<br>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.

77

|                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| John 12:25 ο φιλών τήν •Ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν' καὶ ὁ μισὼν τήν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν. | Mark 8:35 ὅς γάρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν' ὅς ὅταν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ — σῶσει αὐτήν.         |
| 26. ἐάν ἐμοῖ διακονή τις, ἐμοῖ ἀκολουθεῖτο" καὶ ὅπου εἰμι ἰγώ, ἰκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος κ. τ. λ.                                         | — 34. εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, καὶ ἀρατω τὸν σταυρόν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. (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. ἦσαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβαρημένοι), they do not know what to answer. (The same expression Mark. 14, 40. οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῶσιν and Mark. 9, 6. οὐ γάρ ᾔδει τί λαλήσει comp. Luk. 9, 33. μή εἰδώς 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?

78

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:

|                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth 26,37. και παρέλάβε τον πέτραν ζ. τούς δύο ξεβεδαίους.             | Gen. 22,3. ἀναστάς δέ ἄβραάμ τό πρωί — παρέλαβε δέ μεθ ἑαυτὸν ὄνο παῖδας κ. ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον. κ. εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτὸν' καθίστατε ἅν τ' ον, ἐγὼ δὲ — διελενσώμεθα εὗς ὡδε κ. προσκυνησαντες ἀναστρέψομεν. |
| Luke 22,40. γινόμενος δέ ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον.                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Matth 26.36. κ. λέγει" καθίστατε αὐτοῦ, εὗς οὐ ἀπελθὼν 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

81

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 ὑμῶν 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.

84

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: ἰκμυκτηρίζιν) 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

87

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.

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

90

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 επορευεθη κ. τ. λ.                                                   |
| a. n. 10. 2:17 — οi κακως εχοντες· ουκ ηλθον καλσαι κ. τ. λ.        | 5:31. — ως εχοντες. 32. ονκ εληλυθα καλσαι κ. τ. λ. | 9:12. οi κακως εχοντες (insert v. 13.) ου γαρ ηλθον καλσαι 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 παραβολαις (κ.τ.λ. Insert twice v.17.) |
| 13. ουκ οιδετε την παραβ. ταυτην;                                   | 11. εστι δε αυτη η παραβολη.                        | 18. υμεις ουν ακουσατε την παραβολην του σπειροντος (in contrast to v. 24-30. entered παραβολη των ζιζανιων      |

|                                                                                         |                                                          |                                                                                                                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                         |                                                          | compare v. 36.                                                                                                                      |
| n. 20 —                                                                                 | —                                                        | Insert : (10:5-8.) therefore:                                                                                                       |
| 6:8. ἵνα μηδέν αἴρωσι εἰς οδόν κ. τ. λ.                                                 | 9:3. μηδέν αἵρετε εἰς οδόν κ. τ. λ.                      | μή κτησησθε χρυσόν κ. τ. λ. (Reversal of the things mentioned).                                                                     |
| v. 11. καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μή δέξωνται ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ.                                            | 9:5. κ. ὅσοι ἂν μή δέξωνται ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ.                | Insert. v. 12-13. Therefore: και ὅς ἂν μή δέξηται.                                                                                  |
| n. 28. 8:29 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός. 30. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ.                             | 9:20. τον χριστόν τον 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. — τούτο τό γένος κ. τ. λ.                               |                                                          | 17:19. ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; (Insert v. 20. therefore v. 21. τούτο δὲ τό γένος κ. τ. λ.                                                    |
| n. 32. 9:37. και ὅς ἂν ἑν τῶν τοιούτων παιδιῶν δέξηται κ.τ.λ                            | 9:48. ὅς ἂν δέξηται κ. τ. λ.                             | (Insert 18:3-4. therefore v. 5. και ὅς ἂν δέξηται κ. τ. λ.                                                                          |
| n. 35. 10:29. οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὅς ἀφήκεν κ. τ. λ.                                           | 18:29. οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὅς ἀφήκεν κ. τ. λ.                   | (Insert 19:28) therefore v. 29. και πᾶς ὅς ἀφήκεν.                                                                                  |
| n. 47. 12:1. ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγειν.                                        | 20:9. ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τον λαόν λέγειν την παραβ. ταῦτην.  | 21. (Insert 2-32. therefore): v. 33. αλλην παραβ. ακούσατε.                                                                         |
| 12. καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτον κράτησαι.                                                         | 20:19. και ἐξήτουν κ. τ. λ.                              | 21: (insert v. 43-44) 45. και ἀκούσαντ ες — ἐ᾽γνωσαν κ.τ.λ.                                                                         |
| n. 49. 13:1. και ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ιεροῦ — καὶ ἐξελθῶν ἐπορευετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ιεροῦ |                                                          | (Insert 23:2-39. therefore with regard to v. 39.) 24:1. καὶ ἐξελθῶν ἐπορευετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ιεροῦ (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. εὐυέως δὲ μετὰ την θλίψιν —                                          |
| n. 54. 14:46. οἱ δὲ                                                                     |                                                          | (Insert 26:50.) τότε                                                                                                                |



|                                                      |                  |                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ἐπέβαλον κ. τ. λ.                                    |                  | ἐπέβαλον κ.τ. λ.                                                  |
| 48. και ἀποκριεῖς εἶπε etc.                          | 22:52. εἶπε δέ — | (Insert 26:52-54.) ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπε —                        |
| ν. 55. 15:32 καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι ὠνεῖδιζον αὐτόν. |                  | 27. (Insert v. 43.) 44. τό δέ αὐτό και οἱ λησται ὠνεῖδιζον αὐτόν. |

\*) ἀπό does not belong to ἐξελθών, 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                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ν. 20. 6:11. ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν.           | 9:5. ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης.    | 10:14. ἐξεργόμενοι τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης.               |
| ν. 28. 8:28. ἄλλοι δέ ἐνάτων προφητῶν.        | 9:19. ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι προφήτης τις — ἀνέστη., | 16:14. ἕτεροι δέ ἱερεμίαν ἢ ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν.                     |
| 33. ὑπάγε ὀπίβω μου, σατανά, ὅτι ου φρονεῖς — |                                             | 23. ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανά, σκάνδαλόν μου εἶ ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς etc. |
| ν. 29. 9:5. ποιήσωμεν —.                      |                                             | 17:4. (εἰ θέλεις,) ποιήσωμεν —                                    |
| ν. 13. και ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ                      |                                             | ν. 12. και (ουκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν, ἀλλά) ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ —         |
| ν. 49. 13,18. χειμῶνος                        |                                             | 24:20. χειμῶνας (μηδέ σαββάτω).                                   |

|                                  |                                     |                                                                |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| v. 26. και τότε όψονται —        | 21:27. και τότε όψονται —           | v. 30. κ. τότε (κόψονται πάσαι αί φυλαι τής γής και) όψονται — |
| n. 53. 14:24. τό — έκχυνόμενον.  |                                     | 26:28. τό — έκχυνόμενον (είς άφεσιν αμαρτιών).                 |
| n. 54. 14:53. προς τον αρχιερέα. | 22:54. εις τον οίκον του αρχιερέως. | 26:57. προς (καϊάφαν) τον αρχιερέα.                            |
| n. 57. 16:6 'Ιησοϋν ζητείτε.     | 22:54                               | 28:5 (οΐδα γάρ ότι) 'Ιησοϋν ζητείτε.                           |
| v. 7. ότι προάγει υμάς —         |                                     | v. 7. ότι (ήγέρθη από τών νεκρών" καΐ 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 μῖζον, 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 μείζον. 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 μείζον?

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

d) The alleged μείζον 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: εἰ γὰρ ἐγνώχετε 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

97

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

100

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.

101

— 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.

102

— 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 *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* 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 *πνεῦμα ἱγίου* 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 τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, it says τὸν 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: *ὡς εἰάν — ἀποστείλαντά με* (Matth. 18 [*corrected from 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 (*ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου* cf. Mark v. 40. *ὅτι χριστοῦ ἐστέ*), 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

105

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

|                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matthew 24:16 τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίῳ! φευγίτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη- 17. ὁ ἱππὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ ἀναβαινέτω ἀραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ! 18. καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσσω, ἀραι τὰ ἐμάτια αὐτοῦ. (cf Mark) | Luke 21:21 τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἰσχυρεῖτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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.

107

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.

108

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 "ἀνατάξις θαι οίρήγησιν" (to set forth in orderly sequence) in the other clause conveys the same meaning.

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

Then he mentions

109

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 (ἐπειδή ηερ, 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 (οίρήγησιν, not την οίρήγησιν) 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 (ἀνηταξασθαι, 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 ἐπιδή ηερ 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,

110

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" (εδοξε 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

111



—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 άνκηξις (arrangement) - this follows immediately - was added to the apostolic παράδοσις (tradition). As the άνκηξις 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

112

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 —

113

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" (επειδή), 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 ἀγγελισταί (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 ἀσφάλεια (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 ἀσφάλεια (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.

114

α) Does "ἵνα επιγνῶς" (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 ἐπί? 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 agnoscas). This explanation harmonizes

115

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 επιγνῶς, ὅτι οἱ λόγοι, περί ὧν κατηχήθης, εἰσὶν ἀσφαλῆς (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 ασφαλειαν 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.

bb) 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 ἐπιγνῶς περί — το ἀσφαλέστερον (so that you may know about the most certain), but he did not write that way. Therefore, it remains that the ἀσφάλεια 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,

116

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 ἀσφάλεια that those writings did not provide and if his writing contained the ἀκρίβεια, 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 socrorum 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 αϋτόπται 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 χαμοί, 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 ήμϊν γενομένοισ όμοθνμαδόν  | 3. έδοξε χαμοί παραχολουθηκότι πάαιν άχριβώς                |

|                                        |                     |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|
| εχλεξαμένους ἃ 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 παρηχολουθηχότι would also have to stand. — So the παραχολουθεῖν 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 "παι" as neuter, and

cc) the words "άχριβώς" and "άνωθεν" point to our explanation that Luke's "παραχολονθήσαι" 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, ὅς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν 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.



**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?

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.

122

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.

123

[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. —

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:

|                                                                                                     |                                                                                                  |                                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth 14:15. ερημός ἐϋτιν<br>ὁ τόπος χ. ἡ ὥρα ἤδη<br>παρήλθε, ἀπόλυϋον τοὺς<br>ὄχλους, ἵνα χ. τ. λ. | Mark 6:36. οτι 'ε'ρημός<br>ἐβτιν ο τόπος κ. ἡ ὥρα ἤδη<br>πολλή, ἀπόλυϋον αὐτοὺς,<br>ἵνα κ. τ. λ. | Luke 9:12. ἀπόλυσον τοὺς<br>ὄχλους, ἵνα — ὅτι ὥδε ἐν<br>ἱρήμῳ τόπῳ εσμέν. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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 σκοτοῦς) 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

126

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 (τοῦ σπείροντος), the other of the tares (τῶν 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 ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν τῶν ζιζανίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ indeed Jesus himself, in expounding the first of these parables, must say with the writer distinguishing (ch. 13, 18.): νμῆϊς οὐν ἀχοῦσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπείροντος. 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

127

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. —

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 (καὶ 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 τινίς (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.

135

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. –

138

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 παραδόουναι 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.

---

#### 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.

141

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 ποιείτε 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.

142

α) If what we borrowed according to our assumption is omitted in Luke, then verse 19 connects better with verse 21. Because the phrase ἐπὶ 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 δεῖπνήσαί); 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 εὐαριστήσας. 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.

145

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

146

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 ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα κ. φραγμὸν περιέθηκε κ. ὥρυξεν ----ληνόν. See page 70. Jerem. 5, 2., also Matth. 24, 20. (Mark. 13, 24.) cf. Isa. 13, 10. Ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται there: οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ — τό φῶς οὐ δώσουσι κ. σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος κ. ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τό φῶς αὐτῆς to Mark. 13, 19. ἐσονται αἱ ἡμέραι — θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονε τοιαυτή ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἕως τοῦ νυν cf.

Dan. 12:1 εσται καιρός θλίψεως, θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονε ἀφ' οὐ γεγένηται ἔθνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ ἐκείνου. Further:

147

|                                                                                             |                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 1:6 ἦν δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τριχᾶς καμηλοῦ κ. ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτόν. | 2 Kings 1:8 ἀνὴρ δασὸς καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περιζωβμένος (in a similar passage but Dan. 10, 5. ἐνδεδυμένος) τὴν ὀσφυν αὐτοῦ. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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 (εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον γολγοθᾶ), 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: εἰς χωρίον, not the expected one: εἰς τὸ χωρίον, εἰς γεθσημανη (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

150

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.

---

151

#### 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). TThis 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 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."

157

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.

158

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.

---

## 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. οἱ δὲ διέλογίσαντο παρ' ἐαντοῖζ' εἰπόμεν ' ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν· διὰ τί 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.

-----

161

### Note 3.

It has been concluded above that the nonexistence of a primitive oral Gospel can be 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 tables for different representations of one and the same legend.

-----

## Part Two.

Data regarding a written standard of agreement of the gospel accounts.

-----

We seek out data here as well. But since we must seek it by a guide and according to the direction of a leading idea, a few general propositions will again have to precede the investigation here.

General propositions:

First proposition:

If the norm of agreement in writing had been given to our evangelists, the connection in which they entered into can be understood in three possible ways of mediation. Either it is a) immediate, or b) indirect, or c) partly indirect and partly immediate.

The following is an explanation about this. The connection is either

a) immediate, – meaning our evangelists are so connected that there is nothing else intervening between them, through which their agreement would be mediated. – This means that one of them is the first, from whom the other two directly and immediately drew, and one is the last, who used the works of those two as his immediate predecessors. Or

b) it is indirect, — meaning our writers did not draw from each other's works, but the basis of their agreement lies in an external source from which all three independently drew. — Or finally,

c) the connection is both indirect and immediate, to some extent, so that this "to some extent" must be understood either with regard to our writers themselves or to their contributions. —

α) In the case of the writers themselves, it can be either

κ) two of them are indirectly connected (through a commonly used source), and the third has borrowed directly from these two (compiling both or extracting from both), or

б) only two of them are directly connected, and the third is indirectly connected with both, which again implies either

aa) that two of them are dependent on each other, and the third, without their influence, drew from a common source, or

bb) that one of them (e.g., Matthew) directly influenced the medium through which the other two reached agreement independently from each other, or from which only one derived the material, while the other derived it only through this one (from which he himself drew directly).

— As mentioned, the "to some extent" could also refer to the contributions of the writers, in such a way that these, — while perhaps their original authors were only in a relationship of indirect (mediated by something else) association, — were made similar to each other through later editors and redactors by means of transcription and conformation and were placed in a direct relationship of dependency with and from each other.

163

2) From this it will at the same time be seen that the individual hypotheses are capable of manifold modifications. Already the first hypothesis of the immediate relationship allows several forms of connection, so that each of the three evangelists can be set as the third, who uses the first two, and then with regard to the two used, a different position is possible \*). In regard to the indirect connection, it makes a difference whether the preceding is presupposed as a whole of Scripture \*\*), or whether it is assumed that the dependent writers only came into possession of individual messages or parthias in certain, more or less completed or differently ordered collections. \*\*\*) ----- The third hypothesis seeks to half-empty, and can also do so, as we have already seen, in various ways. It has been asserted that

α) Mark alone stands in the immediate relation of dependence to the secondary evangelists; Matthew and Luke are (in relation to each other and to Mark) the two original writers, and these have, where their arrangement is the same, and where, in the case of unequal arrangement, their narratives or representations coincide, (see the first table) certain greater or lesser parts of the Gospels. (see the first table) certain larger or smaller partial essays, and these especially at the front, but at the back towards the end



of their story, larger collections have formed the basis of their reports, †) and Mark has then excerpted the Gospels of Matthew and Luke thus prepared. ††)

β) The original evangelists (in relation to Mark), Matthew and Luke, relate to each other in such a way that their agreement is only indirect, but not mediated by scripture, but by Matthew having somehow influenced the legend, from which Luke in part drew (de Wette Einleit. p. 157.) \*), or

γ) a distinction has been made between an original form and a later form of our Gospels, that especially

κ) the Gospel of Matthew has been reduced to a double authorship, by distinguishing the author of the work from the translator or later arranger, and claiming of the latter that he had combined with the original work compilations from Mark and Luke (which, however, were sometimes supposed to be dependent again on the original Matthew himself). In addition, it has been assumed

ι) that Luke contains interpolations from Matthew and Mark. Finally, it has been

ο) assumed that the compiler of the two Gospels was Luke, insofar as he incorporated the original deliveries (to be distinguished from their later form) into his work. \*\*)

\*) We do not need to mention by name the individual writers who have placed the relationship of dependence in one way or another.

\*\*) According to the hypothesis of the written Gospel.

\*\*\*) Schleiermacher's assumption in his already mentioned critical attempt on the writings of Luke and earlier Paul in the commentary. S. also its conservator.

†) Paul in the commentary and in the conservator.

††) So rückstchtlich des Markus Orieskecd: commentatio, qvL clear! erangeNum totum e klattdaei et l.ucse eommentariis

\*) The opinion of this scholar is not clear enough,

a) Where Matthew and Luke meet in the first and second tables, the material, and here and there the connection of some pieces, is said to have been modified by Matthew even before Luke wrote, and the order of some pieces is

said to have been brought about by Matthew. But Matthew will probably have ordered the other with one parthia. Why, then, does the second table deviate so completely in its arrangement? Matthew's influence was therefore not sufficient until then!

b) Does the author also speak of Luke's sources? (p. 153) - so that it is not at all clear what is received from the account of Luke, and what is to come from the evangelist's own account. By the way, we believe that our earlier remarks exclude the scope of the legend, and what is meant by the second table will be revealed in the future.

\*\*\*) See Credner's opinion in the introduction to the N. T. above.

165

3) Each of these opinions will, of course, have its own merits.

The first, of the immediate connection, is based on the fact that the evangelists agree not only in content, but also in the form of the recitation, not only in thought, but also in reflection, and that this relationship can nevertheless not be explained by the measurement of an original scripture outside of them, This is all the more decisive, since the principle of agreement cannot be sought in an oral original gospel (on which last point we must, however, agree with the defenders of the opinion). As for the position of the individual evangelists in relation to one another, depending on whether they are said to be one or the other, the traces are readily selected where the alleged later either supplemented or corrected the alleged earlier, or improved the expression, or even extracted it, and presupposed it in his exposition (sometimes the circumstantial, sometimes the defective). \*)

- The second hypothesis of the indirect connection (by means of the Scriptures giving the measure) considered in and of itself, appeals, like the first, to the fact that a correspondence, as it finds place here, can only be conditioned by Scripture, and polemicalises against the oral original Gospel. Inasmuch as opinions are divided as to whether the written material to be presupposed was a whole work (like Eichhorn's Gospel) or consisted only of individual essays and collections, the former assumption appeals to the fact that in our Gospels what is communicated together (on the first table) is separated from the dual and singular sections as a whole, and to the fact that the presupposed binding of the speakers cannot in any way be regarded as a direct dependence of them on one another; The other opinion, on the other hand, does not want to accept the distinction made by the hypothesis of the Gospel of the First, but

wants the other pieces, which it sees as additions or interpolations of the allegedly original, to be thought of as being connected with the common sections in the same way as originally, and thus asserts that, because Matthew and Luke, in particular, differ in the arrangement and composition of some parallel pericopes, and because with these pericopes is sometimes connected in one evangelist what in the other is connected in a different way, - that our authors received differently connected masses which contained the same thing as a part. Both hypotheses do not lack points of support on which they can hold. \*)

- The third hypothesis, which considers the half-most likely, is of a more sceptical kind, but also leaves behind, we must say, a great deal of uncertainty. It either halves with the legend, and with the Scriptures, or with the experts and the evangelists, without delimiting its territory for each. \*\*) One does not quite know what the original content of the Gospels or the basis of their report is supposed to be, whether the oral tradition, that in its reproduction and expression written essays were used as subsidiary sources, or whether the written draft, that for its completion the material was borrowed from oral news and thus the legend was only a secondary source. Here, too, most of the confusion arises from the interference of the legend, which, by the way, cannot fail to overlook the distinctions of our texts, which we must observe so carefully. Whether, therefore, a difference between the earlier and later form of this and that of our writings has been rightly recognised, \*\*\*) which has an influence on the distinction between an indirect and direct connection between the authors of our Gospels, - yet the boundaries between the original and the later have not been definitely marked. \*) The hypothesis, however, is based on the fact of equality and inequality in our Gospel accounts, which is now undeniable.

\*) One usually finds no sure criteria about this. Whichever of the writers has once been targeted to be the later one must always be the later one, even if it is either more "or less clear and complete than the presumptive earlier one.

\*) The latter, which prefers to isolate what the former unites, also wants to explain the origin of the evangelical messages in general differently than the primordial gospel hypothesis does, namely, the evangelical records, it thinks, were based on a striving for messages that was directed only to individual things, but by no means to a whole. (S. Schleiermacher: Writings of Luk.)

\*\*) This is de Wette's opinion.

\*\*\*) At least in the Gospel of Matthew, with regard to which others are more concerned with an empty rumour of a Greek transcription of his work, but

Eichhorn is more concerned with textual data that distinguish the later editing from the original writing.

\*) Matthew and Luke, supposedly the original evangelists, are said to have come into connection with each other, sometimes through legend, sometimes through the use of written essays, because they have the same things here in the same order, and different things there in different order, and dissimilar things next to similarities. In any case, a more definite judgement could be made about this, and the view would perhaps be completely changed if it were first determined what in the Gospel of Matthew belonged to the original form of Scripture, and what was later, to be separated from it. Eichhorn's views are not to be put up with, and it cannot be denied that they are based only on a consideration of the texts according to their surface, and according to their external relationship to one another, without an examination of them according to their internal relationship having preceded them. - The opinion presented in Cred- ner's introduction is that, according to Papias' suggestion, the original texts of Matthew are the doctrinal sayings ((τά λόγια), which are related to each other in the Sermon on the Mount. Later, the Gospel of Mark, which also had a different form earlier, was mixed with these according to its original form, and Luke used the original Matthew and the later ordered Mark. The original form of Mark - what did it include? Probably, then, what the present Gospel of Matthew has in common with Mark. (See the first table.) However, there is much to be said against this assumption, just as there is against the idea that a later hand arranged the Gospel of Mark.

168

4) One of these hypotheses must be true, and since it depends on which one, we must take each of them into account in the search for data. We have therefore designated them only according to their main character, and, in so far as it is necessary for that search of the data, we have guarded each as a special and essentially different view from the other. It is advantageous, however, that the investigation can be assigned a specific area in advance, as we shall now note.

Second proposition:

The dividing point at which the views separate, or become confused, is that the contents of the first table are either separated from the material associated with it in Matthew and Luke, or are mixed with it.

(a) If the mixture takes place, and if it is assumed that Matthew and Luke, in the same way as in their books the retellings and the compositions of messages accumulate and occur next to one another, give independent, equally original deliveries, with which the whole first came into being; then Mark - the short one - has, of course, as far as we find the same thing in him, made an excerpt from those, and the gravity of the investigation then sinks to the question of how the harmony as well as disharmony that takes place between the two other evangelists is to be explained. The written Gospel of the first Gospel has been removed from the circle, and the lines of demarcation that are drawn between such a Gospel and between so-called enrichments and additions disappear.

169

Now, perhaps, from another side, the complaint will be raised that, while the Gospel of the First Word is not separated for itself, insofar as it is to be submerged in the masses of Matthew and Luke, the standard by which the relationship of these masses to one another could be judged is lost. - The other part of the evaluation, however, will all the more willingly dispense with such a standard, the more it regards that which is to be separated out in order to establish the written Gospel, in its unseparatedness and insofar as it appears to have grown up in two writings with different material, as factual proof that a written Gospel has not been Christianized, but that an oral one has.

Since, moreover, certain pieces in the whole of Mark's Gospel are found in Matthew and Luke in a different order and connection, for the sake of the latter authorities, the opinion will also be heard that Mark's work, if not an excerpt from them, must have been originally a different composite, alongside which opinion there is again the other, that it consists of fragments of different collections.

170

The opinions, so far as we have recorded them here, are all opposed to each other, and, as will be noticed, we have grasped them almost all at one root. For everything changes when that which is torn apart and incorporated into different wholes receives a different connection in these just as much as these take on a different form in the connection with it, - when this itself is rather separated from other admixtures and kept together as a whole that exists for itself. And would this happen arbitrarily? Here we touch upon the main question and the main object of investigation, which imposes itself all the more irrefutably as the main object, because reasons for decision also really seem to exist, and indeed to exist in such a way that they only want to be selected and acknowledged.

b) Considering the modifications of parallelism, the question is whether what Matthew has in agreement with Mark in a different order, and what Luke has, although standing in the same order but separated by interpolations here and there, should be claimed for the whole of Mark. In other words, whether Matthew has reorganized something given before (from n. 7 to n. 21), while Luke has interrupted the order of the given with interpolations, and each time what the two referents provide has been omitted by the third, where it is missing. If this is the case, and Matthew has reorganized differently, he must have done so to connect different things, which do not originally belong together, with the differently ordered material. And if Luke has inserted \*), one of the two has omitted what Mark has in common with the other. In that case, it would be hasty and arbitrary to consider the Gospel of Mark as nothing more than a mere excerpt from those two, and the criticism engaged in our entire question must take a different standpoint, and perhaps the question of what is original and what is later in the other Gospels will be decided more securely. At the same time, by limiting the investigation first to the shared passages of the first tablet, the advantage arises for us to begin the discussion from a specific starting point and direct our focus on a narrower defined object, or to search for the data within a narrower sphere.

\*) de Wette himself recognises this in relation to the material between Luk. 9:50. and 18:14. [Introduct. S. 158.](#)

171

Third proposition:

Assuming that what Matthew and Luke have in common with Mark belongs to a work in itself, and that the rest is addition and enrichment, there will be both inner differences, by which the original is separated from the addition to form a special whole, and there will be outer characteristics which reveal that what is connected with it did not originally have this connection. According to this, data are generally divided into internal and external.

If two works are combined with each other that originally existed by themselves, then it is already a priori certain that there will be inner characteristic features according to which it will be possible to distinguish between what belongs together and what does not, and the same will be the case if, of the elements thus mixed, only one constitutes a work in itself, while the other mixed with it consists only of fragments borrowed from elsewhere. The separation could only be quite difficult if not even the second case were to take place, and we had no whole but only fragments as constituent parts of the

mixture. We are not in the latter case with our Gospels. It has already been noted above that we have closely connected masses in the history of the Passion and of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, with which we can then also compare what precedes them, even if what is mixed in here and there consists only of particular records or fragments from other writings. We will therefore be able to find criteria for separating the original from the non-original, as is to be done. Inner and outer data, we said, will emerge. We speak of such here in relation to the related and non-relatedness of what is communicated. That which is added to the pieces, or mixed into them, will perhaps itself betray a different spirit in terms of composition than that to which it is added and mixed in, just as the latter will betray a different spirit in terms of composition. the latter a different spirit than the former. This will give inner data. If at the same time it appears that the mixture is not in the other gospels, and that what is joined and that what is united does not have this connection here, but is distributed differently, this gives an external datum. And if, finally, from the related Gospels the true nature of the piece to be separated from the admixture can itself be discerned, so that from it, according to the internal relation, it can be concluded that what is connected with it in one Gospel really does not belong to it; then, in regard to the text to be criticized, internal and external data coincide. The main difficulty in the investigation, the one that must first be overcome, will be overcome if we succeed in making the distinction mentioned here. The difficulty with the subject set before us consists in the fact that

a) we do not seem to have any certain clue in the distinctive nature of the individual texts to be compared, when it comes to setting the parallel relations in relation to one another in the relationship of the earlier and later, since the later referent can sometimes be more detailed or clearer, sometimes shorter or less clear, than the earlier one, and thus the same referent can be the later one in both cases;

b) in that in all our evangelists there are additions which are excluded from the neighbouring texts, so that each one, like the other, can be set against the other as the later one; and finally

c) in that we have no complete certainty at all as to what changes, of which the authors know nothing, were later made with our texts, and what similitudes or distortions they have undergone. We do not doubt that special reasons for decisions can be found, but the most important thing depends on whether the divorce we are talking about here is successful or not. For then

α) the view can be directed to the big picture, to the structure of the works as a whole, and one obtains results against which the changes in the smaller and narrower area decide little or nothing in the main. Then a character of the works themselves is



revealed on whose change the modifications of the individual that occur here and there can essentially have no influence, and

β) can be compared with that which the author himself has attached to the given whole, the smaller modification with which in his case the collectively given degenerates. As far as the difference between the data is concerned, we will first confirm the external ones through the internal ones, and thereby distinguish ourselves from Eichhorn, who only adhered to the external ones.

173

#### Fourth proposition:

It is, however, first of all beneficial for the investigation if, in the textual apparatus to be considered, the reiterated speeches, as that which is supposedly received, are distinguished from that which has proceeded from the productivity of the narrator himself in the representations (the reflective, as we want to call it for the sake of brevity), and thus, for the critical appraisal of the relationship presenting itself for the investigation, two spheres of consideration are divided.

The whole, which, according to what has been said, must be considered, consists of the pieces common to all three evangelists and the dual sections, as both are presented in the first table; with regard to which pieces it is to be seen whether they do not constitute a work in itself. In this whole we have already distinguished above between substance and form. The material, for instance, consists of speeches and facts, and to the form belongs the arrangement as a whole, and, when seen in detail, that which makes the narratives and representations partly something coherent in themselves (the setting of the pieces for themselves), partly in relation to something else, connected with it. This form, both as it shows itself in the arrangement of the pieces in general and as it has its particular expression in general formulas, is the work of reflection (therefore called by us the reflective \*). In our question, attention is to be paid above all to the form and that which belongs to reflection in general, because in this several writers cannot meet without having a standard of agreement before them. Now it would seem, of course, that if the reflective, as has just been said, is the main object of consideration, we should not then have to separate the referred speeches from the other elements of representation, i.e. from the general formulas, and from what the pre-narrator had to create out of himself, and consider them for themselves. For above, where we demanded this distinction between memory and reflection (p. 23), our standpoint was different. We held that an oral primal gospel was possible, and separated for it what might have flowed out of it at first as memory, and what might lead us, as reflection, to



the idea which we might have to form of the origin of such a gospel. The consideration we took there no longer binds us, now that the oral Gospel has disappeared, and can bind us all the less, since we have also noticed traces of written composition in the traditional speeches themselves, even though we called them memorials. (p. 120 f.). If, therefore, we have writings before us here as here, and here as there; it seems all the more likely that, ignoring that distinction altogether, we had to adhere solely to the re-flexional, to that in which the literary element has its main characteristic, and thus to seek the results or data only from this. For if we were to say that the speeches, though written products, are to be considered in themselves, because they are perhaps records which were made before our Gospels, or before any Gospel was formed, as one can indeed say of some of Jesus' long speeches, e.g. the Sermon on the Mount \*) that they were put into writing soon after their emission from the mouth of the speaker, and Papias also says that Matthew wrote out λόγια for himself \*\*); yet it would not be evident from these speeches themselves whether or not they had existed separately and apart from the formulas of reflection composed in connection with other parts and in relation to a scriptural whole; enough that they are now constituent parts of an evangelical whole, and have no special characteristic by which they are distinguished as a special scripture. As for the alleged λόγια of Papias in passing, it is most probable that they, assumed to exist by themselves, are not to be looked for among the speeches falling into our sphere of consideration (the first table), but perhaps elsewhere besides it (about on the second table).

\*) The speeches are indeed also a formed thing, but they can still be distinguished as something recorded by receptivity from that which is the production of the narrator.

\*) See Paulus's Commentary. 1 Th. p. 638. f.

\*\*) Which, strictly speaking, he does not say.

But all this brings something into consideration that should not be disregarded here. For, as is well known, there are also differences in the parallel relations. In view of these differences, however, a difference comes to light. For just as the opposite of these, the equality of expression, is far more admirable in the general formulas and in the field of reflection (because, as I have said, independent writers cannot meet in this without a standard); so, on the other hand, they themselves, the differences, if they have something conspicuous somewhere, are most conspicuous in the speeches, far more conspicuous here than in the formulas of reflection. For the speeches are always the

most important part of the Gospel, already as a referent in general, and then, because the other is really mostly a frame and intermediate insertion. And now the whole relationship turns out in such a way that, if the coincidence of our authors in the matter of revelation is the proof that they followed a written norm, it can now be inferred from the way in which they differ more or less in the speeches what authority they conceded to this norm, and whether here, in the most important part, they perhaps differ too much for one to be able to consider the authoritative Scripture - if, indeed, such a thing is to be presupposed at all - to be a primordial Gospel. In general, however, even if the speeches were not eliminated in themselves, the revelatory measure would in any case have to be considered in itself, as will be shown more clearly below.

176

For these reasons, then, we make the distinction between the speeches and the (historical) domain just as we distinguished the sphere of memory from the sphere of reflection at the beginning of the investigation.

#### Fifth proposition:

From the speeches extracted alone, it will now be possible to discern the twofold question of whether (according to the first hypothesis mentioned above) one author could have copied the other, or whether (according to the second hypothesis) they worked independently of each other according to an identical model. However, whether this model consisted of a Protestant scripture (as a whole) or of particular essays and individual collections can only be decided in the other section of the sphere to be considered, where the connection and sequence of the pieces and the plan of the whole will be taken into account.

177

This is actually self-evident. For the speeches, considered in isolation, are only fragments without any other connection, and even if it could be concluded from their content - the content of all or some of them - that they did not exist as such particular pieces on their own, it would still not be decided whether they were parts of a whole Gospel or only of certain individual collections. If we compare the parallels with them, we will only be able to see this much: whether this or that of the speakers either referred to one of the others, or to the other two at the same time, or whether he, independently of his fellow speakers, must have taken what he communicated from another source. Thus, in this area, we will not yet be able to find any grounds for a decision regarding

the third hypothesis of the partly direct and partly indirect relationship, which can only be found if we go beyond the whole sphere of what is jointly given to that in which, beyond it, the other speakers, Matthew and Luke, were especially divided. The profit to be drawn from the special consideration of the speeches will probably (to put it this way) be a negative one, that we see that one or the other evangelist could certainly not have borrowed from the other speakers, while, as far as the dependence of the others is concerned, it may be doubtful in this area of narration whether the others are dependent on one of the trinity or on a foreign authority. The negative profit, however, must perhaps already be taken into account, and even if this were not the case, we still always see how our writers, in the necessity in which they were placed by the plan of their writings to change secondary matters and some of what is to be put on the writer's account, treated the main material of their story: whether they also changed this arbitrarily, and with a temperate degree of indifference. - Of the speeches included, we do not need to recall how the long ones and those whose presentation is the main purpose of any piece come into consideration. And so we can always set out to find the data, taking the above hypotheses into account.

---

178

## Part Two

### First section: Data from the Speeches.

Here it is not only a matter of comparing scripture with oral speech, but scripture with scripture. We will therefore have to examine the texts more closely than we have done in the above treatise, and must therefore first justify a rule of measure. Since

a) several data are developed from the speeches at the same time, so that one piece will perhaps come into consideration more than once; since, furthermore,

b) we must avoid the appearance as if we were only dealing with some things that suited us, leaving others aside, and since

c) we must be careful to give our statements, which are to be given here and there in the course of the investigation, the necessary clarity while striving for brevity;

we consider it expedient to set out the texts of these speeches one after the other for the sake of clarity, and we shall use the permission to do so at the same time to accompany the texts set out in the series with brief notes, in which we shall partly draw attention to the particular manner of writing of the authors, partly note the points on which emphasis must be placed, and partly finally also intend to eliminate that which could have a disturbing influence on the investigation.

DRAFT

## a) List of speeches.

| 1) n. 1. Mark 1:7                                                                                                                                                                                               | = Luke 3:16                                                                                                                                                                | = Matth 3:11                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 1:7                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Luke 3:16 Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς·<br>[I indeed to water immerse you]                                                                                                   | Matth 3:11 Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι (εἰς μετάνοιαν)·<br>[I indeed immerse you in water (into repentance)]                                                                               |
| Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου, οὐ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν υποδημάτων αὐτοῦ.<br>[He comes who mightier than I after me, of whom not I am sufficient to untie the strap of the sandals of him] | Ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν υποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·<br>[he comes but you immerse of me of which not I am adequate the footwear of him] | ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχομενός ἰσχυρότερός μου ἴστίν, οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς τὰ υποδήματα βαστάσαι·<br>[the but behind me coming mightier of me he is, of whom not I am adequate the footwear to bear] |
| Ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι,<br>[I indeed immersed you in water]                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.<br>[he but will immerse you in spirit holy]                                                                                                                            | αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πνρὶ.<br>[he you will immerse in spirit holy and fire]                                                                            | αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτ. ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πνρὶ.<br>[he you will immerse in spirit holy and fire]                                                                                                 |

## Notes:

1) This is the first piece in which Matthew and Luke give more than Mark with words in agreement. (There will not be many of these, however).

2) The texts of Matthew and Luke, which are extended in the same way, are not quite the same,

- a) Luke lacks Matth. 3, 4. (Mark. 1, 6.) of the costume of the Baptist,
- b) Matthew does not have the verses Luke 10-15,
- c) The words of the baptist mentioned by Matthew and Luke are spoken to different persons, according to Matth. 3, 7. to the Pharisees, according to Luk. 3, 7. to the people in general.

### 3) Peculiarities within the triple parallelism:

α) The different position of the words: ἐγὼ βαπτίζω (Mark. ἐβάπτισα) ὑμᾶς. The position which Mark gives to the words corresponds just as much to his text as the other corresponds to the "longer" texts of the others. The former may have shortened the text, the latter may have lengthened it.

β) The βασιτάσαι τὰ υποδήματα is contrasted in the other two with: λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν υποδημάτων. This difference cannot stem from different translations of one and the same Syriac-Chaldean or Hebrew word, so that the words כשל and נשל could appear to be confused. For instead of כשל.

α) in the Syriac ܫܠܝܬ (solvit) e. g. Act. 7, 33. said, and נשל is not construed with the accusative, but with ܥܠ, also stands

β) with λῦσαι still: τὸν ἱμάντα, which Matthew does not have, so that no confusion of the foreign words is to be thought of. βασιτάσαι seems to have been deliberately chosen by Matthew, including a going after, which should be paralleled with the coming after of the Messiah: I am not worthy to go after him that cometh after me, as his sandal-bearer. (Others translate the βασιτάσαι tollere, according to which Matthew would express the cooðegueos, the others the sotececleos. But βασιτάσαι does not occur in the N. T., nor John 10, 33. so).

γ) In Mark the κύψας seems to be incorporated, for the sake of expression. S. I am not worthy to stoop down before him (as one who wants to perform the προσκυνεῖν), even if it is done with the intention of undoing his sandals. But to this would fit more ἄξιος than ἱκανός.

δ) Since Luke Act. 13, 25. he puts ἄξιος, which he also uses more often elsewhere; so he seems to bind himself to a given text in the present place.

4) The shorter text often relates to the longer one in such a way that it becomes intelligible only through the latter (the characteristic of the Erccrpirten), but that is not the case here. Mark himself also indicates that he does not want to give more of the Baptist's words than belongs to the εναγγίλιον. (Mark 1, 1.)

| 2) n. 9 Mark 1:40-44                                                                                                                                                          | = Luke 5:12-14                                                                                                                                                                | = Math. 8:2-4                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 1:40 – ότι εάν θέλης<br>δύναῖσαι με καθαρίσαι.<br>[that if you may want you<br>can me clean]                                                                             | Luke 5:12 – κύριε, εάν<br>θέλης, δυνασαί με<br>καθαρίσαι.<br>[lord, if you want, you can<br>me clean]                                                                         | Matth. 8:2 – κύριε, εάν<br>θέλης, δύνασαι με<br>καθαρίσαι.<br>[lord, if you want, you can<br>me clean]                                                 |
| — θέλω καθάρισθῃτι.<br>[I want you be cleaned]                                                                                                                                | 13. θέλω ...<br>[I want]                                                                                                                                                      | 13. θέλω ...<br>[I want]                                                                                                                               |
| 44. — ὅρα, μηδενὶ μηδέν<br>εἰπῆς, ἀλλ' ὑπάγε, σεαυτὸν<br>δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ<br>[you see, to no one not any<br>you might say, but you go<br>away, yourself show to the<br>priest] | 14. — και αὐτός<br>παρήγγειλε μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν,<br>ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δείξον<br>σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ<br>[and he relayed to no one<br>to say, but departing show<br>yourself to the priest] | — 4. ὁρα, μηδενὶ εἰπῆς,<br>ἀλλ ὑπάγε, σεαυτὸν δείξον<br>τῷ ἱερεῖ<br>[you see, to no one you<br>might say, but go away,<br>yourself show to the priest] |
| και προσένεγκε περί τοῦ<br>καθαρισμοῦ σου<br>[and offer about the<br>cleanliness of you]                                                                                      | και προσέν. .... Σου,<br>[and offer ....]                                                                                                                                     | καί προσένεγκε τό δῶρον<br>[and offer the gift]                                                                                                        |
| ἡ προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς<br>[which offer Moses]                                                                                                                                     | καθὼς προσέτ. ...<br>[as directed ...].                                                                                                                                       | ὁ προσέτ. ...<br>[which directed....]                                                                                                                  |
| εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.<br>[into testimony to them]                                                                                                                             | ... αὐτοῖς.<br>[... to them]                                                                                                                                                  | ... αὐτοῖς.<br>[.... to them]                                                                                                                          |

## Notes:

1) The texts are almost identical word for word, which is all the more striking when one compares similar narratives such as Luk 17:11-14. No words are referred to in the play other than those that have been extracted.

2) The speakers differ in the use they make of the narrative. Mark and Luke add a similar, but not quite the same, remark, which is not lost on Matthew, who presents the piece differently.

3) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Matth. v. 4. προσένεγκε τῷ δώρον comp. Matth. 2:11. προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα.

b) Luk. v. 4. παρήγγειλε - εἰπεῖν comp. Act. 1, 4. παρήγγειλε - μή χωρίζεσθαι. Luk. 8:29., also ch. 9:21. is peculiar to Luke the formula. - v. 4. καθώς. The formula καθώς προσέταξε is otherwise peculiar to Matthew, Matth. 21:6. 1:24; but in Luke καθώς and καθότι are especially in frequent use, see ch. 1:2, 55, 70. 6:31. 11:30. Act. 11:29.

c) Mark. V. 40. ὅτι. This ὅτι. before the speeches, mixing two constructions, occurs in none so frequently as in him; see ch. 1: 15. 6:35. 8:16. 12:6. - v. 44. μηδενὶ μηδέν comp. 11:14. μηκέτι μηδέες. ουκ - ουδεν 15:4. ονκέτι ουδέν v. 5. - ουδένι ουδόν 16:8. ουδεῖς ουκίτι 12:34. rc. As it is particularly emphasized in Mark that Jesus wished to get rid of the sick man as quickly as possible, and not to make the least fuss about the matter; so the amplification here added (tell no one anything at all) serves to make the expression more definite. Mark shows this purpose with such additions several times; compare above 1:7, κάψας. 2:25. ὅτε (χρεῖαν εσχε) υ. a. St.

4) Lest it should appear for the present that Matthew has given the piece its proper position; it is to be remarked concerning the sense, that the words are not to be thus explained: offer, ut quantopere suspiciam legis Mosaicae decreta testimonium exhibeatur Judaeis (Fritzsche's commentary on Matth, at d. St.), but εἰς μαρτύρων αὐτοῖς wants to say: say thou of the healing nothing; they (the people) may see for themselves that thou art healed when thou bringest thy purification offering.



And this fits in perfectly with the fact that Jesus does not want to make a fuss about the matter. In passing, it should be noted which expressions Mark does not have in common with the others.

-----

| 3) n. 9. Mar. 2:5-11.                                                                                                                                               | = Luk. 5:20—24.                                                                                                                                                                 | = Matth. 9:2-6.                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 2:5 τέκνον, αφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.<br><br>[child, forgiven of you the sins]                                                                                 | Luk. 5:20 ἄνθρωπε, αφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου.<br><br>[man, forgiven to you the sins of you]                                                                                  | Matth. 9:2 τέκνον, αφέωνταί σοι .... σου.<br><br>[child, forgiven to you ... of you]                                    |
| 7. τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τις δυναταί ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μή εἰς ὁ θεός;<br><br>[what? This thus blasphemies; who? Can forgive sins, if not one the God;] | 21. τις ἔστιν οὗτος, ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τις δυναταί ἀφιέναι ... εἰ μή μόνος ὁ θεός;<br><br>[who he is this who speaks blasphemies; who can forgive ... if not alone the God;] | 3. οὗτος βλασφημεῖ.<br><br>[this blasphemes]                                                                            |
| 8. τί (ταῦτα'ι) διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν<br><br>[what (these contemplate in the hearts of you)]                                                           | 22. τί διαλογίζεσθε .... ὑμῶν;<br><br>[what contemplate ... of you;]                                                                                                            | 4. ἵνα τί ὑμεῖς ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρά;<br><br>[so that why you think evil;]                                                 |
| 9. τί ἐϋτὶν εὐκοπώτερον εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι;<br><br>[what? It is easier to say to the paralyzed forgiven you the sins;]                   | 23. τί ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτ. εἰπεῖν' ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου;<br><br>[what it is easier to say forgiven to you the sins of you]                                                   | 5. τί γὰρ ἐστὶν εὐκοπ. εἰπεῖν' ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,<br><br>[that for it is easier to say forgiven to you the sins] |
| ἢ εἰπεῖν' ἐγείραι, ἄρον σου τὸν κράββατον καὶ περιπατεῖ;<br><br>[or to say rise, take up of                                                                         | ἢ εἰπεῖν' ἐγείραι κ. περιπατεῖ;<br><br>[or say rise and walk]                                                                                                                   | ἢ εἰπεῖν' ἐγείραι καὶ περιπατεῖ;<br><br>[or to say rise and walk]                                                       |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| you the mat and walk;]                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 10. ἵνα δέ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι<br>ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ<br>ανθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς<br>αφίεναι ἁμαρτίας<br><br>[that but have seen that<br>authority has the son of<br>man unto the earth forgive<br>sins] | 24. ἵνα δέ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσ.<br>.... ἁμαρτίας<br><br>[that but may have seen,<br>that authority .... sins]                                                                         | 6. ἵνα δε εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσ.<br>.... ἁμαρτίας<br><br>[that but may know, to you<br>authority ... sins]                                                   |
| 11. Σοι λέγω' ἐγειραι, *)<br>ἄρον τον κράββατόν σου<br>και ὑπάγε εἰς τον οἶκόν<br>σου.<br><br>[to you I say rise take up<br>the mat of you and go<br>away into the house of<br>you]               | σοι λέγω' ἐγειραι κ. ἄρας<br>τό κλινίδιόν σου, πορευου<br>εἰς τον οἶκόν σου.<br><br>[to you I say rise and take<br>up the support frame of<br>you, travel into the house<br>of you] | ἐγερθεῖς ἄρόν σου την<br>κλίνην και ὑπάγε εἰς τον<br>οἶκόν σου.<br><br>[raised take up of you the<br>support frame and go away<br>into the house of you] |

\*) This seems to be how it should be read here (surge[?], instead of: ἐγειρε,, age[?]), since καὶ ἡγέρθη is repeated on it.

183

#### Notes:

1) Here, too, we place the related texts next to each other. - The piece makes double questions (after the recension of Mark and Luke), as also other relations do, e.g. n. 30. Mark. 9:19. (Matth. 17:17.), where Luke deviates. n. 42. Mark. 11:28. (Matth. 21:23. Luk. 20:2.) n. 6. Mark 1:27. (Luk. 4:36. deviates). n. 20. Mark. 6:2. (Matth. 13:54. deviates).

2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Matthew: v. 3. οὗτος βλασφημεῖ briefly and without circumlocution as ch. 26:65. ἐβλασφήμησε (where Matthew prefixed this word, but Mark did not). Ch. 14:16. οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν (which the neighbouring texts have not). - ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρά is also intended to express more definitely. s. Ch. 1:20. 12:25. - v. 6. ἐγερθεῖς, for this particip. has Matth. preference, s. Ch. 2:13.14. 20. 21. 9:19.

(b) Luke: v. 20. άνθρωπε. Likewise ch. 12:14. 22:58. as 22:57. 13:21. - v. 20. τις ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὅς κ. τ. λ. comp. 20:2. τις ἐστὶν ὁ δοῦς κ. τ. λ. (Mark 11, and Matt. 21:23. τίς σοι ἔδωκε as here) Luk. 8:45. τις ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; (Mark 5:30. as here, τις μου ἀψατο;) chap. 7:49. same formula: τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὅς - ἀφ'ἡσσι ; - v. 24. πορευομένου comp. 7:50. 8:48.

c) Mark: v. 9. τῷ παραλυτικῇ again a provision which the modern texts do not make.

184

3) This piece, by the way, gives the strangest sample of the harmony of our writers. That there can be no question here of any difference that would betray itself as a different translation of a Hebrew original is self-evident. - The pericope is crowned by all three speakers with a general concluding formula.

|                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4) n. 10. Mark 2:14-22                                                                                                                         | = Luke 5:27-39                                                                                                                                    | = Math. 9:9-17                                                                                                      |
| Mark 2:14 ἀκολουθεῖ μοι.<br>[follow me]                                                                                                        | Luke 5:27 ἀκολούθει μοι.<br>[follow me]                                                                                                           | Math. 9:9 ἀκολούθει μοι.<br>[follow me]                                                                             |
| 16 τί ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν<br>κ. αμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ<br>πίνει;<br>[what why with the tax<br>collectors and sinners does<br>he eat and drinks] | 30 δια_τί μετὰ τῶν<br>τελωνῶν κ. αμαρτωλῶν<br>ἐσθίετε κ. πίνετε;<br>[because of with the tax<br>collectors and sinners does<br>he eat and drinks] | 11 δια_τί μετὰ ... ἐσθίει (ὁ<br>διδάσκαλος υμῶν);<br>[because of with .... Eat<br>(the teacher of you;)]            |
| 17 οὐ χρειαν ἔχουσι οἱ<br>ἰσχυῶντες ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ<br>κακῶς ἔχοντες.<br>[no need have the strong<br>of a physician, but the sick<br>being]    | 31 οὐ χρειαν ἔχουσιν οἱ<br>υγιαίνοντες ἰατροῦ ....<br>ἔχοντες.<br>[no need have the well the<br>physician .... being]                             | 12 οὐ χρειαν ἔχουσιν οἱ<br>ἰσχυοντες ἰατροῦ ....<br>ἔχοντες.<br>[not need have those<br>strong physician ... being] |
| οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι<br>δικαίους, ἀλλὰ<br>αμαρτωλοῦς.<br>[not I came to call the                                                                  | 32 οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι<br>.... αμαρτωλοῦς (εἰς<br>μετάνοιαν)<br>[not I have come to call ...                                                      | 13 (O*) οὐ γάρ ἦλθον<br>καλέσαι .... αμαρτωλοῦς.<br>[not for I came to call ...<br>sinners]                         |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| righteous, but sinners]                                                                                                                                                                                                      | sinners (to repentance)]                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <p>18 δια_τί οί μαθηταῖ Ἰωάννου και οί τών φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν,</p> <p>[because of why the disciples of John and who the Pharisees fast]</p>                                                                               | <p>33 δια_τί οί μαθηται Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσι (πυκνά, κ. δεήσεις ποιούνται) ομοίως καὶ οί τών φαρισαίων.</p> <p>[because if the disciples of Joh fast (often and prayers make) likewise and those the Pharisees]</p> | <p>14 δια_τί ημεῖς και οί φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν πολλά,</p> <p>[because if we and the Pharisees fast often]</p>                                                                         |
| <p>οί δέ σοι μαθηται οὐ νηστεύουσι;</p> <p>[who but your disciples not fast]</p>                                                                                                                                             | <p>οί δέ σοι ἐσθίουσι καί πίνουσι;</p> <p>[who but yours eat and drink]</p>                                                                                                                                       | <p>οί δὲ μαθηται σου ου νηστεύουσι;</p> <p>[who but disciples yours not fast]</p>                                                                                                     |
| <p>19 μή δύνανται οί υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφώνας, ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστι, νηστεύειν; (Ο.)</p> <p>[not are able the sons of the bridechamber in which the bridegroom with them is, fast]</p>                                    | <p>34 μη δύνασθε τους υιούς τοῦ νυμφώνας, ἐν ᾧ ..... ἐστι, ποιῆσαι νηστευειν;</p> <p>[not are able the sons of the bridechamger, in which .... Is to make to fast]</p>                                            | <p>15 μή δύνανται οί υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφώνας νηστεύειν, ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὁ νυμφίος;</p> <p>[not can the sons of the bridechamber fast, as long as with them is the bridegroom]</p> |
| <p>20 ἐλεύσονται δέ ἡμέραι, ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις.</p> <p>[will come however the days when taken away from them the bridegroom and then fast in the days those]</p> | <p>35 ἐλεύσονται δέ .... ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύουσιν .... ἐκείναις.</p> <p>[will come however ... the bridegroom then east ... those]</p>                                                                         | <p>ἐλεύσονται δέ ἡμέραι, ὅταν .... ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν.</p> <p>[will come however days, when .... the bridegroom, and then fast.]</p>                                     |
| <p>21 ουδεις ἐπίβλημα ράκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιήράπτει ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· εἰ δέ μή, αἶρει το πλήρωμα τό</p>                                                                                                                         | <p>36 ουδεις ἐπίβλημα ἱματίου καινού ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν" εἰ δέ μήγε, καὶ τό καινόν σχίζει</p>                                                                                                          | <p>16 ουδεις δέ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπίβλ. ράκους ἀγνάφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· αἶρει γάρ τό πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ</p>                                                                                 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>καινόν τοῦ παλαιού, καὶ χεῖρον σχῖσμα γίνεται.</p> <p>[no one a patch of cloth unshrunk sews on clothing old; if now not tears the patch the new from the old, and worse tear happens.]</p> | <p>(O).</p> <p>[no one a patch a garment new a piece on garment old if however]</p>                                                                                                                                    | <p>τού ἱματίου, καὶ χεῖρον σχῖσμα γίνεται.</p> <p>[no one but puts a patch of cloth unshrunk tears away for the patch of it from the garment, and worse tear happens.]</p> |
| <p>22 καὶ ουδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ασκοὺς παλαιούς·</p> <p>[and no one puts wine new into wineskins old]</p>                                                                               | <p>37 καὶ ουδεὶς βάλλει .... παλαιούς·</p> <p>[and no one puts old]</p>                                                                                                                                                | <p>17 ουδὶ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ... παλαιούς·</p> <p>[nor pour wine new into ... old]</p>                                                                              |
| <p>εἰ δὲ μή, ρήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ασκοὺς, κ. ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ασκοὶ ἀπολύνται·</p> <p>[if now not, burst the wine the new wineskins, and the wineskins destroyed]</p>            | <p>εἰ δὲ μη_γε, ρήξει ὁ νέος οἶνος τοὺς ασκοὺς, καὶ αὐτός ἐκχυθήσεται, κ. οἱ ασκοὶ ἀπολύνται·</p> <p>[if now otherwise, will burst the new wine the wineskins, and it will spill out, and the wineskins destroyed]</p> | <p>εἰ δὲ μη_γε, ρήγνυνται οἱ ασκοὶ κ. ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, κ. οἱ ...</p> <p>If now lest, burst the wineskins and the wine pours out and the ....]</p>                         |
| <p>ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ασκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.</p> <p>[instead wine new into wineskins new must be put]</p>                                                                                    | <p>38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ασκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.</p> <p>[but wine new into wineskins new must be put]</p>                                                                                                             | <p>ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς .... καινοὺς, (καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται).</p> <p>[but pour wine new into ... new, (and both preserved)]</p>                             |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                | 39 (O)                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                            |

\*) The character O indicates that something is switched on [activated? Connected? Inserted?] here.

1) Matthew also connects this piece with the previous one. However, if one considers the content and setting, one cannot subscribe to the idea that both pieces have constituted a particular essay.

2) All three relations are essentially one; also, in all three copies, the play has no general closing formula.

3) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Matthew: v. 11. ὁ διδάσκαλος υμῶν. Matthew is in the habit of defining subject and object more precisely even where others do not do so. A register of examples will be given by us in another place. The designation of Jesus in the speech of the Jews with the young is also found in Matth. 17:24, - v. 16. αἶρει γάρ, carelessly, since v. 17. the verse, has the εἰ δέ μή of the others also. The γάρ, however, Matthew is fond of using for himself alone. S. n. 9. Matth. 9:5. 24. 12:8. 13:12. 15:2. 28, 5. etc. - v. 15. πενθεῖν, as we have already noticed above, is only a wrong reading. - In τότε ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεαῖς is omitted; as Matthew also ch. 24:22. is satisfied with the mere τότε, where Mark (ch. 13:19. ) puts: ἴσονται γάρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐχεῖναι θλίψιν - v. 17. οὐδέ βαλλονσιν comp. 5:15. οὐδέ χαέουσι (Luk. 9:16. 11:33. οὐδεὶς κ. τ. λ.) - ρήγνυνται οἱ ασκοί. Likewise the passive ch. 24:22. ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι, whereas Mark has a construction similar to the one here: ὁ κύριος ἐχολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας. Matthew again writes more carelessly here. For as well as v. 16. was said: τό πλήρωμα αἶρει κ. τ. λ. also had to be written here v. 17: ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος ρήσσει κ. τ. λ. Matthew's chief distinction from the others is v. 14. where the question is put into the mouths of John's disciples themselves. In consequence of this, the opposing expression: οἱ δέ αὐτοὶ μαθηταί (Mark, and Luk.) had also to be changed. (since disciples are no longer distinguished from disciples). The question is: did Matthew change this, or does he have the original?

b) Luke v. 30. διὰ τί - ἐσθάτε καὶ πίνετε; direct address to the disciples. Because below, according to the common text, the disciples are reproached for not fasting, Luke wants the reproach to refer to the fact that they are not fasting now by partaking of the banquet (as if this day had been a day of fasting for the disciples of John and the Pharisees). Therefore, he first lets the disciples themselves be directly questioned, so that afterwards, when Jesus enters into the conversation and the disciples are spoken of in the third person, the same subject remains as the cause of the conversation. Hence, instead of οὐ νηστεύοιαι, the expression: ἐσθίουσι κ. πίνουσι v. 33. because the disciples were thus addressed διὰ τί - ἐσθίετε κ. πίνετε; v. 30. We have here an example of combination and simplification, such as will occur several more in Luke. - The question is: is this textual modification correct? - v. 31. οἱ υγιαίνοντες comp. 7:10. 15:27. - v. 32. there must be no comma after αμαρτωλοὺς, because καλέσαι and εἰς μετάνοιαν belong together. But it is also clear from the position that the latter is only an addition. - v. 33. καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται. Luke mentions gem with fasting praying; comp. 2:37. and are favourite words with him. (Mark 9:29. Matt. 17:21. put: προσευχαί) - οἱ δέ

σοι κ. τ. λ. μαθηται is not repeated. Luke avoids tautologies. So also v. 37. the word: οίνος is not repeated, but αυτός is put for it. - v. 34. μή δύνασθε ποιήσαι. This is how Luke wrote on purpose. Let the opponents see for themselves whether they can change the matter.

c) Mark has a text here that follows one of the secondary texts and then another. S. v. 16 (Matth, v. 12.) v. 19 (Matth, v. 15.) v. 22 (Matth, v. 16.) v. 17 (Matth, v. 12.) - v. 20 (Luk, v. 35.) v. 22 (Luk, v. 38.), even some verses contain parts of both texts v. 18. 22.

4) The mutual deviations do not behave like different translations, but are based on a special choice of expression. Thus the passage Matth, v. 14. v. 17. the addition καί - συντεροῦνται. -Luc. v. 30. 33. 34. 36.

5) We have had to designate intercalations in all the texts, namely Matth, v. 13. πορευθέντες δέ μάθετε, τί ἐστὶν ἐλεον θέλω κ. ου θυσίαν which passage is also found in Matth. 12:7. - Mark. v. 19. ὅσον χρόνον μεθ' ἐαυτῶν ἐχουσι τὸν νυμφῖον, οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν, which is a tautological repetition. - Luk. 5:39. καὶ οὐδεὶς πινὼν παλαιὸν εὐθέως θέλει νέον" λέγει γάρ' ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερος ἐστίν. This addition is already indicated by the mottoes attached to v. 36: καὶ τὼ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνεῖ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ. - The question is whether these are really interpolations inserted by the speakers into an earlier text?

188

6) The meaning of Jefu's speech has very often been misunderstood. We have here gnomes into which it is not allowed to enter. Their purpose is to give examples of how two things (these need not be something new and something old), when mixed together (as is to be done here with joy and fasting), destroy themselves (and render each other ineffective), whereas they are both, kept apart, good in themselves. A new rag on an old garment only does harm, like new wine in old wineskins. Fasting is good in its time, but now, when people are in the mood for joy, it makes just such a combination of the incompatible as that mentioned in those examples. Fasting spoils joy, and with joy becomes no real fasting. (No πένθειν, as this is substituted for the νηστεύειν Matth, v. 15. as a glosseme). - Of the old and new spirit of doctrine (!) (Schleierm.: Schriften des Luk. p. 80.) there is no mention at all. But one must understand the meaning correctly in order to judge the text of Luke correctly.

|                            |                |                     |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 5) n. 11. Mark. 2:24 — 28. | = Luk. 6:2 —5. | = Matth. 12: 2 — 8. |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|

|                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                        |                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                        |                                                                                                    |
| Mark 2:24. ἰδε, τι ποιουσιν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι, ο οὐκ ἔξεστι;                                                                              | Luke 6:2 τῖ ποιείτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι;                               | Matth. 12:2 ἰδοὺ, οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν ο οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ.                          |
| 25. οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησε Δαβὶδ, ὅτε (χρεῖαν ἔσχε καὶ) ἐπείνασεν αὐτός καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ;                                        | 3. οὐδέ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησε Δαβὶδ, οπότε ἐπείνασεν .... αὐτοῦ ὄντες;              | 3. οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησε Δαβὶδ, ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτός κ. οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ;                            |
| 26. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Ο) καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὐδ' οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερευσιν, καὶ ἔδω- | 4. ὡς εἰσῆλθεν .... τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσθ. (ἔλαβε καὶ) ἔφαγε καὶ ἔδωκε κ. | 4. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν .... τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς ... ἔφαγεν, οὐς οὐκ ἔξόν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδέ τοῖς |
| κε καὶ τοῖς συν αὐτω οἰσιν;                                                                                                             | τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἐξεβη ... μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;                              | μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;                                                            |
| 27. (Ο.) 28. (ὥστε) κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.                                                                  | 5. (ὅτι) κύριός ἐστιν ὁ .... τοῦ σαββάτου.                                             | 5. (Ο. 6. 7.) 8. κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.                                |

189

Notes:

1) This piece also has no general closing formula, but ends with the speech. The speech and the occasion for the speech are in the relationship that, for all its brevity, the pericope forms a complete whole.

2) Peculiarities of the expression:

a) Matthew: v. 2. again adds the subject as in n. 10. Matth. 9:9. ὁ διδάσκαλος υμῶν. V. 4. the text is more contracted, "Which he and his companions were not allowed to eat, except the priests." In the other texts there is no concrete before εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, but it is absolute: whom no one was allowed to eat. Attention should be paid to this passage, v. 5 - 7. are marked as intercalation. It will have to be examined more closely whether an earlier text has really been mixed with a later addition. The interpolation, however, would only elaborate on what was already given. -



b) Luke: v. 2. τί ποιεῖτε, again direct address to the disciples, as above n. 10. Luk 5:30. The question is: is this alteration or original text? - V. 3. οὐδέ τούτο, ο instead of τί comp. ch. 22:60. (There Mark 14:68. again τί) v. 4. ὥς, if it be eight, should be closely connected with ἐποῖησε (which David, when he hungered, did by going in), whereas the πως of the rest makes a paragraph by itself, and follows more closely ἀνίγνωτε. Luke loves this also elsewhere in the nearer determination, e. g. ch. 20:37. ἐμήνυσε ὥς λίγει, 21:29. ch. 22:61. ὑπεμνησθη ὥς εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Luk. 8:47. (in the Mark C. L. correct it in the passages Mark. 9:21. 12:26.) v. 4. ελαβε κ. εγαγε two words for one. We will give below a list of the passages in which Luke shows the habit of writing in this way. Compare, however, ch. 5:33. above in n. 10. νηστεύουσι καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται,

c) Mark: v. 25. ὅτε χρεῖαν εσχέ again an addition for the sake of explanation. It is probably cingewrought (as above in n. 1. κῦψας). For judging from the construction of the words, the phrase: αὐτός καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ probably had only one verbum before it. If one puts a comma at ἐπεΐνασεν (against the spelling of ours), so that the αὐτός κ. τ. λ. should belong to both, to χρεῖαν εσχέ as to ἐπεΐνασεν, the harshness is still more striking. - v. 26. Whether ἐπὶ ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερεῶς (i.e., at the time of Abiathar) was an addition of Mark himself, may be doubted just as much as that the insertion ch. 1:2. came from himself. - v. 27. is like an insertion in the other texts, at least in Luke's. This is the second passage of this kind. This is the second passage of this kind. (The first occurred above in n. 10. Mark 2:19.) Here probably the expression κύριος occurring v. 28. is to be explained. It is explained in a similar manner to that saying, spoken to the woman: he shall be Lord of Lein, which in the passage 1 Cor. 11:9. also receives the explanation: οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα. Mark then makes the inference with as ch. 10, 8. (Matth. 19,6.)

190

3) Here too there are no traces of different translations from Heb. or Aram.

191

| 6) n. 12. Mark. 3:3.4.                                                                            | = Luk. 6:8.9.                                                                          | = Matth. 12:11.12.                                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 3:3 ἐγείραι εἰς τὸ μέσον. 4. — ἐξεστὶ τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι | Luk. 6:8 ἐγείραι (καὶ στήθι) εἰς τὸ μέσον. 9. (ἐπηρωτήσω ὑμᾶς τί) ἐξεστὶ τοῖς σάββασιν | Matth. 12:10 is missing. 12. — ὥστε ἐξεστὶ τοῖς σάββασιν καλῶς ποιεῖν. |

|             |                                                              |  |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| ή ἀπολέσαι; | ἀγαθοποιήσαι ή<br>κακοποιήσαι, ψυχήν σώσαι<br>ή απολέσαι. *) |  |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--|

\*) The reading ἀποκτεῖναι, to which the word is spoken (see Fritzsche's commentary on Mark at St.) cannot be defended. For

1) it might well be asked whether it was lawful on the Sabbath to let a life perish (ἀπολέβειν), but not whether it was lawful to put a life to death on that day.

2) From the fact that a life may not be killed, it would not follow that it must be saved (ἀποκτεῖναι and ἀποΖεσαι are not one).

3) Matth. text also does not bring up a ἀποκτεῖναι. For his examples of saving life given v. 11. have only the ἀπολέσαι for their antithesis.

4) Jesus is said to be referring to the is intended to allude to the assassination attempt made against him by the Pharisees. But none had yet been apprehended, and the Pharisees might have said, "Who then would have killed thee?"

Notes:

1) Matthew also connects this piece with the previous one. Again, these connected relations cannot be considered a particular record, because of the historical note Matth. 12:14. 15. For

a) this note, even if it is a concluding remark, does not say anything specific for a particular piece. The author must have made it his theme to tell how the Pharisees, after Jesus had once justified the violations of the Sabbath reproached to him, had become very bitter against him, but he had gone out of their sight, so that their purpose had been thwarted.

b) One would hardly be able to guess what the author's actual purpose had been, whether he had been more concerned with the content of Jesus' words, or whether his main intention had been to indicate the effect of these words.

2) Peculiarities of the presentation:

a) Matthew here gives quite different words than the others, and his narrative is similar to Luk. 14:3-6. given. Instead of the general question: is it lawful to save life, particular cases are given as a premise at the end, in which it is considered lawful to save life (as in that account in Luke); and that which in the texts of Mark and Luke stands as a question, whether it is lawful to ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, is the expression of the conclusion. The question is whether it can be shown that Matthew here changed a given text.

b) Mark and Luke have the same representation, only Luk. v. 8. again puts two words for one, cf. above at n. 11. Luk. 6:4. at n. 10. ch. 5:33.

3) Here, too, it is clear that the difference between Matthew and the others cannot be regarded as the result of different translations of one and the same Hebrew text.

|                                                                                          |                                                                                |                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7) n. 14. Mark. 3:23 — 29.                                                               | = Matth. 12:25—31.                                                             | = Luk. 11:17 — 23.                                           |
| Mark. 3:23 πώς δυναται<br>σατανάς σατανάν<br>ἐκβάλλειν;                                  | Matth. 12:25                                                                   | Luk. 11:17                                                   |
| 24. καὶ εἰάν βασιλεία ἐφ<br>εαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ<br>δύναται σταθῆναι ἢ<br>βασιλεία ἐκείνη. | πάσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα<br>μεθ' εαυτῆς<br>ἐρημοῦται.                          | πάσα βασ. ἐφ' εαυτὴν<br>διαμερισθεῖσα<br>ἐρημοῦται           |
| 25. κ. εἰάν οἰκία ἐφ εαυτὴν<br>μερισθῇ,                                                  | καὶ πάσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία<br>μερισθεῖσα μεθ' εαυτῆς                               | καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον                                          |
| οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι ἢ<br>οἰκία ἐκείνη.                                                   | οὐ σταθήσεται.                                                                 | πίπτει.                                                      |
| 26. καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανάς ἀνίατη<br>ἴφ' εαυτὸν καὶ μεμέρισται.                                | 26. καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανάς τον<br>σατανάν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ'<br>εαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη,          | 18. εἰ δὲ ὁ σατανάς ἐφ<br>ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη,                 |
| οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι, ἀλλὰ<br>τέλος ἔχει.                                                 | πώς οὖν σταθήσεται ἢ<br>βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;                                        | πώς σταθήσεται ἢ βασ.<br>αυτοῦ;                              |
|                                                                                          | v. 27.28 like Luke                                                             | v. 19.20 like Matthew                                        |
| 27. 'Ἄλλ' *) οὐδεὶς δύναται<br>τά σκεύη τοῦ ἰσχυρόν,<br>εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν          | 29. ἢ πώς δύναται τις<br>εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ<br>ἰσχυροῦ, καὶ τά σκεύη | 21. changes. —<br>22. ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερος<br>αὐτοῦ εἰσελθὼν |

|                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                      |                                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| αὐτοῦ, διαρπασαι,                                                                                                                     | αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι,                                                                                     |                                                                                                |
| ἐάν μή πρῶτον τον<br>ἰσχυρόν δῆσῃ' και τότε τήν<br>οικίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσῃ. **)                                                         | ἐάν μή πρῶτον ....<br>διαρπάσῃ                                                                       | νίκησῃ αὐτόν, τήν<br>πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἶρει ἐφ'<br>ἣ ἐπεποίθει κ. τὰ σκύλα<br>αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν. |
|                                                                                                                                       | v. 32 like Luke                                                                                      | 23 like Matthew                                                                                |
| 28. Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι<br>πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τά<br>αμαρτήματα τοῖς νίοις τῶν<br>ανθρώπων και αἱ<br>βλασφημίαι ὅσας ἂν<br>βλασφημησωσι. | 31. διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν·<br>πάσα αμαρτία και<br>βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς<br>ἀνθρώποις,              |                                                                                                |
| 29. ὡς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ<br>εἰς τό πνεῦμα τό ἅγιον, οὐκ<br>ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τόν αἰῶνα,<br>ἀλλ' ἐ'νοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου<br>κρίσεως.        | ἡ δέ του πνεύματος<br>βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται<br>τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (v. 32.<br>repetition of the name). |                                                                                                |

\*) This seems to be how it should be read. The argument consists of two propositions, one of which must be completed before we can proceed to the other. The first sentence is: Satan cannot cast out Satan, but - this is then to be added - - if this happens, it must happen through another, opposite, force. The second sentence: "But now (ἀλλά) the other power, which is different from him, cannot triumph (and successfully work against him) unless it is superior to him." - Nor can it be foreseen how the ἀλλ' could have come into the text if it were not original. The reading offered by some coäa. (taken up by Fritzsche): οὐ δυνάται οὐδεὶς cannot be justified by the other passages where Mark sets the double negation. For in those passages the amplified expression never stands in vain and without cause. But what is the meaning of the expression: "No one can enter the dwelling place of the strong, rc.", where would be the reason for doubling the negation?

\*\*) So is to be read both here and in Matthew, and not διαρπάσει, if one does not wish to tear up and disfigure the text, which has been carefully and properly arranged. Πρῶτον and τότε are interrelated. He who wrote ἐάν μή πρῶτον will also have been able to include the x "I rare in the connection, or he would, if και τότε had not belonged to the sentence, nor would he have begun the preceding clause with ἐάν πρῶτον, or set off what follows by a τότε δέ or τότε δῆ. The

coäices cannot make us believe that there is a difference in the texts here, and that Mark is to be read differently from Matthew.

194

#### Notes:

This is the second piece in which the texts of Matthew and Luke are more comprehensive than Mark, and express some things in agreement that he does not have. (The first was n. 1. No such piece occurs further on.) The difference makes a whole argumentation: εἰ δέ ἐγώ (Matth. καί εἰ ἐγώ) ἐν βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο κριταὶ ὑμῶν ἐ'αονται. Εἰ δέ ἐν δακτυλῷ Θεοῦ (Matth. ἐν πνεῦματι Θεοῦ) ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἀρα ἴφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Luk. v. 19. 20. Matth. v. 27:28.) This reasoning, why is it absent in Mark? also he lacks the verse: ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ, κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστὶν κ. τ. λ. Luk. v. 23. Matth. v. 30. Already where the occasion of Jesus' spoken discourse is mentioned, (Mark 3:22). he departs from the two other speakers at once. (Matth. 12:22.24. Luk. 11:14. 15.)

2) The extended texts of Matthew and Luke are not quite the same,

a) This piece has different additions in each of these speakers. See Luk. v. 24-26 (verses which, according to Luke's plan, seem to belong to the whole), and Matth, v. 33-37 (verses which speak of the punishability of blasphemies and evil speeches in general).

b) The text of Matthew has parts in common with the text of Mark which Luke's text does not know, Matth, v. 29-31. 29. 31. and it therefore seems as if here it is not the text of Mark, but rather that of Matthew, which is a mixture of two other texts.

c) Luke delivers the whole piece after a different treatment.

α) He says nothing about the punishability of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and it seems that the mention of this is replaced in the words Luk. v. 23, "he who is not with me is against me," which words are to be connected with the following verses (Luk. v. 24-26). ), thus: He who is not with me in the fight against the devil, and does not take part in my victory, promotes the return of this enemy, who, when he has had to vacate his dwelling, only seeks it again with the greater longing, - a connection in which Matthew does not place those words (Matt. v. 30.).

β) The speech of the overcoming of the strong Luk. v. 21. and 22. has indeed similarities with the version Mark. v. 27. Matth, v. 25. as we have noted above in the juxtaposition of the texts, but it is nevertheless differently developed. In Mark and Matthew the speech takes the turn of speaking of the condition when the strong man is to be overcome; in Luke the main moment is this: what must happen when the strong man has been overcome and the spoils taken from him, namely, that one must then hasten to the victor, and rejoicing in the victory, gather the spoils. In both accounts there are sentences with the same wording and the same circumstances (the overcoming, the robbing), and so the question is: who has the original version, Luke or the Andes? - Finally, Luke has the scripts in a completely different position.

195

3) Mark's account, though it does not express what the others do, and seems rather to leave out than to insert superfluous matter, is nevertheless complete enough to prove that the pretence that Jesus works by the power of Beelzebul is absurd, and here again it is not the case that the shorter text presupposes the more circumstantial one for its explicitness. (Cf. the note to n. 1.) What then, strictly speaking, is the relation of Mark to the others?

196

4) Peculiarities of expression:

a) in what Matthew and Luke have in common:

α) Matth, v. 25. ενθυμήσεις comp. Matth. 9,4. 5. 1, 20. - InMarkus the word does not occur at all. What Luk. puts for it: διανοήματα Luk. v. 17., which is in the N. T. a άπαξ λεγόμενον - πόλις ή οικία. The same compilation. in ch. 10, 11. 14. comp. 18, 8. - v. 28. έν πνεϋματι Θεού - on the other hand Luk. v. 20. εν δακτύλιο του Θεού. Which is more original?

β) Luk. v. 17:18. διαμεριζεσθαι comp. ch. 12: 52. 53. (Matth. 10:34. also here Matth, expresses itself differently) - in the meaning: to divide, the word does not otherwise occur in Matthew, and never in Mark, but only in the meaning: to distribute. Mark. 15:24. Luk. 23:34. Matth. 27:35.) - v. 20. τά δαιμόνια, This word occurs more frequently in Luke's writings than in Matthew's. Whether, however, it is to be ascribed to Luke rather than to Matthew, it will be necessary to await further proofs. - v. 22. This verse contains the main moment of the discourse before v. 21 (what would and must happen when the enemy, i.e. here Satan, is overcome). The positive sentence

given here, however, is preceded by another from the antithesis, which is related to it as a negative one - what would be the case if the strong man were not yet conquered. Luke, however, is in the habit of dividing the clauses in this way, see Luke 20:34. 35. οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσι καὶ ἐκγαμίσκονται' οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν, - οὔτε γαμοῦσι οὔτε ἐκγαμίσκονται - v. 23. συνάγειν and σκορπίζειν are found again in a pericope which Luke alone has Ch. 15:13. - v. 17. is οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον almost laconic brevity. Luke avoids unnecessary elaboration and tautology everywhere, but here the speech is so indistinct that one must doubt the nullity of the reading. (Οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον means: one house (when it rebels) against the other, πίπτει, - this does not seem right. It will have to be written: ὁ οἶκος ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον i.e. the house - the rulers of the house - against the house. Just such an example of short, and not correct, diction is Luk. 8:10. ὑμῖν δεδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια, τῆς βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ' τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς. For μυστήρια is not the nominative, but the accusative dependent on γνῶναι, and then is absent from: ἐν παραβολαῖς another word, such as: γίνεται).

197

b) In what Mark, and Matth, have in common. -

α) Mark. He makes here v. 24. 25. 26. the singling out (of what might be summed up) as ch. 9:43. 45. 47. (Matt. draws there again together ch. 18:8. ἡ χεὶρ ἢ ὁ ποῦς as here v. 25. πόλις ἢ οἰκία).- v. 24. 25. οὐ δύναται - comp. v. 23. Mark has the word also elsewhere where the others have not: comp. 4:32. (Matth. 13:32.) 6, 5. (Matth. 13, 58.) 9, 29. (Matth. 17:21.) - comp. 1:45. 4, 33. (But see also passages, as Matth. 12:34. πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν 12:29. (where it has Matth, with Mark, in common) 16:3. rc. - Mark, by the way, has σταθῆναι three times, while Matthew puts ἐρημοῦται at βασιλεία with Luke, but since, where Luke has no verbum, Luk. v. 17. agrees with Mark in the choice of the word.

β) Matt. v. 31. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (Mark τοῖς νίοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων), as he does at n. 9. ch. 9:8. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις puts synonymously the expression: τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου v. 6. (Mark 2:10. Luk. 5:24.) = ἀνθρώπῳ τινι. - διὰ τοῦτο looking back on the whole discourse: from this consideration, - a frequently recurring formula in Matthew, v. 32, says nothing else than v, 31.

|                                  |                                                         |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| v. 31 πᾶσα ἀμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία | v. 32. καὶ ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, |
| ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,       | ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ,                                        |

|                                          |                                             |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| ή δέ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία             | ὅς δ' ἄν εἶπη κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, |
| οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (αὐτοῖς ?) | οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ                         |
|                                          | οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰώνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. |
|                                          | Mark v. 29 οὐκ — εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κ, τ. λ.     |

That v. 32. ὅς ἄν — τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is the tautological repetition of v. 31. πᾶσα βλασφημία, Fritzsche's Commentary, on the Matth, also admits at d. St., in consideration, however, of what is remarked x. 487. Hinc patet, Matthaeum aeque ac Lucas rem sic proponere, non ut spiritus divini contumeliae quemquam umquam impetraturum veniam prae-fracte negent, ut statuere videtur Marcus 3:29. sed difficilior omnibus hoc peccatum condonatum iri declarent, — not only do we not see any such difficilior, but it is quite clear that Matth, v. 32. says nothing else at the end than what Mark v. 29.

198

5) Auch hier zeigt sich wieder keine Spur von verschiedener Uebersetzung aus dem Hebräischen. Vergl. Luk. v 22. und Matth, v. 29., die das Gegentheil beweisen.

|                                                                                          |                                                                                                   |                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8) n. 15. Mark. 3:32 — 35                                                                | = Matth. 12, 47 — 50.                                                                             | = Luk. 8:20. 21.                                                                       |
| Mark 3:32 ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσί σε.                            | Matth. 12:47 ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ... ἔξω ἐστήκασιν ζητοῦν τέσ σοι λαλήσαι.                   | Luke 8:20. ἡ μήτηρ σου κ. οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκασιν ἔξω, ἰδεῖν σε θέλοντες.             |
| 33. — τις ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου ἢ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;                                            | 48. τις ἐστὶν ἡ ... μου καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;                                           |                                                                                        |
| 34. ἰδε ἡ μήτηρ μου κ. οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.                                                   | 49. ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ μου ... μου.                                                                    |                                                                                        |
| 35. ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφή μου κ. μήτηρ ἐστί. | 50. ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ ... τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὗτός μου ἀδελφός κ. ἀδελφή κ. μήτηρ. | 21. μήτηρ μου κ. ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες κ. ποιοῦντες. |



## Notes:

1) It is obvious from the piece itself that it had to be an appendix somewhere, or that it could only occur among other messages. For whoever wanted to bring the speeches had to mention that Jesus' relatives had come to him at some point, and no one would have made a record of this alone.

199

2) Peculiarities of presentation. Those who wanted to avoid tautologies could easily condense the words of Mark, v. 33.34. Luke, then, who, as we shall find evidence enough of his habit of contraction, could be all the more brief here, since he has assigned a different position to the piece, and connected it with n. 16. of the parable of the sower. Jesus, he intends, is to declare those to be his kinsmen who are comparable to the good arable land in the parable, that is, the ἀκοῦσαντες τον λόγον κατέχονσιν (Luk. 8:15). Hence also here v. 21. the expression: οἱ τον λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντας κ. ποιοῦντας instead of: τό θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιοῦντες. Mark, v. 35. Matth, v. 50. - Luke has the similar expression ch. 11:28. οἱ ἀκούοντας τον λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ και φυλάσσοντας (marvellous, in the same piece with which in Mark and Matthew the present pericope is connected). - To judge of Luke's arrangement, we must be attentive to the ἐξω v. 20. which Luke has not denied. - ἰδεῖν σε θέλοντας comp. 22:8. ἦν γάρ θέλων ἰδαῖν αὐτόν -

(b) Matth. v. 50. τοῦ πατρός μου κ. τ. λ. peculiar expression of Matthew, compare also 7:21. [(a) has been omitted from the original text]

3) No trace of different translations from the Hebrew. For the brevity of Luke is connected with the arrangement, and because of Matthew τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖ, and because of the different θέλημα and λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ one should not look for a special Hebrew codex.

|                                                         |                                       |                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| 9) n. 16. α) Mark. 4:3 — 9.                             | = Matth. 13:3 — 9.                    | = Luk. 8:5 —8.                                       |
| Mark. 4:3 Ἀκούετε ἰδοὺ, ἐξήλθαν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν. | Matth. 13:3 ἰδοὺ, ἐξήλθεν ὁ σπείρειν. | Luk. 8:5 ἐξήλθεν .... τοῦ σπείρειν τον σπόρον αὐτοῦ' |
| 4· καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ                                    | 4. κ. ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν,           | κ. ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν, ἅ                           |

|                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                   |                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| σπείρειν ὁ μὲν εἶπεν<br>παρά τὴν οδόν.                                                                                                                  | ἀ μαν .... οδόν                                                                                   | μὲν .... τὴν οδόν                                                                             |
| κ. ἦλθε τὰ πετεινοὶ τοῦ<br>ουρανοῦ κ. κατέφαγεν<br>αὐτό.                                                                                                | .... τὰ πετεινα καὶ<br>κατέφαγεν αὐτά.                                                            | (κ. κατεπατήθη) κ. τὰ<br>πετεινὰ τοῦ ουρανοῦ<br>κατέφαγεν αὐτό.                               |
| 5. "Ἄλλο δὲ ἐπέδεν ἐπὶ τὸ<br>πετρώδες, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε<br>γὴν πολλήν'<br>καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλε διὰ<br>τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.                              | 5. "Ἄλλα δὲ ἐπέδεν ἐπὶ τὰ<br>πετρώδη, ὅπου ....<br>πολλήν' καὶ εὐθέως<br>ἐξανέτειλε διὰ .... γῆς. | 6. κ. ἕτερον ἐπέδεν ἐπὶ τὴν<br>πέτραν·<br>καὶ φυέν                                            |
| 6. ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος<br>ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ<br>ἔχειν βίζαν ἐξηράνθη.                                                                         | 6. ἡλίου δὲ .....<br>ἐξηράνθη.                                                                    | ἐξηράνθη διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν<br>ἐκμάδα.                                                           |
| 7. καὶ ἄλλο ἐπέδεν εἰς τὰς<br>ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ<br>ἀκανθαὶ καὶ συνέπνιξαν<br>αὐτό (κ. καρπὸν οὐκ<br>ἔδωκε).                                      | 7. Καὶ ἄλλα ἐπ. .... αἱ<br>ἀκανθαὶ κ. ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτά.                                             | 7. καὶ ἕτερον ἐπέδεν ἐν<br>μέδῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν, κ.<br>δυμφυεῖσαι αἱ ἀκανθαὶ<br>ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό.   |
| 8. καὶ ἄλλο ἐπέδεν εἰς τὴν<br>γὴν τὴν καλήν καὶ ἐδίδου<br>καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα κ.<br>αὐξάνοντα κ. ἔφεν 'ἐν<br>τριάκοντα κ. 'ἐν ἐξήκοντα κ.<br>'ἐν ἑκατόν. | 8. ἄλλα δὲ ἐπέδεν ἐπὶ τὴν<br>.... καρπὸν ὁ μὲν ἑκατόν ὁ<br>δὲ ἐξήκοντα ὁ δὲ<br>τριάκοντα.         | 8. κ. ἕτερον ἐπέδεν ἐπὶ τὴν<br>γὴν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, κ. φυέν<br>ἐποίηδε καρπὸν<br>ἐκατονταπλασίονα. |
| 9. ὁ ἔχων ὠτα ἀκούειν,<br>ἀκουέτω.                                                                                                                      | 9. ....                                                                                           | ὁ ἔχων .... ἀκουέτω.                                                                          |

## Notes:

1) This piece is the first of those in which Luke's text differs most in expression from the parallel texts. But he gives the parable with the same content, with the same division and position of its parts, and it is to be seen whether he must not have had the same text with the others.

2) The texts of Mark and Matthew relate to each other like original and copy, and the question is whether the difference in the number of the ἄλλο is an authentic difference, since if Mark v. 8 ἀναβαίνοντα and αὐξάνοντα is probably the nominative plural (see

Fritzsche's Commentary, on the Mark, at the St.) also in Mark instead of άλλο rather άλλα will have to be read. The variation Matth, v. 8. and Mark v. 8. does not come into consideration. But Luke's v. 8. would like to be a sample of his striving for brevity.

201

3) Peculiarities of expression:- Methodical ones are found here more

a) in Luke; e.g. the recurring v. 6. 7. 8. - v. 5. ἔπρεσε και κατεπατήθη, two words for one, as in n. 5. ch. 6:4. and ch. 5:33. -- v. 5. the addition τον σπόρον αὐτοῦ is connected with v. 11. ὁ σπόρος ἐστιν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεόν. -- v. 6. Luke has contracted the twice: διὰ τῷ μή εχειν and the ἐκαυματίσθη and ἐξηράνθη. One may find this improbable. But we will find more examples of this kind. Meanwhile, we have already had an example of contraction and abbreviation in n. 15 and others which show that Luke avoids tautologies. S. n. 10. Here v. 6. it may well be ascertained whether Luke had the same text with the others, or not. - v. 7. ἐν μέσω, but he has v. 14. εἰς τὰς like the others; just so he puts v. 8. τὴν αγαθήν, and yet v. 15. καλή, like the others. - It seems as if the author wrote with remembrance of Jeremiah 17. comp. e. g. E. g. v. 6. ἰκμάδα and ποιεῖν καρπὸν v. 8. with Jerem. 17:8. ἐν υπομονή with Zerem. 17:13. (v. 13. ἀφίστανται comp. Jerem. 17:8.) v. 8. ἐφώνει comp. ch. 8, 54. 16, 2. 24. 23, 46. - By the way, Luke has placed the piece quite differently from the others.

b) Mark. V. 7. seems to be και καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε addition, since the words of two texts are excluded at once. (Meanwhile one must here again call attention to Mark v. 9. και ἔλεγεν and Luk.v. 8. ταῦτα λέγων, which nevertheless also excludes Matthew).

4) The origin of the different texts or their differences from different translations is not to be thought of. For

a) Luke's text relates to the others only like the arbitrary adaptation of a text to the original,

b) Matthew and Mark must either have copied each other according to the Greek text, or one of them must have used a Greek translation of the other's text, which would then also have been partially transferred into Luke, and then the question would arise why Luke, if he also had to translate, did not use it completely,

c) In the following part of the play, the way in which the difference is to be explained here by different translations would again not explain the more exact coincidence of the texts. -

## b) Interpretation of the Parable.

| Mark                                                                                                                               | Matthew                                                                                                                       | Luke                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ν. 11 νμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τό μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκείναις 5ε (τοῖς ἔξω) ἐν παραβολαῖς τα πάντα γίνεται.              | ν. 11 ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τά μυστήρια τῆς βασ. τῶν ουρανῶν, ἐκείναις δέ (Ο. 12. 13.) 13. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, | ν. 10 ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι το .... βασ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῖς δέ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς·             |
| ν. 12 ἵνα βλέποντες (βλέπωσι και) μή ἴδωσι· καὶ ἀκούοντες (ἀκούωσι και μή) συνιῶσι. (Ο.)                                           | ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι κ. ἀκούοντες οὐκ ακουουσι, οὐδέ συνιοῦσι (Ο. 14—17).                                                | ἵνα βλέποντες μή βλέπωσι κ. ἀκούοντες μη αυινῶσιν.                                          |
| ν. 13 οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταυτην, καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γινωαεσθε;                                                      | 18. υμεῖς ουν ακούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν (τοῦ σπειρόντος).                                                                        | 11. ἐστὶ δέ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή·                                                                |
| ν. 14 ὁ σπείρων τον λόγον σπείρει.                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                               | ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ.                                                            |
| ν. 15 οὔτοιδὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρά τὴν ὁδόν, ὅπου ἀπείρεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὅταν ακούσωσιν, ευθέως ἐρχεται ὁ σατανὰς καὶ αἶρει τον λόγον τον | 19. παντός ακούοντας τον λόγον τῆς βασ. καὶ μή συνιέντος ἐρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς κ. αρπάζει τό                                      | 12. οἱ δὲ παρά τὴν ὁδόν, εἰαῖν οἱ ἀκούοντες· εἴτα ἐρχεται ὁ διάβολος κ. αἶρει τον λογον απο |
| ἐσπαρμένον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.                                                                                                 | ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρά τὴν ὁδόν σπορεῖς.                                                           | τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν (ἵνα μή πιστεύβαντες σωθῶσιν).                                            |
| 16. κ. οὔτοί εἰσιν ομοίως οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι, οἱ, ὅταν ακούσωσι τον λογον, ευθέως μετὰ χαράς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν.         | 20. ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπορεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τον λόγον ακούων κ. ευθύς μετὰ χαράς λαμβάνων αὐτόν.                           | 13. οἱ δε ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας, οἱ, ὅταν οκού σωσι, μετὰ χαράς δέχονται τον λόγον '               |

|                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ν. 17 κ. οὐκ ἔχουσι ρίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ προσκαιροὶ εἶβιν· εἴτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ δια τον λογον, ευθέως σκανδαλίζονται.                               | 21. οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ρίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρος ἐστίν· γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τον λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται.                                    | καὶ οὗτοι ρίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσι, οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστευουσι κ. ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται.                                               |
| κ. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας βπειρομενοι, οἱ τον λογον ακούοντες,                                                                                           | 22. ο δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπορεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τον λόγον ἀκούων,                                                                                          | 14. τό δὲ εἰς τὰς ... πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,                                                                               |
| 19. καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος κ. ἡ ἀπάτη *) τοῦ πλούτου κ. αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσπορευόμεναι αὐμπνίγουσι τον λόγον, κ. ἀκαρπος γίνεται.                 | κ. ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου<br>κ. ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγει τον λόγον" κ. ἀκαρπος γίνεται.                                                          | κ. ὑπὸ μερίμνων κ. πλούτου κ. ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι **) συμπνίγονται' κ. οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι.                                       |
| 20. κ· αὐτοὶ εἰϋῖν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γην τὴν καλὴν σπαρεντες, οἵτινες ἀκονουσι τον λόγον κ· παραδέχονται, κ. καρποφοροῦσιν (ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα κ. ἐν εκατόν). | 23. ο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν γην τὴν καλὴν σπαρεις, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τον λόγον ἀκωνων κ. σϋνιών' ὅς δὴ καρποφορεῖ (κ. ποιεῖ ὁ μεν ἑκταον, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα). | 15. τό ὅε ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἵτινες (ἐν καρδία καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθή,) ἀκούσαντες τον λόγον κατέχουσι καὶ καρποφοροῦϋιν ἐν υπομονῇ. |

203

\*) I am very suspicious that instead of ἀπάτη, both Mark and Matthew would like to read: ἀγάπη. Some Latin. Copies have: et et delectationes mundi, (see Griesbach) and the words ἀπάταν and ἀγαπάν are known to have been often confounded; e.g. ψ. 78, 36. the 70th καὶ ἡγάπησαν Dageg. Breitingen: ἡπάτησαν. - 2 Chron. 18:2. ἡγάπα, for which to read: ἡπάτα. (See Biel. thes. T. I. p. 7.)

\*\*) Here we must try to restore a corrupted reading, as the ordinary text gives no sense. Mark leads us on the right track; for the coincidence of the: εἰσπορευόμενοι in Mark and the πορευόμενοι in Luke cannot be accidental. It will have to be read in Luke: καὶ ὑπὸ μερίμνων πλούτου (καὶ struck out) καὶ (scil. ὑπὸ) ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου εἰσπορευομένων σνμπνίγονται.

204

Notes:

1) The content of this text parable is also essentially the same, as is the structure and form. In response to a question addressed to Jesus in a private conversation, the disciples are told the interpretation of the parable, and this interpretation is given by the texts with the same content. It is true that the usual idea is that Matthew's relation to the purpose of the parables used by Jesus in teaching the people gives a different explanation than Mark's and Luke's, that according to the latter Jesus used the parables to clarify, according to the former to conceal the teaching, and as if this were the main difference between the authors. - As much as this opinion may seem to be correct, it is not; at least the difference between the texts is not based on this point. In Matthew, too, the parabolic is the deficient, the shadow of the essence, and Jesus regrets, here as there, that he can only give the people the parable. That is why in Matthew

- a) The disciples are praised for the fact that they can be given more than the mere parable v. 16, which would make no sense if the parables were the clearer.
- b) How could Jesus consider the parables to be the clearer if he had to fear that the disciples would not understand them either?
- c) Is it said that the disciples can receive, while those are taken away, v. 12. cf. v. 15. This remains even if διὰ τοῦτο is referred to ἀρθήσεται, and thus only becomes clearer.
- d) If the parables had been the easier; no wondering question would have been put into the mouths of the disciples as to why Jesus spoke in parables, v. 10.
- e) If Jesus had not needed to explain the parable to the disciples, of which all texts want to show the necessity. And how could the disciples be thought to have been sincerely praised before the cloud, that their ignorance of what seemed to be suitable for the understanding of the people, for the sake of greater ease, had been remedied? - Thus the texts do not give a different judgement on the relation of the parables in regard to their comprehensibility \*).

\*) The meaning of Matth, v. 13 is: because they are too dull to think about the truth that is presented without pictures, I give them something that is not the thing itself, so that they may, if possible, be prompted to think.

2) The piece cannot have been a particular essay. It wants to show how and why Jesus interpreted to his disciples certain parabolic discourses spoken before the people,

Matth. v. 11, Mark v. 11, Luk. v. 10, Mark v. 34. - Now Jesus undoubtedly always did this according to custom. Why, then, this particular subject, and only these examples taken to prove the point? - Schliermacher (Writings of Luke, p. 116), in order to make its origin as a particular essay comprehensible, attributes to the piece the purpose of glorifying the women who, according to Luke 8:1-3, had joined Jesus' entourage with the explanations about the good land and the explanations about the relationship with Jesus. But if this was really the plan of the play according to Luke's account, it would have to be examined whether Luke did not deviate from the intention of the original author, since according to the other authors the pericope undeniably does not have this purpose.

### 3) Peculiarities of exposition:

(a) Mark - first about his meaning. v. 11. τοῖς ἐξω. One must think of the situation under which the question is asked. Jesus was on the ship, and after the discourse was ended, he departed from the shore, with the disciples alone. \*) To these, who now ask him alone about the meaning of the discourse, are opposed οἱ ἐξω, i.e. the people outside, outside the ship. (Fritzsche z. d. St. qui foris sunt h. e. quibus non ut vobis discipulis major mecum intercedit familiaritas - not at all correct. If the disciples were in the ship with Jesus, they could not interpret the words in any other way than we have indicated \*\*). To these Jesus says: γίνεται τὰ πάντα (le tout) ἐν παραβολαῖς, i.e. the whole of the recital each time, if images and parables are chosen for it. - Actually, to the lecture, as a whole, belongs not only the parable (the partition), but also the ad-umbrated, the essence. But this is concealed from those who are obtuse, and they have the whole ἵνα χ. τ. λ. so that with seeing eyes, i.e. by having the image before them, they do not see - namely, that which is hidden behind the image. That here the τὰ πάντα ἐν παραβολαῖς γίνεται is the people's own fault, whence the ἵνα (as caused by the people themselves) cannot be conspicuous, is given by the words themselves. But Jesus wants his disciples to distinguish themselves from the people, who have the whole only in the parable, and leave it at that, so as not to penetrate to the sense. - The suggestion that the disciples, if they did not understand the parable, would not understand it at all, is in Mark 13 alone. The question is: does it belong to the original text or not? For according to this many other things could be decided. - Further, in the interpretation of the parable, Mark's distinguishing feature is this, that he prefixes the οὐτοί εἰσι (by which he means the hearers of the word, whom the teacher, resembling the sower, is now to have before him, as the sower has before him the field of seed) always as the subject, and makes the seed, and what is said of the seed, a predicate to them, instead of Luke's text making the seed mentioned in the parable the subject of the interpretation, so that the transformation of it into another subject becomes a predicate of it; s. Luk. v. 24. 25. otherwise v. 22. 23. But Matthew agrees most with

Mark. When Mark says: those who stand by the way, who are rc., Matthew says: those who stand by the way are those who are rc. The difference of expression between Matthew and Mark seems to proceed from the introductory verses: Matthew, v. 19, and Mark, v. 14. But it must be possible to determine which of the two speakers has the original text here. -

\*) These are therefore called here οἱ περί αὐτόν. Mark v. 10. i.e. those who were about him while he was κατά μάνας. - The buried συν τοῖς δώδεκα, by the way, is probably an unguarded addition, as Gloffem to οἱ περί αὐτόν. That there were others around Jesus besides the disciples is not stated in the account in v. 1, nor does it want to be, since it is only the disciples to whom the secret is revealed in v. 34. Also, Jesus' address in v. 11 is only suitable for the disciples.

\*\*) Paulus's Commentary 2 Th. p. 243. notes: since Mark was under the misunderstanding (?) that the parabolic way of teaching was chosen by Jesus (- Note: our readers may notice that Mark did not even ask the question: why the parabolic way of teaching was chosen. (Note: the ἵνα depends on a γίνεται, for which Jesus himself was not to blame, as Mark says very clearly); so he may also have thought of the expression οἱ ἐξω as something disparaging." - But Mark must have felt that Jesus, speaking in the open and not in a ship or in a room, could not have used this expression, and therefore, since he lets Jesus speak in the ship, he will not want it to be taken differently than those present there could take it.

(b) Mark and Luke.

(α) v. 9. makes the latter unanimously ask with Mark merely for the meaning of the parable presented (not, as Matth., for the cause of the parabolic doctrine). But the construction: τίς εἶη κ. τ. λ. is merely his mode of writing. - v. 10. brevity as 12, 17. (S. above on n. 14.) Also v. 12. the mere μή βλιῖπωσι (instead of Isa. 6:9. 10. βλέποντες βλέπωσῃ shows a striving after brevity. - v. 11. he alone has: ο σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. But even so also v. 5. τὸν σπόρον αὐτόν. -v. 12. may be proved from the altered construction of the words: αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας (instead of: αἶρει τὸν λόγον, τὸν εσπαρμενον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ), that it is formed after Luke's manner. Cf.

|                                                                     |                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 6:11. ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χόυν<br>ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν (Matth. 10:14. | Luk. 9:5. ἀποτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτόν<br>ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶνυμῶν. - ποδῶν |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|



|                                                                    |                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| τόν κονιορτόν τών ποδών) - ποδών<br>not connected with the verbum. | connected with the verbum, as here:<br>τῆς καρδίας |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|

- ινα μή πιστεύσαντες σεοθώσιν vergl. Act, 2:47. and Luk. 8:50. πίστευε κ.  
σωθήσεται - Το v. 13. ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται, is an important parallel ch.  
22:28. υμεῖς δε εστε διαμεμενηκότες μετ εμού ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου. - v. 15. seems  
ἐν καρδίᾳ καλή κ. ἀγαθή incorporated, for the sake of parallelism with ἐν τῇ γῇ καλή -  
A trace of volatility, however, is that v. 12. the plural: οἱ δε - οδόν is not prepared at  
all, and v. 14. suddenly returns to the singular: τό πεσόν is changed. - v. 15. ἐν  
υπομονῇ cf. ch. 21:19.

### c) Mark and Matthew.

α) Matthew differs from the other two in the form he gives to the question of the  
disciples in v. 10. According to the neighbouring texts, the question would have to  
be: how is it, when you present parables, that what the people receive is limited only  
to the parable? - " It must be possible to show whether the text is original after the  
modification in Matthew.

β) The sentence: ἐκείνοις δε εν παραβολαῖς is split in Matth, v. 11,

κ) into the negative clause: ἐκείνοις οὐ οἶδοται. There is found as a proof of this v.  
12. the gnomes, which Mark and Luke have in quite another place, Mark v. 25.  
Luke v. 18. But from the connection with this gnome it appears that the γνῶναι in  
Matthew must mean: experienced (through me, by interpreting what has been  
said). From this v. 12. δοθήσεται refers. The antithesis must then say: but he who  
does not have (like the people) is taken away by something being presented to  
him, which, in the absence of insight, obscures rather than clarifies the matter for  
him. In the other texts the words ὑμῖν διδοται γνῶναι have more the meaning, "ye  
are able - to grasp." - The use Matthew makes of the gnome used v. 12. is  
essentially different from the application of it in Luke and Mark. In the latter, it is  
intended as a warning to the disciples, lest, on hearing it, they too should fall into  
the case of the people; in Matthew, it is intended to express the advantage which  
the disciples have over the people. —

α) The other half of this split sentence begins at v. 13. The διὰ τοῦτο seems to refer  
to the following ὅτι. - Thus the words were also connected by Clemens Alex-, who  
used them Stromat. B. 1. besides the connection with the preceding thus: διὰ

τούτο, φησι ο κύριος, εν παραβολαῖς αυτοῖς λαλῶ, and the connection thus also corresponds to v. 10. posed question: διατί - λαλεῖς also it is probably through this very διὰ τούτο that it happened that in Matthew in place of the: ἵνα - μή βλίπωσι (Mark v. 12. Luk. v. 10.) was replaced by: ὅτι - ου βλεπουσι.

γ) The words just mentioned already contain the application of the passage of Isaiah. Nevertheless, this passage is cited again in v. 14, 15. Quite the same case is in n. 39. Matth. 21:4. 5. comp. v. 2. From the same passage of Isaiah is further v. 19. μή συνιόντες and v. 23. συνιών. - Very cleverly does the nerf. of the not seeing of the dull-witted people v. 16. make the transition to the beatitude of the disciples on account of seeing; (words which Luke has elsewhere ch. 10:23.) and connects with the hearing (as understanding) the hearing of the sense of the parable v. 18. —

δ) Matthew then uses the singular throughout (where Mark uses the plural) v. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. This way was introduced by v. 19, by which verse, as said, it will be shown whether Matthew changed an earlier text or not. - v. 19. ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλ. as ch. 9:35. 4:23. 24:14. —

δ) Mark in relation to the other two: in the parable he agrees with Matthew almost word for word, in the transition to the interpretation he agrees most with Luke (v. 10), and in the interpretation he finally agrees most with Matthew. - Its peculiarity is: v. 11 τοῖς ἐξω, v. 17. an addition, v. 13. the question of Jesus, — the beginning with οὗτοι εἰσι κ. τ. λ. v. 15. 16. 18. 20.

210

4) The whole piece has various additions in the different writers,

a) According to Mark and Luke, Jesus uses other parables and gnomes in his conversation with the disciples (Mark 21-25, Luke 16-18). It has already been noted elsewhere how far Mark and Luke differ in this respect,

b) According to Mark and Matthew, Jesus then recites other parables to the cloud. The first one in Mark is different from the one in Matt. 24-30, the other one is the same (of the mustard seed, Matt. 31. 32. Mark 30-32). The third parable of the leaven is found in Matthew alone, v. 33 - Luke does not mention any other parable for the bread apart from the first. It will have to be examined whether Luke omitted what was given, and whether Mark changed what Matthew has, or vice versa.

5) There is no trace here of a different translation from the Hebrew. Mark and Matthew must have used a Greek translation, and could not have used it without deviating from it. But the deviation could not have happened according to a Hebrew text. The difference between *iva* (Mark v. 11. Luke v. 10.) and *oti* (Matt, v. 13.) is due to quite another reason. - But that Luke's text is an independent translation from the Hebrew, Eichhorn's Einl. p. 249, will prove to be quite unfounded elsewhere.

-----

|                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10) n. 20. Mark. 6:8—11.                                                                                                                         | = Luk. 9:3—5.                                                                                                                                | = Matth. 10:9—14.                                                                                                                                          |
| Mark.6:8 καὶ παρηγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδέν αἴρωβιν εἰς οδόν                                                                                      | Luk.9:3 μηδέν αἰρετε εἰς τήν οδόν                                                                                                            | Matth.10:9 μή κτήσησθε χρυσόν μηδέ ἀργύριον μηδέ χαλκόν εἰς τὰς ζωνὰς ὑμῶν.                                                                                |
| εἰ μή ράβδον μόνον, μη πήραν, μή ἄρτον, μή εἰς τήν ζώνην χαλκόν.                                                                                 | μήτε ράβδον μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀγύριον                                                                                               | 10. μή πήραν εἰς οδόν                                                                                                                                      |
| 9. (Ο.) καὶ μή ἐνδύσασθαι δύο χιτῶνας.                                                                                                           | μήτε ἀνά δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν.                                                                                                                  | μηδέ δύο χιτῶνας μηδέ ράβδον. (Ο)                                                                                                                          |
| 10. ὅπου ἐάν εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἱκεῖ μένετε, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε ἱκεῖθεν.                                                                         | 4. κ. εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐκεῖ μένετε κ. ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε.                                                                          | 11. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθῃτε, ( Ο ) κάκεῖ μένατε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε.                                                                              |
| 11. καὶ ὅπου ἂν μή δέξωνται ὑμᾶς μηδέ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριαν αὐτοῖς. | 5. καὶ ὅπου ἂν .... ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχάμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης, καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάξατε εἰς μαρτύριαν * ) ἐπ' αὐτούς. | (v.12.13.) 14. καὶ ὁσέᾳν μή δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδέ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, εἰξερχόμενοι τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης, ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κανίον τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν. |

\*) Must it not be read ἀποτινάξατε ἐπ' αὐτούς? (εἰς μαρτ. limped away). Cf. Act. 13:51.

1) The text of Matthew is longer than the corresponding texts of Mark and Luke. Here, too, the case does not occur that the shorter form would only become comprehensible through the longer one. The verses Matth, v. 7. 8. have neither of the others. The words inserted in verse 10: ἀξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς \*\*) (Luk. τοῦ μισθοῦ) have Luk. at the exposition of the 70th ch. 10:7. The employed Matth, v. 11. ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀξιός ἐστὶ has Luke nowhere. Matth, v. 12.13. but s. in Luk. at the appended D. ch. 10:5. 6. - Matth, v. 15. s. Luk. 10:12. - Matth, v. 16. s. Luk. 10:3. The rest of the apparatus which Matth. here gives beyond the measure of what is commonly given, is found in Luke in other places, Matth, v. 26 - 33. (= Luk. 12:2 - 9.) 34-36. (Luk. 12:51 - 53.) v. 37. 38. (Luk. 14:26. 27.) - That all the narrators speak of the same story of the sending forth, and not Matthew of a different one from the others, is clear enough. But how is it that Matthew unites what Luke separates, the words of the sending of the twelve and the seventy, and that the other Gospels, apart from Luke, report nothing of the last?

\*\*) Did the μηδέ ἄπρον fall out before these words in Matthew? The words do not otherwise fit the place.

212

2) To this piece belongs the mention of the return of these sent disciples Luk. 9:10. 6:30; but again it can be seen that we have here no particular essay before us. For what would have been the purpose of it?

a) Nothing specific is mentioned about the accomplishments of the sent ones and their encounters on the journey; only in general it is noted that they carried out the commission of Jesus. Also

b) it is not said when, why, and how they returned, whether individually or all at once, and whether their business was completely finished. A performer who threw himself on the individual could not have let this go unnoticed. But there are

c) there are also really others interwoven with this play (of Herod, of the feeding of the five thousand), so that one is compelled to give up the idea of particular essays in this play, and would have to stick to collections, if one were lucky. (But how could collections have come into being if no individual essays were written?)

3) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Matth, v. 9:10. the words are transposed. What is the reason for this? - v. 11. πάλιν ἡ κώμην so here, and v. 14. again Matthew alone, as n. 14. Matth. 12:25. - v. 14. τοῖς λόγοις. Matthew also elsewhere determines the object more exactly,

b) Luk. v. 3. he changes from direct to indirect speech. Examples of this kind occur frequently, e.g. Act. 1:4. and others - v. 4. κ. Ικεῖθεν ἵξέρχεσθε seems to be spoken quite tautologically. But ἐξίρχεσθαι has the meaning: to set out on the way (for the continuation of the wandering), and strangely, so it is in all the texts. -

(c) Mark. v. 8. παρήγγ. ἵνα - Luk. constructs this and similar words only with the infinitive. - v. 9. ἀλλ' ὑπο δεόμενους σανδάλια an insertion which in special construction is not without harshness, since an infinitive must be added from the word οδόν, e.g. ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι, ἀδοιπορεῖν, etc. But how is it that Mark here also falls from one construction into another, as Luke does, without yet using the latter's words? - v. 10. ὅπου ἰάν - εἰς οικίαν. The others both deviate from this construction. But compare Mark. 6:56. ὅπου εἰς- πορεύετο εἰς κώμας comp. 14:14. - τον χονν. The word which the two other texts have at the same time, κονιορτόν, Mark has not.

213

4) Here, too, we cannot find any translations from the Hebrew; we would have to assume that there are several Hebrew text adaptations, even with regard to the deviations in Matthew. But then it would be incomprehensible how the Hebrew original could have been expanded after the translation already existed, to which Mark and Luke adhered. - In view of the other similarities of the Greek expression, it is not possible to find a Hebrew root for such variant words as κονιορτόν and χοῦν. Matth. 10, 9. is only a transposition of the Greek words, but not another, independent translation.

| 11) n. 28 Mark 8:27–9:1                                               | = Math. 16:13--28                                                                         | = Luke 9:18-27                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;                                   | τίνα .... εἶναι;                                                                          | τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι;                                             |
| 28. Ἰωάννην τον βαπτιστήν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἰλῖαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἓνα των προφητῶν | 14. οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννης τ. βαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἰλῖαν, ἕτεροι δὲ (Ἰερ μίαν ἢ) ἓνα των προφητῶν. | 19. Ἰωάννης .... ἄλλοι δὲ Ἠλ. ἕτεροι δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις των ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. |

|                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 29. υμείς δε τίνα με λέγετε<br>είναι;                                                                                                                                               | 15. υμείς δε .... είναι;                                                                                                       | 20. υμείς δε .... είναι;                                                                                             |
| — συ ει ο χριστός.                                                                                                                                                                  | συ ει ο χριστος υἱος του<br>θεού του ζώντος) (ν.<br>17-20, Ο.)                                                                 | τον χριστον του θεού.                                                                                                |
| 31. ότι δει τον υιον του<br>ανθρώπου πολλα παθεῖν κ.<br>ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπό των<br>πρεσβυτέρων κ. αρχιερέων<br>κ. γραμμα τέων κ.<br>ἀποκτανθῆναι κ. μετά τρεῖς<br>ἡμέρας ἀναστήναι. | 21 — ότι δει αὐτόν<br>εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἱεροσολυμα<br>καὶ πολλα παθεῖν ἀπό ....<br>ἀποκτανθῆναι κ. ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ<br>ἡμέρα ἐγερθῆναι. | 22. οτι δει τόν υἱόν ....<br>παθεῖν κ.<br>ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπο ....<br>ἀποκτανθῆναι κ. ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ<br>ἡμέρα ἐγερθῆναι |
| 32. 33. with Matth.<br>intermediate talk.                                                                                                                                           | 22. 23. with Mark                                                                                                              | missing                                                                                                              |
| 34. εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου<br>ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω<br>εαυτόν κ. ἀράτω τόν<br>σταυρόν αὐτοῦ κ.<br>ἀκολουθεῖται μοι.                                                               | 24. ει τις .... μου ἐλθεῖν<br>ἀπαρνησάσθω .... μοι,                                                                            | 23. εἴ τις θέλει .... μου<br>ἐρχεσθαι .... μοι.                                                                      |
| 35. ὅς γάρ ἂν θέλη τήν<br>ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ σώσαι,<br>ἀπολέσει αὐτήν ὅς δ' ἂν<br>ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν<br>ἐνεκεν ἑμοῦ (κ. τοῦ<br>εὐαγγελίου ), σώσει αὐτήν.                           | 25. οἱ γάρ ἂν .... ὅς δ' ἂν<br>ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ<br>ἐνεκεν ἑμοῦ, εὐρησῇ<br>αὐτήν.                                       | 24.δς γάρ ἂν .... ἐνεκεν<br>ἑμοῦ, οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.                                                                 |
| 36. τί γάρ ωφελήσει<br>ἄνθρωπον, ἂν κερδήσῃ<br>τόν κόσμον ὅλον κ.<br>ζημιωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ;                                                                                       | 26. τί γάρ ωφελεῖται<br>ἄνθρωπος, ἂν τόν κόσμον<br>ὅλον κέρδῃ σῃ, τὴν δέ<br>ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; ἢ τί<br>.... αὐτοῦ;           | 25. τί γάρ ωφελεῖται<br>ἄνθρωπος κερδῆσας τόν<br>κοσμον ὅλον, εαυτόν δέ<br>ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς;                     |
| 37. ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος<br>ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς<br>αὐτοῦ;                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                      |
| 38. ὅς γάρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ<br>με κα'ι τοὺς ἑμούς (ἐν τῇ<br>γενεά ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι κ.<br>ἀμαρτωλώ), καὶ ὁ υἱός τοῦ<br>ἀνθρώπου<br>ἐπαιϋχυνθησεται αὐτόν,                             |                                                                                                                                | 26. ὅς γάρ ἂν .... λόγους,<br>τούτον ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἐπ-<br>αισχυνθήσεται, ὅταν                                     |

|                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| όταν                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                     |
| έλθη ἐν τῇ δόξῃ ταν πατρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων.                                                                                      | 27. μέλλει γάρ ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ. ἐρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ .... αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ· καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστω κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ. | έλθη ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων.                                                            |
| 9:1. ἀμήν λέγω νμῖν, ὅτι εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκοτῶν οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γενσῶνται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδῶσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυίαν ἐν δυνάμει. | 28. ἀμήν .... θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδῶσι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλ. αὐτοῦ.                                                      | 27. λέγω δε ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς, ὅτι εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστώτων, οἵτινες .... θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδῶσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. |

215

#### Notes:

1) We have here a piece, the copies of which agree almost literally throughout; only

a) Matth, v. 27. differs, and Luke lacks the interlocution. Mark 9:1 should not have begun a new chapter, as the words make the conclusion of the preceding. Wherefore then, where Matthew deviates, is the agreement of the others, and likewise, where Matthew and Mark give more complete things, the omission in Luke? Mark does not seek greater riches. For the verses of Matthew 17, 18, 19, he again does not have with Luke.

2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Matth, v. 14. ἱερεμίαν ἢ comp. to n. 20. and to n. 14. - v. 16. τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος comp. 26, 63. - v. 25. εἰρήσει instead of σώσει, even so ch. 10:39. - perhaps after Jerem. 38:23. 29:18. καὶ ἔσται ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτὸν εἰς εὐρημα. - v. 27. μέλλει ἐρχεσθαι comp. 17:22. μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι, 24:1. μελλήσετε ἀκοῦειν. On v. 27. even the passage Rom. 1:16. οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τό εὐαγγελίαν τοῦ χριστοῦ and Rom. 2:6. ὅς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ seems to have had an effect.

(b) Luk. v. 18. οἱ ὄχλοι (the verse, refers it to the fed heaps of people, 9:11. In general he has the word very often). - v. 19, ὅτι τις - ἀνέστη comp. 9:8. 7:16. Act. 5:36. - v. 20. τον χριστόν τοῦ θεοῦ. comp. 2:16. τον χριστόν κυρίου. - V. 25. κερδήσας. Luke loves

above all the participial construction. S. in n. 16. Luk. 8:4. 6. 16. 5:24. 25. etc. St. - εαυτόν for τήν εαυτοῦ ψυχήν, for brevity, comp. 5:33. not to avoid Hebraism;\*) for Luke has elsewhere Hebraism itself ch. 17:33. 23:19. and far harsher Hebraisms, than the others. - απολέσας ή ζημιωθείς. Luke imitates with brevity the disjunction of the Others. Other examples of such contractions: Ch. 9:42. εως ποτε έ'σομαι προς υμάς και ανεξομαι υμών; short is. also v. 27. - Other examples of this kind were ch. 8:10. (in n. 16.) See also n. 14.

(c) Mark v. 35. Addition: - again, explaining, as if the speech should not be both of discipleship on the way to Jerusalem, and rather of discipleship in the service of the Gospel. We have had several such additions in n. 1. n. 10. n. 14. and here comp. v. 38. - του ευαγγελίου comp. 10:29. 115. πιστεύετε εν τώ ευαγγελίω. v. 38. has by the addition. the speech received more symmetry: as έπαισχύνεσθαι and όταν ελθη εν δοξη correspond, so the εν τή γενεά τή μοιχαλίδι corresponds to the μετά των άγιων αγγέλων.

\*) Huz's. Introduct. s. Lh. P. 1SS.

216

3) The piece is bounded in the same way in all copies, and also has no general closing formula.

4) Translations from Hebrew have no place here either.

-----

217

| 12) n. 31. Mark 9:31                                                                                                       | = Math. 17:22-23                                                                                                       | = Luke 9:44                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 9:31 (οτι) ο υίός του άνθρωπον παραδίδοται εις χείρας ανθρώπων κ. αποκτενοῦβιν αυτόν, και τή τρίτη ήμερα άναστήσεται. | Math. 17:22 μέλλει ό υίός τ. άνθρ. παραδίδοσθαι εις χείρας .... 23. και αποκτενοῦσιν αυτόν, κ. .... ήμέρα έγερθήσεται. | Luke 9:44 θέβθε υμείς εις τά ώτα υμών τούς λόχους τούτους ό *) υίός τ. άνθρ. μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εις .... ανθρώπων. |

\*) The γάρ deleted.

Notes:



1) Here again we have a small whole that cannot have existed on its own. All of them put it in connection with the preceding, though Luke differently than the others. Since in their case the return journey from Caesarea and the outward journey (Mark 8:27. Matt. 16:13.) point to each other, this little pericope must have belonged to the same whole as n. 28. Take this whole then (from n. 28. 29. 30.) and convince yourself that it cannot have been distinguished individually. Would the author, who confined himself to this detail, have used the same declarations of Jesus n. 28. (Mark 8:31. comp. the parallels) and twice in the present pericope with such dislocation?

2) Peculiarities of the expression:

a) Luke, as already mentioned, connects v. 43 in a special way. But the similarity remains that, according to Mark, Jesus wants to avoid a stir in Galilee, because according to his plan he would have to suffer and die in Jerusalem, while in Luke the disciples are reminded not to turn to the applause and homage of the Galileans. - The allusion to the resurrection is missing in Luke's words. Since also Jesus' speech is said to have more restraining than elevating power, also more reference is made to the putting down of the utterance in the general note Mark v. 32. (if here the words: και ἡγνούν τό ρήμα - ἐπηρω- τήσαι are genuine) Luk. v. 45.; so that defect in Luke may be taken for improvement. - v. 44. θέσθε εἰς κ. τ. λ. comp. 21:14. θέσθε εἰς τὰς καρδίας υμῶν, i.e. though the people make much boasting, hearken not unto it, but unto that which I say unto you,

b) Mark. - After Mark's remark, however, Jesus had reason to repeat the statement. For the disciples must have wondered why he wanted to observe the incognito in Galilaa this time. - The citations of Jesus' words do not differ in Mark, Matth, and Luk. A small proof that we are dealing here with the

218

3) we are not dealing with translations from the Hebrew.

-----

| 13) n. 32 Mark 9:37                                                                              | = Math. 18:5                                                                                     | = Luke 9:48                                                                                       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 9:37 ὅς ἐάν 'έν τῶν τοιοῦτων παιδιῶν δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμέ δέχεται, κ. ὅς ἐάν ἐμέ | Math. 18:5 (Ο. v. 3. 4.) καὶ ὅς ἂν δέξηται παιδίον τοιούτον 'έν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμέ δέχεται. | Luke 9:48 ὅς ἐάν δέξηται τοῦτο τό παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμέ δέχεται, κ. ὅς ἐάν ἐμέ δέξηται, |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                              |  |                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------------|
| <p>δέξεται, (οὐκ ἐμέ) δέχεται (ἀλλά) τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.</p> <p>ν. 41. ὅς γάρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ὅτι χριστοῦ ἐστε,</p> <p>ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.</p> |  | <p>δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με (Ο.).</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------------|

#### Notes:

1) Luke lists only the words of Jesus. According to Matthew and Mark, the speech was much longer. - In the text of Mark we have added v. 41 to the words, omitting v. 38 - 40. In another place it will be shown that this is an interpolation which does not belong in Mark, and that v. 41 is therefore directly connected with v. 37. - The meaning of the speech has already been discussed in another place (above p. 104). It is not a question here of the children themselves, but of how they would be treated, to what estimation they would be entitled, if they were Christians and belonged to the disciples, as the child now presented stood among the disciples. Jesus gives a symbol. The symbolism of the act lies

a) In the fact that he presents a child in order to represent a lowly member,

b) in that he places the lowly subject among the disciples to represent a Christian. The speech then turns to the apostles themselves, and draws the conclusion how dear they are to the Master, and to him who sent him, and what value the least benefit has, which is bestowed upon them, out of consideration for their common Master (s. Mark v. 41.). - This sense of the text is not only supported by the whole context, but also by similar statements, which are, as it were, other recensions of the words given here. Cf. Matth. 10:40. 41 (which passage also proves that here in our passage Mark v. 41 belongs to v. 37). Incidentally, Luke's expression τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον is therefore the most correct, as already noted above. Sense: this child here, who stands here among you, provided he stands among you, i. e. provided he is a Christian: (Jesus wants to say: every lesser one who is a Christian, and were it the child here) - in Mark it should rather be: Ἐνὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων μικρῶν as Luk. 17:2. Mark 9:42. Matt. 18:6. or τοιοῦτον (As is already seen from Clement Alex, the passage has undergone all sorts of mixtures, because the text was always understood of real children and their reception, and thus

the symbolical and the real were mixed. Hence here ἰν τῶν τοιοῦτων παιδιῶν. Already in Matthew, too, there is this blending in verses 3. 4. For Jesus does not speak of the imitation of children.\*) - This. ἐν Matth, v. 5. can therefore be just as little correct. (Perhaps originally it stood τοιοῦτο παιδίον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου). Already what is said in the following about the aergernissen decides that here it is not the reception of the children that is spoken of, but of the lowly Christians (symbolized by a child). (Matth. v. 6. Mark. v. 42.) The text n. 34. is of a different kind. (To it actually belong the verses Matth. 18:3. 4.) So much about the meaning of the whole. The first question is: did Luke omit the one with which Mark and Matthew prolong the speech, or is that later in the night?

\*) De Wette's Einleit. p. 158. remarks: Luk 9:48. is quite incongruous with v. 46. 47. It has fallen out what Matth. 18:3. 4. states, and what makes the transition to that." - As we see, quite the opposite is the case. What is said to have fallen out would only be an unappreciated addition, and would make a transition εἰς ἄλλο γένος.

220

b) Why are some words missing in Matthew 5?

c) Already v. 1. takes the question of the disciples, which preceded Jesus' speech, in a different way: (τις ἄρα μείζων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν) - than the others; the question is: does his version have the original form?

d) Matthew also extends the speech beyond Mark. Matth. 18:10 - 35. The question is: does this apparatus really belong to the text?

2) Peculiarities of expression:

α) from Matthew there is nothing to notice in these parts but the omission of v. 5.

β) Luke has the same Greek words. Only he adds another sentence with which he seems to want to conclude. How this modifies the meaning has been mentioned elsewhere.

γ) Mark: He has the distinction v. 37. οὐκ ἐμέ - ἀλλά χ. τ. λ. similar is Joh. 12:44. ο πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ ου πιστεύει εἰς ἐμέ, ἀλλ' εἰς τον πέμψαντά με. - (The speech of our passage comes before Joh. 13:20.) Nor must I remark that Mark. v. 35. seems to be nothing but an interpolation,

a) the other texts both say that Jesus, before he begins to speak, performs the symbolic action with the child. This is quite in order, but less appropriate if Jesus were to sit down beforehand and directly pronounce the teaching that he only wants to give through the symbol. The symbolic action would then become a superfluous addendum,

221

b) When the introduction is made: Jesus sat down to give his teaching, the question is raised as to how the interposition of the child might have been conveyed, and so on. The words are probably taken from another context (such as Mark 10:43). - \*)

\*) We therefore see ourselves compelled to deny this addition to Mark, and we call attention to it, since Mark's Gospel in general is very interpolated.

3) Again, we have no translations from the Hebrew. The original text and the main parts of the speech have the same Greek expression, and if the opinion is correct that Matthew's account has only become greater through interpolations (see Eichhorn's Einleit. in's N. T. 1. vol. p. 275), it does not follow that these enrichments would have had to be translated from the Hebrew. Also

4) this pericope did not receive its existence as a particular essay. Schleiermacher, op. cit. p. 157, himself admits that this narrative is separate from the previous one (Luk. 9:46-50), but would like to give it more content than it really has, in that Luk. v. 49-50 is to be connected with it, which, however, we believe we must separate from it. - According to Luke, the content of the play is too short to be regarded as a special theme treated by a writer in its own right.

| 14) n. 34 Mark 10:14-15                                                                                       | = Luke 18:16-17                    | = Matth. 19:14                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 10:14 ἀφετε τὰ παιδία ερχεῦθαι προς με, καὶ μή κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γάρ τοιοῦτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. | Luke 18:16 ἄφετε τα .... τοῦ Θεοῦ. | Matth. 19:14 ἀφετε τὰ παιδία καὶ μή κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρός με, τῶν γάρ .... ἡ βασ. τῶν ουρανῶν. |
| 15. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐάν                                                                                    | 17. Ἀμὴν .... εἰς αὐτήν.           |                                                                                                   |

|                                                                              |  |  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| μη δέξεται τήν βασιλείαν<br>του θεοῦ ως παιδίον, οὐ μή<br>εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν. |  |  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|

222

#### Notes:

1) A very short note, similar to the previous one, with which, however, it could not have been connected, as little as it is the specific treatment of a theme in itself. None of the narrators indicates where the little incident took place, and the premise that what was narrated happened on Jesus' last journey, when it was known that he was perhaps travelling to Jerusalem for the last time, demands a majority of narrative pieces. - By the way, as already noted, the place is actually here, where the verses Matth. 18:3. 4. belong. Why might Luk 18:17. be missing from Matthew?

2) There is nothing to be noticed as an individual diction, as a visible proof that there are no independent translations from the Hebrew in our texts. Luke retains the word: παιδία, but in the preface he puts βρέφη v. 15. He likes to change the words, and does not like to repeat the same; examples of this kind have already occurred to us. The fact that he left the word that the others had in the speech is easily explained when he bound himself to a given text.

|                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15) n. 35. An exchange Mark. 10:17 - 31. = Luk. 18:18 -30. = Matth. 19:16-32.                                          |                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                       |
| Mark 10:17. — διδάσκαλε<br>αγαθέ, τί ποιήσω, ἵνα ζωήν<br>αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;                                          | Luke 18:18. — — διδάσκ.<br>αγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωήν<br>αἰών, κληρονομήσω;                             | Math. 19:16. τί (αγαθόν)<br>ποιήσω, ἵνα εχω ζωήν<br>αἰώνιον;                                                          |
| 18. — τι με λέγεις αγαθόν;<br>οὐδέ τις αγαθός εἰ μή εἰς ὁ<br>Θεός.                                                     | 19. — τί με .... εἰς ὁ Θεός.                                                                        | 17. — τί με λέγεις .... ὡς ὁ<br>Θεός. (εἰ δέ θέλεις<br>εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τήν ζωήν,<br>τήρησαν τάς ἐντολάς).               |
| 19. τάς ἐντολάς οἶδας' μή<br>μοιχεύσης, μη φονευσης,<br>μή κλέψης, μή<br>ψευδομαρτυρησης (μή<br>ἀποστερήσης)' τίμα τον | 20. τάς ἐντολάς .... μή<br>κλέψης, μη<br>ψευδομαρτυρησης' τίμα<br>τον πατέρα σου και τήν<br>μητέρα. | 18.—ποιας; — τό' ου<br>φονευσεις, ου μοιχεύσεις,<br>οὐ κλέψεις, ου<br>ψευδομαρτυρήσεις. 18.<br>τίμα τον πατέρα κ. τήν |

|                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| πατέρα και τήν μητέρα.                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                         | μητέρα. *)                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 20. — ταύτα πάντα έφυλαξάμην έκ νεότητάς μου.                                                                                                        | 21. — ταύτα .... νεότητάς μου.                                                                          | 20. πάντα ταύτα έφυλαξαμην έκ νεότητάς μου (τί ετι ύστερώ);                                                                                                                  |
| 21. — εν σοι υστερεί, ύπαγε, όσα έχεις πώλησον και δός τοῖς πτωχοῖς, κ. εξ εις θησαυρόν έν ουρανῷ' κ. δεύρο ακολουθεῖ μοι.                           | 22. — ἔτι εν σοι λείπει' πάντα όσα έχεις πώλησον κ. δίοδος πτωχοῖς, και .... ακολουθεῖ μοι.             | 21. εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ύπαγε, πώλησον σου τά υπάρχοντα κ. δός πτωχοῖς, κ. εξεις .... μοι.                                                                              |
| 23. — πώς δυσκόλως οἱ τά χρήματα εχοντες                                                                                                             | 24. — πώς δυσκό- λως οἱ .... ἔχοντες εἰς-                                                               | 23. ότι δυσκόλως πλούσιος                                                                                                                                                    |
| εἰς τήν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰςελεύσονται *)                                                                                                          | εἰλεύσονται εἰς τήν βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ.                                                                    | εἰςελεύσεται εἰς τήν βασιλ. τῶν ουρανῶν.                                                                                                                                     |
| 25. εύκοπώτερόν ἐστι, κάμηλον διά τῆς τρηνμαλίας τῆς ραφίδος διελθεῖν ή πλούσιον εἰς τήν βασιλείαν τον Θεοῦ εἰςελθεῖν.                               | 25. εύκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστι, κάμηλον διά τρηνμαλίας ραφίδος διελθεῖν ή .... εἰςελθεῖν.                     | 24. πάλιν δέ λέγω ὑμῖν" ευκ. .... δια τρυπήματος ραφίδος διελθεῖν ή πλούσιον .... εἰςελθεῖν.                                                                                 |
| 26. καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι ;                                                                                                                        | 26. και τις .... σωθῆναι ;                                                                              | 25. τίς ἀρα δύναται σωθῆναι ;                                                                                                                                                |
| 27. — παρα ανθρώποις αδύνατον, ἀλλ ου παρά τω Θεῷ ' πάντα γάρ δυνατα ἐστι παρά τῷ Θεῷ.                                                               | 27. τα αδυναχα παρα ανθρωποις, δυνατα ἐστι παρά τῷ Θεῷ.                                                 | 26. περὰ ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο αδύνατον ἐστι,παρά δέΘεῷπάντα δύνατα.                                                                                                               |
| 28. — ιδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα κ. ήκολουθήσαμέν σοι.                                                                                               | 28. ιδού, ἡμεῖς .... σοι.                                                                               | 27. ιδού, .... καὶ ήκολουθήσαμέν σοι' (τί ἀρα ἐσται ἡμῖν;)<br><br>28. (Ο.)                                                                                                   |
| 29. ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐδεὶς ἐστιν ος αφήκεν οικίαν ή αδελφούς ή αδελφάς ή πατέρα ή μητέρα, ή γυναῖκα ή τέκνα ή αγρούς ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ και τοῦ ευαγγελίου. | 29. — ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ότι .... οικίαν ή γονεῖς ή αδελφους ή γυναικα ή τέκνα ἐνεκεν τῆς βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ. | 29. καὶ πászος αφήκεν οικίαν ή αδελφούς ή αδελφάς ή πατέρα ή μητέρα η γυναικα ή τέκνα η αγρούς ἐνεκεν τοῦ ονόμ. μου, ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήψεται και ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει. |
| 30. ἐάν μή λάβῃ                                                                                                                                      | 30. ός ον μή απολαβῇ                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                              |

|                                                                                      |                                                                          |                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| εκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ (Ο) καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. | πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τουτω κ. ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. |                                                         |
| 31. πολλοί δε ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἐσχατοὶ κ. ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι.                              | is missing.                                                              | 30. πολλοί δε ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἐσχατοὶ κ. ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι. |

223

\*) How the addition: v. 19. και αγαπήσεις τον πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυ-τόν, which rightly attracted the attention of the Ori'gines, could still find defenders, is not comprehensible. Can we not see that if the words belonged to the text, Jesus' answer would have to be formulated quite differently? Jesus could not have said that the young man should do more than he had done, but that he should have demanded that he should first do and record what he had done, especially since what Jesus demanded of him was the very confirmation of it. (Jesus' answer in the Gospel of the Hebrews is actually worded in this way. - quomodo dicis, legem feci et prophetas ? ecce multi fratres tui, filii Abrahae, amicti sunt stercore, morientes prae fame et domus tua plena est bonis multis etc.

b) The words: ταντα ἐφυλαξαμην ἐκ νεότητάς μου are the echo of the words: τίμα τον πατέρα σου κ. τήν μητέρα, and become puffing only when those are the last words,

c) "Love thy neighbour as thyself!" Answer: "I have done this since I was a child (I did it from my youth)." What prudent person speaks like that?

224

\*) The words: v. 27. τέκνα πῶς ὀνσκολόν ἐστι, τοὺς πεπειθοτας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν εἰς τὴν βασ. τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν, which so much disturb the progress of the speech, are unächt, see Fritzsche's commentary on Mark at St. The '. 28. occurring word x^oooio; gives the decision that the explanatory: πεπειθύτες ἐπὶ τοῖς- χρήμασι could not have immediately preceded it.

225

Notes:

1) The narrative is a complete relation in itself. The question raised by the rich young man is answered, as is the second question raised by the disciples (Peter), and all copies give the same content. Matthew deviates from the common expression only in a few places, where words and sentences are inserted into his text.

## 2) Peculiarities of presentation:

a) Matthew: v. 17. The αγαθόν, which disturbs the connection, seems to be connected as an interpolation with the wrong reading of some coäices: τί με έρωτας περί τον αγαθόν; which is preferred by those who, for special reasons, would like to make our texts different. But that the reading just mentioned is illegitimate is as certain as it follows in the text: ούδεις αγαθός κ. τ. λ. On this s. Fritzsche'sKommentar zum Matthäus bei der St. - ινα εχω, -but v. 29. likewise stands κληρονομείν. - v. 17. εί θέλεις κ. τ. λ. Spelling of Matthew. Cf. v. 22. εί θέλεις κ. τ. λ. also comp. ch. 8:31. 17:4. and others. st. - v. 18. ποίας ; Matthew is fond of forming dialogues. Cf. 21:40. 41. 22:42. - ον φονενσεις according to the Alex. Ex. 20:13. 12. cf. Matth. 4:7.10. 22:24. just as the citation in n. 16. adhered to it. - v. 20. τί ετι υστερώ ; a question, introducing the answer, as it were tempting from the mouth, like v. 27. τί άρα εσται υμῖν ; We find in Matth, also elsewhere such questions appropriate, where in the others not. S. in n. 16. Matth. 13:10. 22, 42. τίνος νίός έστι ; 24:8. τί τό σημείον τής παρουσίας; comp. also in n. 32. ch. 18:1. - v. 23. αμῆν λέγω υμῖν. This does not seem to reach the mimic expression of the Others. - v. 23. πλούσιος, strange that Matth, alternates with this expression so well as Luke v. 23:24. - βασιλ. τών ουρανών the formula merely common toMatthew. - v. 25. τίς άρα as v. 27. 18:1. - σφοδρά especially to Matthew frequent 2:10. 17:6. 23. 18:31. 26:22. 27:54. - v. 23. The verse stands in Luke in another place (see the second tablet), only it differs here, as Matth, gives it, also by the άκολουθήσαντες more fitting here. - V. 29. καῖ πας, ός. The negative ουδεις εστιν ός κ. τ. λ. could not find room here. -ένεκεν τοῦ ονόματος μου. Probably the author has in mind those who are persecuted as martyrs for the sake of Christianity. - The distinction of εν τώ νυν καιρώ and εν τώ αιώνι τώ έρχομένω, is missing here, that: εκατοντα- πλασίονα λήψονται, does not seem to refer at all to gain in the world, but is intended to be explained by that which follows in the same way: καῖ ζωήν ,,, κληρονομήσει. So it must have been, if v. 28. was to belong to the text.

226

b) Luke: v. 18. τί ποιήσας the participial construction he liked. S. to n. 28. the same question thus expressed ch. 10:25. - v. 22. πάντα Luke sought this stronger expression, probably because the youth was rich, to suit the sacrifice demanded. - v.



25. Attention is to be paid to γάρ, by which a connection is to be made. Cf. Mark, and Matt. v. 27. τά αδύνατα κ. τ. λ. different from the others. But Luke writes thus ch. 16:15. τό εν ανθρώποις υψηλόν βδέλυγμα Ινώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν - v. 29. ; ἡ γονεὺς νενβί 21, 16. - ἐνεκεν τῆς βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ comp. 4:49.

(c) Mark agrees more with Luke in the whole pericope. - v. 19. Ζ μή υποστερήσης - v. 22. the words: ἀπας τὸν σταυρόν are suspect as additions. But as much as they exclude οοαῖces, they have been excluded, because now once all kinds of additions are imposed on Mark. - v. 21. ἐν σοι υστερεῖ, the clause with Luke, the verbum with Matthew. Paul Commentary 2 Th. p. 829. accuses the texts of Mark and Luke of misunderstanding. "Inasmuch as Jesus is supposed to have said the "One thing thou lackest" without cause, (for if that question of Matthew: τί ἐτι υστερῶ ; had not preceded it), the whole narrative would take an incorrect turn. Jesus could not claim that the rich man really needed to sell his possessions in order to become blessed. Only the decision to give up one's wealth is as necessary as it is difficult. Luke, therefore, has here an incorrect turn of phrase, which, without light from Matthew (who prefaces it with a request for such a declaration), would have to give the whole discourse a false view." We think that neither Mark and Luke give an incorrect view, nor that a light from Matthew is needed to elucidate the meaning of Jesus. For

227

a) In Mark and Luke, too, Jesus does not require the selling of possessions as a means to salvation, but the young man is to join him as a promoter of the good cause, as Jesus' disciples had done, and to dispose of his possessions in the same way as Jesus' disciples had to do. But the young man was not interested in the good, and he who is not, but a slave of sensuality, rejecting the demands of duty, of him Jesus says that he is not fit for the kingdom of God,

b) The question put before us in Matthew makes no difference to the meaning of the whole. What Jesus, according to Mark and Luke, says in reply to the young man's remark that he still lacks one thing, he would have said even without the answer inviting: τί ἤι υστερῶ ; \*) — If Mark precedes the words of v. 21 with Luke's question: "r/ ap" terr"" not with Matthew's v. 27; this, however, makes a difference in the text. According to Mark, Peter only remembers in the name of his fellow disciples that they have left everything, and Jesus merely corrects this expression, replying that there is actually no question of leaving, since in the furtherance of one's purpose one only enters into greater connections - here in this world and in the world to come one has to hope for eternal life. In Matthew, however, this correction is regarded as the promise of a reward \*), and therefore the question, anticipating the answer, is sent

before it. The question is: which is more in keeping with the original version of the whole text? - v. 30. Again a tautological expansion, which, however, again serves to elucidate the text, like the above in n. 10. 11. - On the vñ before έν τω χαίρω τοντω comp. ch. 14:30. σήμερον, Iv τή νυχτί ταντη. Ch. 5:5. διαπαντός, νυχτός χ. ημέρας. - v. 29. και τον εναγγελίον as un n. 28. Whether v. 31. belongs to Mark must be very doubtful in view of the spirit of his Gospel. Perhaps it is the same here as with ch. 10, 15. (in n. 20.), which verse Mark is also supposed to have taken from Matthew.

\*) Fritzsche's commentary wants to find in Mark v. 20. the questioning words of Matthew, and also after the words "εν σοι υστερεί" the Matthaean: εί θέλεις τέλειος είναι. This is certainly incorrect. It cannot decide the authority of those coäices which have been followed here,

b) He from whom the question is derived, τί αρα εσται νμιν; which Mark v. 28. has not, from him also the question is derived, τί ετι υστερώ; and it is more than too probable that this Mark had not with Luke either,

c) That question did not even fit into Mark's text. Mark remarks on the young man's explanation: Jesus had his liking for him (he wanted him gladly in his company), and therefore said, "One thing thou lackest." The remark ήγάπησεν αυτόν, which precedes Jesus' answer, is precisely to show that Jesus continued thus to speak, i.e. to sort out the speech with the expression: εν σοι υστερεί, was not determined by any ankicipirative question of the youth. - How could it fit together: "What do I still lack? and: Jesus loved him and said: One thing you still lack.

\*) One therefore even thought that Jesus' words had to be taken ironically, as if he could not speak seriously of his brotherly covenant, which met every faithful member's home and family circle. It would even be an irony against the art of interpretation to take the words Matth. 19:18. ironically because they are figurative.

3) This piece is the strongest counter-evidence against the assumption of various translations from the Hebrew. The speakers express the words of Jesus with the same Greek words, even Matth. v. 29. goes back into the Greek text, - only in the historical inter- formulas, the inter- remarks of the narrators, is there variation; in the words of Jesus only where the same words are augmented by others. For the secondary formulas, however, one would not have translated freely from the Hebrew, and the

translation of the same words with other words looks just as little like another translation.

229

| 15) n. 36. Mark. 10:33. 34.                                                                                                                                                                                   | = Matth. 20:18. 19.                                                                                                                                                                                                     | = Luk. 13:31 — 33.                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Mark. 10:33 (οτι) ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς ἱεροβόλυμα,</p> <p>και ο υἱός τον ανθρωπου παραδοθησεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦδι κ. τοῖς γραμματεῦσι, και χαταχρῖνοῦσιν αὐτόν θανάτῳ κ. παραδώσουδιν αὐτόν τοῖς εθνεδι.</p> | <p>Matth. 20:18 ἰδοὺ, αναβ. ....</p> <p>κ. ὁ, υἱός .... τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦβι κ. γραμματεῦδι .... θανάτῳ. 19. καί παραδώσουδιν .... τοῖς εθνεδι εἰς τό ὀμπαῖξαι κ. μαστιγῶδαι κ. αταυρώδαι, κ. τη τρίτη .... αναὔτηβεται.</p> | <p>Luke 18:31. ἰδοὺ, .... ἱεροβόλ· (Ο.)</p> <p>32. παραδοθήσεται γάρ τοῖς εθνεβι.</p>                                                    |
| <p>34. καί ἐμπαῖξουσιν αὐτῳ κ. μαδιγῶδονδιν αὐτόν (κ. ἐμπτυῖβουδιν αὐτά) κ. ἀποχτενοῦδιν αὐτόν, κ. τη τρίτη ἡμερα αναστήοεται.</p>                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <p>κ. ἐμπαιχθηῖται (κ. υβρισθησεται κ. ἐμπτυαθησεται)</p> <p>33. καὶ μαβτιγῶσαντες ἀποχτενοῦαιν αὐτόν, κ· τη τρίτη .... ἀναδτήσεται.</p> |

Notes:

1) All copies give the same content in conforming and mostly identically expressed sentences, even though Luke here and there places the words in a different construction and v. 31. increases the words. Eichhorn, p. 280, remarks: "Extensions are found in the paraphrastic Mark and Luke, of which, however, it can no longer be determined whether they are by Mark or Luke themselves or by an earlier copyist of their common original text. However, it must be possible to determine this.

2) Peculiarities of expression. a) Luke: v. 31. addition: και τελεσῶνται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα δια των προφητών τῷ νίῳ τον ανθρωπον. By the same remark Luke's text also differs ch. 21:22. τον τελεσθηναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα and 22:36. Hence here v. 32. γάρ. We must especially call attention to the example of simplication occurring here v. 32. whereby the speech is so shortened as if words had fallen into omission through the fault of a homoeoteleuton.

Matth, and Mark:

|                                    |                      |                                          |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------|
| παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀργιερεναί      |                      | Luke v. 32 παραδοθησεται<br>τοῖς ἐθνεοι. |
|                                    | κ. γραμματ. — θανατω |                                          |
| κ. παραδώσουσιν αὐτόν τοῖς ἐθνεσι. |                      |                                          |

A very similar example is ch. 19:36. where Luke likewise unites the double: and ἐστρώσαν and τστροώννον, and omits that which is buried to the first. An example of contractions was also ο. 15. and υ. 16. διὰ τό μη εχειν Ικμάδα. - v. 33. the participial construction.

(b) Matthew: v. 19. εἰς τό εμπαῖξαι, comp. 27:31. εἰς τό στανρώσαι - As here v. 19. και στανρώσαι is chosen as the more definite term, so also ch. 23:34. comp. Luk. 11:49. where it is not. -

(c) Mark. V. 33. ο τι. Comp. 1:37. 40. 5:23. 28. 6:14. 35. 7:6. 20. 8:16. (Luk. 9:28. it is wrong reading, as it cannot stand with questions and the imperative) 9:31. 11:17. 12:6. 7. 14:14. 27. 58. 69. 70. 72. (Luke has it with Mark. Luk. 8:40. 21:8.). - v. 34. is suspicious of εμπτνσοναιν αντω. The scourging immediately precedes the ἀποκτανθηναι s. Luk. v. 35. and Matth, v. 19. It seems taken over from Luke, where, first inserted by Luke, it stands in its proper place.

3) Here, too, the variations are not special transmissions from a Hebrew text. The Hebrew would have to have been added to the Greek in order for it to be translated into Greek by the owner of the codex (!).

-----

|                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16) n. 39. Mark. 11:2-10.                                                                                                                                                    | = Luk. 19:30-38.                                                                                                                             | = Matth. 21:2 - 9.                                                                                                      |
| Mark. 11:2 — υπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν. κ. εὐθέως εἰσπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν· λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε. | Luk. 19:30 υπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην" ἐν ἣ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὐρήσετε .... ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν· λύσαντες .... ἀγάγετε. | Matth. 21:2 πορεύθητε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθέως εὐρήσετε ( Ὁ ) πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς λύσαντες ἀγάγετέ μοι. |
| 3. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τί ποιεῖτε τούτο; εἶπατε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει καὶ εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀποβτελεῖ ὧδε.                                                             | 31. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ διατί λύτετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ὅτι ὁ κύριος .... ἐχει.                                                                | πορεύθητε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθέως εὐρήσετε ( Ὁ ) πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς λύσαντες ἀγάγετέ μοι.             |
| 9. ὡσαννὰ, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου ' ( Ὁ. ) ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.                                                                                       | 38. εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, εἰρήνῃ ἐν οὐρανῷ κ. δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.                                                | 9. ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Λαβὶδ ' εὐλογημένος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου · ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.                                       |

## Notes:

1) As far as this piece gives information about the words of the order and the execution of the same, the mottoes are essentially the same in all copies, according to the extent and content of the expression. - The acclamation of the people, although expressed with varying mottoes, nevertheless occupies the same place in all texts.

## 2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Luk: v. 30. υπάγετε. Whether Luke should not rather have written πορεύθητε (Matth, v. 2.)? Passages will occur to us which prove that in such cases the traditional text cannot be relied upon. - v. 31. ἐρωτά, the more definite word, as Luke also elsewhere gives the more definite word for εἰπεῖν and λέγειν, e. g. 4:38. 8:47. 5:30. 20:14. - v. 38. βασιλεὺς is inserted and does not stand in the original passage Ps. 118:26. It is probably borrowed from Zach. 9:9. ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἐρχεται (comp. also John 12:13). From here also comes χαίροντες; comp. Zach. 9:9. χαῖρε θύγατερ Σιών. - εἰρήνῃ ἐν οὐρανῷ κ. δόξα κ. τ. λ. comp. Luk. 2:24. δόξα ἐν νηυσὶ τοῖς Θεῷ κ. ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνῃ. - v. 31. Luke omits: καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτό. He always omits what is self-evident as success. So 20:24. omits that the denarius was shown; after 18:17. that Jesus

really blessed the children. Ch. 20:3. the words are missing: I will also tell you by what power I do this and so on.

232

b) Matthew: v. 2. He makes the allusion to Zach. 9:9. more visible. Hence *όνον και πώλον*, but the explanatory *καί* of the original text is taken copulatively, and one animal is doubled into two. Hence that which is applied by Matthew elsewhere is also applied here, comp. 26:29.38. 40. 26:36. 49:31. and *αυτόν* v. 3. is changed into *αυτών*. We must not wonder, therefore, that here the: *εφ ὃν οὐδεις ἐκάθισε* of the others does not degenerate. For if the animal intended for riding was the colt, then, if it was still a sucking colt, what those words set as a condition understood itself. If it was the old ass, the condition set would not have been realizable with regard to such an ass. - Although the relation to the Old Testament passage had already been placed in the text of 2, it is still specially cited later in 4. p. We had a similar example in u. 16. - The citation here differs from the Seventy, as in which the passage reads thus: *χαῖρε σφόδρα ὑἱγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε Οὐγατερ Ιερουσαλήμ ἰδοὺ, ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἐρχεται δίκαιος κ. σωζων, αὐτός πραυς κ. ἐπιβεβηκώς ἐπὶ υποζύγιον κ. πώλον νέον.* (After *πώλον* may have stood in the seventy *υἱόν ὄνον* or *όνον* alone, as Justin Mart. dial. c. Tryph. § 53. cit.) As Matthew puts *ἐπὶ ὄνον* (instead of *υποζύγιον*), so also Aquila: *ἐπὶ ὄνου κ. πώλον*, Symmachus likewise: *ἐπὶ ὄνον κ. πώλον*. - Two passages are combined here. Namely, *εἶπατε τῇ Ουγατρι Σιών* is from Isa. 62:11. Both passages could easily be assimilated to each other, since the *δυνατήρ Σιών* also degenerates in the passage of Zacharias, and in both is spoken of the coming of the Saviour. (Isa. 62:11. *ἰδοὺ, σοὶ ὁ σωτήρ παραγίνεται.*) We also meet with such combinations in Luke. - v. 9. *τω υἱᾷ Δαβίδ*. Likewise ch. 21:15.

233

c) Mark: v. 10. again an addition with a different turn of the same. The *βασιλ.* occurs here under *prosopopoeia* also ch. 9:1.

3) The original of the story is again based on what is the same Greek in the texts. At least no Syriac Chaldean original is needed to explain the deviation in Matth, v. 2. original. (Eichhorn's Introduction, p. 284.)

4) That we have here no particular historical essay is evident from the fact that what is narrated is placed in relation to Old Testament allusions, and is thus treated dogmatically. ---

---

|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                             |                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 17) n. 41. Mark. 11:17.                                                                                                          | = Matth. 21:13.                                                             | = Luk. 19:46.                                                                                      |
| Mark. 11:17 γεγραπται' οτι ο οἶχος μου, οἶχος προσευχῆς χληθήσεται (πάυι τοῖς εθνεσι') υμεῖς δε ἐποιησατε αὐτόν σπηλαιον ληστων. | Matth. 21:13 γεγραπται ' ὁ οἶχος μου .... χληθήσεται· υμεῖς δε .... λύσεων. | Luk. 19:46 γεγραπται' οτι ὁ οἶχος μου .... προσευχῆς ἰστιν · υμεῖς δε αὐτόν ἐποιησατε .... ληστων. |

Notes:

1) Here it will not occur to anyone to think of a particular essay; and yet in John, who does not include it in this last period of the history of Jesus, the narrative is placed in a completely different position. It can be seen, then, that the difference in position proves nothing for the particularity of what is presented.

2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Mark, v. 17. gives the Old Testament passage Isa. 56, 7. as it reads. πάυι τοῖς εθνεσι is not, therefore, his addition, that anything is to be inferred from it with reference to the purpose of his Gospel. But the main thing here is not the purpose of the house of prayer for all, but the name of it. That is why the others do not have the addition. And indeed

234

b) Luke wanted to omit with it also the corresponding χληθήσεται, and therefore puts ἐστί. Nevertheless

c) Matthew v. 13. χληθήσεται retained, so that it seems as if here one wanted to surpass the other in accuracy.

---

|                             |                      |                               |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 18) v. 42. a) Mark 11:28-33 | = Matth. 21:23-27.   | = Luk. 20:2-8.                |
| Mark 11:28 ἐν ποία          | Matth. 21:23 ἐν ποία | Luk. 20:2 ἐν ποία .... ποιείς |

|                                                                                                       |                                                                                   |                                                                    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ἐξουσία ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καί<br>τις σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταυτην<br>ἔδωκεν, ἕνα τὰντα ποιῇς;                  | ..... ταύτην;                                                                     | ; ἢ τις ὁ δοὺς σοι ταύτα ....<br>την ;                             |
| 29. ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς καγὼ<br>ἕνα λόγον· ἀποκρίθητέ μοι,<br>καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν, ἐν ποίᾳ<br>ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. | 24. ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κάγώ<br>λόγον ἕνα, ὃν εἰπῆτέ<br>μοι, κάγω ὑμῖν ἐρῶ ....<br>ποιῶ. | 3. ἐρωτήσω .... ἕνα λόγον,<br>καὶ εἵπατε μοι.                      |
| 30. τὸ βάπτισμα, Ἰωάννου<br>ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢν, ἢ ἐξ<br>ανθρώπων; ἀποκρίθητέ<br>μοι.                       | 25. τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου<br>πόθεν ἢν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἢ ἐξ<br>ανθρώπων;                | 4. τὸ βάπτ. Ἰωάννου ἐξ<br>οὐρανοῦ .... ἀνθρώπων;                   |
| 33. --- οὐκ οἶδα μὲν ---<br>οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐν<br>ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.                        | 27. --- οὐκ οἶδαμὲν --- οὐδὲ<br>ἐγὼ .... ποιῶ.                                    | 7. καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ<br>εἰδέναι πόθεν. --- οὐδὲ ἐγὼ<br>.... ποιῶ. |

#### Notes:

1) A piece which, next to n. 28, most strongly refutes the assumption of different translations from the Hebrew, since the harmony of the texts in the Greek expression could hardly be more intimate here than it is.

2) The ταῦτα (Mark v. 28. Matt, v. 23. Luke v. 2.) is found in all the texts, notwithstanding it is referred to differently. For in Mark it looks back to the fact of the cleansing of the temple; in Luke it refers to the fact that Jesus is found teaching (Luk 20:1. cf. 19:47.), and this relation it has also in Matthew. For Matth. v. 23. διδάσκοντος cannot be deleted (Fritzsche's Commentary on Matth.), unless Matthew's account is to be a thoughtless one; ταῦτα would then have no relation at all. For it could no longer refer to the cleansing of the temple, since this is completely relegated to the background in Matth. 24, 14-26, and the cause of the Pharisees' displeasure with Jesus is not the expulsion of the sellers, but the exaltations of praise called to Jesus by the healed. Which relation of this τὸ "Lr" is the more correct, that of Mark or of the others? - Matthew goes beyond the secondary texts in v. 23-33. It will be as easy to determine here as anywhere else whether what he adds is an integral part of the text or not. The appearance of the former is present insofar as the analogy of the content with the preceding is unmistakable. For it continues about John, and v. 32. sees οὐκ ἐπιστεῦσατε back to v. 25.



3) Peculiarities of expression: There can only be a few of them here.

a) Luke. Concerning v. 2. we only want to remark that he expresses Hct. 4, 7. he expresses himself differently: εν ποια δυνάμει ή εν ποιο δνόματι Ιποιήσατε τούτο υμείς; and that here, nevertheless, a similarity of speech takes place. On the construction και τις ό δοϋς σοι κ. τ. λ. comp. above to n. 9. - V. 6. Luke expresses the thought of the opponents still more definitely. But this does not belong here, but under the neflexion-formulae. v. 7. μή - πόθεν. Luke has often the oratio iollirecla, where the others have the äirecta; e. g. ch. 5:14. 8:29. 32. 8:41. - V. 3. lacks words which are self-evident. S. above on o. 39. -

(b) Matthew: v. 24. δν εάν ει'πητε. Matthew is fond of constructing antecedent and subsequent clauses; comp. 21:34.40. and other examples at o. 35. - v. 25. πόθεν ήν. Thus Matthew loves to suggest disjunctive questions and to form such questions. Comp. 27:21. τίνα θέλετε από των δυο κ. τ. λ. Ch. 17:25. από τίνων λαμβάνουσιν χ. τ. λ. This is connected with the habit of making questions which are intended to put the answer into the mouth. Examples see above 35. - (v. 26. is also the relation of the φοβοϋμεθα to the Mark. εφοβοϋντο to be specially noticed).

(c) Mark: v. 28. a tautological addition, like ch. 3:28. 13:19. et al.

236

| 19) n. 42. b. Mark. 12:1-11.                                                                                                                                   | = Matth. 21:33-44.                                                                                                                                                         | = Luk. 20:9-18.                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 12:1 αμπελώνα<br>έφύτευεν άνθρωπος κ.<br>περιέθηκε φραγμόν και<br>ώρυξεν ύπολήνιον και<br>ώκοδόμησε πύργον κ.<br>έξέδοτο αυτόν γιωργοις και<br>άπεδήμησε | Matth. 21:33 άνθρωπος ην<br>οικοδεσπότης όστις<br>έφϋτευσεν αμπελώνα κ.<br>φραγμόν αυτώ περιέθηκε<br>κ. ώρυξεν έν αυτώ ληνόν κ.<br>εξεδοτο αυτόν γεωργοίς κ.<br>απεδημησε. | Luk. 20:9 άνθρωπός τις<br>εφύτευαεν αμπελώνα και<br>εξέδοτο αυτόν γεωργοίς<br>και άπεδημηβε χρόνους<br>ικανούς. |
| 2. χαϊ άπέϋτειλε προς τους<br>γεωργούς τώ χαίρω<br>δούλον, ι'να παρά τών<br>γεωργόν λάβη από του<br>χαρποϋ του αμπελώνα                                        | 34. οτι όέ ηγγιϋεν ό καιρός<br>τών χαρπών, άπέβτειλε<br>τούς δούλους αυτού προς<br>τούς γεωργούς, λαβειν<br>τούς καρπούς αυτού.                                            | 10. και εν χαίρώ απέστειλε<br>προς τούς γεωργούς<br>δούλαν, ι'να από του<br>χαρπού του αμπελώνας<br>δώσιν αυτώ  |
| 3. οί δε λαβόντες αυτόν                                                                                                                                        | 35. κ. λαβόντες οί γεωργοί                                                                                                                                                 | οί δε γεωργοί δείραντες                                                                                         |

|                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ἔδειραν κ. ἀπέστειλαν<br>κενόν.                                                                                                         | τούς δούλους αὐτοῦ, ὃν<br>μεν ἔδειραν,                                                                                                                   | ἐξαπέστειλαν κενόν.                                                                                                                            |
| 4. καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλε<br>πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον<br>δούλον· χαιῖνον<br>ἐκεφαλίωσαν κ. ἀπέϋτειλαν<br>ἡτίμασαν.                                | ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν,                                                                                                                                        | 11. καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι<br>ἕτερον δούλον, οἱ δὲ<br>κακῶν δείραντες κ.<br>ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξαπέστειλαν<br>κενόν.                                   |
| 5. χαῖ ἄλλον ἀπέστειλε·<br>χαχεῖνον ἀπέκτειναν                                                                                          | ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν.                                                                                                                                      | 12. καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι<br>τρίτον· οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον<br>τραυματίσαντες ἐξέβαλον.                                                               |
| καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, τοὺς<br>μὲν δέροντες τοὺς δὲ<br>ἀποκτείνοντες.                                                                      | 36. πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν<br>ἄλλους δούλους, πλείονας<br>τῶν πρώτων, κ. ἐποίησαν<br>αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως;                                                           |                                                                                                                                                |
| 6. ἔτι οὖν ἐνα υἱὸν ἔχων<br>ἀγαπητὸν αὐτοῦ,<br>ἀπύστειλε καὶ αὐτὸν πρὸς<br>αὐτοὺς ἐσχάτον, λέγων ὅτι<br>ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν<br>μου.  | 37. ὕστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλε<br>πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν<br>αὐτοῦ λέγων·<br>ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν<br>μου,                                                       | 13. εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ<br>ἀμπελῶνος· τί ποιήσω;<br>πέμψω τὸν υἱὸν μου τὸν<br>ἀγαπητὸν· ἴσως τοῦτον<br>ἐντραπήσονται.                         |
| 7. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ<br>εἶπον πρὸς εαυτοὺς οὗτός<br>ἐστὶν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε,<br>ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, κ.<br>ἡμῶν ἐστί ἡ κληρονομία. | 38. οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες<br>τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον ἐν εαυτοῖς<br>οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος,<br>δεῦτε, ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν<br>καὶ κατὰσχωμεν τὴν<br>κληρονομίαν.   | 14. ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτόν οἱ<br>γεωργοὶ διαλογίζοντο πρὸς<br>εαυτοὺς, λύγοντες· οὗτος<br>.... αὐτόν, ἵνα ἡμῶν<br>γύνηται ἡ κληρονομία.              |
| 8. καὶ λαβόντες αὐτόν<br>ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλον<br>ἐξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος.                                                                  | 39. καὶ λαβόντες αὐτόν<br>ἐξέβαλον ἐξω τοῦ<br>ἀμπελῶνος κ. ἀπέκτειναν.                                                                                   | 15. καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτόν<br>ἐξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος<br>ἀπέκτειναν.                                                                                   |
| 9. τί οὖν ποιήσει ὁ κύριος<br>τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται<br>κ. ἀπολύσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς<br>καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα<br>ἄλλοις.                | 40. ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος<br>τ. ἀμπ., τί ποιήσει τοῖς<br>γεωργ. ἐκείνοις; 41. (Ο)<br>κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολύσει<br>καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα<br>ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις (Ο.) | τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ<br>κύριος τ. ἀμπελῶνος; 16.<br>ἐλεύσεται κ. ἀπολέσει τοὺς<br>γεωργοὺς τούτους κ. δώσει<br>τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις<br>(—Ο.) |
| 10. οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν<br>ταύτην ἀνύγνωτε· λίθον ὃν<br>ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ<br>οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος                                             | 42. (Ο) οὐδέποτε ἀνεγνώτε<br>ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς· λίθον ....<br>γωνίας;                                                                                      | 17. (Ο) τί οὖν ἐστὶ τό<br>γεγραμμένον τοῦτο λίθον<br>.... γωνίας;                                                                              |

|                                                                 |                        |         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------|
| ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν<br>γωνίας;                                  |                        |         |
| 11. παρὰ κυρίου αὐτή, κ.<br>ἐστὶ θαυμαστή ἐν<br>ὀφθαλμοῖς υμῶν; | παρὰ κυρίου .... ὑμῶν; |         |
| 43. (Ο)                                                         |                        |         |
| 44. (Ο)                                                         |                        | 18. (Ο) |

238

Notes:

1) This piece is directly connected with the previous one, although each seems to be a single unit. The homologue has several moments:

- a) Planting and renting of the vineyard,
- b) The sending and treatment of the servants,
- c) Mission and treatment of the son,
- d) Conclusion. - All three writers attach a special conclusion and transitional formula to it.

2) Peculiarities of expression:

- a) Luke: v. S. he has omitted words, as in v. 16, cf. also above to o. 36. Those omitted here cannot have been missing from the play, since the whole is an allusion to Isa. 5:2. where the same words occur: και φραγμόν περιέθηκε και εχαράκωσε και εφύτευσε ἀμπελον, κ. ωκοδομησε πύργον εν μέσω αὐτοῦ και προλήνιον ὠρνξε εν αυτω. It is always noticeable that Luke makes contractions where synonymous phrases stand next to each other. Another example will occur above 49. -- χρόνους Ικανούς, comp. ch. 8:28. 32. 20:9. act. 9:23. 48. &c. St. - V. 10. is again his expression shorter, as v. 15. - v. 11. 12. προσέθετο. Luke wants to express more definitely: he continued to send. The προστίθ. is more frequent in the Acts. - τί ποιήσω. A soliloquy like Luk. 9:9. - ον τί ποιήσω comp. ch. 16:3. - v. 14. ὁ ιελογ ἴζοντο λέγοντες comp. 5:3. εγόγγυζον λέγοντες. - v. 16. Addition: ἀκούσαντες δέ εἶπαν μή γένοιτο. This would be just the opposite of what Matthew v. 41. states as the word of the Pharisees. - v. 17. τί

ἐστι τό κ. τ. λ. comp. 21:22. act. 2:16. - v. 18. is a saying of which no other type is known than Dan. 2:34. 35.

(b) Matt. V. 33. οικοδεσπότης, comp. 20:1. Matth, seeks everywhere to define subject and object more exactly, as also v. 34. 35. - εν αυτω retained from Isa. 5:2. - V. 34. οτε δε and v. 40. The construction of the sentence in the ante- and post-clause see on o. 42. a. - τους δούλους as Matth. 22:3. - v. 35. ον μέν, ον δε gräcissirendcr; comp. 22:5. - Matthew thus also mentions three servants, like the Others. - v. 3b. πάλιν άλλους as ch. 22:4. - κ. έπ. ώςαύτως comp. 22:26. - v. 38. είπον εν εαυτοις as ch. 9:3. - v. 41. is added for the more exact determination of the άλλοις: οίτινες αποδώσονσιν αυτώ τους χαρπους εν τοις χαιροις αυτών, which addition it did not need. We shall find enough other examples of this kind in other places. - v. 43. 44. I consider to be a later interpolation. For v. 43. contrasts too strongly with v. 45: ε'γνωσαν οτι περί αυτών λίγει- and v. 44. must probably have been transferred either from Matth, into Luke, or from Luk. into Matthew (the latter is more probable). -

239

c) Mark: V. 4. πάλιν απέστειλε is not from Matth. as it rather corresponds Luk. v. 11. - v. 6. is to be seen whether the version of the words has not more signs of originality than Luk. v. 15. - v. 9. δώσει with Luk. - Matth, wants the more definite εχδώσει. (The τῆ ποιήσει of all the texts is from Isa. 5:5. νυν δε ευαγγελώ υμῖν, τῇ ποιήσω τῷ ἀμπελώνι μου.) - In the passage of the treatment of the servants all the texts vary. Before and v. 6 - 8. Mark agrees with Matthew, v. 9-12. but most with Luke. (At least Luke has here the text of Mark under multiplications.) Mark v. 8. the words have probably been displaced by an error of the copyists, and the words will have to be placed just as in Matthew v. 39.

3) Schleiermach admits that there are no individual sentences before us, and that for this reason he feels compelled to adhere to collections. But we ask once more where the collections are to come from, if nothing individual to be collected arose?

4) One and the same Greek text runs through the play from beginning to end, and different translations are also not to be thought of fem.

-----

240

|                            |                    |                 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 20) n. 43. Mark. 12:14-17. | = Matth. 22:16-21. | = Luk.20:21-25. |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 12:14 διδάσκαλε, οἶδαμεν ὅτι αληθής εἶ, καί ου' μέλει σοι περί ουδενός' ου' γάρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀλήθειας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις. ἐξεστὶ κήνσον καίσαρι δοῦναι, ἢ οὐ ; (δῶμεν, ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;) | Matth. 22:16 διδάσκαλε, οἶδαμεν .... εἰ, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀλήθεια διδάσκεις, κ. ου' σοι μέλει περί ουδενός' οὐ γάρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων. 17. (εἶπε οὖν ἡμῖν, τί σοι δοκεῖ) ἐξεστὶ κήνσον δοῦναι καίσαρι, ἢ οὐ; | Luk.20:21 — διδάσκαλε, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγεις κ. διδάσκεις κ. ου λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀλήθειας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις. 22. ἐξεστὶν ἡμῖν καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι, ἢ οὐ; |
| 15. — τί με πειράξετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον, ἵνα ἴδω.                                                                                                                                                                          | — 17. τί με πειράξετε ὑποκριταί; ἐπιδείξατέ μοι τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσον.                                                                                                                                                          | 23. — τί με πειράξετε; δείξατε μοι δηνάριον.                                                                                                                                       |
| 16. τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτῆ καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή; — καίσαρος —                                                                                                                                                                           | 20. τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτῆ κ. ἡ ἐπιγραφή; — καίσαρος.                                                                                                                                                                               | 24. τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα κ. ἐπιγραφήν; — καίσαρος.                                                                                                                                    |
| 17. — ἀπόδοτε τὰ καίσαρος καίσαρι, κ. τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.                                                                                                                                                                     | 21.— ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ .... τῷ θεῷ.                                                                                                                                                                                                | 25. ἀπόδοτε τοῖ- νυν τὰ καίσαρος .... τῷ θεῷ.                                                                                                                                      |

#### Notes:

1) The similarity both in the Greek expression, as well as in the content and in the entire form of presentation, could not be more intimate here than it is. Also, as the piece has the same position in all of them, it is also crowned by the same general closing formula.

#### 2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Luke: v. 21. ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγεις. Luk 7:43. 10:28. Here again Luke remains faithful to his method of either contracting, or omitting, in the case of tautological phrases of the same kind. So here the words are missing: καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περί ουδενός. Cf. to n. 42.  
b. Therefore, however, the double διδάσκεις is conspicuous, and since an unsuspecting example of such repetition is unlikely to occur again in Luke, one would suppose that the words so completely similar to the text of Mark: ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀλήθειας κ. τ. λ. were interpolated. A similar example of interpolation in the Luk. from Mark will occur to us later. - v, 22. φόρον, comp. 23, 2.

Why did Luke here change with the expression? Since he likewise disjuncts the question, and ends with ἢ οὐ, as do the others; he must have had a definite text and definite given words in mind. He must therefore have chosen the other expression on

purpose. - v. 24. he omitted that the denarius was shown according to the request. S. above on n. 39. -

241

b) Matthew: in Matthew, v. 16, the words which Mark has in his text are placed differently. What is the original position? - ον γάρ βλέπεις. It has already been remarked above that Matthew is fond of applying the γάρ, but Mark also hath it here. - v. 17. εἰπέ οὐνήμῳ. We shall give below a list of the passages where Matthew seeks to supplement the sentences by adding words. An example has already been given in n. 42. b. Matth. 21:41. τί σοι δοκεῖ does not occur in Mark, in Matth, before questions very often. S. e.g. 17:25. 18:12. 21:28. 22:42. 26:66. - υποκριταῖ, comp. the addition: ολιγόπιστοι ch. 8:26. 14:31. - v. 19. τό νόμισμα τον κήνσον, instead of δηνάριον, to denote the object as definitely as possible. Hence also the addition: υποκριταῖ v. 18. -

(c) Mark: v. 14. is δώμεν ἢ μή δώμεν quite according to Mark's habit of expressing vivid speech mimetically, comp. at n. 42. a. Mark. 11:30. ἀποκρίθητέ μοι, and 11:10. the doubling to imitate affect. - v. 15. "να ἰδῶ, superfluous as n. 42. a. 11:28. ἵνα πάντα ποιῇς. - There are no other words in Mark which do not also occur in the secondary texts.

3) The piece is not of a different nature than those that are usually taken for special records. But it is obvious that it is not such a record.

242

| 21) n. 44. Mark. 12:19-27.                                                                                                                                                                     | = Matth. 22:23-32.                                                                                                                                  | = Luk. 20:27-38.                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 12:19 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, οτι εαν τίνος ἀδελφός ἀποθάνῃ, και καταλίπη γυναῖκα, και τέκνα μή αφή, ἵνα λαβῇ ὁ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ την γυναῖκα και ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. | Matth. 22:23 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν' ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μή ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ὁ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ τήν γυναῖκα, κ. ἀναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. | Luk. 20:27 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ἐάν τίνος ἀδελφός ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, κ. οὗτος ἀτεχνος ἀποθαντ), ἵνα λαβῇ ὁ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ τήν γυναῖκα κ. ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ .... αὐτοῦ. |
| 20. Ἐπτὰ ἀδελφοί ἦσαν και ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβε γυναῖκα,                                                                                                                                              | 25. Ἦσαν δέ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπτὰ ἀδελφοί, κ. ὁ πρῶτος                                                                                                     | 29. Ἐπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοί ἦσαν, χ. ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν                                                                                                                                           |

|                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| και αποθησκων ουκ<br>αφηκε σπερμα.                                                                                                                                                        | γαμήσας έτελεύτησε, και<br>μή 'έχων σπέρμα αφήκε<br>τήν γυναίκα αυτού τώ<br>αδελφώ αυτού.                                                  | γυναίκα απέθανεν άτεκνος                                                                                                                                |
| 21.καί ό δεύτερος έλαβεν<br>αυτήν, κ. απίθανε, κ. ουδέ<br>αυτός αφήκε σπέρμα, και ό<br>τρίτος ώς αύτως'                                                                                   | 26. ομοίως κ. ό δεύτερος κ.<br>ό τρίτος, έως τών έπτα.                                                                                     | 30. κ. έλαβεν ο δεύτερος<br>τήν γυναίκα κ. ουτος<br>απίθανεν<br>άτεκνος.                                                                                |
| 22.καί έ'λαβον αυτήν οί<br>επτά, κ. ουκ αφήκαν<br>σπέρμα έσχατη πάντων<br>απίθανε και ή γυνή.                                                                                             | 27. ύστερον δέ πάντων<br>απίθανε κ. ή γυνή.                                                                                                | 31. κ. ο τρίτος έλαβεν<br>αυτήν ώς αύ — τως κ. οί<br>επτά' ου κατέλιπον τέκνα.                                                                          |
| 23. 'Εν τή ούν άναστάσει *)<br>τίνας αυτών έσται γυνή; οί<br>γάρ επτά έσχον αυτήν<br>γυναίκα.                                                                                             | 28. 'Εν τή ούν άναστάσει<br>τίνας τών επτά έσται γυνή;<br>πάντες γάρ έσχον αυτήν.                                                          | 33. 'Εν τή ούν άναστασει<br>τίνας αυτών γίνεται γυνή; οί<br>γάρ επτά έσχον αυτήν<br>γυναίκα.                                                            |
| 24. — (ου) διά τούτο<br>πλανάσθε, μή είδοτες τάς<br>γραφάς μηδέ τήν δύναμιν<br>τού θεού;                                                                                                  | 29. Πλανάσθε, μή είδοτες<br>.... τού θεού.                                                                                                 | Missing<br><br>34. (Ο).                                                                                                                                 |
| 25. "Όταν γάρ έκ νεκρών<br>άναστώσιν, ούτε γαμοῦσιν<br>ούτε γαμίσκονται, άλλ' είσίν<br>ως άγγελοι οἱ έν τοῖς<br>ουρανοῖς.                                                                 | 30. 'Εν γάρ τή άναστάσει<br>ούτε γαμοῦσιν ούτε<br>γαμίζονται, άλλ ως άγγελοι<br>του θεοῦ έν ουρανῷ είβι.                                   | 35. οί δέ καταξιωθέντες του<br>αιῶνας εκείνου τυχεῖν κ.<br>τής άναστάσεως τής έκ<br>νεκρών ούτε γαμοῦβιν<br>ούτε έκγα- μίσκονται 36.<br>(Ο)             |
| 26. Περί δέ των νεκρών ότι<br>έγείρονται ονκ άνέγνωτε έν<br>τή βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως έπι τής<br>βατόν, ως είπεν αντώ ο<br>θεός, λέγων' έγώ ο θεός<br>Αβραάμ κ. ο θεός 'Ισαάκ κ.<br>δ θεός 'Ιακώβ; | 31. Περ'ι δέ τής<br>αναϋτάβεως τών νεκρών<br>ουκ άνέγνωτε τό ρηθέν<br>νμῖν υπό τον θεοῦ<br>λέγοντος' 32. έγώ είμι ....<br>Ιακώβ; ουκ έστιν | 37. οτι δε έγείρονται<br>οίνεκροίκαί Μωϋβής<br>έμήνυβεν έπι τής βατού,<br>ως λέγει κύριον, τον θεόν<br>Αβραάμ κ. τον θεόν 'Ισαάκ<br>κ. τον θεόν 'Ιακώβ. |
| 27. Ουκ έστιν δ θεός<br>νεκρών, άλλα ζώντων.<br>ύμεις ονν πολύ πλανάσθε.                                                                                                                  | Ουκ έστιν ο θεός νεκρών,<br>άλλα ζώντων.                                                                                                   | 38. θεός δέ ουκ έστι<br>νεκρών, άλλα ζώντων (Ο).                                                                                                        |

\*) όταν γάρ - άναστώσιν does not belong here, but in the v 25.

## Notes:

1) That the piece is the same in all specimens is taught by sight. The question of the Sadducees consists of a premise, a subsumption and a conclusion (or it is concluded from the cases that can occur through the Mosaic ordinance of marriage; because it cannot be determined which of the several men is entitled to the one wife). Jesus' answer is twofold. First, it speaks of what takes place, not both when there is a resurrection, but rather when the resurrection has taken place: *ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν οἱ νεκροί* Mark; then it is proved that there is a resurrection. All the texts have the same form of argumentation and the same order of propositions.

## 2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Mark agrees here literally, sometimes with Luke, sometimes with Matthew. Luke deviates in the following: v. 28. *ἄτεκνος*, as v. 29. 30. not to make the expression more Greek; - for Luke hebraizes more than the others; but because this word is used in the Alex. translation, to which Matthew adheres. But because this word is often degenerated in the Alex. translation, to which expression the verse has become accustomed. - v. 28. the reading seems to be distorted, and, if *καὶ οὗτος* is to hold good, must be read: *ἐάν τίνος ἀδελφός ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκνος ἢ --* v. 29. *λαβὼν γυναῖκα*. Luke uses the participle far more often than Mark. Examples have already occurred. S. n. 36. n. 28. v. 34. 35. Luke makes the diction more solemn by Hebraisms, as he is wont to do elsewhere, and passages of the kind will still occur. - οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου comp. ch. 16:8. - *καταξιώ* comp. ch. 21:36. 7:7. Act. 5:41. - *γαμοῦσι* and *γαμοῦσι*: resolution of the thought into two propositions opposed to each other, comp. above to n. 14. - v. 36. Logical additions, for the best of the argument. - The question is: are these really additions to an earlier text? - v. 37. *ἐμήνυσεν ὥς*, comp. above n. 9. on Luk. 6, 4. - v. 38. again an explanatory appositive, which, however, must not be misunderstood. -

b) Matthew: v. 24. He gives the allusion to the Mosaic commandment the form of a citation. Hence the future tense. *ἐπιγαμβρεύσει* and comp. *ἀναστήσει*, above to n. 35., and *Μωϋσῆς εἶπε* (instead of , *ἔγραψε*, ἴνα). The expression of the others: *λαβεῖν γυναῖκα* was predetermined by Deut. 25:5. *ἐάν κατοικῶσιν ἀδελφοὶ ἑπ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἀποθάνῃ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, σπέρμα δὲ μὴ ἦ αὐτῷ \**), *οὐκ ἔσται ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος ἕξω ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐγγίζοντι ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς - ληψεται αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα*.



So As but the neighbouring texts borrow from this passage only the main content, and that: ἐξαναστήση σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ elsewhere, so also Matthew has his επιγαμβρεύσει from another passage, and that from the same, which also seems to have preceded those, and to which a very natural association of the Jews led, as it mentions a special case of the law contained in the first, namely Gen. 38:8. καὶ γάμβρευσον αὐτήν, καὶ ἀνα- στήσεις σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου. (Bon here, therefore, is also of Matthew: ἀναστήσεις σπέρμα and that: ἐξαναστήσης σπέρμα of the others). (Else also Deut. 25:8. ἀναστήσεις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ and Isa. 66:22. occurs connected with σπέρμα). - v. 25. παρ' ἡμῖν supplementary, according to Matthew wise. - v. 26. epitomizing, comp. ch. 24:10. 26:18. - v. 28. τίνος τῶν ἐπτά, is again to give more definiteness to the expression - v. 31 τὸ ρηθὲν frequent in Matth, cf. 1:22. 3:3. 8:17. 12:17. 13:35. 21:4. 26:9. 27:35. etc. St. -

\*) Hence Luk. v. 28. καὶ οὗτος ἀτεκνός ἢ (not: ἀποθάνψ.)

245

(c) Mark: nothing peculiar is to be distinguished from him, except the constant expression: ἀφιέναι σπέρμα v. 19. 21. Up to v. 23. he harmonizes more with Luke, thenceforth more with Matthew. - v. 24. the ου(before διὰ τοῦτο) is just as wrong as ch. 11:17. and Matth. 24:2. Perhaps instead of ου διὰ τοῦτο is to be read: πυκ οἶδατε, ὅτι πλανάσθε --- ; To this fits v. 27. the assurance repeated again at the conclusion, which refers back to the expressed in another form. - v. 22. το/urA as ch. 12, 6.

3) How would one think here of various translations from the Hebrew?

| 221 n. 46. Mark. 12:35-37.                                                                                                                       | = Luk. 20:41-44.                                                              | = Matth. 22:42-45.                                                                                                                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 12:35 πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι ὁ χριστός υἱός ἐστι Δαβὶδ;                                                                            | Luk. 20:41 πῶς λέγουσι τὸν χριστὸν υἱὸν Δαβὶδ εἶναι;                          | Matth. 22:42 τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ; τίνος υἱός ἐστι;                                                                     |
| 36. αὐτός γὰρ Δαβὶδ εἶπεν ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ λέγει ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου' κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἐως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροῦς σου ὑποποδίου τῶν ποδῶν σου. | 42. καὶ αὐτός Δαβὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν' εἶπεν ὁ κύριος .... τῶν ποδῶν σου. | — τοῦ Δαβὶδ. 43. — πῶς οὖν Δαβὶδ ἐν πνεύματι κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ; λέγων' 44. εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου .... τῶν ποδῶν σου. |

|                                                                    |                                                            |                                                           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 37. Αυτός οὖν Δαβὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον" και ποθεν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ; | 44. Δαβὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ" και πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ εἰσι; | 45. Εἰ οὖν Δαβὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ; |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|

246

Notes:

1) If Matthew seems to give a quite different relation than his neighbours, we must at least remember that his text has exactly the same elements as the texts of those. But here the question is: who had the original text? All the speakers leave it unclear in what respect and with what intention Jesus actually raised the question- This much is clear: Jesus rebukes this common conception of the Messiah, that he is thought of merely as the Son of David\*). According to the interpreters who would like to make Matthew an original writer, he has said something very different from what the others are supposed to have said. We do not accept all such rhetoric and sophistry, and in fact claim the opposite, since we know Matthew's way of presenting things quite well. We shall speak of this in a moment.

\*) This passage points as well as that in u. 42. b. "The stone which the builders rc." to an extension of the kingdom of God, in which Judea remains just as little the centre as it is important for the Messiah to be a descendant of David. (It seems that Jesus himself does not want this to be the criterion of the Messiah).

2) Peculiarities of presentation:

(a) Matthew: v. 42. τί νῦν δοκεῖ κ. τ. λ. Spelling of Matthew. S. to n. 43. Matthew resolves the question, πῶς λέγονσιν, ὅτι ὁ χριστὸς υἱὸς ἐστὶ Δαβὶδ (Mark v. 35.) into two constituent parts:

α) let the opponents themselves say that he is David's son. Then shall

β) to argue against it, as in the other texts. To effect the first, Matthew, according to his custom, forms a question, putting the answer into the mouth, as it were anticipating it: τίνας υἱὸς ἐστὶ; answer: τοῦ Δαβὶδ, samples of such questions we have cited above at n. 35. 35. Matthew also likes to form dialogues, even though the others have none. See, e. g., at n. 35. Matth. 19, 18. Here λέγει ἰησοῦς, and n. 42. a. Matth. 21:41 λῑγονσιν αὐτῷ, are inserted in the same way as in the present passage v. 42. The second part, the refutation of the assertion, consists of no other raisonnement than that of the secondary texts. - v. 43. πῶς οὖν - comp. n. 14.

(where Matthew 12:26. is also enlarged to put on the final: πώς ουν). (As to ἐν πνεῦματι, we only remember that ἐν does not mean: per, but that the idiom is derived from: εἶναι ἐν πνεῦματι, and that therefore the ἰγίω appended to Mark, v. 36. should hardly be correct. Something else, for example, is βαπτίζειν ἐν πνεῦματι ἁγίῳ, which Mark, however, wrote. - The ἅγιον piety would gladly put everywhere, as in the headings of the Gospels). - v. 45. εἰ ουν χ. τ. λ. On this inferential εἰ comp. at n. 35 Matthew. It must be examined more closely what could have induced Matthew to give a special turn to Jesus' utterance, and to turn it into a question to the Pharisees.

247

b) Luke: v. 41. Brevity, which turns into incomprehensibility, is found in Luke in several places. For examples see above n. 14. - v. 42. ἐν βιβλίῳ ψαλμῶν as Act. 1:20.

3) Whoever notices the methodical nature of Matthew's deviations will not want to declare his text to be a special translation from the Hebrew.

-----

| 23) n. 47. Mark 12:38-40.                                                                                      | = Luke 20:46. 47.                                                                                          | = Matth. 23:2-6. rc.                                                                                           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 12:38 βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελόντων ἐν ὁτολαῖς περιπατεῖν, καὶ φιλονυκτησίου ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς,  | Luke 20:46 προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελ. .... ἀγοραῖς                                             | Matth. 23:2 —οἱ γραμματεῖς κ. οἱ φαρισαῖοι — κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε 6. φιλοῦσίν τε *)                |
| 39. καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κ. πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις.                                    | .... ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις.                                                                                     | τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις κ. τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κ. τοὺς ἀσπασμούς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς — |
| 40. οἱ κατεσθίοντες τοὺς οἶκους τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφαῦει μακρὰ προσεύχομενοι, οὗτοι λήγονται περισσότερον κρίμα. | 47. οἱ κατεσθίουσι τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν κ. προφασει μακρὰ προσεύχονται· οὗτοι περισσότερον κρίμα λήψονται. | (Ο,) v, 8 — 39. ;                                                                                              |

\*) Fritzsche's Comment, on d. St. : quando sumimus praecessisse πάντα όέ τά έργα et πλατννουσι δέ, ea res hic, ubi in eodem argumento pergitur, efflagitat φιλοθσι δέ. δέ alone would be quite inappropriate here for this very reason. It is to be read: πλατύ- νουσι (without δέ) τά φυλακτήρια - φιλονβι τε κ. τ. λ. (φιλονβι δέ would begin something new without being something different from what immediately preceded it. - The τε occurs also elsewhere in Matthew. Matth. 27:48. 22:10.

248

#### Notes:

1) The piece has special importance for the question: whether Mark borrows his text from one of the two neighbours or from both at the same time. (Fritzsche's commentary on Mark says b. d. St. p. 547. "Nam cum Marcus h. l. singula paene verba a Luca 20:45-47. mutuatus sit etc." - But at least we cannot judge so hastily before we have waited for other proofs).

2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Mark: v. 38. He always prefixes βλέπετε από where others say προσέχετε, and the latter does not occur with him at all. (S. Luk. 12, 1. Matth. 16, 6. comp. Mark. 8, 15. - Luk. 21, 34. comp. Mark. 13, 33. - Matth. 10, 17. comp. Mark. 13, 9.) - v. 40. the construction of the words deviates from Luke. Fritzsche's commentary correctly observes in this passage of Mark, that οί κατεσθιοντες is not an anacoluth (though anacoluths are not without example in Mark), but the nominative to the following: ούτοι λήπονται. But for the same reason, "καί" before cannot be deleted, as the commentary wants. " και ante προφίσει orationem reddit hiulcam" the oratio becomes rather hiulca when κατεσθιοντες is drawn to λήπονται, and the particip. προσενχόμενοι again to be a nearer determination to κατεσθιοντες, and thus to be translated: They that devour widows' goods, pretending (under pretence) to make long prayers. But this is not the sense either, If the words so belonged together; Luke would probably also have written: οί κατεσθίουσι προφάσει - προσευχόμενοι - προφάσει means here not: under pretence, but: with pretence, with dissimulation, and each particip is thus by itself: those who eat widows' houses, and with dissimulation make long prayers, these will (the more hypocritical they are) receive the more severe punishment.

249

b) Matthew. - For the transition to the parallel words, we have contrasted the βλέπετε and προσέχετε with those words which, preceding those, also contain a warning. Much of what is interwoven here in Matthew is found elsewhere in Luke. See the second table above.

3) Here Eichhorn (Einleit. p. 292.) urges nothing even of various translations from the Hebrew.

-----

24) n. 49. Mark. 13:2-32. = Matth. 24:2-36. = Luk. 21:6-33.

A long discourse in answer to a question raised by the disciples. The answer is written in such a way that it gives hints and suggestions about the conduct that Jesus' disciples and the followers of the true Messiah in general should adopt during the time period of concern. There are several of these hints and suggestions. - Therefore, for the sake of an easy overview, we want to arrange the whole piece according to certain sections and paragraphs.

250

| Question of the disciples                                                             |                                                                                                    |                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 13:2 βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομίας;                                      | Matth. 24:2 βλέπετε πάντα τούτα;                                                                   | Luke 21:6 ταῦτα θεωρεῖτε;                                                       |
| οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὅς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.                                         | οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὡδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ, ὅς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.                                               | ελευσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ .... ὅς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.     |
| 4. εἶπε ἡμῖν, πότε τούτα ἔσται καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ πάντα τούτα συντελεῖσθαι; | 3. εἶπε ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον (τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ τῆς συντέλειας τὸν αἰὼνος; | 7. διδάσκαλε, πότε οὖν ταῦτα ἔσται καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ἵταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι; |

Notes:

1) All copies divide the question into two parts. This is the usual way of presentation. S. the remarks on n. 9. in Mark. 2:7.

2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Matthew: v. 2. ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν. Matthaeus has this here alone, as in n. 35. Matth. 19:23. - ὡδε such insertions Matth, very often applies, in order to leave nothing wanting for the definiteness of the expression. Comp. ch. 12:2. οἱ μαθηταί σου. 9:11. ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν. 18:4. εἰ θέλεις. 19:26. τοῦτο. 21:2. μετ' αὐτῆς, v. 9. τῷ νίῳ Δαβὶδ. 21:25. ἡμῖν. 26:22. εἰμι κύρις; here 24:5. ὁ χριστός. 6. ὁράτε υ. α. St. - v. 3. τῆς συντέλειας τοῦ αἰῶνος, an expression which only degenerates in Matthew, and is important according to the passages wherein it occurs. Cf. ch. 13:39. 40. 49. 28:20. Just so the expression: παρουσία - cf. 24:27. 37. 39. (In which passages Matthew thus differs from Luke. Matth. 24:27. cf. Luk. 17:24. - Matth. 24:39. cf. Luk. 17:27.) The question here put by Matthew is directed with its discriminating definiteness to the nature of Christ's answer, which develops later in the text, and is one of the anticipatory questions, as they have already occurred to us in the sections n. 16. n. 35. n. 46. - This question itself raises the question of whether the disciples could really have asked it in this way, and we ask that this be noted. For from this depends the judgement about the originality of the texts. We predict that Bertholdt's Echristology cannot give a decision here. -

251

b) Luke: we have departed v. 6. from the ordinary reading: ταῦτα α θεωρεῖτε, ελενσονται κ. τ. λ. for the following reasons:

α) Does the emphasis in this anomalous construction of the words: ελενσονται ἡμέραι κ. τ. λ. entirely lost.

β) It requires but a slight bending to make Luke's text equal to the others.

γ) So also those notes, beginning a solemn assurance of an unexpected thing, really regain their emphasis. - V. 7. γῖνεσθαι, comp. v. 28. 31. 36. -

(c) Mark: v. 4. συντελεῖσθαι, differing from Matth, and Luk. -. comp. Dan. 12:6. ἕως πότε τό πέρας ὧν εὕρηκας τῶν θαυμάσιων; (parenthetical: I translate: when will the all be performed, brought to completion? - not: when the all, i.e. this building there, is destroyed? partly so that the πάντα ταῦτα goes to the same, as in the formula: ταῦτα ἔσται, partly because of v. 7. τό τέλος, partly finally because the question: what is the sign that the all there is destroyed, would not even fit. For the sign of it would be that manual labour would be applied to the destruction. The correct sense is to be determined, lest it appear before other proofs as if Mark had copied his συντελεῖσθαι from the quite heterogeneous Matthaean: συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος).

3) The different expression of the question is therefore not a consequence of different translations. If one or the other of us has deviated, the deviation was not determined by the original. (This against Eichhorn Einleit. p. 294.).

252

Jesus' answer. First hint:

Beware of false messiahs.

|                                                                                              |                                                                   |                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark v. 5. βλέπετε, μή τις υμάς πλανήσῃ·                                                     | Math. v. 4. βλέπετε, μή .... πλανήσῃ'                             | Luk. v. 8. βλέπετε, μή πλανηθήτε'                                                |
| 6. πολλοί γάρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες' ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. | 5. πολλοί γάρ .... ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι (ὁ χριστός) καὶ .... πλανήσουσιν. | πολλοί γαρ .... ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι (καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε) μή οὖν πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. |

Notes:

1) What Jesus says here, he says once and for all, according to the prelude of the whole speech, concerning what he has to say about false Messiahs. We must therefore note here that the passage in Matthew, Matth, v. 23=27, which is interwoven into our piece, is nothing other than the present passage, modified. For Luke has this modification in a quite different place. See Luke 17:23. 24. Matthew has here only incorporated some peculiarities, namely 24:24. then v. 26. words, which are only tautological repetition of Matth, v. 23. Luk. ch. 17:23. and just as structured, compare namely:

|                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 17:23 καὶ ἐροῦσιν' ἰδοὺ ὡδ' ἐ, ἢ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ' μη ἀπέλθῃτε, μηδε διώξητε. | Matth. 24:23 τότε ἐὰν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ' ἰδοὺ ὡδε ὁ χριστός, ἢ ὡδε' μή πιστεύσῃτε. | Matth. 24:26 ἐὰν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστὶ' μή ἐξέλθῃτε · ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις' μή πιστεύσῃτε. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Then Matth, v. 27, falls into the interrupted text of Luke. Cf. Matth, v. 27. and Luk 17:24. ὥσπερ γάρ ἡ ἀστραπή κ. τ. λ.

(b) Luke either formed that passage ch. 17:23. 24. after the present one (Mark 13:5. 6. - Luk. 21:8.), or had another recension of the same passage before him. For the passages Luk. 17:23. μή ἀπέλθῃτε μηδὲ διωξήτε, and Luk. here (21:8.) μή οὖν πορευθῇτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν (Matth, has here 24:23. and 26. both times μή πιστεύσητε), are quite alike. - If Mark is said to have the words of Jesus analogous to our own here, v. 22, 23, then we may certainly regard them, according to the spirit of Mark's Gospel, as an interpolation made later in the text. With regard to Matthew, however, we cannot yet judge whether the interpolation was either already made by an author of the entire Gospel of Matthew or only by the hand of a later interpolator. We would like to note this here in passing. -

253

2) Peculiarities of expression: a) Matth, v. 4. He here puts βλέπετε, as usually Mark, who always puts it when the others have προσέχετε. Cf. above to n. 47. in Mark. - v. 5. πολλοί γάρ. Why does not Matthew's text here give to πολλοί the provision ψευδόχριστοι and ψευδοπροφήται as v. 24? πολλοί so here like Mark. - εἰμί added ὁ χριστός. Cf. the remarks on v. 2.

b) Luk. v. 9. - εἰμί καί κ. τ. λ. a connection by a καί where the others have only one. Comp. 5:3. 6:4. 8. 8:5. 17. 45. 9:12. 19:38. - μή ἀπέλθῃτε μηδὲ διωξήτε - comp. 17:23. μή ἀπέλθῃτε μηδὲ διωξήτε. -

c) From Mark nothing is to be distinguished.

Second hint:

Don't tremble at the first movements.

|                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark v.7 "Ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοάς πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γὰρ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος. | Matth. v.6 μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκοῦειν πολέμους .... πολέμων, (ὁράτε) μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γὰρ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω ἐστὶ τὸ τέλος. | Luke v.9 "Ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους κ. ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ πτοθῇτε· δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ευθέως τὸ τέλος. |
| 8. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος κ. βασιλεία ἐπὶ                                                        | 7. Ἐγερθήσεται .... ἔσονται λιμοὶ κ. σεισμοὶ κατὰ                                                                      | 10. — ἐγερθήσεται .... βασιλείαν.                                                                                         |



|                                                                      |                                   |                                                                            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| βασιλείαν κ. έσονται<br>σεισμοί κατα τοπον και<br>λιμοί και παραχαί. | τόπους.                           |                                                                            |
| 9. αρχοί ωδίνων ταυτα.                                               | 8. πάντα δε ταυτα αρχή<br>ωδίνων. | 11. σεισμοί τε μεγάλοι κατά<br>τόπους κ. λιμοί και λοιμοί<br>έσονται. (Ο). |

254

Notes:

Peculiarities of expression:

1) Luke: v. 9. He still repeats άκοϋσητε, not άκοάς πολέμων because he does not like to put the same words twice. S. at n. 10. and n. 34. - πποτηθήτε comp. 24, 37. - Addition: φόβητρά τε και σημεία άπ ουρανού μεγάλα έσται. Luke has taken pains at all to complete the account of the horrors S. v. 23. 24-26.

(b) Matth.: v. 7. we could already suppose that he would insert the: εστί. S. above at v. 2. and there at the same time about the όρατε v. 6. - All texts have here had the passage Jerem. 6, 24. before them: ήκοϋσαμεν την ακοήν αυτών (comp. όταν άκοϋσητε άκοάς) παρελυθησαν αι χείρες ήμιν, θλίψις κατ- ίσχυεν ημών, ωδίνες (comp. άρχαι ωδίνων) ως τικτοίσης.

Third hint:

Trust in assistance in trial.

|                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 13:9 βλέπετε<br>δε υμείς εαυτ.<br>παραδώ σουσι γαρ<br>υμάς είς συνέδρια<br>και εν συναγωγαίς<br>δαρήσεσθε κ. επί<br>ηγεμόνων κ.<br>βασιλέων<br>σταθήσεσθε ένεκεν<br>εμού εις μαρτύριον | Matth 10:17<br>προσέχετε δε από<br>τών ανθρωπων ·<br>παραδώσουσι γάρ<br>.... συνέδρια, και εν<br>ταίς συναγωγαίς<br>μαστιγώσουσιν<br>υμάς. 18. κ. επί<br>ηγεμόνας δε κ.<br>βασιλείς άχθήσεσθε | Matth 24:9 τότε<br>παραδώσουσιν<br>υμάς είς θλίψιν, (κ.<br>άποκτενοϋσιν υμάς.<br><br>14. και<br>κηρυχθήσεται τοϋτο<br>τό εύαγγέλιαν τής<br>βασιλείας έν όλη τή<br>οικουμένη είς | Luk 21:12 προ δε<br>τούτων απάντων<br>έπιβαλοϋσιν έφ'<br>υμάς τας χείρας<br>παραδιδόντες εις<br>τάς συναγωγάς κ.<br>φύλακας κ.<br>ηγεμόνας ένεκεν<br>του ονοματος μου. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                |                                                   |                             |                                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| αυτοῖς.                                                        | ένεκεν ἑμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριαν αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι. | μαρτυρίαν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι. |                                       |
| 10. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη δεῖ πρῶτον κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. |                                                   |                             | 13. Ἀποβήσεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριαν. |

255

| Mark                                                                                                                                                                              | Matthew                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Matthew                                                                               | Cf Luke                                                                                                                                                                       | Luke                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11. "Όταν δέ ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνάτε τί λαλήσητε· ἄλλ' ο ἂν δοθῇ νμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. | 19. "Όταν δέ παραδιδώσιν ὑμᾶς, μὴ μεριμνάτε πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε· δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε·<br><br>20. οὐ γάρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλῶν ἐν ὑμῖν. | missing at 24:9                                                                       | 12:11. "Όταν δέ προσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς κ. τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ μεριμνάτε, πῶς ἀπολογήσησθε ἢ τί εἴπητε· τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν. | 21:14. θέσθε οὖν εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι. 15. ἐχω χθρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα κ. σοφίαν, ἣ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιπεῖν ἢ ἀντιστήναι πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν. |
| 12. παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφός ἀδελφόν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς κ. θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς.                                                        | 21. παραδώσει δε .... αὐτούς.                                                                                                                                                                               | 10. καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθῶσονται πολλοί κ. ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσι κ. μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους. | cf. Luk. 12:53. διαμερισθήσεται πατὴρ ἐφ' νίῳ, κ. υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί, μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρί, κ. θυγατὴρ ἐπὶ μητρί, πένθερά ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς, κ. νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πένθεράν αὐτῆς.     | 16. παραδοθήσεσθ' ἐδέκαί ὑπὸ γονέων κ. ἀδελφῶν κ. συγγενῶν κ. φίλων, κ. θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν.                                                                                |
| 13. καὶ ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων                                                                                                                                              | 22. κ. ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι .... οὗτος                                                                                                                                                                         | From v. 9. κ. ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι ....                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                               | 17. Κ. ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι .... μου.                                                                                                                                           |

|                                                 |            |                                          |  |                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------|
| διὰ τό ἄνομα<br>μου.                            | σωθήσεται. | μου.                                     |  |                                                          |
| ο δέ ὑπομείνας<br>εἰς τέλος οὗτος<br>αωθήσεται. |            | 13. ο δέ<br>ὑπομείνας ....<br>σωθήϋεται. |  | 19. ἐν τῇ<br>ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν<br>κτήσεσθε τὰς<br>φυχὰς ὑμῶν. |

#### Notes:

1) We have here compared with the texts of our pericope quite similar passages which are found elsewhere in Matthew (10:17 f.) and Luke (12:11.). Certainly it must attract attention that

a) only these passages are similar to the text of Mark, and that

256

b) the very writers who have placed the same verses elsewhere, here vary partly against each other, partly against Mark.

2) There are some interpolations here. For

a) the verses are quite certain: Matth, v. 11. 12. are to be deleted. For

α) the words are merely tautological repetitions of what has been said before in the text. Namely, v. 11. corresponds entirely to the above v. 5. as can also be seen from the same expression: και πολλους πλανήσουσι. Compare also v. 24. (which verse, as noticed, is also interpolation), v. 12. is quite identical with v. 10.

β) If these verses be deleted; so v. 13. ὁ δέ υπομείνας κ. occurs. τ. λ. is connected with the μισεῖσθαι (Matth, v. 10.) just as it is in the text of Mark (Mark v. 13.) and Matth. 10, 22. and the connection of the words is then, here as there, the same. ("He who, in spite of the experience of hatred of man, perseveres in the Christian creed, is the same.)

γ) There are many interpolations, especially in Matth. Recall from n. 35. Matth. 19, 19. καί αγαπήσεις κ. τ. λ. from n. 42. b. to Matth. 21, 43.

(b) Luk. 21, 18. is also interpolated.

α) The verse contradicts the preceding words (v. 16.) και θανατώσονσιν εξ υμών. downright. It seems to be from Luk 12, 7, to which it is an explanation. Compare the analogical explanations:

|                                                                                                                                                 |                                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 12:6 καὶ ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλεγμένον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.                                                                               | Matth. 10:29 ἐξ αὐτῶν ου πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Against it: |
| Matth. 10:30 υμῶν δὲ και αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ἡριθμημέναι εἰσὶ. So also Luk. 12:7 ἡριθμῶνται, but differently in Luk. in our passage, namely:) | Luke 21:18 καὶ θρ'ιξ εκ τῆς κεφαλῆς υμῶν ου' μή ἀπόληται.  |

β) If the verse be here deleted; the words of constant perseverance (Luk. v. 19.) likewise enter into connection with the μισεῖσθαι, as in Mark. \*)

\*) Incidentally an exegetical remark: from the parallel passage Matth. 10:18. it follows, as here Mark v. 9. that εἰς μαρτύρων is to be understood. For what Matth. 10:18. is εἰς μαρτύριαν τοῖς ἐθνεσι, Mark. 13:10. κηρυχθήβεται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη therefore μαρτύριαν is one with κήρυγμα, and the sense of εἰς μαρτύριαν. is accordingly: ut edere de me testimonium possitis, which is also according to the words Luk. 21:13. (So not aptly Fritzsche's comment, on Matth, at Matth. 24:14. ut rei notitiam habeant - Matth. 10:18. he again explains it differently: ut sibi testimonium habeant vestrae mentis imperterritae. - It goes without saying that the words in both passages must mean the same thing, and we would not believe it if we were assured of the opposite.

257

### 3) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Matth. - The whole passage about trusting in the help of the court is omitted here, and has been incorporated into the Jn- struction to the disciples to be sent out (Matth. Ch. 10.). Whether now here Matth, v. 9. it be fitting that ἀποκτενοῦσιν υμάς should correspond to the: ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι, let it be decided. - According to Matth. 10:17. just as according to Mark. 13:10. the verse Matth. 24:14. should have been placed here between Matth, v. 9. and 10. How is it that it was pushed down so far? - This will probably be shown, and also where the words heredity at the end of v. 14. και τότε ηξει τό τέλος. -

(b) Luk.: v. 12. Ἰπμβαλοῦσιν τὰς χεῖρας, comp. 22:53. - v. 13. he makes a new paragraph for the sake of comprehensibility. - The parthy v. 14 -19. bears very strong

traces of his style of writing. - v. 14. θέσθε - καρδίας comp. 9:44. and formulae like 2:19. Act. 19:21. - απολογηθῆναι. This word has of the Evangelists only Luke. S. 12:11. Act. 19:33. 24:10. 25:8. 26:1. 2. 24. - On the words v. 15. σοφίαν, ἢ οὐ -- ἀντιστήναι comp. of Stephen Act. 6:10. - στόμα as in the Alex. Mouthing or frank speech i. q. παρηρησία \*) - (but does not occur again in Luk.). - ἀντειπεῖν Act. 4:14. - οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ch. 13:17. - v. 16. Why does it not also say here that the children will be raised against the parents? - v. 19. The parallel passage shows that not χτήβασθε, but χτήσεσθε, ought to be read. - χτήσασθε cannot have vim future here, as Kühnöl's commentary on d. St. wants, whether it may also be suitable in other connections. - In passing, one sees here that Luke does not avoid Hebraisms, but on the contrary makes use of them in solemn expression. -

\*) Wahl's clavis does not have this meaning.

258

c) Mark: v. 9. βλέπετε, common to him. - Instead of σταθήσεσθε, several codd. ἀχθήσεσθε, s. Griesb. from the parallel passage Matth. 10, 17. which we have excavated above. -

4) We have here a new proof that no different translations from the Hebrew are to be thought of. Or are we to believe that one and the same author - Matthew here and ch. 10:17 f. and Luke here and ch. 12:11 - made various Greek translations, and in the translation of one passage consulted Mark himself or a Greek translation similar to his text? or even that there were already Hebrew originals which dislocated the passages in different places as Luke and Matthew did? Eichhorn's introduction, p. 295, remarks: "There are so many traces of the common auxiliary scripture in the translation that it is not necessary to mark them" (quite naturally; for there are far more traces of a common Greek text than of any other text, of the last there are none at all). "but the case writing already followed more the Hebrew text, which came into Matthew's and Mark's hand, than that which Luke used." (So it must certainly seem, because Luke has expressed the text according to his manner of writing. v. 12-19. But where is the proof that he had a Hebrew one? The exact opposite would be the case, namely, that Mark's and Luke's Hebrew cockex must have been much more similar to each other in essential points - especially in the part of the text just mentioned - than the alleged cockex of Mark and Matthew. How many cockices are there to be, if every deviation of our writings is to be relegated to codices)?

---

## Fourth hint:

Admonition to flee during the siege of the city  
(and before the end that immediately follows).

|                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark v. 14 Όταν δέ ἴδῃτε τό βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστῶς ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη·                        | Matth. v. 15 15. "Ὅταν οὖν ἴδῃτε .... ἐρημώσεως (τό ρηθέν διά Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου,) ἐστῶς ἐντόπῳ ἁγίῳ · (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω 16. τότε οἱ .... τὰ ὄρη· | Luke v.20 "Ὅταν δέ ἴδῃτε κυκλομένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων τήν ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ γνῶτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς·<br><br>21. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ .... ὄρη· |
| 15. ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβατῶ (εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν) ἀραὶ τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ·                                                        | 17. ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ .... μὴ καταβαινέτω ἀραὶ .... αὐτοῦ·                                                                                                     | καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρεῖτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις· μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν.                                                         |
| 16. κ. ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν ὦν, μὴ ἐπιϋτρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, ἀραιτό ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.                                                             | 18. καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, μὴ .... ἀραὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ.                                                                                                    | 22. (Ο.)                                                                                                                                      |
| 17. Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαῦτρὶ ἐχούσαις, καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.                                                       | 19. Οὐαὶ δὲ .... ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.                                                                                                             | 23. Οὐαὶ δὲ .... ἡμέραις·                                                                                                                     |
| 18. Προσεύχεσθε δέ, ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμῶνος·                                                                                  | 20. Προσεύχεσθε δὲ .... γειμῶνος (μηδὲ σαββάτου                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                               |
| 19. ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλί- ψις, οἷα οὐ γέγονε το- σαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, ἢς ἐκτίσεν ὁ Θεός, ἕως τοῦ νῦν, καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται. | 21. ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλίψις, οἷα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κοσμοῦ ἕως τοῦ νῦν, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται.                                                            | ἐ'σται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ. οργὴ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ (24. Ο.)                                                                            |
| 21. Καὶ εἰ μὴ ὁ κύριος ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἔσω- θη πᾶσα σὰρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο,                            | 22. Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, οὐκ ἂν .... δια δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι                                               | missing.                                                                                                                                      |

|                       |          |  |
|-----------------------|----------|--|
| έκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας. | ἐκεῖναι. |  |
|-----------------------|----------|--|

260

#### Notes:

1) Here Matthew and Mark agree almost word for word. - The interpolation Matth, v. 23 - 28. has been discussed above. However, if we leave it undecided whether it originates from the editor of the Gospel of Matthew himself or from the hand of a later author, we dare to assert more decisively that the same verses of Mark, v. 21 - 23, are to be referred from Mark. He is more consistent with his text than the others, and is not in the habit of taking up what only presents itself. The reasons for the exclusion of the smuggled-in text are as follows:

[a] it is, especially in the form it takes in Matthew, nothing other than another recension of the same warning already given above. Matth, v. 5. Mark, v. 6. Luk, v. 8. We have noted this about these verses above. -

b) Jesus counsels to flee before the siege is made (Mark 14-17), and is so sure that those to whom he speaks will follow this counsel that he only recommends to them the prayer that this flight may not take place in the winter. (Mark 18. Matth 20.) How then could Jesus continue to speak of Mark 22 as if He expected His own to be there on the scene of the calamity at the time when the means of salvation would be tried, that is, at the time which they should not wait for, in order to be deceived by false Messiahs? The rore Matth, v. 22. catches up, but something that is no longer expected,

c) The assimilation of this part of the text to the earlier text was only caused by the Matth. v. 22: τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς. Compare v. 24, εἰ δυνατόν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς.

(d) If the interpolation be effaced; Mark. v. 24. the speech-increasing: ἀλλ' ἐν ἑκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν κ. τ. λ. with the preceding words v. 19:20. only in a natural connection, which makes it all the more palpable that what belongs together is made clear by the words v. 23. appended to the interjection: Ἰδοὺ προεῖρηκα ἰμῖν πάντα is forcibly severed. \*) Alone there is still an interpolation here in the Mark, the more exact designation of which may be of importance. We mean the words Mark v. 14: οὐκ ἀναγινώσκην νοεῖτω which are given by all the codicibus, and the:τό ρῆθεν διὰ Δανιήλ τον προφή- τον which present only some of them. \*\*) We cannot by any means admit that these words are charged to Mark, since they are a visible interpolation.

\*) With the authority of our codices, we shall not wish to strike down the criticism justified here, if we but think of the single pericope Mark. 16:9, and to passages such as Mark. 10:24. and the verse 9:12-13. in order to say nothing of the others.

\*\*) In Fritzsche's commentary on Mark, these words - interpolated from Matthew - are virtually excluded from the text, as is the case in n. 35. with Mark. 10:19. with the words of Matthew: τί ἐτι ὑστερῶ, and ibid. v. 21. with the words: εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι. Cf. the remark, to n. 35. the commentator once wants Mark to write out Matthew and Luke, asserting that he who does not see this is blind (illum caecutire). One sees so much here with bright eyes, that in our case the acceptance of a part for any hypothesis can also shift the standpoint of criticism.

261

a) Bon the latter: τό πρῆθεν διά κ. τ. λ. it is hardly necessary to say anything about them. They express the formula which, above all other expressions, is appropriated to Matthew alone and exclusively. For τό πρῆθεν comp. 3:3. 4:14. &c. St. S. at n. 44. as to διά του προφήτου comp. 4:14. 8:37. 21:5. Mark, as will be shown in more detail elsewhere, does not even have anything in common with the less conspicuous peculiarities of Matthean diction, let alone with such, and the words would therefore have to be excluded from Mark's text, even if all coclicos had them, how much more so, since some, which are otherwise counted among the best, really do not have them, especially since it is also impossible to see why, if they belonged to Mark as well as to Matthew, they should have been omitted from Mark. - To ascribe the cause of the omission to a homoeoteleuton, - as is found here in ἐρημώσεως and ἐστώς Statt, -, remains a tolerable maxim in such cases only if one may assume that the copyists did not have a passage in mind as the copyists of the Gospels must have remembered it if it had been the joint text of two evangelists. It is a well-known fact that one evangelist has sought to make the other equal rather than unequal.

262

b) The words: ὁ ἀναγινώσκων κ. τ. λ. are

α) not genuine, if those are not, since they are indisputably connected with the citation. - For the very passage of Daniel was to be read, and so the invitation to "read" must also have been connected with the indication of what was to be read. Otherwise the ἀναγινώσκων would also have no subject, since it cannot be drawn



directly to βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως. It is therefore already a mistake if (in most codd.) the ο ἀναγινώσκων is offered as text without that citation. But now there are also

β) the isolated words: ο ἀναγινώσκων κ. τ. λ. are not even in their proper place. What should this mean: If you see the βδέλ. standing where ks should not stand, who ran it, (what then ran?) let him take notice! When you see it standing there, the text does not want you to read it first, but to flee: the words, therefore, if they are to mean anything, ought to be placed with the words: τό ρηθέν προφήτου but not here. here.

γ) If the same words, together with the citation from Mark, are omitted, it remains that Mark also speaks of the βδελ. ἐρημ. according to Daniel, but without formally citing him. And just this - a new argument - is Mark's habit. (Cf. Mark. 1:6. the allusion to the description of Elijah. - Mark. 4:12. the allusion to the words of Iesaias. - Mark, 11:2. the allusion to Zachar. 9:9. where Matthew also first switches on the citation, as in n. 16,) -

δ) If Daniel is not eulogized for the words of Jesus, the author presupposes that Jesus used an expression that was already understandable to the disciples. And this presupposition is already in accordance with the structure of the words; let their composition be explained psychologically! "When you shall see X standing where it ought not to stand;" (on this circumstance lies the tone); - do not these words presuppose that the subject X was already known? If it had depended on the designation of the subject, the words should have received the reverse position: when ye shall see standing in the holy place (or: where it shall not stand) that X of which Daniel speaks rc. (here it would be fitting: he that ran it, take notice!) - thus: εὖν εν τόπω ἅγιοι υμεῖς ἴϋητε ἐστῶς τά βόιλ. τῆς ἐρημ. But this is not how the words are written. --Really, however, could also

263

ε) the expression be accepted as intelligible, since it is only a predicate at all, and nothing distinct in concreto. - What was in fact meant by couciLlum is given by the text of Jesus' speech itself. The flight is to be taken even before the storming of the city. So the βδέλ. ἐρημ must be an appearance which precedes this storming, or is an omen of it; whereupon Luke may well prepare the right interpretation, when he lets us think of the Roman army (as it were of the eagle flying towards the scene of the desolation, compare Luk 17:37.). Now the position of the words is also quite correct: when you see the image of the unclean bird (flying towards stink and ashes) in the place where nothing unclean is supposed to be, then rc. -

## 2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Luke: in v. 20 we believe that it is not read "forerun, could: rare - for the räri, which belongs to the apodosis, only follows from it, and to put the same word twice is contrary to Luke's custom. We think it right: καὶ γνῶτε: when ye see Jerusalem besieged, and so may conclude that there is also desolation; then rc. - Thus it is according to the context, and Luke then connects the Roman army and the ἐρήμιοις into one term, as the Nebentcrte, who also construct the βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως from two terms. - Incidentally, the passage is important in order to correctly assess the mutual relationship of the texts. (We compare with it Luk. 20, 8. 22, 53. passages which stand in a similar relation to their parallels). Of equal importance in this respect is the immediately following v. 21, which is similar in structure to the adjacent ones, but is divided into other sentences. But comp. Luk. 17:31. - v. 22, τοῦ τελεσθῆναι comp. Luk. 18:31. n. 36.) - v. 23. It will seem as if this exclamation did not belong to Luke's text except εἶναι ἀνάγκη. For why should the prophesied misery here be thought great only in relation to the pregnant and nursing women? It is something else in the secondary texts, where the flight is mentioned here. - v. 24. πάτονμένη after Dan. 8:13. ἄχρι κ. τ. λ. Luk. 4:13. 17:27. Act. 3:21. and many a. St. It occurs in Matth, only once, (but only in a place curious also in other respects chap. 24:38.) and in Mark never, Why does Luke mention nothing of the flight to be taken? -

264

(b) Matthew: v. 15. τό ρηθέν κ. τ. λ.. S. note 1. - rüTE instead Mark v. 14, όπου ον δεῖ sets, Matthew always uses a noineo where Mark makes use of a periphrasis. S. above Matth. 8:4. τό δῶρον ὃ προσῆταξε (Mark. περί καθαρισμόν ἃ προσέτ, Mark. 1:44.) Matth. 17:9. τό ὄραμα (Mark, 9:9. ἃ εἶδον) Matth.3:4. τό ἐνδύμα. - ἀγίω comp. ch. 8:4. - v. 20. μηδέ σαββάτον. Did Matthew add this, or did Mark omit it? This passage belongs among those which must be specially noted. - v. 21. where Mark hebraiseth, Matthew hath almost always the Greek expression, comp. Matt. v. 29. and Mark v. 24. (It is always adduced in proof of the contrary, Matt. 3:4. εἶχε τό ἐνδύμα comp. Mark. 1:6. ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος κ. τ. λ. But Mark has not changed anything here, but the expression is fashioned after 2, Kings 1:8. and perhaps only changed by Matthew).

(c) Mark: - v. 15. μηδέ εἰσελθέτω an addition here just as suspicious, as the similar v. 11. μηδέ μελετάτε is unächt. \*) - V. 20. οὐς ἐξελέξατο comp. 3:28, σσας ἀν βλασφημήσωσιν and here v. 19. ἥς ἐκτίσεν ὁ Θεός. (It is noteworthy, however, that even the copyists have sometimes conformed the passages according to such peculiarities. Thus Mark. 12:23. after ἐν τῇ ὄν ἀναστήσει the ὅταν ἀναστήσωσιν is

certainly omitted, for only the following argument of Jesus himself lays weight on the distinction between όταν ἀναστῶσιν and between the itself as a fact).

\*) v. 18, ἡ φυγή cannot be omitted (Fritzsche's Kom-mentar zum Mark, at d. St.), because.

(a) the mere ἵνα μή γένηται would have no relation at all, since it cannot be connected with v. 17,

b) v. 18. looks back to v. 14. from where the thought is continued to v. 17,

c) Mark is in the habit of repeating words for the sake of certainty, even if they have already been said shortly before. How could he have left an indeterminacy here? But the noun φυγή is here likewise drawn from φεγγέτωσαν v. 14, and is the return of the speech to "this" word.

(d) Two texts, which agree so exactly in other respects, will truly not differ here.

265

Fifth hint:

Comfort and rescue after the capture of the city.

|                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                    |                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 24 Ἄλλ' ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τό φέγγος αὐτῆς · | Matth 29 Ευθέως δέ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται καὶ ἡ σελ. .... αὐτῆς. | Luke 25 Καὶ ἔσται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ<br><br>καὶ σελήνῃ                             |
| 25. καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰσονται ἐκπίπτοντες, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται.                     | καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται.                | καὶ ἀστροῖς' (Ο.) 26. (Ο.) αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρ. σαλευθήσονται.             |
| 26. Καὶ τότε ὀψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης'                                        | 30. Καὶ τότε (Ο.) — ὀψονται τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρ. ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ           | 27. Καὶ τότε ὀψονται τὸν .... ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμ. καὶ δόξης πολλῆς |

|                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                         | δυνάμεως κ. δόξης πολλῆς                                                                                                            |                                                                                                             |
| 27. και (τότε) ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ και ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ ἀκροῦ γῆς ἕως ἀκροῦ οὐρανοῦ. | 31. καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ (μετὰ σαλπιγγος φωνῆς μεγάλης) καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσι .... ἀνέμων ἀπ ἀκρῶν οὐρανῶν ἕως ἀκρῶν αὐτῶν. | 28. ἀρχομένων δε τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀνακνῦσατε κ. ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν · διότι ἐγγέζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν. |

266

#### Notes:

1) Concerning the sense: By the fact that Luke v. 24. is inserted with an anticipation of the later success: "και αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται - και ἱερουσαλήμ εσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν - ἐθνῶν" which would presuppose the destruction, the appearance is produced as if chap. 21:25. is a still later one, and as if in Luke what is connected in the others (the future of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem) should be more definitely separated. Luke, however, gives the passage this appearance without wanting to, by remaining faithful to his method of writing. Compare Luk. 9:36. και αὐτοὶ ἐσίγησαν και οὐδενι ἀπήγγειλαν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Here, too, the following day, of which something is reported to continue the previous narrative, is ignored, as if ἐκεῖναι αἱ ἡμέραι lay between the face on the mountain and the day when the epileptic boy was cured, which the author does not want. - It is just as there in our passage; the destruction of Jerusalem and the coming of Christ remain as well connected in the following description beginning with v. 25 in Luke as in the others. Attention must be paid to this, and we make a note of it, so that nothing may be inferred from our passage, in the bed test of the time when the Gospel of Luke might have been written. (This against the wager, Introduction to the N. T. p. 182.)

#### 2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Luke: v. 25. What is expressed of changes in the sun, in the moon, in the stars in Mark, and Matt, in special, equally divided, sentences, Luke draws together. We have already drawn attention to this peculiarity several times above. S. above on n. 42. b. - ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς for the sake of symmetry, because signs in heaven were spoken of, and according to the guidance of Old Testament passages, as Joel 2:30. comp. Act. 2:19. - συνοχή, the verb συνεχεῖν and συνέχεσθαι, occurs very often in Luke. occurs very often in Luke. Luk. 4:38. 8:37. 45. 12:51. 19:43. Act. 7: 57. 18:5. 23: 8. - ἐν ἀπορία and ἡχοῦσης θαλάσσης. Luke had here the passage in remembrance Isa.

5:30. και βοήσει δι' αυτούς τή ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ως φωνή θαλάσσης κυμαينوῦσης' καί επιβλέπονται εἰς τὴν γῆν, καί ἰδοὺ σκότος σκληρόν ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ \*) αὐτῶν. - v. 26. Luke falls back into the communal text. It remains to be seen whether the homonymous words are as appropriate in him as in the others. - v. 28. is like a factual statement in relation to the parallel texts. ἐγγίζει refers to v. 20. and v. 31. - ἀπολύτρωσις 2:38.

267

(b) Matthew: v. 30. τό σημεῖον comp. v. 3. τί τό σημεῖον τῆς παρουσίας; - The v. 30. added to the corresponding text: καὶ τότε κόφονται πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς have the reputation of being taken from Apoc. 1:7,

c) Mark: He agrees v. 24. 25. 27. with Matthew mostly literally, though not so consistently, but v. 26. quite literally with Luke. - Why does not Mark give the painting Matth. v. 30. κόφονται πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς and v. 31. μετὰ σάλπιγγος? -

3) Here again we have no different translations of one original, but if there should be translations, we should have to presuppose several originals, for which there is no reason at all.

\*) ἀπορία: Wahlii clav.: defectus vel inopia consilii Luk. 21:25. It rather means (and here especially) the lack of a way out. Hence dabeistehl there σκότος, here αὐνοχή. - They are crowded about, that they find no way out. For this see ch. 19:43, 44.

268

An antitype or parable of success and its omens.

|                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark v. 28 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς αὐχῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν ὅταν αὐτῆς ἤδη ὁ κλάδος ἀπαλός γένηται καὶ ἐκφυῇ τὰ φύλλα, γινώσχεται, ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν· | Matth. 32 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συχῆς ..., ὅταν ἤδη ὁ χλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται ἀπαλός χ. τὰ φύλλα ἐκφυῇ, γινώσχεται, .... τὸ θέρος. | Luke 29 ἴδετε τὴν συχὴν κ. πάντα τὰ δένδρα ' ὅταν προβάλωσιν ἤδη,<br><br>γινώσχεται, ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστί |
| 29. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ταῦτα ἴδῃτε γινόμενα,                                                                                                    | 33. Οὕτω .... ἴδῃτε πάντα ταῦτα, .... θύραις.                                                                        | 31. οὕτω κ. ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδῃτε ταῦτα γινόμενα,                                                                |

|                                                                                                                   |                                                                                |                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| γινώσχετε, ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις.                                                                            |                                                                                | γινώσχετε, ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστὶν ἡ βασ. τοῦ Θεοῦ.              |
| 30. Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, μέχρις οὐ πάντα ταῦτα γένηται.                                | 34. Ἀμήν „ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ .... αὕτη, ἕως ἀν-πάντα ταῦτα γένηται.          | 32. Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι .... αὕτη, ἕως ἀν πάντα γένηται. |
| 31. Ὁ οὐρανός κ. ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι.                                              | 35. Ὁ οὐρανός .... παρέλθωσι.                                                  | 33. Ὁ οὐρανός .... παρελευσονται, οἱ δὲ .... παρέλθωσι.  |
| 32. Περί δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐχέινης ἡ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός), εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. | 36. Περί δὲ .... ἐχέινης καὶ ὥρας .... ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου. | missing                                                  |

#### Notes:

1) Even in the parable, an addition to the main content of the discourse, there is a single Greek text, and not only Mark and Matthew, but also Matthew and Luke, agree.

2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Luke: v. 29. He does not let the speaker notice, but he himself notices that a similitude is given.

269

Εἶπε παραβολήν. So according to his habit ch. 5:56. 12:16. 13:6. 14:7. 15:3. 18:1. 19:4. Already v. 28. is judiciously set up according to the parable. - The words: βλέποντες ἀφ' εαυτῶν could already, since the following γινώσκετε is to be changed into γινώσκεται, be deleted without waiting for their defense by codices. This is done with all the more reason, since cod. D. cant. really expels them. - v. 31. The added: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ relates to the other texts like explanation. - Why does Luke omit the remark that the day and hour are not known, and is this remark necessary for the text itself or not? -

b) Matthew and Mark do not differ here in expression, only Mark, v. 32. is added: οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός. Is this really an integral part of the text of Mark?

-----

Exhortation to be vigilant. Parables:

|                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 33 βλέπετε,                                                           | Matth.                                                                                                                                                             | Luke 34 προσέχετε δέ<br>ἑαυτοῖς —                 |
| αγρυπνεῖτε κ.<br>προσεύχεσθε.                                              |                                                                                                                                                                    | 36. ἀγρυπνεῖσθε οὖν, ἐν<br>παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι — |
| 35. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν' οὐκ<br>οἴδατε γὰρ ποτὲ ὁ κύριος<br>τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται. | 42. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ<br>οἴδατε, ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κύριος<br>ὑμῶν ἔρχεται, (Vergl. Kap.<br>25:13. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι<br>οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν<br>οὐδ' ἐ τὴν ὥραν.) |                                                   |
| 34. ὥς ἄνθρωπος<br>ἀπόδημος —                                              | :14. ὥσπερ γάρ ἄνθρωπος<br>ἀποδημῶν —                                                                                                                              |                                                   |

Notes:

1) All presenters, then, by linking exhortations to vigilance, give both special expression and special support to the moral precept.

270

A peculiar circumstance. For how could one of the narrators, if he believes he must adhere to the general with the others, shape the particular according to his own will?

2) Peculiarities of representation: We have here

a) to look at the communal.

α) Luke. - Mark and Luke begin with the injunction: beware, watch; - the expression βλέπετε is in Mark always where the others put προσέχετε. Luke, however, draws the cautionary word: προσέχετε into a special context: προσέχετε μή κ. τ. λ. and of what he indicates that one should beware, neither Mark, nor Matthew, say anything. - On this he turns again to the general warning which Mark expresses: be watchful and pray! \*) But to this he again adds that why should prayer be made? (Luk. v. 36. "κα καταξιωθῆτε ἐκφνεῖν ταντα πάντα μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι και σταθῆναι ἐμπροσθεν τον υιοῦ τον ἀνθρωπον, words which have quite the stamp of fine writing about

them. - Comp. Luk. 20:35. 7:3.) - ὥς παγῖς κ. τ. λ. from Isa. 24:17. παγῖς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς  
τους ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. - Paul's comment on Luk 21:35: "Probably citation  
from an unknown scripture of that time." - The citation begins as early as v. 34.  
αἰφνίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (πιστὴ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, comp. 1 Thess. 5:3. αἰφνίδιος αὐτοῖς  
ἐφίσταται ὀλεθρος. Luk. v. 36. also ἐκφνέειν alludes to it. Cf. 1 Thess. 5:3. καὶ οὐ μὴ  
ἐκφύγωσιν. - Mark has nothing of this.

(β) Matthew and Mark merely urge us to be watchful, because we do not know when  
the time will come, and they explain this by means of mountain stories. The  
exhortation with which Mark begins, v. 33, and to which he returns again after his  
comparison, v. 35, is also found twice in Matthew, as it is expressed in the last  
passage, but each time after quite different citations. (The passages are marked  
above in the column Matth.,).

\*) We, however, consider the καὶ προσενχεῖσθαι Mark v. 33. with Millius to be  
interpolation from Luke. For Mark speaks only of watchfulness, as is evident both  
from the reason of exhortation appended to v. 34. and from the repetition of v. 35.

271

b) The particular:

α) Matthew:

κ) The first comparison from which the exhortation to watchfulness is derived,  
Matth, v. 37-39. is found Luk, 17:26. 27. (Here also in relation to the indefiniteness  
of the time.)

ϛ) Matth, v. 40. 41. is found in the discourse Luk. 17:35. (though Matth, v. 40. is  
peculiar to Matthew alone).

ϝ) Matth. v. 43 - 51. is found in Luke chap. 12:39 - 46. -

τ) The following parable of the ten virgins, Matth. 25:1 - 13. is in Matthew alone. -  
This is followed by

η) the parable of a traveller from afar, Matth. 25:14 - 30, with which cf. Luk. 19, 12 -  
27. Here Matthew begins the third comparison almost in the same way (25:14.) as  
Mark begins his only comparison here (v. 34.) (see the columns). - The following  
description of the judgement (Matth. 25:31 - 46.) is again in Matthew alone. - The



question is: does all this apparatus belong here, and why does Mark have none of it? or how is it that he begins his comparison in the same way as Matthew begins his third, without agreeing with Matthew in the content of the comparison?

β) Luke warns against worry and luxurious living (without using parables). In the conformation of his words, he probably also remembers the days of Noah, as described by him in chap. 17:26, and the difference between him and Matthew then consists only in the fact that the latter directly states what he, Luke, has in mind. -

γ) Mark: in the area of his last words v. 36. there is another strange coincidence. Compare.

|                                                    |                                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark. 36. ο δέ υμῖν λέγω, πασι λέγω<br>γρηγορεῖτε. | Luk. 12, 41. κύριε, προς ἡμᾶς τὴν<br>παραβολὴν ταύτην (of the returning<br>Lord.) λέγεις, ἢ και προς πάντας; |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

272

| 25) n. 53. Mark. 14:12 — 15. = Luk. 22:8 —12. = Matth. 26:17. 18.                                            |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 14:12. που θέλεις<br>ἀπελθόντες ετοιμασωμεν,<br>ἵνα φαγῆς τό πάσχα;                                     | Luke 22:8 πορευθέντες<br>ετοιμάσατε ἡμῖν το πασχα,<br>ἵνα φάγωμεν. 9. ποῦ θέλεις<br>ἐτοιμάσωμεν; | Matth. 26:17 ποῦ θέλεις<br>ἐτοιμάσωμέν σοι φαγεῖν τό<br>πάσχα;                                  |
| 13. υπάγετε εἰς την πάλιν,<br>και απαντήσῃ υμῖν<br>ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον<br>υδατος βαστάζων<br>ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ | Ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων υμῶν εἰς<br>την πόλιν συναντήσῃ υμῖν<br>ἄνθρ. .... αὐτῷ                         | 18. υπάγετε εἰς την πόλιν<br>προς τον δεῖνα,                                                    |
| 14. και ὅπου ἐάν εἰσέλθῃ,<br>εἶπατε τῷ οικοδεσπότη .                                                         | εἰς την οἰκίαν, οὐ<br>εἰσπορεύεται' 11. και ἐρεῖτε<br>τῷ οικοδεσπότη τῆς οἰκίας                  | και εἶπατε αὐτῷ                                                                                 |
| ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει ποῦ<br>ἔστι τό καταλυμα, οπου τό<br>πάσχα μετά τῶν μαθητῶν<br>μου φάγω;               | λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος ποῦ<br>ἔστι .... φάγω;                                                    | ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει ὁ<br>καιρός μου ἐγγύς ἔστι<br>πρός σε ποιῶ τό πάσχα<br>μετά τῶν μαθητῶν μου; |
| 15. και αὐτός υμῖν δείξει                                                                                    | 12. κάκεῖνος υμῖν δείξει                                                                         | missing                                                                                         |

|                                                                 |                                              |  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--|
| ανάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον<br>ἐτοιμον *) ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε<br>ἡμῖν. | ανάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον<br>ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε. |  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--|

\*) One will take offence at this ἐτοιμον, even if one does not dare to exclude it.

a) ἐστρωμένον is already ἐτοιμον, and what should lie in ἐτοιμον more than in this, of which ἀνάγαιον would probably not be the subject,

(b) It is not probable that the words κροῶ; and ἐτοιμάζω should have been used in such succession of heterogeneous things-whether by the speaker, or by him who makes him speak, and in such a way that the words should come together so accidentally from one already accomplished, and one which alone is to be mentioned as the first to be accomplished. Matthai remarks: Si ea omnia in Marco expungenda sunt, quae vel redundare, vel quodammodo repugnare videntur, aut ea etiam, quae caeteri evangelistae omiserunt, (no one will demand this!) multa profecto alia sunt expungenda. But one can also say that if everything is to be excluded that is folded into the text of Mark in the manuscripts, then the ordinary text must still be made far more eloquent than it is in very many places. - Although Mark now and then gives himself the appearance of not sparing words, he has no psychological inaccuracies anywhere.

#### Notes:

1) Eichhorn (Introduction, p. 296) remarks: "The message of Jesus' commission to order the Passover is shortest in Matthew. Mark and Luke have presented it more definitely, as is to be expected from a revised edition of a rough draft." - We leave it undecided whether Matthew's Relation, compared with the others, is to be called a rough draft, and the others a development of it. In particular, however, the question arises whether Matthew did not also have the same text that was expressed by the secondary speakers. And this must be able to be decided.

2) Peculiarities of expression:

a) Luke: v. 8. 9. speech and counter-speech as distinguished from the secondary texts also ch. 8:46. Why might Luke here begin with the command of Jesus, instead of with the question of the disciples? - v. 10. the participial construction. S. above at n. 28. 35. a. St. - The words οὐ εἰσπορεύεται are connected differently in Luke than in Mark. -

(b) Matt. v, 18. The expression: πρὸς σε ποιῶ κ. τ. λ. hangs together with the other: πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα. For an appointment was made with a certain man. Hence here: Words of remembrance: now the time has come, and there: that the man is not designated further. In the other texts, too, the question is best explained by the presupposition of a previous appointment. -

c) Mark. How is it that he agrees with Matthew only from the beginning to the words: υπάγετε εἰς τὴν πάλιν, and then not, but with Luke, and with Luke not at the beginning? -

3) Not even the slightest trace of different translations.

-----

274

| 26) n. 53. Mark. 14:18—25. = Matth. 26:21—29. = Luk.22:15—25.                                                                    |                                                                    |                                                                                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 13:18 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με *)                                                                       | Matth 26:21 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν .... με.               | Luke 22:15,16 (Ο.) 21. πλὴν ἰδοὺ, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.                 |
| 19. μήτι ἐγώ ;                                                                                                                   | 22. μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κύριε;                                          | 23. Κ. ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, τότε τις ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πρᾶσσειν.                  |
| 20. εἰς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρυβλίον.                                                                  | 23. ὁ ἐμβάψας με ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ τὴν χεῖρα, οὗτός με παραδώσει. |                                                                                                          |
| 21. Ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου υπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ " οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται | 24. Ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ. υπάγει καθὼς .... παραδίδοται'             | 22. Κ. ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ. πορεύεται κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον ' πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται. |
| καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκεῖνος.                                                                               | καλὸν .... ἐκεῖνος.                                                |                                                                                                          |
| 22. — λάβετε · τοῦτό ἐστι                                                                                                        | 26. λάβετε τούτο ἐστι τό                                           | 19. — τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα                                                                                 |

|                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| τό σώμα μου.                                                                                                                                               | σώμα μου.                                                                                                                      | μου τό υπέρ υμών<br>διδομενον.                                                                                |
| 23. — καὶ ἐπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ<br>πάντες.                                                                                                                        | 27. — πῖετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ<br>πάντες.                                                                                                | 17. λάβετε τοῦτο κ.<br>διαμερίσατε ἑαυτοῖς.                                                                   |
| 24. τοῦτο ἐστι τό αἷμά μου,<br>τό τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης τό<br>περί πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.                                                                       | 28. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τό αἷμα<br>μου τό .... ἐκχυνόμενον<br>(εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).                                                |                                                                                                               |
| 25. Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι<br>οὐκέτι μή πῖω ἐκ τοῦ<br>γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου,<br>ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης,<br>ὅταν αὐτό πίνω καινόν ἐν<br>τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. | 29. Λέγω δέ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μή<br>πῖω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ<br>γενν. .... πίνω μεθ' υμῶν<br>καινόν ἐν τῇ βασ. τοῦ<br>πατρός μου. | 18. Λέγω γάρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ<br>μή πῖω ἀπό τοῦ<br>γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου,<br>ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ<br>έλθῃ. |

\*) The words: ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ must in any case be deleted. For the v. so. following say the same thing, and yet should be the more exact designation. Thus those words cannot find room, if one were to burden the Mark as much as one wishes.

275

#### Notes:

1) We have already explained above in a note to the first part what we consider to be the original text of Luke. After what was excluded there, what remains is what is placed here next to the other texts. Nothing is left out but what is found in Paul. What remains consists of the elements of the other texts, the only difference being that in Luke transpositions are made (first the ceremonial drinking is mentioned, and only then the symbolic breaking of the bread. The betrayer is spoken of last). Luke also has Jesus express the assurance at the beginning of the meal, v. 15, that he had a longing for this meal and that it would be his last meal, instead of giving the same assurance in the other passages only at the presentation of the cup \*).

\*) Schleierm. op. cit. p. 281. "If the speaker let Christ say, when he took the cup, that he would drink no more of it (Luk. v. 18.), why does he not determine beforehand the precise moment, when the Passover lamb was offered, whether Christ said, in relation to the Passover, that he would eat no more of it, or at the first distribution of the bread, and more in relation to the bread? Anyone who wanted to be more scheming would have helped here." Here the serious thinker

must not have been attentive at all to the text he criticised, or - I do not know how to judge - he must have forgotten himself. Does not Luke, precisely in order to maintain the symmetry of the account, expressly assure Jesus, as he did with the cup in relation to drinking, so also with the Passover lamb in relation to eating, that this was his last meal? v. 15. 16. and could it not really be concluded from this that Luke was indeed writing in Christ?

## 2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Luk: v. 15. επιθυμία, επεθύμησα Luke uses hebraisms in a solemn style. Cf. here v. 21. and u. 49. ch. 21:14. 19. - 20:35. 36. - 22:31. u. a. St. - προ τον με παθειν. Ch. 2:21. .Act. 23:15. - (v. 16. πληρωθή I cannot think is the right reading, and rather believe that βρωθή must be read, ἐξ αὐτοῦ is not Luke's way of writing either. - No codex is more attentive to the manner of writing of the evangelists than cod. L., and one has to pay much attention to what he takes offence at). V. 22. πορεύεσθαι Luke very often puts instead of the other υπάγειν. Passages are given above. - κατά τό ὠρισμίνον Act. 2:23. - δὴ ον παραδίδοται. Luke does not repeat the oomen as the others do, comp. ch. 5:37. v. 23. Luke himself often tells where the others indicate the ipsissima verba. Examples have already been given. Cf. also ch. 8:42. with the parallel st. - τό τις εἶη in this connection the construction usual to Luke; comp. 8:9. 18:36. and many others - v. 19. λάβετε is not repeated, because it already occurred v. 17. - ἕως ὅτον v. 15. 18. comp. 13:8. 15:8. - Combinations of a similar kind to this, where the utterances of the same subjects are put together v. 23. 24. will meet us with several more in Luke. -

b) Matthew. - Here again we notice textual additions which would not be necessary v. 22. to ἐγώ (εἰμί, κύριε-) and v. 23. the quite unnecessary: ουτος με παραδώσει. Other examples have been given above n. 42. n. 43. Comp. also 16:20. 24:2. (S. n. 49.) The verse 25. I cannot possibly regard as anything but interpolation. (It is in the class of passages: Matt. 21:43. ch. 24:11. 12.) "For that Judas now, when Jesus had just pronounced his woe! upon the traitor, should have asked, I cannot believe him to do so." (Paul Comment. 3rd Th. p. 573.) - V. 29. βασιλ-τοῦ πατρός μου. Again, exclusively peculiar to Matthew as 12:50. 25:34. 18:10. - μεθυμων here buried as 26:38. 40. μεθ' ἐμοῦ -.

(c) Mark here agrees literally with Matthew. Why here? and why did he deviate from him in the previous piece? But he has not the additions here either: Matth. 22. 23. 28. 29. and not the verse: Matth, v. 25.

3) Only Luke could be assumed here to have translated a special text from the Hebrew, but this assumption will soon be dispelled if one is to assume at the same time that the translator nevertheless wrote for v. 22. and some parts of v. 19. For these verses only, I also used the Greek translation on which the other texts are based.

| 27) n. 54. Mark. 14:32-49. = Matth. 26:36-55. = Luk. 22:40-53.                                                                                 |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 14:32 — καθίσατε<br>ώδε, έως προσεύξωμαι.                                                                                                 | Matth. 26:36 — καθίσατε<br>αυτού, έως ού (άπελθών)<br>προσεύξωμαι (έκει.)                                               |                                                                                                                       |
| 34.— περίλυπος έστιν ή<br>ψυχή μου έως θανάτου,<br>μείνατε ώδε και γρηγορεΐτε.                                                                 | 38. — περίλυπος ....<br>γρηγαρεΐτε (μετ' έμού.)                                                                         | προσεύχεσθε μή είσελθεΐν<br>είς πειρασμόν.                                                                            |
| 36.— άββά, δ πατήρ,<br>πάντα δυνατά σοι<br>παρένεγκε τό ποτηριον απ<br>έμού τούτο άλλ' ού τί έγώ<br>θέλω, άλλα τί συ.                          | 39. — πάτερ μου, εί<br>δυνατόν έστι, παρελθέτω<br>άπ έμού τό ποτήριον τούτο<br>πλην ούχ ως έγώ θέλω,<br>άλλ' ως σύ.     | 42. πατερ, εί βου- λει,<br>παρενέγκε τό πο- τήρ.<br>τούτο απ' έμού" πλήν μή τδ<br>θέλημά μου, άλλα τό σόν<br>γενέσθω. |
| 37. Σίμων, καθεύδεις; ουκ<br>ίσχυσας μίαν ώραν<br>γρήγορήσαι;                                                                                  | 40. ούτως ουκ Ισχύσατε<br>μίαν ώραν γρηγορήσαι (μετ<br>έμού);                                                           | 46. τῖ καθεύδετε;                                                                                                     |
| 38. γρηγορεΐτε κ.<br>προσεύχεσθε, 'ίνα μή<br>είσέλθητε είς πειρασμόν                                                                           | 41. γρηγορεΐτε ....<br>πειρασμόν                                                                                        | άναστάντες προσεύχεσθε,<br>ένα μή .... πειρασμόν.                                                                     |
| τδ μεν πνεύμα πρόθυμον,<br>ή δέ σαρξ ασθενής.                                                                                                  | το μεν πν. .... ασθενής 42.<br>(Ο.)                                                                                     | missing                                                                                                               |
| 41. καθεύδετε τδ λοιπόν<br>και αναπαυεσθε; απέχει,<br>ήλθεν ή ώρα ιδού,<br>παραδίδοται ό υίός τον<br>άνθρώπου είς τάς χειρας<br>τών αμαρτωλών. | 45. καθεύδετε τό λοιπόν κ.<br>άναπ.; ίδου, ήγγικεν ή ώρα<br>και ο υίός τ. άνθρ.<br>παραδίδοται εις χειρας<br>άμαρτωλών. |                                                                                                                       |
| Jesus' words to the<br>captors: v. 48 ωρ Επί<br>ληστην εξήλθετε μετά<br>μαχαιριάν κ. ξύλων                                                     | 55. ως έπι .... συνλλαβεΐν<br>με'                                                                                       | 52. ως έπι ληστήν<br>έξεληλύθατε μετά<br>μαχαιρών κ, ξύλων                                                            |

|                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| συλλαβεῖν με                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                        |
| 49. καθ' ἡμέραν ἢ μην<br>προς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ<br>διδάσκων, κ. οὐκ<br>ἐκρατήσατέ με, ἀλλ' ἵνα<br>πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. | καθ' ἡμέραν προς ὑμᾶς<br>ἐκαθεξόμην διδάσκων ἐν<br>τῷ ἱερῷ, κ. οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ<br>με. 56. τοῦτο δέ ὅλον<br>γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθ. αἱ<br>γραφαι τῶν προφητῶν. | 53. καθ' ἡμέραν ὄντος μου<br>μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐκ<br>ἐξετείνετε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ'<br>ἐμέ' ἀλλ' αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ<br>ώρα κ. ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ<br>σκότους, |

278

#### Notes:

1) As the comparison shows, many things are missing here in Luke, viz.

a) The circumstance that Jesus divides the disciples, and takes only three of them with him - probably into the garden (comp. Joh. 18:1. and v. 4. ἐξελθῶν) - (Mark v. 33. Matth, v. 37.), but leaves the others at some distance before the garden.

b) That Jesus, after turning back from prayer to the three disciples and awakening them from sleep, returns again to prayer, and from it again to the sleep-drunk disciples, then leaves them the third time to pray again, and then comes again to awaken them from sleep, because the betrayer is near. So the drawing of the sleep-drunk state of the disciples is missing, and so are the words that Jesus speaks to the disciples each time he returns, although Luke, like the others, notes that Judas came with the crowd ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος v. 47. Eichhorn calls what Matthew and Mark give in more detail extensions of the earlier text. But with equal justification it could also be said that Luke's shorter message is an abbreviation of the earlier text. - It goes without saying that the verdict on this should not remain undecided, least of all since Luke shows an effort to complete the account instead of abbreviating it. For the note he inserted in verses 43-45, that Jesus was strengthened by an angel from heaven in the midst of the greatest fear, is not given by the other speakers, nor are the words in verses 48-49 (of Judas and Jesus).

279

2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Luk.: v. 40. μὴ εἰσελθεῖν comp. to n. 42. n. v. 46. alone is the construction of the others. \*) - v. 42. If we read παρηνεγκεῖν connected with βοῦλει; the expression with lack of apodosis has its analogue at ch. 19:42 - v. 47. We call this passage important

in order to be able to judge whether Luke had abbreviated or not. - v. 51. Luke omits συλλαβεῖν με. Cf. 20:24. at n. 43. - v. 53. μεθ νμῶν corresponds to this, that, according to Luke, even priests are there to take Jesus captive; (comp. v. 51.) - ἀλλ' αὕτη υμῶν .... τον σκότους. This clearer expression relates to Mark's text as ch. 20:6. (πας ὁ λαός - προφήτην εἶναι) and 21:20. (ὅταν δέ ἴδητε κυκλουμένην κ. τ. λ.) relate to their parallels. (By the way, σκότος is to be taken entirely in the physical sense, and neither ironically, nor tropically. - That it was dark is also shown by Joh. 18:3.) -

\*) But it can be seen here that in both constructions the idea is modified. -

(b) Matth.: v. 38. μετ ἑμοῦ, as v. 40. v. 47. the τοῦ λαοῦ appended to πρεσβύτεροι (comp. 27:1.) - v. 55. the graphic: ἐκαθεζόμεν - v. 56. the one belonging to γραφαί; τῶν προφήταιν and the one belonging to ἐφυγον ο μαθηταῖ also the οὕτως v. 40. - All this Mark, notwithstanding that in all other respects he agrees literally with Matthew, has nevertheless not. Such additions to Matthew's text have already been demonstrated above. S. at n. 53 - v. 39, Matthew expresses the motto of Jesus somewhat differently than Mark. It remains to be seen which of the two has the more correct expression. - Compare 15:28. v. 56, τοντο δέ ολον the formula common to Matthew.

280

Why does Mark differ from this?

c) Mark.: v. 36. πάντα δυν. σοι cf. 10:27. πάντα γάρ δυνατά ἐστι παρά τῷ Θεῷ. — ἀββά ὁ πατήρ. From the peculiarity of Mark, the aram. Sometimes citing words with the accompanying Greek translation, we have already somewhere concluded that he was not in the condition of a translator. — It is not entirely unimportant that Matthew always has only the Greek words, except for chap. 27:46. ἡλί, ἡλί κ. τ. λ. As always, Mark avoids the πλήν, which both of the sub-texts have (only once, but as a preposit. he has chap. 12:32). 41. (By the way, καθεύδετε τό λοιπόν means sleep afterwards when this act is over, \*) during the time that follows this — as it were appended.

\*) Fritzscher commentary, on the Mark, at St. τό (τό λοιπόν) est exterminandum, praesertim quum Matth. 26:45. pauci libri deleant, quos e Marco corruptos esse patet. — Everyone stands without glasses, so that one and the same reading must be maintained in both places, i.e. either λοιπόν, or τό λοιπόν. But λοιπόν cannot stand anywhere, so τό must stand λοιπόν. — cf. Apollod, ἀπεῖπεν αυτοί τό λοιπόν εἰς την πόλιν εἰσιέναι. (i.e. once again in the future except this time) —in posterum tempus τό λοιπόν in these phrases does not mean. —



| 28) n. 55. Mark. 14:60-64. = Matth. 26:62-65. = Luk. 22:66-71.                                                  |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 14:60 ουκ ἀποκρίνη ουδέν; τί αυτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν ! **)                                               | Matth 26:62 ουδέν ἀποκρίνη; τί αυτοί σου καταμαρτυρουσιν !                                                        | Luke 22:66                                                                                                                                        |
| 61. σύ εἶ ὁ χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;                                                                      | 63. ἐξορκίσω σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος, ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σύ εἶ ὁ χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.                     | εἰ σύ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἶπε ἡμῖν.<br>67. ἐάν ὑμῖν εἴπω, ου μηπιστεύσητε' 68. ἐάν δέ καὶ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μή ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι ἢ Απολύσετε.                   |
| 62. ἐγώ εἰμι,                                                                                                   | 64. αὐ εἶπας,                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                   |
| καὶ ὤψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρ- χόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. | πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ' ἄρτι ὀφείθε τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρ. καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν .... ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. | 69. Ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ. καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. 70. σύ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ; 71. ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, — |
| 63. τί ἐτι χρειαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων;<br>64. ἡκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας, τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται ;                           | 65. ἐβλασφήμησε ' τί ἐτι .... μαρτύρων; ἴδε, νῦν ἡκούσατε τὴν βλασφημίαν αὐτοῦ ·<br>66. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ;            | τί ἐτι χρειαν ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας; αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἡκούσαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.                                                                       |

\*\* ) Frische: Comment, to the Matth, b. d. St. interpungirt: ουδέν ἀποκρίνη, τί αυτοί - καταμαρτυρονσι; (as if τί, as otherwise, stood for ο, or for ών) and declares: nihilne respondes, car isti adversus te testimonium edant? - without any sense. How then could Jesus answer why those testified? - they must have their own causes. The commentator means: in the matter of why rc. But this would have to be expressed here: ουδεν ἀποκρίνη προς ἅ οντοι - καταμαρτυροῦβιν, and that composition, if it should express this, would be contrary to language. The same is true of the passage in Mark. Ahn- lich is Mark. 15:4.

1) That Luke combines the verhor at night and the verhor on the following morning (v. 66) has already been noted. - Why does he say nothing about the false witnesses who appeared? - The question addressed to Jesus does not sound like an interrogation, but like a mere enquiry (v. 66). Jesus' answer has the form of an ordinary conversation. Thus the question to Jesus does not occur first: συ εἶ ὁ χριστός; as in Mark, and Matth. but this question develops only after Jesus has dropped the utterance 69. which is therefore prefixed. Cf. also Jerem. 38, 15, which passage the author probably had in mind here. - Also, the statement of Jesus himself (v. 69) is worded differently in Luke. The words: ὡψεσθε τον υιόν τ. άνθρ. ερχόμενον επί - τού ουρανού (s, Mark, and Matth.) are missing. Mark and Matthew have one and the same relation.

282

## 2) Peculiarities of expression:

(a) Matth.: v. 63. at the words: εἰ σύ εἶ ὁ χριστός - τού Θεού Matth, has the apposition of Mark: ὁ υἱός τού ευλογητού. It could not, however, be added for convenience if preceded (which again Mark has not) by ἐξορκίζω σε κατά τού Θεού τού ζώντος. (On the last words see Matt. 16:16.) - v. 65. see 9:3. οὗτος βλασφημεῖ. - Therefore the words are put differently, and ἤκονσατε construed with τήν βλασγ. i.e. you have heard the blasphemy as a fact (as much as οτι ἐβλασγήμησε, but Mark: τῆς βλασφημίας i.e. the blasphemy according to its content and sense).

b) Luke: (Incidental to v. 68. εἰάν δέ και ἐρωτήσω - it seems to me that the author here aims at Jesus' - ch. 20:41 - 44. mentioned,- counter-question, why then the Messiah should be David's son.) v. 71. ἀπό τ. στόματος, ἀπό for εκ according to Luke's mode of writing. -

c) Mark: v. 62. again he has not πλήν, - not even v. 64. the τί - δοκεῖ so frequently occurring in Matth. - Which will be the more original word here? - He also indirectly says v. 64. κατίκριναν αὐτόν εἶναι ἐνοχον θανάτου instead of the Matthaean ἐνοχος θανάτου ἐστί. But Matth, retains his habit of making dialogues, comp. at n. 35. In μαρτύρων Mark v. 63. and Matth v. 65. we have still to remark, that Luke, as he mentions no false witnesses here at all, so also does not use this word, but puts for it Luk v. 71: - μαρτυρίας (consistently).

3) Eichhorn (Introduction, p. 299) remarks: "In the first draft of the description of Jesus' life, there was a message about the interrogation of Jesus. (This is inferred from the fact that Luke reports nothing of this interrogation in the place where the others report it). "The following copyists were to enter it." (So the original author had relied on them

and did not want to report anything about the interrogation, even though he believed he had to give an account of Jesus' accusation before Pilate?) "We have two inscriptions of this from different hands, each edited in its own way. In the copy that later fell into Mark's and Matthew's hands, the narrative of the ransom (?) was newly edited, inserted immediately after the news of Jesus' imprisonment; in the copy that Luke used, it came after the denial of Peter, and now either Luke himself or someone else before him simultaneously reworked the whole section of Jesus' interrogation before the Synod (note: but this is supposed to have already been edited in its own way?) and before Pilate." We note here that, just as the original author would indeed have expected too much from the copyists, our critic also relies too heavily on the approval of his readers in his assertions. And such a thing could have been written on the off chance of the day!

283

| 29) n. 56. Mark. 15:2-14. = Matth. 27:11-23. = Luk. 23:3-23.                           |                                                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jesus' interrogation before Pilatus.                                                   |                                                                                                                      |                                                                   |
| Mark 15:2 σι ει ο βασιλεύς τών 'Ιουδαίων; — σύ λέγεις.                                 | Matth. 27:11 'σύ .... Ιουδαίων; — 'σύ λέγεις.                                                                        | Luke 23:2 (Ο) 3. συ εἶ .... Ιουδαίων; — ού λέγεις.                |
| ν. 9. θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τον βασιλέα τών Ιουδαίων;                                    | 17. (τίνα) θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν (Βαραββάν, ἢ) Ἰησοῦν τον λεγόμενον χριστόν;                                           | (Cf. ν. 16. παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτόν ἀπολύσω.)                         |
| (ν. 11. οἱ δέ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσκεισαν τον ὄχλον, ἵνα μάλλον τον Βαραββάν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.) | (20. οἱ δέ ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τον Βαραββάν, τον δέ 'Ιησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν.) | 18. αἶρε τούτον, ἀπόλυσον δέ ἡμῖν Βαραββάν.                       |
| 12. τί οὖν θέλετε ποιήσω τον βασιλέα τών 'Ιαυδαίων; *)                                 | 22. τί οὖν ποιήσω 'Ιησρύν, τον λεγόμενον χριστόν;                                                                    | (20. Παλιν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος προσεφώνησε, θέλων ἀπολύσαι τον Ἰησοῦν.) |
| 13. σταύρωσαν αὐτόν.                                                                   | 22. — σταυρωθήτω.                                                                                                    | 21. σταύρωσαν, σταύρωσαν αὐτόν.                                   |
| 14. τί γάρ κακόν ἐποίησεν;                                                             | 23. τί γάρ κακόν ἐποίησεν;                                                                                           | 22. τί γάρ κακόν ἐποίησεν ὄντας;                                  |

|                                              |                                                   |                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐκραξαν)<br>σταύρωσαν αὐτόν. | (οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐκραξαν<br>λέγοντες)· σταυρωθήτω. | 23· (οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο<br>φωναῖς μεγάλαις<br>αἰτούμενοι αὐτόν<br>σταυρωθῆναι.) |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

\*) The words *ον λέγετε* are an addition not to be tolerated,

a) The Jews had not called Jesus the King of the Jews, but accused Jesus because he called himself so. - Pilate therefore could not have so expressed himself,

b) It is a different matter when it is written: *τον λεγόμενον (οδεεε ον λέγετε) χριστόν* i.e. whom you wisely call Messiah according to your language, (*ον λέγετε* would thus refer only to the Hebrew expression.) Thus is Matth, v. 22. written, and this passage may have been in the mind of the copyists. It is therefore no coincidence that this insertion is missing in several manuscripts. S. Griesb.

285

2) idiosyncrasies in expression:

a) Luk.: He formed v. 2. himself. -- *λίγοντα εαυτόν χριστόν* - *εἶναι* comp. the participial *λίγων* in Act. 21:21. *λίγων μὴ περιτεμνείν αὐτούς τὰ τέκνα*. 19:26. *λίγων ὅτι οὐκ εἰσι Θεοὶ κ. τ. λ.* Act. 17:7. *βασιλέα λεγοντες ἕτερον εἶναι, Ἰησοῦν*. - *τούτον ευρόμεν* comp. Act. 24:5. *εν ράντες γάρ τον ἄνδρα τοῦτον λοιμον*. - *φόρον οἰδόναι* comp. Luk. 20:22. - *οἰαστρίφειν* comp. Act. 13:8. 10. 20:30. - v. 18. *αἶρε τοῦτον*. Same Act. 22:22. - v. 20. *προσεφώνησε* comp. , ch. 13:12. and *επιφωνεῖν* here v. 21. also Act. 22:24.-In the question v. 22. Luke himself remarks that it was the third. He has therefore the same order as the others. - v. 23. *ἐπείκειντο* comp. the same word ch. 5:1. By mentioning among the criers v. 23. also the *αρχιερεῖς*, he certifies the nullity of the indication Mark. v. 11. Matth, v. 20. -

(b) Matth.: he intends v. 17. to make the question more definite. Thus it appears as if Pilate, by placing Barabbas in the choice, had himself brought about the request against his will. According to the other texts it is not so. Rather, the context in Mark is formed in this way: Pilate, as one comes to ask for the return of a prisoner, asks: You certainly want to have the king of the Jews released? But against his expectations the answer is: no, but Barabbas. Now Pilate asks: what shall I do then with the King of the Jews? - The question is whether Matthew did not also have this text, or

whether his account was the original one. - As to the form of the disjunctive question, compare Matthew above n. 42. a. ch. 21:25. - v. 22. λεγουσιν αυτω common to Matthew; comp. e.g.. E. g. 21:41. 42. In the present passage it can be directly proved that another word must have stood in the original text. -

c) Mark. - v. 3. it seems as if the words had fallen out: καὶ ου δεν απεκρίνατο. Similar indeed is ch. 14:60. but there is something different in the message there. Jesus let the witnesses speak against each other without saying a word. There the question of the text might follow, ουκ αποκρίνη ουδιν; though no ουδόν απεκρίνατο or απεκρίθη of the narrator preceded it. - Here, however, the ουκέτι v. 5. also seems to reclaim what has fallen away.

\*                      \*

\*

286

These, then, were the passages from which we have to select data, according to their nature and order. According to what we have already explained above, we had more than one reason why we arranged them one after the other in this way, although we could have used one of the printed synopses, of which we have several, as is well known, as a basis for the future cases of the text citations. It was important to us that the readers should have the extracts, to which our argumentation in this part of the investigation will first adhere, separated from the rest of the textual apparatus, and that they should have them completely together, because the argumentation must go into detail. However, as the notes placed under them will show, we have at the same time drawn other advantages from the list, in that we have not only made it easier for ourselves to prove some special facts, but have also, by noting those passages that are particularly important for our investigation, enabled the examining reader to follow the traces of the course that the investigation will take, and to judge, according to the measure given, whether we have fulfilled our task or not. By the way, we ask again for attention to the textual purifications we have made, especially in Mark, from whose text we have made interpolations, in n. 32. Mark. 9:35. and verses 38. and 39. (which we have at least called obscure,) - further n. 35. mark. 10, 24. τέκνα, πῶς - εἰσιλῆν - n. 49. Mark. 13:21 - 23. and have eliminated false readings in o. 35. and n. 53. \*) - And so we now proceed to the business, which, after these preparations, is first incumbent on us, of developing from the parallel redactions set up, the Data, inserted in themselves to explain their relation'ss. Just one more brief explanation.

\*) We seem to have been too worldly in what has gone before, or in the whole space that our investigation occupies at all; So we have to remark that in laying

out the work we have taken special care not to set too narrow boundaries, and that in this investigation we do not stick with that oratorical "yet there" would lead us too far." "If any point is left undiscussed, or doubts creep back anywhere, the whole discussion is in vain. Many a man who has used that phrase would have omitted to advance his conjectures and fantasies on the subject, if only he had that at the same time want to discuss what he said would have led him too far away and that it was not in his task.

287

After what has been said above, the dilemma is posed with regard to the result in general: either our writers had a common model (in individual collections or in a manuscript as a whole), or each later one of them used the earlier one. If we now set individual collections, we have an exterior, as if we set an original. But if we make the latter the basis, then we have something more than an exterior in general, namely, we have in addition a whole, and this, that it is an exterior, is included. The latter hypothesis, then, goes further, and it will therefore have to be considered first and foremost. The main question, then, would be: Can our writers have drawn from an original writing? Now we cannot determine in advance, if they based their presentation of history on such a manuscript, what use they will have made of it, or ought to have made of it. But presupposing such a thing, they will

a) just as the original writing itself was an identical thing, special signs of identity will also have been imprinted on the representations formed according to its type, such signs which, even under variations and inequalities, point back to the original image, and we shall therefore have to see first of all whether we discover such signs,

b) What the original has communicated as a speech will have been a whole, or, if like some of the speeches cited in our writings, it was part of a historical narrative, it will have had a certain moment in it. Accordingly, in the case of the genre of speeches which, according to the purpose of our narrators, are themselves to be whole, we shall have to see whether, after the distinctions which we may have to make in them, they really retain so much content that they can be taken for relations of an original writing, and in the case of those speeches that are not only given in a shorter form, but are also merely parts and intermediary parts of a given historical account, it will depend on whether they are found in our copies at least in the same place of the relation. What

c) as for the general agreement that will have to be found in our writings under this presupposition, the agreement will have to be the predominant and preponderant one before the deviations, or there will sometimes have to be agreement where one does

not expect it because of the other deviations. Furthermore, under the same condition, it is to be expected,

d) that the deviations which the authors have allowed themselves will still be able to stand with the relationship in which they are supposed to have placed themselves to an original manuscript, i.e. that they will not entirely annul the authority which the authors, by drawing from a foreign source of history, must themselves have conceded to it. All these are conditions of the possibility of that presupposition. They do not, of course, prove the reality of the assumed fact itself, even if corresponding assumptions can be made in our writings. But we must, if we wish to search for data, start from something, and will therefore most conveniently start first from the possible, or make the basis of the investigation in such a way that we first look to the conditions of possibility of the assumed cases.

e) We have to deal with several hypotheses at the same time. The first, from the original, is directly opposed by the other, which does not seek the condition of the agreement in question outside our evangelists; the latter must be disproved if the former is to hold. Therefore, while something is being selected for the former, that must at the same time be taken into account which the latter argues against it, - one hypothesis will limit the advantages of the other. We shall therefore proceed best in such a way that we limit our data one after the other, and thus proceed in a developing manner; consequently also, by starting, as we said before, from the possible, we shall begin in such a way that we shall at the same time gradually diminish the possibility of what is on the opposite side, and then continue the limitation of the opposites until the final either-or emerges. This is the plan of the following investigation.

-----

## b) Listing of Data.

## First Datum:

Just as there is not a single speech in which there are not variations of expression or changes in the textual measure at one or the other place of the specimens, so there is not a single speech in which, in the directly connected parts of the speech that has begun, either all three speakers at the same time, or at least two against one, are harmonised either literally or in thought. Also, as a rule, the agreement is only interrupted at different places in the relation.

a) If our writers had the given type, which was either an original used by them in common or the work of one of their secondary writers, - purely expressed; then the copies would everywhere have the same expression and the same measure. This is not the case. They deviate here and there in both respects, and their deviations can therefore be divided into quantitative (i.e. increases and decreases in text) and phraseological (i.e. variations in expression). But just as there is no play that is given with a consistent verbal difference between the copies, there is also no play with such a degree of agreement that there is not a deviation of one kind or another (quantitative or phraseological) here or there in one or the other copy. - One should not be surprised at this; on the contrary, the opposite case would be astonishing. For if the copies corresponded verbatim throughout, the writers would have merely copied the original, and one would not see for what purpose and with what intention. If this is not to be presupposed, and therefore not to be established as a postulate, that the writers would have had to slavishly bind themselves to the borlage they may have had; then neither, in the case of their using a foreign writing, is a continuous literal harmony among them to be expected or demanded, nor, if one had the writing of another before him, a complete equality of the copy with the presupposed original, although in the examination of the "latter" hypothesis this postulate has commonly been assumed. We say, then, that a consistent literal conformity of the copies is not to be expected everywhere. But now, assuming an original, s prior! it is also to be assumed that the writers who based their relations on it will not only agree with each other in some way, but to the extent that the agreement would prevail over the deviations. At the very least, such a relationship only provides the premise from which a used original can be inferred. This is what our datum refers to.

b) Literal correspondence is found in the three copies of each speech



α) almost universally in the following: n. 8. 9. 28. 41. 42. 43. (Here in long text passages.) But where the literal agreement is not a universal one, nevertheless

β) as a rule, two agree against the third, and this relationship appears to be

κ) more extensively in the following passages:

n. 15. Matth, and Mark, against Luk. 8:22.

n. 16. Mark. 4:21 - 25. (Luk. 8:16 -18.) against Matth. -

n. 28. Mark. 8:32. 3S. (Matth. 16:22. 23.) against Luk. 9:22. -

n. 32. Mark. 9:36. 37. (Luk. 9:48.) against Matth. 10:5.; then Mark. 9:42- 46. (Matth. 18:6 - 9.) against Luk. -

n. 53. Mark. 14:13 -16. (Luk. 22:10 -13.) against Matth. 26:17. 18. -

n. 49. Mark. 13:18 - 23. (Matth. 24, 20 - 24.) against Luke; then Mark. 13:10-12.

Luk. 21:14 -16. (Real-Harmony) against Matthew (but comp. Matth. 10:17 - 21.) -

n. 54. Mark. 14:26 - 42. (Matth. 26:30 - 46.) against Luke - passages where two hold that which the third excludes.

In other passages, what the third adds to the text is excluded by two; see n. 20. n.

32. n. 35. n. 47. (in all these the dissenter is Matthew.) - n. 44. (dissenting Luke), or

two agree in expression against the third, as n. 14. 15. 16. 28. 35. 42. b. 47. 53.

291

α) On a smaller scale, the following passages show us the relationship (with quantitative deviations):

n. 31. 34. (in both of which Luke deviates)

n. 34. deviating there, Matthew and others (with mere variations of expression)

n. 8. 10. and others, and the passages, not all of which can be listed here, where the deviations concern only a small part of the sentences, and while one begins to vary, the others remain in agreement. We must also note here that it is sufficient for the expression to correspond if the sentences correspond only in form and construction, even if the words are not quite the same. (Compare, for example, n. 9, Mark 2:7, with Luke 5:28, n. 16, n. 43.) We shall find, however, that in almost every new sentence of one and the other copy, words are found which occur in the parallel place of the other, and where this is not the case, and the one copy varies entirely in the same place, the relation of correspondence nevertheless takes place in the other copies. (The rare exceptions will be discussed below).

291

c) We said earlier that it is not surprising that deviations occur in our copies. This is indeed true; but what matters in the whole matter is how the deviating and the concordant in the parallel texts relate to each other, and here, of course, the deviations, compared with the concordant parts of the text, reveal many striking things. While sentences that could be expressed in very different ways fall into the agreement here and there, elsewhere the authors use their own expressions in secondary parts of the speech, and sometimes they change only this or that word in the sentence, without the change being considered an improvement, or it being possible to see why the improvement should have been limited to such a small matter. See, e. g., n. 8. and compare Matt. 8:4. with the parallelst, or in n. 9. the words by which the bed of the sick is signified: κλίνη, κλινάιον, κράββατος n. 10. the νγιαίνοντες Luk. 5:32. and v. 36. theίματίου καινόν, in the same piece Matth. 9:17. ουδε βάλλουσι and ρήγνυνται οί ασκοί and the επιρρίπτει of Mark 2:21. - in n. 20. of Mark (6:11.) τον χοῦν against the common τον κονιορτόν of the others. So further, in n. 28. the ευρήσει Matth. 16:25. against the σώσει of the others, in n. 41. the εστὶ chosen by Luke 19:46. instead of the χληθήσεται of the others, which is nevertheless according to the passage cited. However, we will not have to look at the relationship in the small and individual at first, but will rather have to direct our attention to the mutual relationship of the pieces in the large. The following remark also belongs here:

292

d) that unity exists in general alongside the deviations, and how it exists in the main. To speak of additions in general, these usually only occur between the common text, or they are appendices and additions to the same - on the whole, what the additions of words and phrases between words and phrases with the same wording are on the small scale. Where the text is shortened in the other copy, it nevertheless continues with the neighbouring one on what follows what has been left out. In the same way, after the variation of the expression, the homophonous resumes. - Thus the unity recedes in the one specimen, while it emerges in the others, and by the individual referents making changes and interferences here and there, "the relation, which originally had only one expression, imparts to all three that they all have something in unison. Thus it will be noticed in the comparison. It is as if an objective and a subjective were separated. And so it is also an essential characteristic of the phenomenon that, as we noted last, the literal agreement is only very rarely interrupted in one and the same place of the parallel texts, and as a rule only in different places of the relation. This is a main circumstance. One becomes aware of the difference that lies in the presupposed relationship when our authors are supposed to have used an original that has not yet been revised, and when they are supposed to have used the more complete work of the other. This was indicated here,

although the significance of the circumstance can only be fully revealed when we look deeper into the area of relations. The observation explained here, however, requires an even more circumstantial expression. We have not even been able to take a merely superficial look at the preliminary correspondence of our referents without at the same time perceiving a peculiar relation of the latter to one another, concerning the consistency with which they maintain the correspondence. Since it is at the same time a question here whether the concordant elements of one gospel have not flowed into the other, we shall have to present this relationship in particular as a special quality of the harmony described here.

293

Second Datum:

The relation of the speakers to each other is this, that

- a) Mark's text always participates in the agreement, either by harmonizing with the other two at the same time or with one of them, sometimes with this and sometimes with that, and that
- b) Matthew and Luke, when it comes to whole sentences, do not agree with each other unless Mark agrees with both at the same time. The only exceptions are in the passages above 1 and 14.

294

a) At the previous data, passages have been cited where two of the speakers record what the third drops, or exclude what the third adds to the text. As we have seen, one of these two is always Mark, and

(α) this his alternation with the fellow-testators often falls into one and the same piece of discourse. E.g. 16 Mark. (4:21 - 25.) keeps here with Luke (8:16 - 18.), which excludes Matthew, and v. 30 - 32. with Matthew (13:31. 32.), which Luke drops. Likewise n. 28. n. 32. n. 49. He refers

β) with one of the other two, not only according to the same order of thought, but also usually with the same expression,

aa) The more and the further Luke varies in expression from Matthew, the more exactly Mark harmonises with Matthew. See n. 15. n. 16. (in the parable Matth. 13:2

- 9. compare the parallels, in the same piece Matth, v. 19 - 23. compare the parallels). - n. 36. n. 42. n. 44. n. 49. n. 53. n. 54. - But this is not always the case. Sometimes he harmonises more with Luke throughout; e.g. n. 28. n. 35. n. 47. It is striking that he

bb) in the first part of the narrative, which is divided into two parts, n. 53, he mostly gives the words of Luke (Luk. 22:10-13.), and in the other part he agrees with Matthew alone (Matth. 26:20-29.), that he

cc) continues the speech with one of the others, sometimes in literal agreement, as in n. 28. with Matthew, n. 34. with Luke, sometimes only partly in literal agreement, as in n. 32. with Matthew, sometimes entirely varying, as in n. 42 b. with Luke (20:11. 12.) and n. 49. with Luk. 21:12-16, and that in one and the same perlope he sometimes excludes something from the referent with which he continues and prolongs the speech in relation to the other, as in n. 32. As his relation as a whole unites the parts and quanta of the secondary relations, so also some of his sentences and verses unite the elements of the parallel passages, which vary in expression, as if they were composed of them. And it is again striking that, when he has long been in agreement with one of them, he uses some words, indeed often only one word, with the one from which he had previously deviated, and then deviates again, and that, where he himself had previously varied and deviated from both, he sometimes joins none in particular, but only shares certain words with them. We do not want to list the passages of this kind individually, since more details will be given on another occasion below. (See, for example, n. 10.)

295

b) If we exclude the pericopes n. 1 and n. 14, there is no passage in which Matthew and Luke express multi-membered sentences in the same way without Mark also harmonising them. Only in n. 42 b. Matthew (21:44.) and Luke (20:18.) have an identical verse, which is not found in Mark - the verse: *χαι ὁ πεσών ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον - λικμήσει αὐτόν.* But in the matter of this verse Griesbach will probably have to be believed, who thinks it an interpolation made in Matthew. This passage will therefore be omitted, and then only those remain where the unison of the two others, in which Mark does not participate, consists only in one or a pair of words or in a phrase. We will record these passages here at once:

|       |                                    |                             |                                |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| n. 10 | Matth. 9:16. ουδε'ις δε ἐπιβάλλει. | Luke 5:36. ουδεφ ἐπιβάλλει. | Mark. 2:21. οὐδεὶς ἐπιρράπτει. |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|

|                 |                                        |                                          |                                    |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                 | 9:17. εἰ δέ εἰ δέ.                     | 5:37. εἰ δέ μήγε.                        | 2:22. εἰ δέ μή.                    |
| n. 15           | 12:47. ἔξω ἐστήκασι.                   | 8:20. ἐστήκασι ἔξω.                      | 3:32. Omits ἐστήκασι.              |
| n. 16           | 13:8. τὰ μυστήρια.                     | 8:10. τὰ μυστήρια.                       | 4:11. τό μυστήριον.                |
| n. 20           | 10:10. μηδέ ράβδον.                    | 9:3. μήτε ράβδον.                        | 6:8. εἰ μή ράβδον μόνον.           |
|                 | 10:4. μηδέ ἀργύριον.                   | — 3. μηδέ ἀργϋριον.                      | 6:9. μή — χαλκόν.                  |
|                 | 10:11. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν —                  | 9:4. εἰς ἣν ἂν —                         | 6:10. ὅπου ἐάν .... εἰς —          |
|                 | 10:14. ἐξερχόμενοι τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης. | 9:9. ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπό τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης. | 6:11. ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐχεῖθεν.       |
| n. 28           | 16:12. ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.    | 9:22. the same.                          | 8:33. μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήναι. |
|                 | 16:26. τί γάρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος       | 9:24. the same.                          | 8:36. τί γάρ ὠφελήσει ἄνθρωπον     |
| n. 36           | 15:22. μέλλει παραδίδοϋθαι.            | 9:44. the same.                          | 9:31. παραδίδοται.                 |
| n. 39           | 21:3. ἐρεῖτε —                         | 19:31. οὕτως ἐρεῖτε —                    | 11:2. εἶπατε —                     |
| n. 44           | 21:27. ὕστερον δέ πάντων.              | 29:32. ὕστερον·                          | 12:22. ἐσχάτη πάντων.              |
| n. 46           | 22:45. χαλεῖ αὐτόν χυριον.             | 20:44. the same.                         | 12:37. λέγει αὐτόν χϋριον.         |
| n. 49           | 24:2. ὅς οὐ ἡταλνθήσεται.              | 21:6. the same.                          | 13:2. ὅς οὐ' μή χαταλυθή.          |
| Cf. still n. 30 | 17:17. ὡ γενεά ἀπίστος κ. διεστραμμένη | 9:41. the same.                          | 9:19. ὡ γενεά ἀπίστος.             |

c) The datum given here draws attention to Mark, and makes one inclined either to deduce the corresponding relations of the others from him, or to deduce his from those. Particularly the latter has seemed acceptable, as we believe, partly because it can be related to the brevity of Mark's Gospel in relation to the others, that this Gospel, both according to the composition of its relations and according to the number of its

narratives, partly because, on the assumption of this case, one could refer to something obvious for a hypothesis, and partly because one believed that this would save one the trouble of discussing the mutual relationship of our texts in greater depth. If Matthew and Luke should have drawn from a common source, the hypothesis mentioned above cuts off the presupposition that this source could have been Mark, who, according to it, first drew from them, and in this respect it is certainly important. If it is false, we must refute it the more thoroughly, the easier it presents itself, and shows the whole object of investigation in a completely different light to the one in which it is seen from another point of view. It must at least be admitted that the other view, to which Mark rather appears as the source of the others, has just as much merit. For as the latter makes Mark dependent on the others, because he agrees almost universally either with both or with one of them, so the latter can plead that those two now also agree with him alternately, and do not themselves agree with each other in the pieces of the first tablet, without the text expressed in agreement also appearing in Mark. - The slight exceptions to this rule considered above can perhaps be eliminated by one kind of explanation, and the great ones noted above perhaps decide nothing against it. Thus our attention will always have to be directed to Mark. The hypothesis of a jointly used original will be facilitated if the former premise of Mark is found to be unacceptable, and there will then be none more likely to be opposed to it than the latter, which, instead of subordinating Mark to the others, rather superordinates him.

297

The following datum, however, will determine the relationship more precisely, or at least cause us to consider it further.

#### Third Datum:

If, however, Mark does not begin and carry out the relation without agreeing in expression with one of the secondary speakers, then these, too, without his interposition, agree either literally in series of sentences after one another, or else in the thoughts expressed and in the connection of these with one another, and the parts of the relation falling into agreement and the variations and deviations running under them relate to one another in such a way that the agreement results as the essential, and the deviations appear as the accidental.

298

a) If Mark's relation consisted of propositions which, according to their expression or content, were contained only in the two secondary relations of one, and Mark thus

sieved out of agreement with one secondary referent into agreement with the other; then his text could certainly be taken for the result of the secondary texts. But this is not the case, not by a long shot, according to the interrelationship of the parallel representations, and this must be noted here.

α) Even without Mark's interposition, Matthew and Luke agree word for word through long series of sentences, and it was precisely this relationship that was to be illustrated above by the list of the passages one after the other. Just consider the passages n. 8 - 11. n. 16. (Luk. 8:5.) - in n. 20. Matth. 10:14. Luk. 9:5. - in n. 28. Matth. 16:21. 24. 25. Luk. 9:22. 23. 24. n. 32. and thus go through all up to n. 49. and also further.

β) The literal agreement is also not usually interrupted without being renewed again, or without echoes of the other relation being heard. See n. 9. - in n. 16. Luk. 8:6. (Matth. 13:5. 6.) - in n. 42 b. Luk. 20:8. - in n. 42 b. Luk. 20:16. - especially in n. 49. Luk. 21: 23. 30 - 33. (compare Matth. 24:32-35. where the texts resolve into complete harmony after previous disharmony). - It is therefore not quite true what is commonly said, that Mark is the mediator of the common agreement, and that the texts come together by uniting in Mark's text, or that the harmony is conditioned by him. - However, in some pericopes, as we have seen, there are textual parts which Mark has in common only with one of the neighbouring texts. He also appropriates the specially composed expression of the sentences, where the secondary relations differ from each other as a result, with one against the other (e.g., in n. 8. E. g. in n. 8. Matth. 8:4. ηροσενεγχε τό όώρον ο προσέταξί Μωϋσής εις μαρτύριαν αυτοϊς. Luk. 5:14. (and with him Mark) προσένεγχε περί τον καθαρισμού σου καθώς (Mark. α) προσέταξε κ. τ λ. But what will follow from such and similar passages? For our datum makes another remark, which must be sent in advance as a more general one to other discussions:

299

b) The parallel texts, which are harmonious with each other even without Mark's attunement, should actually be completely harmonious with each other. Already

α) their layout and version is the same in general, and this becomes all the clearer when one may separate out and separate from the copies what is added to them. If now, in the parallel series of thoughts, whole lexical periods occur with the same expression, what must be considered accidental, the deviation or the coincidence? Consider

β) the deviations, how here and there the concordant turns, and after bends and manifold transitions comes together again; they give so many samples of the authors' ability to change the representation, and to form it in the most diverse ways, that one well notices that they could, if they had wanted to, have formed the texts much differently, and made them far more dissimilar to one another, than they are in fact. The authors, however, have kept themselves within bounds, and the constraint under which they have submitted themselves becomes only the more conspicuous when one compares the sameness that has escaped from none of the conforming relations with the deviations to their own and free representation. The deviations - if they are involuntary, as they undeniably can only be in very many places; so they can only be brought into play all the less against the rest. If they are intentional, as they may well be from time to time, - then the endeavour underlies them to express even more precisely, or to bring into a firmer and more natural connection, precisely that which is expressed in the secondary texts. The fact that the deviations are accidental is often shown by

γ) the place they occupy in the text next to the "concordant", in that they are placed between what is literally the same, here as an interpolation to explain what has gone before, there as the varying expression of the same thing that stands in its place in the neighbouring texts. Here we can explain examples in the "greater" by examples in the "lesser".

300

In a minor way, we notice that our writers sometimes begin sentences in parallel passages with identical words, but vary in the execution of them: the identical word thus begins the sentence or periods to which it belongs, but does not complete them. Often the dependent words are the homophones, and the word by which the individual words are united to form the sentence is the non-homophone, or the word which, expressing a modality, cannot occur at all without being connected with a definite sentence, is the fixed word, and the main parts of the sentence to be connected with it are subject to change. - See, e. g., n. 15. The fixed thing is: ἡ μητηρ καί οι αδελφοί σου εξω. To this each narrator puts something different, Matthew: εστήκασι, ζητοῦντές σοι λαλήσαι. Luke: εστήκασι ἰδεῖν σε θίλοντες. Mark : ζητοῦσι σε. - n. 16. (Matth. 13:19.) ἐρχεται - και - καρδιά. To this the writers put the subject with different words, Matthew: ὁ πονηρός, Luke: ὁ διάβολος, Mark: ὁ σατανάς. The verbum is also different. Matthew puts: ἀρπάζει, Mark and Luke: αἶρει. - So also the designation of the object, in Matthew it says: τό εσπαρμίνον, in Mark: τον λόγον τον εσπαρμίνον, in Luke: τόν λόγον. - Matthew and Mark connect καρδιά with εσπαρμίνον, Luke with αἶρει. We do not want to cite all the passages of this kind here. How easy it is to make the remark



here that the homonymous moths indisputably belong to the root of the sentence expression found in our copies, and that these words, where they were first used, must have stood in a certain connection with certain other words by which the sentence was filled out and completed! That original which presented the one words must also have been able to present the others belonging to the full sentence, and the referents which express different things at the same place must have deviated one and the other from the definite expression given. Here we have, in a rejuvenated sense, what pericopes represent on the whole with the alternating word parallelism of their series of sentences and periods. If the copies of the pieces begin with identical sentences, but vary in the middle, and indeed, as usually happens, vary only in the expression of the identical; must we not also assume that in the varying intermediate parts the original gave a certain expression, and had certain middle sentences, through which the preceding, still preserved in agreement, and the following, just as preserved, were put into context, as well as it is now in context in the various copies? Pericopes that occur in such a form are especially the piece above 49 (about the destruction of the temple). The beginning (first and second verse, s. above under the listed speeches of 49.) is completely identical in the copies up to Matth. 24:9; - at the third verse the texts go out of harmony, at the fourth Matthew and Mark agree on Luke, at the fifth Matthew and Luke interrupt the harmony at different places. The three-part harmony begins again in the parable of the fig tree, which is actually only an appendix to the whole. Would it be likely that only here and in the beginning of the piece the original measure would have been given, without in the middle? Another pericope of this kind is n. 42. b. Here the copies of the conclusion from the parable supply the identical text, and likewise of the first sentences of the parable. Now, in the middle section, at the mention of the servants sent out and the treatment meted out to them, where the copies vary, must the original not have had certain sentences in a certain version, and must the variations therefore not have deviated from the original? The same will apply to n. 44. 44, where one of the texts is drawn together at the point where the others partly vary in expression. In the last part of the Sadducee question, they all agree word for word; in the following answer of Jesus, Luke forms Jesus' speech differently from the others, but towards the end he also returns to the same sentences as the others, retaining over-voiced words with the other texts: must not the deviation here be accidental, and the agreement the essential? In those passages where the sentences continue a reflection that has already begun, as is the case in the pieces n. 44. and n. 49., the fragmentary agreement that still exists, especially in conjunctions and the transitional particles - such as n. 49. ὅταν δὲ ἰδῇτε, — καὶ τότε — et al. a much clearer proof that what is in agreement still contains fragments of a text which, in the specimens, could rather be thoroughly harmonious than not. — We have to make one more remark.

δ) Our speakers usually preface the relation to be begun with summary preliminary remarks on the occasion and the relationship which the speech has had. In this way, they themselves separate what is their own, their authorial speech, from what is foreign to them. But in doing so, they sometimes communicate to the readers, to a greater degree, the feeling that the thing to be referred to has really been a fetter for them, limiting the writer's arbitrariness. How easily the first words of the speaker could have been woven together with the narrator's own words into the expression of indirect speech! but it is as if one had resisted the link with the other. Thus the sentences oppose each other in n. 36. where Mark, after his preliminary statement that Jesus had said what he would encounter, then begins the relation with the *ὅτι* preceding it thus: *ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν κ. τ. λ.* But like Mark, the secondary speakers, guarding themselves, begin to weave the *verba ipsissima* into their own words. Matth. 20:9. Luk. 18:38. - The same remark prompts in n. 34. Luk. 18:15. with its *βρέφη* and *ἡαῖδιά* v. 16. (S. above Annot. to the piece p. 222.) At times we find also.

ε) the same motte in different places; could not the sentences parallel to each other have the same expression all the more readily? Examples of such transpositions, in which the original words have mostly remained intact, are given in the following passages: n. 11. Mark. 2:26. Luk. 6:4. Matth. 12:4. (Mark places the motte: *καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς οὖν αὐτῷ οἰσὶ ἡαφ οἰς οὐκ ἔξεστι - τοῖς ἱερεῦσι*. Luke prefixes them to these last moths, and in Matthew they are woven into the same.), n. 43. there are Matth. 22:16. the words: *τὴν οδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις* in a in a different order than in the side texts. (We should like to remark in passing that sometimes the *reflerion* formulas of the narrators are also displaced in this way; e.g. the concluding remark in n. 41. Mark. 11:18. *πας ὁ ὄχλος Ἐξεπλήσσετο Ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ*, which in the same place Luke 19:48. expresses differently, is in Matthew literally so in n. 44. Matth. 22:33. - The formula: *οὐδεὶς οὐκεὶ Ἐτόλμα αὐτόν ἐπερωτήσαι* has all three writers in different places, Mark ch. 12:34. Luke in the next preceding piece ch. 20:40. and Matthew in the next following ch. 22:46. \*). From all these remarks it will follow that the literal harmonies of our texts are of earlier origin than the disharmonies, and that the common elements are older than the particularly distinctive ones. If, however, in the passages where Matthew and Luke harmonize literally, no direct connection of Mark with one or the other of these two is recognized, how can it now be proved that such a connection must take place where the third speaker happens not to agree, whether or not he could agree? This is the controversial point to which attention should be drawn here.

\*) The word prefix Mark. 12:8. and Matth. 8:26. seem to be errors in the copy.

c) But now that we have proved our datum, we must admit that it still does not take us very far. The following is made clear, to be sure:

α) The three parallel relations can by all means agree literally, and where the opposite case finds Sratt, and the one referent gives a different expression than the two others that agree, there is the greatest probability that the deviation from the norm that has occurred is to be presupposed on his side, and where all three differ, there at least two must have deviated from the norm.

β) A certain original expression must be assumed for each passage on the first table, and where there is no literal harmony, there is a deviation from the norm. Thus, for example, one cannot say that Mark coincides with the other two in that which was most marked in the oral contract. In the oral presentation, as we have seen in the first part of our investigation, nothing else of the content and form of our pieces was marked, because they did not lie, as they are, in the circle of the oral presentation, and in that written presentation which first comprised them, everything was marked, so that the difference of the copies can only be based on a deviation from a given.

304

γ) The assertion is put in check that Mark must have borrowed from one of his fellow speakers what he has in common with them in the content and expression of his exposition. For if our representations cannot be based on more than one original, - which is sufficiently evident from the sameness of the parallel relations in their layout, in the division, connection and position of their individual sentences, and in the delimitation of the parts of the whole against the others, and of the whole against other things that do not belong to it ; - so the possibility remains that what Mark is said to have taken from one of the neighbours could have been in an earlier work, both in the quantity of the content and the form of the expression. - This is what, like that, is brought to light by our datum. But some things still remain undeveloped.

κ) Even if it turns out that without a deviation having occurred, the relation could not even have degenerated into a duplicity, and thus the difference between two referents must in any case be based on deviation, nevertheless, among the three, one may have been formed like the other, which precisely does not give the original but the deviating form, by the redactors or recensors, or, as Mark is supposed to have done, may have formed itself like the one and the other reserter, thus both the deviating and the original. There is as yet no certainty as to which of the two differing forms is that of the norm and that of the deviation.

ב) Even if the possibility is proved that all three copies could have been taken from one original, nothing is more proved than this possibility, since the existing agreement of the texts, from which the unity of a type is inferred, can also be based on the fact that one of Matthew and Luke copied the other, and therefore, if this were the case, and they had no source apart from themselves, Mark must have borrowed the elements of his text from them. Thus, if the reality of an original writing outside of Matthew and Luke is to be demonstrated, and thus it is to be proved even more clearly that Mark, instead of drawing from those two, could rather have drawn from this one, the negative would have to be corroborated first and foremost, that Matthew and Luke did not have the elements of agreement one from the other. But again, in reference to this, so much follows from our datum that this must not necessarily be assumed beforehand. In order to proceed further, it goes without saying that we must make a more precise comparison of the texts within the individual pieces themselves. The following is general datum on this.

305

#### Fourth Datum:

Far sooner than it can be shown that, where only two of the speakers agree completely, this agreement is due to only one of them, it can not only be assumed, but also proved by the expressions of the style of writing, that, where the third does not agree with the two, he has deviated from the given type.

a) As has been mentioned, Mark always has something special in common with one of his neighbours, and this special thing he is said to have borrowed from the one with whom he has it in common. - Whatever ease or difficulty this opinion may have, it not only does not explain the fact of the literal agreement between Matthew and Luke in itself, but also leaves the circumstance that this special agreement of Mark with those, even within the pericopes, is a changing one, and must sometimes be only an exchange of trifles from one text for the other, as an effect of arbitrariness. It can be assumed with equal justification that all three speakers drew from one and the same source. This hypothesis explains both the actual literal correspondence of all three texts and the relationship of the correspondence to the interruption, as well as the circumstance on which the former hypothesis is based. This special circumstance finds its explanation when it may be assumed that where only two harmonize with each other, the one who does not harmonize with them at the same time deviates from the given type. This has been postulated above as a fact (Dat. 3.). It is therefore still necessary that it be proved as a fact, and it must be proved if the question whether Matthew and Luke, instead of

having used a foreign scripture, are not rather in direct connection with each other, and Mark must have borrowed from both, is to be brought nearer to its decision.

b) This proof, however, must, depending on the reasons for the deviation, also seek out traces of various influences that have passed over to the text. First of all, if it can be asserted that one or the other speaker has deviated, this must be probable from the consistency of his manner of writing and from the method of his diction. For

α) the reason for him to express himself in a particular way must have been in his method, if not in all deviations, but especially where they consist in a change of expression;

β) secondly, however, if a sameness and a habituality are perceived in this, then that which differs from the communal of the other texts as a particular really appears as an individual, which could not occur without having something distinguishing, and in this it will be

γ) thirdly, at the same time as a deviation from the other, if, as a particular expression, it nevertheless expresses in matter the same thing that is the content of the other. - Now, from the mutual relationship of our texts, insofar as it often represents only a difference lying in the expression and not in the expressed content, it can indeed be proved that where two speakers agree against the third, the latter, according to its peculiar mode of expression, has deviated. We would have to give this proof here, and it would have to go into detail. But precisely because it must go into detail, that is why we have already given it, in that for this very reason we have accompanied the series of speeches listed above with notes, which had the particular purpose of drawing attention to the traces of the characteristic and methodical in the diction of our authors. We therefore refer back here to those notes, and only remind you of the following at this point, if something needs to be added about the conclusiveness of that evidence:

307

a) The peculiar mode of expression of the individual writers only appears in the deviations, but not in what is in agreement. This might seem very natural. But we mean by it something that is not so natural. How is it that each of our writers, but especially Matthew and Luke, have certain favourite expressions, accustomed phrases, even ways of constructing things, which have not occurred anywhere in the whole area of literal agreement, but have remained the private property of these writers? We will mention only a few, since more detailed lists will be given elsewhere. Who does not remember the formulas that occur so frequently in

Matthew: ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν - ὁ πατήρ μου (υμῶν) ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς - τῇ σοί (υμῖν) δοκεῖ; of the δία τοῦτο etc. which so often links the sentences. a. ? The other two exclude all these expressions, and where Matthew wants to introduce them into the parallel pieces, he keeps them to himself. Luke's use of language is particularly evident in the Acts of the Apostles and in the mass of those passages which are placed between the scripts of the first tablet in his Gospel. The very words which occur most frequently here, favourite words of the writer, such as ἕτερος, ἐπιστάτα, δέομαι, υποστρέφω, formulas like: εἶπε δε (και) παραβολήν (which he also uses in n. 10. ch. 5, 30. and in n. 49. ch. 21, 19. ), constructions such as that of r/x and r- with the optative (when the question is placed in the soul of another; e. g. in n. 16. ch. 8:9. in n. 32. ch. 9:46. comp. 18:6.), etc.-it is just these which the literal parallelism does not take up, but leaves to Luke alone. Now, as we have seen, the peculiarity appears not only in the particular expression of the same ideas, and in the choice of phrases, but also in the treatment of the content of the sentences, and in the connection of the sentences. Samples of this have been found where, in the case of Matthew, e.g. in his way of forming anticipatory questions (see the notes to n. 35. and p. 246. 250.), disjunctive questions (see notes to n. 42. a. p. 235.), inferential sentences (see notes to n. 35. n. 42. a. n. 42. b. n. 46.), providing the sentences with grammatical fillings (see above p. 250.) and so on. (see above, p. 250), etc., and in Luke's case, for example, his way of simplifying and contracting sentences (see p. 198, p. 201), but sometimes also of copulating where the others express only a word or a concept (p. 253), the conformable passages have been compared with each other. But where do these peculiarities present themselves, in the concordance of the texts or in the divergence?

308

b) We are not yet talking about the quantitative differences in content. But attention must also be drawn to something in the context of these. Namely, sometimes the writer who adds textual augmentations somewhere already makes certain allusions to them in the preceding verses belonging to the parallelism, or he adds a modification to words that follow later and fall into this parallelism, which is related to the preceding textual augmentation, perhaps only in a distant way, sometimes in such a way that this relationship can only be noticed by paying close attention to the context. How is it, then, that this allusion and this modification are not found in the secondary texts, although they would certainly have been included in the copy that would have been made of this modified text, even if the larger insertion had been omitted? A few examples of this may be given. In n. 16, Matthew praises the disciples for seeing and hearing. (Ch. 13:16. 17.) The parallel texts do not have this. But the formula with which (v. 18.) the interpretation of the parable is passed over is

connected with these words woven into Matthew: νμείζ ονν ακούσατε τήν παραβολήν (τοῦ σπείρον- τος). A transitional formula to the interpretation of the parable was also needed by the other relations. Why is this one not found in them? One more example out of many others: in n. 57. the words of the angel to the women who came to the tomb of Jesus are thus expressed: in Luke ch. 24:5. τί ζητείτε τον ζώντα κ. τ. λ. In Mark words precede: (16:6.) μή εκθαμβεῖσθε, Ἰησονν ζητείτε κ. τ. λ. In Matthew the expression is still more succinct: (28:5.) μή φοβεῖσθε νμείζ, οἴύα γάρ οτι Ἰησοῦν - ζητείτε. How Mark's words could easily have taken on the same modification! But of Matth, νμείζ and the οἴύα γάρ, besides binding the sentence, have their special meaning. νμείζ is a "Distinctive" against the grave-keepers, who were stricken with terror, and by the οἴύα γάρ the angel is to signify why the women should have no such impression to fear from him as he made on those keepers. Matthew therefore has the expression alone, as he has the mention of the keepers alone. - An example from Luke in n. 10. Here the other texts suggest those cases where the old and the new are mixed together and destroy each other. Luke 5:39. gives another example of a case where the old and the new do not go together either: whoever suddenly drinks new wine out of old wine does not like the new wine, which he might have liked if he had not immediately waved it over the old. This example, which is only intended to be the example of a disproportion in general, is alluded to beforehand by the addition which Luke makes to the garment at the mention of the old and the new: (v. 36.) και τῷ παλαιῷ ου συμφωνεῖ. (He also wants to distinguish two things here, namely, one is: the new from the old does harm, the other: it does not agree and stings against each other). How many readers read this addition of Luke without thinking of the allusion to v. 39! and would not a copy made according to Luke have excluded at least these words, even if it omitted the 39th verse? But the words are found in the secondary texts as little as this verse. (Cf. note above, p. 187.) And so the corresponding texts often exclude very faint allusions to the characteristic style of writing of the individual writers, even if they occur in the most diverse places, with a consistency that would not be explicable at all if these relations were not earlier drafts independent of our individual speakers.

c) If one were to suggest that it is precisely the author who, deviating from the others, expresses his own way of writing and remains faithful to his mode of expression, who shows himself before the others to be the original and independent one, from whom, therefore, the first draft and the first formation of the account itself can be derived, then we have to answer this objection with the following.

κ) The original writers would be Matthew and Luke. But were the common relations their own products, or first formed by them; whence then in the individual pericopes their literal agreement, and that even where they vary within them, yet they agree in the ideas, and place these in the same order? (The quantitative textual differences cannot be asserted, since these, where they are multiplications, are yet only the multiplications of an earlier text, and where they are diminutions, they are likewise the diminutions of a given text). They express, let us say, the same ideas one after the other, but even where their ostensible originality enters, namely in the variation, it does not last long, but is sometimes withdrawn after a few lines at one and the same point of the development of thought into the common bounds, and compelled to join in the unified expression. See the pieces n. The writers may be original, but they are not original as creators or authors of the representation, but as singers of the song that has already been written. One may only compare the reviews of some pieces, such as n. 9 -12. n. 35, in order to realise immediately that the pieces themselves are older than the variations in the representations.

311

β) How is it to be explained at all when the two writers, as mentioned, express the same ideas with different words? The ideas must have been borrowed from somewhere, and in order to be borrowed, they must already have their specific expression. It would

γ) the strange case would also arise that the varying authors would only be original at different points in the same play, sometimes at the beginning, but not in the middle and at the end, or at the end and at the beginning, but not in the middle. One given thing, then, always remains, but by it it will be possible to tell whether the other has belonged to it or not, and this all the more easily if that pretended originality consists in nothing but variation of expression. - So much here about the deviation, insofar as it turns out to be on the account of the individual writers, and indeed, what has just been casually remarked, on their account, without being proof of their originality. Let us now turn to what is in agreement, What can the individual cases, where Mark in a pericope has this or that expression in common with Matthew or Luke, decide in favour of the assertion that he takes what is in agreement from the latter? What, for example, What, for instance, can be inferred with certainty from the fact that Mark, in n. 8, has the expression περί του καθαρισμού σου (Mark 1:44.) in common with Luke 5:14. has in common, though it is to be seen on the side that Matthew has a principal part of the sentence at the same point of relation, viz. the προζίνεγκε, and then the further ηποξέταξε Μωϋσής



belonging to the sentence also, and that the deviating  $\rho\omicron$  following from  $\pi\rho\omicron\zeta\iota\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon$  with him is just that word which, according to a habitual phrase (s. p. 181.) could easily occur to him, and if it can finally be noticed that, while the others deviate from him and agree with "one" of them, these therefore show no sign of individual spelling in their agreement? But so it is almost universally, - almost in all places, where the third deviates, and thus only two agree, it can be proved how and why the other deviated. But we must

312

c) and, in particular, to draw attention to the relationship, which has already been mentioned above, that sometimes, where Mark and one of the secondary speakers deliver the speech alone, their relationship does not harmonise literally. Just as, then, the writers in the same speech and in the use of the same formulas do not signal each other by signs of their own style of writing, so also their relations do not agree to a special harmony when two narrators, continuing the speech, separate themselves from the third, but here, too, we perceive peculiarities of diction as the cause of the texts' not having the same expression, so that the reason for the harmony, but rather for the disharmony, is not to be sought in the individual speakers.

d) From this, then, we draw the following conclusion: the cases of mere two-part harmony do not prove any particular dependence of the concurring speakers on one another; rather, it is to be assumed that they concur because the third, had he not changed, would also concur with them. This is the datum that emerges from the text itself. - Just as, then, Marcus does not depend directly on the other two, so the harmony between them will not lie in the fact that they themselves depend directly on one another.

But is this now also quite irrefutably proven? It will be objected that this argument is still circular, in that the deviations of Matthew and Luke are held up against what Mark has in common with " - new, and of which the question is whether it is not an accidental composition from their own text. However, this objection also has a semblance, at least that by which it is refuted has not yet emerged with complete clarity. - Therefore, if the discussion is to become completely clear, we shall have to present the One from which we have deviated more precisely in its distinction from the individual, and also to separate the text of Mark from the others by a sharper distinction. - Since we are now dealing with the question of whether, apart from our texts, there was a special original that could have been used as a basis for them, we will first have to take into account that which is important in so far as it could be opposed to this presupposition. Above we mentioned the circumstance that the correspondence of our texts is usually interrupted

at different places, and noted how explicable this was if the representations of the speakers were based on a single original. What is the significance of the fact that the harmony of the texts is sometimes interrupted at one and the same place?

313

#### Fifth Datum:

Where, in one and the same place, the copies differ from each other in expression or content, the origin of the differences is partly due to different reasons, and their simultaneous occurrence is accidental, and partly the traces of a certain original text can still be perceived in these differences.

a) This datum must be exhibited in our line of thought, if the one opposition to the other is not to undeservedly either receive a confirmation or lose a support. The hypothesis that all our evangelists have drawn from one and the same source has, as already noted, its direct opposition in the other: Matthew and Luke did not draw from another source, but are directly connected, and Mark, therefore, who agrees with each of them alternately, has borrowed what is in agreement from them. - Against the second of these hypotheses, the observation has been made that the agreement of all three referents is the essential, and the deviation of the same only accidental, and that therefore, if variations take place, these variations are in all probability deviations from a given, and the latter has not only been assumed, but even proved to be a fact from the writing style of the authors. - But it could be argued against the conclusion that we are caught in a circle, because the deviations are always judged according to what Mark has in common with one of the two others, that is, according to that of which it is precisely the question whether Mark did not first take it from Matthew and Luke. And so there is no proof that Matthew and Luke, if they differ from each other, either in expression or in content, must have deviated from a foreign standard; nor is it necessary to assume this, since it is quite conceivable that their relations came into being in which the coincidence in expression was no less accidental than the mutual deviations, and the literal agreement could take place without the one referent being directly connected with the other, or if this was the case, being prevented from developing the relation in particular. For one may only remain with the idea that the two writers, Matthew and Luke, first put into a definite form what had been given before them in another kind of tradition with unequal formation of the individual parts, with partly more, partly less, definite expression. For, therefore, even the one could borrow from the other what was consistent, if its expression was not riormised by tradition, and yet form the rest of the relation especially according to the sense of the indeterminate tradition, and consequently each could create a representation for

himself, from which Mark then composed his own. This opinion, we say, could be exhibited, and it demands a thorough examination. In the first part of our investigation, we have already taken the basis of this opinion, insofar as it is based on legend and tradition. Also, in the same division of the parallel relations lies a counter-evidence against them, as we have recalled in the present investigation at the third datum. But to support it, which would disturb us so much here in our broad investigation and in the specific consideration of the text, precisely those passages could serve, or be used as instances, in relation to which we have just now established the new datum. - According to a critical canon, if the manuscripts each make special additions to certain passages of the text, and give these additions a different position, it is concluded from the latter that they are completely foreign to the original, and that the latter contained nothing of them. The same could be concluded here from the passages in the relation where our copies all three deviate from each other at the same time. One could conclude that the relation had no definite expression here, and if this were admitted, and according to this some main element of the connection had to be lost, one could further conclude that our narratives had no definite connection at all before they were written down by Matthew and Luke, and that they therefore probably did not exist as written representations. But even if these passages were not used to argue against a written original text, and we had nothing to fear from the hypothesis which seeks to maintain the originality of Matthew and Luke, even if a written original text were assumed as the basis of our relation, something could be inferred from these passages, in accordance with the aforementioned critical canon, about the nature of this text, which would be just as inconsistent with the truth. Thus, for example, Eichhorn, although he presupposes an original for our Gospels, nevertheless wanted to limit the original of their passages mostly only to that which is expressed in our texts with corresponding words, and to explain that which deviates - to which the deviations mentioned here especially belong - for later additions or elaborations, which the original received by chance from foreign hands. A kind of inspection that leaves the original with no other idea than that of a crude, incoherent draft, and is therefore more of a hindrance than a benefit to the premise itself, if it does not outright nullify it.

316

b) Let us therefore examine more closely the examples that occur of how the referents sometimes diverge in one and the same place. The datum is that the deviations in each copy are due to a different cause, and that therefore the deviation of one copy for the other, and the simultaneous departure of all from one and the same passage for the original itself, is accidental. An example is given in n. 10. Matth. 9:10. with the parallel passages (admittedly such an example, which in another respect is also not an example). The copies ask a question in the same place, which has received different

turns of phrase. However, the same text is used, and the changes occur in different places of it, and between different words. Matthew changes the subject. Luke increases the words of the predicate, and exchanges the end words of the question for another phrase. The deviations have a different reason. Both Matthew and Luke want to bring unity and coherence into the sentences, but they do it in a different way - Matthew, by making those about whom the question is asked the questioners themselves, Luke, by taking the occasion for the question about not fasting from the fact that Jesus' disciples were partaking of a banquet on that day (cf. note above, p. 186.) Both authors, however, deviate from each other with Mark precisely in the point for which they change the question. According to Luke, the questioners are not the disciples of John themselves; according to Matthew, the non-fasting on this day is not meant. The text which does not take part in any of these changes, and yet has corresponding words, lies in the middle as the proof that there could have been an original text which was free from the modifications which make the difference of the parallel texts, and yet had a certain expression. - n. 16. the transition to the interpretation of the parable Matth. 13:18. Mark. 4:13. Luk. 8:11. is made differently by each narrator. The reason why all three differ is found in each copy. In Matthew, Jesus' speech moves from the secret praise of the enlightened disciples to the communication of the mystery contained in the parable; in Mark, Jesus, at the request of the disciples, makes up for what they themselves had not yet found, but should have found. In Luke, the interpretation is given immediately without any further preface. Since Luke does not regard the parable as an exercise in reflection, but as a given practical teaching (see above, p. 103), he does not preface the interpretation with such a statement by Jesus about the disciples' failure to understand, as Mark does, and Matthew is even less able to do so. His beatitude, however, which prevents him from doing so, excludes both the secondary texts, and in the theoretical relation of the parable Mark and Matthew agree against Luke overcin. Would not the harmony of the texts be even more harmonious if Matthew had not excluded what the others do not have, and Luke had not placed the piece under a different point of view? But the original, from which the interpretation of the parable was taken, must also make a certain transition to it. - In n. 28. Matth. 16:28. (comp. the Parallelst.) the various appositions ἕως αὐτῶν are hardly to be reckoned hiehr, since Mark and Luke only va- rüren insignificantly. The same is true in n. 35. (Luk. 18:29. and the parallels) of the various additions to ἐνέχιν, since in the other parts of the verse each text has words in common with the other. But a special reason can be thought of each of the special additions. Matthew has in mind those who, as persecuted, must leave their possessions and goods, and therefore writes ἐνέχεν τοῦ ὀνόματος μου. Mark adds here, as in n. 28. ἐμοῦ ἡοφ τον εναγγελίον. Luke, because the foundation and enlargement of the Christian brotherhood here in the world, and the eternal life beyond, concerned the one kingdom of God as its beginning and consummation, puts the expression: ἐνέχεν τῆς βασιλείας τον Θεοῦ. \*) So all of them were warning. But we notice here a place in the

relation where each speaker, thinking about the cause of Jesus, could easily be tempted to give the words their own expression. Otherwise the verses Matth. 19:29, Mark. 10, 30, Luk. 18, 18. 10:30. Luk. 18:30. relate to each other in such a way that alternately two thirds come together against one. A similar example is given in n. 39. in the passage about the acclamations of the people, Matth. 21:9. 11:10. Luk. 19:38. The variations in one and the same periods of the relation occur in different places of the same, or between different words. Each narrator has a special reason for his insertion. Matthew wants to indicate more clearly to whom the hosanna is addressed; Mark doubles the sentences in order to make the affect of the acclamation more vivid; Luke wants to avoid the  $\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}$ , and by the interpolation of the  $\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}$  to make the relation of the words to the testamentary passage more recognizable. Two tertes join against the third - in n. 42. a. the texts (Mark 11:32. Matth. 19:26. Luk. 20:6.) therefore varnish, because Matthew helps the construction, but Luke sets clearer words. One can say that here only two texts are opposed to each other, and that the differing one is that of Luke. n. 42. b. All three vary in the place where the mistreatment of the sent servants is spoken of (Mark 12:4. and the parallel texts). Since here is only a repetition of the same, the one (Matth.) forms a general, which he divides threefold, ( $\text{ov m\acute{e}n, ov d\acute{e}, ov d\acute{e}}$ ) and the others give their differently, but likewise evenly, divided description only here and there a different individual expression. In addition, words from each text creep into the others. - Finally, the whole also only makes a transition to the following, whereby it depended more on the matter in general (on the fact of the maltreatment) than on the particular (the kind of it), and the writers could thus vary, even if the original had a certain expression. - n. 44. bend Mark. 12:26. and the parallel passages from one another according to  $\text{o\acute{u}k \acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\gamma\pi\tau\eta$ , each reserent endeavouring to designate the citation more exactly according to its kind, and in such a way that it might be seen that what is referred to is really said there. (Luke:  $\text{k\acute{\alpha}\i Mw\ddot{u}\sigma\acute{\eta}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\eta}\nu\upsilon\tau\epsilon}$  seems to have been set up after the previous:  $\text{k\acute{\alpha}\i Mw\ddot{u}\sigma\acute{\eta}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\eta}\nu\upsilon\tau\epsilon}$ ). In all these passages, therefore, one also notices at the same time the other thing that we have indicated in the datum, namely, that the lexical unity still stands out in these simultaneous deviations. This last point, however, should be particularly noted in certain examples which are examples on a large scale and seem to make an exception to this. They occur in the pericope above 49, see Matth. 24:9, Mark. 13, 9-12. 13:9-12. Luk. 21:12-15. Here one copy remains behind, while the others continue the speech through long periods with unequal expression. But if the remark must be made that the text of Mark, which is missing here in the Matthaean copy, is found - as has been pointed out above in the exposition of this piece - literally in this way in another place of the Gospel of Matthew, and Luke also has verses in another place of his Gospel, which come closer to the text of Mark expressed here, is this not the rejection of a unity, which could have emerged here, or which really existed, and was only cancelled out by the speakers? - Also at the end of the piece the texts differ Mark. 13:33. f. Matth. 24:37. f. Luk. 21:24. f. But it has also been made clear

above (above at the end of n. 49.) that in the far flowing floods, to which Matthew's speech poured out, there are also words from the text of Mark. - Other passages, which could be included here, will come into less consideration. We have gone into more detail about the passages mentioned here, because what is perceived in the speeches is repeated in the same way in the other area of representation, in which the narrator's own reflection on the narration falls, and now it follows from what has been discussed here that such simultaneous deviations in the text are even less evident there than here, because they can occur far sooner in that area, and such a textual determination is not to be assumed there at all, as it is here in the speeches.

\*) Incidentally, let us see which of the speakers seems to want to express the text in a more definite way, and to rework an earlier copy! The expression Luke uses here would not fit the passage in n. 28, Luk, p. 24. Mark, however, has the same here as there.

320

c) We must therefore by no means conclude from the phenomenon now under consideration that the earlier expression in the original (if there was such a thing apart from our Gospels) was defective; on the contrary, where the deviations occur in one and the same place in the copies, they indicate the underlying unity of an original text, which can be assumed for the very reason that the deviation of one and the other text must be regarded as non-original. As we have seen, various observations can be made on these passages.

α) Have some of them in the one copy undergone changes through the consequence of the speakers, by virtue of which, after a modification made in the preceding one and in consequence of it, they must now also change at that place at which the secondary authors first began to change something for other reasons, one the phrase, the other the quantity of the words, so that the same place is thus accidentally included here in a preceding one, or touched upon incidentally, and there the change again falls into other sides of it. The two other copies, however, often do not recognise, while they themselves change, the reason from which the change in the third flowed. The change, therefore, is accidental for them, and if this accidental change could occur against them, it could also occur against an original, just as the deviations that the other specimens themselves make, if they consist in nothing but a change of expression, could occur the sooner, the less they change the character of the given.

β) Since the differences usually fall into different interspaces of the same sentence, and are placed at different points; so also in the texts there remains more or less

agreement, and in the one copy the same words crowd closer together, which in the other are interrupted and kept apart from each other, and where only the expression is changed, the material sameness of the sentences remains anyway.

321

γ) a certain delicacy of the tercets in relation to one another is also apparent to the observer, by virtue of which, if they exclude something in one place, and what is connected with it is to be implanted in any of their places, their words must be changed here as well as there. If the specimens vary in one and the same place, while at the same time a reason can be discovered why it happens, and they nevertheless agree literally afterwards, it may be concluded all the more certainly from this that the part which literally agrees will have had a certain part, connected with it and belonging to it, also where the difference has occurred. -

(δ) Thus, by the datum given, that hypothesis which would like to fall back on indeterminacies is cut off, and the opposing assertion of the consistent determinacy of the presupposed original gains in force, and thus also the whole idea of such a thing in probability. We add only one more remark:

Note: The clearer the spates of an original text on which our relations are based become, the more the text of Mark separates itself from the others. However, in the passages considered here, it was already possible to make the observation that deviations from the given are more likely to be found in Matthew and Luke than in Mark.

We ask you to bear this result in mind as we proceed. How then do we proceed? Our purpose is first to examine the possibility of such a text, which might be regarded as the basis of our concordant relations. This text, as was said above, has had its definite expression throughout, and the objection that could be made to it should be removed by the datum here established. This has now been done. But this does not yet prove that the definite expression belongs to a definite thing, distinct from others, as it ought to be, if that on which our texts are based is to be a particular thing. The question that must now be raised, then, is whether the concordant thing of our specimens and the same thing, the definiteness of which was spoken of with regard to its expression, separate themselves from the relations as a unity. Only then, when this happens, does something present itself whose quality can be distinguished more precisely and whose quantity can be determined more certainly. Now, as it seems, this really happens. We will undoubtedly have to notice this, and the following datum will therefore enter into our perceptions:

## Sixth Datum:

a) All speakers make additions at various points in the relation, which, where they are attached, are excluded from the concurring secondary texts. These additions have, as they are made by different writers, so also a different character.

α) All speakers, we say, make additions. These are placed either in the middle of the play, while two other narrators continue the relation in agreement, or where the co-narrators limit the relation, i.e. at the end of the play. The ") intervening in the relation, which belong here from Matthew, have already been mentioned above, the small as well as the large, p. 92 - 94. for the most part, and both types will be considered again below, each in a special place- The pericopes, to which additions are added at the end in Matthew, have been mentioned above p. 97. and the additions themselves will also be spoken of specifically in the following. We need not, therefore, give a complete acco

β) The textual additions in Luke are also larger and smaller. They, too, need not be fully described here, since they must be dealt with below in the same place where they are discussed. However, the

γ) which occur in Mark, although further discussion of them must follow, may nevertheless find a place here, because in the future we might have special reason to refer back to the list of them. They are the following:

The smaller ones:

|       |                                  |         |                                       |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
| n. 1  | Mark 1:7 κύψας.                  | n. 20   | Mark 6:9 αλλ' νποδεδεμένους σανδάλια. |
| n. 9  | 2:9. τώ παραλυτικώ.              |         | Compare 6:7. δηναρίων διακοσίων.      |
|       |                                  |         | 6:39. συμπόσια συμπόσια               |
| n. 11 | 2:25. χρείαν έσχε.               | n. 42 a | 11:30 άποκρίθητέ μοι.                 |
|       | 2:26. επί άβιάθαρ του αρχιερέας. | n. 43   | 12:14. δώμεν ή μή δώμεν;              |



|       |                                       |       |                                        |
|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------|
|       |                                       | n. 44 | 12:27. υμείς ούν πολύ πλανάσθε.        |
| n. 16 | 4:7. καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε.            | n. 49 | 13:32. ουδὲ ὁ υἱός.                    |
|       |                                       | n. 53 | 14:20. εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα.              |
|       | 4:11. τοῖς ἐξω.                       |       | 14:30. τρις (ἀπαρνήση μέ) comp. 14:72. |
|       | 4:19. καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι. | n. 54 | 14:42. ἀπέχει (dubious reading).       |
| n. 28 | 8:35. καὶ τοῦ ευαγγελίου.             |       | 14:44. καὶ ἀπαγάγετε αὐτὸν ἀσφαλῶς.    |
| n. 35 | 10:29. καὶ τοῦ ευαγγελίου.            | n. 57 | 16:7. καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ.                    |

The larger ones are n. 10. mark. 2:19. ὅσον χρόνον .... νηστεῦειν; n. 11. ch. 2:27. τὸ σάββατον .... διὰ τοῦ σαββάτου. n. 35. ch. 10:30. οἰκίας .... μετὰ ὑκογμών,

(b) About these additions it is now further remarked here:

α) They are excluded from two concordant texts, alternately,

aa) those made by Matthew exclude Mark and Luke,

bb) those which Luke puts forward are excluded from the corresponding texts of Mark and Matthew, and

cc) those added by Mark are excluded by Luke and Matthew in the same place. Each of the copies is therefore sometimes active, sometimes passive in the exclusion. This circumstance is strange in view of the position it takes against the hypotheses under consideration here. If a common original is assumed for the individual copies, the appearance of such additions is easily explained. For why could they not have been made into such by the authors of the Gospels? But if this could have been done by one of the evangelists (and it can be proved of him that he added to one given earlier), it could also have been done by the second and third. On the other hand, the explanation of the matter becomes more difficult when no foreign original is presupposed for our writers, but the later is supposed to have borrowed his relation from the others out of their number. The additions are usually rejected with Mark's consent. The one whom Mark follows in this must have borrowed the rest of his relation from the other, to whose text the expelled matter

belongs. How then should it have come about that he, excluding this one, excluded the other from it? and that Mark makes the addition as he does? If Mark himself is set as the first, it becomes mysterious that the others both unite against him in the exclusion of that which in his text really has the appearance of an addition. -

Certainly, then, before entering into still deeper discussions of the relationship, one will feel more inclined to assume: our writers did not know one another's account, but drew, independently of one another, what they refer to from another source. Here, however, we must at the same time, true to the truth, remark,

β) that these additions have a different character in the different Gospels. But we

κ) those of Matthew from the rest, which have their like in the parallel texts; so what is separate are either

aa) grammatical additions to the sentence, which could be left out, but which, together with the parts associated with them, raise the expression of the sentence to greater clarity and definiteness, so that there was no reason for the one who borrowed such sentences to reduce the words in order to express the same thing. The additions of this kind are to be listed one by one below for a special purpose. Or

325

bb) they are longer sentences, after the separation of which, in most cases, changes must be made to the remaining words that are similar to the parts of the secondary texts, or to the sentences that are initially connected with them, e.g., in the latter, transpositions (as in n. 20. Matth. 10:9. 10.), in the latter, a different combination with the preceding through the omission of connecting particles, etc., if the texts are to correspond completely to each other. (See the passages listed above, pp. 92-93.) Matthew's additions are assimilated to the words that stand in this place in the secondary texts, but united with them through such assimilation, they withdraw their content for themselves, so that they only behave like the compilation of something similar or similar.

б) The additions of Mark (consider those listed above) can all be separated from the corresponding text without changing anything in its expression. They contain everywhere only a closer definition of the part of the sentence expressed immediately before, like appositions, and therefore appear as tautologies. They therefore also bear this characteristic feature in those passages where they stand

out to a greater extent, which passages have also been mentioned above. The additions of Matthew are not such tautologies and nbcnpositions,

γ) The passages of Luke are generally logically connected with what is connected with them, so that in the construction of the sentences a conditionality of the thoughts is expressed by one another, e.g. n. 16, Luk. 8:12. ἵνα μή πιστεῦσαντες αἰσθῶσι. Other examples will occur below, and they will all give proof that the added words are either made dependent on the others to which they are appended, or these are dependent on them, and thus all the words are integrating parts of the expression, even after the placing of their concept in the whole of the sentence. Even where Luke connects two words or sentences by καὶ, these words or sentences make a logical connection of the reason with the consequence, or of the general with the particular, or of the different, and are never tautologies. An example of Luke thus linking whole sentences with the concordant elements of the other texts is given in the pericope o. 44; additions which would have the appearance of compilations, such as those in Matthew, do not occur at all in Luke. Even where he makes larger additions, these are placed in a reciprocal relationship of dependence with the others, so that together they form only one whole. So much about the peculiarities of the individual writers, not in order to characterise them more precisely in relation to each other, but in relation to the additions that stand out in their representations. However, we would like to pay special attention to the remark that Mark's additions are far easier to distinguish from the common parts than the additions of the others.

326

c) But if these additions, as we have seen, have a different character from one another in the various Gospels, then the probability increases that what is a consistent expression of our relations is older than these additions. And so, then, in our texts, a foregone conclusion does indeed distinguish itself from that which was added later; at least no one will deny that the appearance of it exists. But now further. Can this separating really have existed as an original relation in itself? This question suggests itself, or rather we take up the thread of the connection again by raising this question. In the same way, however, it is easy to see what we have to look at when we think of its answer. That which must have existed in itself will indisputably have constituted a coherent whole. If we wish to examine whether such a whole is to be found in the concordant expression of our texts, we must look as much at the content of the concordant expression as at the concordance of the same. Now our writers give the relations, as we have just seen, with quantitative diversity. Two of them continue where the third remains behind, or they cease where the third "prolongs the speech.

How far, then, - that would be the question, - must the presupposed whole have extended? On closer examination, the following date emerges:

327

#### Seventh Datum:

Wherever the one text contains additions and extensions that are excluded from both side texts at the same time, either in the middle or at the end, the shorter texts, in view of the meaning and purpose of the speech, lack nothing for completeness, notwithstanding their distinctive brevity.

Since we are speaking of the material wholeness of the concordant text, of the special amplifications only those come into consideration here which, according to their content, give a more complete meaning, or if they relate to the concordant like elaborations of the form, not only clarify the concordant expression, like some smaller additions, but also have the appearance of particularly supporting the truth of the speech. - It is the "greater" details of this kind, then, against which the date just established must prove itself. We must now, going into detail, compare the passages in which such a quantity discrepancy occurs. Let us look at the individual examples of greater detail that occur in Matthew.

a) occur in Matthew, namely

α) between the common relation. The series begins with

n.10. - Matth. 9:13. πορευθίντες δέ - ου θυσίαν. It is hardly necessary to remark here that the identical text of the other copies, which excludes the addition, already has a complete expression without it. Likewise also

n. 11 - Matthew adds ch. 12:5-7, but since according to the narrative it was a question of whether the disciples could not do that for which they were rebuked because they were compelled by hunger, it was sufficient to recall for their defence the similar example given by David under the same circumstances, and there was no need for Matthew's expansion of the text for the author of the narrative. The conclusion that the man was also lord of the Sabbath was already apparent from the similarity of the cases compared, without the conclusion having to be drawn about the man of the temple. .---

328

n.16. - Here are several additions.

α) Matth. 13:13. ὅσης γάρ ἐχει - ουδέ σννιονσι. The unanimously shorter texts say the same thing: the people are not given the true thing itself, but its shell and image, as if the people had to keep the saying of the prophet for themselves. Therefore, there was no need for an explicit citation, as Matthew adds from Isaiah (v. 14, 15).

(β) v. 16. 17. is just as little missed in the "concordant" secondary texts, since the expression: νμῖν δίδοται γνῶναι - τον Θεό (Mark 4:Luk. 8:10.) also speaks of a "more generous" spiritual gift.

n.20, Here Matth. 10:8. as the word of Jesus still particularly expresses, that the apostles should not have their performed healings paid for. The secondary texts do not mention this explicitly. But when Jesus, according to their account, demands that His pilgrims wear nothing but an outer garment, and also forbids them to take money with them, then what Matthew expresses moreover was already clear from the words. 6:10. and Luk- 9:4. εἰς ἣν ὕ' ἀν οικίαν εἰσέλθητε κ, τ. λ. complete, as an explanation of what the outcasts have to observe when they enter a house. As the words close, so does Matthew 10:11, (ἐκεῖ μείνατε, εως ἀν ἴξίλθητε ἰκεῖθεν.) What ex further brings v. 12. 13, is really only a supplement to the expression already concluded, and therefore not necessary to completeness.

n.28. - After the answer given by the disciples to Jesus' question, that they believe him to be the Messiah, there follows, in Matthew ch. 16, 17-19, a more verbose reply of Jesus to Peter, which the other, literally harmonic, texts do not have. But since what follows immediately after the disciples' answer is also a reply of Jesus, and one that follows the answer exactly, they are complete in themselves and lack nothing.

329

n.32. - Jesus indicates how highly he esteems anyone who grants hospitality to one of the least of the confessors of the Messiah. Since the least among the Christians is symbolized by a child, it was in accordance with the context of the speech to let Jesus symbolically speak of the reception of the child. Therefore, what is interwoven in Matth. 18:3. 4. cannot be regarded as the filling of a gap in the unfinished text.

The statement of Peter: we have left everything, Matth. 19:27. is sufficiently taken into account in the answer of Jesus, as Mark and Luke let it follow, so that the given

answer must be sufficient for the disciple. Therefore, as Mark and Luke both exclude the explanation given by Matthew, their texts do not need it.

n.42. a. - The parable introduced between Matth. 21:28-32. is a whole in itself, and is just as little, as it is a component of the secondary texts, necessarily connected with the preceding and following. Mark. 12:1. the expression εν παραβολαῖς demands no more than a parable, since it stands more verbally, and is to be translated: he spoke parabolically.

n.47. - The texts of Mark and Luke, which agree and are equally limited, are indeed very short. But if the alternate speeches referred to from n. 42 until now, for each of which their special occasions were required, are to fall on the same day, then one does not expect a long speech here, and the report, which just before had the external occasions alternated under a somewhat detailed exposition, does not seem to want to expect one either. Nor will anyone take the shorter text of Mark and Luke for an excerpt from the longer one of Matthew; on the contrary, the latter, even if only superficially considered, will be seen as an extension of the former and as a compilation.

330

n.49. - Matthew here alone expands the text ch. 24:39. cf. Mark. 13:26. Luk. 21:27. But for the present, fine words: και τότε φανήσεται τό σημεῖον τοῦ νιοῦ του ανθρώπου say in substance no more than the words with which the Nebc texts alone bk' suffice: και τότε ὁψονται τόν υἱόν του άνθρ. ερχόμενον κ. τ. λ., at most they contain an antecellens, which, however, must be considered dispensable in this context. It says: all the sexes will howl. But of affliction (θλιψις) and wailing there has already been enough said in the foregoing, and that in that the description pursues the purpose of describing the departures preceding the coming of the Son of Man, so that the whole description is not only lacking nothing if this wailing is not spoken of again, but it rather brings something conspicuous into the representation, if it is now again to be made into a special phenomenon preceding that coming - as Matth. 24:30. happens\*).

\*The verses in n. 42, b. Matth. 21:43. 44. and n. 49, Matth. 24:11. 12. and n. 53. 26, 25. have just been described as interpolations in the notes to these passages. So we need not take them into account here. But if we were to accept them as genuine, they are not extensions of the secondary texts. In the same way, it has been noted that the Parthia n. 49. Matth. 24:26 - -8. contains only another recension of v. 5. The extensions which we find in Matthew in those

passages which he alone has in common with Mark must also be abstracted from here.

These were the textual amplifications in the middle of the discourse. The following are the pericopes in which Matthew extends the speech

b) at the end of the secondary texts. - The first piece that belongs here is

n. 20. - However the textual proliferation of Matthew may be treated here, the parallel relations, where they both bound each other at the same time, are also closed whole.

331

According to them, the instruction which Jesus gives to those who are sent out refers only to the following points:

a) that they should go out to teach and to heal the sick,

b) what they should not carry with them on the journey,

c) how they should behave if they are excluded from any house and if they do not find hospitality in a market town. The purpose and nature of the journey, then, is what exhausts the instruction and gives it unity. No critical reader of the Gospels will maintain that the brief account of the two others is an excerpt from Matthew, or in itself incomplete; on the contrary, if one reads the following remark of the narrators, how the disciples returned from their missionary journey, and told the Master what they had accomplished, and the latter now went with them into solitude, one must conclude backwards that, according to the plan of the narrators, the report of the instruction previously given to the disciples could include nothing more than those points. - The other piece, which belongs here, is

n. 35 - Matthew again, making additions, assumes a parenetic content by linking (Ch. 19, 30.) to a warning saying\*), and also symbolises this in an added parable \*\*). But, as already noted, when Jesus responds to Peter's word: No one without exception, as a messenger of the faith, as you have done, leaves for me something which he would not already here in the world receive again to a greater extent, namely, friends, relatives, dwellings (that is, not houses as possessions, but lodgings) and fields, and, moreover, in the world to come, eternal life; so Peter's expression: we have left, was so corrected that he could be satisfied with it. Something by which Jesus retracted his

assurance, or by which it became uncertain, could not be added to the categorical expression of it. The addition, then, Matt. 30, that many first shall be last, contrary to their expectation, which cannot apply to Jesus' messengers of faith, but only to such as have no inclination to become so (the proud Abrahamides), is also not an integral part of this text, and if it is not, neither is it the parable which vividly describes it. —

\*) My private opinion is that this saying does not belong in Mark, which only ever adds as much as belongs to the theme, or was determined by the preceding.

\*\*) The explanation of it, which I consider to be the correct one, I have given in vr. Winer's Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie. 1, vol. Sulzbach 1826, pp. 71 -109. explanations which I must reject are those afterwards exhibited by ä. k. Ilxer in: A. F. Unger in: de parabolarum Jesu natura, interpretatione, usu. läps. 1828. p. 115 -118. and the one, in my opinion, totally mistaken by I. L. Liebe in Winer's exeget. Studien. 1. vol. Leipzig 1827. p. 61 - 78. as well as the one in taken up in Fritzsche's commentary.

332

Furthermore, according to the synopsis, there are no pericopes which could be drawn here as such, in which Matthew extends the speech beyond certain texts bounded by Mark and Luke at the same place. So now we turn

2) to Luke. - He only adds a few sentences here and there to the secondary texts s) in the middle:

n.16. - Luk. 8:12. "να μή πιστιῶσαντες σωθῶσι. The parallel passages ignore this addition, and can do so, since only the taking away of the word, and not the consequence, or the purpose of it, is spoken of.

n.32 . - If in the parallel texts the continuation of the discourse deals with what a grave sin it is to tempt even the least disciple of Christ to apostasy, but in the immediately preceding passage there is also talk of the opposite, namely of what it means to receive the least disciple of the Messiah for the Messiah's sake, and Jesus gives this latter reminder at the very moment when he points to such a lowly one; so it can also be seen that the representation of the child was only done with the intention of being able to point to a lowly one for the sake of such reminders. -. Those texts which so directly link the symbolic action and the word of instruction directly attached to it are complete in themselves. The addition of Luke, then, (9:48.) ὁ γάρ μικρότερος ἐν ἡμῖν -



μίας, according to which Jesus had connected with the representation of the child the duty of representing a subject to be imitated, is a stranger in this connection \*).

\*) To the words Matth. 18:3. 4. - ἐάν μή βῆτε πρῶτον κ. τ. λ. cannot be invoked for Luke. - They stand in a different place from the words of Luke, and are, as we have remembered elsewhere, also only - interpolated. The words of Mark 9:35 are likewise. The interpolators once wanted Jesus to set up the depicted child as a model, misunderstanding the text, which, as true as it first speaks of the reception of the least disciple of Christ and then - in a rambling speech - immediately afterwards of the seduction of such a one to apostasy, also gives sufficient information about the next and sole purpose of Jesus' symbolic action. The debris of this textual context, however, can still be found in the related relations of all.

333

n. 36. — Luk. 18:31. καὶ τιλισθήσεται πάντα - τὼ ἰὼν τὸν Ἀνθρώπον is only an appropriate general reflection on what the parallel texts mention specifically, in so far as it can be compared at all with Mtestamentlichen AuSprüche, - an abstract remark, which only comes to the common text.

n.44. — Luk 20:35. 36. see the note above under the speech texts. Luke amplifies here only what the secondary texts express, and what alone comes into consideration, that among the resurrected no longer, as formerly in their bodily life, conjugal unions take place. - The corresponding texts express the same thing in few words, and when they say that the risen ones are like the (bodiless) angels of God, it is not necessary to add that they, as such, do not die.

n. 49. Luk. 21:22. may be taken as an addition to what Mark. 13, 16. 13, 16. Matth. 24:18. as the narrator returns to the "secondary texts" after the variation. - In Luk 21:23 we do not know whether we should regard Luke's account as an increase or a decrease of the text. Luke also has the cry of woe over the pregnant women, but not where the others speak of the flight to be taken, as Luke does not. What refers to flight is completely suppressed in Luke 23, which is why he does not mention Matth 24:20, Mark 12, 18. 12:18. is not to be found. But he does speak (chap. 21:23. ) of the misfortune of the pregnant women, and if he does not, like the others, take into account the flight to be made, but comes afterwards with them to the description of the misfortune from which one should flee, without, however, connecting this description with the exhortation to flee; so the easier it is to make the remark that the others give a

coherent and complete text, the more the suspicion arises that Luke has both omitted some things and added others to his type of writing. -

334

n.53. - Luk. 22:15. mentions other words which Jesus spoke, but he also places them in such a way that they are said to have been spoken to the disciples, like those referred to in the subsidiary texts. On this Jesus is always said to take and take at table v. 17. και δεξάμενος, v. 19. και λαβών, v. 20. ὡσαῦτως τὸ ποτήριον (scil. λαβών). The narrative juxtaposes unmediated sentences, giving it the appearance of a fragmentary composition or compilation. What is added at the end of the speech v. 20-23 about the betrayer is the same, partly with different words, partly with the same words, which the related relations place at the beginning, without taking away from Luke Nottz's account. - Other prolongations, which expanded the content and scope of a jointly communicated speech in the middle and within its context, cannot be cited from Luke.

b) There is no other example of the prolongation of a speech at the point where the subordinate references limit it, except in n. 10, Luk 5:39. Here, however, what is added is only a special explanation, an addition, before which the speech, as it is completed in the subordinate texts without it, already had its completeness. - Luk. 19:39 - 44. (after n. 39.) is even less to be mentioned here. The purpose of the narrative was to describe the solemnity of the entry of Jesus, as it was held in accordance with prophetic prediction and with the jubilation of the people. This purpose is achieved where the communal narrative ends. Luke, in wanting to connect something with v. 39 (as some Pharisees speak against Jesus about the accusations against him), at the same time separates what is to be connected from each other, and what he adds as newly originated speech and counter-speech, refers only back to that account, and can consequently just as well be dispensed with as the corresponding post-Bar texts do not have it. What Luke refers to in n. 53. is not a continuation of a speech begun, but has the form of a special pericope, and therefore belongs least of all here. So much from Luke.

335

Mark, too, multiplies, but not at the end of the discourses, so that he continues where the others are simultaneously bounding their concordant text\*), but only in the middle and before the common bounding. The passages have already been cited.

n.10. - Ch. 2:19. the addition: ὅσον χρόνον - οὐ ὄννυνται νηστείαν is only a tautological explication, -\*\*) which is not even necessary for the clarity of the speech. Equally dispensable as this addition is:

\*) The prolongation n. 30. belongs to a historical narrative, and thus lies outside the circle of what is to be compared here.

\*\*Fritzsche's commentary on Mark in D. St. errs in asserting that the negative expression (οὐ ὄννυνται) is absolutely necessary on account of the following δέ (ἐλεναονται δέ),

a) If this were so; then the secondary texts would also have assumed the negation,

b) The formal negation with ον - would be necessary, if δε had the meaning: but, or: but well, and ἰλιννοονται, as it ought to be in this case, had the tone: but well come the situation, da rc., the tone, however, falls quite differently; in the preceding verse it rests on νηβτενειν, in this on the words: ὅταν ἀπαρῦή κ. τ. λ. "can the wedding party, while the bridegroom is with them, fast? But days will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them, and then they will fast." If one emphasises the preceding verse incorrectly, then there is of course a gap. And if the gap is filled, the following b. must again be emphasised incorrectly. A small philological remark in passing: the commentary explains that the question is formed with: "but not, for instance," that e. g. μή ὄννυνται would mean: surely they cannot - but the correct explanation seems to be the following: the sentence is put into the indecision, which it must have as a question, by placing, as it were, the direct affirmation or negation (ὄννυνται or οὐ ὄννυνται) in the one wagschale, but in the other the μη (the enclitic ne in Latin) i. e. not as a possible negation. i.e. not as the possible negation of that directly pronounced. E. g. οὐννυνται would be affirmative, to which is now added μή: about not? possunt - ne? and from this becomes: μή ὄννυνται, possuntne, can they about? - Without this, the sentence would be a position, but as a question it is not supposed to be.

336

n.11. - Mark. 2:27. τό σάββατον - τοῦ σαββάτου. The addition is not necessary for the secondary texts which exclude it. For it could be deduced from the case where the satisfaction of hunger gave a justification against the prohibition, what must be

permitted in the same relation on the Sabbath, even if something of the subordinate relation of the Sabbath to man was not inserted. Dispensable is

n.35. - Mark. 10:32, though this addition at least makes the discourse clearer than it already is. The speech needs the smaller additions mentioned above (p. 322) even less for completeness. And so there is nothing more to be said about Mark here.

So we have listed here the passages where the texts that literally correspond are the shorter ones, and where they are contrasted with an expanded text. Since the opposite sometimes occurs, and the concordant text is the longer one, but the deviating text is the shorter one, we will have to consider this case here at the same time.

#### Eighth Datum:

Where, in the opposite case, a shorter text from Mark or Luke is juxtaposed with the concordant texts, there is indeed nothing lacking in the essential content of the shorter relation, but on the one hand the more complete text, considered in terms of its content, cannot be regarded as a later extension of the shorter one; on the other hand, however, there are traces of method which suggest a deliberate shortening of the text.

337

As in the previous section only the "larger" additions were considered, so here only those passages are mentioned where there are larger gaps. They are

a) from Matthew - the following: n. 16. After Ch. 13:23. a part of the conversation of Jesus with the disciples is missing, Mark. 4:21 - 25. - Luk. 8:16 -18. In Mark this part contains the admonition given to the disciples to make use of their abilities in listening to the parables (as evidenced by v. 24. and 25.). This admonition could not be found in Matthew, since according to his account Jesus was completely satisfied with the disciples and even blessed them for their insight. (Matth. 13:17 - 18.) The accounts are therefore different. Now it is not credible that what is found in Mark should have been worked into the relation later. For the intermediary would have wanted to change the point of view of the depiction in order to add this admonition. But it is rather an essential part of the narrative.

α) According to all relations, the disciples had not understood the parable either. The exhortation therefore carries nothing strange in the plan of the narrative.

β) Since the parable in Matthew, as in Mark, is regarded as an admonition, and as such is placed in such a way that it is to be the first for the disciples who have been set apart; such an admonition was just here in the right place.

γ) Similar exhortations occur even later in Matthew, as in Mark, Matth. 15:15. f. Mark 8:18. f. Further: Matth. 16:9-11. Mark 8:17 - 21. which, far from confirming the assumption of an alteration made here against Mark, rather contrast against the text as it was formed under the hand of Matthew, to his detriment.

δ) Mark coincides with Luke in the words, although, as has been noted elsewhere, not in the relationship of the words. But here again it is not probable that Mark merely uses the words taken by Luke differently, namely in the practical sense, and should have given them a changed relation as the editor of the relation. For the meaning that Mark gives to the words about the use of light harmonizes too closely with the theoretical relationship that the piece also has in Matthew to allow a distinction to be made in this turn of the words between what belonged to the inventor and what was left to the later editor. Apart from the fact that Luke is here rather suspected of having altered, he also has the same statement about the purpose of light in another place (chap. 11, 23-36.), where it is also placed in the theoretical relationship. Thus, on the part of Mark, no change is to be assumed. But just where the root of the difference is to be found in Matthew, one notices words which are found in Luke in a completely different place and in a different context (Luk 10:23. 24.), and Matth, v. 12, words which Luke excludes here just as well as Mark. Therefore, one will not long be in doubt as to whether Mark rather inserted something into the text, or whether Matthew rather suppressed something from it.

338

Matth. 18:5. the words are missing: καὶ ὅς ἐάν ἐμέ δεξῆται - τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. One does not miss these words in Matthew, since he does not begin with the sentence to which they should be appended, but makes this sentence an appendix to a preceding sentence by means of an x". Now, it has been noted in the previous passage that this preceding passage in Matthew (18:34.), as it is excluded from the secondary texts, is also only an insertion. And what is omitted is found elsewhere, namely, Matt. 10:40. Could not the insertion of the words in the other place be the cause of their absence here? We shall notice the same method of oversight, which changes where it takes away, in other passages in Matthew, and shall only call attention to it here for the time being. Further

n.34. Matth. 19:14. lacks the words: ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅς ἐάν μὴ δεξηται τὴν βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον κ. τ. λ. (Luk. 18:17. Mark. 10:15.) The words, however, are not missed to the substance of the whole. But since they are found in two texts that literally correspond, it is more likely that Matthew omitted them. In fact, we find here again a sign of method. Matthew had already put the question in n. 32: who will be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, with the answer that childlike sense is required, in a place where he alone gives what is appropriate. Can we be in doubt as to how the absence of words in the present passage is to be explained?

339

n. 49. - Matth. 24:9. Here a double n"- (the one time v. 9., the other time v. 10.) occurs, as in the secondary texts. In between there is no mention that the apostles may count on assistance before the tribunals, and the announcement that they will be brought before the tribunals (Mark 13:9. Luke 21:12.) is shorter: παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν. The text of Matthew alone does not lack any content. But since in the other parts of this discourse Jesus always adds something comforting for his followers when he mentions a particular evil, as in v. 6, 13, 22, it is more likely that Matthew omitted something here than that the others later added something analogous to the other parts. Luke's text also harmonizes with Mark, even though his expression is formed differently. But Matthew again shows his method here. What should be here, next to the other texts, has been moved by him to another place, namely to Matt. ch. 10 (see above note on v. 49. Third hint), where it hardly belongs. Hence the alteration here in the same way as we have noticed in the passages mentioned above. If we read verses 32. 33. in the tenth chapter of Matthew, which is so considerably enriched, we will, remembering the aforementioned method of Matthew, come to the assumption that something may have been changed in Matthew in n. 28. in the passages Mark 8:38. Luke 9:26. Now look more closely, and you will find it so.

n. 53. - Matth. 26:18. Again an example of abbreviation. It is not possible to see why, if Matthew's account were the original, the other writers should have abridged it, since they too only stop at the general. Why Matthew shortened the text cannot be shown either, but the examples given make it very probable that he may have shortened it. These are the passages from Matthew that are to be cited here. We now turn to

340

2) Luke. He has the shorter text in the following pericopes:

n.15. - It is true that nothing is missing here in the essential content, and even less can anything be missed, since the shorter narrator has placed the piece in a different place and under a different point of view. But one also notices in the referred words of Jesus a rearrangement, which, as it is in Luke, can rather have been arranged according to the position of the piece, than the other form, which the whole has in Matthew and Mark, can be an amplification and alteration of an originally shorter one. Shortenings and additions are, by the way, Luke's way - (see above notes on n. 15 and n. 36).

Luke, after ch. 8:18, omits the second and third parables presented to the people, together with the concluding remark, Mark 8:43, 44, Matt. 13:34, 35. Luke's text misses nothing, since these parables are paragraphs by themselves, and the speaker has placed the first under a different point of view. But just as in this he has certainly made a change with the former, so also in the intention of what is missing the reason can be discovered why the writer has taken away from the first parable what was connected with it. He does not regard the added parables from the point of view of their (parabolic) form as theoretical exercises, but from the point of view of their content, and therefore separates them, just as they are different in content, although in form, insofar as they are parables, they are congruent. With the first parable, which was a (practical) admonition to him to keep the Word of God faithful, he prefers to link the pericope in which Jesus speaks about his relatives, and the others about the growth and spread of the Kingdom of God he places elsewhere (ch. 13:18 - 20.), where their content also stands out. Is this not method? the trace of deliberate shortening and alteration?

341

n. 28. after Luk. 9:22. the interlocution of Jesus with Peter is missing. (Mark 8:32. 33. Matt. 16:22. 23.) We cannot yet show that Luke must have had this conversation, but we can already assume it for the reason that his text in the other parts completely agrees with the neighbouring ones, and it is not possible to see why the other speakers should have inserted the conversation if it did not belong to the original relation. Luke is all the less free from the suspicion of having abbreviated, since he has demonstrably abbreviated in other places. And here he could do so all the more easily, since the conversation is not an integral part of the speech, but a paragraph in itself. (Compare, by the way, Luk. 9:36. with the parallel passages).

n. 31. Luk. 9, 44. lacks some words: (και τή τρίτη ἡμέρα ἐγερθήσεται) which the original probably had, and Luke will have omitted. A reason can also be found which may have induced him to do so. S. above notes to n. 31. p. 217. 31. S. 217. -

n. 32 - The shorter text of Luke is presumably an abbreviation according to the method.

α) The author has sought to conceal the gap by the insertion of the words v. 48: ὁ γάρ μικρότερος - οἷός ἐστι μέγας, by which words the purpose why Jesus had given the child is supposed to be expressed. But Luke also has these words alone in this place; (in Mark they are only interpolated, see above p. 220, and are also found in another place. Mark 9:35.)

β) Though it cannot be evidently shown that Luke must have had the longer text of the others - of the seduction of others and of self-seduction - before him, yet it is probable that he had it. For if Jesus emphasises that it is a great merit to receive one of his own, and Luke also makes the same statement, he will also have spoken of the grave sin that lies in the one who is rejected, to make one of his own disparaging of him. And the warnings against the seduction of others will again have been connected with the warnings against self-seduction, as they are in the other texts. We find proof of this in the similarity of the speech (in form and emphasis). Just as in the warning against the first kind of astonishment the comparison is used: it is better for such a man not to live on earth, so it is said with the same form of expression: instead of becoming one's own seducer, it is better (the καλόν ἐστι μάλλον here as there!) that the member should perish from which the impulse to evil proceeds, or which assists in its exercise. Speech and manner of writing thus remain quite the same here \*). If we now add to this the other examples of textual abbreviation in Luke, we shall be all the less inclined to consider it a fact.

\*) Paulus's Commentary on 2 Thess. p. 682 explains that Jesus could not have said what is written here about the causes of self-annoyance in this context, where the whole purpose is rather to prevent the danger of annoying others. - We believe, then, that we have discovered here that Jesus could well have said it, and, if he did say it, would have said it, and why. For the commentary has not taken into account the form and expression of the speech in which the same author announces himself.

342

n.36. - Luk. 18:32. Before the mention that Jesus would be delivered to the Gentiles, the words that he would be delivered to the chief priests and scribes are missing. The twice παραδίδοσθαι seems to have run together, and one does not miss the words, since they express an Ἀντίδοσθαι which, when the following was expressed,



understood itself. Another passage of this kind, however, is ch. 19:36. (see above p. 230.)

n.49. is missing Mark. 13:18. Matth. 24:20. located: προσεύχεσθε δέ κ. τ. λ. However, Luke has changed several things in this pericope, although there is no doubt that the author had the piece in the same form as the others. Also missing are Mark. 13:20. Matth. 24:22. και ιί μή ό κύριος εκολόβωσε κ. τ. λ. (In passing we will mention here, what ought not really to be brought up here yet, that Luke has the omitted passage elsewhere chap. 18:7.) Just so absent is the intimation Mark. 13:32. - Matth. 24:36. τυρί όΕ τής ήμίρας κ. τ. λ. (but comp. Act. 1:7. where the writer has used this explanation).

343

n. 54. (Cf. the note on this.) The circumstance that Jesus divides the disciples may be ignored by the relation. But it may be observed that here also the double καθίσατε αύτοῦ Matth. 26:36. and μείνατε ώύε (Matth. v. 38.), which is distinguished in the "page" texts, is coalesced. (For other examples, see the notes to n. 36.) And so the assumption arises that the threefold element distinguished in the others - the prayer of Jesus, his return to the disciples - will be combined in one in Luke. This could also happen with the repeated: do not sleep, especially since the last (third) call of the secondary texts coincides with the first words of the exhortation.

It is very important to us here that we pay attention to the analogies of such confections in Luke's text. The more the examples are congruent \*), the less one will believe that the other speakers have always methodically extended the original where Luke gives it in a shorter version. These are the samples of textual abridgement in Luke that are under consideration here. Accordingly, there would only be the speech

c) Mark. There are only two of the passages in which the secondary relations with corresponding verses extend beyond Mark's text, and thus he can appear to have abbreviated it, namely n. 1 and n. 14. These passages, however, are of a different nature than those considered above, and for this very reason we must call them exceptions to the rule. In how far they are exceptions, we do not want to show here in more detail, since the result to be developed from them can only be made more detailed below. What has been stated as a datum, that the shorter of two corresponding, long texts is surrounded by features of the "scriptural" method, by virtue of which it can be taken for the abbreviation of an earlier one rather than for its extension, applies only to the alternately appearing shorter texts of Matthew and Luke.

\*) It should also be remembered that the narrative of Jesus' interrogation and the treatment he received has been simplified.

\*\*) The story of the temptation does not belong here.

344

2) Now that these proofs have been given, we can answer the question raised above (at Dat. 6. ), whether the "common" which separates itself from our relations, as it is sometimes the harmonious expression of all three referents, sometimes of two of them, could already have existed as a complete type in itself before the origin of our Gospels, and we now set up the very answer to be given as the result of the observations collected so far, "The concordant, as Mark gives it either with the other two, or with one of them, is complete in content, neither the extension nor the abbreviation of another communication, and since, furthermore, even at the points where the relations all three vary in expression, there is nevertheless agreement in content, and from this agreement it follows that in the original there must also have been a definite expression here, the difference in all the passages is, both in expression and in content, a thoroughly definite and complete whole, and can therefore certainly have existed by itself. - We also make a few incidental remarks.

---

Note I.

With special regard to the phraseological deviations, the datum was established above (see above, datum 4.), where two agree, and the third does not agree with them, then the third has deviated from the given. We may now conclude the same for the quantitative differences of the parallel texts: where one or the other speaker gives more or less than the concurring secondary texts contain, he will have deviated from the given (either increasing or decreasing the text).

345

Note 2.

In the matter of Mark, this much has come to light: Mark always professes that type of relation which is complete in itself, neither an extension of another, nor an abbreviation. Earlier, we mentioned the pe- ricopes n. 1 and n. 14, where the text of the ncb is extended beyond that of Mark with corresponding verses. But perhaps Mark's text is not

an excerpt here either, and the assertion that he does not give an excerpt anywhere would then be absolutely valid. More detailed discussion of this will be given in the future, but in the present place at least it will not be found probable that the speaker, who always adheres to the complete, neither abbreviated nor interpolated, relation, should have made an abbreviation elsewhere, if he had had before him a longer text than his own.

### Note 3.

It was remarked above that the two agreeing referents agree with each other because the third, had he not changed, would also agree with them. The same assertion must now extend to the quantitative relation of the texts: two of the parallel relations have the same measure, because the third, had it not been changed, would have the same measure.

But have the premises for these conclusions been proved so completely irrefutably? Could not Mark, notwithstanding this, be dependent only on the two referents, and that unification of two texts which is asserted have its origin in the fact that Mark, when one representation seemed to him too short, turned to the side of the other, and again omitted from the latter that which he considered superfluous? - We have not yet gone as far as we can in our investigation. But if this is done, then the uncertainty that may have remained in the previous line of argument can be removed. For it is to be shown from the internal logical relation of the text that the measure of agreement could not have come into being only through distinctions which the one speaker (Mark) made in the two other relations, or, which is the same thing, that in the original form of the representation there could not have been at all what appears in the texts of Matthew and Luke - held against that of Mark - as a difference of measure. If this were proved, what right would there be to assert that Mark must have been dependent on the others, that he must have had before him textual adaptations which could not be the original form of that which he represents with them at the same time, and from which, on the contrary, the original form differs precisely in the measure in which Mark himself gives the relation? - But now it can indeed be proved that Matthew and Luke, where Mark's relation deviates from them in quantity, no longer have the original, but only the changed textual measure. We go to work to prove this, and therefore first draw attention to the following data.

The material additions that appear in Matthew's and Luke's representations between the corresponding text, the corresponding text, whose content they are supposed to amplify or whose words they are supposed to transform, already separates itself as something foreign by virtue of the way in which it is expressed in sentences, and in which the sentences with their words are constructed into a whole. They are not organic parts of the text, and therefore cannot have belonged to the original form of the relation.

347

a) Here, then, we offer a critique of the text according to its internal, logical relationship, i.e., according to the coherence of its thoughts and sentences, and according to the nature of its words, how these are drawn together for expression under the progress of thought, and arranged into sentences. Perhaps we shall not be willing to accept this criticism, and we shall raise the preliminary objection that every writer is to be judged according to what he himself has given, and that, in accordance with his meaning and purpose, the constituent parts of his speech are to be understood in the connection in which he himself has placed them. But we must remember that our standpoint here is different from that of the interpreter. The latter has nothing to worry about but what is in the text, and must explain everything that is there as an expression of the writer, although in the interpretation of our evangelical writings we must also consider it an error of judgement when compilations of the writer, so that they do not appear as such, are screwed together with the help of an artful exegesis into a connection which the writer himself did not even think of. - Our purpose here is to separate the original from the non-original, and anyone who would not allow us to do so would have to presuppose that in our works the linking of an earlier given and later added to it could not occur, which would then be nothing other than a *pmitio priocipü*. But furthermore, in making observations on our representations according to the logical relations of the content, we are actually also proceeding in the manner of the interpreters, since they, too, in order to preserve the text of their author pure, must separate what is right from what is wrong by interpretation, as by Kririk. For here we separate the writing of the original author and what is original in his relation from the additions it has received under the hands of another editor, by interpreting the words of the original author and the words of the latter, each separately. What could be further expressed, on the other hand, would be the doubt whether it is permissible to apply the requirements of logic to such productions as those of our evangelists, and to determine and limit the content according to them. However, we do not want to try to correct the misinterpretations and misunderstandings that are hidden behind these doubts, but rather to justify our critical procedure by applying it to the individual passages, while at the same time making the criteria on which the analysis is based particularly clear.

b) We now take before us the passages that belong here. We are speaking mainly of the additions that have already been described above as superfluous, namely:

1) The additions of Matthew. The passages to be considered are the following:

Matth. 9:3. Here the construction of the sentence shows that the insertion in Matthew must be a later insertion. A general proposition, - we may call it a gnome, - is applied α) v. 12. to a particular case. The formula of the application is just as articulated as the gnomes themselves (οἱ ἰσχυῶντες = δίκαιοι, - οἱ κακῶς ἰχοντις = αμαρτωλοί). Thus it is to be assumed that premise and application should be placed in a direct relationship with each other, especially since the division of the gnomes and that of the application are placed in parallel with each other, and the one is divided off in relation to the other.

β) The relationship is really found in this way in the secondary texts.

γ) If what is interposed in Matthew (mercy over sacrifice) belonged to the original text, the original author would not have structured the following words according to those gnomes, nor would he have been able to structure them in this way, nor would the whole have been connected in a different way, since the interjection can only be connected with the other words by force. If one understands the words

κ) in such a way that the saying allegorised from Hosea justifies Jesus' dealings with sinners as a work of mercy, then

aa) two reasons, ' that Jesus acts as a physician, and that he acts according to that saying, are mixed up, or rather the proof only begins with the folded saying, and that comparison with the physician, according to which the separation of those for whom he is there is to be made, is dropped, notwithstanding the following separation of the αμαρτωλοί from the δικάσις is furnished after the same.

bb) Does the negative expression fit that saying (if no consideration is given to the gnomes who are pushed away): οἶχ ἦλθον χαλίσαι, since as proof that Jesus' behaviour corresponds to that saying, rather the positive expression: ἦλθον γάρ χαλίσαι τοὺς αμαρτωλοὺς is expected, or if Jesus, as in that saying a disjunction is made, (not use, but mercy wills God), would have wished to set up a disjunction after it, this such a figure would have been formed: I am not come to judge sinners, but to call them to repentance (somewhat like Joh. 3:17.). But are the words

quoted from Hosea - translated: learn that God is interested in piety (έλεος in the broad sense), not sacrifices -

בב) designate the goal to which Jesus wants to lead men\*), then the disjunction that (because God demands piety, not sacrifice) Jesus did not come to call the righteous to correction, but sinners, always does not harmonise with this. For this disjunction could not be proved by the passage cited. It would be a different matter if Jesus had really been reproached for not associating with the righteous, but only with sinners. However one turns the explanation, the following always contradicts the context, and it remains compulsory that the conduct of Jesus should be explained rather than justified by an Old Testament passage, and that in such a way that the explanatory passage is cited beforehand, and then what is explained is followed by a γάρ \*). If the interpolation is taken out, the words stand quite correctly. -

\*) Fritzsche seKommentar zum Matth, p. 34). But the interpolator did not so understand the words, and did not take Aeos for pietss, as appears from the other place where the same saying is interpolated, Matth. 12:7. For there έλεος clearly means mercy. - Therefore it cannot be proved, even by the interpretation adopted by the above-mentioned commentary, that the words: είς μετάνοιαν Matth. 9:13. belong to Matthew's text.

\*) The help of this γάρ is often used by the switch, e.g. B. Chap. 9:13. 24. (15:2.) 28:5.

350

n. 11. - Matth. 12:5 - 7. The words v. 8. κύριος γάρ έστι χ. τ. λ. belong to what has been adduced by the David (i.e. to v. 4.), and, according to the original writing, are

α) an assertion, for the justification of which what David sent out to Boraus was intended; or they are the further extension of the last. Their original context is shown

β) the form of the expression itself. Just as the Tadler used the words, the disciples thäten ο ουχ εξεστι (empowered themselves of a forbidden), and Jesus had reminded, David also had done (with a self-empowerment) ο ουχ εξεστι, it now follows, that the Nlensch (in an urgent case) also gave himself a εξουσίαν (comp. ο ούκ εξεστι) over the Sabbath, and one who has εξουσίαν, the expression κύριος is intended to signify. It is used, therefore, because it belongs to that line of thought, and in this line of thought it still stands in Mark and Luke. But now consider the interpolation in Matthew. It brings

κ) an example that the temple excused work on the Sabbath. But there was no question of work at all, but only of work which necessity or need compels. But this shall follow. The temple is inserted as an intermediate element in order to lead the discussion to man, whose needs are still above the temple. With reference to this

β) v. 7. the passage from Hosea is cited \*\*) which now makes a new argument. In this it is now to be remembered,

aa) if this argument had been in the original text, the rest of the apparatus would not have been used at all,

bb) The words of v. 8, which should stand for themselves as an assertion, as the statement of what was at stake here in the matter of the disciples, are placed in the relative relation of a reason before something else (by means of the γάρ habitually used by the Ein schaltcr).

cc) The formula: let man be lord of the Sabbath, is torn away from the example of self-empowerment by which it was introduced (the example of David), and linked with the passage from Hoscas, so that the reason for the use of this formula can no longer be discerned.

dd) In the connection with the passage from Hoscas, the formula has no natural connection. - The disciples were to be innocent because man is Lord of the Sabbath, and the innocent could not be rebuked, considering that mercy was above sacrifice. - Here two arguments are actually mixed up, which are already separated from each other as two in the position of the sentence. The connection is, indeed, that he who is called the Lord of the Sabbath is the same one on whom God wants mercy to be practised, and for whose welfare God himself is concerned with a preference, according to which he follows mercy with the observance of religious customs, which again coincides with the fact that man is the Lord of the Sabbath. - The like, then, is connected; but every unprejudiced person will feel that the connection of thoughts can only be effected by compulsion, and we have here to assert the criterion that where words are used in a combination of words which cannot have been chosen (or created) for the connection, the original text has been abridged.

\*\*) This is the *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* more expressly named in v. 8, which has more value in the eyes of God than the temple, and out of consideration for its needs God declares to have more pleasure in mercy than in sacrifices. Thus we

see why the passage of Hoscas is combined with the original text, and why it is included in the words v. 8. κύριος γάρ κ. τ. λ. bends back. This as an addendum to the note p. 95.

351

n. 16. — Matt. 13:12. 13. Here v. 10. formed the question why Jesus speaks to the people in parables.

352

The answer, if we look closely at the text, is in v. 12, because he who does not have is taken away, and because (according to the repeated explanation in v. 13) the blinded people do not want to see the unchanging truth. - Far from Matthew, therefore, considering the parabolic contract to be the more intelligible, in contrast to his fellow-referents, he rather attributes to it, as is not done by them, the purpose of concealing the true. The author himself seems to want to draw attention to the peculiarity of his presentation by having the disciples ask, not without a semblance of astonishment, why Jesus speaks in parables \*). But this is a determination - the first one - which cannot have been in the original text. According to the pages of the text, there is no mention of the reason why Jesus spoke in parables, but rather of why the people did not think about the parable (and thus left it at the parable they had heard). Matthew now presents the matter as if Jesus' rebuke that the people did not go beyond the parables with their thinking contained the information why he used parables for the people. A confusion that could easily arise, but which, according to the texts, is a misunderstanding, because it would imply that Jesus wanted to give the people precisely what they did not think about, and this with the intention that they would not need to think, or that they would not find the true, and the disciples would be left alone as the fortunate ones who were granted to know the secrets of the kingdom of God. Now Jesus cannot have used the parables as a means of concealing the true, and with the intention of concealing it, - he would then have kept silent, but, if they were covers of a truth, he can only have used them on condition of the possibility that the true would nevertheless be recognised through them - thus he will have used them as a means of stimulation, and this also emerges from the continuation of the Matthaean account itself, since the disciples ask for the interpretation of another parable, and Jesus himself teaches them the art of interpreting parables, which, however, Matthew again presents as if the disciples had thereby received an instruction which Jesus deliberately denied or withheld from others. -



β) Also in the side-entries Jesus distinguishes the disciples as those who can discern the secret of the kingdom of God from the dull-minded people. He gives them the interpretation of the parable, but on request, and with the exhortation to fulfil the condition in future under which they can profit from the parables. According to Matthew it is different. Because the disciples are the enlightened ones, they are the ones to whom Jesus tells what he (deliberately) withholds from those. But this does not mean that what is said is only the interpretation of what is said to the others. Matthew again confuses what the people do not know with what he withholds, and the secondary relation, according to which the parables were as good for the disciples as for the others, is more correct. -

γ) The expression: whoever does not have will be deprived, says that the parables are only concealing if one does not think about them. But according to Matthew, that which is accidental is reckoned to their essence, and they are used for veiling themselves. - This is confusion \*). So also with the antitype: to him who has, to him shall be given. According to Mark, he who has ability can find the truth; according to Matthew, it will be given to him immediately. - But even in Matthew it does not harmonise with this that the esoteric teaching is only a posiorius, and is only based on what is presented (to the disciples as well as to the people). - But one sees how one point of misunderstanding is connected with the other. Further, the disciples are blessed because they see and hear (v. 16). Since, therefore, because they see, as the people do not, the sense of the Parables is revealed to them (v. 18) (υμεῖς οὐν ἀκουσατε); this seeing must be understood subjectively, by the use of the faculty of sight. But when afterwards, in the Beatitude, it is added, Many prophets desired to see and hear what ye see and hear (v. 17), it is indisputable that they desired to see, and that seeing and hearing are here taken objectively. Thus two things are amalgamated here, and this is all the more to be believed, since Luke not only has the words inserted here in another place (Luk. Ch. 10:23. 24.), but also in such a connection, in which they are really only taken in the objective sense. Who would doubt that in Matthew an original has been altered? But there is something else connected with the whole alteration. Since Matthew wants to include in the series of thoughts an object of vision (which many prophets and kings would have liked to see, but to which the rest of Jesus' contemporaries, apart from the disciples, were blind), he also explicitly cites that passage from Isaiah, which is only alluded to in the secondary passages. This passage is also used elsewhere in the N. T. to express the complaint about the blindness of the contemporaries, in that the complaint refers to the fact that they are blind to the signs of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. Joh. 12:30. Act. 28:26. Rom. 11:8 - Those who see and those who do not are distinguished in Matthew in so far as they recognise the Messiahship of Jesus or not. Now this, of course, is connected with the mystery of the kingdom of God in general; but for the interpretation of such parables,

such as the one given here, the recognition of the personal dignity of Jesus and the attention to the proofs of it were less required than the insight into the nature of the divine kingdom itself. Matthew thus mixes up what does not belong together here, and his text cannot therefore be the original one. Therefore, we must apply the following criterion to this pericope: where sentences occur in a text that do not fit the structure of the whole piece and, according to the side texts, are fragments from another text, the original text has been changed - especially if other traces of a mixture can be seen in this text - and the several materials with which the basic sentences have been woven together have received a different meaning.

\*) Cf. just now Anmeckk. S. 208.

\*) So our explanation runs directly counter to the one usually assumed in the commentaries. But we are so sure of its correctness that we regard it as a parable whose meaning can be found if one wishes, and that we dispense in advance with other teachings about this meaning.

355

n. 20. Matth. 10:8. - The words: δωρεάν - δότε and. v. 9. cannot have stood in the original type.

α) In the side texts, the first prohibition of Jesus is that the disciples should not take anything with them on the way. The word αἶρειν could not easily be added to the words: χρυσόν, ἀργέριον, χαλκόν by Matthew, who in v. 9 places money (which the disciples were not to give themselves for their healings) as the thing not to be taken. He therefore uses here the word: μή κτήσεσθε. Now, however, v. 10, where that which is not to be taken on the way is mentioned, could also not properly follow: μηδέν αἶρετε εἰς ὁδόν, since the money mentioned before would also have belonged to that which was not to be taken on the way, and thus could not have been separated. So μηδέν is omitted, and instead of it a concrete, that which follows in the subordinates, μή πήραν, is put, and this, because αἶρειν is also omitted, is connected with the preceding: μή κτήσεσθε. But thereby a hardness arises, and is linked what will not agree. For though μή κτήσεσθε is translated: do not procure, yet this, put to ἀργίριον, etc., has a different meaning from πήραν. In the former it is said: do not let yourselves be given (as a reward), in the latter: do not buy yourselves.

β) The words: μή - εἰς ὁδόν, instead of preceding, as in the next verses, follow Matth, v. 10. other words. This is again an alteration. For if, according to v. 9, Jesus is to forbid the disciples to accept no money for their healings, these must already be thought of on

the journey they had begun, and on account of the μή κτήσεσθε the words: μή πήραν εἰς οὐδὲν could not be understood otherwise than from the fact that the disciples, where they performed healings, were not to take money to buy themselves a bag to continue the journey. But the original text will undoubtedly have referred the words: μή - εἰς οὐδὲν to the beginning of the journey (as well as the parallel relations), and not to the continuation of the journey after the healings performed in between, or in other words, Jesus will have told the disciples before they set out on the journey what they should not take with them, and not have mentioned it only in relation to the way they would continue after the resting points of the journey they had already started. It is to be presupposed, on psychological grounds alone, that the narrator, who speaks of a sending forth, and then of an apparatus αὐτῶν, did not want the latter to be understood otherwise than of the way that is just to be taken \*). (With the relation of the parallel texts also agrees Luk. 22:35., a piece which would prove all the more if it were borrowed from another evangelical scripture). This would be the first insertion in this pericope. - We have even less hesitation in declaring the attached words v. 10. ἄξιός γάρ - τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν to be intercalation. They belong to the word ἄριστος, which must have fallen out before them here, as we have remarked above p. 211. (If we were to regard them as an appendix to the whole of what has preceded from v. 9, - what sense would that give: do not acquire money (by your healings, as v. 8 expressly gives to understand) -- not - not - for the labourer is worth his food? They are far more appropriate if they are the explanatory addition to the demand that the disciples should not take bread with them on the way. (Hence in Matthew also τῆς τροφῆς, while Luk. 10. puts τοῦ μισθοῦ \*). It is noticeable, however, that here an explanation is added only in regard to the bread not to be taken, and not also in regard to the other things not to be taken. The original text, from which the other words which agree in the copies are taken, will therefore have had as little such explanation here as there. - Another interposition is v. 11. Matthew puts: κάκει (μεῖναι) as well as the Ncbntcxte. In the latter, however, the word οἰκία precedes the ext? But the latter, after the cingcshifted words: ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἁγίός ἐστι, gives it another grammatical connection, that it is so much as: καὶ παρὰ τούτοις, and to the preceding: Εἰάν ἐλθῆτε εἰς (or εἰς ἢν ἂν ἐλθῆτε) puts ex not, like the by-texts, οἰκίαν but: πάλιν ἢ κώμην. It has thus been inserted into retained words between what they did not originally have in their sphere. (The linking καὶ - κακεῖ - after intercalations s. Matth. 19:29. 24:30.) To the intercalation further belongs v. 12. 13. as appears from the following:

\*) Fritzsche's commentary on Matth, bei d. St. p. 361. "will übrigens" das εἰς οὐδὲν nicht bloß auf πήραν, sondern auch auf das v. 9. genannte bezogen misten: nolite vobis in iter acquirere nummos aureos atque argenteos, etc.. Alone

(a) this is quite impossible, according to the relation which the former words have received from the word εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, and which is supposed to be a parallelism with the other formula εἰς οδόν. (But it would also have to stand: μηδὶ πῆραν.)

b) there would still remain the inferior natural, that there would be talk of a way after healings already performed (i.e. after the way already taken),

c) μή πῆραν, followed by another μηδέ, visibly begins something new.

\*) Luk. 10:7. the words are in another sense: do not be afraid to let yourselves be fed by the householder. 2 You are doing service in the places where you are exempt, and the labourer is worth his wages.

α) it is noticeable that the travelling apostle is to stop at the landlord's house, who is worthy of it, and that, nevertheless, with regard to the greeting, the possibility is set up that the house is not worthy of granting it. (Already the successive degenerate ἄξιος, drawn to various things, betrays compilation.)

β) In Mark and Luke, the words καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ ὑξωνται ὑμᾶς, i.e., of which place the inhabitants, or: if in a city or town the inhabitants do not receive you, stand in relation to the non-reception. Matthew puts for it: v. 14. καὶ ὅς Εἰ μὴ δεξηται ἡμᾶς - which inhabitant of the house rc. because v. 11. was intended that the traveller should inquire of a certain landlord, and now the case is to be spoken of, if the landlord does not give you shelter.

358

However, several things do not fit here,

κ) it does not fit that in v. 11 it was absolutely stated that if the traveller made enquiries as to which inhabitant was worthy of hospitality, he should stay there, (as if no negative answer was to be feared),

β) does not the following fit in with this, that the travellers, if they do not find accommodation in the house, (should not seek accommodation in another house, but) should leave the town or the district, and the threat of 25. that such a place should fare even worse than Sodom and Gomorrah. (Could there not be other

houses in the place where an exception could be found, and how can a whole city be made to pay for a single house?) Just so, then, does not fit

λ) the combination: τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλιως, and what is put together falls apart on all sides. If we compare the new objects, we see in Matthew the ruins of the original, and the criterion for separating the non-original is the same here as in the previous piece.

ε) n. 28. - The partbie: Matth. 16:17-19. cannot have been in the original text. "Should Christ have thus, as it were in one breath, first given Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and then called him a Satan, who had not the divine at heart? No one will easily believe this, - but by comparing it with Luke (and Mark) it is mostly probable that the solemn exaltation of Peter was not spoken on this occasion, but there remains room for the reproof of Christ \*)" (Matth, v. 23. - Mark 8:33.), Schleiermacher in the Scripture cited p. 146. - The apposition to ὁ χριστός Matth. v. 16. ὁ υἱός - ζώντος, by the way, recalls John 6:70. where the same words occur in Peter's confession \*\*). But what, standing in the middle of a text, is not only excluded from two other copies of this text, but also does not fit the structure of the piece itself; what else can it be but a later insertion into the original text?

\*) For inasmuch as the narrative wants to make the transition to Jesus' wanting to suffer and die aloud, (to the declaration, therefore, against which Peter just now objects.)

\*\*) If the first reading is a work in itself (which will be investigated), then the passage of Peter before the Pericopes: n. 32 and 37, which is included here, cannot find a place in it at all. It is undeniable that Peter, according to the Gospel story, had distinction before the other apostles. - He was to strengthen the apostles who had been disheartened by the death of Jesus Luk. 22:31. 32. He was to feed the Lord Joh. 21:15 -19. - He speaks before the others, as here, Luk. 12:41. Joh. 6:70. and with regard to his relationship, Jesus seems to speak of the servant whom the Lord has set over His servants in the passage just cited: Luk. 12:41. f. - But

a) If Peter alone, or the other disciples with him at the same time, had received the authority to loose and bind for heaven now (at the time here spoken of), then the dispute of rank told in n. 32. 32. would either not have arisen, or would have been settled by Jesus with differently worded teachings and reminders. But Jesus only says here that the dignity of the disciples consists in being His messengers, and He does not think of them as leaders of the church, but as

messengers who go about on behalf of the Lord, proclaiming the Gospel, and who must seek reception. It is

b) It is strange that the Gospel which is derived from Peter, that of Mark, does not contain those passages from which a distinction of Peter can be inferred, not that of the servant set over the others, not the praise given to Peter because of his confession, not the exhortation of Jesus that he might one day strengthen the brethren (Matthew does not mention this either), nor the narrative of the Stater, and Peter's walking on the sea.

359

ζ) n. 32 - It is already clear from the above comments on this pericope that the verses Matth. 18:3. 4. do not correspond to the meaning of the whole. Indeed, these verses themselves do not even seem to belong together, v. 3. says that only by becoming like children can one enter the kingdom of heaven (at all), v. 4. sets the same condition, so that one may be greater than others in the kingdom of heaven. The author wants to refer to the expression in which he had formulated the question of the disciples in v. 1, which question, however, cannot be understood as if the disciples were seeking information about who would enter the kingdom of God and have a part in it. - But neither the question nor its answer is found in such a form in the secondary texts, although the words that agree with them belong to the content of the Matthaean relation. What, then, can the latter be other than a reworking of the original text?

360

η) n. 35. - The greater interpolation here is Matth. 19, 28. It stands in a logical disproportion to the rest. Note,

α) that the difference between the substitute here in the world, and that in the future life v. 29. is blurred, because already v. 28. a promise for the future life (after the palingenesis) was anticipated, and hereupon the speech of the future life could not once more be placed after an intermediary cradle of the substitute to the earthly life. The interpolator therefore makes use of the artifice of combining the *ἰχατονταπλασίονα* with the *ἰχατονταπλασίονα*.

ζωή αἰώνιος, as if the latter were the explanation of it. But now that *ἰχατονταπλ.* is certainly distinct from the *ζοιή αἰώνιος*, and it is not to be doubted, that in the given text such a contrivance hath been exercised. That with which the change is connected, and of which it is the consequence, must therefore be later intervention.

β) Matthew's speaker divides Jesus' answer in relation to the apostles v. 28. and in relation to others: You shall sit on twelve chairs and - everyone who has left etc. One notices here

aa) the interposition. Peter had said: we have left. This word is only excluded in the speech of the others, except the apostles, because what was said before in relation to the apostles is included. Furthermore, everyone who has left house and home, possessions and goods, parents and blood relatives in the service of Jesus (which the apostles also did) should receive eternal life. This is said in actual words. Does a speech that speaks of the reward of the apostles themselves only use figurative words fit to such a text? But here again one notices

bb) the art of the interpolator. Peter had said: we have left everything and followed you. The interpolator shares these words. The echo to the ἠκολουθήσαμεν becomes what is said v. 28. with regard to the apostles: ὅτι υμεῖς, οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντες κ. τ. λ. (Luke has other words: ch. 22:28. υμεῖς ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου) and the ἀφήκαμεν is used in the speech of the Others. v. 29. except: καὶ πᾶς ὅς ἀφήκεν κ. τ. λ. Connected with the whole interposition is the fact that, according to Matt.

361

γ) the answer of Jesus is to be conceived as a promise of rewards (of something to become to his servants), wherefore the question is "put into Peter's mouth" v. 27. τί ἄρα ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ; This question, - after a complaint justly made about selfishness and worldliness, an adverse sound, - does not appear in the secondary verses, but neither does Jesus' reply to Peter's words have the form of a promise. Jesus merely corrects the expression: ἀφήκαμεν, and says: what one leaves for the kingdom of God will be multiplied for him already here in the world in his widely spread brotherhood \*), and the world to come will give him eternal life. In Matthew, moreover, the multiplication of the forsaken has been suppressed, although in the words of Jesus he has retained the mention of those who have "forsaken" and also the ἑκατονταπλασάκις (admittedly rendered unrelated). So we have here again the same thing as in the previous pieces, that words, having dissolved their own original context, are woven into a context into which they do not fit. So much for the greater interpolation to be noted here. Matthew has also added other smaller additions in the same piece. About the question that does not belong to the text: τί ἀπαιτῶν ἡμῖν; has just been said. Interpolations of a very similar kind are placed at the beginning of Jesus' conversation with the young man. The first question of the young man is the same in all texts, also the first words of Jesus'



answer are the same; but at the end of v. 17 Matthew gives an explication, as it is not expressed in the secondary texts, and should not have been expressed in the original text. In the neighbouring relations, Jesus' reply to the young man's question is adapted in the following sense: "If you call me good, you will certainly know that the only good one, the source of all goodness, is God; whose commandments you know! In this, of course, lies the fact that the commandments are to be kept, - that which the Matthean speaker, according to his manner of instructing prefixes and suffixes (see above, p. 225), has uttered in express words as doctrine, - but in the form of this speech there is also this, that Jesus himself does not want to give the youth any doctrine, but only to refer him to that which he knows, and it is this distinguishing element which is blurred in Matthew, under the formation of that direct answer. If the original text had intended the answer to be given with such an expression, it would have begun with these words at once, and would not first have had Jesus remind the young man of the meaning of the expression he himself had used: good. This is the first transformation of the former. Then the question is put into the mouth of the young man: τί ἐτι ὑστερῶ; the speaker thereby wants to bind the text more firmly, because in Jesus' answer there is really talk of something that is still missing, but thereby changes the original form. Already follows

\*) These give (even to the wanderers, cf. μετὰ διωγμῶν Mark 10:30.) dwellings and lodgings, providers similar to letters, friends similar to blood relatives, and so on. Some who did not understand this speech and thought of stone buildings that Jesus was supposed to promise his followers as possessions, not only believed that Peter's question belonged in the text because Jesus was speaking of a reward, but that Jesus' promise must also be understood in such a way that it contained an irony. An explanation with true super cleverness!

a) if Jesus also spoke to the young man about what he still lacked, it does not follow that the young man himself must have asked about it. But the mention of such a question is contrary to the spirit of the whole narrative.

α) If the original text had let this prompting question precede it, would it not have been told in the following, where the conduct of the young man is spoken of, after the answer he had heard, how Jesus now shamed the rash questioner by the counter-question: "Why then do you want to know what you still lack, if you are not inclined to add the "lacking"?"

363

β) The position of the question has no psychological probability. - If Jesus had said that whoever would enter into life must keep the commandments, then the young man had



had enough and knew that if he had kept the commandments he would enter into life. What more could he ask? But the speaker only first poses the question according to the following text, which, however, does not presuppose it at all. What Jesus mentions as lacking is not lacking for salvation, so that it belongs as an object in the questioning words of the young man, but a casual remark that he could still do something that he had not yet done, and the expression of the wish that he might still do it.

γ) As the interpolated question is formed after the *εν σοι Ισπερ*, so are the words: *εἴ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι*. With these words one must not even be so precise in Matthew. According to their origin they really only say this: do you want to be the one who does not lack what I will now call the lacking = one who lacks nothing. If they were related to the moral, they would be even more alienated from the text. For the idea that those who belong to his circle of disciples are morally more perfect than others is certainly not what Jesus intended,

δ) If the question of the young man were the 'organic development' of his own speech, as the latter is referred to in Matthew as a dialogue (s. v. 18. *ποια*), it would rather read thus: which commandments have I still further to fulfil? but not thus: what do I still lack? So we see here in everything the artificial transformation and processing of an earlier one.\*)

\*) All the more must we beware of imposing on the text of Mark that from which it is free to its advantage. Cf. the comment above, p. 227, which will be even more firmly substantiated by the examination of the text undertaken here.

n. 39 - Just as the secondary narrators, if the words *εφ' ον ονδεις - εκάθισε* did not essentially belong to the text, would have put *όνος* instead of *πώλος*, so Matthew had to omit those words for the sake of his textual transfiguration. (Cf. p. 232.) But how he thus changed the original is shown in other parts of the relation. Ch. 21:3. *αυτού* is changed into *αυτών*. This would be acceptable. But v. 7. *is αυτώ (ιπιβάλλουσιν αυτώ and εκάθισαυ επ' αντώ (Mark 11:7. )* is again changed into *αυτών (επάνω αιτών)*, and now arises the unseemly thing that Jesus is said to have ridden on two beasts at once (*alternis vicibus?* - the commentaries certainly say so, but it is not there). Was not *αυτών* perhaps to be referred to *ἱμάτια*? (Fritzsche's commentary on the St.) One can save oneself the trouble of helping Tert. The (*επεκάθισαν επάνω*) *αυτών* parallel to the (*επικάθισαν*) *ἱπ αυτώ* in Mark, has here no other origin than v. 7. (where, as here, it has the same parallel of the *αυτού*), let us pretend what we will. But that it does not fit here at all, we cannot account for. Enough all texts speak of sitting on the animal, and not on the clothes \*). The criterion here is: where one representation bends the words of a homonymous one in such a way that something unnatural comes out, while in the other

the values, free from this modification, give something natural, there the original has been altered.

\*) Incidentally: I do not consider the *επεκάθισεν* taken up by Griesbach to be the correct reading, but believe that *επεκάθισαν* must be read.

(a) Let one give oneself impartially to the impression of the. If one listens impartially to the impression of the story, one will realise that, according to that reading, it sounds as if Jesus, who had asked for the animal, had now also waited until the clothes were taken off and placed on it in order to sit on it. But the text does not mean that the throwing of the clothes on the road should be considered necessary. He is speaking of voluntary honours,

b) The *πλιῖβτος ὄχλος* is distinguished from those which v. 7. actively find. The *ἐπικάθιυν*, however, having another subject, would enter between the other subjects drawn from each other, disturbing the relation. Far better does the representation hang together when *επίθηκαν* (one put upon it) and *ἐπικάθισαν* are drawn together upon the one class of agents in the same way as the immediately following *εατρωσαν* has another class of them for its subject. So it is also in Luke's equally divided account. In Mark, therefore, *εκάθισαν*, will likewise be read. (To include *καθίζει* from the corrupt D here can only be arbitrary).

365

n. 47 - Matth. 23, 2 f. According to the parallel texts, Jesus criticises three things about the scribes: their ambition, their greed, their hypocrisy. But what Matthew puts together here is a visible compilation, because one isolates itself from the other in content and rhetoric. At the beginning, the scribes are spoken of in the third person, as in the secondary texts. They are warned according to three main considerations:

α) one should not imitate them,

β) their hypocrisy,

γ) their pride, (v. 8.) Both last parts of the rebuke contain the side texts, but Matthew has rearranged them by letting the rebuke of shyness precede v. 5, because this is more similar to that which is first said of the works from v. 2 - 4. Even this first part is a compilation. The word *ἐργα* is taken in different senses, and the expression: one should not judge by the works of the scribes, has different meanings in the words placed one after the other. - v. 3. by that which is to be kept as the precept given under Moses'

authority, is probably more understood the generally applicable moral, not both the traditional, and the ἔργα are here the mode of acting contrary to the moral precepts. - But v. 4. refers to the traditional (φορτία οἱ ζβάζακτα), and here are relative parts of the sentence: that while the scribes burden others too much, they make it too easy for themselves. These are, as we know from Luke, words from another context, although they have some similarity with v. 2. - In v. 5, the ἔργοις means expressions of piety, (comp. Matt. 6:1-9.) and thus the transition is made to the rebuke of hypocrisy, which is therefore expressed in other words than in the secondary cxts. - In contrast to the Pharisaic pride, v. 8, the disciples are given a teaching that Jesus would certainly not have given here in front of such a mixed audience and at a time when people were waiting for a statement of this kind. The interpolator, however, wants to give it the appearance of belonging here, and therefore already notes v. 1. , that Jesus had the μαθηταί, whom, if the instruction should be in its place, he could have had about him alone, yet he had about him also: ἐλάλησε - και τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτόν, - which addition the side-texts, because they are not interpolated, have not. - Finally, v. 13, the scribes and Pharisees themselves are addressed. - The repeated οὐαί v. 13. 15. 16. 23. 25. 27. 29. is clear enough to be compiled. Again, we know from Luke that these words do not belong here, but in another nexus, and therefore we will spare ourselves further discussion of them, since we shall return to them on another occasion, when we shall speak of the pieces of the second tablet.

366

n. This interposition has already been spoken of above, p. 252. We may add here: if the words v. 27. 28. here assert antithetically the general visibility of the coming of the Messiah in advance, while the speech preceding it is not yet completed, and must only be completed by the indication of the moment in which this coming falls, then first of all the course of the speech is disturbed, and then what follows (v. 29.) is so anticipated that it becomes a tautology. - For the visibility of that coming is precisely the destruction of the city to be mentioned after its siege. The latter had been spoken of, so why should the latter, before it is mentioned, first be placed in an antithesis? We know here again from Luke that the interpolated words belong to another context.

These are the great interpolations in Matthew. At the same time we want to consider the most important of the smaller ones that occur here and there. Of n. 20. Matth. 10:14. τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως has been spoken of above p. 258. A very similar interposition is n. 28. Matth. 16:24. ἱερεμίαν ἢ ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν. The subsidiary texts here mention two kinds of opinions,

α) that which names a specific prophet, and

β) that which does not name a particular one. It soon becomes evident that if the original text had known how to tell of those who took Jesus for Jehovah, it would have included them with those who took him for Elijah. The interpolator, however, sees *λεπεμίαν* to the second clap.

the second clave, because he calls a second prophet. But by this the words now receive the sense: the other class says: if he be not Jeremias, he is one of the prophets - so probably Elias also, for Elias was also a prophet. The addition cancels the segregation again. The distinction, if the Matthean words could really make one, would be this: the first class says: he is Elias, and no one else; the other: he is Jeremias, or another prophet. But since the distinguishing words are lacking, the distinction to be made becomes troublesome. If there was another class who took Jesus for Jeremiah, doubting whether he might not also be Elias, the distinction of the latter from the first class should have been made much clearer. - But what is the use of much talk? He who is not blinded sees, in any case, that those who name an individual, and those who name none, should have made up the classes to be distinguished. - n. 49. Matth. 24:20. *μηδέ σαββάτου*. - This Mark is said to have omitted ch. 13:18. On closer examination of the nexus we find it otherwise. As the exhortation of Jesus to take flight is expressed, and connected with the other parts of the whole discourse, it presupposes that, remembering beforehand to take flight, one would not wait till the Sabbath came. It speaks only of an inevitability, and thus of the thing to be prayed for, that the flight should not fall in winter. If Jesus had presupposed the possibility that the Sabbath might be an obstacle, it would not have been the pregnant women and the suckling women who would have been the first to complain. But as the text is arranged in the other copies, it does not take into account the Sabbath, which is inevitable, but nature. - But it was easy for the compiler to put *μηδέ σαββάτου* here as well as in the previous passage A - Of the Sabbath. in the previous passage *λεπεμίαν* ή. - From Matthaean intercalations made in the middle of the text, we have none further to mention here. We turn

368

2) to Luke. There are no significant interpolations of Luke between the two texts other than the reference to Scripture in n. 36, Luk 18:31. To this, however, the remark in 34. does not fit well, that the disciples understood nothing of what was said - and by this is meant only what Jesus said about his destinies. Would the first narrator, if he thought he had to draw Jesus' appeal to Scripture into the narrative, have been able to make such a remark, for which the reference to Scripture was not even present? Would he not have had to notice that the disciples had asked Jesus for more precise expositions in accordance with Scripture? The other texts have nothing about an appeal to Scripture, and therefore no gap is noticeable in their words.

n. Luke here comments on the text of the others. When the other texts say that the risen ones do not enter into marital unions, for they are like the angels of God, it is to be supposed that the proof has reached its highest point, as is also the case in these texts. Luke, however, adds that the resurrected are like the angels of God, since they are children of the resurrection, but the latter has meaning only if the resurrected are really like the angels.

n. 49. - Luk 21:23. 24. ἔσται γάρ - καιροί ἐθνῶν It has already been remarked above, p. 266, that these verses, as interpolations are wont to do, break off the thread of the connection, and this in that they anticipate, just as an interpolation made elsewhere by Luke (ch. 9:36.), over what immediately follows. Other interpolations in the middle of the speech begun (which would be increases in content, and not merely variations of expression), we would not know from Luke. - We have thus sifted here what belongs together according to the inner relations of the text, separating it from what does not belong to it, and what could not have been written at the same time by the writer in the act of writing, when he put it into an expression \*). We have thought our way into the writer's soul, and what appeared to us at the time of the separation to be a duplicity, we have given for it for no other reason than that for which a duplicity arises when two persons speaking at the same time about one and the same point fall into each other's speech with words that come from their own circle of thoughts. The remarks that have been made here about the interpolations in the middle of the speech, and between the sentences that belong directly to it, can now also be made in the appendices that have been attached to such speeches by the one speaker where the others simultaneously border the piece. We will continue our criticism of these immediately.

\*) One more example of the smaller interpolations from Matthew in n. 49. 49. to be added; the question: (Matth. 24:3.) τί το ὑμῖν τῆς βῆς παρονβίας; However, Jesus says hereafter, that at the time of the destruction of the temple the Son of Man will come: Mark. 13:26. Matth. 24:30. but.

(a) It was not the thought of the disciples that he would come only on condition of this destruction, as neither will those have thought of whom Luk. 19:11. is spoken of. If this had been the disciples' idea, Jesus would not have warned against false Messiahs (who wanted to avert the destruction) in verse 5. Nor would he have needed to tell the disciples that they should not tremble at the first movements preceding his coming. (Matth. v. 6.) In fact, he could have,

b) According to the layout of the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples could not yet have thought of Jesus' return after his death. - Jesus rather gives the disciples an unexpected instruction, as is already indicated by the fact that they are said to have admired the temple building. Matthew, however, anticipates Jesus' answer as in u. 35. (This to p. 251.)

369

#### Tenth Datum:

The prolongations of speech, too, which go beyond the boundary set by two speakers at the same time, are separated from the organism of that with which they are connected, as foreign constituent parts.

370

By this organism we understand the purpose of the play, in so far as for its sake the connection of certain sentences is made, and for this connection of sentences certain words are chosen, and in so far this purpose of the play can be discerned from the connection of sentences and the choice of words. Two speakers often, as we have already seen, bound the same piece, which the third extends beyond this boundary. Here we say of this extension that it continues with a content that does not unite with the preceding as an organic component. In particular, however, this assertion points to those appendices which Matthew makes to the pieces that are simultaneously bounded by the co-representatives. It has been shown above that even without them, the pieces to which they are added form a complete whole; here, then, it is to be shown that they did not originally belong to these pieces at all. In the first pericope belonging here, n. 20, where the instructional speech of Jesus to the disciples to be sent out is prolonged from Matth. 10, 15. f., a deeper criticism is not necessary. Jesus sends out the disciples and awaits their return in order to be able to set out on other paths with them. How could words of instruction be thought here in case the messengers of the faith were dragged before the tribunals (vv. 18-20)? or how could the words occur here as part of a speech appropriate to the circumstances: if the disciples were persecuted in one city, they should flee to another, and before they had passed through the cities of Israel, the Son of Man would come? (v. 25.) Or how could reminders enter into the context of the speech spoken here, such as this: the disciples should not imagine that Jesus had come to bring peace, since rather participation in his cause would cause strife in the families, and thus in confessing his name they would have to expose themselves to the hatred of their own? Or how, finally, could Jesus here already assure that those who were to be sent out, when they were brought before the tribunals, could count on the

assistance of the spirit (,-. 19.) who would guide the word for them, as if his resurrection from the dead, after which the spirit could only come, were here already presupposed for the present sending out? - It is therefore clearer here than on the day that things which do not belong together are mixed up with each other, in that the compiler mixes up the sending which is to be mentioned in the present place with the proclamation of the word to be given after Jesus' death, and carries the hints about the latter given by Jesus in later times into the instruction given at that sending. -

371

n. 35. A parable is added to Matth. 20:1. f., which is connected with the words Matth. 19:30. (Many who were first will be last). - The parable sketches out a symbolic historical narrative in which the first and the last - the words taken in their true meaning - really occur, and the last (they are workers who entered the work last) receive their wages sooner than those, and the first later, and the payment is arranged in such a way that the last receive their wages through generosity, and the payment is arranged in such a way that the last receive, through the generosity of the employer, that surplus which the first do not receive, although it is precisely they who think they have the most justifiable claims to it \*), and to this is attached the saying that, although many belong to the called, yet of the elect there are only a few \*). - My eyes see, by that excrescence (in the groschen of grace) is to be understood blessedness, and the first are those who think they have the most claims to blessedness. (That the first in the parable are the hired ones who have worked long is accidental, and belongs to the parabolic form, because the parable wanted to distinguish grace from the imaginary right to labour. The fact that workers occur also belongs only to the form of the parable). - Now for more details on the statement explained by the parable. "Among the many who would be the first to become last, Jesus' disciples - those to whom he is speaking - could not fear to be counted, since they were assured that everyone who, like them, had sacrificed possessions and goods for the good cause, would receive eternal life as a compensation in the world to come. So the saying was not for the disciples, and that is why Luke does not have it here. But it also came here only through compilation. Namely, Jesus had replied to the doubting exclamation: "Who can be saved? According to the next surroundings of the words, this only has the meaning: through God it is possible for man to overcome the dominion which the possession of earthly possessions exerts on his willpower. - But since we are speaking here of a grace of God (of a gracious influence of God on the will of man, or of an endowment of maritime grace by God), the compiler here goes further, in that he takes occasion to represent maritime grace especially as a gift of grace, and for this purpose makes use of the expression which Luke uses in another context (Luk 13:30) and in another context (Luk 13:30). 13:30.) and with a different peculiarity, spoken as a threat against the Jews who

were proud of their supposed privileges. - Here again, as is usual in the Matthaean compilations, similar things are linked with similar things. - But that young man did not actually show Jewish pride. The compilation is therefore only attached to the one thing, that salvation is a gift of grace, and can therefore also be bestowed on so-called last ones. The opposition to Jewish pride, however, does not attach itself here, and therefore what is added in v. 39, together with the parable, is only a compilation. - Mark usually gives only as much as belongs to the historical context of what is narrated; nothing beyond that is parenetic or ascetic. It is therefore very probable that the saying: Many firsts rc. belongs as little to his text as Luke has it. We have a similar example in Matth. 10, 15. which verse, beginning a whole, which in Luke's Gospel stands in a different connection, is likewise in some manuscripts appended to Mark's terte, and does not belong to the same either. -

\*) If this be over-argued, one comes to the false opinion that Jesus wants to say that there is no difference between the first and the last, and that all should receive the same, which would be a quite absurd explanation. For

a) Which of the first in blessedness would envy the last to have the same blessedness? How could it have occurred to the author of the parable to represent blessedness as something beyond which the backward first would demand something, as over the penny, if they received the same as Andre?

b) The last in the parable are those who are excluded from grace. Where then does it say in the parable that the first and the last received the same? Does it not rather mean that the last were the favoured? It is not the same penny that matters, it belongs to the parabolic form - do you not understand that? - but what the last should have received, if what the first were entitled to had been taken as a basis, which did not happen, and then what the first thought they could demand and must have received, if what the last received had been taken as a measure, which did not happen either, - that is what comes into consideration.

\*) Fritzsche's Kommentar, zum Matth. p. 617. verba v. 16. πολλοί γάρ εἰβι κλητοί - εκλεκτοί nihil pertinent ad parabolam, sed argumento communiunt sententiam. argumento communiunt sententiam, parabola illustratam - ὁὕτως εβονται - εοχαιοι. Now if this is so, then the false explanation, which the commentary has adopted: Jesus here only wanted to tell Peter seriously that later ones could also become as holy as he was (as if poor good Peter would have denied a later one the blessedness Jesus himself had assured him of and which, according to Jesus' assurance, he was once to participate in), cannot take place. Those called



and those chosen could not be distinguished if the first and the last, as this declaration intends, were to receive the same. Incidentally, we refer to the above-mentioned treatise, in which we have disputed the false explanation with sound reasons. If it is to have any meaning, it would amount to saying that Peter and his like had reckoned on a greater portion of blessedness than could be granted to later professors of Christ! Where is there a single word of such an expectation in the New Testament Scriptures? - But if this explanation is to say: the first may not receive blessedness, while the last receives it, this cannot be expressed as follows: the first and the last are equal, and receive the same penny!

373

n.42. a. - Here Matthew ch. 21:28 - 32. again begins a parable, but is itself excluded by 21:45. How could a writer, without forgetting himself, have made the remark: .the priests having heard the parables, perceived (ἐγνώσαν) that Jesus aimed at them, if he had let precede words of Jesus like these: the publicans and the harlots shall enter into the kingdom of heaven sooner than ye? (v. 31.) - To be sure, the compiler wishes to give the appearance of indisputability to his insertion; therefore he works the note Mark. 13:12. Luk. 20:19. transposing the words, that he might attach ἀκούσαντες τὰς παραβολὰς (i. e., the parable of the original text, and his intercalated). He thus differs from the original author of the relation both by that intercalation, to which the ἐγνώσαν v. 45. does not agree, and by transposition of the words v. 45, 46.

n. 42. b. - Matth. 23, 1 -14. If it is clear anywhere that Matthew makes subsequent interpolations, it is obvious here. For the text is already closed with the general remark Ch. 21, 46. According to this case, however, one should now also judge those that were mentioned earlier and those that are still to be mentioned.

n. 47. also belongs here in part. The necessary has already been recalled at the previous date.

n. 49. Matthew makes several appendices from ch. 24:37 - 25:1 - 46. They betray themselves by the same annexes and paragraphs: 24:45. 25:13. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν. - ὥςπερ 24:37, ὥςπερ 25:14. - The parable chap. 25:14 - 32. of the talents also remains strange to the other parables associated with it. It fits well into a context where reward according to merit and work is spoken of, but not into such a context where the return of the Lord is to be portrayed as uncertain. (S. also Schleierm. Luk. p. 239.) Now these are the additions of Matthew, which are to be separated from the original given. The more conspicuous they are, even on a superficial examination of the texts to be compared,

the more justified will appear the criticism that has been made of the Matthaean interpolations in the middle of the texts \*).

\*) If Mr. Pros. Theile in Or. Winer's *ereget. Studien I. Bänd-* chen Leipzig 1827. p. 1647. as it seems, expresses with a lingering doubt: "what can be made probable from the whole arrangement of the Gospel of Matthew, that already existing diegeses were excluded, would be brought to evidence, if passages could be proved where the original connection was overlooked by the reworker or the one who worked it in;" so we are now, however, so bold as to believe that we have already brought the matter to evidence by the few proofs given so far, which, by the way, will probably not have been a secret to any connoisseur of our texts. All that is lacking, then, is the good will to agree with us. We require nothing for our person but this good will, since the matter already takes care of itself with its power to compel assent.

375

b) From Luke, as we have seen, no further example of textual prolongation belonging here is to be distinguished than n. 10. Luk. 5:39. It has been noticed that the allusion to this verse already v. 36. with the words: καὶ οὐ συμφωνεῖ κ. τ. λ. has been made. Luke did not want to change much here. He merely suppresses the words: καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται, and substitutes for it the analogue of his συμφωνεῖ: σχίζει.... But this is too weak. It is an essential provision for the text that the rift becomes more severe. This corresponds to the other case of the complete destruction of the wine (by the bursting of the hoses). A sign of the later unformation to an earlier framework is also revealed in v. 39, since the word οἶνον must be taken from v. 38, which is self-contained, and dragged over into the appendix v. 39. Shall here be added

Luk. 19, 39. as a similar example of the prolongation of the Nativity, we may well reflect on the whole structure of the description given of the entry of Jesus, that its purpose is to describe the solemnity of this entry, but not to present it as an occasion for other speeches, and that such speeches, when added by one speaker alone, are nothing more than an appendix. With Luke we have come to an end here, and consequently with all the interpolations and appendices, which are contrasted by the speeches of two speakers with a text of the same form. But before we draw any conclusions from the observations we have made about the textual multiplications, we want to direct our criticism to the opposite nature of the deviating texts - to their brevity, which lags behind the other copies. For it must be possible to decide from the nature of the text whether the longer is an extension or the shorter a shortening.

## Eleventh Datum:

In the shorter texts of Matthew or Luke, the words harmonizing with the words of the more detailed copies reveal that they originate from a longer relation, and that the speaker has therefore shortened the earlier text.

We turn here first to the passages mentioned above, where

a) in Matthew there are textual abbreviations. - n. 16. the exhortation of Jesus to the disciples (Mark 4:21 - 25. cf. Luk 8:16 -18.) to pay closer attention to the parables to be heard in the future is missing. At the same time, Matthew did not use the gnome associated with this exhortation in Mark (cf. Luk. 8:18.): to whomsoever hath, to him shall be given rc. (Matt. 13:12) But if you put under Matthew the meaning, To him that hath I will impart the secret (as to you), but from him that hath not it will be withdrawn, and only so will be given that which is not (as to the people), this application is not according to the wording and expression of the gnomes themselves. For though the parable took from the people, because they had not (understanding), yet must

α) Jesus, if he once gave parables to the people, must nevertheless presuppose that some of the people would also be able to understand them. The saying: to whomsoever hath, to him shall be given, thus referred to all the hearers of his parables, to the people as well as to the disciples,

β) Jesus undoubtedly recited his parables with the intention that they should be understood. Since the disciples themselves confessed not to have understood them, what is more natural to believe than that Jesus, just as he presupposed of some of the people that they would be given through the parable, would also have presented to the disciples the possibility that they, like others among the people, could be taken from them if they did not have them? i.e. that he spoke the gnomes as an admonition and warning, just as the other texts present it?

Matth. 18:5. However, there is nothing missing in these words if they are to be connected to the interpolated words of v. 3. 4. But if the interpolated words are omitted, then between v. 5 and 6 an intermediate link is missing, that which is inserted in the corresponding other texts. It should be said: whoever receives such a lowly one, and me in him, has great reward to expect. But he that vexeth rc. rc. - But this very

thing, that such a one has great reward to expect, should be expressed by the words (left out): he that receiveth me receiveth God in me. -

n.49. - Matth. 24:9. 10. In the Nebenterten the word παραδιδόσθαι is here twice, and both times in both texts, placed in the parallel place, by beginning the sentences with it: Mark. 13:9. παραδώσει γάρ = Luk. 21:12. επιβαλοῦσιν - παραδιδόντες - then Mark. v. 10. παραδώσει δί = Luk. v. 16. παραδοθήσεσθε δε. There is a reason for this doubling. The second verse takes up the word from the first and gives a more detailed definition. In the first verse it says: they will deliver you up. The second verse says: among the deliverers there will be even such, and so on. Now in Matthew the word is also doubled. But the position is quite different. The second time it is not again placed at the head, as if the exposition had once more made it the basis, but it is placed in the middle of other words as if it had not yet occurred at all and were only an appendix to others (see 10.). Now, should not the text in which one sees the reason for the doubling be earlier than the one that doubles without reason and without knowing why?

Matthau's text also expresses the same words with the others: ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει and μετά τῶν μαθητῶν μου. Only the indication by which the disciples are to recognise the man whom they are to follow into the house, and that they are to have the landlord show them the room furnished for the keeping of the passover, is missing, and could be missing if, as Matthew supposes, an arrangement had already been made with the landlord. The omission is thus a consistent and deliberate one. But if the host was an acquaintance, the explicit addition: μετά τῶν μαθητῶν μου was not necessary. This addition, it seems, has its home in the secondary texts. This about the abbreviations in Matthew. But even more than they betray themselves are

378

b) which occur in Luke; as they have already been listed above. n. 15. Luk 8:19-21. We do not want to examine the correctness of the position which Luke has given to this story, although the changes which we notice in the text of the piece itself - the omission of some words and the rearrangement of those retained - are connected with it. Luke does not want to use anything from the short story other than Jesus' explanation of who his relatives were. He has to keep the note that Jesus' relatives were registered. And so he cannot conceal it, rather it becomes even more apparent to him that there is something rejecting in Jesus' reply to the registration that has taken place. Where does this come from? The story in its original form must have implied this. If we compare the Nebenterte, such a suggestion is indeed noticeable. The relatives of Jesus came with an intention that Jesus probably already knew, and it is now with reference to their

untimely concern, and because only disturbances were to be expected from this concern, that he gives this reply when he announces that they have come. The words, even as Luke gives them, thus point back to this connection of circumstances. (Since there are traces of his way of writing here, since he has rearranged the words and brought the piece into its own connection, there is even less doubt about the abbreviation).

Luke, as noted several times, changed the theoretical relationship of the parable. But ") the piece must have had this relationship, and this is evident from its structure and form. One tries, for example, with Schleiermacher, to impute to it the purpose of being a glorification of the women mentioned in Luke 8:1-3 who had come into Jesus' company, and one will immediately find a disproportion to this imputed purpose in the fact that the parable is afterwards interpreted in a special way. Why would it have been necessary to give the play this disposition, i.e. to wrap the praise to be given to those women, or the reason for it, in a parable, and to present the meaning of this parable as something that is hidden from the people's gaze, and which only those who look deeply are able to discover? - This form only harmonises with the point of view under which the play is placed in the side texts. But there is another proof of the latter in Luke's own account 1"). Does not Luke himself have the words of exhortation: (Ch. 18:18.) See how you hear? But these words cannot originally mean: watch how you take the word you have heard into your heart. For even if the words were to mean this according to Luke's intention, one would only be able to find a later allusion in this turn of the meaning. It would be different if the play were not a parable, or not a parabolic representation of a certain relationship, but a lecture of practical teachings. But the words cannot be interpreted in this way for the sake of the words that immediately follow: with the measure wherewith ye measure etc. For these words certainly only have meaning if they are taken as an exhortation to think about the meaning of the parabolic contracts, because here a gain for the one who has them really takes place. - Whatever purpose Luke may have given to the play, that which is similar to the secondary passages still reveals the original purpose of the play. - If, however, the play was intended to be a sample of the teaching of Jesus as he taught it for the instruction of his disciples, it will not have had the emphasis and brevity that it has in Luke, as if it had been intended merely as a practical lecture on doctrine or an exhortation to faithfully keep the Word of God; - It must have been connected with similar excerpts as those in the other verses, and this is all the more to be believed because Luke omitted the other parables precisely because he gave the piece a different purpose than it originally had.

n. 28 - We do not want to examine here why Luke omitted the interlocutory conversation, but only prove from his own text that he must have omitted it. For this is revealed in ch. 9:23. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς πάντας. Whence this πρὸς πάντας? Didn't Jesus also say the preceding words of 22 to all? So there is a gap here in Luke's text. And what has fallen out? The words of Jesus that were not spoken to all, words of a private conversation that he then broke off in order to address all. - Luke still had this in mind when he wrote, so the word that was related escaped from his pen, even though he did not make the relationship.

n. 32 - Luk 9, 48. what Jesus said as a warning against seducing others and against self-delusion is not found, and the words that Jesus spoke after the presentation of the child were only meant to recommend humility. But

a) it is not probable that Jesus should have placed a child before the apostles in order to recommend humility to them. For could this not have happened without the child's presence? And to what examples of humility worthy of imitation could a recommendation of humility made to the apostles have referred? But supposing Jesus had taken occasion to present the child to the disciples because of certain amiable qualities, this recommendation would not have been reinforced from elsewhere, especially as we find elsewhere that Jesus is said to have said that one must have a childlike mind in order to enter the kingdom of God, without any other importance being attached to the children from elsewhere. - What, then, if they had occurred at the same time on this occasion, would the words have said in particular? He that receiveth such a child in my name receiveth me? "In my name"-means nothing at all but, because it is a Christian ((ὅτι χριστοῖ ἐστι comp. Mark 9:41.)). How could the child be a Christian, or how could children be taken in Jesus' name, and under what relation to Him should it be done? and what would this taking mean? - If we look at the text on the page, it becomes quite clear what no information can be gleaned from Luke. Jesus does not put the child there to show humility. He places him among the apostles, and thus makes him a person who can be exempted in his name. But as he is the least among the disciples, Jesus declares that he only wants to tell the proud ones that in this least of their number he will be exempted. It is these words that Luke really still has, and to which he links the others that go to the recommendation of humility, namely, he links them in order to be able to omit what was connected with those words as a more detailed speech and can still be found in the secondary texts. But while Luke mixes, the mixed is separated from each other.

n. The solemn assurance of Jesus that his words, spoken as it were for eternity, would certainly be fulfilled before the end of this human age (may he come when he will), indicates that Luke has omitted the other words which relate to this assurance as a closer determination of it, namely, that the day and hour of the fulfilment cannot be determined. For how would the assurance of the reality of what was said be appropriate here again at the end of the whole explanation, if there had not been a secondary provision connected with the fulfilment of the words? Also, such a completion of the speech already seems to be indicated by the preceding question: πότε ταῦτα ἰσται. It is true that in the following Luke also speaks of the indefiniteness of that time (v. 35. ὡς παγίς 7 "ὁ ἰπτελενσεται κ. τ. λ.), but only in relation to the carelessness of men, if the day would come when they did not suspect it. But as Luke gives another form to those words of Jesus, Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven, chap. 22:69: ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσται - καθήμενος, because of the far-reaching continuations of the story with which his second writing begins, he also saves Jesus' declaration that only the Father knows more precisely about the decisive point in time for another occasion, which is also to be mentioned at the beginning of the second writing. It is therefore hardly doubtful that he abbreviates the text here.

382

n. Luk 22:40. "Abbreviating here" Paul Commentary, 3 Thess. p. 623. 3 Th. p. 623. But how is this abbreviation to be recognised? v. 47. betrays it by the words added from the longer narrative: ἔτι αὐτοὺς λαλόντος. Luke says: Jesus got up from prayer, came to the disciples and called out to them: do not sleep! pray that you may not fall into temptation! and now it says: ἐτι λαλόντος etc. - This comes too quickly. It is quite different in the side texts. Here the formula has its appropriate place: Jesus comes to the disciples several times; he comes to them the last time, and announces to them that the betrayer will come, and- "while he is still talking like this," - the betrayer really comes. So the words say at the same time that Jesus was really not mistaken. Luke uses the words and takes away their natural force by separating other things from them. - Let us mention in passing another example of how Luke is convicted of the abbreviation of the text. This is in n. 16. Luk. 8:6. (comp. p. 201.) Here his text lacks the words: - ἐνθὺς ἐξάνειλε - ἡλιον δὲ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκκατατίθη. The Excerptor alone must have had these words. In the parable and its interpretation type or antitype must correspond to each other. Now Luke, in the place where this part of the parable is interpreted, has in his text itself: v. 13. μετὰ χαρὰς δέχονται τὸν λόγον. which omits that: εὐθέως νῆανείλει vovausfecht, then the words:

εν χαίρω 7ειρασμού άφίστανται, to which those words: ήλιον άνατείλαντος εχανματίσθη, are the model, and therefore must have preceded as such, v. 16. is consequently carelessly copied. - The critical equations cannot be continued here. If we now consider the digressions, which the debris of the long text itself reveals in the abridged text, and also the still perceptible traces of a methodical procedure observed by the abbreviating speakers, to which traces reference has been made above at the 8th date; then there is no doubt that the abbreviating narrators themselves have abbreviated. And so our research, which was intended to determine the original textual measure according to the internal relationships of the text itself, has been taken so far that we can draw conclusions from the dates. Perhaps the question will be asked why we did not make these special distinctions according to the internal textual relationships at an earlier stage, since the seventh date referred to the measure of the text? The answer to this is this: there it was first necessary to determine whether the text to be distinguished from the "longer" and from the shorter form as the original one constituted such a complete and finished whole that it could be regarded as something that existed outside of our writings; - it was the integrity of what remained after the separations that was important, and the separation of the non-original from the latter was to be made only after what has now been done, according to the three last data (9. 10. 11.). We now make the following remarks:

383

Note 1.

It was a quite incorrect and uncritical presupposition when Eichhorn assumed that the unformed text was the original one, and which of our parallel relations was the shortest, the one that came closest to the original form. The determination of the original depends on something more than a comparison of the parallels according to the space they occupy next to each other on the paper, and the characteristics of the original are something quite different from the incompleteness and deficiency of the relation. The critic has not entered into the inner relationship of the texts to one another at all.

384

Note 2.

It is evident that the abbreviated Luke and the Matthean interpolator at any rate had an earlier text before them. This is an important conclusion for Mark. For whence those have their text, therefore Mark may also have taken his, and those need not be his source.



### Note 3.

The separations from the other texts are not made according to what Mark has accidentally retained from both, that is, neither are the extensions of the texts regarded as such because Mark goes parallel with the very referent that gives the shorter relation, nor is the boundary of the piece for the referents set at a certain place because Mark leads the relation with one of the two only as far as this place, but the separations have an objective reason that lies in the inner relation of the texts themselves. This is again an important result. For above, p. 312, the objection was made that, if it is assumed that where two agree, the third has deviated from the norm, this assumption perhaps turns in a circle, in that the deviations are only estimated against what Mark has in common with one and the other co-referent, and thus perhaps borrowed from them both. As we have seen, this objection is completely omitted here when the quantitative textual differences or the nature of the textual measure are discussed, and will therefore probably also be omitted when the phraseological differences alone are discussed.

385

Our discussion has thus been carried further on this point. But the result can be developed still further, as has already been indicated above. Namely

### Note 4.

Mark is said to have omitted from Matthew that which Matthew has more than he, and Luke, and to have taken from Matthew that which he gives with Matthew more than Luke. With what on earth is this to be proved? I ask every impartial person whether this is an assertion that can in the least be based on an impartial observation of our texts. If it can be clearly proved that the interpolations and extensions, the additions and compilations of Matthew do not belong to the original text at all, where is the proof to be found that Mark must nevertheless have had before him what does not belong to the original text, and must therefore have omitted it? and that, if he is richer than the abbreviating Luke, no other source could have been available for him than Matthew? But we are not yet finished with our deduction. If the result does not seem to be sufficiently certain from the textual criticism we have carried out here, then we can, to make matters worse, also draw out another date.

## Twelfth Datum:

In his relations, Mark does not show any effort to extend or shorten the account with one secondary referent as a difference from the other.

Mark, as we have seen, did not select and omit; the measure of the relation is determined by the texts before the selection. If we now assume the hypothetical case that Mark composed his text after selecting from the materials of the two side texts, then, since he chooses between the longer and the shorter, or between the more and the less, it will be apparent as a sign of arbitrariness that he either strives to lengthen the text at all, and if that were not the case, to shorten it, or, if the one or the other is done, to model himself on the predecessor that he would have chosen as a model in one way or another. However, as will now be confirmed, there is no trace of this. Namely, for the time being, Mark sometimes shortens the text with that referent against the other with which he otherwise lengthens it against the latter, and vice versa: he lengthens it with that referent against the other with which he otherwise shortens it against the latter. Take the following eye-opening examples from the Nedes. In n. 16 he takes for the parable the fuller expression of Matthew, and likewise for the interpretation; nay, he even completes (we speak according to the hypothesis) Matthew from Luke (Luk. 8:16 - 18.), yet he does not take up the following longer parable of the Zizanias with its interpretation from Matthew, but sets for it another shorter one. - In n. 28, Matthew includes two conversations between Jesus and Peter. Mark does not take the first, but only the second. He shortens Matthew in one place with Luke, from which he completes Luke in the other. - Mark omits verses 3 and 4 from Matthew chapter 18. Thus he wants the shorter. But he enlarges on Matthew v. 5. again with Luke, but in such a way that he again omits words of Luke, as if he wanted the shorter, and he does not want the shorter, for he lengthens the speech with Matthew, whose gift, however, he spurned above. - n. 35. Here he sticks to the shorter text against Matthew, from which he usually completes the shorter one. Likewise n. 42. a., but 42. b. he gives Luke the more complete, as if he had henceforth chosen Luke as his guide. But in n. 44. he ignores just those sentences by which Luke is really richer than Matthew. He seems to want to abbreviate in the pericopes n. 46. 47. however n. 49. he expands with Luke (Luk. 21:13 - 16.). But he does not stay with Luke, although he can complete Matthew from him (Luk. v. 24 - 26.). He continues with Matthew, and yet again abridges what the latter (ch. 24:30.) presents, according to Luke. - And this is supposed to have been done so deliberately? and Mark is supposed not to have known what he wanted? This will be considered a fable by those who do not yet know the more correct explanation of the apparition. - Secondly, however, Mark, by extending with the one referent, ought to

seek the more complete. Why then does he again abbreviate the one with which he wants to give the more complete, and omit from the borrowed "complete" other words and phrases connected with it? This happens, e. g., in n. 28. with Matt. 16:22. - in n. 32. where he omits Matt. 18:7. and yet gives the following words a greater prolixity than they have in Matthew himself. - n. 54. where he removes from the borrowed complete (Matth. 26:42. 43.) just that prolixity which he himself adds elsewhere, e.g. in n. 32. and where, although he does not want his narrative to lack completeness, he nevertheless ignores certain words of Jesus, namely those with which the Lord is said to have forbidden Peter the use of the sword, which were placed by both speakers at one and the same moment in time. - If, however, this arbitrariness is really noticeable, and one would like to explain the selection that was nevertheless made, then one could only assume two things: - either Mark sifted the deliveries of his fellow evangelists according to a certain other standard, - but then we come back to an original manuscript, consequently to that against which the hypothesis of the origin of Mark's Gospel from the two others sets itself up, - or one would have to say: Mark compared the parallel texts of each pericope, and separated from the contexts that which revealed itself to him either as an inclusion or as an incompleteness. But then, in order not to think of other objections that could be made against this assumption, the question must be raised as to where this came from, that the texts of Matthew and Luke entered into such a mutual relationship that the essential content of the other could be measured according to the standard of the one ? a question that one cannot even attempt to answer without presupposing a written archetype for our relations. So those who put forward this hypothesis will not want to make use of these explanations, and so they must rather reject all attempts at explanation out of hand, and let pure chance dispose of this selection, to which means of desperation, however, we could only resort when all sources of explanation had dried up. Thirdly, in saying that Mark makes no effort to abbreviate the text, we must add the explanation that Mark never abbreviates, but Matthew and Luke do from time to time, Matthew, for example, in n. 9, ch. 9:3, in n. 28, ch. 16:27, in n. 34, ch. 19:14, in n. 42, b., ch. 21:36. , n. 49. ch. 24:9. 10., n. 53. ch. 26:18. (and far more often the instances will occur to us in the reports of facts, and where the reflective remarks of the narrator are interspersed) Luke in n. 15. n. 16. n. 28. n. 32. n. 36. (Luk. 18:30.) n. 40. n. 49. (Luk. 21:23. 24. 25. (Luk. 21:23. 24. 25.) n. 54. - Mark has sometimes been called the supplementary abbreviator; but it is not he, but Matthew, inasmuch as the latter often abbreviates the given text when he interposes, of which the examples are in n. 16. (here Mark 4:21- 25. is wanting because of Matt. 13:11 -17.) n. 32. (abridged Matth. 18:5. turned on v. 3. 4.) n. 35. (abridged 18:23. εν τω χαίρω τοῦτω and εν τω - ερχομίνω on account of v. 28.) But if Mark, where he is shorter than Matthew, is supposed to have abridged the latter; Luke ought likewise to have abridged Matthew. For is not the shorter text given by Luke also contained in the Matthaean of many pericopes? The relations here are usually so exact that, if they do not have

another, common root, either the one can only have come into being by multiplying the other, or the latter only by abbreviating the "longer" one. Why then does Luke usually have the shorter form, as well as Mark? See especially the pieces n. 20. n. 35. (Luk. 18:29. comp. Matth. 19:28.) n. 47. But if now even the most obstinate advocates of the originality of Matthew must concede, against their will, that what is found in Mattheus in n. 20. and in n. 47. as a greater richness, is nothing else at all than a later intercalation, so there is no need for a long exchange of words about the fact that the rest, which in Matthew stands out from the organism of the relation, will also be an intercalation. The contrary assertion, that this is not so, and that Mark, in spite of this, has composed his text only of the elements of the sub-narratives, is based on nothing but a dictum of power, and a dictum of power, which does not enter into criticism at all, and wants to be more valid than reasons and results, is then justly conceded its right to be left to itself, without, by the way, allowing itself to be disturbed in the investigation. We now proceed. So far, we have examined the dimensions of the text, and the result was: whatever intrudes between the corresponding text of two referents, or comes to the border of it, did not belong to the original form of the relation, and to the extent that it originally received with its form, but is a later addition. But while we were leading the investigation directed at this point to the result we have just indicated, we noticed in the parallelism of the texts on the interruption of harmony a determination that must still be set up here as a particular datum.

389

#### Thirteenth Datum:

Matthew and Luke, where one of them changes the textual measure of the pericopes, hold fast the original one against the other. Thus they do not have what is shown in the pericope as the original content, one from the other, but this original lies, as Mark's text agrees with it, outside of their representations.

a) The observation has been made above (Dat. 6.) that each of our speakers makes his own particular additions to the concordant text, and that these additions, depending on whether they are those of one or another evangelist, have a different character. But it was not yet decided there whether of these additions those of one or the other evangelist do not belong to the original text itself. The investigation to be made into this matter has been undertaken and now completed in such a way that the original measure of the text has been determined more precisely, not only against additions, but also against textual reductions and contractions. As, after this determination of the measure, a special comparison is to be made among the writers with regard to the way in which they relate to the original text norm with their deliveries next to one another, so

also in this comparison, especially between Matthew and Luke, an alternating relationship stands out, the historical indication of which, in addition to the above date (Dat. 6.) concerning the additions in general, is to be set up as a new special date. It is this: When Matthew or Luke change the measure of the text (by increasing or decreasing it), one of them keeps the original in relation to the other.

b) The proof of the date is prepared.

α) The passages where Matthew extends and lengthens are given above p. 92. 93, and have been gone through at the 7th, 9th and 10th dates. Likewise the similar passages of Luke. The examples of textual shortening have been taken into account at the eighth and tenth dates. - So Matthew gives more where Luke gives less according to the original measure. But he also gives more where Luke shortens the original measure. On the other hand, Matthew gives less where Luke, according to the original measure, gives more and more complete, but also less where Luke is overcomplete. Now both writers could both increase and shorten their original. But they could not have used each other's text as a model, as if they had combined their writings.

β) Sometimes it happens in one and the same pericope that both writers keep the original measure in relation to each other. E. g. n. 10. Here Matt. 9:12. extends and lengthens Luke 5:14. and each separates the other's addition from the third. The same is the case in o. 49, where both writers also shorten the text by forcing the original text through the middle of them. Here we can

γ) the remark can be made that in such alterations of the text, especially when they increase, both often have the same purpose, the purpose of bringing more completeness or coherence into the relation, and yet neither of them takes cognizance of the way in which the other carries out this purpose. An example of this is given in n. 39. Luke here alludes more distinctly to the passage Zach. 9:9. by inserting the words βασιλιάς (ch. 19:38.) and χαϊροντις (v. 37.) (comp. above p. 232.). Matthew, notwithstanding he is particularly concerned to distinguish that passage (ch. 21:2. 5.), yet does not use Luke's allusions. Another example, which, though it does not first of all touch upon the Tertmaß, and therefore certainly does not yet belong here, but is nevertheless similar to it, is in n. 10. where Matthew does not put the question mentioned in ch. 9:4. into the mouth of John's disciples themselves with any other intention than to bind the connection of the text more firmly, and Luke has quite the same intention in the combination which he makes in ch. 5:33 (cf. above p. 186.). Here, too, it should be thought that if the one writer had known the way in which the other tied the connection, he would not have thought of a special means of binding the fugues of the text more closely together. Matthew's and Luke's parallel accounts are therefore, in

so far as they have a different form from each other, the products of two authors independent of each other. In some of these parallel relations, however, it is quite clear

δ) it is particularly clear that, even if the longer form originated from the shorter, at least the latter could not have originated from the former. Just compare, for example, the accounts of Matthew and Luke in n. 16 with each other. - Would a writer who had no other source than Matthew's account of Matthew 13:9-19 have arrived at the account that Luke gives us? Compare also the parallels of n. 20, and admit here that Luke, drawing from the Matthaean narrative alone, but using it at his own discretion, has separated or omitted the verses of Matth. 10:15. Will it be just as easy to understand, or make understandable, the origin of the shorter relation Luk. 9:3. 4. from a longer one of the kind that Matth. 10:8 -14. Is? In the same way, however, it is inconceivable, when comparing the representations of some pericopes given by both writers, that the more complete of the one should have been formed from the shorter of the other, e.g., n. 16. the Matthaean form of the parable from that of Luke, according to which especially Matth. 13:5. 6. had its germs in Luk. 8:6. \*), or that in n. 28. the private conversation of Jesus with Peter would have been indented by Matthew to give the correlative to the (ἐλεγε δὲ) πρὸς πάντας Luk. 9:23. or in n. 54. the narrative of Jesus' praying three times, and coming back to the disciples, indented to make the formula Luk. 22:47. ἐπιαντοῦ λαλοντος more suitable or imposing. Certainly this will not be found probable. We must, however, note one more thing, or rather recall something already noted above in the criticism of the texts. Namely

\*) Above we have seen the opposite, namely that Luke's shorter verse is a fleeting excerpt from the fuller text as given by Matthew and Mark.

392

ζ) The case arises that, while Matthew abridges the text, Luke retains the omitted words and, not only retaining them but also adding others to them, combines two different things to prove that he has added to the text what Matthew omitted as little from himself as he could have borrowed it from Matthew. This case is in n. 32. the words Luk. 9:48. ὅς εἰν Ιμέ δεζηται - τον ἀποστείλαντά με contain an explanation about the symbolic action of Jesus narrated there, whereby the one linked with it: ὁ γάρ μικρότερος - μέγας is eliminated from the relation not only as superfluous, but also foreign, element \*). Luke added the latter of his own accord, but he retained the former (for Mark also has it) and thus retained it from a different text than that of Matthew. - So much for the individuality of the parallels, especially their difference of measure.

\*) Also the γάπ in Luke does not make a paffing connection. The reason that he who receives the sufficiency receives Jesus Himself cannot be this, or more clearly: this cannot be given as the reason that Jesus' disciples should be one before the other. And yet this is what Luke seems to say.

393

c) But the parallel representations of which we are speaking are so closely related to one another that one and the same root relation must be assumed, at least for individual parts. With this, the two writers must be related independently of each other, or in other words: that by which their representations have equality with each other must lie outside them. This result is therefore both the datum and the premise just explained and proved. And it is through this that the phenomenon that these writers change the measure of the parallel pieces first receives its explanation. But another restriction must be applied here. For if the conclusion is drawn that the Matthean speaker and Luke could not have known each other, then the considerable material which Matthew with Luke, or the latter with him, both with each other, as if one were retelling the other, could be added to the constituent parts of the common narrative as an instance against it, and thus a special connection of these writers with each other could be concluded from this special harmony. Our investigation has not yet progressed so far that we can consider the correctness of this possible objection or the relevance of the materials mentioned. But even if we were to assume that both speakers agreed on these materials, we would only have to explain their mutual estrangement in those pericopes that have been discussed so far by the fact that the speakers had a type in mind that lay outside of their mutual representations, and which they believed they could imitate without making themselves dependent on each other. The result is now easy to draw.

394

Note.

Matthew and Luke drew from one and the same source that which Mark has in common with them, and in which they harmonize with each other without Mark's concurrence (comp. Dat. 3.); they both agree with each other and with Mark in that which Mark not only must not have borrowed from them (comp. p. 304.), but also could not have borrowed. Further, just as those two must have drawn what agrees with Mark from a foreign source, so Mark can have drawn what he has in common with them from the same source, and he will have drawn it from it, if he had to go to any source, since he cannot have borrowed it from Matthew and Luke. This is our result, and the text of Mark is now completely detached from the secondary texts. (This to p. 312. f.)

In all of this, however, nothing is to be fudged. Rather, now that the original scope of the pieces has been measured, we return to consider more closely the deviations that emerge from the literal parallelism within this scope. It has been asserted above, and also proved, that where two of the referents agree and the third does not, the latter has deviated from the given. This assertion can be contradicted. Our writers can only have deviated with the differing expression if they had a Greek type before them. If this is not the case, however, and if they have rather arrived at their relations as translators of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, then the differences occurring in their conformist reports are not to be regarded as deviations from a given expression, and what is still more, they cannot, even with their content, present us with any features for the special characterisation of our writers. Now, as a result of criticism - as is well known, by Eichhorn and others who, with him, presupposed a written original Gospel - the assertion has been made about our texts that they are in fact translations of a Hebrew original, and what was intended to support this opinion were precisely the varieties and deviations that occasionally occur in these concordant texts. And this hypothesis, on top of everything else, was connected with a traditional statement, namely that of Papias about the descent of the Gospel of Matthew from a Hebrew original, which seems to many to be even more unquestionable than the hypothesis of the Hebrew original Gospel, and if it is credible, from one side at least it ties our concordant relations to the Hebrew. What we are stating here as a hypothesis and as a statement has been doubted or disputed by others, but has not yet been thoroughly refuted. We will therefore undoubtedly have to engage in a closer investigation of the matter, especially since in the case that our deductions lead us to a Gospel original, it would also be part of the matter to establish something more definite about the language idiom of the same, but moreover, as we have seen, the judgement about it has an influence on the way in which we judge the authorial character of our evangelists themselves \*). - In this investigation, however, we will not first discuss whether Greek was spoken in Palastina or not, and what credibility is to be attributed to Papias and his descendants, but we will, according to our custom, merely adhere to the data contained in our texts. These data will enable us to destroy at one stroke the pretence of the Hebrew Gospel and the fable of the Hebrew Matthew.

\*) The subject has already been discussed above (Th. 1. p. 193. f.), but there it was spoken of more,

a) that the Greek translation of the Aramaic Gospels, by which the economic agreement of our Gospels is said to have been procured, could not have been arranged or made by the teachers at Jerusalem, and



b) that the incorporation of the Aramaic Gospel into the Greek form of expression could not have been completed, while the preachers of the Gospel confined themselves to oral communication. Some of the reasons given there, however, are also valid here, where the transition from the written to the other written is spoken of, and are therefore assumed without being cited again here.

396

#### Fourteenth Datum:

The differences of expression occurring in the parallel relations within the identical sentences relate to the corresponding text like branches to the trunk, and thus point back to an original Greek text.

As has been remarked, the deviations of representation that degenerate between the corresponding words of our relations are of various kinds. But only the phraseological variations, or the synonymous phrases and the different forms of expression in which the identical sentences are put, could be regarded as different translations from the Hebrew. But these, as they are included here among the inconsistencies, are proofs of the originality of the Greek text. - We make it all the more our duty to give an orderly list of them, since many other conclusions can be drawn from them. Our parallel relations give

#### 1) The same sentences with different expressions:

Examples are n. 16. Luk. 8:8. 13. (cf. the parallel verses.) The other verses in the piece, however, prove that Luke had no other text than the others. - Luk 20:6 - Luke here only clarifies the text of the others. He expresses the φοβοίμεθα τον όχλον in the very words which he elsewhere connects with that formula: Act. 5:26. έφοβοϋντο γάρ τον λαόν, ἵνα μή λιθασθώσιν. He did not translate, but explained. - 20:11. προσίθετο - is purposely chosen, instead of πάλιν άπίστιλε. This means: he sent once again, that: he continued to send. - Ch. 21:9. In the remaining parts Luke expresses the same Greek text. Here he uses a more solemn expression on purpose, as in n. 53. ch. 22:21. - n. 54. ch. 22:42. is a different expression, but not a different translation. - We encounter

397

#### 2) the sentences in the same Greek expression with partial changes, namely

a) with multiplications. These are of different kinds. ") a double is joined by καί, instead of a single. Examples first from

κ) Luke. - n. 10. ch. 5:13. νηστεύονσι (πυκνά καί δεήσεις ποιούνται). - n. 11. 6:4. - (έλαβε καί) έφαγε. - n. 12. 6:8. έγειρε (καί στήθι) εις τό μέσον. - n. 15. 8:12. οί άκονοντες (και ποιούντες). - n. 16. 8:5.- πεσε (καί κατηπατήθη). - n. 34. 19:38. (ειρήνη έν ουρανώ καί δόξα) έν νηίστοις. - n. 49. 21:8. ότι εγώ είμι (καί ό καιρός ήγγικε). - n. 16. 8:17. ο ου γναισθήσεται (καί εις φανερόν ελθη). Cf. still n. 6. Luk. 4:36. 8:4. 47. 52. n. 18. 8:35. n. 20, 9:1. n. 2?, 9:17. - Here every one will probably admit that Luke added to a text, and to a Greek text at that, what was not given "xar. Such examples occur also

β) in Mark. n. 11. Mark. 2, 25. (ότι χρείαν έσχε καί) επείνασε. - n. 16. 4:19. ή απάτη του πλούτου (καί -- ιπιθτρίαι). - n. 28. 8:35. ένεκεν ιμοϋ (καί τοϋ ευαγγελίου as 10:29.) Compare still n. 17. 5:19. n. 18. 5:34. n. 29. 9:12. - But just such additions now also occur (z) in Matthew. n. 28. 16:21. (άπελθειν εις Ιεροσόλυμα καί) πολλά παθειν - n. 57. 28:7. (ότι ήγερθη από τών νεκρών καί) προάγει comp. 19:13. καί προσεύξεται. - It also belongs here to. the additions with ή, as: n. 28. 16:14. (Ιερεμίαν ή) ένα τών προφητών. - n. 20. 10:11. εις ήν δ' αν πόλιν (ή κώμην). 14. (τής οικίας ή) τής πόλειος εκείνης. - n. 14. 12:25. καί πάσα (πόλις ή) οικία. - The same remark will be made here as is made earlier about the passages of Luke.

398

(β) Explanatory additions to the idea expressed in the sentence. -

Examples again

κ) from Luke. - n. 16. 8:12. remove the word (ina μή πιστευσαντες σαιθώσι). - n. 44. 20:38. άλλα ζώντων (πάντες γάρ αυτώ ζώσιν). 35. for they are angels (and sons - being). - n. 36. 18:31. to Jerusalem (and is performed - of the man). - n. 10. 5:36. tears (and the old man is not in agreement -). - It will be admitted here again that Luke has added to the Greek text. Such explanatory additions are also found

β) in Mark, namely, n. 16. 4:7. they drowned it (καί καρπόν ουκ έδιοκε). - n. 14. 3:26. und εί ό satanas (άνέστη επί εαυτόν καί) μεμέρισται. - n. 28:8, 38. and the reasons of emus (in the generation of sinners). - n. 35. 10:19. not false (not to be false) - n. 39. 11:10. in the name of the Lord (blessed - dav.) - n. 43. 12:14. or so; (shall we or shall we not give?) - n. 53. 14:20. (εις εκ εκ τών δώδεκα) ό έμβαπτόμενος (cf. Matth. 26:22.). Noch vergl. n 18. 5:23. (as saved) - 2:26. 6:37. 12:27. Such examples occur also in Matthew - n. 10. 9:17. "βάλλουσι (and both are sustained)." - n. 55. 26:65.

(εβλασφήμησέ) τί ἐτι .... μαρτύριαν; - n. 53. 26:28. - ἐκχννόμενον (εἰς ἀφεσιν αμαγντιών). Vergl. n. 18. 9:24. (depart) thou hast not fallen away; - n. 29. 17:12. and they did not (acknowledge him other) do unto him; - n. 22. 14:16. (u chreiae echuisin a fallen away) then they - eat. One should add here the insertions mentioned above p. 92. They are additions to the Greek text.

γ) subsequent additions to individual words of the sentence.

The examples

κ) again from Luke. - n. 10. 5:32. ονκ εληλνθα καλέσαι (εις μετάνοιαν). - n. 11. 6:4. ονς ονκ ἐ'ξεστι (νόμω). - n. 16. 8:15. οἴπινες κ ατέχουσι (εν καρ- δία καλή). 8:5. of the spiraeus (his seed). - 15. and fruit-bearing (in patience). Vergl. noch 8:22. to πέραν (the lake). - Such additions are also found

ιβ) in Mark. - n. 1. 1:7. able (κύψας) λῦσαι - n. 16. 4:8. and yielded (ἀάβαίνοντα και ανξάνοντα) καρπον. Vergl. noch in n. 49. 13:32. ουδέ ό νίός und 14:44. κ. άγάγετε ασφαλώς. 14:68. ουδέ έπισταμαι. -- Besonders sei man aber aufmerksam man auf die folgende Zusätze

ιγ) from Matthew (which are quite visibly incorporated into the Greek tertē) \*). - n. 1. 3:11. ἐγώ μέν ύδατι βαπτίζω υμάς (εις μετάνοιαν). - n. 10. 9:11. Lest thou (thy teacher) - n. 11. 12:2. behold, (thy disciples) are born. - n. 28. 16:16. thou art the christus (the son - of the living). - n. 42. 21:34. 35. and took (the husbandmen). 33. man was (host). 41. others (husbandmen, who gave him the fruit in their seasons). - n. 43. 22:25. were (but in their times). - n. 48. 22:18. What tempt ye me (hypocrites?) Vergl. n. 17. 8:26. what cowards are ye? (of the kingdom. 15. the abomination of desolation (spoken by Dyniel the prophet). 31. his angels (with a trumpet of a great voice). n. 53. 26:22. μήτι ἐγώ> (am I, sir?) 23. the plunger - the time (he delivered me). Vergl. still n. 55. 26:63. = Mark. 14:61; Luk 22:66. Other passages see above p. 94. - Our writers give the same Greek phrases

\*) No commentary or conservatory commemorates these additions! - The comparison with Luke will prove that Mark did not omit these additions, and it would be quite ridiculous to claim that he did.

399

b) with partial changes, by exchanging one or the other word for synonymous ones.

## Examples

κ) from Luke - n. 9. 5:20. άνθρωπε (Mark, and Luk. τεκνον). 24. to bedion (Mark, the kralbaton, Matth, the bed), πορεύου (Mark, and Matth. ύπαγε). - n. 10. 5:31. the hygiinontes (Mark, and Matth. the equalizers). 33. sethius and table (Mark, und Matth, thou fastest) 36. imatiau καινού (Mark, und Matth, rackus holy) - n. 15. 8:20. idein in θέλοντες (Matth. ζητούντες σοι λαλήσαι). 21. the word of God (Mark, and Matth, the will of God). - n. 16. 8, 6. - ikmada (Mark, and Matth, root) 8. - the good (Mark, and Matth, the good). 12. - the devil (Matth, the evil one; Mark, Satan). 13 - Upon the stone (Mark- und Matth, upon the stones), accept. (Mark. Und Matth. λαμβάνουσι); 14. to - peson (Matth, the - sparers; Mark, the - spiromen). n. 28. 9:18. the - rabble (Mark, und Matth, the people). n. 42. 20:21. - that thou sayest rightly and teachest (Mark, und Matth. that true 0). 22. - φύρον (Mark, und Matth. κήνσον). - n. 46. 20:42. in the bible of psalms (Mark, und Matth. έν πνεύματι). - n. 49. 21:9. And of disturbance (Mark, und Matth. k. k. hear wars), be not dismayed (Mark, und Matth. nicht θροεΐστε). - n. 54. 22:53. and do not lay hands on me (Mark, und Matth. k. k. do not curse me).

400

β) In Mark we meet with the following examples: - n. 10. 2:21. - έπιρράπτει (Matth, and Luk. επιβάλλει). - n. 20. 6:11. - τον χοϋν (Matth, and Luk. τον κονιορτόν). - n. 42. a. 12:15. φέρετέ μοι "να ιδω (Matth, and Luk. δείξατέ μοι). - n. 44. 12:22. έσχατη πάντων (Matth, and Luk. ύστερον πάντων). -

γ) From Matthew the following are to be excised: n. 8. 8:4. - τό δωρον δ - (Mark, ά, Luk. καθώς). - n. 9. 9:4. - ένθνημείσθε πονηρά (Mark, and Luk. διαλογίζεσθε). - n. 35. 19:29. ένεκεν τοϋ όνόμοτός μου (Mark. ένεκεν έμοϋ κ. τοϋ ευαγγελίου, Luk. ένεκεν τής βασιλ. τοϋ Θεοϋ). - n. 42. b. 22:24. Άλωΐσής είπε - έπιγαμβρεϋσει (Mark, and Luk. Μωϋσής έγραψε, ινα λάβη \*).

\*) The list could have been considerably increased if only the sections common to all three speakers had not had to be taken into account.

The other parts of the sentences are, it should be noted, the same. Now let us assume for the moment that our writers translated from the Hebrew; how did they come together in the Greek expression? Eichhorn answers: in their translation they made use of a Greek translation (which had already been taken from a first copy of the Urevangelium), and retained from it what corresponded with their Hebrew copy to be retranslated (altered here and there). This would mean, for example, as much as: Luke translated ch. 5:20. from the Hebrew. He now took from the Greek case-script the sentence:

ἀφίωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου. But he could no longer use the word τίκνον. His Hebrew collex required that he put ἀνθρώπε for it, and so also in the other places that he interchanged such little words for one another. - This, then, are we to believe? in earnest? To use an auxiliary, here to take the main parts of the sentence from it, and not the unimportant ones belonging to it, there to translate the main parts anew from the Hebrew, and to borrow the unimportant subordinate parts or patch words from the auxiliary (as, for instance, Luk. 8:6. διὰ τό μή ἔχειν), would not be a petty game, and this should have been the procedure of our authors? - But just as the individual word relates to the sentence, so do the varying sentences relate to the whole piece. They are to the Greek expression, which runs through the whole, what ἀνθρώπε is there to the other parts of the sentence - subordinate variations! - The translators must also have had the Greek auxiliary translation in front of them in order to play that game. To make matters worse, we want to prove that it is folly to think this, and to prove it, we may only continue our register. For in our copies we not only encounter the same Greek phrases with different filling out of the sentence, but also

401

3) the same Greek words in different constructions. Namely, the following appear in the sentences

a) the same words in different variations.

Examples

κ) from Luke.

- n. 9. 5:24. ἐγείρε καί ἄρας, - (Mark, and Matth. ἄρον και -)
- n. 16. 8:14. και υπό — συμπνίγονται (Mark, and Matth, the active).
- 15. ὡἴπινες ἀκοῦσαντες (Mark. ἀκοῦουσι, - Matth, ὁ ἀκοῦαιν).
- n. 20. 9:4. καί ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε (Mark, and Matth, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε ἐκεῖθεν).
- n. 35. 18:8. τί ποιήσας - (Mark, and Matth, τί ποιήσοι ινα -).
- n. 42. b. 20:10. οἱ δέ - δείραντες ἐξαπτεπεπειλαν (Mark. οἱ δέ - ἔδειραν και, Matth, ον μεν ἔδειραν).
- 15. καί ἐκβαλόντες (Mark, and Matth. καὶ ἐξέβαλαν καὶ -).
- n. 44. 20:29. καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα (Mark. ἔλαβε .... καὶ).
- n. 28. 9:25. κερδήσας (Mark and Matth. εἰάν κερδήσῃ).
- n. 36. 18:32. καὶ ἐμπαυχθήσεται (Mark. καὶ ἐμπαῖξουσιν αὐτῷ, Matth. εἰς τό ἐμπαῖξαι).
- 33. καὶ μαστιγώσαντες (Mark. μαστιγώσονται αὐτόν, Matth. εἰς τό μαστιγώσαι).
- n. 43. 20:24. τίνας ἔχει εἰκόνα (Mark and Matth. τίνας ἢ εἰκόν αὐτή).

- n. 54. 22:34. οὐ μή φωνήσῃ αλέκτωρ πρὶν ἀπαρνήσῃ (Mark and Matth. πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι ἀπαρνήσῃ). 22:53. ὄντος μου μεθ' υμῶν (Mark. ἡμῃν πρὸς υμᾶς). -

402

β) from Mark.

-- n. 28. Mark. 8:36. τί ὠφελεῖ, σὲ ἄνθρωπον (Matth. and Luk. τί ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος).

- n. 31. 9:31. παραδίδοται (Matth. and Luk. μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι).

- More often Mark has the words in the plural which Matthew puts in the singular, and vice versa. -

λ) from Matt.

- n. 10. 12:4 οὐς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν - (Mark, and Luk. οἷς ἀνκ' ἐξεστὶ -).

n. 16. 13:19. παντός ἀκούοντας (Luk. οἱ ἀκούοντες, Mark. ὅταν ἀκονσωσιν).

- n. 42. b. 21:34. ἀπέστειλε λαβεῖν (Mark, and Luk. ἀπεσείλε ἵνα λάβῃ).

- n. 35. 19:29. πᾶς λήψεται (Mark, and Luk. οὐδεὶς — ἐάν μή (Luk. ὅς οὐ μή) λάβῃ (Luk. ἀπολάβῃ).

- n. 44. 22:24. καὶ ἀναστήσῃ (Mark, and Luk. ἵνα - καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ).

- n. 49. 24:2. βλέπετε (Mark. βλέπετε).

14. κηρυχθήσεται (Mark. δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι).

22. εἰ μή ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι (Mark. εἰ μή ὁ κύριος ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας).

- n. 53. 26:17. ετοιμάσωμεν σοι φαγεῖν (Mark. .... ἵνα φάγῃς, Luk. ετοιμάσατε ἵνα φάγωμεν).

- n. 54. 26:39. παρελθέτω (Mark - ἵνα παρέλθῃ).

b) The same Greek words connected with different parts of the sentence. -

κ) In Luke.

- n. 16. 8:12. αἶρει - ἀπο τῆς καρδίας (Mark, and Matth. αἶρει τὸ εσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ).

- n. 36. 18:31. τὸ γεγραμμένον τῷ νῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται).

- n. 49. 21:12. διώξουσιν παραδιδόντες (Mark. παραδώσουσιν γάρ) ἀγομένους (Mark. σταθήσεσθαι) ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. - v. 13. ἀποβησεται δὲ νμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον (Mark. εἰς μαρτύριον anders verknpft). v. 20. - ὅτι ἡγγικε ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς (Mark, and Matth. ὅταν ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως).

29. εἶπε παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς - Γύιτι τὴν σκὴν ("Κανί. αἱβ (Καίφ. ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν).

- n. 42. b. 20:13. - πεμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν ("Καί, ἔχων ἓνα υἱόν ἀγαπητόν ἀπέστειλε καὶ αὐτόν). Cf. n. 21. 9:9. Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀποκεφάλισα τις δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος; (Mark. ὃν ἐγὼ ἀποκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην αὐτός ἐστι \*). -- n. 53. 22:10. ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτό

εις τήν οικίαν οὐ εἰσπορεύονται, καὶ ἐρεῖτε (Mark. ακολουθήσατε αὐτῷ καὶ ὅπου ἑάν  
εἰσέλθῃ, εἶπατε -).

\*) This is probably what we read in Mark. See also ch. 10:47. ὅτι Ἰησοῦς - ἐστι.

403

ב) In Mark, there is no example of this kind that would have the agreement of the others  
against it. -

ג) Bei Matthäus. - n. 10. 12:4 ovse ro7; /irr"vrov (Mark, und Luk. and he gave and gave  
tois plus tois to him). - n. 14. 12:26. and he was - ejected, Nachsatz: εφ' εαυτόν  
διεμερίσθη (Mark. Vordersatz: εἰ δέ - ἐφ' εαυτόν διε- μερίσθη, Luk. οἱ μεμερισται). - n. 20.  
10:11. evil ye abide (Mark, und Luk. ἐκοῖ μένετε). - n. 28. 16:27. mellei come in the gift  
(Mark, und Luk. when he comes in the gift). - n. 34. 19:14. ye leave and do not hinder  
him to come (Mark, und Luk. leave or/osthai k. do not hinder request) - n. 29. 21:3. if  
you do what (Mark, if you do what - Luk. if you do what, what do you do?) - n. 42. b.  
21:40. when you have been blessed - what do you do? \*\*) (Mark, und Luk. what have  
they done -; he is loosed -). - n. 44. 22:25. and left the woman, having no seed (Mark.  
took a wife and left no seed. - n. 49. 24:29. after the tribulation of those days (Mark, in  
those days after the tribulation). 24:3. τί τό σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας (Mark, and Luk.  
τί τό σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας (Luk. γίνεσθα) ; - Hieher ziehe man noch die  
Matthäischen Einschaltungen, wie diese aa) eine Versetzung der Worte verursacht  
haben, Matth. 10:9., and bb) another conjunction of the same, Matth. 10:11. 17:4. - Still  
compare n. 35. Matth. 19, 29. (see above p. 92. 93.), to which must be added n. 49.  
Matth. 24:30. - Now how did our writers here come to the same Greek words? Are they  
supposed to have taken these from the Greek auxiliary script, but, in order that they  
might do something, to have put them into a different construction? - You say that the  
translators of the original Hebrew scripture had the Greek auxiliary scripture in mind,  
and it entered into their various constructions without any effort. - But there is a  
difference whether the authors wrote in order to give a more complicated representation  
of what they had in their memory, or whether they had to use their stock of memory for a  
translation. In the latter case, if they pursued their work conscientiously, they made  
themselves dependent on a scripture, and sought to express its contents. In order to  
translate the Hebrew original, which did not quite correspond to their Greek manuscript  
(but was in some places lengthened and in some places shortened), they would not  
have gone through the original in their minds and quickly transposed the Greek words  
that emerged from their memory into a different construction. They would have taken  
the trouble to put the Greek text in front of them in order to make measurements  
according to the Hebrew, and then the borrowing from the Hebrew script and the fiddling

with the word construction, which the Hebrew script could not demand, would have been a real play. - The modified construction also includes

**\*\*)** Cf. Matth. 21:45. 46. (Mark. 12:12. Luk. 20:19.)

404

c) the transpositions of sentences and periods.

κ) Lukas. - n. 15. 8:21. b) μητηρ μου - οὔτοί εἰσιν

(a) οἱ - ποιοῦντες. Cf. n. 22. 9:12. b) ἀπόλυσον τον ὄχλου - a) ὅτι ὡδε εν ἐρήμῳ τόπω ἰσμίν.

β) Mark.- n. 1. 1:7. b) ἐρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερος μου - αὐτοῦ

(a) ἐγὼ μέν εβάρππισα υμάς υδατι. - n. 16. 4:16. οὔτοί εἰσιν οἱ - (Luk. ὁ δέ - (οὔτοί εἰσιν) οἱ.. Matth, ὁ δέ - οὗτός ἐστι).

λ) Matt. - n. 1. 3:11. ὁ δέ ὀπίσω μου ἐρ-χόμενος ἰσχυρότερος μου ἐστίν (Mark, and Luk. ἐρχεται ὁ ἰσχ. μου ὀπίσω μου Would also really like the Hebrew original already had such a transposition (which, however, is not true at all), then ours would certainly not have first looked to see which Greek words from the (differently placed) Greek case script fitted the expression of the (differently placed) Hebrew words. - What Hebrew texts are to be singiren, whereby the translators would have been compelled to omit one or a few words from the sentences of the Greek auxiliary and to replace them with synonyms, or to change the active into the passive form, singulars into the plural form, etc.? - We notice other transformations that are not at all separate from the Greek word material, namely:

405

d) Transformation of the direct speech into the indirect, and vice versa of the "latter" into the former. Luke. -n.8. 5:14. καὶ παρήγγειλε μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν (Mark. and Matth. ὅρα μηδενὶ - εἰπης). Cf. n. 17. 8:29. παρήγγειλε γάρ τῷ πνεῦματι ἀκαθάρτῳ 1'ξελθεῖν (Mark. ἔλεγε γάρ αὐτῷ' ἐξελθε τό πνεῦμα τό ἀκάθαρτον). v. 32. παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, ἵνα επιτρεψη αὐτοῖς εἰσελθεῖν (Mark. πεμψον υμάς - ἵνα εἰσελθωμεν). Cf. n. 18. 8:41. παρεκάλει αὐτόν .... εἴσελθεῖν (Mark. αὐτόν λίγων, .... ἵνα ελθών, Matth. .... ἀλλά ελθών Comp. n. 17. 8:46. ἐγὼ γάρ ἐγνων δῦναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν ἀπ ἐμοῦ (Mark. 5:30. ἐπιγνον ζ τήν ἐξ εαυτόν δῦναμιν ἐξελ- θοῦσαν). v. 30. οτι - πολλά εἰσήλθεν εἰς αὐτόν (Mark, οτι πολλοί εσμεν). -



n. 42. a. 20:7. και ἀπεκρίθησαν μή εἶναι πόθεν (Mark, and Matth. καὶ εἶπον (λίγονσιν)" οὐκ οἶδμεν). Whereas n. 22. 9:14. καὶ εἶπε κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς Mark. καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς, (Matth. καὶ κελεῦσας τοὺς οὐλοὺς) ἀνακλίνειν, (Matth. ἀνακλιθῆναι) πάντα.

β) Mark. - n. 49. 13:1. διδάσκαλε, ἰϋί, ποταποῖ λίθοι κ. ποταπαῖ οἰκοδομαί! (Matth. πρυγήλθον αὐτῷ ἐπιδείξαι τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱερὸν, Luk. τινῶν λεγόντων περὶ τὸν ἱερὸν ὅτι κεκόσμηται λίθοις).

γ) Matt. - n. 32. 18:1. τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐν - (Mark, and Luk. indirectly). - n. 53. 26:27. πῖτε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες (Οὐαί χε. καὶ ἐπιὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες). - n. 54. 26:66. ἐνοχὸς ἐστὶ θανάτου (Mark. κατεκριναν αὐτὸν ἐνοχὸν εἶναι θανάτου). Comp. n. 17. 8:18. ἰκῦλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν (Mark, and Luk. διελθῶμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν).

e) The transformation of the speech of a person into the address of the same and vice versa.

κ) Luke. - n. 11. 6:2. τί ποιεῖτε (Mark, and Matth. ποιοῦσιν) - n. 49. 21:16. παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ νῦν - φίλων (Mark. παραδιῶσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφόν - ἐπὶ γονεῖς, comp. Matt. 24:10.) καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν (Mark. καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς). - n. 54. 22:56. καὶ οὗτος συν αὐτῷ ἦν (Mark, and Matth, συ ἦσθα μετὰ -).

406

β) Matth. - n. 2, 3, 17, οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου (Mark, and Luk. συ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου). - n. 46, 22:42. τί νῦν δοκεῖ (Mark, and Luk, πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς). - All these metamorphoses are probably proof enough that the Greek text is the basis, and the ground on which the changes are applied. The basic element here has been transformed into other forms in the same way that words of a speech, when someone recalls them from memory after hearing them, are combined into a special expression in the mouth of the reteller with all kinds of mixtures and transpositions. - Matthew's text, however, makes no exception. What is true for the other tertians is also true for this one. We also mention

f) special peculiarities of the Matthew text in the construction of the sentences, which are nothing other than special turns of the Greek basic text. - The construction of the sentences into anterior and posterior clauses is to be distinguished. -

α) the construction of the sentences into anterior and posterior. - n. 29. 17:4, (εἰ θέλεις) ποιήσωμεν. - n. 35. 19:17. (εἰ θέλεις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, τήρησαν) τὰς ἐντολάς. 21.(εἰ

θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι) πώλησον. - n. 46. 22:45. (εἰ) οὖν Δαβὶδ καλεῖ αὐτόν κύριον, -n. 56. 27:42. (εἰ) βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστὶ, - comp. n. 17. 8:31. (εἰ) ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς) ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς, - n. 42, a, 21:34, ὅτε οὖν ἤγγισε ὁ καιρὸς καρπῶν) ἀπέστειλε, 40. (ὅταν οὖν ἐλθῇ ὁ κύριος) τί ποιήσει. Cf. n. 18. 9:25, (ὅτε ἂν ἐξεβλήθῃ ὁ ὄχλος) \*). -n. 42, 21:24. ὃν ἐάν εἴπητέ μοι, καγὼ νῦν ἐρῶ. - The other texts have the same words, but not these bindings.

\*) The analogies listed here will justify our objection raised against Fritzsche's criticism above p. 227.

β) Question formation and dialogues formed from the words of the secondary texts). We will only refer to the following passages: n. 16. 13:41. - n. 35. 19:21. 25. 27. - n. 46. 23:42. - n. 32. 21:30, - n. 56. 27:13. - n. 43. 21:17. cf. n. 52. 26:15. - Thus we have here adaptations and formations which directly presuppose no other text than the Greek, but which also really presuppose it. - So there is nothing wrong with the Aramaic Gospel. But what the other texts are, that is also the Matthaean - it is not a translation into Greek, but the special shaping and expansion of a Greek original text.

407

- One can therefore

aa) we cannot speak of a Matthew-interpolator, but of a Matthew-interpolator.

bb) If we subtract what Matthew has incorporated into the text, and if we subtract the peculiarities of the redactor, Matthew's text does not differ at all from Mark's, so that in its identity with Mark it would have to be the translation from the Hebrew. But in this form it bears

αα) it does not have the characteristics of a translation.

ββ) Mark originally wrote in Greek. This is evident from the fact that he sometimes adds the Aramaic version to the Greek version of the words of Jesus (chap. 3:17. 5:4. 7:12. 34. 15:34.). For only the writer who allows his readers to believe that the foreign word is as good a foreign word to him as to them does so.

cc) Should an Aramaic Matthew have been translated, one would have to assume that Mark had copied the Greek text of Matthew before it came into the hands of the Matthaean compiler, who demonstrably made his interpolations only in a Greek text. But the presupposition of such a Matthew-Mark is nothing but a pure fiction. - The defenders

of the Papias saga will therefore have to retire from the pieces of the first tablet to those of the second. There, however, they will be replaced. -

dd) It has been shown above that the Matthaean interpolations do not belong to the original stock of the relation, and thus to the original text. It can therefore neither be assumed that they were connected with an Aramaic original of the Urcvangclium, nor can it be proved that they were translated from the Hebrew before the interpolator took them in hand in order to fold them into the Greek original text with difficulty (as in n. 35. and in n. 20.).

408

ee) The textual abbreviations of Matthew, also noted above, are based directly on the Greek text. It has been assumed that the Matthaean translator used the Greek text of Mark \*); but a translator of Matthew who used the writing of Mark would certainly not have left the text of Matthew shorter by words, let alone whole sentences, than the text of Mark is. (But we know the matter better; the interpolator has abbreviated here in order to interpolate there. See above p. 338 f.) - There is nothing further to be added to the given discussions, and the result is and remains: our writers, where they vary from the corresponding page texts, have indeed also deviated from the original type. But in order to be able to establish this result with complete certainty, we still need a date, namely a date to answer the question of the relationship of the authors to the original type, whether they held it before them directly or only in other, more or less altered copies. We therefore proceed immediately to this question.

\*) Aloy[?]s. Gratz: Neuer Versuch, dlc Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien zu erklären. Tübingen, 1812.

Fifteenth Datum:

The reporters had the original text before them in the same unchanged form.

The proof of this date is already prepared, and develops from the following propositions:

(a) that which appears as alteration and deviation in the copies of the individual relations was not present in the original text,

b) These textual alterations have no other author than that of our writers in whom they are found,

c) The occasions for these alterations lay in that text which the secondary writers agree in expressing.

-- These premises have already been presented as facts, and we therefore have only a few things to add here for explanation.

a) What in our relations is the distinguishing characteristic of individual textual treatment must, if our writers are to have had the same situation, be separable from the original text, and not already have belonged to its form. With regard to the quantitative differences, the separation has already been made, and justified in Dat. 9. 10. 11. and as far as the phraseological deviations are concerned, we refer to what has been said on p. 320, that the original typical relation must have had a certain expression in the same place. If the first point is thus settled, the only question is

409

b) whether that which is textual difference - quantitative or phraseological - derives from our authors themselves, or whether, as Eichhorn assumed, it was given to them in already existing adaptations of the original text, and was determined in advance.

Here we have to insist that the methodical expressions demonstrated in these textual differences, with which they are juxtaposed as productions of our writers, be noticed and acknowledged. Therefore, in order that the judgment may be based on a total view, we wish to arrange the observations we have communicated above in various places once more under certain main points of view.

α) Luke signals himself above all by his endeavour to shorten and condense the text. . The traces and characteristics of this method are in his text

αα) omissions, for he leaves out

κ) what is already implied as success, and is self-evident from the relation. After this manner he has omitted the following words: n. 34. 18:17. και ηύλόγει αυτά. - n. 39. 19:31. ευθέως αποστελεῖ ὡδε. - n. 42. 21:24. και ἐρώ νμῖν - ποιῶ - n. 43. 20:24. οἱ δε ἡνεγκαν. - n. 54. 22:51. συλλαβεῖν με. - Compare n. 18. 8:44. where the words are missing: ἔλεγε γάρ, ὅτι - σω- θήσομαι. - n. 56. 23:52. the words: και ἐδωρήσατο τὸ σῶμα. - n. 41. 19:45. και τὰς τραπέζας -- περιστερὰς. - n. 49. 21:27. missing: προσεύχεσθε δὲ - χειμῶνας comp. but 21:36. - Luke omits.

β) that which was already expressed in a similar phrase. e.g. n. 43. 20:21. και ου μέλει σοι περί ουδενός. - n. 22. 9:12. και ή ώρα ήδη πολλή. - n. 54. 22:69. και έρχόμ. μετά τών. - n. 20. 9:5. μηδέ άκοῦσωσιν υμών. - n. 16. 8:6. ήλιου δέ άνατείλαντος έκαυματίσθη and όπου ουκ είχε γην πολλήν. - n. 42. b. 20:9. και περιέθηκε φραγμόν - πύργον. - n. 49. 21:25. σκοτισθήσεται, ου δώσει τό φέγγος, πεσοῦνται από τοῦ ουρανοῦ. He leaves out

410

He leaves out

α) that which is mentioned of him in another place. E. g. n. 49. 21,33. περί δέ τής ημέρας. Act. 1:7. n. 49. 21:24. και εἴ μή ό κύριος έκολόβωσε. -- Comp. 18:8. Herewith present themselves in comparison.

ββ) simplifications and contractions, of which the following examples occur: n. 30. 9:42. έως πότε - και (instead of έως πότε). - n. 28. 9:25. εαυτόν δέ άπολέσας ή ζημιωθείς. - n. 35. 18:4. none: πάλιν λέγω (and the gap covered by: ευκοπώτερον γάρ). - n. 36. 18:32. παραδώσονσιν and παραδοθί'ισεται simplified.- n. 39. 19:36. έστρωσαν and έστρώνυνον simplified.- n. 15. 8:21. τις έστιν ή μήτηρ μου; and ή μήτηρ μου έστιν simplified. - n. 16. 8:6. the twice διά τό μή έχειν simplified. - n. 54. 22:40. καθίσατε αυτού and μείνατε ώδε simplified. - n. 54. 22:46. the praying three times simplified, u. 56. 23:35. both parts of the blasphemers, the passers-by and the priests, combined. 23:35. The words of the blasphemers: σώσον σεαυτόν and άλλους έσωσε combined in: άλλους έσωσε, σωσάτω εαυτόν, and that lying therein: κατάβα από τοῦ σταυρού weggelasien. - n. 54. 22:66. the night and morning interrogation (Mark 14:53. and 15:1.) combined. Compare still n. 18. where Mark. 5:37. και ουκ αφήκεν ουδένα συνακολουθήσαι and Mark. v. 40. εἰσπορρήεται όπου ήν τό παιδίον is combined in Luk. 8:51. ουκ αφήκεν εἰσελθεῖν ουδένα εἴ μή πέτραν. - On the same methodological principle is based

γγ) the avoidance of tautologies by substituting other words. E.g. n. 10. 5:37. και αυτός (instead of και ό οίνος). 6:10. n. 49. 21:9. όταν ακούσητε ακαταστασίας (st. άκοάς πολέμων). - n. 34. 18:15. τά βρέφη (st. τά παιδιά). - n. 10. 5:33. οί δέ σοί (μαθηταί weggelgssen.) - n. 53. 22:22, omitted the tautological: ό υἱός τοῦ ανθρώπου. Furthermore, this subheading includes.

δδ) Combinations of the contents, and transpositions and transpositions made within them, e. g. n. 53. 22, 23. the interchanges of the disciples about the betrayer and about their relation of rank connected. 23. 36. the givers of the vinegar drink combined with the scoffers, v. 35. v. 38. 39. the inscription of the cross, which designates Jesus as

king, combined with the acknowledgement of the cheat. - 22:44. 45. The tearing of the curtain in the temple is connected with the mention of the darkness that has arisen. - n. 22. 9:13. To the statement of the disciples that the multitude was so great, v. 14. immediately the determination of the number of the people is added. On the combination of n. 10. see above p. 186. Finally, these peculiarities are combined with

411

εε) the author's preference for the Participia! construction, see p. 401 f. Now, to transfer these peculiarities to cutUces, like the rules to be given to Luke, what would that mean but to put a Luke before Luke? - Whoever does not want to do this cannot admit that the texts shortened by the same method existed in this form before Luke.

Thus, however, also

-

Thus, however, also β) the Matthean speaker appropriates his own. It has been remarked of him above (p. 399.) that he

αα) completes the sentences (grammatically) by a closer determination of the subject and object, (as the other speakers do not do). To the passages listed there let us add the following, where the subject is more closely defined: - n. 35. 19:20. ὁ νεανίσκος (Mark, and Luk. ὁ δέ). 25. οἱ μαθηταί (Mark, and Luk. δέ). - n. 43. 22:15. οἱ φαρισαῖοι (Mark, and Luk. ἀπο- στέλλουσι). - n. 44. 22:30. ὡς ἄγγελοι (τοῦ Θεόν). Just so 14:26. 20:35. 26:8. 56. added οἱ μαθηταί. - n. 39. 21:9. (οἱ οἱ ὄχλοι) οἱ π ροάγοντες. v. 8. ὁ δέ πλεῖστος ὄχλος, 27:20. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς (καὶ - οἱ πρεσβύτεροι). 26:31. τὰ πρόβατα (τῆς ποιμνῆς). 27:27. οἱ στρατιῶται (τον ἡγεμόνος). So also he puts the name of persons where the others do not 26:14. ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰονδας ο Ἰσκαριώτης 26:57. πρὸς (Καϊάφαν) τον ἀρχιερέα. - Places where the object is further defined: n. 8. 8:4. τό δῶρον. 17:9. τό ὄραμα (Mark. τό ὄραμα 13:18. τήν παραβολήν (τον σπείροντος) 16:28. τον νίον τον ἀνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον (Mark, and Luk. τήν βασιλείαν τον Θεού). 10:14. τους λόγους υμῶν 17:1. Ἰωάννην (ἰόν ἀδελφόν αντον). - n. 17. 8:31. (εἰς τήν ἀγέλην τῶν) χοίρων. 22:19. ἰ' νόμισμα τον κένσον. 10:1. and 20:17. τους δώδεκα (μαθητάς). 14:23. τοὺς ὄχλους. 26:61. τον υαon (τοῦ Θεοῦ). 27:59. σινδόνι (καθαρά) u. a. St. - Likewise such where the relation is still more definitely expressed: 21:2. ἀγάγετέ (μοι). 25. ἐρεῖ (ὑμῖν). 9. ὡσαννά (τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ). 22:25. ἦσαν δέ (παρ ἡμῖν). 24:31. μετά, σάλπιγγας. 26:10. (τῇ γυναικί). 29. πίνω (μεθ' υμῶν). 38:40. μετ' ἐμού. Cf. 21:2. καὶ πῶλον (μετ' αὐτῆς). 26:36. ἐρχεται (μετ' αὐτῶν). 26:55. τοῖς ὄχλοις. 27:15. τῷ ὄχλῳ. 26:33. σκανδαλισθήσονται (ἐν σοί). Cf. 14:26. (ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου) ἔκραξαν. This subheading includes

ββ) Clarifications of sentences by improving the construction.

Z. B. n. 42. a. 21:26. if we see - fear the multitude (Mark 11:32. τ'ο/ῶνχρο rö? ). fear the people). - n. 54. 26:33. I never (scandalized. Mark 14:29. elliptisch: but not I). -- 26:56. toto gegenen, a fulfill the writings of the prophets (Mark 14:49. elliptisch: albeit a fulfill the writings). Vergl. das erklärende 15:5. and thou shalt not honor his father - him. (Mark 7:12. and ye shall not touch him, nor do anything to his father - him.) - 16:11. how ye understand (that they said about bread - and Sadducees). - 26:12. for I have beaten this myron - he hath made it. - 20:23. albeit they are prepared (by my father.

γγ) General remarks, which point out the connection of the words with what precedes, as of the kind the example given was 16:11. - 15:20. (τό δέ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶ φαγεῖν, οὐ κοινοί τον ἀνθρωπον. 16:12. then συνήκαν that - καδδονκα/ρν. 17:13. then the disciples said, that - antois. Vergl. 20:16. indeed they are the last - the elect. 21:21. (so only the snakes do other things) even to the ori - Vergl. 13:18. 36. the parable of the sower, the tares,

δδ) Ergänzungen und Zusammenstellungen mit Die Stellen s. oben p. 397.

εε) The concatenation of logical propositions p. 406.

ζ) The formation of questions, by which the following answer is introduced p. 406. with the readily prefaced τί σοι (νμῖν) δοκεῖ;. 17:25. 18:12. 21:28. 22:17. 42.

ηη) The habit of prefixing unutterable utterances to their proofs. - n. 9. 9:3. οὗτος βλασφημεῖ - n. 18. 9:4. ἀναχωρεῖτε. - n. 22. 14:16. on ηρείαν έχοναιν apelthein. - n. 55. 26:65. he hath been blasphemed. - All these expressions of method unite in the endeavour to put into the contract the most possible completeness and definiteness. Can we wonder that this writer also makes greater insertions, and such as differ from the additions of the other narrators in that they

κ) overfilling the measure of the speech (as those minor additions overfill the measure of the sentences) and

ι) at the same time have the appearance of laborious interpolations (just like those minor additions)?

Be this text-multiplier who he will, Matthew or another; the methodical principle, according to which in his writing the compilations are made, and the masses are linked, is his own, and even if the materials inserted by him should have been borrowed from earlier writings; of the insertion of these into the common relation, and of the linkage made, he is the first author, and there has been no writing before his redaction of the text, which would have supplied the orations with these compilations, or in general with the extensions, which distinguish the text of Matthew. "But could not the richer writer have translated what was already so compiled in a Hebrew Scripture?" We have already explained, and every unpar-theician will agree with us, that the compilations of Matthew are intercalated with the Greek text (s. p. 407.), and that consequently they could not have been connected with this (Greek) text in a Hebrew Eremplar. - Our two redactors, Matthew and Luke, had, - this is the last point to be distinguished here -

c) had no other text before them (for the corresponding relations) than that which Mark also had before him. No other text underlies the phraseological variations considered above than that which is expressed in the same place in the concordant secondary texts, and no middle copy intervenes between the original and the altered expression. This has already been proved to us. For the sake of explanation, we will make a few remarks about the passages where Luke differs the most. From n. 16, the first pericope of this kind, he had no other recension before him than the others. This is shown by the whole line of thought in his account, by individual expressions and phrases, and by individual verses such as 8:13 (cf. above p. 384). But where he differs most, in the account of the Last Supper in n. 53, not only are the traces of his creative hand most visible, but a closer examination also shows that he could not have had a different text than the others. Luke combines and rearranges. He has placed the discourses of the disciples about the betrayer at the end, where they are to be followed by their exchange of words about the precedence. In order to have similarities together (as if a dispute had to be continued), he therefore also calls the back and forth talk of the disciples about the betrayer a συζητήν 22:23. and thus already varies with this expression from the neighbours. Further: Jesus had begun to speak of the betrayer at the table, during the meal. This remains so in Luke's account. But the re-payer simplifies here, as he is wont to do. He connects the statement εσθιόντων αὐτῶν Mark. 14:18. with Jesus' own request, which follows later, that the disciples should take and eat v. 19. and so Jesus' speech of the betrayer must follow here v. 21. \*) v. 22. agrees completely with the secondary texts. Because Luke wanted to make the transition to the speech about the betrayer, which was to be placed at the end of the report, and this was to be connected with the moment when Jesus offered the bread, a change had to be made, so that Jesus' request to eat of the bread was placed later than the request to drink of the cup, v. 17. This explains the whole difference in which Luke's report stands to the related



relations. But as Luke here had the same type before him with the others, so he will also have had the following, which the others refer to the finished Passover meal as a spoken speech afterwards. Mark. 14. 26, 31. - Matth. 26, 30 - 35. For Jesus' conversation concerning the denial also follows Luk. 22, 31 - 34. Only the differing performer made changes. For the time being, he has interpolated the rank dispute. The lack of connection at 22:31 shows that this insertion is a piece in itself, which verse, not connected with the preceding one, is only meant to refer to Jesus' conversation with Peter, which is to be reviewed. The assurance given by the latter is formed differently than in the secondary texts. Luke alone repeats Jesus' own words in the same way as those texts express them here Matth. 26, 34. A proof that they would have had his text here just so \*). Finally, however, he enriches the story with a historical note. According to Luke, Judas was present at the supper, but separated from the company as they were about to leave for the garden. He went to the priests, and then came into the garden with armed men. Luke wants to explain this circumstance by telling us that Jesus commanded the disciples to have swords ready, so that the betrayer would be given the hint to bring armed men to meet him, like a robber. But these speeches and statements had to precede the departure to the garden, and so Luke had to place before the departure that which follows it in the secondary accounts as a conversation that took place on the way. The difference in his report is therefore quite understandable. - We have spoken here of those reviews of parallel biblical passages which stand out most for their peculiarities. In Matthew there are none of the kind just considered. For even his more comprehensive accounts always contain the text of the others, or make mixtures with it, and where he abridges, the basis of the narrative and the order of the main moments remain unchanged. But it is particularly evident in the Matthaean interpolations that they are subordinate to the corresponding text and are additions to it, either as explanations of it or because their content is related to it. We may only compare the passages arranged under the seventh date with the content and expression of the page texts to notice that they have their basis in these, notwithstanding that he does not need them for his own completeness. But even to the abbreviations Greek words from the common text have had to offer help. Z. E. n. 9. Matth. 9:3. βλασφημεῖ (Mark.2:7. Luk. 5:21. λαλεῖ βλασφημίας) - n. 11. 12:4. οὐκ ἐξόν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν, οὐδέ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, (comp. Mark, and Luk.). - n. 16. 13:12. οστις γάρ ἐχει. - n. 42. a. 21:36. πάλιν ἀπίστειλε (comp. Mark, and Luk.). - n. 49. 24:9. παραύωσουςιν twice, (comp. Mark.) and ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι κ. τ. λ. (Mark 13:13.) Luk 21:17. (How should an Eichhorn Hebrew cockney have given cause, or how could it have been necessary, to plant the differently placed sentence from the alleged Greek auxiliary scripture, so completely unchanged, just here?) - So it is decided, middle writings and influences of the writers on each other, for instance, by means of legend, or what is called the historical thing, we have nowhere to presuppose in our field of representation. What appears as a modification, a reshuffle and a mixture is directly assimilated to that

Greek text which is not given by any referent without having for itself the corresponding expression of one of the two others; it has not been assimilated to this text by any other performer than the one in which it is found. This shows the method of the editor, and thus, just as the text takes on a special form only under the particularity of the method, and only where this is expressed, without, however, changing its essence (its essential content), so the form of the same, in which the signs of the special method of representation do not show themselves, is the original and primitive one. - Thus we have proved up to now that our writers, where they vary, have deviated from a norm, since they had no other norm than a Greek text. They have sometimes deliberately deviated from this norm, and very significantly at that, as is proved in particular by their abridgements of the text, which they have made here and there and which cannot be denied as a fact. Underlying all their changing forms is no other substrate than the text that the neighbouring copies express harmoniously. This result is based on equations. Now, however, we have not been able to make the necessary comparisons without a date leaping into our eyes which, because of its connection with this result, must also be established and emphasised precisely because it is a premise for the judgement on Mark. We therefore now set up this date.

\*) V. 19. τοῦτο ποιεῖτι - ἀνάμνησιν and V. §0. does not belong INLuka's text; s. above note. S. 140.

\*) That Jesus promises to go on to Galilee Mark. 14:28, which Luke changes because of Act. 1:12. (Cf. the other examples p. 381 f.)

417

#### Sixteenth Datum:

What appears in Matthew and Luke as a textual adaptation (see the remarks on date 14) presupposes directly either the text of Mark or an earlier text which Mark has expressed more purely than the latter.

When we listed above, p. 309, the passages where Matthew makes subsequent additions to the sentences (concerning the subject and object), the remark presented itself to us that it is only these additions by which a difference arises between the texts of Mark and Matthew.

When we listed above, p. 309, the passages where Matthew makes subsequent additions to the sentences (concerning the subject and object), the remark presented

itself to us that it is only these additions which create a difference between the texts of Mark and Matthew.

1) One could now say that Mark, in his ex- terpation of Matthew, omitted the superfluous subordinate clauses from the sentences. For we find ^the same alternation of the texts

α) in the passages where Mark alone refers to Matthew. E. g. Mark 14:50. καὶ ἀφεντες αὐτόν πάντες ἐφυγαν, certain Matthew 26:56. τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες - ἐφυγαν. - Mark. 14, 4. ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἀγανα- κτοῦντες, certain Matthew 26:8. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἠγανάκτησαν. Just so Mark. v. 6. τί αὕτη (Matthew certain: τῇ γυναικὶ) κόπους παρε'χετε; -- Mark. 14:48. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (Matthew certain: τοῖς ὄχλοις \*). We do not want to mention other passages.

\*) The Mark. 15:10. buried οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς owes its origin probably only to the v. 11. following: οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς and is therefore unächt.

418

But one would be very mistaken if one were to believe that Mark abbreviated here. The opposite would be

β) all those passages which have been cited above at the fourteenth date from Matthew and Luke as evidence that these writers have made additions and additions (of a threefold kind) to a Greek text. - Here, the shorter text of Mark is usually accompanied by a more uniform one, which throws off from Mark the suspicion of having made some weggelassen to the words of the Nebenrcferent. But we do not even want to refer to these passages, since they allow the objection, though already amply refuted by other reasons, that Mark could have been guided by the shorter text that stands beside him. It is far more important for us

γ) on those parallels of which one text testifies in a different form to the originality of the measure of the sentence given by Mark. Such passages are the following:

|                                                                       |                                      |                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| κ) n. 28. Matt. 16:16. συ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ξώντος.) | Mark 8, 29. σύ εἶ ὁ Χριστός.         | Luke 9:20 τον Χριστόν τοῦ Θεοῦ.        |
| n. 42 a. 21: 23. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρε-σβύτεροι (τοῦ λαοῦ).         | 11:27. οἱ ἀρχ. — καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. | 20:2. οἱ ἀρχ. — συν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. |

|                                                                                         |                                                      |                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| η. 49. 24:5. ότι ἐγώ εἰμι (ὁ Χριστός).                                                  | 13:6. ότι ἐγώ εἰμι.                                  | 21:8. ότι ἐγώ εἰμι (καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε).                               |
| η. 42 β. 21:36. καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους (πλείονας τῶν πρώτων.)              | 12:4. καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον.  | 20:11. καὶ πρὸς- ἔθετο πέμψαι ἕτερον δοῦλον.                            |
| 26:57. ἀπήγαγον πρὸς ( Καϊάφαν ) τον ἀρχιερέα.                                          | 14:53. καὶ ἀπήγαγον πρὸς τον ἀρχιερέα.               | 22:54. ἤγαγαν εἰς τον οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.                              |
| Cf. η. 17. 8:31. ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς (εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν) χοίρων.                           | 5:12. πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τους χοίρους.                  | 8:32. παρεκά- λουν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἐπι- τρέψη αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν. |
| η. 28. 16:14. ἕτεροι δὲ (Ιερειάν ἢ) ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν.                                   | 8:28. ἄλλοι δὲ ἓνα. τῶν προφητῶν.                    | 9:19. ἄλλοι δὲ ότι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.                     |
| η. 35. Matt. 26:71. καὶ οὗτος ἦν (μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ναζωραίου.                                 | 14:69. ότι καὶ οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ.                  | Luke 22:58 καὶ συ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ.                                          |
| β) η. 10. Luk. 5:33. διατί οἱ μαθηταῖ Ἰωάνναν νηβτινονβι (πνχνά καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται); | Mark 2,18. διατί οἱ μαθηταῖ Ἰωάν- νου — νηστεύουσιν; | Matth. 9:14 . διατί ἡμεῖς — νηστεύομεν;                                 |
| η. 16. Luke. 8:15. χαῖ καρποφοροῦσιν {ἐν υπομονῇ}.                                      | 4:20. χαῖ καρποφοροῦσιν.                             | Matth. 13:28 ὅς δὴ καρποφορεῖ.                                          |
| η. 17. Luk. 8:22. βιέλθωμεν εἰς τό πέραν (τῆς λίμνης).                                  | 4:35. διέλθωμεν εἰς τό πέραν.                        | Matth. 8:18 ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τό πέραν.                            |

Are we seriously to believe here that Mark has read only so much of the passages under η) from Matthew as was sufficient for harmony with Luke, and of those under 2) from Luke as much as was sufficient for Matthew? - But this is not what those who want to take Mark's text for an excerpt from the other two want. They prefer to ignore such cases, or direct their gaze away from the annoying phenomenon. - But we examine these passages, and ask, if someone should seek an explanation for their harmony, whether the texts of Matthew and Luke could not have received their form much sooner, if they originated from the middle text, than the latter could have received its proportion

to the secondary texts as a result of a lucky grip made in one of these texts. - In fact, it requires very little understanding to choose between the explanatory reasons. - However and wherever we may find traces that Matthew and Luke presuppose a Greek text, we are always led to the conclusion,

2) that the presupposed text could be that of Mark, or if it is not directly the original text itself, it is nevertheless the purest imprint of it that still exists. Therefore, we are allowed to make more precise comparisons within the original scope of the pieces (after we have already noted the interpolations and reductions above).

420

a) We compare Mark ") with Matthew. -n.8. Although Matth. 8:4. τό δῶρον is an unbcdeutative difference, it is nevertheless due to modification of the original. The words ορα, μηδεὶ εἰπῆς υ. εις μαρτύρων αὐτοῖς unite in the One Intimation: without anything being said to the people, they are to infer what has happened (and been kept silent) themselves. The word περί καθαρισμοῦ, which expresses the concealed object, which is the main object in this word context, is therefore more appropriate than τό ἄωρον. (For it gives of itself at the same time Complement to εἰπῆς and to μαρτύριαν.)

n.9. Matth. 9:3. 4. (ἐνθνμεῖσθε πονηρά) is not as appropriate to the spirit of the piece as what Mark expresses. Jesus' question: which is easier rc. (Matth, v. 5.) is worded in such a way that it wants to cut off or clear away the doubtful wedges. Certainly fits better to this: τί οἰαλογίζεσθε (what do you make for worriers?) and into the form of such are again the thoughts of the opponents Mark. 2:6. better set with the doubleness of expression than with the unapologetic οὗτος βλασφημεῖ of Matthew.

n.10. - Matth. 9,14. The pre-narrator meant to say that the disciples of John were referred to, but not that they themselves came and asked. "From John Schiss lern himself the question would have been almost fatuously posed" (Schleierm. p. 79.). On v. 17. ρι'γη-νται οἱ ασκοί see above note p. 186.

n.11. - Matth. 12:4. draws together the original correct expression. It cannot be said, which he durst not eat, as the priests; but it can only be said, which no man durst eat, as rc.

n. 16 - Matth. 13:19. It has alienated some readers in the interpretation of this parable that the Saame is compared to men and not to doctrine. (S. Eckermann's theol. Beiträge 5r vol. 2 p. 230.) But pay attention to Mark's presentation, and you will find the matter explained. Mark compares with the Saemann the teacher, as he is in action and

surrounded by listeners. Therefore, these are also distinguished and divided into classes (those who stand by the way, those who have no root in them, those who are choked with thorns, and those who bear fruit like good land). And that is why Mark always begins with οὗτοι εἶπιν, i.e. those who are present at the teaching. The whole thing is therefore more a comparison of the teacher with the sower than it is the interpretation of a parable. Now Matthew also begins in this way, v. 20, 21; without one seeing how he arrived at this form. But he changed v. 18, 19, where this should have been made clear, as we have already seen; and v. 19 reveals his departure from the original by something else. To the: ἦλθε τὰ πετεινά και κατέψαγεν αὐτά in the parabola corresponds as an underlying type: ἐρχεται ὁ πονηρός (comp. Mark, and Luk.). This latter must be presupposed as fact for the parabolic counter-image so that it is the primitive. But Matthew makes it again the image of something else, and precedes it with an explanation: if one does not consider the word, then the devil comes, etc., so that the latter appears only as a trope of the preceding actually expressed, and Papist the performer departs from the original. (This to page 207.)

421

n.44. - Matth. 22:24. gives the rejection to the Mosaic commandment the form of a citation. (See above p. 244.) Hence also his: Μωσῆς εἶπε. But now no citation is given of Moses' words, but only an abstraction is made. - The expression of Mark (and Luke): Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ἓνα - λάβη is therefore more correct and consequently the original.

n.46. - Matthew has formed his dialogue only from the material of the secondary narrative, for if we disregard its (methodical) formation, it has no more material than this. But he has departed from the original.

κ) All the texts are similar in that the words of the psalm are mentioned first and then a reflection is made on them. Matthew also keeps this order.

422

However,

β) which the other copies express as a reflection and conclusion only after the words of the psalm quoted: Δαβὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ, is prefixed by Matthew in v. 43, and then repeated again after the liturgical passage, thus introducing an unnecessary verbosity into the text. Two questions are asked, the first of which is superfluous:

aa) if the Messiah is David's son, how does David call him his Lord? and

bb) if David calls him his Lord, how is he his son? The first question was not intended to be a special one, but only the fact that David calls the Messiah his Lord should be linked to the only question of the text to be raised, how he is his son. A text that would have developed both questions out of an organic creative impulse would have let them come forward in a different connection of ideas. We see that the author imposes the first question on the text, while the second is forced from him by the given text \*).

\*) Fritzsche's commentary on Matthew, p. 670, cannot instruct "us" here, least of all by analogies from Homer.

n. Matth. 24:9.10. Notice here how a text such as Mark's has had to submit to the abbreviatory hand, and the abbreviated form is no other than his own. - Two kinds of persecutions (a double παραδιδόναι) are spoken of, as proceeding from the unbelievers (Mark 13:9.), and then from the Christians themselves (Mark v. 11.). Both combined, after omissions, Matthew 24:9. The verse Mark 13 is shifted in Matthew 9 to the persecutions of the non-Christians. But the μιβέειν is also repeated again in verse 10. At the same time the abbreviator wants to bring out a causal connection by the καί τότε σκανδαλιθήσονται v. 10, i. e. the persecutions from without (v. 9.) will have such a harmful effect on the Christians themselves that they will declare themselves to each other among the enemies, and deliver themselves into the hands of these, (v. 11. and 12, are, as already remarked above, to be deleted). -

423

Matth, v. 14. should have come immediately after v. 9. where it speaks of being dragged before the tribunals. But Matthew placed the words between v. 13 and 15, and thereby interrupted the order of Mark (and Luke). But because by this Mark was separated from v. 13 and 14, that the saying: ὁ δε ἐπιμεένας εἰς τέλος no longer immediately precedes the words Mark. v. 14, therefore Matthew 24, 14. interposes the words: καὶ τότε ἤξει τὸ τέλος (that τέλος may remain, as in Mark). This is the Genesis of his text with its reference back to the text of Mark (incidentally a striking proof against the reverie of Hebrew originals).

n.54. Matth. 26:39. We have always held to the expression: εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρελθέτω - πλήν ουχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω κ. τ, λ. offended. It sounds as if the possible and the divine will could come into conflict with each other. If we translate the words thus: if your wisdom finds it permissible, let this cup pass from me; then the limiting addition: yet not as I will rc. makes itself felt as an improper thing. Mark's text is more correctly expressed: you

can, if it depends on your ability, do everything (thus also spare me this cup), but I surrender myself to your will. But Matthew's εἰ δυνατόν gives the thought a different form. Matthew, however, has drawn his text together from one such as that of Mark:

|                                                                                                                                   |                                                                      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Mark 14:35 (προσηϋγέτο, ἵνα,) εἰ δυνατόν ἐστί, παρέλθῃ (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα.</p> <p>36. παρένεγκε) τὸ ποτηριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τούτο,</p> | <p>Matth. εἰ δυνατόν ἐστί, παρελθέτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτηριον τούτο.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|

Two sentences have merged into one at Matth.

n. This passage should have been mentioned above among the interpolations; in order not to pass it over, we will consider it here. The more eloquent speaker formulates Pilate's question as if two had been presented for selection. But the note v. 18. ἥξει γὰρ κ. τ. λ. still proves that the original text did not have Barabbas placed next to Jesus, since the note looks back only to Jesus. For it cannot contain the reason why Pilate did not set up Jesus alone, but with Barabbas, if words are not to be arbitrarily entered into the counter. Also v. 21. is an alteration of the original. For if the original report had intended Pilate to put the question thus: which of the two here do you want to have released? he would not have put into his mouth afterwards the words by which Jesus is more closely described v. 22. But it is different when it is the people themselves who mention the name of Barabbas, and Pilate then opposes this (cf. above p. 285). But because two names are mentioned at the same time, Matthew, true to his method of forming anticipatory questions, has both names put up for election beforehand. - These were the passages of Matthew to be compared here. Those which still

424

β) Luke's text presents for closer observation are the following

n. Luke 5:30 and 33 changed the question (see note above, p. 186), and his text is no longer the original. For Jesus' answer in 31-32 would not fit if the rebuke had not been directed first to Himself, but only to the disciples, and if the rebuke against the disciples for not fasting had been directed, as Luke suggests, to their partaking of the banquet that day; then the original account would have had this second rebuke addressed directly to the disciples themselves, just as Luke did with the first question in 10. In Mark's text, speeches and counter-speeches fit together harmoniously. - The texts of the 15th and 16th have already been examined. But in the latter, the transition 8:30. is not as appropriate to the play as the one made at the same point in Mark. (The sower



and the teacher must be the correlates if the hearers are to be located, not first of all the seed and the word. - It is less clear from Luke's text why the hearers must give the counter-image to the seed in the parable than in Mark; Luke v. 11. is much more on the way to directing the mountain church differently. But the author of the parable does not compare the word of God with the seed, but the hearers who receive the word).

425

n.28. Luk. 9:26. is no longer the original expression. Even if the one in Mark seems to be more hebraistic, it nevertheless has the appropriate feature of distinguishing with the ψυχή a thing that can be lost, just as the κόσμος can be a thing that can be gained. The author of the sentences, however, undoubtedly had such a distinction in mind when he divided the sentences. Luke looked less at the form of the expression than at the content, and believed that he could put this into fewer words.

Luke refers ταῦτα 20:2. to teaching, as if Jesus should have given authority to do so. Against this, however, Jesus' answer would not be accurate. For even if John had a higher authority for his baptism, it did not follow that Jesus did not need any authorization for his teachings, unless his teaching was connected with John's baptism in content and purpose. But there is nothing of this in the text. But the relationship and connection with John's baptism really did not need to be explained if it did not refer to teaching, but to Jesus' cleansing of the temple. It was this which already as a fact - without the need for explanatory words in the text - was connected with John's purpose. - (This to p. 235.)

n.42 b. the criterion of the shortening of the text Luk. 20:9. the omitted Old Testament words, in so far as they form a whole with those retained by Luke, and those, a part of the picture, would not have been used if the whole picture had not been expressed in Isaiah's words (cf. above p. 238). A similar criterion is given by Mark in n. 49. to Luk. 21. 9) Here ἀκοάς πολέμων (not Luke's ἀκαταστασίας) is original, because Jerem. 6:24. is considered (comp. above p. 254).

426

Likewise in Luke 21:20, for since Luke once has ἐρήμωσις, he will also have had βδέλυγμα ἱερῶσεως before him according to the Danielic passage (like Mark). In the same way the tropical words retained in Luke 21:26, αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις -- σαλευθήσονται, which he uses rather for a logical proof than for a poetical account, join more naturally with the poetical words Mark. 13:22. which, taken from the Old Testament, do not only indicate the origin of Luke's shorter text: ἴσονται σημεῖα ἐν χ. τ. λ., but also to the

equally poetic words retained by Luke: αἱ δυνάμεις χ. τ. λ. have led first. - Luk. 21:16. makes an immediate salutation, and must alter dicserhalb. Since it could not be said in a proper manner that those addressed would bring up traitors in their own children; so it could not stand: ἐπανά- στήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς (Mark 13:12.), and Luke therefore put for it: ὑπὸ ἀδελφῶν κ. συγγενῶν κ. φίλων, being θανά- τώσουσιν χ. τ. λ. shows that he had the same text as Mark. -

n. 53. - Luke here 22:15. fills up the gap of Jesus' words taken away (from the betrayer) by other words: ἐπιθυμία ἐπιθύμησα χ. τ. λ. For the sake of these words, because Jesus expresses by them that he longed for the supper, the narrator also changed the preceding of the commission to prepare the passover (22:9.), that not, as in the other texts, the disciples first remind Jesus of the passover, but Jesus' own commission precedes it. (This to p. 273.) In

n. S5. notice the symmetrical relation between Luk. 23:16. 20. and Mark. 15:9. 12. in order to convince oneself that Luke had no other text before him than that expressed by Mark. And so the series of passages to be compared would run through.

b) Do not say that Mark corrected the expression of one copy after another. It has been proved

α) that the other texts which harmonize with it, where they do not literally harmonize with it, anticipate its expression.

β) Sometimes he deviates from both co-referents at the same time, namely, where they have wanted to introduce an improvement into the relation, as in n. 10. By the original we understand not merely the more correct, but that without which that which is harmonized in the copies would not be so expressed and placed in this line of thought. -

γ) Just as Mark did not change the textual measure, as Matthew and Luke did, so his expression also proves to be the unchanged original one, and if he has had a borlage, from the fact that he has changed the quantity of the neatest pieces far less than Matthew and Luke, the conclusion is to be drawn that he will also have changed the quality of the expression far less than they did.

The hypothesis that Mark composed his text out of the two others by separating them out is therefore completely null and groundless, and only gives a blindly grasped finding, instead of a more thorough knowledge of the nature of our texts. The defenders of it, in order to assert the non-fact, presuppose an objective (on the part of the text from which it is supposed to have been separated) and a subjective (on the part of Mark, who is supposed to have made the separation - either voluntarily or involuntarily), which does not exist at all. The first has been spoken of up to now. Mark has had nothing to select,

a) What he is said to have omitted from the secondary texts, the authors of the latter added to the text only later,

b) The priority of Matthew's and Luke's adaptations of the text cannot be proved in itself; rather, they have as their basis a text such as that expressed by Mark. Their defenders themselves mix together (original and non-original) by falsely accusing Mark of having made a mixture of two texts. If they persist in their opinion in spite of the evidence given by the opposing side, it can be a matter of no concern to us, since nothing is decided by denials and power claims - rather, everything depends here on criticism \*). But if we take into consideration what the hypothesis on the part of the Martius himself makes a prerequisite (the subjective, as mentioned above), then the inadmissibility of Heller is obvious, and this will become apparent in the following. - "But does not Mark's text really appear as a combined and mixed one?" It certainly has this appearance, but we also know how to explain the matter. The defenders of this opinion, however, will not explain it for all eternity, and can only demand blind faith for their opinion. The circumstance that Mark's text has the appearance of a compilation and mixture develops itself as a datum from the composition of our parallel relations, and we therefore proceed to it at once.

\*) Here justice is done, and not according to mere suspicion. But here we have an analogy to the case in which someone is sometimes convicted on suspicion, by people who commit the crime themselves, for which reason they bring him under suspicion, and for that very reason assert their subjective suspicion against the innocent person even against evidence to the contrary, because they themselves believe it.

#### Seventeenth Datum:

By the fact that Matthew and Luke have each added different elements to the original text in different places, Mark's text has the appearance of a mixture and compilation

made from the reviews of those writers, although Mark has nothing of what is the peculiar style of writing of his secondary writers.

a) It is an undeniable fact that Matthew and Luke deviated from their original texts, and if this were not proven by anything else, it would already be irrefutably proven by Matthew's interpolations and Luke's abbreviations of the text. Now, if Mark either had the same preliminary text with those, and remained more faithful to it, or if the text produced by himself was the model for those; then it can also be understood, granted that those could differ from the model, and indeed could differ as well from one and the same sentence of it as from different sentences, how Mark Tert had to enter into the very relationship with the neighboring ones in which he really stands with them. - For this relationship will be the following:

429

α) Mark will agree with none where the others both vary at the same time, and with both at the same time where neither varies. So it is also, e. g., n. 8. n. 28. 42 a in the referred speech n. 29. and n. 39. (in the latter only Matthew 17:4. differs by its εἰ θέλεις, in this only Matth. 21:2. by its υἱός καί πῶλο,ς).

β) Varieties one of the neighbours through the whole pericope, the other not; so that on the whole it will harmonise more with the "latter. This is the case in the pericopes cited above, p. 294. In this case, it will appear as if Mark copied the one who did not break the harmony, just as in the cases where the other two do not differ, it cannot be stated which is the one he copied. That which the one speaker has omitted from the text, Mark will seem to have borrowed from the other, or that which the one adds, he omits with the other. But here again it will be the case that, where these two have omitted nothing, it cannot be stated whence Mark has the matter, instead of that, when one omits something, one is immediately at hand to show whence Mark has excepted and borrowed something (thus n. 28 Mark 8:31). 28. Mark 8:31. ἀποδοῦναι μαθεῖναι is from Luke, but whence the rest is, no one wants to know).

γ) Since the changes of text are of a double kind, changes of textual measure, and phraseological; the following cases may occur,

κ) One writer can change the expression in the same passage where the other changes the textual measure (increasing or decreasing); in which case Mark will stand alone, as n. 49. Mark. 18:10 - 12. n. 42 b. Mark. 12:4. 5. or the one may make both changes where the other changes nothing, or the one may add to the unchanged words (as Matthew often did) where the other changes the expression. In this case Mark will have

copied the expression of the first, but will seem to have omitted some of it. (For examples, see p. 399 above.)

430

ב) As the changes may occur in various intermediate spaces, either alternately after a whole verse, which one retains while the other omits it, or after individual verses of the verse, or after individual words of the sentence, it will seem as if Mark had compiled, namely, in the first case from each a whole verse, in the second from each a verse of the verse, in the third certain words of the sentence. So we do not need to give examples to prove that Mark seems to have a mixed text; we see clearly from our above criticisms that it must be so, and from what we have found in Matthew and Luke, that it could not be otherwise. Therefore, from what we know of the text of Mark, namely, that, if it is not the original text itself, it nevertheless comes closest to it, we understand very easily why passages with the appearance of a mixed text can occur less in Matthew, and still less in Luke, than in Mark, and why such passages must also occur from time to time in the latter.

aa) In the case of these two, the appearance of a mixture cannot emerge so often, since when they change the original text, they always retain something of what Mark has, but each ignores the change that the other has made, so that the other element for the mixture of two foreign texts is always missing. It will have a different appearance

bb) where Mark, like the other two, also really interrupts the original text, we do not want to say really interrupts it, but seems to interrupt it, namely in the pericopes n. 1 and n. 14, where Matthew and Luke have the same larger quantities, and in the smaller quantities listed on p. 295 f.. Here Matthew or Luke will borrow what they have in common from one another, depending on the dependence one wishes to place, and what follows from Mark that is in harmony with one or the other will seem to have been added from the latter. Such cases, however, must occur less frequently than those mentioned above, because Mark has expressed the text most purely, where the others have either only something or nothing at all from him, and none of them falls into agreement with the other, where they change both at the same time.

431

b) Since at least "priori, even if all evidence is abstracted, the possibility exists that our writers have drawn from a common source, it is obviously not yet sufficient to prove that expressions and idioms which he uses also occur in the same way in the secondary texts, in order to convict the Mark of a compilation made from the secondary writers;

Rather, if he is to have infringed the property of the secondary writers, it must be proved that he appropriates that which is peculiar to their mode of expression and method of representation. But this is by no means the case, and one must pay attention to this. - The method of writing and presentation of the two writers, Matthew and Luke, has already been so adequately characterised in Date 14. 15. that from the samples given there, results can be obtained with regard to the relationship of our speakers to one another. Since, however, one deliberately blinds one's eyes in order to assert a hypothesis which only requires fingers \*) instead of research, contrary to all truth, we feel compelled to make a few more remarks here.

\*) Paul Conservat. p. 27. observes, that other scholars, as if with their fingers, have found many proofs of passages, such as Mark's text from Matt. and Luke. - We have explained here that we refrain from giving evidence with fingers, since fingers only touch the surface, but here we must go to the bottom.

432

α) The same methodical principle has revealed itself under the hand of those writers in major and minor textual changes, - which, however, are analogies to each other. Just as in Mark's parallel text the greater outpourings of the principle have not penetrated, neither have the lesser ones. Did Mark include the questions of Matthew n. 16. n. 44. n. 52. n. 56. that are found under greater textual transformations? (The same writer who sought to complete the text with matter was, according to the same maxim, concerned with the grammatical wholeness of the expression, and sought to make it as complete as possible. Mark does not have Matthew's larger interpolations; but neither does he have his smaller sentence-fillings (as the examples p. 397. 399. and p. 411. show). The same writer who likes to bring speech and response to speech into an intimate nexus by anticipatory questions, also likes to constrict the sentences into a logical context (by means of the εἰ beginning the prefix, see p. 406). Mark does not use this method either \*). Does he follow Luke in omitting the additions? Luke is in the habit of simplifying. - But wherever his methodical principle shows itself, in the simplification of larger masses, as in n. 54. n. 14. and where it has had its influence on the formation of individual sentences, as in n. 16. (Luk. 8:6.) n. 30. (Luk. 9:41.) and in other places (see p. 409.), Mark deviates. Luke's preference for the participial construction is connected with his striving for brevity (passages e.g. Luk 5:24. 8:4. 6. 7. 15. 42. 18:18. 20:29. and others). Mark does not use this means of shortening the speech, even though he is said to have shortened some of Matthew's sentences. - But what is the need for special references here? The notes placed under the passages above prove that Mark does not have the peculiarity of the others, and that it does not pass over to him anywhere, throughout the whole series of these passages.

\*) To be taken from n. 14. mark. 3:26. and 28. Mark 8:34. But the εἰ does not come from Matthew either, as is evident from Luke.

433

β) It requires very little perspicacity to say: Mark has taken this or that word from Matthew or Luke, but he has omitted this or that. But how, if what is supposedly omitted is connected with the author's method or manner of diction, which, wherever it is expressed, remains only a special thing of its own; should we not thereby rather be made aware that it may well be different with what is declared to be a compilation, and that the methodical special thing, which always remains behind what is meant, may well have followed it only later? The condition for admitting this is, of course, that one does not merely take this or that individual piece before oneself, of which Mark has given a homogeneous representation, and then determine its extent according to the measure of the other representations given of the same piece - as is usually done - but that one seeks to penetrate the spirit of the evangelical relations themselves, and gather observations about the method of the writers, as it is repeated in all their representations.

γ) If Mark did not borrow from the others what belongs to them or is from them, he rather breaks off the agreement with them as soon as this appears, and not in such a way that, leaving the one, he followed the other, but, if both secondary writers let their peculiar diction flow into one and the same place, he then also breaks off the agreement with both at the same place. Only a few such passages may be cited: - n. 9. Mark. 2:7. (see above p. 183.) - n. 10. Mark. 2:18. (see p. 186.) - n. 28. 8:29. (p. 216. Mark has here neither the interposition Matth. 16:16., nor Luke's own expression.) - n. 44. Mark. 12:19. 26.

δ) If Mark had borrowed his text from the others, his dependence on them would be betrayed especially in those pericopes which he alone has in common with one and another of them. But even here Mark has nothing of the peculiarities of the secondary writers, as will be found on closer examination. Since, contrary to the truth, the opposite is claimed, it will be worth the effort to examine the relationship of the parallels here a little more closely,

κ) Parallels from Luke:

434

|                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| n. 7. Mark. 1:38 ἀγωμεν εἰς τὰς ἐχυμενας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα κακεῖ κηρύξω. | Luk. 4:43. ὅτι - με δεῖ, peculiar to Luke, when a journey or a sojourn with someone is presented as the purpose. E. g. ch. 19:6, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ὑοῦ δεῖ με μένειν. Act. 19:24. δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν. 18:21. δεῖ με - ποιήβαι εἰς ἱεροο. Furthermore here: ἐναγγελίζεσθαι comp. 20:1. (where Mark has it also not) 1:19. Act. 8:12.40. It never occurs in Mark. - ταῖς ἐτέραις. This word, familiar to Luke (Luk. 6:6.8:6.7.8. 20:11. 22:58.) Mark has it nowhere. |
| εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἰλήλνθα.                                                 | Luk. ὅτι (comp. 11:18. 9:12. 38.)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| n. 16. Mark. 4:21 — 25.                                                | Luk. 8:16. - ἄψας νεεβί. 22:55. 11. 33. 15:8- ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι - τῷ φωσ. So also 11:33, (But of Luk. v. 18. it has been shown above p. 379. that the words contradict the purpose of Luke himself).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

n. 21. Mark. 6:14 -16. comp. Luk. 9:7. Mark has here no (24:4. Act. 2:12. 5:24. 10:17.), no soliloquy (as Luk. 20:13. 16.). περ' ἰ ον ἀκούω Luk. 16:2. - n. 42 b. Luk. 20:11. 12. and n. 49. Luk. 21:14 - 16. Where would Mark have words from Luke here? - n. 48. Luk. 21:1 - 4. Here the transition is quite different: ἀναβλύσας εἰς - εἶδε χήραν πενιχράν. Luke alternates here with the words πενιχρά in the preface and πτωχή v. 3, as in n. 34. with βρῖση and παιδία. Mark has here as there the same word twice, and there on his side was also Mattheus. The addition to εβαλον; εἰς τα δώρα Mark has not. - Don the parallels

435

б) with Matthew we need here only consider those which occur in the joint narrative pieces (where Mark continues the relation with Matthew alone). - Matth. 13:10 - 18. After the above discussion, there is no need for a comparison here. - And the parable Matth. 13:24 - 30. 36 - 52. where is it in Mark? "He left it out." Of course, anyone can easily say that, but it does not prove anything. (We will prove something quite different below.) Mark also adds a parable. He could at least have kept the transitional words Matth. 13:32: ἀλλην παραβολήν παρίθηχι. If he had but these, we would at once admit that he drew from Matthew. For the words are eight Matthean (words of the Matth. compiler), v. 33. 21:33. But these words he has not, precisely because they are Matthean. - Matth. 16:22. Mark is otherwise so fond of giving vividness and liveliness to his descriptions. He also likes to use the verbi, ipsiUma. - Why then does he not have here the words of Peter presented to him by his supposed source? Of the σχάνδαλόν



μου η Matth, v. 23. he knows nothing either, and leaves it to the same compiler, who uses it in n. 16. in his interpolated parable of the Zizanias likewise, Matth. 13:41. and in the same sense of men, as here. The verse Matth, v. 27. completely repulses us with our attempt to derive Mark Tert from Matthew. The worst thing is that Luke (9, 26. 27.) is here again supposed to give pleasure to our opponents. (But the latter also retains his own: λίγω νμῖν αληθώς and his mutilation of words at the end of v. 27.)

n. 32. How completely different is Mark. 11:34. than Matth. 18:1. - Matth, v. 3. 4. ignores Mark completely. Why? we already know. But are there not also genuine Matthaean expressions here? - προσήλ^ον - ή βασό.ία τών ουρανών? In the present of Mark v. 42 - 47. Mark has Matthew alone by his side. Did he take what he refers to from Matthew?

436

Paul's Commentary 2 Th. p. 725. remarks on Mark v. 43. 45.: "it is striking that what Matth. 18:9. had united into one verse, χεῖρ and πους Mark cut out into two säst quite similar." It is remarkable that one can say this straightforwardly, since nothing is more certain than the opposite. - The way of joining words with H, and of changing the original text with this added H, is already known in Matthew. In the passages cited above, p. 397, he used it for interpolations (add 27:17.); here he uses it for contractions. That the original text would have separated the members as Mark does the separation, may also be inferred from the fact that in Matthew 9 the ncde of the eye remains in its separation, and η χεῖρ also stands alone in Matt. 5:30. The words εἰς τό πυρ το ασβεστον Matth. v. 8. have arisen from Mark 9:44. 46. καί το πῦρ ον σβίννυται (Mark. v. 43. 45. are the Matthaean words interpolated and unächt, and are therefore also used by L. Syr. Pers. p. u. v. 45. moreover still expelled by B. C.) \*). The words, Matth, v. 6. ινα - και καταποντισθη (comp. Matth. 14:30.) εν τω πελάγει της θαλάσσης and the whole of v. 7. (comp. Luk. 17:1.) Mark has not at all; not even εκκοπον Mark. v. 9. which yet is also recorded Matth. 5:30. can be found in Mark's text. - n. 49. The expression Mark. 13:20. differs from Matth. 24:22. in a not insignificant point \*\*). -- n. 53. Where Mark most agrees with Matthew, he does not have the very peculiarities of the latter, not the additions to the sentence Matth. 26:22. (σφόδρα - είμι κύριε) 23. (ουτός με παραδώσει) 27. (λέγων πίετε - Mark. καί επιον -) 28. (εις αφεσιν αμαρτιών) 29. (not μεθ υμών). Just so also not in n. 54. Matth. 26:33. (ουδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι) 35. (οί μαθηταί) 36. (μετ αυτών). v. 37. (λνπεῖσθαι) 38. (μετ εμού) 40. (μετ εμού), v. 42. (not the repetition, although Mark is said to tantologisir at times) \*). The words Matth, v. 50. Mark has not (as he had not Matth. 16:22.), nor v. 52 - 54. and therefore there is also difference between Matth, v. 56. (which verse, however, is expressed entirely in the Matthaic manner) and Mark. 14:50. - n. 55. there are differences which cannot yet be spoken of

here. As far as referential words are concerned, the expression Matth. 26:61. and Mark. 14:58. are essentially different. (The τὸν νόον added to τοῦ Θεοῦ is Matthaean.) The solemn expression Matth, v. 63. (ἐξορ- κίζω - ζώντος) Mark has not. - Mark. 14:65. there is not even the τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ, which is so peculiar to Matthew; but instead there is: τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται ; (By the way, it might be said here that the Matthaean formula is after all in the passage of Mark according to its content, and that the original text therefore has an author to whom, like Matthew, the use of that formula was usual. But in order that this should not appear to be the case, it should be noted that the formula in Matthew is otherwise never used absolutely, as it is here, but always as an introduction to a question with the following interrogative words. Wherefore it will be more likely to be believed that in Matthew the original τί φαίνεται; has been exchanged for the popular τί δοχεῖ)). - n. 29. Mark 9:5. is just that which is Matthaean, (εἰ θελεῖς Matth. 17:6.) not to be found. - The defenders of this hypothesis ignore all this, and must do so if they wish to maintain it. We shall therefore have to turn far less to their assurance than to our date, and may rather conclude two things from the last:

438

a) whoever cannot be proved to have taken something from another that is his provable property, cannot be said without injustice to have taken something from him;

b) since Mark does not have that which the secondary author proves to be his property, what he has in common with them does not belong to them as their property either. - And so, after it has already been shown that what Mark delivers as text was not originally connected with what he is said to have passed over and omitted, it has also been proven here that he could not have borrowed his text from those who connected it with other parts. The conclusion, then, is and remains this: what that opinion of the separation of the text of Mark from the secondary relations of Matthew and Luke presupposes on the part of the objective does not exist. But if we now turn to the side of the subjective, in order to make us understand the origin of this text as a compilation brought about by Mark, we come to the point where the presupposition loses all conceivability. And this is the same point to which we must still continue the examination of the hypothesis. -

#### Eighteenth Datum:

Mark's text separates itself from the secondary texts in such a way and unites the constituent parts of them in itself in such a way that, as a mixture made from them, it would have to be either the outflow of a coalition that arose involuntarily in the writer's

memory from both texts, or a "combination" made by chance in writing out both texts, or finally the effect of a deliberate neutering of both texts. - But he himself cancels out each of these presuppositions.

439

a) First we want to illustrate the alleged tert-mixing with only a few samples. See the passages listed in bci- \*): - These passages are remarkable, partly because they instruct us more precisely as to how the mixture by which Mark's text is supposed to have come about is to be imagined in its essence, namely, either as a coalition or conflation, or neutering of two texts, partly because they are themselves the best refutation of the hypothesis which invokes them, which in turn is the more remarkable the more the defenders of the latter believe they have in these passages. For they regard them as more valid than all arguments. In these passages, they think, the assumed fact itself has taken place, and that quite visibly and evidently, so that all further talk about the intention underlying the fact and the associated - expedient or inexpedient - way of proceeding is superfluous and useless \*\*).

\*) That which is distinguished in the table by larger print is that which is allegedly compiled by Mark.

\*\*) "What does it mean against this graphic proof to ask: why Mark did not also include this, not also that? May Mark's intention be completely unknown to us, may some assumptions about his purpose be mere conjecture, may he even have excerpted himself without a definite, consistent plan; it is not on this point, but on the obvious evidence that, and even how in detail, Mark has summarised all the main parts of yours from the texts of the two others, that the exegetes who have carried this view through (?) have based their assertion." Paulus Conservator. I. Lief p. 37 f

b) Impartial judges of the matter would not blame us if, after what has been revealed to us above about the relationship of our texts, we felt a secret reluctance to enter into more detail with a hypothesis that has not yet taken the slightest cognizance of all this. However, to the reason just given, which at the same time has the appearance of a philosophical axiom, we reply as follows:

α) even if a fact, once it has occurred, cannot be annulled again by any reasoning, yet many things are assumed to be facts which are not facts. The fact here is merely that Mark's text contains united components of the secondary texts. But that these parts

should have come into being by means of a mixture made by Mark of the two other texts is not a fact, but only the explanation, and indeed the false explanation of the fact.

β) Every fact has a reason. We are in a position to think of all the reasons that can possibly be assumed from the one assumed here, and none of these reasons takes place, namely, the text's own incompatibility with each of the reasons thus added to it is a datum to be developed from itself.

440

c) For that mixture, prepared by Mark himself, could only be either a voluntary (intentional) or involuntary one, or it could finally be both at the same time; we understand the latter in such a way that Mark - in reading both writers, peering out of one "with glances (as Paul's commentary often says) into the other" - took what struck him out of one and the other, and so threw his text together, as it were. Now, in order to remain stubborn about this last of the imagined possible cases, it would be extremely speculative,

α) that Mark should not at the same time have taken up some of the peculiarities of the secondary texts, that which belongs to the characteristic features of their style of writing or is connected with their individual treatment of the text, or how the taking up could have happened without the latter happening at the same time. And yet it is a fact, as only something can be a fact, that Mark's text has nothing of the peculiarities of Matthew and Luke in expression and presentation. But in general Mark probably needs

β) does not need any defence at all against the fact that he has taken his relation from others. - The moderation of his treaty, both where precision and completeness are important, so that purpose and execution correspond to each other, is evident enough, and if examples were to be given, we would only have to recall his presentation of the pericope u. 16. So we could not speak of picking out, but only of selecting. And even so we do not bring reason and consequence together. Mark would have to

441

α) have wanted to supplement one of his secondary writers from the other, or to unite both relations in one extract. But if he had had the supplies of the secondary evangelists before him, this could either not have been his purpose at all, or if it had been, the author would not have been able to carry it out as he is said to have done. As for the abbreviation of the addition (as well as the abbreviation), we refer to what has been said above under Datum 12, and the proof that it could not have been Mark's plan to

epitomize the relations of the two co-tellers or to unite them in one excerpt, we take from the following:

κ) both secondary writers sometimes give the more detailed speech with the same words in one and the same piece (as n. 1. and n. 14.), or the same words in different places (as, for example, n. 20.). Why does Mark not keep to that in which both agree? "He wanted to abbreviate!" but he should also want to combine? But it is true that he wanted to abbreviate, because one can say that he would have had to abbreviate further if he had wanted to express the common text. But there are also 2) places in the relations, where the two speakers do not sort the speech equally; and where Mark likewise prolongs the speech without harmonizing with either of them- This case occurs in n. 49. Matth. 24:37. Luk. 21:34. Why, then, did not Mark here combine both relations by means of an extract, or make a composition of them? \*) "He would not do it here, but he did it there" is no answer for us, because we do not admit that he did it there. How can one want to explain Jcinand's action from a maxim which he does not reveal to have had by unambiguous signs?

\*) We are not yet speaking of the Protestant writings as a whole, otherwise the objection and the proof would have to be extended much further. Hug's Einleit. If Mark had taken Matthew and Luke as the basis of his writing, and had wanted to "unite" both together in one essay, he would have had to have proceeded quite differently, or vice versa, from his conduct such a thing cannot be perceived, if the writer's striving must otherwise be appropriate to his intention."

442

β) Mark sometimes agrees literally with the others where no intentional reading out of the expression can be assumed. For example, in n. 49, Mark. 13:35. have his γρηγορεῖτε οὖν skimmed off from the floods of the Matthaean discourse (Matth. 24:42. 44.), or his ἀπόδημος (Mark 13:34.) formed after Matth. ἀποδήμων (25:14.)? Or, in order to form the account of n. 20., is he to take Matthew before him, and from the relation of the latter to form nothing but the general expression παραγγελας (Matth. 10:5.) excepted, and to this expression his ζα! παρήγγίλε (Mark 6:8.), that he might improve on Luke's account, which is to be copied, its και εἴπι (Luk. 9:5.)? But we might, to have more of the incredible, ask still further: shall the same epitomator at -n. 49. when he had got as far as Matt. 24:9. have now all at once come to a standstill, and, bearing misgivings about taking up the following text from Matthew, or even about looking into Luke, have turned backwards and copied off Matt. 10:17 - 22? We could ask even more if the sajjiemi sat did not forbid it \*). But one may only

\*) Casually, what Paulus Conservator. p. 75: "In his foundation (i.e. in the texts of Matthew and Luke) he (Mark) deliberately changes some expressions, sometimes in order to choose a more appropriate expression, sometimes in order to remove something rough from the style. For it is he who improves the expression of his predecessor, and grinds away the roughness, as the following passages show:

n. 18th mark. 5:23. ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθήῃς — cf. Matt. 9:18. ἀλλὰ εἰλθὼν ἐπίθεῃς κ. τ. λ. Also: n. 54. Mark. 14:49. — ἀλλ'ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί— cf. Matt. 26:56. τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον νένονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ νραφαί τῶν προφητῶν. — n. 42 a. Mark. 11:32. εἰπὼμεν — εφοβοῦντο τὰν λαόν — cf. Matth. 21:26. correcting the consequent in: εφοβοῦντο τον ὄχλον. — n. 20th mark. 6:10 ὅπου εἰς οἰκίαν. Matt. 10:11. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν (πάλιν ἡ κώμην Luk. οἰκίαν). — n. 49th mark. 13:24. ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν — cf. Matt. 24:29. εὐθεὺς δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων.—n. 1 Matth. 3:13. says: παραγίνεται Ἰησοῦς — ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Mark. 1, 9. on the other hand: καὶ ἐγένετο — ἦλθεν (that is, to grind down the roughness of the expression?) Further: Mark, also, εἶδε οὐρανοὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν. Matthew more definite: ἀνέωχθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρανοί (that is supposed to be more Hebrew-trendy?) — Matth. 3:4. again more definitely than Mark: εἶχε τὸ ἐνδύμα — ἡ δὲ τροφή αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. (that is supposed to be Hebraic? and Mark with ἡ δὲ ἐνδεδυμένος κ. τ. λ. is said to have "revised how it became more readable for his gracious readers"?— If only the critics had looked at 2 Kon. 1:8., to see the source of the expression and to convince oneself of its originality. And the author of the Isagogue was able to copy these notes, of which not a single syllable is true! The passages where Matthew corrects the text of Mark, see above p. 412 .)

γ) take a closer look at the passages previously given as examples of the mixture, in order to have clear proof that the combination of the words used in the other texts cannot be based on any intentional selection. Mark would not be an abbreviator, nor an epitomator, nor an excerptor, but — castrator of the secondary texts, or what else should one call the mangle of the borrowed sentences and the mangle of the mutilated? and this idea would exist with the idea of a reasonable writer? and could it be said without accusing the level-headed author, who far surpassed his fellow referees in accuracy, of nonsense and frivolity? What should have induced Mark to play with the expressions of his informants and to decide to make a mishmash of their words? Was he striving for originality like that? But then he would have changed other things in the same way, and he would not have provided us with payment pieces that are the same as the ancillary entries, like copies of the original (e.g. n. 28. n. 42 a. u. a.). Or could Mark not create an account without appropriating words from the other texts? His

representations of n. 13. n. 14. n. 30. n. 7. (Mark. 1:35 - 39.) - n. 8. (Mark. 1:45.) - n. 16. (Mark. 4:26-29.) show the opposite. Or did he go by the other reports because it was a question of rendering spoken words? But then he would have had to depend entirely on one or the other informant: what could justify him in mutilating the words of the speakers and making a new mixture out of them? So there is nothing left but to take the combination for a coalition that had involuntarily formed from them in Mark's memory when reading the ancillary texts. But this suspicion can scarcely last a minute. How should it?

444

α) happened with such an unconscious imprint in the memory that this imprint is based on precisely that quantity of text from which the additions and insertions made by the other editors were excluded? And why

β) the favorite phrases and formulas of Matthew and Luke, belonging chiefly to these writers, or such solemn and emphatic expressions as Matth. 18:6. 24:31. 26:63. 18:1. etc. not pressed at the same time as abgc-? or how about it

γ) it came about that expressions which allow the two subtexts to be heard at the same time (see p. 295.), and which therefore had to have an effect on the receptive reader or listener with redoubled force, did not stick in his memory like some others, which only one of the two original texts has? But now look at all

δ) self-awareness and consideration emerge far too clearly from Markus Relation to appear composed of accidental memories. So Mark would probably have put their texts in front of him and weighed them against each other, since he is supposed to improve the others from time to time. How could this inconsistent and unplanned combination, this jumping back and forth from one text to another, have come about? Of course, once it is presupposed, in a completely natural way, as happens "when one reads a story which one wants to retell. In the main passages one has then kept the line of thought and expression precisely in one's memory, or even looks it up again. In unimportant parts of the speech one does not stick to the words of the previous narrator without paying attention to them. One varies unintentionally, not in order to produce a seemingly diverse author's product, or to hide one's informant" (Paulus Konservat. p. 75.). But if that is the nature of the matter, it becomes a new riddle that Mark 1. He would have completely forgotten the main passages Matthew 3:7 - 10 - Luke 3:7 - 15 and Matt v. 12. Luke v. 17 and not The secondary parts of the speech - and among them will probably be some of what one of the previous narrators left out - had attracted his special attention. E.g. in v. 18 Luke 8:49, 50. n. 17 .Luke 8:35, 36. "One varies unintentionally."

But is it also possible to unintentionally fall from one text to another when you have them in front of you and want to make improvements? And is e.g. B. n. 49. Mark. 13:9 — 13. an unintentional variation of Luke? — We can therefore assume neither arbitrariness nor its opposite in the alleged mixture without Markus Text himself convicting the assumption of inconsistency. Now what do the defenders of the hypothesis do, because they get away with none of the accepted principles? They assert all three, as they are quoted, as they have to explain them—a new mixture, as they mix the original and the non-original in the text. — Just a remark about some examples of the alleged mixture given in the list because they are borrowed from the reflection formulas; and so nothing has yet been noticed about them and their kind. The passages after 7th mark. 1:32. n. 8th mark. 1:42. are meant to be a mixture of their subtexts. You don't believe that. Had the former place been given its form by such a mixture; so would Mark also chap. 14:17. the formulas *δψίας δέ γενομένης* (Matt. 26:20.) and Luk. 22:14. *δτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα* have mixed. Mark's statement is just as original as chap. 16:2. *λίαν προῖτης μιας σαββάτων* also from Luke 24:2. (*τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, ὀρθρον βαθέως*) recognized. Matthew and Luke only expressed the statement here more simply—the former because it is generally more vague in such statements, the latter (chap. 4:40.) because it avoids apparent tautologies. The expression: *δτε εδου ὁ ἡλως* is exactly the same addition as Mark. 14:12. *δτε ἐθυον το πᾶσχα*. How is it that the subtexts came together in a combination that Mark would have done without them? But in the passage just quoted, Luke 22:7 has. same duality. — The other passage 1, 42. should be a mixture. Again, don't believe that. *ἐχαθαρίσθη* has a completely different subject in Mark (scil. *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*) than in Matthew, who connects it with *ἡ λίπτρα*. Mark also does not write: *χαί ἀπηλθεν ἀτί αντοῦ χαί ἐκαθαρίσθη ἡ λέπτρα, ἡοφ χαί ἐχαθαρίσέλη χαί ἀ πηλθεν ἀπαντοῦ ἡλέπτρα*; but he closes with *ἐχαθαρίσθη*, and this refers back to the preceding *χαθαρίσθητι* in the constant manner of our representations. compare Mark. 1:17. *δεντε δπῖσω μου*, then: *καὶ ἡκολονθησαν αὐτῷ*. Also: 1:25. *ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, then: *καὶ ἐξηλθεν ἐξ αντοῦ* 2:11. *εγείρει*, then: *χαὶ ἠγέρθη* and others, wherever the indication of the effect coincides with the purpose indicated above. Matthew and Luke give the expression less fully, and have departed from the spirit of our narratives. (For Luke's text see the passages above on p. 410.) So much now for the mixtures and the mixing method in general.

446

d) We do not flatter ourselves that we can convince all friends of the opinion we dispute by the evidence of another; on the contrary, we are convinced that even the clearest proofs will be regarded by some as errors and misapprehensions rather than as correct observations. But how now? Is it in itself more probable that Mark's text is, as is supposed, a mixture made from the other Gospels, than that the appearance of it has



arisen only because the other speakers have altered the original text? is that, I say, more credible in itself than this? Not at all! On the contrary, the riddle is solved far more easily by the truth. - For it is comprehensible, for example, how one of our authors could have substituted a synonymous expression for the one given in the common pre-text; but it is not comprehensible how the writer who had two models before him should have dropped an expression from one of the texts he had hitherto recorded, and instead borrowed the synonymous one from the other text, which he had hitherto taken less into account. It is also understandable how a writer could introduce a variation in the middle of a sentence and thereby transform unity into division; but it is not understandable how someone could have wanted to make a mixed one out of two texts by breaking off one and then replacing it with the words of the other. It is understandable how one speaker could clarify or obscure the given expression; but it is not understandable how one who had the choice between two modes of expression should have forgiven the clearer one the mindcrdcut one. Further, it is understandable how two writers vary a text in such a way that one omits from the text and the other expresses it differently; but it is not understandable how one who had two such texts before him should have filled the gap left by the one from the other without at the same time taking up its expression. It is comprehensible how two writers could change a pre-text even in one sentence, each between particular words; but it is not comprehensible how one who had two parallel texts before him should have read out only a few words from two parallel verses, from the one and the other sometimes this, sometimes that, in order to make a verse with a different wording. It is finally comprehensible how, of two writers reproducing one and the same original narrative, one could remain faithful to the original type through several periods, and the other could express the same sentences differently, and how the former could then begin to deviate from the given expression, while the latter, after his deviation, returns to it again; But it is not comprehensible how the excerptor should all at once leave the writer, whom he followed through several series of sentences, and now, for the sake of only a few words, turn to one of whom he seemed to know nothing before. And who should now expect us to choose the incomprehensible instead of the comprehensible, or to close our eyes for the sake of the latter to undeniable facts that can be "invented in the text itself? But we still have to bring to light a datum which, although it initially only provides information about a narrative whole, can be used to draw conclusions about the whole relationship under investigation here. This is the following

As in the account of the Last Supper Mark does not harmonise with that part of the account which is Luke's own creation, so also that part with which he harmonises is not Luke's creation.

a) The account of the Last Supper (n. 53) consists of two parts, the first of which tells of the commission given for the preparation of the Passover, the other of the Passover meal and the words spoken by the Lord. In the first part of this account Mark agrees with Luke, much less with Matthew, in the second part the agreement is only between him and Matthew. Did Mark borrow the first part of the account from Luke and the second from Matthew? Not at all, and this is a circumstance that attracts our attention in particular. We already have the correct explanation of the phenomenon. For as far as the first part of the account is concerned, the reason lies in the fact that only Mark and Luke agree more exactly in Matthew, who, as his own words reveal (cf. above p. 377), has here shortened the original text, and with regard to the second part it has been shown (p. 414) that and why Luke has given the account a peculiar imprint, betraying his hand. For this reason, however, we can say in regard to this second part: Mark does not agree with that which is Luke's own creation. We only use the expression in this way because we can conclude from it that the first part, in which Mark agrees with Luke, did not first receive its expression through Luke. The latter is indeed confirmed, and that is what is to be proved here. Namely

449

b) if one compares this piece with n. 39, one will soon become aware by the same features of the presentation that both pieces must be by the hand of one and the same author.

|                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| n. 39. Matth. 21:1. Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγιβαν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα                                                                                      | Mark 14:12 καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἄζυμων ὅτε — ἔθουν.                                                    |
| ἀπέστειλε δυο μαθητάς (Mark and Luk. δυο τῶν μαθητῶν) λίγων αὐτοῖς (Luk. εἰπὼν comp. 9:22. 5:13. Mark: 11:2. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς as here). | 13. Καὶ ἀποῦτέλλει δυο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ                                                                 |
|                                                                                                                                         | καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς '                                                                                       |
| πορευθέντες (Mark and Luk.: υπάγετε) εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν, Now the characteristic is given:                                  | υπάγετε εἰς τὴν πάλιν (Luk. 22:8. πορευθέντες -). Just so here Matth. - Now the characteristic is given: |
| καὶ εὐθέως (Μαρκ: καὶ εὐθέως εἰς πορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτήν. Luk.: ἐν ἡ εἰς πορευόμενοι) εὐφράσεται - δεδεμένον                              | καὶ (Luk. 22:10. adds here as there: εἰς ἐλθόντων ὑμῶν).                                                 |

|                                                                                      |                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Mark u. Luke: πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεις ἀνθρώπων ἐκαθισε); now the imperative: | ἀπαντηθεὶ ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὑδατος βαστάζων. now the imperative:              |
| Λυσαντες αὐτόν ἀγαγετε. - When that has happened, what then to observe further.      | ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ. - When this has happened, what then to observe further:         |
| 3. Καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τι                                                          | 14. καὶ ὅπου ἐάν εἰσέλθῃ, (Luk. 22:10. only connected the words differently here). |
| ερεῖτε- - (the words follow)                                                         | εἶπατε (Luk. ερεῖτε) τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ (the words follow) ,                           |
| καὶ εὐθεὺς αὐτόν ἀποβτελεῖ ὡδε (von Luk. weggelassen, s. oben S. 409.)               | 15. καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει - ἐστρωμένον.                                            |
| Mark. 11:4. ἀπήλθον δε κα' ἐνρον τον πῶλον (δαί. ἀπελθόντες ευρον.) —                | 16. καὶ ἐξήλθον — καὶ εὗραν καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς                                     |
| καὶ λνονδιν αὐτον (cf. above λνῦαντες ἀγάγετε).                                      | καὶ ἡτοίμαβαν το πάσχα.                                                            |

450

Now, the first of the compared narratives (n. 39.), according to the same version, gives the referents to all three. So what Mark seems to have borrowed from Luke alone in the second place (namely, in the place of the second account), he also borrowed from Matthew in the first place. Who was the first to connect the sentences in both pieces in the same way? If Luke is to be the original author of the second report, he would also have to be the author of the first, and it would therefore have to be assumed that Mark and Matthew are both - directly or indirectly (one through the other) - derived from Luke. But this assumption cannot be carried out. For among Luke's reports, it is precisely his own accounts with which the reports of the others do not harmonize, as the parallels of n. 7 (Luk. 4:42 - 47.) n. 16 (Luk. 8:1 - 15.) n. (Luk. 9:7 - 9.) n. 36 (Luk. 18:31 - 34.) n. 49 (Luk. 21:11 - 28.) n. 53 (Luk. 27:14 - 19. 24 - 38.) and others prove. We have this proof already in the first of the two accounts compared here, Luk 19:36 - 44. But as here certain phrases peculiar to Luke v. 37. 38. difference, so Luke's treaty also omits phrases which the original writer will certainly have expressed, and which the re-narrator, according to a special custom, has only omitted-namely, v. 31. καὶ εὐθεὺς ἀποστελεῖ ὡδε and v. 34. καὶ ἀφήκαν αὐτοῦς (comp. above. p. 409.). Matthew, however, cannot be the original author, because he did not remain faithful to the spirit of the exposition in the second piece (namely, in the place of Matth. 26:18.), although in both pieces he shows a similar manner in that he abbreviates what is given. Compare Matth.

21:6. -- και ποιησατες καθως προζιτάξιν αυτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, and 26:18. και εποίησαν - ως συνετάξεν αυτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. - What will result from this, and what can result? Nothing but this: either Mark is the predecessor of the others, or the reports of the speakers are based on one and the same original report, more or less modified by them. Here we come back to the result that earlier investigations have already led us to, whereby the existing relationship of the parallel texts to each other, namely that Mark at the beginning of the second report Mark 14:12, is not the same as Mark at the beginning of the second report Mark 14:12, is not the same as Mark at the beginning of the second report Mark 14:12. 14:12. is not harmonised with Luke as in the following verses, but more with Matthew.

451

After this discussion, let us take a look back at the path we have taken in our investigation. After the original dimensions of the texts had been determined, we set ourselves the task, after page 304, of comparing the parallel pieces more precisely within their original scope. This comparison was made and carried through the series of the same pieces, which had been quantitatively altered. The result here, as above in the determination of the measurements, turned to the side of Mark. Far from this writer having made an excerpt from the mixtures of others, or a mixture and combination of two copies of the identical, he rather gives us the purest expression, as well as the correct measure, of the original Greek text, which the speakers all had before them. This, then, has resulted from the comparisons. But we have not yet compared the copies of all the orations: one strange genre is still lagging behind. These are the pericopes n. 1 and n. 14, in which Matthew and Luke extend the speech beyond Mark's text with words that agree with each other. These pieces are strange because they seem to be instances against our result. For what in two copies of the same piece is a part of the speech connected with it, and has the same expression, should it not also belong to the original text? and on this condition - what could Mark's shorter text be but an abbreviation or an excerpt? We promised above, p. 345, that we would pay special attention to the pieces now mentioned. It is now time to consider them. However, they do not contradict our view, for the following is the date.

452

Twentieth Datum:

In one of the speeches, which Matthew and Luke extend beyond Mark's text with concordant words, Mark himself makes it clear that he did not have a longer text before him, and in both of them the encounter of Matthew and Luke in the extension of the

|                 |          |                                                                                                                                                      |                                                             |                                            |              |                                |           |                            |                                                    |              |           |                     |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|---------------------|
| n. 8            | Mt 8:4   | ορα, μηδενι ειπης, άλλα ύπαγε (the following from both Mt. and Lk. at the same time up to) Lk 5:14 περί τού καθαριδμού σου (the following from both) |                                                             |                                            |              |                                |           |                            |                                                    | = Mk 1:14    |           |                     |
| n. 10           | Mt 9:14  | δια_τί                                                                                                                                               | ημεις και οι φαρισαιοι νηστευομεν πολλα                     |                                            |              |                                | οι δε     | μαθηται σου ου νηστευοθαι; |                                                    | = Mk 2:18.   |           |                     |
|                 | Lk 5:33  |                                                                                                                                                      | οι μαθηται ιωαννου νηστευουσι (πυκνα και δεησεις ποιουνται) |                                            |              |                                |           | σοι εσθιουσι και πινουσι;  |                                                    |              |           |                     |
| Fu<br>rth<br>er | Mt 9:15  | μη                                                                                                                                                   | δυνανται οι υιοι                                            |                                            | του νυμφωνος | νηστευειν εφ οσον              |           | ο νυμφιος μετ αυτων εστι;  |                                                    | = Mk 2:19    |           |                     |
|                 | Lk 5:34  |                                                                                                                                                      | δυνασθε τους υιους                                          |                                            |              | ποιησαι νηστεθειν εν ω         |           |                            |                                                    |              |           |                     |
| Fu<br>rth<br>er | Mt 9:17  | ουδε βαλλοθαι                                                                                                                                        |                                                             | οινον νεον εις ασκ. παλαιους ει δε μη (γε) |              | ρηγνυνται οι ασκοι             |           | και ο οινος                | εκχειται                                           | .... αλλα    | βαλλουσιν | εις ασκους καινους. |
|                 | Lk 5:37  | και ουδεις βαλλει                                                                                                                                    |                                                             |                                            |              | ρηξει ο οινος νεος τους ασκους |           |                            | εκχυθησεται                                        |              | βλητεον   |                     |
| n. 11           | Mt 12:2  | ιδού. οί μαθηται σου ποιούσιν                                                                                                                        |                                                             |                                            |              | ο ουκ εξεστι ποιεν             |           |                            | εν                                                 | τω σαββάτω   |           | = Mark 2:24         |
|                 | Lk 6:2   | τι ποιείτε                                                                                                                                           |                                                             |                                            |              |                                |           |                            |                                                    | τοις σαββασι |           |                     |
| Fu<br>rth<br>er | Mt 12:4  | πως                                                                                                                                                  | είζηλθεν εις τον οικον του θεου .... προσθεσ εως            | εφαγεν                                     | ους ουκ      | εξόν ην αυτώ                   |           | φαγειν. ει μη              | τοις ιερέυσι μόνοις                                |              |           |                     |
|                 | Lk 6:4   | ως                                                                                                                                                   |                                                             | ελαβε και εφαγε                            |              | εξεστί νομω                    |           |                            | μονούς τους ιερείς, και εδωκε και τοις μετ' αυτού; |              |           |                     |
| n. 16           | Mt 13:19 | ερχεται                                                                                                                                              | ο πονηρός κ. αρπάζει το εσπαρμενον εν τη καρδιά αυτού       |                                            |              |                                | = Mk 4:13 |                            |                                                    |              |           |                     |
|                 | Lk 8:12  |                                                                                                                                                      | ο διάβολος κ. αίρει τον λόγον από της καρδιας αυτών         |                                            |              |                                |           |                            |                                                    |              |           |                     |

|         |           |                                  |                           |                 |                                                    |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
|---------|-----------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------|----------------------------|--|---------|
| n. 20   | Mt. 10:11 | εις ην δ' άν πόλιν η κώμην       |                           | εισελθητε       | εξετασετε — κάκει μέινате εως άν εξελθητε.         |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
|         | Lk 9:4    | εις ην δ άν οικίαν               |                           |                 | έκει μένετε και εκείθεν εξέρχεσθε.                 |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
| n. 28   | Mt 16:26  | τι εάν κερδηση                   |                           | τον κοσμον ολον | την δε ψυχην αυτού ζημιωθη; η τί δώδει .... αυτού. |                                  | v.27 μέλλει γάρ ό υιός του άνθρωπον κ. τ. λ. |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
|         | Lk 9:25   | τί κερδησας                      |                           |                 | εαυτόν δε άπολεσας η ζημιωθείς; missing            |                                  | v.26. ός γάρ άν επαΐσχυνη κ. τ. λ.           |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
| n. 35   | Mt 19:16  | τί                               | ποιησώ ίνα εχω            |                 | ζωην αιωνιον;                                      |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
|         | Lk 18:18  |                                  | ποιησας κληρονομησω       |                 |                                                    |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
| n. 42 b | Mt 21:37  | Mk 12:6 ετι ουν ενα υιον εχων    |                           |                 | Ύστερον δε απεστειλε προς αυτους.                  |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
|         | Lk 20:13  |                                  |                           |                 | πεμψω τον υιόν μου τον αγαπητόν.                   |                                  |                                              |                  |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
| n. 43   | Mt 22:16  | οιδαμεν οτι                      | αληθης ει                 |                 | και ου μελει .... ουδενος                          | ού γαρ βλεπεΐς εις .... ανθρωπων |                                              | και εν αληθεια   |                  | την οδον του θεου διδασκεις |  |            |                            |  |         |
|         | Lk 20:22  |                                  | ορθως λεγεις κ. διδασκεις |                 | missing                                            | και ου λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον        |                                              | αλλ' επ αλητείας |                  |                             |  |            |                            |  |         |
| n. 44   | Mt 22:31  | περί δέ τής ανσπτάσεως των νεκων |                           |                 | Mk 12:26 cf n. 7                                   |                                  | Mt 8:16 οφιας δε γενομενης                   |                  | Mk 1:32 cf. n. 8 | Mt 8:3                      |  | και ευθεως | εκαθαρι σθη αυτου η λεπτρα |  | Mk 1:42 |
|         | Lk 29:37  | οτι δε εγειρονται οι νεκροι      |                           |                 |                                                    |                                  | Lk 4:40 δυνοντος                             |                  |                  | Lk 5:13                     |  |            | η λεπτρα απηλθεν απ' αυτου |  |         |

|                              |             |                                        |                                  |                                                      |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| n.<br>55                     | Mt<br>26:71 | και ουτος ην μετα 'Ιησου του ναζωραιου |                                  | Mk 14:69 S. more Mk 10:29.30, 12:14.26 (cf. 6:35.36) |
|                              | Lk<br>22:58 | και συ                                 | εξ αυτων ει                      |                                                      |
| Combinations of other kinds: |             |                                        |                                  |                                                      |
| n.<br>35                     | Mt<br>19:21 | τι επι υστερς;                         | Mk εν σοι υστερει                |                                                      |
|                              | Lk<br>18:22 | εν σοι λειπει                          |                                  |                                                      |
| n.<br>49                     | Mt<br>24:1  | επιδειξαι αυτω τας οικοδομας του ιερου |                                  | Mk 13:1 ιδε ποταπτοι λιθοι και ποταπται οικοδομαι!   |
|                              | Lk<br>21:5  | οτι λιθοις καλοις κεκοσμηται           |                                  |                                                      |
| n.<br>42<br>b                | Mt<br>21:34 | λαβειν τους καρπους αυτου              | Mk 12:4[sic. corr. 19] ἵνα λάβῃ. |                                                      |
|                              | Lk<br>20:10 | ινα δωσιν απο του καρπου               |                                  |                                                      |

speech would not have occurred if Matthew had not offset the original text with later additions.

a) Not in the pericope n. 1. 1, but certainly in v. 14.

α) Mark himself indicates that he had no longer text before him than that which he had expressed. Let us now consider this passage. Where does this indication lie? First of all, we ask you to look at what has been noted above, p. 193, about the context of the argumentation expressed by Mark. The second sentence of the same, by which it intends to prepare the conclusion, contains nothing more for its premise than the sentence: No one can take anything from the strong unless he first overcomes him. In this, Jesus overcame Satan through a superior power, but that this power was the power of God was not actually said. (Matthew and Luke are clearer on this point, of which we shall speak later.) If, according to Mark, the exalted speaker is said to have gone directly from here to the statement that he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit receives no forgiveness, then this statement, because it was not properly motivated, was not sufficiently comprehensible. But this is precisely what the narrator himself felt. What does Mark do? He adds an explanatory note to the saying v. 30. και ποιησατε ως προς ταυτα

αυτοις ο Ιησους, by which it is to be made clear, partly what the saying refers to, partly why the expression πνεύμα ακάθαρτον (opposed to: πνεύμα άγων v. 29. is used. Had belonged to the argument that member which Matth. 12:27. 28. incorporated it; so Mark would as little have appended the remark mentioned, as that, his secondary narrator. - But now let us also show that

453

β) Matthew inserted that part of the argument only later.

κ) was reminded earlier that the verse Mark. 3:27. - Matth. 12:29. expresses nothing more than the idea of a power superior to Satan. The inference to the power of God is, however close it may be, a later moment. Matthew, however, according to his habit of putting similar things together, reverses the moments. The declaration that Jesus casts out demons by God's power he prefixes to the sentence that a superior power is required, and the latter is supposed to be the affirmation of the former, if it were doubted. This in itself would still be sufficient. But now the preceding statement is itself only a conclusion from another premise which preceded it, by which it was already sufficiently and clearly proved: Jesus casts out devils by Beelzebul as little as the Jewish exorcists. If the contrast to this is: he casts them out by the co-operation of God,



- why should this only be proved by another proposition, namely, from the fact that one must be superior to the devil if one casts him out? But notice further

β) that in that text from which Matthew has taken the interpolated, the proposition that Jesus casts out devils by God's power, in so far as it is opposed to an impossibility (Matt. v. 27.), is in part already taken as proved, and in part, for this very reason, is subordinated as a basis to another conclusion, the conclusion: that then the reign of God among men has already taken hold, v. 31. Is it now a very natural connection of ideas, if the conclusion is put aside again, and the proposition, from which, as from one already admitted, it was further concluded, is first itself to be proved again, and that by a general one? It will perhaps be objected that in Luke, too, the explanatory speech of overcoming the strong follows those sentences. It follows, indeed, but in a quite different form. It does not form a proof that the devil is overcome by God's power, but speaks of the distribution of the spoils after the conquest (see above, p. 195). Here these expositions cannot be made,

454

Luke's text thus proves that those verses: Matth, v. 27. 28. to a verse, expressed as Mark. 3:27., do not belong. But further

γ) one also sees that Matthew wants to fill in by those verses what seemed to him to be incomplete in a text such as Mark's. He wants to fill in Jesus' saying about Mark. He wants to fill in Jesus' statement about the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. He wants to motivate Jesus' statement about the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit (which Luke again does not have). This shows

aa) his διά τὸντο (Matth, v. 31.),

bb) he changes Luke's expression ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεόν \*) into the other: ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ because of v. 31. following: ἡ δὲ τὸν ἡγενηματος βλασφημία. Now if the more complete in Matthew is really an intercalation, then we have one more proof that Mark did not have a longer text before him than he himself gives.

\*) The words in Luke are the original ones. The original author wrote from the memory of Exod. 8:15. Jesus is to distinguish himself here from the Jewish exorcists by means of the expression by which in that passage the distinction is made between the power of magic and the power of God.

b) From what we have found here, we can draw conclusions with regard to the first part of n. 1. But there is again special evidence that what goes beyond Mark's relation in Matthew and Luke is a later addition to an earlier text. Let us take

κ) the addition *καὶ πυρὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου* Matth. 3:11. - Luk. 3:16. together with the following words which belong to it; so we have here a transformation of the speech of the Baptist into a threat, But the comparison which the Baptist makes between himself and the Coming One does not fit this, if this comparison is to be the expression of humility according to the original text. The Baptist, when he compares himself with one who will accomplish greater and more perfect things (in the pleasing sense), and instead of cleansing men with water, as he does, may rather use the Holy Spirit, - he may well, when he compares himself with the latter, use the expression that he is scarcely worthy to have his shoe-straps untied; but how could it be an expression of humility, if he should thus compare himself as the milder with the more severe and, as it were, the more fearful? How does John's assurance that the Messiah is the one who is much greater than he is, for the sake of his function, fit in with the announcement that the Messiah will execute the judgment? The Baptist must have made his serious rebukes and punitive sermons an analogy of the erection that the Messiah would bring about, in order to conclude a *mioori all msius*, to which, however, the expression that He, the serious one, (with all His severity) could hardly untie the laces of the coming one and place Himself in the lowest relation to him, is again not correct. So we see that Matthew and Luke have retained words from the original text which are not compatible with their enrichment of the text. No wonder that Mark does not have this richer text! But also

455

ב) that which precedes Mark's words from the Baptist's speech in Matthew and Luke (Matth. 3:7 - 10.) will be textual enrichment. This can already be concluded from the fact that in Matthew and Luke those words, which Mark also *rcserates*, are placed differently. But there is also other evidence. However, we want to speak only of Matthew. On his side it is quite clear that he has given the text a different form and direction through amalgamations. If we take his words in their entirety, they are nothing else than a threatening speech to the Pharisees (see v. 7), and at the same time an invitation to them to be baptised. Now the Gospel history assures us that the Pharisees were not baptized, Luk. 7:30. cf. Matth. 21:32, and therefore the speech of the Baptist told here would be a vain speech. But it is not in the spirit of the evangelical relations to give examples of exhortations which are said to have been spoken in vain; least of all will the original relation have had the purpose of setting up here, at the beginning of the Gospel, the type of such a vain speech. - Whoever wants more proof that what has been

described here in the text of Matthew as a later compilation and combination of the interpolator is really interpolated, should compare the transitional formula Matth. 3:7. with 5:1. 8:18. and the interpolated punitive speech 3:10. with chap. 7:19., furthermore 3:7. with 22:33., where the analogy is also only interpolated. - Thus Mark's text again asserts itself as - either the only original one or closer to the original one, and it will now become clear why the pieces now considered above p. 343. f. had to be separated out as pericopes of their own kind. Our investigation has now reached a limit. It is a fact proved on all sides that Mark did not draw from the secondary gospel writers. This is as clear as day, and we have to ask those who are interested in our investigation to convince themselves of the correctness of this result above all else, and not to believe a syllable, not even a word, of all the talk that is supposed to prove the opposite. What should now be taken into special consideration is the question whether the original text lies outside of Mark, that is, whether this evangelist either with his secondary authors at the same time, or these indirectly through him from another source, or whether it does not lie outside of him, and Mark is therefore himself the first concipient of the relations, from which the other speakers have directly drawn. Therefore, we still establish that datum which expresses the last characteristic feature of the relationship of our texts, and, just as it presupposes the previous data, also makes the dividing point at the end of them between the decided and the problematic.

456

#### Twenty-first Datum:

According to the interrelationship in which the parallel texts of the communicated orations are placed to each other, nothing stands in the way of the assumption that Mark is the original author of the narratives, except the additions by which his text is richer than the common text.

457

a) If we take a look at the series of data that have been established, and draw together what comes into account with them, they all unite in the proof that Mark himself could be the author of the original text. Above, the pieces were first reduced to an original quantum of content; but this quantum was contained in the text of Mark (see Dat. 7. n. 8.). Concerning the language idiom, according to which the original type of the parallel relations formed its expression, it was found that it was the Greek one (Dat. 14.); the original type can therefore have its origin in Mark. Matthew and Luke were found to have expanded the sentences of a Greek text, partly by incorporating them, and partly to have condensed them; but the very sentences which are the substratum of the

transformation still have their original form in the text of Mark. We noted that all copies are based on one and the same original type; however, the comparisons made showed that Mark's execution of the relation is in a more correct relationship to the tendency and purpose of its composition and structure than is the case with the other narrators.

Matthew and Luke sometimes vary in the same passage; but instead of Mark having taken something from one or the other and formed a third, these variations can only be explained and related to each other when they are based on Mark's expression (Dat. 16). The existence of the relation, the structure and purpose, the form and expression of it - to whichever of these we direct our gaze; Mark's account, where it is paralleled in the other Gospels, has the marks of originality before them. In addition, the spirit of his speech and presentation, where he writes alone, is the same as that which was represented in the archetype of the communal communications. It is permissible to remark only a few things about this.

κ) It is peculiar to Mark, before the other speakers, to mention the verbs ipsissims; e.g., n. 17, Mark 4:39. 4:39. σιώπα, πεφίμωσο, comp. 5:8. 9:25. 5:41. This way alone also the common relation follows. Mark. 4:35. (Luk. 8:22.) 5:12. (Matth. 8:31.) 5:23. (Matth. 9:18.) 5:41. (Luk. 8:35.) n. 8. 1:44. (cf. the parallel) 1:24. 27. (Luk. 4:34. 36.) n. 20. 6, 10. (cf. the parallel).

β) Mark loves distinctions and contrasts, n. 14. 3:26. αλλά τέλος έχει, comp. v. 29. 45. 5:26. 2:27. 6:5. 9. 9:37. 10:27. \*) But the common text also aspires to these; e.g. Mark. 1:22. ουχ ως οί γραμματεῖς (Matth. 7:29.) 3:29. (Matth. 12:31.) 4:17. (Matth. 13:21.) 33. (Matth. 13:34.) 5:36. (Luk. 8:50.) 39. (Matth. 9:24. Luk. 8:52.) 4:8. (Matth. 17:8.) 2:22. Luk. 5:38. Matth. 9:17.) 10:8. (Matth. 19:6. ) 14. (Matth. 19:14. Luk. 18:16.) 10:39. 40. (Matth. 20:22. 23.) 45. (Matth. v. 28.) 12:14. (Matth. 22:16. Luk. 20:21.) 12:25. (Matth. 22:30. 8:33. Matth. 16:24.

\*) The examples given in Echott's Isagoge p. 92. n. 9. are not correct, since the author has mixed up with them "those" passages which are not peculiar to Mark.

α) Mark is fond of repeating the words used just before in the continuation of his discourse, e.g. 2:27. 28. τοῦ σαββάτου st. αὐτόν in n. 14. 3:24. (βασιλεία) 25.(οικία) - n. 16, 4:15. σπείρεται, and εσμαρμένος. - n. 17. 5:15, 16. δαιμονιζόμενος). 6:37. before δότε, after καὶ δωμεν αὐτοῖς. 9:42, 14:3. This alone is also the manner of the common relation, which, of course, is commonly not noticed. See n. 10. 2:20. 22. ὁ οἶνος εκχεῖται as Matth. 9:17. - n. 14. Mark. 3:27. twice (Matth. 12:29.) 28. (Matth. v. 31.) - n. 15. 3:35. (same tautology Matth. 12:51.) - n. 16. 4:7. αἱ ακανθαι (Matth. 13:7.) 4:19. ῥον twice (Matth. 13:22.) 4:34. ἐλάλει (Matth. 13:34.) - n. 17. 5:27. ἤψατο and ἀψοί μαι (Matth. 9:21.) n. 28. 8:35. ψυχὴν twice (just so the subsidiary texts.) - n, 42, a. 11:28. ἐξουσία

(so also the subsidiary texts). 29. ερα υμῖν κ. τ. λ. comp. 33. οὐδε ερώ κ.τ. λ. (Matth. 21:24. 27.) - n. 42. b, 12:7. κληρονόμος and κληρονομιά (so also the subsidiary texts). - n. 49. 13:20. εκολόβωσε (Matth. 24:22.). - n. 53. 14:21, ὁ νιος τον ἄνθρωπον and ὁ ἄνθρωπος εκείνος (Matth. 26:24.). Compare still in n. 7. Mark. 1:29. 30. τον σίμωνος (Luk. 4, 38.)

459

τ) Mark loves inversions; e.g. ὁς - αὐτός, e.g. n. 28. 8:38. ὁς αν επαισχυνθη - και ὁ νιος τ. ἄνθη, επαισχυνθήσεται αὐτόν (Luk. 9:26. τούτον επαισχυνθήσεται). Perhaps 6:16. u. 36. τί φάγωσιν ουκ εχουσιν. 11: 24. But Matthew also has the same construction with Mark in n. 54. Mark. 14:44. = Matth. 26:48. ὃν αν φιλήσω, αὐτός κ. τ. λ. Likewise in n. 15. Matth. 12:50. and in n. 16. Mark. 4:25. cf. Luk. 8:18., in n. 20. Mark. 6:10. comp. Luk. 9:4. - Especially peculiar to Mark is the construction: ὅπου - εις οικίαν, κώμην, and the like; e. g. 2: 4. 6, 10. 55. But just so writes with him Matthew, Mark. 14:9. ὅπου αν - εις ὅλον τον κόσμον (Matth. 26:13. οπου - εν ὅλω τω κόσμῳ).

η) The orr, which is so often used in Mark before the speeches, sometimes occurs in the same place in Luke: Luk 8:40. 21:8.

ι) Mark likes to make the construction of the εἶναι with the particip; s. e.g. Mark. 13:25. 2:18. 5:21. but so also the communal text in n. 35. Mark. 10:22. Matth. 19:22. comp. Mark. 1:22. = Matth. 7:29. Matth. 21:57. - 15:40.

ρ) Especially frequent in Mark is the Adv. ευθέως. Matthew also has it often enough in the parallel passages; e.g. Matthew 13:5. (comp. 4:20. 22. 14:22. 20:34.) 21:2. (3.) -

η) It is noticed that Mark sometimes makes questions where the others do not (Schott's lssg. p. 92. 8.); e. g. Mark. 4:21. but herewith compare the common text in n. 10. Matth. 9:15. Luk. 5:34. and in n. 37. Matth. 20:22. Another kind of questions: 5:35. τί σκυλλεις; (Luk. 8:49. μη σκνλλέ) 39. τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; (Luk. 8:52. μή κλαίετε) 8:12. τί επιζητεί; (Matth. 16. 4. affirmative: επιζητεί). But the questions of this kind (by which it is made known how unnecessary the action is, and that commonly by adding assertive sentences from which the uselessness or unseemliness of the action results) also belong to the rhetoric of the common text. See n. 9. mark. 2:8. τί ὀιαλογίζεσθε; - n. 17. Mark. 4 40. τί δειλοί εστε οντω; - n. 27. 8:17. τίδιαλογίζεσθε; n. 51. 14:6. τίαυτη κόπους παρέχετε; (compare with these passages Matth.). And so perhaps still more characteristic features can be found, in which the similarity which Mark's own representations have with the common relations is just as noticeably expressed. But the perceptions of such similarities must strengthen the opinion that Mark himself was the

original author of those relations. However much this assumption may have in itself, we must at the same time mention what stands in opposition to it. And what will this be?

460

b) First of all, difficulties arise from the passages listed above, p. 205, where Matthew and Luke give words that agree with each other, which Mark does not express. For where does the literal agreement between these two come from? If the words are an outflow from the text used by all together, then this must have been outside Mark, because he deviated from it. - But this conclusion can be eliminated if the premise is changed, i.e., if it may be assumed that one of these two writers borrowed the expression from the other and implanted it in the original typical relation which he, as a re-narrator (like Mark), had to express. And could this not also have happened in this way? We have already been given hints as to how we should think of the connection between Matthew and Luke. Let us remember what has already been found.

κ) 14. Matthew amalgamated several sentences with the text of Mark, which have their appropriate connection, indeed, as we saw in one place, even the original expression, only in Luke. In n. 1, Matthew, by referring to the words of the Baptist with Luke, but changing them into an address to those who were not baptized, has caused an exposition by a deviation from Luke, contrary to the otherwise consistent report, which is not the fault of his secondary speaker. But just as he, as the narrator who deviates from the correct type, refers to himself as the re-narrator, so in other respects his relation to Luke's account, which conforms to it, is such that it may well be taken for an excerpt from it, although we do not yet wish to determine anything definite about this.

Consider, however, in what relation Matthew (or we want to say, the Matthaean compiler) again places himself to Luke in the treatment of the play n. 20. Matth. 10:9. enumerates the acceptable masses completely (as this speaker strives for completeness), gold, silver, brass. His secondary writers already had two masses, the one (Mark) the other (Luke) He unites and completes Both. And that which he adds to Mark's text in the following and draws from a secondary source, where is it found? again in Luke. In Luke it is a separate thing in itself, the same thing that in Matthew, just as it is added to another material by the hand of a compiling writer, separates itself by its nature as a special thing from the mixtures. But the suspicion that the Matthaean speaker may have borrowed from Luke is strengthened by other truths. Compare n. 12. with Luk. 14:1 - 6. Matthew here transforms the words used in the neighbouring texts Mark. 3:4. 3:4. Luk. 6:9. into an inference - from cases in which saving life was regarded without contradiction as something permissible, as cited Luk. 14:5. But by placing the ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, retained from the original text, between animals and men, the impropriety arises, that either the benevolence to be exercised against men is not

distinctly enough denoted, or, taken in this sense, is so detached from those examples of benevolence practised towards animals, as if it were something quite different, and that were not a ἀγαθοποίησις, - a difficulty into which that other narrative of Luke, in which those examples occur (Luk. 14:5.), does not involve. But Matthew has used other things from the same story, and again in such a way that one can see how he has made a new composition out of different parts. According to Luk 14:3, Jesus himself put the question to the Pharisees whether it was right to heal on the Sabbath before he heard the healing. In our narrative it is said, they (probably also the Pharisees,) observed Jesus whether he would heal on the Sabbath, and that ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτόν. Matthew retains these words, expressing the reflection of the narrator, and now, in doing this, but wanting to use the other narrative also, puts into the mouths of Jesus' opponents that question which Luk 14:3. was a question of Jesus, although it is clear enough from our narrative that the Pharisees did not want to know Jesus' opinion about the permissibility of such healings, but rather whether he undertook such things on the Sabbath. - But we find another passage in Matthew, where a mixture is made with the words of Luke, which cannot even be blamed on Matthew, namely in n. 16. Matth. 13:31. If this passage refers us back to Luk. 13:19. we must also notice a difference in the use of the same words. What Luke compares to the kingdom of God is given as historical: the kingdom of God is like a mustard seed, which a certain man sowed in his garden and which became a tree. But here, in the common relation (comp. Mark 4:31. 32.), it is not spoken of any mustard seed taken for sowing, but of the nature of the mustard seed, how it is the smallest, and, when sown, becomes (not became) a tree. Now this sense of the original text is likewise expressed by Matth. 13:32. with ἐστὶ and γίνεταί. This, then, is the proof that the words v. 31. ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος - αὐτόν, which to the following would demand not an ἐστὶ and γίνεταί, but an ἐγενετο, and instead of ὅταν αὐξηθῇ rather ἡνξήθῃ, as it is in Luke, do not belong in the text \*). But where else would the words be from than from the passage of Luke cited, where they occur in the same grammatical form? (ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος κ. τ. λ.) - From all these inductions the possibility will now probably arise that the above examples of special agreement between Matthew and Luke may have as their basis a conformation of the text made after the last. In this way, however, the objection taken from these examples against our assumption would be eliminated. What is it now that still stands in the way of this? If we consider everything, nothing more than the additions which Mark makes to the relation, and which the other speakers exclude on both sides.

\*) Again, an argument that Mark is not dependent on Matthew.

c) But of these additions we must also note that they permit a distinction. - We include

α) the smaller ones (see above p. 323.).

κ) Some of them certainly do not belong to the original text. Among these may be reckoned those in n. 11. (comp. p. 190.), further 4:7. and so 6:37. *θηναρίων διακοσίων*. Let these words be omitted, and then compare the following question of Jesus with the words of the disciples, and it will be seen (especially by the *και θα μεν αυτοις*) that the determination of the trouble to be taken, if any, could not have been intended at all in the construction of the words. (They are from Joh. 6:7. where they are in the appropriate context.) Further, in n. 20. 6:9. - in n. 49. 13:32. *ονδε ο νιυς*. (By *οι αγγελοι* is set vas highest. This is already betrayed by the *οιδε* after *ονδεις* - *ne angeli guidem*; - a double *ουδε* cannot have been intended in the construction of the sentence, apart from the fact that Jesus, when speaking out of his earthly circumstances, designates himself in Mark only as *νιος του ανθρωπου*, as also 13:26. But if the Son is to be thought of after his transition into the state of exaltation; then the gradations: *ουδεις* - *εν ονραι οις* become superfluous, and the distinction no longer fits. 1 - n. 53. 14:20. 14:30. (All the other Gospels have not this provision. But it also here omits the *H ä*/; from Mark cod. D., and the remarks on it Mark. 14:72. *εκ δευτερου* separate the codd. C. L. and Mark. 14:68. *και -- ειρωνησε* cod. L. out.) - n. 57. 16:7. *τω πετριμ* is only patched in after *μαθηταις*. Why should Peter be called special, and distinguished from the *μαθηταις*? (Note, by the way, that the commission is not both to report the resurrection that has taken place, but rather to indicate where Jesus would be found; *τη πικρω* is inserted out of consideration for Mark. 14:28.) But if these additions were not in the original text, it is always doubtful whether they were added to it by Mark, and whether they have Mark as their author. Of some we would rather deny this, and among them also of 1 Mark. 1, 7. (*χνησας*) for the reason that it is peculiar to Mark in the relation of the speeches to avoid the participial construction.

464

β) Other additions may be by Mark's hand, such as those in n. 9. 16. 28. 35. 44. 54. excellent. Can these not have been omitted by the other speakers? What

β) the larger ones, it would certainly seem that in n. 10. Mark. 2:19. does not belong to the original text. For why should the question have been raised beforehand, if the relation had been intended to express the same thing immediately afterwards in a negative sentence? Would not the answer have been immediately begun with the negative clause *ον δυνανται*, etc., as Mark 2:21? 2:21.? (The text intends here, as in the following examples, to distinguish between two things, namely, the time when fasting could not take place, and the opposite time when it could. The contrast only has its



force when the opposing elements are placed directly next to each other, without one sentence being developed before the other or being made verbose. Thus the addition of v. 19. intervenes unwelcome). - Mark. 2:27. seems to belong just as little to the original text, although the sentence is connected with the following v. 28. and this connection with "He" also has an analogy in Mark 10:6. 10:6. To remark only a few things, it is not clear how the expression ὁ νίος τοῦ ἀθρ. would be used in the conclusion, if the premise had kept to the word. And then, according to that proving sentence (v. 27.), what is the καί before σαββάτον? (apart from the fact that the latter is already communicated something conspicuous by the repetition). It seems that the gnomes are not to be explained further. Luke hints at this by prefixing the καὶ ελεγεν to it, as to a note made in passing. - Mark. 10:30. the decision is difficult. After the explanatory note it seems as if Mark wanted to divide the εκατονταπλασίονα by means of a closer definition into a twofold, into that which is to be received here in the world, and eternal life. ("No one leaves - without receiving a hundredfold, namely here in this world this and that, and in the world to come eternal life"). But according to Luke (18:30.) the sentences are not to behave in this way; rather Luke refers the εκατονταπλασίονα merely to that which is to be received here in the world, which indeed seems more correct, since the expression is probably only intended to indicate a multiplication of that which was mentioned as being left. Mark's words can now also be taken in this way, if the comma is not placed after εκατονταπλασίονα, but only after ἐν - τούτῳ. But then the following words: οἰκίας - διωγμῶν isolate themselves even more to a mere addition. Now, on the one hand, it seems as if the ἑκατονταπλ. would remain too indefinite if the explanatory apposition were not added, but, on the other hand, one would like to suppose from the express singling out made in v. 29. that it was made precisely so that the ἑκατονταπλ. following it need not be explained further. It also appears that the original author, if such an addition should have been made to the words, would have sought to achieve clarity in a shorter way, for instance, by forming the expression as follows: ἢ τις ἀγῆκεν ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἴτε οἰκίαν εἴτε, and so on. s. w. ἀπολήψεται πάντα πάντα u. s. w. But what does not come from the original author, we do not need to derive from Mark. But if the addition really belongs to Mark, then it is not impossible that the others, drawing from Mark, have omitted it (especially since the Matthaean copyist has also followed Luke elsewhere, and Mark can therefore always be the writer from whom the relation has its origin \*). Among the great additions is the verse Mark. 11:10. in n. 39. is to be reckoned among the great additions. What is said of the others also applies to this one.

\*) The reading taken from Fritzsche's commentary Matth. 10:30: καὶ πατέρα καὶ μητέρα καὶ γυναῖκα cannot claim to be included. It is derived from copyists from whom Paulus Comment. 2 Th. p. 834. quite correctly remarks: the good people thought of substitutes in return. On the meaning of the passage, see our remarks above, p. 361. Jesus was so sure of the victory of his cause, because of his faith

in mankind, that, according to his conception, it required but a short time for the company of his confessors to expand to a great extent (Mark 4:32.). How could he not have rightly said that in his family covenant one would often find again all that one left to enter into it: fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, and also dwellings enough? Is the explanation which thus summarises his words supposed to be jejuna? Yes, jejuna would be the one who wants to plant in the developed speech again the v. 29. as it is, with πατέρα and μητέρα and even γυναίκα. - That explanation, moreover, is said to be false? and why? Nam quo tempore Iesus hoc pronuntiavit, apostoli de futuro Christianorum coetu ne suspicari quidem potuerunt. - So? What ruling of power decided this?

a) Will Jesus have explained to the disciples even more clearly than our Gospels tell us, what their destiny was, and how they were to influence the nation through teaching and instruction, i.e. how they were to gather a coetus of true confessors of the Messiah? The idea of such a coetus must not have been so remote to them,

b) Compare sayings like Mark. 13:10. 14:9. 4:32. Several more in the other evangelists.

466

d) Thus, as we have now seen, the additions under consideration are not decisive proof against the assumption that Matthew and Luke drew from Mark. If, however, together with others of their kind, which we have not yet been able to consider here, they should constitute an instance against the presupposition, let the result always remain that our evangelists, independently of one another, drew from a common source. Either this or that, then, is what contains the final answer to our question. Our development should have led up to the point (p. 288) where the final either-or emerges. Here we have it now; we find nothing further in the area granted to us, and a standstill therefore occurs for our investigation.

e) However, we would still have a quite incomplete and inadequate knowledge of our evangelical writings and their sources and of the relationship in which their authors placed themselves to one another, if we were to stop at this result, drawn from only one part of their content and wavering between two possibilities, and did not want to investigate their organisation more precisely and more deeply. Rather, we realise that even on some of the points on which the discussion has been made, a still brighter light must be shed if we are to have a firm and certain judgement. But our investigation so far has been of so much use to us that we have

1) we have arrived at results that cannot be overturned by the discussions that are still reserved. It has been proved

a) that our writers did not translate Hebrew originals, but that the original type of their relations was Greek. It is further raised to certainty

b) that Mark did not draw from the Nbcnevangelists; only that it is not yet clear whether he is not himself the original Revangeist to whom the others owe their relations. And

2) even this, that the question of controversy has been brought to this point, may be regarded as a gain which the investigation has procured for us. The really problematic has now emerged, and we know what we have to find out more about if the investigation is to be continued: just as the points have separated from one another on which we can be more brief, and on the discussion of which we must devote even more effort. Finally, however

3) we must also consider the speeches in themselves, so that we may see how our writers have treated the main material of the tradition they have received (cf. p. 177). There is no doubt that our comparisons will have revealed something about this. What has been found is entitled to be distinguished as a date in its own right. As we are about to complete this section of the investigation, we still have this last date to issue.

#### Twenty-second Datum:

The speakers have given full credence to the historical source they used, that Jesus really spoke the speeches referred to; but they have been of the opinion that the preliminary news did not deprive them of the liberty either to place these speeches in a different context, or to use other words instead of those given before, in order to express their meaning.

What results from the interrelation of the texts on this point, if it is to be fully expressed, cannot be summed up in any shorter expression than this. If we divide our consideration between the concordant and the divergent that occurs in our relations, we must,

however far the latter may extend and however often it may appear, nevertheless admit that

a) that the authors considered their model to be a credible account of the sayings of Jesus,

α) Of Mark, if he is not himself the original author of the unanimous report, it is immediately evident that he would have changed the least and handed down most faithfully what he had received.

β) Matthew strives for completeness of the materials. It is not important to him in what context and on what occasion the words spoken occur. It is enough for him that they are the words of Jesus, and that they remain so, however they are spoken. For this reason, he connects what is important with what is not, so that nothing is lost. Wherever he omits something from Jesus' discourses that he does not himself replace by other formulas, he inserts other authentic words, as he has borrowed them from another account. He thus also changes one speech for another (as in n. 16), but it is enough for him, or rather he strives to form a whole that consists of the Lord's words, whenever and on whatever occasion they may have been spoken. What he omits in one place, he adds in another. Even though this speaker may be a compiler, these compilations reveal the author's conviction that the components of his message are drawn from credible traditions.

γ) In Luke we notice that he does not omit anything from an account that he did not replace again, or of which he did not retain the essentials. At least this is his rule. In n. 1 he is over complete. In the pieces n. 8. - n. 12. he has left out nothing. Of n. 14. he gives a more detailed review - n. 15. he abridges the form of the narrative, but retains the essential content of Jesus' words (in Luk. 8:22.). Even though he makes changes in n. 16, he leaves the parable of the sower intact. Of the other parables belonging to it, if one takes Mark's text as a basis, his Gospel only lacks the comparison of the kingdom of God with a fruit that develops of its own accord from the seed once it has been sown, and which grows towards the harvest. Luke probably thought that the main idea underlying the comparison was also expressed in the other parable of the mustard seed growing into a tree (whereupon we have here again a sample of his way of avoiding apparent tautologies). - In n. 28, the wording concerns only a circumstance, namely that Peter wanted to dissuade Jesus from the declared intention, not Jesus' declaration itself. - In n. 29. the narrator omits the instruction given to the disciples, that Elias had already come in the person of the Baptist, but it had also already occurred Luk. 7:26 - 28. - n. 32. Since the warning of Jesus against self-seduction says nothing else than: get used to renunciations in order to preserve yourselves to eternal life, Luke did not

leave out anything but an instruction, which is often repeated in his gospel in different forms. Compare Luk 12:20 - 24. 14:26 - 35. - n. 36. (see above p. 342.) The words of Jesus contain only the description of the course of events, and Luke therefore believed that he could make them shorter. - In regard to the wording of n. 49, it has already been noted above, p. 342 f., how Luke substituted for what was omitted. - In n. 54, the same narrator omits the statement of Jesus that he was deeply grieved. The same narrator omits the statement of Jesus that He was deeply grieved (Mark 14:34.35.), and gives the description of Jesus' anguish in another place (Luke 22:46.). Since in the detailed account of Jesus' repeated return to the disciples, and to prayer, it is mentioned that the Lord always spoke the same words, Luke believed that he could simplify the account. - In the story of the crucifixion of Jesus, the narrator was just as at liberty to abbreviate the words of the mockers (Luk. 23:35.), since here it was less a question of the words themselves than of the content, and the general statement of the fact would also have sufficed. - Luke does not mention the words of the dying Saviour, which are mentioned in the corresponding texts, probably because they were used as an excuse for mockery, but he gives others instead, unknown to the secondary narrators. Thus Luke proceeds throughout \*). What else does he reveal in the care he has taken to omit what could not either remain or be replaced, than the conviction that the standard scripture he uses has a credible content and presents this content in an expression from which the Protestant historian must depart as little as possible? All our writers, then, at the same time, and each in a special way, give evidence that they ascribe full credibility to their historical source, and if we now consider this more closely, we can also draw a conclusion from it with regard to the external nature of this written source. It was said above, p. 177, that the speeches alone, considered in isolation, would not give us any information as to whether they were part of a single whole or of individual collections. Of course, they do not provide any decisive information about this; however, it is very likely that our authors, if they had drawn their information from various collections, perhaps originating from unknown compilers, would hardly have given their originals credit with so much resignation to their own literary freedom. But

\*) It may be noted in passing that Luke did not abridge because he presupposed existing knowledge of the matter (as Dr. Hug thinks, Einleit. L. Th. p. 171. 3rd edition). For as we have seen, Luke abbreviates and simplifies

a) according to method, namely, that which has the appearance of a tautology (i.e., without taking into consideration how the matter might be presented elsewhere).

b) Since he replaces what he omits, it follows that he wants to indemnify the readers for what he omits by means of extraneous information (such as that of

Matthew). We also remark subsequently on n. 53. that Luke's twice εσθιοντων αυτων Mark. 14:18. 22. offered itself for simplification, as in other passages where Luke has simplified, similar doublings, and that therefore our criticism, which excluded that which is interpolated from Paul, has for itself that Luke, instead of doubling, as is supposed to have happened in his relation to the cup (Luk. 22:17. 20.), rather "simplifies" and combines.

471

b) "our authors have always deviated from the standard script here and there, and even, as we have noted, significantly! - At this point we note that the expression "significantly" is relative. If it applies to diplomatic accuracy and fidelity to the copy, then the expression is in its place. But our authors did not make it their duty to do so. They looked more at the meaning of the speech than at the words and the expression. If we wish to explain to ourselves how they united accuracy and arbitrariness in one plan, we shall have the unifying thought when we say: our authors did not want to be the recounters of the words of Jesus, but the interpreters of his meaning, and therefore believed that they could clarify and explain these words at one time, and abbreviate or supplement them at another. And only on the assumption that this could have been the plan of our writers, can the origin of several Gospels be conceived from the root relation of an original writing that preceded them. If, then, there was such an original, its expression of the sayings of Jesus was not regarded by the retellers as a compelling standard, from which it may be concluded that this Scripture, when it was written, was not intended to give such a standard. - On the other hand, the author of such a writing, even if it had only been intended as a guide to evangelical preaching, would not have been able to make room for such compositions as those made by the Matthean speaker, who interweaves news from works that have been prepared and from various places into a whole. - The difference is that the author of the first writing, when he was conscious of having put everything into a certain expression, could hardly allow an extension of his work by another work, but later editors could mix works which they considered equally credible, in the opinion that they were so. - Our explanation of this must remain uncertain until we have considered the layout and disposition of our Gospels more closely. Therefore, we now set out to find what we might still be lacking in order to substantiate and complete our results, in the area where alone it can still be found.

---

## Of the second part

## Second section:

Data from the reflective aspect.

First, some preliminary remarks.

1) As soon as there was a reason to separate the mnemonic aspect from the substance of the evangelical accounts, the rest, which is contingent upon the narrator's agency, could only be distinguished under the name of the reflective aspect.

It is unnecessary to extensively discuss the manifold contribution that reflection, in general, had on the formation of the evangelical narratives. However, they possess such a nature and are so interconnected that the characteristics of the reflection incorporated into the narrative can be specifically identified. Specifically, if we consider all general statements as a whole that are used to carry out logical functions, whether in the categorization of the concrete into general concepts or in the formation of judgments and conclusions, or in the use of intermediary formulas that connect preceding and succeeding elements or in the exclusion of the thread of coherence for the purpose of further development of the discourse, then the following aspects stand out in our evangelical accounts as products of the reflection performed by the narrators:

473

α) the general statements and summary remarks preceding the specific accounts of events or the relation of certain speeches, which mark the external circumstances to which the facts or reported words are connected, and through which the specific elements are partly introduced, partly explained, and partly marked as a new specific moment in the progressive narrative;

β) the general concluding formulas attached to the individual narrative sections or those placed between the sections, which replace the lack of specific descriptions in order to maintain the historical connection. In particular, we will have to derive from the narrator's agency

γ) the narratives of facts because they are based on perceptions and moments of perception that could not become the content of a narrative without first being designated by concepts and ordered into a coherent structure. When shaping such



narratives, the connection and arrangement of moments and the teleological relationship that the account is intended to have are already the work of reflection. Moreover, what is noticeably separated from the objective aspect of the narrative is often what is merely the narrator's judgment, and thus undeniably the product of their reflection. And if the writer of the factual description occasionally adds or intermixes pragmatic remarks, it is the writer themselves who separates the subjective from the objective in the presentation without leaving this separation to the reader. Therefore, we see where our focus should primarily lie when drawing conclusions from the reflective content of the Gospels. However, if conclusions are to be drawn from this, the consideration needs to be further expanded. Specifically,

474

δ) even the quantification of the discourse conveyed in the speeches, insofar as its quantity is related to the narrator's purpose, appears as an expression of reflection (or reflective mental activity), just as any calculation of means for a purpose appears as such. Moreover, any speech conveyed by the historian, even if it is presented as something received by them, will have one of its conditions rooted in the reflection of the re-narrator, as it always relies on a particular selection of words from several words, even if it is not the narrator who must clothe the meaning of what was heard in specific words according to their own manner. However, it is undisputed that the narrator's own activity has played a role, especially when, as our evangelical storytellers sometimes do, they convey dialogues. In cases where such dialogues occur in reality, even if the narrator must clarify the meaning and context of the conversation through it and has been set, there usually exists an unorganized mass of words and speeches that need to be arranged. Therefore, the historian who is supposed to reproduce such a conversation must first delineate a territory and make various divisions and connections within it to create a coherent and cohesive whole. Finally, in our Gospels as a whole,

ε) the entire structure and arrangement, the limitation of scope to specific materials and their placement—thus, what matters most to us now—are to be regarded as works of reflection. The designation under which we intend to address the materials to be examined in the new part of the investigation, in contrast to the first part, is therefore fully justified. However, for the sake of this justification, we do not want to deconstruct the concept into its elements. The main point is rather

2) to assert and apply the psychological datum right at the beginning, before all other data, that in the expression of reflection, various writers cannot coincide without having a standard of agreement or being dependent on each other. Since reflection is the free activity of the mind, it individualizes itself in each individual and is carried out in each



person's own way. We therefore maintain, according to what has been called the characteristic of reflection, or the measure of reflection, in regard to our Gospels, that our writers, without having a particular standard of agreement before them, could not have disagreed

475

a) in all the general terms and propositions by which ideas are designated and summed up;

b) not in the summary statements preceding the specific introductions at the beginnings or in the middle of the narrative pieces, because these could undeniably be defined more narrowly or more broadly, and it has a different influence on the writing of such statements if the narrative is begun with the description of the event, or if a series of similar descriptions already begun is continued;

(c) in the general clauses and their succession, by which the description of a fact is carried out and completed; or

d) in the concluding and transitional formulas, by which the particular reports are excluded from the common context, because this context is founded in the outline of the whole, and thus has as its prerequisite a particular direction and entertainment of the reflection; just as little finally

e) in the division and the measure of the interchanges, because these, too, must be included by the narrator, especially if they are to contain the preconceptions for an abstraction to be made, both within the specific scope and quantified within it as speech and counter-speech in relation to one another. But why would we need specific remarks to confirm or remove any doubt about something that is self-evident? Perhaps it may not be entirely self-evident.

a) It may not be so self-evident. For otherwise it would have been impossible to have put forward hypotheses about the harmony of our Gospels, which could only have been put forward if all this had not been thought of at all, nor would it have been possible to have regarded the coincidence of our authors in the general formulas and in the expressions of the reflections as something so quite natural, as it were self-evident, in order to have reports which are quite undisputed because of such characteristic similarities, which quite indisputably, because of such characteristic similarities, can have only one narrator as their author, to be derived from different authors, or to assume them to be originally different productions because, in addition to those

similarities, they also sometimes have many different things \*), as if what is really rathsome about the matter were only the coincidental, and, on the contrary, what is in fact coincidental is rather the rathsome thing. If the psychological datum is acknowledged to be correct and true, then we can make the arrangement of our investigation all the more certain. For then

\*) This is done especially by those for whom the source of our tales is the multifarious saga, or who have collections made by various collectors, in which different narrators have written, and from the mouths of different sources, some specimens nevertheless -- who solves this riddle? -- are said to have occurred in conformity and in the same construction.

476

b) as a methodological principle, the principle emerges and legitimizes itself that above all, attention should be given to the agreement in our accounts, and the extent of the original should be measured according to how far this agreement truly extends and must have extended. This principle, too, has been attempted to be invalidated. Schleiermacher, in his frequently cited work (on Luke), says on page 16: "To decide this question (whether the agreement of the Gospels presupposes even a single type only in their arrangement), it is certainly not sufficient, as has been largely contented with recently, to compare the individual sections of the three Gospels, whether they are shared or unique. Because through this comparison, attention is more or less diverted from the way in which the individual narratives in each Gospel are connected or linked with one another \*\*), and thus one may perhaps obscure more than half of the matter, perhaps the best and most reliable indications from which one could still develop the manner of the origin of these books. If until now the comparative view has been pursued unilaterally, then it seems almost necessary, for the advancement of the matter, to bring forward just as unilaterally (?) the other half and from the consideration of each of these three books individually," and so on. And further down, when evaluating the examples from numbers 42 to 46, the identity of which an unbiased person cannot at all overlook, he says, after seeking to make major differences for the entire account based on the different arrangements in Matthew 22:22 and later in verse 34, on page 259: "I ask, then, how must the original Gospel have been composed, from which narratives that present such different views could have arisen?" \*) A question that, of course, does not arise when one dissects the three Gospels into the smallest possible sections and only compares those sections among themselves." However, if we remain true to that psychological fact, according to which it is entirely impossible for the accounts of the three narrators in those sections to coincide without a root relation as they actually do, here and elsewhere we will not only ignore the chatter of aster criticism but also flatter

ourselves to have found in that fact the true and decisive reason by which such speeches are refuted. So, it remains firm for us: where in the three similar formations of the shared narrative, general statements are expressed in the same way, even if only with synonymous words or phrases that are identical in content, and in the same place, then—especially if the agreement is repeated several times in the same passage—we must observe the consequences of a single original account. However, we should still consider

\*\*\*) As if anything would or could come of this, if these narratives in themselves, whatever their position, had the same version. Editors and authors would still be different. Why should it be assumed that what comes from one author cannot be arranged differently by another?

\*) As if this question didn't answer itself! — In general, the verse is inconsistent. For the sake of similarity, he assumes one original narrative from many similar narratives, and thinks that they have passed through different hands. Again, he doesn't want it from others.

478

c) one objection. It has been attempted to explain the convergence of our narrators in general formulas and phrases by the poverty of the Hebrew language, its own rhetoric, and the familiarity of the authors with the narrative typology expressed in the historical books of the Old Testament (see above, page 41). It has been suggested that for such narrators, this convergence in form is not remarkable but rather natural when they had only one and the same narrative object to deal with. While we certainly do not overlook the truth of what is actually the case, we must note that it does not suffice for our question, and we can easily demonstrate this.

α) Language, even if it provides phrases and formulas, does not determine the sequence of thoughts, the entry of formulas, and their connection. Least of all does it determine the place and expression for concluding and transitional formulas to the extent that the latter is to be formulated with respect to the whole. All of this is the product of reflection, which, as performed by each individual, is also expressed in a particular way, regardless of how limited the language may be to certain formulas. Just as little can

β) the language determine how an idea that precedes the action as a principle should be expressed, whether as cause and reason (by means of certain causal conjunctions like γαρ, οτι, etc.) or as its purpose (through conjunctions like ὡστε, ινα, εις τι, τοῦ, etc.),

and even the Hebrew language must allow for freedom in this regard, just as any language that has different words for expression even more so.

γ) General formulas such as: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, καὶ ἐγένετο, and the like, are not important here, but the place which they occupy in a narrative divided into moments, whether this is the same in the uniform narratives. Nor does it depend solely on whether the phrases have something similar to each other, but on the expression of compound sentences, whether this can occur with the same word stock in the different copies of a narrative as the product of different authors.

δ) We have already noticed above, p. 50, by means of an example, what latitude the narrators have been given by their language and their circle of ideas, in order to be able to give different turns and forms of expression to the speech of one and the same occurrence. And

ε) who would say that singleness of language and equality of formation of mind could have led different speakers to the same mode of exposition, such as is given, e. g., in n. 42. a., where the answer: οὐκ οἶδούμιν (Matth. 26:27. comp. the parallel st.) is rendered intelligible not by a remark appended by the writer, but by the relation of what the authors of the same thought before? - So much for that objection. But if

479

d) our speakers could not completely agree on what is an expression of reflection without shaping the expression according to an original type that predetermines certain words, then one should also assume that this agreement, once it had begun, would also have been continued as far as the narrative reaches in the narrative. But this does not happen. It is suspended and renewed again. But the more often this happens in a narrative piece, or the longer the conformity is maintained in it, the more it will draw our attention to the deviations that occur, in order to trace the reasons for them, since they must have special causes. The comparative approach, then, far from being one-sided and directed solely to the similarities of the parallel sections, has its essence rather in that it relates opposites - the concordant and the divergent - to one another, in order to investigate the nature of each all the more precisely. It is therefore not one-sided, but rather two-sided, and that it must be so follows from the psychological principle that has been established. At the same time, however, something else flows from what has just been said for the method of investigation. We see in advance how much rests on the differences between the texts to be paralleled and their individual parts. If correct results are to be drawn from the text, we must have it before us according to its original composition.

What matters, then, is correct criticism. But correct exegesis will be no less important than this, so that real differences are not mixed up on the one hand, and such things are not invented from the other where there are none, as has nevertheless been done by many critics of our texts. - 3> Finally, let us consider what course the investigation must take from now on, and in what order it must proceed; then, first of all, certain points of inquiry will be distinguished and brought into relation with one another, which will draw certain circles for the data to be selected, so that structure or classification can be brought into the discussions. A few more remarks on this.

a) First of all, according to what has been said above about the concept and scope of the reflective, two things can be distinguished from one another: the composition of the pieces (according to their logical formulas, according to the division of their propositions, according to their quantity and purpose) and then the order and position of them and the connection in which they are placed with others.

α) From the setting of the pieces, if it is the same in the three copies, it will follow that the narrative given in the copies has one and the same original author (may he be one of our evangelists or another). This would be the most general result. It does not yet follow from this that the pieces of which the three copies are present all originate with one another from one and the same original author; they could also be by different authors (borrowed from different collections and arranged together). \*) More precise information will be found here if

\*) We have ended our consideration of the passages in the first section with the result that the evangelists either drew from a common source, or that Mark was the author of the texts. The latter, however, could only be considered possible and not yet definitely asserted, and in view of the equally presupposable common source, it could also not be firmly determined whether it was a whole of Scripture or a majority of collections or individual essays, whether the former was more probable: only this was completely decided, that Mark did not have his text from the secondary speakers.

β) the order and position of the pieces is observed. This is what is mainly being considered here. - After the phenomenon that is revealed in the first tablet, that Matthew and Luke sometimes hold on to Mark's order in opposition to each other, and also that certain narrative pieces are appropriated with him one before the other, the interest of the investigation rests on the question: was the first tablet a work in itself, or did Mark's

Gospel only come into being as an excerpt from Matthew and Luke? Should the former prove to be the case, then that which has not yet been decided from the version of the pieces alone will be decided at the same time, since it will probably be possible to determine more precisely whether the order of the pieces was later than their composition or whether it originated at the same time as it. But even here there remains an indeterminacy. For even if we were to arrive at a Protestant original, not only would nothing be determined about its author, but there would also remain the doubt as to whether Mark did not give the original in a different scope than it originally had (either in a small or in a wide one). How could this indeterminacy be removed?

y) In the first section just completed, we came to the dilemma: either our speakers have drawn from one and the same source, or Mark himself is the author of this text, and we expressed that we wanted to await further clarification on this. If this question were decided, and it were shown that Mark's Gospel itself was the original, then the doubt just mentioned as to the author and the extent of it would be settled, and the last light would have been shed on our whole question, so far as it concerns the harmony of our writings. - Thus, three questions stand out, and according to these we will divide our investigation. There is still one remark to be made here

b) on the first point. The pieces on which we want to look first at the version, according to our plan, are, as has already been mentioned, of two kinds: speeches and reports of facts. Since they have already been considered above, we have nothing more to add to the speeches than the historical information, the general formulas of events, the intermediate remarks, etc., added by the narrators. It does not seem necessary, however, to single out these formulas in order to prove that the copies of each play are based on one and the same original relation, since this proof has already been deduced from the nature of the speech texts themselves. However, even if it were not necessary to make use of these formulas, it would still be necessary to complete the argument if it were shown that the traces of unity in the conformal relations can be traced not only in the memorable material, but even in the expressions of free reflection. It might also be feared that some of our fellow researchers would not have been convinced by the earlier reasoning, and if, then, Mark should still have no other relationship than to be the first cerptor of the others, then the opinion could attach itself to Matthew's and Luke's parallel relations, at least to several of them, that they were originally different records, if the opposite were not proven from the equality of the reflective elements, and thus the latter were not still particularly shown. So much for the present. We now proceed to the matter itself, and collect the data under each particular question.

The first question concerns the version of the parallel narrative sections, whether they derive from a primordial relationship.

It is a fact that up to n. 34, not a single piece is found that is given by the speakers in completely the same form and with the same historical moments. Luke is shorter than Matthew in one part of the narrative, and Matthew shorter than Luke in another. - Matthew's n. 7. is placed differently, and has a shorter form. Likewise n. 8. and n. 9. - n. 10. the connecting formulas in Luke are different. - n. 11. is placed differently in Matthew. - n. 12. has special content in Matthew. -

Matthew and Mark have only certain parts of n. 13. (Matthew says nothing of the separation of the twelve, and the Sermon on the Mount, which he has, is put differently. Mark has not the Sermon on the Mount). - n. 14. in Luke is not only differently placed, but also differently formed. - n. 15. is also differently placed in Luke and of shorter form. - n. 16. is altered by Matthew, and Luke takes the piece from a different point of view. - n. 17. is placed in a different connection in Matthew, n. 18. has a much shorter form in him than in the others, and n. 20. has quite different surroundings. - n. 21. differs from Luke's account, Matthew lacks some things. - n. 22. Matthew's historical context is changed, Luke mentions nothing about a departure by ship. - n. 28. Luke does not want to know about a journey to Caesarea. - n. 29. The location is described differently in Luke. - n. 30. Mark's account differs. - n. 31. Luke connects in a special way. n. 32. all speakers have their own, Matthew gives more, Luke less than Mark. From n. 50 to n. 57, however, Luke almost always gives his own account. - With such differences the investigation becomes all the more difficult, but special characteristics of the unity, which is important to us here, can be emphasised.

483

#### First Datum:

The oratorical remarks added by the narrators at the beginning of the play or in the middle of the play about the external occasions to which the speech is connected, and the concluding remarks about the effects and consequences of the speeches, are either literally identical in the parallel relations, if the different linking of the plays has not had an influence on this, or they express the same general sentences with other synonymous words, or their expression includes jointly used words and speech formulas. But they always stand at the same place in the play.

484

We consider a) those sections that are in the same order.

| n. 34. (cf. p. 221.)                                                                                |                                                                                                |                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 10:18 Και προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἀψητοι αὐτῶν ' οἱ δέ μα&ηται ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν. | Luk.18:15. Προσέφεραν δέ αὐτῷ και τα βρέφη, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἀπτηται' — οἱ μαθηταῖ ἐπετίμησαν αυτοίς. | Matth. 19:13. Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνατας γείρας ἐπιδή αυτοῖς (Ο) — οἱ δέ μαθηταῖ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς. |
| 14. Ἰδὼν δέό Τησοῦς (ήνανάκτησε και) εἶπεν αὐτοῖς" —                                                | 16. Ὁ δέ Τηβοῦς ( προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτά) εἶπεν" —                                               | 14. Ὁ δέ Τηβοῦς εἶπεν·                                                                                       |

-----

| n. 35. (cf.p.222.)                                                                                                           |                                                                                               |                                                                                                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 10:17 Καὶ — προσδραμὼν εἰς και — ἐπηρωτα αὐτόν · — 18. Ὁ δέ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ · — 20. Ὁ δέ ἀποκρι- ῶ· εἶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ' — | Luke 18:18 Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέ τις αὐτόν — λέγων · —19. Εἶπε δε αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησους · — 21. 'Ο δέ εἶπε' — | Matth. 19:16 Καί ιδού, εἰς προσελθὼν εἶπεν αὐτῷ' — 17. Ὁ δέ εἶπεν αὐτῷ' — 20. Λέγει αὐτῷ (ὁ νεανίσκος) — |
| 21. Ὁ δέ Ἰησοῦς — καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ' —                                                                                          | 22. 'Ακοῦβας δέ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ' —                                                        | 21. 'Εφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς' —                                                                                |
| 22. Ὁ δέ στυγνάβας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπήλθε λυποῦμενος ' ἦν γάρ ἐγὼν κτήματα πολλά.                                                | 23. Ὁ δέ ἀκοῦσας ταῦτα περίλυπος ἐγένετο" ἦν γάρ πλοῦσιος σφόδρα'                             | 22. 'Ακοῦσας δέ (ὁ νεανίσκος) τον λόγον ἀπήλθε λυποῦμενος' ἦν γάρ ἐγὼν κτήματα πολλά.                    |
| 23. Καὶ περιβλεψά- μενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ"                                                                 | 24. Ἰδὼν δέ — εἶπε'                                                                           | 23. 'Ο δε Ἰησοῦς' εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ·                                                             |
| 26. ,Οἰδέ (περισσῶς) ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες προς ἑαυτούς' —                                                                   | 26. Εἶπον δέ οἱ ἀκονσαντες·                                                                   | 25. Ακοῦσαντες δέ (οἱ μαθηταῖ) ἐξεπλήσσοντο σφόδρα λέγοντες' —                                           |
| 27· Εμβλέψαςδὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει ' —                                                                                     | 27. Ὁ δέ εἶπε —                                                                               | 26. 'Εμβλέψας δε δ Ἰησοῦς' εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ' —                                                              |
| 28. Ἦρξατο δέξ ο' Πέτρος λέγειν αὐτῷ'                                                                                        | 28. Εἶπε δέ ὁ Πέτρος                                                                          | 27. Τότε ἀποκριθεῖς ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ" —                                                               |



|                                                 |                         |                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 29. Ἀποκρι <sup>^</sup> εις δέ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν — | 29. Ο δέ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς — | 28. Ὁ δέ Ἰησοῦς' εἶπεν αὐτοῖς" — |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|

485

| n. 36. (cf. p. 229.)                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 10:32 Ἦσαν δε ἐν ὁδῳ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλ. — *) καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν (τά μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν')— | Matth 20:17 Καὶ ἀναβαίνων ο Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλ.<br><br>παρελαβε τοὺς δώδεκα κατ' ἰδίαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῳ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' — | Luk. 18. (missing. But cf. ch. 17:11.<br><br>18:31. Παραλαβὼν δέ τοὺς δώδεκα εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· — |

\*) The καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο and καὶ - εφοβουντο seems to be a double gloss.

a) Contradicts the statement that the disciples are said to have walked in anxious fear, the following Mark. 10:35. (and Matth.)

b) Since the δώδεκα are mentioned after the αὐτοῖς, those αὐτοί must have been others. The text means the caravan that accompanied Jesus. He went ahead of it and then called the disciples to him. But how could it be said that the companions other than the disciples followed with trepidation?

c) If the gloss is removed, the text of Mark is united with that of Matthew.

| n. 39. (cf. p. 231.)                                                                                                |                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 11:1 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ, εἰς Βηθφαγη — πρὸς τοὸρος των ἐλαιῶν, ἀποῦτελλει δύο των μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ | Luke 19:29 Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὥς ἤγγισαν εἰς Βηθφαγη —πρὸς τὸ ὄρος (τὸ καλούμενον) ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλε .... αὐτοῦ | Matth 21:1 Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλ. (καὶ ἤλθον) εἰς Βηθφαγη πρὸς .... ἐλαιῶν, τότε ὁ Ἰησ. ἀπέστειλε δύο μαθητας, — |
| 2. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς"—                                                                                               | 30. εἰπὼν' —                                                                                              | 2. λίγων αὐτοῖς'                                                                                                       |

|                                                            |                                                                              |                                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. Ἀπήλθον δε καὶ ευρον<br>τον πῶλον —                     | 32. Ἀπελθόντες οἱ<br>απεβτναλμέοι ευρον καθῶς<br>εἶπεν αὐτοῖς                | 6. Πορευθέντες δε οἱ<br>μαθηταί, —                                 |
| καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν.                                         | 33. Λυόντων δε αὐτῶν τον<br>πῶλον                                            |                                                                    |
| 5. Καίτινες τῶν ἐκεῖ<br>εοτηκότων ἐ'λεγον αὐτοῖς"<br>—     | εἶπον οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ προς<br>αὐτούς' —                                      |                                                                    |
| 6. οἱ δέ εἶπον αὐτοῖς —                                    | 34. οἱ δέ εἶπον —                                                            |                                                                    |
| 7. Καὶ ηγαγον τον πῶλον<br>προς τόν Ἰησοῦν                 | 35. Καὶ ηγαγον αὐτόν προς<br>τ. Ἰησ.                                         | 7. ηγαγον τόν — πῶλον,                                             |
| και ἱπιβάλλουαιναυτῷ τά<br>ἱμάτια κ. ἐκάθισεν επ<br>αὐτόν. | και επιρρίψαντες εαυτῶν<br>τα ἱμάτια επ'ι τον πῶλον<br>επεβίβασαντόν Ἰησοῦν. | καὶ επεθηκαν τά ἱμάτια<br>αυτῶν καὶ επεκάθισαν<br>επάνω αυτῶν.     |
| 8. Πολλοί δι' τά ἱμάτια<br>αυτῶν εστρωσαν εις την<br>ὁδόν  | 36. Πορευομένου δε αυτοῦ<br>ὑπεστρώννουν τά ἱμάτια<br>αυτῶν εν τῇ ὁδῷ'       | 8. Ὁ δε πλείατος ὄχλος<br>εστρωσαν εαυτῶν τά ἱμάτια<br>εν τῇ ὁδῷ ' |
| ἄλλοι δε .... εἰς την ὁδόν.                                | missing                                                                      | ἄλλοι δε .... εν τῇ ὁδῷ.                                           |
| 9. Και οἱπροάγοντες και οἱ<br>ἀκολουθοῦντες                | 37. Ἐγγίζοντος δε αυτοῦ<br>ἤδη προς — τῶν ελαιῶν                             | 9. (Οἱ δε ὄχλοι) οἱ<br>προάγοντες και οἱ<br>ἀκολουθοῦντες          |
| ἐκραζον λεγοντες· —                                        | ἦρξαντο — αἰνεῖν τον θεόν<br>φωνή μεγάλη — λίγοντες<br>—                     | εκραζον λεγοντες· —                                                |

| n. 41. (cf. p.233.)                                                                                           |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 11:15 Και εἰσελθὼν<br>εἰς τό ἱερόν ἤρξατο<br>εκβάλλειν τους πολοῦντας<br>κα'ι αγοράζοντας εν τῷ<br>ἱερῷ' | Matth 21:12 Και εἰσήλθεν<br>εἰς τό ἱερόν κ. ξεβεαλε<br>πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας κ.<br>ἀγοράξ. εν τῷ ἱερῷ, | Luke 19:45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν<br>εἰς τό ἱερόν ἤρξατο<br>εκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας<br>κ. αγοράζοντας πεισμε |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| και τας τραπεζας ....<br>κατίστρεψε                                                                                                                                                                                                            | literally the same.                                                                                                                                                                                           | missing                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 17. (Καί ἐδίδασκε) λίγων<br>αὐτοῖς —                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 13. Καὶ λεγὲι αὐτοῖς'                                                                                                                                                                                         | 46. λεγων αὐτοῖς                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Final formula: v. 18. Κ. —<br>— οἱ γραμματεῖς κ. οἱ<br>ἀρχιερεῖς, καὶ ἐξήτουν, πῶς<br>αὐτὸν ἀπολίσωσιν                                                                                                                                         | missing, but occurs:<br>ιδόντες δε οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ<br>γραμματεῖς —                                                                                                                                         | 47. — οἱ δε ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ<br>γραμματεῖς ἰξήτουν αὐτὸν<br>ἀπολεσαι'                                                                                                                |
| — ὅτι πας ὁ ὄχλος<br>ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ<br>αὐτοῦ *).                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 48.— ὁ λαὸς γάρ ἅπας<br>ἐξεκρεμασε αὐτοῦ ἀκοῦων.                                                                                                                                    |
| n. 42 a. (cf. p, 234.)                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Mark 11:27 Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ<br>περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ<br>ἐρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ<br>ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ γραμματεῖς<br>κ. οἱ πρεσβυτεροὶ. 28. καὶ<br>λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ·                                                                                      | Matth. 21:23 Καὶ ἐλθόντι<br>αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν<br>προσῆλθον αὐτῷ<br>διδάσκοντι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ,<br>οἱ πρεσβυτεροὶ τοῦ λαοῦ<br>λέγοντες —                                                                        | Luke 20:1 Καὶ ἐγενετο —<br>διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν<br>λαόν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ,<br>ἐπεστησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ.<br>οἱ γραμματεῖς συν τοῖς<br>πρεσβυτέροις, 2. κ. εἶπον<br>πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντες · — |
| 31. Καὶ ἐλογίζοντο πρὸς<br>ἐαυτοὺς λέγοντες ' ἐάν<br>εἴπωμεν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ' ἐρεῖ<br>διὰ τὸ οὐκ ἐπιστεῦσατε<br>αὐτῷ; 32. Ἀλλ' ἐάν<br>εἴπωμεν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ,<br>ἐφοβούντο τὸν λαόν<br>ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν<br>Ἰωάννην, ὅτι ὄντως<br>προφήτης ἦν. | 25. Οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο παρ'<br>ἐαυτοῖς λέγοντες" ἐάν ....<br>ἐρεῖ (ἡμῖν) διὰ τὸ οὐκ ....<br>αὐτῷ; 26. ἐάν δὲ εἴπωμεν<br>.... ἀνθρώπων φοβούμεθα<br>τὸν ὄχλον πάντες γὰρ<br>ἐχουσι τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡς<br>προφήτην. | 5. Οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο<br>πρὸς ἐαυτοὺς λέγοντες ·<br>ἐάν .... αὐτῷ; 6. ἐάν δὲ<br>εἴπωμεν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων —<br>πεπεισμένος γὰρ ἐστὶν<br>Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι.                         |
| 33. Καὶ ἀποκριθέντες<br>λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ" —                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 27. Καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ<br>Ἰησοῦ εἶπον'                                                                                                                                                                       | 7. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν —                                                                                                                                                                |

\*) Mark v. 18. is perhaps an oversight, that αὐτὸν is put instead of τὸν ὄχλον.

| n. 42 b. (p. 236.)                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 12:1 Καί ήρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγειν · —                                                                                | Matth. 21:33 "Ἄλλην παραβολήν ἀκούσατε.—                                                                                     | Luke 20:9 "Ἦρξατο δέ πρὸς τὸν λαόν λέγειν τὴν παραβολήν ταύτην                                                                                  |
| Concluding remarks: v. 12. Καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν κρατήσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον· ἐγνώσαν γάρ, ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολήν εἶπε·   | 45. — ἐγνώσαν, ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει. 46. Καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατήσαι ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἐπειδὴ ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. | 19. Κ. ἐξήτουν (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς — ) ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας — κ. ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν ἐγνώσαν γάρ, σιτηρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολήν ταύτην εἶπε. |
| καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπήλθον.                                                                                                          | S. ch. 22:22.                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                 |
| n. 43 (p. 240)                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                 |
| Mark 12:13 Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσι πρὸς αὐτὸν τινὰς τῶν φαρισαίων — ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρευσωσι λόγῳ. — (Compare the conversion chap. 21, 45. 46.) | Matth. 22:15 Τότε — ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεῦσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ. 16. Καὶ ἀποστελλουσιν αὐτοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν '— λέγοντες ·                | Luke 20:20 Καὶ — ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους — ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου — 21. Καὶ ἐπηροίτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες—                                      |
| 15. Ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· —                                                                                  | 18. Ἰνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν, εἶπε" ·—                                                                           | 23. Κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπε πρὸς, αὐτοὺς —                                                                                      |
| Concluding remarks: 17. Καὶ ἐθαύμασαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.                                                                                     | 22. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν.                                                                                                | 26. — καὶ θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτὸν ἐσίγησαν.                                                                                          |

| n. 44. (p. 242)                                                                                                     |                                                                                             |                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 12:18. Καὶ ἐρχονται σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν λέγοντες | 23. προσελθὼν αὐτῷ σαδδουκαῖοι λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν· καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν λέγοντες — | 27. Προσελθόντες δὲ τινες τῶν σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν· |

| n. 46. (p. 245)                                                                               |                                                                   |                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 12:35. Και ἀποκριθεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.                                | Math. 22:41. — ἐπηράτησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων'                  | Luke 20:42. Εἶπε δέ πρὸς αὐτοὺς · —                          |
| n. 47. (p. 247)                                                                               |                                                                   |                                                              |
| Mark 12:37 — καὶ ὁ πολὺς ὄγλος ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως. 38. Και ελεγεν αὐτοῖς (ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. | Matth. 23:1. Τότε ἐλάλησε τοῖς ὄχλοις (καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ) — | Luke 20:45 Ακούοντας δέ παντός τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς. *) |

\*) The ordinary τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ is without doubt correction according to Matthew. This is in addition to the comment on p. 366.

-----

| n. 49. (p. 249.)                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                    |                                                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 13:1 Και ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, λέγει αὐτῷ εἰστών μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ· διδάσκαλε, ἴδε, ποταποὶ λίθοι κ. ποταπαῖ οἰκοδομαί! | Matth. 24:1 Καὶ — ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδειῖξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ. | Luke 21:5 Καί τινων λεγόντων περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὅτι λίθοις καλοῖς καὶ ἀναθήμασι κεκόσμηται, |
| 2. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ · —                                                                                            | 2. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς" —                                                                                     | εἶπε —                                                                                   |
| 3. Καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν (κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ) ἐπηρωτων αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν —                                      | 3. Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐροῦ τῶν ἐλαιῶν προσήλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ' ἰδίαν λέγοντες'                      | 7. ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγοντες —                                                        |
| 5. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς ἤρξατο λέγειν                                                                                       | 4. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς'                                                                           | 8. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε·                                                                            |

| n. 53. (p. 272) |
|-----------------|
|-----------------|

|                                                                                                                        |                                                                                       |                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 14:12. Καὶ τη πρώτη ἡμέρα των ἄζυμων δε τό πάσχα ἔθουν,                                                           | Luke 22:7. Ἦλθε δε ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἄζυμων, ἐν ἡ ἔδει θύεσθαι τό πάσχα·                    | Matth. 26:17. Τῇ δε πρώτη τῶν ἄζυμων                                                         |
| λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταῖ αὐτοῦ · —                                                                                     |                                                                                       | προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταῖ — λέγοντες—                                                             |
| 13. Καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο των μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς · —                                                          | 8. Καὶ ἀπέστειλε (Πέτρον κ. Ἰωάννην) εἰπών—                                           | 18. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ·                                                                             |
| 16. Καὶ ἐξήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κ. ἦλθαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν κ. εὐρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, κ. ἡτοίμασαν τό πάσχα.            | 13. Ἀπελθόντες δε εὐρον καθὼς εἶρηκεν αὐτοῖς κ. ἡτοίμασαν τό πάσχα.                   | 19. — ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς κ. ἡτοίμασαν τό πάσχα.                                             |
| (Cf. p. 274.) 17. Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἐρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα. 18. Καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς' | 14. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετό ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, κ. οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι συν αὐτῷ.                  | 20. Ὁψίας δε γει νομένης ἀνέκειτο μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα. 21. Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν εἶπεν '           |
| 22. Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον, εὐλογήσας ἐκλάσε κ. ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς κ. εἶπε'                              | 19. Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον, εὐχαρίστη σας ἐκλάσε καὶ ἔδωκε λέγων ·                           | 26. Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον κ. εὐλογήσας .... ἐδίδου. τοῖς μαθηταῖς κ. εἶπε' |
| 26. Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐζήλθον εἰς τό ὅρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.                                                                     | 39. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορευθῆ — εἰς τό ὅρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ κ. οἱ μαθηταί. | 30. like Mark.                                                                               |

For Luke's report, see above p. 414.

-----

| n. 54 (p. 277)                                             |                                                                               |                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Mark 14:32 Καὶ ἐρχονται εἰς χωρίον, οὐ τό ὄνομα Γεθσημανή, | Matth. 26:36 Τότε ἐρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς χωρίον λεγόμενον Γεθσημανή, | Luke 22:40 Γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου |
| καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς                                    | κ. λέγει αὐτοῖς' —                                                            | εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' —                       |

|                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| αὐτόν · —                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |
| 35. Καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν ἐπεσεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ προσηύχετο. 36. Καὶ ἔλεγεν —                                             | 39. Καὶ .... ἐπεσεν ἐπὶ προσώπον αὐτοῦ προσευχόμενος κ. λέγων —                                                   | 41. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπασθὲν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡς εἰ λίθος βολῆς , κ. θεῖς. τα γόνατα πρὺς ἡύχεται λέγων — |
| 37. Κ. ἐρχεται κ. εὐρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας,                                                                          | 40. Καὶ ὀρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς καὶ εὐρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας,                                                | 45. Καὶ — ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς εὗρεν αὐτοὺς κοιμωμένους (ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης),                    |
| καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ' —                                                                                                   | καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ —                                                                                              | 46. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' —                                                                        |
| 43. Καὶ εὐθέως, ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος,                                                                                    | 47. Καὶ ὅτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος,                                                                                      | 47. Ἐπιδέ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος,                                                                     |
| παραγίνεται Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα                                                                                       | ἰδοῦ, Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα                                                                                       | ἰδοῦ ὄχλος καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος, Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα.                                             |
| καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ξύλων,                                                                     | καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ .... ξύλων                                                                        | Omitted because of v. 51.                                                                      |
| παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων κ. (τῶν γραμματέων καὶ) τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.                                                             | ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων κ. πρεσβυτέρων (τοῦ λαοῦ).                                                                      | Cf. v. 51.                                                                                     |
| 44. Δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν σύσσημον αὐτοῖς, λέγων ὅν ἂν φιλήσω κ. τ. λ.                                          | 48. Ὁ δὲ παραδιδούς αὐτόν ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς σημεῖον, λέγων · ὃν ἂν φιλήσω κ. τ. λ.                                    | 47. Προήρχετο αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡγγίσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσαι αὐτόν.                                        |
| 45. Καὶ εὐθέως προσελθὼν — κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.                                                                           | in the same way                                                                                                   |                                                                                                |
| 46. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον ἐπ' αὐτόν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.                                                      | 50. — Τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.                                   | Omitted in v. 49. because the use of the sword is mentioned before.                            |
| 47. Εἰς δὲ τις τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἐπάεισε τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον *). | 51. Καὶ ἰδοῦ εἰς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ —. ἀπέσπασε τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ καὶ πατάξας τὸν δούλον .... ἀφείλεν .... τὸ ὠτίον. | 50. Καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἀρχ. καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ οὖς (τὸ δεξόν).     |

|                                                                     |                                                             |                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 48. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς                            | 55. Εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς οὄχοις                              | 52. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ' αὐτόν —                                    |
| 50. Καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτόν πάντες ἐφυγον. *)                             | 56. Τότε (οἱ μαθηταὶ) πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτόν ἐφυγον.          | Is omitted in v. 53. because it is included in v. 54. (Cf. p. 410.)                          |
| 53. Καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησ. πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα —                       | 57. Οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς — τὸν ἀρχ. — | 54. Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτόν ἤγαγον κ. εἰσήγαγον εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.                    |
| 54. Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ,                     | 58. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολοῦθει αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν                 | Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολοῦθει μακρόθεν.                                                              |
| εὼς ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.                                | εὼς τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ ἀρχ.                                      |                                                                                              |
| καὶ ἦν συγκαθημενὸς μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν κ. θερμαινόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. | καὶ εἰσολθὼν ἔσω ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρ. (ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος.)   | 55. Ἀφαντῶν δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς, κ. συγκαθισάντων αὐτῶν ἐκάθητο ὁ Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. |

\*) That this notice (of the use of the sword) did not constitute a part of the original text can be proved for the following reasons:

a) Jesus expected that night, as the common account of Matthew ch. 26:31 and Mark ch. 14:27 tells us, only the behaviour of cowardice from the disciples, and the same account justifies this assumption by the fact that the disciples all fled (Matth. 26:56. Mark. 14:50.) - a proof that the discourse had only planned to carry out the word of the prediction, and that therefore there was no question of an attempted resistance or the omission of it after Jesus had forbidden it,

b) The use of the sword, if it should have constituted a historical moment in our narrative, would also be seen as a (presumed) attempt to avert Jesus' imprisonment: ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν. With this last, however, such a note is indisputably cut off, and it receives no more space after it. The assertion thus just made justifies

(c) Luke himself, who places that note according to plan. He



says that the sword was grasped when one saw τό εσόμενον, which indisputably precedes the concluding: καί εκράτησαν αὐτόν. - But even Mark's Gospel cannot have originally conceived the message in itself.

α) Already no gap at all arises when v. 47. is omitted, but one does arise when it is inserted (or, as it is present after the interpolation, retained). For it is noticeable that the fact is not taken into account at all in the narrative, and not a word is mentioned that Jesus spoke in relation to it. Mark would least of all have omitted to mention such a word if it had been in his plan to include the circumstance in the narrative.

β) The account is condensed in such a way that the facts actually narrated have certain preliminary remarks by the narrator as a counterpoint. Namely, v. 47. Jesus' words are related to v. 43 (μετά μαχαίρων καί ξύλων), and v. 46 is joined by the note v. 50. - And because all who could protect Jesus had escaped, it just happened that he had to speak only as a prisoner v. 43, and that now v. 53. the καί ἀπήγαγον could immediately follow. - The note v. 47. is therefore omitted altogether. -

γ) If it should remain a part of the narrative; then one would have to imagine that the disciples would have departed only when Jesus, by his words v. 48, 49, made it known that he would not attempt any resistance. But in this way the word ἀφέντες stands out, which contains for the disciples the secret reproach that they alone met their Master.

δ) The πάντες (έφυγον) v. 50. is not said without emphasis. It takes in itself the word of Jesus : πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοί (Matth. 26:31. Mark, 14:27.). But what does this σκανδαλίξεσθαι say? (It corresponds to the πάντες έφυγον.) - Mark nowhere inserts anything contradictory into his reports. So that note will have to be omitted.

\*) The anecdote Mark. 14:51. 52. is certainly interpolated.

(a) The text of the narrative unites the flight of the disciples and the taking away of Jesus in such a way that the latter becomes explicable by the former, and both circumstances are supposed to come into immediate connection. How could the narrative be held up by the intervening mention of a young man who was almost caught during his flight?

b) Since the removal of Jesus is not mentioned until v. 53, it cannot be said before v. 51: ἡκολούθει αὐτῷ.

c) Only one person was reported as following Jesus, and that is Peter. -

d) Jesus had - as the narrators have expressly preferred - gone into the garden with the twelve disciples after the Passover. In one of these the word νεανίσκος is all the less suggestive, since πάντες ἐφυγον precedes it.

493

| n. 55. (p. 280)                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Mark 14:55 Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὁλον τό συνέδριον ἐξήτουν χατά τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν εἰς τό θανατώσαι αὐτόν, καὶ οὐχ εὐριῦκον. — 56. Πολλοί δὲ ἐψευδομαρτυροῦν κατ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαν οὐκ ἦβαν. | Matth. 26:59 Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς — καὶ τό συνέδριον ὅλον ἐξήτουν ψευδομαρτυρίαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως αὐτόν θανατώσωσι, καὶ πολλῶν ψευδομαρτυρῶν προεσλθόντων οὐχ εὗρον. | missing                                      |
| 57. Καὶ τινες ἀναστάντες ἐψευδομαρτυροῦν, λέγοντες —                                                                                                                                                    | 60. Ὑστερον δὲ προσελθόντες δυο ψευδομάρτυρες εἶπαν · —                                                                                                             |                                              |
| 60. Καὶ ἀναστάς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τό μέσον ἐπηρωτησε τόν Ἰησοῦν; —                                                                                                                                        | 62. Καὶ ἀναστάς ὁ ἀρχ. εἶπεν αὐτῷ —                                                                                                                                 | follows at the interrogation in the morning. |
| 61. Ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπακ. οὐδέν ἀπεκρίνατο.                                                                                                                                                                     | 63. Ὁ δὲ ' Ἰησοῦς ἐσιώπα.                                                                                                                                           |                                              |
| Πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν κ. λέγει αὐτῷ — 62. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν                                                                                                                                   | Καὶ ἀποκριθε' ἰς ὁ ἀρχ. εἶπεν αὐτῷ' — 64. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ' Ἰησοῦς" —                                                                                                  |                                              |
| 63. Ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς διαρρήξας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγει ' —                                                                                                                                               | 65. Τότε ὁ ἀρχ. διέρρηξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, λέγων                                                                                                                     |                                              |

Other events of that night:

a) Jesus' maltreatment by the servants;

b) Peter's denial.

Both parts of the account are left over in Luke - after the nightly interrogation was taken away - but rearranged: b. a. We will look at them later.

494

| n. 56 (p. 283)                                                                                                   |                                                                                                             |                                                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Mark 15:1 Καὶ — δῆσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον, καὶ παρεδωκαν τῷ Πιλατῳ                                            | Matth. 27:2 Καὶ δῆσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον, κ. παρεδ. αὐτὸν Πιλάτοι (τῷ ἡγεμόνι.)                              | Luke 23:1 Καὶ — — ηγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον (2. Ο.) |
| 2. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλάτος                                                                                | 11. — καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ ἡγεμὼν, λεγων —                                                                | 3. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν, λεγων —              |
| Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ —                                                                                     | Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐφη αὐτῷ —                                                                                      | Ὁ δὲ ἀποκρίσεις αὐτῷ ἐφη —                             |
| 3. Καὶ κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλὰ (omitted: καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο).                                      | 12. Καὶ ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων κ. τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο.                  | 2. Ἦρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ (λεγοντες · —)          |
| 4. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν, λεγων — 5. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκετι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτον. | 13. Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος" — 14. Καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ἐν ῥήμα *) ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λίαν. | Luke omits the superfluous (cf. p. 410).               |
| 6. Κατὰ δὲ εορτὴν ἀπελυσεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δεσμιον,                                                                   | 15. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν εορτὴν εἰώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἕνα (τῷ ὄχλῳ) δεσμιον, ὃν ᾔθελον.                           | 16. Ἀνάγκην δὲ εἶχεν ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς κατὰ εορτὴν ἕνα.  |
| ὃνπερ ᾔτούντο.                                                                                                   |                                                                                                             | (cf. v. 25. ὃν ᾔτούντο)                                |
| 7. Ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος                                                                                             | 16. Εἶχον δὲ τότε δεσμιον                                                                                   | cf. 25 (τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ                             |

|                                                                                    |                                                                                                         |                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Βαραββᾶς μετά τῶν συστασιαστῶν δεδεμένος, οἵτινες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποιήκεισαν. | ἐπίσημον λεγόμενον Βαραββάν                                                                             | φόνον βεβλημῖνον εἰς τήν φυλακὴν).                                         |
| 8. Καὶ ἀναβας *) ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι, ὡς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. —                     | 17. Συνηγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος **).                                                    |                                                                            |
| 10. Ἐγίνωσκε γάρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.)               | 18. Ἦιδει γάρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν.                                                           | is already contained in Luke 23:4-15.                                      |
| 11. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσκεισαν τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββάν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.  | 20. Οἱδὲ ἀρχ. (κ. οἱ πρεσβ. ἐπέισαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββάν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν. | 18. Ἀνέκραξαν δὲ παμπληθεὶ λέγοντες αἶρε τούτον! ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν Βαραββάν |
| 12. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἀποκριθεὶς πάλιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς —                                   | 21. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἡγεμὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς' —                                                              | 20. Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος προσεφώνηβε· —                                     |
| 13. Οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἐκραξαν'                                                           | Οἱ δὲ εἶπον —                                                                                           | 21. Οἱ δὲ ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες" —                                            |
| 14. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς' —                                                  | 23. Ὁ δὲ ἡγεμὼν ἐφῆ' —                                                                                  | 22. Ὁ δὲ τρίτον εἶπε' —                                                    |
| Οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐκραξαν —                                                           | just so.                                                                                                | 23. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο φωναῖς μεγάλαις —                                      |
| 15. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι,                             | missing.                                                                                                | 24. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἀπέκρινε τὸ αἶτημα αὐτῶν γενέσθαι.                        |
| ἀπίλνοεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββάν                                                       | 26. Τότε ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τ. Βαραββάν,                                                                   | 25. Ἀπέλυβε τὸν — ὃν ἡτοῦντο ·                                             |
| καὶ παρέδωκε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, φραγελλώσας, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.                                | τὸν ' δὲ Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.                                                    | τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρίδωκε τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.                                  |

\*) The agreement of Matthew with Mark suggests that after the omission of πρὸς, it should be expressed: Jesus answered no word, not: he answered the judge not a word. The former rather than the latter is also consistent with the fact that the praetor is said to have been amazed. But if it were meant to be: 'not a word of the accusers' — which would indeed be correct — then αὐτῷ would be in the way.

Another is another: he did not answer him a word. The former sounds as if the judge had presented him with special questions. According to the latter, this is not the case.

\*) Fritzsche's Commentary on Mark at the passage: "Certum est, si quidquam, Marcum ἀναβοήσας, non ἀναβάς scripsisse," we maintain that nothing is more certain than the opposite, and that Dav. Schulz is right. The Verfaller of the Commentary remarks: p. 674.

a) ἀναβάς est tantum in B. D. (et al.) - But he himself has Mark. 11:7. καθίζει included, notwithstanding it is also only in D. and a pair of others.

(b) ἀναβάς nimis nude positum est quam ut explicari possit: et quum plebs in Pilati palatium enixa (?) esset. This, however, is true. About ἀναβοήσας before ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι is still far more improper: the people cried out and began to ask (for stærkeres does not lie in αἰτεῖσθαι). The word order should be another, that: καὶ ἤρξατο ὁ λαὸς ἀναβοῶν αἰτεῖσθαι, or ἀναβοῶν, αἰτοῦντες, κ. τ. λ.

(c) ἀναβάς vix recte habet ob vers, οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν.

Untw.: these words do not look back to v. 8. but to ἀνεσεισαν, ἵνα - ἀπολυση v. 11. where indisputably

α) an analogous κράξαι is to be thought of — far sooner than it can be thought that the people should have cried out to Pilate about it, let him do as he used, v. 8.

β) The πάλιν ἔκραξε v. 13, with which the definite desire is expressed to release Jesus, can only reasonably correspond to a similar mention, and a cry raised with the same intention, thus only to what is told in v. 11, and not to what is told in v. 8.

γ) But that in v. 11. the narrator intended to subintelligate a κράξαι, is also shown by the parallel passage in Luke (23:18.).

\*\*) The reading taken up by Prof. D. Fritzsche in Matth. 27:17. Ἰησοῦν Βαραββάν we must likewise reject.

a) Matthew, as we saw earlier, has a way of making more explicit what the communal text contains. The common text here supplies only the names Barabbas (from the mouth of the people Mark v. 11. Luk v. 18. Matth. v. 20.) and Jesus (from the mouth of Pilate Mark v. 9. 12. Luk v. 16. 20.). The two persons in question are mentioned by Pilate at the same time, as if they were being put forward for election. Since the common narrative mentions only one Barabbas and not one Jesus Barabbas, it is more than probable that the composition of Matthew v. 29. also had only one Barabbas, and that the pre-sanctified 'Ιησοῦς was only a scribal error, the anticipated name of the other person. The reasons given to justify the wrong reading do not decide anything.

a) In idoneis invenitur libris. The idonei libri very often have wrong readings, and this would not be the first. But here find not even idonei libri for it. S. Griesbach.

b) After the confusion of Matth. v. 17. had arisen, v. 16, could also be formed according to it in other manuscripts.

c) Barabbas cognomen potius est, quam nomen. Answer: But where such a cognomen, formed with bar, is put, it has vim nominis ; comp. Act. 13:6. 4., 36. 13:1. 2. Matth. 10:3. Mark 10:46. An exception is made in Matth. 16:17. but for a special cause. - If the writer had known Barabbas by the name of Jesus, and had wanted to base Pilate's question on two similar names, he would have had to mention the name already in 16, and no doubt would have done so. (The confusion may also be due to the fact that the name Barnabas was in the minds of the copyists with a double: Joses Barnabas Act. 4:36. in their heads, and so they took the misspelled name Jesus rather for the surname of Barabbas (who had been confused with Barnabas).

497

These were the speeches that are placed in the same chronological order. We now also consider

b) Those which occur in one or other of our writers in a different order of time.

α) Those which in Matthew are placed differently (n. 8. 9. and 10. 11. and 12. 20.)

|                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| n. 8 (cf. p. 180) - Matthew's text must be placed first here. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                           |                                                                               |                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth. 8:2. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν προσκύνει αὐτῷ λεγὼν — | Mark 1:40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς — καὶ γονυπετὼν αὐτόν κ. λεγὼν αὐτῷ — | Luke 5:12 — καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας καὶ — πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λεγὼν — |
| 3. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λίγων' —            | 41. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς — ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ —                            | 13. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ εἰπὼν' —                                        |
| καὶ εὐθεὺς ἐκαθαρίσθη (αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα).                    | 42. Καὶ εὐθεὺς ἀπήλθε'ν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα κ. ἐκαθαρίσθη.                      | καὶ εὐθεὺς ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα *).                                               |

\*) Schleiermacher (Luk. p. 73) remarks with regard to the recensions of this piece: "Incidentally, the narrative of Matthew and that of Luke only coincide almost word for word at the decisive moment, which is certainly not to be wondered at in the case of such a simple event (note: as if it would have been so simple in itself as it is presented here!). This should come out as if narrators who were independent of each other could also have come together in this way. Therefore, he did not consider at all what the coincidence in abstract and general formulas, such as: ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ — the adaptation of the effect: ἐκαθαρίσθη to Jesus's word: καθαρίσθήτι and already at the beginning: καὶ ἰδοὺ or καὶ ἐρχεται says.

| n 9. (p. 182,) follows in Matthew after n. 17.                         |                                                                                             |                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Math. 9:2 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον. | Mark 2:3 Καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν παραλυτικὸν φέροντες. —                                    | Luke 5:18 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος ·      |
| Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπε τῷ παραλυτικῷ —.               | 5. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ ' —                                | 20. Καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπεν —                                               |
| 3. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς —                   | 6. Ἦσαν δὲ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι κ. διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν, ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. — | 21. Καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς (cf. v. 17.) κ. οἱ φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες — |
| 4. Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησ. τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπε·                          | 8. Κ. εὐθέως ἐπιγνοῦς ὁ Ἰησ. — ὅτι οὕτως                                                    | 22. Ἐπιγνοῦς δὲ ὁ Ἰησ. τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν                                      |

|                                                                         |                                                                           |                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                         | διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς<br>εἶπεν αὐτοῖς —                                | εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς —                                                                                     |
| 7. Κ. ἐγερθεῖς ἀπήλθεν εἰς<br>τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.                          | 12. Καὶ ἠγέρθη εὐθέως κ.<br>ἄρας τὸν κράββατον<br>ἐξήλθεν ἐναντίον πάντων | 25. Κ. παραχρῆμα ἀναστάς<br>ἐν ὥπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας<br>ἐφ' ὧ κατέκειτο, ἀπήλθεν<br>εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. — |
| Final note: Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ<br>ὄχλοι ἐθαύμαζαν κ.<br>ἐδόξαζαν τὸν θεόν. — | ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας κ.<br>δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν. —                         | 26. Καὶ ἐκστασις ἔλαβεν<br>ἀπαντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν<br>θεόν.                                          |

498

Here the unity would stand out if the narrators only agreed that Jesus was willing to help because he saw the trust of the bearers - not of the sick person himself.

| n. 10 (p. 184)                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth. 9:9 Καὶ παράγων ὁ<br>Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδε —<br>καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ τελωνίῳ<br>— καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ —                                                        | Mark 2:13 Καὶ ἐξήλθε<br>πάλιν —<br>14. Παράγων εἶδε —<br>καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ τελωνίῳ<br>κ. λέγει αὐτῷ —                                                     | Luke 5:27 Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτα<br>ἐξήλθε<br>καὶ ἐθεάσατο —<br>καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ τελωνίῳ<br>καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ                                   |
| καὶ ἀναστάς ἠκολούθησεν<br>αὐτῷ.                                                                                                                           | likewise                                                                                                                                                 | 28. Καὶ καταλιπὼν ἅπαντα<br>ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. —                                                                                      |
| 10. Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ<br>ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ<br>ἰδοὺ, πολλοὶ τελῶναι κ.<br>αμαρτωλοὶ ἐλθόντες<br>συνανέχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ κ.<br>τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. | 15. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ<br>κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ<br>οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, κ. πολλοὶ<br>τελῶναι κ. αμαρτωλοὶ<br>συνανέχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ κ.<br>τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. — | 29. Καὶ ἐποίησε δοχὴν<br>μεγάλην — ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ<br>αὐτοῦ κ. ἦν ὄχλος τελωνῶν<br>πολὺς κ. ἄλλων *) οἱ ἦσαν<br>μετ' αὐτῶν κατακεῖμενοι. |
| 11. Καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ φαρισαῖοι<br>εἶπον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ·<br>—                                                                                           | 16. Καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ<br>φάρισαῖοι ἰδόντες —<br>ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ<br>—                                                                   | 30. Καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ<br>γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι<br>πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ<br>λέγοντες —                                         |
| 12. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν<br>αὐτοῖς —                                                                                                                          | 17. Καὶ ἀπούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς<br>λέγει αὐτοῖς —                                                                                                               | 31. Καὶ ἀποκρι — θεὸς ὁ<br>Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς<br>—                                                                              |
| 14. Τότε προσέρχονται                                                                                                                                      | 18. Καὶ — καὶ ἔρχονται κ.                                                                                                                                | 33. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν                                                                                                           |



|                                                                       |                                                                     |                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| αὐτῷ οἱ—λέγοντες.                                                     | λέγουσιν αὐτῷ' —                                                    | —                                                     |
| 15. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ' Ἰησοῦς' —                                    | 19. ditto                                                           | 34. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς —                           |
| n. 11. (p. 188.)                                                      |                                                                     |                                                       |
| Matth. 12:1. —ἐπορευθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασι διὰ τῶν σπόριμων         | Matth. 2:23 Καὶ ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν .... διὰ τῶν σπόριμων, | Luke 6:1 Ἐγένετο — διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τ. σπορ.   |
| οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπείνασαν καὶ ἥρξαντο τίλλειν στάχυν καὶ ἐσθίειν. | καὶ ἥρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς σταχυν.     | καὶ ἐτίλλον οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ τοὺς στάχυν κ. ἥσθιον - (Ο) |
| 2. Οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπον αὐτῷ' —                              | 24. Κ. οἱ φαρισ. ἔλεγον αὐτῷ —                                      | 2. Τινὲς δὲ τῶν φαρισ. εἶπον αὐτοῖς                   |
| 3. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς —                                                | 25. Κ. αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς —                                        | 3. Κ. ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπε· —                  |

\*) Did this αλλων originate from ἀμαρτωλῶν?

499

|                                                                                       |                                                                                 |                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| n. 12 (p. 191)                                                                        |                                                                                 |                                                                                                  |
| Math. 12:9 Καὶ — ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν.                                       | Mark 3:1 Καὶ εἰσῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν'                                   | Luke 6:6 Ἐγένετο δὲ — εἰσελθεῖν αὐτόν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν (κ. διδασκεῖν)·                          |
| 10. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐκεῖ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων ξηρόν.                                  | καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρ. ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.                                   | καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρ. κ. ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὴ ἦν ξηρά.                                               |
| Καὶ (ἐπηρώτησαν) αὐτόν — εἰ (ἐξεσι) τοῖς σάββασι θεραπευεῖν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωδιν αὐτόν. | 2. Καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτόν, εἰ τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορᾷ αὐτοῦ.  | 7. Παρετήρουν δὲ — εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔχωι κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ.                 |
| 11. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ- 3. Καὶ λέγει τῷ τοῖς' —                                          | 3. Καὶ λέγει τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα' — 4. Κ. λέγει αὐτοῖς — | 9. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησ. πρὸς αὐτοὺς' — 8. — κ. εἶπε τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τῷ ξηρὸν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα. 9. Εἶπεν οὖν |

|                                                     |                                                                              |                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                     |                                                                              | ο'Ιησοῦς προς αυτοὺς' —                                |
| 13. Το'τε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ' —                       | 5. Καὶ περιβλεψά- μένος αὐτοῦς — λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ                            | 10. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ' —     |
| Final expression: 14. Οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι ἐξελθόντες *) | 6. Καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ φαρ., ευθέως                                            | 11. Αὐτοῖ δὲ ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας                         |
| συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτόν ἀπολέσωσι. | (μετὰ τῶν ἡρωδιανῶν **) συμβούλιον ἐποίουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτόν ἀπολέσωσι. | καὶ διελάλουν προς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσῃαν τῷ 'Ιησοῦ. |

\*) Fritzsche's commentary also puts this word differently from the usual text, namely: ἐξελθόντες δε οἱ. But since δε stands there, and yet nothing new begins herewith, but the conclusion is made of the speech of persons already mentioned, and consequently also of the whole speech ; so we believe that οἱ δε φαρισαῖοι must be prefixed. Here again we have proof that the text can be incorrectly fine, even if there is no variety of readings in the manuscripts.

\*\*) It is impossible that Mark has already mentioned the Herodians here. The interpolation is from the very similar passage in n. 43, where in Matthew ( 22:15) the formula used by him here: συμβούλιον ἔλαβον degenerates, and in the parallel passage of Mark the Herodians are mentioned as pariahs. From the whole of the note given there, the reminiscence has been expressed here under the hand of the copyist. Another error in the traditional text.

500

| n. 20 (p. 210)                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Matth. 10:1 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα (μαθητάς) ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ( ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτά) καὶθεραπεύειν πάσαν νόσον και πάσαν μαλαχίαν. | Mark 6:7 Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, και ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσιάντων πνευμάτων τῶν ακαθάρτων<br><br>missing (but is in the concluding note v. 13) | Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς (δύναμιν καὶ) ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ (πάντα) τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν *). |

|                                                                                    |                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5. Τούτους τούς δώδεκα<br>ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,<br>παραγγείλας αὐτοῖς, λέγων<br>· — | καϊήρξατο αὐτοὺς<br>ἀποστέλλειν δύο δυο.<br>(Rearranged the<br>sentences)                                           | 2. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς<br>κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν<br>τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. ἰάσθαι τοὺς<br>ἀσθενούντας. |
| 7. Πορευόμενοι δέ<br>κηρύσσετε λέγοντες· ὅτι<br>ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλ. τῶν<br>ουρανῶν.   | missing (but is in the<br>concluding note v. 12)                                                                    |                                                                                                |
| 8. Ἀσθενοῦντας<br>θεραπεύετε —                                                     | Concluding note: 12. Καὶ<br>ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυσσον, ἵνα<br>μετανοήσωσι. 13. Κ.<br>δαιμόνια πολλά ἐξέβαλαν<br>(καὶ Ο.) | 6. Ἐξερχόμενοι δέ<br>διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας<br>εὐαγγελιζόμενοι κ.<br>θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ.  |

\*) The enclosed last words seem to be ruled out by v. 2.

501

β) Which are placed in a different chronological order in Luke: n. 15. 16. 28. 31. and 32.  
- (n. 14. we pass over here, because Luke has given a different recension of it, and  
Matthew a mixture of the texts of Mark and Luke, as we have seen in dat. 21.)

| n. 15 (p. 198)                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 8:19 Παρεγένοντο<br>προς αὐτόν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ<br>ἀδελφοί αὐτοῦ κ. οὐκ<br>ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ<br>διὰ τὸν ὄχλον (but cf. v. 20<br>ἐστήκασιν ἐξω). | Matth. 12:46 12:46. Ἐπὶ<br>αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, Ἰδοὺ, ἡ<br>μήτηρ κ. οἱ ἀδελφοί<br>εἰστήχισαν ἐξω ζητοῦντες<br>αὐτῷ λαλήσαι. | Mark 3:31 3:31 Ἐρχονται<br>οὖν ἡ μήτηρ .... αὐτοῦ καὶ<br>ἐξω ἐστώτες ἀπέστειλαν<br>προς αὐτόν. 32. Καὶ<br>ἐκάθητο ὄχλος περὶ αὐτόν. |
| 20. Καὶ ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ<br>λεγόντων · —                                                                                                                    | 47. Εἶπε δέ τις αὐτῷ —                                                                                                  | Εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ' —                                                                                                                    |
| 21. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε<br>προς αὐτοὺς —                                                                                                                | 49. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα<br>ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ<br>εἶπε' —                                                         | 34. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος<br>κύκλῳ τοὺς περὶ αὐτόν<br>καθημένους (vergl. v. 32.)<br>λέγει —                                            |

-----

| n. 16 (p. 199)                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 8:4 Συνιόντος δέ όχλου πολλού και —<br>(According to the others, the people gather around Jesus on the shore of the lake; according to Luke, on the journey. All make a preliminary remark to convey the presence of the audience). | Matth. 13:1 — εκάθητο παρά την θάλασσαν. 2. Καί συνήχθησαν προς αυτόν όχλοι πολλοί, ώστε αυτόν είς τό πλοϊον εμβάντα καθήσθαι, και πας ό όχλος έπ τον αίγιαλόν είστήκει. | Mark 4:1 K. — ήρξατο διδάσκειν παρά την θάλασσαν καϊ συνήχθη προς αυτόν όχλος πολύς, ώστε .... καθήσθαι εν τή θαλάσση, καϊ πάς ο όχλος προς την θαλασσαν επι τής γής ήιν.          |
| είπε διά παραβολής· —<br>(otherwise Luke always says είπε παραβολήν— here; he gave a parab. lecture. Compare Mark v. 32, χωρίς παραβολής.                                                                                                | 3. Και ελάλησεν αύτοίς πολλά εν παραβολαίς, λεγων —                                                                                                                      | 2. Καί εδίδασκεν αύτούς εν παραβολαίς πολλά κ. ελεγεν αύτοίς εν τή διδαχή αυτού.                                                                                                   |
| 9. Έπηρώτων δέ αυτόν οί μαθηταί αυτού λέγοντες, τίς είη ή παραβολή αύτη.                                                                                                                                                                 | 10. Καϊ προσελθόντες οί μαθηταί ειπον αύτώ' διατί — λαλείς αύτοίς;                                                                                                       | 10. Ότε δέ εγίνετο καταμόνας, ήρώτησαν αυτόν — την παραβολήν.                                                                                                                      |
| 10. Ό δέ είπεν ' —                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 11. Καϊ έλεγεν αύτοίς —                                                                                                                                                  | 11. Ό δέ άποκριθεις είπεν αύτοίς —                                                                                                                                                 |
| The concluding remark is missing.                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 34. Ταυτα πάντα ελάλησεν ό Ίησ, εν παραβολαίς τοίς όχλοίς κ. χωρίς παραβολής .... Αύτοίς.<br><br>Examples of such interpretation v. 36-52.                               | 33. Καϊτοι αύταις παραβολαίς πολλαίς ελάλει αύτοίς τον λόγον, καθώς ήδύναντο άκούειν *). 34. Χωρίς δέ παραβολής ούκ ελάλει αύτοίς, κατ' ιδίαν δέ τοίς μαθηταίς αύτού επίλυε πάντα. |

\*) This formula proves that Mark did not want to express Jesus' own intention with the ινα - μή ἴδωσι v. 12, and that therefore our explanation given above was the correct one. (This subsequently to p. 206. Note \*\*.) The parables were therefore understandable also to the people.

| n. 28, (p, 213.) in Luke directly connected with n. 21                                    |                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 9:18 Καί ἐγένετο — καταμάνας, ουνήσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταῖ καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοῦς λέγων" — | Mark 8:27 — καὶ ἐν 'τῇ ἁδῶ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς ' —                 | Matth. 16:13 — ἡρωτατοῦς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ λίγων —                                                                                            |
| 19. Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον —                                                            | 28. Οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρίθησαν" —                                                               | 14. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον —                                                                                                                         |
| 20. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς —                                                                      | 29. Καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει αὐτοῖς —                                                           | 15. Λέγει αὐτοῖς —                                                                                                                        |
| 21. Ὁδὲ ἐπιτιμησας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλε μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο, εἰ- πών —                       | 30. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοῖς — | 20. Τότε ἐπετίμηκε τοῖς μαθ. αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μηδενὶ εἵπωσιν (ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός.) 21. Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησ. δεικνῦειν τοῖς μαθ. αὐτοῦ. |
| 23. "Ελεγε δὲ πρὸς πάντας —                                                               | 34. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ·                            | 24. Τότε ὁ Ἰησ. εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ —                                                                                                |

As according to the others Jesus is on the journey with the disciples, so Luke also expressly notes that he had them around him.

-----

503

| n. 31, (p. 217.) in Luke directly connected with n. 30.                                                                         |                                                                               |                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 9:43 Πάντῳ δὲ θαυματοῦν ἐπὶ πάνσιν οἷς ἐποίει —                                                                            | Mark 9:30 Καὶ — παρεπορευοντο διὰ τῆς γαλιλαίας καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλεν, ἵνα εἰς γινώ. | Matth. 17:22 Ἀναστρεφομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ γαλιλαίᾳ *). |
| 45. Οἱ δὲ ἡγνόουν τὸ ρῆμα τοῦτο, καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένοι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ αισθωνται αὐτό, κ. εφοβούντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ | 32. Οἱ δὲ ἡγνόουν τὸ ρῆμα τοῦτο καὶ εφοβούντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι *).            |                                                         |

|                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|
| ρήματος τούτου. |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|

\*) Here the ordinary way of life is indisputably wrong, and we must take the other one: στρεφομένων δε αὐτῶν εἰς γαλιλαίαν. The following reasons decide the choice:

(a) is Matthäus' text sufficiently conformable to that of Mark to be made entirely equal to it by transforming the εἰς into εἰς (just as the codices interchange both prepositions elsewhere), or rather, is it too conformable to it for the εἰς to be tolerated here. Matthew here mentions (why here?) Galilee just like Mark does, and uses a word that can mean "return" just like Mark does when he speaks of a return journey.

(b) Jesus, according to the Gospels, gives the revelation that he is to meet suffering three times, first on the journey to Caesarea, then on the return journey from thence, and the third time, as he has Jerusalem before him as his goal (Mark 10:10). Now Matthew makes the same division points for this announcement. Why, then, should his words be contradicted here at the second point, or should we wish to wring his στρέφεσθαι εἰς out of his hands, in order to assert the εἰς instead of εἰς?

c) How then would Matthew just here come up with the remark: "As they turned to and fro (turned around) in Galilee? The little that Matthew lets follow from here on with Mark for the stay in Galilee, does not testify that the writer had a ἀναστρέφεσθαι εἰς in mind, or could grasp it in his mind.

\*) As Griesbach notes, 2 ed. omit this verse; but nothing is more probable than that it came into Mark by interpolation from Luke.

a) After v. 30, Mark himself does not suggest any other conclusion than that of r. 33: καὶ ἤλθεν εἰς Καπερν. since v. 31. is a parenthetical remark. If v. 32. should still have been added to v. 31; Mark would not have given v. 31. the form of a subsequent parenthetical remark,

b) If r. 32. belonged to the narrative, the author would have wanted to summarize what was to be said of the disciples' behaviour on the way, or he would have wanted to cut off any question about it by this remark. That Mark could not have had such an intention is shown by v. 34. Read impartially, and you will feel that v. 34 contrasts unpleasantly with v. 32.

c) Luke could well have made such a remark, since he has not yet sent a piece in which the announcement of Jesus was explained (in n. 28. there is no explanation of it); but after a piece like Mark 9:11-13. such a remark would have to be disconcerting in the present place.

(d) Consistently Luke repeats the same remark at n. 36, (Luke 18:34.) Mark there remarks nothing of the kind. What he does not know there will be strange to him here,

e) We see here that the words of Luke are written out, in themselves. Mark never agrees so literally with Luke in the closing formulae. (That Luke 4:44. makes no exception will be shown elsewhere).

505

| n. 32 (p. 218)                                                       |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 9:46 Εἰσῆλθε δὲ διαλογισμός ἐν αὐτοῖς, τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. | Mark 9:34 — πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελίχθησαν(ὃν τῇ ὁδῷ), τίς μείζων.                     | Matth. 18:1 — προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λεγοντες τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐστί —                                        |
|                                                                      | previously v. 33. Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς καπερναοὺμ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενομένου ἐπηρώτησε αὐτοῦς | 17:24. Ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς καπερναοὺμ. — 25. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, προεφθασεν αὐτόν ὁ Ἰησοῦς λίγων — |

These were all the orations with their written details. However, there are differences here and there in the narrative formulas woven into or attached to the outside of the specimens. But these differences would hardly come into consideration against those parts that are imprints of one and the same type, if we could not even make an effort to explain the origin of each formula that emerges from the unity in fact. But this too can be done, and so it is all the more certain that our concordant relations have flowed out of a single written source. Now we turn to those pieces of narrative which, although they are no less integral parts of our Gospels than the speeches, we have nevertheless distinguished from the speeches according to the extent to which reflection took part in the formation of the relations when they were first produced - to the descriptions of facts. (The reason for the distinction that led us to separate the latter from the former was, to mention it again in passing, that for the drafting of the former, the original author already had certain, more or less definite or extensive, boron descriptions of the

declarations of Jesus or others whose speech was to be handed down, whereas the first report of facts was preceded only by the facts themselves \*).

\*) We made this distinction in the first place with regard to the hypothesis of the oral primal gospel in order to

a) to show, with regard to the latter, that, even if it could be assumed to be a co-healing organ for the substance in question, the the matter under discussion, the obscurity might still have been different, if from composition, teleological direction, and composition... the operations of reflection are seen;

b) in the event that the written record had to be set as the principle of the formation of the evangelical news, to concede its right to the presupposition that the author's will might have been bound by "something".

506

It is to be assumed that the mutual relationship of our Gospels will also present itself in the pieces of this second type in the same way as in those. But this must be mentioned as a special datum.

#### Second Datum.

Even the reports of individual miraculous acts of Jesus presented on the first table as parallels, even if they are presented in different ways and in part especially executed, nevertheless have the "same" disposition and sequence of moments, and include not only individual concepts and views, but also whole series of general sentences in the same literal expression, as proof that they originated from a single original record.

We consider

a) those pieces that are in the same chronological order in all speakers. We will designate the successive moments of the narrative with numbers.

| n. 22. (is found in all of them after the sending out of the disciples)                                     |                                                                                         |                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Math. 14:13. 1) Καί —<br>ἀνεχώρησιν ἐκείθεν ἐν<br>πλοίῳ — εἰς ἔρημον τόπον<br>κατ' ἰδίαν, καὶ ἀχοῦσαντις οἱ | Luke 9:10 Καὶ —<br>ὑπεχώρησε καὶ ἰδίαν εἰς<br>τόπον ἔρημον — 11. οἱ δὲ<br>ὄχλοι γνόντες | Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπήλθεν εἰς<br>ἐρημον τόπον τῷ πλοίῳ<br>κατ' ἰδίαν, 33, — καὶ<br>ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοί |



|                                                                 |                                                                                        |                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| ὄχλοι ἤχολονθησαν αὐτῷ                                          | ήχολουῖθήσαν αὐτῷ '                                                                    |                                                             |
| (πεζή ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων).                                          |                                                                                        | (κ. πεζή ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμαν καὶ ἦλθον ἔχει).   |
| 14. 2) Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδε πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς | καὶ δεξιόμενος αὐτοὺς                                                                  | 34. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδε πολὺν ὄχλον κ. ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς |
| καὶ ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν.                            | καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο. | καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλὰ.                          |

507

For the rest, see p. 51 above. The following moments in the narrative are found:

3) The disciples ask Jesus, as it is evening, to dismiss the people. Matth. v. 15. Luk. 12. (The words here are constructed in the same way ἀπόλυσον — ἵνα. Before, in the same place, the narrator's remark that it was evening).

4) Jesus encourages the disciples to feed the people themselves.

5) He takes the small supply of bread that they have, which is not nearly enough for the people.

6) He arranges for the people to lie down.

7) He says a prayer of thanksgiving over the food supply and then distributes it.

8) Finally, he says that they all ate and were satisfied. - Now compare the accounts according to their literal expression and then judge - when a statement is made such as the following: "The news of what happened on the return, which is obviously still connected with this story, shows that the story of the feeding can also be traced back to another original story, and one also sees from this how great the agreement between two simple stories of a simple process can be, even without a common source. (Veil Writings of Luke, p. 144) - one may judge, I say, what is to be said or thought of such a statement, perhaps one will admire the ease with which the primal gospel is thus explained away\*).

\*) Still we remember in view of the text that the ordinary reading Mark 6:40 πρασιαῖ πρασαι ἀνά ἑκατόν και ἀνά πεντήκοντα is wrong. Mark divides the 5000 men into groups according to ranks. So it is to be read: κρᾱσιαῖ ἑκατὼν ἀνά πεντήκοντα, i.e., a hundred shifts of 50 men each = 5000 men. How is it that this has not yet been noticed?

508

| n. 29 and 30. (Luke gives a freer account).                                                                                               |                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Math. 17:1. 1) Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησ. τον . Πέτρον κ. Ἰάκωβον κ. Ἰωάννην — καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος υψηλὸν και ἰδίαν. | Luke 9:28 Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ — ὥσει ἡμέραι οκτώ, κ. παραλαβὼν Πέτρον — .... Ἰωάννην, — ἀνέβη εἰς τοὸρος (προσεύξασθαι). | Mark 9:2 Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησ. τον Πέτρον .... (Ἰαννην κ. ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς .... υψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μονοὺς |
| 2.2) Καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν                                                                                                      | 29. Κ. ἐγένετο (ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτόν)                                                                            | κ. μετεμορφώθη ἔμπρ. αὐτῶν,                                                                                              |
| και ελαμψε τό πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος                                                                                                   | τό εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον,                                                                                  |                                                                                                                          |
| τά δε ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκά ὡς τό φῶς.                                                                                               | κ. ὁ ἱματισμός αὐτοῦ λευκός ἐξαστράπτων.                                                                             | 3. καί τά ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα —                                                                               |
| 3. 3) Καί ἰδοὺ, ὥφθησαν αὐτοῖς Μωυσῆς κ. Ἠλίας μετ' αὐτοῦ συλλαλοῦντες.                                                                   | 30. Κ. Ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες δυο συναλαοῦν αὐτῷ, οἵτινές ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας' 31. Οἱ ὀφθεντὶς ἐν δόξῃ —                     | 4. Καὶ ὥφθησαν αὐτοῖς Ἠλίας καὶ Μωϋσῆς καὶ ἦσαν συλλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησου.                                                   |
| 4.4) Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησουν (the words are the same in all copies).                                                  | (v. 32. Ο.) 33. Κ. — εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν" — (μή εἰδῶς ὁ λέγει).                                           | 5. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ —                                                                              |
| 5.5) Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ, νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτοὺς                                                                          | 34. Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λέγοντας ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκ. αὐτούς· (Ο.)                                                      | (οὐ γὰρ ἤδει, τί λαλήσῃ *). 7. Κ. ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκισσοῦσα αὐτοῖς                                                     |
| καὶ ἰδοὺ, φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα' — (the words are the same for all.) 6.7. Ο.                                                        | 35. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα" —                                                                       | κ. ἦλθε φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης. —                                                                                           |
| 8. Ἐπαρᾶντες δε τοὺς                                                                                                                      | 36. Κ. ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τήν                                                                                            | 8. Καὶ ἐξάπινα                                                                                                           |

|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| οφθαλμούς αὐτῶν οὐδένα εἶδον, εἰ μή τόν Ἰησοῦν.                                                                                  | φωνήν εὐρέθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς μόνος.                                                                           | περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκ ἐτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλά τόν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.                                                                               |
| 9. Κ.(καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν τῷ ὅρου) ἐνέτειλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησ. λίγων μηδενὶ εἰπητετό ὅραμά (ἐως ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστή). | Καὶ (cf. 37. κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρου) αὐτοὶ εσῖγησαν κ. οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν — οὐδέν ὦν ἑωράκασιν. | 9. Καταβαινόντων, δέ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρου διεβείλατο αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ διηγησῶνται α εἶδον, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀνδρ. ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστή. |

\*) Did it originally also say: ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλήσει ἐγένετο νεφέλη ? At least the coincidence of this λαληση with the ἐτι λαλοθης of Matth. is striking.

509

| n. 30.                                                                          |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Math. 17:14                                                                     | Luke 9:37Κ. ἐγένετο κατελθόντων αὐτῶν — συνήνησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς.                                                              | Mark 9:14 Καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδεν ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοῦ. —                                                              |
| 15. 2) προσήλθιν αὐτῷ ἀνθρ. γονυπετῶν αὐτόν<br>16. καὶ λεγῶν                    | 38. Κ. ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀνέβη σε λεγῶν                                                                                    | 17. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἰς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπε                                                                                           |
| κύριε, ἐλεησόν μου τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι σελήνιάζεται, καὶ κακῶς πάσχει (cf. 15:22.)·   | διδάσκαλε — ἐπιβλέψον ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου. — 39. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν — καὶ σπαρασσεν αὐτὸν μετ' ἀφροῦ — συντρίβον αὐτόν | διδάσκαλε, ἡνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρόσσε έχοντα πνεῦμα ἀλαλόν. 18. Κ. σποῦ ἂν αὐτόν καταλάβῃ, ρήσσει αὐτόν κ. ἀφρίζει — κ. ξηραίνεται |
| 16. καὶ προσήνεγκα αὐτόν τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου, κ. οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν αὐτόν θεραπεύσαι. | 40. κ. ἐδ ἐθήν τῶν μαθητῶν σου, ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν.                                                          | κ. εἶπον τοῖς μαθ. σου, ἵνα αὐτό ἐκβάλωσιν κ. οὐκ ἴσχυσαν.                                                                         |
| 17. 3) Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·                                            | 41. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν                                                                                                 | 19. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε —                                                                                                         |
| ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος κ. διεστραμμένη· ἐως πότε ἔσομαι μεθ' ὑμῶν, ἐως                 | ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος κ. .... ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνίσταμαι ὑμῶν; προσάγαγε                                                           | ὦ γενεὰ ἀπίστος, ἐως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι, ἐως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;                                                                |

|                                                                                                         |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ποτέ ανίξομαι υμών;<br>φέρετε μοι αὐτόν ὡδε.                                                            | ὡδε τόν υἱόν σου.                                                                   | φέρετε αὐτόν πρὸς με.                                                                                                                                                         |
| 4) missing                                                                                              | 42. Ἔτι δε προσερχομένου<br>αυτοῦ ἐρρηξεν αὐτόν τό<br>δαιμόνιον κ.<br>συνεσπάραξεν. | 20. Κ. ἤνεγκαν πρὸς αὐτόν<br>κ. ἰδόν αὐτόν ευθέως<br>τό πνεῦμα ἐσπάραξεν<br>αὐτόν *). — (21 - 24. Ο.)                                                                         |
| 18. 5) Κ. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ<br>ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐξ-ἦλθεν ἀπ'<br>αυτοῦ τό δαιμόνιον, κ.<br>ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς — | 42. Ἐπετίμησε δέ ὁ Ἰησ.<br>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ<br>κ. ἰάσατο τον παιῖδα. —       | 25. — ἐπετίμησε τῷ<br>πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ —<br>Ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ — καὶ —<br>ἐξήλθε.<br><br>(v. 26. Ο.) 27. Ὁ δε Ἰησ.<br>κράτησας αὐτόν τῆς χειρός<br>ἤγειρεν αὐτόν, κ. ἀνέστη. |

\*) The ἰδων is in fact nothing but a spelling mistake, probably caused by the transposition of the words that should actually stand like this: καὶ ἰδόν αὐτόν το πνεῦμά ευθέως ἐσπ. Ανιόν.

510

| n. 38. 1)                                                                                                  |                                                                                                 |                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 18:35 Ἐγένετο δέ ἐν<br>τῷ ἐγγίξειν αὐτόν εἰς<br>Ἱεριχώ, τυφλὸς τις ἐκάθητο<br>παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν | Mark 10:46 Καὶ<br>ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ<br>Ἱεριχώ — τυφλὸς ἐκάθητο<br>παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν | Matth. 20:29 Κ.<br>ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν<br>ἀπὸ Ἱεριχώ.— 30. Κ. Ἰδοὺ,<br>δύο τυφλοὶ καθημένοι<br>παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, |
| 36.2) ἀκούσας δέ — 37. —<br>ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ ναζωραῖος<br>παρέρχεται.                                          | 47. καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς<br>ὁ ναζωραῖός ἐστιν,                                                | ἀκοῦσαντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς<br>παραγεί,                                                                             |
| 38. Καὶ ἐβόησε λέγων<br>Ἰησοῦ, υἱέ Δαβὶδ, ἐλέησόν<br>με.                                                   | ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν ὁ<br>υἱὸς Δαβὶδ, Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν<br>με.                                | ἐκραξαν λέγοντες ἑλέησόν<br>ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαβὶδ                                                           |
| 39. 3) Κ. οἱ προάγοντες<br>ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ, ἵνα<br>σιωπήσῃ αὐτός δέ πολλῶ                                    | 48. Καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ<br>πολλά, ἵνα σιωπήσῃ οὐδὲ<br>πολλῶ μάλλον ἐκραξεν υἱέ                    | 31. Ὁ δέ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν<br>αὐτοῖς, ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν ὅτι<br>δὲ μείζον                                          |

|                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                               |                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| μάλλον έκραξεν' υιός<br>Δαβίδ, έλέησόν με.                                                                                  | Δαβίδ, έλέησόν με.                                                                                            |                                                                            |
| 40. 4) Σταθείς δέ ό 'Ιησ.<br>έκέλευσεν αυτόν άχθήναι<br>προς αυτόν                                                          | 49. Κ. στάς ό'ίησ. είπεν<br>αυτόν φωνηθήναι — 50. —                                                           | 32. Κ. στάς ό Ιησ.<br>έφώνησεν αυτούς                                      |
| 5) έγγίσαντος δέ αυτού<br>έπηρώτησεν αυτόν λέγων'<br>τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω ;                                                 | ό δέ—αναστάςήλθε προς<br>τον 'Ιησ. 51. Κ. — λέγει<br>αυτοί ό 'Ιησ. τί θέλεις<br>ποιήσω σοι;                   | καϊ είπε' τί θέλετε ποιήσω<br>ϋμίν;                                        |
| Ό όέ είπε" κύριε, ι'να<br>άναβλέψω.                                                                                         | Ό δέ τυφλός είπεν αϋτώ'<br>ραββουνί, ι'να άναβλέψω.                                                           | 33. Λέγουσιν αϋτώ· κύριε,<br>ι'να άνεωχθώσιν ημών οί<br>οφθαλμοί.          |
| 42. 6) Κ. ό Ιησούς είπεν<br>αϋτώ' άνάβλεψον, ή πίστις<br>σου σέσωκέ σε. 43. Κ.<br>παραχρήμα άνέβλεφε καϊ<br>ήκολούθει αϋτώ. | 52. Ό δέ 'ίησ. είπεν αϋτώ'<br>ύπαγε, ή πίστις σου .... σε<br>κ. ευθεως άνέβλεφε κ.<br>ήκαλούθειαϋτώ έντή όδω. | 34. Σπλαγχνισθεις δέ ό'<br>Ιησ. ήψατρ τών οφθαλμων<br>αϋτών (vergl. 9:29.) |
|                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                               | καϊ ευθέως άνέβλεψαν<br>(αϋτών οί οφθαλμοί) καϊ<br>ήκολούθησαν αϋτώ.       |

511

Now follow b) those pieces which - especially in Matthew - are placed in a different order.

| n. 7.                                                                                           |                                                                             |                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Math. 8:14 Καϊ έλθών ό<br>'Ιησ, είς την οι κέαν Πέτρου                                       | Luke 4:38 Ανάστας δέ έκ<br>τής συναγωγής εισήλθεν<br>εις την οικίαν Σίμωνος | Mark 1:29 Καϊ εύθέως έκ<br>τής συναγ. έξελθών ήλθεν<br>) εις τήν οικίαν Σίμωνος κ.<br>'Ανδρέου (μετά Ιακώβου κ.<br>'Ιωάννου). |
| 2) είδε τήνπενθεράν αϋτοϋ<br>βεβλημένην καϊ<br>πυρέσσουσιν (Matthew<br>summarises two sentences | πενθερά δέ του Σίμωνος<br>ήν συνεχο μένη πύρετω<br>(μεγάλω)                 | 30. 'Η δέ πενθερά Σίμωνος<br>κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα                                                                             |

|                                                                                            |                                                                        |                                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| in the είδε).                                                                              |                                                                        |                                                                         |
|                                                                                            | καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς.                                         | κ. εὐθέως λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς.                                     |
| 15. 3) Κ. ἥψατο τῆς χειρός αὐτῆς,                                                          | 39. Καὶ ἐπιστάς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπέτιμήσε τῷ πυρετῷ,                       | 31. Κ. προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτήν, κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς,              |
| καὶ ἀφήκεν αὐτήν ὁ πυρετός                                                                 | καὶ ἀφήκεν αὐτήν                                                       | κ. ἀφήκεν αὐτήν ὁ πυρετός εὐθέως                                        |
| κ. ἠγέρθηκ. διηκάνει αὐτοῖς.                                                               | παραχρήμα δέαναστάσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς                                   | κ. διηκονεῖ αὐτοῖς.                                                     |
| 16. 4) Ὁψίαςδὲ γενόμενης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ                                                  | 40. Δύνοντας δέ τον ἡλίου                                              | 32. Ὁψίας δέ γενόμενης, οτε εδυ ὁ ἡλιος, εφεραν προς αὐτόν              |
| missing                                                                                    | πάντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νοσοῖς ποικίλαις ἤγαγον προς αὐτόν       | πάντας τοὺς κακῶς εχοντας                                               |
| δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς.                                                                   | missing                                                                | καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζόμενους.                                               |
| Transition: b. καὶ ἐξέβαλε τὰ πνεύματα (λόγω) a. καὶ παντας τοὺς κακῶς εχοντας ἐθεράπευσε' | a. ὁ δὲ ἐκάστω — ἐπιθεῖς ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς.                           | (33. Ο.) 34. a. Καὶ ἐθεράπευσε πολλούς κακῶς εχοντας (ποικίλαις νόσοις) |
|                                                                                            | b. 41. Ἐξη'ρχετο δέ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν—                           | b. καὶ δαιμόνια πολλά ἐξέβαλε                                           |
| missing                                                                                    | καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ἤδεισαν τον χριστόν αὐτόν εἶναι. | καὶ οὐκ ἤπει λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν (τον χριστόν εἶναι). |

\*) So cod. D. - ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον can only be a scribal error if μετα Ἰακ. κ. Ἰωάννον belongs to the text, and it cannot be said that the singular is correction according to Matthew or Luke (Fritzsche's Kommentar, zu Mark, bei d. St.). Nor does the suddenly emerging αὐτῷ. v. 30, nor the preceding v. 28, harmonize with the plural. These surroundings show that the author had Jesus in mind before others, and thus must have made the report v. 29 dependent on him.

| n. 17.                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Math. 8:18. 1) —<br>έκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τό<br>πέραν.                                                                     | Luke 8:22. — καί εἶπε<br>προς αὐτούς· διέλθωμεν<br>εἰς τοπέραν (τῆς λίμνης),                                                                           | Mark 4:35. Καί λέγει αὐτοῖς<br>— διέλθωμεν εἰς τό πέραν.                                                                                   |
| 2) The departure took<br>place. v. 23.                                                                                      | 22. κ. Ἀνήχθησαν.<br>23. —                                                                                                                             | 36. (All three vary.)                                                                                                                      |
| 24. 3) Καί ἰδοῦ, σεισμός<br>μέγας ἐγένετο ἐντῇ<br>θαλάσῃ, ὥστε τό πλοῖον<br>καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν<br>κυμάτων                  | καί κατέβη λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου<br>εἰς τήν λίμνην καί<br>συνεπληροῦτο τό πλοῖον<br>καί ἐκινδύνευον.                                                           | 37. Καί γίνεται λαῖλαψ<br>ἀνέμου μεγάλη τά δέ<br>κύματα ἐπέβαλον εἰς τό<br>πλοῖον, ὥστε αὐτό ἤδη<br>γεμίζεσθαι.                            |
| αὐτός δέ ἐκάθευδε.                                                                                                          | (v. 23. πλεόντων δέ αὐτῶν<br>αφύπνωσε)                                                                                                                 | 38. Καί ἦν αὐτός —<br>καθεύδων.                                                                                                            |
| 25. 4) Καί προσελθόντες οἱ<br>μαθηταί ἡγειραν αὐτόν<br>λέγοντες.                                                            | 24. Προσελθόντες δέ<br>διῆγειραν αὐτόν λέγοντες·                                                                                                       | Κ. διεγείρουσι αὐτόν κ,<br>λέγουσιν·                                                                                                       |
| κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς,<br>ἀπολλυμεθα!                                                                                           | ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα!                                                                                                                                  | διδάσκαλε, ὦν μέλει σοι, ὅτι<br>ἀπολλυμεθα;                                                                                                |
| 26. 5) Τότε ἐγερθεῖς<br>ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις κ.<br>τῇ θαλάσῃ κ. ἐγένετο<br>γαλήνημεγάλη, καί λέγει<br>αὐτοῖς              | ο ὁ ἐγερθεῖς ἐπετίμησε τῷ<br>ἀνέμῳ κ. τῷ κλυδωνί τοῦ<br>υδατος ( — ) κ. ἐγένετο<br>γαλήνη.                                                             | 39. Κ. διεγερθεῖς ἐπετίμησε<br>τῷ ἀνέμῳ κ. εἶπε τῇ<br>θαλάσῃ — κ. — ἐγένετο<br>γαλήνη μεγάλη.                                              |
| τί δειλοί ἐστε, (ολιγόπιστοι);                                                                                              | 25. Εἶπε δέ αὐτοῖς ποῦ<br>ἐστίν ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;                                                                                                         | 40. Κ. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τί δειλοί<br>ἐστε οὕτω; πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε<br>πίστιν;                                                                       |
| 27. 6) Οἱ δέ ἄνθρωποι<br>ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες·<br>ποταπός ἐστίν οὗτος, ὅτι<br>καί οἱ ἀνέμοι κ. ἡ θάλασσα<br>ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ; | Φοβηθέντες δέ ἐθαύμασαν<br>) λέγοντες προς ἀλλήλους<br>τίς ἄρα οὗτος ἐστίν, ὅτι καί<br>τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει<br>κ. τοῖς ὕδασι κ.<br>ὑπακονοῦσιν αὐτῷ; | 41. Καί ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον<br>μέγαν κ. ἔλεγον προς<br>ἀλλήλους τίς ἄρα οὗτος<br>ἐστίν, ὅτι καί ὁ ἀνεμος κ. ἡ<br>θάλασσα ὑπακονοῦσιν<br>αὐτῷ; |
| 28. Κ. ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τό<br>πέραν, εἰς τήν χώραν τῶν<br>γαδαρηνῶν, ὑπηγήσαν<br>αὐτῷ ὄνο δαιμονιζόμενοι                    | Luk. 8:26. Κ. κατέπλευσαν<br>εἰς τήν χώραν τῶν<br>γαδαρηνῶν. —                                                                                         | Mark 5:1. Καί ἦλθον **) εἰς<br>τό πέραν, εἰς ....<br>γαδαρηνῶν.                                                                            |

|                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                 | 2) 27. Ἐξελθόντι δέ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπηντησεν αὐτῷ ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὃς εἶχε δαιμόνια (ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν) καὶ ἱμάτια οὐκ ἐνεδιδύσκετο κ. ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμεινεν, ἀλλ' ἐντοῖς μνήμασιν. | 2. Καὶ ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθέως ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ ***) ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ,                                                                 |
| ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι, χαλεποὶ λίαν, ὥστε—                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                            | 3. ὃς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι, καὶ οὔτε ἀλῦσεσιν οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο αὐτόν δῆσαι. (4. 5. Ο.)                                                          |
| 29. 3) Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐκραξαν λέγοντες                                                                                                                               | 23. Ἰδὼν δέ τὸν Ἰησοῦν προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνακραξας φωνὴ μεγάλη *) εἶπε                                                                                                                   | 6. Ἰδὼν δε τὸν Ἰησοῦν — — προσεκυνησεν αὐτῷ 7. καὶ κράξας φωνὴ μεγάλη εἶπε                                                                                    |
| τί ἡμῖν κ. σοί, Ἰησοῦ, υἱέ τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε προ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;                                                                                       | τί ἐμοί κ. σοί, Ἰησοῦ, υἱέ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαι σου, ἵνα μὴ με βασανίσῃς.                                                                                                          | τί ἐμοί .... τοῦ ὑψίστου; ορκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃς.                                                                                                |
|                                                                                                                                                                 | 29. Παρήγγειλε γάρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. — 30. Frage: wie der Dämon heiÙe. 31. Bitte der Dämonen.                                                             | 9. "Ελεγε γάρ αὐτῷ' ἐξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 9. Ask how the daimon heeded/is called. 10. request of the Damon.                          |
| 30. 6) Ἦν δέ οὐ μακρὰν **) ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. 31. Οἱ δέ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτόν λέγοντες' — ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων.  | 32. Ἦν δέ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένων καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν,                                                                            | 11. Ἦν δέ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὄρει ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλῃ βοσκομένη. 12. Καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν πολλὰ λέγοντες· πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν. |
| 32. 7) Κ. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὑπάγετε οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπήλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· 8) κ. ὠρμησε πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν κ. ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι. | καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. 33. Ἐξελθόντα δέ τα δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρ. εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· κ ὠρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην κ. ἀπεπνίγη.                                  | 13. Κ. ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς, κ. ἐξελθόντα τα πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς αὐτοὺς' καὶ ὠρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλ. — καὶ ἀπεπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ   |



|                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                            | θαλάσση.                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 33. 9) Οί δέ βόσκοντες εφυγονκ. (άπελθόντες εἰς την πάλιν) ανήγγειλαν πάντα. | 34. Ἰδόντες δέ οἱ βοσκοντες τό γεγεννημένον εφυγον και απήγγειλαν εἰς την πολιν καί εἰς τοὺς αγρούς.                                                                                       | 14. Οἱ δέ βόσκοντες εφυγον καί απήγγ. .... τοὺς αγρονς,                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 34. 10) Καί Ἰδοῦ, πάσα ἡ πόλις ἐξήλθεν εἰς συναντηῦν τῷ Ἰησοῦ                | 35. Ἐξήλθον δέ ἰδεῖν τό γεγονός καί ἦλθον προς τόν Ἰησοῦν κ. εύρον καθημένον τόν άνθρωπον — ἱματισμένον καί σωφρονοῦντ — καί ἐφοβήθησαν. 36. Ἀπήγγειλαν δέ αὐτοῖς κ. οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐσωθη. | Καί ἐξήλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστι τό γεγονός. 15. Κ. ερχονται προς τον Ἰησοῦν κ. θεωρούσε τόν δαιμονιζόμενον καθημένον κ. ἱματισμένον καί σωφρονοῦντα κ. ἐφοβήθησαν. 16. Κ. διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες, πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ. — |
| καί ἰδόντες αὐτόν παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν, ἵνα μεταβή ἀπό τῶν ορίων αὐτῶν.         | 37. Κ. ηρώτησαν αὐτόν — ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν; —                                                                                                                                              | 17. Κ. ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτόν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ορίων αὐτῶν.                                                                                                                                                                     |

513

\*) If this formula were found in Mark, it would immediately prove that Mark had mixed the two secondary texts together.

\*\*) Since the continuation of the journey is still spoken of here, and in the word lies at the same time the suggestion that the danger was happily overcome, the reading ἦλθον must be preferred to the other: ἦλθεν.

\*\*\*) The added: ἐκ τῶν μνημείων makes with ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι v. 3. such an intolerable tautology that it cannot be considered genuine. It probably first crept into the text from Matthew. -

514

\*) Thus the words are indisputably to be transposed again.

**\*\*)** Without hesitation we adopt the reading οὐ μακράν, whatever codices or critics may advise against it. The reasons for the decision lie in the text itself.

a) it is already psychologically true that in the introductory preface, which should explain the origin of the request, not a μακράν, but the μακράν, is used. οὐ μακράν should have been the indication. It was precisely the proximity of the Pigs caused the demons to make the request.

b) If one evaluates the choice of words and the combination of words psychologically, the epithet ἀπ' αὐτῶν only becomes comprehensible as a natural outflow of the thought if it is immediately preceded by a οὐ μακράν. -

c) If the herd had been far away, how would the herdsmen have been able to know the course of events so precisely as to be able to tell the πάντα? (Matth. v. 33.)

d) How easily the οὐ could have fallen out of the text!

e) Since the copies of the narrative piece are based on one and the same original relation, the μακράν could never have come into being without οὐ, without being a deviation from the original. But there is no need to assume that the deviation arose before Matthew or even through him.

| n. 18.                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Math. 9:18 — Ἰδοὺ, ἀρχῶν ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων                                  | Luke 8:41 Κ. ἰδοὺ, ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰάειρος κ. αὐτὸς ἀρχὴν τῆς συναγωγῆς υπῆρχε καὶ πεσὼν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ παρ' ἐκάλει αὐτόν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ | Mark 5:22 Καὶ ἐρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων ὀνόματι Ἰάειρος κ. — πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτόν πολλά λεγὼν |
| ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ' αὐτήν καὶ ζήσεται | 42. ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ — καὶ αὕτη ἀπέθνησκεν.                                                                                                              | ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθήσῃ αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας, ὥπως σωθῇ, καὶ ζήσεται.                                  |

|                                                                           |                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19. 2) Και έγερθεῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠκολουθήσεν αὐτῷ κ. οἱ μαθηταί.              | Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπαγεῖν αὐτόν οἱ ὄχλοι                                                                                           | 24. Καὶ ἀπήλθε μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ κολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς,                                       |
| missing                                                                   | συνέπνιγον αὐτόν.                                                                                                         | καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν.                                                                            |
| 20. 4) Κ. ἰδοῦ, γυνή αἱμορροῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη                                | 43. 3) Καὶ γυνή οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα,                                                                    | 25. Καὶ γυνή τις οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος ἔτη δώδεκα,                                               |
|                                                                           | ἥτις ἰατροῖς προσαναλῶσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ὑπ' οὐδενός θεραπευθῆναι,                                            | 26. καὶ — δαπα- νήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα, κ. μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα, ἀλλὰ μάλλον εἰς χεῖρον ἐλθούσα. |
| προσελθούσα ὀπίσθεν ἤψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.                | 44. προσελθούσα ὀπίσθεν .... αὐτοῦ                                                                                        | 27. — ἐλθούσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὀπίσθεν ἤψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.                                        |
| 21. "Ἐλεγε γάρ (ἐν ἑαυτῇ)" ἐάν μόνον ἄψωμαι τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι. | missing                                                                                                                   | 28. "Ἐλεγε γάρ, ὅτι καν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ ἄψωμαι, σωθήσομαι.                                     |
| missing                                                                   | 45-46 Jesus feels in himself the touching that has taken place. - 47. the woman admits it.                                | 29-32. 33.                                                                                       |
| 22. 5) Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιστηφεῖς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτήν                              |                                                                                                                           | (cf. v. 30. ἐπιστραφ εἰς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ) (cf. v. 32 περιβλεψάμενος ἰδεῖν.)                           |
| εἶπε θάρσει, θύγατερ ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε                               | 48. Ὁ δε εἶπεν αὐτῇ θάρσει .... σε (πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην).                                                                 | 34. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ' θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις .... σε (ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην (καὶ Ὁ.)                       |
|                                                                           | 6u. 7. 49-50. Meanwhile, people from Jairus' house come with the news that the daughter is really dead and Jesus' answer. | 35-36.                                                                                           |
| 23. 8) Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχοντος,                    | 51. Ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν —                                                                                             | 38. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγωγῶν,                                                |
| καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητάς κ. τὸν ὄχλον θορυβουμένον                           | 52. Ἐκλαίον δὲ πάντες κ. ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν.                                                                                 | καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον κ. ἀλαλάζοντας                                                                |

|                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                 | πολλά.                                                                                                                  |
| λέγει αυτοῖς ἀναχωρεῖτε οὐ γάρ ἀπέθανε τό κοράσιον, ἀλλά καθευδεῖ. | Ὁ δέ εἶπε· μή κλαίετε οὐκ ἀπύθανε, ἀλλά καθευδεῖ.                                                                                               | 39. Καί εἰσελθὼν λέγει αυτοῖς τί θορυβεῖσθε κ. κλαίετε; τό παιδίον οὐκ .... καθευδεῖ.                                   |
| 9) Καί κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.                                            | 53. Κ. κατεγέλων αὐτον (εἰδότες, ὅτι ἀπέθανεν).                                                                                                 | 40. Καί κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ                                                                                                 |
| 25. 10) "Ὅτε δέ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος, ἐκράτησε τῆς χειρός αὐτῆς,       | 54. Αὐτός δέ ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρός αὐτῆς                                                                                   | Ὁ δέ ἐκβαλὼν ἀπαντας — 41. καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρός τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ — τό κορασίου, σοῖ λέγω, ἐγείραι.             |
| missing                                                            | ἐφώνησε λέγων ἡ παῖς, ἐγείρου !                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                         |
| 11) καὶ ἡγήθη τό κοράσιον.                                         | 55. Καί — ἀνέστη παραχρήμα, κ. διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. 56. Κ. ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς ὁ δέ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τό γεγονός, | 42. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τό κοράσιον — κ. ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ, κ· διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ , ἵνα μήδεῖς γινώ τούτο — |

517

However these pieces may be placed, it is unmistakable that the parallels derive from one and the same relation, and one must therefore wonder how the aforementioned astute critic could also here again, with regard to the last two n.. 17. 18. could come to the opposite conclusion. His opinion (on the writings of Luke, p. 128 f.) has too much of the strange for us not to cite it. The account in n. 18.

α) because of its accuracy \*), must be derived from one of the disciples whom Jesus took with him to Jairus' house; though from the nature of the preceding narrative, especially from the subsequent remark (Luk. 8:29. παρήγγειλε γάρ, etc.) and from the improbability of the statement that the demons had still engaged in negotiations after Jesus' previous command to depart, that this narrator was not present at the moment when Jesus encountered the demonic but arrived only when the possessed man begged Jesus and inferred from the address that a command from Jesus to the spirits must have preceded \*\*). In contrast,

\*) To maintain the appearance of this assertion, the account of Luke is made more precise than it actually is. For when the phrase "ελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν" in verse 51 must be understood not primarily as entering the house but as entering the chamber of musicians, then the expression is vague enough, and if, in verse 52, "ἐκβαλὼν ἴξω" is also supposed to refer to the musicians' chamber, as if the pipers and minstrels had been gathered there, then the other narrators might again be more correct. The good Mark is said to misunderstand everything. See page 129. However, the critic has not noticed that Luke 8:51 is a combination of Mark 5:37 and 40 (see above, page 410). Moreover, he has not taken into account the writing style and presentation method of our authors.

\*\*) As if this narrator, when he wanted to rely on a retelling, could not have also obtained information from someone else about what he had not seen himself, or as if someone who needed to collect the report through oral information had to limit himself to the incomplete and misleading, without being able to improve it by incorporating more accurate knowledge! It is striking that the remark in Luke 8:29, "παρήγγειλε γάρ," is said to have taken on the form of an afterthought because its author supposedly filled in the gap through conjecture. The critic does not seem to be aware that such additions, by nature of the narrative style of our writers, are common; compare Mark 1:22, Luke 18:23, and many others. By adding the remark here, the circumstances are explained as to why the demon-possessed man came running to beg for the release of his demons. Indeed, it was necessary to explain why the enraged man immediately resorted to begging. And what gives us the right to consider the explanation provided by the narrator as false simply because it seems more likely that the infuriated man already had knowledge of Jesus' exorcisms beforehand? The explanation of the fact is, therefore, as much a part of the narrative as the fact itself. Furthermore, Mark also includes the explanation, and the assumption that Luke copied it from Mark is incorrect.

β) the

Matthew's account of n. 17. has a different author, namely, one of Jesus' companions who stayed by the ship, because in this account the storm is told in more detail than the event on the shore, and the description of the ravager after his healing, his wish, and Jesus' answer are completely missing. The lack of the last notes is explained by the fact that this was not told to this man, who is said to have become a reporter later. - Against such explanations it is difficult to recall anything. We shall therefore only assert what immediately suggests itself:

a) this man, from whom the more inaccurate record is derived, and who is supposed to tell of the event on the shore what he had heard, could not have received any other or less complete information than Luke's speakers, since the parts of the narrative Matth. v. 30-33. in the construction and position of the sentences, and in the choice of words, completely coincide with Luk 8:32 - 34 ?

b) How did it come about that in the Gospel of Matthew just the report of such a witness entered, who had to let himself tell a part of the report, the event on the shore and the story of the demonic?

c) It is even said of this man that he had distinguished his report. Should he not, if he wished to do so, have been able to obtain information about the event on the shore?

d) Luke's speaker is said to have been an eyewitness of what happened at Gadara, at least of what took place after the casting out of the demons. He must therefore have been the author of the description in Matt. v. 32, καὶ ὡμῆσε, etc., since it literally agrees with Luke v. 33; or Luke's speaker must have drawn from another source with the Matthean. How then is agreement and disagreement to be explained?

We see that nothing at all is explained by deriving the news from different narrators. - The account of the incident in Jairus' house is supposed to have come to Matthew from another hand - a supposition against which we do not wish to remind you further. Our critic's views are based on three things:

a) he ignores everywhere that different writers cannot coincide in the composition and expression of general propositions connected in a reflective utterance;

b) in parallel relations, he considers the divergent parts of the representation to be equally original with the concordant ones, and believes the latter to have arisen at the same time as the former, which is why the difference between the two escapes him altogether, and the concurrence in that in which no concurrence is possible without a norm appears as something entirely accidental;

c) he does not care at all how the differences could have arisen in the unity of the original account. He attributes all differences to the pre-narrators and the authors of our Gospels, and here he errs again in two ways,

α) by not asking how the differing pre-narrators were able to harmonise the formation, order and expression of thoughts through entire sections of the narrative, and

β) by leaving completely unexamined whether our writers themselves did not first change the type given to them, as is undoubtedly the case. -

His explanations, however, are of value to us insofar as they require us to seek out those data through which our point of question to be discussed here is precisely discussed and such confusions are prevented. And these data are now to be sought out. We want to compare the archetype and the deviations with each other in more detail, in the order that we first look back at the speeches.

### Third Datum.

Just as in the speeches the historical starting, transitional and concluding formulas, where they vary, only changed their original form under the hands of the writer; so what appears to be the essential difference with regard to these formulas is also based on the author's calculations, and the way of writing, the method of presentation and the position of the piece then reveals that it is the direct product of the writer in whom it is found. The modification of the original form that has taken place in this way is always visible in that text against which Mark stands in harmony with the other.

The following is an explanation of the datum:

a) If the opening, transitional and closing formulas and the general remarks and information of the narrator, which are added to a speech, vary in the copies of the same; These variations are, for the time being, only literary production (by no means copies of different traditions), and this is evident both from the fact that the nature of the play has remained intact in that part of it which is made up of the speech, and from the fact that these varying formulas, despite their differences, are located in the same way in the reviews of the play. Now, where these variations, held against each other, consist in nothing but a change of expression, they cannot have anything further that is disconcerting, even if they were preceded by a certain expression in the original type. For if the expression of the given could be changed anywhere, it could do so especially in such secondary formulas. On the other hand, if substantial differences are noticeable in the place where such formulas and general remarks are found, then, if a certain type is presupposed, these must be considered much more likely to be the production of a writer, because the alteration made is undoubtedly based on plan and intention.

b) We do, however, sometimes find substantial differences in these historical additions, even if their specially developed text, as has been noted in regard to some of them above, still includes certain words retained from the original text. For these words are sometimes combined with others in order to express something else. Sometimes also such formulas are transitions in one and another copy, although they are expressed in the others, or they are added where they are absent in the others. We have said that such deviations are intentional, that is, undoubtedly authorial. In this there are two things - that they are deviations (from the original type), and that they are intentional. The former is included in the latter. But if we have a special criterion for the former, this



will serve to draw our attention to the latter, to the intentionality of the deviation, and to induce us to trace its causes. Do we now have such a criterion? Certainly, where two referents agree against the third, we shall assume the original expression in the former, and consider the expression of the latter to be a deviation, of which deviation, as I have said, we shall then have to look more closely into the reason for it.

522

1) the series of passages from n. 34. to n. 56. we can notice deviations

α) in Luke in the following passages, where

κ) certain details are missing: n. 35. Luk. 18:18. (the indication that Jesus was on the way is missing). Likewise n. 36. Luk. 18:31. - n. 49. Luk. 21:5. 7. (where the indication is missing that Jesus made the preliminary statement that the temple would be destroyed on leaving the temple, and only gave the explanation about it on the mountain of Lel). - n. 54. Luk. 22:39. (there is no indication that they left for the Mount of Olives after the hymn of praise was spoken). - n. 55. Luk. 22:66. (the hearing of the false witnesses is missing). .

β) Places where narrative formulas are appropriate, which do not have the parallel relations. - n. 36. Luk. 18:34. (a closing formula). - n. 44. Luk. 20:39. (a closing formula)- n. 49. Luk. 21:37. 38. (a closing formula). - 52. Luk 22:3. (an opening formula). - n. 39. Luk. 19:37. (a special connecting formula).

λ) Special indications: n. 41. Luk. 19:47. 48. (changed closing formula). - n. 42. a. Luk. 20:1. (altered opening formula).

β) in Matthew; v. 41. Matth. 21:15. 16. (the discontent of the priests explained differently). n. 42 b. Matth. 21:33. (the indication that Jesus spoke in parables changed). - n. 42 b. Matth. 21:45. 46. (changing the closing formula). - n. 43. Matth. 22:15. (changed opening formula). - n. 46. Matth. 22:41. (special opening formula) and v. 46. (special closing formula). - Matth. 26:1. 2. (change of the beginning formula). - n. 56. Matth. 27:11. (other connecting formula). -

2) In the preceding series of pericopes there are

a) in Luke the following passages are to be marked: n. 1. the description of the costume of the Baptist is missing. - n. 9. Luk. 5:17. (special indication). - Luk 8:1 - 3 (other preliminary remarks). - n. 28. Luk. 9:28. (missing the remark about travelling to

Caesarea). - Luk. 9:28. (changed time determination). - Luk. 9:44. 45. (change of the transition and connection formulas). - n. 32. Luk. 9:46. (the remark of the return from Caesarea is missing). b) in Matthew the following: n. 8. Matth. 8:4. (the closing formula is missing). - n. 9. Matth. 9:8. (changed closing formula). - (Certain moments are missing from the beginning of 1.) - n. 20. Matth. 11:1. (changed closing formula) (compare Mark. 6:12. 13. and Luk. 9:6.). The passages where Luke has Mark alone beside him (e.g. 5, 15. 16.) have been abstracted here.

523

d) The recorded variations have their reason in the different arrangement of the passages and are, therefore, indeed stylistic. Since we have not yet discussed the order and arrangement of the materials, the explanation of them must be postponed for now. However, it was noticed that in these deviating formulas, the particular writing style of the author to whom they belong can also be recognized, and this can be demonstrated here. Let us first examine the deviating formulas of Luke (the missing ones cannot be taken into account, only the given ones), which are as follows: n. 36. Luke 18:34. The annotation consists of tautological and partly Hebraizing sentences. It is peculiar that Luke, in other instances where he uses such formulas, tries to give them fullness by employing tautologies, contrary to the manner he observes within the scope of parallel narrative passages, where he avoids tautologies. - Compare the very similar formula to the current one in n. 31. Luke 9:45 - similarly in v. 42, 43, 22:55 (5:26) - for κεκρυμμένον άπ' αυτών 18:34, compare 10:21, 19:42 - n. 41. 19:48 - το τι ποιήσωσιν, compare 6:11, 22:4 - n. 42. 20:1. εν μια των ημερών, 5:17, 8:22 (5:12, 10:38, 11:1, 3:10) - ευαγγελίσεσθαι, compare 4:43, 8:1, 9:6 - επίστησαν, 2:38, 10:40, Acts 22:13, 20 - n. 44. 20:39. τινες. Luke often notes, before presenting Jesus' responses, that "Some" have expressed something previously, e.g., 6:2 (9:7, 8), 11:15, 13:1, 19:39 (20:40, which Luke did not create himself, compare Mark 12:34) - n. 49. 21:5. τινων λεγόντων, again "some" - a similar summary statement as in c. 13:1 - Also here, Luke 21:37, το χαλοῦμενον ελαιών (compare 19:29, 23:33), v. 38, όρθρίζω (compare 24:1, όρθρου βαθιές) - n. 52. Luke 22:3. είζηλθε ό Σατανάς, compare 8:30 - In the formulas with which Luke fills gaps and which he writes alone, he tends to Hebraize in ideas as well as in expressions; compare n. 30. 9:43, 44, many passages in n. 49, and n. 53, 22:31 - In the previously mentioned sequence: n. 9. 5:17. καί εγενετο, καί κ. τ. λ. No one uses this formula more often than Luke. νομοδιδάσκαλοι, compare Acts 5:34, εάω occurs more often with Luke than with anyone else. n. 16. 8:1-4, again και εγενετο κ. αίτος - διώδευε κατά πόλιν κ. κώμην κηρύσσων, compare 9:6 (here, too, Mark deviates). 13:22, Acts 18:23, είαγγελιζόμενος, 4:43, 9:6, 20:1, αφ' ής - εξιηλύθει, compare 8:35, 38 - και είπαι πολλάί, compare 3:18 - n. 28. 9:18 - ηροσευχόμενον. Luke never forgets to mention that Jesus, when supposed to be alone, was praying, compare 5:16, 6:12, 9:28, 20:1, 3:20

(except 4:36) - n. 31:9, 44, 45, compare 18:34 - n. 32. 9:46, 2:35, 5:22, 6:8, 24:38, το τίς  
άν εἶη, compare 22:2, 1:62.

524

β) From the Gospel of Matthew, the following passages in the latter pericope sequence are to be distinguished, as previously mentioned: n. 41. Matthew 21:14 — 16. ὡσαυνά τῷ Θεῷ Δαβὶδ, compare 21:9. (which passage the compiler had as a model). Therefore, also χράζειν κ. λεγεῖν. However, it should also be noted here that it does not say here, as it does there: ἐχράζον λεγοντες, both words combined, but χρίζοντας with the addition ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, so that indeed a temple-related fact is mentioned, about which the priests, just like the fact of the cleansing of the temple, which was pushed into the background by the compiler, can become unwilling. Only verse 16 does not fit precisely with this, because the priests did not become so much displeased with the fact that the children were shouting in the temple, but rather with what they were shouting. — One has to pay particular attention to the signs of interpolation here so that it does not appear as if the interpolator were also the author of the other passage he had in mind, 21:9, which corresponds to the text of Mark. — n. 42. b. 21:35. ἄλλην παραβολήν, compare 13:24. 31. 33. — ἀχοίσατι (παραβολήν), compare 13:18. 21:45. — n. 42. b. 21:45. 46. Reordering. See above, p. 374. — n. 43. 22:15. συμβονλιον ελαβον, compare 12:14. 27:1. — τότε πορευθεντες occurs frequently in Matthew, e.g. 26:14. — n. 46. 22:41. συνηγμένων, compare 22:34. 26:3. 27:62. (the concluding formula 22:46 was transferred here from elsewhere, compare Mark 12:34.) — n. 50. 26:1. 2. ὅτε ἐτελεσεν κ. τ. λ. 11:1. 13:53. — v. 2. formed according to the manner of speeches and dialogues. — τότε συνήχθησαν, (see the just mentioned passage at n. 46.) 26:3. τον λεγομόνον Καϊάφα, compare v. 57. — n. 56. 27:11. resuming the thread from v. 2 (according to the compiler's habit) (compare formulas like 26:55. 23:1. 22:41. and others); — in the previous series: n. 9. Matthew 9:8. τον δόντα εξουσίαν κ. τ. λ. formed according to v. 6: ινα δε εἰδήτε, οτι εξουσίαν εχει χ. τ. λ. — οί ὄχλοι, compare 12:23. 46. 14:22. 15:35. In Mark, it never occurs in the plural. — v. 20. 11:1. οτι ἐτελεσεν διατάσσων. (Such passages are unwelcome to those who prefer a Hebraizing diction in the Gospel of Matthew.) Compare 13:53. 26:1.

525

e) These formulas are now truly individual; - expressions of the style of writing of the writer in whom they are found, they have their proper place only in the work arranged by him, and the coincidence of these two characteristics is important here.

α) Why do the other texts deviate from these formulas at the same time and in agreement with each other? Either the authors of the other texts or the writer who uses these formulas must have deviated from the order of the original type. The latter will be considered the more probable, if those formulas, just as they are connected with the different arrangement of the piece with which they are provided, are also made recognisable by expression and manner of writing as the product of the same writer in whose writing the deviating arrangement is perceived. At the same time

526

β) another conclusion can be drawn from this. For if we said earlier that the agreement between two texts and the differently formed third leads to the assumption that the difference in the latter, if it is an essential one, must have its reason in a special intention of the differing writer, or in his peculiar manner of writing; We can now also say that, if this supposition is confirmed, this is proof that the text which the other two writers express harmoniously is the original text, and this can be asserted all the more confidently, since our writers, in general, where they do not follow their individual style of writing, and deliberately or unintentionally follow others, everywhere agree with each other.

Finally it follows

γ) that if one or the other of the authors appropriates as his product a special formula written with reference to the deviating arrangement of the pieces, and he thus reveals himself as the author of the deviating arrangement, the reason why the alteration was made will also be found in his writing. All this will be completely disregarded when we speak of the order and position of the pieces.

δ) However, in general, wherever Matthew or Luke deviate from the text that agrees with Mark, the individual writing style of one or the other becomes evident, and we want to make this even more noticeable with the other formulas, to which the arrangement and connection of the passages had no influence. — In the latter series, starting from n. 34, the following distinct writing styles appear:

α) in Luke: n. 39. Luke 19:37. ἅπαν τῷ πλήθει, compare 23:1. αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεόν. 2:0. 8:43. — n. 36. πορευομένου αὐτοῖ, compare 9:57. — n. 43. 20, 20. ἐπιλαβεσθαι λόγου, how different from the others in v. 26. — τῇ ἀρχῇ κ. τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, compare 12:11. — n. 47. Compare here Luke 20:45. ἀκούοντος δὲ παντός τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπε, and Mark 12:37. καὶ ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος ἤκουε αὐτοῦ ἡδέως, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς (12:38.), with Mark 11:4. καὶ λύουσιν αἰτόν, καὶ — ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς (v. 5.), and Luke 19:33. λυόντων δὲ αὐτῷ — εἶπον. — n. 53. 22, 14. ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, compare 14, 13, — n. 54. 22:44. ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡς

— compare — Acts 2:2. ἐγένετο ἡχος ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας. — v. 43. ἐνισχύων, compare Acts 9:19.; — in the front series: n. 8. 5:12. κ. ἐγένετο καὶ ἰδοὺ, 14:1. 2. — ἀνὴρ, compare 5:18. 8:41. 9:37 --- πλήρης λέπρας, compare 4:1. — ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ, 8:28. 38. — v. 8. διήρκτη ο λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ, compare 7:17, 4:37. ἡχος περὶ αὐτοῦ. — ἀκούειν, compare 6:17. — n. 9. 5:18. κ. ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες, compare 9:30. 23:50. 24:4. δς ἦν παραλελυμένος, compare n. 24-25. παραχρήμα frequently used by Luke. 26. ἐκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας, compare 7:16. — ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, compare 6:11. Acts 3:10. — n. 10. 5:29, ὄχλος τελωνῶν, compare 6:17. 5:30. ἐγόγγυζον λέγοντες, compare 15:2. — n. 12. 6:8. Αὐτός δε ἦδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς, compare 5:22. 9:47. —

527

β) in Matthew: — in the latter series, apart from what has already been considered or belongs to a different category, there is little or nothing that needs to be distinguished — nothing in n. 34. 35. (Although it is also a matter of discussion whether the expression in Matthew v. 14, which differs from Mark's, is the original text or not, it still does not become distinguishable as specifically Matthew's from others. The content of the passage has already been subjected to criticism elsewhere, and it has been shown that Matthew has made enough alterations.)

g) Now, comparing these historical formulae and the whole accompanying apparatus of the narrator with the reported content of the speeches, we will notice

α) that in the (large) speech passages where those formulae only make short transitions, there is more agreement among the copies in the expression of the speech than in these formulae. — But can we be surprised about this, since

κ) the arrangement of the passages must have influenced the wording of such formulae, and

β) the spoken speech could be faithfully reproduced even if its connection with its external occasion differed more or less? So, we have no reason to resort to the explanation that the differences are due to different translations of given expressions, and thus we have neither to believe that our authors had a different written norm for expressing the content of the speeches than for connecting the historical details, nor do we have to assume that there were so many different copies of the account before our authors, as we find different connecting and transitional formulae at the parallel passages of the narratives. The original that determined the Greek expression for the content of the speeches also gave the authors the specific expression for the incidental

remarks of the narrator, so that they always had a fully formed narrative piece at hand. And this is not to be doubted because

β) In the other speech passages, where the historical preliminaries before the speech lengthen, the agreement among the copies in the expression of the preliminary remarks also lengthens (see n. 39) — and the harmony would be threefold when it is twofold, if one referent had not modified it. — Now we turn from the speech passages to the narrations of actions and events, and focus primarily on what seems to be essential discrepancies.

In n. 36, Matthew 21:17 does not belong here either, as it is solely Mark's text that stands opposite to it. However, n. 39, Matthew 21:4—6, is in Matthew's diction, as is v. 7, επάνω αὐτῶν, compare 2:9, 5:14, 23:18, 20:22. — v. 8, ο δε πλεῖστος ὄχλος and v. 9, οἱ δό ὄχλοι — are additions by Matthew, see above p. 411. — n. 42a, Matthew 21:23, προσήλθον — is Matthew's style, compare 22:23, 24:1, as is the inserted: λίγουςιν αὐτῷ, compare 27:22, 22:42. — n. 48, Matthew 22:19, προσήνηγγαν αὐτω, compare 12:22, 8:16. — n. 49, 24:1, προσήλθον, — and επιδείξει, compare 22:19, 16:1. — n. 53, Matthew 26:17, προσήλθον λέγοντες, is Matthew's alone here. Compare with v. 19, see 21:6. — n. 54, Matthew 26:36, and v. 38, τότε (not present in Mark, just like v. 50, not: τότε προσελθόντες). 26:56, γούτο δε ολον — των προφητών — is a modification by Matthew. — v. 57, οπου συνηχθησαν — is Matthew's (Mark 14:53, καί συνέρχονται αὐτω, probably l. αὐτού) — v. 58, ειςελθὼν εσω is lengthy for the sake of clarity. — n. 56, 27:2, τω ἡγεμόνι and 11. τοῦ ηγεμόνας and the same in the same place, ὁ ἡγεμών and v. 24, τον ηγεμόνα and 27:15, 27, are not present in the parallel texts. (23, ουκ ακοῦεις, compare 21:16.) — In the other pericope sequence, we encounter the following peculiarities: n. 8, Matthew 8:2, προσεκῦνει αὐτω, compare 9:18, 14:33, 15:25, 28:17. (In Mark, it only occurs in c. 5:6, and the question arises whether προσέπεσε might be more accurate here.) — v. 3, εκαθαρέσθη (to which Mark adds ἀνθρωπος) is connected with ἡ λέπρα (see above p. 446). Similarly, in n. 38, Matthew 20:34, where ἀνέβλεψαν is added with the subject: αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (to distinguish from Mark and Luke). — n. 10, Matthew 9:9, ἀνθρωπον — λεγόμενον is a phrase that occurs frequently in Matthew, but never in Mark. Compare Matthew 26, 86, 27, 16, 17, 38. (compare Mark). — n. 13, Matthew 9:13, συμβουλῶν ἔλαβον, compare 22:15, 27:1, 7. — 15. γνους ἀνεχωρησεν. Although Mark also uses ἀνεχωρησεν here, he does not express it as if he wanted to say that Jesus immediately withdrew from the synagogue and went to the lake because of the persecution. However, the γνούς and ἀχούσας in ἀνεχώρησε are in Matthew's style, compare 2:22, 4:12, 14:13, 15:21. \*) — n. 14, Matthew 12:25, εἰδὼς τὰς ἐνθνήσεις, compare 9:4. — There is nothing more to remark about n. 16 here. — n. 28, Matthew 16:13, ἐλθὼν, the participle, where Mark uses the verb ἔλεγε. Similarly, 8:14,

14:32, 21:23, 22:15, 26:71, and others. — n. 32, Matthew 18:1, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, compare 13:1, 22:23, 26:55. — προσήλθον, no word is more frequent in Matthew than this.

\*) The ἠκολουθησαν or ἠχολονθησεν Mark 3:7 is absolutely incorrect and is rightly omitted in Codex D among others.

a) A clumsiness already arises when v. 8. ἀχονσαντες κ. τ. λ. is supposed to be solely related to οἱ περὶ Τύρου κ. τ. λ., as it obviously belongs to πολὺ πλῆθος v. 7. and all its parts. (Why should it only be said of the Syrians and Sidonians that they followed Jesus because they had heard of his deeds? Wasn't that also true of the others?)

b) The ἠχολοῦθησεν sounds as if the masses of people from the synagogue had followed Jesus, which is certainly not to be thought of remotely, since it is rather to be said that the people first gathered around him at the sea, and thus the ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν gives the verbum which alone completes the sentence.

c) When the interpolated ἠχολονθησεν (ἠκολουθησαν) is eradicated, similar sentence parts come together, and the whole gives an expression that is as understandable as it is appropriate. The interpolated word is from Matthew 4:25.

529

g) Now, comparing these historical formulae and the whole accompanying apparatus of the narrator with the reported content of the speeches, we will notice

α) that in the (large) speech passages where those formulae only make short transitions, there is more agreement among the copies in the expression of the speech than in these formulae. — But can we be surprised about this, since

κ) the arrangement of the passages must have influenced the wording of such formulae, and

β) the spoken speech could be faithfully reproduced even if its connection with its external occasion differed more or less? So, we have no reason to resort to the explanation that the differences are due to different translations of given expressions, and thus we have neither to believe that our authors had a different written norm for expressing the content of the speeches than for connecting the historical details, nor do we have to assume that there were so many different copies of the account before our

authors, as we find different connecting and transitional formulae at the parallel passages of the narratives. The original that determined the Greek expression for the content of the speeches also gave the authors the specific expression for the incidental remarks of the narrator, so that they always had a fully formed narrative piece at hand. And this is not to be doubted because

β) In the other speech passages, where the historical preliminaries before the speech lengthen, the agreement among the copies in the expression of the preliminary remarks also lengthens (see n. 39) — and the harmony would be threefold when it is twofold, if one referent had not modified it. — Now we turn from the speech passages to the narrations of actions and events, and focus primarily on what seems to be essential discrepancies.

530

#### Fourth Datum.

Where Mark's text contains more elements in the accounts of Jesus' miracles than the third, the latter, as the abridged text, presupposes those elements by virtue of its construction. Where, on the other hand, Mark's text is narrower or more precise in places than the third, the latter only makes superfluous amplifications.

One could raise doubts about the unity of the pieces because of the quantitative differences. In this case, then, we note the following:

a) Matthew always gives - the shorter text; never in this kind of presentation the longer one (only where he has included speeches is his communication the richer). His account of n. 7 is abbreviated, as is that of n. 17, and n. 18. - n. 7 lacks the information that Jesus departs early in the morning and does not allow himself to be kept in Capernaum, because he must also teach elsewhere. But if this remark leads to the conclusion that Jesus visited Capernaum for the first time after the beginning of his career, then this is just the circumstance by which in the narrative, as far as Matthew communicates it, the note that Jesus had entered Peter's house (Matth. 8:14.), and the one that on this day all kinds of sick people were brought to him, is first clarified, the circumstance, therefore, which contains a provision that belongs essentially to the play. The introductory formula v. 14: When Jesus came to Peter's house, he saw his mother-in-law lying ill with a fever, will be understood, since on the one hand it is left quite unnoticed how far this "coming" is to be thought of as connected with a tendency of Jesus, and on the other hand the cause of healing the sick woman is merely implied in the fact that Jesus saw the sick woman, and since both the coming and the seeing



thus seem to have been brought together quite by chance, I say, this formula, when compared with the opposite statement of the secondary *entendre*, will at once be regarded rather as a fleeting deduction from the specific and the definite, than as that statement, which contains the more specific, as an artificial alteration made later on the indefinite Matthaean formula. But also v. 16. the accuracy observed in the evangelical mode of narration otherwise, and in the secondary texts also here, is missed, mornad the *καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς -- ἐθεράπευσεν* cannot It is strange that in this passage, too, the accuracy otherwise observed in the Gospel narrative, and in the secondary texts, cannot occur unless it is mentioned beforehand that these sick people were brought to Jesus, just as it has been mentioned of the demoniacs. It is strange that in the place where Matthew only remembers the bringing of the demoniacs without mentioning the other sick, Luke mentions the weak and sick just as one-sidedly, without remembering the demoniacs. But in Luke the one-sidedness is less noticeable, since the remark Luk. 4:41. *ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ* stands apart from the preceding like an aside. But because the gap is evident in Matthew, in that the passage about the healings and exorcisms is in the postscript just as it is in Mark, it cannot be said that Mark 2:32. was a mixture of the two secondary texts. - n. 17. Here the Matthaean narrative lacks several elements. The main difference between it and the parallel relations is due to the twofold number of demoniacs introduced in Matthew, in place of which there is only one in the latter. - The narrator who doubled the number did not take into account that two demoniacs do not come together in reality in the way he combines them in the narrative. According to this combination, however, some things in the narrative must have taken a different form from that in which they appear in the related others.

532

α) The latter describe in more detail the terrible affliction of the sick person of whose admirable cure they want to speak. The speaker, speaking of an unhappy pair of this kind, could not enter into the specifics, since the description of the condition of each of the two should have been different, and therefore fills the passage with the general statement that the two ravagers made the road passing by unsafe (Matth, v. 28.).

β) At the same place, where the harmonic representations, after the description of the sick man, introduce his address to Jesus, the Matthaean Two are also introduced speaking. But the two will not have spoken the same words. While the other relations, which only refer to the words of one, seem to reflect really spoken words, that which is referred to in Matthew rather has the appearance of being a transformation of the indirect speech of the narrator into the direct speech of those being narrated.

γ) The question of Jesus, what the demonic power is called, had to be dropped at the same time with this answer, because the answer that it is called legion could not be given by two. \*) Nevertheless, the information contained in that answer is an essential part of the account given by the narrators, because it not only explains the destruction of the numerous host, as it occurred after the expulsion of the demons, but also the request (of the sick person), made to Jesus before the expulsion, to be spared with the torment.

\*) In n. 39, where Matthew also makes a doubling, he has omitted the speech (Mark 11:4-5) that was previously calculated only for one sync before the doubling.

δ) The description, which only had to do with the condition of a single person, could well strive to make the change that took place after the healing a little more vivid (as Mark 5:15.16. Luk 8:35.). It is no less understandable, however, how the other narrative, which speaks of two, took the trouble to give such an account, and merely left it at the result that the wretches were healed. This account also quite consistently omits the request, according to the other account, made by the healed man to Jesus for admission into his retinue, because it seemed too individual to be put into the mouths of the two at the same time. - The reports, as we have seen, have, apart from the differences noted, the same structure and form. Now, since the more natural and more particular, - the one with whose content the form is more in harmony, - cannot have arisen from the elements of the other (Matthean), but rather the doubling and combination in the latter could more easily have received its origin on the basis of the first; nothing is more certain than that that which is the same form in the representations is in the Matthean narrative that which is used, and that which is peculiarly different is the later modification of the given. - n. 18. The narrative of Matthew leaves

533

α) unexplained how it came about that the sick woman approached just now, while Jesus was going with Jairus to his dwelling; nor does it say whether the woman tried to touch Jesus unnoticed. It therefore remains obscure and incomprehensible, unless it is supplemented from the secondary narratives.

β) In Matthew, Jairus says that his daughter was so different (Matth. 9:18.). But if this news is only brought to the father afterwards by messengers, of whose arrival Matthew mentions nothing, and if these messengers say that now that the girl is dead, the father should not trouble Jesus any further; one is easily led to think that Jairus, if he had known beforehand what the messengers now knew, would have considered the search

for help no less useless than these messengers, and that the Matthaean narrator only, in order to make the news of the messengers superfluous \*), thus abbreviating the report, put that more definite news into the father's mouth \*\*). Still missing in Matthew,

\*) Why did he want to make them superfluous? in another place, the problem will be solved.

\*\*) The effort was vain to derive the difference that exists here from different transpositions of certain Hebrew words.

γ) that Jesus, going to Jairus' house, took only three of his disciples with him, and that after the work of salvation was done, he forbade the child's parents to say anything about the matter, - that is what is missing, which betrays Jesus' intention to prevent all appearances as much as possible. One can conclude that the narrator who placed more importance on making the event known (Matth. v. 26) also abbreviated it here. What he remarks is not the point of the narrative, but what he omits is part of its plan. For the fact that Jesus wanted the matter kept secret is also attested by those parts of the narrative which the abbreviator has not suppressed. By stating with the others that Jesus had declared to the complainants that the girl was not dead, and demanded the removal of the persons who did not belong in the house, he gives a note that is only made comprehensible by the conclusion of the original narrative, which he omitted. - We have already seen other examples of abbreviations of the text in Matthew (cf. above p. 337 f.), and so the ones presented here can be all the less conspicuous, however unwelcome they may be to some, since these abbreviations, just as much on the one hand as the same author's compilations on the other, provide clear and irrefutable proof that the original narrative, if it does not exist elsewhere, is least of all to be found in Matthew. - From Luke we have to note the following as similar examples of shortening of tercets in the present place. 18. it has already been remarked above, p. 410. and p. 518. that Luk. 8:51, is composed of a text like Mark. 5:37, 40. is drawn together. Matthew harmonizes with Mark in that he also distinguishes between going into the house and entering the death chamber, or mentions each specifically. Now Mark, in mentioning the first, makes the special remark that Jesus allowed no one to go with him but those three disciples who are also mentioned in Luke's narrative, The *οὐκ ἀφῆκεν* has also been retained by Luke, but instead of, as Mark, *συναχολυνθήσαι* to it, he puts *εἰσελθεῖν* to it, and indeed Jesus is said not to have allowed this *εἰσελθεῖν*, since he (not first, as in Mark, on his way to the house, but) had already arrived at the house. With contractions ambiguities are wont to arise. So here. One would scarcely suppose that the reader should think of anything else in addition to the *εἰσελθεῖν*, than *εἰς οἰκίαν*, if Luke had not added that which is retained from the original narrative, that Jesus only the father and mother of the deceased, whereby one is compelled to think of an

entrance not into the house, but into the chamber of the dead. If Luke had left the text as it originally was, then after the *οὐκ αφήκεν* (which still belongs to the way), and after the mention of the arrival of Jesus in the house, the speech, as in Mark and Matthew, would first come to the wailers. Now this order is also in Luke, if one takes out his combination from v. 51. But since he joins those who were allowed to go alone with those who went in alone, making one class out of the two, the mourners do not appear until after they have entered the death chamber, and it now looks as if they had been the last to be assembled in the death chamber. But this is probably not correct. - Luke should have added his combination only at v. 54. What is the reason, however, that he speaks of the people being let in and the people being let in, rather than of the wailers? Merely the *οὐκ άγήκεν*, that this stood in the same place in the original narrative where it stands in Mark (before the perception of the wailers), and Luke wished to use it (after the added *είσελθεῖν*), in order to dispense with Mark. 5:40. to spare \*).

\*) According to Schleiermacher (a. a. O. p. 129.) Mark, in stating to *οὐκ αφήκεν δας συνακολουθήσαι*, rather misunderstood Luke (!), why ? because on the road the prohibition not to go along could have been of no use, since, after all, from all sides the people always converge on a heap where there is a crowd." We answer that:

(a) misunderstand that Luke could not have said Mark at all, because the latter does not say anything different from Mark v. 40, but only improves it.

b) There is nothing untrue about the message itself.

α) Jesus was honoured among the Galileans (Luk. 8:40.), That he did not want to make an appearance in Capernaum, was perhaps known. But if he expressly required that no one should go with him, why should he not have been obeyed? If Jesus' command had not worked, perhaps the archisynagogue would have prevailed.

(β) He would not have wanted to take anyone with him, and it is therefore very doubtful that he would have made his request loudly and in front of the people, so that they would have heard that there was a commotion in his crowd.

Incidentally, in that Mark, like Matthew, distinguishes the entrance into the house and the entrance into the death chamber (the distance of the wailers between them being present), and also how Luke interpolates the *οὐχ αφήχε* into his words, he could again seem to make a mixture of the two neighbouring

texts, and yet what would the verdict that he had done this be but a total misunderstanding of the texts?

536

(Already in n. 17. Luk. 8:44. an abbreviation occurs, as noted above p. 410.) - n. 22. Here Luk. 9:11. lacks the indication that Jesus departed by ship to the lonely place. The original narrative must have contained it. For

α) it fits much too naturally with the other circumstances mentioned at the same time to be taken for an insertion made later. It is therefore rather

β) for that which Luke retains. If Jesus went away to ships, it is easy to understand how it could be said that

κ) the people recognised him (Mark), or heard of him (Matt.);

ι) they hastened on foot (Mark and Matthew) to the place where Jesus was about to arrive (Mark).

λ) Jesus then met the assembled people as he was getting out\*), and although he could have

\*) This is what the ἐξελθών in Matthew and Mark means here without any doubt (see Kühnol on Matth.). What else could it mean in the participial form referring to one who was in the ship? One is already led to the correct explanation by the fact that Luke does not use the word here, as he does not speak of a ship. (Fritzfche's comments want to interpret it differently).

τ) could have immediately departed again (to ships), he nevertheless devoted himself to the people (Mark. v. 34. and Matth.). Now the γνόντις put by Luke also points to κ, although it has nothing intelligible in him, who speaks only of a journey on foot. (What had the people learned: that Jesus had departed, or that he was about to depart? and how did they learn the one or the other? How did they come together with Jesus in one place?) The expression δεξάμενος used by Luke points to τ, as which also presupposes of Jesus that he, if he had willed, could have eluded the people, but now that the note is displaced by the navigation, remains incomprehensible without the secondary texts. (The way of writing itself shows that Luke wants to fill the gaps from his own supply. - The samples of textual abbreviations presented here from Luke are also not striking, since we have seen such abbreviations before in his work (cf. above p. 340, 371). As in

the narrative piece now under consideration, Luke has also changed the situation in n. 16. The more complete text, as Mark expresses it, is therefore not an extension of the shorter one, but we do have the following

537

b) to perceive extensions made later in that text which wants to be even more complete than the one given by Mark in agreement with the other. Of examples of an expansion of the text, by which the narration of an individual action or event \*) was increased by historical moments, we find none in Matthew other than that in n. 29. Matth. 17:6. 7. if this is to be accepted. But here it is only an insertion, which is partly superfluous, and partly not even in accordance with the purpose of the narrative. For the latter would rather have it that the disciples, when the voice occurred which spoke of the Son, immediately looked around to see of whom it spoke, and at the same moment saw no one around them but Jesus (so that by the Son meant they must have understood him), and this relation is changed by the Matthean insertion. We find nothing further in Matthew, but it is strange that we, in speaking of Luke's extensions, can only mention first and only the same piece that has just been spoken of. Luke also adds remarks here, but they are nothing more than superfluous amplifications and interpolations. Luk. v. 30.31. says with its periphrases (comp. ch. 24:4. δύο ἰνδρις, and the more definite ὅστις, comp. ch. 8:3.26. 43. 23:19. 55.) nothing more than is expressed in Mark 9:4. (The δφθεντες v. 31. is taken from the parallel ὠφθησαν αὐτοῖς, but αὐτοῖς omitted, because something special is to be inserted by the disciples only v. 32. But what was inserted - that the disciples had already awakened from sleep when the appearance took place - already lies in the ὠγθησαν αὐτοῖς). Only in that v. 33. it is remarked that the transfigured had departed at the moment when Peter spoke of building a hut, it seems as if what Peter said was to be made intelligible according to his relation, if it had been the desire of the speaker that the departed should tarry longer. But this remark is not sufficient to explain the meaning and the origin of Peter's statement. Rather, one can imagine that Peter, after the hitherto continued wanderings with Jesus, which had not permitted a long stay in one place, was tempted to stay here in the place irradiated with light, and thus did not wish both those transfigured, but rather Jesus to stay longer in the place, and not at the moment when the radiance went out, but when it still shone brightly. (Hence καλόν ὥδε εἶναι.) Luke here comments on an earlier text, as we have had an example of it in n. 44. This betrays here his manner of writing (with v. 33. comp. ch. 24:4.), and shows among others also v. 32. where, because Mark. 4:5. Matth. 17:4. only Peter is the speaker before others, also the explanatory interjection that the disciples were asleep, names Peter first before the other disciples and those only as his companions. The general vague statement in v. 33. about the subject of the conversation of the transfigured ones is also an addition to the text that can be

dispensed with \*). But by making remarks here, Luke follows a method which we will have the opportunity to learn more about in other directions of our attention, according to its consistency. And so we can end our consideration here all the sooner, since from the narrative pieces, which are distinguished from the discourses, and which are also supposed to be particular, nothing more can be adduced than amplification of the common text, i.e. that with which Mark harmonises.

\*) The last story of Jesus, which is a combination of several facts, is described here.

\*) Um so mehr zu verwundern ist Schleiermacher's, in der angeführten Schrift S. 148. ausgesprochenes, Urtheil: „Wäre dieses (nämlich was Matthäus und Markus Beide kürzer als Lukas erzählen) die getreue und unverfälschte Erzählung eines Augenzeugen; niemals (?) hätte jemand jene umftande, die bei Lukas die Sache dem natürlichen und begreiflichen viel näher bringen, hineindichten können, das offenbar wäre ganz gegen den Geift jener Zeiten (!)“. Hätte doch der Kritiker sich zuvor mit dem Geiste unserer Schriftsteller, und insbesondere des Lukas, der in n. 39, (Luk. 19:37.) gar nicht anders, als hier verfährt, bekannt gemacht gehabt, ehe er ihre Arbeiten nach dem Geiste jener Zeiten (von dem wir uns übrigens nur Privatvorstellungen machen können) beurtheilen wollte.

539

c) We have had to consider here the same pieces with their copies, from whose constituent parts, as they are preserved in our three Gospels, it was concluded before (Dat. 2.), because of the uniform expression, that they received their form through one and the same author. Just as the uniformity of the expression was established as proof of this, so it must now also be shown that the speakers also had these pieces before them according to the same measure. But if this is indeed the result of the comparison of the parallels, as we have just seen, it is at the same time evident that Mark could not agree with Matthew and Luke where they shorten or interpolate, and that those two writers, in so far as one of them goes beyond the shorter report of Mark, do not first extend the measure by themselves; - thus the result is here confirmed which we have already found above (in the first section) in the examination of the speeches. Now that this has been proved, let us turn our attention to another point. We have not yet spoken of the order and layout of the evangelical messages. But while we are looking at the particulars, and still want to disregard the order, a certain individual thing stands out from the other particulars, which at the same time represents to us a certain order of several particulars, and gives proof of how all our messages, although they isolate

themselves into particulars, were nevertheless able to be based on one main idea when they were written. - By this detail and whole we mean the last history of Jesus told in our Gospels (as it begins with the betrayal of Judas and continues from there to the last of the events of Jesus' life). Luke, in particular, gives us such a peculiar account of this whole, deviating from the secondary accounts, that one has believed that one must divide his account into completely different sections and derive it from completely different sources than those secondary accounts. Consequently, whatever must be found to be true after an impartial examination of the matter will have to be established as a special date.

540

#### Fifth Datum.

In the last story of Jesus, in which Luke deviates the most from the secondary narrators, the order and position of what he mentions at the same time as the secondary narrators shows that he followed the same guidelines as they did, and in certain places the form of expression shows that he must have had the same Greek text as his neighbouring narrators, just as it does not conceal the fact that he changed the text according to his literary purposes and his own way of writing.

1) Luke followed the same guideline. For a) his whole history contains the main moments placed in the same sequence as in the secondary accounts, and in such a way that, after omissions, the text is again placed in the same constructed order as in those.

These moments are the following:

a) n. 50. a preface to Luk 22:1. 2. (Schleiermacher says of it, p. 278, that it has nothing at all in common with Matth 26:1-6. The opposite is clearly evident, without the need for a close examination. The remark consists of two clauses/sentences:

α) the feast of Easter was approaching,

β) the priests sought to kill Jesus. Both phrases are found in the parallels). Compare.

α) Luk. 22:1. ἡγγιζε δε η εορτή των αζύμων = Mark 14:1. ἦν δε το πάσχα - μετά δύο ἡμερας (Matthew, as is his habit, makes a conversation out of what is given, and it may be noted here again how Luke's text with a different expression confirms Mark's direct



statement: ἦν δέ κ. τ. λ. as the original text. Matthew is the changing one, not Mark the excerpting one).

β) Luk. v. 2. και ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχ. και οἱ γραμμ. even so Mark. (Matth. 26:4. καὶ συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα κ.τ.λ.) About Luk. v. 2. cf. Still above note p. 73:--- b) Luk. 22:4. Judas offers himself for treason. The remark consists of three sentences in all the parallels:

541

α) Judas departs (ἀπελθάν = Mark 14:10. ἀπήλθε, Matth. παρωθείς) to the priests, and speaks to them of the design to deliver up Jesus: το πῶς αὐτόν παραδῶ αὐτοῖς = Mark. 14:10. ἵνα παραδῶ αὐτόν αὐτοῖς. (Matthäus, making a conversation, as he is wont to do, turns the abstract statement of purpose into the words: what will you give me? The purpose he expresses, like the others, changing the αὐτοῖς into ὑμῖν).

β) The priests rejoice (εχάρησαν, like Mark) and promise him money, ἀργύριον δοῦναι Luk. 22:5., like Mark (Matthew makes ἀργύριον planmiβig fine τριάκοντα ἀργύρια).

γ) Judas now sought to deliver up Jesus. (Luk. v. 6. ἐζήτει ευκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι = Matth. ἐζήτει .... ἵνα παραδῶ - Mark. ἐζήτει πῶς ευκαίρως - παραδῶ. -

(c) Luk 22:7. Transition to Jesus' Passover celebration.

Clauses/sentences:

a) Only on the day when the Passover was to be observed, do the disciples inquire where it shall be prepared.

β) Jesus, therefore, sends disciples (on a mission).

γ) He arrives at the celebration, and it is generally indicated when he arrived. After Luke chapter 22 inserted the text from verse 24 to 31 and rephrased Jesus' statement that his disciples will leave him in verses 31 to 34, and inserted verses 35 to 38,

d) Chapter 22:39 picks up the thread again.

a) Jesus goes out (ἐξερχεσθαι in all texts) to the Mount of Olives (the same sentence in all texts). The scene opening here is described similarly (cf. p. 489).

β) Arrival of Judas while Jesus is speaking with the disciples. Luke 22:47. (still speaking with them, according to all [accounts], as well as the designation of Judas as one of the twelve). The similarity of the narrative is noted on page 490. It extends up to Peter's arrival in the high priest's courtyard. The other narrators mention the trial of Jesus and then return to Peter (Mark 14:66 = Matthew 26:69). Luke omits the trial of Jesus and continues from the point where the others have returned, namely from Peter (Luke 22:56 - 62).

e) Peter's denial has three acts, just like in the other accounts. The response of Peter to the first maid's speech is indicated as the second [act] with the phrase "ο δε ήρνήσατο" (but he denied). Luke leaves out the part where Peter went out into the courtyard where the maid had probably seen him first - therefore, this part where he came into contact with the same maid again is changed in Luke as well. (Incidentally: the "πάλιν" [again] in Mark 14:69 should not be related to "Ιδοῦσα" [seeing], but to "ήρξατο λεγειν" [he began to say], since according to verse 70, it is symmetrically arranged with "πάλιν ήρνεϊτο" [he denied again] and placed against the repeated denial against the repeated assertion). In the third act, Luke uses the same confirmation as "ἀληθώς" (truly) in the parallel passages, and adds "καὶ γάρ γαλ. εστιν" (for you are also [a Galilean]). All of them mention that Peter, at the third denial, thought of Jesus' prediction, and at the cockcrow, began to weep.

542

f) Jesus' trial before the high priests is a consultation in the morning according to Luke, while in the other accounts, it is a consultation. (The original narrative had to mention such a trial before speaking of Jesus' delivery to Pilate. Luke acknowledges this himself.)

g) Luke 23:1.

α) Jesus' being brought to Pilate (ήγαγαν αυτόν προς τον Πιλάτον, the others: παρίδιοχαν αυτόν τω Πιλάτῳ).

β) Pilate's question to Jesus, Luke 23:3. (Mark 15:2—4. = Matthew 27:11—14), the same as in the other accounts (see page 280.)

γ) Pilate's three attempts to have Jesus released, Luke 22:18 — 24.

h) Jesus' being led to Golgotha. Luke 23:26. Same idea connection as when

α) they led Him away (Luke verse 26: ὡς ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν [as they led Him], Mark and Matthew: ἐξερχόμενοι [as they came out]);

β) they forced Simon (Mark and Matthew: ἀγγαρεύουσιν [compelled] to carry [the cross], Luke expresses it differently: ἐπιλαβόμενοι — ἐπέθηκαν αὐτόν τὸν σταυρόν [seizing Him, they laid the cross on Him]).

γ) Simon receives the epithet "ὁ κυρηναῖος" (the Cyrenian), and Luke and Mark make the aside that he came from the country. - There follows

(i) the narrative of the crucifixion. Moments:

α) They offer the one to be crucified a drink (Mark 15:23, Matthew 27:34), omitted in Luke. However,

β) Division of the clothes and the statement that they crucified him, Luke 23:34, "διαμεριζόμενοι .... κλήρον" (casting lots), like Matthew and Mark (\*). Then,

γ) Inscription on the cross (Mark 15:26, the same words are placed elsewhere in Luke).

\*) Mark. 15:23. The reading ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν cannot be correct, if v. 24, σταυρώσαντες is to precede, since neither the καὶ can be translated by post quam (which in other passages, as e. g. Luk. 23:44. Luk 23:44), nor ἐσταύρωσαν can be taken as plus quam perf. (because the author unquestionably did not intend to specify the exact hour when he was crucified but rather the moment when he was being crucified). According to all conjecture, the σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν is to be taken from v. 24, and we may suppose that it crept in from Matth. 27:35. Mark 24:25 is then parallel to Luk 23:33.

543

δ) Two others are crucified with him (Mark verse 27, Matthew verse 38, drawn in Luke to 28:33). After this, Luke continues simultaneously with the others:

ε) Mockeries from those passing by (Mark verses 29-30, as in Matthew, drawn to Luke verse 35). Then, Luke inserts verse 36, the drink offered, but means the one given by the soldiers (Mark 15:36). And then, Luke presents the inscription in verse 37. Following this, the parallelism resumes:

ζ) The speeches of those crucified with him, Matthew 27:44, compared with Mark verse 32, and Luke verses 39-43.

η) The darkness that came over the land, Luke verse 44 (the same words as Mark verse 33, Matthew verse 45).

θ) The words Jesus speaks as He dies: (Luke verse 46, "χαῖ φωνήσας φωνή μεγάλη," like Matthew verse 50, "εξίπνευσε," like Mark verse 37).

ι) The words of the Roman centurion (Luke verse 47, "ἰδὼν δε ὁ εκατόνταρχος," like Mark verse 39, "ἰδὼν δέ ὁ κεντρίων," Matthew verse 54, "ὁ δέ εκατ. καὶ — ἰδόντες"). Afterward,

κ) The mention of the observing women (Luke verse 49).

κ) εἰσπήκισαν — ὁρῶσαι = in Mark and Matthew, "ἦσαν — θεωροῦσαι."

β) μακρόθεν, like in the other accounts.

β) αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς γαλιλ., like in Mark and Matthew.

λ) Joseph comes to take down the body.

κ) Time specification, Luke 23:54, like Matthew 27:57.

β) Detailed identification of Joseph, Luke verses 50-51, like Mark verse 43, Matthew verse 57.

α) Afterward, Luke verse 52, "οὗτος προσελθὼν τὰ Πιλάτῳ ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ" (he went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus), just like in the other accounts.

\*) Mark. 15:42. 43, the text is corrupted.

a) ἦλθεν and behind it τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε cannot be written, and ἐλθων instead of ἐλθεν at the beginning of v. 43. can be found after ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, i.e. not cum esset, but quoniam erat, etc., but not plag. - do not find plag either.

b) The words v. 43. ὅς καὶ αὐτός - τὸν Θεοῦ are inserted from Luke. This shows

α) the manner of writing (comp. also Luk 2:25). Mark has nothing in Luke's way of writing. -

β) Is the *τολμήσας* thereby pushed down too far, and

γ) the *ουτος* preserved after Luk. v. 52. and Matth. v. 53. has been cast out of the text.

(c) The remark v. 42. *επει ην παρασκευη* which would not reach further than *ηλθε*, does not belong in the text at all, and is interpolated from Joh. 19:31. If it belonged in the text, it would be written : *ουτος επει ην παρασκευη προσελων τω Πιλατη ετολμησε κ.τ.λ.* So the correct text will be this: *Και ήδη όψίας γενομένης ήλθεν Ιωσήφ ο από 'Αριμαθαίας, ευσχήμων βουλευτής. Ούτος τολμήσας εισήλθε προς κ. τ. λ.*

544

τ) Also in verse 53, the same construction.

μ) The women see how the body is laid (Luke verse 55, "*εθεάσαντο — ως ετεθη τδ σώμα*," Mark verse 47, "*εθειόρουν ποϋ τίθεται*," Matthew made a change, as discussed below).

ν) The behavior of the women after Jesus' burial.

κ) What they do on the first day of the week, Luke 24:1, like Matthew 28:1. Mark mentions they came to the tomb, Luke says they brought the spices that they had prepared before the Sabbath (compare with Luke verse 56).

β) *ήλθον επί το μνήμα* in Mark 16:2, *έρχονται επί το μνημείον* in Matthew 28. Variants in the original texts, for example, *ήλθε* and the names of the women.

λ) *δρθρου βαθιές*, compare with Mark 16:2, *λίαν πρωί*.

τ) They see the stone rolled away, verse 2, like Mark 16:4, Matthew verse 2, "*der Stein wurde abgewälzt*" (the stone was rolled away).

η) They go into the tomb, and according to Mark, they see one angel, while according to Luke, they see two angels (Luke verse 4).

ι) They are frightened. Mark uses *εξεθαμβήθησαν* (compare with Matthew verse 4, *από του φόβου*), and Luke verse 5, "*έμφοβων δε γενομένων*" (they became greatly afraid).

η) They are addressed by the angel (angels in Luke) -

αα) who asks what they are seeking: ζητείτε in Mark and Matthew, and in Luke, "τί ζητείτε;" (what are you seeking?).

ββ) then assures them that the one they seek is not there (Mark and Matthew, "οὐκ ἐστὶν ὧδε," He is not here),

cc) the women reminded of a previous saying of Jesus (Mark 16:7, Matthew 28:7, = Luke 24:7).

η) The women return from the tomb (ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου in all texts). — Thus, it is evident that Luke followed the same course as the others on that day. However, he must also

2) had the same Greek type before him. This is proved by the passages where he meets them in the Greek expression. We have to note the following passages: Luk 22:4 - 6. and the piece n. 53. - n. 54. - n. 55. - 23:3. 25. 34. 46. 47. 49. 52. 55. 24:1 - 3. But why does Luke not agree with the co-tellers throughout? After what we have already perceived of his manner, we cannot be at all embarrassed about the answer. Namely, as elsewhere, so has

545

3) Luke also wrote and intentionally changed here. He has

α) rearranged and combined - over n. 53. s. above p. 414. -

β) contracted - about n. 54. s. p. 278. 382. (Luk. 22:47. lacks Mark. 14:44. the deliberation preceding the act, when it indicates the execution of the thing beforehand, and anticipates the description, as here: ὀνάν φιλήσω χ.τ. λ. Luk. is wont to omit, cf. in n. 18. where he Mark. 5:28. ἐλεγε γάρ χ.τ. λ. omits, compare also Luk. 22:2. where Mark. 14:2. ἐλεγαν ὅτι χ.τ.λ. is omitted). The same is true of the contractions in n. 56 (see above p. 411) - also transpositions.

γ) The rest consists in peculiarities of expression, as has been pointed out above. Note still ch. 22:2. τὸ πῶς comp. 23:4. 9:46. 19:48. 22:41. θεῖς τὰ γόνατα, comp. Act. 9:40. 7:60. - v. 44. ὡσεὶ pictorial simile, comp. Act. 2:2., above n. 56. Luk. 23:18 - 25. s. p. 285. - With the words of Jesus 23:46. comp. Stephen's words Act. 7:59. - The centurion's word: αὐτός δίκαιος ἦν 23:47. is Luke's language, comp. v. 50. and 20:20. -23:48. τυπτοντες εαυτῶν τὰ στήθη, comp. 18:13.-a word that may be called preferably

Lukassian. - v. 49. εἰστήχεισαν, comp. v. 35. - As Jesus is crucified, he asks God's forgiveness for his murderers 23:34. Likewise Stephen, as he is stoned Act. 7:60. - What Luke deviates from the common text, he himself is the author.

4) In general, what matters in our question is that we should

α) to separate what is individual in our texts from what is common,

β) that we find the reason for this individuality in the mode of representation of our writers, and

γ) that we are attentive to everything that refutes the assumption that Mark may have composed his text from Matthew and Luke. - For these very reasons, then, we have the following datum to note:

#### Sixth Datum.

Luke, in particular, makes the commentator on the original narrative, and inserts determinants into the text which Mark can have had so little in mind that it can be assumed that the Matthean speaker would have omitted them from the original type.

1) The evidence of these lodged determinations: -

n. 7. Luke gives the types of healing in more detail:

(a) ch. 4:39. ἐπιστάς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησε τὸ πυρετῶ.

b) In healing the weak: ἐκάστω αὐτῶν ἐπιθεις τὰς χεῖρας v. 40.

(c) The demons go forth with shouting: συ εἰ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ v. 41. ----- More definite phrases: ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς v. 38. ἐπίτιμών οὐκ εἶα v. 41. τὸν χριστῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι v. 41. —

n. 9.

a) Ch. 5:17. οἱ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς γαλιλ. κ. Ἰουδαίας.

b) δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ λᾶσθαι αὐτούς.

c) εξήτουν αυτόν - ενώπιον αυτού v. 18.

d) More clearly than Mark, from whose texts έξορϋξαντες with D must be left out : αναβάντες επί το δώμα καθήκαν αυτόν v. 19. -

e) δοξάζων τον Θεόν v. 26. - n. 10.

a) καταλιπών άπαντα v. 28.

b) και εποίησε δοχήν μεγάλην v. 29. (comp. ch. 14:13.)

c) εγόγγυζον λέγοντες v. 30. -.

d) έλεγε δε και παραβολήν v. 36. -

n. 11.

a) εν σαββάτω δευτεροπρώτω 6:1. -.

b) ψώχοντες ταίς χερσί v. 1. —

n. 12.

a) η χείρ αυτού η δεξιά. 6:6. -

b) αυτός δε ήδεν τους διαλογισμούς αυτών 6:8. (Comp. 9:47.)

c) επλήσθησαν ανοίας v. 11. -.

n. 13.

a) 6, 12. προσεύξασθαι -.

b) ήν διανυκτερεύων εν τη προσευχή. -

c) ότε έγένετο ημέρα προσεφώνησε τους μαθητάς v. 13. -

d) εκλεξάμενος απ' αυτών δώδεκα v. 13. -



e) οὐς και αποστόλους ὠνόμασε -

f) ζηλωτην (ft. κανανίτης) v. 16. -

n. 17.

a) της λίμνης 8:2. -.

b) τῷ κλύδωνι του ὕδατος κ. επαύσαντο v. 24. -

c) κατέπλευσαν v. 26. (Comp. 4:31. κατήλθεν. 8:22. ανήχθησαν. -

d) ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέραν κ.τ.λ. v. 26. -

e) ἱμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδύσκετο \*) και ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμεινε v. 27. -

\*) This detail is indeed assumed in Mark 5:15, even though it was not mentioned in Mark 5:3. However, it is passed over there as something that was self-evident - and rightly so, as it would be a rather insignificant detail in the description. Introducing it as a preamble to what follows, namely, that the demoniac was clothed again after the healing, or as an explanation of how the townspeople could recognize him as healed, would be too contrived. Only a later editor of the text wanted to create symmetry and believed that a gap needed to be filled.

547

(v. 29. the words seem: πολλοὺς γάρ χρόνοις .... εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους, which contain the explanation of ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμεινε v. 28 - before the others: παρήγγειλε γὰρ κ.τ.λ. to be placed).

f) παρά τους πόδας του Ἰησοῦ v. 35. -

g) πῶς ἐσώθη v. 36. -

h) ἅπαν το πλῆθος της περιχώρου and ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλη συνείχοντο (cf. ἦν συνεχ ὁμη μένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ 4:38.) v. 37th -

n. 18.

a) 8:40. ἀπεδέξατο αὐτόν ὁ ὄχλος .... προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν,

b) θυγάτηρ μονογενής v. 42. (cf. 9:38. 7:12.)

c) The enlargement of v. 46

d) ιδούσα δε η γυνή ότι ουκ έλαθε v. 47. υπο δι' ήν αιτίαν ήψατο αυτού, και .... παραχρήμα.

e) ειδότες, ότι απέθανεν τ. 53

f) επέστρεψε το πνεύμα αυτής v. 55. -

n. 22. 9:10. υποστρέψαντες (the words Mark. 6:44., can they belong in the text, since the number of those fed has already been given in Mark. v. 40. For the correct reading, cf. p. 507). ---

a) n. 29. 9:28. ωσει ημέραι οκτώ (Correction of μεθ' ημέρας έξι).

b) προσεύω ξασθαι και εν τω προσεύχεσθαι αυτόν -

c) εγένετο το είδος του προσώπου αυτού έτερον (which explains the μετεμορφώθη of the others). 29

d) The more complicated v. 30th 31st 32nd

e) Peter wants to build huts έντώ διαχωρίζεσθαι αυτούς v. 33

f) εφοβήθησαν .... την νεφέλην v.34. ---

n.30.

a) 9:37. Jesus fell from the mountain εν τη εξής: ημέρα.

b) ότι μονογενής εστίμου v.38.

c) μόγις αποχωρεί απ' αυτού, συντρίβον αυτόν (Mark. blotz: ξηραίνεται) v.39.

d) v. 43.--

n.35.

a) 18:18. Statement that the questioner was άρχων (the statement has something striking. Perhaps the text is even corrupted from πλούσιος υπάρχων). –

b) v. 24. ιδών δε .... γερόμενον (Luke loves to make the transition with ιδών, cf. 8:47. 9:47. etc. St. — n. 36. Rejection of the writings of the prophets. 18:31. –

n. 38.

a) 18:36. Extension (cf. Ch. 15:26.).

b) additions v. 43. –

n. 39. 19:37.

a) Designation of the spot where the Hofianna chanting began. Likewise, the commentator remarks on the scattering of the clothes that there were πορευομένου αυτού v. 36

c) wherefore the calling arose (άπαν το πλήθος - περί πασών ων είδον δυνάμεων, cf. 2:20.) –

n. 42.

a) 20:16. ακούσαντες δε είπον μη γένοιτο. 17. 'Ο δε έμβλέψας αυτούς είπε --- to this

b) v. 18. n. 43. a) 20:20. εγκαθέτους instead of τινάς των φαρισαίων. Luke does not give, as Schleiermacher says on p. 261, the imprecise expression, but the more chosen - why?

548

When the Pharisees came, people whose characters Jesus knew beforehand, he did not need to see their wickedness when they asked them; he knew her before. Since the text nevertheless says: he noticed her wickedness, v. 23. , so Luke makes out of the Pharisaern dear lurker, and that is correction.

b) v. 26. Kai, ουκ ίσχυσαν επιλαβέσθαι αυτου ρήματος κ.τ.λ., more definitely than Mark (n. 44. has already occurred above).

after 50

a) Turn-on 22:1.

b) συνέθεντο μηδ και εξομολόγησε V. 5. 6.

c) Addition άτερ όχλου v. 6. - n. 53, 22. 8. Πέτρον και Ιωάννην. (Schleiermacher remarks on p. 280. that this Luke was lost later, as in Mark and Matthew, than could be added by Luke -- as if it could have been so difficult to make this addition and to advise certain disciples. The addition has been made , like the other additions here mentioned (chap. 9:54. is called the other of the three confidants of Jesus with John.) - n. 54. 22:41. a) άπεσπάσβη άπ αιτών α ζεί λίβου βολήν. b) From the angel who strengthened Jesus v. 43--55.

c) από τής λύπης v. 45

d) Jesus addressing Judas v. 45. —

n. 55.

α) determination of time: διαστάσης ωσει ώρας μιάς 22:59., cf. μετά, βραχύ v. 58

b) άλλοι διΐσχυρίζετο v. 59. (Compare Acts 12:15.)

c) στραφείς και κύριος ενέβλεψε τω Πέτρων. 61. ---

n. 56.

a) the specific charge 23:2. b) προσεφώνησε v. 20

c) v. 23. fuller and more awkward.

d) v. 33. and 39. the expression χαχονργας.

e) Words of Jesus when he was crucified v. 34

f) The remark that the title of the cross was written in three languages v.38.

g) v. 35. έξειυχτήριζύν from Psalm 22.

h) v. 39. The correction that only one thief mocked Jesus, the other not.

i) v. 48. The remark that the people felt remorse.

k) v. 51. Remark on Joseph for not consenting to the advice of his colleagues.

l) v. 53. Addition, that no one had yet lain in the grave,

m) v. 56. that the women prepared ointments.

n) v. 56. Several additions and notes. - Everything that Luke implanted in his text is also what makes it individualized and distinguished from the others.

2) This datum is important. It

α) first of all, it immediately rejects the pretence that Mark had Luke in mind. For how? Mark should have used Luke's text as his source and omitted these particulars? This has too little probability for an unbiased person to believe it. As for the enrichments of Matthew, if these are missed in Mark, the explanation is always at hand: Mark omits speeches (scil. because Matthew usually includes speeches) or it was not in his plan to include such speeches; on the side after Luke, therefore, if the poor idea is to be preserved, it must be said: "it was not in Mark's plan to include historical things. - But what else was in his plan? The idea leads us to "nothing," just as it is itself based on nothing. -

549

β) One urges that the writer who makes additions is the later. But now we would think that the ones from Luke that are excellent here would be coarse enough.

γ) If it is said that Mark, omitting these additions, adhered to Matthew; then

κ) it must be remembered that Mark not only does not adhere to Matthew and his textual measure in general (see, e.g., n. 52), but also does not always have him at his side in these omissions, or, if this is the case, is not content with the text of the same (see n. 12. 17. 18.). n. 12. 17. 18. 30. and others), and that when the others both intervene, he does not have what has been intervened either (as in n. 54. Jesus' address to Judas. Luk. 22,48. Matth. 26-50.).

ב) It is unmistakable that these additions of Luke are later additions to the original type,

aa) If they were not, and if they belonged to the original type itself, one would have to assume, since Matthew and Luke's texts are undeniably descended from an original narrative, that Matthew or his pre-narrator omitted these provisions from the original type, which, however, if it were more probable than it is, would give an explanation only for these pieces, where Matthew really stands by Mark in such omissions, but not for the others.

bb) If they are later works, then Mark need not have had them before him, on the contrary, one must conclude that Mark does not have them precisely because they do not belong to the original text,

cc) Even the Matthaean compiler, although it is connected with Luke, does not have these provisions either - in the area of what it also has in common with Mark - because this area was supplemented by a type, and its content was already given with a certain expression, but the compiler only included speeches or fragments of speeches in it, and historical things only insofar as speech was connected with them; cf. above p. 393. c. -

550

dd) Since Mark did not have Luke before him, but the latter treated the text mostly according to his own style, it can be explained why Mark, where he continues with Luke alone, - but this only ever happens where Matthew has abbreviated, - mostly agrees with the detailed co-narrator only in thought, without agreeing with him in words. (This fact has already occurred to us in the speeches: in the area where we now find ourselves, compare n. 7. Luk. 4:40. 41. (42. 43.) \*). Mark. 1:32-34. (35-38.)-n. 8. Luk.5:15.16. = Mark. 1:45. -n. 9. Luk.5:26. = Mark. 2:12. -n. 17. Luk. 8:27 - 31. = Mark. 5:3 -10th - n. 18. Luk.8:38 - 41st = Mark. 5:18-22. Only between Luk. 8:49. = Mark. 5:35. the harmony is more intimate, as far as Luke has not changed). - But further: Luke's insertions in the text are based on method. Our date is therefore also important in that it gives us a contribution to the exact characteristics of this method. Luke, as we have seen (cf. p. 410), made contractions and simplifications. Here we see more clearly than elsewhere that he seeks to enrich the narrative text with more precise definitions. - We already found traces of this method in the speeches, but less frequently. - The copulative sentences, additions, such as n. 36, Luk 18:31, n. 44, n. 49, Luk 21:11, 12, 20, 24, 26, etc., belong here, and we will not be surprised that Mark does not have these additions there either. - Luke sometimes rearranges what is in the common record when he wants to enrich the text with provisions and notes. He makes combinations, and therefore simplifies. One example of this is the pericope in 53 and others are found

in the history of suffering (see above p. 410 f.). Perhaps he also follows an analogous procedure in the positioning and inclusion of entire pericopes, and we therefore want to keep his method in mind in the event that, for example, further on, when we speak of the arrangement of our Gospels, explanations and insights must be sought in them. It should be noted here that Mark does not have this methodical approach. But while it is excluded from him, it so relates to his text that, instead of belonging to the root of it, it rather has the appearance of being an uneducation applied to this text.

\*) That Luk. 4:44. Καί ἦν κηρύβων κ. τ. λ. from Mark is interpolated, shall be shown below.

551

3) We thus return to the result that emerged above from the comparison of the harmonic speech texts, but at the same time everything considered is gathered under one point of view. Even where the copies seem to differ the most (see Dat. 5), the parallel representations of each narrative are based on a single original relation, which, with the text of Mark, separates its basic features from the imaginings and conceits preserved under the hand of later authors. Since Mark, wherever Matthew abbreviates the given measure (see Dat. 4.), preserves this measure intact, without taking the fillings from Luke: since he does not coincide with Luke wherever the latter condenses (f. Dat. 4.), and wherever he comments on the text (see Dat. 6.), Mark's text is not the same. ), does not agree, even though Matthew's text gives no rule, - since the others, where they deviate from the given, also annul the agreement with Mark, and the latter does not agree with them everywhere where they have demonstrably altered the given; -It follows that the type which was given to the speakers either had Mark himself for its originator, or if this were not the case, it lay as well outside the other speakers as outside Mark, and if the latter are supposed to have had it directly before them (which, however, is rightly asserted), this can be said of Mark still sooner, because he expressed it far more purely than it was done by those. It is therefore still necessary to decide whether Mark himself is the author of the original text or not. However, we do not want to claim that this has been decided, since we still have to establish the date that contradicts this assumption, or seems to contradict it. This is the following:

#### Seventh Datum

Matthew and Luke occasionally agree in excluding certain formulas and sentences with which Mark has woven the historical account, and sometimes they also agree in

choosing individual words and expressions that are not present in Mark's text at the corresponding passage.

552

1) First, we shall give a list of the additions that Mark makes to the common text. We follow the order in which the pieces are listed under the next preceding datum. These additions are as follows:

α) from the pieces of the same order: n. 34. (cf. above p. 484.) Mark. 10:13. τοῖς προσφέρουσι (B. C. L. have for it αντοις ). v. 14. ιδών - ήγανάκτησε. - v. 16. καί ένεγκαλίσάμενος αυτά (one, suspected of impropriety, addition). - n. 35. 10:17 και γονυπετήσας αυτόν (cf. 1:40.). 21. εμβλέψας αυτω ήγάπησεν αυτόν. 22. στυγνάσας επί - 23. περιβλεφάμενος. 24. οι δέ μαθηταί αυτού εύαμβουόντύ επί τοῖς λόγοις αυτού. (The addition τέκνα πώς - είσελθεῖν is unächt. p. 224 above.) - n. 36. (p. 485.) 10:32. καί ήν προάγων αυτούς. Το ήρξατο λέγειν addition τα μέλλοντα αυτω συμβαίνπν. n. 39. (p. 485. ) 11:4. δεδεμένον προς τήν&ύραν έξω επί του αμφοδου. - n. 41. (p. 486.) 11:16. καί ούκ ήφιεν, "να τις διενέγκη σκεύος διά του ιερού. - n. 44. (p. 488.) 12:27. υμεῖς ουν πολύ πλανάσθε. - n. 47. 12:38 εν τή διδαχή αυτού. - n. 49. (p. 488.) 13. 3. πέτρας κ. Ιάκωβος κ. άνδρέας. - n. 55, 14:68. καί αλέκτωρ έφώνησε. 72. έκ δευτέρου. (Both are missing in L.) -

β) in the pieces placed in different order. - n. 8. (p. 497.) 1:40. καί γονυπετών αυτόν (absent in D. and suspect.) - ό δέ Ιησοϋς σπλαγχνισθεις. 42. ειπόντος αυτον (missing in B. D. L. et al.). 43. καί έμβριμησάμενος αυτώ ευθέως έξέβαλεν αυτόν (comp. Matth. 9:30.). - n. 9. ( 2:1. 2. have altered Matth, and Luk.). - 2:3. αίρόμενον ύπο τεσσάρων. - n. 10. 2:13. παρά την θάλασσαν καί πας όχλος ήρχετο προς αυτόν κ. έδίδασκεν αυτούς. 14. τον του Άλφαίου. 15. ήσαν γάρ πολλοί κ. ήκολούθησαν αύτώ. Mark does not have such battology elsewhere. The reading seems to be composed from the debris of other readings, such as that in the cod. L. put together. One had ascribed the ηκολουθησαν to the γραμματεῖς, meaning the Pharisees, of whom mention was made in the preceding piece). - n. 12. 3:5. μετ οργής, σνλλυπούμένος επί τή πωρώσει τής καρδιας αύτων. - n. 14. 3:22 οί από Ιεροσολύμων καταβάντες. 30. οτι έλεγαν πνεύμα ακάθαρτον έχει. - n. 16. (p. 502.) 4:10 οτε δε εγένετο καταμόνας (σύν τοῖς δώδεκα is gloss). - n. 20. 6:13. καί ήλειφον ελαάρ πολλούς αρρώστους. - n. 31. (p. 503.) 9:30. καί ουκ.ήθελζν, 'ίνα τίς γνώ. 31. έοίδασκε γάρ τούς μαθητάς αύτου. - n. 32. 9:33. 34. (But here the others have changed both), v. 35. (interpolated) v. 36. εγκαλίσάμενος αυτό ( probably no less a foreign addition than in n. 34. ch. 10:16.) -

553



γ) in the reports of acts and facts. - n. 22. (p. 506.) 6:30 - 33. (The other Both amended here), v. 34. ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα (comp. Matth. 9:36.). v. 40. (see p. 507.) 41. καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθὺς διεμέρισε παλαι. 43. καὶ ἀπὸ των ἰχθύων. -- n. 29. (p. 508.) 9:3. οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται λευκάσαι, (v. 6. ἦσαν γὰρ ἐκφοβαὶ cannot belong in the text), -- n. 30. 9:14. καὶ γραμματεῖς, συζητοῦντας αὐτοῖς. 15. καὶ εὐθέως πας ὁ ὄχλος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθη κ. προστρέχοντες ἠσπάζοντο αὐτόν. 16. καὶ ἐπηρώτησε αὐτοὺς τί συζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς; v. 21 -24. the special conversation with the boy's father. 26. καὶ ἐγένετο ὥς νεκρός, ὥστε πολλοὺς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. - n. 38. (p. 510.) 10:46. νίδος τιμαῖου βαρτίμαιος. 49. καὶ φωνοῦσι τὸν τυφλὸν λέγοντες αὐτῷ " θάρσει ἐγείραι, φωνεῖ σε. 50. ὁ ἄε ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ. - Which are in different order: n. 7. (p. 511.) 1:29. μετὰ Ἰακώβου κ. ἰωάννου. 33. καὶ ἡ πόλις ὅλη ἐπισυνηγμένη ἦν πρὸς τὴν θύραν. - n. 1.7. (p. 512.) 4:35. 36. (Cannot be quoted, as the others have changed both). 38. ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον. 39. εἶπε" - σιώπα, πεφίμωσο (the words 5:4. καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτὸν ἐσχρσε δαμάσαι cannot belong in the text. They are the repetition, arising from error, of the words v. 3. οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι). 13. ἦσαν δὲ ὡς δις χίλιοι (the words are missing in B.). - n.18. Almost nothing can be quoted here, because the two others have abbreviated in different places. - 5:41. ταλιθά κουμι. -

δ) From the last history of Jesus. -- n. 56. (p. 542.) 15:21 τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ 'Ρούφαν. 25. ἣν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη. 39. ὅτι οὐτωχράσας ἐξέπνευσε. 41. καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαί,. αἱ συναναβασαὶ αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. 44. ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐβαυμασε εἰ ἤδη τέβνηκε -- ἀπέβανε. 46. καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα. Now compare these additions with those recorded above p. 323, from the speeches, also it would be seen whether they differ from those noted p. 546 f. from Luke. - We now have here still

554

2) to list the passages where Matthew and Luke agree in expressions that Mark's text does not have. Here is the list of them: n. 9. Matth. 9:2. Luk. 5:18. καὶ ἰδοὺ, (Mark. 2:3. καὶ ἔρχονται) ἐπὶ χλίνης. (Mark absent), Matth. 9:2. Luk. 5:20. καὶ ἰδὼν (Mark. 2:5. δὼν δέ). Matth. v. 7. Luk. v. 25. ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶχον αὐτοῦ (Mark. 2:12. ἐξήλθεν ἐναντίον πάντων). - n. 10. Matth. 9:17. Luk. 6:37. εἰ δέ' μήγε (Mark. 2:22. εἰ δέ μή). - n. 11. Matth. 12:3. ἤρξαντο - καὶ ἐσθίον. Luk. 5:1 καὶ ἡσθιον (Mark 2:23 omitted). - n. 13. Matth. 10:2. καὶ ἀνδρέας δὲ ἀδελφὸς μύτον. Luk. 6:14. καὶ ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ - called James after Peter on it (otherwise Mark 3:18.). - n.14. Matth. 12:48. Luk. 8:21. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε (Luk.: πρὸς αὐτούς. Mark 3:33. καὶ ἀπεχρίθη αὐτοῖς). - n. 17. Matth. 8:25. καὶ προσελθόντες. Luk. 8:24. προσελθόντες δὲ (Mark. 4:38. omitted). Matth. v. 27. (οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι) ἐθαύμασαν. Luk. 8:25. (φοβηθέντες δέ) ἐθαύμασαν (Mark. 4:41. ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν). - n. 18. Matth. 9:20. Luk. 8: 44. προσελθούστα ὀπίσθεν

(Mark 5:27. ελθούσα εν τώ όχλω όπισθεν.) - n. 22. Matth. 14:14. και εθεράπευσε τους αρρρώστους αυτών. Luk. 9:11. και τους χρείαν έχοντας ιάτο (Mark 6:34. omitted). - n. 30. Matth. 17:17. Luk 9:41. αποκριθείς δέ δ Ιησούς είπε (Mark 9:19 ο δέ άποκριθείς λέγει). - n. 35. Matth. 19:22. άχούσας- δέ δ νεανίσχος. Luk. 18:23. δ δέ άκούνας (Mark 10:22. ο δε συγγνάσας). - n. 38. Matth. 20:30. ότι Ιησούς παράγει. Luk. 18:37. ότι .... παρέρχεται (Mark 10:47. ότι .... έστιν). - n. 52. Matth. 26:10. Luk. 22:6. έζήτει εύχαιρίαν (Mark 14:11. έζήτει πώς εύχαίρως). - n. 55. Matth. 26:75. Luk. 22:60. έ'ξελβών έξω. (Mark. 14:72. έπιβαλών). - n. 56. Matth. 28:54. Luk. 23:47. δ έχατόνταρχος. (Mark 15:39 δ χεντυρίων).-.

3) Whether these additions and these examples of agreement prove more than the additions listed above on p. 323 and the cases of agreement mentioned on p. 29Z according to p. 460. 463. f. can prove, we must leave that for the time being undecided; the result always remains certain for us: Matthew and Luke agree in a text which neither has from the other, and Mark's text is not composed with the others.

555

The parallel narrative pieces are based on only one and the same type, as certainly as the differences that occur in the copies are only individual formations that have only that author as their author in whom they are found - in short, we have here the same either-or that we arrived at above on p. 466. (Incidentally, the textual parallels listed under this question from p. 484 onwards also gave new confirmation that the language idiom of the original translation could only have been Greek, since the historical epithets interwoven with the translation in the copies, in part

α) where they are different, by far do not always differ in mere expression, as different translations do, but also consist of additions which the other copies do not have, partly

β) where in the copies they are harmonies, very often in the same Greek expression, even if they are in different places. - One sees, e. g., in n. 9. Luk. 5, 17. καί ήσαν καθήμιοι - which just so Mark. 2, 6. and other examples are given on p. 303. 423. - This, then, is an afterthought to the proof given in the first section under Das. 14. p. 396. f.). - After these preliminary discussions, - for the question whether the parallels of each piece are based on one and the same original relation is only a preliminary one, - we have now, in order to advance further in the investigation, to examine our considered masses from an entirely new side. Everything that has hitherto been dealt with in the first and second sections of the investigation, directed towards the written unification standard of our reports, concerned the pieces in and for themselves, in detail, apart from their order and connection, and in this respect the discussion conducted up to this

point stands apart as a whole in itself. Now we will also consider the order and connection of the pieces, so that, as we have hitherto spoken of the individual pericopes, we will now speak of the Gospels themselves as whole works, and in this respect the object of investigation, although it remains in the sphere of reflection, changes. If we now look at the order of the pieces as illustrated by the above tables, we can say in one respect: the Gospel of Mark is lost among the masses of the secondary Gospels, and in the other: whole masses emerge from those, and unite with it. Again, it is unity among diversity that captivates our gaze, and thus, the

556

second point to be discussed is this: does the first table represent the outline of a work that existed on its own?

We take the liberty of making a few brief comments on this topic, as we did on the first questionpoint.

1) The question is determined by the first table. On it we notice the following relationship:

a) Mark's Gospel has no such prehistory as Matthew and Luke,

b) As to the order followed in his Gospel, he has

α) from n. 6. to n. 13. the same order with Luke, but excludes the piece Luk. 6, 1 -11. which falls between n. 7. and 8. (s. the third plate p. 15.).

β) Bon u. 16 - 22. he keeps the order with Luke , except that he places n. 15. with Matthew differently (before n. 16.) and gives ". 16. in a longer form, then inserts o. 19. and connects i., 21. with Matthew in the narrative of John's beheading.

γ) From n. 22. to n. 39. he follows the same arrangement with Matthew, except that between n. 25. and 26. he gives a story of healing (Mark 7:12 - 37.), and likewise one between 27. and 28. (Mark 8:22-26. s. (Mark 8:22-26, see third plate, p. 13), but Matthew does not have a pericope (Matt. 17:24-27, see third plate, p. 14) which falls between n. 31 and n. 32, nor does he give some passages shorter with Luke than Matthew,

δ) Just so from n. 40-49. where, however, he inserts with Luke the piece n. 48.

ε) From n. 50. to 56. he unites with Matthew against Luke in the arrangement and formation of the accounts, except that he ignores some notes which Matthew inserts.

c) n. 57. his writing seems to lack the end, since the authenticity of the verses of Mark. 16:9- 20. must be doubted. - Here, finally

d) it should not be overlooked that Mark, like each of the secondary evangelists, also has his own passages, but very few of them. - So the whole investigation here revolves around the question: did Mark excerpt from Matthew and Luke or not ? If he has not excerpted, then the sum of his narrative pieces, as far as they represent the first tablet, forms a work in itself, that work to which the two other evangelists have added their peculiar materials, as well as those that are common only to them both. So now we can also

557

2) to shed more light on the connection in which this second question stands with the first.

a) Here we are again dealing with the hypothesis that was disputed in the preceding passage, when we spoke of the form and nature of the individual pieces in and of themselves and apart from their connection. Just as the friends of the hypothesis there appealed to the fact that Mark gives individual pieces in terms of expression and quantity in the same way as the effle or other of his secondary evangelists, so they support themselves here:

α) that Mark places some pericopes in the same order and sequence in which they are found in one or other of the secondary evangelists,

β) that he has some passages in common only with one or the other of his fellow narrators,

γ) that Mark's Gospel is for the most part contained in the secondary Gospels in the same quantity as his individual pericopes are contained in the parallel texts of the latter. For which reason, perhaps, they will not accept the reasons hitherto given against their opinion as a refutation of it, until these supports of their hypothesis have also been broken,

b) If, however, we are led to the opposite result, namely, to the conclusion that the content of the first tablet is a work in itself independent of Matthew and Luke, then our

investigation also enters into connection with the earlier discussions inasmuch as through this result the conclusion established earlier with respect to the first question, that the uniform representations of each narrative piece are formed according to one and the same archetype, is put even more out of doubt. For then, not only is the particular trinity of the specimens given of one piece based on one archetype of this piece, but all the pieces of the first tablet, of which there are such corresponding specimens, are altogether the product of one and the same archetypal author, and belong to one and the same work.

558

c) In the discussion of the first point of the question, when we considered the unity of the parallel pieces in the expression of the reflection, we noted that the unity of the original relation in our Gospels was individualized only under the hand of the copyists and under the influence of their individual way of diction, but especially by the exception of certain formulas, which were implanted in the type by the speakers with reference to the special position and connection of the pieces. This assertion has yet to be proven, and it will be under the present question, since it refers precisely to the order and connection of the pieces, so that the discussion to be made here will also be kept in context with the previous one. So much, then, about the connection of the questions. If we want to

3) determine the object of the investigation to be made more precisely, then, if the first tablet is to appear as an independent work, it depends

a) on the negation: that Mark did not exclude the dual sections and the order in which he sets up the sequence of his pieces from the secondary writers, and that what they contribute as special material was not taken from them as their excerptor;

b) it depends on the extent that the work is said to have had originally, whether this included the dual sections of the first table or not. (As is well known, according to Eichhorn, they are later enrichments of the original gospel). Finally,

c) it must be determined whether the arrangement and position of the pericopes was later than their composition, or whether one originated at the same time as the other. - With regard to these points, the data must be selected and arranged. But then we also need

4) Criteria for sifting the original and non-original -- here in the order and connection of the pieces - that is, what is the same, what belongs together and what does not belong

together. Now, where are these criteria? Just there, where they lay above, when we looked at the original and non-original in the individual pericopes - in the common above we compared those parts of the text/ which are the speakers' corresponding expression, with the variations and deviations occurring in one and the other, and then examined the relationship which the latter had to the corresponding text. We argued from the purpose of the pieces, from the relationship of their parts to each other, from the construction of the whole, and sought to determine from this what belongs to the original measure and to the expression of it, and what does not. Here we must proceed in the same way, and compare both their construction and position with each other in order to see whether the latter, the position, is appropriate to their construction or not. If the speakers, as we have already indicated, have made changes to the pieces for the sake of their special position and linkage (abbreviating the relation or lengthening it), or if they have underlaid them with special formulas, then these special formulas and changes will also have to be examined for their appropriateness to the other parts and generally to the construction of the piece, and they will also provide criteria for distinguishing the original and the later, that which is given with the type, and the productions of the arrangers from one another. -So much about these criteria in general. For we will spare ourselves more specific determinations about them here, since they will make themselves known below in the course of the critique. There is nothing more to be noted in advance, and so we immediately begin to search for the data that belong to the question.

559

#### First Datum.

Just as Matthew and Luke, when excluding Mark, express certain relations either entirely or in individual parts with corresponding words (see section 1, datum 3, section 2, 1, interrogative datum 2); they also place several of the agreeing narrative pieces in the same order relationship and concur with each other in arranging entire sequences of them, without the possibility of such concurrence being governed by any rule through individual collections that these writers may have used.

560

1) It has already been noted earlier that the problem lying in the agreement of our Gospels is far from solved even if Mark is considered as the excerptor or epitomizer of the other two evangelists, as the mystery still remains in the agreement between these two. However, just as Matthew and Luke, even when Mark is removed from their midst, show harmonies in the expression of individual pericopes, they also give several narrative pieces the same order and arrange whole masses in the same sequence.

These pieces are, as the first table shows, as follows: a) n. 1 - 6. b) n. 9. and 10. c) n. 11. and 12. d) n. 21. and 22. e) n. 28. to 32. f) n. 34. to 36. g) n. 38.39. h) n. 41. to 44. Then i) n 46. and 47. k) n. 49. and 50. l) n. 52. to the end. (The missing intermediate numbers are either insertions in the work that contains them or gaps in the one that does not.)

2) Since the question here is whether the first table constitutes an independent work, this datum is of importance. For how can we explain this convergence of the two reporters in the arrangement and disposition of the whole, and in the midst of it, the grouping of the same pieces, even though their immediate connection is made in different ways? (One can see this, for example, in n. 30 and 31, n. 48 and 49.) We have no other choice here but to consider either that our Gospels are based on a whole with a specific arrangement of materials - our reporters filled certain parts of this whole with different content and rearranged some elements in a different context - or that the connection arose piecemeal through the concatenation of individual collections consisting of connected pieces, which our writers used. Indeed, as we noted above (p. 166ff), the latter view is maintained in Schleiermacher's critical attempt concerning the sources of Luke. However, it must also be impartially acknowledged, as others have already realized \*), that the author has not succeeded in carrying it out satisfactorily. Without delving into the examination of the general assumptions from which he proceeded in the isolation of the evangelical materials, we only want to pay attention to the resistance that the pericopes of our first table themselves present to the attempt to forcibly detach them from the whole and confine them to collections. Specifically, let us consider here only the numbers just listed as particular examples. Thus,

\*) A thorough review of this writing can be found in the *Mg. Litterat.-Zeitung*. November 1817. Number 263.

561

a) a) n. 1. to n. 6. - Here n. 1 - 4. shall make up a single whole, which came to Luke's hand when he was looking for news about the beginning of the teaching ministry of Jesus. Of this n. 1, because it closes with Luk 3:19.20, is a special essay, probably not written by a Christian, containing memorabilia from the public life of John (Schleiermacher p. 59). The two other pieces. 2.3. are news from Jesus' life before the beginning of his teaching ministry. - We reply against this fragmentation as follows:

α) It is already highly improbable in itself that someone would have distinguished or collected information about Jesus' life immediately before the beginning of his ministry without including other accounts of Jesus' subsequent public activities. However, it is

understandable how someone intending to write a cohesive narrative, an Evangelium, would begin the story of Jesus' public life with the baptism, the act through which Jesus first connected his own purpose with a work already begun. Consequently, they would start the narrative with information about the activities of the forerunner, namely John the Baptist, and thus, had to send forth such accounts in advance.--

β) Because Luk. 3:19. 20. is interposed, the preceding essay on the Baptist does not become special. — The critic himself admits on p. 52 that Luke got stuck somewhere, namely the genealogy (Luk. 3:23-28.). If Luke was able to pinch something in one place, he could also pinch it in the other place, so also chap. 3:19. 20. And there is absolutely no thought that the essay on the Baptist might have been written by someone who was not a Christian. The essay portrays the forerunner of the Messiah; we can say it is dogmatic. Luke 3:11-14 is shaped according to Malachi 3:5, and Paul, who was undoubtedly a Christian, also refers to what follows in Luke 3:15 in Acts 13:25.

562

γ) The critic himself admits on page 64 that the narrative of Luke 4:16-30, which is supposed to separate the following from the preceding, was placed here by Luke for the first time.

b) n. 9. 10. About this briefly the following:

α) one must admit, as noted on p. 76, that the two pieces are not chronologically related; they are in order. But since they nevertheless occur together in our gospels; so it can be concluded that she wrote for this order of things and so

β) are not individual records, especially since they lack historical detail, as the critic himself admits. —

c) The same applies to n. 11. and 12. These two pieces and the 9th and 10th are said to have already constituted a collection when Matthew received them (p. 96). We reply:

α) No unbiased person will believe that a collection of these four pieces existed.

β) Matthew would have separated this collection into two halves and inserted them between other materials. Did he find it necessary, for the sake of his materials, to locate the two double pieces differently; so he could find himself compelled to do so when he had them in front of him in a whole book (such as the Gospel of Mark) as soon as this book did not contain all the materials that he wanted to incorporate into the work. —



d) n. 20. 22. Our critic separates these pieces with the following to n. 32 from the preceding ones as a special recording (p. 138 f.), a separation and isolation that is entirely arbitrary. Then

α) the mention of the sending out of the disciples n. 20. is obviously related to the previous story in the Gospel of the separation of the disciples n. 13 \*)

β) The presumed whole has no special theme at all in order to be a special whole. To be sure, the critic raises such a theme (p. 140)—to give indications about the end that Jesus awaits, although n. 22. cannot be brought under this theme.

\*) Here, however, the author wants to persuade us (p. 84.), Luke's report, chap. 6:12. f. does not deal at all with such a selection of the disciples, and Markas is only the first who so misunderstood him. He probably thinks Lukas didn't understand himself

a) says Luke v. 13. expressly that Jesus chose twelve, just as he mentions in the Acts of the Apostles that after the departure of Judas the number twelve had to be fulfilled again,

b) does he also give the "list of names" of the selected twelve,

c) he mentions that Jesus' spent the night in prayer before this selection, v. 12., with which cf. Act. 1:2 οὐς δια πνεύματος αγίου εξελέξατο and Act. 1:24. 6:6. 13:2 — But the author must use such hermeneutical tricks in order to make his idea of the origin of the Gospels from fragments plausible to us.

563

γ) The whole would have no conclusion at all, n. 32. declares the author to be an appendix to this whole (p. 152.), by himself admitting that he is not internally connected with it. — We're coming up

δ) n. 34 - 46. From n. 34, where Luke takes up the thread of the secondary gospels again

ε) p. 223. Admitted that something new begins with this, to which what immediately precedes in Luke does not belong.

β) But the author will not make anyone believe what he wants to assert on p. 232. that from n. 34. and 35. Matthew is based on a different report than in Luke (see above p. 484.) . So if both pieces had been parts, the one with Luk. 9:51. beginning of the gathering, Matthew, and likewise Mark, who is independent of him, must have taken them from Luke's gathering and separated them from Luke's masses. But just as little as someone will consider probable, can it be assumed that

γ) that with n. 34 a separate collection has begun, however far this may be continued from here on or however narrowly it may be limited. (Because the report n. 34 is not suitable for such a beginning, if only because it lacks time and location.) But what our critic goes on to say is just as erroneous that the section of his collection beginning with n. 34 extend only to n. 41 by Luk. 19:47.48. make the limit of the collection (p. 240.). Where would there be a limit here? It is obvious that in the passage just quoted from Luke, what has gone before is not summarized, but a preliminary remark is made about what follows, just as in Mark. n. 42. a. to 49. (Luk. 21, 38.) should originally constitute a whole in itself.

564

But the reasons provided for this claim (page 250 f) can be easily refuted. The critic relies on:

α) the argument that if the closing formula in Luke 21:37-38 were from the same author as the one in Luke 19:47-48, the phrase "τας δε νύκτας - τυλίζετο εις το ορος - έλαιών" would already be expressed in the latter passage. However, Luke 19:47-48 only contains a preamble about the behavior of the priests, not about what Jesus did. But in Luke 21:37-38, the latter is indeed referred to.

β) He also objects that Luke 22:2 repeats what has already been said in Luke 19:47. However, it is stated at both places in different contexts; there (Chapter 19:47): they sought to kill him immediately after his cleansing of the temple but were afraid because his teaching captivated the people; here (Chapter 22:2): they made the decision to carry out their long-cherished plan on the approach of the Passover. Furthermore,

γ) he believes that the mention of the Passover festival in Chapter 22:2 should have already been mentioned at least in Chapter 20:1 if everything was written in one context. However, there (Chapter 20:1), the festival was not as close as here (Chapter 22:1), and the proximity of it, as it became an occasion for Judas, could not be mentioned there yet. And precisely this fact that the narrator delayed this mention provides evidence that he was not the postulated fragmentist but the writer of a Gospel

who intended to continue his account. How could one consider the two chapters, Luke Chapter 20 and 21 (i.e., numbers 42.a. - 49.), as isolated recordings when they lack any indication of time? (For it is only in Luke 22:1 that we learn they belong to the days before the Passover.) Moreover, the beginning of Chapter 20:1, "ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν," clearly refers to something that had happened before. We will not continue following the confusing book any further, as it is unlikely that anyone will believe that the last narrative starting with Luke 23:3 (n. 52) formed a separate composition in the form it appears in Luke. It has also been demonstrated earlier that in this narrative, which varies among the secondary reporters, Luke had no other text before him than the one they had (see page 489 and page 540, respectively).

### 3) But if now

a) we have no reason to assume individually established collections of the gospel accounts and the previously mentioned sections, identified as starting or stopping points of common agreement, were not part of different collections, then what remains for us is to consider them as integral parts of a larger narrative and to seek the reason why our reporters touch and continue the same parts of the narrative together at one and the same place within the order of this whole narrative. Here, we find

565

b) an analogy to what we discovered earlier regarding the individual sections. Just as the reason for the reporters meeting again at the same point in the narrative, after insertions and omissions, was rooted in the archetype of those sections, so, in this case of the dislocation of the whole sections, the possibility for the orderers to find the rule of arrangement again at the same place, after insertions, rearrangements, and omissions, is contained in the typified disposition of the whole narrative. Hence, the assumption of such a whole narrative becomes the first premise that we lay as the foundation for all further discussions. Now, one might immediately grasp this assumption and ask: If our authors had a structured whole narrative before them, how did they end up making changes and deviating from the pre-established order? This is precisely the subject of our further investigation. We shall, as we did with the individual sections, compare the deviating parts with the concurring ones and seek the reasons for these deviations. This shall now be done, starting with more detailed observations on Luke to facilitate our investigation.

Second Datum.

Luke has exchanged entire narrative sections that, in Matthew and Mark, are situated between other sections, also arranged in the same order by him, with other examples. These examples are not only different in content but also positioned differently and inserted between sections that, in Matthew and Mark, stand side by side. Thus, on one hand, Luke creates a gap, and on the other hand, an insertion.

566

1) So we first speak about the entire sections that have been indicated as missing in Luke on the first tablet. The reason for their absence is explained here, namely, because Luke has provided different examples in other places. Among these sections, a division can be made based on how obvious the exchange is compared to others.

α) Those sections that Luke has unmistakably exchanged for other forms of presentation are n. 5, n. 14, n. 19, n. 37, n. 45, and n. 51. Let us examine these sections individually. — n. 5. It has been noted elsewhere (above p. 62 ff.) that the section Luke has included in its place, Luke 5:1-11, only offers a different portrayal of the same event. Thus, there is a gap between n. 4 and n. 6 in Luke, but an insertion between n. 7 and n. 8, thereby separating both sections that are connected in Mark (we will discuss the different order in Matthew later).

n. 19 is exchanged for Luke 4:16-30 (see Tablet 3, p. 15). It has also been observed above (p. 60) that this other section provides an alternate description of the same event. The exchange creates a gap between n. 18 and n. 20, compared to Mark (since Matthew has made changes here), and an insertion between n. 4 and n. 5, which Matthew and Mark place in the same order, is introduced by Luke.

n. 37 is exchanged for what Luke places in Luke 22:24-30 (about the identity of the sections, see above p. 68 ff.). Thus, between n. 36 and n. 38, for the parallelism with Mark and Matthew, Luke is only missing this section. However, where Luke has attached it after changing the form, it separates what is connected in Mark and Matthew.

n. 45 is exchanged for another example, Luke 10:23-37 (see Tablet 3, p. 15; about the identity of the sections, see above p. 67). Therefore, again, between n. 44 and n. 46, Luke lacks only this pericope for parallelism with the others. The exchanged passage is found by Luke between numbers 33 and 34.

n. 51. Luke provides a different account of it (see above p. 65), namely, Luke 7:36-50, which is part of a mass inserted between n. 13 and n. 14 (the order of Mark must also be recognized by Matthew, as we will see below).

Still to be considered is n. 14. Luke provides a different account of it in chapter 11:14 onwards. He has inserted it after n. 13 and placed it differently from Mark and Matthew. The material he incorporated lies in the aforementioned interpolation, which falls between numbers 33 and 34. These are the most evident exchanges. Less conspicuous are

567

β) other ones that should also be noted. Among these are n. 24 to 27, n. 33, and n. 40. We must first accept a couple of things about these pieces—n. 24-27:

α) n. 26 does not belong to the archetype (and was not merely omitted by Luke);

β) they are interrelated. Thus, we must seek permission to interpose some additional remarks here. First of all, n. 26 does not belong to the archetype, primarily because it is not present in Mark either, and we prove this through the following reasons:

aa) It is already unlikely that a narrator like Mark, who sparingly allocates materials, would duplicate one and the same event (see above, p. 55). But

bb) the narrative is not connected and prepared in the manner of Mark. There is no apparent source for the multitude of people needed for this account. The transition in Mark 6:32-33 is completely different.

cc) There are traces indicating that this story has been inserted, causing the separation of related parts. For instance, Mark 8:11 onwards is connected with Mark 7:37. The Pharisees, wanting to test the reputation of the praised one due to the spectacular healing of the deaf-mute through the crowd's admiration, we find here

αα) the same passage present in another recension, Luke 11:14 onwards, which also involves a request for a sign from heaven after the healing of a mute \*). The combination is exactly the same.

\*) The fact that in Mark, the deaf-mute is not mentioned as possessed does not negate the identity of the incident referred to in the narratives. Even in Matthew's account, in the same story (Matthew 12:22 onwards) that corresponds to Luke's, there is a variation, stating that the possessed man was not only mute but also blind. According to Matthew 9:32, he was only mute. However, the identification

of this account with the one in Luke is evident from certain words that harmonize it with Luke's narrative. Compare Matthew 9:33 with Luke 11:14.

568

ββ) Jesus healed the deaf-mute within the borders of Decapolis (Mark 7:31) and then crossed over to the opposite (western) shore: Mark 8:22. This aligns well if the interpolated account is omitted, and it is also harmonious with the disciples' caution not to buy bread in the region, which is less understandable if we assume a departure from Dalmanutha (Mark 8:10) or Magdala (Matthew 15:39) to Bethsaida (Mark 8:20) and consequently to the eastern Bethsaida-Julias in the domain of (gentle) Philip. In general, the

γγ) New Testament knows only one Bethsaida, and it is specifically referred to as the western one (Luk. 10:13).

δδ) If this second feeding account truly belonged in the sequence of events, then Jesus' question in Mark 8:20 would be quite unnatural! Should this question here, as it recalls a past feeding, really find a place? If so, it can only refer to a longer event that preceded it, specifically, only to the first feeding (v. 14), and thus, one must believe that in Mark's Gospel, no other feeding has been mentioned except this one. Therefore, it is hardly conceivable to consider Mark 8:20 as a later addition. This view is also supported in Matthew's text. For the phrase "οὐπω νοεῖτε" (Matthew 16:9) can only stand absolutely: "Have you not understood yet?" Then, it becomes noticeable that the immediately doubled "οὐδέ" does not fit, and it is evident that originally only one word, related to "νοεῖτε," stood here (as in Mark 8:17, "οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδέ συνίετε;"), and that the added "μνημονεύετε" is merely a modification to provide brevity and symmetry to the enriched text with the addition of the second feeding (Matthew 16:10) \*). It seems that in this chapter of Mark, other interpolations are present as well, namely, the loquacious verse 18 (similar to Mark 7:8, "βαπτισμούς 'ξηστών — ποιοῦντις," which the more critical analysis also regards as inauthentic, as in Fritzsche's commentary on this passage).

\*) The writing style of the Matthaean compiler is also evident here: ἄρτοι των πιντακιςχιλίων, cf. 13:18. παραβολή τοῦ βπείροντος v. 36· των ζιζανίων. 21: 21. τό τῆς ἀνκης.

569

εε) The mentioned feeding story has been later inserted into Mark from Matthew. In the Gospel of Matthew, an attempt has been made to establish a connection with the

preceding events by adding details to the feeding story. Instead of mentioning only one healed person, as in Mark (7:32), Matthew includes the incident of many - the deaf, mute, and other sick individuals - coming together for the feeding. Additionally, Matthew mentions the mountain (as in the first feeding story) where Jesus sits down and waits for the sick to gather. This clarification regarding Pericope n. 26 is provided to absolve Luke from the suspicion of having omitted it. Now, as we mentioned before, there is something noteworthy about the characteristic shared by the other stories, n. 24, n. 25, and n. 27, and the reason why they are grouped together. Just as in n. 28, when Jesus, at a specific time, asks his disciples whom the people consider him to be, and they inform him that some think he is Elijah, similarly, in the immediately preceding narrative pieces, namely, those mentioned just now, actions and words of Jesus are presented that resemble Elijah. The parallel with Elijah begins with n. 22, which can be compared with 1 Kings 17:16 and 2 Kings 4:43. Then follows n. 24, depicting the zeal for the divine law, which can be compared with 1 Kings 18:18 and following, and also with Mark 7:10 compared to 1 Kings 18:30, where Elijah summons the people. The parallel lies particularly in Jesus accusing the false teachers of approaching God only with their mouths and replacing God's word with their own human words, similar to the servants of Baal (who worshipped a self-made god). And concerning n. 25, one can compare it to 1 Kings 17:9. We want to draw parallels to this:

570

| 1 Kings 17:10                                                                                                             | Mark 7:14                                                                                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Και ανίατη καί επορευῆθη εἰς Σαρεπτά, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ γυνὴ χήρα                                                             | Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἀπήλυσεν<br><br>Matth. 15:22. κ. ἰδοὺ γυνὴ χαναναία<br>(Mark. Συροφονίκισσα |
| καὶ ἐβόησεν ὀπίσω αὐτῆς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ                                                                                    | ἐκραύγασεν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ:                                                                         |
| ν. 13. ἀλλὰ ποίησόν μοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐγκρυφίαν — καὶ ἐξοίσεις μοι ἐν πρώτοις, αὐτὴ δὲ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις σου ποιήσεις ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ | Mark 7:27. ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα.                                                    |

In n. 27, Jesus is said to act like Elijah, who caused clouds and rain to appear from the sky (compare 1 Kings 18:45, 2 Kings 1:12 \*). So, as we can see, these pieces are not randomly placed here; rather, they are intended to explain the popular belief mentioned in n. 28, to which the historian himself drew attention in n. 21. Therefore, they are placed in their appropriate context, side by side. With this in mind, we can make a more specific judgment about Luke's omissions. He most likely had the pieces n. 24, 25, and 27 before him, but he omitted them while including others in their place. Instead of n.

24, he provides a similar account in chapter 11:37-54 (where the empty ritualism of false teachers is also criticized). It becomes clear how he could have exchanged n. 25 and what piece he considered as a replacement by referring to the aforementioned parallelism. Luke chose a story that presents a similar parallel to the story of Elijah, which is the account of raising the widow's son in Nain in chapter 7:11-17, comparable to 1 Kings 17:17-23. Even individual words in Luke's account echo that Old Testament narrative; for instance, Luke 7:12: "As he drew near to the gate of the town," compares to 1 Kings 17:10: "he came to the gate of the city." - In Luke 7:15, "And he gave him to his mother," the same words can be found in 1 Kings 17:23. The raising of the dead corresponds to what is narrated there in 1 Kings 17:21-24. Story outlined. This piece could thus be exchanged by Luke for the other, as it also reports the benevolence shown to a woman, just like the other account, and just as that one presents the healing of a daughter as a miraculous act, this one presents the resurrection of a son and maintains the parallel with Elijah (also only partially, as in Mark and Matthew. The similarity with them lies in the fact that the woman is a Phoenician, just as the widow in that story was also one, and then, that the conversation initially presents the needs of the children; in Luke, the similarity is that the woman is a widow and that she regains her son, as a certain woman does in the story of Elijah told there). So, this is the other piece. The remaining third piece, n. 27., speaks of the request for a heavenly sign, and Luke narrates it in chapter 11:9-36. The warning of Jesus against the leaven of the Pharisees and scribes, which follows in Mark and Matthew, appears in Luke 12:1-12, so the lack of the missing numbers here in Luke can be fully explained. Therefore, only the pieces n. 33. and 40. remain to be found. However, the explanation given by Jesus in n. 33. and the main part of his answer can be found in Luke 16:16-18, and concerning n. 40., Storr (Purpose of the Gospel, John p. 276) has already correctly remarked: "by passing over this passage, Luke explains it." The withering of the fig tree could indeed be seen as a symbol of the impending downfall of the neglectful temple officials, just as Jesus' own speech afterwards contains the threat that the vineyard will be taken away from them precisely because they do not pay the tribute from the vineyard. Now, however, the fig tree on which fruits were sought in vain, though it is a symbol here in this context, is also elsewhere the subject of a parable given by Jesus himself in Luke, and in such a way that the presentation has the appearance of a threat, just as the destruction of the fig tree here has a prefigurative aspect. Therefore, it is not surprising that Luke exchanged one presentation for the other or that, after having taken one, he omitted the other. — These were thus the gaps made in the typology by Luke, along with their completions.

\*) I ask you to pay attention to the discovery of these parallels, since other results follow from them, which cannot be presented here. Otherwise, the remark made above on p. 146 can be completed from these and similar references.



2) Certainly, it is striking that:

a) precisely through the comparison of Matthew and Mark, a gap is discovered in Luke, where Luke has removed one or more such pieces from the sequence, and

b) that Luke, in providing differently shaped versions of these pieces, does not place them in the same locations as the removed ones but elsewhere, and that they

c) where he has placed them, stand outside the sequence of Mark and Matthew (e.g., n. 29, n. 87, n. 45). Can this be explained by the arrangement of different collections? Does it not rather clearly indicate the type of an originally ordered evangelical whole? Or should we perhaps say: Matthew or Mark inserted one or more pieces, not belonging to the original type as Luke had it, where Luke is supposed to have gaps, and the appearance of gaps in Luke's text is only a result of this? Against this, it must first be argued that the pieces included by Luke are also differently shaped than the omitted ones. It is indeed not understandable how one of the other evangelists could have placed just those pieces in the positions where Luke has gaps, which, while similar in content to the differently arranged examples in Luke, are nevertheless always shaped differently. However, it is understandable that Luke, when including other examples, could not leave the others as they were due to his habit of avoiding redundancies and simplifying whenever possible. Furthermore, we can strengthen the evidence that Luke changed the type after including other pieces if we first examine the mutual relationship of the writers who have the pieces missing in Luke. What is this relationship?

### Third Datum.

Far from the fact that Mark should have borrowed from the work of Matthew the passages missing from Luke, the order of the same relates to the latter as something predetermined and in their text, like the Gospel of Matthew, provides it, the original separates itself from that under the hand of the later processors.

1) One could perhaps deny the previous statement, that Luke exchanged some of the pieces of the first tablet for others, and on the other hand claim that Luke did not have them; - the difference between Matthew, who sets up these pieces, and Luke, who does

not have them, is something accidental (a private matter, as it were), and Mark is irrelevant, because he first took them from Matthew. But this excuse is nothing, and that it is nothing is to be shown here. -

a) The arrangement of these pieces is not from the editor of Matthew's work, but it existed before his work, - something determined before him, given to him. It is true that this can only be fully demonstrated below after other data have been compiled, but it can already be seen here by examining individual numbers. - n. 5. It is quite indisputable that the one who first wrote the narrative wanted to link to it the note that Jesus entered Capernaum from here accompanied by the disciples who had entered into contact with him, as this note follows in Mark, and Luke too, after reporting that Jesus came to Capernaum from Nazareth, mentions that fact as the first which, according to Mark, followed Jesus' entry into contact with the disciples. In Matthew, however, nothing is mentioned about the entrance into Capernaum. The reason for this is the anticipation Matth. 4, 13. (which already comes too early, because according to our gospel news Jesus' living in Capernaum was only mediated by the acquaintance with Peter). - Here the Matthean folder seems not to have known why both pieces had to take the place immediately after n. 13 (which he even erased). Here again (which no interpreter has noticed) is a parallel to the Old Testament story. Jesus' relatives (n. 15.) come out of concern that his healing of the sick might attack him too much (cf. Mark 3:20.), probably not knowing that he had already chosen helpers (n. 13.). In the story of Moses, Exod. 14:18-20, Moses' father-in-law, Jethro, came, and seeing his son-in-law so crowded with business, gave him counsel to choose certain men to be his helpers. This story is looked back upon here, and the only difference in the account is that here the helpers have already been chosen, and Jesus does not want to be removed from his sphere of activity. But the fact that that story was referred to in the formation of the narrative is also illustrated by some parallels. Compare Exod. 18:1. ηκούσε δέ Ἰαθόρ = Mark. 3:21. και ἀκονσαντες οἱ - Exod. 18:5. κ. ἐξήλθεν Ἰαθόρ = Mark. 3:22. ἐξήλθον - Exod. 18:6. ἀνηγγέλη δε Μοϋσῇ λέγοντος- ἰδοῦ, ο γαμβρός σου Ἰαθόρ παραγίνεται πρὸς σε και η γυνή και οι δύο υιοί σου μετ αυτού = Mark. 3:32. ἔπινον δέ αὐτῷ (Luk. 8:20. καὶ ἀπηγγέλη αὐτιά λεγόντων)' Ἰδοῦ, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐξω ζητοῦσί σε.... - With Mark. 3:21. ὅτι ἐξέστη comp. Exod. 18:18. φθορα διαφθορήση. And that the description of the disciples-selection (n. 13.) is modelled on the same story, on this compare Exod. 18:25. Και ἐπέλεξε Μωνσῆς ἀνδρας- και εποίησεν αὐτους ἐπ αὐτους χιλιάρχας χ. τ. λ. = Mark. 3:13. καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὺς ἠθέλεν αὐτός ( Luk. 6:13. καὶ ἐχλε'ξάμενος). v. 14. καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα (here it is also stated what the function of the elected should be). This parallelism proves that n. 13 and 15 belong together. The piece n. 14. comes in between for the sake of the order of things, because the Pharisees also wanted to hinder the effectiveness of Jesus. Therefore, only Mark \*) has the correct order; and it follows from this that the blasphemous statement of the Pharisees (n. 14) is

quite correctly not based on a specific fact, but on a general one. Luke, who made the changes, was the first to be specific, because here he separated what was connected.

\*Schleiermacher p. 121 (Saunier in the cited text p. 65) explains the expression Mark. 3, 42. as strange, and the whole composition as incomprehensible. One cannot blame him for this judgement, since he did not know the composition of the evangelical relations.

The Matthean compiler, since he included the concrete content with or from Luke, should have followed him in the change of position. But he did not do so since he deprived n. 15 of its connection with n. 13. Therefore, Mark could never establish the correct connection from Matthew. Concerning n. 19, we can only note here that Matthew must have had the arrangement of Mark before him; however, the proof of this will be given later. For n. 27, since the Matthean arranger has included this fact with or from Luke and also left this piece as it is (unlike Luke); it follows that the left piece must have had its place earlier. As for n. 45, Mark at least did not take the arrangement from Matthew, as one cannot see what purpose the (abbreviated) piece serves here in his account. The response given to the scribes is not further considered, and the narrator's remark, "No one dared to ask him any more questions" (which belongs to this piece in Mark 12:34), is added as a result of further discussions in Matthew (after n. 36, Matthew 22:46), just as it precedes piece n. 45 in Luke.

575

b) The fact that Mark has the same formula exactly between the places where the others have it will not be explained by assuming that he made alterations. Instead, it should be considered as a sign that the others have deviated from the track. (Luke himself testifies that the formula does not belong to n. 36, just as Matthew testifies that it was not an appendix to n. 44). Mark and Matthew, therefore, converge independently here. We can also conclude from the numbers considered here about n. 24, 25, 33, 51. None of these pieces did Mark take from Matthew, and this will become even more evident when we

2) compare the texts provided by Matthew and Mark, observing that the original and the creations of later editing differ from each other in Matthew's account. We recall only the following:

a) n. 5. Here there is the closest agreement between the two speakers. But Matthew's text is the later copy.

α) μετά των μισθωτών Mark. 1:20. is not an insertion, but the fact that this addition is missing in Matthew is an essential defect. The concipient of the original text will not have wanted to say that the sons immediately left the ship and the father (left him alone), but he would have wanted to say: they left the father in the ship, and then it had to be indicated that the one left behind was not alone there. The Excerptor omits this and therefore constructs the words differently.

576

β) In Matt. 4:18, the explanatory remark "ἦσαν γάρ αλιεῖς" (for they were fishermen) is added, just as in Mark. But why aren't the Zebedee brothers mentioned there also in a similar way, to explain how Jesus found them engaged in their business? In a more precise manner, Mark narrates the story by saying "καὶ αὐτούς" (and them) in verse 19: "Jesus saw, as well as these (like those mentioned before), etc." This "καί" (and) was not added later but was originally included, as the author's thought process and combination of ideas led him to add this explanatory comment in the first place. There is also another indication of Matthew's variability:

γ) He puts "ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς" (two other brothers) before the name of the brethren, as seen in his usage of "ἄλλους δούλους" (other servants) in 21:36 and "ἡ ἄλλη μαρία" (the other Mary) in 27:61. Yet, when referring to the name John, Mark involuntarily adds "τον ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ" (his brother). -

b) From n. 14, it is evident on its own that Mark did not take it from Matthew.

c) n. 19. Once again, there is a profound agreement, but also a more hasty copy by Matthew! For:

α) Instead of Mark 6:2, where it says "καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο" (and they were astonished), the copier in Matthew 13:54 makes a combination "ὥστε ἐκπλήττεσθαι αὐτούς" (so that they were astonished). However, in verse 57, he abandons this construction and continues with Mark (accustomed to the earlier text) saying "καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο" (and they were offended). (In vain, one seeks to excuse this through other anomalies of this kind. The crucial point is: what construction did the original author have in mind before composing? Moreover, verse 57 does not introduce something new, but it is a continuation of what was started.)

β) In Matthew, verse 53 omits "διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν" (because of their unbelief) from the connection where it appears in Mark. The brevity indicates that this was excerpted - just

as the relationship between Matthew 14:36 and Mark 6:55-56, which will be discussed later. —

d) n. 37. In Matthew, the earlier text has been edited;

α) The words of the request have been attributed to another person and accordingly changed from plural to singular. (We have not yet encountered such transformations in Mark but have seen them in Matthew. See in n. 17, n. 38, n. 39, and in n. 23, compare Matthew 32, and Mark 6:51.) However, the narrative itself does not acknowledge Matthew's modification, as Jesus speaks to the Zebedee brothers as he had to if they were the ones making the request, and the other disciples are only angry with the two brothers, not with their mother. Finally, if the narrative had portrayed Salome as the petitioner, the transition to Jesus' response would have been different, perhaps like this: "You do not know what you are asking," and then turning to the two sons, he said, etc.

—

577

e) n. 24. Matthew's Text is the adaptation of an earlier one:

α) He provides clarifications. So, instead of using 15:2, κοινᾷς χερσὶ, he offers an explanation, disregarding the κοινός, which occurs in v. 11, as κοινοῦν. — In v. 5, the words οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ (for that is how it should be read, i.e., he may not honor) are a clearer but also more condensed and burdening expression compared to the corresponding words in Mark's account. — In v. 20, the commentator recapitulates according to his habit (see page 412, also compare 13:51).

β) Some verses are inserted into the text, namely verses 12-14, and they appear somewhat foreign. For someone who wants to know the impression that a statement has made on other listeners, it indicates that he himself understands its meaning. Moreover, v. 15 has become unclear due to the insertion since it precedes a parabolic statement in v. 14.

γ) Some verses are rearranged. Matthew 15:3-6 appears in Mark after Matthew's verses 7-9. (Mark places the general statement first, which is then illustrated by the specific one. Matthew begins with the specific one and connects the general one to it.) However, Matthew's v. 6 is awkward after v. 3 and is here only because it comes from a text like Mark 7:13. — In v. 7, the words: "you hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you," fit more appropriately if they still prompt the question of in what way did Isaiah prophesy, and then transition to the specific explanation, rather than following after the specific

evidence has already been presented. One can also imagine that if a reference to a prophecy was to be taken for the sake of characterization, the original author would not have placed it as a tautology after the characterization but before it. At least, this is how it appears when evaluated from a psychological perspective. Also, in v. 19, "evil thoughts" (διαλογισμοί πονηροί) does not fit as well as in Mark's v. 21 unless it is also read as "evil reasonings" (οί διαλογ. πον.) because the διαλογ. are to be mentioned as the principle of the following particulars, as in Mark, rather than something added to the other. —

578

f) n. 25. In Matthew, the later adaptation is present \*).

\*) Regarding the meaning of the conversation, I will briefly note: Jesus understands the woman as if she were asking him to leave the region where the Jews could seek his help and go beyond the border with the Gentile woman. However, the woman implies that Jesus can stay where he is and still help her from a distance. Hence Jesus' exclamation: "Your faith is great." A similar situation is found in Luke 7:7-9. (Jesus was only near the region of Phoenicia, but not within it. This is clearly proven in Matthew 15:22). I consider the reading in Mark 7:31, "διὰ Σιδωνος," to be nothing but corruption, and I make the following observations about it:

a) The cities of Tyre and Sidon are mentioned in Matthew 15:22 and Mark 7:24 to refer to Phoenicia (see the Old Testament parallel on page 570). The codices that omit "καὶ Σιδωνος" in Mark 7:24 give us a mutilated text.

b) Where Jesus was supposed to go to, he will be mentioned to have come from there again. This happens in Matthew 15:29. The "ἐκεῖθεν" (from there) is, when compared to Matthew 15:22, nothing but "ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τυρου καὶ Σιδωνος," exactly what is in Mark at the same place.

c) Two texts as thoroughly harmonious as the ones in Matthew and Mark could not differ at this point without one of them being false. The original account must have contained only one.

d) Jesus had not crossed the border of Phoenicia where it touches Galilee. How then could it be said: he went from Tyre (where he was not) through Sidon? And if he went through Sidon, how could it be said that he went out from

the borders (!) of Tyre? This statement would not be appropriate for the text, and furthermore,

f) the omission of the name of the city Sidon in Mark 7:24 is simply a corruption.

a) It cannot be said that Mark omitted the portion of Matthew 15:23-24 (at the very least, one could argue that this omission was done out of consideration for the Gentile Christians since Jesus' subsequent response, which Mark also reports, conveys the same message). Rather, in Matthew, the same thing is inserted as in Matthew 10:6. The former (Matthew 10:6) is excluded by Luke, just as the latter (Matthew 15:23-24) is excluded by Mark.

b) The woman's response, as given by Mark, is more suitable to the meaning of the passage than the version presented in Matthew. In Mark, it is: "Yes, Lord, yet even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs." (If you are a helper to your fellow countrymen, then you also have the power to work for my benefit from afar.) —

579

g) n. 27.

α) The verses Matthew 16:2-3 are an insertion, even if they were in Matthew's style (although they were not mentioned by Origen). If one reads them objectively, it becomes immediately apparent that the words in verse 3 are intended to be Jesus' initial response to the request made to him, just as they are in Mark. Furthermore, the affirming words in verse 4: "A sign shall not be given to this generation" (σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτοῖς), are expressed differently from verse 3 ("the signs of the times"). The addition "except the sign of Jonah, etc." (εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ κ.τ.λ.) is probably not genuine, as it is already absent in the account taken from Luke in Matthew 12:39 (in addition, it is incorrectly explained there), and it is also inappropriate in its current context because it is not explained, although Jesus had to make something clearer to the disciples according to verse 7. However, the author of the addition altered Jesus' warning to refer to the Sadducees (Matthew verse 6) instead of Herod (Mark 8:15), as he intended Jesus to allude to his resurrection with the sign of Jonah.

β) Regarding verse 9, it has already been discussed above on page 568.

γ) The phrase "Do you not yet perceive?" (οὐπω νοεῖτε;) appears in Matthew 16:9 itself, just like in Mark (meaning "Do you not have insight?"). At the end of the discourse, Mark 9:21 also uses it in the same way: "How do you not understand?" (πῶς οὐ συνίετε;) If

here at the parallel passage in Matthew 16:11, he inserts the words "How is it that you fail to understand?" (πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε), it is undoubtedly evidence that he had the same text before him as Mark. However, he places the word in a different construction, adding an explanatory object to which the insight should refer, according to his way, in such a way that having insight should not so much mean "not being anxious" (as in Mark) but rather "grasping the meaning" that Jesus' warning had. This is a later adaptation of the text, and there is no reason to believe that Mark omitted the other Matthean words in chapter 8:21.

h) n. 33. Here

a) as in n. 24, the verses are transposed. It is Matthew who has changed the original order. In Matthew, the words: "to give a certificate of divorce and to dismiss her" (Matthew 19:7) are incorrectly placed as if they still belonged to the expression of the Mosaic commandment, instead of being the Pharisees' inference attached to that expression in the original text: "to give a certificate of divorce" and dismiss her in this way (Mark 10:4).

580

β) The words Matth, v. 6. indisputably fit better when they are the conclusion of the speech, as in Mark.

γ) Matth. 19:3. is κατά πάσαν αἰτίαν again by the hand of the insertor (like the anticipative question in n. 35.). Really Moses exempted the dismissal of the woman κατά πάσαν αἰτίαν. Is it probable, however, that the Jews, if they afterwards wished to appeal to Moses for their justification, would have framed the question in advance, according to the decision which was to be taken about it from Moses? If we put in the subsidiary clause, that it should receive the expression, the dismissal of the woman is generally permitted to the man; then the question ceases altogether to be captious, and it is more than too clearly pointed out to the possibility of an inception in advance \*).

\*) Similar is the δόλω Matth. 26:4.

δ) In the answer of Jesus the ἐπίτρεψεν Matth. 19:8. is, though less strong than the ἐνετείλατο or ἔγραψε την εντολήν in Mark, yet not the more definite, the more etched to the sense of the original text. Rather, Mark's text expresses the meaning correctly: Moses, with his ordinance, directed himself according to hardness of heart; ἐπίτρεψε πρὸς, etc., cannot actually even be said, - the phrase rather demands: διὰ. But Matthew, accustomed to another text, has involuntarily let the πρὸς run in from it. - This



about this pericope against Paulus Conservator. 1. delivery. P. 102. and Saunier loc. cit. p. 120. -

(i) n. 40. It is quite undoubted that Matthew and Mark have one and the same narrative. - The general formulae are the same, and the sentences are constructed in the same way. Either Mark has placed the parts of the narrative differently, separating the cursing of the fig tree and the perception of its withering from each other, - and this is not probable, for one who narrates falsely does not copy the narrative, - or Matthew has pushed together what does not belong together, and this is more than probable, since he anticipates the fact of the cleansing of the temple, and immediately transfers it to the day of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, in order to follow the compilation chap. 21:15. (the continuation of the Hosanna call begun in n. 39.) and to place it closer to 21:9. It is also to be presumed that the original author, if he had the intention to tell of the imprecation of the tree as something that happened on the way, and thus of such a thing with a historian's contempt, would not have wanted to deprive his narrative of its probability by telling it as if Jesus had not gone into the city with the disciples, but had waited for the tree to wither before he went further. What semi-critics pronounce, that the more natural is just, as such, the later, is far too wretched and miserable to deserve a more exact refutation. -

581

k) About n. 45. the necessities have already been considered. -

l) n. 51. (Anointing of Mary.)

α) Markus does not have what is characteristic of Matthew's diction. This includes the phrase "προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ" (Matthew 26:7), and also that instead of using "τινες" like in Mark 10:4, Matthew employs the more definite subject "οἱ μαθητὰ αὐτοῦ" in verse 8 (compare page 411). Furthermore, instead of using the indefinite pronoun "αὐτή" as in Matthew 14:6, Matthew specifies with "τῇ γυναίκί" in Matthew 26:10.

β) Inaccuracies in Matthew:

κ) The phrase "ἀγανάκτησαν" (Matthew v. 8) and the following statement are not as thoroughly considered as in Mark 14:4, "ἦσαν ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς εαυτούς" (it cannot be connected with "πρὸς εαυτούς καὶ λεγοντες" since it should be read as "πρὸς εαυτούς λέγοντες" without "καί").

β) Those familiar with our texts will feel that in Matthew (v. 7), "κατέχειν," which should have the participial form in Matthew's construction after "προσέληθεν," indeed desires a participle, just like the one found in Mark before it.

γ) Matthew clearly comments on Mark's text. The words of the writers are related as follows:

Mark: She has done what she could; she has anointed my body beforehand for burial.

Matthew: By pouring the ointment on my body (here "σῶμα" refers to the living body), she has done it, etc. Matthew adds the concrete element, namely, "what she knew," including the "βαλοῦσα μύρον" (which is the model for Mark's "προελαβε μυρίσαι") immediately after to make the sentence more specific. In Matthew, "προς" takes on the meaning of "in relation to." However,

582

δ) with this, Matthew departs from the original text. Instead of placing the word "σῶμα" in the latter part of the sentence, meaning the dead body, it is placed at the beginning by Matthew, where it refers to the act of pouring the ointment (the present action), and it becomes redundant since, considering what the woman did now, pouring the ointment on the body, it would be self-evident and need not have been included in the description.

2) These are now the dual sections that are only common to Mark and Matthew, and are most emphasized whenever one attempts to derive the Gospel of Mark from Matthew. We wanted to strengthen the evidence with these sections, showing that Luke also had them and only omitted them. The analogies previously mentioned in Luke's substitutions will now strengthen the evidence that Mark did not take these sections from Matthew since Luke also had them. However, since this proof may appear to be circular, we will seek further confirmation of the observation that Luke indeed had these sections and, for that purpose, return to Luke.

## Fourth Datum

Just as Luke omitted entire sections of the first table to include others in their place (Datum 2), he also shortened certain sections of the same table because he excluded other material.

1) Up to now we have spoken of the omission of whole passages. We now also have to mention certain abridgements made by Luke. The shortened passages are as follows: n. 1. (shortened and lengthened at the same time) - n. 16. n. 21. n. 22. (from which n. 23. is taken away) n. 28. n. 29. n. 32. - In n. 55. (the story of the Passion) there is omitted

α) Jesus' complaint that He was deeply grieved (Matth. 26:37. 38. Mark. 14:33. 34.),

β) the interrogation of witnesses against Jesus (Matth. 26:60-62. Mark. 14:56-59.),

γ) the mocking disguise and crowning of Jesus (Matth. 27:27-31. Mark. 15:16 - 20,)

δ) the drink given to Jesus on the cross (Matth. 27:46 - 49. Mark. 15:34 -36.). Some of these abbreviations, in so far as they concerned speeches, have already been discussed above, pp. 340-343 and 378 f. (including the simplifications, but abstracted from here). Here, several more are added, and it will now be shown by means of all these pieces how the inclusion of others has had an influence on the shortening of them.

2)

a) n. 1. When Mark 1:6 (Matt. 3:4) describes the garb of the Baptist, he is to be identified as the prophet resembling Elias and precursor of the Messiah. Luke did not need this silent representation as he quotes John's speeches, by which he announces himself as a strict reformer of morals and the people, similar to Elias. Luke provides the further account of Mark 1:5 in Luke 3:7-14 and omits that description. -

b) n. 16. That a shortening has occurred here has been made clear above on p. 379. The question here is what motivated Luke to place the piece under a different aspect and to shorten it. According to what has already been said above, the piece was

originally intended to be the first rehearsal of a doctrinal lecture written with the disciples in mind for their training (cf. p. 103 and 379). n. 13. (to which n. 14. and 15. still belong) (and also follows n. 14.15. in Matthew, after the latter omits the election of disciples \*)). Luke knew very well the purpose of the pericope, but he also knew that if he had left its original purpose and with it its connection with the other parables attached to it, he could not have included the Sermon on the Mount as the first treaty given to the chosen disciples (Luk 6:17 f.). He took up this, and therefore changed that piece. It will be required that we prove this more exactly. We notice, then, the following:

\*) Schleiermacher, op. cit. p. 117, not knowing what purpose and what meaning the doctrinal piece had in the gospel as a whole, thinks that Matthew still made up for the parable (!), as if it were such a saying of the usual kind, which could also be made up for transitions or by chance. Such views are now supposed to be based on criticism !

584

α) the Sermon on the Mount and the Pericope n. 16. are pieces which have one and the same purpose. Both are

κ) a contract delivered to the people while the disciples stand by, and

β) a contract that, although dedicated not only to the disciples but also to other hearers, still pays special attention to the disciples. Therefore, a Gospel like Mark's could not have the Sermon on the Mount. (His Sermon on the Mount, to use the expression, is precisely the section n. 16.) So did Luke only insert the Sermon on the Mount into the archetype? Indeed, and that is the second thing we notice.

β) Namely, let us examine the text of Luke 6:12-19 more closely to perceive that the Sermon on the Mount is nothing other than a continuation, and indeed a very laborious continuation. First, compare the statement in Luke 6:17 with the parallel in Mark 3:7: και — ανεχώρησεν εις την θαλασσαν, και πολυ πληθος κ.τ.λ. Mark ascribes the circumstance of the overwhelming crowd as the reason for Jesus subsequently climbing the mountain and selecting twelve disciples (Mark 3:13; recall here the parallel drawn with the Old Testament history on p. 574) \*). Mark's presentation is coherent and clear; it separates the fact of the selection of the disciples from what prompted it, and the comment preceding this prompting of the disciple's selection is specific and clear, saying this: Jesus could no longer satisfy the ever-thickening crowd by himself, to the extent that he had to keep a ship ready because of the crowd's pressure. How different and confused, however, does Luke present the same thing, intending to make room for

the Sermon on the Mount! Lukas begins by stating that Jesus ascends the mountain and spends the night in prayer before choosing the disciples; he does not yet mention the gathered and present crowd. Nevertheless, according to his account, Jesus descends the mountain with the chosen disciples the following morning and stops before a gathered (as if appearing like a *deus ex machina*) multitude of people. He stands there to deliver a speech. While Luke includes the mention of the people gathered to listen to the sermon (after some rearrangement), he forgets that he retained too much from the original text. Specifically, he keeps the part where the entire crowd sought to touch Jesus (Chapter 6:19). But if that was the case, how could there be calmness and silence, time, and space for delivering the sermon amid such a tumultuous crowd? Nothing is more certain than Luke rearranging here, in order to connect the events, just as he did in n. 53 (see above p. 414). Therefore, the Sermon on the Mount does not belong to the archetype; rather, it is a later insertion \*) made by Luke. Because of this insertion, as was intended to be shown here, the author abbreviated and modified section n.16, causing it to lose its theoretical connection. Let us proceed further.

\*) We will receive a new parallel to this further below in no. 30. Just as only the more difficult matters were to be brought before Moses, the disciples there must also take Jesus' place while He is on the mountain. However, the matter must still be brought before Jesus because it is too difficult for the disciples.

\*) I know very well that it has been said that Luke's account is the correct, lucid and coherent one, and that Mark has excerpted, reworked and misunderstood. But I leave it to the judgment of impartial judges to decide who is right. Of course, these judges must be different from those judges who, in order to be able to judge others in partisanship, refer to their suspicions.

c) n. 21. The story of John's beheading was given by the prototype so that it would explain how Jesus, as he was taken for Elijah by some, could also be taken for the resurrected John, especially by Herod and others (cf. above p. 569). Luke, however, did not except any other account of this story, but he believed that he had to anticipate the fact where the first mention of the Baptist occurs (Luk 3:19, 20). Hence the narrative is in another place, and here is the gap. Luke is wont to proceed in such a way that he anticipates notes and places them where they seem to him to belong for the sake of completeness (examples: Mark. 2:6. he anticipates Luk. 5:17.; further: Mark. 4:38. he anticipates Luk. 8:23.; further: Mark. 5:42. = Luk. 8:42. *ὡς ἱτῶν δώδεκα* - further: Mark.6:44. = Luk.9:14.; Mark. 15:7. he puts to Luk. 23:18.; further: Mark. 15:27. to Luk. 23:33. = Mark. v. 29.). Also the note attached to 3:19. is evidently by his hand

(ελεγχόμενος περί πάντων ὧν ἐποίησε, so Luke is wont to write, comp. 19:37. αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεὸν περί πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων and just so summarizing ch. 2:20. \*)). -

\*) And yet, the poor concluding formula (Luke 3:18-19) is supposed to create such a demarcation, by which the preceding narrative is deprived of the honor of being a Christ-like utterance. (See Schleiermacher's opinion on this matter in Dat. 1.)

586

d) n. 22. Luke has taken away from this what belongs to it n. 23. This part indisputably belonged to the original archetype, as the Gospel of John, ch. 6:16-21, proves. Luke probably omitted the description given here, because the essence of it seemed to him already anticipated in n. 17 (description of the stormy journey to Gadara). It is undeniable that both stories are very similar to each other. There, too, a storm arises during the nocturnal voyage, just as it does here. The passengers are left to themselves, there because Jesus is asleep, here because he is absent. There, when Jesus rises, the storm is immediately calmed, here the same happens when Jesus enters the ship. There, as here, those present are astonished. We know Luke's tendency to simplify, why could he not have followed his way here too? -

e) n. 28. (cf. p. 380.) The omitted interlocutory conversation would reveal that Jesus was on a journey with the disciples and had other followers with him besides them. For only in this way could Peter come nearer to him to speak to him in particular, and Jesus, as is said, turn back to speak to all. But in this and the following passages Luke has always suppressed the suggestion that Jesus made a journey to Caesarea Philippi. This note is missing in him here ch. 9:18. (comp. Mark. 8:27. and Matth. 16:13.), just so in n. 31. ch. 9:44. (Mark. 9: 30- Matth. 17:22.), and just so again n. 32. (Mark 9:33. Matt. 17:24.), for certain proof that it was intentionally suppressed, and with the exclusion of it is connected the very shortening of the text now mentioned (the omission of that interlocutory conversation), so that it must also be an intentional one. If it is now asked: why did Luke make the change that nothing is to be said about Jesus' journey to Caesarea? the answer is: it happened because Luke first lets other reports follow which contain the indication that Jesus was on the journey to Jerusalem, such as chap. 9:51. 13:22. 17:11. and then again others according to which Jesus is later still in Galilee, such as 13:31. -

587

f). n. 29. About this abbreviation see above p. 101. What caused the writer to abbreviate here? The answer is easy to find if one compares with what has been omitted the chap. 7:18-35 recorded in Luke. For here the instruction is clearly given that John is the representative of Elijah. - The Matthaean compiler also knows the identity of these pericopes. He enters from here from the appendix to n. 29. into that piece Matth. 11:14. the words: αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας ὁ μίλλων ἐρχεσθαι (comp. 17:11. Ἡλίας μὲν ἵρχεται. -

(g) The warning against offenses omitted here can be found in Luke 17:1-2. The other warning against self-deception could also be omitted by Lukas (see above p. 469). The saying about salt in Mark 9:50 is included by Lukas in Luke 14:34-35. - We now come to the passion n. 55. -

α) The degree of Jesus' sorrow may be judged from the interpolated note, Luk. 22:43 - 45.

β) The interrogation of the witnesses before the priests deserved no mention. For of such an authority, which has already signed the verdict of condemnation before it investigates, it need not be said that it has investigated. Jesus' witnesses would not have been intercepted. In the case of judges such as he had before him, it would probably also have been said: "that it is not considered necessary to hear the defence witnesses. Besides, the interrogation before the priests is substituted for that mentioned by Luke before Herod, ch. 23:4.

γ) The disguise and crowning of Jesus had already been done in Herod's palace, ch. 23:11.

δ) The drink is mentioned ch. 23:36. and instead of the words which Jesus speaks immediately before and immediately after, Luke puts others, ch. 23:46. - These are the pieces which Luke has shortened for the sake of others.

588

2) If the same writer could, for the sake of certain sections, omit some parts and abbreviate others, he could also have the liberty to exclude entire pericopes that seemed redundant to him. Both approaches share the same methodological principle, and one is related to the other. So, would it be believed that Lukas omitted because he also abbreviated, and that he abbreviated because he omitted? But even if one were not willing to concede this, we are not content with just the presented evidence! We go further and want to provide distinct evidence to anyone who still doubts that Lukas indeed possessed both the omitted complete sections and the removed elements of the

abbreviated sections. Following the established datum, we present the following evidence.

#### Fifth Datum.

Lukas, in expanding the scope of the narrative cycle presented on the first table by means of interpolations, took pains to conceal the changes he made within this cycle for the sake of that interpolation, partly in the order and partly in the size of the narrative pieces. In other narratives, which he retained, if he did not shorten them, he nevertheless changed the expression, and where he shortened them, he filled the resulting gaps with special inserts. - This is further proof that he must have had the omitted pieces and the parts of other pieces of the first table, which are missing in his recension, in front of him.

1) Here, then, it is to be shown from Luke's Gospel itself that its author must have had before him what is missing from the first table, and that he must have had it in mind when he wrote it,

a) The pieces that were completely omitted were mentioned earlier in Dat. 2. Where now

589

κ) such a piece was connected with another, Luke changed the last one, if he kept it completely. We have the example of this, when we look at the first table, immediately at n. 6. and 7. before which n. 5. is omitted. Luke could not leave here in n. 6. Mark. 1:21. εἰςπορεύονται, nor Mark. 1:29. ἦλθεν μετὰ Ἰακώβου κ. Ἰωάννου. (since nothing preceded from Jesus' connection with the fishermen after that piece was taken away). So he changes. But he had to alter still more. Also Mark. 1:36-38. could not remain as it was. It could no longer be said that Peter and his companions were looking for Jesus. Luke therefore puts instead of these, οἱ ὄχλοι (Luk. 4:42.). Since Jesus no longer had the disciples before Him, but ὄχλους, neither could His speech be thus: ἀγωμὴν εἰς τὰς ἐχόμενας κωμοπόλεις κ. τ. λ. (Mark 1:38.); Luke therefore makes the transformation: οὐ καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις εὐαγγελίσασθαι μὴ δεῖ τὴν βασ. τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. τ. λ. - The consequence in the amendment here goes through the whole piece - to prove that what Mark has as the antithesis are essential provisions \*). (Regarding the writing style of the editor, see above, page 434. Compare with δεῖ με v. 43. - also compare with 3:49. - with ἐρχεσθαι εἰς v. 42. compare with 2:15. Act. 17:15, 11:19.22.) We must still note here how Luke



attempted to integrate his piece, which was added to the cycle instead of n. 5, into the context in chapters 5:1 - 11.

\*) Not at all what Saunier makes out of it, p. 55, accidental interpolations of Mark.

aa) Since, according to the intimation of Luk 5:11. (ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ), Jesus is on the first journey of annunciation; so the writer does not want an immediate inhibition to occur, as it was caused by the fact n. 8 (according to Mark). He therefore reports the healing of the leper as well as Mark, but does not say, as Mark does, that the healed leper broke the silence imposed on him, and thereby caused the people to flock to Jesus, which hindered him - why does he not say this? because between the cause and the effect there could not be a long delay, and the thread begun in 11. with the report of the journey would have had to be cut short too soon. Luke therefore changes Mark's statement (1:45.) into the more indefinite one: Jesus' call spread more and more (Luk 5:15.), because this leaves room for a longer, indefinite intermediate time.

590

bb) He modifies the introduction to the story (n. 8.), noting that the leper had come ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, by which he wants to awaken the thought that Jesus had already travelled through several cities or spots. - But here we must also make a critical remark. When Luke (chap. 5:12.) uses the expression: ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, he has at any rate in mind the cities of which chap. 4:43. was said, as Jesus was going to travel through them (as Mark also places the meeting of the leper in Jesus' first journey from Capernaum). But if those πόλεις are to be understood; then the formula Luk. 4:44: καὶ ἡν κηρῦσάων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῆς γαλιλαίας, cannot stand. For this formula would then set apart the first journey for itself. It would also give a note which Luke certainly did not want to give, namely that Jesus undertook the first journey without Peter and those other disciples, and only later entered into contact with Peter. But there is also the fact that nothing is reported about Jesus' return to the Sea of Galilee, and if one looks at the beginning of the pericope chap. 5:1, it rather seems, contrary to the meaning of the statement expressed in that formula, as if Jesus had not set out on the journey at all. All this considered, and added to the fact that, if that formula is deleted, the message given in Luke, ch. 5:1-11, about the calling of Peter is connected with Jesus' stay in Peter's house in the same way as in Mark, -this, I say, added to it, there seems to be no doubt left that the formula really must be deleted, and that it was most probably first written over from Mark, which supposition is also strengthened by the similarity of the expression. In Mark the note takes on a completely different position. The disciples are chosen and Jesus begins the journey with them. There is also room for the statement that the leper himself proclaimed the healing he had received, against Jesus' will. Jesus

had already been on the journey for a long time, as this formula indicates (Mark 1:39.) - an indication which Luke did not have, who therefore, because he had no other remark about the beginning of the journey than 5:11, had to change the closing remark to n. 8. After the removal of this formula, the context in Luke must be thought of as follows: Jesus, wanting to leave, is still held back in Capernaum. The people surround him at the lake; here he teaches, then joins the four fishermen, and with them he begins the journey (5:11.), and on this journey he meets a leper in a town \*). - By the way, we want to notice that Luke makes a conclusion after the first journey just like Mark, but then takes the peculiarity to count the Sabbaths, which are now distinguished as strange after the return of Jesus, during his new stay in Capernaum. Thus he significantly adds to n. 11. (6:11.) εν σαββάτω πρώτω, and to n. 12. (6:6.) εν ετέρω at. A busy hand wrote in the first place with reference to n. 5. beside πρώτω, in the margin δευτέρω, and from the coalescence of the two indications arose the monstrosity of the reading: δευτεροπρώτω, on the explanation of which so much vain trouble has been expended \*\*). This was the first piece to be omitted. We follow the others on the tablet. - n. 19. Here, it is true, Luke made no change in the connection between 18. and 20. after the piece n. 19. was taken away, unless we are to regard the change of προσκαλεῖσθαι into συγκαλεῖσθαι in Luk. 9:1. (as if Jesus had not had the disciples together before, but referred back to the separation ch. 8:51.) for such a change.\*) - n. 14. Since Luke carved this pericope out of its connection with n. 13. (to which it belonged with n. 15., see above p. 574.), he also changed n. 15. (by making it a shortened appendix to n. 16.). - Then follow the Elijah pieces (for the sake of brevity we will call them after their parallelism ss. p. 569. f.) n. 24. 25. 27. (for n. 26. does not belong here at all, see above p. 567.), of which, as has been said above, Luke has given partly other recensions in chap. 11:14. - 12:12., partly another parallel 7:11 -17. These pieces, as was also noted above (p. 569), were intended to contain the premises of the popular belief that Jesus was Elijah. - After their omission, Luke did not change anything in the preceding n. 21. for their sake (indeed, he shortened n. 21. and took away the appendix n. 23. from n. 22. but both, as we have seen, for other reasons), but he did make a change in the following. For in n. 28. he changes οἱ ἄνθρωποι into οἱ ὄχλοι Luk. 9:18. (as he also substitutes this word in n. 7.) and in all probability wants to understand by it the heaps of people mentioned in n. 22. at the feeding (Luk. 9:11.), so that this piece comes into direct connection with n. 22. \*). - Because of n. 33. there was nothing to change in the preceding and following. For it is not directly connected with n. 32, and n. 34 follows only after the previous mention of a journey, which is no more omitted from Luk. ch. 17:11 than it is from Mark. 10:1. is forgotten. Just because he made it, Luke omits the repetition of Mark. 10:32. omitted. - n. 37. is not directly connected with the preceding and following. However, the statement Mark. 10:46. immediately after the preface Mark. 10:32, and one senses that an event must have been mentioned between these pieces in n. 36 and 38. On the other hand, if we look at the closing formula of n. 36. in Luke

(18:34.), this feeling disappears, as we are led to think that the disciples were absorbed in quiet contemplation, following Jesus, without being distracted by anything else, and without visiting Jesus until they approached Jericho (Luk 18:35.) But may we not for this very reason believe that Luke added this formula to the piece only with the intention of covering up this gap and making it imperceptible? We will find other examples of the same procedure in him. (We have here, then, ch. 18:34, again a formula which the other Gospels do not have. On the manner of writing s. p. 523.) - n. 40. Here, too, traces show that Luke had this piece before him. According to Mark, the order is as follows: first day: Jesus enters Jerusalem; second day: the cursing of the fig tree and the expulsion of the sellers; third day: perception of the withering of the tree and the rebuke of Jesus in the temple. - Now Luke moves the expulsion of the sellers to the first day, and consequently, if the imprecation of the fig tree is omitted, nothing remains for the second day. He could have transferred the fact of the third day to the second, but he does not do so, but leaves it in his order. But that it might really remain in order, and not come on immediately after the cleansing of the temple (on the first day), the steward makes an intervening space by the phrase inserted in n. 42 a.: εν μια των ημερων Luk. 20:1. (on the manner of writing, see p. 524.) - n. 45. There are also traces that Luke had this piece. Why does Luke make the remark at the end of n. 44 that the scribes applauded? 44, that the scribes applauded, since there was no mention of their presence in the previous passage, and why must the approval expressed by them conclude that no further question should be addressed to Jesus, and that the dispute should come to an end? Namely, Luke draws the γραμματεῖς from the suppressed narrative n. 45. and also retains the conclusion of the same; comp. Mark. 12:32. 34. (Mark did not take these words from Luke. For in the other recension of this piece the same words occur before Luke 10:28, which is a proof that they belong to the original relation). ουκ ετόλμων v. 40. (instead of ουδεις ετόλμα) seems also not without intention to be so placed, that the γραμματεῖς may be drawn to it as a subject. Let it be thought that the scribes themselves did not bring forward anything, and thus did not miss the question raised about the greatest commandment. - n. 51. There are traces that Luke had the omitted piece before him. He will not mention anything of Bethany. But thus arises

\*) If one does not want to accept the criticism applied here, then one should at least not say that Luke has a proper context, as Saunier p. 58.

\*\*) In my opinion, σαββ. δευτερο πρωτον would thus be nothing more than the Sabbath, and it is debatable whether it is the first or the second. However, what particularly supports the correctness of this opinion is:

α) that afterwards, ετερον follows in Luke 6:6. This indicates a first (I omit και, as L. and others do).

β) That Luke could begin numbering here after a conclusion.

γ) That one could want to correct πρωτον with regard to n. 6 (no other Sabbath, distinguished by Jesus' stay in Capernaum, followed before this one).

\*) I must honestly say that I doubt very much whether Luke really took it out of order here and placed it where it stands in his Gospel. I am well aware that Luke sometimes anticipates remarks in order to complete the mention of the nämlichen Gegenstand once begun. (This is what he did with the story of John's beheading in n. 21. Luk. 3:18. 19. - summarily anticipates. (See above p. 585.) But here special doubts arise.

a) Should Kuskas, when he tells us that Jesus first came back to Nazareth from the desert, have the Nazarethites say that Jesus was to do such deeds here as he had done in Capernaum? Should the narrator have forgotten himself in this way?

b) A strange parallel is found if one places the play again in its place after n. 18. For compare the conclusion of n. 18. (Matth. 9:26.): καὶ ἐξηλθεν ἡ φήμη αὐτῆς εἰς ὅλην τὴν γαλιλαίαν with the Anfange Luk. 4:14. καὶ φήμη ἐξήλθε καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.

c) Luk. v. 15. does not fit 4:43.

(d) After scl. 4:30. ch. 9:1. may very fitly occur. - It is certain that Tertullian taught the piece in the very order in which Luke's Gospel is presented to us. The rearrangement must therefore have taken place earlier. It is just as certain that Marcion's mute Luke did not have the piece here (although Messrs Hahn and Olshausen, in their studies of Marcion's Gospel, consider the opposite assumption probable). But nothing can be inferred from Marcion, since he quite undeniably fumbled Luke's Gospel.

\*) Schleiermacher, on the contrary, claims that Luk 9:18 is directly connected with Luk 9:7, 8, by wanting to convey the connection through the interpolated thought: Jesus had the accounts begun with the return of the disciples to Don completed afterwards (this "afterwards" is merely a makeshift in order to be

able to declare the intervening mentions of the secondary evangelists to be just as dispensable as not superfluous). Only

κ) was already time to complete these reports after the homecoming of Mark. 7:30, and if there was not enough space here to include the many detailed reports, they would have to follow afterwards. But there is as little of this in Luke as in Mark, and the completion is merely sung by Luke's patron.

ב) But the latter must regard the intervening fact of the feeding of the 5,000 as a disturbing circumstance occurring between the beginning of the account and its completion (!), which opinion shows too much ignorance of the construction of the Gospels for us to refute it more extensively than has already been done.

595

α) between ch. 23:1. and ch. 23:7. there is a gap, which every one must feel who ran the seven verses impartially. (There ηγγιζι, and here so soon after ηλθει!)

β) In order that Jesus' stay in Bethany and the story from there might be concealed, Luke ch. 21:37. 38. interposes the remark: ην δε τας ημερας- ακουειν αυτου. (About the way of writing s. S. 524. We had discussed earlier at n. 36. Luk. 18:34. a similar lacuna). The interpolated remark, however, is intended to accomplish two things in Luke; first, as we have said, it is intended to replace the mention of Bethany, but then it is also intended to replace the note Mark. 13:3. και καθημενου κ. τ. λ. with in itself. Jesus is said to have set foot on the Mount of Olives only after the discourse n. 49. to set foot on the Mount of Olives (therefore the remark stands between n. 49. and 51. to embrace both cNotes, and therefore therefore, as Bethany, so Mark. 13:3. is omitted, as is also evident from the fact that in the text nothing but this note, and the related: εκπορευομενον Mark. 13:1. is wanting in Luke). The speech n. 49. is thus transferred to the temple. - So much now concerning the (Dat. 2. mentioned) completely omitted pieces. Now we turn to the (Dat. 4. mentioned) shortened pieces, and show

ב) that Luke sought to conceal the gaps caused by abridgements. - The omission in n. 1 was not necessary to conceal, since John's resemblance to Elijah is illustrated not by the costume, but by John's lengthened speech. - Luke not only shortens the passage (for the sake of the Sermon on the Mount), but also changes it so that the abbreviation is not noticed. He turns it into a (moral) lecture, which Jesus is said to have given on the journey, while the crowd of his companions grew more and more. It seems that Luke wants to make this lecture an exhortation of Jesus to his disciples and friends to remain

faithful to him. Hence the preface ch. 8:1 - 3. and in it the mention of the women who became Jesus' constant companions. With Luk 8:13. compare also ch. 22:28. Thus the point of view under which Luke places the piece is no different from that under which it is placed in Mark and Matthew, except that there it is an exhortation to the disciples to learn to understand the Word, here an exhortation to keep it in the heart as the eighth friend of the good cause. (On the manner of writing f. p. 524.) Neither does Luke say: εν παραβολαῖς, but: διὰ παραβολῆς v. 4. (because he wishes to teach only One Parable). - Because Luke has the pieces n. 16. and n. 17. separated by the interposition of n. 15. he puts into n. 17. in order that it may have the appearance of being a separate one by itself, the formula: εν μια των ημερων ch. 8:22. (the same which he used for the same purpose in n. 42a.). - n. 21. We are not to miss the story of the Baptist's beheading. The verse makes the conclusion of Herod's speech, ch. 9:9, with words that do not suggest it at all: Herod wished to see Jesus. (The style of writing is entirely Lucan, s. p. 434. With the composition of the double sentence: Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα, τὶς δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος κ. τ. λ. comp. Act. 19:15 τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω - υμεῖς δὲ τίνες ἐστέ;) - n. 22. In order to cover the gap made with the removal of the appended piece n. 23. (of the departure for Bethsaida), Luke suppresses

α) takes the note that Jesus departed by ship out of the passage in n. 22, and lets Jesus travel on foot. Therefore he also changes Mark. 6:34. (see p. 536.)

(β) Lest a departure to Bethsaida should first be mentioned, it is said that the wilderness whither Jesus went, according to n. 22, and the place of the feeding, were situated at Bethsaida (Luk. 9:10.). - The suppressed note that Jesus was on his way to Caesarea (with which Luke suppressed Jesus' conversation with Peter on the way, Mark 8:32.33.) should not be missed; therefore the writer makes use of the artifice not only to connect the pericopes of n. 22. and 28. with each other, but also to connect them in such a way that the interlude about the departure to Bethsaida and the other omitted narratives are now remembered even less. And how does he effect this connection? The other narrators report that Jesus went to pray on the mountain after feeding the people, Mark. 6:46. Matt. 14:23. It is this note which Luke uses, and plants in n. 28. Luk. 9:18. και εγενετο εν τω ειναι αυτον προσευχόμενον καταμόνας(how, therefore, he would have the word ὄχλοι 9:18. referred to, has been noticed before, and is here still more clearly). - n. 29. In order that the interlocutory conversation about Elias and John might not be missed, Luke transforms the words of Jesus' command to observe silence about the face, which occasioned this conversation, into the statement that the disciples kept silence of their own accord ch. 9:36. (και αυτοί εσίγησαν κ. τ. λ.). - n. 30. This piece has been overlooked above in paying up the abridgements (Dat. 4.). Therefore, what should have been noted there about it should be noted here at once. Luke omitted the question of the disciples (Mark. 9:28. 29. Matth. 17:19 - 21.) because of the included pericope ch.

17:5-10. (which also only becomes understandable if one thinks of it as a reference to the fact described in n. 80). - As Luke omitted here, and had to cover a gap, so he had to give another context to the following piece, which should not mention a return journey from Caesarea. What measure does the steward use? He makes the end of the one (n. 30.) the beginning of the other (n. 31.), linking both pieces directly with each other. - n. 32. How Luke sought to preserve the semblance of integrity of this passage, notwithstanding the abbreviation made, ch. 9:48, has already been indicated earlier, p. 341, 381. About n. 53. from which Mark. 14:26. and 28. is displaced, see above p. 415. - n. 55. The lack of the (omitted) notice of the interrogation of Jesus is covered by the statement that the priests, instead of first having Jesus brought before them and having a witness interrogated about him, rather took him prisoner themselves, Luk. 22:51. (Consequently, the epitomator also leaves out the references to the words of the false witnesses: Mark. 14. 58. 14. 58. Matth. 26:61. later alluding to the words : Mark. 15:29. Matth. 27:40.) - The other changes in the Passion are based on interpolations, transpositions, combinations and simplifications, as has already been noted. - We have no further proofs to give, and believe that we have sufficiently proved what we wanted to prove from Luke's Gospel itself, that he had before him the pieces that were omitted and exchanged for others in the order as they are presented in the first tablet, and the abbreviated ones in the form as they are given by Mark.

597

2) What would be further objectionable about this proof?

a) It cannot in fact be coincidental that Luke has a gap precisely at the place where one piece is exchanged for another.

598

b) There is also method in the way he fills in the gaps after slackening and abbreviations. (See, for example, n. 37. comp. n. 51. where the gaps are supplemented by attached formulae. Likewise the insertion of the phrase: *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων* in n. 8.)

c) It is precisely this individual procedure by which Luke's texts of the common pieces have here and there acquired a form of their own, in which they differ from the representations of Mark and Matthew. Can this be so coincidental? Finally, arguments can also be drawn from the sameness of the style of writing. "But has not Eichhorn made significant expositions against the same assertion, made earlier already by Storr (in the writing: *On the Purpose of the Gospel History and the Epistles of John* Z. 58.),



that Luke exchanged certain pieces of narrative, or parts of them, for others?"

(Eichhorn's Einleitung in's N. T. 1. Bd.

1st ed. S. 388 - 95.) We answer

d) to this:

α) Storr has not given the correct reason for these interchanges, and the one he gives, that Luke's purpose was to save space, could easily be refuted;

β) Some of Eichhorn's objections must be deleted, e.g., at n. 1. p. 389. that Luke must have altered very clumsily, in that by the supplement Luk. 7:33. against which he omitted Mark. 1:6. he changes the Baptist into a Nazarite. (It has been shown above that the reason for the omission was not Luk. 7:33, but that it was a matter of the representation of the Elias-Anigen). Thus, the doubter, p. 391, will not admit that Luke, instead of Mark's statement in n. 14, omits the piece ch. 11:14-28. But he ignores the fact that Luke inserted the whole parthia ch. 6:20-7:50. after n. 13. and consequently could not leave that information as it is in Mark when he returned to it later, and the following objection (p. 393.) that the omitted pieces had not become dispensable through the ones included for them, is downright false. - Storr has not proved that Luke must have had those pieces and parts of the text before him, and Eichhorn could not find his way into our author's procedure, because he is not even aware of the simplifications made by him in other places, such as those mentioned by us above, p. 409 ff. But even if the last-named critic's counter-criticism is not accurate, it still gives us cause to ask why Luke did not content himself everywhere with the parts of the first table, and on the other hand exclude from his Gospel such parts for the sake of which he had to give up some narrative parts altogether, and shorten others? - The question can be answered, and the answer lies in the following date.

599

#### Sixth Datum.

The pieces which Luke has exchanged for others, and those for the sake of which he has abridged others, are partly more lively representations of the same subject of which this or that omission deals, partly they contain more teaching material, partly they provide special historical notes, or they are connected with other pieces of this kind.

1) If we have been somewhat more extensive in the foregoing, we can be all the shorter here.



a) The substituted narratives are more vivid, more individualised representations of the objects or facts of which the omitted ones deal. This relationship is unmistakable in the following copies: n. 5. Luk. 5:1 - 11. - n. 19. ch. 4:16 - 30. - n. 45. ch. 10:25 - 37. - n. 51. ch. 7:36 - 50.

b) They contain more doctrinal material. This is also true of some of those mentioned. Specifically, it must be said of the following: n. 14. and n. 27. which are united by Luke into one whole, ch. 11:14- 36. (after the similarity of Mark. 7:31 - 37. and 8:11-13. if the interpolation 8:1 - 10. is taken out; comp. above p. 567. ) - n. 24. ch. 11:37 - 44. The warning at n. 27. against the leaven of the Pharisees, Mark 8:13 - 20., follows in Luke not after the demand of the sign, but after the rebuke of the Pharisaic statutes, Luke 12:1-12. Not only are these pieces filled with more doctrinal matter in Luke, but they are also placed in factual order. Incidentally, these pieces of Elijah are also placed together, as in Mark and Matthew. But one also sees that if Luke wanted to include his recensions once, he could not retain the others that Mark and Matthew provide, since the Gospel relation only wanted to mention the demand for the heavenly sign, the rebuke of the Pharisaic statutes, and the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees once, as Luke knew quite well. (The objection of Eichhorn that Luke should nevertheless also have kept the reviews of Mark and Matthew is not to be listened to at all). In n. 1. the speech Luk. 3:7 - 14. (which Matthew's compiler has also excluded from Luke) has been put in the place of the silent sign. -

600

c) Even the pieces for the sake of which others are shortened contain more didactic material - such as the Sermon on the Mount, ch. 6:17. f., towards n. 16. Here, too, it is clear that the evangelist could only leave one first discourse, given with regard to the chosen disciples, since the original text only contained one such treaty. - The report, for the sake of which the abbreviation was made, ch. 7:18-35, is more animated, and gives a clear exposition of that which, according to the omitted part of the text, was still unknown to the disciples about John. Jesus' answer to the request to increase their trust in God's help - chap. 17:5-10 - is also more comprehensive than the answer omitted in n. 30. 30. - n. 32. Here Luke could have included the warning against self-seduction. But think of the author of the Gospel before the arrangement of his work in the case of having before him a more closely bounded original scripture (of about the same extent as the Gospel of Mark), the guide of which, even if it has been enriched, should be retained, and one will easily find it possible that he, who just at this point had in mind to incorporate so much material into his work, with regard to the content of this material, which also for the most part consists of practical exhortations, as e. g. ch. 12, 22 - ch.

12, 22 - ch. 12, 22 - ch. 12, 22. Ch. 12:22 - 40. Ch. 14:26 - 35. could feel moved to make an abbreviation. - How the circumstance that Luke had taught similar things in other places, or wanted to teach them, had an effect on the alterations made here and there in n. 49, has already been noted. -

601

d) Some of the excepted pieces gave special historical notes, or they were connected with such or with their own doctrinal pieces. Here we include in n. 25. the narrative chap. 7:11-17. included for this purpose, furthermore n. 33. cf. ch. 16:14-31. further n. 37. the other copy of which is connected with n. 53. Why Luke omitted the journey to Caesarea has already been mentioned above, but can be made more evident here. According to n. 30, disciples from the Twelve were not yet able at that time to perform all the casting out of demons. Nevertheless, Luke provides a piece in which even the Seventy are blessed for their effective efficacy in this matter, chap. 10:1-24. Could Luke, by referring to the Elijah piece n. 22. and to n. 28. n. 29. and 30. in the connection, could Luke leave the journey to Caesarea, which brought Jesus so close to the time of the Lion, if he still wanted to include the sending of the seventy in his Gospel? But the binder could not have placed the story of the sending of the seventy before n. 22, since the fact recounted in n. 22 directly concerns the return of the twelve who were sent out, and thus only the sending of them before that. - The other abbreviations mentioned are merely based on a simplification of the material, such as those in n. 22 and 23, and therefore nothing further is to be said about them.

2) After what has been said, one should not be surprised that Luke conceived and carried out the plan to extend the boundaries of the original scripture and to increase its materials. If he increased and extended, why could he not have changed the original type here and there, why could he not have omitted what he replaced? But now we have to complete the proof that Luke really had what he omitted by the main sentence which the following date contains.

#### Seventh Datum.

As artificially as Luke has inserted other pieces into the simpler type, the changes and gaps he has made in the common pieces (of the first tablet) in order to include them are not in keeping with the layout and construction of these pieces, and this inappropriateness betrays the fact that he had the changed pieces before him in exactly the same way as Mark, or as Mark and Matthew, who agree with him, and that the type which contained these pieces must have been free of Luke's interpolations.

1) We will go through the numbers under consideration here one by one. - n. 7. Because only in this passage does a gathered crowd appear, as Luke's account of the calling of the two pairs of brothers presupposes; so he gave the "last" fact a different, but in so far improbable order, as the mention of Jesus' return to Peter's house rather leads us to think that the connection of Jesus with Peter had already been established. Furthermore, the people are said to have visited Jesus Luk 4:42. One must imagine that this happened because the people wished to have the miracle-working physician with them longer. If Jesus is supposed to have given the answer that he had to proclaim the kingdom of God in other places as well (v. 43), we suspect that Luke might have been hindered by some regulation to make the answer more appropriate. Mark's parallel text removes the doubt. Luke's phrase is only another expression of what Jesus said to his chosen four teaching disciples. - If Jesus did not really depart, as seems to be the case according to Luke, then the words are all the more likely to be considered as being included, because they are superfluous in Luke's text. - n. 13. That an inconvenience has arisen with the transposition made here by Luke has been remarked on p. 585. - On n. 15. see p. 378. - n. 16. In addition to what has already been noted about this, the following can also be considered. Luke leaves us uncertain as to whether the discourse was held in a house or in the open air. If the former, then the preface is not correct, that the audience of this discourse is said to have gathered gradually on Jesus' journeys. If the latter is the case, then 8:19 is inappropriate. By the way, the circumstance that Jesus did not ask others of the audience, but only his disciples, about the meaning of the parable, remains unexplained in Luke, because he has suppressed the note that Jesus delivered the discourse from the ship. - n. 17. That Luke has separated this piece from n. 16. against the intention of the original author (by interpolating n. 15.) is evident from the following:

α) It was evening time when Jesus departed (Luk 8:23.). This is true that Jesus, at the time when the parabolic lectures were given, sailed to the other shore in the ship in which he was holding the treaties; but how it is true, or how it fits with him, what Luke says, that Jesus first came to the lake from somewhere else and got into the ship, is not clear.

β) If Jesus was already on the lake in a ship (Mark 4:35. ), then the expression lent him, we want to cross over to the other shore, also has the naturalness which it must have in order to be probable; but it is far less natural in the mouth of one who, as it were, in order to be able to utter this word, is said to have gone to the lake, as Luke here gives us the account of Jesus, and this alone, that the word is said to have been spoken after

the one who was in the ship, and not before him (Luk 8:22), is proof of the fact that the word was spoken after the one who was in the ship. 8:22.) is proof that Luke had before him a text so expressed as that of Mark (4:35.). Also the word: rä is only a natural expression for the one who is already in the ship and does not first go to the lake to indicate the destination of his journey.

y) They are said to have waited eagerly for Jesus' return (Luk 8:40.). This fits well if Jesus, as Markus suggests, departed in the presence of a gathered crowd or on the day when he was engaged with such a crowd. However, it is not clear how the commentator could have arrived at this observation if the narrative had originally held the position it has in Luke's account \*). Where the expression and the placement of a passage harmonize, we find the original, and where it is absent, the later addition. — n. 21. Just as the style here indicates that Luke himself is the author of his text, the deviation of the author from the original can also be recognized in the latter. For in Luke 9:9, the statement that Herod was troubled by the judgment that Jesus was John the Baptist resurrected is in no appropriate relationship to the information just given before, and it presents itself as the production of an author who did not immediately know with which words to replace the intended abbreviation. — n. 22. That the passage reclaims the note about the voyage, which was taken from it, as its original property, has already become apparent above on page 536. — n. 28. The introductory remark that Luke placed in chapter 9:18 does not fit the passage. For although the conversation has been removed along with its presupposition that the speakers were on the journey, Luke must still retain the distinction that Jesus said some things to all and other things not to all, as stated in chapter 9:23. But how does this distinction fit with that introductory remark, which states that Jesus had all the disciples around him at the place where he was? — n. 31. According to Luke's account (9:43-44), Jesus was prompted to direct the conversation back to his sad fate because people were now speaking of his deeds with admiration. But why did the narrator include this remark exactly here? Why not at similar mentions of Jesus' fame, as had occurred earlier and will also occur later in the expanded Gospel, e.g., 13:17, 19:37? Since the statements by Jesus about his sad future follow n. 31 in all three Gospels, the question is only which Gospel provides the most satisfying reason for this arrangement. Luke's Gospel does not give the passages the position demanded by their construction. The already mentioned prohibition of Jesus, that the disciples should not say who he is, does not suggest a subsequent report of the sending out of other disciples with the task of driving out demons in Jesus' name (Luke 10:17, compare v. 22), thus no passage like that of the sending of the Seventy. Moreover, those pericopes which contain the initial indications of Jesus about his impending sufferings must have been originally closer to the accounts of the final events than they stand in Luke's Gospel, even though the expansion of the Gospel has displaced the journey to Caesarea and the return from there from the sequence of

events. — n. 29. It becomes evident that the annotation placed in chapter 9:36 as a replacement for the omitted passage does not fit in, as has been pointed out on page 102 above. — n. 45. It is more than likely that if one of the dangerous questions posed to Jesus is mentioned, as it is said to have been presented by the Sadducees, then a question raised by the scribes will also have been mentioned in the original report, as the Gospels of Mark and Matthew report on it. — n. 51. In vain does Luke attempt to fill the gap made by the removal of this passage. The annotation made for this purpose in chapter 21:37-38 does not provide a satisfactory answer to the question of where Jesus was with the disciples when he sent some of them into the city for the preparation of the Passover. He must have been in Bethany, and this information should be given in the other Gospels along with what they report from there. If the Luke's annotation also required a change to the note that Jesus spoke on the Mount of Olives about the future of the city and the temple, and to move the spoken words back to the temple, it would contradict the original construction of the reports even more as a foreign addendum. — n. 55. The assertion imposed by Luke's account that the chief priests had taken Jesus themselves is undoubtedly less probable than the differing account of the other Gospels. And if the mockery of dressing Jesus in royal clothing and crowning him happened only once, then the report that it was Herod who dressed Jesus in kingly attire and sent him to Pilate in this way might not be as probable as what the other Gospels report on this matter.

\*) It has been wrongly said of Mark's account that it forces into the space of one day that for which one day is not sufficient (Saunier, *op. cit.*, p. 80 f.). Mark did not say that the events of n. 14 and 15, together with those of n. 16-18, fell on one day.

606

2) We have to draw the following result from the observations made. If Luke had to omit entire narrative passages from the first tablet to fill it with other materials, and if he also had to shorten others or modify them in some way, then the pieces he included cannot have originally been together with the omitted, shortened, or otherwise altered ones in the same writing. However, it is all the more certain that the omitted and shortened pieces were part of the earlier structure of his type, as he attempted in vain to fill the gaps he made. Therefore, the following pericopes must be restored for the original type: n. 5, 14, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27, 37, 40, 45, and for the following shortened sections, their losses must be compensated: n. 15, 16, 22 (23), 28, 29, 30, 32, 54, 55. — The sections that do not belong to the text of the first tablet are as follows: n. 1, Luke 3:7–14, 17–20, Chapter 4:16–30, 5:1–11, 6:20–49, 7:11–17, 7:18–35, 7:36–50, 8:1–3, 10:1–24, 25–37, 11:14, 12:10 (also 12:11, 12, which is why it has a different expression in n. 49, Chapter

21:14, 15), 13:6–9, 14:26–35, 17:1–4 (which is, however, connected with 15:1–18), 17:8–10, 18:1–8 (which is modified in n. 49). — Interruptions in the final narrative, Chapter 22:24–38, 43–45, 48–51, 23:2, 5–15, 39–43 (a rearrangement has been made for this reason), 46, 24:7. — We have only listed the materials that have been shown to be connected with certain modifications made to the common apparatus. The nature of one can again be judged by the other that is related to it. As for the main point, it has been demonstrated that the dual passages that are shared only by Mark and Matthew are by no means to be considered as later enrichments of the original evangelical text according to Eichhorn, but rather that they are essentially related to the type presented on the first tablet and originally connected to the rest of its contents. Finally, it will have become evident how the criteria for distinguishing between the original and later, related and unrelated, as described in our above remarks on page 558, are contained in the character that the elements belonging to the common type have acquired in the hands of the later editor. — There is nothing further to add about Luke to the discussions made, and now we turn to Matthew.

607

#### Eighth Datum.

In Matthew's front series of pericopes from verse 6 to 22, some of the common narrative pieces have been shortened because they are arranged in a different order.

1) The passages are in the following order in Matthew :

| n. | in the table | Matthew  | n. | in the table | Matthew   |
|----|--------------|----------|----|--------------|-----------|
| 1  | n. 5         | 4:18-22  | 9  | n. 20        | 10:1.7-14 |
| 2  | n. 13        | 5:1-7.29 | 10 | n. 11        | 12:1-8    |
| 3  | n. 8         | 8:1-4    | 11 | n. 12        | 12:9-14   |
| 4  | n. 7         | 8:14-17  | 12 | n. 14        | 12:22-42  |
| 5  | n. 17        | 8:18-27  | 13 | n. 15        | 12:46-50  |
| 6  | n. 9         | 9:1-8    | 14 | n. 16        | 13:1-34   |
| 7  | n. 10        | 9:9-17   | 15 | n. 19        | 13:53-58  |
| 8  | n. 11        | 9:18-26  | 16 | n. 21        | 14:1-20   |

2) The following pieces are shortened: n. 7, Matthew 8:17. It is missing that Jesus departs early in the morning because he does not want to stay in Capernaum any longer but wants to teach in other places as well. This had to be missing in Matthew's account since the same event, on which Jesus is supposed to go out according to Mark (1:35–39) and Luke (4:42–44), is already anticipated before the Sermon on the Mount. Compare Mark 1:39, "καί ἦν χρηρῶσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν γαλιλαίαν" = Matthew 4:23, "καὶ περιήγεν ὅλην τὴν γαλιλ. διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αἰτῶν καὶ κηρῶσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλ. κ. τ. λ." Therefore, the note that Jesus departed, was sought after, and explained the reason for his departure, had to be omitted as well. — n. 8, Matthew 8:4. The remark that, despite Jesus not wanting to make the healing known, his reputation continued to spread, is missing. However, this remark had to be suppressed in Matthew's account since the incident is said to have occurred immediately after the Sermon on the Mount when Jesus came down from the mountain accompanied by a large crowd (Matthew 8:1). — n. 9. Matthew 9:2ff. It is missing that they try to bring the paralyzed man to Jesus through the roof, and the conclusion is also altered. How Mark and Luke conclude: Mark 2:12 "ὥστε δοξάζειν τὸν Θεὸν λέγοντας ὅτι οὐδέποτε οὕτως εἶδομεν" = Luke 5:26 "καὶ ἐπλησθησαν φόβου λέγοντες · ὅτι εἶδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον," indicates that the described act of Jesus was the first of its kind among the miracles performed in Capernaum. However, in Matthew's account, this conclusion could not be arranged in the same way, as a similar event of Jesus' activity in Capernaum had already been mentioned in Matthew 8:5–13. Therefore, the conclusion is modified as follows: "καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν," the words retained from the original text, to which the following is added: "τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις," taken from verse 6, "ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. κ. τ. λ." — n. 17. Since Matthew separates the sections n. 17 and 18, the connecting statement that forms the conclusion of one and the beginning of the other section could not remain in the same form as in Mark and Luke. While Matthew 9:1 retains the words from the original text, "καὶ ἐμβάς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον διεπερᾶσε" (compare Mark 5:21 "καὶ διαπεράσαντος ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν," Luke 8:40 "ἐν τῷ ὑπόστρεψαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν," compare v. 37 "ἐμβάς — ὑπεστρεψε"), the following part of the statement "συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρά τὴν θάλασσαν" (Mark 5:21 "Mark v. 21," Luke 8:40 "μυαράδοξα σήμερον") had to be omitted, as Matthew immediately follows n.17 with the healing of the paralyzed man. For this reason, Matthew adds to the retained words: "καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν." The use of "ἰδίαν" was not without reason; Jesus' arrival in Capernaum is not intended to appear unusual or unexpected, so that the efforts made to bring the paralyzed man before Jesus can be passed over in silence. We will also encounter other instances where Matthew manages to insert a replacement for what was removed, even in a single word. — n. 18 (regarding Jairus' daughter): Matthew also presents it differently. Jairus does not fetch

Jesus from the lakeshore (as in Mark and Luke) but from a house in Capernaum. Due to the changed arrangement, the section had to undergo significant alterations.

609

α) It could no longer be sustained that a crowd followed Jesus, pressing around him (Mark 5:29, Luke 8:42). Matthew only includes the formula (9:19): και εγεθεις ο Ἰησοῦς ἡκολούθησεν αντίο και οἱ μαθηται αὐτοῦ. Thus, the mention that Jesus asked who touched him and the ensuing dialogue between him and Peter, as well as the mimetic description of the woman's embarrassment and her fear turning into the confession of her action, could not find a place in the narrative. — This and other directly related elements had to be omitted, such as the immediate awareness of the woman of the healing touch on her body, to believe that she was discovered.

β) The more complete account, abbreviated by Matthew, depicts, in order to present the instant healing as even more miraculous, the magnitude of the affliction to be relieved more extensively (Mark v. 26, Luke v. 48). The condenser proceeded consistently by omitting this description as well. However, the consistency had to extend even further. For when the other reporters relate

610

γ) that after the death of Jairus' daughter messengers came to explain the way to the called-for physician (Mark 5:35 f., Luke 8:49); this suited the circumstances well if Jesus had to make his way to Jairus' house from the lake, but it ceased to be appropriate if he was supposed to have been fetched from a house in the city itself and had been on the way with Jairus. However, this is how Matthew presents the narrative, and therefore, what does not fit this context is also not found in his account. Since no effort is made in his presentation to depict gestures, it is not surprising that Matthew does not specifically mention the words that Jesus is said to have spoken during the resurrection of the deceased girl. - n. 22. A condensation made by Matthew because he overloaded this chapter with inappropriate masses. In the Instructional Discourse of Jesus, he gathered everything related to the proclamation of the word, to which time and under what circumstances the apostles should address it. We pointed out above on page 370 against these insertions the circumstance that Jesus expected his disciples to return from the mission, mentioned as a fact in the report, and that, therefore, the report could not contain instructions that presuppose later and completely changed circumstances. But the compiler himself felt this inconsistency. For he omitted precisely the circumstance, which is incompatible with his enlargements, that the disciples returned from the mission (Mark 6:30-31, Luke 9:10). With this omission, he also left out the



indication that the disciples carried out their commission and how they did so (Mark 6:12-13, Luke 9:6). The conclusion that the compiler himself has given to the report (Matthew 11:1: και εγενετο οτε ετέλησεν - μετίβη εκείθεν) bears, as his creation, the stamp of his style of writing, and therefore cannot be found in the parallel accounts of Mark and Luke. In Matthew's Gospel, the news of the sending of the disciples is taken out between n. 19 and n. 21, and therefore, these two numbers immediately follow each other. From this, we can again explain the phenomenon that the information of no. 21 is abbreviated in Matthew. It is only what Herod agreed with that has been excluded from the conjectures or judgments expressed about Jesus' person, and the other judgments of the people are transitions. The immediately preceding passage n. 19 also contains judgments about Jesus' person, from the mouth of the people. Why could not the reason for this abbreviation be sought therein? Especially since in the same passage n. 21 in Matthew, undoubtedly, several things have been omitted, and the beheading story of the Baptist is also only briefly mentioned, as will have to be shown elsewhere in particular.

611

3) We have listed pericopes which are shorter in Matthew than in Mark and Luke. Did Matthew, or the editor of his Gospel, really shorten them, or were they originally already so short? This must undoubtedly be decided according to the structure of the relations, and according to whether the parts of the shorter report are constructed in such a way that they presuppose the more detailed form, and require a different position for the sake of this form. Now this has already been shown by some (n. 7. n. 17. n. 18.) above pp.530-534. In the case of n. 8. the verdict is not difficult to reach. The little story of the healing would not have been told in the Gospels at all if it had not been connected with something that contrasts with the prohibition of Jesus, that is, precisely what is omitted in Matthew (namely, the note that the healed man transgressed the prohibition of Jesus). Consider the construction to find that it is calculated precisely for the position which the story has received in Mark and Luke. Jesus declares himself ready to do all that the sufferer so urgently desires of him. This fits in with the other thing, that Jesus himself demands something. This also fits in very well with the fact that the more the narrator makes it his business to make sense of the quick and obliging readiness with which Jesus' request is granted, the more emphasis is placed on Jesus' counter-demand. And as these two things, so also the circumstances are placed in a suitable correlation to each other, that Jesus' commandment, although emphatically inculcated, and expressed towards an obligation, was nevertheless not kept by the one obliged to give thanks. Thus here the construction of the play and the arrangement of its place are mutually dependent, while in Matthew not even the similarity of the narrative, lacking all vividness, with the accounts given of it by Mark and Luke can be explained. -

The author, who deprives the account of those parts by which it becomes as interesting as it is intelligible, cannot be the first author of it. - n. 9. The transitional formula retained by Matthew, "when Jesus saw their (the bearers') confidence," points back to what he omitted (the way in which the bearers showed their confidence by laboriously bringing the sick). (What is left out is about the bearers, and why, in spite of the omission, it is precisely the trust of the bearers that is taken into account in Matthew, just as in the circumstantial narrative, is not clear in Matthew). Incidentally, the piece is meant to show how Jesus began to be suspicious of the Pharisees. This is immediately followed by stories in Mark and Luke, in which the Pharisees have repeated reasons to be suspicious of Jesus. Even in Matthew, such a narrative follows the piece just considered, as proof that the narrator who connected these messages had intended to develop the Pharisaic attitude. Now it is easy to imagine how the narrator, placing the facts in this connection, could close the first piece belonging to it with the remark: the spectators, full of astonishment, affirmed that they had never seen anything like it (Mark 2:12. Luke 5:26.). ); but much too mild an introduction to such narrative pieces is the remark appended to the first piece now under consideration in Matthew: the spectators praised God that he had given such power (the power to forgive sin) to men; since a recognition thus expressed should have rendered all other occasions of suspicion ineffectual, rather than, like an introduction, have made such occasions the more attentive. - n. 21. The piece which is now to be guarded from those before mentioned, according to its construction, has received from the writer the designation of being a prefatory note to the sequel, just as n. 52. Visibly, the reported factual n. 28 (Mark 8:28, Luke 9:19) refers back to the introductory statement made by the Evangelist here, which anticipates the fact. Now, however, Matthew parallels Mark (and Luke) with the mention of the factual in n. 28. He has taken over the introductory statement in Matthew 14:2, at least to some extent. However, in the part where the factual (the explicit answer to Jesus' question about who people think he is) is mentioned, it also receives its consideration, like the others, in the introductory statement that is mentioned by Matthew alone, the judgments expressed about Jesus in Mark 6:15, Luke 9:8. Shouldn't the introductory statement placed in the third part of Matthew, after having omitted one element, also not have originally included the other related one, that is, the other judgments expressed about Jesus, as they stand quoted in Mark 6:15, Luke 9:8, forming a complete anticipation? — This is more than likely, and therefore, taking into account the aforementioned examples of text abbreviation, there is no doubt that Matthew abbreviated at the cited passage (Matthew 14:2). — So these are the shortened passages that appear in the front section of Matthew's pericopes. It may be worth mentioning in passing that the abbreviator also endeavored to provide replacements for what was omitted by changing the expression. The expression used for this purpose, "εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν" (to his own city), in 9:1, has been used shortly before, and the word of Jairus, changed by Matthew in chapter 9:18 (for more on this,

see page 533); but in n. 17, such a replacement is also provided. Mark and Luke state that Jesus advised the healed man, instead of including him in his followers, to stay in his homeland and tell his countrymen about the mercy he had received, and they add that he did just that and filled the whole city with the news (Luke 8:39). Matthew omits this part. However, he still wants to inform the entire city about the fact. He says (strengthening the expression of the side accounts) in chapter 8:34: as soon as the shepherds had first brought news of the matter, the whole city had come out to meet Jesus. \*) Is it a coincidence that Mark and Luke already deviate from Matthew here, and that after his interpolation, Matthew concludes the narrative in the same way as the others (Mark 5:17, Luke 8:37)?

\*) I would therefore like to assume that Mark. 5:20. should not be read: εν τη δεκαπόλει, but: εν τη πόλει.

614

4) But if in Matthew several "narrative pieces", as we have just seen, have been shortened for the sake of a different position, so that they no longer have their original form, it follows first of all, with regard to this position, not only that it is the later one, compared with the composition of the pieces, but also that it is not the correct one, and that the shortened pieces must originally have had a different position from that which Matthew has given them. All these pieces in Mark and Luke have

a) the position corresponding to their structure. - n. 7. belongs to n. 6. Both narratives connected describe the first day of Jesus' stay in Capernaum, n. 6. namely gives

α) the notice that Jesus was in the synagogue, and to this in n. 7. the circumstance points back that the sick were brought to him only at sunset.

β) n. 6. gives an account of a healing performed in Capernaum to the general astonishment. The fact thus narrated is connected in n. 7 with the fact that the house in which Jesus was staying was surrounded by sick people of all kinds. Because

γ) after n. 6 Jesus appears for the first time in Capernaum and his imminent departure is feared, therefore after n. 7 his presence is used to bring all kinds of sick people to him.

(δ) If Jesus was in company with Peter, the going to Peter's house was the common purpose of both. Hence in n. 7 the expression: Jesus came to Peter's house.

ε) In Peter's house Jesus was entertained as a guest. Hence, in addition to the fact that Peter's mother-in-law had recovered, it is said of her: διηκόνει αὐτοῖς (which expression Matthew also has).

ζ) n. 6. is prefixed as a document that Jesus appeared in that place for the first time teaching. This is harmonised with Jesus' response in n. 7 that he must also teach elsewhere. Both pieces are an inseparable whole. - According to n. 8, Jesus does not want to make a boast of himself, and yet what he wants to be concealed is the cause of the widespread spread of his reputation. Jesus' declared desire and the opposite success belong together, and the piece, in so far as it explains the spread of a tidings, places itself in a historical account, which soon wants to speak of the effects of the widely spread tidings, of itself among the first facts of the description, thus in the place i

615

α) One part of the whole message, which is that not Jairus himself, but the messengers from his house, who arrived later, report the death of the daughter, is inseparably connected with the other part, which is the message that Jesus had to be fetched not from within the city, but from further away.

β) The fact that the woman, suffering from the flow of blood, strove to approach Jesus unnoticed, presupposes the emergence of a crowd of people surrounding Jesus. A contribution to the explanation of the situation is given on the one hand by the circumstance, taken into account in n. 18, that Jesus was chosen and fetched outside the city by Jairus, but on the other hand by the fact that he, as the preceding piece n. 17 says, had arrived from a return journey on the shore of the Sea of Galilee.

γ) The circumstance that after his return to the shore crowds of people gathered around Jesus is explained by the introduction which the preceding passage n. 17. makes (in Mark), that Jesus, who was soon to be missed, had departed to the other shore on a day when he had occupied himself with a crowd of people. And as these two pieces are inwardly connected, so also n. 20 and n. 22 belong together.

616

α) According to n. 22. Jesus goes into solitude with the disciples in order to give them or secure them rest after their labours. This happened after their return from the missionary journeys.

β) This return of theirs cannot be spoken of if the sending from which they are said to have returned has not been mentioned before. We see, therefore, that in Mark and Luke the narratives are constructed according to the place they are to occupy. And in the same way

b) the longer form and the development, which they have to distinguish them from the homogeneous Matthaean narratives, is in the right relation to the determination which they must have according to their position. The latter does not need to be set apart, since it has already been noted for some of the pieces, and for the others it follows from what has been said.

4) Our attention was directed to the series of pericopes which was formed in Matthew by rearranging certain common passages. Now, if it has been shown in regard to this series in general that the pieces in it do not have the position corresponding to their construction, and that the order in which they are placed in Mark and Luke does correspond to their construction, then three things will follow from this:

a) that the order of Mark and Luke is not an improvement made later with the order of Matthew, as one has tried to make credible on the basis of a non-history thought to be history,

b) that Mark did not attribute the different order of Matthew to Luke as much as he knew Luke's idiosyncrasies,

c) that Matthew knowingly and intentionally deviated from the order expressed as a type in the other Gospels. We can therefore regard all this as proven. Of course, the question now arises as to why and for what reason Matthew might have deviated from the original order of the type, and we must proceed to answer this question more precisely. However, it can already be "assumed in advance" that in the series of pericopes mentioned above, Matthew made changes and, as a result, also shortened some of the passages because he combined or mixed them with other material. In fact, we find that he has given a greater extension to the very series to which the pieces under consideration belong. Thus, just as we have shown that the transposed pieces require a different position by their nature, we must now also investigate what is mixed in with them in Matthew, whether it is a later addition to the original type or not. - Here is the place where a remark made earlier (p. 171) with regard to sightings of this kind will be confirmed. For we have first to establish the following date.

### Ninth Datum.

The largest part of the apparatus that the Gospel of Matthew has excluded from the mentioned series of pericopes, apart from the common sections, corresponds to the material that, in Luke's Gospel, is separated as interpolated from the original type. Just as it is inserted there, it also does not form a chronological order here with the sections between which it is placed, although the compiler of the work tried to place it in a chronological context.

1) What within the designated series of Matth. ch. 5. to ch. 13:58. coincides with certain narratives, which in Luke are arranged in a different order and connection, or with parts of the same, is clearly presented above p. 9. 10. in the second table, and can be seen there. - Inasmuch as these materials occur in Luke, we are certain that they do not belong in the original type, as is evident from several other dates already cited, especially because Luke, in order to include these materials, made various changes to the common pieces. The question now is, how firm or loose is the bond which is to connect them with this type in the work of Matthew? We will prepare the correct answer when we explain our datum.

618

2) What is included in Luke does not form a chronological order in its connection with what it is connected with in Matthew. - Matthew's Gospel, ch. 4:17 (ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρυσσεῖν κ. τ. λ.), has the appearance of laying the foundation of a history gradually developing from the first beginnings, such as is given in the other Gospels. Therefore, like those who, after the introduction of Jesus into Galilee, begin by describing the first day of Jesus' stay in Capernaum, it first connects Jesus with the four fishermen who lived here or nearby. When we read in chap. 4, 18-22 that Jesus, who first came from Nazareth to the Sea of Galilee, joined Peter and his comrades who lived in Capernaum, and that they went with him, we expect to hear about the entrance to Capernaum, just as this entrance is the first thing mentioned in Mark and Luke after the reported arrival of Jesus in Galilee. But this expectation is deceived. What follows is

a) merely the general, indefinite: Jesus went about in the Galilean country (4:22.), and the statement: "And Jesus came into Peter's house," follows only, like the postscript of the forgotten, much later ch. 8:14. -

(b) If the Gospel of Matthew, like the related works, had the purpose of setting forth particular acts and facts out of which the call of Jesus developed - and such acts and

facts it does set forth - it cannot be found in accordance with the chronological order that there should first be mention of a flocking of the people from the remotest places, and of a covenant made to that people, chap. 4:24 f., before the particular facts are mentioned by which Jesus' call was first spread to the distant places. But what is most striking in this transposition is that the conditional specific is expressly placed in later time, as the anticipated conditional, and as its result. (See chap. 8:1. 18. 9:1. 9. 18. 27.)

c) The people, who had gathered from all places before the mountain ceremony, were said to have been attracted by the call of Jesus' deeds. These deeds were healings of the sick. But it was only later, after the Sermon on the Mount, and only then, when Jesus performed such healings in Peter's house, that the word of Christ prophesying of the half physician was fulfilled (chap. 8:17.), an implication which presupposes that Jesus had not performed such healings before.

619

d) The mountain speech is said to have been given with special regard to the disciples. (One even wants to call it the inaugural speech \*). However, none of the disciples joined the Master other than the four fishermen, and nothing at all is said in Matthew's Gospel about the selection of the twelve. -

\*) Unseemly and against the intention of the author, who only gives this speech as a sample of Jesus' antipharisaic and at the same time forceful teaching. Even if the disciples are taken into consideration in the speech, an inaugural speech is something completely different. What should the disciples have been inaugurated for? To be with Jesus and to pay attention to his way of teaching and healing.

e) According to the mountain speech, Jesus is said to have healed the leper. But if Jesus, when this happened, was still surrounded by a crowd, as is said in chap. 8:1; he could not give the prohibition to the leper, that he should tell no man of the healing. -

f) If the return of Jesus to Peter's house is to follow, and it is to be said that Jesus, by the healings which he performed here, fulfilled a prophecy concerning him, the healing of the centurion's servant, if it were to be included in the series of facts, must of course be placed before the return to Peter's house. It is an artificial arrangement of the narrator that the centurion must take possession of Jesus immediately on entering the city, as it were, before he comes into Peter's house. But as this has little probability, neither does the other circumstance fit in with it, that all the other sick people are said to have been brought to Jesus' house only towards evening, and indeed only as he is in Peter's house (8:16.).

g) After Jesus' stay in Peter's house, the departure to Gadara is said to have taken place. However, the folder does not make a suitable connection. The first thing that stands out is that after it is said in glorification of Jesus that he had proved helpful to the sick in fulfilling a scriptural word, immediately afterwards, as if this praise were to be refuted, it is said: When Jesus saw many people, he ordered them to go away. But then - how should Jesus have departed? He would have had to leave Capernaum, where the many people were, secretly with the disciples to the lake, either at night or on the following day. However, nothing is said about this, but circumstances are mentioned that do not fit the story of the attempted departure. It is said that two persons offered themselves to Jesus as travel companions. How did they find out about his intended departure if Jesus wanted to withdraw from the people without being noticed? Furthermore, the word that Jesus is said to have said to one of the men who offered himself, that he had no place to lay his head, how does it fit into Jesus' situation at that time? and how, if Jesus had no time to linger, could the other of these men insist on being allowed to go and bury his father first? There is neither chronological order nor factual order here. -

620

h) If Jesus departed from Capernaum to escape from the people, it is not probable that, because he could not stay in the place where the departure had gone, he immediately went back to Capernaum. -

i) Jairus is to fetch Jesus from a house in the city. We have seen that Matthew, in order to make this probable, had to mutilate the message he gives. -

k) Returning from Jairus' house, Jesus is said to have immediately healed two blind men, but to have told them not to say anything about the matter. And as the blind went away, Jesus is said to have cast out a demon before many people. Who does not notice a disjointed compilation here? -

l) After ch. 10, 1.f. Jesus sends out the disciples, but gives them such instructions in regard to later time conditions, as if he always separated himself from them, just as the narrator does not report that these disciples had returned again. -

m) After sending the disciples, Jesus is said to have gone about teaching (Ch. 11:1.). Where John's messenger, who according to the immediately following account is said to have come to him, met him, is passed over with silence, as one who did not know, and



who did not dare to give the missing location to a message borrowed from elsewhere, had to pass it over. -

621

n) Immediately afterwards it is said that Jesus passed through fields on the Sabbath, but that his disciples were rebuked for plucking up ears of corn. How the disciples could be around Jesus again, who had been sent out shortly before, cannot be guessed from the chains that Matthew makes. After all these great historical anticipations, - the people coming from the remotest places, the solemn mountain speech, the negotiations with John's messengers, after the many deeds that are said to have happened at Bethsaida and Chorazin (11:20-24.) - we are now told that

o) the Pharisees sought to cast suspicion on Jesus' healing influence on the demoniacs on the occasion of an exorcism by the slanderous pretence that he cast out demons through Beelzebul, without being able to answer the question why, after so long a power had been exercised over demons, it was only a single case that gave rise to the slander. - Behind this and the story of the arrival of Jesus' relatives that follows it, there now follows

p) the parable of the sower, together with Jesus' attempts to train his disciples, who had already been sent out earlier, in the interpretation of the parables. And all this was supposed to be in chronological order?

3) One will say: it has long been known that Matthew has no chronological order. But then I ask you to look at the nature of the narratives, and allow me to ask the question: what reasonable person can want to claim, despite this, that "Matthew's Gospel is the original, the most independent of the Synoptic Gospels, and if it is not taken as the starting point for the explanation of the harmony of the Gospels, this is a serious (!) mistake? "It is not to be said that the author of the work produced his materials independently according to his own plan; no, he wants to arrange them chronologically as well as the other evangelists. This is proved by the connecting formulas he uses everywhere, and by the time indications he gives (8:1. 6. 11. 9:1. 9. 14. 18. 27. 28. 32. 11:1. 20. 5. 12:1. 9. 15. 46. 13:1. 53. 14:1.), sometimes connecting, sometimes separating them, however improbable they may be in detail. However, he still had a secondary intention in his arrangement, and we will find this. For the time being, we have come to the conclusion that Matthew mixed something strange with the original type. It must be discussed in more detail that and how the purpose of making such a mixture caused him to change the order of the original type. In order to promote or

facilitate our understanding of this mystery, we will use the following date as a premise for our judgement.

622

#### Tenth Datum.

In the Gospel of Matthew there are still traces left of the fact that the binder of the same inserted his interpolations into a work which had set up the common passages, now rearranged in Matthew, in the same order as they are recorded in the Gospel of Mark.

That the rearranged and abbreviated passages originate from such an order as it is in Mark has been proved above (Dat. 8.); here it shall be shown that the traces of the earlier order are also still present in Matthew's writing. We will therefore go through the series of pericopes in Matthew, as described above, and compare it with the parallel series in Mark and Luke, and for the sake of convenience, we will begin the pattern from the bottom end.

a) n.19 - v. 21. Only the piece o. 20. is taken out in Matthew. But it is here. For this proves ") the fragment still extant Matth. 14:12. *χαὶ ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ* (Mark. 6:30. *καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα*. Luke 9:10. *καὶ υποστρεψάντες διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ* -). coincidence in this indication in different relation to the subjects cannot be accidental. But now the words in Matthew are placed in a wrong relation for which they cannot be formed, namely, that the subject should be the disciples of John, who tell Jesus of the death of their Master. This relationship is false. For the story of the beheading of the runner ch. 14:3. (Mark 6:37.) stands only parenthetically, and the parenthetical narrative can reach only as far as the words v. 12. *καὶ ἐθαψαν αὐτό*. Would the following

*ἐλθόντες* were to be referred to the disciples of John likewise, then this would either likewise enter into the parenthetical - like one made up from the past, but to which the following *ἀκοῦσας* 14:3, referring to this, would belong. ( which with its *αναχώρησε* attaches itself to something lying in the present time and is a new beginning) does not fit, - or it made a new paragraph, and then The Beheading History stepped out of its construction, and ceased to be a parenthetical one. The *ἀπήγγειλαν*, therefore, is still there in Matthew as the proof that the part of the sending forth and return of the disciples, which he took out, stood in the foreground of the text.

623

β) The departure happened on the Sea of Galilee, and the disciples who had been sent out had returned to Capernaum. Now, since in Matthew the notice of the return of the disciples is expelled from the text, and the ακουσας 14:1. is supposed to refer to the message of John's disciples, it is not at all clear what terminus a quo is to be set for the άνεχώρησεν εκειθεν εν πλοίω. According to the tearing up of the text which the steward has made, the εκειθεν is merely Nazareth from n. 19, and thus the appearance is made as if Jesus had sailed from Nazareth in a ship, or as if Nazareth had been situated by a lake.

γ) By the false relation given to the mutilated words, the text is forced to induce the incorrect opinion that Jesus departed in ships for fear of Herod. The story of the sending forth, therefore, belongs again to its place, so that to ελθόντες ν. 12. οί απόστολοι as subject, and to απήγγειλαν the proper object (οσα εποίησαν και έδιδαξαν, as in Mark and Luke) be thought of, and after the previously thought of return of the disciples, a departure at Capernaum may be thought of. If the story of the expedition originally stood where it stands in Mark and Luke, then one cannot be surprised that the

δ) it is not surprising that the preface to the story in Matthew (9:35.), και περιήγε - διδάσκων, is the same as that which Mark reads. 6:6. is read. So the first piece in Matthew incorrectly placed is Matth. 9:35- 11:1. After the Restoration we have backwards one and the same order with Mark down to Matth. 13:54. Now here n. 18. and 17 are missing. If this is inserted, then one and the same order continues down to ch. 12:22. i.e. to n. 13.

624

b) n. 13. The mention of choosing disciples was one of the elements of the text of Matthew. It is hcraxcepted between Matth. 12:21. and 22. The words Matth. 12:16. και επιτίμησεν -- ποιήσεσιν, comp. Mark. 3:12., are wrongly referred in Matthew -- not to the demons, that they should not tell who Jesus was, but to the healed, that they should not tell where he was. (For what else should φανερόν ποιήσαι mean in Matthew?) But now Jesns shows.

α), according to the following narratives, does not at all endeavour to conceal himself, nor has

β) the prohibition put into his mouth, in so far as it is to be pronounced before a crowd, has nothing natural about it. The text, from which the moths now falsely referred to, must have had the parts which the text of Mark contains (Mark 3:11.), and as it will not alone have spoken of the demoniacs, it must also have contained the rest, so that

therefore after ανεχώρησε Matth. 12:15. the retinue is to be added, which accompanied Jesus, Mark. 3. 7 -10. where the: εθεράπευσε γάρ αυτούς with Matth. v. 15.: και εθεράπευσεν αυτούς. But what is most peculiar is that we do not even need to take the words to be used from Mark; they are found in Matthew itself, precisely in a place where the notice of the election of disciples is presupposed, namely before the Sermon on the Mount. Compare the third passage, which we have as a trace of an earlier textual order.

c)

| Mark 3:7                                                                                                                            | Matth. 12:25 and 4:26                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| και πολυ πληθος απο της γαλιλαιας — και απο της ιουδαιας και ιεροσολυμων και απο της ιδουμιας και περαν του ιορδανου                | καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὡς ἐν 4:26. ἀπὸ τῆς γαλιλαίας καὶ δεκαπόλεως καὶ ἱεροσολύμων — ἰορδανου. |
| και περι Τυρον και Σιδωνα (cf. Luke 6:17) v. 13. και αναβαινει εις το ορος (from the Matthean ἰδων τοὺς ὄχλους Mark knows nothing). | 24. καὶ ἀπήλθεν ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν. 5:1.— ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος.                                  |

At the same time, pay attention to the definite article next to ὄρος in Matthew. The text has thus been torn up Matth. 12:15. hence the twice ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.

625

β) Before the verse Matth. 4:25. which has been taken away from here, another is placed which does not belong to it at all. How can 4:24. be written as a postscript και προσήνικαν- αυτούς and now again v. 25. και ἠκολ. αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί? (Parenthetical: It will not be possible to assert without absurdity that Mark composed his text from the torn passages and misreferenced words of Matthew in order to agree with Luk. 6:17 -19. But the torn and mutilated text also testifies that Mark, in deviating from Luke, first mentions the sick and then the going up the mountain, has the right and original). - The incorrectly placed part is therefore here the verses Matth. 4:24. 25. up to ανεβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, and like these verses, so also the list of names of the apostles, which Matthew, well as he eradicated the election of the disciples, will have to be placed elsewhere (in the story of the sending forth 10:1. f.), in its place. If we now go backwards from here (from Matth. 12:21.), we have the same order up to ch. 12:1. From here ch. 11. is to be skipped as an insertion, then we come (after ch. 10. has been put back in its place) first to ch. 9:34. This is an insertion up to v. 27. We then come to n. 18. if this is put in its place (viz. after Matt. 13:52.), then we come to that which immediately precedes ch. 12:1. in Mark and Luke, viz. n. 10. and we remain in order till ch. 9:1. if then ch. 8:18 -

34. is again put in its place; then the two stories remain n. 7. 8. which find transposed in Matthew. The rearranged pieces are thus, if we go backwards again in the series:

(a) n. 7. and 8.

b) n. 17. and 18.

c) n. 20. (Ch. 10:1 - 11:30.)

d) n. 13. (after ch. 12:21. 4:24.-7:27. \*))

\*) Another piece torn out of the context is Matth. 10:17 - 22. Therefore Matth. 24:9. 10. are still the traces of the tearing of the text.

Now the question: why did Matthew make this change? is even more pressing, but it can now be answered more easily.

626

#### Eleventh Datum.

The changes in the first series of pericopes in Matthew were caused by the insertion and pre-setting of the Sermon on the Mount.

1) The Sermon on the Mount is

a) insertion. -

α) It is, as we have seen, in Luke, and must therefore also be in Matthew.

β) In the latter it also has the marks of insertion. For it stands

κ) out of the chronological order, and by it the accounts which are based on special facts are displaced from their place.

β) So that it would be placed, the text Matth. 12:15. was torn apart,

b) Why was it inserted? Consider the ending it has in Matthew, Matth. 7:28. 29.

ἐξεπλήσσαντο οἱ ὄχλοι - οὐχ ὥς οἰγραμματοῖς. These are the same words which are

used in Mark. Ch. 1:22. but not only in this, but also in Luk. Ch. 4:32. are found differently connected. Let us first look at these words more closely:

κ) Luke did not connect them with the Sermon on the Mount, but with the passage with which Mark connected them; they must therefore not belong to the Sermon on the Mount.

β) That Mark has the words from Matthew is as ridiculous as it is arbitrary. - Where then did Luke get the words? And then, how should it have come about that Mark, when he took them from Matthew, did not also place them as they are placed by Matthew, namely at the end instead of at the beginning? What is found of the same words in Matthew does not belong to the compiler, but what belongs to the compiler does not belong to Mark. Where is the Matthaean *οἱ ἄλμ* in Mark? ( this never occurs with him in the plural) or the *οἱ συνετελεῖσεν τοὺς λόγους* Matth. 7:28. which, as it is a common phrase to Matthew, so never occurs with Mark?

α) The words, set to the Sermon on the Mount, appear as borrowed. For neither after such a long and detailed discourse as the Sermon on the Mount has the remark at the end of it about the way in which Jesus preached, nor after a discourse expressly polemicising against the Pharisees (comp. Matth. 5:20. f.) does the explanation that Jesus preached in the same way as the Pharisees have anything quite fitting about it.

τ) According to its version, the remark contains the reason of the *ἐξεπλήσσοντο*, and it is precisely what is to replace the content of the speech. The meaning, therefore, which Mark and Luke give it, is natural to it,

627

η) If the speaker in Matthew had been concerned to present "this" speech in the historical connection which it had as a fact, and in the relation which it must have had as such; he should have concluded it as the speaker himself concluded it, or, if he added a general reflection of his own, he should have said what Jesus intended by this speech. But since he does not do this, but only makes a remark about the impression the speech had made and about the way Jesus preached, one also sees that he does not want to present it both as a mountain speech, which was conditioned by the circumstances of the time, but as a sample of Jesus' way of teaching in general. This remark must be recorded, so that we can see how Matthew came to place the speech in this point of view and to plant it there. For it is with this

i) happened in this way. After vem Stücke n. 5 was followed by n. 6 in the type that the Mattæan compiler had before him, just as both pieces are set in interrelation to each other by their construction. Now n. 6. mentions the first lecture Jesus gave in the place where he was a native, and it is noted that this treaty made a shattering impression. This compiler wants to make this general statement more concrete, and therefore places a special treaty here, to which he then connects this general statement. The correctness of this explanation is further confirmed by other reasons, namely by the fact that

aa) the Matthaean mountain speech is completely parallel to the play n. 6. is completely parallel,

bb) that in Matthew this very passage is omitted,

cc) that the compiling binder before the Sermon on the Mount omits the mention of the election of disciples, although he implicitly presupposes it (and therefore does not mention it in ch. 11:22), and only keeps the preface, which explains the presence of the listeners. (Ch. 4:25. 24. belongs immediately before the mountain speech , v. 23. notes Jesus' first journey, as Mark. 1:39.) This first about the mountain speech.

2) As n. 6. and 7. form the story of one day, and n. 7. makes an end point, so n. 7. from the Sermon on the Mount, is the end point also in Matthew (the end of the day, as if Jesus came with the fishermen for the first time to Capernaum - namely not before, but after the beginning of the first journey Matth. 4:23.). Luke also connects the healing of the centurion's servant with the Sermon on the Mount, and n. 8. belongs to the way before Jesus, having returned from the first journey, enters Capernaum again. Matthew, therefore, by making Peter's house the destination, places both pieces here. The leper must be healed outside the city, when Jesus comes down from the mountain; he must be called to the centurion's servant when he enters the city. But the steward must shorten both pieces; from the one (v. 8) he takes the closing formula, and from the other he takes the notice of the deputation sent to Jesus (Luk. 7,3-6.), because there was no room for this expansiveness here. (Jesus must obligingly say: I will come, Matth. 8,7., and what the centurion lets say in Luke, he says here in Matthew v. 8. himself: - the same abbreviation as in n. 17. 18.)

628

3) After n. 7. there is a departure in the other speakers (Mark. 1:38. 39. Luk. 4:43. 5:11.). Since this first journey had already been anticipated in Matth. 4:23 (so that the Sermon on the Mount could be placed on it), the apostle here refers to the second

journey, the one that followed the separation of the disciples, namely the journey to Gadara. (This departure, then, belongs more to the notice of the election of the disciples, which is to be thought of before the Sermon on the Mount, than to n. 7. 7.) Up to this point, then, the Sermon on the Mount is unmistakably to blame for the change. Further:

4) n. 9. takes place after Jesus' return from the journey - in Mark and Luke from the first, here from the second. N. 10 remains connected to n. 9 in Matthew as well. In both, after the return from Gadara, the journey to Jairus makes the end (and the end of the day). n. 8. and 9. thus stand as intermediate acts, after the return from Gadara, and Matth. 9:18. thus remains in connection with 8:18 - 34. Thus included, the pieces n. 8. and 9. have been separated from n. 10. and 11. The folder leaves the last ones together, but adds a few things before them. And what is it that he interpolates?

5) The revival of Jairus' daughter after the return from Gadara is followed on the tablet by n. 19. and 10. The folder takes n. 20 to bring it closer to the Sermon on the Mount, and so after that revival story he now places 9:35 - 10:1 - 11:1 (with many enrichments). But because he introduces many things into Jesus' instructional discourse that are not yet motivated, he must add interpolations beforehand. Namely, because of 10:25 (that the father of the house was called Belzebul), chap. 9:32-34 is prefixed. (Hence this story is mentioned twice in Matthew, once here, and once ch. 12:24.) Further:

629

6) The pieces n. 11. and 12. are put under a different point of view; they are supposed to be samples of the liberal teaching of Jesus. That is why they were preceded by ch. 11:28-30. The preceding words are reminiscent of Jeremiah 6:16, and this chapter of Jeremiah is the source from which the binder also drew many other things. There Jehovah calls out to the inhabitants of Jerusalem: they should ask for the right way, in order to find rest for their souls (cf. Matth. 11:29.), then he declares that he does not ask for sacrifices (Jerem. 6:20.). Hence the inclusion of Matth. 12:7 (from another passage, but from the same series of verses). There the complaint is made that one does not seek the right way, and will not follow the voice of the watchmen: Jerem. 6:16.17. - According to Matth. 21:32: ἦλθεν πρὸς υμᾶς Ἰωάννης ἐν ὀνόματι δικαιοσύνης to judge, the steward here, borrowing from Jerem. 6:16, could easily think of John, and thus it is explained why, before the pieces n. 11. and 12. (before the borrow ch. 11:28 - 39.) the piece of John's mission, which contains Jesus' complaints about the contemporaries, ch. 11,2 - 24. (with the appendix v. 25 - 27.). (This piece is therefore placed here for the sake of subject order).



7) In the intercalated pericope of John's mission, the healings of the blind are mentioned among the beneficent acts of Jesus, ch. 11:5. This prompted the folder to include the narrative ch. 9:27 - 30. beforehand. - In this way, all of Matthew's transpositions are explained, and his arrangement and the different order of the original type are quite different from the way in which Paul's commentary, for example, with its lcxxt devastations, wanted to present the matter to us. We note one more thing. Since the Matthaean folder had torn off the piece about the departure to Gadara from n. 16, he also received an empty space which he could fill with something else. He fills it with the interpretation of the parable of the Zi- zanyies etc. ( after he has used this parable instead of the one originally given: Mark. 4:26 - 29-), and lets Jesus, in order to give this interpretation, go home. Thus Matthew's work expands \*). We can see that the binder, while concerned with didactic material, did not want to violate the predetermined chronology in any way. Before we leave his series of pericopes, we must mention one more date, namely the following:

\*) By the way, I would like to draw your attention to something. Above p. 613. has been shown above, how Matthaas adds to what he has abbreviated on the other side. on the other side. From n. 17. we already had an example of this, but it is 'still included' in it. Matthaas has omitted Matthaas has omitted the fact that the man who had been bitten by the rage asked Iesum, on his departure from Gabara to take him in among his companions. To his two He did not put this request into the mouths of his two Dâmonische. What did he but what did he say in return? He made the same request of two Undern before the departure to Gadará, chap. 8:19-22.

630

Twelfth Datum.

According to the original type, Jesus did not say anything about his Messiahship before the announcement that he had to suffer and die. All specific statements of this kind, which occur only in Matthew's anterior series of pericopes, are therefore excluded from the original Gospel account.

1) The date is contained in n. 28. - Jesus asks the disciples,

a) Who the people think he is, and the question is answered. All kinds of suspicions of the people are mentioned, but nothing is said about the fact that among Jesus' admirers or admirers there were some who believed him to be the Messiah. If one feels moved to

read backwards from this place, where one would expect the recapitulation of earlier statements, to see if the confession that Jesus is the Messiah is not being referred to in the news given earlier from the mouths of sick people seeking help or other persons from the people, then one really finds, apart from what the demons are said to have brought forward against Jesus' will (Mark 1:84.25.34.), that Jesus is the Messiah. 1:84.25.34. 3:11. 12. 5, 7. 8.), no such confession is found in Mark, and when Matthew makes such a confession, the text of Mark always deviates from it. See n. 23. Matth. 14:32. Mark. 6:51. n. 25. Matth. 15:22. - Mark. 7:25.; in both passages Mark does not have the predicates: Son of God, Son of David. Likewise n. 14. Matth. 12:22. (compare Mark and Luke). So also Matth. 9:27. is a narration from a later period, analogous to the story n. 38. and unchronologically placed in Matthew. - According to the passage mentioned earlier, Jesus asks the disciples more

631

b) Who they themselves think he is. - From this it must be concluded that Jesus could not have made a direct statement about his Messiahship earlier. However, we would not draw this conclusion if the same passage did not at the same time say"/that Jesus, in pronouncing his judgment, also forbids them to make it known to others. For from this one may well conclude

α) what Jesus forbade others (the disciples) to say aloud, he himself would have kept secret, or he himself would not have said it directly and assertively before, against the making known of which he now warns. This is also

β) because, if there had been explicit declarations of Jesus about the point before, the warning connected with it would not have occurred only here.

γ) The reason why Jesus forbids the opinion that he is the Messiah to be expressed aloud is because he does not want to enter into the intentions of the people, but to suffer and die. To enter into the intentions of the people alone had never been Jesus' will, and so the reason from which the prohibition now flowed had already taken place earlier.

(δ) The evangelical account, according to the type expressed by Mark and Luke, gives us to understand that Jesus, as soon as he began to work, avoided as far as possible the sensation, and far from expressing anything himself about his Messiahship, also prevented the demons from making their report of his personality known. (The passages have been quoted above).

ε) Jesus declares, according to the passage alluded to n. 28. that he could only present himself as Messiah in such a way that he would suffer and die. The account makes a new period with this declaration, because it was hitherto unheard of to the disciples. As one part of the explanation, which concerned suffering and death, expressly indicates that it was something completely new to the disciples, so the other part, which concerned the Messiahship, indicates that Jesus had not yet explained Himself about it, in that Jesus was first to inquire of the disciples what their opinion of Him was.

2) Now Matthew, as we have seen, also had the type of Mark and Luke, so that the content of the preceding passage can be inferred just as well from him as from them. He tells us here, together with those, that of the people whose opinion Jesus asked, no party was named as to whom he was the Messiah, which could not be said if this opinion had been expressed at some time or other, or if it had been Jesus' own demand that he should be regarded as the Messiah. We therefore have reason to declare that all the statements in Matthew in the front row of pericopes and before u, 28., by which the conviction of Jesus' Messiahship is said to be expressed, as well as those teachings from Jesus' own mouth which include the assertion that he is the Messiah, are interpolations made later in the original type, and all the more so if they are found in Matthew alone. Therefore, a later insertion in Matthew is

a) in n. 16. the parable Matth. 13:24-30. 36-52. (because of v. 41.) - We have already seen above that with this Matthew has filled a place he had left empty.

b) In n. 20. Matth. 10:22-24. 26 - 33. (Speeches which belong to later times anyway.)

c) Matth. 7:21-23. (compare Luk. 6:46.)

d) Matth. 11:25 - 27. Luke also gives these words a later date than n. 28. is, s. Luk. 10:17 -24 \*).

\*) Incidentally: One can also see here why Luke could not place the piece n. 28. as a travelogue of Caesarea close to the Tribulation if he wanted to include the account of the sending of the seventy, which he could not place before n. 28.

(e) In n. 14. Matth. 12:40 - 42. (Words of later date, see Luk. 11:29 - 32). It will not be objected here that Jesus had earlier called Himself the Son of Man, even according to

Mark, but rather in the passage just considered n. 28. will prove that this expression cannot be synonymous with the name Messiah. Just as little does the sending of the disciples mentioned earlier contradict our date. The mission of those sent forth was not to proclaim Jesus as Messiah, but only to call the people to correction and to heal the sick, because of the approach of the Kingdom of God (Mark 6:12, 13, Luke 9:2). Also the reply which Jesus (Luk. 7:12. f. ) to John contains only an indirect explanation, in that reference is made only to facts, and those which gave rise to the opinion among the people that Jesus was Elias or one of the prophets, and the following discourse of Jesus about John as the God-sent guide of the people (εμπροσθεν σου \*\*) is incorrectly understood if it is taken for a self-announcement of Jesus as the Messiah. All definite declarations of Jesus about His Messiahship are only introduced by n. 28 and follow (also in Luke) only after the opening made here. And so it is confirmed that Matthew has intervened in the "orderly series of pericopes, from several sides at the same time, and it was this

\*\*) This σου instead of μου (Mal. 3:1.) is not explained by the fact that Jesus changed the words in the quoted passage into an untruth about Himself as the Messiah (as Grotius interprets Fritzsche's commentary on Matthew), but because John is thought of as a signpost (Luk. 1:77. Matth. 22:32., cf. Jerem. 6:16-20. and above p. 629.), and thus the ideas of the God's forerunner and the people's wayfinder coincide, therefore that passage is compared with another, which at the same time contains an exhortation that one should follow the forerunner to be sent, namely with Exod. 23:20. f. (where also the εμπροσθεν σου occurs). In the following passage, Luk. 7:28, Matth. 11:21, Fride's commentary on Matthaüs gives a more correct, but still not quite correct, interpretation in comparison with the other interpretations. For ο μικρότερος is neither specifically Jesus, nor is the word in comparison with John, but the sense is: among the dead (i. q. εν τώ αιώνι τουτω) there is none greater than John (he who is great in mortal life is still less than He); in the kingdom of God, on the contrary (i. q. εν τώνι τουτω). q. εν τώ αιώνι τώ μέλλοντι) he who is inferior therein (who takes the last place among its citizens) is still greater than John. The parallel members must be thought of as placed against each other in this way:

(a) Subject:

α) ο μειζων εν γεννητοίς γυναικών.

β) ο μικρότερος εν τη βασ. τού Θεού.

(b) Predicate:

α) μικρότερος αυτού ἐστὶν -.

β) μείζων αυτού ἐστὶν.

634

3) the last thing we had to say about this series in Matthew concerning its arrangement.  
- If we now stand still here for the time being, in order to draw the sum total from the discussions we have had on the present point, the results we have obtained are as follows:

a) Just as it has been shown that those passages which Mark and Matthew alone have in common are original parts of the work sketched out in outline on the first table, because Luke also had them before him, so it has been shown concerning Matthew that he had the anterior series of pericopes before him in the same order in which Mark's Gospel presents them.

b) Just as the parts of the original work that belong to it had to be assigned to it, so also everything that does not belong to it had to be separated from it. But we took back what was original in content and order by the same act by which the later addition was separated.

c) If those pieces for the sake of which Luke left some others for Matthew and Mark alone, and those which caused Matthew to reverse the order of Mark and Luke, do not belong to the original type, then this is the direct and clear proof that Mark did not first gather or select his apparatus - from whose interpolation the Gospels of the Vine arose - from these. It was

d) we have spoken of the dual sections. But we have only explicitly mentioned those which Mark has in common with Matthew. For the completeness of the result, it is necessary that those of which Mark shares possession with Luke should also be mentioned.

635

Thirteenth Datum.

Those passages which Mark alone has in common with Luke as real parts of his Gospel are missing from Matthew's Gospel because they have been eliminated by the interpolations that were placed in their place or near them.

1) There are three of these pericopes:

a) n. 6,

b) an intermediate anecdote at n. 32. and

c) n. 48 - that is, only very few, because Matthew did not exchange the pieces for one another as Luke did, and when he included certain materials in the Gospel with or from the latter, he only used the material from the individual particulars, without taking into account its connection with the historical causes, as Luke had done. (There is no longer any mention here of the abbreviated passages in Matthew, which are found in longer form in Mark and Luke). That the first piece is missing from Matthew cannot surprise us at all, since, as we saw above, another - the Sermon on the Mount - has been put in its place. And how n. 48 could have been omitted from Matthew is just as difficult to understand, if we take into account the increased flow of words in n. 47.

2) Here we can only speak of those dual sections which are real parts of the Gospel of Mark, and so the number of them will only be reduced to two, since the second piece mentioned above, the intermediate narrative in n. 32. Mark. 9:38 - 40. bears too strong traces of obscurity. We have already described the piece above, p. 218, as inauthentic, and here we want to develop the evidence of its inauthenticity. The pericope is from Luke.

a) Does it belong to the play about the sending of the seventy, or to the work from which it is taken? The story of the election and sending of the seventy looks back to Num. 11:16.25. Moses' Spirit comes upon the seventy. - As Jesus himself by the Spirit of God casts out devils Luk. 11:20. so also this Spirit came upon seventy Luk. 10:28.29. Those seventy were καταγεγραμμένοι Num. 11:26. so also this one, Luk. 10:20. There a young man complains to Moses that two others who had remained behind in the camp, and had not gone out with them to the tabernacle, were also prophesying, and begs that Moses should forbid them: Illum. 11:26.27. But Moses answered, would God prophesy it all v. 29. The latter is the story of which we have here Luk. 9:49. 50. (Mark. 9:38-40.) the antitype. -

b) This piece has the same spirit as the recension given in Luke 14. There, too, importance is attached to the casting out of the devil, and it is presented as a matter in which one must take an interest, Luk. 11:23. Also, the statement of Jesus occurring here: "He who is not with me, let him not be with me. Also, Jesus' statement here, "He who is not with me is for us," is similar to that expressed here in Luk 9:50. The piece therefore belongs only to Luke. -

c) Luke has not the verses Mark 9:41. f. He has broken off the piece n. 32. with Luk. 9:48. and passes on to something else with v. 49. to which the following narrative Luk. 9:51 -56. is connected by factual order. (Both pieces give samples of John's zeal for Jesus.) Mark's verse following the first piece after Luk. 9:50. (Mark 9:41.) does not belong to Luke's pericope, nor does it belong to him. -

d) Is it probable that Mark added it to the piece n. 32. in the least? not at all.

α) Mark 9:37 and 41 belong together, and only in this connection is it significant.

β) That these verses belong together is also proved by the fragment Matth. 10:40-42.

γ) This connection is disturbed by the inserted story, and v. 41. no longer fits to what is inserted. (Instead of γάρ it should rather be δε.) Jesus speaks here of the merit of the reception granted to one of his disciples: why should the behaviour of one who is not against the disciples be mentioned here?

δ) The threefold, γάρ v. 39-41. betrays the interpolation.- Mark, v. 39. is also nothing more than a gloss on v. 40. and both verses do not fit together. (On the identicalness of the expressions: (For the identical expressions of doing deeds and casting out demons, see Matt. 7:22.) How did this interlude come into Mark? Perhaps it happened in the same way as the story of the adulteress in the Gospel of John. We must therefore dispense with this passage altogether, and only the two above remain as common property of Mark and Luke.

637

3) If Matthew also had the same pieces which Mark has in common with Luke, then it must become all the more undoubted that the work adumbrated on the first tablet was the basis of Matthew. And this result is made even more certain by the following datum.

Fourteenth Datum.

What Matthew has more in the way of historical information than Mark in the back row of pericopes (from n. 22 onwards) has no internal connection with the text which he expresses together with Mark, and stands apart from it as an addition.

1) The intercalated pieces are the following:

a) n. 23. Matth. 14:28 - 33. because

α) according to the common narrative (that of the archetype) the storm resisted the shipwrecked men Matth. 14, 24. and only subsided when Jesus entered the ship. Peter must therefore have known that the wind was ισχυρός before he attempted the dangerous passage.

β) v. 32. και εμβάντων αὐτῶν is a transformation of the words of Mark, Mark. 6:51. -

(b) n. 82. Matth. 17:24-27.

κ) The dispute of rank had occurred on the way. This is the basis, which only becomes the firmer if one holds against Mark's account the incorrect Matth. 18:1. (where already the question is incorrectly expressed). This being the case, what Matthew has introduced appears to be an imitation of the form given by Mark 9:33, 34,

ι) Matthew's anecdote also mentions a conversation that took place in the house before Jesus' arrival.

2) As in Mark Jesus precedes the disciples with the question, so here in Matthew.

β) The passage is placed here by Matthew because of its similarity to n. 32. Those who are not even children of the earthly kingdom are not to be vexed, just as (according to n. 32.) those who belong to the kingdom of heaven, even if they were as little children, are not to be vexed. -

638

(c) n. 39. Matth. 21:14 - 16.

α) it is more than too probable that Matthew would have had the narrative of the withered fig-tree before him in the same position against its surroundings in which it is placed in Mark, since at any rate the natural preceded the unnatural.



β) Matthew postponed the cleansing of the temple to the day of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, in order to be able to put up a similar hosanna as happened before the entry.

γ) The fact that aroused the displeasure of the priests is pushed into the background, but the analogy is maintained that those whose displeasure related to that fact are named as the same ones who would have lingered over the children's Hosian call.

δ) Matthew's account reveals itself as a compilation by heaping together too much for the same day. -

d) n. 52. Matth. 26:15.

α) The texts are so alike that, if the note added by Matthew were not Zuthat, it must have been omitted by the other speakers. There is far less reason to think of the omission than of the addition.

β) The switch-on operator proceeds here according to the same method as he shows elsewhere with switch-ons.

κ) He forms a conversation, as in n. 46.

β) When he has blown the text apart, he seeks to reattach the other end to the first. Hence here: από τότε as ch. 26:50. 55. 18:1. 12:1. cf. above p. 92. 93.

γ) Further on, where the story of the silver rings recurs, Matth. 27:3 -10. the intercalation makes itself still far more visible. The outer ends here are: Matth. 27:2. and 27:11. (Mark 15:1. Luk. 23:3.)

κ) The latter the switch-on presses on the former again, as if he had not wished to separate it from it at all. (Of course Jesus stood before Pilatus after he was brought before him).

β) The whole negotiation of Judas with the chief priests, and what they, after Judas had returned the money to them, discussed together about it, - all this is supposed to have happened in the meantime, while Jesus, who had been brought before Pilate, stood before him to hear the first question from him!

α) The high priests who accused Jesus before Pilate are said to be in the temple to receive Judas' money! As an aside, the interpolator of the origin of the name Blood Acre gives us a very different, but also much more contrived explanation, than Luke Cct. 2:19. (The effort of interpreters to amalgamate the two messages is but a vying with Matthew to make the improbable probable.) -

639

e) n. 56. Matth. 27:19.

α) v. 17. 18. and 20. are directly connected, and the original narrator did not want to give the description the form, as if Pilate had asked the question before ascending the judge's chair and this latter had to be mentioned as a special act. But if Pilate asked the question from the judge's chair, v. 28 does not belong here either. Nor would

β) Pilate's wife would have told her husband about her dream before he sat down on the judge's seat.

f) Matth. 27:24. 25,

α) Paul's commentary notes here itself: that Pilate should have called Jesus so publicly and emphatically a δίκαιος is in itself improbable.

β) The interpolator again endeavours with the compression of the fragmented text: 27:26. Hence τότε. By this τότε the interpolator intends to put the παρέδωκεν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ back into the connection with the pronounced σταυρωθήτω v. 23. which it had with the same before the interpolation. -

(g) Matth. 27:52. 53.

α) This anecdote has already been suspected by others as an interpolation. Fritzsche's commentary calls to it: male, quia in omnibus subsidiis isti versus leguntur - is then this a counter-reason? There is no mention of what is read in Matthew, but of what he has switched on the archetype. Parenthetically: μετά τήν ἐγερσιν αὐτῶν is the correct reading, but not αὐτοῦ (after their revival, as ch. 22:31. ἀνάστασις is the rising as an act). The interpretation: postquam eos αὐτός i. e. Jesus in vitam restituerat is impossible. - αὐτοῦ could only go to ἱεροῦ, and if it were to be referred to Jesus, the reserter must also have thought of this, that Jesus had torn the rocks. The N. L. does not suggest that Jesus raised others from the grave before his own emergence from the grave.

β) The original text ignores the whole anecdote. For it starts from what the centurion saw, whose gaze (according to Mark) was directed towards Jesus. Of course, he is said to have seen the earthquake in the text of Matthew, and the guardians are also said to have seen it (for which, however, the ἰδόντες is probably too weak - the formula of a writer who only makes notes on the paper without vividly enough imagining what is to be described. The ἰδόντες is made from the ἰδων of the original text, and this has quite a different object)-----

640

(h) Matt. 27:62-66. 28:4. 11-15. On the improbability of the fact itself, see Paul Comment. 3rd Th. pp. 879 - 890. We show here that the narrative was on.

α) The report, which closes with the burial of Jesus, mentions the women as spectators, because afterwards it is to be told what the women did after the Sabbath. Between their watching and their first performance there was nothing in the middle but the Sabbath, and the original report wants us to think of nothing else;

β) according to the interpolator, the chief priests and Pharisees were gathered together. So every time he interpolates something from them. Compare ch. 22:41. 26:3. 27:17. 28:12.

γ) Why the women come to the tomb, say the subtexts. Matthew, after the interpolated fact of the earthquake, imposes on them the intention of looking after the grave (whether it was still unharmed). But to which 28:5. is already not true: Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε (from the primal report),

δ) The main thing for the interpolator is to have a terrible phenomenon for the watchers, who are to be as if dead. With this he connects the appearance of the angel and the rolling away of the stone, so that the words of the original text are transposed with other words and woven into a completely different context. For compare Mark. 16:2. και - ἔρχονται (= Matth. 28:1. τῇ δε - ἡλθε ) ἐπι το μνημεῖον. v. 4. και θεωροῦσι (Matth. 28:1. θεωρῆσαι τον τάφον) οτι ἀποκεκυλισται ο λεθος εκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου (Matth. 28:2. και ἰδοῦ, ἄγγελος ἀπέκύλισε τον λίθον ἀπό τῆς θύρας) v. 5. - και ἐξεθαμβήθησαν (in Matth, v. 4. artificially referring to the watchmen: ἀπο δε τοῦ φόβου κ. τ. λ. On the υμεῖς and γάρ see above p. 309.)

ε) The artificial connection, however, does not want to succeed. For

κ) compelled to lead the narrative of ch. 28:ü - 8. with the original text, the interrupter must either leave the watchers lying dead for the time being, or interrupt their story, and take it up again only later, as happens in v. 11.

ב) The representation loses its naturalness. If an earthquake had really occurred beforehand, the women would not have endured the sight of the angel any more heroically than the guards did. Finally, in the case of the correspondence of the relations in the order of the sentences and in individual words, only one of the two can take place: either Mark and Luke's account is an abbreviation of Matthew's text, or the latter is an extension of the former; but according to what has emerged, the choice cannot be doubtful.

641

2) Now, what is a manifest insertion into the text expressed by Mark, that Mark is supposed to have removed from Matthew? - Certainly this opinion is too inconspicuous to merit further attention; the only marvellous, even incomprehensible thing is how it could ever have been put forward. Now, however, we still have something qus to clear up. If the work depicted on the first panel is to be regarded as an independent work, it must not lack anything essential. Therefore, the question still remains as to whether the prefaces which Matthew and Luke send before the parts of the common report synoptically presented in the first table have the same origin as the latter and were therefore first omitted by Mark, or not. According to the textual relationship, one and the same judgement is to be made about both prehistories, and so we now set this as the date for our question.

## Fifteenth Datum.

The prefaces which Matthew and Luke place in their Gospels before the beginning of the whole of the history described in the first table isolate themselves in the one work, as in the other, from that beginning as later additions, and are formed according to the expression of the writer who interspersed the original type in the Gospel of which they are a part.

1) Each of these two prehistories isolates itself from the beginning of the common account (n. 1. on the first table) in a special way. Let us consider

a) Matthew's.

α) The formula Matth. 3:1: ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐχθραῖς' looks back to a previous one. But if one asks which ἡμέραι is meant, or ought to be meant; one also immediately notes the gap between chap. 2:23. and 3:1. and feels the impropriety of the formula, by which it is to be filled up, and the connection established. Even if it were not certain in advance that the author of this prehistory is not the author of the message which begins afterwards from the Baptist (this is certain, namely, because Luke, according to his differently constituted prehistory, also begins afterwards from the Baptist, and both writers, according to their individual notes, could not have arrived at the same form of the following message without a predetermined standard) - even if this, I say, were not decided in advance; If this, I say, were not decided in advance, it would be impossible to think of the author of Matthew's Prehistory as the first producer of the account of the Baptist, because it is impossible to imagine that the writer would have continued his production with that formula in order to make the transition to what follows with it. But it is possible to imagine how a composing writer, who connected this prehistory to a given work, and especially the editor of the work of Matthew, who also connects the separate parts of the Gospel with such formulas (cf. 12:1. 13:1. 14:1.) - how he could be content with the formula mentioned here \*). However, the author who linked to the formula was still led to it by a special association with Jdeen. In his prehistory, he had the purpose of showing the prophetic prediction of the places which became the Saviour's abodes in the first days and years of his life, and thus accompanied Jesus to Nazareth along the lines of the prophecy. Here his message is terminated, and now what he has to say about John and Jesus himself, before he changed his place of residence from Nazareth to another, falls "in those days," so that his formula extends to the sense: "in those days

when Jesus dwelt at Nazareth, where, as I have just proved, he had to dwell," The prototype, however, does not mention John's appearance because of the subtle simultaneity with Jesus' dwelling in Nazareth. As for the

\*) Indeed, it seems as if Fritsche's commentary on Matthew 3:1 wants to argue with us about how the Matthaean prologue could be seamlessly connected to what follows, as he remarks that Matthew's mention of the forerunner of Jesus comes very naturally after other signs and pre-announcements of Jesus' Messianic dignity were mentioned. However, this transition, in order to avoid the inappropriate, is a very weak excuse.

a) John is not being placed in the same category as the signs and phenomena here.

b) The reason why John must be mentioned is entirely different; namely, it is because Jesus must be baptized and connect Himself to the precursor with purpose and effectiveness, as the archetype presents and requires.

643

b) prehistory of Luke and its connection with the earlier work, it is not a gap but rather "something intervening" that separates the two. For in coming to the appearance of the Baptist (from which the archetype begins), Luke, as if with the intention of marking more exactly the starting point of the story given for treatment, adds the determination of the time, which, if he had a type such as that expressed in the Gospel of Mark, he could not have put anywhere else than here. The determination of time is therefore the proof that a new thing began here \*), just as this new thing in Mark's Gospel is the first thing that is begun. (Luke always imitates the Old Testament way of presentation. Thus he had passages as models, such as Jerem. 1:1-3. 1:1-3. Incidentally, it is clear here that Luke is writing a text like Mark's. For when the word of the Lord is spoken to the Lord, the word of the Lord is spoken to the Lord. For when the word of the Lord was given to John, that he should appear, as Luk. 3:2. 3. says, the departure of John had already its definite cause, and there was no need of the rejection from another prophetic passage Luk. 3: 4 - 6, retained with Mark).

\*) But it does not follow at all, "that the beginning report of the Baptist's appearance was a single one, and that the time was determined by another than Luke, which Schleiermacher concludes in p. 62.

2) These prehistories bear the characteristic features of the writer's style and presentation, as expressed in the works in which they are found, within the Gospel, in his interpolations and deviations from the original type.

644

a) In the prehistory of Matthew, the author has

α) the intention of demonstrating the fulfillment of prophetic predictions. Similarly, the interpolator of the original type n. 7. (Here, in Matthew 8:16, the κακώς εχοντες [those who were possessed by demons] have been inserted to bring forth verse 17 [to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet].) n. 13. (Here, in Matthew 13:34, the words: κατ' ιδίαν δε ---- παντα [privately to His own disciples] have been omitted for the sake of the quotation from Mark 4:34.) n. 13. (Here, in the fragmented text of Matthew 42:16, the words, for the sake of the quotation, have been falsely connected, see above page 624.) n. 4. (Here, Matthew 4:13, the phrase εις την γαλιλαίαν [to Galilee] from the original text is unsuitably followed by και καταλιπών — νεφθάλείμ [and leaving Nazareth], as if Jesus had left Nazareth to go to Galilee, either the κατάλιπών [leaving] or the preceding εις την γαλιλαίαν [to Galilee] comes inappropriately in the text.) n. 39. Matthew 21:4-5. (Here, one can recognize the foreign nature of the interpolation from verse 2, compare with Mark and Luke. Also, the Hebrew text has been misunderstood.) n. 56. Matthew 27:3-10. (Here, an entire anecdote has been inserted, see above page 638.) Also compare Matthew 26:51-54. (Here, a speech of Jesus is inserted, and therefore, verse 55, which originally contains the words spoken by Jesus, has been modified by the interpolator into his own formula of citation.) Just as all these quotations are later inserted interpolations into the Gospel, the prehistory of Matthew is also such an interpolation.

β) Traces of the writing of the interpolator: Math. 1:20. ενθυμεῖσθαι (ch. 9:4. 12:25. 1:12. το ρηθεν διὰ κ. τ. λ. (4:14. 8:17. 13:35. 24:15. 3:3.) 1:24. εποίησε ως προσεταξεν αιιώ (21:6. 26:19.) 2:1 ιδοὺ after the genit. absol. (2:13. 19. 12:46. 9:18. 32. 28:11.) 2:9. εως εστήλ (24:39.) 11. ελθοντες εις την οικίαν ειδον (8:14. 9:23. 22:11.) 2:16. άπεστειλας άνειλε (14:10. 22:7.) 2:20. εγερθείς - και πορεύου (9:6.) 22. ακούσας ανεχώρησε (14:13. 12:15.) εις τα μέρη (15:21.) 23. ελθών κατώκησεν εις (4:13.)

b) in Luke's prehistory, individual pieces have

a) poetic structure and composition, like some in the Acts of the Apostles. Engclvisionen, whereby different individuals are brought in connection with each other: in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. 9. Ch. 9. Paul and Ananias, Ch. 10. Peter and Cornelius, here: Luk. 11. f. 26. f. Zacharias and Mary - also s. Luk. 1, 13. and 60. (Cf. S. G. Frisch: *utrumque Lucae commentarium de vita, dictis factisque Iesu non iam historicae simplicitatis quam artificiosae tractationis indolem habere*. Fribergae 1817.)

645

β) A special familiarity with the Old Testament diction is revealed in the presentation, and the tendency to imitate it. We notice this tendency in Luke also in the Gospel, where he deviates from the secondary speakers; e.g. in n. 49. ch. 21:22.24:26. n. 52. 22:3. - n. 53. 22:16. 30-32.

γ) One notices the skill of portraying psychological accuracy, i.e., introducing the speeches and expressions of the speaking characters in accordance with their external circumstances. Examples of this are the speeches attributed to Zacharias, Mary, Simeon, Elizabeth, and the acquaintances of Zacharias. But there are also similar descriptions within the Gospel, unique to our narrator Luke; for instance, in 4:16, where the Nazarenes are upset that their fellow townsman prefers to gain attention elsewhere rather than among them. In 5:1ff, there is Peter, who is persuaded to follow Jesus after being impressed by a miraculous catch of fish. In 7:1ff, the centurion in Capernaum measures Jesus' authority and power based on the effectiveness of his own words. In 7:36ff, there is the Pharisee who uses the ability to discern sinners as a criterion for prophetic infallibility. We should also consider the depictions of the Samaritan in 10:30ff, the Prodigal Son in 15:11ff, and Lazarus and the Rich Man in chapter 16.

δ) Traces of the manner of writing peculiar to Luke: 1:5. τίς ονόματι (10:38. 16:20. Act. 5:34. 8:9. 10:1.) 1:6. δίκαιοι ενώπιον του Θεου (comp. 1:15.75. 24:19. Act. 4:19.) 7. καθοτι (19:9. Act. 2:24. 45. 4:35.) 10. ηάν το πληθος του λαού (2:13. 19:37. 23:1. 8:32. Act. 6:2. 5. 23.7. et al.) τη ώρα του θυμιάματος (14:17. Comp. 22:14:) 15. πλησθήσεται πνευματος αγίου (1:41. 57. Act. 2:4. 4:8.31: u. a. comp. Luk. 4:1. Act. 6:8. 9:36. 11:24.) 20. αχρι ης ημερας (17:27. Act. 1:2. 2:19. 23:1. 26:22.) ανθ ων (12:3. 19:44. Act. 12:23.) 22. σπτασίαν εωρακεν (24:23. Act. 26:19 . ) 23. ως επλήσθησαν αι ημεραι (1:57. 2:6. 22. 43. comp. 4:2. Act. 9:23.) 27. εξ οικου Δαβίδ (Act. 2:36. 7:42. 10:2. 11:14 16:15.) 30. ποταπός ειη (1:6 same construction 8:9. 9:46. 15:26. 18:36. 22:23. etc.) 32, 35. υψίστου (absolute, as 1:76. Act. 7:48.) 44. εγενετο εις τα ωτα (comp. 7:1. Act. 11:22.) 1:45. μαχαρία η πιστεύσασα (10:23. 11:27.) 1:48. επεβλεπεν επί (9:38.) 1:64. παραχρημα (Luke's most frequent word) 1:65. πάντας τους ηεριόκούντας αυτούς (comp. 1:58. and



Act. 1:19. 2:14. 4:16. 9:35. rc.) 1:68. εθεντο εν τη χάρδία (9:44. Act. 5:4.) 1:80. ανάδειξες (comp. 10:1.) ημέρα ἀναδ. (comp. 9:51. 2:23.) 2:9. ἐπίστη αυτοῖς (2:33. 4:39. 24:4. Act. 4:1. 6:12. Act. 12:7.) 2:10. μη φοβείσθε ἰδοὺ γάρ (comp. 5:10.) 2:14. δόξα εν υψίστοις Θεοῦ (2:38. 19:38.) 2:20. αἰνούντες τον Θεον επι πάσιν οἷς ηχουον (19:37. 18:43. Act. 2:47. 3:8. et al.) 2:15. διελθεινεως (Act. 9:38.11:22.) ως απηλθον - οι αγγελοι (Act. 10:7.) 2:25. ηροςδεχόμενος την - 'Ισραήλ ( cf. 23:5.) τον χριστόν κυρίου (9:20. ) 2:45. υποστρεφειν (1:56. 2:20. 30. 45. 4:1.14. 8:37.39. 9:10. 10:17. rc. especially peculiar to Luke) 2:52. χάρπι παρά Θεώ (Act. 2:47. 4:33. et al.).

646

3) Matthew and Luke differ completely in their pre-announcements. Their agreement is only in general terms: Mary, who was engaged to Joseph, became pregnant by the Holy Spirit, and Jesus was born in Bethlehem and raised in Nazareth. Jesus was born in Bethlehem and brought up in Nazareth. But these individual circumstances are

a) are included in the circles of quite different, divergent stories. Within the Gospel, on the other hand, the two writers meet in certain accounts (those of the first panel), and give them in one form. Would the prehistory have turned out so differently under the hands of the two writers if these writers had borrowed it from one scripture just as they borrowed the contents of the first table?

b) The prehistory has been individualized by those evangelists who give it, according to each one's own presentation. Must we not conclude that it did not belong to the work from which both writers, notwithstanding their individuality, deliver the same thing, especially since Mark harmonizes with both only where the style of writing and manner of presentation prevailing in their prehistory does not show itself? - We have separated from the "first table" that which does not belong to it, and thus it has just been shown that from the starting point set up on it, that which precedes it in Matthew's and Luke's works must also be separated. Of course, now that we have spoken of the beginning of the whole that remains, we are also reminded of the conclusion of the same, and all the more so since, after the distinctions that are to be made here, no definite conclusion seems to remain for the simpler. The critical relationship of the homogeneous texts, however, also gives us a satisfactory datum, namely the following.

647

Sixteenth Datum.

At the end of the overall account, the text of the shorter work is merely interpolated; however, the other Gospels also offer special adaptations of the originally given material.

1) The shorter Gospel must have had a different ending, since it could not have ended with the words: εφοβουντο γάρ (Mark 16:8.), and it must have had a definite ending, since it lacks only a few things for complete closure. What is missing? After what precedes as a foreshadowing of the words quoted, it is nothing but the express report that the women carried out the angel's commission, and that the disciples then, according to the instruction they had received, went to Galilee, and the Risen One gave them his last orders here. The original report could not have contained more, and this becomes even clearer if one considers the contents of the Matthaean report after separating out what is included in it. Namely

2) here in Matthew, too, there is an insertion into the archetype, namely what?

a) The news of some of the tomb guards who came to themselves again (Matth. 28:11-15.), the continuation of an insertion that had already been made in the earlier parts of the general report (Matth. 27:61 - 66. 28:2- 4.), which has already separated itself from the original text elements above (p. 640.). As little as Mark had the beginning of this message, so little can his final account have contained the continuation of it,

b) Matthew mentions that Jesus himself appeared to the women hurrying back from the tomb (Matth. 28:9.10.). This is again only an insertion. -

648

α) In John there is something similar (chap. 20:11-17.); but the Synoptic account differs from the Johannine in that it has the women all go to the tomb, and they are told by the angel the definite message where the Risen One is to be found. (Only Luke changed the second point, as we shall see later). So this report seems to want to exclude the appearance of Jesus himself.

β) The message interpolated in Matthew lacks all vitality, and Jesus only repeats the words of the angel.

γ) In order to give room for the Lord's own speech, the interpolator changes the words: καθώς είπεν υμῖν (Mark 16:7.), because these do not suggest a repeated explanation from Jesus' own mouth, into the differently worded: ιδού, ειπον υμῖν.

δ) If Jesus appeared to the women according to the original account, would he not also have appeared to the disciples in Jerusalem? But Matthew's report says nothing about this, and he cannot say anything about it, if the disciples should have seen Jesus in Galilee,

ε) Matth. 28:9. ὡς ἐπορεύοντο and v. 11. πορευομένων αὐτῶν shows the usual manner of the speaker, when after intercalations he ties up the thread again, comp. 22:34. 41. 26:51. 55. 27:2. 11. This of the intercalation. Other is in Matthew change of the given expression according to the diction proper to the intercalation, as μαθητεῦν v. 19. (comp. 13:52. 27:47.) συντελεῖα τοῦ αἰῶνος v. 20. ( comp. 13:39. 40. 49. 24:3.) - τηρεῖν .... ἐντειλάνην v. 20. which seems to have regard to the constitution of Christian congregations, as 18:16 - 20. comp. 16:17 - 19.

3) Luke also made interpolations and changes.

a) If, according to the original account, the disciples receive the instruction to seek the Risen Lord in Galilee, this account does not allow the disciples to be weary of an appearance of Jesus, which would become Jerusalem to them. Luke, therefore, has exchanged the words of Jesus, of which the women are reminded by the angel, chap. 24:7., for others, and has also already suppressed from his report (Luk. 22:31. 32.) Jesus' own declaration that he would go ahead of the disciples to Galilee (Mark 14:28. Matt. 26:32.).

649

The appearances Luk. 24:13 - 48. and the news that Jesus led the disciples from Jerusalem to Bethany (v. 50.) are not part of the original report,

b) The account 24:13-32 (with which the following one is by the same author) is similar in its specific execution to the form of the accounts in Luke's prehistory, and to the other accounts of this evangelist compared to it above p. 645, and therefore stands out as its own from the parts of the common account.

c) Ch. 24:44-49. the discourse of Jesus is written according to Luke's manner of writing (μεῖνον - ὅτι 24:29. comp. 9:12. ἀπόλυσον -- ὅτι Act. 10:20.), also the fact of Pentecost is referred to in advance v. 49.

d) That Jesus should have given the disciples the last orders in their living room in Jerusalem, and only blessed them in Bethany, is an artificial representation.

4) The appendix of the Gospel of Mark from 16:9 onwards has already been identified by critics as spurious (see Fritzsche's commentary on Mark, p. 717 f., Schott's Isagoge, p. 94 f.). The significance of the following grounds for suspicion has been recognized:

a) It begins with the spurious addition of something new that does not take into account what precedes it and is not a continuation of it.

α) The message of the angel is completely ignored.

β) Mary Magdalene is introduced here as if she had not been mentioned before. Also,

γ) it is not evident how the characteristic identifying her is connected with what is narrated about her here.

b) The appendix uses expressions that Mark himself avoided in his Gospel, such as μετα ταῦτα, ἕτερος (v. 12), ὕστερον (v. 14), and the phrase "ἀφ' ἧς ἐχέβληται" which is foreign to him and found nowhere else but in Luke 8:2. Acknowledging this, however, we must object to the total rejection of the pericope and the appeal to critical authorities and testimonies. The following points should be considered:

α) The interpolation does not begin with the words "ἀναστὰς δὲ κ. τ. λ." (v. 9), but it must already include the preceding words "εἶχε δὲ αὐτὰς τρόπον κ.τ.λ." (v. 8). These words are meant to negate the claim that the women who came to the tomb said something, and they prepare and introduce the information that the news received by the disciples was conveyed differently. — As Hug already pointed out in his Introduction, Vol. 2, p. 289, this should be noted. Yet, it is all the more inexcusable that this has not been taken into account. For if this is upheld, what can the testimonies of old interpreters (Euthymius, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, Eusebius, and others) tell us, that the words following "ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ" (v. 8) were missing in some or many manuscripts? They can only demonstrate that the verses have been omitted for some reason (which these ancient interpreters themselves provide). It would be something entirely different if those ancient commentators were to tell us that the preceding words "εἶχε δὲ αὐτὰς — ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ" (v. 8) were missing in the manuscripts.

650

γ) The traces of the interpolated text can only be followed up to the end of verse 14, but not further. --- The report must have contained Jesus' instruction to the disciples, and the expression used in Mark 16:15 does not contradict the Evangelist's style. — For

κηρύσσειν compare 3:14; for πιστεύσας 1:15; for το ευαγγέλιον 1:15; and for κηρύσσειν το ευαγγέλιον εἰς κόσμον ἅπαντα compare 13:10, 14:9. — What is said here in verse 16 about a separation based on belief and disbelief is consistent with other passages (which have been placed elsewhere but originally may have been connected to the end of the Gospel narrative) where Jesus grants his disciples the authority to bind and loose. Thus, Matthew 28:20 evokes memories of 18:15—20, 16:17—19, compare John 20:23. The promise in Mark 16:18 can also be compared with the commission to the Seventy (whose mission in general may have occurred only after Jesus' resurrection), Luke 10:19. — Compare Luke 10:22 with Matthew 28:18. — The Seventy are comparable to the seventy elders of Moses, and in Luke, they are attributed the power to resist Satan victoriously. Compare this with Mark 16:17, 18, and one should not be surprised that in the latter passage, another characteristic of inspiration, the gift of speaking in new tongues, is mentioned. The expression: ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος κ. τ. λ. (v. 19) cannot be found inappropriate, regardless of what Fritzsche's commentary on Mark says (p. 747). It is the conclusion of the whole narrative, and it is natural for an author who, full of the idea of Jesus' dignity, begins his writing with: ἀρχὴ τοῦ ευαγγελίου — υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 1:1) to be immersed again in the same perspective at the end. Finally, who could take offense at the words: ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 19)? (Contrary to Fritzsche's commentary, p. 749.) The Evangelist knows what has happened without claiming to have seen it himself or through someone else. It is a teaching of the Gospel that Jesus is now seated at the right hand of God. Now, this sitting must have had a beginning! When should it have taken place? Undoubtedly after the resurrection! Would the Evangelist have done better if he had ended the narrative by saying that Jesus disappeared? His statement should be no more surprising than: ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (Luke 5:25; Matthew 9:7), for in both cases, only the terminus a quo, not the ad quem, is mentioned. — Based on all this, it is our critical judgment that the conclusion of Mark is not entirely spurious but rather interpolated, just like other pericopes in his Gospel, although all colophons contain them. Before verse 15, the notice still found in Matthew 28:16, 17 has been displaced, because the interpolator replaced the appearance of Jesus on the mountain in Galilee with other appearances that were supposed to have taken place in Jerusalem. — The shorter work was, therefore, a complete unit. — Thus, our question has been discussed, and we do not need any further evidence to prove that the series of narrative pieces ordered from the first table constituted an independent work before its incorporation with the materials of Matthew and Luke. We would like to make one more observation at the end of the discussion.

## Seventeenth Datum.

The way in which Matthew and Luke have mixed the simpler work as a whole with other materials, and changed the connection of its parts, corresponds to the method by which the content and expression of particular pericopes have been changed by them.

652

1) Matthew and Luke, as we have seen,

a) have rearranged the sentences of certain pericopes in order to connect them with other things. This is

α) done in Luke in n. 1 (p. 455), in n. 13 (p. 585), in n. 15 (p. 404), in n. 53 (p. 414 f.) and in the Passion (p. 545).

β) Matthew gives examples in v. 20. (p. 355.), in n. 24. (p. 577.), in n. 46. the conclusion (p. 575.). Concerning the last part we want to answer the question raised above (p. 247), how it came about that in n. 46 Matthew changed the question about the Christian scholars, how they could call the Messiah only by the predicate: Son of David (see Mark and Luke), into a question to the Pharisees. Matthew, in fact, abbreviated n. 45. He did not want to let the Pharisees speak with the insight how Jesus had explained Himself correctly about the main commandment. The conclusion therefore: Mark. 12:34. they did not ask Jesus any further, he appends to the following passage, and from it gives the explanation that they did not ask any further, because they had not been able to answer. He combines both pericopes in n. 45 and 46: The Pharisees gathered together to ask Jesus (Matth. 22:34.), and: Jesus asked the Pharisees how they were gathered together (22:41); whereby the artificiality is already noticed, though it is not seen that the question itself, as it is put in Matthew, could have caused the Pharisees no difficulty at all. - This in passing. Another example is n. 33 (p. 580). Here, too, we want to add the reason why Matthew changed the position. The report says that the disciples, after he had given his explanation to the Pharisees, asked the Lord about it and received an answer. Now, however, Matthew's referent to the answer given in Mark (10:11.12) is another - less probable one (a healing of the celibate, with the suggestion that special insight is needed to imagine abstention from marriage as a sacrifice made to the kingdom of God (Matth. 9:10-12.), and he includes it in the preceding explanation given to the Jews. It is inserted by means of a λέγω δέ υμῖν (v. 9.), which was best introduced when what Moses had commanded was immediately preceded (Matt, v. 8).

653

- The author has therefore rearranged in order to add an insertion. This is added to p. 580. - Now, just as the extending writers made alterations to the pericopes and within them, they also altered whole pericopes within the work extended by them - Luke the passages n. 14. 14. 15. 16. n. 21. then n. 28 - 31. which, in order to bring in the sending of the seventy, he moved out of their temporal context, - Matthew several pieces in the preceding series of pericopes and n. 40. The method is thus the same.

b) Both writers omitted sentences from the individual pericopes, as shown above. In the same way, they have omitted entire pericopes from the original script: - Matthew the passages n. 6.13. 48., Luke much more.

c) The writers expand, each in a special way, the individual pericopes and the work as a whole, according to the same method. - Just as the Matthaean text editor

a) seeks to complete the individual sentences grammatically, he also completes the pericopes by adding elements from other pieces (see above p. 413); and in the same way he expands the work by adding similar things to similar things. - How he

β) in the individual pericopes, especially in the speeches mentioned, he gathers together what has been spoken by Jesus in a similar way, even if at different times, or what is related in content to the material; so he has also expanded the work as a whole mostly only by the insertion of speeches and parables, and has excluded historical matters only because of the speeches connected with them, and because he could place these speeches in factual order with others. (Thus before n. 11. the speeches ch. 11:2-30. [s. p. 629.], the appendix to n. 41. and 8:5---13.)

γ) As he has only inserted speeches into the individual pericopes, and omitted from the inserted ones the historical causes, so as not to make them into special pericopes; so also, according to the same method, he has so incorporated his new materials into the whole work, that they are carried by the pericopes--which originally belonged to the work--as appendices, or as introductions to them, or as fillings of their contents. (He proceeded in this way differently from Luke.)

δ) As he attaches Old Testament citations to particular pericopes (p. 16., which have appeared as interpolations p. 644.), so he has prefixed to the whole work a narrative of those circumstances from Jesus' earliest years which could be connected with Old Testament prophecies. - But Luke also remains faithful to the method by which he gives the individual texts a special form. He places

α) material provisions in the texts (see p. 546. f.) and, where a historical whole, such as the history of the Passion, is given, interpolates special notes. In this way, he expands the whole work by trying to enrich it with additional information - with news, let us say. He has therefore also

β) he has retained the historical information about the external causes of the speeches in the intercalated passages, or he has designated these speeches as special historical moments, not excerpted them, as Matthew did, in order to weave the material into the pericopes of the original text. The interpolated pieces are special to him, not amalgamations.

γ) Luke, as we have seen, avoided tautologies in the individual pericopes and reduced the expression to the simplest. He also followed this method in the expansion of the original scripture as a whole. By including other pieces, he omits from the pericopes of the original text those which must be left out if the same thing is not to occur twice and tautology is not to arise.

2) We would not have been able to make all these observations if we had been deterred from applying criticism by the assertion that Mark epitomized his fellow evangelists, and that the latter were harmonized through a flexible legend, a carefully meditated tradition, or a written legacy (the απομνημονεματᾶ) attributed to so-called authorities. - Now that the question has been discussed, we summarise the result in the following main propositions:

a) The first table is an independent work.

b) This work has been mixed with other materials by Matthew and Luke,

c) Both writers have shaped the individual texts of the original here and there according to their own style of writing and presentation (sometimes expanding the sentences, sometimes shortening them, sometimes expressing them in other words), and they show a tendency to shape the expression according to the diction that prevails in the pieces they have inserted into the original.

d) In order to link the pericopes of the original text with other material, the expanding writers had to make changes to them, each according to his own plan.



α) in the order and position of the pieces,

β) in the linking of their coherence

κ) by the prefixing of special links Sfvrmrln,

υ) by abbreviating the pieces (p. 583. 607.),

λ) by altering the closing formulae,

τ) by transpositions,

η) by covering up and supplementing the gaps made, - for which they made use of the following means

aa) the contraction (of two pieces into one: Matth. n. 21. and 22. n.45. and 46. Luk. n. 22. and 28. n. 30. and 31.),

bb) certain formulas or notes (Matth. 9:8. 8:34. 9:13. 12:16. Luke inserts formulas as stopgaps between the texts: 8:1---3. 9:36.45. 48. 18:34. 21:37.38. 22:3.), or

cc) the reshaping of the given words: Luk. 4:42.43. 8:21. 9:9. 11. 20:40. 22:52. (altered indication).

e) Mark has nothing of what in the secondary writers is the result of individual textual editing, and is connected with the peculiar arrangement of the original writing; and this is the last and most telling of the proofs that he did not draw from those. - We have here

f) aN the order and number of the pieces an analogy to that which was presented above as the quantity of the individual texts.

α) Just as Mark's text has the appearance of being an extract from those texts because Matthew and Luke have inserted them in different places (p. 428), so his Gospel has the appearance of being an extract from the richer Gospels because Matthew and Luke have inserted whole pericopes into the original text at different places.

β) As little as Mark composed his individual texts out of the interpolated secondary texts, so little did he compose his Scripture out of the New Gospels, since the subjective condition of the selection, i.e. the procedure that Mark must have used in doing so, is

neither conceivable as a cursory reading nor as criticism, but the objective relationship of the Scriptures to one another does not even allow us to think of the origin of the simpler work out of the interpolated works.

γ) Confirmed also by the quantity of the pieces - what was found above about the quantity of the texts: where Mark has more with one of the referents than the third, the third has omitted this, where less, the latter has included it.

656

3) Now we will take the liberty of drawing attention to the conclusions that can be drawn from our results, and thereby highlighting their importance.

a) It is clear that our writers did not work according to oral tradition, but had a written type in mind, and this is clear from the fact that they so anxiously endeavoured to bring their interpolations into relation with the original type, to supplement the gaps made in it, and to restore the disturbed balance of the various texts.

b) The cause of the original gospel is far from lost. No polemic against it can overturn the fact that the work of the first table was expanded by Matthew and Luke. The objections have force only against Eichhorn's modification of the hypothesis, but not against the true result of the criticism. In asserting a Protestant original, we do not presuppose either

a) an Aramaic original Gospel with several Greek translations and redactions of it, nor

b) an original Gospel, if by this we mean a standard of evangelical preaching, since we readily admit that the first preachers of the Word did not need one, and if such a Scripture had been the basis of our works, it would be difficult to understand how our writers could have allowed themselves to make so many changes to it. But we understand an original scripture as an attempt to give an orderly account of the main facts of the Messianic life and ministry of Jesus - a scripture, therefore, which on the one hand had its origin in the importance of the subject it dealt with, and on the other hand was intended to accomplish in form what could be done by the written account alone or in the best possible way, to preserve that which soon disappears from memory, to bring together in one overview that which in time united as a scattered succession into one result,

c) Did such a writing exist before our works? Luke says that before his work there was not only one, but several such writings. If, therefore, it is said that there is no trace in

antiquity of a primitive gospel, of an original gospel writing, this is either a clear and obvious falsehood, or the name primitive gospel is taken to mean something that is not at all relevant here.

657

α) Our Gospels are based on a simpler and independent work. The work has therefore existed. If one seeks a name for it, then, if the derived works are called Gospels, it too can be called a Gospel (the word taken in the ecclesiastical sense), and then relatively, i.e. in relation to those derived works, the basic or primal Gospel, even if it was not in itself the very first among the attempts to portray Jesus' life. It was an ordered diegesis, such as Luke himself intended to provide, a whole.

β) There was such an original (even if not written by the apostles and for preachers of the faith); but smaller records of certain events and incidents from the life of Jesus, which would have been made after special enquiries, or in order to answer enquiries, individual reports, as Schleiermacher's critique of Luke takes them as a basis, such did not exist,

κ) The version of the individual Gospel narratives proves this itself. They are parts of a whole, and therefore have neither the historical circumlocution, nor the beginnings and conclusions, which they would have to have if they had been written separately.

Luke knows no such individual essays, but only larger attempts to form a narrative from the facts from the beginning, so that what is formed is a whole.

λ) The sources of the information, according to which the authors of the story were guided, were not people who had first inquired of others, or who had written out what they had inquired about in Galilee, but - the apostles, and among them those who had been servants of the Word from the beginning, that is, from the point from which the report, if it was to become a whole, had to begin.

γ) But why has this primal gospel disappeared without trace? About the talk! has it disappeared? is it not in Mark, in Matthew, in Luke? (The objection is no more clever than if it were said: How can Luke say that many before him have made such writings, if they are no more? Would they have been able to perish without trace and not still exist?)

δ) That our writers have expanded such a work cannot be strange. Does Luke say that he must copy the works of his predecessors, or is he to be blamed for not doing so? We see, rather, that historical data also agree with our critical results. But in addition to this

c) the character of our works in general (cf. p. 172, f.). Before Matthew's and Luke's works there were no others of a similar kind, in which the original writing had been so mixed with foreign matter. Where, therefore, we find Tertian quotations with such textual elements as are intercalated in Matthew, or with formulas such as he implanted in the pericopes because of their special position and connection, and which thus have the whole plan of the Matthaean work as their condition, the quotation is nowhere else than from Matthew. And so it can be proved with certainty that Justin Martyr, for example, quoted from Matthew. In the same way, it can be shown that Marcion had no other work than the work of Luke as a model, since he likewise does not have the pericopes which Luke exchanges for others, and has the transpositions which in Luke are the result of special interpolations. - From our investigations it also follows

d) What is to be looked at, if a disaster is to be pronounced on the purpose of our individual evangelists. We are not to look at what they have in common, for the plan of the original is quite independent of them, but we must examine what they intended by their extensions of the original (partly according to the nature of the materials they included, partly according to the way in which they added them to the original). Finally, e) how our writers are to be treated, if one wants to get to know their spirit. They must be considered synoptically, not each independently for itself, not the individuals as if that which is not their production, the common, were at the same time with the particular, (which perhaps their production is not either), thus the interpolated with the interpolation, the interpolator would have as its first author. The spirit of the writers can only be recognised by what is peculiar to them. We therefore declare that commentaries which do not treat our three evangelists synoptically are in vain, just as we declare that every attempt to solve the problem of the harmony of the Gospels is in vain which does not decide on all three Gospels at the same time, but (like Schleiermacher, Saunier and others) only adheres to individual evangelists. - These are the results of our investigation at the present point. But the synopsis is not yet exhausted, as certainly there is still one question left for us to discuss, namely:

It is obvious that, if a decision is to be made on this, the peculiarities of this evangelist must be given special consideration. We will now examine these, and among the data that remain to be established, we will leave out the most important ones.

#### First Datum.

Wherever in Mark there is a narrative piece in a form different from the two side pieces, the presupposition can be asserted that the secondary evangelists had the same piece before them according to the same version that it has in Mark.

1) The pieces in which Mark's account differs most are n. 1. 3.13-15. 16.21. and 22. n. 30. n. 31. - they are therefore the ones that come into consideration here. With regard to n. 1. we refer to what has been said about it above p. 454. 583. Concerning n. 13. we have discussed it on p. 584 and p. 624. On n. 14. see p. 452. f., on n. 15. see p. 573. f. Matthew, as he still preserved the position of n. 44. and 15. must have had both pieces also in the connection in which Mark sets them up (since he also demonstrably had the passage Mark 3:7. 8. 10-13.). - The Sermon on the Mount in particular caused the disturbance of the order in Luke as well as in Matthew. - In n. 16, Matthew and Luke have demonstrably changed (as has been shown above in the examination of the passages). It has also been shown above that the parables of Mark. 4:26 - 29., the Matthaean, 13:24 - 30. with its interpretation 36 - 54. is only a later insertion (see p. 632.). The same is evident on other sides. If the parables, as Matthew and Mark indicate, had the purpose of giving the listeners, especially Jesus' disciples, food for thought, and Mark indisputably expresses the meaning of the original narrative quite correctly by saying that Jesus found the disciples' lack of understanding disconcerting; So we can have no other idea about the original version and form of the whole account than that the parables which this account has set up after the parable of the sower as similar samples of presentation will have had auck among themselves and a kinship with this parable. In Mark's account it is indeed so. The first parable (of the sower) speaks of the scattered seed, the second of the unnoticed, gradual growth, the third of the growth of a tree: - in all of them the kingdom of God is thought of as a becoming, developing, gradually spreading. Now, like the first, Matthew also has the third similitude. When he now sets up a second one, which is quite heterogeneous, inasmuch as it conceives the concept of the kingdom of God quite differently, according to the idea of a judgment and a separation of the good from the evil, just as the compiler also elsewhere in intercalated parables represents the kingdom of God as judgment and retribution, e.g. ch. 25 - is it not evident that here in his representation the order of thought has been interrupted, and something else has been substituted for what was

originally given? - Nor does the parable of the leaven (Matth. 13:33.) belong to the other parables. If it be not conceded that it does not belong to them, as it does not stand here in Mark; we must only use the words ἢν λαβουσα κ. τ. λ. with the words of v. 31: οὐ λαβών - αὐτοῦ, in order to convince oneself that, as these last words are inserted from Luke (see above p. 462.), so also the similitude of the leaven is borrowed from Luke. - n. 22. the remark Mark. 6:31. is peculiar, but also perfectly in accordance with the circumstances, that the disciples had returned from their journeys, and that they had come to Capernaum, and that Jesus departed with them by ship; and it will be all the less possible to deny that Mark has the original, since Matthew and Luke have altered the account. - n. 30. Mark's narrative is much longer and more circumstantial than the parallel accounts. But the secondary narrators must have had the longer form before them. From what does this appear? Namely, one notices:

661

a) Here again is a parallel to the Old Testament history, as we have already noted above p. 584. Moses appointed assistants to take his place, only the heavier things were to be brought before him (Exod. 18:26.). It is further said (Exod. 24:13.14.) that Moses ascended the mountain with his servant, and left the seventy elders below with Aaron and Hur, that whosoever had a matter might apply to them. On the seventh day, it says at last, v. 16, the voice sounded from the cloud. It will be no trouble to discover the same features in the narrative reproduced - in our Gospel n. 29. and 30. Jesus climbs the mountain only with his most trusted disciples, leaving the others behind, and whoever has a request, like the man with the epileptic boy, must turn to them. - On the seventh day (cf. μεθ ημερας εξ - Luk. 9:28. has therefore the original no longer!) - it was when the shining of the light was perceived on the mountain, and the heavenly voice sounded from the cloud. - The helpers whom Jesus had ordered were only to bring the heavier things before him. Here was such a thing, and it had to be brought before Jesus. There, in the exemplary report, it is told: Moses, as he came down from the mountain, heard afar off shouting and tumult in the camp, Exod. 32:17. Something similar happens here, according to Mark 9:14. One more thing! Moses has reason to complain about what happened during his absence. So Jesus has to complain that His constant presence is required (Mark. 9:19.).

662

b) But the Gospel account excuses the disciples with the fact that what had been demanded of them in Jesus' absence had been too difficult for them.

α) Jesus' own words, which express the acknowledgement of the difficulty, are mentioned by Matthew and Mark. (Only in Luke they do not occur, because he omitted the question of the disciples Mark 9:28, in order to be able to connect n. 30 and 31). But what

(β) Mark presents the relation of the father even more circumstantially and explicitly than Matthew, that is by which the very difficulty of the case of healing mentioned is put into the light, and the meaning of Jesus' words is explained: - the boy had the evil from childhood; it was therefore ingrained, and to lift just such an evil (to cast out such a kind of demon) required an exaltation of the spirit, a stirring of the mind, such as in those days was not the business of the disciples, but of Jesus. Now, should that which explains the difficulty of the matter and only brings light into the narrative - the conversation in Mark 20-26 - not have been part of the original report? It will have been as good in it as the account in n. 18. Mark. 5:26-33. cf. Luk 8:43-47. is an original part of the account there (although Matthew has nothing of the specific account there). Luke at least begins the account in our passage (9:41). Matthew, again, has not even this beginning, though he may have taken from the omitted conversation the words: πολλάκις γάρ - το ἴδιον (Matth. 17:15. - Mark. 9:22.) just as in the n. 18. mentioned the επιστράφεις (Matth. 9:22.) from Mark. 5:30. With the conversation referred to by Mark, especially with the words Mark 9:23-25, compare Luke 17:5 f., so that we may not be surprised that it is missing in Luke's present place. The passage of Luke thus just quoted is used in Matthew, and hence Matt. 17:20. 2t. an amalgamation of two unrelated answers has been formed, as 9:13.11:5.6.16:3. 4. etc. - Now only a little remark! As Moses came from the mountain, says the exemplary history, there was something awe-inspiring in his countenance: και εφοβήθησαν ἐγγίαι αὐτῷ Exod. 34:29. 30. The same trait s. here in Mark's account (9:15.) πας ὁ ὄγλος-εξεθαμβήθη - words, then, which, as parts of an account which, according to its whole arrangement, parallels that Old Testament history, are original parts of it, and will be missing in the other relations only because they have been omitted. (Already Euthymius and more recent authors, such as Heupelius and others, have noted this parallel). - Another piece: n. 31. and 32---Even here the peculiar prefaces of Mark in 9:30. 31. and those in v. 33. belong together, and are founded in the essence of the pieces. Jesus returns to the speech of his future destinies because he declares, before setting out on his return journey to Galilee, that he will pass by there entirely incognito. And precisely because he is willing to do this, he goes after the disciples and arrives in Capernaum alone without them (v. 33.). The latter is now also confirmed by the Matthaean interpolator (likewise stating that Jesus came later than the disciples) 17:25. Only the remark Matth. 9:30. οὐκ ἠθέλην - γινῶ he suppresses, because the question to the disciples should arise, whether Jesus wanted to pay the census Matth. 17:24. - That Luke changed these pericopes (because he inserted the sending of the seventy into the Gospel), has been noticed earlier. - From

all this we see at the same time that the often-used objection that if Matthew and Luke had had before them such a text as Mark's, they would not have omitted this and that, is quite empty and void. All the deviations of these writers from the text of Mark are due to the enrichments with which they have endowed the shorter Gospel as a whole. - Among Mark's specially designed pieces is n. 3. The shorter narrator is said to have omitted the story of the temptation. Yes, if it were history, and it could be proved that it belonged to the original writing because of its similarity to the pieces of the first table, then we would believe the pretence. But in the work of the first table we must look for nothing more than the news that Jesus was somewhere after his baptism and before he appeared in public (which happened only after John's arrest). Of John the Baptist himself, before he appeared, it is said (Luk. 1:80.), he was in the wilderness until the time of his appearance. So it is also said of Jesus. Is anything further required? We have, however, given examples of how the Gospel narratives are poetically formed according to similarities with Old Testament history, namely the story of Elijah. Thus, Jesus is mentioned here as living with the animals (in the wilderness) and being fed by the angels. But the original account will have been content with this. And really, the story of the visitation is only a connection.

664

α) According to Matthew, the devil tempts the hungry Jesus before the arrival of the food-bringing angels. But the story ignores that Jesus, in order to receive the food from the angels, must be in the place where he needs it, in the wilderness, and must be in the state that is to be changed by the angels until then. For if the acts of temptation follow one another in the order in which Luke arranges them, Jesus will be brought to Jerusalem, and the extraordinary feeding at the end will be omitted. If they are arranged as Matthew, in order to refer back to the original text, places them, then the beginning, that the tempter takes the occasion for the temptation from Jesus' hunger, fits this, but not the following, after which the scene changes for the temptation, and the occasions become completely different, without any indication being given as to whether Jesus' first-mentioned condition remained permanent. -

β) In Luke, the remark that Jesus was tempted by the devil for forty days precedes the description given of the temptation, as if the temptation described, which is supposed to be proof that Jesus was tempted, only followed the temptation. - Both writers thus link the story with the original account in different ways.

γ) But are there not words in Mark's text that must be from Luke? They are there, but precisely because they are from Luke, from whom Mark borrows nothing, and can borrow nothing, they are inserted into Mark by another hand, and this is confirmed, if



one does not want to believe it, by the twofold και ην. - For Mark's manner of writing is not so unconnected and irregular that one could also impute to him the manner of writing which presupposes thoughtlessness. - It is more likely that the interpolators were clever enough to transform Luke's expression διαβόλου into one appropriate to Mark's language - see Mark. Mark. 3:23. 4:15. - to the language of Mark.

665

2) So much about the pieces that Mark gives in his own form. We not only use them to prove that Mark did not draw from the others, but they are for us the original that the others had before them in this form. And we now support this judgement on other data.

#### Second Datum.

In Mark's Gospel, the individual pericopes have the appropriate relationship to each other in form and setting, and in quantity to the whole, as they must have if the details of the account are to be by the writer who arranged the whole.

1) The Gospel of Mark gives

a) the passages with the same precision.

α) It presents only facts, and it refers to speeches only in relation to past, present or future events, that is, only in a historical context (there are no practical religious teachings, such as those compiled in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount).

β) The speeches are short, and only as much of them is given as is necessary to make their connection with the historical occasion clear. All the examples show this. n. 1. The Baptist says nothing more than how he characterises himself as the forerunner of the Messiah. n. 3. No poetic story of temptation, but merely the fact: Jesus was in the wilderness, and his stay there was miraculously prolonged. n. 5. Nothing more than Jesus called the fishermen, n. 6.7. No teachings of Jesus, but only the fact: Jesus went to Capernaum and was supposed to stay there, but went on, n. 8. Words of Jesus, only to present them as not followed. n. 9.-12. Short words, which put the Pharisees to shame. Just such n. 14. - n. 15. also a short answer. - 16. parables as samples of the parabolic teaching method. 17. and 18. facts, 19. words which show that Jesus could not work in Nazareth. - 20. Sending of the disciples, and what the sent ones have to observe concerning the journey, 24. The Pharisees put the word of men above the word of God, and of this only one example. - 28. Jesus' declaration of His personal dignity, in

so far as it differs from other opinions, and refers to future events, 29. 30. Facts. 32. do not disown one another! - n. 33. Marriages should not be separated, n. 34. Children are the most suitable for the kingdom of God according to their sense, ( n. 35.) Rich people are the least suitable according to their circumstances. n. 36. The Messiah must suffer. His sacrifice of life sets an example of humility for the proud of rank (n. 37), just as it points out the goal of striving to the one who wants to become great. - 38. 39. Facts. - 40. a fact and the fulfilment of the word factually presented, 42-47. short answers to questions put, 48. a fleeting utterance at a perception, 49. hints for the disciples concerning their future experiences. (The attached exhortation, which goes beyond general morals, says nothing but: Watch!) n. 51. Justification of an action, in so far as it points to a future event. (For the sake of history, the act of Matta has value, not, as in Luke, because the woman thereby shows love.) n. 53. A celebration, represented as the last, and pointing to future events. - The rest is history, told according to its main moments. - Jesus thus speaks everywhere in reference to history, present or future, and as much as the circumstances cause to be said. - The digression into general religion and declamation, as in Matthew and Luke, is not found here. (The verses: Mark. 11:24-26. must be called interpolated, v. 25. ὅταν — κατά τινος must have stood before Matth. 6:14. and there fallen out of the text). - At the same time, when comparisons are made, it will be seen that those copies of which it was said above that Luke exchanged them for other pieces, are by no means so conformable to the type now under consideration as the other copies given for it.

666

b) Most of these pieces are double pieces and compound. Thus n. 1. and 2. - n. 5. - n. 7. α (Mark 1:29. f.) β. (v. 36. f.) γ. (v 35. f.) - n. 9. & 10. - n.11. & 12. n. 13. α. (Mark 3:7. f.) β. (v. 13. f.) - n. 14. and 15. - n.16. (Instruction of the people and private instruction of the disciples.) - n. 17. α. (4:35. f.) β. (5:1. f.) n. 18. α. (5:21. f.) β (v. 25. f.) - n. 20. and 21. -- n. 22. α. ( 6:32. f.) β. (7:45. f.) n. 24. α. (7:1. f.) β. (7:17.) - n. 25. α. (7:24. f.) β. (7:31.f.) - n. 27. α. ( 8:11. f.) β. (8:13. f.) - n. 28. α. (8:27. f.) β. (8:32. f.) - n. 29. α. (9:1. f.) β. (9:11-13. Here find the verses displaced by a mistake, since after γίγρᾱπται ἐπὶ v. 13. the words: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ - ἐξουθενωθῆ of v. 12. must be put after the words: καὶ πῶς γεγρᾱπται v. 13. - have been obliterated. Cf. also Fritzsche's commentary on d. St.) n. 30. α. (9:14. f.) β. (9:28. f.) - n. 31. and 32. α. (9:33. f.) β. (9:43. f.) - n. 33. α. (10:1. f.) β. (10:10. f.) - n. 34. and 35. - n. 36. and 37. - v. 38. and 39. - n. 40. and 41. - n. 42 a. to n. 49. (Speeches of a day.) - n. 50. to end, historical context. -

667

c) The speeches are artificially formed and have the same layout:

α) short refutations which take up or come back to the word to be corrected, e.g. n. 9. Opponent: 2:7: τῖς δύναται -- ὁ Θεός; with this compare 2:10.: ἵνα δε εἰδῆτε - αμαρτίας. - n. 10. 2:16. τί ὅτι - μετὰ των τελωνῶν κ. τ. λ. comp. v. 17. τους αμαρτωλούς. Further, v. 18. - ου νηστεύουσιν; comp. v. 20. τότε νηστεύουσιν. - n. 11. 2:24. τί ποιοῦσιν - cf. v. 25. τί ἐλποίησε κ. τ. λ. - n. 12. 3:2. - εἰ θεραπεύσει ἐν τοῖς σαββ. cf. v. 4. ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἐν τ. σαββ. - n. 13. 3:22. - ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμ. comp. v. 23. πως - ἐκβάλλειν; and v. 30. - n. 15. 3:32. ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου κ. τ. λ. comp. v. 35. - n. 24. 7:5. διατί - των πρεσβυτερων κ. τ. λ. comp. v. 9. το κοινᾷς χερσὶ v. 5. comp. v. 15. - n. 25. the Phoenician seizes Jesus' word. 7:27. comp. 28. - n. 27. 8:12. Σημεῖον twice mentioned. So also 8:17. - n. 38. 10:2. comp. v. 9. - n. 34. 10:13. against rejecting and refusing admittance comp. v. 15. δεξασθαι and εἰσελθεῖν. - n. 35. 10:28. ἀφηκαμεν comp. v. 29. - n. 37. 10:37. ἵνα χαθίσωμεν κ.τ.λ. comp. v. 40. - n. 42 a. 11:28. ἐν ποία ἐξουσία κ. τ. λ. comp. v. 30. 33. - n. 43. 12:14. ἐξεστι δοῦναι - ; comp. 17. ἀπόδοτε κ.τ.λ. - n. 45. 12:28. 710 Το - ποῖα - πρώτη κ.τ.λ. comp. v. 29. (comp. v. 32. where Jesus' word is apprehended.) - n. 46. question: 12:35. comp. v. 37. - n. 49. question: 13:4. comp. v. 32. - n. 51. 14:5. τοῖς πτωχοῖς comp. v. 7. -

668

β) Especially artificial are v. 32 and n. 16. This parable is a composition of the writer. Since the people are not capable of the moral sense required for the kingdom of God, they are represented as not understanding images by which the coming into being of the kingdom of God is adumbrated. -

δ) The narratives of events like to juxtapose contrasting things, n. 7. All seek Jesus, but he does not stay, n. 8. Jesus inculcates the healed man not to say anything. But he spreads the word. n. 9. The word, which seemed to be blasphemy, Jesus justifies by deed. n. 12. - n. 12. The Pharisees lie in wait for reasons of accusation, and yet cannot answer when asked. - The storm rages. Jesus sleeps calmly. He rises and the storm is calmed. - The possessed man, whom no man could subdue, asks Jesus to spare him, and is brought to his senses. n. 18. The woman, whose evil no man could cure, is instantly healed by touching the garments of Jesus. Jairus' daughter was only near death when Jesus was approached for help. He raised her up again as she was already dead. - The disciples are to feed the people, and think that Jesus cannot be serious about it. And indeed he feeds five thousand with their provisions. - 38. The blind man is forbidden to cry out, but he cries out much more. - The tree from which no one is to eat in the future is withered the next day. -

ε) Regarding the relationship of the sentences to one another:

α) when it is said that something should happen, the fact that it happened is expressed with the same words; for example,

n. 5: 1:17, δευτε όπισω μου, compare v. 20, απήλθον όπισω αυτου,

n. 6: 1:25, εξελθε εξ αυτου, compare v. 26. - n. 7: 1:38, ίνα κηρυξω, compare 38, ήν κηρυσσων. -

n. 8: 1:41, καθαρίσθητα, compare 42, εκαθαρίσθη. -

n. 9: 2:11, εγειραι, 12, ηγερθη. Similarly,

n. 10: 2:14, n. 12: 3:5,

n. 13: 3:13, -

n. 17: 4:39, τω ανεμω, ο ανεμος. 5:12, εισέλθωμεν, 14, εισηλθον v. 19, 20 (compare Luke). -

n. 18: 5:23, ίνα — τας χειρας, compare v. 41, then: 5:27, 23, -

n. 22: 6:31, compare v. 32 (Luke shortened), also v. 37, δοτε and δωμεν (different from Luke and Matthew). -

n. 23: 6:56, -

n. 25: 7:26, compare 29:30. - But also 7:34, διανοϊχθητι, compare 35. -

n. 27: 8:12. - Similarly, 8:22, request, compare 23. -

n. 30: 9:19, 20. -

n. 34: 10:1, request, compare v. 16. -

n. 38: 10:49, also: 51, 52. -

n. 39: 11:2-3, compare 4-6. -

n. 53: 14:12, που — ετοιμάσωμεν, compare v. 15, 16. -

n. 54: 14:44, compare 45, κατεφίλησεν, 46, εκράτησαν. -

669

β) Before questions or expressions that are prompted by an external circumstance, in an introductory statement, the circumstance is mostly indicated just as the question or expression expresses it. For example,

n. 9. 2:6. ησαν διαλογιζόμενοι (they were reasoning), compare 8. τί διαλογίζεσθε (why are you reasoning) —

n. 10. 2:16. τί—εσθίει και πίνει (why do you eat and drink) — Likewise v. 18. —

n. 11. 2:23. 24. εν τοις σάββασι (on the Sabbath). —

n. 15. 3:31. compare 32. —

n. 16. 4:1. compare v. 11. τοις εξω (to those outside). —

n. 17. 5:11. compare 12. —

n. 18. 5:24. compare 31. —

n. 21. 6:14 —16. compare n. 28. 8:28. —

n. 22. 6:35. ώρα πολλή (late hour).

n. 24. 7:2. compare v. 4. κοιναῖς χερσὶ ἐσθίειν (eating with unwashed hands).  
 n. 27. 8:14. compare 16. —  
 n. 30. 9:14. οὐκ ἐβrought him), compare 16. —  
 n. 32. 9:33. and 34. διελέχθησαν (they discussed). —  
 n. 34. 10:13. ἐπετίμησαν (they rebuked) and 14. μὴ κωλύετε (do not hinder). —  
 n. 35. 10:17. προσδραμών (running up) and 21. ἀκολουθεῖ μοι (follow me) —  
 n. 36. 10:32. and 33. —  
 n. 41. 11:15. and 11. (If v. 11. had not preceded, then v. 15. would have begun: εἶδε τοὺς πωλοῦντας κ. τ. λ. -  
 n. 40. 11:21. and 20. —  
 n. 56. 15:11. and 7. —

γ) Of the verbis expressing the movement from one place to another, Mark usually uses praesens,

κ) in cases where the goal of the movement is already indicated beforehand, and the remark of the terminus reached is followed by something new. E.G. 1:21. 3:13. 20:31. 5:15. 38. 40. 6:30. 48. 9:2. 10:11. 46. 11:1. 15. 27. 14:17. 32. 37. 45. -

β) Of an unexpected coming to Jesus, whereby he receives a summons, esp. καὶ ἐρχεται or ἐρχονται, where the others put καὶ ἰδοὺ. E.g. 1:40. 2:3. 4:37. 5:12. 22. 14:43. or Matthew προσέρχεται. E.g. Mark. 2:18. 7:1. 10:35. 11:27. 8:22. 12:18. 5:35. 7:32. -

δ) The persons who appeal to Jesus for help for themselves or for others always indicate the method by which Jesus is to help: 1:40. - n. 18. 5:23. 28. - 0. 24. 6:56. - u. 30. 9:18. (cf. n. 34. 10:13.). But in the same way now also 7:32. 8:22. (Different are Luk. 7:3. 41. 8:41. 11:14. 13:12). By the way, compare what was said above on p. 457. f. Remarked. -

670

f) Mark does not refer back to the Old Testament prophecies as a writer, like the intercalary of Matthew, but only places the relationship to the Old Testament in the composition of the pieces. Thus n. 3. n. 13. 15. (see p. 574.) u. 22. 24. 25. 27. (p. 569.) n. 29. 30. (p. 661.) n. 39. n. 54. (p. 79.) n. 56. Likewise n. 1. (Mark 1:6.). Except his preface 1:2. 3. (But the citation from Malachias is not from Mark, but only that to which ἐν τῇ ἰρήμῳ v. 4. refers back).

2) All this gives evidence of the unity of the work and its harmony with itself,

a) One and the same piece has, sometimes in its form, sometimes in its content, various signs of similarity with other pericopes that differ from one another in content.

b) The setting and design of the individual corresponds to the setting and design of the whole, and vice versa. For

α) the individual pieces, whether they be orations or descriptions of certain facts, are expositions of a special theme which the writer does not himself indicate, but only allows to be divined from the construction of the piece. In the same way, the purpose and tendency of the whole work must first be guessed from the individual compositions, and the author only gives premises and materials for abstractions in the whole as well as in the individual. -

β) Just as the speeches are cited only because of their connection with historical circumstances, the author likewise wants to develop the result of the whole only from facts, or from historical moments, of whose reality and significance speeches bear witness. He has therefore

γ) he has also arranged the individual speeches and descriptions in such a way that the particular is subordinated to the general (linked by subject order), of which the individual parts of nos. 9- 12. (Jesus is beset by the Pharisees), further n. 22. - 27. (Jesus acts like Elijah) n. 23 - 31. (Jesus is as Messiah on the way to death) n. 32. and 33. (Sanctity of certain connections for the Messiah disciples) n. 34. 35. (Who is sent to the kingdom of God?) n. 42 - 49. are samples. A proof,

δ) that his work in general - according to the precision and brevity, according to the subordination of the specific to the general, according to the reproductions of Old Testament stories, as well as according to the way in which doctrine and history, the simple and the sublime, are combined in the description - is a work of art, both as a whole and in detail. (The pieces of the first table would not have been included in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke at all if they had not previously been combined in a work such as the Gospel of Mark. This being the case, we have only a few more appearances to explain. Mark has a few pieces of narrative to himself. We notice very well what could be concluded from this. But look at these pieces. They are quite similar to the others. That they are additions to another, interpolations in a closed context, is in no way to be shown. How, then, should these pieces be proof that the work of the first table lies outside of Mark? But perhaps this is already proved by other additions which are found in Mark in the individual narrative sections, especially those mentioned above p. 552 f.? These additions will be discussed in a moment.

## Third Datum.

The words or sentences that appear to be additions in Mark's text mostly belong to the explanatory prefaces and interludes to the narrative pieces. Of those which do not fit the construction of the play and its original parts - and there are many of them - it cannot be shown that they have Mark as their author. But of the genuine ones, too, it cannot be proved that they do not belong to the original type, because they are quite analogous to those subordinate clauses which in other pericopes the other two narrators either really express or demonstrably omitted, and where they are excluded from both neighbouring texts at the same time, this coincidence is usually accidental.

1) On the few additions in the speech texts, see above p. 463. Those in question here, see p. 552. f.

2) Even among the latter, many are not even eight. Eliminated from Mark's text already other critics have the insertion Mark. 2:26. ἐπὶ - ἀρχιερεως. 5:13. ἦσαν δὲ ὡς διςχίλιοι. 7:2. τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀνεπτοῖς. 7:8 βαπτισμοὺς - ποιεῖτε. 10:24. τέκνα - εἰσελθεῖν. 13:14. τὸ ρηθὲν κ. τ. λ. 15:28. καὶ ἐπληρώθη - ἐλογίσθη, (see Fritzsche's commentary on Markus at the passages). To which must be added the famous interpolation 16:9. s. and the citation 1:2. - The reasons on which, in the matter of these passages, criticism has based its definitive judgment are not both the otherwise so-called external reasons, but rather internal reasons, such as would apply if all the coäices also conspired to the retention of what is internally contradictory. Since our coäicos of Mark's Gospel have no decisive voice in such sightings, because they are for Mark. 16:9. and in n. 29. 9:12.13. all have a word displacement which distorts the text; it follows that, where in certain places internal reasons require us to make distinctions from the true text, these reasons must retain their weight just as well where the "coeicos" agree, as they should retain it where the disagreement of the latter is only, as is usually the case, accidental. (For the coä6. have the most important interpolations pretty much all, and where they do not have some, the absence, according to Datis, usually has another reason). - We have therefore ventured to call other such additions also unächt, - viz: 1:13. καὶ ἦν - σατανά. 3:6. μετὰ τ. ἡρωδ. 4:10. συν τοῖς δώδεκα. 6:9.- 6:37. δηναρ. διακ. (For according to v. 38. only ἀγοράσωμιν can be the essential.) 8:1-10. - 8:20. (Probably also v. 17. ἐτι - μνημονεύετε.) - 9:32. 35. 38.39. 10:16. ἐναγ-καλ. αὐτά. 10:31. (As 6:11. and 11:24 - 26.) 10:32. καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο - εφοβοῦντο. 9:6. ἦσαν γὰρ ἐκφοβοί. 13:14. ο ἀναγιν, νοεῖτω.

13:21-23. 32. ουδε ο υιός. 14:47. 51. 52. 15:24. και σταυρώσαντες αυτόν. 25. ήν - τρίτη. 15:42 επεί - προσάββατον. 43. ος και αυτός -- του Θεού. 16:8. είχε - εφοβούνται γάρ. - Those additions which are obvious copyist's errors are not even brought into play, as e.g. 4:31. όταν σπαρή (belongs only in v. 32.) 5:4. δαμάσαι - (belongs only in v. 3. ) 12:23. όταν ανάστωσι (belongs only in v. 25.) 5:27. έν τώ όχλω is perhaps also only from v. 30. - Besides these additions, however, several others (of the original type) are to be set apart. We list among them:

673

a) Certain names inserted in the text, such as: 10:46, υιός—βαρτίμαιος. If the name of the blind man should have been mentioned (for certain readers), then the fact that he was sitting begging would probably not have been particularly emphasized. From this expression, it is rather evident that only a blind man in general was meant to be indicated. Moreover, it would not have been said: ό τυφλός but rather: τυφλός ων (when he was still blind). The original text only had τυφλός τις. And this is also evident from v. 49. (For if the narrator had already mentioned the specific name of the man to his readers, why would the one called be described as "the blind man" here? It is different when the text had no specific name but only spoke of a blind man in general.)—15:10, the words: τόν πατέρα—Πουφου do not belong to the original type. If the man should have been more precisely designated, why would it have been mentioned earlier that they forced a certain man from Cyrene? (The readers who knew the man did not need the specification that he was from Cyrene, and for those who did not know him, the latter was sufficient; indeed, it is evident that it was meant to replace the name.)—2:13, τόν του Άλφαίου. Mark only mentions one N. τόν τοϋ Άλφ. It is not to be expected that the author would have so particularly wanted to name Alpheus's sons twice as designating two different persons. Also, the addition 3:17, και επέθηκεν — βροντής was not part of the original type. Only to introduce this epithet did Andreas receive a different position than in the other two listings.

β) Additions of another kind Mark 7:3-4 and 13 (the words: και παρόμοια — ποιείτε). These words are just as spurious here as in v. 8.

κ) The παρόμοια in v. 13 should specifically be such cases in which the Pharisees, while holding onto traditional regulations, set aside divine commandments, just as they violated the fourth commandment with the excuse "that is Corban!" However, the παρόμοια here do not fit this type, but the word refers back to the various cleansings listed in v. 4, which thus fall under one category; compare the interpolation in v. 7.

674



β) v. 3. 4. would give an explanation of how the Pharisees could have noticed the circumstance that the text, according to v. 2, wants to tell about. But the author of the narrative did not explain this, nor did he want it to be explained, since the purpose of the narrative is only this: to show that the Pharisees' rebuke, which was certainly expressed, and the statute to which it first refers, are empty and void. v. 2. and 3. is therefore interpolation, and this can already be seen

λ) from the words connected with it: τόῦτ ἐστὶν ἀνίπτοις which have already fallen out to others as a quite superfluous explanation, but belong precisely to the following interpolation and its οἱ γάρ - νίψωνται (and therefore must not be separated from it according to Fritzsche's commentary).

τ) This interpolation has also fallen out with the grammarians, as one notices from the word ἐπειτα, which is to make the piece turn on v. 2,

ν) If one omits the interpolation, that the words thus follow one another : v. 2. καὶ ἰδόντες - κοιναῖς χερσὶ ἐσθίοντας ἄρτους, ἐπερωτώσιν αὐτὸν διατῆ κ. τ. λ., we have Mark's mode of representation, comp. 2:16. - 6:40. indicates how the, laying down of the 5000 happened by divisions: ἀνεπεσον ἀνά πεντήκοντα, πρᾶσιαι ἑκατόν (p. 507). But if this remark were an original part of the narrative; it would not again be followed by 6:44. But how many more interpolations might there be in Mark! But what does not belong to the original text, - how can one prove that this is from the hand of Mark himself?

2) Other things, however, which seem to be additions to Mark's texts, held against Matthew and Luke, belong to the text, and it is easier to prove that the others omitted them than that Mark added them.

α) Only those parts of the text can be considered here which are excluded from the two subsequent texts at the same place. For if one of these two deviates from the other, how shall the measure of the original be determined against Mark? But now

β) the coincidence of the two other texts in the exclusion of what Mark adds to the words is often only accidental (a consequence of changes made). Thus e.g. Mark. 1:29. μετὰ - Ἰωάννου (both Matthew and Luke, each for a reason of his own, could not keep), v. 33. καὶ ἡ πόλις ὅλη κ. τ. λ. - Of these Jesus healed only πολλούς v. 10. No wonder they wanted to compel him to stay in Capernaum. (Matthew could not include v. 37. He therefore omits also v. 33.) 1:43. (This also Matthew may have omitted, because he omitted v. 45.) 2:3. seems to be αἰρόμενον κ. τ. λ. to betray itself by the construction as an unlawful addition. (For indisputably πρὸς αὐτὸν belongs to φεροντες, to think of

companions, say, apart from the bearers, the πρὸς αὐτόν will not allow, if it is to be drawn to ἐρχονται. The principal subject is and remains the bearers, as in δυνάμενοι v. 4. and it would thus have to be written: ε. π. α. παραλυτικὸν φέροντες τέσσαρες.) - 2:9. καὶ ἄρον - κραββατον may be an addition from v. 11. (Mark does not anticipate thus. Compare 2:23. and 25. further 5:3. and 15. further 6:7. and 13. further 11:2. and 4.) - 3:32. καί - περὶ αὐτόν (Matth, omits this because he links the piece with the preceding 12:46., and Luke, because he links differently, likewise). 4:19. καὶ αἱ περὶ- ἐπιθυμίαι (do not recognise several codd.). 4:38. καὶ ἦν - ἐπὶ προσκεφάλαιον (Luke changed and so did Matthew). - 4:39. The correct reading gives Cant: τῶ ἀνεμοὶ καὶ τῇ θαλ. καὶ εἶπε κ.τ.λ. (For the following words: καὶ ἐκόπασεν - μεγάλη - are not a divided καί, but they describe One. In the omission of the following words: σιώπα, πεφ. if they belong to the original text, the secondary narrators could coincidentally coincide). -- 5:23. ἐσχάτως ἐχει. (The Others have both changed.) -- 6:34. ὅτι ἦσαν - ποιμένα (Luke has changed 9:11. Matthew has put the moth elsewhere, 9:36. where you see the compilation on ἰδὼν and τότε). - 6:41. and 43. The additions of the fishes, however, have not been in the original narrative. - 10:21. ἐμβλύψας αὐτόν (Matthew has altered, and another expression, than that of the Luk. ἀκούσας, has certainly been given by the author of the thoroughly mimic account). - 11:16. καὶ οὐκ ἦφεν - τοῦ ἱεροῦ. (Here Luk. has shortened the text, and Matth, may also have omitted it.)-14:58. The words: τὸν χειροποίητον and ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον seem, however, to behave against Matthaëus text like interpolations. But is the addition also from Mark?

676

The words would probably not be what the text wants them to be, a ψευδομαρτυρία (false testimony). - v. 59. How can it be said that the testimony was not unanimous when it is told that two said the same thing? And how could the high priest, if the testimony was not consistent, ask Jesus why he did not respond (mind you! against this testimony of the two)? - 15:44-45. (From Luke, it can be proven that he omitted the granting of the request. Examples see page 469. But could he have omitted even more?) -

γ) The side remarks of Mark are partly words that illustrate the gestures of the speaker, such as 1:40,43, 3:3, 9:36, 10:2, 21, 22, and partly descriptions of the situation under which something is spoken or done. But those require, as Mark expresses them, the context of the pieces themselves (e.g., 3:3, the imperative ἐχτεινον), and the latter are also in relation to the arrangement of the pieces (e.g., 4:38). Moreover, Mark remains consistent in making such remarks (see, for example, 1:35, 2:2, 3:9, 20, 6:31, also 2:13, 9:33, 10:17, 32, 6:55), and the other narrators make such remarks in conjunction with Mark, sometimes one, sometimes the other - of the first kind, for example, Luke 6:11,

Matthew 12:49 (although here Matthew has modified it because when Jesus' relatives come, his opponents are to be present as listeners, v. 46, and thus he cannot point to these listeners), 19:26, Luke 8:27-29, 30, 31, 5:21 - of the latter kind: Luke 5:18,19, Matthew 13:2, Luke 8:40, 45, 55, and others.

δ) It is easier to show that the others, where they are less verbose than Mark, have shortened the text rather than to demonstrate that Mark has expanded it. They have omitted what they undoubtedly had before them (see page 580, etc.). For example, Matthew 14:3 is a contraction of Mark 6:55-56 (when the sick were brought to Jesus, it is unlikely that they were asked to touch him, but the sick people who were placed in the streets where Jesus passed by may have desired to do so). The passage Matthew 14:5-11 is also acknowledged to be an excerpt from Mark (compare Saunier, loc. cit., page 92). Incidentally, Matthew here again attributes the words of Mark 6:19 to a different subject, and instead of τὸν Ἰωάννην (John), he puts τὸν ὄχλον (the crowd) with no reason, changing it arbitrarily, as he also does in 14:12, 12:16, 21:41, 27:49 (The ἀφ' ἧς ἴδωμεν would have been too late after the ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν).

677

ε) Our narratives on the first table are arranged in such a way that main and subordinate clauses, shell, and core, are clearly distinguished from each other. If even main clauses have undergone changes under the hands of the presenters, how could this not also have happened to subordinate clauses, regardless of the definiteness of their expression? However, it is inconceivable that Mark, drawing from the core of the narrative, would have used his diligence only to improve the form.

ζ) It is unthinkable that Mark, borrowing the core of the narrative, would have only focused on improving the form.

3. Therefore, the apparent additions that stand out in Mark's text cannot prevent us from considering the author as the author of the original gospel. Moreover, as we shall see shortly, this assumption is further justified by specific data.

#### Fourth Datum.

There are passages in which it is quite irrefutably evident that Matthew and Luke had before them no other text than that formed by Mark of the narrative passages recorded in the first table.

1) We say, the text formed by Mark, - that is, not merely a Greek text, as he also would have had it, but that of which he himself is the author. And so the passages from which the date is to be proved will also be of a special kind. - We can state at once what characteristics they must have. Namely, we do not merely mean passages where the other speakers give the same expression as Mark, - for they could also have borrowed it from elsewhere, - nor merely those where Mark's text has the correct expression appropriate to the construction of the piece, - for Mark could here only have expressed an earlier text more purely, as this, however, is the result of our comparisons so far, - by which we mean passages in which it becomes clearer than in others that the form of the expression given by Matthew or Luke is conditioned by the text, which is not only found in Mark's Gospel alone, but, moreover, is also written according to Mark's peculiar manner. - We could cite many such passages, but we will content ourselves with only a few.

678

2) Such passages are

a) from Matthew: n. 10. ch. 9:14. τότε προσέρχονται - διατί ημεῖς κ. οἱ φαρισ. νηστενομεν πολλά κ. τ. λ. - How did Matthew come to this remark, which betrays a misunderstanding? Answer: He had moths before him, which, though they expressed the right thing, yet might easily be so misunderstood by him who wished to express himself according to his manner of writing. And where are these words? They are in Mark 2:18. 2:18. Mark here, after making a preliminary remark (wherewith comp. n. 36. Mark. 10:32. n. 9. 2:6.), writes after his manner: και έρχονται (viz. τινες absolute: one comes, as 2:3. 4:32. ειπον, 6:15. έρχονται κ. τ. λ.). In the preface those were named to whose fast the ερχόμενοι referred. But now these very words of Mark might easily be put in the wrong connection, as if those, to whom reference was made, and whom the writer adduces with the remark: ησαν οἱ μαθητιά Ιωάνναν - νηστευοντες - as if these to έρχονται should be the subject (as Fritzsche's Commentary, e. Mark. p. 62 also falsely accuses the words). Just so the Matthean speaker asked the words to be understood. Therefore he also makes the disciples of John, who precede him in Mark, the coming ones and the questioners, and this all the better, because he can follow his habit of putting the definite subject to the verb. - His connection is not correct, and his text therefore not the original one. If the other correct, and therefore original, could cause the misunderstanding; should not this be the source of that? - Another passage! n. 42". Here it will not be doubted that the Auacoluth Mark. 11:32: άλλ' εάν είπωμεν-εφοβοϋντο τόν λαόν, is according to Mark's own style; comp. 14:49. άλλ' ίνα κ. τ. λ. But as the Matthean has corrected in this last place (Match. 26:56.); so in that he has changed

Mark's motto into the form: φοβούμεθα τον λαόν. Alone, though these words puff grammatically, they do not fit as speech. It is not psychologically probable that the speakers would have said: so we fear the people (another would be: so we must - fear). So the speaker only mends words. But the words he mends must remain, and the words which must remain are those which are pronounced according to Mark's diction. What follows from this ? - A similar passage with an anacoluth (after an aposiopesis ) is Mark. 7:11.12. Matthew's referent here again amends : 15:5. but melts Mark's words (7:12.) into an unnatural expression : ον μή τίμηση κ. τ. λ., as if the Pharisees had directly said: one should now no longer honour father and mother (cf. above p. 577.). Concerning another similar passage, where Matthew's text presupposes Mark's words, viz. Matth. 24:9. see above p. 377. and so it may be enough with those cited. -

679

b) Passages from Luke: We have already noted above, p. 643, that if, according to Luke's introductory words, ch. 3:2. 3. the Baptist went by divine command to the place where he was to fulfil his function, the quotation from v. 4. is, if not inappropriate, nevertheless superfluous. It is one retained by Luke. In Mark (1:2.) it is in the proper place. Can it not be from Mark? It is from Mark, for the latter writes thus; comp. 13:34. - also precis: ὡς ἄνθρωπος κ. τ. λ. (as here: ὡς γεγραπται κ.τ.λ.) .- n. 21. The passage Mark. 6:14-16. ἤκουσε - την ἀκοήν Ἰησοῦ - καὶ ἐλεγον κ. τ. λ. is written according to Mark's spelling. The closer definition of τὴν ἀκοήν is given by φανερόν γάρ v. 14. - v. 15. - προφητῶν. Then the ἀκούσας again joins the ἤκουσε v. 14. Luk. 4:7 - 9. misunderstands this text. Mark had not said that Herod had heard all the judgments cited by him, the writer, so specifically, but only in general: Herod heard τὴν ἀκοήν Ἰησοῦ, and met with others in his judgment. Luke, however, makes the intermediate remarks of the writer, which are here for the sake of explanation, on the object - heard by Herod; and the sentence, which is an analepsis of the writer, Mark v. 16, he develops from the intermediate remark, as if the words of Herod were formed out of what he heard. In doing so, however, he makes the mistake of including too much from the pretext, namely, also the judgments of 8, which did not belong to what is said to have caused Herod anxiety. So we see that Luke had before him a text as constructed and structured as that of Mark. - We must also draw attention to the fact that Luke, no less than Matthew, has tried to help the two passages of Mark (11:32. 14:49.) mentioned above (Luk. 20:6. 22:63.). - Another passage under consideration here, Luk 4:42, has already been referred to above, p. 602. And so let these remarks be enough.

689

3) If we now add that the other Gospels do not contain any work that is arranged differently from the Gospel of Mark, what is the point of writing another original besides the Gospel of Mark? There is no telling what it would be that would require us to do so, if it were not the passages that Mark alone has. So let us now take these before us, and set up that date which cuts off several objections at once, - the following:

#### Fifth Datum.

The redactor of the Gospel of Matthew had the Gospel of Mark before him, including its entire content, i.e., also those sections that are unique to Mark (see p. 635).

1) The first of the passages to be mentioned here is Mark 7, 82 - 37. 7:32-37. The proof that Matthew's steward had the pericope before him, we take from the conclusion Matth. 15:30. 81. This conclusion puts the Mark. 7:37. but by no means the latter presupposes the former". The words Mark v. 37. καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε - λαλεῖν have been changed into the words Matth. v. 31. ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους - βλέποντας. How so?

α) it cannot be denied that the verses Matth. v. 30. 31. are artificial, and have nothing natural about them, inasmuch as Jesus is said to await the blind and the lame, etc., on the mountain.

681

β) What, according to these verses, is supposed to have been the object of admiration, that the blind saw, the deaf heard, etc., and thus every sick person received restored to him the ability and sense which he needed, of the possibility of which one must already have been convinced when one sought Jesus' help! Something quite different and much more natural is the account Mark gives us that the double healing (the restitution of two powers) effected in a single person was admired.

γ) The expression used by Matthew, in which, besides the healed infirmities, he expressly mentions the restored power: - sight in blindness, hearing in deafness, etc., is caused by Mark's text. - is caused by Mark's text, where this expression has meaning. For since it was praised that Jesus did more than one thing at the same time, it must of course be expressly mentioned what was done, and how the good done to one man was multiplied (which is different from saying of the lame, the blind, the deaf, etc., individually that they ceased to be so. Here is a prolixity which could be cancelled by the single: ἐθεραπεύθησαν).

δ) That Mark first invented his concrete case of healing, and used for it those pleonastic words of Matthew, cannot seem probable to any one who is not prejudiced.

ε) The same performances, which according to Matthew are said to have been admired here, have already occurred in Matth. 12:15. 14:14. Why is the expression of admiration not so particularised there? The answer is because Matthew did not have such a text in Mark as here.

ζ) But why did the compiler of Matthew not exclude the specific narrative of Mark? If we look at his v. 30, we see that he asked for ample compensation. He has a great many such people who were thus healed, and at last

η) he had also to multiply their number, since, as we have seen above p. 569. he wished to apply the second feeding. So we can be sure enough that Matthew had Mark's account before him. - The second piece is Mark 8:22-26.

α) Mark himself could not miss it. Jesus, according to Mark 8:13 (Matth. 16:5), goes by ship to the other side. So a place had to be named where he landed or came to after landing. This place could not be Caesarea, but it had to be another. Mark says 8:22. ἐρχεται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν (on the present tense comp. p. 669.);

682

β) Matthew did not need to specify any further place after his v. 5. Alone

γ) the words Mark, v. 13. ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν (to which v. 22. refers back) and Matth, v. 5. καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὸ πέραν (by which the mention of Bchsaida is rendered superfluous) relate to each other in such a way that one of the two writers must have changed the given text. Let us prove,

δ) that Matthew changed.

κ) A gap can already be assumed between the two participles Matth. 16:5. and 13,

β) The first participle v. 5. ἐλθόντες, cannot be the right one. For the warning of Jesus, which the disciples interpreted as meaning that they should not buy bread in Herod's territory, originally stood quite indisputably only in such an account as preceded the landing. Fritzsche's commentary, however, wants to contrive an apologia for Matthew's text, namely thus: Jesus departed without the disciples to Magdala (Matth. 15:39.). Here

he is taken to task by the Pharisees, and then goes away 16:4. Then, as the disciples came to him afterwards (16:5.), he gives them the warning. But the help cannot be given to the textual interpolator. For

aa) 15:39. it is not said that Jesus departed without the disciples, and from the ηλθεν this cannot be inferred (comp. 16:13.), and if it should be said (16:6:) that the disciples afterwards rejoined Jesus, without all doubt προς αὐτόν would have been added to ἐλθόντες.

bb) How would it look if the disciples, who must have followed Jesus from the place of the miraculous feeding (15:39), were said to have forgotten to buy bread!

cc) Mark 8:13. ἀπήλθε and 15. διεστέλλετο stand side by side as main clauses, and v. 14. is only an explanatory interjection, with which no new pericope is to be begun. If, as that commentary would have it, a new one had been begun, the beginning would have been thus: "And when the disciples were come, Jesus saith unto them: Beware. But the disciples had forgotten to buy bread, and thought to themselves." The narrator would have begun with this sentence: the disciples had forgotten. if the words of Jesus to be recounted had referred to this circumstance, or had been prompted by it, which, however, is neither the case here, nor is it supposed to be. - It remains, therefore, that Jesus also, according to Matthew, as the sign was required, departs with the disciples at the same time (Matth. 16:4.), and to ἀπήλθε belongs εἰς τὸ πέραν (as in Mark.), which Matth, here omits. For ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, however, Matthew artificially places that which is omitted, and writes: ἐλθόντες εἰς τὸ πέραν οἱ μαθηταί. Just leave out these words and you have Mark's text. Jesus warned on the ship's deck, and after the fishing on the other shore the first fact is a healing in the place where Jesus first comes, and not, as Matthew would want, that warning (transposed from him to the land). Matthew's speaker has deliberately omitted the fact of Bethsaida. - But we are not satisfied with this evidence; we want to solve another riddle - the riddle which many interpreters have already given up, or have allowed to be given up, without being able to solve it: - how is it that Matthew does not show one blind man at Jericho, but two, and sets two authors of the speech and action reported by the other narrators? Lightfoot suspected the combination of two stories, but he did not yet find the right one. Our passage puts us on the track of the one we are looking for. Matth has combined the blind man at Bethsaida with the blind man at Jericho, and so, if this is the case, it must follow that he had the pericope of Mark before him. But is this so probable? Let us prove at once that it is more than probable. For we have another case of this kind. Matthew did just this with o. 6. He combined the demoniac at Capernaum with the one at Gadara. The combination itself can be seen in the words that are put into the mouths of the two possessed ones at Gadara: Mark. 1: 24. τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ - ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς =



Matth. 8:29. τί ἡμῖν - ἦλθες ὧδε .... ἀπολέσμι ημᾶς. The compiler also has the combination of the blind in mind Matth. 9:27 - 31. With the words v. 27. compare 20:30. - with 9:29. compare 20:34. from the story of Jericho. Then with 9:30. compare Mark 8:26. from the story of Bethsaida.

684

2) The cited and, as we firmly believe, established datum is very important. For what follows from it? Firstly, it follows that if the redactor of the Gospel of Matthew had the mentioned sections of Mark before him, the same sections would also have been before Luke, who intentionally omitted the sections from n. 22 to n. 27. Therefore, we must assume that all the sections contained in Mark's work were also before the other evangelists. But how should we proceed? Should we propose a Gospel of Mark before the Gospel of Mark itself, or, in other words, believe that Mark simply copied another work and enriched his copy with occasional words and phrases that he inserted into the subordinate clauses? Who could find this plausible? And how could we then attribute importance to the additions, which were mentioned earlier, if they were to be compared with the now discovered datum? (See p. 173.) — We have thus reached the point in our investigation where we can now state the final result of our research: Mark is the original evangelist. His work is the foundation upon which both Matthew's and Luke's Gospels are based. This work is not a copy of an oral original gospel; rather, it is an artificial composition. The fact that his compilations are less determined by historical connections than by preconceived general principles, even though they have assumed the appearance of a historical connection, can be explained by the fact that the author was not one of Jesus' immediate followers. A non-apostle authored this work, and what Matthew's Gospel expresses according to its type cannot be derived from this apostle of the same name due to this uniformity. Mark's work — this has simultaneously emerged as the main result — originally had no other plan and form than it has now, except for some interpolations. Whatever may still be brought forth against this to assert divergent views, we stand firm in our belief that our result is correct. But now — what about Matthew? The author of the part that his Gospel has in common with Mark's Gospel is not him; therefore, he must be the author of what is added to his work in that part. Now, one thing is clear: what is added to Matthew's Gospel in that part is sustained and supported by it. It is attached, interspersed, and assimilated to its individual materials, and apart from this connection, it has no independent support. Secondly, much of it coincides with what was enriched in the original gospel (Mark's Gospel) by Luke, and thus the question arises as to whether Matthew borrowed from Luke or Luke from Matthew. But the true relationship can be discovered through careful comparison and impartial examination. We assert the following as textual data.

## Sixth Datum.

What in Matthew's Gospel is similar or related to the interpolations of Luke is nowhere borrowed but from Luke.

1) If it can be shown

a) that Matthew is modelled on Luke in his connections,

b) that he even uses characteristic words of Luke, or

c) that he excludes pieces of the same spirit that blows in other representations that are peculiar to Luke,

d) that he has given the pieces a coherence and here and there an expression such as they could not have had originally and before his adaptation, while they have the original one in Luke; - thus, hopefully, the date will be taken to be founded. We now give

2) The proofs.

a) Matthew followed Luke. Of this there is proof

α) the Sermon on the Mount,

Luke has it in the place which Matthew also presupposes for it (see above p. 624).

β) Luke has first attached it to this One (p. 584.).

λ) Luke's mountain speech is not the abbreviated one of Matthew, but conversely Matthew's is the expanded one of Luke,

aa) Some verses have the correct form only in Luke, e.g. Luk. 6:22. (comp. Is. 66:5.) 23. (comp. Nuui. 32:7.) 46.

bb) Luke's Sermon on the Mount is complete in itself. 6:24. is the most appropriate transition to the following: If you are attacked by enemies, it is better than being

flattered. But you must treat your enemies and everyone with love and gentleness, v. 27. is not an abbreviation of Matth. 5:21.28. 34. but cf. Luk. 12:4.

686

cc) In Matthew's mountain speech, parts of the speech that are formed for a completely different context are gathered together, e.g. Matth. 5:23-26. (cf. Luk. 12:58.) 28 - 30. (cf. Mark. 9:43. f.). Since Matth. 6:1 - 34. is all intercalation, it explains how the speech behind, 7:1. 2. f. as in Luke, comes back to the social duties. 7:1. follows on from 5:44. 7:7 -11. is visibly turned on. (Comp. Luk. 6:30. the compiler comments on the οἰδόναι with 7:6. and on the αἰτεῖν with Matth, v. 7 - 11.) 15 - 20. is intercalation. 5:23 - 26. alludes to Luke 12:56 -13:5. "Even when thou (like those Galileans) art already at the altar of sacrifice, fail not to make up with thine adversary, lest afterwards it be too late. (This is the advice given to the Jews against the Romans in Luke).

β) In n. 1. Luke first made the enlargement, by substituting for Mark. 1:6. the zealous discourse of John, Luk. 3:7-15. 17. 18. and now, according to his method, omitting that. If he had taken from Matthew, he would also have excluded Matt. 3:4.

b) Matthew changed the passages of Luke and put them into a different - not correct - context. Thus

α) Matth. 8:5 - 11. shortened (p. 628.). The appended v. 11. 12. is from Luk. 13:28. 29.

β) Matth. 8:19 - 22. (Luk. 9:57 - 60.) does not belong to this passage (p. 620.). v. 22. is only explained by Luk. 9:53.

γ) In n. 20. Matth. 10:10. (more properly Luk. 10:7. comp. p. 357. f.) 12. (more properly Luk. 10:5. comp. Matth. 10:13.) v. 26 - 28. is the Um- formed of Luk. 12:3. (Matthew puts: ο λέγω, ο ακούετε because Jesus is to speak as the sender. In Luke Jesus wants to say that the disciples should speak the same way, and remain true to their convictions, and this in contrast to the Pharisees - hypocrites; compare Luk 12:1.) - v. 20. is more correctly Luk 12:6. for only there 7x has meaning. - v. 35. the expression διχάσαι is too strong (comp. Luk. 12:51.) and changed by the compiler (comp. Matth. 5:17.) - v. 37. 38. ἅγιός μου is reshaping Luk. 14:26. 27. on v. 40 - 42. comp. Luk. 10:16. the compiler has here put expressive words, as 7:21. f. instead of Luk. 6:46.

687

δ) Matth. 11:12 - 15. does not belong to the piece and does not fit v. 10. - v. 20-27. from Luk. 10:13 ---15. For Matth, -r. 21. is rather an exclamation in the middle of the speech, fitting after words, like Luk. 10:12., and also Matthew, in order to put the words here, must make a preliminary 11:20. τότε κ. τ. λ.. Also, in the context of Luke, in the case of a sending forth which Jesus proposes to do, the reference might well be to cities which proved recalcitrant against the exhortation to amend. In Matthew's text, however, where it is said that the age finds fault with every teacher, they are less fitting. Matth. 11:25 - 27. is only in Luke in a natural context,

ε) About n. 14. Matth. 12:39 - 45. cf. p. 452. f. Luke first introduced this piece into the type (see p. 574.). The Matthaean compiler both retains that omitted by Luke, and takes up that exchanged from Luke. Jesus here calls himself a sign for his time, whose disregard would result in ruin, just as Jonah was to be a sign for the Ninevites. - The explanation of Matth. 12:40. is in the most crying contradiction with the text. -

ζ) n. 32. Matth. 18:10-20. Because the compiler found these verses in the "context" which they have in Luke, (Luk. 15:1. f.), he also copied 18:11. from Luk. 19:10. (from Zacchaeus ). In Matth, v. 12.13. Luk. 15:4 - 6. is modisicised. Likewise Matth, v. 14. Luk. 15:10. Instead of the sinner who is a sinner, Matthaëus puts ενα των - τούτων, and modifies the inference. He only wants it to be inferred from the parable that God does not want even the most gting Christian to be lost, and thus departs from the original. θελημα εμπροσθεν Reproduction of Luk. 15:10. χαρά ενώπιον. - Matth, v. 15 - 22. the reception of sinners is commended, because God also receives them. But comp. Luk. 17:3. these shorter words Matth. comments. Το εάν δε - ό αδελφός σου he adds (Matth. 18:15.) other things from the late circumstances of the Christian churches (as 7:22. and 23:9. .10.) and 16-20. is a supplement to them. From v. 21. we see that he had the verse Luk. 17:3. before him; for in that he now comes to the words και εάν-αύτω, Peter is to come forth with his question (Matth, v. 21.) to make the transition. But after v. 16 Peter's question does not even fit. First there is to be an amicable admonition, then it is said what is to happen if the έλέγχειν does not help at all (there is no mention of its being repeated). If an instruction had been necessary against the too early exclusion, it should have been given before v. 16. If, however, the text was primarily concerned with making it obligatory to forgive many times, Matth, v. 16 - 21, shows itself all the more clearly as an intended anticipation. Matthäus formed v. 22 differently, because he connected the piece differently. (Matthew also formed other sentences in this way, e. g. 16:11.12. - Mark 8:21. Matth. 5:16. 7:12. -- Luk. 13:25. Matth. 10:17. 24:42: and others).

η) n. 49. The appendices are from Luke, only here and there the expressions changed, e. g. Matth. 24:39. (comp. 24:3.) v. 28. is more properly in Luke as an answer to a question. - v. 40. is from a different context and v. 45 - 51. is almost entirely the same as Luk 12:40 - 46. Whence the question Matth, v. 45.? see Luk. 12:41. (Incidentally: it is to be read κατέστησε, not καταστήσει). With 25:14 - 30. compare Luk 19:11 - 28. literally Matth, v. 24 - 29. - Luk 19:20 - 26. Matthaeus has only woven the simile into another context. Instead of the departing prince, another lord is placed; the reward of the servants is also changed; the kingdom taken possession of is replaced by the banquet of joy. Previously it is historically noted what each servant did with the talent - (Matthew spelling v. 11. and 20. v. 19. compare 18:24. 25.) instead of the ten servants, servants in general, because the number ten had already occurred 25:1. - But v. 22. 23. the ἐπί - καταστήσω is not so natural as the setting over cities in Luke, especially as the only excellent reward is only the admission to the banquet, which then has its correlate in the exclusion of the slothful servant. But now it can also be explained how the interpolator was led to make these appendices. At first the verses Luk 21:34. 35. reminded him of the contemporaries of Noah. Hence the first appendix Matth. 24:37. 39. 41. Then Mark. 13:35. to Luk. 12:39. f. Hence the second appendix 24:43-51. The same pericope begins in Luke with Luk. 12:35. Hence is attached Matth. 25:1-13. third appendix. At last the Mark. 13:34. mentioned ἀπόδημος Matth. 25:14 - 30. is confounded with the travelling prince (Luk. 19:11. f.), fourth appendix. But because Matthew here changes the narrative of the prince given by Luke and omits circumstances, he gives substitute 22:2 - 14. Here he introduces the king's son Matth. 22:2. = Luk. 14:17. - 22:5.= Luk. 14:18 - 21. Matth, v. 7. = Luk. 14:21.. Match, v. 9. = Luk. 14:21. 23. Matth. v. 7. = Luk. 19:27. -

689

θ) About Matth. 23:13. 23 - 39. see above S- 365. f. The address to the Pharisees is from Luke, but the one to the scribes, which is separated from it there, has been mixed with it. The address to the Pharisees, taken from the apocryphal book σοφία Luk. 11:49 (which is probably the original - cf. Jerem. 25:3.4.7.11. 26:5.6. 2 Maccab. 1-13. Luk. 13:35. written by Jeremias before the destruction of the first temple, contained a warning and punitive speech of the σοφία to the nation enlh, with threats that the temple would be laid waste because of the murder last committed on Zacharias) are revised in Matth, v. 34. (comp. 20:19. 10:17.). Parenthetically: the sense of the passage is: I send you prophets, that, when ye kill these, all the blood which was before cruelly shed from the first, except the last murder, may be required of you. These are the words of Sophia. These are followed by Luk. v. 51. ναὶ λέγω κ. τ. λ.. the words of Jesus. Matth. 23:37 - 39. are still words of Sophia from that apocr. Book cited at Luk. 13:34. -

c) Matthew has characteristic words from Luke. Matth. 9:37. 38. δεήθητε (Luk. 10:5. 6. The words also only fit in Luke's place, as Jesus had already sent forth labourers, though few, the Twelve namely). Matth. 11:8. τί-ιδού but to Luk. 7:25. comp. Act. 5:9. then Matth, v. 9. ναι λέγω υμῖν, but to Luk. 7:26. comp. 11:51. 12:5. (In Matthew the ναι occurs only in the answer 13:51. 9:28. 15:27. 17:24. 21:16. , not as here, except in passages which are from Luke, e.g. 11:25. (Luk. 10:21.), for Luk. 11:51. puts Matth. ἀμήν 23:36. - Matth. 8:21. (Luk. 9:59.) ἕτερος. It is in Matthew Only in the passages which he has from Luke, e.g. Matth. 6:24. 11:3. (LQox Luk. 7:9. is not the correct reading). 12:45. 16:14. - In the passage 15:30. it has cod. L. not, and 21:30. is to be read δευτερω. - Matth. 24:33. αχρι ης ημερας, comp. Luk. 1:20. Act. 1:21. 3:21. 23:1. 26:22. 13:12. 6) The pieces recorded by Matthew belong only in the Gospel of Luke, because they are connected with other peculiar representations of that writer, and are of the same spirit.

690

α) The Sermon on the Mount, a speech to the poor, cf. 7:22. 16:19. cf. 6:24. cf. 16:25.

β) Matth. 8:5 - 12. of the centurion's servant, cf. Luk. 4. 27. This also explains the expression Matth. 8:10. Where Luk. 4:25. speaks of a widow who is distinguished above others, the story of the widow of Nain Luk. 7:11 - 17. is also connected with this piece. These pieces are the work of one author and belong together. Similar humble confessions, like that of the centurion here, see Luk 1:38. 51. 52. 5:8. 18:13. 14. By the way, compare p. 599. n. 14. has the same spirit in the form of Luke as the piece about the sending of the seventy. Matth. 12:27. has the same expression in Luke as Luk. 10:13. 14. 11:31. 32. - After these references we will compare the copies of the story of the visitation. It is cited as proof that Luke had Matthew in mind, and - improved upon it. But if the more natural is the original, - for the inventor, who wanted to insert a doctrine into the narrative, will not have wanted to put anything monstrous under the doctrine as a foil, - then I cannot agree with that view.

α) According to Matthew, Jesus is also abducted from the desert. In Luke's account, however, the acts of temptation follow one another in such a way that they are at the same time the movement on the journey. This is more natural than being moved back and forth in the air.

β) Matthew changes the position in order to bring together the two "are you the Son of God". The second act has a natural beginning in Luke's account. The lack that Jesus suffered gives the tempter the opportunity to show him all fullness and splendour.

y) The ending is also more fitting. After the futile intermediate act, the tempter comes back to the fact that Jesus, after having rejected worldly glory, is to test his Son of God once more. - The fact that Luke has some additions which Matthew does not (as Luke v. 5-7) is not conclusive in our view as long as it cannot be shown that Matthew, if he had Luke's account before him, would also have had to copy his words. - So we have seen that Matthew was familiar with Luke's texts. Since this is the case, we are not at all surprised that in Matthew's common narrative passages we sometimes hear hints of Luke's words, as has been pointed out above in Dat. 7. (E.g. in n. 22. Matth. 14:14. " He healed their sick." Luke could well have said this, since he has Jesus travelling on foot. But where, if Jesus departed by ship, and the people hurried before him, as Matthew tells with Mark, the sick should have come from, that would be difficult to see.) But it now follows from our date still more.

691

2) He is also not the author of what Matthew adds to the original. We find mere textual distortions, dislocations of the parts of speech from their original position. The material he inserted into the Gospel consists of fragments of torn pericopes and is separated from its context. This material, if it were not borrowed from Luke, would have to be borrowed from another work, but always from a historical work similar to that of the first table. What in Matthew might have the reputation of being the λόγια, which Papias mentions as the compositions of Matthew, did not exist in itself. - The Sermon on the Mount did not exist by itself, but was composed of fragments of narrative pieces. But where else should the alleged λόγια be? Shall we look for them in another work of Matthew, which would have been the promiuarium both for Luke and for our compiler? But how could the compilation, which must have been much less exact and more careful than that of Luke, have obtained the reputation of being the work of Matthew? But what is most important, if we are to finger such a common source for the compiler and Luke, it would have to be something more and contain more than mere λόγια. To presuppose a pre-Matthew before the author of our Gospel of Matthew causes us nothing. But the editor of our Gospel of Matthew had no part in the writing of the original, nor in the additions which he inserted into it. - Nothing comes from him but the compilation and amalgam of various works. Should such a compiler have been the apostle Matthew? We can never believe this, and so we completely lose the authenticity of the first Gospel. In expressing our opinion, we fear so little the reproach that we have judged prematurely, that we rather believe that we have first brought the critical question about Matthew to a decision. Besides, we remind you that, even if Matthew's Gospel were not unimpeachable, there could be no question of a Greek translator of Matthew, although some speak of him as if he were the most real person in the world.

α) the basis of Matthew is the Greek original Gospel, i.e. the Scriptures of Mark, because

β) the compiler of Matthew has added to this work other things from Luke, and that which was taken from Luke has been so altered as was necessary to bring about the amalgamation of the same with the original writing; and

γ) the same compiler has also made changes to the pericopes of the original, sometimes intentionally, sometimes unintentionally. Finally, a datum.

#### Seventh Datum.

The Matthaean interpolator and Luke did not copy the original scripture into which they interpolated while they were doing this from memory, but had it before their eyes.

1) The proof is briefly as follows:

α) Luke has methodically changed - by transpositions, omissions and simplifications, but in both places, - where he takes away, and where he interposes, he resumes the interrupted text with the original writing. He would not have been able to weigh the sentences against each other if he had not had his normal text in front of him. As we have seen, he tried to bring the common pieces into harmony with those he used for the type. He has inserted definiteness into the sentences without disturbing their original construction; he has made comparisons between what was written and what he himself wanted to write. How could he have done this if he had not had the text, which was his guide, vividly before him? One must think the same of the Matthaean compiler. He may have reproduced some parts of the common narratives from memory with his own thoughts or words mixed in, as it happened when he was writing. But since he often artificially added other parts to the text, and also tied the separate ends together again after rich supplements, restoring the nexus through small modifications of the given, he must have been able to follow the sentences of the original script with his eyes. One must assume, therefore, that they copied the Gospel of Mark, which they had before them, in order to add other materials to it.



2) If the question were to be raised why did the Matthaean binder, if he had Luke before him at the same time, not also include his materials in the manner of the original, as Luke had done? the answer would be that he did not want to do what he would then have had to do, namely, to copy Luke completely. But if one looks at the way he proceeded, the answer can be even more definite. The binder was in possession of the Gospel of Mark before he heard of Luke's writing, or he knew it as the older work and knew that Luke had only made additions to this work. He therefore inserted what he had to insert into his original writing as he had it in his hands, and proceeded to augment the speeches of Jesus occurring in it with similar speeches, or to make their importance more noticeable by placing such speeches next to them - according to a method similar to that which we find in the apologetic writings of the Church Fathers, e.g. of Justin, Clementine, and others. This is a method similar to that used in the apologetic writings of the Church Fathers (e.g. Justin, Clement, Tertullian), in which, citing words of Jesus from the Gospels, they explain one passage by means of another, similar one. One can also see that Matthew, if he had such a plan, and his textual translations developed in such a way, did not need to include the entire apparatus that Luke offered him.

3) The third point has been discussed, and the content of the synopsis has been exhausted. We conclude our work with the assurance that, after honest research and strenuous diligence, we have not been able to find anything else to explain the much-discussed phenomenon than what has been presented with its reasons in this paper, through which we have sought to win the applause of unpartisan truth researchers.