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Scripture quotations, except quotations from others, are from

the New Revised Standard Version, unless indicated otherwise.

# Part 1: The Synoptic Problem

## Outline of the Sermon on the Mount

## and the Sermon on the Plain

*Matthew Mark Luke*

**4** 23 crowds follow Jesus (3.7-13a) **6** 17 crowds follow Jesus

**5** 3 beatitudes 20 beatitudes and woes

13 salt of the earth (9.49-50) (14.34-35)

14 + light of the world

15 + hidden lamp (4.21) (8.16) (11.33)

17 the law and the prophets

*antitheses*

21 murder and wrath

23 + reconcile before altar

25 + reconcile before court (12.57-59)

27 adultery and lust

29 + remove hand or eye (= 18.8-9) (9.43-48)

31 divorce (16.18)

33 oaths

*love of enemies*

(5.39-42) 27 love of enemies

38 retaliation 29 retaliation

(7.12) 31 golden rule

(5.46) (5.45) 32 love of enemies

43 love of enemies

*piety*, *public and secret*

**6** 1 almsgiving

5 prayer

7 + long prayers

9 + Lord’s Prayer (11.1-4)

14 + forgive to be forgiven (=11.25-26)

16 fasting

19 treasures in heaven (12.33-34)

22 the sound eye (11.34-36)

24 God and mammon (16.13)

25 anxiety (12.22-32)

*judging* *judging*

**7** 1 judge not 37 judge not

2b the measure you give (=13.12) (4.24-25) 38 the measure you give (=8.18b)

(15.14) 39 blind leading the blind

(10.24-25) 40 disciple not above teacher

3 speck and log 41 speck and log

6 pearls before swine

7 ask, seek, knock (11.9-10)

9 give son a serpent (11.11-13)

12 golden rule (6.31)

13 the narrow gate (13.23-24)

15 wolves in sheep’s clothing

16 by their fruits (=12.33) 43 by their fruits

(12.34-35) 45 mouth and heart

21 saying “Lord, Lord” 46 saying “Lord, Lord”

22 exclusion from the kingdom (13.25-27)

24 houses on rock and sand 47 houses on rock and sand

## The Question about Fasting

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Matt 9*:*15* | *Mark 2*:*19-20* | *Luke 5*:*34-35* |
| Greek | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· | ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· |
| literal English | And said to them Jesus: | And said to them Jesus: | But Jesus said to them: |
| NRSV | And Jesus said to them, | Jesus said to them, | Jesus said to them, |
| NAB | Jesus answered them, | Jesus answered them, | Jesus answered them, |
| NJB | Jesus replied, | Jesus replied, | Jesus replied, |
| REB | Jesus replied, | Jesus replied, | Jesus replied, |
|  | | | |
| Greek | μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν | μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος | μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος |
| literal English | Not can the sons of the bridal house mourn | Not can the sons of the bridal house | Not can the sons of the bridal house |
| NRSV | The wedding guests can­not mourn | The wedding guests cannot fast | You cannot make wed­ding guests fast |
| NAB | Can the wedding guests mourn | Can the wedding guests fast | Can you make the wed­ding guests fast |
| NJB | Surely the bridegroom’s attendants cannot mourn | Surely the bridegroom’s attendants cannot fast | Surely you cannot make the bridegroom’s atten­dants fast |
| REB | Can you expect the bride­groom’s friends to be sad | Can you expect the bride­groom’s friends to fast | Can you make the bride­groom’s friends fast |
|  | | | |
| Greek | ἐφ᾽ ὅσον μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὁ νυμφίος; | μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστιν νηστεύ­ειν; | ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι; |
| literal English | as long as with them is the bride­groom? | in which [sc. time] the bride­­groom with them is, fast? | in which [sc. time] the bridegroom with them is, be made to fast? |
| NRSV | as long as the bride­groom is with them, can they? | while the bridegroom is with them, can they? | while the bridegroom is with them, can you? |
| NAB | as long as the bride­groom is with them? | while the bridegroom is with them? | while the bridegroom is with them? |
| NJB | as long as the bride­groom is still with them? | while the bridegroom is still with them? | while the bridegroom is still with them? |
| REB | while the bridegroom is with them? | while the bridegroom is with them? | while the bridegroom is with them? |
|  | | | |
| Greek |  | ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ᾽ αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν. |  |
| literal English |  | During [the] time they have the bridegroom with them not can they fast. |  |
| NRSV |  | As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. |  |
| NAB |  | As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast. |  |
| NJB |  | As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. |  |
| REB |  | As long as he is with them, there can be no fasting. |  |
|  | | | |
| Greek | ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι | 20 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι | 35 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, |
| literal English | Will come but days | Will come but days | Will come but days, |
| NRSV | The days will come | The days will come | The days will come |
| NAB | They days will come | But the days will come | But the days will come |
| NJB | But the time will come | But the time will come | But the time will come |
| REB | The time will come | But the time will come | But the time will come |
|  | | | |
| Greek | ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, | ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, | καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, |
| literal English | when is taken up/away from them the bride­groom, | when is taken up/away from them the bride­groom, | and when is taken up/­away from them the bride­groom, |
| NRSV | when the bridegroom is taken away from them, | when the bridegroom is taken away from them, | when the bridegroom will be taken away from them, |
| NAB | when the bridegroom is taken away from them, | when the bridegroom is taken away from them, | and when the bride­groom is taken away from them, |
| NJB | when the bridegroom is taken away from them, | when the bridegroom is taken away from them, | when the bridegroom is taken away from them; |
| REB | when the bridegroom will be taken away from them; | when the bridegroom will be taken away from them; | when the bridegroom will be taken away from them; |
|  | | | |
| Greek | καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν. | καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. | τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐ­κείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. |
| literal English | and then they will fast. | and then they will fast  in that day. | then they will fast in those days. |
| NRSV | and then they will fast. | and then they will fast on that day. | and then they will fast in those days. |
| NAB | and then they will fast. | and then they will fast on that day. | then they will fast in those days. |
| NJB | and then they will fast. | and then, on that day, they will fast. | then, in those days, they will fast. |
| REB | then they will fast. | that will be the time for them to fast. | that will be the time for them to fast. |
|  | | | |

## Eschatological Discourse

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Matt 24*:*20-25* | *Mark 13*:*18-23* |
| Greek | προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμῶνος μηδὲ σαββάτῳ. | προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος· |
| literal English | Pray but that not happens the flight of you of winter nor sabbath. | Pray however that not it happens [in] winter. |
| NRSV | Pray that your flight may not be in winter or on a sabbath. | Pray that it may not be in winter. |
|  | | |
| Greek | 21 ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλῖψις μεγάλη οἵα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν οὐδ᾽ οὐ μὴ γένηται. | 19 ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται. |
| literal English |  |  |
| NRSV | For at that time there will be great suffering, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be. | For in those days there will be suffer­ing, such as has not been from the be­ginning of the creation that God cre­ated until now, no, and never will be. |
|  | | |
| Greek | 22 καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι. | 20 καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολό­βωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας. |
| literal English |  |  |
| NRSV | And if those days had not been cut short, no one would be saved; but for the sake of the elect those days will be cut short. | And if the Lord had not cut short those days, no one would be saved; but for the sake of the elect, whom he chose, he has cut short those days. |
|  | | |
| Greek | 23 Τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἤ· ὧδε, μὴ πιστεύσητε· | 21 Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· ἴδε ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε· |
| literal English |  |  |
| NRSV | Then if anyone says to you, “Look! Here is the Messiah!’ or “There he is!” do not believe it. | And if anyone says to you at that time, “Look! Here is the Messiah!’ or “Look! There he is!” do not believe it. |
|  | | |
| Greek | 24 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. | ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. |
| literal English |  |  |
| NRSV | For false messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce great signs and omens, to lead astray, if possi­ble, even the elect. | False messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce signs and omens, to lead astray, if possible, the elect. |
|  | | |
| Greek | 25 ἰδοὺ προείρηκα ὑμῖν. | 23 ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε· προείρηκα ὑμῖν πάν­τα. |
| literal English |  |  |
| NRSV | Take note, I have told you before­hand. | But be alert; I have already told you everything. |
|  | | |

## Synoptic Passages with the Most Identical Wording

Hawkins, John C. *Horae Synopticae*: *Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. 1899. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1909. Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968. 66.

1. **sayings**

“You’re sins are forgiven” Mark 2:9-10 Matt 9:5-6 Luke 5:23-24

fasting wedding guests Mark 2:19-20 Matt 9:15 Luke 5:34-35

eschatological discourse Mark 13:19-23 Matt 24:21-25

Beelzebul Matt 12:27-28 Luke 11:19-20

Solomon and Jonah Matt 12:41-42 Luke 11:31-32

unexpectant homeowner Matt 24:43-51 Luke 12:39-46

unknown time

faithful and unfaithful slaves

1. **narratives**

call of the four Mark 1:16-20 Matt 4:18-22

Capernaum demoniac Mark 1:21-28 Luke 4:31-37

leper Mark 1:40-44 Matt 8:2-4 Luke 5:12-14

centurion’s son Matt 8:9, 10 Luke 7:8, 9

feeding the 5000 Mark 6:41 Matt 14:19 Luke 9:16

feeding the 4000 Mark 8:1-9 Matt 15:32-39

Gethsemane Mark 14:32-34 Matt 26:36-38

arrest Mark 14:48-49 Matt 26:55-56

Jesus mocked on the cross Mark 15:29-32 Matt 27:39-44

## Streeter on the Synoptic Problem

??

Anderson, Hugh, ed. *Jesus*. Great Lives Observed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Hawkins, John C. *Horae Synopticae*: *Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. 1899. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1909. Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Trans. How­ard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abindgon, 1975. 38‑80. (Trans. of the German 17th ed. of 1973.)

Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels*: *A Study of Origins*, *Treating of the Manuscript Tradi­tion*, *Sources*, *Authorship*, *and Dates*. London: Macmillan, 1924.
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         3. scribal omissions from Mark after Matthew and Luke used Mark
7. second objection to the four-source theory: the Ur-Markus hypothesis
   1. omission of whole sections
   2. minor agreements
8. **the synoptic problem**
   1. The synoptic problem is: why are Matthew, Mark, and Luke so similar, yet so different?
   2. so similar
      1. basic chronology (John the Baptist, then Galilean ministry, then travel narrative, etc.)
      2. order in grouped material (controversies [Matt 9, Mark 2, Luke 5], sabbath sto­ries [Matt 12, Mark 2‑3, Luke 6], parables [Matt 13, Mark 4, Luke 8], etc.)
      3. near‑verbatim material
         1. Matthew, Mark, and Luke
            1. “. . . if you will, you can make me clean” (Mark 1:40 pars.)
            2. “By what authority are you doing these things, or who gave you this author­ity?” (Mark 11:27 pars.)
            3. the “Little Apocalypse” (Mark 13 pars.)
            4. Also Mark 8:34‑36 pars., 9:1 pars., 10:13‑15 pars., etc.
         2. only Matthew and Mark: call of the four (Mark 1:16‑20a = Matt 4:18‑­22a), etc.
         3. only Mark and Luke: Capernaum demoniac (Mark 1:23‑25 = Luke 4:33‑­35), etc.
         4. only Matthew and Luke
            1. John the Baptist’s preaching (Matt 3:7b-10 = Luke 3:7b-9)
            2. Jesus on John the Baptist (Matt 11:4-19 = Luke 7:22-35)
            3. lament over Jerusalem (Matt 23:37-39 = Luke 13:34-35)
         5. two agreeing against a third
            1. authority as service (Mark 10:41-45 = Matt 20:24-28 vs. Luke 22:24‑27)
            2. woes on scribes (Mark 12:38-40 = Luke 20:46-47 vs. Matt 23:6‑13)
         6. statistics
            1. In the verses they have in common, Matthew and Mark share “51% of the actual words . . .” (Streeter 159)
            2. In the verses they have in common, Mark and Luke share “­53% of the actual words . . .” (Streeter 160)
            3. conclusion: the synoptics are “literarily dependent . . .” (Kümmel 43)
   3. so different
      1. The infancy narratives (Matt 1-2, Luke 1-2) are very different.
      2. The resurrection narratives in all three synoptic are very different.
      3. There are passages only in Matthew and Luke (sermon on the mount/plain, etc.).
      4. There are passages only in Matthew (unforgiving servant, laborers in the vineyard, etc.).
      5. There are passages only in Luke (good Samaritan, prodigal son, etc.).
9. **major solutions to the problem**
   1. In the first and second centuries, word‑for‑word trans­mission was of no interest (cf. the evidence of text criticism). So synoptic agreements and disagreements may or may not be original.
   2. theories that suppose no direct lit­erary contact among the synoptics
      1. the primitive written gospel hypothesis:

primitive (written) gospel

↙ ↓ ↘

Matthew Mark Luke

* + - 1. J.D. Michaelis (l750): primitive written gospel → synop­tics
      2. G.E. Lessing (1776): Jerome’s (Aramaic) *Gospel of the Na­zar­enes* → synoptics
      3. J.G. Eichhorn (1804) Eichhorn proposed that the synoptics are direct translations of primitive Aramaic documents: Aramaic gospel → nine gos­pels → synoptics.
         1. Fol­lowed by C.C. Torrey (Carmig­nac says the primitive docu­ment was in Hebrew). (Kümmel 56 n. 31)
         2. Eichhorn also recognized a sayings source for Matthew and Luke.
      4. criticisms: no primitive Aramaic gospel (as a written document) existed.
         1. “. . . numerous alleged translation errors [i.e., Semi­tisms] are only in a small degree convincing . . .” (Kümmel 56)
         2. Even if true, they prove translation only of one saying or pericope, not a whole gospel.
         3. Samenesses in the synoptic material only make sense for same-language docu­ments.
         4. The synoptics use the LXX.
         5. Therefore, although “our Greek Gospels still show the Aram­aic tradition clearly in the background . . . Earlier Ara­maic stages of our Gospels are . . . to be posited with cer­tainty only for the oral tradi­tion.” (Kümmel 56)
    1. the primitive oral gospel hyp­othesis (“tradition hypothesis”)
       1. J.G. Herder (1796): a primitive oral gospel → synop­tics
       2. J.C.L. Gieseler (1818) (similar: P. Gaechter, 1961) (those who agree that the narrative’s de­tails were transmit­ted in con­junction with exegesis of OT texts are J. W. Doeve, 1957, and S. Hunt, 1951):

primitive oral gospel

(which apostles in Jerusalem made uniform)

↙ ↓ ↘

Aramaic trad. 1st Gk trad. 2nd Gk trad.

↘ ↓ ↙

synoptic gospels

* + 1. the fragment (*diēgesis*) hypothesis:

disconnected pericopes

↙ ↓ ↘

Matthew Mark Luke

* + - 1. H.E.G. Paulus: “memorabilia” of individual days of Jesus → Matthew and Luke
      2. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1817) (who also attributed a sayings source to the apostle Matthew):

*diēge­ses* (Jesus’ words and deeds) → col­lections of mira­cles, of speeches, etc. → synoptics

* + - 1. W.L. Knox (l953): tracts (collections by content) → sy­noptics
  1. theories that suppose direct literary contact among the synoptics
     1. literary-dependence probability
        1. It does seem probable that the synoptics are “literarily dependent” (Küm­mel, *­­­Introduction* 43).
        2. Matthew, Mark, and Luke have many pericopes in common, and word­ing in these passages is often identi­cal.
        3. Also, all three gospels have a simi­lar order of peri­copes.
        4. So there must have been some sort of writ­ten rela­tionship among the three gospels.
     2. literary-dependence possibilities
        1. If one assumes literary dependence, then here are some possibilities.

Matt → Mark → Luke Mark → Matt → Luke Luke → Matt → Mark

Matt → Luke → Mark Mark → Luke → Matt Luke → Mark → Matt

Matt Mark Matt Luke Mark Luke Matt Mark Luke

↘ ↙ ↘ ↙ ↘ ↙ ↙ ↘ ↙ ↘ ↙ ↘

Luke Mark Matt Mark Luke Matt Luke Matt Mark

Matt Matt Mark Mark Luke Luke

↓ ↘ ↓ ↘ ↓ ↘ ↓ ↘ ↓ ↘ ↓ ↘

Mark ↘ Luke ↘ Matt ↘ Luke ↘ Matt ↘ Mark ↘

↳ Luke ↳ Mark ↳ Luke ↳ Matt ↳ Mark ↳ Matt

* + 1. the Augustinian hypothesis: Matthew → Mark → Luke
       1. Augustine (*De consensu evangelistarum* 1.2): “Mark fol­lows him [Mat­thew] closely and seems to be his slave and epitomist [*breviator*, “abbreviator”].”
       2. Before ad 1778, differences between the synoptics were noticed; but generally, only individual details were explained.
       3. Before ad 1778, most scholars accepted the Augustinian hypothesis.
       4. Even in the 20th century, it was supported by Adolf Schlatter, Theodor Zahn, N. Walker, B.C. Butler, OSB, and Bernard Orchard, OSB.
       5. “But Augustine did not possess a Synopsis . . .” (Streeter 157)
    2. the Griesbach hypothesis
       1. 1774: Johann J. Griesbach published a synopsis of the gospels. (“Johann Jakob Griesbach”)
          1. “Synopsis” means “seeing with”: for the first time, the gospels were printed in parallel vertical columns.
       2. First proposed by Griesbach in 1789.

Matthew

↙ ↘

Luke → Mark

* + - 1. A variant was proposed by F. Bleek (1822) and W.M.L. DeWette (1822):

Matt Luke

↘ ↙

Mark

* + - 1. In the 1800s, Griesbach’s hypothesis was accepted by David Friedrich Strauss and the Tübingen School, including Ferdinand Christian Baur.
      2. In the 1900s, it was accepted by William Farmer, Austin Farrer, and David Dungan.
      3. The best proof: Mark 1:32, “That evening, at sundown,” may conflate Matt 8:16, “That eve­ning,” and Luke 4:40, “Now when the sun was setting.”
    1. the two‑source theory
       1. In the 1700s, the theory that copies of Mark were used by both Matthew and Luke was proposed by J.B. Koppe (1782) and G.C. Storr (1786).
       2. Carl Lachmann (1835) established the priority of Mark (i.e., its more primitive nature, not necessarily Matthew and Luke’s use of it as a source) by a proof from the order of peri­copes found in all three gospels: Mat­thew and Luke agree in order only when agreeing with Mark.
       3. Lachmann also said that Matthew was a compilation from Mar­kan material and a sayings source, soon called “Q” (from German *quelle*, “source”). (Kümmel 48)
       4. C.G. Wilke (1838) showed that Mark was the source of Matthew and Luke, and H. Weisse (1838, independently of Wilke) showed that Matthew and Luke are Mark plus a sayings source.
       5. Since Matthew has material unique to his gospel (whose source is called “M”), and since Luke has material unique to his gospel (whose source is called “L”), the two-source theory is now usually presented in an expanded form, the “four-source theory”:

M Q Mark L

↘ ↓ ↘ ↙ ↓ ↙

↘ ↓ ↙ ↘ ↓ ↙

Matthew Luke

* + 1. other theories
       1. the Urmarkus theory (H.J. Holzmann and others; Holzmann later repudiated an Urmarkus): Urmarkus → sayings source??
       2. the proto‑Luke hypothesis
          1. Since Luke in his Markan material de­parts from Mark (especi­ally in the passion narrative), per­haps Luke used Mark, Q, *and* a special narrative source (at least a spe­cial passion narra­tive).
          2. The proto-Luke hypothesis proposes that Luke first combined Q and the special narrative source, then inserted Markan material.
          3. B.H. Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, 1924) advocated the proto-Luke hypothesis.
       3. the Aramaic‑Matthew hypothesis
          1. Eusebius, in his *Historia ecclesiastica* (3.39.16, c ad 325), quotes from Papias’ *Explanations of the Sayings of the Lord* (c ad 120?):

Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.39.16, c ad 325): “Of Matthew he [Papias] has this to say: “Matthew compiled the *Sayings* in the Aramaic language, and everyone translated them as well as he could.” [Qtd. from Eusebius. *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*. Trans. G.A. Williamson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Pen­guin, 1965. 152.]

Richard Longenecker (*Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975): “On the nature of τὰ λόγια [the *Sayings*] in Papias’ remarks on the Gospels, see C.F.D. Moule, *Birth of the New Testament*, Excursus I, pp. 215ff.”

* + - * 1. On the basis of Papias’ comment, Benoit and Vaganay conclude that an Aramaic Matthew is the root of the synoptic gospels:

Aramaic Matthew

↙ ↓ ↘

Peter’s preaching in Rome Greek Matthew Q

↓

Greek Mark

↓

Matthew, Luke??

* + - * 1. Xavier Léon‑Du­four, Levie, Cer­faux, Harrington, and Parker also assume a (written or oral) Aramaic Matthew.
        2. criticism: Papias is of no value. (Kümmel 55)

Papias’ chronological setting is uncertain.

Papias on Matthew

Since “Matthew is certainly not a trans­lation from the Aramaic,” many assume the document referred to in Eusebius’ statement, “Mat­thew collected the accounts in the Hebrew language,” is Q or a primitive Aramaic gospel. But *ta logia* refers to records of Jesus, and clearly Matthew is meant (since Papias says, “*Mat­thew* collected”). Hence Papias (or John the Pres­byter) “on grounds unknown to us assumes that behind [Mat­thew] lies a primitive Aramaic text.” (Kümmel 55)

But this does not correspond to the ac­tual literary situation: Matthew “is certain­ly not a translation from the Aramaic . . .” (Kümmel 55)

Since Papias is of no value, “it is in order [i.e., appropriate] to leave the Papias referen­ces out of consider­ation . . .” (Kümmel 55)

* + - 1. Others with multiple‑source theories: Hirsch, Helmbold, Bussmann, F. C. Grant, Boismard, Gaboury.

1. **priority of Mark**
   1. The majority of scholars now believe that ­Mark was a source for both Matthew and Luke. This would mean that Mark was written prior to Matthew and Luke (hence the term “priority”). There are five arguments for Mark’s priorness. (See Street­er *Four Gos­pels* 168.)
   2. most of Mark
      1. All but about 20 of Mark’s 666 verses is in Matthew or Luke. “. . . the resulting presupposition indi­cated by this evidence [is] that Mark could be the com­mon source for Mt and Lk . . .” (Kümmel 57)
   3. Mark’s unique 20 verses (Kümmel 57)
      1. About 20 verses of Mark’s 666 verses aren’t in either Matthew or Luke.

3:20 Jesus’ family thinks him mad

4:26‑29 seed growing secretly

7:31‑37 healing the deaf‑mute

8:22‑26 blind man of Bethsaida

9:49 salt with fire

14:51 fleeing young man

* + 1. “. . . the omission of small bits of Markan special mate­rial by Mt and Lk is thoroughly comprehensible . . .” (Kümmel 57)
       1. The “posi­tion adopted by the relatives of Jesus [is] offensive . . .”
       2. The “two healings (by means of magical manipulations) . . . are offensive . . .”
       3. Mark 9:49 “is incom­prehensible . . .”
       4. The “note in 14:51 is no longer of any interest . . .”
       5. “. . . only the omission of the seed parable is inex­plicable, al­though [Matt 13:24-30] does have at this place in the Markan structure the parable of the tares among the wheat.” (Kümmel 57)
          1. This parable also has the motif of sleep in common with the seed growing secretly (Mark 4:26-29).
          2. Mark 4:26-27, “The kingdom of God is as if someone would scatter seed on the ground, 27 and would sleep and rise night and day, and the seed would sprout and grow, he does not know how.”
          3. Matt 13:25, “while everybody was asleep, an enemy came and sowed weeds among the wheat, and then went away.”
  1. Mark’s omissions
     1. Mark’s omissions of Q, M, and L cannot be explained.
     2. “. . . only a lunatic would leave out Mat­thew’s account of the In­fancy, the Sermon on the Mount, and practically all the parables, in order to get room for purely verbal expansion of what was re­tained.” (Streeter 158)
     3. That Mark had Matthew or Mark had Luke is “inconceiv­able, since the omissions . . . are incapable of explana­tion.” (Kümmel 57)
  2. compression
     1. Matthew has 1071 verses, Mark has 666 verses (with the shorter ending; 678 with the longer ending), and Luke has 1151 verses.
        1. Streeter (*Four Gospels* 159) says that Matthew has 1068 and Mark, 661.
        2. Streeter (*Four Gospels* 182) says that Luke has 1149.
     2. Matthew and Luke share about 200 verses. (These are called “Q.”) (Streeter 182)
     3. Matthew and Mark share about 600 verses. (Streeter 159)
        1. So “eleven-twelfths” [159] of Mark is in Matthew (elsewhere: over 90% is in Matthew [160]). (Streeter 159-160)
        2. These 600 verses are “about half” of Matthew [182] (elsewhere: “less than half”). [159] (Streeter 182, 159)
        3. In the shared verses, “it is usually Matthew, and not Mark, who does the ab­brev­i­ation. [158] . . . Mark’s style is diffuse [and] Mat­thew’s ­succinct . . .” (Streeter 158-159)
        4. Mark and Luke have “many details which Matthew omits . . .” (Streeter 160) Among them are: “in the stern . . . on a cushion” (Mark 4:38), and “they only had one loaf in the boat” (Mark 8:14). (Streeter 163)
     4. Mark and Luke share about 330 verses [182] (elsewhere: “about 350 verses”). [160] (Streeter 182, 160)
        1. So “slightly more than half of Mark” is in Luke. (Streeter 159)
        2. These 330 (or 350) verses are “less than one-third” of Luke. (Streeter 159)
        3. In the shared verses, Luke shows “some compression of Mark’s style,” [159] though he “does not com­press the language quite so much” as Matthew. (Streeter 159-60)
     5. The “compression” argument, then, is this:
        1. If Mark had had Matthew or Luke or both, then he would have eliminated Q, M, and L to make room for minor details. That is in­con­ceiv­able.
        2. On the other hand, Matthew and Luke’s “omission of minor detail . . . has an obvious purpose, in that it gives more room for [other] material,” i.e., Q, M, and L. (Streeter 158)
        3. In actual wording, “while one or both of them [Matthew or Luke] are constantly in close agreement with Mark, they never [except in the “minor agree­ments,” see below] support one another against Mark. This is clear evidence of the greater ori­ginality of the Marcan version . . .” (Streeter 161)
  3. distribution of Marcan and non-Marcan materials ­in Matthew and Luke
     1. “Certain elements in the non-Marcan matter clearly owe their posi­tion in the Gospels to the nature of their contents. For example, [the infancy narratives]. Similarly the ad­di­tional details . . . of the Temptation and the Passion . . .” (Streeter 165)
     2. From the temptations on, “there is not a single case in which Matthew and Luke agree in in­serting a piece of Q material into the same context of Mark.” (Streeter 165)
     3. “Matthew’s method is to make Mark the framework into which non-Marcan matter is to be fitted, on the principle of joining like to like. That is to say, whenever he finds in a non-Marcan source teaching which would elaborate or illustrate a saying or incident in Mark, he inserts that particular piece . . .” (Streeter 166) Examples:
        1. additions of a single sentence
           1. Matt 17:20
           2. Matt 19:28 (Streeter 166)
        2. additions of a few verses
           1. Matt 19:10-12
           2. Matt 10:1-16
           3. Matt 21:28-32 and 22:1-14 (added to reinforce the anti-Phar­i­saism of 21:33-41). (Streeter 166)
        3. additions of long discourses (Streeter 166)
           1. The sermon on the mount “is inserted in such a way as to lead up . . . to the Marcan saying, “And they were aston­ished at his teaching . . .”“ [Mark 1:22//­Matt 7:29] (Streeter 167)
           2. “Thus the 7 verses of Mark’s sending out of the Twelve [6:7-13] become the 42 verses of [Matt 10].” (Streeter 167)
           3. “The three parables of Mk. iv are made the basis of the seven parable chap­ter, Mt. xiii.” (Streeter 167)
           4. “The 12 verses, [Mark 9:33-37, 42-48], are elaborated into a discourse of 35 verses in Mt. xviii.” (Streeter 167)
           5. “The “Little Apocalypse” (Mk. xiii.) is expanded [by] apo­cal­yptic sayings (ap­par­ently from Q), but also by . . . three parables of Judgment, Mt. xxv.” (Streeter 167)
     4. “Luke’s method is quite different and much simpler. . . . until we reach the Last Supper [22:14], Marcan and non-Marcan materi­al alternates in great blocks.” Roughly as fol­lows:
        1. Luke 1:1-4:30 non-Markan
        2. Luke 4:31-6:19 Markan
        3. Luke 6:20-8:3 non-Markan
        4. Luke8:4-9:50 Markan
        5. Luke 9:51-18:14 non-Markan
        6. Luke 18:15-43 Markan
        7. Luke 19:1-27 non-Markan
        8. Luke 19:28-22:13 Markan
        9. Luke 22:14-24:53 (here Mark’s passion narrative is interwoven with anoth­er account).[[1]](#footnote-1) (Streeter 167)
        10. “. . . Luke appears deliberately to substitute a non-Marcan for the Marcan version of a story or piece of teaching.” (Streeter 159)
            1. “Luke omits more than 45% [of Mark], but for much of this he substitutes a similar matter from another source.” (Streeter 160)
            2. Examples: “the Rejection at Nazareth, the Call of Peter, the parable of the Mustard Seed, the Beelzebub Controversy, the Great Com­mand­ment, [and] the An­ointing . . .” [159] Moreover, these are always “in a context quite other from that in which they appear in Mark.” (Streeter 159-160)
            3. (The material that Luke omits from Mark and for which he does not supply a substitute includes the “great omission” [Mark 6:45-8:26 = 75 verses] and “several shorter sections [which] amount to 56 verses.”) (Streeter 160)
     5. So: why would Mark pick out Q material from Luke’s chunks (if he had Luke) or from Matthew’s intertwinings of sources (if he had Matthew)?
  4. order
     1. “. . . wherever Matthew departs from Mark’s order Luke supports Mark, and whenev­er Luke departs from Mark, Matthew agrees with Mark. The section Mk. iii. 31-35 [Jesus’ true kindred] alone occurs in a different context in each gospel; and there is no case where Matthew and Luke agree together against Mark in a point of arrangement.” (Streeter 161)
     2. “. . . while in the latter half of his Gospel [chs. 14-28] Matthew adheres strictly to the order of Mark [6:14-16:8], he makes consider­able rearrangements in the first half.” (Streeter 161)
     3. Luke “hardly ever departs from Mark’s order, and only in trifling ways [see *Oxford Studies* 88 ff.]. On the other hand, wherever Luke substitutes for an item in Mark a parallel version from another source, he always gives it *in a different context* from the item in Mark . . .” (Streeter 162)
  5. improvements: Matthew and Luke show “a constant tendency” to improve Mark’s lan­guage. (Streeter 162)
     1. increased reverence: “Of these small alterations many have a reverential motive.” (Streeter 162)
        1. For example, κύριε (“Lord”) occurs only once in Mark; else­where Jesus is called “Rabbi” or “teacher” (διδάσκαλε, the Greek equivalent of “Rabbi”). Matthew and Luke often change “Rabbi” and “teacher” to “Lord” (Matthew has “Lord” 19 times, Luke 16 times). (Streeter 162)
        2. “. . . phrases which might cause offence or suggest diffi­cul­ties are toned down or excised.” (Streeter 162)
           1. Cf. Mark 6:5 with Matt 13:58 (Luke omits Mark 6:5). (Streeter 162)
           2. Cf. Mark 10:18 with Matt 19:17. (Streeter 162)
     2. stylistic and grammatical im­provements: these are “Much more fre­quent . . .” (Streeter 162)
        1. oral versus written style
           1. Mark seems like spoken language, Mat­thew and Luke like written language. “Mark reads like a short­hand account . . . taken down from rapid dictation . . . Mat­thew and Luke use the more succinct and carefully chosen lan­guage of one who writes and then revises an arti­cle for publica­tion.” (Streeter 163)
        2. omission of repetitions
           1. “Usually, however, it is only the re­petitions and redun­dan­cies . . . Hawkins collects over 100 in­stances of “enlarge­ments of the narra­tive, which add nothing” [*Horae Syn­opticae* 125] . . . Again, Mark is very fond of “dup­li­cate ex­pressions” such as “Evening coming on, when the sun set” [1:32]. [163] . . . fre­quently it happens that Matthew re­tains one and Luke the other.” (Streeter 163-64)
        3. correction of awkward or ungrammatical sentences
           1. “Matthew and Luke regularly emend awkward or ungram­matical sentences . . .” (Streeter 164)
        4. substitution of proper vocabulary
           1. “. . . there are two cases where they give the literary equivalent of Greek words, which Phryni­chus the grammarian express­ly tells us belonged to vulgar speech.” (Streeter 164)
        5. elimination of Latinisms
           1. “. . . sometimes they substi­tute the usual Greek word for a Latinism . . .” (Streeter 164)
        6. elimination of Aramaisms
           1. “Lastly, there are eight instances in which Mark preserves the original Aramaic words used by our Lord. Of these Luke has none, while Matthew retains only one, the name Golgotha [27:33,] though he substitutes for “Eloi, Eloi . . .” [Mark 15:34] the Hebrew equivalent “Eli, Eli . . .” [Matt 27:46] as it reads in the Psalm [22:­1].” (Streeter 164)
     3. The argument from stylistic improvement “is an argument essen­tially cumulative in character.” (See Hawkins *Horae Synopticae* 114-53.) (Streeter 164)

1. **Matthew and Luke worked independently of one another**.
   1. That Matthew had Luke or Luke had Matthew is “inconceiv­able, since the omissions . . . are incapable of explana­tion.” (Kümmel 57)
   2. In wording, Matthew or Luke “are constantly in close agreement with Mark . . .” But, except for the “minor agree­ments” (see below), they never “support one another against Mark. This . . . is exactly what we should ex­pect to find if Matthew and Luke were *independently* reproducing Mark, adapting his language to their own individual style.” (Streeter 161)
   3. From the temptations on, “there is not a single case in which Matthew and Luke agree in in­serting a piece of Q material into the same context of Mark.” (Streeter 165)
   4. “. . . there is no case where Matthew and Luke agree together against Mark in a point of arrangement.” (Streeter 161)
2. **Q**
   1. data on which the Q hypothesis rests
      1. Material in Matthew that is not in Mark is mostly parables and sayings, mostly in lengthy discourses. (Streeter 182)
      2. Material in Luke that is not in Mark is both parables and narra­tives, but not as much sayings material. The sayings occur in shorter sections than in Matthew. (Streeter 182)
      3. Of the material in both Matthew and Luke that is not in Mark, “approxi­mately 200 verses [appear] in *both* Matthew and Luke.” (Streeter 182)
   2. hypotheses to explain the data
      1. Did Matthew have Luke or Luke have Matthew? Unlikely, because:
         1. After the temptation, “there is not a single case in which Mat­thew and Luke agree in inserting the same [Q] saying at the same point in the Marcan outline. If then Luke derived this material from Matthew, he must have gone through both Matthew and Mark so as to discriminate with meticulous precision between Marcan and non-Marcan materi­al; he must then have proceeded with the utmost care to tear every little piece of non-Marcan materi­al he de­sired to use from the context of Mark in which it appeared in Matthew—in spite of the fact that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate—in order to re-insert it into a differ­ent con­text of Mark having no special appro­priateness.” (Streeter 183)
         2. “Sometimes it is Matthew, sometimes it is Luke, who gives a say­ing in what is clearly the more original form. This is explica­ble if both are drawing from the same source, each making slight modifica­tions of his own; it is not so if either is dependent on the other.” (Streeter 183)
      2. Did Matthew and Luke derive non-Markan material from oral tradi­tions? This may have happened when wording in non-Marcan material is only slightly iden­ti­cal, but it cannot be true when “the verbal resem­blances are close and striking . . .” (Streeter 184)
      3. Did Matthew and Luke use the same source? This is the most proba­ble conclusion. (“. . . in older books it [Q] is spoken of as “the Logia” or “the Double Tradition.”“ [Street­er, *Four Gos­pels* 184])
   3. difficulties in reconstructing Q
      1. “Critics have [184] underestimated the probability that in many cases slightly differing versions of the same sayings or para­bles would be in circulation. They have therefore been unduly anxious to extend the boundaries of Q by including passages, like the Lord’s Prayer and the parable of the Lost Sheep, where the paral­lelism between Matthew and Luke is not exact enough to make deriva­tion from a common written source its most likely explana­tion. Even if items like these stood in Q, it is proba­ble that one or other of the Evangelists also had before him another version as well. Further study of the facts convinces me that a substantial proportion of the 200 verses in question were probably derived from some other source than Q.” (Streeter 184-85)
      2. “. . . since Matthew and Luke would presumably have treated Q much in the same way as they treated Mark, it is fairly certain that some passages which are preserved by Matthew only or by Luke only are from Q . . .” (Streeter 185)
      3. “Not enough allowance has been made for the extent to which sayings of a proverbi­al form circulate in any community. One such, “It is more blessed to give than to receive,” which does not appear in any of the Gospels, is quoted by Paul (Acts xx. 35). . . . Where, howev­er, a number of consecutive sayings occur in two Gospels with approximately the same wording, or where a detached saying is not of a quasi-proverbial character, a doc­u­mentary source is more probable.” (Streeter 185)
   4. overlapping of Q and Mark
      1. “. . . certain items were known to Matthew and Luke both in Mark’s version and also in another decidedly different.” (Streeter 186)
      2. These include “John the Baptist’s Preaching, the Baptism and Temp­tation, the Beelzebub Controversy, the parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven, and the Mission Charge [Mark 6:7-11, cf. Matt 10:1-16a//Luke 10:1-12]. The phenomena revealed are only explica­ble on the theory that Matthew and Luke had before them a version of these items considerably longer than that of Mark. [186] . . . This over­lapping of Mark and Q, found in the above sections and in a few other short sayings, covers about 50 verses of Mark.” (Streeter 186-87)
      3. “. . . while Matthew carefully combines the two versions, Luke pre­fers the non-Marcan, introducing at most a few touches from that of Mark. [186] . . . Luke tends to preserve the Q version unmixed, while Matthew combines it with that of Mark. . . . This differ­ence . . . affords a valuable principle for distinguishing the Marcan and the Q versions in doubtful cases.” (Streeter 186-87)
      4. “Many critics explain this overlapping of Q and Mark on the theory that Mark knew and made extracts from Q. In favour of this view there is the fact that in many cases where Mark and Q overlap the Q version is longer and also looks the more origi­nal.” (Streeter 187) But there are problems with this view.
         1. “. . . the first difficulty would be to explain the very small amount of matter (not more than 50 verses) which Mark de­rives from Q.” (Streeter 187)
         2. Mark’s account of the temptation is wholly different from Q’s. (Streeter 188)
            1. “John’s Preaching, the Baptism, and the Temptation obviously form a single section, and a source which contains the first and third must have contained the second, which not only connects the other two but is the point round which they hinge. Q, therefore, must have contained an account of the Baptism.” (Streeter 188)
            2. “. . . wherever Mark and Q overlap, Matthew conflates the two versions; Luke prefers that of Q. But if we take Luke as on the whole representing Q, [188] and consider the section John’s Preaching, Baptism and Temptation as a whole, the differences between his version and Mark are far more strik­ing than the resemblances.” (Streeter 188-89)
         3. Concerning the mission of the twelve (Mark 6:7-11): if Luke 10:1-12 represents Q (since it is not conflated with Mark), then “the differences between Mark and Luke are so great and the resemblances so few that they favour the view that Mark’s ver­sion is independent, not derived from Q.” (Streeter 190)
         4. “There remain no other considerable passages where Mark and Q are parallel; for only portions of [Mark 4:21-25 and 9:42-50] have their equivalents in Q, and that in scat­tered contexts. The rest are all quite short, consisting of one or two verses. Mostly they belong to the class of proverb-like saying which . . . would be likely to be circulated in different forms by word of mouth.” The chief examples are Mark 8:34 (cf. Matt 10:38//Luke 14:27) and Mark 8:38 (cf. Matt 10:33//Luke 12:9). “. . . Matthew and Luke give these sayings twice ov­er—once in the context parallel to Mark and in a version very close to Mark’s, and again in the quite different contexts to which the refer­ences are give above, but in a version much less close to Mark’s. This shows beyond doubt that Matthew and Luke had versions of the sayings in two distinct sources.” (Streeter 191)
3. **first objection to the four-source theory**: **minor agreements**
   1. There are “minute agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark . . .” [168] These com­prise a weighty objection against the four-source theory, since they sug­gest that Matthew used Luke’s gospel or Luke used Mat­thew’s. These minor agreements are either “minor omissions” or “minute altera­tions.” (Streeter 168, 179)
   2. shared omissions: “If the agreement consists in an omission it is almost invari­ably of the unnecessary or unimportant words which are charac­ter­istic of Mark’s somewhat verbose style. . . . [Since] Mat­thew and Luke *in­dependently* compress Mark . . ., and since in any sentence only certain words can be spared, they could not avoid frequently concurring in the selection of words to be dispensed with. *Under such circum­stances*, *coincidence in omission calls for no explana­tion*.” (Streeter 180)
   3. shared alterations: there are approximately 175 of these (Streeter 328), and they are what are normally referred to by the phrase “minor ag­ree­ments.”
      1. due to Matthew and Luke
         1. Most of the shared alterations are ex­plicable as instances of coinciding but indepen­dent improve­ments of Mark. “Most commonly these agree­ments result from Mat­thew and Luke
            1. “changing a historic present in Mark into an im­per­fect or aorist tense,[[2]](#footnote-2)
            2. “in their substi­tut­ing a particle for a finite verb with “and,”

“or in using a different conjunction or preposi­tion from Mark.

“In every instance the change is, from the stylistic or grammat­ical point of view, an improvement. And as both Matthew and Luke continually make this kind of improve­ment concur in doing so . . .” (Streeter 179) There’s something wrong with this quote.

* + - 1. Major instances of these “deceptive” minor agreements (ag­ree­ments “explicable as the result of independent edit­ing,” 304) are:
         1. Mark 2:12//Matt 9:7//Luke 5:25
         2. Mark 16:8//Matt 28:8//Luke 24:9
         3. Mark 3:1//Matt 12:9-10//Luke 6:6
         4. Mark 4:10//Matt 13:10//Luke 8:9
         5. Mark 4:36//Matt 8:23//Luke 8:22
         6. Mark 13:19//Matt 24:21//Luke 21:23
         7. Mark 8:29//Matt 16:16//Luke 9:20
         8. Mark 15:30-32//Matt 27:40//Luke 23:35-37
         9. Mark 14:47//Matt 26:51//Luke 22:49-50
         10. Mark 15:43//Matt 27:57//Luke 23:50. (Streeter 298-305)
    1. due to Q influence
       1. Both Q and Mark “contained versions of John’s Preaching, the Bap­tism, Tempta­tion, Beelzebub Controversy, Mission Charge, par­able of Mustard Seed, and that Matthew regular­ly, Luke occasion­ally, conflates Mark and Q. Hence agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in *these* contexts can be explained by the in­fluence of Q.” (Streeter 305)
       2. Also in Mark 4:21//Matt 5:15//Luke 8:16//Luke 11:33, and in Mark 4:22//Matt 10:26//Luke 8:17//Luke 12:2, “it seems to me that an agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark ought to be explained by conflation from Q . . . In both of these the doublet in Luke is evidence that the saying stood in Q. Again, in [Matt 16:4] the addition of the word πονηρ?? and the mention of the sign of Jonah [absent from Mark 8:12] are due to the influence of the long Q passage Mt. xii. 39 ff.=Lk. xi. 29 ff.” (Streeter 306)
       3. Consequently, the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, as an argument against the four-source theory, “are only significant in contexts where there is no reason to suppose that the passage also stood in Q.” (Streeter 179)
    2. due to scribes’ (i. e., later copyists’) alterations: “There are, how­ever, three instances where the agreement of Mat­thew and Luke against Mark amounts to five consecutive words; and there are per­haps thirty of an agreement in one or two words. These ag­reements are all of a kind which, if there were fewer of them, could easily be attrib­uted to accidental coinci­dence. But there are just too many of them to make this at all a plausible ex­plan­ation.” (Streeter 180) These significant minor agreements are:
       1. Mark 1:40-42//Matt 8:2-3//Luke 5:12-13 (striking)
       2. Mark 2:21-22//Matt 9:16-17//Luke 5:36-37
       3. Mark 2:22//Matt 9:17//Luke 5:37
       4. Mark 2:23//Matt 12:1//Luke 6:1
       5. Mark 2:24//Matt 12:2//Luke 6:2
       6. Mark 2:26//Matt 12:4//Luke 6:4
       7. Mark 4:11//Matt 13:11//Luke 8:10 (striking)
       8. Mark 5:27//Matt 9:20//Luke 8:44
       9. Mark 6:32-34//Matt 14:13,14//Luke 9:10,11 (strik­ing)
       10. Mark 6:43//Matt 14:20//Luke 9:17
       11. Mark 9:2-3//Matt 17:2//Luke 9:29
       12. Mark 9:6-7//Matt 17:5//Luke 9:34
       13. Mark 9:19//Matt 17:17//Luke 9:41 (striking)
       14. Mark 10:25//Matt 19:24//Luke 18:25
       15. Mark 10:30//Matt 19:29//Luke 18:30
       16. Mark 11:1//Matt 21:1//Luke 19:28,29
       17. Mark 11:27//Matt 21:23//Luke 20:1
       18. Mark 11:29//Matt 21:24//Luke 20:3 (striking)
       19. Mark 12:11,12//Matt 21:44//Luke 20:18
       20. Mark 12:12//Matt 21:45//Luke 20:19
       21. Mark 12:22//Matt 22:27//Luke 20:32
       22. Mark 12:28//Matt 22:35,36//Luke 10:25,26 (striking)
       23. Mark 14:62//Matt 26:64//Luke 22:69-70 (striking)
       24. Mark 14:65//Matt 26:67-68//Luke 22:64 (most striking)
       25. Mark 14:70//Matt 26:73//Luke 22:58
       26. Mark 14:72//Matt 26:75//Luke 22:61 (striking)
       27. Mark 14:72//Matt 26:75//Luke 22:62
       28. Mark 15:39//Matt 27:54//Luke 23:47
       29. Mark 15:43//Matt 27:58//Luke 23:52 (striking)
       30. Mark 15:46//Matt 27:59-60//Luke 23:53 (striking)
       31. Mark 16:1//Matt 28:1//Luke 23:54 (cf. 24:1)
       32. Mark 16:5//Matt 28:3//Luke 24:4. (Streeter 309-29)
       33. assimilation
           1. To “assimilate the text of one Gospel to another” [37] means to alter the text of one gospel so that it con­forms to the text of another gospel. It results from the “tendency of scribes to make small verbal alter­ations in the direction of bringing passages where the Gospels already resemble one an­other into a still closer resem­blance.” (Streeter 37, 129)
           2. “Assimilation of par­al­lel passages in the Gospels is the common­est form of textual corruption.” (Streeter 307)
           3. Probably “minute agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, which cannot be attributed to coinci­dence, were absent from the original text of the Gospels [of Matthew and Luke, and] have crept in later as a result of “as­sim­ilation” be­tween the texts of the different Gospels.” (Streeter 181)
           4. “Assimila­tion of parallels is a form of cor­ruption which [has resulted in] *identical* corruption along more than one *independent* line of transmission.” (Streeter 327) Most of the 32 re­maining minor ag­reements can be ex­plained as in­stances of assimila­tion of Matthew to Luke or of Luke to Matthew. (See Street­er 309-31.)
           5. “. . . freedom from assimilation [is] one of [the] prin­ci­pal criteria of a pure text. . . . [Because assimilation is so common,] a reading which makes the Gospels differ is more likely to be original than one that makes them agree . . .” (Streeter 330)
           6. examples of assimilation

“Crowds” (ὄχλoι) in Mark 6:33. (Streeter 314)

“Very much more” (πoλλαπλασίoνα) in Luke 18:30 for ἑπταπλασίoνα in Matt 19:29//­Mark 10:30. (Streeter 318)

In Matt 19:24//Mark 10:25//Luke 18:25, “as­simila­tion has run riot.” (Street­er 317)

* + - 1. scribal additions to Mark before Matthew and Luke used Mark: “in the great majority of cases . . ., the *existing text of Mark seems the more primitive* and original. If, then, the document used by Matthew and Luke was not identi­cal with our Mark, so far from being an earlier form of Mark, it must have been a later and more pol­ished recension, all copies of which have since disap­peared. This is the explanation of the phenome­na which was adopted by Dr. Sanday in the *Oxford Studies* (pp. 21 ff.) . . . It involves no *a priori* difficul­ties. There would have been sev­eral copies of Mark at Rome at a very early date; and it is quite likely that one copy­ist would have felt [180] free to emend the style a little.” Nevertheless, it seems pre­ferable to explain the ap­proximately 32 significant minor ag­reements as due to as­sim­ilation or accidental omission. (Streeter 180-81)
      2. scribal omissions from Mark after Matthew and Luke used Mark: “Now, most ancient MSS. [manuscripts] teem with ac­cidental omissions of single words, of lines, and occa­sion­ally of para­graphs. There are MSS. of Homer where as many as 60 lines at a time are omitted. . . . It is, there­fore, antecedently probable that some lines or words which stood in the copies of Mark known to Matthew and Luke have dropped out of the text of all our oldest MSS. It may, then, not infrequently be the case that a verbal agreement of Matthew and Luke preserves a word or a line which once stood in Mark. I do not think this has happened very often, but it would be rather surprising if it had never hap­pened at all.” (Streeter 307)

1. **second objection to the four-source theory**: **the Ur-Markus hypothesis**
   1. “To the view that their [Matthew and Luke’s] common source was *exactly* iden­tical with our Mark there are two objec­tions.” (Streeter 168)
   2. omission of whole sections
      1. Since Matthew and Luke omit some whole sections of Mark, perhaps “the document used by Matthew and Luke did not contain the omitted items . . . it was an earlier form of Mark, or “Ur-Marcus,” of which our present Gospel [of Mark] is an expand­ed version . . .” (Streeter 168)
      2. But omission of whole sections can be explained in other ways. (Streeter 168)
         1. “Very often we can surmise reasons of an apologetic nature why the Evange­lists may have thought some things less worth while reporting.” (Streeter 169)
         2. Matthew and Luke “probably did not wish their work to exceed the compass of a single papyrus roll. If so, space would be an object. As it is, both Matthew and Luke would have needed rolls of fully thirty feet long; and about twenty-five feet seems to have been regarded as the convenient length.” (Streeter 169)
   3. minor agreements
      1. “. . . if the text of Ur-Marcus differed slightly from that of Mark, the same theory would account for the minute agreements of Mat­thew and Luke.” (Streeter 168)
      2. But each of the minor agreements is explicable given the four-source theory: they are largely due to (a) coinci­ding but indepen­dent improve­ments of Mark by Matthew and Luke or (b) assimilation of Matthew’s text to Luke’s or of Luke’s to Matthew’s. See above, “objection to the four-source theory: minor agree­ments.”
2. **miscellaneous addenda**
   1. “Matthew may be regarded as an enlarged edition of Mark; Luke is an indepen­dent work incorporating considerable portions of Mark.” [151] “Matthew is *a fresh edition* of Mark . . . Luke is a new historical work made by combining parts of Mark with parts of other documents.” (Qtd. from Burkitt, F.C. *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*. Constable, 1922.) (Streeter 158)
   2. Printing “facilitated the development of inverted commas, footnotes for reference, and other such devices unknown to the scribes of Classical Antiqui­ty, which make it easy for an author to indicate without clumsy circumlocu­tions the exact extent of his debt to predecessors. The conventions of every art are determined by what is mechanically possible . . . the historian pursued what we should call a method of “scissors and paste.” Without any acknowl­edgement, he will copy page after page from his source, omitting [and] adding . . . he will often abridge, and occasionally paraphrase . . . It is clear that, from 1 Chron. x. on, almost everything is an abridgement, with trifling modifications, of the narrative [156] in the books of Samuel and Kings. Consult . . . the earliest accounts of St. Francis of Assissi, . . . and you will see a “synoptic problem” . . . the Greek historian Ephorus [repeats] the same events in Diodorus . . . the Greek writer, in contrast to the Hebrew, makes many more little alterations of phrase so as to leave upon all that he has incorpo­rated the impress of his own style. Such being the almost universal method of ancient historians, whether Jewish or Greek, it is natural to ask whether the remarkable resemblance between the first three Gospels . . . would not be most easily explained on the hypothesis that they incorporate earlier documents.” (Streeter 156-57)

## An Example of a Minor Agreement:

## Healing the Leper

(Matt 8:2-3//Mark 1:40-42//Luke 5:12-13)

|  | *Matt 8*:*2-3* | *Mark 1*:*40-42* | *Luke 5*:*12-13* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Greek | καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς | Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς | Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας· |
| literal  English | And behold a leper | And a leper came to him | And it happened, in the to be him [= while he was] in one of the cities, and behold a man full of leprosy. |
| nrsv | . . . and there was a leper | A leper | Once, when he was in one of the cities, there was a man covered with leprosy. |
| nab | And then a leper | A leper | Now there was a man full of leprosy in one of the towns where he was; |
| njb | Suddenly a man with a virulent skin-disease | A man suffering from a virulent skin-disease | Now it happened that Jesus was in one of the towns when suddenly a man appeared, covered with a skin disease. |
| reb | And now a leper | On one occasion he was approached by a leper, | He was once in a certain town where there was a man covered with lep­rosy; |
|  | | | |
| Greek | προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων· | παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ γονυπετῶν] καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι | ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων· |
| literal  English | coming was kneel­ing to him, saying: | coming to him and kneel­ing, and saying to him that | but seeing Jesus, bend­ing over face, he was begging him, saying: |
| nrsv | who came to him and knelt before him, saying, | came to him begging him, and kneeling he said to him, | When he saw Jesus, he bowed with his face to the ground and begged him, |
| nab | ap­proaced, did him hom­age, and said, | came to him and kneel­ing down begged him and said, | and when he saw Jesus, he fell prostrate, plead­ed with him, and said, |
| njb | came up and bowed low in front of him, saying, | came to him and pleased on his knees saying, | Seeing Jesus he fell on his face and implored him saying, |
| reb | ap­proached him, bowed before him, and said, | who knelt before him and begged for help. | when he saw Jesus, he threw himself to the ground and begged his help. |
|  | | | |
| Greek | κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. | ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. | κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. |
| literal  English | “Lord, if you will, you can cleanse me.” | “If you will, you can cleanse me.” | “Lord, if you will, you can cleanse me.” |
| nrsv | “Lord, if you choose, you can make me clean.” | “If you choose, you can make me clean.” | “Lord, if you choose, you can make me clean.” |
| nab | “Lord, if you wish, you can make me clean.” | “If you wish, you can make me clean.” | “Lord, if you wish, you can make me clean.” |
| njb | “Lord, if you are willing, you can cleanse me.” | “If you are willing, you can cleanse me.” | “Sir, if you are will you can cleanse me.” |
| reb | “Sir, if only you will, you can make me clean.” | “If only you will,” said the man, “you can make me clean.” | “Sir,” he said, “if only you will, you can make me clean.” |
|  | | | |
| Greek | 3 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· | 41 καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκ­τείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· | 13 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· |
| literal  English | And extending the hand he touched him, saying: | And feeling compassion, extending his hand, he also said to him: | And extending his hand he touched him, saying: |
| nrsv | He stretched out his hand and touched him, saying, | Moved with pity, Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, and said to him, | Then Jesus stretched out his hand, touched him, and said, |
| nab | He stretched out his hand, touched him, and said, | Moved with pity, he stretched out his hand, touched him, and said to him, | Jesus stretched out his hand, touched him, and said, |
| njb | Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him saying, | Feeling sorry for him, Jesus stretched out his hand, touched him and said to him, | He stretched out his hand, and touched him saying, |
| reb | Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, saying, | Jesus was moved to anger; he stretched out his hand, touched him, and said, | Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, saying, |
|  | | | |
| Greek | θέλω, καθαρίσθη­τι. | θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. | θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. |
| literal  English | “I will, be cleansed.” | “I will, be cleansed.” | “I will, be cleansed.” |
| nrsv | “I do choose. Be made clean!” | “I do choose. Be made clean!” | “I do choose. Be made clean.” |
| nab | “I will do it. Be made clean.” | “I do will it. Be made clean.” | “I do will it. Be made clean.” |
| njb | “I am willing. Be cleansed.” | “I am willing. Be cleansed.” | “I am willing. Be cleansed.” |
| reb | “I will; be clean.” | “I will; be clean.” | “I will; be clean.” |
|  | | | |
| Greek | καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα. | 42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη. | καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. |
| literal  English | And immediately was cleansed of him the lep­rosy. | And immediately left from him the leprosy, and he was cleansed. | And immediately the leprosy was cleansed from him. |
| nrsv | Immediately his leprosy was cleansed. | Immediately the leprosy left him, and he was made clean. | Immediately the leprosy left him. |
| nab | His leprosy was cleansed immediately. | The leprosy left him immediately, and he was made clean. | And the leprosy left him immedately. |
| njb | And his skin-disease was cleansed at once. | And at once the skin-disease left him and he was cleansed. | At once the skin-disease left him. |
| reb | And his leprosy was cured immediately. | The leprosy left him immediately, and he was clean. | The leprosy let him im­mediately. |

## Kümmel on the Synoptic Problem

Anderson, Hugh, ed. *Jesus*. Great Lives Observed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967. (professor of NT, University of Edin­burgh.)

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Trans. Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abindgon, 1975. 38‑80. (From the German 17th ed., 1973.)

1. **arguments for the priority of Mark**
   1. order
      1. “. . . within the material that they have in common with Mk, Mt and Lk agree in sequence only insofar as they agree with Mk . . .” (Kümmel 57)
      2. Lachmann was the first to recognize this fact but concluded only that Mark is closest to the primitive gospel (Urmarkus); he did not draw (though he did imply) a further conclusion made by most scholars: that Mark itself is a source of Matthew and Luke. This con­clu­sion is therefore not “Lach­mann’s fallacy” (as the Griesbachians characterize it), nor even a “fal­la­cy,” since “the divergence of Mt and Lk from Mk can be ren­dered comprehensible, but not the diver­gence of Mk from Mt and Lk.” (Kümmel 58)
      3. The argument from order can be stated in two ways:
         1. Matthew and Luke agree in sequence only when they agree with Mark.
         2. When Matthew deviates from Mark, Luke follows Mark; when Luke deviates from Mark, Matthew follows Mark. [Hahn note.]
      4. In explaining Matthew and Luke’s divergences from Mark’s order, one need only compare Matthew and Luke to Mark 1‑6:6, because from Mark 6:7 on, Matthew and Luke rarely deviate from Mark’s sequence (Luke 22 is an excep­tion), though they often supplement Mark.
         1. Luke deviates only four times, and “in all four cases Lk’s alteration of the Markan sequence is readily explicable . . .” (Minute devia­tions are merely noted in parentheses.)

*pericope* *Mark* *Luke*

John the Baptist 1:1-8 3:1-6, 15-18

baptism 1:9-11 3:21-22

temptation 1:12-13 4:1-13

Jesus’ preaching in Galilee 1:14-15 4:14-15

[Luke: rejection at Nazareth] 4:16-30

call of first disciples 1:16-20 ———

Capernaum demoniac 1:21-28 4:31-37

Peter’s mother-in-law 1:29-31 4:38-39

healings at sunset 1:32-34 4:40-41

Jesus leaves at morning 1:35-38 4:42-43

first preaching tour 1:39 4:44

[Luke: call of first disciples] 5:1-11

leper 1:40-45 5:12-16

paralytic 2:1-12 5:17-26

call of Levi/Matthew 2:13-14 5:27-28

eating with sinners 2:15-17 5:29-32

fasting controversy 2:18-20 5:33-35

cloths and wineskins 2:21-22 5:36-39

grain on sabbath 2:23-28 6:1-5

withered hand 3:1-6 6:6-11

healing crowds at seaside 3:7-12

up the mountain 3:13a 6:12

choosing the twelve 3:13b-19a 6:13-16

[Luke: healing crowds at seaside] 6:17b-19

family thinks him mad 3:19b-21 ———

Beelzebub controversy 3:22-27 (11:15-23)

blaspheming the Spirit 3:28-30 (12:10)

Jesus’ true kin 3:31-35

sower 4:1-9 8:4-8

why parables 4:10-12 8:9-10

sower explained 4:13-20 8:11-15

hidden lamp 4:21 8:16

hidden made manifest 4:22 8:17

ears to hear 4:23 ———

measure you give 4:24 8:18a

to him who has 4:25 8:18b

seed growing secretly 4:26-29 ———

mustard seed 4:30-32 (13:18-19)

use of parables 4:33-34 ———

[Luke: Jesus’ true kin] 8:19-21

stilling the storm 4:35-41 8:22-25

Gerasene demoniac 5:1-20 8:26-39

Jairus’ daughter/hemorrhage 5:21-43 8:40-56

rejection at Nazareth 6:1-6

* + - * 1. Luke moves the rejection at Nazareth (Mark 6:1‑6) so that it can be “a program­mic scene [at] the inception of Jesus’ activity . . .” (Kümmel 59)
        2. Luke puts the call of the first disciples (Mark 1:16-20) after the first of Jesus’ works (Mark 1:21-28, Capernaum demoniac [1:29‑39 = heal­ing summary, preaching tour]) “because in this way the response of those called is more plausible . . .” (Kümmel 59)
        3. Luke puts the crowds pressing on Jesus after the call of the twelve (Mark 3:13‑­19) so that crowds will be on hand for the sermon on the plain (Luke 6:20-49).
        4. Luke moves the true‑kin story (Mark 3:31-35) to the front of “the parable speech” so that crowds will be on hand for it. [59] (What “parable speech” is Küm­mel refer­ring to? There is no “parable speech” till Luke 10‑18, and other crowds become available between the true‑kin story and ch. 10.—Hahn)
      1. Matthew also deviates only four times. (Minute deviations are merely noted in paren­theses.)

*pericope* *Mark* *Matthew*

John the Baptist 1:1-8 3:1-6, 11-12

baptism 1:9-11 3:13-17

temptation 1:12-13 4:1-11

Jesus’ preaching in Galilee 1:14-15 4:12-17

call of first disciples 1:16-20 4:18-22

Capernaum demoniac 1:21-28 ———

Peter’s mother-in-law 1:29-31

healings at sunset 1:32-34

Jesus leaves at morning 1:35-38 ———

first preaching tour 1:39 4:23

[Matthew: up the mountain] 5:1

leper 1:40-45 8:1-4

[Matthew: Peter’s mother-in-law] 8:14-15

[Matthew: healings at sunset] 8:16-17

[Matthew: stilling the storm] 8:23-27

[Matthew: Gerasene demoniac] 8:28-34

paralytic 2:1-12 9:1-8

call of Levi/Matthew 2:13-14 9:9-13

eating with sinners 2:15-17 ———

fasting controversy 2:18-20 9:14-15

cloths and wineskins 2:21-22 9:16-17

[Matthew: Jairus/hemorrhage] 9:18-26

[Matthew: choosing the twelve] 10:1-4

grain on sabbath 2:23-28 12:1-8

withered hand 3:1-6 12:9-14

healing crowds at seaside 3:7-12 12:15-16

up the mountain 3:13a

choosing the twelve 3:13b-19a

family thinks him mad 3:19b-21 ———

Beelzebub controversy 3:22-27 12:22-30

blaspheming the Spirit 3:28-30 12:31-37

Jesus’ true kin 3:31-35 12:46-50

sower 4:1-9 13:1-9

why parables 4:10-12 13:10-17

sower explained 4:13-20 13:18-23

hidden lamp 4:21 (5:15)

hidden made manifest 4:22 (10:26)

ears to hear 4:23 (11:15)

measure you give 4:24 (7:2)

to him who has 4:25 (13:12, 25:29)

seed growing secretly 4:26-29 ———

mustard seed 4:30-32 13:31-32

use of parables 4:33-34 13:34-35

stilling the storm 4:35-41

Gerasene demoniac 5:1-20

Jairus’ daughter/hemorrhage 5:21-43

rejection at Nazareth 6:1-6 13:53-58

* + - * 1. Matthew gathers miracles scattered in Mark, in order to have ten miracles to il­lus­trate Matt 4:23 (“he went about all Galilee, teaching . . . and preach­ing . . . and heal­ing”). (This explains changes a, b, and d.)
        2. Matthew moves forward the choosing of the twelve (Mark 3:13-19) in order to in­tro­duce the Mis­sion Discourse. (This explains change c.)
      1. Mark’s divergences from Matthew and Luke’s order can­not be explained.
  1. irregularities in narration
     1. Roughnesses in Matthew and Luke’s narra­tive flow prove that each had Mark’s order before him.
        1. Luke
           1. Luke 4:23 mentions Capernaum miracles, but none occurs till 4:31-41.
           2. Luke 4:38 mentions Simon, but he is not called till 5:1-11.
        2. Matthew
           1. Matt 9:9-17 (call of Matthew; eating with sinners; fasting con­tro­versy) is out of place among ten miracles and is expli­cable only as a re­tention of Mark’s order.
           2. In the parable discourse (Matt 13), Matthew follows Mark in sepa­rat­ing the interpreta­tion of the sower parable from the parable itself by intruding an expla­nation of why he speaks to the crowd in parables (Mark 4:10-12/Matt 13:10-17).
           3. Also, the parable discourse has two con­clusions.

Matt 13:34-35, “All this Jesus said to the crowds in parables . . . This was to ful­fill . . .”

Matt 13:51ab, “‘Have you under­stood all this?’ They said to him, ‘Yes.’”

* 1. stylistic improvements
     1. Matthew and Luke have better Greek equiva­lents for Mark’s colloqui­alisms or Semitisms.
     2. lexical improvements
        1. *Krabatos* (Mark 2:4, “pallet”) becomes *kline* (Matt 9:2, “bed”) or *klinidion* (Luke 5:19, “bed”).
        2. Mark has 7 Aramaic words: *Boanerges* (3:17), *Talitha cumi* (5:41), *Corban* (7:11), *Ephphatha* (7:34), *Abba* (14:36), *Eloi*, *Eloi*, *lamach sabach­thani* (15:34), and *Golgotha* (27:33). Of these, Luke has none, and Matthew has only the last two.
     3. grammatical improvements: *ti houtos houtos lalei*; *blasphemei* (Mark 2:7, “Why does this man speak thus? It is blasphemy!”) becomes *houtos blasphemei* (Matt 9:3, “This man is blaspheming”) or *tis estin houtos hos lalei blasphemias*; (Luke 5:21, “Who is this that speaks blasphemies?”). (Further examples in Haw­kins *Horae Synopticae* 131-38.)
     4. narrative improvements: Matthew and Luke alter Mark to smooth the narrative. “Thus, the clear his­torical impression given by the Lukan narrative is due . . . to lit­er­ary polishing, not historical accuracy.” Example: call of Levi (Matt 9:9//Mark 2:13-17//Luke 5:29). (Ach­te­meier, *Mark* 12)

alternative theory: priority of Urmarkus

* 1. That Matthew and Luke (as well as Mark) used an “Urmarkus” (primitive Mark) rather than our Mark has been proposed by Lachmann, Holz­mann, Hauck, Bornkamm, Barni­kol.
     1. These men argue that Luke’s “great omission” (Mark 6:45-8:26—from the walking on water to the blind man of Bethsaida) is explic­able only if Luke’s Mark lacked Mark 6:45-8:26. Now, the om­ission is “admittedly enigmatic”; nevertheless, some of Luke’s special material parallels the omitted Markan material, so perhaps Luke made the omission to avoid doublets. (Kümmel 62)
     2. They also argue that the “minor agreements” (of Matthew and Luke against Mark in texts other­wise common to all three) show that Matthew and Luke possessed an Urmarkus containing the minor agreements. But this is unlikely.
        1. Some minor agreements disappear when textual corrup­tions are corrected.
           1. Mark 1:40 (the leper says, “If you will, you can make me clean”) should read, “Lord, if you will” (= Matthew/Luke). (But Kümmel seems wrong: Nes­tle26 cites no textual vari­ants at this point).
           2. Mark 5:27 (the woman with a hemorrhage touches “his gar­ment,” tou hima­tiou autou) should read with Matthew and Luke “touched the fringe of his garment,” tou kraspedou tou himatiou autou. (Has Kümmel here mis­read Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 306 ff., which he cites on p. 62 n. 43?—Hahn)
           3. Mark 9:19 (“O faithless generation”) should perhaps read with Matthew and Luke, “O faithless and perverse [diestram­menē] generation.”
        2. Other minor agreements are stylistic improve­ments, where “convergence is either un­avoidable or easily explicable.” (Kümmel 62)
        3. A few minor agreements probably result from oral tra­dition influencing the later gospels after their pro­mulgation.
           1. Matt 13:11/Luke 8:10 (humin dedotai gnōnai ta musteria) vs. Mark 4:11 (humin to musterion dedotai).
           2. Matt 26:68/Luke 22:64 (tis estin ho paisas se;—”who is it that struck you?”) vs. Mark 14:65 (which omits the ques­tion).
        4. Another argument: phrases in Matthew that seem more primi­tive (i.e., Jewish) than Mark’s version suggest that Matthew used an Urmar­kus. But it is just as likely that Matthew has judaized texts radically critical of the Law.
           1. Mark 7:1‑23/Matt 15:1‑20 (unwashed‑hands con­troversy; Cor­ban; only what is inside de­files)
           2. Matt 15:21‑28 (Syrophoenician/Canaanite woman)
           3. Mark 10:2-12/Matt 19:3-9 (divorce)

Q

* 1. Matthew and Luke have extensive non-Markan common material.
  2. That Luke → Matthew has no supporters today.
  3. That Matthew → Luke is supported by Rengstorf, Butler, Far­mer, Turn­er, Sanders, etc. (These support the Griesbach hypothesis.)
  4. But that Matthew → Luke is unlikely. (The following are arguments against the Griesbach hypothe­sis.)
     1. Why would Luke shatter the Sermon on the Mount?
     2. Except for the baptism and temptation pericopes, Matthew and Luke never insert material at the same point in Mark.
     3. Luke would hardly have accepted only the minor agree­ments among all of Matthew’s alterations of Mark.
     4. In the Q material, “Mt and Lk alternate in offering the origi­nal form . . .” (Kümmel 64)
  5. Q was a written document and not merely oral tradition.
     1. Many (R. Grant, Jeremias, Vaganay, etc.) argue that Q was oral tradition, because
        1. Q cannot be reconstructed accurately,
        2. a written source without a passion narrative is incon­ceiv­able,
        3. Matthew and Luke’s close verbal agreements in Q material are few­er than their close verbal agreements in Markan material, and
        4. the verbal agreements that do exist are the sort that re­sult from oral tradition.
     2. But:
        1. Matthew and Luke’s agreements are too often verbatim for Q to have been oral tradition (e.g., Matt 3:7‑10; 7:7‑11; 11:­4‑6; 12:43‑45; 24:45‑51 pars.). Also, more than 50% of the voca­bulary in Q texts is the same in Matthew and Luke.
        2. Some of the lack of exact agreement results from Matthew’s min­g­ling of Mark and Q. For example, “Mt 10:1‑16 [mis­sion of the twelve] makes contact alter­nately with Mark 6:7‑13 [mis­sion of the twelve] and Luke 10:1‑12 [mission of the seven­ty].”
        3. Matthew inserts Q mostly in blocks of discourse (5‑7, 10, 11, 18, 23, 24-25), where­as Luke in­serts Q mostly in his “lesser” and “greater” insertions (Luke 6:20‑8:3 and 9:51‑18:14); hence there should be no agreement in the order of Q peri­copes. But there is common order, and “Such agreement . . . proves a com­mon, written source.” (Texts in the same or­der are underlined; the chart omits iso­lated sayings.)

*Luke* *pericope* *Matthew*

1 3:7‑9, 16‑17 Baptist’s preaching 3:7‑12 1

2 4:2‑13 three temptations 4:2‑11 2

3 6:20‑23, 27-30 Sermon (part I) 5:3-6, 11‑12, 3

39-42, 45

4 6:37‑38, 41-49 Sermon (part II) 7:1-5, 16-21, 24-27 9

5 7:1‑10 centurion’s servant 8:5‑13 11

6 7:18‑35 on John the Baptist 11:2‑19 15

7 9:57‑60 on would‑be followers 8:19‑22 12

8 10:1‑12 mission discourse 9:37-10:15 13

9 10:13-15 woes on Galilean cities 11:21‑23 16

10 10:21‑22 exultation of Jesus 11:25‑26 17

11 11:1‑4 Lord’s Prayer 6:9‑13 5

12 11:9-13 on prayer 7:7‑11 10

13 11:14‑23 Beelzebub controversy 12:22‑30 18

14 11:24‑26 return of unclean spirit 12:43‑45 20

15 11:29‑32 sign of Jonah 12:38-42 19

17 11:34‑35 eye as lamp of body 6:22‑23 7

18 11:9‑52 woes on Pharisees 23:4, 23-25, 29-36 22

19 12:2-10 fearless confession 10:26-33 14

20 12:22‑31 on anxiety 6:25‑33 8

21 12:32‑34 treasure in heaven 6:19‑21 6

22 12:39-46 watchfulness 24:43‑51 25

23 13:20‑21 mustard seed and leaven 13:33 21

24 13:34‑35 lament over Jerusalem 23:37‑39 23

25 17:22‑37 eschatological discourse 24:27‑28, 37-41 24

26 19:11‑28 talents/pounds parable 25:14‑30 26

* + - 1. Doublets in Matthew and Luke (“texts which one evan­gelist pres­ents twice”), with one of the texts from Mark and the other from Q, are “the decisive evidence for a common, written source . . .” (Kümmel 66)
         1. Luke has the mission of the disciples twice, Luke 9 (= Mark 6:7‑13) and Luke 10 (= Matt 10). (True, Luke 10:1 has “sev­enty” disciples, where Matthew has “twelve”; but Luke 10:4 [“Carry no purse, no bag, no san­dals”] was originally addressed to the twelve [cf. Luke 2:35, “he said to them (the twelve), ‘When I sent you out with no purse or bag or sandals . . .” This verse (22:35) cannot be re­ferring to Luke 9’s mission of the twelve, however, since 9:3 says “no staff, nor bag, nor bread, nor mon­ey . . .”])
         2. Matt 9:19 (“And say to you: whoever divorces his wife, except for unchas­tity, and marries another, commits adultery”) is similar to Mark 10:11‑12 (“And he said to them, ‘Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, com­mits adultery against her; and if she divor­ces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery”). But Matt 5:32 (“But I say to you that every one who di­vor­ces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress; and whoever marries a di­vorced woman commits adul­tery”) is more like Luke 16:18 (“Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery”).
         3. Several sayings found in Mark occur twice in Matthew and Luke—once in their Markan setting, again in a setting found only in Matthew or Luke.

Matt 13:12 (“For to him who has will more be giv­en,” = Mark 4:25, Luke 8:18) is ap­proximately in its Markan setting (it is part of Jesus’ response to the dis­ciples’ question, “why do you speak to them in para­bles?”). But Matt 25:29 (a doublet of Matt 13:12) is in the eschatol­ogical dis­course (Luke 19:26 puts the saying in the pounds parable).

Matt 16:24‑25 (“If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it,” = Mark 8:34‑35, Luke 9:23‑24) is in its Mar­kan setting (right after the first pas­sion prediction). But Matt 10:38‑39 (“and he who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake will find it”) is in the Mission Discourse, right after “He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me . . .”; and this parallels the setting of Luke 14:27 (“Who­ever does not bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple”), which follows “If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother . . .”

* + - * 1. When this evidence from doublets “is placed beside the fact that Mk pres­ents a single doublet [“If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all,” Mark 9:35, 10:43], it is incontrovertibly proved that Mt and Lk must have used a second source . . . in written form . . .” (Kümmel 67)
  1. Q was in Greek, perhaps never (as a written document) in Ara­maic.
     1. “The linguistic agreements demonstrate that this source was in Greek.” (Kümmel 67)
     2. Though there are Aramaisms and translation variants, individu­al oral sayings may have been translated and then collected, rather than an Aramaic collection being translated.
  2. The extent of Q cannot be determined.
     1. “. . . what belongs to Q can be indicated only where there is extensive agreement in wording.” (Kümmel 67) But the beatitudes and the parable of the talents/pounds, with their common structure and their common placement in the order of Q, rarely agree in wording.
     2. Matthew and Luke omit many Markan texts; perhaps parts of M and L are actually Q (especially texts found in both gospels, e.g., Matt 11:28‑30 and Luke 9:61‑62 [last would-be disciple]).
  3. The wording of Q cannot be determined.
     1. “Even if . . . we can infer an original text lying behind Mt and Lk . . ., it remains uncertain whether that version of the text stood in Q or is to be assumed as lying behind Q.”
     2. “. . . at times in Mt (e.g., 4:22ff [introduction to the ser­mon]), at other times in Lk (6:20ff [beati­tudes]), the more original tradition [of the word­ing] can be recognized.” (Kümmel 69)
  4. QMT and QLK
     1. Reasons for assuming that Matthew and Luke knew different versions of the Q document
        1. Sometimes Matthew is more original, sometimes Luke.
        2. Some common texts differ sharply (e.g., tal­ents/­pounds).
        3. translation variants (cf. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts 186 ff.)
     2. Luhrmann has shown (*Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* 111 ff.) that Matthew used a Q “expanded along Jew­ish‑Christian lines.” (Kümmel 69 n. 60a)
     3. “But if it is supposed that the written source Q developed in different directions, so that perhaps on occasion the Greek form of one text or another was replaced by a divergent form from the oral tra­dition, this assumption best corresponds to the observa­tions about a common text for Mt and Lk.” (Kümmel 69)
  5. the order of Q
     1. For Q as a whole, no ordering principle is evident “other than the fact that in Q as in Mk an account of the Baptist comes at the beginning and the parou­sia/judg­ment comes at the end.” (Kümmel 68-69)
     2. But sub-sections of Q do show an ordering principle: sayings are grouped by content. (Kümmel 68)
     3. “. . . Lk has followed the Q order on the whole, while Mt has many times departed from the Q order . . .” (Kümmel 69)
        1. Matthew sprinkles Q material throughout, whereas Luke has it in two blocks; so Luke’s order is a priori likely to be the more original.
           1. See also Taylor, Vincent. “The Order of Q.” *Journal of Theol­ogical Studies* 4 (1953) 27 ff. (= Taylor, Vincent. *NT Essays*. 1970. 90 ff.).
  6. Q as narrative
     1. Though Q is mostly sayings, it does include six narra­tives (bap­tism; temptation; centurion’s servant; John the Baptist’s question; Beelzebub controversy; sign of Jonah). (Kümmel 68)
     2. Q was probably not, however, a complete gospel (thus Hirsch, Helmbold), since the material is mostly arranged topically. (Kümmel 68)
  7. authorship, provenance, and date of Q
     1. Authorship is completely uncertain. “The oft‑re­peated hypoth­e­sis that the author was the apostle Matthew is based entirely in Schleiermacher’s pro­blematical interpretation of the Papias witness about Mt . . .” (Kümmel 69‑70) (Schleiermacher assumed that Matthew incorporates “a collection of the sayings of Jesus that was to be traced back to the apostle Matthew . . . Schleiermacher in­fer­red the existence of a sayings source from the Papias ref­er­ence.” [Kümmel 46, 63])
     2. provenance: “Q probably arose in Palestine, because it obvi­ously consists of a collection influenced by the oral tradi­tion of the sayings of Jesus even after the first written re­cord was made.” (Kümmel 70) “Luhrmann, 85 ff, suggests a Syrian provenance, because Mt 11:27 par. [‘All things have been de­liv­ered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father ex­cept the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him’] stems from a Greek‑speaking Hellenistic church and Q presupposes the Gen­tile mission; but both presuppositions are appropriate in the same way for the Pales­tinian church ‘in the 50s and 60s’ (Luhrmann).” (Kümmel 70 n. 61a)
     3. date
        1. Is Mark or Q older? For the small amount of material common to Mark and Q, Mark is often older, Q is occasion­ally older. But literary dependence, “in view of the strong linguistic difference between Mk and Q in the double tradition (cf. e.g., Mk 4:30‑32 with Lk 13:­18f) is an extremely remote possi­bility . . .” [70] So Mark cannot determine Q’s date.
        2. Matt 23:35/Luke 11:51: “Zechariah [Matthew: the son of Bara­chiah] who perished between the altar and the sanctu­ary.” Jo­sephus (Bell. IV, 335‑43) mentions a Zaxarias huios Bareis murdered in the temple in ad 68. But huiou Baraxiou is Matthew’s addi­tion, since “it is hardly likely that mention of the father’s name would have been omitted by Lk . . .” (Kümmel 71) Luke’s (and Q’s) Zecha­riah must be the prophet Zechariah (stoned in the temple forecourt, 2 Chr 24:20‑21). So Matt 23:35 par. cannot pro­vide a terminus a quo.
        3. “Even though any possibility of a more exact dating of Q is impossible, it is unlikely that this document was com­pleted later than ca. 50 to 70.” (Kümmel 71)

(Note: Some worthwhile material in Kümmel, pp. 68-80, has not been included in this outline.)

## An Outline of Q (Kloppenborg 74-76)

Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987. 74-76.

*Luke* *Matthew* (*Markan*

*parallels*)

John’s preaching (1) 3:7-9 3:7-10

John’s preaching (2) 3:16-17 3:11-12

Temptation story 4:1-13 4:1-11

Beatitudes (1) 6:20b-21 5:3-6

Beatitudes (2) 6:22-23 5:11-12

Love your enemies 6:27-28 5:43-44

On retaliation 6:29 5:39-41

Giving freely 6:30 5:42

Golden Rule 6:31 7:12

Be sons of God 6:32-35 5:45-47

Be merciful 6:36 5:48

On judging 6:37-38 7:1-2

Blind guides 6:39 15:14 7:1-23

Disciples and teachers 6:40 \*10:24-25

On hypocripsy 6:41-42 7:3-5

Good and bad fruit 6:43-44 7:16-20/12:33-34

Treasures of the heart 6:45 12:35

Lord, Lord 6:46 7:21

Parable of the builders 6:47-49 7:24-27

Centurion’s son 7:1-10 8:5-10,13

John’s question 7:18-23 11:2-6

Jesus’ eulogy 7:24-26 11:7-9

Quotation of Mal 3:1 7:27 11:10

None born of woman. . . 7:28 11:11

Children in the marketplace 7:31-34 11:16-19a

Sophia saying 7:35 11:19b

Discipleship chria (1) 9:57-58 8:19-20

Discipleship chria (2) 9:59-60 8:21-22

“The harvest is great. . .” 10:2 9:37-38

Sheep ammong wolves 10:3 10:16

Carry no purse 10:4 10:9-10a 6:8-9

Greeting of peace 10:5-6 10:12-13

Remain in one house 10:7a,c 10:11b 6:10

On support of missionaries 10:7b 10:10b

Activity of missionaries 10:8-9 10:7-8

Concerning rejection 10:10-11 10:14 6:11

Threat 10:12 10:15

Woes against Galilee 10:13-15 11:21-24

“Whoever hears you. . .” 10:16 10:40

Jesus’ thanksgiving 10:21-22 10:25-27

“Blessed are the eyes. . .” 10:23-24 13:16-17 4:12

Lord’s prayer 11:2-4 6:9-13

On prayer (1) 11:9-10 7:7-8

On prayer (2) 11:11-13 7:9-11

Belzebul accusation 11:14-15 12:22-24

A kingdom divided 11:17-18 12:25-26

Jewish exorcists 11:19 12:27

Exorcism by the finger of God 11:20 12:28

Binding the stronger one 11:21-22 12:29

“He who is not for me. . .” 11:23 12:30

Return of the evil spirit 11:24-26 12:43-45

Demand for a sign 11:29 12:39

The sign of Jonah 11:30 12:40

Jonah and Solomon 11:31-32 12:41-42

Light saying 11:33 5:15

Sound eye 11:34-36 6:22-23

Woe: clensing the outside 11:39-41 23:25-26

Woe: neglect of justice 11:42 23:23

Woe: the best seats 11:43 23:6-7

Woe: unseen graves 11:44 23:27-28 12:37b-40

Woe: you burden men 11:46 23:4

Woe: murderers of the profits 11:47-48 23:29-31

Sophia’s oricle 11:49-51 23:34-36

Woe: you lock the kingdom 11:52 23:13

Revelation of the hidden 12:2 \*10:26

What is said in the dark 12:3 \*10:27

“Do not fear. . .” 12:4-5 \*10:28

You are worth more 12:6-7 \*10:29-31

Confessing Jesus 12:8-9 \*10:32-33

Blasphemy of the Spirit 12:10 12:32 3:28-30

Assistance of the Spirit 12:11-12 10:19-20 13:11

Anxiety about daily needs 12:22-32 6:25-33

Treasures in heaven 12:33-34 6:19-21

Parable of the householder 12:39-40 24:43-44

Parable of the faithful servant 12:42-46 24:45-51

I cast fire on the earth 12:49,51 \*10:34

On divisions 12:52-53 \*10:35-36

Agreeing with one’s accuser 12:57-59 5:25-26

Parable of mustard seed 13:18-19 13:31-32 4:30-32

Parable of leaven 13:20-21 13:32-33

Two ways 13:24 7:13-14

I do not know you. . . 13:25-27 7:22-23

They will come from east and west 13:28-29 8:11-12

First will be last 13:30 19:30 10:31

Lament over Jerusalem 13:34-35 23:37-39

Great supper 14:16-24 22:1-10

Loving one’s parents 14:25-26 \*10:37

Take up your cross 14:27 \*10:38

Salt 14:34-35 5:13

Lost sheep 15:3-7 18:12-14

Serving two masters 16:13 6:24

Law and profits 16:16 11:12-13

Endurance of the Law 16:17 5:18

On divorce 16:18 5:32

On scandle 17:1-2 18:7 9:42

Forgiveness 17:3-4 18:21-22

Faith as a mustard seed 17:5-6 17:20 9:28

“Lo, here, lo, there” 17:23 24:26 13:21

The day of the Son of Man (1) 17:24 24:27 13:21-23

The day of the Son of Man (2) 17:26-27 24:37-39c 13:33-37

The day of the Son of Man (3) 17:28-30 24:39b 13:33-37

He who saves his life 17:33 \*10:39

Two in the bed 17:34-35 24:40-41 13:33-37

Where the corpse is. . . 17:37 24:28 13:21-33

Parable of the talents 19:12-27 25:14-30

Twelve thrones 22:28-30 19:28 10:29-31

## An Outline of Q (Kloppenborg 92)

Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987. 92.

John’s preaching Luke 3:7-9, 16-17

temptation 4:1-13

Jesus’ inaugural sermon 6:20b-49

John and Jesus 7:1-10, 18-28; (16:16); 7:31-35

discipleship and mission 9:57-62; 10:2-24

on prayer 11:2-4, 9-13

controversy stories 11:14-52

on fearless preaching 12:2-12

on anxiety 12:(13-14, 16b-21), 22-31, 33-34

preparedness for the end 12:39-59

two parables of growth 13:18-19, 20-21

two ways 13:24-30, 34-35; 14:16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:33-34

parables and sayings 15:3-7; 16:13, 17-18; 17:1-6

eschatological discourse 17:23-37; 19:12-27; 22:28-30

## M: Material Only in Matthew

*MATTHEW* *MARK* *LUKE*

Prologue

**1** 1 prologue

Infancy Narratives

2 genealogy (cf. 3.23-38)

18 birth of Jesus (cf. 2.1-7)

**2** 1 adoration of the magi

13 flight to Egypt, massacre of the inno-

cents, return

22 childhood at Nazareth

Preparation for Ministry

Galilean Ministry

**5** 14 light of the world

17 the law and the prophets (cf. 16.17)

21 murder and wrath

23 reconcile before altar

27 adultery and lust

33 oaths

**6** 1 almsgiving

5 prayer

7 long prayers

14 forgive to be forgiven (= 11.25-26)

16 fasting

**7** 6 pearls before swine

15 wolves in sheep’s clothing

**11** 1 continuation of the journey

28 “come unto me”

**13** 24 tares

36 interpretation of the tares

44 hid treasure

45 pearl

47 net

51 treasure new and old

**15** 29 healing the lame, maimed, blind,

and dumb

Travel Narrative

**17** 24 payment of the temple tax

**18** 19 where two or three are gathered

23 unforgiving servant

**20** 1 laborers in the vineyard

Jerusalem Ministry

**21** 28 two sons

**22** 1 marriage feast (cf. 14.16-24)

**25** 14 talents (cf. 19:12-27)

31 last judgment

Passion Narrative

**27** 3 death of Judas

62 guards at the tomb

Resurrection Narrative

**28** 18 great commission (cf. 24:47-49)

## L: Material Only in Luke

*MATTHEW* *MARK* *LUKE*

Prologue

**1** 1 prologue

Infancy Narratives

5 promise of John the Baptist’s birth

26 annuncia­tion

39 Mary’s visit to Elizabeth

57 birth of John the Baptist

**1** 18 birth of Jesus **2** 1 birth of Jesus

8 adoration of the shepherds

21 circumcision and presentation

39 childhood at Nazareth

41 the boy Jesus in the temple

Preparation for Ministry

**3** 10 John’s replies to questioners

(cf. 1.2-17) 23 genealogy

Galilean Ministry

**4** 14 teaching in synagogues

(cf. 13.53-58) (cf. 6.1-6a) 16 rejection at Nazareth

(cf. 4.18-22) (cf. 1.16-20) **5** 1 call of the first disciples

(miraculous draught of fishes)

**5** 3 beatitudes **6** 20 beatitudes and woes

**7** 11 widow of Nain’s son

**8** 1 ministering women

Travel Narrative

**9** 52 rejection at a Samaritan village

**10** 17 return of the seventy

29 good Samaritan

38 Mary and Martha

**11** 5 importunate friend

27 blessing of Jesus’ mother

37 at a Pharisee’s table

45 woes to lawyers

53 scribes and Pharisees lie in wait

[(16.5-6) (cf. 8.14-15) **12** 1a thousands trod each other]

1b leaven of the Pharisees, hypocrisy

13 request to divide inheritance

15 beware covetousness

16 rich fool

(cf. 24.42-51) 35 watchful servants (= ten virgins)

39 if householder had known of thief

40 Son of man at an unexpected hour

41 wise and wicked stewards

47 severe and light beatings

48 where much is given

51 not peace but divided households

**13** 1 Galileans’ blood, tower in Siloam

6 fig tree parable

10 setting: synagogue on sabbath

11 crippled woman

(13.15 = watering animals)

22 setting: journeying

31 Pharisees warn against Herod

**14** 1 setting: at a ruler’s table

2 man with dropsy

(14.5 = rescuing animals)

7 take the lowest place

11 everyone who exalts himself

12 when you give feast, invite poor

(cf. 22.1-10) 15 great supper

25 setting: Jesus turns to great multitudes

28 tower builder

31 rash king

33 renounce all

**15** 8 lost coin

11 prodigal son

**16** 1 unjust steward

8b sons of this age, sons of light

9 make friends by unrighteous mammon

10 he who is faithful in little

11 being faithful in unrighteous mammon

12 being faithful in that which is another’s

14 Pharisees’ hypocrisy

19 rich man and Lazarus

**17** 7 servant from the field serves table

10 we are unworthy ser­vants

11 setting: between Samaria and Galilee

12 ten lepers

20 kingdom is in the midst of you

22 you will desire to see one of the days

28 as in the days of Lot

32 remember Lot’s wife

34 two in bed, one taken

37 “Where, Lord?”

**18** 1 unjust judge

9 Pharisee and tax collector

**19** 1 Zacchaeus

(cf. 25.14-30) 11 pounds

Jerusalem Ministry

39 prediction of Jerusalem’s destruction

**21** 34 end of the discourse

37 summary of Jerusalem ministry

Passion Narrative

**23** 6 trial before Herod

Resurrection Narrative

**24** 13 Emmaus

36 appearance in Jerusalem

47 great commission

50 ascension

## Some Comments on L

L occurs mostly in Luke 6:20-8:3 and 9:51-18:14. It comprises almost half of Luke. It includes the infancy narratives, part of John the Baptist’s preaching, the genealogy in Luke, the Nazareth sermon, much of the lesser (6:20-8:3) and greater (9:51-18:14) insertions, and traditions in the passion and resurrection narratives (a variant of the Last Supper; Emmaus; a variant of the appearance in Jerusalem; the ascension). (Lohse *Formation of the New Testament* 148)

Luke’s portrait of Jesus depicts “a person who is . . . at times even romantic. It is the sort of details or qualities that one would expect from the writer who sought to compose the first life of Christ. . . . Furthermore, they are probably qualities which reflect the sensibilities of Luke himself. Centuries ago Dante described Luke as *scriba mansuetudinis Christi* (*De monarchia* 1.18), “the scribe of the gentleness of Christ.” For the qualities of mercy, love, charm, joy, and delicacy that [257] are part of the Lucan portrait of Jesus in the Third Gospel tend to soften the starker reality that is at times portrayed in the other Gospels. This aspect of the Lucan Gospel perhaps deprives it of some of the radical and critical character associated with Jesus in the other Gospels, but it is part of the picture that Luke wanted to paint. Ernest Renan, in his own inimitable way, once wrote of the Lucan Gospel, “C’est le plus beau livre qu’il y ait” (*Les évangiles et la seconde génération chrétienne* [3rd ed.; Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1877] 283). . . . aspects of the Lucan portrait of Jesus . . . which tend to build up the impression . . . include the Lucan parables of mercy (the two debtors, 7:41-43; the good Samaritan, 10:29-37; the barren fig tree, 13:6-9; the lost sheep, 15:3-7; the lost silver coin, 15:8-10; the prodigal son, 15:11-32; the Pharisee and the Toll-collector, 18:9-14), the episodes about Zacchaeus and Emmaus; the prominence of women in various episodes of Jesus’ ministry; the pairing off of parables of men and women.” (Fitzmyer *Gospel According to Luke* 1.257-58)

Several parables focus on possessions.

two debtors Luke 7:41-43

good Samaritan 10:29-37

rich fool 12:16-21

unjust steward 16:1-8

rich man and Lazarus 16:19-31

pounds 19:11-27

All but one of these stories are unique to Luke.

“. . . the receptivity and unreceptiveness of the hearers” are often antithetical parallels in Luke. Examples: Zachariah is doubtful while Mary accepts; Simon the Pharisee and the sinful woman (7:36-50); the various classes in the sower (8:4-8); the faithful and unfaithful servants (12:42-46), and the servant who knew his master’s will versus the servant who did not (12:47-48); the priest and Levite versus the good Samaritan (14:15-24); the two sons (15:11-32); the rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31); the importunate widow (18:18) versus the Pharisee (of the and the publican, 18:9-14); the Pharisee and the publican (18:9-14); the little children (18:15-17) and the rich ruler (18:18-30); the various classes in the pounds parable (19:11-27); the scribes who parade before men (20:45-47) and the widow’s mite (21:1-4); the two thieves at the crucifixion (23:29-43). [29-30] “It is difficult to ascertain from the texts quoted, which come mostly from the special Lucan material, whether Luke found these contrasts already incorporated in the tradition.” (Flender *St Luke* 29-30)

Gollwitzer (*Die Freude Gottes*: *Einführung in das Lukasevangelium*. 1940. Rpt. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1979. 9): L material is “from the Jewish region.”

But see Bruner (“Lukas—Literat und Theologe” 110-11): “Today Lukan scholars are more reserved and point out Luke’s ignorance of geographical relationships in Palestine.”

L provides individual pericopae without reference either to place or to time. (Conzelmann *Theology of St Luke* 62)

## Luke’s Travel Narrative

**9** 51-56 rejection at a Samaritan village L

57-62 would-be disciples Q

**10** 1-12 mission of the seventy Q |

13-15 + woes on Galilean cities Q |

16 + he who hears you hears me Q |> mission of the 70

17-20 return of the seventy L |

21-22 + exultation of Jesus Q |

23-24 + prophets and kings desired to see Q |

25-28 great commandment Mk

29-37 + good Samaritan L

38-42 Mary and Martha L

**11** 1-4 Lord’s prayer Q |

5-8 + importunate friend L |> on prayer

9-10 + ask, seek, knock Q |

11-13 + serpent for fish Q |

14-16 dumb demoniac Q |

17-22 + Beelzebul Q |

23 + he not with me is against me Q |

24-26 + seven spirits return Q |

27-28 + blessing of Jesus’ mother L |

29-32 + sign of Jonah Q |> controversy

33 + lamp under bushel Q | speeches

34-36 + sound eye sayings Q | (Kümmel 126)

37-38 at a Pharisee’s table L |

39-44 + woes to Pharisees Q |

45-52 + woes to lawyers Q |

53-54 summary: scribes and Pharisees lie in wait L |

**12** 1a thousands tread upon each other L

1b + leaven of the Pharisees, hypocrisy M |

2-3 + hid made manifest Q |> hypocrisy

4-5 + whom to fear Q |

6-7 + sparrows, hairs of head Q |

8-9 + acknowledging and denying Jesus Q | fearless

10 + blaspheming the Holy Spirit Mk |> confession

11-12 + Holy Spirit will speak through you Mk |

13-14 + request to divide inheritance L |

15 + beware covetousness L |

16-21 + rich fool L |> possessions

22-32 + anxiety about necessities Q |

33-34 + treasure in heaven Q |

35-38 + watchful servants (= ten virgins) Q |

39 + if householder had known of thief Q |

40 + Son of man at an unexpected hour Q |

41-46 + wise and wicked stewards Q |

47-48a + severe and light beatings L |

48b + where much is given L (Mk) |

49-50 + I came to cast fire; I have a baptism L |

51-53 + not peace but divided households Q |

54-56 + interpreting the sky and the present time Q |

57-59 + settle on the way to court Q |

**13** 1-5 Galileans’ blood and tower in Siloam L

6-9 fig tree parable L

10 setting: synagogue on sabbath L | presence

11-17 + crippled woman (v.15 = watering animals) L |> of the

18-19 + mustard seed Q (Mk) | kingdom

20-21 + leaven parable Q |

22 setting: journeying L |

23-24 + narrow gate Q | penalty

25 + closed door (= ten virgins) Q |> of

26-27 + depart, you evildoers (= Lord, Lord) Q | refusal

28-29 + gnashing teeth and the messianic banquet Q |

30 + last will be first Q |

31-33 Pharisees warn against Herod L

34-35 + lament over Jerusalem Q

**14** 1 setting: at a ruler’s table L |

2-6 + man with dropsy (v. 5 = rescuing animals) L |

7-10 + take the lowest place L |> table

11 + everyone who exalts himself Q | talk

12-14 + when you give a feast, invite the poor L |

15-24 + great supper Q |

25 setting: Jesus turns to great multitudes L

26 + hating one’s relatives Q

27 + bearing one’s cross Q (Mk)

28-30 + tower builder L

31-32 + rash king L

33 + renounce all L

34-35 + salt Q (Mk)

**15** 1-2 eating with tax collectors and sinners L (Mk)

3-7 + lost sheep Q

8-10 + lost coin L

11-32 + prodigal son L

**16** 1-8a + unjust steward L

8b + sons of this age, sons of light L

9 + make friends by unrighteous mammon L

10 + he who is faithful in little L

11 + being faithful in the unrighteous mammon L

12 + being faithful in that which is another’s L

13 + serving two masters Q

14-15a + Pharisees’ hypocrisy L

15b + what is exalted among men L (Q)

16a + the law and the prophets were until John Q |

16b + entering the kingdom violently Q |

17 + law will not pass away Q |> on the Law

18 + divorce Q (Mk) |

19-31 + rich man and Lazarus L |

**17** 1 + temptations are sure to come Q

2 + causing a little one to stumble Mk (Q?)

3 + rebuking a sinning brother Q

4 + forgiving seven times Q

5-6 + faith as a grain of mustard seed Q (Mk)

7-9 + servant from the field serves table L

10 + we are unworthy servants L

11 setting: between Samaria and Galilee L

12-19 + ten lepers L

20-21 + kingdom is in the midst of you L |

22 + you will desire to see one of the days L |

23 + they will say, “Lo, there!” Q (Mk) |

24 + as the lightning Q |

25 + but first he must suffer L (Mk) |

26-27 + as in the days of Noah Q |

28-30 + as in the days of Lot L |> eschatology

31 + on the housetop and in the field Mk |

32 + remember Lot’s wife L |

33 + whoever would gain his life will lose it L (Mk) |

34-35 + two in bed, two grinding, one taken Q |

37a + “Where, Lord?” L |

37b + eagles Q |

**18** 1-8 + unjust judge L

9-14a + Pharisee and tax collector L

14b + everyone who exalts himself Q

15-17 + blessing the children Mk

Kümmel’s other suggestions on structure:

12:1-53 warnings to disciples (Kümmel 126)

12:54-13:30 warnings to the people about repentance (Kümmel 126)

Kealy’s suggestions on structure:

9:57-62 about discipleship (Kealy)

10:3-4 polemics against adversaries (Kealy)

11:1-4 about discipleship (Kealy)

11:14 ff controversies (Kealy)

11:29 ff polemics against adversaries (Kealy)

12:1-2 polemics against adversaries (Kealy)

12:8 ff about discipleship (Kealy)

13:10 ff controversies (Kealy)

14:1 ff controversies (Kealy)

14:25 ff about discipleship (Kealy)

16:10 ff about discipleship (Kealy)

16:14-15 polemics against adversaries (Kealy)

17:1 ff about discipleship (Kealy)

18:15 ff about discipleship (Kealy)

## Mark in Luke’s Travel Narrative

(LUKE 9:51-18:14)

Schramm, Tim. *Der Markus-stoff bei Lukas*: *Eine Literarkritische und Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Cambridge: CUP, 1971. 46 nn. 2, 3.

**Doublets**: **Other**:

10:1 (Schramm did not include this saying.)

10:4

10:5

10:7

10:10

10:11

10:25-28

11:15-16

11:17-23

11:33

11:43

12:1

12:2

12:9

12:10

12:11-12

12:18//19

13:30

14:27

14:34

16:18

17:2

17:6

17:19 (sort of)

17:23

17:31

17:33

14 verses 25 verses

# Part 2:

# Source, Form, and Redaction Criticism

## The Authors of the Gospels and Acts

Paul Hahn

University of St. Thomas

Houston TX 77006

Who wrote the four gospels? The answer seems obvious: Mat­thew, Mark, Luke, and John. Matthew was one of Jesus’ twelve apostles; Mark was “John Mark,” missionary compan­ion of Paul and Peter; Luke was a physician who accompanied Paul on his journeys; and John was also one of the twelve.[[3]](#footnote-3) The titles of the gospels tell us who their authors were.

None of the four gospels, however, states the name of its author, *except* in its title. Nowhere in the actual text of a gospel is it said that Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John wrote it. Prov­ing the accuracy of the ti­tles is therefore crucial to establishing the traditional authors.

Most English translations of the New Testament enti­tle the four, “The Gos­pel According to Matthew,” “The Gospel According to Mark,” etc. These titles also occur in most Greek manu­scripts of the New Testament (ἐυαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον, ἐυαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον, ἐυαγγέλιον κατὰ Λοῦκον, ἐυαγγέλιον κατὰ Ιωάννης—*euanggelion kata Maththaion*, *euanggelion kata Markon*, *euanggelion kata Loukon*, *euanggelion kata Iōannēs*). The earliest Greek manu­scripts simply say, “Accord­ing to Mat­thew,” “According to Mark,” etc. (κατὰ Μαθθαῖoν, κατὰ Mάρ­κoν, etc.). These are probably the earliest gospel titles, and they imply the word, “gos­pel.” The Greek word for “gos­pel” (εὐαγγέλιoν) original­ly meant “good news,” but for Christians it soon came to mean a book that presents the good news about Jesus.

It is unlikely, however, that the gospel titles were part of the orig­inal gos­pels; probably they were added later. Three con­sider­ations make this likely.

* It would be very peculiar for a person to write a book and then name it after himself: for example, “Ac­cording to Joe Smith.” It is especially un­likely that a Christian author in the first cen­tury would use his own name to enti­tle an ac­count of his Lord’s life.
* Probably the four gospel writers did not know each other.[[4]](#footnote-4) It would be too coinci­den­tal for four isolated authors, writing on the same sub­ject, to happen upon such similar titles.
* The most important consideration concerns the preposi­tion, κατά, “according to.” Grammarians of New Testament Greek believe that κατά in the titles is a way of saying the pos­ses­sive: “Gospel According to Matthew” means “Matthew’s Gospel.”[[5]](#footnote-5) But probably the reason κατά, of all Greek preposi­tions, de­veloped this meaning is because it often had a distributive mean­­ing—as if the single good news has been distributed in four parts,[[6]](#footnote-6) like a pack of cards dealt into four hands. A gospel dispersed in four parts, however, is an idea that could only come about after the gos­pels were col­lec­ted. That means that the present titles of the gospels cannot have been added to them until the gospels became a collection.

Now, the ear­liest evidence of the four gospels being a collec­tion is from about ad 180. The gos­pels *may* have become a collection at any time between the completion of the most recent gospel (John, c. ad 100[[7]](#footnote-7)) and our first evidence of them as a collection (c. 180). But a date toward the end of this period is likely. A late date would allow time for the four gospels to cir­culate widely enough to ap­pear in the same locale. Also, it would allow time for the four to be­come thought of as parts of a single gospel, a single “good news.” Since the titles were almost certainly added some time after the gospels were collected into a group, and since their collection was probably between, say, ad 150-175, the titles must date from c ad 150-175.[[8]](#footnote-8) None of the four apostles would still have been alive in ad 150-175, so the titles must not be original to the gospels. This late date for the titles weakens their reliabil­ity: at best they are second-hand informa­tion.

The crucial question now becomes, can we trace the second-hand information backward, into a period closer to the writing of the gospels? Probably many early Christians discussed the author­ship of the gospels, but only one man’s remarks concerning author­ship remains from the period before ad 150-175. That man is Papias, bishop of Hiera­polis in Asia Minor. Papias wrote a five-volume work, *The Sayings of the Lord Ex­plained*, around ad 130. The five volumes themselves have disappeared, but fortunate­ly several quota­tions have survived because they were quoted in a book still extant, *The History of the Church* (Latin title: *His­toria ec­clesi­as­tica*), by the Church his­tori­an, Euse­bius, written c. ad 325.

Euse­bius quotes a statement by Papias concerning the au­thorship of the first gospel. It reads: “Matthew compiled the *Sayings* in the Aramaic language, and everyone translated them as well as he could.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

Papias apparently affirms the tradition that later appears in the first title: the author was the apostle Matthew. Curious­ly, however, Papias calls Matthew’s com­pos­i­tion *Sayings*, and *Sayings* is not at all an apt description of Matthew, since Matthew contains as many narratives as sayings. Also, Pa­pi­as says that Matthew com­piled the *Sayings* in Aramaic.[[10]](#footnote-10) This cannot refer to our gospel of Matthew, because many passages in Matthew, Mark, and Luke have identical wording, which shows that all three were originally written in Greek.

Some schol­ars have thought that perhaps Papias meant a collec­tion of Jesus’ sayings, like Q, that was later incorpo­rated into the gospel of Matthew; since Matthew wrote the pre-gospel collec­tion, they reason, perhaps his name was transferred to the gospel. While it is possible that an Aramaic origi­nal under­lay Q, however, the copies of Q used by Matthew and Luke were cer­tainly in Greek, since the wording of the Q pas­sages in Matthew and Luke is often the same. Besides, if Papias were refer­ring to a sayings document, then he would only be saying that Matthew was the author of a sayings collec­tion. It would not follow that Matthew was also the author of the completed gospel.

But since Papias does say “*Matthew* wrote . . .,” he probably does mean the first gospel, and not a saying source. In that case, he is simply incorrect: we can say cate­gorically that our first gospel was not written by Matthew, nor by any other member of the twelve disciples. For one thing, the date of Matthew (c. ad 85, see p. 29 below) is late for apostol­ic author­ship.[[11]](#footnote-11) More importantly, Matthew de­pends heavily on Mark’s gospel for information about Jesus. No evange­list would need to rely so slav­ish­ly on anoth­er’s gospel if he were truly an eyewitness of Jesus. Our first gospel, therefore, was not written by Matthew.

Papias’ statement of c. ad 130, then, is probably just hearsay that had become common in Christian communities. But if early Chris­tians attributed an otherwise anonymous gospel to Matthew, why did they pick him, since he was not prominent in early Christianity? Perhaps they chose Matthew because, where Mark and Luke relate the call of Levi (Mark 2:13-17, Luke 5:27-32), Matthew relates the call but calls Levi “Matthew” (9:9-13). Also, though all three men­tion Matthew in lists of the twelve dis­ciples, only Mat­thew’s gospel adds that Matthew was a tax collec­tor (10:3). Since the first gospel seemed to know more about Matthew, per­haps early Christians assumed that the gospel must have been by him. Naming the gospel after Matthew would fulfill two natural desires: to supply as many details about first-century Christianity as possible, and to give the first gospel apostolic authority.

At any rate, as we have seen, Papias’ statement is of little value; and since better infor­ma­tion was probably not available when the titles were added c. ad 150-175, the first title, we con­clude, is unreli­able.

The earliest evidence for the authorship of the second gospel also comes from Papias. Here is the statement about Mark that Eusebius, in his *History of the Church*, quotes from Papias’ *Sayings of the Lord Explained*: “This, too, the presbyter used to say. ‘Mark, who had been Peter’s interpreter, wrote down carefully, but not in order, all that he remembered of the Lord’s sayings and doings.’”[[12]](#footnote-12)

Papias did not say (in the fragment preserved by Eusebius) how he came upon the informa­tion that Matthew wrote the first gospel. But here he actually quotes someone else about Mark, someone Papias calls “the presby­ter.”[[13]](#footnote-13) In other quotations of Papias preserved by Eusebius, Papias makes it clear that the presby­ter’s name was John. Some scholars have thought that Papias’ John the Presbyter was in fact John the apos­tle. Iren­aeus, a bishop and scholar, sug­gested this already c. ad 180. But Eusebius himself took Papias to mean a teacher of Papias’, and most scholars today think Euse­bius was correct.

At any rate, John the Presbyter’s statement con­cerning Mark has problems. The assertion that Mark’s events were “not in order” implies that John the Presbyter knew the cor­rect order. John the Presbyter, however, was probably not an eyewitness of Jesus’ life; as a teacher of Pa­pias, he was probably a third-generation Chris­tian. In all likelihood, then, he based his judgment that Mark is disorder­ly, not on a comparison of Mark with Jesus’ life, but on a compar­ison of Mark with another gos­pel. The other gospel to which John the Presby­ter compared Mark would probably have been Matthew. Judging by frequency of quotation, Matthew was the most popu­lar gospel in the presbyter’s day (early second century). John the Presby­ter’s state­ment, then, is of no value to us: we have Mark and Matthew and can com­pare their “orderli­ness” for our­selves.

But the greatest difficulty with Papias’ statement on Mark comes from the assertion that Mark was “Peter’s interpreter.” Modern investiga­tions of the structure of Mark—in particular, form criticism—have convincingly shown that the contents of Mark’s gospel under­went a lengthy period of oral trans­mission before they were written. The contents of Mark cannot, then, be the transcribed memo­ries of a single eye­witness, Peter.

Probably the idea that Mark was Peter’s “in­terpreter” was inferred by early Chris­tians from 1 Peter 5:13, which reads, “She who is at Baby­lon, who is likewise cho­sen, sends you greet­ings; and so does my son Mark.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

At any rate, as with Papias’ statement concerning Matthew, so with his statement concerning Mark: Papias’ evi­dence for the author­ship of the gospels is not reliable. Once again it looks as if the earliest information about a gospel’s author is “second-century guess­work.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

Eusebius only quotes Papias about Matthew and Mark; either Papias did not discuss the authorship of Luke and John, or Euse­bius chose not to quote him. Our earliest statement about the author of the third gospel comes from Iren­aeus, who grew up in Asia Minor but became the bishop of Lyons on the coast of France. In his chief work, *Against the Heresies*, he writes: “Luke, too, the companion of Paul, set forth in a book the gospel as preached by him [Paul]. . . . this Luke was insepara­ble from Paul and was his collabora­tor in [preach­ing] the gospel . . .”[[16]](#footnote-16)

Though this is the first statement we have about the author of the third gospel, the idea that its author was Luke the com­pan­ion of Paul had probably been around for some time. The reason why Mar­cion (above, p. 2) put only Luke alongside ten letters of Paul in his canon of the New Testament was surely because he thought Luke had been a companion of Paul. Marcion must have known, c. ad 140, the tradition that Luke the com­panion of Paul wrote the third gospel.

Nothing in the third gospel itself suggests that it was writ­ten by a companion of Paul. However, the same person who wrote Luke also wrote the Acts of the Apos­tles,[[17]](#footnote-17) and at first glance Acts seems to have been written by a companion of Paul. Several times the author of Acts uses “we” in de­scribing Paul’s travels. For example, Acts 16:10: “we sought to go on into Macedo­nia . . .” Early readers of Acts no doubt as­sumed that the author of Acts was an asso­ciate of Paul’s. Since Paul in his letters some­times refers to a travel­ing com­panion named Luke,[[18]](#footnote-18) readers of Acts perhaps assumed that the “we” of Acts included Luke. Since they knew that the author of Acts also wrote the third gospel, they concluded that the third gospel was written by Luke.

In fact, howev­er, it is unlikely that a companion of Paul wrote the third gospel, because it is unlikely that a companion of Paul wrote Acts. For one thing, Acts several times contra­dicts the order of events in Paul’s letters.[[19]](#footnote-19) Moreover, Acts shows no knowl­edge of Paul’s famous let­ters.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Perhaps one reason for attri­buting the third gospel to Luke was to con­nect the gospel with an apostle. This, at least, is the suggestion of the leading expert on Luke, Joseph Fitzmyer.

Irenaeus clearly ascribes the Third Gospel to Luke, an “insepara­ble” companion of Paul, because of his desire to estab­lish its “apostol­ic” origin. . . . Once Luke is recog­nized as the companion of Paul, he became to him what Mark was believed to have been to Peter, a com­piler of his preach­ing.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Once again, the traditions of author­ship of the gospels, and thus the gospel titles that enshrine those traditions, are of little value in determining the authorship of the gospels.

The fourth gospel, like the first three, nowhere states the name of its author. Unlike the first three, however, it does contain a statement about its authorship. Here are the fourth gos­pel’s concluding verses.

John 21:20, 24-25, “Peter turned and saw following them [himself and Jesus] the disciple whom Jesus loved, who had lain close to his breast at the [last] supper . . . This is the dis­ci­ple who is bearing witness to these things, and who has written these things; and we know that his testimony is true. But there are also many other things which Jesus did; were every one of them to be written, I suppose that the world itself could not con­tain the books that would be writ­ten.

According to this passage, the author of the gospel is the disciple who lay near Jesus’ breast at the last supper. If one turns to the account of the last supper in John, one finds this narrative.

John 13:21b-26, “Truly, truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me.” The disciples looked at one another, uncertain of whom he spoke. One of his disciples, whom Jesus loved, was lying close to the breast of Jesus; so Simon Peter beckoned to him and said, “Tell us who it is of whom he speaks.” So lying thus, close to the breast of Jesus, he said to him, “Lord, who is it?” Jesus answered, “It is he to whom I shall give this morsel when I have dipped it.” So when he had dipped the morsel, he gave it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscar­iot. (John 13:21b-26)

Here again, the disciple close to Jesus’ breast is the one “whom Jesus loved.” This “beloved disci­ple,” as both passages make clear, is not Peter. Can we identify which of the other dis­ciples he is?

Besides the passages we have quoted, the beloved disciple ap­pears in John 19:26, 20:2, and 21:7; but none of these verses mentions the disciple’s identity. Thus, there is no evidence in the fourth gospel to allow us to identify its author. What is more, the conclu­sion of the gospel—the only spot in John that says its author was the beloved disciple—is a later addition to the gospel, not an original part of it. The author of the conclusion (John 21:24-25) cannot be the beloved disciple himself: the author of the conclusion refers to him­self in the first person (“we” and “I”), while he refers to the be­loved disciple in the third person (“his”). The concluding verses were added later, probably to emphasize that the author of the gospel was in fact an apos­tle.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Aside from the title, our earliest identifi­cation of the fourth gos­pel’s au­thor with the apostle John is by Iren­aeus, c. ad 180:

After that, John, the disciple of the Lord, he who had leaned on his breast, also published the Gospel, while living at Ephesus in Asia. . . . John lived there till the time of Trajan [ad 98-117].[[23]](#footnote-23)

Irenaeus does not say that the John to whom he refers is a member of the twelve, only that he was a disciple. Some schol­ars have proposed that Irenaeus therefore meant a John other than John the apostle—John Mark, for example, or Papias’ John the Presby­ter.[[24]](#footnote-24) But surely Irenaeus meant John the apostle, since he iden­tifies his John with “he who had leaned on his breast,” and the disciple at Jesus breast was one of the twelve (only the twelve were at the last supper).

Irenaeus does not say *how* he learned that John the apostle was the author. Perhaps he got his informa­tion from Polycarp, a bishop whom Irenaeus knew in his youth. Eu­se­bius quotes excerpts from Irenaeus’ works that refer to Polycarp.

Polycarp was not only instructed by apostles and conver­sant with many who had seen the Lord, but was appointed by apostles to serve in Asia as Bishop of Smyrna. I myself saw him in my early years, for he lived a long time and was very old indeed . . .[[25]](#footnote-25)

When I was still a boy I saw . . . Polycarp . . ., his goings out and comings in, the character of his life, his per­sonal appear­ance, his addresses to crowded con­grega­tions. I re­member how he spoke of his [conver­sations] with John and with the others who had seen the Lord . . .[[26]](#footnote-26)

Whether Irenaeus’ information that John was the author of the fourth gospel was from Polycarp or not, Irenaeus — and per­haps Polycarp before him — was surely wrong to attribute the fourth gospel to John. If the fourth gospel were by an apostle, then in it we would be directly in touch with histori­cal reminis­cences of Jesus him­self. Yet John’s gospel differs so drastic­ally from the synop­tics that both the synoptics *and* John cannot contain direct histor­ical reminis­cences.[[27]](#footnote-27) Scholars are nearly unanimous that the synop­tics, not John, are more histor­ically credible. The fourth gospel, in fact, is more like a piece of devo­tional literature. It is more a meditation on the nature of Jesus than a synop­tic-type life of Jesus.

Once again, we find that a rumor of authorship from Chris­tian tradi­tion, enshrined in a gospel title, is not a re­li­able source of in­for­­mation. The informa­tion available to those who composed the titles c. ad 150-175 was apparent­ly hearsay, and the titles, therefore, are unreli­able.

The answer to our initial question, then, “Who wrote the four gospels?” must be: we do not know. The gospels are anony­mous Christian writings which were later supplied with titles to connect each gos­pel with an apostle—Matthew and John for the first and fourth gospels, Peter and Paul for the second and third gospels.

This brings us to a final consideration. If the purpose of attaching names to the gospels was to secure for them apostolic authority, then the names “Matthew” and “John” are understand­able. But why the names “Mark” and “Luke”? If attaching each gospel to an apostle were the only motive behind the choice of names, then one would expect early Christians to call the second and third gospels “The Gospel According to Peter” and “The Gospel According to Paul.” Thus, authorship of the second and third gospels by Mark and Luke is not as unlike­ly as authorship of the first and fourth by Matthew and John. The increased likelihood is not, admittedly, very strong; we have already seen the reasons why early Christians might have come up with the names, “Mark” and “Luke.” Still, that the names of relatively ob­scure Chris­tians became attached to the second and third gospels is to some degree a point in favor of the authenticity of those names.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Regardless: since early Church tradition did settle upon the names, “Matthew,” “Mark,” “Luke,” and “John,” we can go ahead and use these names to designate the authors of the four gos­pels—remembering, however, that all four are likely to be misno­mers.

## The Dates of the Synoptic Gospels

Paul Hahn

When were the four gospels written? Obvious­ly, if the traditional authors of the gospels were in fact their authors, that would strongly affect our deci­sions concerning the gospels’ dates. But, as we have already seen, the traditional titles of the gospels are not reli­able. Knowing, then, that the gospels are best thought of as anonym­ous, we need to discover evidence of some other kind that will allow us to deter­mine when the gospels were written.

There are two sorts of evidence to consider when trying to date the gospels, external and internal. External evidence is documentation provided by something other than the gospels them­selves; internal evidence is documen­tation provided by the gospels themselves.

External evidence is primarily useful in establishing the latest possi­ble date for a gos­pel (in scholar­ly language, the *terminus a quo*, Latin for “end toward which”). Under external evidence, at least three types of evidence need to be considered: the earliest copies of the gospels, the earliest references to the gospels, and the earliest quota­tions from the gos­pels.

Internal evidence is primarily useful in determining the ear­liest pos­si­ble date of each gospel (the *terminus ad quem*, “end from which”). What needs to be determined is the latest fact or event to which each gospel refers.

Let us begin with external evidence and consider each of its three types in turn.

Earliest Manuscripts

Obviously, the earliest manu­scripts of the gospels might be of help in determining the latest possible date at which a gospel must have been in existence. We have, for example, a fragment of John’s gospel which was discovered in southern Egypt and was written c. ad 125. The latest possible date for John, then, is c. 125.

What about the synoptics? Here the evidence is more ambiguous.

Earliest References

We have already considered the earliest references to the gospels, when, in discussing their authorship, we examined Papias’ references to Matthew and Mark and Irenaeus’ references to Luke and John. The references by Irenaeus are quite late (c. ad 180) and so of no value in determining dates: other types of evidence, we shall see, supply earlier evidence for the dates of Luke and John. Also, Papias’ statement about Matthew is ambigu­ous: “Matthew compiled the *Sayings* in the Aram­aic language, and everyone translated them as well as he could.”[[29]](#footnote-29) Is he refer­ring to the written gospel of Mat­thew, such as we have it, or is he referring only to a collection of sayings? Papias’ reference to Matthew is too uncer­tain to be useful for dating that gospel. Papias’ reference to Mark, however, seems clearly to refer to the *written* gospel of Mark: “Mark, who had been Peter’s interpreter, wrote down carefully, but not in order, all that he remembered of the Lord’s sayings and doings.”[[30]](#footnote-30) External evidence based on the earliest references to the gospels, then, does not provide us with any help in the dating of Matthew, Luke, and John, but does suggest that Mark’s gospel was in existence by the time of Papias, c. ad 130.

Earliest Quotations

To be of use in dating, the earli­est quotation from a gos­pel must be un­am­bigu­ously from the *written* gospel. Since stories of Jesus no doubt contin­ued to circulate orally even after the writing of the gospels, we must care­fully check to see whether an early Christian writer who relates a saying or deed of Jesus is quoting from one of our written gospels or is merely citing an oral tradi­tion about Jesus. Only if it can be shown that a citation of early Jesus material *must* have come from one of our written gospels can an early quotation be of value in determining the dates of the gospels. Finding the earliest, cer­tain quo­tation of a gospel will help to give us the latest possi­ble date of that gos­pel (the *terminus a quo*).

As we search for the earliest quotations that are definitely from our written gospels, let us move backward in time, beginning with an author who unquestionably quotes from each of the gospels as we now have them.

1) *Irenaeus*, bishop of Lyons in France, wrote a work entitled *Against Heresies* in about ad 180. In this work he quotes from the first sentenc­es of each of the synoptic gospels: he quotes from Matthew in *Against Here­sies* 3.­16.2, from Mark in 3.16.3, from Luke in 3.14.2, and from John in ??. Ir­en­aeus’ evidence proves that all of the synoptic gospels were in existence by c. 180 at the latest.

2) *Justin Martyr*, a Christian teacher in Rome c. ad 155-165, quotes sayings of Jesus in forms which combine divergent readings among our gospels. Here is an example, Jesus’ saying about whom to fear, which can be found in our present gospels in Matt 10:28 and Luke 12:4-5. The words in the Greek text of Justin that agree with the Greek text of Matthew are under­lined; those that agree with the Greek text of Luke are capital­ized; and those that are not from either gospel are in bold type.[[31]](#footnote-31)

Do NOT FEAR THOSE [who] **kill you** and AFTER THESE THINGS are not able TO DO ANYTHING, but FEAR THE ONE [who] AFTER KILLING [you] is able TO CAST both soul and body INTO GEHENNA.

In tabular form, the agreements look like this:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Justin*’*s words*: | *agree with*: |
|  |  |
| not fear those | Matthew and Luke |
| kill you | neither |
| after these things | Luke |
| are not able | Matthew |
| to do anything | Luke |
| but | Matthew |
| fear | Matthew and Luke |
| the one after killing | Luke |
| is able | Matthew |
| to cast | Luke |
| both soul and body | Matthew |
| into | Luke |
| Gehenna | Matthew and Luke |

If Justin constructed his quotation from copies of our Matthew and Luke that lay before him, then he must have deliberately alternated between the gospels. On the other hand, perhaps he was quoting from memory; or perhaps he was quot­ing, not from our gospels, but from a harmony of the gospels that had already come into exis­tence. (A harmony results when someone combines the four gos­pels as we have them into a single, smooth narrative, so that all discrepancies among the gospels are eliminated.) We know that Tatian, a student of Jus­tin’s, published such a harmony c. ad 170; his harmony was called the *Diates­saron*, which in Greek means “[the gospel created] out of four.”

At any rate, Justin’s quotations of Jesus traditions do not establish that he knew our gospels in their present forms.

3) *Marcion*, a layman at Rome who was excommunicated in ad 144 for his hereti­cal views, must have known the gospel of Luke, for he edited it to delete references to Jesus’ Jewishness, which he found offensive. Luke, therefore, was in existence by c. 140.

4) *Papias*, bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor c. ad 125-150, wrote about 130-140 a com­mentary on Jesus’ sayings, which he called *The Sayings of the Lord Explained*. This work no longer survives, but a later Church histori­an, Eusebius, writing c. ad 325, quotes statements that Papias wrote about the gospels of Matthew and Mark. (For these quota­tions, see the article on authorship above.) Unfortunately, these statements by Papias do not include quotations of Jesus’ words or deeds, and so they cannot help us in our present task.

5) *Ignatius of Antioch*, bishop of Antioch in Syria, wrote seven letters to churches in Asia Minor as he was being led to Rome for trial; he was exe­cuted in Rome c. ad 110-115. In one of his letters (*Smyrnaeans* 1), Ignatius notes that Jesus at his baptism, while speaking to John the Baptist, used the phrase, “fulfill all right­eous­ness.” This phrase occurs only in Matthew’s gospel (Matt 3:15); but Ignatius does not name his source.

6) *Clement of Rome*, bishop at Rome near the end of the first century, wrote a letter to the church at Corinth c. ad 96. In that letter, now known as *1 Clement*, he says (13.1-2):

Above all, remember the words of the Lord Jesus which he uttered while teaching forbearance and patience, “Be merciful, that you may receive mercy. Forgive, that forgiveness may be given you; as you do, so it shall be done to you; as you give, so shall it be given you; as you judge, so shall you be judged; as you show kindness, so will kindness be shown to you; the measure you give will be the measure you get.”

Here we have material from Matt 5:7; 6:14//Mark 11:25; 6:15; 7:1, 2, 12; and Luke 6:31, 36-38. The quotation is simply attributed to “the Lord Jesus.”

7) The *Didache* is an anonymous, early-Christian “manual for mission­aries.” We do not know its date for certain, but esti­mates range from c. ad 70 to 125. The *Didache* (8.1-3) quotes the Lord’s Prayer, and it quotes the prayer in Matthew’s form (Matt 6:9-13) rather than Luke’s (Luke 11:2-4). Still, it attributes the prayer simply to “the Lord in the Gospel,” without specify­ing Matthew.

How are we to assess these earliest of all quotations from the synoptic gos­pels? Sanders and Davies have summarized the con­clusions to be drawn from these quotations.

. . . Matthew was written by 100 at the latest, since some of the material characteristic of that gospel, and that gospel alone, was used *c*. 110. If Papias meant our Mark, it must have been written before 140. If the Elder meant our Mark, it is to be dated before 125. . . . The gospel [of Luke] was used by Marcion *c*. 150, and some of its sayings material was known by Justin at about the same date, but there is no earlier completely firm evidence of its existence.

Internal Evidence

We now turn to the internal evidence for the dating of the gospels, and that means determin­ing the most recent event to which each gospel refers.

One clause addressed by Jesus to his disciples in Matthew (24:15) and Mark (13:14) seems to refer to an event that occurred after Jesus’ death and resurrection (his death and resurrection are usually dated in ad 30): “So when you see the desolating sacri­lege spoken of by the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place . . ., then let those who are in Judea flee . . .”[[32]](#footnote-32) According to Sanders and Davies (*Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 17), “This seems to refer to the threat of Caligula in ce 40-41 to have his statue set up in the temple.”

At the same moment that Jesus in Matthew and Mark refers to the “deso­lating sacrilege,” he speaks in Luke’s gospel (21:20-21) of an apparently dif­ferent event: “When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near. Then let those who are in Judea flee . . .” This seems to be a reference to the destruc­tion by the Romans in ad 70 of Jerusa­lem and espe­cially of the temple. We know that Jerusalem was in fact sur­rounded by armies and desola­ted in ad 70 (and only in 70 in the first century ad) because a Jewish historian, Josephus, who was himself an eyewitness to the siege of Jerusalem, later wrote an account of it (*The Jewish Wars*, c. ad 95). It seems likely, then, that Luke’s gospel in the quotation above refers to the destruc­tion of the temple in ad 70.

How are we to explain the fact that according to the first two gospels Jesus at a certain moment said one thing, whereas according to the third gos­pel he at the same moment said something else? Perhaps Jesus said both things, and each evangelist only recorded one of his statements. But it is also possible that Jesus referred only to the desolating sacrilege *or* to Jerusalem surrounded by armies, and that either Matthew and Mark altered Luke’s saying or Luke altered Matthew and Mark’s saying (or those between Jesus and the evangelists, who transmitted the tradition to the evangelists, altered the sayings). Since one often finds in comparing the gospels that Matthew and Luke will have a clearer, more speci­fic statement than Mark at the same point in the gospels, it seems probable that they are clarifying Mark, rather than Mark obfuscating Matthew or Luke. Thus, if Mark’s version of the saying is the earliest, then Mat­thew’s can be seen as an attempt to clarify the saying, and Luke’s can be seen as an attempt to clarify it even further.

Early version: “But when you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be . . .” (Mark 13:14)

Some clarification: “So when you see the desolating sacri­lege *spoken of by the prophet Daniel*, standing *in the holy place* . . .” (Matt 24:15; clarifications italicized)

Further clarification: “When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near.” (Luke 21:20-21)

If it is correct to attribute to Luke himself the exact wording of his version of this saying, then we can attribute to Luke himself a knowledge of an event that did not happen until ad 70. Hence, Luke’s gospel was written after ad 70.

But there is some indication that Matthew, too, knew of the destruction of Jerusalem in ad 70. Both Matthew (22:1-14) and Luke (14:16-24) relate Jesus’ parable of the “marriage feast” (as it is called in Matthew’s version) or of the “great supper” (as it is called in Luke’s version). Both versions of this parable relate how a wealthy man invited people to a feast he would soon be hosting. At the time of the feast, he sent servants to bring the guests, but the guests made excuses and would not come. Both versions say that the man was angry; he then sent his servants to invite people who had not at first been invited. So much is common to both versions; but what is of interest to us at the moment is Matthew’s statement, after saying that the king was angry, that “he sent his troops and destroyed those murderers[[33]](#footnote-33) and burned their city” (22:7). This too seems like a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in ad 70; and again, it seems likely that the words in one gospel and not in the others have been added by the evangelist himself. If so, then Matthew, like Luke, must have known about the destruction of Jerusalem in ad 70; and his gospel, too, must have been written after ad 70.

A possible reference to the destruction of Jerusalem may also occur in Mark’s gospel (13:2): “Do you see these great buildings? There will not be left here one stone upon another, that will not be thrown down” (cf. Matt 24:2, Luke 21:6.) But unlike the reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in Matthew and Luke, this passage does not indicate that Mark’s gospel was written after ad 70. The prophecy in Mark 13:2 did not come true: the temple in Jerusalem was destroyed by fire, and many stones remained atop one another (and remain so still: the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem today). We have no reason, then, to suspect this statement of being a “touch up” after the fact (as in Matt 22:7 and Luke 21:20-21); there is therefore nothing in Mark’s gospel that forces us to date it after ad 70.

Nevertheless, there are a couple of indications in Mark’s gospel that suggest that quite some time has passed since Jesus’ death and resurrection. These indications have to do with the problem of “the delay of the parousia” (*parousia* was the Greek term often used in the New Testament for Jesus’ “sec­ond com­ing”).

Immediately after Jesus’ death and resurrection, early Chris­tians ex­pec­ted his second coming to be any day. 1 Thess 5:1-2, written c. ad 51, indicates that some of the ear­ly Christians wan­ted to know the exact date of the parousia; and 2 Thess 3:6-12 (date uncertain; see also 1 Thess 5:6-7, 14) suggests that some had quit working, pre­sumably on the grounds that, since the end was so near, why bother? But the prob­lem of the expectation of an imminent parousia soon gave way to another problem, the increasing delay of the parousia. 1 Thess 4:13-18 suggests that some early Chris­tians were concerned that their fellows who were dying before the second coming would miss out on the re­wards of heaven. 2 Peter 3:3-13 contains an exhortation to stand firm in the faith despite those who scoff, “Where is the promise of his coming? . . . all things have continued as they were from the beginning of creation.”

The problem of the delay of the parousia seems to be referred to in two pas­sages in Mark. Mark 13:6-7 says, “Many will come in my name, saying I am he!’ and they will lead many astray. And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is not yet.” The delay of the parousia permits impostors to proclaim themselves to be the returning Christ. The other passage is Mark 9:1 (cf. Matt 16:28, Luke 9:27), “Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see that the kingdom of God has come with power.” Both of these passages are indications that some time has passed since Jesus’ first coming. Now, according to 1 Cor 15:6, *most* of those to whom the risen Lord had appeared were still alive; and 1 Corinthians was written c. ad 55. According to John 21:21-23, only the beloved disciple was expected to be alive at the time of the parousia; and John 21 was written c. ad 100. Since Mark’s passage supposes that *some* will be alive, it falls on a trajectory somewhere between Paul in 55 and John in 100. Since most of Jesus’ disciples would likely have been dead by, say, ad 70, it is more likely that Mark was written in the period 55-70 than the period 70-100.

Another passage in Mark (10:39, cf. Matt 20:23) seems to presuppose that both James and John are dead: “you will drink the cup that I drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized.” James was ex­e­cuted c. ad 44 (Acts 12:2), and John was still alive in c. ad 55 (Gal 2:9); if Mark 10:39 was written after John’s death as well as James, then it was writ­ten after ad 55.

All of this evidence for the date of Mark seems to converge on a period somewhere around 65-70.

## On the Date of Matthew

1. “That Ignatius quotes it as authoritative suggests that it had been in circulation for some time, perhaps since at least ad 100.” Depen­dence on Mark proves it is post‑70 (confirmed by Matt 22:7, “The king . . . de­stroyed those mur­derers and burned their city”), “for the writing of Mat­thew would be, therefore, about 80 to 85.” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 273)

2. “. . . Ignatius of Antioch . . . makes unmistakable use of it in Eph­esians, chapter 19 (the virginity of Mary, the star, and the end of magic, suggest­ed by the Adora­tion of the Magi), Smyrnaeans, chapter 1, etc. Streeter traces fifteen reminis­cences

3. Rev. 1:3 reflects Matt. 288;resembles Matt. 17:2; Rev. 3:3 re­flects Matt. 24:42‑ 44, and 25:13; Rev. 3:5 reflects Matt. 10:32, perhaps combined with Luke 12:8; Rev. 13:10 repeats the sub­stance of Matt.26:­52; and Rev 1:9 reflects Matt resemblances are noted [177] by Dr. Moore. On the whole, these make it very probable that Matthew was used by the writer of the Revelation and was therefore not unknown 90 or soon after.” (Goodspeed 177‑178 n. 2) On Matt 23:35‑36, “the blood of innocent Abel to the blood of Ze­chariah . . . will come upon this generation”, Goodspeed says, “He could hardly refer more unmis­takably to the terrible scenes attending the fall of Jerusalem . . . it cannot have been very long af­ter that event that he wrotso feelingly about it: O Jerusalem! Jeru­salem! murdering the pro­phets, and stoning those who are sent to her, how often I on around me as a en r, but you fused! Now Ieave you to yourselveou will nevr see me again until you say, Blessed be he who comes in the Lord’s name!’ This great invective, built up by Matthew from a number of sour­ces, is almost immediately followed by a final discourse, the sixth, foretelling the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the age, chapters 24, 25.” (Goodspeed 168)

4. “The date of Matthew is fairly fixed by its use of Mark and its evi­dently intense interest in the fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. The place the fall of Jerusalem plays in the writ­er’s thought makes it likely that he wrote not long after that event . . . This consider­ation finds some striking corrobora­tions in the gospel . . .” (Goodspeed 176)

1) “. . . immediately after the misery of the fall of the city, the mes­sianic advent will occur [Mt 24:29‑31, “Immediately after the trib­ulation of those days will appear the sign of the son of man in heaven . . .”] . . . immediately’ is absent from Mark 13:24 . . .” (Goodspeed 176)

2) “In 16:28 Jesus says to the disciples, Some of you here will certainly live to see the Son of Man come eless says, [6]You will not have gone sons of Israel before the Son of Man arrives,’ 10:2 (Goodspeed 1)

3) “Jesus answers the high prie soon see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Almighty and coming upon the clouds of the sky!’ 26:64. [“Soon” is not in Mk 14:62.]” (Goodspeed 176‑177) <Eon to its icorpa­tion oMark, which impliesm it [Mk isc. 65], ther pased since th­ (Davies 209)

4) Mt 11:22, “Ever the Baptist the kingdom of Heaven has­been subjec­tedto d olent n are seizing it.”

5) Mt explains the name Blood Acre,’ by which that field has been known ever since.”

6) Mt 28:15, “So they took the money and did as they were told. This story became widely known, and is current in Jewish circles to this day.” d all things] points to a time when there was a revival of Messianic expectation and excitement (see 24:23 f.). When was this? The time of the rising of Bar Kochba against Rome (about A.D. 135) has been suggest­ed . . .The distress of such a wa explain Matthew’s emphasis on peace. Recall his words, All they that take the sword shall perish by the sword’ (26:52), and the wartime atmosphere law­iplied in hs day. [210]. . . [But] concern with the end of all things . . . existed long before, as Mark itself shows, and was ever recurring. It is best to recognize that Matthew is later than Mark and probably reflects the discussion which took place between Christianity and Judaism after A.D. 70. Nothing makes it necessary to date it after A.D. 90, and it is best to think of it as emerging a­round A.D. 85, at a time when the Jewish people were reorganiz­ing themselves after the collapse of their state in A.D. 70.” (Davies 210‑211)

5. “Mt 22:7 [the king . . . destroyed those murderers and burned their city’] makes it clear that Mt was written after 70. It is a sub‑apos­tolic work, concerned with the beginnings of church organization, but without the clear‑cut polity of the Past[orals] or Ignatius. A date between 70 and 110 is re­quried: perhaps about 85. But this date, though widely favoured, is really no more than a conjecture.” (Fuller 114)

## On the Date of Mark

1. Papias: “The Elder [John the Elder in Papias] gives no clue as to the date, tly that the goel was written after m thesce say after 64. Iren­aeus (III, 1.1) says Mk was written after the death of Peter and Paul. Whether this is an intelligent inference from the Elder, or upon inde­pendent tradition, we have no mns of . But sithe tendency as to push ba the dates of NT writings into the ap­ostolic age (cf. Clement of Alexan­dria, quoted Eusebius, *H*.*E*. VI. 14), who makes Mark write while Peter was still alive in Rome, Ir­enaeus’ dating may be accepted: Mk was cer­tainly written after 64.” (Fuller 106)

2. Mark reflects the situation on the eve of the fall of Jerusalem. (Kee, Young, and Froelich 252)

1) Mk 13:4, 7, 14 ‑- [Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple, and the disciples ask,] “what will be the sign when these things are all to be accom­plished?” [Jesus re,7E]when you hear of wars an, do not b alarmed . . . But when you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be (let the reader un­derstand), then let those who are in Judea flee . . .” Mt 24:15 says the place is the same as the “holy place” of Daniel 9:27, 12:11; Lk 21:20 says that Daniel re­fers to the seige of Jerusalem (A.D. 66‑70). Hence Mk probably has the same interpretation of Daniel. verse was written before the fall of Jerusalem; but even *ex eventu* prophecies are usually vague in form, “oack of precision whe­ther this prophecy’ written before or after thevent that it purports to pre­dict.” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 254) “. . . the intensity of the writing suggests that the crisis was a living re­ality for the evangelist, perhaps only a few years or even months before he wrote.” (2514‑20). Josephus himself city ever sffer rs v.105) ..” (Bornkamm 147) “Certainly as wdin the Little Apocalypse of chapter 13, Mark was­ written after a.d. 70, but not very long after, since Matthew soon made it the basis of his own gospel.” (Bornkamm 148)

2) “The Little Apocalypse,’ Mk 13:5ff, 14, indicates know­ledge of events up to the Jewish War (66‑70) bJerusalem. So a date c. 68 would be ac­cept­able.” (Fuller 106)

3) The significance of the fall of Jerusalem, however, lay not in the fall of the city itself but ion as a sign r the consummation of the Age. (Kee, Young, and Froelich 256) warns of pe­secution to come from the Romans. (Kee, Young, and Froelich 2)

4) “. . . the martyrdom of Peter . . . was but one, though the most nota­ble, of a series of martyr­doms that ravaged the Roman church. . . . infor his follow­ers.” (Bornkamm 150) ]Mark hal, with the esus. It m be that thiparticu­lar aspect of the ministry of Jesy him because t of the lie of Chris­tians when he wrote. In ad 64, Nero had accused Chris­tians of setting fire to the city; Paul and Peter had been put to death. Christians knew the extreme of suffering; persecution might break out at any moment again. . . . Mark persecuted Church.” (Davies 107)

3. “The stress laid on the controversy stories (Chapters 2, 3, 7, and 12 especially) in Mark would lead us to the conclusion that con­flict with Jewish institutions [was a major issue].” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 270)

4. The persistent hostility of Jewish authorities and Jesus’ vehement counter­at­tack suggest “that Mark is writing under circumstances where ob­servance, fast­ing, and ceremonial cleanliness with which Mark deals are not merely dead is­sues recalled from the past, but living questions on which the Church wants the authority of Jesus in defending its own position: 14ff.; see especially 12:‑­40).” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 267)

5. “It is somewhat more difficult to understand on this basis the pre­serva­tion by Mark of the stories about the conflict between J e Herodian sh . . . may be that te enmity toward Herod Agrippa [I, who martyred James in ad 44] is recalled by the Church . . .” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 267)

## On the Date of Luke

1. Arguments for a date late in the first century:
   1. “. . . the idea of writing such a work as Luke-Acts on the beginnings of the Christian move­ment could hardly have occurred to anyone until the Greek mission was a marked success and a great future had begun to open before the Christian faith.” (Goodspeed 191)
   2. “Its infancy interest, pushed back to the birth of John. One is reminded the Book of James (the Protevangelium), half a century or more later, this infancy interest is pushed still farther back to the nativity of the Virgin herself.” (Goodspeed 191)
   3. The resurrection appearances are protracted through forty days. This “is much nearer to the second-century representations of Jesus’ long post-resurrection conversations with the apostles, e.g., the Epistle of the Apostles, *ca*. A.D. 150.” (Goodspeed 192)
   4. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit permeates both volumes, and such a developed doctrine was “the fruit of no little religious reflec­tion.” (Goodspeed 191-192)
   5. “Paul is dead; that he is still living when the curtain falls upon the Acts in 28:30, 31, is outweighed by his farewell to the Ephesian elders, 20:25, with its solemn declaration that none of them would ever see his face again, underscored by its repetition in 20:38: they were especial­ly saddened at his saying that they would never see his face again.’” (Goodspeed 194)
2. On the other hand, there is an arguments against dating Luke-Acts after A.D. 100, namely, Luke’s lack of acquaintance with Paul’s collected letters: “if he had known them, he could not have helped making use of them . . .” (Goodspeed 195)
3. Conclusion: “Acts (and Luke of course with it), was written about A.D. 90 . . .” (Goodspeed 196) “. . . c. 90 would be a good date.” (Fuller 122)

## On the Date of John

1. **earliest possible date**

1) “. . . John’s attitude toward the Jews . . . reflects the hos­tility between Christianity and the synagogue after A.D. 70. . . . he goes much further [than the synoptics] in stressing the inten­sity of the Jewish rejec­tion, and the contrast between the old and the new.” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 329) “. . . it was written after A.D. 70 when Christians were being deliber­ately weeded out of the syna­gogues in chapter 7.” (Davies 377)

2) “The fact that the argument over the Law has been largely superseded by the conflict over the person of Jesus, espe­cially his relation to God (or the divinity of Jesus), likewise suits the later period.” (Kee, Young, and Froelich 329)

3) relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls

(1) Both John and the Scrolls share a vocabulary “based upon a dualistic conception of light/­darkness, truth/falsehood, life/death, love/­hatred, world/Christian fellowship.” (Fuller 174; cf. Kee, Young, and Froelich 330)

(2) “But it is a dualism of decision’ (Bultmann), not a metaphysical dualism. . . . Men are confronted with a decision to receive it [Jesus’ revelation]: if they reject it they choose darkness, false­hood, death, unbelief, hatred.” (Fuller 174)

(3) Hence, “recent attempts to push the Fourth Gospel very early into the second half of the first century be­cause of its alleged affinity with the Dead Sea Scrolls must be rejected . . .” (Davies 377)

2. **latest possible date**

1) The best argument against a very late date for John is P52, a papyrus fragment containing John 18:33-38, found in Egypt and dating from c. A.D. 135. “This is the earliest known fragment of the New Testament in existence. . . . For a Gospel to have reached Upper Egypt and achieved such a status by A.D. 150 implies that it was written considerably earlier, probably by the end of the first century . . .”

2) Conclusion: “. . . between A.D. 90 and 100.” (Davies 376) “. . . the conver­gence of probabilities points strongly to a date between 90 and 100.” [Raymond E. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, lxxxvi.]

## Source, Form, and Redaction Criticism

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

**Source Criticism**

Source criticism is analysis of a biblical text in order to discern the sources that were used in creating it. Besides comparing a text with other works that preceded it, to see if they have influenced it, one usually uses three types of clue to detect sources: (1) discrepancies (contradictions within the text), (2) doublets (the same material repeated twice in one gospel), and (3) stylistic variations.

The major application of source criticism in the New Testament is in the synoptic gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke). There the conclusion of the majority of scholars has been the “two-source theory”: Matthew and Luke had two sources, Mark and a no-longer-extant collection of Jesus’ sayings (“Q”). (Since Matthew has some material that only he relates, and since Luke also has special material, this is sometimes expanded into a “four-source theory,” with “M” used for Matthew’s special material and “L” used for Luke’s special material.)

**Form Criticism**

Form criticism in the Old Testament and in the epistles of the New Testament is largely a matter of noticing what genre a work belongs to, so that one can interpret it in accord with the type of literature it is (e.g., one does not read a poem in the same way as a newspaper article, and one does not read a story from a Genesis saga in the same way as an historical account in 2 Samuel). For the synoptic gospels, however, form criticism is more involved. The ultimate aim of form criticism in the synoptics is to arrive at the historical Jesus.

Form critics have noticed that the individual stories in the gospels are independent of their narrative contexts[[34]](#footnote-34) and are set in different frameworks in the gospels. On the basis of this datum they go through several stages of analysis.

1. They first separate the frameworks created by the evangelists from the pericopes embedded in the frameworks.[[35]](#footnote-35)
2. Then they classify the units by form. The basic distinction of form is between Jesus’ *utterances* and *narratives about Jesus*. These can be outlined as follows:
   1. utterances
      1. individual sayings
         1. statements
         2. literal aphorisms
         3. metaphorical aphorisms
      2. narratives by Jesus
         1. similitudes
         2. parables
   2. narratives about Jesus
      1. miracles[[36]](#footnote-36)
         1. healings
         2. nature miracles
         3. exorcisms
      2. pronouncement stories[[37]](#footnote-37)
      3. special stories

“Statements” are just ordinary statements, which do not instruct (e.g., John 11:34 on Lazarus: “Where have you laid him?”). Aphorisms (proverbs, maxims, adages, epigrams, *sententia*) are statements that instruct; they are either literal (e.g., Mark 2:27, “The sabbath was made for humankind, and not humankind for the sabbath”) or metaphorical (e.g., Matt 5:14, “You are the light of the world”). Both similitudes and parables tell stories, but they have different characteristics: similitudes are short, in present tense, describe what normally happens, and have indistinct characters (e.g., Luke 15:8-10, the lost coin); parables (also called “parables proper” or “story parables”) are long, in past tense, describe a unique situation, and have memorable characters (e.g., the prodigal son). Pronouncement stories are narratives whose point is not so much the story as it is a saying of Jesus that concludes it, a “punchline.” (A large subset of pronouncement stories is “controversy stories,” pronouncement stories in which Jesus and his opponents have a disagreement.) Special stories about Jesus are narratives uniquely about him, such as the infancy stories, his baptism, the temptations, the passion and resurrection narratives, etc.

1. The third step is to assign each unit to a setting in the life of the early church (called a *Sitz im Leben*, “setting in life”) that may have influenced the unit: such settings are preaching, teaching, liturgy, controversy with Jews, the Gentile mission, etc.
2. Since form critics assume that early Christians altered the traditions about Jesus to fit their preaching, liturgy, and so on, the last step is to try to reverse those alterations, so that one can arrive at the pericopes in as close to their original form as possible.

**Redaction Criticism**

Redaction criticism, too, is primarily used in interpreting the synoptic gospels, though it can be used elsewhere in the New and Old Testaments, wherever sources can be distinguished from editorial touches. “Redaction” means “editing” or “revising.” After form criticism separates the tradition (the original units) from the redaction (the evangelists’ frameworks), form criticism in essence throws away the framework as being of no interest in the discovery of the historical Jesus (the ultimate aim of the form critics). Redaction critics, on the other hand, consider the editorial touches of the evangelists (not only the frameworks but any changes they have made within the units) to be precious too, since these changes tell us about the views of the evangelists themselves and about the situation of the church in the time of the evangelists (the ad 60s-90s). By studying the evangelists’ editing, we can see if there are patterns of changes.[[38]](#footnote-38) The main result of the redaction criticism of the gospels has been the discernment of certain theological emphases that each evangelist has. Matthew emphasizes Jesus’ fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies and of the Mosaic Law; Mark emphasizes the authority of Jesus and his suffering; Luke emphasizes Jesus’ continuity with the rest of history and Jesus’ compassion for unfortunates (Gentiles, sinners, the poor, Samaritans, women); and John emphasizes the divinity of Christ and the fact that the kingdom of God is a reality now, not just something to come at the end of time.

## Words Characteristic of Matthew, Mark, and Luke

Hawkins, John C. *Horae Synopticae*: *Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. 1899. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1909. Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968.

The first column of numbers on the right gives the number of occurrences in the gospel being discussed; the second column gives the number of occurrences in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts, in that order—but skipping the gospel being discussed; and the final column gives the number of occurrences in the remainder of the New Testament. For example, in the first instance below @(), “10” is the number of occurrences of the word in Matthew; “0,2,0” are the number of occurrences in Mark, Luke, and Acts, respectively; and “4” is the number of occurrences in the remainder of the New Testament (John, the letters, and Revelation).

1. **words characteristic of Matthew**[[39]](#footnote-39) (Hawkins 4-8)

**most characteristic**

 10 0,2,0 4

kingdom of heaven    32 0,0,0 0

behold  after gen. absolute 11 0,1,0 1

called  + name 13 1,2,2 13

our/your/their Father  /// 20 1,3,0 19

Father in heaven    ()  13 1,0,0 1

heavenly Father    7 0,0,0 0

fulfill , used of Scripture 12 1,2,3 13

 52 5,10,10 35

ῥ (once ῥ) 13 0,0,0 0

What do you think?  / ; 6 0,0,0 1

then  90 6,15,21 71

hypocrite  13 1,3,0 4

 10 0,2,3 26

**characteristic**

lawlessness  4 0,0,0 10

 plural 8 0,0,0 0

now  7 0,0,0 29

star  5 1,0,0 19

wailing+gnashing of teeth +   6 0,1,0 1[[40]](#footnote-40)

 5 0,0,1 2

 6 3,0,0 6

righteousness  7 0,1,4 83[[41]](#footnote-41)

 9 1,2,0 10

 8 0,1,0 6

 =  4 1,0,0 5

 12 5,3,4 15

 7 0,1,0 1

 6 0,0,0 4

 10 1,2,6 10[[42]](#footnote-42)

day of judgment   4 0,0,0 3

 6 0,2,0 17

 7 0,1,18 19

 6 1,1,1 11

judgment  12 0,4,1 35

hide  7 0,3,0 12

 6 2,0,0 17

 6 0,1,1 6

hate  10 1,3,1 19

 adverb 7 2,1,8 59[[43]](#footnote-43)

 6 0,0,0 6

 4 0,1,3 11

little faith  4 0,1,0 1

  13 2,1,1 13[[44]](#footnote-44)

 4 0,2,3 22

 6 0,0,0 0

 17 1,7,14 36

 4 0,0,0 20

evil , /,  5 0,0,0 9

sheep  11 2,2,1 28[[45]](#footnote-45)

  + infinitive 5 1,1,1 7

 13 2,3,4 47

 14 3,4,3 32

Sadducees  8 1,1,5 7

earthquake  4 1,1,1 10

  5 0,0,0 0

 4 0,0,0 6

 24 5,6,11 35

end of the age   5 0,0,0 1

 7 1,1,1 4

 6 0,0,0 1

 6 0,0,0 1

 4 0,1,7 12

blind man  as metaphor 6 0,0,0 6

 7 1,1,0 4

 13 1,2,0 9

 5 1,1,0 7

 7 0,2,0 7

 5 0,0,1 4

that hour  +  in narrative 6 0,1,1 4

1. **words characteristic of Mark**[[46]](#footnote-46) (Hawkins 12-13)

**most characteristic**

 4 0,0,0 0

, [[47]](#footnote-47) 24 3,1,0 20

,  41 18,7,10 45

  6 0,0,0 3

 6 0,1,0 1

 as adverb 9 0,0,0 5

 6 0,2,2 4

**characteristic**

 11 2,6,5 20

 3 0,0,0 0

  5 2,2,0 7

 5 0,0,1 2

 8 1,5,4 10

 11 5,3,3 22

, , 3d.per.impf. 50 10,23,11 93

   = on the journey 6 3,2,2 7

 8 4,0,2 76[[48]](#footnote-48)

 3 0,0,0 0

 3 0,0,0 0

 5 0,0,2 6

 3 0,1,0 5

 3 0,1,1 3

 3 1,0,2 5

 6 3,1,0 9

 + indicative 3 0,0,0 2

 = why? 3 0,0,0 0

 13 3,4,4 45

 5 2,1,0 24

 28 17,3,5 114

 intransitive 6 0,2,8 15

 3 1,0,0 14

 6 3,0,1 6

 5 2,2,1 5

 15 5,4,10 52

1. **words characteristic of Luke**[[49]](#footnote-49) (Hawkins 16-23)

**most characteristic**

  25 3,2,7 47

  11 1,0,1 2

 + finite verb 22 5,2,0 7

 + infinitive 5 0,1,16 17

 ,   59 0,0,15 16

  + infinitive 32 3,2,7 20

 22 0,0,13 70[[50]](#footnote-50)

 7 0,0,0 0

 27 2,0,36 49[[51]](#footnote-51)

 + name or epithet 11 0,0,13 17

,  (of J. in narr.) 13 0,0,0 0

 5 0,0,0 6

 10 2,0,6 8

 after speaking verb 99 0,5,52 82

 + infinitive 20 6,0,0 6

 15 3,0,25 45[[52]](#footnote-52)

 21 0,0,11 14

 15 1,0,3 14

 8 0,0,17 147[[53]](#footnote-53)

 = when 19 0,1,29 49

**characteristic**

 4 0,1,0 6

 4 0,0,2 21

 4 1,0,1 8

 + optative 4 0,0,5 5

,  16 2,6,18 26

 27 8,4,100 189[[54]](#footnote-54)

 4 0,0,0 4

   5 0,0,1 2

 4 0,1,0 5

 6 1,2,28 74

 (of the Jews) 4 0,0,5 8

  11 1,2,2 26[[55]](#footnote-55)

 4 1,1,0 6

 4 0,0,6 10

 4 0,1,15 44

 4 0,0,0 0

 4 0,1,0 5

 5 0,0,1 3

 8 4,0,4 18[[56]](#footnote-56)

,  4 0,1,3 4

 +  + acc. 6 1,1,5 7

 6 1,1,0 14

 8 1,0,7 14

 6 1,1,0 8

 4 0,1,3 4

 4 1,0,5 12

 10 1,2,20 31

 5 2,0,2 34[[57]](#footnote-57)

   8 2,1,3 17

 optative 7 0,0,4 4

 + dative 15 3,2,10 23

 after prep. + art. 7 0,0,3 14

  7 0,1,0 1

 14 4,1,7 77[[58]](#footnote-58)

 4 1,0,1 4

, neut. w/o noun 4 0,0,0 1

 ,   9 1,1,0 4

 6 30,0 21

   5 0,0,0 0

    4 0,0,3 3

 4 0,0,7 9

  13 5,1,3 14

 6 1,0,5 8

 5 2,0,2 4

 5 1,1,7 14

 15 4,3,7 48[[59]](#footnote-59)

 33 8,1,17 46

 15 1,2,11 34

 10 1,0,15 44

 6 0,0,2 8

 7 0,0,11 14

 + infinitive 5 1,0,6 6

  4 0,0,1 1

  4 0,0,0 0

 11 4,1,4 15

  5 0,0,1 2

’  5 1,1,6 12

 in apodosis 4 0,0,1 4

 , etc., nom. 41 4,5,8 61

 , etc., nom 8 0,1,1 7

 5 0,0,0 0

 4 1,0,4 10

 11 2,3,2 36

 4 1,0,0 3

 as “womb” 7 1,0,2 5

 36 14,2,48 104

  6 0,0,0 0

  ,  4 1,1,13 23

  5 0,0,4 23

 6 1,0,0 3

 14 4,3,25 112

 as “household/family” 7 2,0,7 21

 11 3,2,0 20

 nom.=“whose name was” 7 1,1,1 9

 = “by name” 7 1,1,22 24

 in attraction 11 2,1,23 62

,  5 0,0,0 3

 = beyond 4 0,0,0 17

   4 1,0,5 6

 8 3,1,20 29

/   10 1,0,6 8

 13 2,0,9 11

 8 0,2,16 23

 15 5,1,4 16

 11 3,2,0 17

 6 0,0,13 33[[60]](#footnote-60)

 5 0,1,2 7

 6 2,0,5 10

 7 2,1,6 11

 4 1,0,2 3

ῥ 19 5,2,14 50

 7 1,2,2 6
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part 1: questions of introduction

1. **author**
   1. Papias, a Christian writer c. ad 140, says that “Mark, who had been Peter’s inter­preter, wrote down carefully, but not in order, all that he remembered of the Lord’s sayings and doings.”
      1. But the pericopes show evidence of a history of oral trans­mission, not tran­scribed memories from one eyewitness.
      2. “The connection Mark-Peter-Rome looks like second-century guesswork based on 1 Pet 5:13.” (Fuller 107) 1 Pet 5:13 reads, “She who is at Babylon, who is likewise chosen, sends you greet­ings; and so does my son Mark.”
   2. Still, Mark was not an apostle; so there was no reason to choose him as the author if he were not.
2. **integrity**: Mark’s gospel has three different endings in the Greek manuscripts:
   1. the shorter ending (concluding at Mk 16:8)
   2. the longer ending (adding Mk 16:9-20)
   3. the Freer logion (found only once, in the Freer manu­script).

part ii: major theological themes

1. **Jesus**’ **authority**: Mark emphasizes Jesus’ authority over:
   1. illness (“Take up your pallet and go home,” 2:11)
   2. demons (“he first binds the strong man,” 3:27; exorcisms)
   3. nature (stilling the storm, feeding the 5000 and 4000, walking on water)
   4. sins (“my son, your sins are forgiven,” 2:5)
   5. the kingdom of God (“To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God,” 4:11)
   6. Jewish institutions:
      1. fasting (“Why [is it that] your disciples do not fast?” 2:18)
      2. sabbath (“The Son of man is sovereign even over the sabbath,” 2:28)
      3. dietary laws (“he declared all foods clean,” 7:19)
      4. oral traditions (“You leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men,” 7:8)
      5. divorce (“he [Moses] wrote you this commandment. But from the begin­ning of creation, ‘God made them male and female,’” 10:5-6)
      6. temple (“he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold,” 11:15)
      7. Israel’s election (the vineyard owner “will come and destroy the tenants, and give the vineyard to others,” 12:9)
2. **Jesus**’ **suffering and death were God’s plan**: Mark emphasizes the death of Jesus.
   1. With his occasional hints of Jesus’ death (the Son of man “should suffer many things,” 9:12; death as baptism, 10:38-39; blood of the covenant, 14:24; etc.) and the three passion predic­tions (8:31, 9:31, 10:32-34), Mark showed that God willed Jesus’ death in order to save men. Cf. 10:45 (Jesus will give up his life as a ransom for many).
   2. Mark thus demonstrated to Christians (a) that God was at work from the start of Jesus’ ministry and (b) that the Lord suffered just as they are suffering persecutions now. Mark also thus demon­strated to Jews that Jesus was not merely an executed criminal.
3. **the messianic secret**
   1. Mark seems to think that there was something secret about Jesus’ being messiah.
      1. After demons identify Jesus as being more than ordinary, Jesus regularly orders them to be silent (1:24-25, 1:34, 3:11-12 [but cf. 5:7]).
      2. After healing someone, Jesus regularly orders them not to tell anyone about it (1:42-44, 5:43, 7:36, 8:26 [but cf. 5:18-19]).
      3. Again, the disciples seem peculiarly obtuse in Mark’s gospel (esp. 8:16-21).
      4. Also, Jesus teaches secretly.
         1. Note the theory that Jesus’ parables are de­liber­ately told to prevent understanding (4:11-12, 4:33-34).
         2. Jesus gives special, private teaching to his disciples (6:7-8; 7:17; 8:27-33; 9:2, 9, 30-31, 35; 10:10, 32; 13:3). Jesus also with­draws with his disciples (3:7, 13; 4:35-36; 6:30-31; 14:17, 32-33).
   2. How can this be explained?
      1. Perhaps Mark is explaining why Jews rejected Jesus (and why Jews of Mark’s day still re­jected him), in spite of his miracles and his fulfillment of messi­anic pro­phecies (thus Kee, Young, and Froelich).
      2. Perhaps Mark wanted to contrast Jesus’ modesty with that of Hellenistic wonder-workers (thus Fuller).
      3. Perhaps the secret Jesus kept was not his messiah­ship, but the nature of it: he was to be a suffer­ing messiah, which would be scandalous to the Jews who expected a conquering messiah (Davies).

## The Messianic Secret

Tuckett, Christopher. “Introduction: The Problem of the Messianic Secret.” In *The Messianic Secret*, ed. Christopher Tuckett. Issues in Religion and Theology 1. London: SPCK; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983. 1-28.

1. “**messianic secret**”
   1. “The term “messianic secret” has become the conventional English equivalent of the German *Messiasgeheimnis* [from William Wrede’s book, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in der Markusevangelium*, 1901] . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 22 n. 1)
   2. “However the German word *Geheimnis* carries the sense of “mystery” as well as “secret” . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 22 n. 1)
   3. “Wrede tended to use the term “messianic” somewhat loosely to refer to anything which suggested that Jesus had supernatural power and authority.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 23 n. 11)
2. **evidence for the secret**
   1. commands to secrecy
      1. Jesus silencing demons (1:25, 34; 3:12) (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
      2. Jesus silencing witnesses miracles (1:43-44; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26) (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
      3. Jesus silencing disciples (8:30; 9:9)
      4. Jesus keeping his location secret (7:24; 9:30-31)
      5. others silencing Bartimaeus (10:47-48)
   2. “cryptic speech” (Wrede’s term) (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
      1. Jesus giving private instruction (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
      2. Jesus performing miracles with only a few watching (Mark 1:29ff, 35; 5:40; 7:17, 33; 8:23; 10:10) (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4, 13)
   3. the “theory of parables” (Mark 4:10-13, 4:33-34) (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
   4. obtuseness of the disciples (4:13, 40-41; 6:50-52; 7:18; 8:16-21; 9:5-6, 19; 10:24; 14:37-41). (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 23 n. 13)
3. **evidence for a messianic revelation**: the secrecy motif is occasionally contradicted. There is “the element of revelation which exists alongside the element of secrecy in Mark.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
   1. The parable of the wicked husbandmen *is* understood (12:12). (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
   2. Jesus’ command to silence is sometimes disobeyed (1:45, 7:36-37). (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
   3. “. . . Jesus’ condemnation to death in Mark is not the result of nay secrecy being imposed: on the contrary, it is precisely due to the veil of secrecy being lifted [14:61-62].” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
4. **historical theories**
   1. “A number of [19th-century] “lives of Jesus” were written, all based for their chronology on the Marcan outline . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 1)
      1. “. . . the literary priority of Mark’s Gospel [was] taken as an indication of Mark’s historical reliability.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 1) “This is of course a non sequitur: the fact that Mark is earlier than the other Gospels can show nothing about its historical reliability in absolute terms.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 22 n. 7)
      2. “Jesus became conscious that he was the Messiah at his baptism . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 1)
      3. “. . . he kept this secret . . . so that the correct evaluation of his person might develop gradually . . . Slowly the disciples did become aware . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 2)
      4. After Caesarea Philippi, “Jesus had to try to free the disciples from Jewish nationalistic ideas . . . Jesus still kept his identity hidden from the crowds . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 2)
      5. But “his miracles led to public recognition (cf. Mark 10:47), and finally Jesus accepted the crowds’ acclamation” at the triumphal entry. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 2)
      6. The secrecy elements were variously explained. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
         1. Jesus silenced the demons because they were not on God’s side. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
         2. Jesus did not want the reputation of a miracle worker. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
         3. Jesus “was seeking to avoid popular ideas of messiahship with their political overtones.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 1)
   2. Albert Schweitzer’s *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (German: 1906)
      1. For Schweitzer, as for the 19th-century lives, “the literary priority of Mark’s Gospel [was] taken as an indication of *Mark*’*s historical reliability*.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 1)
      2. He showed that the “psychologizing approach of the nineteenth-century critics” [7] did not take seriously Jesus’ eschatology. [2] (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7, 2)
      3. “. . . Jesus sent out the twelve on a lightning preaching tour to warn others, not expecting that they would return before the End (cf. Matt 10:23).” When they did, “Jesus decided to go to Jerusalem in order to take upon himself the “messianic woes” . . . and thus force the arrival of the Kingdom.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 2)
      4. “Schweitzer’s theories . . . make Jesus into . . . a disappointed apocalyptic fanatic . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 2)
      5. “. . . Schweitzer too had a basic trust in [2] . . . Mark’s historical sequence . . .” [3] But “His reliance on the synoptic chronology has been vitiated by the work of the form critics.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 2-3, 8)
      6. Since Wrede saw the secrecy elements as unhistorical, Schweitzer characterized Wrede’s explanation of them as “thorough-going scepticism”; his own approach he contrasted as “thorough-going eschatology.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7)
      7. origin of the secrecy elements: according to Schweitzer, the elements stem from Jesus himself. Jesus understood his messiahship “in wholly futurist terms. Jesus thus had to keep his identity hidden since his messiahship would only be fully realized in the future when the Kingdom of God came . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7)
   3. Johannes Weiss
      1. Some secrecy elements (e. g., 1:25, 8:30) were historical; others (e. g., 1:34, 3:11-12) might be secondary.
      2. The historical elements “reflected the belief, common to Jesus and the earliest Church, that Jesus’ messiahship was futurist, i. e. Jesus would become Messiah at a future date (for the earliest Church this was the resurrection) . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 8)
      3. Also, “Jesus was here seeking to avoid political ideas popularly associated with messiahship.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
   4. Paul Wernle “claimed that some of the secrecy charges were due to Jesus’ desire to preach about God and the things of God, rather than about himself (1917, 334).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 8)
   5. Sanday (1907, 70-76) argued that “the resurrection is insufficient in itself to explain the rise of the belief that Jesus was the Messiah.” [8] Schweitzer agreed: “the resurrection itself could [not] have given rise to the belief that Jesus was tghe Messiah: claims that John the Baptist had been raised did not necessarily carry with them any claim that he was the Messiah (1954, 343).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7)
   6. Julius Schniewind (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 10)
   7. Ernst Lohmeyer (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 10)
   8. Sjöberg (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 11)
   9. Dunn (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 11-12)
5. **redactional theories**
   1. William Wrede’s *The Messianic Secret* (German: 1902)
      1. Wrede “opened the way to seeing the Gospels as reflecting the beliefs of the early Church, quite as much as reflecting the historical career of Jesus. [6] . . . Thus Wrede is probably more important than Schweitzer in bringing to an end the “old quest” . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 6, 23 n. 9)
      2. Wrede proved that there is no gradual revelation by Jesus or growth in understanding by the disciples. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 3)
         1. Jesus did not initially keep his identity secret: he claimed explicitly to be the Son of Man already in Mark 2:10, 28. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 3)
         2. Caesarea Philippi is no turning point: the disciples are blind immediately before it (Mark 8:15ff) and after it. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 3)
         3. Caesarea Philippi is not the beginning of Jesus’ teaching about his passion, since he already predicts it in the bridegroom saying (Mark 2:19-20). (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 3)
         4. The passion predictions are redactional. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
            1. They correspond so precisely with subsequent events that they look like later creations. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
            2. The disciples’ unpreparedness at Jesus’ death implies they received no prior instruction. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
         5. The disciples remain “totally uncomprehending throughout Jesus’ ministry.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
      3. Wrede concluded that “All the secrecy elements in Mark were later additions . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
         1. The commands to secrecy are “all unhistorical,” “later additions,” since silencing the witnesses after raising the girl in 5:43 cannot be taken seriously. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
         2. The instances of cryptic speech may or may not be historical. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
         3. The theory of parables is unhistorical. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
            1. Obscuring his meaning is not Jesus’ usual procedure. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
            2. Taken with the other secrecy evidence, where the secret is Jesus’ identity as messiah, the “mystery” of Mark 4:11 must also be Jesus’ identity as messiah. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 4)
         4. The motif of the disciples’ obtuseness “depended on Mark’s literary composition [see 8:17] . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
      4. the purpose of the secrecy elements
         1. The “key to all the secrecy passages” is 9:9, “And as they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
         2. Wrede wrote, “During his earthly life Jesus’ messiahship is absolutely a secret . . .; with the resurrection, however, its disclosure ensues. This is in fact the crucial idea, the underlying point of Mark’s entire approach” (p. 68). (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 5)
      5. the origin of the secrecy elements
         1. “The various motifs in Mark were too variegated in nature to be work of a single individual (1971, 145).” They therefore originated after Jesus but before Mark. [6] But “in most of his book, Wrede appears to assume that the secret is the work of Mark himself, and only introduces the theory of a pre-Marcan stage at the end of his analysis.” [23 n. 14] (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 6, 23 n. 14)
         2. At first Christians believed “that Jesus only became Messiah at the resurrection” (Rom 1:4, Phil 2:6-11, Acts 2:36). Later they believed he must have been messiah before the resurrection. [6] “. . . Wrede’s explanation about the origin of the secret [was that it stemmed] from the juxtaposition of a non-messianic and a messianic view of Jesus’ earthly life.” [12] (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 6, 12)
         3. A corollary is that “the secret could only have arisen at a time when no explicit messianic claims by Jesus were known.” 6 But “His conclusions about the lack of any messianic claim by Jesus was only a corollary tentatively drawn . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7)
      6. Since Wrede saw the secrecy elements as unhistorical, Schweitzer characterized Wrede’s explanation of them as “thorough-going scepticism”; his own approach he contrasted as “thorough-going eschatology.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7)
      7. summary: “According to Wrede, the historical Jesus did not understand himself to be a messiah; therefore, the original tradition did not yet have any messianic character. The early church, which believed in his messiahship on the basis of the Easter experience, reconciled the contradiction between their faith and what they found in the tradition by means of this theory of the “messianic secret”: i. e., that Jesus knew himself to be the messiah, but he kept it secret.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 7)
      8. objections
         1. “. . . what has become the standard critique of Wrede’s original theory [is] that Mark’s material was never understood non-messianically . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
         2. Recently there has been “questioning of Wrede’s initial premiss that all the secrecy texts must be explained in the same way, and the adoption of different explanations for various parts of the evidence.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 19)
         3. “. . . is it [Wrede’s] the most logical interpretation? If we take the Markan narrative as we have it, can we discern any reason for Jesus’ secrecy as it is presented in that book? [72] . . . we can see good reasons for Jesus’ admonition to silence: (1) He felt compelled to give his disciples a good deal of instruction concerning the nature of his messiahship. It was not political, but spiritual. . . . (2) If Jesus had allowed his disciples to proclaim him as Messiah, the people would have been aroused to a political and perhaps military campaign that would have concluded his ministry before it began. We must be reminded that in spite of Jesus’ frequent injunctions to secrecy, from the point of view of the Romans he was eventually crucified for his claim to be the Messiah (Mk. 15:26, etc.).” (Charles Anderson, *Historical Jesus* 72-73)
         4. “The confession of Peter in Mk. 8:29 was not made, as is that of contemporary Christians, in the context of belief in Jesus’ deity. His confession was made in the context of the Jewish idea of the Messiah—a political Messiah. Jesus’ commendation of Peter at that time cannot be taken to mean that the full and final realization of Jesus’ messiahship had dawned on Peter. One need merely read the rest of the Gospel to see that. Peter is filled with militaristic ideas and actions . . .” (Charles Anderson, *Historical Jesus* 72)
   2. Martin Dibelius (*From Tradition to Gospel*, 1919)
      1. Dibelius generally agreed with Wrede, though he said Jesus’ withdrawal from crowds to perform miracles was not evidence of the secrecy motif but “simply a standard feature in such miracle stories . . .” [13] “. . . the silencing of the demon [was] the standard means whereby the power of the demon is overcome—cf. O. Bauernfeind’s programmatic study, *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium* (Stuttgart, 1927).” [23 n. 20] Tuckett agrees: “the secrecy charge in 1:25, and the privacy motif in the miracles, are probably standard features of such stories.” [21] (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13, 23 n. 20, 21)
      2. Unlike Wrede, Dibelius “assumed that the secrecy theory was due to Mark himself . . .” But if Mark created the messianic secret, then Wrede’s explanation of the origin of the secret (“as stemming from the juxtaposition of a non-messianic and a messianic view of Jesus’ earthly life”) is wrong, “For Mark himself seems unaware of a non-messianic view . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 12)
      3. Dibelius had his own special “apologetic” theory of the secret: “its origin lay in Mark’s concern to explain . . . “why He was not recognized as Messiah by the people and why He was opposed, despised, and finally sent to the cross [Dibelius, p. 230].”“ (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
      4. But Wrede had already rejected this explanation, since “Mark’s presentation of the secret “at no point awakens the impression that in this we are dealing with an apologetic evasion” (1971, 226).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
      5. Also, “The apologetic theory can provide a good explanation for the saying about the purpose of parables in 4:11f, but the conjunction of messianic revelation with messianic secrecy is more difficult.” (For “messianic revelation,” see above, p. 1.) (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
   3. Rudolf Bultmann (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 1919)
      1. “Bultmann adopted Wrede’s theory enthusiastically.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 12)
      2. Like Wrede, he concluded that “Jesus had never claimed to be Messiah.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 12)
      3. But Bultmann “assumed that the secrecy theory was due to Mark himself . . .” But if Mark created the messianic secret, then Wrede’s explanation of the origin of the secret (“as stemming from the juxtaposition of a non-messianic and a messianic view of Jesus’ earthly life”) is wrong, “For Mark himself seems unaware of a non-messianic view . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 12)
      4. Bultmann claimed that “. . . Mark is setting the stories about Jesus in terms of the (hellenistic) kerygma.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
   4. H.J. Ebeling’s “epiphanic” theory (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
      1. Mark is pure kerygma (the kerygma of Mark’s day) and not at all history. So the secrecy elements are redactional, presumably Markan. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
      2. Mark certainly saw Jesus’ life as messianic, “as the epiphany of the Son of God.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
      3. So the secrecy elements cannot be attempts to hide Jesus’ messiahship. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
      4. “Thus these elements were . . . literary devices which simply highlight the glory of Jesus and stress the epiphanic nature of the events concerned.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
         1. The emphasis is not on the commands to silence but on their constantly being broken, which shows “the irresistible way in which Jesus’ fame spread (115ff).” But “this does not cover all the secrecy charges, since at times there is no mention of their being broken.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
         2. “The Marcan theory about parables serves a similar aim: . . . the readers are shown that they too belong within the circle of those to whom the mystery has been revealed . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
         3. “Similarly, the failure of the disciples to understand Jesus’ teaching is merely a stylistic device which conveys to the reader the idea of the transcendent nature of the revelation being given (146ff).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
      5. The epiphanic theory takes seriously the elements of messianic revelation and may explain some instances of secrecy, but there are problems. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
         1. Emphasis on the commands being broken “does not cover all the secrecy charges, since at times [e. g., 5:43] there is no mention of their being broken.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 14)
         2. Ebeling relies on a parallel in apocalyptic literature where “a secret [is] to be universally revealed at a future date,” but “in Mark the time in question is now past.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 15)
   5. Percy’s theory
      1. Like Wrede, Percy sees the secret as the result of two streams of tradition merging. But Wrede saw one stream as depicting an unmessianic Jesus, the other a messianic; Percy sees one stream as messianic, the other as also messianic, but the latter “had reflected more deeply on the importance of the cross and resurrection.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 15)
      2. “Thus Percy claimed that Mark’s Gospel is to be interpreted as very similar to the Pauline kerygma (cf. 1 Cor. 2:8; 2 Cor. 13:4; Phil. 2:7f), where Jesus’ earthly life is to be seen as one of humility and lowliness, and his true glory only dates from the resurrection. In Mark, “lowliness” is replaced by “secrecy”, but the basic idea reamins the same.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 15)
      3. “Thus the disciples *could* not see Jesus’ true glory prior to Easter . . . The time limit set to the period of secrecy in 9:9 is thus taken very seriously.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 15)
      4. objections
         1. “There are difficulties raised by those points in Mark where the secret is broken *prior* to Easter (cf. 1:45; 7:36).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 15)
         2. “Further, if it is true that the secret belongs primarily to the past, then it is not clear why Mark should have taken the trouble to stress it so much in his Gospel, and it becomes doubtful whether it has kerygmatic significance.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 15)
   6. J. Schreiber
      1. “. . . Jesus’ hiddenness and his failure to be understood are compared to the ideas in the gnostic [redeemer] myth where the redeemer is unrecognized by the supernatural powers (cf. 1 Cor. 2:8) (Schreiber, 156f).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
      2. objections
         1. It is a uncertain “where there was a pre-Christian redeemer myth . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
         2. “. . . Mark’s Gospel lacks vital elements in the proposed scheme . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
            1. “. . . there is no idea of pre-existence in Mark . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
            2. “. . . nor is there any typically gnositc cosmology . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
         3. “. . . the distinctive feature of Mark is that Jesus *is* recognized by the supernatural powers but not by men.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
   7. Herbert Braun
      1. Messiahship is a later addition: “the community, since the emergence of their Easter faith, confessed him as the Messiah who was about to come and then read their confession back into a few striking scenes in his life” (his baptism, Peter’s confession, the transfiguration, [25] the trial before the Sanhedrin). (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 25-26)
      2. On the messianic secret: “The second gospel covers over the conflict between the actual non-Messianic character of Jesus’ life and the Easter confession of the Messiah moving about on earth by means of repeated commands of silence that Jesus imposed . . .” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 26)
   8. Hans Conzelmann
      1. The messianic secret motif does not go back to Jesus himself: though “after Peter’s confession and the transfiguration, he demanded from the disciples silence about his nature,” this was only “until the resurrection.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 48)
      2. “Also, the secrecy motif is not present in the early bits of tradition, but in the redactional framework . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 48)
      3. “Wrede [48] wished to explain it in a historical-pragmatic way: the community created it in order to remove the contradiction between the unmessianic character of the tradition and its own messianic faith . . . This explanation is improbable, for the secrecy theory was first produced at a time when there was no longer a *consciousness* of an unmessianic character of the tradition. It served rather for the positive presentation of a doctrine of revelation—conceived in the sense of paradox! It is significant that Mark (who was probably the originator of the theory), in applying it, had to work hardest in those places where the traditional material (already in the pre-Markan stage) was most strongly “messianic,” e.g., in connection with the transfiguration (Mark 9:9).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 48-49)
      4. “Conzelmann ascribes the secret to Mark . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
      5. “His contribution does not consist in his forcing non-messianic elements into a framework of christological belief, but rather in his putting together a mass of materials already understood christologically in such a way as to conform to the kerygma (understood in the sense of the secrecy christology) . . .” [Quotation from Conzelmann, 1968, 42.] (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 16)
      6. “The secret is thus the means whereby Mark *controls* the Christology of his tradition by pointing to the cross . . . Only by such a means can Mark prevent his account from becoming a series of unambiguous epiphanies of a divine being, or, in Conzelmann’s famous words, “the secrecy theory is the hermeneutical presupposition of the genre ‘gospel’” (1968, 43).” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17)
      7. For Percy “the secret is a matter of past history alone; for Conzelmann the secret still applies in the present: . . . “the mystery . . . remains veiled from the world even after Easter . . . (1969, 139).”“ (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17)
      8. “This theory [is] that the secret reflects the central importance of the cross as the only valid key for interpreting the person of Jesus . . . The cross and resurrection are thus the “ending” of the secret in that they provide the key to the interpretation of the whole . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17)
      9. “Overall, the theory that the secret is Mark’s way of stressing the centrality of the cross is very attractive.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
         1. “It takes seriously the results of form criticism which sees that a non-messianic Jesus tradition is hard to envisage . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
         2. It “also takes eriously the time limit set in 9:9 (even if it has to interpret this as referring to only the possibility of understanding after Easter) . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
         3. It “seeks to explain the relationship between history and kerygma which is involved in the writing of any “Gospel”.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)

So “the theory that Mark may be trying to correct another christological view by the secret is widely accepted . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 19)

* + 1. objections
       1. “Why do some of the miracle stories lack a secrecy charge (e. g. 5:1-20)?” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
       2. “Why too are some of the secrecy charges disobeyed whilst others are not?” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
  1. Theodore J. Weeden
     1. Weeden’s theory builds upon Conzelmann’s in that it assumes that Mark’s purpose is to stress the importance of the cross in reaching a true evaluation of Jesus. (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17)
     2. One part of the evidence for a secrecy motif is often separated from the rest, and that is “the motif of the disciples’ lack of understanding. . . . Tyson points out that, in the rest of the secrecy material, people recognize Jesus’ true identity but are forbidden to publicize it, whereas the disciples have a wrong conception of Jesus’ nature.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
     3. Several scholars have assumed that “Mark [is] deliberately opposing a specific Christology in his community” [17] and that “the disciples represent a group within Mark’s own community, and Mark’s unfavourable picture represents a polemical attitude towards this group.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17-18)
     4. Tyson “claims that the disciples represent the Jerusalem church of Mark’s day: these Christians have too narrow a view of messiahship (conceiving of it solely in royal terms), and fail to give central improtance to the cross.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18)
     5. Weeden assumes that the too-narrow christology, represented by the disciples and opposed by Mark, is that of a *theios anēr*, “a view [of] Jesus primarily in terms of a great miracle worker and the possessor of supernatural power. . . . In this respect reference is often made to D. Georgi’s study on Paul’s opponents in 2 Corinthians.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17)
     6. Mark is “taking the stress away from the miracles and pointing to the cross as the decisive event for reaching a true evaluation of Jesus.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 17)
     7. “Weeden believes that the [18] opponents based their claims on resurrection appearances which gave them positions of privilege and power. By contrast, he claims, Mark writes his story in such a way as to deny any resurrection appearances to the opponents at all . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 18-19)
     8. objections
        1. “The ending of Mark (cf. 16:7) suggests a theophany and hence a restoration of the disciples, rather than their final rejection.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 19)
        2. “Further, negative features about the disciples are balanced by equally positive ones.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 19)
        3. The instances in Mark of incomprehension by the disciples (4:13, 40-41; 6:50-52; 7:18; 8:16-21; 9:5-6, 19; 10:24; 14:37-41) may serve more than one function. The purpose of some may be “simply to highlight the importance of the miracle or teaching in question . . .” Also, “not all the passages suggest that the incomprehension is culpable.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 19)

1. **explanations of the messianic secret**
   1. historical theories (i. e., the messianic secret stems from Jesus)
      1. “traditional” theory (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
         1. “. . . the traditional view [is] that Jesus was modifying the popular idea of messiahship, from one involving military warfare to one of suffering service.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
         2. This is “by far the most common explanation . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
         3. objections
            1. “Mark himself gives no suggestion explicitly that the title “Messiah” needed modification before being acceptable to Jesus.” [9] ““. . . there is a remarkable lack of passages in which Jesus is reported as trying to counter possible misunderstandings” ([Barbour] 1968, 237).” [25 n. 30] (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9, 25 n. 30)
            2. “. . . a more natural way for Jesus to have proceeded would have been to have given some explicit teaching on the subject . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
            3. “It *might* be appropriate in explaining the secrecy charge at 8:30, but not in explaining . . . the commands to silence after miracles.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
      2. “future messiahship” theory
         1. Schweitzer: Jesus understood his messiahship “in wholly futurist terms. Jesus thus had to keep his identity hidden since his messiahship would only be fully realized in the future when the Kingdom of God came . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 7)
         2. Sanday: ““although He was the Messiah, the time for entering upon His full Messianic functions was not yet” (1907, 119). And this idea that messiahship involves a future, . . . as yet uncompleted task, has been supported by others . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 9)
      3. “modesty” theory
         1. Wernle: secrecy elements “were due to Jesus’ desire to preach about God and the things of God, rather than about himself . . .” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 8)
   2. redactional theories (i. e., the messianic secret stems from after Jesus)
      1. The secrecy motif arose during the stage of oral transmission.
         1. This is Wrede’s position.
         2. At first Christians believed “that Jesus only became Messiah at the resurrection” (Rom 1:4, Phil 2:6-11, Acts 2:36). Later they believed he must have been messiah before the resurrection. 6 “. . . Wrede’s explanation about the origin of the secret [was that it stemmed] from the juxtaposition of a non-messianic and a messianic view of Jesus’ earthly life.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 12)
      2. The secrecy motif arose in Mark’s redaction.
         1. Dibelius’ “apologetic” theory: “its origin lay in Mark’s concern to explain . . . “why He was not recognized as Messiah by the people and why He was opposed, despised, and finally sent to the cross [Dibelius, p. 230].”“ (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 13)
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part i: questions of introduction

1. **structure**
   1. Bacon and the Pentateuchal theory
      1. B. W. Bacon of Yale University proposed in 1930 that Matthew pat­terned his gospel on the structure of the Pentateuch: the Penta­teuch, he wrote, “consists of five books of command­ments of Moses, each body of law intro­duced by a narrative concerned with ‘signs and won­ders’ . . .” (Davies 213) Matthew similar­ly has five discourses (Matt 5-7, 10, 13, 18, 24-25) which, Bacon argued, present the New Law of the New Israel, and each discourse is preced­ed by a narrative section.
         1. Further evidence for Bacon’s theory is the fact that Matthew begins with the words, “the book of the *gene­sis* of Jesus Christ.”
         2. Also, Herod’s slaughter of the innocents parallels Pharaoh’s massa­cre of children when Moses was an infant (Exod 1:15-16).
         3. Moreover, Jesus ascends a mountain to deliver the sermon on the mount (5:1), just as Moses ascended Mount Sinai when the first Law was delivered.
      2. But there are problems with Bacon’s theory.
         1. Mt 23, a denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees, has as much claim to being a dis­course as the five discourses Bacon delin­eated. It is unlikely, howev­er, that 23 should be grouped together with 24-25 (thus making the fifth discourse be 23-25), since in between 23 and 24-25 Jesus leaves the temple, crosses down the Kidron Valley, and ascends the Mount of Olives (24:­1, 3). (Goodspeed 168-169)
         2. Far from providing a new Law, Jesus is, for Matthew, the ful­fill­ment of the Law of Moses (Matt 5:17). (Kee, Young, Froelich 278)
         3. Most scholars today have therefore abandoned Bacon’s pentateu­chal theory.
   2. For an outline of Matthew, see below, “Outlines of the Synop­tic Gos­pels.”
   3. problems with the outlne of Matthew
      1. In Mt 14-18, “it is difficult to differentiate between narrative and discourse.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 277)
      2. Mt 23 is more discourse than narrative.

part ii: major theological themes

1. **ambivalence toward Judaism**
   1. Matthew has “a paradoxical attitude toward Judaism. On the one hand he is deeply sympathetic . . . on the other hand, he is [bitterly] critical of Judaism . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 275)
   2. Matthew makes additions to the passion narrative to emphasize the guilt of the Jews.
      1. “His blood be on us and on our children” (27:25).
      2. “You serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to es­cape being sentenced to hell? . . . upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on earth . . .” (Matt 23:33-35).
   3. Nevertheless, “he expects the Church to take over so much of Jewish institutions and practices: scribal interpreta­tions, ceremonial require­ments, alms, fasting, etc.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 292)
2. **fulfillment of the prophets**
   1. fulfillment of prophecy in general
      1. “The foretelling of Jesus’ ministry was not limited to the obvious­ly pro­phetic sectons of the Old Testament, but included passages which did not appear to be predic­tive at all . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 279)
      2. “Did Mt first find the texts, and create incidents to match them? Or did he find the inci­dents in the tradi­tion and match them with proof texts?” (Fuller 117)
         1. We are certain that in some cases he began with a tradi­tional story or detail and then found a prophecy that it fulfilled.
            1. This is obviously the case when he introduces prophe­cies into material from Mark. (Fuller 117)
            2. “Mt did not invent the tradition of the virginal concep­tion to square with Isa 7:14 or the birth at Bethlehem to square with Mic 5:1. For both these traditions are found indepen­dently in Mt and Lk . . .” (Fuller 117)
            3. “It is not certain whether the massacre of the innocents and the flight into Egpyt are tradi­tion­al, or whether they are Mt’s creation from the prophecies. But the other instances suggest that there was some prece­dent in the pre‑Mat­thean tra­di­tion for both these inci­dents.” (Fuller 117)
         2. But Matthew does sometimes modify the stories to match the prophecies. (Fuller 117)
            1. “In at least one instance, Matthew seems to have created a story [the death of Judas Is­cariot, 27:3‑10, cf. Acts 1:18-19] to fit his combination of two or three prophecies (Zech 11:12‑13; Jer. 32:6‑15; 18:2‑3). . . . None of the other gospels reports this incident at all . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 280)
            2. Another instance is Matt 21:1-7. Matt 21:5 quotes Zech 9:9 (“humble and riding on a donkey, on a colt, the foal of a donkey”), which in Zechariah is just a typi­cal instance of Hebrew poetic paral­lelism (i.e., the second clause simply rede­scribes the same animal referred to in the first clause). But Matthew has Jesus ful­fill the quotation quite literal­ly: Jesus rides into town on two donkeys simul­tan­e­ously!
   2. formula citations
      1. Matthew is the only evangelist who regular­ly introduces prophecies with a formula: “This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet . . .,” or something similar. The occurrences of these formula citations are: 1:22-23, 2:5-6, 2:15, 2:17-18, 2:23, 4:14-16, 8:17, 12:17-21, 13:14-15, 13:35, 21:4-5, 26:56, 27:9-10.
      2. “It must be acknowledged that, by current standards of Biblical interpretation, none of these [ful­fillment‑­quota­tion] prophecies means in its original context what Mat­thew has made it mean in his setting.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 280)
3. **fulfillment of the Law**
   1. “The scriptures were understood by Matthew to be fulfilled in another than the prophetic sense: that is, in fulfillment of the . . . Law . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 281)
   2. “The heart of Matthew’s attitude toward the Law . . . is dis­closed in two passages . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 282)
      1. “Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them.” [5:17] “‘Ful­fill’ cannot mean in this context what it meant in the formula quota­tions discussed below; instead, it means that Jesus has come to accomplish what the Law summons man to obey. [Matthew] affirms the unchange­ability of the Law [and he] looks forward to the true and total accom­plish­ment of everything promised and commanded in the Law. . . . There is no hint of reducing the Law to a single principle, such as the law of love, nor is the Law presented as an instru­ment that will drive men to despair of their own moral abillities and thereby throw them back in repentance upon the grace of God [as Paul presents the Law in Rom 7].” (Kee, Young, Froelich 282)
      2. The antitheses [Matt 5:21-48] show, however, that ful­fill­ing the law requires a good motive at the root of one’s actions and not mere conformity to rules of con­duct.
   3. “Obedience to the Law, as Matthew describes it, was not confined to *ethical* perfor­mance, however: it included par­ticipation in such typical Jewish acts of piety as prayer (Matt 6:5‑8), giving alms (6:1‑4), fasting (6:16‑18), and apparent­ly offering the appropri­ate sacrifices . . . [284] These may have been empty require­ments by Matthew’s time, since the Temple was no longer standing . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 284-285)
4. **the Church**
   1. “Certain striking passages dealing with the Church are pecu­liar to Matthew.” (Davies 214)
      1. “In Mt. 13:52, Jesus [compares] a ‘scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heav­en’ with ‘a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old.’ The leadership role in the Church, there­fore, includes the task of interpreting the Law—whether old or new—in relation to the daily needs of the Church’s life.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 289)
      2. Matt 16:18‑19: “And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.”
      3. Matt 18:15‑18: “If another member of the church sins against you, go and point out the fault when the two of you are alone. If the member listens to you, you have regained that one. But if you are not listened to, take one or two others along with you, so that every word may be confirmed by the evidence of two or three wit­nesses. If the member refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if the offender refuses to listen even to the church, let such a one be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector. Truly I tell you, whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.”
      4. In Matt 28, Jesus assures the community that he will always be with them. (Davies 214‑15)
   2. “. . . the Church is the true Israel, while the people that calls itself ‘Israel’ has actually forfeited that claim by its failure to recognize Jesus . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 275)
5. **the Gentiles**: Matt 21:43‑44 (“the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it”) “marks the turn­ing-point in the action of the Gospel of Mat­thew.” (Goodspeed 167) Up to this point, Jesus had ministered only to the Jews (10:5‑6, 15:24, “the lost sheep of the house of Israel”); now he turns from them. Israel’s leaders are denounced and Jerusalem lamented (Matt 23), the gospel is to be “preached throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations” (24:­14), and the disciples are commis­sioned at the end of the gospel to preach to the Gen­tiles (28:19‑20, “Go there­fore and make disciples of all nations, baptiz­ing them [and] teaching them . . .”).
6. **eschatology**
   1. Matthew expected the second coming in the near future.
      1. 24:29-31, “Immediately after the tribulation of those days will appear the sign of the son of man in heaven . . .” (“Immediately” is not in Mark 13:24.)
      2. 16:28, “there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his king­dom.”
      3. 10:23, “you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes.”
      4. 26:64, “you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.”
   2. However, the interval between the present and the second coming will not be brief. (Kee, Young, Froelich 291)
      1. To the parable of the talents, Matthew adds the phrase (24:19), “after a long period of time.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 291)
      2. The disciples have the obligation to preach the gospel and to instruct all the nations on earth (28:19-20). (Kee, Young, Froelich 291)
      3. Though the Lord is not visibly present, “Lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.” (28:20) (Kee, Young, Froelich 293).

## An Introduction to the Gospel of Luke

part i: questions of introduction

1. **Luke-Acts as two volumes**
   1. The beginnings of Luke and of Acts link the two volumes together.
      1. Both Luke 1:3 and Acts 1:1 directly address Theophilus.
      2. Acts 1:1 refers to a previous volume and summarizes the content of Luke: “In the first book, O Theo­philus, I have dealt with all that Jesus began to do and teach.”
   2. The ending of Luke has connections to the beginning of Acts.
      1. The ascension is only recounted twice in the New Testa­ment: at the end of Luke (24:50-53), and at the begin­ning of Acts (1:2-11).
      2. Luke 24:49 says, “I will send down upon you what my Father has pro­mised. Wait here in the city . . .” The fulfillment of this promise is in Acts 2 (Pentecost). (Goodspeed 181)
2. **structure**
   1. “. . . Luke has considerably reshaped the Markan source, espe­cially the twofold structure Galilee-Jerusalem into the more elaborate threefold structure: Galilee—the jour­ney—Jerusalem.” [Loh­se, *Formation* 149.] But Mark and Mat­thew do have travel narratives, however brief.
   2. Luke seems to have deliberately caused his gospel to begin and end with scenes in Jerusa­lem, in fact, in the temple itself.
   3. For an outline of Luke’s gospel, see below, “Outlines of the Synoptic Gos­pels.”
3. **the prologue to Luke** (Luke 1:1-4)
   1. Luke has a unique beginning: a prologue, something not found in Matthew and Mark. Luke’s prologues in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1-5 are similar to the prologues in other ancient, multi-volume works—for example, Joseph­us’ prologues in the first two books of *Against Apion* (c. ad 75-95). Note (1) the direct address to (probably) a patron who is designated “most excellent,” (2) the concern to “instruct” about “the truth,” (3) the high-flown, periodic sentence struc­ture in the first prologue, and (4) the reference in the second pro­logue back to a “first volume.”

[Prologue to Book i:] In my history of our Antiquities, most excellent Epaphrod­itus, I have, I think, made sufficiently clear to any who may peruse that work the extreme antiquity of our Jewish race . . . Since, however, I observe that a considerable number of persons . . . discredit the state­ments in my history . . . I consider it my duty to devote a brief treatise to all these points, in order . . . to instruct all who desire to know the truth concerning the antiquity of our race.

[Prologue to Book ii:] In the first volume of this work, my most esteemed Epa­phrod­itus, I demon­strated the antiquity of our race . . .

* 1. Luke 1:1 refers to “many” sources. Some scholars consider this an exaggeration, but others think Luke’s statement is “justified by the array of written sources he evident­ly did make use of.” (Goodspeed 206-207)
  2. “Luke distinguishes himself from the eyewitnesses, who handed down their witness in the form of tradition. Whether the eyewitnesses form a group distinct from the ‘minis­ters of the word’ is not clear. If they are distinct, Luke stands in a tradition twice removed from the original events of Jesus—the eyewit­nesses, the ministers (e.g., Mark), and Luke. Lk is definitely a sub-apostolic work.” (Fuller 119)
  3. “Luke claims to have been careful about the ‘order’ in which he presents his material. His concept of ‘order’ is very different from that of Matthew. Matthew conflates his mate­rial into tidy dis­courses and collec­tions of like matter. Luke as a historian seeks to relate matters in the order they were ‘said and done’. But his sources were not in this kind of order (cf. Mark . . .). So his method (rather arbitrary it will seem to the modern historian) is to follow one source at a time. . . . He follows Mk, Q and Special material in turn.” (Fuller 119)

1. **sources**
   1. L material comprises almost half of Luke.
   2. Luke reproduces Mark’s material in great blocks:

4:31-6:19 (except 5:1-11) = Mark 1:21-3:19

8:4-9:50 = Mark 4:1-9:41

18:15-43 = Mark 10:13-52

19:45-22:13 = Mark 11:15-14:16

* 1. Luke has inserted two major blocks of material into the Markan scheme: the “lesser insertion,” Luke 6:20-8:3 (= the “sermon on the plain” plus some narratives [“centuri­on’s slave,” “widow’s son at Nain,” “Jesus and John,” “Jesus’ anointing and the parable of the two debtors”]); and the “greater insertion,” Luke 9:51-18:14 (= the “travel narra­tive”).
  2. Luke has also eliminated one major block of material from the Markan scheme: the “great omission,” Mark 6:45-8:26. For some of it he had parallels elsewhere, and some may have been distasteful to him. The explanation of Jewish cere­monial customs he probably thought super­fluous. This leaves very little; and each of his two volumes already contains as much as a Greek papyrus rolls could ordinarily hold.

part 2: major ttheological themes

1. **salvation history** (the delay of the parousia and the worldwide Church)
   1. *Parousia* is a Greek word that refers to Jesus’ second coming. “. . . the Church in Luke’s day [was] changing from a free-moving evangelis­tic enterprise to a set­tled institution.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 322) “. . . Why should there be a Church? If the end of the Age was to be the next act in the redemptive drama of God, what meaning could be found for the Church as an ongoing institution? [In Luke’s view,] the Church was as much a part of the fulfillment of the divine plan as the act of Consumma­tion itself.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 295) “. . . the overarching redemptive pur­pose of God . . . is the main concern of his entire work.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 321)
   2. Luke “adjusts redemptive history to its prolongation through the delay of the parousia.” The delay of the parousia has affected Luke; see his suppression of references to the imminent parousia in Mark 1:14-15 and Luke 4:14-15, Mark 13:7/Luke 21:9, and Mark 14:62/Luke 22:69. Luke substitutes for the imminent parousia “the in­definitely extended rule of the exalted Christ.” (Fuller 120)
   3. Mark explained the delay of the parousia by assuming that the end would come as soon as the Gentile mission was completed (Mark 13:10). (Kee, Young, Froelich 294) Matthew goes further in that he provides “regula­tions for the Church’s life (Mt. 5-7; 18), but there was no broad framework for comprehending the meaning of the Church in the long-range purpose of God.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 321) “It was Luke who took on the task of devel­oping an encompassing view in which the place of the Church in God’s over-all purpose would be depicted.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 395) “Luke . . . thinks of Jesus as the inaugu­rator of a world-wide community . . . he thinks of the Church as a settled com­munity, growing in time; it is not feverish either from perse­cution or from a fervid expecta­tion of the end.” (Davies 226)
2. **the Holy Spirit**: The Holy Spirit permeates Luke-Acts (“the whole narrative . . . seems to float upon a sea of it”). (Goodspeed 192) The Spirit is the agent of God’s purpose. It is poured out on John at his birth (Luke 1). Jesus is conceived by it (Luke 3), moves about “in the power of the Spirit” (Luke 4:14), and announ­ces that “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me” (4:18). The Spirit comes upon the Church at Pente­cost (Acts 2) and guides the apostles throughout their mission (Acts 5:9, 6:3, 7:55, 8:19, 9:17, 10:44, 13:2, 13:4, 16:7, 19:21, 20:28, etc.).
3. **Jesus**’ **compassion for outsiders**
   1. **Gentiles**: Jesus will be “a light for revelation to the Gen­tiles” (2:32). The angels sing, “Glory to God in the high­est, and on earth peace among men . . .” (2:14). To the quota­tion from Isa 40:3-4 as found in Mark and Matthew (“the voice of one crying in the wilderness”) Luke adds Isa 40:5, “and all flesh shall see the salvation of God”. Only Luke has soldiers repent at John the Baptist’s preach­ing (3:12-14). While Mat­thew traced the genealogy of Jesus back to Abraham, Luke traced it back to Adam (4:25-27). Jesus fore­tells his accep­tance by the Gentiles when he refers to Eli­jah’s and Elisha’s going to Gen­tiles rather than to Israel (4:25-27). Repentance and forgiveness should be preached “in his name to all nations, beginning from Jeru­salem” (24:47). The gospel is given to the Gentiles on Pente­cost (Acts 2). “It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it from you, . . . we turn to the Gen­tiles” (13:46-47). “. . . this salva­tion of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen” (Acts 28:28).
   2. **the poor**: several passages only in Luke’s gospel concern the poor: the woes (Luke 6), and the para­bles of the good Samari­tan (10), the prodigal son (15), the Pharisee and the publi­can (18), and the rich fool and Lazarus (16). Luke also edits Q material to emphasize Jesus’ compassion for the poor (e.g., in the great supper parable, “the poor and maimed and blind and lame” are invited in only in Luke [14]).

The converse of Luke’s interest in the poor is his castiga­tion of **the rich** and his interest in the ethics of posses­sions: see the sermon on the plain (6:20-26, 30, 34), the communi­ty of goods in Acts (2:44-45, 4:32-37), the greed of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5), etc.

* 1. **sinners**: in Luke, Matthew and Mark’s woman who anoints Jesus for burial is said to be a “sinner” (7); Zacchaeus (19).
  2. **Samaritans**: the rejection in the Samaritan village (9), the good Samaritan (10), the Samaritan leper who returned to give thanks (17), the Samaritan mission (Acts 8).
  3. **women**: Only Luke has the widow of Nain’s son (7), the women who travel with Jesus (8), Martha and Mary (10), the bent-over woman (13), the woman with the lost coin (15), and the importunate widow (18).

1. **prayer**
   1. Luke alone has the three parables of prayer, the Pharisee and the publican (18), the importu­nate neighbor (11), and the unjust judge (18). “Luke mentions Jesus as praying on several occasions when the other gospels do not do so, as at his baptism, at the choice of the twelve, at the transfiguration, at the teaching of the Lord’s prayer, and else­where. Prayer appears in the Book of Acts in correspond­ing situations, as when the holy Spirit is conferred, when visions or messages are received from heaven, when officers are selected and when men are in danger or facing martyrdom.” (Cadbury 269)
2. **apologetic**
   1. “Apologetic” means “a writing in defense (of something).”
   2. “. . . there must have been a tension between the young Church and the Roman State, [and] the author is trying to speak to that problem at least indirectly.” (Kee, Young, Froelich 321) Luke-Acts has “a strong strain of Christian apologetic, that is, against civil persecution by the state; all Paul’s trials . . . tend to show him innocent and acquit him.” (Goodspeed 207)
   3. Luke wants to show that “Christianity is not a subversive movement. The actions taken by Roman officials against both Jesus and his later followers were due to Roman misunder­standings and Jewish machinations. This suggests that Luke was written when the imperial authorities were beginning to distinguish between Jews and Christians and to refuse the latter the tolerance they had tradi­tion­ally shown to the former.” (Fuller 119) The “apologetic tone of Acts [may thus point] to the middle years of Domitian [ad 81-96].” (Goodspeed 207)
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John wrote “a theological interpretation of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Though he makes use of the gospel as a literary form, his main concern is . . . to *reinter­pret* the ministry in the light of his faith . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 329) John is more a meditation on the synoptic type of gospel than a gospel of the synoptic type.

part i: questions of introduction

1. **structure**
   1. The main division of John is into chapters 1-12 (the public ministry) and chapters 13-21 (private instruc­tion and the passion-resurrection narratives).
   2. John 2:11 (“This, the first of his signs, Jesus did at Cana”) and John 4:54 (“This was now the second sign”) suggest that the author has structured the public ministry (chap­ters 1-12) around a series of signs. Consequently, the first half of John is often called “the book of signs,” and the second half, “the book of glory.” “Tradition­ally, seven signs have been recognized” (Davies 442):

2:1-12 water to wine

4:47-54 official’s son

5:1-16 man at pool

6:1-14 feeding the 5000

6:15-21 walking on water

9:1-17 man born blind

11:1-44 Lazarus

* 1. “Often the evangelist takes episodes [and] makes these a point of departure for dialogues or dis­courses [442] . . . But he follows no fixed pattern. The long allegory of The Good Shepherd in chap­ter 10 stands alone, attached to no episode or sign; . . . the sign at Cana of Galilee (2:1-12) stands alone . . .” (Davies 442-443)
  2. For a full outline of John’s gospel, see below, pp. ?.

1. **integrity**
   1. Chapter 21 is a later addition.
      1. 20:30-31 seems to be the end of the gospel: “Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are writ­ten that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name.”
      2. “At the very least, 21:23-24f is an editorial addition.” (Fuller 175)
      3. “John 21 begins a completely new series of resurrection narratives located in Galilee and unrelat­ed to the Jeru­salem series in ch. 20.” (Fuller 175)
   2. John 7:53-8:11: “The story of the woman taken in adultery (*pericope de adultera*) . . . is a later, non-Johannine inter­po­lation, as the MS evidence and considera­tions of form and style show.” (Fuller 175) Some manuscripts have this pericope after Luke 21:38 or at the end of John.
   3. Bad connections and roughnesses in the flow of the narrative have suggested that some of the materi­als have become dislo­cated from their original positions.
      1. “2:13-3:21 constitute a problem. Nicodemus visits Jesus early in his ministry, before any hostil­ity had been aroused and when Jesus had only performed one sign, in Cana of Galilee. But Nicode­mus speaks of the signs that Jesus had performed; he is already afraid and visits Jesus by night.” (Davies 383)
      2. “At 4:54 Jesus is in Galilee; but in 5:1 he is in Jeru­salem.” (Davies 383)
      3. “. . . Chapter 5 ends with Jesus in Jerusalem, while at the beginning of Chap­ter 6 he crosses the Sea of Galilee . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 324)
      4. John 13:31-14:31a is a lengthy discourse during the last supper, and three more chapters of dis­course during the last supper follow (15-17); but in between is 14:31b, “Rise, let us go hence.” Appar­ent­ly this was the origi­nal conclusion of the first discourse, a conclusion that led immedi­ately into the events of the passion narra­tive. (Davies 383)
   4. “To account for these data, two theories have been propound­ed. First, . . . its pages came to be mixed up. This could easily have happened. From early copies . . . in book (co­dex) form, pages could fall apart and be wrongly replaced. [383] [Sec­ondly,] the author has combined different materi­als and . . . neglected to cover up his seams.” (Davies 383-384)
2. **sources**
   1. Did John know the synoptic gospels?
      1. The language in some passages recalls the synoptics. John 12:1-8 (the anoint­ing) is verbally very close to Mark 14:3-9 (the anoint­ing); John 5:8 (“Rise, take up your pallet, and walk,” said to the man at the pool) is similar to Mark 2:9 (“Rise, take up your pallet and walk,” said of the para­lytic). (Davies 385)
      2. “The basic outline of the ministry is the same . . .” (Davies 385-386)

*Mark* *pericope* *John*

1:4-8 John the Baptist’s work 1:19-36

6:33-44 feeding the 5000 6:1-13

6:45-52 walking on water 6:16-21

8:29 Peter’s confes­sion 6:68-69

11:1-10 triumphal entry 12:12-15

14:3-9 anointing at Bethany 12:1-8

14:17-26 last supper 13:1-17:26

14:43-52 arrest 18:1-11

* + 1. But if John were depen­dent on Mark and Luke, or indeed merely on the tradition lying behind them, certain *omis­sions* in his work are very difficult to under­stand: the baptism, the tempta­tion, exor­cisms, as­sociation with outcasts, the transfiguration, the institu­tion of the eucha­rist, the agony in the garden, the cry of de­spair on the cross, etc. (Davies 387)
    2. “Again the *style* of John is so very differ­ent . . . that a common reser­voir of tradi­tion for both is hard to imag­ine.” (Davies 386)
    3. Therefore, many have con­cluded that “an early Pal­estin­ian tradi­tion—not pre­served in the Synoptics—is found in John.” (Davies 387)

part ii: major theological themes

1. **apologetic**
   1. Against John the Baptist: “There were still those who regard­ed John the Baptist as the Messiah, . . . like the men Paul found at Ephesus, Acts 19:1-7.” (Goodspeed 304) “In several pas­sages he depreciates John the Baptist’s mission (1:6-8; 1:35-37; 3:25-30; 10:40-42) . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 332) (Also 1:29-33.)
   2. Against docetism: John “affirms Christ’s true manhood (2:3; 4:6-7; 11:35; 19:26-27), refers to Jesus’ ‘flesh and blood’ (6:53-55), and vividly describes his death . . . by referring to the blood . . . (19:34). There is no doubt that in empha­sizing Jesus’ humanity John was combatt­ing . . . *doce­tism* (from the Greek word ‘seem’ or ‘ap­pear’—he *seemed* to be a man) . . .” (Kee, Young, Froelich 330)
2. **realized eschatology**
   1. “Jesus’ work on earth is finished, not postponed. Paul, viewing Jesus as the Messiah of Jewish expecta­tion and be­lieving that the supreme function of the Messiah was to judge the world, conclu­ded that Jesus would return to complete his messianic work. But in the Gospel of John Jesus de­clares that he has completed the work God had given him to do, 17:4 . . .” (Goodspeed 299)
   2. “. . . what then becomes of his expected return of which Paul had spoken so confident­ly? It has already been realized. He was himself Resur­rection and Life, 11:25. In John, Resur­rection, Second Coming, and the gift of the Spirit are made one. [299] . . . Jesus himself after the Resurrection imparts the holy Spirit to the disciples, 20:22, in contrast with Luke’s account, where it comes upon them after the Ascension at Pente­cost, Acts 2:4. So Resur­rection, Return, and the gift of the Spirit are identified.” (Goodspeed 299-300)
   3. “What, then, becomes of Judgment, of which Paul had made so much as a messianic func­tion? We re­member Matthew’s gigantic canvas of the general judgment . . . It disap­pears as a future expecta­tion, to be replaced by another profounder kind of judgment within the human soul. ‘God did not send his son into the world to pass judgment upon the world, but that through him the world might be saved,’ 3:17. . . . ‘I have come into this world to judge men,’ 9:39*a*. ‘The judgment of this world is now in progress,’ 12:31.” (Goodspeed 300)
3. **Christology**
   1. . . he moves through the successive scenes of the gospel perfect master of every situation [306] . . . In his debates with the Jews he defends his union with the Father, his pre-exis­tence, and his sinless­ness. . . . The writer has, in short, read back the Jesus of experience into the Jesus of history.” (Goodspeed 306-307)
   2. the “I am” sayings
      1. Instances of “I am” sayings in John:
         1. 6:20, “It is I [= *ego eimi*, literally ‘I am’]; do not be afraid.”
         2. 6:35, 51, “I am the bread of life [or: living bread].”
         3. 8:12 9:5, “I am the light of the world.”
         4. 8:24, “Unless you come to believe that I AM, you will surely die in your sins.”
         5. 8:28, “When you lift up the Son of man, then you will realize that I AM.”
         6. 8:58, “Before Abraham even came into existence, I AM.”
         7. 10:7, 9, “I am the [sheep]gate.”
         8. 10:11, 14, “I am the model shepherd.”
         9. 11:25, “I am the resurrection and the life.”
         10. 13:19, “When it does happen, you may believe that I AM.”
         11. 14:6, “I am the way, the truth, and the life.”
         12. 15:1, 5, “I am the [true] vine.”
         13. 18:5, “‘I am he [= *ego eimi*].’ . . . When he said to them ‘I am he,’ they drew back and fell to the ground.”
         14. See Exod 3:14, “I am who am [in Hebrew, ‘YHWH’],” Isa 43:25, “I am I AM who blots out trans­gres­sions,” Isa 51:12, “I am I AM who comforts you.”

## Notes on the Infancy Narratives

Brown, Raymond E., SS. *An Adult Christ at Christmas*: *Essays on the Three Biblical Christmas Stories*, *Matthew 2 and Luke 2*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1978. (Hereafter ACC.)

Brown, Raymond E., SS. *A Coming Christ in Advent*: *Essays on the Gospel Narratives Preparing for the Birth of Jesus*, *Matthew 1 and Luke 1*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1988. (Hereafter CCA.)

1. **introduction**
   1. Mark does not mention Joseph; John does not mention Mary. (ACC 1)
   2. Pontifical Biblical Commission, Instruction on *The Historical Truth of the Gospels*, 1964 (see Fitzmyer, *Theological Studies* 25 (1964) 386-408): (ACC 1 n. 1)
      1. stage 1: ministry of Jesus c. ad 28-30
      2. stage 2: apostolic preaching c. 30-65
      3. stage 3: gospel writing c. 65-100 (ACC 1-2 n. 2)
   3. The Instruction does *not* cover the birth stories, for it concerns only *the ministry*, where “*eyewitnesses*, the apostles, were present . . . there is no way to know precisely how historical the Infancy Narratives are, or to know where Matthew and Luke got them. [9] . . . [On the other hand, similarities] militate against the purely fictional approach . . .” (CCA 9-10; cf. ACC 3 and n. 5)
   4. Infancy-narrative scholarship has gone through three stages: (ACC 3)
      1. Since the infancy stories are not apostles’ testimony, the likely sources were Mary or Joseph. (ACC 4)
      2. Recognition of historical problems.
         1. Matthew and Luke contradict. (ACC 4 n. 8)
         2. Public events left no historical records outside the narratives (ACC 4) (e. g., the star; the slaughter of the innocents; the census under Augustus). (ACC 4 n. 8)
         3. “. . . the infancy stories echo Old Testament stories to an extent unparalleled in the rest of the Gospels.” (ACC 5)
      3. Recognition of the theology of the infancy narratives. (ACC 5)
   5. similarities
      1. similar series of events
         1. Herod is king
         2. Joseph is of the house of David (“Luke pays less attention than Matthew . . . to how Jesus would have David lineage when Joseph did not beget him . . .” (CCA 62 n. 30)
      2. virginal conception (ACC 15) Mary is a virgin; yet she and Joseph are married. “. . . both use the less customary verb *mnēsteuein* to describe this marriage where the principals do not yet live together . . .” (CCA 62 n. 30)
         1. anunciation to one parent (ACC 15)
         2. “The visionary poses an objection as to how this can be, sometimes asking for a sign”
      3. birth at Bethlehem (ACC 15)
         1. celestial proclamation (star or angel) of messianic birth to a group not present (magi or shepherds) (ACC 15, 25)
         2. each group proceeds to Bethlehem (ACC 15) and pays homage (ACC 16)
         3. each group returns elsewhere (to explain no adoration at beginning of public ministry) (ACC 16)
      4. persecution is depicted (Matthew) or predicted (Luke): i. e., those who refuse to believe seek to destroy. (ACC 16, 26)
         1. Matthew: persecutors are Herod, chief priests, scribes. (ACC 16) Except for Joseph, all Jews in Matt 1-2 are hostile. (ACC 32)
         2. Luke: (2:34, Simeon to Mary), “this child is set for the *fall* and rise of many in Israel, and for a sign that is spoken *against* [35] (and a *sword* will pierce through your own soul also) . . .”). (ACC 16 n. 25; p. 26) Except for this statement, all Jews in Luke are obedient (Zechariah, Elizabeth, shepherds, Simeon). (ACC 32)
         3. After the resurrection, the apostles’ preaching received a twofold response, for and against. When the baptism became the christological moment, they read a twofold response back into Jesus’ ministry. The infancy stories do the same. (ACC 9)
      5. similar “motifs and theology” (CCA 40)
         1. echoing the OT (CCA 40); rehearsing the story of Israel (CCA 42)
            1. Jesus is the “embodiment of the whole of Israel’s history.” (CCA 10)
            2. Matt 1-2 and Luke 1-2 are “a transition from these Jewish Scriptures [the only ones they have] to the story of Jesus’ ministry.” (CCA 12)
            3. “. . . the names in the genealogy show a continuity with the Law and the Former Prophets [36] . . . In chapter 2 Matthew will quote the . . . Latter Prophets four times . . . as having referred to the places where the Messiah will accomplish his task.” (CCA 36-37)
         2. believing Jews can combine faith and Law (CCA 40) Jesus is salvation for the obedient in Israel (Matt 1:21, Luke 2:32). (ACC 32)
         3. salvation for Gentiles (Matthew: magi; Luke: Simeon says, “a light for revelation to the Gentiles” 2:31) (ACC 31)
         4. Jesus’ dual identity
            1. Jesus’ genealogical descent is through Joseph. (Luke 1:32, “his father David”). (CCA 64) Messiah = son of David: 1st in Nathan’s prophecy. (CCA 63)
            2. Through conception by the Holy Spirit, Jesus is Son of God. (CCA 10) (Luke 1:35, “Son of God”). (CCA 64)
            3. In Matthew and Luke, “. . . the identity of Jesus was a divine revelation [by angel], not a human deduction.” Cf. God revealing in the synoptic baptismal accounts, in Peter’s confession (Matt 16:16-17), in Paul’s conversion (Gal 1:12, 16). (CCA 11)
            4. In both, “Christ’s identity is never received to be kept a private possession.” God shares Joseph’s revelation with the magi (Matthew) and Mary’s with the shepherds (Luke). (CCA 11) “In the visitation she [Mary] hastens to share this gospel . . .” (CCA 69)
         5. Jesus as embodiment of Israel’s history (CCA 12)
            1. “Both Matthew and Luke used their first two chapters . . . as a transition from these Jewish Scriptures [the only ones they have] to the story of Jesus’ ministry.” (CCA 12) Both echo “Old Testament patriarchal stories . . .” (CCA 40)
            2. “. . . all the history of Israel [is] allusively described beneath the surface of the birth stories.” (CCA 14)
   6. discrepancies
      1. Matthew: Mary and Joseph’s home is Bethlehem (2:11); they went to Nazareth after Egypt because Herod’s son Archelaus scared them. Luke: home is Nazareth. (ACC 4 n. 7) No room in the inn implies “no house of their own in Bethlehem.” (CCA 8)
      2. After the birth, the family: flees to Egypt (Matt 2:13-18) or: peacefully presents Jesus in the temple (Luke 2:22-40). (ACC 26 and n. 40)
   7. The “backwards-growth” of the “christological moment,” “the moment when God revealed who Jesus was.” (ACC 6)
      1. Brown: Christian understanding developed “of a reality already there.” Liberals: Christians created christology *ex nihilo*. (ACC 7-8 n. 13)
      2. at parousia. (CCA 64)
      3. at resurrection-exaltation
         1. The canticles’ “christology is phrased entirely in Old Testament language . . .” (CCA 53 n. 21) Thus, the “canticles could refer to the work of Jesus at any time in his career. (Indeed, the reference to an accomplished salvation may once have been directed to the cross and resurrection . . .)” (ACC 32)
         2. in the ancient preaching: Acts 2:32, 36; 5:31; 13:33; Rom 1:4). (ACC 6-7)
         3. Rom 1:3-4: “descended from David according to the flesh [4] and *designated Son* of God in *power* according to the *Spirit* by his resurrection . . .” Note “the same twofold identity found in the two Infancy Narratives . . .” (CCA 10)
         4. “As more attention was focused on Jesus’ ministry . . ., resurrection as the moment . . . did not do justice to the continuity between the Jesus of the ministry and the risen Lord.” (ACC 7)
      4. at baptism
         1. Mark 1:10-11 (= Rom 1:3-4 in narrative form): “he saw the heavens opened and the *Spirit* descending upon him like a dove [11] and a voice came from heaven, “Thou art my beloved *Son*; with thee I am well pleased.”“ Whole scene = *power*. (ACC 7 n. 12)
         2. Luke 3:21-38 echoes Mark’s solution: the voice proves Jesus is Son of God, and the genealogy proves Jesus is son of David. (CCA 10)
         3. But this still suggests that at baptism “Jesus became God’s son.” (ACC 8)
      5. at age of reason: The “hidden life” stories “are centered on the first moments of his rational life . . .” (ACC 40) In “conception christology” (ACC 39), an angel must proclaim Jesus’ identity; in his youth, Jesus himself can declare it. (ACC 40)
      6. at birth: conception christology.
         1. The infancy narratives ruled out adoptionism. (ACC 8)
         2. Luke 1:35: “The *Holy Spirit* will come upon you, and the *power* of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be *called* holy, the *Son of God*.” (ACC 8 n. 15)
      7. at pre-birth: preexistence christology.
         1. 1 Cor 8:6 hints of creational activity by Jesus.

(But Phil 2:6-7 (kenotic hymn) probably does not refer to preexistence. So Paul’s acceptance of preexistence is uncertain.) (ACC 39 n. 58)

* + - 1. Col 1:15-17 (ad 80s?): preexistence is clear. (ACC 39 n. 58)
      2. John’s preexistence christology advances beyond Col.
         1. “The Johannine Word is not a creature—compare Colossians 1:16 . . .” (ACC 40 n. 58)
         2. “Preexistence is historicized in a Gospel about the earthly Jesus (John 17:5) . . .” (ACC 40 n. 58)
      3. “The preexistence christology of John and the conception christology of Matthew/Luke are two *different* Christian answers to the question of pre-ministry christology. There is not a word in John about the virginal conception of Jesus; and there is not a word in Matthew or Luke about preexistence or about incarnation (which logically presupposes preexistence).” (ACC 40 n. 59)
  1. two-stage development of Luke 1-2
     1. In the second stage, Luke “added the canticles and the story of Jesus at age twelve—all of which are quite detachable.” (ACC 28 n. 46)
     2. Nothing in Luke 2:1-40 “presupposes anything that happened in chapter one.” Joseph and Mary are even reintroduced. Probably the stories in chapter 2 were independent of those in chapter 1. (ACC 15)
  2. canticles in general
     1. Luke’s four canticles are:
        1. 1:46-55 Magnificat by Mary
        2. 1:67-79 Benedictus by Zechariah
        3. 2:13-14 Gloria in Excelsis see “angels,” 2:9-15
        4. 2:28-33 Nunc Dimittis by Simeon
     2. origin of the canticles
        1. They are not historical, on-the-spot compositions by Mary, Zechariah, angels, and Simeon. (CCA 49)
           1. common style (CCA 49)
           2. poetic polish (CCA 49)
           3. loosely connected to contexts (ACC 23 n. 34)

All but the Gloria can be omitted without disruption.

The Gloria can be omitted if one reads “angel” (with the Old Latin) rather than “angels.” (ACC 23 n. 34)

* + - 1. They are not by Luke.
         1. There would be greater uniformity and a smoother fit in the contexts. (CCA 50) Luke did add 1:48 and 1:76-77. (ACC 23 n. 35; CCA 50)
      2. The canticles have the “Jewish hymnic style and thought of . . . 200 B.C. to ad 100 . . .” (CCA 51; cf. ACC 31 n. 52)
         1. The style is a pastiche, “cento or mosaic pattern where almost every phrase and line is taken from the earlier poetry of Israel . . .” (CCA 51)
         2. Examples: “the Psalms, the Prophets, and hymns in the Pentateuch and the Historical Books” (CCA 51); “in 1 Maccabees, Judith, *2 Baruch*, *4 Ezra*, and the Dead Sea (Qumran) *War Scroll* and *Thanksgiving Psalms* [= “*Hodayoth*, hymns of praise,” ACC 31 n. 52].” (CCA 51)
      3. The canticles are not Jewish rather than Jewish-Christian. “There is . . . a particular tone of divine salvation *accomplished* and (in the Benedictus) an emphasis on the house of David . . .” (CCA 51-52)
      4. So Luke got them from a collection of Jewish Christian hymns. (ACC 23, 30 n. 50; CCA 50, 52)
         1. The hymns were probably those of a Jewish-Christian *community*, rather than one individual. (CCA 52)

“. . . there are enough differences . . .” (CCA 52)

“The “we” of the Benedictus and the latter part of the Magnificat (“our fathers”) reflect . . . a collectivity.” (CCA 52)

* + - * 1. Four further specifications “are shrewd speculations about the origins of the canticles, [but] they cannot be proved.” (CCA 53)

Perhaps they were written by a group of Christian “Poor Ones” (*Anawim*). (CCA 52)

Psalm 149:4, etc., praises the *anawim*. (CCA 52)

The Qumran *Thanksgiving Hymns* praise them. (CCA 52)

“. . . Mary is a Poor One . . .” (CCA 54 n. 22)

Perhaps the “Poor Ones” were at Jerusalem. (CCA 52-53)

The Jerusalem Christians owned possessions in common (Acts 2:43-47, 4:32-37). (CCA 53)

The Jerusalem Christians praised God (Acts 2:47), and the canticles are by genre psalms of praise. (CCA 53 n. 20)

Paul collected money for them (Gal 2:10, etc.). (CCA 53)

Perhaps the temple piety of Zechariah and Simeon reflects the temple piety of the Jerusalem community (Acts 2:46, 3:1). (CCA 53)

Perhaps the Greek canticles are translations from Hebrew or Aramaic. (CCA 54)

* + - 1. Luke added the canticles after writing his infancy narratives. (ACC 23)
         1. He added the Magnificat (1:46-55) because 1:40 says Mary greeted Elizabeth but does not report her words. (CCA 54)
         2. He added the Benedictus (1:68-79) because 1:64 says Zechariah praised God but does not report his words. (CCA 54)
         3. Luke matched each song with its most appropriate speaker. E. g.: the Magnificat begins with an allusion to Hannah’s thanksgiving song (1 Sam 2:1-2 LXX, see “Magnificat” below), so Luke attached it to Mary. (CCA 54)
      2. The canticles’ christology
         1. The canticles’ “christology is phrased entirely in Old Testament language, unlike the developed hymns we find in the post-50 Christian writings.” (CCA 53 n. 21) Phil 2:6-11 and John 1:1-18 “spell out the human career of Jesus . . .” But in the “Lucan canticles . . . we are hearing [58] . . . *perhaps the oldest preserved Christian prayers of praise* . . .” (CCA 58-59)
         2. See “backward-growth” above.

1. **Matthew 1:1-17**: **genealogy**
   1. 1:1, “the book [story] of the genealogy [beginning/origin/genesis] of Jesus Christ.” Probably a play on the literal meaning of γέvεσις plus the LXX term for “genealogical record.” (CCA 18) “. . . “a story of the genesis of Jesus Christ,” evoking memories of an earlier Genesis story.” What?? (CCA 23)
   2. “For Matthew the origin of Jesus Christ starts with Abraham begetting Isaac!” (CCA 18)
   3. “Matthew’s choice of Isaac over Ishmael [“the more abused figure,” CCA 19], of Jacob [“a liar,” CCA 20] over Esau, of Judah [“who sold his brother and sought out prostitutes,” CCA 20] over Joseph is faithful to the Old Testament insight that God frequently does not choose the best . . . [God] is not controlled by human merit . . .” (CCA 20) “. . . a theology of salvation by grace . . . is “the beginning story of Jesus Christ,” since he will preach salvation to tax collectors [20] and sinners . . .” (CCA 20-21) “A sense of being unimportant and too insignificant to contribute to the continuation of the story of Jesus Christ in the world is belied by the genealogy . . .” (CCA 25)
   4. The first part (1:2-6a) moves from Abraham, landless but with a promise, to David who rules the promised land. The second part (1:6b-11) shows the monarchy losing the land: it ends with the Exile. (CCA 21)
   5. “. . . God did not hesitate to entrust to a monarchical institution an essential role in the story of His Son’s origins—an autoritative institution (at times authoritarian) which He guaranteed with promises lest it fail but which was frequently led by corrupt, venal, stupid, and ineffective leaders, as well as sometimes by saints.” (CCA 26)
   6. Second part (1:6b-11): except for Hezekiah and Josiah, the rest were “idolaters, murderers, incompetents, power-seekers, and harem-wastrels.” (CCA 21)
   7. Third part (1:12-16): “Except for the first two (Shealtiel and Zerubbabel) and the last two (Joseph and Mary), they are . . . unknown . . . He accomplishes His purpose through those whom others regard as unimportant and forgettable.” (CCA 23)
   8. the five women
      1. Mentioning women in a genealogy is “anomalous.” (CCA 28)
      2. “We hear nothing of the saintly patriarichal wives, Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel.” (CCA 23)
      3. Tamar: “she disguised herself as a prostitute and seduced him [Judah] [23] . . . causing Judah to recognize that she was more just and loyal to God’s law [Levirate marriage] than he was.” (CCA 23-24)
      4. Rahab: a Canaanite; “a real prostitute, but one who . . . made the conquest of Jericho possible (Joshua 2).” (CCA 24)
      5. Ruth: “a Moabite . . . faithful to the Law in raising up a child to her dead husband as she literally threw herself at the feet of Boaz.” (CCA 24)
      6. Bathsheba: another foreigner (CCA n. 5); “the victim of David’s lust.” “All these women had a marital history that contained elements of human scandal or scorn . . .” (CCA 24)
      7. Mary: “whose situation is also peculiar . . .” (CCA 24) Foreign OT women prepare for, not Mary, but “Matthew’s Gentile-containing audience (Matt 10:5-6; 28:19).” (CCA 24 n. 5)
      8. 1:16, “And Jacob the father of Joseph the husband of Mary . . .” This breaks the pattern “A begat B.” 1:18 explains it: “Now the birth [γέvεσις] of Jesus Christ took place in this way [virginal conception].” (CCA 28) “The double use of genesis in . . . 1:1 and 1:18 has a parallel in the double use of genesis in reference to Noah in Genesis 5:1; 6:9.” (CCA 28 n. 6)
      9. 1:16: Gentiles in antiquity, too, were disturbed that Jesus was not directly a “son of David,” so they hypothesized that Mary was Davidic. (CCA 33) But the *Mishnah* (Baba Bathra 8:6) says, “If a man says, ‘This is my son,’ he is to be believed.” Matt 1:21 specifies, “she will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus . . .” Thus he becomes Jesus’ legal father (“a more correct description than adoptive father or foster father”). (CCA 34) “According to Jewish law, Joseph’s acknowledgment of Jesus would make him the legal father of the child . . ., and so Jesus was truly a Son of David.” (CCA 10)
   9. The genealogy mentions David five times (1:1, 6, 17); Gabriel addresses Joseph as “Joseph, son of David . . .” (1:21). “. . . Matthew refers to Jesus as Son of David more often than do the other three Gospels taken together.” (CCA 28)
   10. “. . . the names in the genealogy show a continuity with the Law and the Former Prophets [36] . . . In chapter 2 Matthew will quote the . . . Latter Prophets four times . . .” (CCA 36-37)
2. **Matthew 1:18-25**: **annunciation to Joseph**
   1. The annunciaton presumably takes place in Bethlehem (2:11), David’s birthplace. (CCA 28)
   2. Joseph in Matt 1:18-25 is like Joseph in Gen 35-50 (ACC 10), and Jesus is like Moses (CCA 34).
      1. The OT Joseph escapes an attempt on his life by going to Egypt (Gen 37:28) (ACC 10), “thereby saving Israel/Jacob” (CCA 34).
      2. The OT Joseph is “master of dreams” (Gen 37:19). (ACC 10) In *Antiquities* 2.9.3.216, “in a dream God told Moses’ father that the child about to be born would ultimately “deliver the Hebrew race from their bondage in Egypt.” But Matthew (1:21) says, “You shall call his name Jesus, for he will save *his people* from their sins”: the people is not Israel but all nations, and the bondage is not Egypt but sin. (CCA 35)
      3. In the midrashes (expanded narratives) on Gen 35-50 in Philo and Josephus, “Pharaoh was forewarned through his scribes (see Matthew 2:4) that a child was about to be born who would prove a threat to his crown . . . through a dream there was divine revelation to Moses’ father that his wife, already pregnant, would bear the child who would save Israel . . . Moses fled into Sinai and reutnred only when he heard from the Lord: “All those who were seeking your life are dead” (Ex 4:19, cf. Matthew 2:20).” (ACC 11)
      4. Moses returns from the OT Joseph’s trip to Egypt. (ACC 11, CCA 34)
      5. “. . . Moses’ successor who completed his work by bringing Israel back to the Promised Land was also named Jesus (Joshua).” Of Joshua, Philo [34] says: “Jesus is interpreted ‘salvation of the Lord’—a name for the best possible state.”
   3. 1:18b (“betrothed”): Mary “is in a seemingly scandalous pregnancy. She and Joseph are married, but they are now in the customary interim period separating the marriage contract from the bride’s living with the groom.” (CCA 29) “The verb in 1:18 is not the regular Greek verb “to marry”: evidently it was difficult to describe Jewish marriage customs in that language, even as it is in English. Nevertheless, translations such as “engage, betroth” do not do justice to the fact that the formal contract had been exchanged before witnesses and that Joseph is Mary’s “husband” (1:16, 19).” (CCA 29 n. 7) “Marriage, agreed upon by parents, usually came almost immediately after the age of puberty; but the girl continued to live with her parents for a time after the wedding until the husband was able to support her in his home or that of his parents. Marital intercourse was not permissible during that period . . .” (CCA 29) “. . . reputed differences on this point between Galilee and Judea, suggested by later rabbinic references, were [probably not] applicable at this time.” (CCA 29 n. 8) “. . . the second stage of his [a Jewish man’s] marriage [was] taking his wife to his home . . .” (CCA 38)
   4. Matt 1:18c, “before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit . . .”
      1. Did Joseph so trust Mary that he immediately assumed her pregnancy was God’s doing? Or was Mary so obviously holy that Joseph assumed it was God’s doing? Neither is likely: the annunciation to Joseph only has a purpose if Joseph believes another man is the father. (CCA 29-30)
      2. Did the angel tell Mary that conception was by the Spirit, and she told Joseph? But the annunciation to Mary is only in Luke. (CCA 30)
      3. 1:18c “does not describe a knowledge that the finders had but a knowledge that the readers need . . .” (CCA 30)
   5. 1:19: Joseph is δίκαιoς (“just/upright/righteous”: i. e., Law-abiding (cf. Luke 1:6, “And they [Zechariah and Elizabeth] were both righteous [δίκαιoς] before God, walking in all the commandments . . .”) (CCA 31) “For Matthew it was perfectly possible to be simultaneously a Law-observant Jew and a Christian . . .” (cf. 5:18-19, 13:52). (CCA 32) “Thus, in Joseph, the evangelist was portraying what he thought a Jew should be and probably what he himself was.” (CCA 32)
   6. 1:19: “His decision to divorce her showed a sensitivity to Israel’s understanding of the sanctity of marriage required by God’s Law, since her loss of virginity might have been considered adultery (Deut 22:20-21).” (CCA 31)
   7. 1:19: But Mary could be pregnant with (Deut 22:20-24) or against (Deut 22:25-27) her will. “. . . Joseph could have demanded a trial (and presumably have escaped returning the dowry if she were guilty). Joseph, however, did not manifest his righteousness at Mary’s expense . . .” (CCA 31)
   8. 1:19: “divorce her quietly”: “not in the sense that no one would know of it, but in the sense that there would be no formal inquiry into Mary’s behavior.” (CCA 32)
   9. 1:19: “two precise translations of” ἀπoλῦσαι (RSV “divorce”): Joseph was not willing to
      1. “expose [31] her to public disgrace” or
      2. “make a public spectacle of her” (CCA 31-32)
   10. 1:20: It was crucial to God’s plan that Joseph not divorce Mary, for Jesus must be the son of David to fulfill 2 Sam 7:12-13, “. . . I will raise up your offspring [and] establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.” Hence the angel addresses Joseph as “Son of David.” (CCA 33)
   11. 1:20: virginal conception
       1. “. . . we have no evidence that a virginal conception of the Messiah was expected in Judaism.” (CCA 30)
       2. That both Matthew (1:20) and Luke (1:35) refer to conception by the Spirit, rather than by male generation, “suggests that this [“conceived . . . of the Holy Spirit”] is a most ancient phrasing . . .” (CCA 35)
       3. The same Spirit that enlivened the world at creation also enlivens Jesus. (CCA 36)
       4. Adam is “the other human being whose life did not come from human generation.” (CCA 36)
   12. 1:23: “Emmanuel” (= Isa 7:14)
       1. 1:23: As the genealogy demonstrates “Son of David,” so the annunciation demonstrates “Emmanuel” (1:23). (“Son of God”: 3:17, 16:16-17, 17:5, 22:41-46). (CCA 28)
       2. “God with us” echoes Matt 28:20, “lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.” (CCA 36)
       3. “Virgin” and future tense = LXX; “be with child” = c. MT; “they will call” = neither. (CCA 37)
       4. In Isa 7:13 (introduction to 7:14), Isaiah addresses Ahaz not by name but as “house of David.” Matthew would have been attracted to 7:14 because it linked Jesus-as-”Emmanuel” to Jesus-as-”son of David” (in Matthew’s genealogy). (CCA 38)
       5. Isa 7:14 MT has “she will call”; LXX has “you will call”; Matt 1:23 has “they will call,” “they” being Israel *and* the nations (“his people,” 1:21). (CCA 38)
   13. 1:25: Isa 7:14 LXX says, “The virgin shall conceive” = virginal conception, Matt 1:23; but 7:14 LXX continues, “and shall bear a son” = virginal birth, 1:25 (“but knew her not until she had borne a son”). (CCA 38) “. . . modern polemics [assume] that he was giving information implicitly about what happened after birth. . . . [But] his concern was with the fulfillment of the prophetic past . . .” (CCA 39)
3. **Matthew 2:1-12**: **magi and star**
   1. “. . . nothing . . . in Matthew 2:1-21 . . . presupposes anything that happened in chapter one.” (ACC 15) Thus originally the stories in chapter 2 probably were independent of the stories in chapter 1.
   2. This story combines Moses-Balaam echoes with Davidic-messiah imagery (Matthew 1:1, “Jesus Christ, the son of David”). Herod = Pharaoh + Balak, king of Moab, who tried to destroy Moses with a non-Israelite seer *from the East* (Num 23:7). (ACC 12)
   3. “Magi” meant “those engaged in occult arts: astronomers, fortunetellers, priestly augurers and magicians of varying degrees of plausibility. Matthew probably thinks of astronomers.” (ACC 11 n. 18)
   4. Num 24:7, 17 (Balaam to Balak), “his [Israel’s] king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted. . . . I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not nigh: a star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a scepter [= man] shall rise out of Israel . . .” Originally, star and scepter = David; later, = messiah (Aqiba called Simon ben Kosibah “bar Cochba,” “which by popular etymology became the “son of the star”“ [12]). (ACC 12-13)
   5. 2:2: magi to Herod: “we have seen his star in the East . . .”: “at its rising” is a better translation. (ACC 12 n. 20)
   6. The good news first draws Gentile believers (Magi). (ACC 13)
   7. Matthew believed that Scripture given to Jews is a fuller revelation than nature given to Gentiles (Rom 1:19-20, 2:14-15). So, while the star tells the magi of the birth, “it does not tell them where . . .” The ill-informed Gentiles worship, while the well-informed Jews will not. (ACC 13)
   8. The secular ruler, chief priests, and scribes oppose Jesus (as at the passion); but God brings Jesus back. (ACC 14) Matthew 2:1-12 is an “anticipation of the passion and resurrection narrative. . . . The Matthean infancy story . . . is the essential gospel story in miniature.” (ACC 14)
4. **Matthew 2:13-15**: **flight into Egypt**
   1. Matthew thinks Joseph and Mary live in a house in Bethlehem (2:11). So he uses the flight into Egypt to get them to Nazareth (2:22-23). (ACC 17)
5. **Matthew 2:16-18**: **slaughter of the innocents**
6. **Matthew 2:19-23**: **return from Egypt**
   1. “. . . the return after the king’s death [is] a story clearly patterned . . . on the return of Israel from Egypt under Moses.” (ACC 26)
7. **Luke 1:1-4**: **prologue**
8. **Luke 1:5-25**: **annunciation to Zechariah**
   1. Parallelisms between John and Jesus:
      1. annunciation of John’s conception (1:5-25) (1:24-25: conception of John)
      2. annunciation of Jesus’ conception (1:26-38)
      3. John’s birth (1:57-66), hailed by Zechariah’s canticle (1:67-79)
      4. Jesus’ birth (2:1-7), hailed by Simeon’s canticle (2:29-35)

“This carefully crafted parallelism has often been compared to a diptych painting with its two facing panels.” (CCA 41)

* 1. Luke 1:6, “And they [Zechariah and Elizabeth] were both righteous [δίκαιoς] before God, [=] walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.” (CCA 31) Joseph too is δίκαιoς in Matthew’s annunciation (Matt 1:19). (CCA 43)
  2. “The Lucan technique of echoing the Scriptures of Israel . . .” (CCA 44)
     1. John the Baptist’s parents
        1. “While for some of these details Luke may be drawing on historical tradition, he is primarily interested in the symbolism of what he narrates.” (CCA 43)
        2. “Several Old Testament parents were barren but made capable of child-bearing by divine intervention . . .” (CCA 43)
           1. Abraham and Sarah

“. . . but in only one Old Testament instance were both parents also incapacitated by age, . . . namely, Abraham and Sarah . . .” (CCA 43)

1:18: “How shall I know this?” is “a verbatim quotation” from Gen 15:8, “how am I to know . . .?” (CCA 43)

1:58: “Also Elizabeth’s rejoicing with her neighbors who hear the good news (1:58) echoes Sarah’s rejoicing with all who hear her good news (Gen 21:6).” (CCA 43)

1:80: “And the child grew and became strong in spirit” = “And the child grew” (Gen 21:8). (CCA 47)

1:37: “For with God nothing will be impossible” (re Elizabeth’s age) = “Is anything too hard for the Lord?” (Gen 18:14, re Sarah’s age). (CCA 66 n. 32)

1:58: “And her neighbors and kinsfolk . . . rejoiced with her” = “God has made laughter for me [Sarah, on Isaac’s birth]; every one who hears will laugh over me” (Gen 21:6). (CCA 47)

* + - * 1. Jacob and Rachel: 1:25b: “to take away my reproach [disgrace] among men” = “She [Rachel] conceived and bore a son [Joseph], and said, “God has taken away my reproach” (Gen 30:23). (CCA 47)
        2. Elkanah and Hannah, parents of Samuel

1:5: “there was a priest named Zechariah . . .; and he had a wife . . ., and her name was Elizabeth” = “There was a certain man . . . whose name was Elkanah . . . He had two wives; the name of the one was Hannah . . .” (1 Sam 1:1-2). (CCA 43)

1:8-11: An angel announces the birth while Zechariah is in the temple = Eli announces the birth while Hannah is in the temple (1 Sam 1:3, 17). (CCA 43-44) Both sets of parents “yearned for a child and had their prayer answered while praying in the sanctuary.” (ACC 29)

1:15: Both children are to be Nazirites (Num 6:1-21) = 1 Sam 1:11. (CCA 44) But neither passage says “Nazirite”; also, 1:15 = “drink no wine nor strong drink” and 1 Sam = “no razor shall touch his head.” (Hahn)

1:23-24: “. . . he went to his home. After these days his wife Elizabeth conceived . . .” = “they went back to their house at Ramah. And Elkanah knew Hannah . . . and in due time Hannah conceived . . .” (1 Sam 1:19-20). (CCA 46-47)

1:25a: “Thus the Lord has done to me . . .” = “and the Lord remembered her . . .” (1 Sam 1:19). (CCA 47)

1:46-55: The Magnificat = Hannah’s song (1 Sam 2:1-10). (CCA 44)

1:80: “And the child grew and became strong in spirit” = “And the boy Samuel grew in the presence of the Lord” (1 Sam 2:21b). (CCA 47)

2:22-24, 2:36-38: Jesus’ presentation [Hannah/Anna] = Samuel’s presentation (1 Sam 1:24-28). (CCA 44 n. 14)

* + - * 1. Abraham and Sarah are from the Law, Elkanah and Hannah from the [Former] Prophets. The Law is reflected in the setting in Luke 1 (the priestly offering of incense); the Prophets are reflected in Zechariah prophesying (1:67, Benedictus introduction) and John described as Elijah (1:17, cf. Malachi 3:1; 4:5-6, the last prophetic writing). (CCA 44)
    1. Luke 1 echoes Daniel 9-10. Daniel was one of the Writings in the Hebrew canon [44] and perhaps “was the last book of the collection to be written . . .” (CCA 44-45)
       1. the appearance of Gabriel
          1. Gabriel only appears in Daniel in the OT. (CCA 44)
          2. Luke 1:10-13 = Dan 9:20-21: “. . . Gabriel comes at the time of liturgical prayer to a figure who has been praying in distress . . .” (CCA 44)
          3. Luke 1:12 = Dan 10:7-8, 10-11: “the visionary becomes afraid . . .” (CCA 44)
          4. Luke 1:13 = Dan 10:12: “the visionary . . . is told not to fear . . .” (CCA 44)
          5. Luke 1:20-22 = Dan 10:15: “the visionary . . . is struck mute . . .” (CCA 44, 46)
          6. Luke 1:22 = 6 times in Dan 9-10: the appearance is called a vision. (CCA 44)
    2. “So Zechariah, likened to Abraham, meets the angel of the endtime. Luke thus summarizes the sweep of Israel’s history just like Matthew in his genealogy (Abraham to Messiah).” (CCA 45)
    3. OT figures (Zechariah and Elizabeth) and Gospel figures (the Baptist) encounter each other, thus bridging the two periods. (CCA 46)
       1. John’s parents, who observe the commandments (1:6) and who prophesy (1:41, [45] 67), belong to the period of the Law and the Prophets. (CCA 46)
       2. John belongs to the time of Jesus.
          1. Luke 16:16, “The law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached . . .” (CCA 46)
          2. “. . . the Baptist belongs to the time of Jesus. Consequently, the child is described in language anticipatory of the descriptions of him found in the Gospel . . .” (CCA 46)

Gabriel is sent “to bring you [Zechariah] this *good news*” (1:19). (CCA 46)

1:15a: “for he will be great” = “among those born of women none is greater than John . . .” (7:28) (CCA 46)

1:15b: “for he will be great *before the Lord*” = “I send my messenger before thy face” (7:27, quoting Mal 3:1). (CCA 46)

1:15b: “and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink” = “John the Baptist has come eating no bread and drinking no wine . . .” (7:33). (CCA 46)

1:15b: “. . . he will be filled with the Holy Spriit, even from his mother’s womb” culminates in “the word of God came to John . . .” (3:2) “To appreciate the full force of the two descriptions one should compare the alternation of spirit and word in biblical vocations, e. g., Isa 61:1 and 2:1; Joel 3:1 [RSV 2:28] and 1:1.” (CCA 46)

1:17b: John will “turn the hearts of the fathers to the children” = “he [Elijah] will turn . . . the hearts of children to their fathers . . .” (Mal 4:6). (CCA 46) The quotation “may have been influenced by Gospel sayings pertinent to the Baptist which speak of father and/or children . . .” Luke 3:8, “do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father’ . . .” and 7:31-33, “this generation [is] like children sitting in the market place . . .” (CCA 46 n. 17)

* + 1. Both Jesus (2:40) and Samuel (1 Sam 2:21, 26) grew in stature and in favor with God and men.

1. **Luke 1:26-38**: **annunciation to Mary**
   1. The pattern of birth annunciations: (CCA 62 and n. 31)
      1. “appearance of (an angel of) the Lord”
      2. “fear or prostration”
      3. “heavenly messenger addresses the visionary”
         1. “usually by name”
         2. “sometimes [62] with an added phrase pertinent to the visionary’s role”
         3. “urges, “Do not fear”“
         4. “The message is that the future mother is or will be with child to whom she will give birth”
         5. “a child who is to be named X (sometimes with an explanatory etymology)”
         6. “and whose accomplishments will be Y”
      4. examples:
         1. Ishmael (Gen 16:7-12)
         2. Isaac (Gen 17:15-22) (ACC 10; CCA 31)
         3. Samson (Jgs 13:3-20) (CCA 62-63 n. 31)
         4. Matthew’s annunciation (1:18-23)
         5. Luke’s annunciations (Zechariah, 1:8-23) (Mary, 1:26-38)
         6. See also “angelic annunciations of vocation, e. g., of Moses in Exodus 3:2-12; of Gideon in Judges 6:12-23.” (CCA 62-63 n. 31)
   2. Mary as first disciple
      1. “. . . Luke presents Mary as the first to hear and accept it [the good news] and then to proclaim it. Thus he holds her up as the first and model disciple [“indeed, the first Christian,” CCA 69]. The vocation of the disciple is not the primary message of the scene [that message is Jesus as Messiah and salvation through him, CCA 60], but a necessary corollary . . .” (CCA 60)
      2. the growth of NT Mariology
         1. Mark has a negative view of Jesus’ family (Mark 3:21, 31-35; 6:4). (CCA 61)
         2. Matthew omits Mark’s negative view but does not show Mary as a disciple. (CCA 61)
         3. Luke and John both consider Mary a disciple. (CCA 61)
            1. Luke: see below.
            2. In John 19:26-27 the author “describes Jesus as constituting her to be the mother of the disciple whom he loves (the model disciple) and thus gives her a shared preeminence in discipleship.” (CCA 61)
         4. “Reflecting on the role of Mary as a preeminent disciple was probably a second-stage development in New Testament thought. After Christians had reflected on the mystery of Jesus, they turned to reflect on how he impinged on those who were close to him physically and then included that reflection in the “good news.”“ (CCA 61)
         5. “Written earlier than Luke or John, Mark . . . does not include . . . this wider understanding of the gospel.” (CCA 61 n. 29)
         6. “A popular piety has suggested prayer to Mary on the grounds that surely Jesus listens to his mother. This stress on physical motherhood is a misunderstanding . . . she is remembered . . . because she believed the Lord’s word in a way that gave her a preeminent membership in his true family of disciples (1:41 [*sic*]; 8:21).” (ACC 36)
      3. “Her discipleship . . . comes into being when she says yes to God’s will about Jesus [1:38]; but such readiness is possible for her because by God’s grace she has said yes to Him before. Thus Mary’s discipleship does not exhibit conversion but consistency.” (CCA 63)
      4. 1:32-35: Gabriel describes Jesus as son of David (“the language of the Old Testament prophets”) and “Son of God” (“the language . . . of New Testament preaching”). (CCA 64). Thus Mary is first to hear and believe the “gospel”—the word by which Paul in Rom 1:3-4 describes the dual proclamation of Jesus as son of David and Son of God. (CCA 65)
      5. 1:45 shows Mary as the first disciple: Elizabeth says, “Blessed is she who believed that there would be a fulfilment of what was spoken to her from the Lord.” (CCA 67)
      6. Jesus defines discipleship in Luke 8:21, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.” (CCA 65) This is “Jesus’ own encomium of his mother . . . [Mary] meets the criterion of Jesus’ family of disciples.” (CCA 67) In Luke “. . . Mary emerges as part of the eschatological family of Jesus . . . (see Acts 1:14).” (ACC 35)
   3. “For the previous annunciation [Elizabeth’s], the place was Jerusalem [61] and the heritage was priestly—circumstances befitting Old Testament characters like Zechariah and Elizabeth. In this annunciation the place is Nazareth in Galilee and the heritage is Davidic . . .” (CCA 62)
   4. 1:28: “Hail, O favored one [κεχαριτωμέvη] . . .” “This has the connotation of being especially graced, whence the Latin translation that gave rise to the “full of grace.”“ But “favored” has two meanings. “The favor or grace . . . is explained in 1:31 in future terms: She will conceive and give birth to Jesus.” But Mary has already enjoyed God’s grace by the way she has lived. (CCA 63)
   5. 1:32: “The identity of the Messiah as the Son of David goes back in Jewish thought to 2 Samuel 7 [Nathan’s prophecy] . . .” (CCA 63) “Luke makes this explicit in 1:32-33 by [63] having Gabriel quote that promise from 2 Samuel in a slightly rephrased manner (evidently customary at this time as we can see in the Dead Sea Scrolls). The following comparison of the wording shows this . . .” (CCA 63-64) Luke 1:32-33, “He will be *great*, and will be called the *Son* of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the *throne* of his father David, [33] and he will reign over the *house* of Jacob *for ever*; and of his *kingdom* there will be *no end*.” 2 Sam 7:9, 13, 14, 16, “. . . I will make for you a *great* name . . . [13] and I will establish the *throne* of his kingdom for ever. [14] I will be his father, and he shall be my *son*. . . . [16] And your *house* and your *kingdom* shall be made sure *for ever* . . .” (CCA 64)
2. **Luke 1:39-45**: **visitation**
   1. 1:39: “Mary arose and went with haste” to see Elizabeth—not just to see a relative, but because Gabriel had told her that Elizabeth’s pregnancy was part of God’s plan, and she was anxious to be obedient. (CCA 66)
   2. 1:42: Elizabeth’s “prophetic” cry, “Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb!”
      1. “Blessed are you among women” “echoes a praise of distinguished women of Israel: Jael (Judg 5:24) and Judith (Jud 13:18).” (CCA 66 n. 33)
      2. “Blessed is the fruit of your womb”: in Deut 28:1, 4 this benediction is promised Israel if it is obedient. In Luke 11:27 (= L), a woman in the crowd shouts, “Blessed is the womb that bore you, and the breasts that you sucked!” So Elizabeth’s greeting expresses, not just joy that Mary will have a son, but joy that she [66] has the honor to bear the Messiah. (CCA 66-67)
   3. 1:44: the Baptist leaping in the womb “is an anticipation of his witness . . .” (CCA 67)
   4. 1:42, 45: Elizabeth blesses Mary (twice); Mary now blesses God (Magnificat, 1:46-56). (CCA 67)
3. **Luke 1:46-56**: **Magnificat**
   1. 1:46-47, “My soul magnifies the Lord, [47] and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior,” echoes 1 Sam 2:1-2 LXX, “My heart is strengthened in the Lord; my horn is exalted in my God . . . I delight in Your salvation.” (CCA 54)
   2. 1:48 is a Lucan addition to fit the canticle to its context better: “That verse echoes language that Luke has already used of Mary in 1:38, 42 . . .” (CCA 50)
   3. 1:48 (“for he has regarded the low estate of his handmaiden”) continues “the Hannah parallelism” (CCA 67) (1 Sam 1:11, “look on the affliction of thy maidservant”). This motif was in 1:38, “Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord . . .” “The term employed is literally the feminine form of “slave” . . .” This had religious connotations (Acts 2:18, quoting Joel 2:28-32, “on my menservants and my maidservants in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy”) and sociological connotations (“. . . to outsiders . . . Christianity was bizarre: a group consisting of many slaves, worshiping a crucified criminal”). (CCA 68)
   4. 1:51-53 has two parallels.
      1. One is OT: 1 Sam 2:7-8, “The Lord makes poor and makes rich; he brings low, he also exalts. [8] He raises up the poor from the dust; he lifts the needy from the ash heap, to make them sit with princes and inherit a seat of honor.” (CCA 68)
      2. One is NT: Luke 6:20b-26, beatitudes and woes. The Magnificat was written after Jesus’ sayings, so it is based on the beatitudes and woes. (CCA 69) “Such a reaching forward [to the beatitudes and woes] is appropriate on Mary’s lips because she is a Gospel-ministry figure who has been brought back to Luke’s “bridge” chapters of the Infancy Narrative.” Zechariah and Simeon, purely OT types, “do not have such clear anticipations of Gospel wording.” (CCA 54)
4. **Luke 1:57-66**: **birth of the Baptist**
   1. Zechariah’s insistence on the name “John,” as the angel commanded, shows that he now believes (Luke 1:62-64); so his muteness (1:20) is lifted. (CCA 47)
   2. 1:60, 63: “The marvelous coincidence that Elizabeth also chooses the name John . . . is a further sign that the hand of the Lord was with the child (1:66).” (CCA 47)
5. **Luke 1:67-80**: **Benedictus**
   1. structure (CCA 55)
      1. 1:68a”Introductory Praise”
      2. 1:68b-71”First Strophe”
      3. 1:72-75”Second Strophe”
      4. 1:76-77”Lucan Insertion”
      5. 1:78-79”Conclusion”
   2. The tense is aorist because the Jewish Christians who wrote the canticle referred to Jesus in the past. As a prophecy (1:67), however, the aorists show how sure Zechariah is of its accomplishment. (CCA 58)
   3. Strophes One and Two constitute the “body” of the hymn. (CCA 57)
      1. The first identifies God’s “redemption” with fulfillment of promises to David; the second identifies God’s “mercy” with fulfillment of promises (= covenant) to Abraham. (CCA 57)
      2. Promises to David = 2 Sam 7; promises to Abraham = Yahweh/Abraham covenant. Hence the two strophes refer to fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets (2 Sam = Former Prophets). (CCA 57)
      3. Matt 1:1 calls Jesus “son of David, son of Abraham” to show that Jesus’ salvation is both for Jews (David) and for Gentiles (“Paul uses Abraham to make the Gentiles sharers in the promises . . .” [e. g., Gal 3]). (CCA 57)
   4. 1:68a: “Clearly, the Jewish Christians who composed this canticle thought of themselves as continuing to belong to Israel.” (CCA 56)
   5. 1:68a echoes the end of three books of the Psalms (41:13, 72:18, 106:48), attributed to David, and also echoes 1 Kgs 1:48 (spoken by David). The canticle praises “what God has done in the last anointed king of David’s lineage.” (CCA 56)
   6. 1:69: “a horn of salvation” = Messiah, see 1 Sam 2:10, “exalt the power [literally, “horn”] of his anointed.” (CCA 58)
   7. 1:70: “as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets . . .” = Nathan, 2 Sam 7.
   8. 1:76-77: “And you, child, will be called th prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways . . .” A Lucan addition to adjust the canticle to the context; Luke composed it from his own language in 1:17, 3:4, 7:27. (CCA 50)
   9. 1:76-77: “Probably Luke’s use of “the Lord” is deliberately ambiguous . . .” (Lord = God, Lord = Jesus [called “Lord” by Elizabeth in 1:43]). (CCA 56)
   10. 1:78-79 refer to Jesus, not the Baptist. (CCA 57)
   11. Luke 1:80b, “and he was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation to Israel,” connects with 3:2, “the word of God came to John the son of Zechariah in the wilderness . . .” (CCA 48)
6. **Luke 2:1-21**: **manger and shepherds**
   1. structure
      1. 2:1-5 census brings Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem (ACC 17)
      2. 2:6-7 birth in manger (ACC 17)
      3. 2:8-14 shepherds (ACC 17, 24)
      4. 2:15-20 reactions of shepherds, their hearers, and Mary (ACC 24)
   2. 2:1-5: census
      1. historical problems
         1. Augustus never had a single census of the whole Empire. (ACC 17 n. 26)
         2. Roman censuses did not require returning to ancestors’ sites (unless you had property there). (ACC 17 n. 26)
         3. “Herod died in 4 B.C.; Quirinius became governor in Syria . . . in ad 6-7 . . .” (ACC 17 n. 26)
         4. Quirinius “conducted the first Roman census of Judea in ad 6-7—. . . not of Galilee as Luke assumes.” (ACC 17 n. 26)
         5. “In Acts 5:37 Luke mistakenly mentions the revolt of Judas the Galilean (provoked by the census of Quirinius) after the revolt of Theudas which occurred in ad 44-46.” (ACC 17 n. 26)
      2. The census was necessary to move Mary and Joseph from Nazareth (2:39, “their own city”) to Bethlehem. (ACC 17)
      3. The census provides a solemn setting for Jesus’ birth: 2:1-2, “In those days a decree went out from Caesar Augustus . . . when Quirinius was governor of Syria.” (Cf. Jesus’ baptism: 3:1). (ACC 18)
      4. 2:1: “The name of Augustus would evoke memories and ideals for Luke’s readers. In 29 B.C., one hundred years before Luke wrote this Gospel, Augustus had brought an end to almost a century of civil war . . . In 13-9 B.C. there was erected a great altar to the peace brought about by Augustus, and this *Ara Pacis Augustae* still stands in Rome . . . The Greek cities of Asia Minor adopted September 23rd, the birthday of Augustus, as the first day of the New Year. He was hailed at Halicarnassus as the “savior of the whole world”; and the Priene inscription grandiosely proclaimed: “The birthday of the god marked the beginning of the good news for the world.” Luke contradicts this propaganda . . . Men built an altar to the *pax Augustae*, but a heavely chorus proclaimed the *pax Christi*: “On earth peace to those favored by God” (2:14).” (ACC 18)
      5. 2:1: censuses in Jewish history
         1. “King David ordered a census for Israel and Judah (2 Sm 24) and incurred the wrath of God in the form of a pestilence.” (ACC 19)
         2. “Most recently the census of Quirinius in Judea in ad 6-7 had provoked the rebellion of Judas the Galilean which was the beginning of the Zealot movement . . . which culminated in . . . ad 70.” Whereas Judas revolted at the census, Jesus’ parents were obedient; “thus even from birth Jesus was never a party to a rebellion against Rome.” (ACC 19)
         3. “. . . this was the census foretold in Psalm 87:6 where God says: “In the census of the peoples, this one will be born there.”“ (ACC 19) Brown quotes according to Origen’s *Quinta*, probably an early recension of the LXX (perhaps known by Luke). 87:6 Heb = registering nations in Jerusalem; 87:6 LXX = princes are born in Jerusalem; Aramaic targum = a king brought up in Jerusalem. (ACC 19 n. 28)
   3. 2:4: Bethlehem
      1. 2:4: Joseph “went up . . . to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem . . .” “Go up” is “a standard Old Testament expression for ascent to Jerusalem”; and in the OT the “city of David” is Jerusalem, never Bethlehem. (ACC 21) So the new, messianic kingdom stems from Jesus’ birth in Bethlehem.
      2. See Micah 5:1-2 (Eng. 5:2-3) (= Mt 2:6), “But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. [2] Therefore he shall give them up until the time when she who is in travail has brought forth; then the rest of his brethren shall return to the people of Israel.” (ACC 21)
   4. 2:7: manger
      1. “It is probable that *phatnē* [φάτνῃ] is better translated by “manger” than by “stall” . . .” (ACC 20 n. 29)
      2. “The manger . . . is probably meant to evoke . . . Isaiah 1:3 . . .”: “The ox knows its owner, and the ass its master’s crib; but Israel does not know, my people does not understand.” With Jesus, “God’s people have begun to know the manger of their Lord.” (ACC 20)
   5. 2:7: inn
      1. “. . . it is quite unclear whether *katalyma* means “the home,” “the room,” or “the inn.”“ (ACC 20 n. 29)
      2. Luke does not mention (and so has no interest in) why there was no room, or the innkeeper’s heartlessness, or the hard poverty of Mary and Joseph. The lack of room is probably “no more than a vague surmise in order to explain the mention of a manger.” (ACC 20)
   6. 2:8-9, 15-20: shepherds
      1. The OT background “seems to be the memory that David was a shepherd in the area of Bethlehem . . .” (ACC 21)
      2. “To modern romantics the shepherds . . . take [20] on the gentleness of their flock and have even become Christmas symbols for the common man.” (ACC 20-21)
      3. The shepherds “symbolize an Israel who at last recognizes its Lord . . .” They praise God for what they’ve seen (2:17, 20). (ACC 24)
   7. 2:8: flock
      1. Near Micah 5:1 (“you, O Bethlehem”) is Micah 4:8, “And you, O tower of the flock (= Migdal Eder), hill of the daughter of Zion, to you shall it come, the former dominion shall come, the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem.”
      2. “Has Luke also shifted over the designation “Tower of the Flock” (Migdal Eder) from Jerusalem to Bethlehem . . .?” This might explain the emphasis on Bethlehem in 2:11 (angels: “to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior”) and 2:15 (“the shepherds said to one another, “Let us go over to Bethlehem” . . .”). (ACC 21)
      3. The only other reference to Migdal Eder is Gen 35:21, “[19] So Rachel died, and she was buried on the way to Ephrath (that is, Bethlehem) . . . [21] Israel journeyed on, and pitched his tent beyond the tower of Eder.” Matt 2:18 [= Jer 31:15] “presupposes Gn 35:19”: “A voice was heard in Ramah [north of Jerusalem, scene in Jer 40:1 of national grieving inflicted by an enemy], wailing and loud lamentation, Rachel weeping for her children; she refused to be consoled, because they were no more.” (ACC 22 n. 32)
      4. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (in present form, perhaps ad 200s) translates Gen 35:21 into Aramaic: “The Tower of the Flock, the place from which it will happen that the King Messiah will be revealed at the end of days.” “. . . that can scarcely have been borrowed from Christians . . .” (ACC 22)
      5. Since both Matthew and Luke seem to know both Micah 5:2 and 4:8, perhaps the two were connected by Christians before the evangelists, or even by Jews before Christ. (ACC 22)
   8. 2:9-15: angels
      1. 2:10-11 (“I bring you good news of a great joy . . . [11] for to you is born . . . a Savior, who is Christ the Lord”) “echoes in its style the imperial propaganda of Augustus . . .” (ACC 22)
      2. 2:11, “a Savior, who is Christ the Lord”: the titles are from Luke’s accounts of early Christian preaching. Acts 2:32, 36: God “made him both Lord and Messiah”; Acts 5:31: God exalted Jesus as “Savior.” (ACC 22)
      3. 2:14: Gloria in Excelsis (“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men with whom he is pleased!”) has two parallels. (ACC 23)
         1. Luke 19:38, “Blessed is the King who comes in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!” Perhaps 2:14 and 19:38 are antiphonal lines from the same hymn, with the angels imagined as proclaiming peace on earth, and the disciples imagined as proclaiming peace in heaven. (ACC 23; cf. CCA 49)
         2. Isa 6:3 [the Sanctus, said by one seraph to another]: “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory.” “. . . in Jewish prayer tradition each . . . was expanded: “Holy in the highest heavens; . . . holy on earth, etc.” . . . the host of angels have moved from the Temple to praise the new presence of the Lord in Bethlehem.” (ACC 23)
   9. 2:17-18: hearers (the shepherds “made known the saying . . . [18] and all who heard it wondered”)
      1. “Astonishment is a standard reaction in the gospel . . ., and it does not necessarily lead to faith.” (ACC 24)
      2. The hearers are those who hear with joy but “have no root” (8:13). (ACC 24)
   10. 2:19: Mary (“But Mary kept all these things, pondering them in her heart”)
       1. Mary is the good soil, those “who, hearing the word, hold it fast in an honest and good heart . . .” (8:15). (ACC 24) Mary’s only appearance in Luke’s public ministry is immediately afterward, in 8:19-21 (ACC 28 n. 38): “[21] My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.” Here Mary is praised for hearing and doing it. (ACC 24 n. 38)
       2. “The idea of “keeping events with concern” appears in Genesis 37:11; Daniel 4:28 (LXX); and *Testament of Levi* 6:2 . . .” There the reference is to “attempts to discover the hidden meaning behind marvelous happenings.” (ACC 24)
       3. Mary reappears in Luke 8:19-21 and Acts 1:14. “Thus Luke knows that Mary must have sought to interpret these events . . ., for she became a model Christian believer.” (ACC 25)
7. **Luke 2:22-40**: **presentation of Jesus in the temple**
   1. “. . . the presentation scene is . . . the climax of the Lucan infancy narrative.” (ACC 25)
   2. The presentation is based on Hannah’s presentation of Samuel to the priest Eli at the Shiloh shrine (1 Sam 1:24-28). (ACC 26)
   3. The presentation scene exists “in order to get the family from Bethlehem to Jerusalem.” (ACC 27)
   4. historical problems re Jewish cult customs
      1. Luke confuses purification and presentation.
         1. At the purification of the mother at the sanctuary, “she offered two young pigeons or doves (Lv 12:1-8) . . .” (ACC 27) Luke thinks “the offering of two young pigeons was related to the presentation (2:24 in sequence to 2:22b).” (ACC 27)
         2. At “the presentation of the first male child to the Lord [at the sanctuary, the parents pay] five shekels to buy him back.” (ACC 27)
      2. Luke thinks “both parents need to be purified . . .” (2:22, “*their* purification”). (ACC 27)
      3. Luke thinks “the child needed to be brought to Jerusalem to be presented to the Lord (2:22b-23) . . .” (ACC 27)
      4. Luke never mentions purification after 2:22a, the opening verse of the scene. (ACC 27)
   5. The presentation “was according to the Law of the Lord which he mentions five times (2:22, 23, 24, 27, 39).” As Luke showed the parents obedience to the census, so he shows their obedience to Jewish laws. (ACC 27) “In his origins Jesus was an offense neither to Rome nor to Israel.” (ACC 28)
   6. “Even as Luke mentions “the Law” three times in the consecutive verses 22, 23, 24, so he mentions the Spirit three times in the consecutive verses 25, 26, 27.” (ACC 28 n. 44)
   7. Simeon (2:25-35) and Anna (2:36-38)
      1. Simeon and Anna “could have stepped out of the pages of the Old Testament.” Anna is a prophetess (2:36) and Simeon is moved by the Spirit to prophecy (2:34-35). “Thus, added to the Law [2:22, 23, 24, 27, 39] is the element of prophecy . . .” For “the Law and the prophets,” see Luke 16:16, 24:27; Acts 13:15; 24:14; 26:22; 28:23. (ACC 28 n. 45)
      2. Simeon and Anna were probably the original ending; see below, “finding the boy Jesus in the temple.”
      3. Simeon had been “looking for the consolation of Israel . . .” (2:25). Anna “spoke of him [Jesus] to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem” (2:38). (ACC 30 and n. 51) See Isaiah 40:1 (LXX): “Console, console my people . . .” (ACC 31)
      4. Simeon and Anna “have their biblical foreshadowing in the dramatis personae of the story of the birth of Samuel.” (ACC 29)
         1. Simeon and Eli are both aged. Both bless the parents (1 Sam 2:20, Luke 2:34). (ACC 29)
         2. Hannah (= Anna) “yearned for a child and had [her] prayer answered while praying in the sanctuary.” (ACC 29)
         3. Hannah presented Samuel to the Lord at the sanctuary (1 Sam 1:25). (ACC 29)
         4. Anna is like the women who served at Shiloh’s entrance. In 1 Sam 2:22, the women sleep with Eli’s sons. But in the LXX and Targums of Exod 38:8—the only other mention of them in the Bible—they fast and pray (RSV: “And he made the laver of bronze and its base of bronze, from the mirrors of the ministering women who ministered at the door of the tent of meeting”). Anna too was “worshiping with fasting and prayer night and day” (2:37). (ACC 29 n. 48)
   8. 2:29-32: Nunc Dimittis
      1. The Nunc Dimittis is Simeon’s first oracle (a blessing on God); 2:34-35 is Simeon’s second oracle (a blessing on the parents, especially Mary).
      2. The Nunc Dimittis echoes Isaiah: “The themes of seeing salvation, a light to the Gentiles, and glory for Israel constitute almost a pastiche from passages like Isaiah 40:5; 42:6; 46:13; 49:6; 52:9-10.” (ACC 31)
      3. The infancy narratives contain the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah. (ACC 31)
   9. 2:34-35: Simeon’s second oracle
      1. Simeon’s first oracle (Nunc Dimittis, 2:29-32) refers to Jesus’ work as past (the perspective of the Jewish-Christian hymn collection); this one is future. (ACC 32)
      2. 2:34: Putting “fall” before “rise” emphasizes those Jews who will fall. (ACC 32) At the end of Acts, Paul quotes Isaiah’s prediction that the Jews will never understand, and he ends by saying, “this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen.” (ACC 33)
      3. 2:34: Mary will be an “exception to the generally negative reaction in Israel which is the subject of Simeon’s prophecy. For her Jesus will not be a sign to be contradicted but a sign to be affirmed.” (ACC 35)
      4. 2:35a, “a sword will pierce through your own soul also . . .”
         1. Church Fathers: because Mary was calumniated as an unfaithful wife (only Matt 1:18-19).
         2. Modern Catholics: because Mary was at the foot of the cross (only John 19:25-27).
         3. Ezek 14:17, “If I say, . . . Let a sword go through the land [that I may] cut off from it man and beast . . .” *Sibylline Oracles* III, 316 refers 14:17 to Antiochus Epiphanes’ invasion of Egypt c. 170 B.C. “The image is of a selective sword of judgment, destroying some and sparing others . . . Simeon proclaims that a discriminating judgment will come upon Israel and that it will touch Mary too, as an individual Israelite.” (ACC 34) It is “the sword of decision that passes through Mary’s soul . . .” (ACC 35)
         4. The sword touches Mary in Luke 8:19-21: “[21] “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.” (ACC 34) “. . . she will be a positive exception to the generally negative reaction in Israel . . .” (ACC 35)
      5. 2:35b: “that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed.”
         1. “. . . in the New Testament “inmost thoughts” (*dialogismoi*) are always pejorative.” (ACC 32)
         2. Jesus “will cause the hostile thoughts of many to be revealed (2:34-35).” (CCA 12)
   10. 2:39-40: “The original ending of the infancy narrative was 2:39-40 . . .” (ACC 28 n. 46), and Simeon and Anna (2:25-38) was the final scene. Thus Elizabeth and the Spirit-filled Zechariah (1:5-7) proclaiming the good news about John the Baptist, the prophet of the Most High (1:67, 76) form an *inclusio* with Anna and the Spirit-filled Simeon proclaiming the good news about the Son of the Most High (1:32). As Elizabeth gave thanks (1:24-25), and after John’s birth the good news reached her neighbors (1:57-58), so Anna “gave thanks to God, and spoke of him to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem” (2:38). (ACC 29)
   11. 2:40 was originally “an ideal transition to the Gospel”: “And the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the favor of God was upon him.” (ACC 38)
8. **Luke 2:41-52**: **finding the boy Jesus in the temple**
   1. outline

“*Framework Statement* about Jesus’ growth, his wisdom and favor [see ACC 40]

*Geographical Introduction*: Jesus and his parents had gone up to Jerusalem [ACC 41-42]

*Setting*: The parents lost Jesus and searched for him [ACC 43-45]

*Core of the Story*: The parents found the child and were amazed; Jesus answered them by stressing his Father’s claim [ACC 45-50]

*Geographical Conclusion*: Jesus went down with his parents to Nazareth [ACC 51]

*Framework Statement* about Jesus’ progress in wisdom, maturity, and favor [ACC 52]” (ACC 43)

* 1. Luke added this story (and the canticles) after writing the infancy narrative; see “two-stage development of Luke 1-2” above.
     1. The finding in the temple is outside the “double diptych arrangement” of Luke 1:5-2:40 (matching annunciations, prophetic psalms, births, circumcisions, namings). (ACC 38)
     2. The finding story “is quite independent of what has gone before . . .” (ACC 28 n. 46) and is easier to read without it. (ACC 38)
        1. 2:41, 43 includes Joseph among Jesus’ “parents,” and 2:48 calls him the father of Jesus. What precedes says that Joseph was not Jesus’ father. (ACC 38)
        2. Luke 2:48, “Son, why have you treated us so?” The reproachful tone is unlikely if Jesus’ Sonship were revealed to Mary at his birth. (ACC 46) The verse “implies that the parents had no previous indication of Jesus’ true identity . . .” (ACC 28 n. 46)
        3. 2:49-50: Why would Mary and Joseph not understand Jesus’ reference to God as his Father? (ACC 39)
     3. The Greek of the finding story has fewer Semitisms than Luke 1:5-2:40. (ACC 39)
  2. “The scene of Jesus’ finding in the Temple is often thought to be a portrayal of him teaching the teachers of Israel, but in reality that scene depicts him as a disciple or learner . . .” (Fitzmyer, *Gospel According to Luke* 218)
  3. The genre of “boyhood stories” (ACC 40) is common. “The underlying justifying principle is that the child must already have been what the man was known to be . . .” (ACC 42)
     1. Retrojection in world literature: “there are stories about great men who already [40] at an age between ten and fourteen showed astounding knowledge, for example, legends about the Buddha in India, Osiris in Egypt, Cyrus the Great in Persia, Alexander the Great in Greece, and Augustus in Rome.” (ACC 40-41)
     2. Retrojections in Jewish literature
        1. Moses as a boy, in stories contemporary with the NT, had extraordinary knowledge and beauty. Philo places these stories between the OT birth and ministry stories. (ACC 41)
        2. Samuel began to prophesy at age twelve, “thus supplying a date for the call of Samuel . . . (1 Sm 3:1-18).” (ACC 41)
        3. “. . . the Moses and Samuel examples explain why a story of Jesus’ boyhood could have been attached to an infancy narrative as a preparation for his ministry.” (ACC 41)
        4. Daniel (at “twelve,” “according to the Syro-Hexaplar version”) received a spirit of understanding that made him wiser than his elders (Dan 5:45, 63). (ACC 41)
        5. Josephus (*Life* 2.9) says, “While still a boy about fourteen, . . . leading men of the city used to come to me constantly for precise information on some particulars in our ordinances.” (ACC 41)
        6. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus ran away and was found studying the Law. (ACC 41)
     3. Retrojections in the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*
        1. The finding story “is a canonical example of those stories [37] of the “hidden life” [found] in apocryphal gospels . . . The best example of these is the second-century *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. . . . Stories are told therein of what Jesus did at ages five, six, eight, and twelve . . .,” the last a retelling of Luke 2:41-52. (ACC 37-38, cf. 28 n. 46)
        2. Jesus makes clay birds on the sabbath, retrojecting
           1. sabbath violations in the ministry and
           2. Jesus’ sovereignty over the Law. (ACC 42)
        3. Jesus withers the son of Annas the scribe, retrojecting
           1. the hostility of Annas the high priest and the scribes,
           2. cursing the fig tree, and
           3. the crowds’ amazement. (ACC 42)
     4. retrojections in the finding story (Luke 2:41-52)
        1. 2:49, Jesus calls God his Father; his Father will call him Son (at baptism, Luke 3:22). (ACC 43)
        2. 2:47, “all who heard him were amazed”; cf. Luke 4:22, 36. (ACC 45)
        3. Jesus will place the demands of God over the demands of family (Luke 8:21). (ACC 42)
        4. Jesus will culminate his public ministry in the temple (Luke 19:45-48). (ACC 42)
        5. Jesus will teach the chief priests and scribes in the temple (Luke 19:47). (ACC 45) (In 2:46 they are called “teachers,” perhaps because “scribes” would connote hostility in readers’ minds.) (ACC 45 n. 66)
     5. “In the general pattern of boyhood stories there is customarily stress on at least three features anticipated from what is known of the subject’s later career: his piety, his wisdom, and some distinctive aspect of his life work.” (ACC 43)
        1. piety: the family’s obedience is stressed. (ACC 43)
           1. The parents are obedient to Augustus’ edict (2:1, 4), obedient to the angel in naming him “Jesus” (2:21), obedient to the Law for [43] purification and presentation (2:22-24), now obedient to the Law for Passover pilgrimage (2:41, see Exod 23:17, 34:23; Deut 16:16). (ACC 43-44)
           2. The finding story “has nothing to do with the much later custom of Bar Mitzvah.” Jesus may not have been obliged to go; “the general talmudic principle is that a child reaches manhood at his thirteenth birthday.” (ACC 44 n. 63)
           3. “We are in the same context of “Temple piety” that marks the Lucan description of the first Christians in the Book of Acts (2:46; 3:1; 5:12).” Thus Luke shows that the later controversies over Law and temple were not Jesus’ doing. (ACC 44)
        2. wisdom: Luke mentions wisdom “in both the growth statements which supply a framework for the narrative . . .” (ACC 45)
           1. 2:40, “And the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the favor of God was upon him.” (ACC 44) (Cf. 1 Sam 2:21, “And the boy Samuel grew in the presence of the Lord.”) (ACC 45)
           2. 2:52, “And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man.” (ACC 44) (Cf. 1 Sam 2:26, “Now the boy Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the Lord and with men.”) (ACC 45) Luke 2:40, 52 “are virtually a Lucan modification of the two growth descriptions in 1 Samuel.” (ACC 44)
           3. Cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities* 2:9:6.230), “His [Moses’] growth in understanding was not proportionate to his growth in stature [*h\_likia*] but far outran the measure of his years.” (ACC 44 n. 64)
        3. a basic attitude of Jesus’ life: Mary sounds reproachful here (2:48, “Son, why have you treated us so?”) and in her first scenes with Jesus in Mark (Beelzebul, 3:21) and John (2:3, Cana—she “lays upon Jesus a type of family claim [but in 2:4] priority is given to the “hour” of Jesus determined by his [46] relationship to the heavenly Father (13:1)” [ACC 46-47]). In each case “his priorities are with God rather than with earthly family.” (ACC 46)
  4. 2:49. Jesus calling God his Father is “the core of the . . . story . . .” (ACC 37)
     1. “This reference [God as Father] makes the finding story a vehicle of self-revelation . . . The christological revelation . . . has been moved back to the first moment of Jesus’ adulthood.” (ACC 47)
     2. “Note the climactic arrangement . . .: in chap. 1 an angel proclaims that Jesus is God’s Son; in chap. 2 Jesus proclaims it; in chap. 3 God the Father will proclaim it at the baptism.” (ACC 48 n. 70)
  5. 2:50. The parents do not understand Jesus’ reference to his “Father.” When the story was independent, this was because it was Jesus’ first revelation of his Sonship. In the Luke 1-2 context, they misunderstand, not his identity, but the priority of vocational claims over family claims. (ACC 48)
  6. 2:51. Focusing on Mary (the only adult from Luke 1-2 to continue into the ministry), Luke says, “his mother kept all these things in her heart.” (ACC 48) She comes to understand at 8:21: “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.” (ACC 49)
  7. 2:51-52. “The original ending of the infancy narrative was 2:39-40 . . .” (ACC 28 n. 46) “. . . when Luke added the story of the boy Jesus, he had to repeat the information in that ending by supplying a second ending in 2:51-52—the idea of growth or progress at Nazareth was needed to serve as a transition to the ministry.” (ACC 28 n. 46)
  8. 2:52. “If Jesus should continue behaving this way [revealing his wisdom and Sonship], how will Luke plausibly describe a situation where the people at Nazareth will have no suspicion that Jesus is God’s Son and think that he is merely Joseph’s son (Lk 4:22)?” (ACC 49)
     1. Luke emphasizes that the finding story was unique: Jesus’ usual behavior at Nazareth was “obedient to them” (2:52). (ACC 49)
     2. The finding story “foreshadows the cross by insisting that Jesus preserved his identity in the role of a servant.” (ACC 50)

## Notes on the Gospel Of Mark

Achtemeier, Paul J. *Mark*. Proclamation Commentaries: The New Testament Witnesses for Preaching. 1975. 2nd ed., rev. and enlarged. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

1. **introduction**
   1. Expectation of an imminent parousia caused a lack of interest in the exact sequence of historical events. (Achtemeier 1)
   2. But interest was centered on Jesus because of 1) missionary preaching, 2) to solve new problems (contrast 1 Cor 7:12 and 25), 3) guidelines for the church (e.g., the last supper), and 4) the nascent creed. (Achtemeier 2)
   3. “. . . by what right did people . . . change the form [2] . . . in reporting what Jesus had done and said? The answer [is that they] did not cele­brate a dead hero [but] Jesus who now lived . . . Faith in Jesus risen and ruling thus colored the presentation of materials . . . but it also gave . . . freedom to use and adapt them to new situations. The risen Christ was . . . guiding and directing . . . he continued to speak to them through the Spirit . . .” (Achtemeier 2-3)
   4. “Why, then, a gospel?” (Achtemeier 5) Achtemeier gives six reasons.
      1. “A growing church, for example, would need to cover, with its authoritative materials about Jesus, a wider geographical range than the custodians of such memories, the apostles and their immediate followers, could responsibly cover.” (Achtemeier 5)
      2. “Again, as new converts began to proclaim their faith, some check would be needed on [their] accuracy . . .” (Achtemeier 5)
      3. Another reason was “The disappearance through death of those who had known Jesus, and who served as the well spring and check on the traditions . . .” (Achtemeier 5)
      4. Traditional materials (e. g., Phil 2:6-11) emphasized “Jesus as preexistent, and as risen and regnant, with almost no reference to [his] earthly career. A desire [5] . . . to know more . . . may also have contributed . . .” (Achtemeier 5-6)
      5. “We know of . . . an internal crisis . . .: the crisis of the place of Judaism within Christianity. Did you have to become a Jew first[?]” (Achtemeier 6)
      6. “An external crisis [was] the fall of Jerusalem . . .” (Achtemeier 6)
         1. “For the first time that we can determine, the Jesus traditions were understood as a “story” in the Gospel of Mark . . .” (Achtemeier 6) Mark is “that unknown Christian who first conceived the idea of putting the . . . traditions about Jesus into a larger framework.” (Achtemeier 9) (The anonymity of Mark’s gospel is also asserted on p. 43.)
   5. “. . . an enormously subtle and sophisticated theological mind [re­solved] independent, at times dissonant, pieces of tradition into a un­i­fied whole. Indeed, if Mark was using older traditions in a new way, he may well have felt compelled to allow his readers to recognize those familiar traditions . . . Perhaps that is why, even today, it is pos­si­ble for us to identify those earlier independent stories.” (Achtemeier 10)
   6. Since Mark was prior, to recover “the points Mark wanted to make . . ., we will have to read Mark all by itself, with no reference to . . . Matthew or Luke.” (Achtemeier 7)
2. **Mark is not historical**
   1. Mark’s geography is confused. (Achtemeier 12-13)
   2. Mark’s chronology is confused. (Achtemeier 13-14)
   3. His aim was theological, not historical; so geography and chronology serve theology, not history. (Achtemeier 14)
   4. three historical stages that the Jesus traditions went through (Achtemeier 14)
      1. redaction criticism (Achtemeier 14-15)
      2. form criticism (Achtemeier 16-17)
         1. e. g., form of pronouncement stories (Achtemeier 17)
         2. g., form of miracles (Achtemeier 17)
      3. historical events (Achtemeier 17-20)
         1. criteria of authenticity: dissimilarity, multiple attestation, and coherence (Achtemeier 19)
         2. example: Mark 12:23-34 (Achtemeier 19-20)
   5. “In summary, we have seen something of the nature of the intention of the Markan Gospel: it is proclamation rather than history.” (Achtemeier 21)
   6. “A narrative’s value for illuminating human experience will not depend solely on whether what is told happened . . .” (Achtemeier 43)
3. **Mark’s methods of creating a narrative**
   1. arrangement (overview: Achtemeier 22)
      1. juxtaposition of traditions (Achtemeier 23-26)
      2. editing a tradition (Achtemeier 26)
         1. by adding an introduction (Achtemeier 26-27)
         2. by adding a conclusion (Achtemeier 27)
         3. by adding an introduction and a conclusion (Achtemeier 27-28)
         4. combining traditions into larger narrative units (Achtemeier 28)
      3. summaries (Achtemeier 29-30)
4. **the structure of Mark**
   1. “partial patterns” (Achtemeier 34)
      1. bracketing (Achtemeier 31)
         1. Mark 5:21-43 (Achtemeier 31)
         2. Mark 3:20-35 (Achtemeier 31-32)
      2. public teaching and private explanation (4:1-12, 7:14-23, 9:14-29, 10:1-10, 13:1-8) (Achtemeier 32-33)
      3. patterns of threefoldness in Mark 8-10 (Achtemeier 33-34)
   2. “overall structure” (Achtemeier 34)
      1. “Son of God” is implied at the baptism (1:11), the transfiguration (9:7), and the crucifixion (see wicked tenants, 12:6-8) (Achtemeier 34)
         1. The title “seems to be the christological frame around which the Gospel was constructed.” (Achtemeier 34)
         2. objections
            1. The baptism and transfiguration have only, “my beloved Son.” (Achtemeier 34)
            2. The centurion’s confession is not emphasized. (Achtemeier 34)
            3. The centurion’s confession “seems to share significance with the rending of the temple veil (15:38).” (Achtemeier 34)
            4. The other two instances of “Son of God” are spoken by demons (3:11, 5:7). (Achtemeier 35)
      2. Peter’s confession (8:27-31)
         1. Some say Peter’s confession distinguishes Jesus’ public preaching from his private teaching. (Achtemeier 35)
            1. Perhaps this is reinforced by geography, since Jesus leaves Galilee for good in 8:27. (Achtemeier 35)
            2. objections

Jesus teaches publicly after Peter’s confession (9:14, 17-29; 10:1; 11:17; 12:1, 13, 18, 35, 38). (Achtemeier 36)

Jesus taught privately before Peter’s confession (4:10; 7:17). (Achtemeier 36)

* + - 1. Some say Peter’s confession is the turning point in the gospel because it is where Jesus’ messiahship is first asserted by a disciple. (Achtemeier 36)
         1. But Jesus rejects “messiah” here, where its meaning is ambig­uous (cf. 14:62, where Jesus accepts it because it is unam­biguous). (Achtemeier 36)
         2. Mark correpts Peter’s misunderstanding of the title with the title “Son of man” in 8:32-33, a title “which Mark seems to find more adequate . . .” (Achtemeier 36)
    1. Rudolph Pesch’s “stichometry” (counting of lines) yields:
       1. 1:2-3:6
          1. 1:2-34
          2. 1:35-45
          3. 2:1-3:6
       2. 3:7-6:29
          1. 3:7-4:34
          2. 4:35-5:20
          3. 5:21-6:29
       3. 6:30-8:26
          1. 6:30-7:13
          2. 7:14-23
          3. 7:24-8:36
       4. 8:27-10-52
          1. 8:27-9:29
          2. 9:30-50
          3. 10:1-52
       5. 11:1-12:44
          1. 11:1-26
          2. 11:27-12:12
          3. 12:13-44
       6. 14:1-16:8
          1. 14:1-52
          2. 14:52-15:5
          3. 15:6-16:8 37-38

But Pesch has to leave out ch. 13. Pesch suggests that perhaps Mark added it later [38], but much of ch. 13 is anticipated earlier in Mark. (Achtemeier 38-39)

1. **Mark as literature**
   1. The model of all human communication is: transmitter, message, receiver. In the case of fiction, this results in a teller, a story, and a reader. (Achtemeier 43)
   2. teller
      1. The point of view (as technique) is omniscient. (Achtemeier 43)
         1. The narrator “stands above the events narrated and is not a charac­ter in them . . .” (Achtemeier 43)
         2. The narrator “tells the reader things unknown to characters in the narrative (e.g., 1:1) . . .” (Achtemeier 43)
         3. The narrator “tells the secret thoughts and inner experiences of the characters (e.g., 2:6-7; 5:30) . . .” (Achtemeier 43)
         4. The narrator “narraties scenes in which no observer, only the actor is present (e.g., 14:35-36).” (Achtemeier 43)
      2. The point of view (as the narrator’s values) (Achtemeier 44)
         1. “The narrator . . . communicates norms . . . either through direct statement or through the fate of those who espouse the various views.” (Achtemeier 44)
         2. There are two points of view in Mark (8:33), “thinking the things of God” (= Jesus) and “thinking the things of men” (the demons and Jesus’ opponents). 44 “The disci­ples . . . waver between . . .” (Achtemeier 44)
   3. story
      1. “The location of Mark’s narrative moves with Jesus . . .” (Achtemeier 44)
      2. Story time is the full set of actions related in a story; narrative time is the fuller set of actions (e. g., creation of the world, 10:6) in which narrative time is locat­ed. “In Mark, the narrative time begins with the appearance of John the Baptist (1:4) and ends with the empty tomb (16:6). Yet there are references within that narrative time to events that occurred much earlier [and] long after . . .” (Achtemeier 45)
      3. Plotted time is the order in which the events of narrative time are related. (Achtemeier 45)
      4. reader (Achtemeier 45-46)
         1. historical reader
         2. implied reader
         3. real reader
2. **the Christology of Mark** (Achtemeier 53)
   1. Jesus (Achtemeier 54)
      1. 1:1
      2. Cf. Matt 1:21
      3. 1:9 + 16:6 form an intercalation.
   2. Christ (Achtemeier 54-55)
      1. Hebrew *meshiach* > Greek *Christos* = “anointed one” = king
      2. OT: 1 Sam 9:16, 10:1; 2 Sam 2:4, 22:51; Ps 2:2, 6
      3. When was Jesus anointed?
      4. When will Jesus be acclaimed king?
   3. Son of God (Achtemeier 55-56)
      1. OT: “Son of God” = king (e. g., 2 Sam 7:13-14)
      2. “Son”
         1. 1: (cf. Ps 2:7): Jesus is acclaimed “Son” at baptism
         2. 9:7 (transfiguration)
         3. 14:61 (“Son of the Blessed”)
         4. 1:24 (demons: “Holy One of God”)
         5. 5:7 (demons: “Son of the Most High God”)
      3. “Son of God”
         1. 1:1
         2. 3:11
         3. 15:39
      4. Why secrecy about Sonship?
         1. “Son” = “divine man”?
   4. Son of David (Achtemeier 56-58)
   5. Son of man (Achtemeier 58-61)
   6. royal titles combined (Achtemeier 61-62)
   7. prediction-fulfillment pattern (Achtemeier 62-63)
   8. gospel (Achtemeier 63-65)

## Miracle Catenae in Mark

Achtemeier, Paul J. “The Origin and Function of the Pre-Markan Miracle Cat­enae.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972) 198-221.

“From an analysis of the Markan miracle narratives, Achtemeier has concluded that Mark made use of a pre-Markan cycle of miracles, which circulated in the form of two catenae as follows:

Catena I (4:35-5:43; 6:34-44, 53, with 4:35, 5:21c, 5:43a, and 6:34bc as probably editori­al, and 5:24 and 6:35b as clearly editorial):

The Stilling of the Storm (4:35-41)

The Gerasene Demoniac (5:1-20)

The Woman with a Hemorrhage (5:25-34)

Jairus Daughter (5:21-23, 35-43)

Feeding of the 5,000 (6:34-44, 53)

Catena II

## The Miracles of Jesus

Fuller, Reginald H. *Interpreting the Miracles*. London: SCM, 1963, 126-27.

*Matthew* *Mark* *Luke* *John*

**Q Miracles**

1. centurion’s son 8:5-13 7:1-10

**Markan Miracles**

1. Capernaum demoniac 1:21-28 4:36-37
2. Simon’s mother-in-law 8:14-15 1:39-41 4:38-39
3. healings at evening 8:16-17 1:32-34 4:40-41
4. leper 8:1-4 1:40-44 5:12-16
5. paralytic 9:1-8 2:1-12 5:17-26
6. withered hand 12:9-14 3:1-6 6:6-11
7. Galilean healings 12:15-21 3:7-12 6:17-19
8. stilling the storm 8:23-27 4:35-41 8:22-25
9. Gerasene demoniac 8:28-34 5:1-20 8:26-39
10. Jairus’ daughter; haemorrhage 9:18-26 5:21-43 8:40-56
11. feeding the 5000 14:13-21 6:30-34 9:10-17
12. walking on water 14:22-33 6:45-52
13. healings in Gennesaret 14:31-36 6:45-52
14. Syro-Phoenician woman 15:21-28 7:24-30
15. deaf mute 7:31-37
16. feeding the 4000 15:32-39 8:1-10
17. blind man of Bethsaida 8:22-26
18. epileptic boy 17:14-21 9:14-29 9:37-43a
19. blind Bartimaeus 20:29-34 10:46-53 18:35-43
20. cursing the fig tree 21:18-22 11:12-14

**M Miracles**

1. healings in Galilean synagogues 4:23
2. two blind men 9:27-31
3. dumb demoniac 9:32-34
4. healings in Galilean cities 9:35
5. blind and dumb demoniac 12:22
6. healings in the wilderness 14:14
7. healings on the mountain 15:29-31
8. healings in Transjordan 19:2
9. healings in the temple 21:14

**L Miracles**

1. miraculous draft of fishes 5:1-11
2. widow’s son at Nain 7:11-17
3. healings in answer to John 7:21
4. healings at Bethsaida 9:11
5. bent woman 13:10-17
6. man with dropsy 14:1-6
7. high priest’s servant’s ear 22:51

**Johannine Miracles**

1. marriage at Cana 2:1-11
2. signs at Jerusalem 2:23-25
3. official’s son 4:46-54
4. lame man of Bethesda 5:1-18
5. feeding the 5000 6:1-13
6. walking on water 6:16-21
7. man born blind 9:1-34
8. raising of Lazarus 11:1-44

(Since both the synoptics and John have feeding the 5000 and walking on water, the total number of Jesus’ miracles should be reduced by two: 43.)

**Sayings Referring to Miracles**

Beelzebul controversy (Mark and Q) 12:22-37 3:30-33 11:14-28

discourse on the feedings 16:5-12 8:14-21

discourse on the fig tree 21:20-22 11:20-25

answer to John 11:2-6 7:18-23

woes on Galilean cities 11:20-24 10:13-15

blessedness of the disciples 13:16-17 10:23-24

message to Herod 13:32

on the sabbath healing 5:19-47

on the bread of life 6:26-59

on the light of the world 9:35-40

## Jesus’ Miracles

Trench, Archbishop. *Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord*. Introduction by A. Smythe Palmer. London: George Routledge and Sons, n.d.; New York: Dutton, n.d.

1. The Water turned into Wine
2. The Healing of the Nobleman’s Son
3. The First Miraculous Draught of Fishes
4. The Stilling of the Tempest
5. The Demoniacs in the Country of the Gadarenes
6. The Raising of Jairus’ Daughter
7. The Healing of a Woman with an Issue of Blood
8. The Opening of the Eyes of Two Blind in the House
9. The Healing of the Paralytic
10. The Cleansing of the Leper
11. The Healing of the Centurion’s Servant
12. The Demoniac in the Synagogue of Capernaum
13. The Healing of Simon’s Wife’s Mother
14. The Raising of the Widow’s Son
15. The Healing of the Impotent Man at Bethesda
16. The Miraculous Feeding of Five Thousand
17. The Walking on the Sea
18. The Opening of the Eyes of One Born Blind
19. The Restoring of the Man with a Withered Hand
20. The Woman with a Spirit of Infirmity
21. The Healing of the Man with a Dropsy
22. The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers
23. The Healing of the Daughter of the Syrophenician Woman
24. The Healing of One Deaf and Dumb
25. The Miraculous Feeding of Four Thousand
26. The Opening the Eyes of One Blind at Bethsaida
27. The Healing of the Lunatic Child
28. The Stater in the Fish’s Mouth
29. The Raising of Lazarus
30. The Opening of the Eyes of Two Blind Men near Jericho
31. The Cursing of the Barren Fig-Tree
32. The Healing of Malchus’ Ear
33. The Second Miraculous Draught of Fishes

## Miracles and Modern Physics

Jaki, Stanley L., OSB. *Miracles and Physics*. Front Royal: Christendom, 1989.

“Evangelicals, or in general Protestants who want to strike out anew on the road of purely biblical Christianity without repeating some blatant missteps of the Reformers, are a cause of encouragement as well as forebodings.” (Jaki 7)

“. . . the essence of Mary’s virginity *in partu* . . . was indeed specified by many Church Fathers, namely, that the infant Jesus left the body of Mary in the same miraculous way in which the risen Jesus appeared through the closed door.” (Jaki 9)

“Indeed, Vatican II has achieved a special status in one-sidedness by the fact that it came to be taken by so many, to recall a recent remark of Cardinal Ratzinger, for an excuse to ignore all previous Councils.” (Jaki 11)

“One wonders whether Newton had ever as much as suspected the miracle of creation in the beginning that lukred behind each and every law of nature, or the miracle of a nature stable in its orderliness. For only with an eye on that miracle can the possibility of miracle be raised meaningfully. [38] . . . The miracle of creation in the beginning implies, of course, the Creator’s sovereign freedom to create or not to create. No less importantly, his creative freedom is divine also in the sense that the actual universality of things created by him is only one of an infinite number of possibilities at His disposal.” (Jaki 38-39)

“. . . Voltaire’s often quoted utterance that “to suppose that God will work miracles is to insult Him with impunity.” [39] “The ground for that insult was, according to Voltaire, that a miracle meant the inability on God’s part to accomplish any particular end by immutable laws.” (Jaki 39-40)

The physicist Arthur H. Compton, in *The Freedom of Man* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1935) 36, declared “that the evidence on behalf of man’s conviction to move his little finger at will was immensely greater than all the evidence on behalf of Newton’s laws. From this it followed, according to Compton, that should a conflict arise between our sense of freedom and Newton’s physics, it is the latter that needed to be revised.” (Jaki 40)

“The mathematical tools of the new physics—quantum mechanics—were statistical. They were very different, nay irreducible to pure differential equations, which are the backbone of Newtonian physics. Those equations are all translatable into geometry in which the lines or curves representing various parameters are always continuous. . . . The geometrical continuity implied, in principle at least, the possibility of measuring with perfect accuracy the physical processes described by those figures. It was at that point that an elementary error in reasoning gained currency among physicists who were then readily echoed by philosophers overawed by the success of a field they did not really know. The possibility of perfectly accurate measurements became quickly taken as *the* justification [41] of ontological causality in physical interactions [and] that mistaken philosophical maneuver began to function as the *exact* foundation of the ideology of immutable laws of nature, of absolute physical determinism, and of the absurdity of miracles.” (Jaki 41-42)

Jaki objects to “the non sequitur of inferring from the uncertainty of measurements to an ontological incompleteness in natural interactions.” (Jaki 51 n. 6)

“. . . the principle of indeterminacy or uncertainty principle. A much less misleading label would have been the principle of imprecision. For what Heisenberg found was simply that measurements of physical interactions involving conjugate variables, such as momentum and position, time and energy, will always contain a margin of imprecision, which can be significant on the atomic level. . . . Heisenberg, however, jumped to the conclusion that because of the significance of inevitably imprecise measurtements on the atomic level, the principle of causality should be considered as overthrown. [52] . . . From that principle one can proceed only by an elementary disregard of logic to the inference that an *interaction that cannot be measured exactly*, *cannot take place exactly*.” (Jaki 52, 54)

The shift from Newtonian to quantum physics “appeared as a departure from a deterministic notion of nature to a non-deterministic one. The inference that thereby belief in the freedom of the will received a scientific approval was quickly made, and by no less a scientist than Eddington [in 1934].” (Jaki 57)

“. . . a departure from the deterministic world view . . . is not necessarily a guarantee of reliability. [58] . . . reliable scientific grounds . . . are always very different from current fashionable appraisals of the latest in science.” (Jaki 58-59)

“. . . some scientists . . . tried to discredit miracles by calculating the enormous improbabilities of deviations from the ordinary course of nature. The figure 10100 [was] given by J. Perrin, a French Nobel-laureate physicist, to illustrate the improbability of a tile to deviate from its vertical fall . . .” 59 “The figure in question is about 20 magnitudes larger than the total number of atoms in the expanding universe.” (Jaki 59, 59 n. 17)

In Ockham’s occasionalism, “God creates anew every moment (occasion) and makes thereby every event a miracle.” 3 Prior to Ockham, occasionalism was advocated by al-Ashari. 33 Matt 10:21 says that no sparrow falls to the ground without God willing it, which seems to support occasionalism; but “in many biblical passages the workd is spoken of as firmly established and . . . even the endurance of God’s covenant is asserted in terms of the endurance and unfailing regularity of his physical creation . . .” 64 See Pss 18, 32, 73, 88, 96; Isa 40:12-14, 21, 22, 28, 40:24, 45:12; Jer 10:11-16, 31:35-36, 33:19, 24-25; and Jaki, “The Universe in the Bible and Modern Science,” *Ex Auditu* 3 (1987) 137-47. “Far removed is indeed the biblical world view from the one in the Kuran that provided power stimulus to Muslim orthodoxy which later inspired the occasionalism of al-Ashari and al-Ghazzali. Both were driven by the kind of “mysticism” that centuries later claimed as its victims Ockham and his countless followers . . .” (Jaki 3, 33, 64, 65 n. 23)

“. . . Hume’s notion of the invariability of [32] nature’s laws as a refutation of miracles rested on the presupposition that God does not exist. For as [John Stuart] Mill put it, a “miracle is a new effect supposed to be produced by the introduction of new cause . . .; of the adequacy of that cause, if present, there can be no doubt.” (Jaki 32-33)

Missing are notes from 34 onward.

The numbers of angels that can dance on the head of a pin is an “allegedly medieval preoccupation whose first written [55] appearance does not antedate the fifteenth century . . .” (Jaki 55-56 n. 12)

Jaki, Stanley L. “The Intelligent Christian’s Guide to Scientific Cosmology.” *Faith and Reason* 12.2 (1986) 124-36. (Jaki 49 n. 3)

On Einstein’s recognition that his theory of relativity pointed toward the existence of God, see: Jaki, Stanley L. *Cosmos and Creator*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1980, 52-53. (Jaki 50 n. 5)

“. . . the best modern Roman Catholic monograph on miracles: L. Monden, *Signs and Wonders* . . .” (Jaki 50)
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THESIS

1. “There is reason for optimism in recovering a portrait of Jesus as an exorcist, based on the textual evidence. This portrait can then be filled in further by applying anthropological and sociological insights to it. What we will come away with is a clearer sense of the interconnectedness in Jesus’ world between the social, the political and the spiritual, and his rootedness in that world.” (Witmer 10)
2. Witmer links “the reality reflected in the textual tradition with . . . the socio-political context of early first-century Galilee and with observations and studies made by anthropologists of the phenomenon of spirit possession across cultures.” (Wit­mer 206)

BACKGROUND TO JESUS’ EXORCISMS

anthropology of exorcisms

1. **spirit possession**
   1. “Throughout the ancient world, belief in supernatural forces that could bring about both good and evil was assumed . . .” (Witmer 33)
   2. Whether deity, spirit, or ancestor, supernatural beings were “thought to possess human characteristics such as “gender, personalities, special interests and abilities,” and to exhibit human passions.” (quoting Janowitz *Magic* 34-35) (Witmer 33)
   3. permeable boundary
      1. “For spirit possession to exist in a society there must be . . . a belief that the boundaries between the human and spirit realm . . . can be penetrated” by spirits. (Witmer 23)
   4. spirit affliction vs. spirit possession
      1. spirit affliction
         1. With spirit affliction, a spirit (or deity or ancestor) afflicts a person without inhabiting the person. (E.g., causing an illness.)
         2. Spirit affliction is not an altered state of consciousness (a deviation from normal waking consciousness).
      2. spirit possession
         1. With spirit possession, a spirit uses a person’s body as a vehicle. (Witmer 24)
         2. Spirit possession is an altered state of consciousness. (Witmer 23)
      3. In Judaism, spirit affliction and removal of a spirit preceded spirit possession and exorcism. (Witmer 42)
         1. In Aramaic, evil spirits “afflicted”; in Greek, they “took hold of.” The change “suggests a development over time from affliction to possession . . .” (Witmer 46)
         2. Apparently spirit possession “developed during the Second Temple period [539 bc-ad 70] . . . along with the . . . shift from monism to dualism.” (Witmer 34)
   5. evaluations of spirit possession
      1. Possession by evil spirits is negative, and invading spirits are exorcized. (Witmer 24)
      2. Possession by good spirits is positive: it is spirit control, including shamanism and mediumship. (Witmer 26)
         1. Possession may “even be voluntarily initiated . . .” (Witmer 24)
         2. In voodoo, spirits are “powerful allies that offer advice, curing, or magic.” (Witmer 24)
         3. Early Christians were “filled with the Holy Spirit.” [24] But that and charisms such as prophecy, healing, and working miracles are spirit influences, not spirit possession, since the human personality is not shunted aside. (Perhaps speaking in tongues [glossolalia] could be positive possession.) (Witmer 24, 26)
      3. Possession may be rejected, then welcomed. An initial “period of illness or withdrawal . . . may develop into an ability to control the spirits and to exorcize them from others.” (Witmer 25)
         1. This is probably Jesus’ experience in his baptism and temptations. (Witmer 25)
      4. Assessment “as malevolent or benevolent may also depend on . . . the social status of the individual [and] his or her relationship to others in the community—especially those in power . . .” (Witmer 25)
   6. universality
      1. Spirit possession is “virtually universal in human experience . . .” (Witmer 15)
      2. “The characteristics . . . associated with spirit possession across cultures [are] a change in the voice, eyes and behavior of the possessed person.” (Witmer 54)
      3. Belief in good and bad supernatural forces was “common to virtually all non-industrialized cultures . . . and is still evident today. . .” (Witmer 33)
      4. According to Bourguignon (“World Distribution and Patterns of Possession States” 3-32): (Wit­mer 23)
         1. 92% of societies have altered states of consciousness.
         2. 52% of the 92% have spirit possession.
      5. In the ancient world, belief in curses and spells crossed social classes. (Witmer 24)
         1. “Throughout the ancient world, . . . supernatural forces . . . could bring about both good and evil . . .” (Witmer 33)
         2. From the ancient Near East, we have many “curse tablets, binding spells and incantation bowls . . . both for curses and for protection . . .” (Witmer 23)
2. **exorcism**
   1. definition
      1. To exorcize (Greek *exorkizō*) is to drive out (expel) an evil spirit. (Parrinder “Exorcism” 3.225) (Witmer 26)
      2. Exorcism is “the battle between the cosmic forces of good and evil fought in the human body.” (Witmer 26)
   2. literary form
      1. description of the condition
      2. recognition by the demon of the exorcist
      3. address by the exorcist to the demon
         1. negotiating or forcing information from the spirit: its name, its character, how many there are, how it can be expelled
         2. request or command for the spirit to leave
         3. a spell or incantation, often with a deity’s name
      4. ritual
         1. “The use of herbs, oil, mud, roots, smoke, salt, water, strong smells or sounds [e.g. music], or magical words . . . [are] effective against evil spirits cross-culturally.” (Parrinder “Exorcism” 230-33) (Witmer 26 n 22)
      5. request or command for a sign proving the spirit’s departure
      6. audience’s response
      7. Not all of these components are in all accounts. (Witmer 26)
3. **marginality**
   1. possession and marginality
      1. Anthropology links spirit possession “with social and political oppression.” (Witmer 15)
         1. Anthropology links “marginal ethnic, religious or gender status and spirit possession.” (Witmer 176)
         2. “. . . ecstatic phenomena are often experienced among socially peripheral, dispossessed or deprived groups . . .” (Witmer 59)
      2. “. . . those on the margins of society are in a better position to comment on, question, challenge, or otherwise engage with the issues of the dominant culture than those more centrally situated. Spirit possession can offer an alternative voice to these people, allowing them to express dissent or critique, while still maintaining their position within the society.” (Witmer 176)
   2. boundaries
      1. “. . . pollution and danger are associated with crossing cultural and religious boundaries.” (Witmer 28)
      2. A group’s “position within the larger society plays an important role in determining the way it constructs boundaries in relation to that society. The less secure a group feels, the more defined its boundaries will be, and the more the “other” will be viewed as dangerous.” (Witmer 35)
      3. Some societies have “few social constraints and [much] individual autonomy, as in contemporary North American Society.” (Witmer 29)
      4. Societies with strict rules have these characteristics. (Witmer 28)
         1. strong “cultural, religious and social boundaries . . .” (Witmer 28)
         2. “Socialization for conformity.” (Witmer 29)
         3. “A highly structured and stratified society with clearly defined social roles.” (Witmer 29)
         4. “Subordination of the personal to the public.” (Witmer 29)
         5. “A dualistic belief system that includes the assertion that the cosmos is made up of both malevolent and benevolent forces.” (Witmer 29)
         6. “The view that sin involves ritual or social transgression rather than personal intention.” (Witmer 29)
         7. “A negative assessment of loss of control [in] spirit possession.” (Witmer 29)
   3. society symbolized by the body
      1. “. . . dangers thought to be present in the larger society are reproduced in the human body on a smaller scale . . .” (Douglas *Purity and Danger* 114-39) (Witmer 28)
      2. Douglas (*Purity and Danger* 121): “Any structure of ideas is vulnerable at its margins. We should expect the orifices of the body to symbolize its especially vulnerable points.” (Qtd. in Witmer 28)
      3. “. . . cultural, religious and social boundaries . . . are reflected in a view of the inside of the body as positive, but vulnerable to attack from outside forces and [requiring] the body’s orifices to be carefully guarded from external invasion.” (Witmer 28)
      4. purity regulations
         1. In the Old Testament, skin diseases and bodily fluids are dangerous. (Lev 13-14) (Witmer 28 n 34)
         2. In the gospels, leprosy makes one unclean. (Wit­mer 28 n 34)
            1. Mark 1:40-42 (//Matt 8:1-3), “A leper . . . said to him, “If you choose, you can make me clean.” 41 Moved with pity, Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, and said to him, “I do choose. Be made clean!” 42 Immediately the leprosy left him, and he was made clean.”
            2. “Declaring a person clean who had previously been in the social category of [146] unclean enabled that person to participate fully in the life of the community.” (Witmer 146-47)
         3. “In first-century Jewish Galilee, purity regulations [28] [were a] boundary that distinguished between those “outside” and those “inside” . . .” (Witmer 28-29)
      5. possession and exorcism
         1. “Persons or groups at the periphery [of a larger society] may feel . . . freer to hold and express views not accepted at the center.” (Douglas *Natural Symbols* 83-84) (Witmer 30)
         2. Douglas (*Natural Symbols* 82): “the leaders of an occupied but still resisting nation [cannot] adopt an effervescent [i.e. ecstatic] form of religion. To expect them to stop preaching a stern sexual morality [and] vigilant control of bodily boundaries . . . would be asking them to give up the political struggle.” (Witmer 29)
         3. “. . . Jesus’ work at the periphery of society, precisely where the Jews felt the least secure in relation to Roman power, may have brought resistance from the Jewish leadership because . . . his words and activities threatened their already tenuous position.” (Witmer 30)
            1. John 11:47-48, “What are we to do? This man is performing many signs. 48 If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and the Romans will come and destroy both our holy place and our nation.”
4. **women**
   1. “. . . possession is more common among women cross-culturally . . .” (Witmer 199)
   2. Possession “is typically connected with issues such as arranged marriage, patriarchy and fertility.” (Witmer 199)
   3. In Sri Lanka, possession is usually associated with “rigid socialization, particularly of girls, and the widespread existence of hysteria, anorexia and hypochondriacal tendencies and the somatization of conflicts.” (Obeyesekere “Psychocultural Exegesis” 243-45) (Witmer 199 n 220)
   4. “. . . healings through surrogates (usually female relatives of the person who is ill) are found across cultures.” (Witmer 54)
      1. Mark 7:24-30 (//Matt 15:21-28), Syrophoenician girl’s mother intervenes.
      2. Mark 9:14-27 (//Matt 17:14-21//Luke 9:37-43), epileptic boy’s father intervenes.
      3. In Taiwan, surrogates (usually female relatives) bring cases of illness to indigenous healers 25% of the time. (Kleinman *Patients and Healers* 226-27) (Witmer 53 n 169)

Palestinian society, 37 bc-ad 66

1. **upper class** (0.5% to 5%)
   1. An elite, usually in cities, controlled the surrounding land “and received most of its profits. . . . a few men owned the majority of land . . .” [63] E.g., six landlords owned half of Africa. (Pliny *Nat*. 18.35) (Witmer 63, 63 n 9)
   2. patron and client
      1. “Patrons, usually wealthy landowners, [offered benefits to] tenants, debtors or slaves [65] . . . in the form of cancellation of debts or other kinds of gifts . . .” (Witmer 65-66)
      2. The patron received in return “public honor and acknowledgment of his generosity, as well as loyalty and service.” (Witmer 66)
      3. Augustus and client kings (like Herod the Great) had a patron-client relationship. (Wit­mer 65 n 20)
2. **middle class** (0%)
   1. There was no middle class. (Witmer 63)
3. **lower class** (95% to 99.5%)
   1. Infant mortality was 25%. [64 n 13] Life expectancy was 45-50. (Witmer 64 n 13, 65)
   2. The lower class consisted of the relatively poor and the absolute poor. (Witmer 63 n 11)
      1. relatively poor
         1. Bengt Holmberg (*Sociology and the NT* 53) thinks “artisans, tax collectors and fishermen” were relatively poor. (Witmer 64 n 14)
         2. free peasants and tenant farmers
            1. “Galilean villagers were made up of a combination of those who were poor but still owned their own land (free peasants), and tenant farmers who worked land owned by others.” (Witmer 71)
            2. In Galilee, the average cultivated land was 6-16 acres, “barely enough to sustain a family” of five. (Witmer 71-72)
      2. absolute poor
         1. The absolute poor “were unable to provide the most basic necessities for themselves.” (Witmer 63 n 11)
         2. Stegemann and Stegemann (*Jesus Movement* 134-35) think fishermen were absolutely poor. (Witmer 64 n 14)
         3. The absolute poor included “itinerant and local beggars (especially the disabled and chronically ill), day laborers, runaway slaves, poor peasants and tenants, as well as widows who were not able to remarry or return to their natal home.” (Stegemann and Stegemann 92-94) (Witmer 63 n 11)
   3. freemen and slaves
      1. Many freemen “were landless and poor . . .” (Witmer 64)
      2. Many slaves “had higher status and more security . . .” (Witmer 64)
         1. This was “a result of being part of a household and being looked after by his or her master.” (Stegemann and Stegemann 86-87) (Witmer 64)
         2. Pliny (*Nat*. 33.135) “refers to wealthy liberated slaves.” (Witmer 64 n 15)
4. **taxes**
   1. amount of annual taxes
      1. Nolan and Lenski (*Human Societies* 155) estimate “that in agrarian societies the tax is set at around one-half of the value of the goods produced.” (Witmer 74 n 68)
      2. The Tosefta (*t*. *B*. *Meṣia* 9:13) “reports that tenant farmers kept about one half of what they produced . . .” (Witmer 74 n 68)
   2. disproportionate taxes
      1. “Since Italy was exempt from taxes on property or persons, there was an increased tax burden on the remainder of the empire.” (Witmer 75 n 69)
      2. “. . . people living in Rome received regular distributions brought in to the city from North Africa and Egypt to fend off starvation and revolt. . . . Roman rulers were not as concerned about revolt outside of Rome.” (Stegemann and Stegemann 51-52) (Witmer 75)
   3. forms of tax
      1. “. . . tariffs collected at border points and entrances to cities . . . had a greater impact on those operating on a smaller scale.” (Witmer 71)
      2. Poll (head) taxes were levied on males 14-65 and females 12-65.
      3. Land was taxed.
      4. Produce was taxed.
      5. Locals also had to feed and shelter Roman soldiers. (Witmer 75)
         1. Luke 3:14, “Soldiers also asked him, “And we, what should we do?” He said to them, “Do not extort money from anyone by threats or false accusation, and be satisfied with your wages.””
      6. Judeans and Galileans “paid a temple tax of two denarii . . .” (Witmer 75)
   4. If a family had a bad year and borrowed money, “it could be challenging for them to get out of debt. If they experienced a second bad year, loans could be called in and they could lose their land and become tenants, or be sold into slavery . . .” (Witmer 72)
5. **urban vs**. **rural**
   1. “. . . cities controlled the rural areas [and lived off] taxes and rents derived from the surrounding lands.” (Witmer 66)
   2. “. . . the relationship between cities and the rural areas surrounding them was based on the exploitation of the resources of the rural poor by the urban elite, and was therefore parasitic . . . wealth generally benefited only a small percentage of the population . . .” (Witmer 62)
   3. The cities “reflected broader shifts that were occurring across the area from a traditional form of economics based on kinship to a redistributive economy.” (Witmer 67)
   4. “. . . during the Hellenistic and Herodian periods a demographic shift occurred in Palestine away from isolated family-run farms to living quarters in villages that were part of a courtyard, from extended family units to single nuclear families, and from small, family-run farms to larger estates worked by tenants, often under absentee landlords. . . . more and more families became landless.” (Witmer 73)
   5. “. . . loss of land compelled many to earn their living as day laborers, tenant farmers, beggars or bandits.” (Witmer 73)
   6. “. . . urban and rural, wealthy and poor, and gentile and Jew . . . overlapped to a large degree . . .” (Witmer 68)
   7. in Galilee
      1. In Galilee, “exploitation was mitigated somewhat by the smaller size of Galilean cities . . .” (Witmer 66)
      2. The Galilean cities were Tiberias and Sepphoris, each with about 10,000 residents. (Witmer 66)
         1. Herod Antipas rebuilt Sepphoris in 4 bc, just 4 miles from Nazareth. (Witmer 67)
            1. Probably its population was mostly Jewish. (Witmer 69)
         2. Antipas built Tiberias in ad 19 as new capital. (Witmer 67)
      3. “. . . social stratification was also present in the smaller towns of Galilee.” (Witmer 69)
      4. Matthew especially “characterizes cities as places which display an unwillingness to repent, while rural areas show more openness to . . . Jesus.” (Witmer 195)
6. **spirit possession and agriculture**
   1. Possession “has been linked particularly with agrarian societies . . .” (Witmer 15)
   2. Possession especially correlates with *complex* agrarian societies. [57] A study of 488 cultures has shown that possession increases with “a shift from traditional agricultural communities and practices to paid employment, a breakdown in kin-based village systems, and political occupation or oppression.” (Bourguignon *Possession* 43-45) (Witmer 57-58)

Galilee under Rome, 37 bc-ad 66

1. **Herod the Great** (**37-4 bc**)
   1. Horsley (*Galilee* 278-79): “The Roman takeover of Palestine [multiplied] the levels of rulers that claimed revenues from the villagers’ crops.” (Qtd. in Witmer 85)
   2. “Herod, like many of his predecessors, [confiscated] large tracts of land from peasants and [gave] it to his supporters and to army veterans.” (Witmer 78)
   3. Resentment of inequality “was exacerbated by Herod’s spending on grandiose projects,” including rebuilding the Temple, building a theater and amphitheater in Jerusalem, renovating Caesarea Maritima, and “several elaborate palaces and fortresses . . .” (Witmer 79)
   4. spirit possession in the temple
      1. In 37 bc, as Herod fought Antigonus for Judea, Herod besieged Jerusalem.
      2. Josephus (*War* 1.347): “The feebler folk, congregating round the temple, indulged in transports of frenzy [spirit possession: *edaimonia*] and fabricated oracular utterances to fit the crisis.” (Qtd. in Witmer 94)
      3. This incident supports “the link between political crisis and the incidence of spirit possession . . .” (Witmer 94)
2. **Herod**’**s three sons**
   1. At Herod’s death in 4 bc, Archelaus got Judea. (But Judea became a province in ad 6.)
   2. Herod Antipas got Galilee and Perea, which he ruled for 43 years (4 bc-ad 39).
   3. Philip got Gaulanitis, Batanaea, Trachonitis, Aranitis, and the area around Panias.
3. **resistance**
   1. “. . . banditry and other forms of resistance were common from at least the mid-first century bce through the Jewish War in these areas.” (Witmer 86)
   2. violent resistance
      1. banditry
         1. Banditry “is a universal phenomenon associated with [peasantry] . . . in transition from kinship-based systems to agrarian economies . . .” (Witmer 87)
         2. “Resistance in the form of banditry was endemic to both Judea and Galilee during the first century . . .” (Witmer 89)
      2. peasant revolts
         1. “. . . widespread revolts in Palestine were limited to 4 bce and 66-67 ce . . .” (Witmer 86)
      3. Some of Jesus’ followers saw armed resistance as the path to bringing in God’s reign . . .” (Witmer 91)
         1. Luke 6:15, “Simon, who was called the Zealot . . .”
         2. Mark 14:47, at Jesus’ arrest, “But one of those who stood near drew his sword and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off his ear.”
   3. non-violent resistance
      1. Resistance included “a language different from those in power (i.e., Hebrew or Aramaic) [and] dressing differently . . .” (Witmer 86)
      2. Jews held “apocalyptic views of a coming transformation of the social order . . .” (Witmer 86)
      3. Scott (*Weapons of the Weak* xvi): non-compliance includes “foot dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, and sabotage.” (Qtd. in Witmer 86)
4. **prophetic and messianic movements**
   1. “Simon of Perea, Athronges the shepherd, Judas of Sepphoris and Judas of Gamala” all “claimed kingship after Herod’s death (4 bce) . . .” (Witmer 91)
   2. Judas of Gamala Judas (aka Judas the Galilean)
      1. Acts 5:37, Gamaliel says, “After him [Theudas,] Judas the Galilean rose up at the time of the census and got people to follow him; he also perished, and all who followed him were scattered.”
      2. After Herod died in 4 bc, Judas led “insurrections throughout Galilee . . .” (Wit­mer 88)
      3. After Archelaus was deposed in ad 6, Judas urged Jews “to resist the census ordered by Quirinius [and] make a bid for independence.” (Wit­mer 91)
         1. Luke 2:1-3, “In those days a decree went out from Emperor Augustus that all the world should be registered. 2 This was the first registration and was taken while Quirinius was governor of Syria. 3 All went to their own towns to be registered.”
         2. The census was “imposed for Roman tax purposes . . .” (“Judas of Galilee”)
      4. Varus brought in 12,000 troops and 2,000 cavalry, which suppressed the rebellions. (Witmer 88 n 150)
   3. Theudas
      1. Acts 5:36, Gamaliel says, “some time ago Theudas rose up, claiming to be somebody, and a number of men, about four hundred, joined him; but he was killed, and all who followed him were dispersed and disappeared.”
      2. Theudas was active from ad 44-46. (Witmer 92)
      3. He “convinced a group of devotees to follow him to the Jordan River, where he planned to part the water . . .” (Witmer 92)
      4. The Romans killed or imprisoned many of his followers, while “Theudas himself was beheaded and his head displayed in Jerusalem.” (Witmer 92)
   4. anonymous Egyptian
      1. An Egyptian (c. ad 56) “promised the masses that if they would follow him to the Mount of Olives, he would cause the walls of Jerusalem to fall down.” (Witmer 92)
         1. Acts 21:38, tribune to Paul, “Then you are not the Egyptian who recently stirred up a revolt and led the four thousand assassins out into the wilderness?”
         2. Acts says the Egyptian had 4,000 followers; Josephus says 30,000. (Witmer 92)
   5. prophets in Felix’s time
      1. ad 52-60: when Felix was procurator, “several other prophets . . . led their followers into the desert under the impression that God would provide “signs of deliverance.”” (Witmer 92)
      2. Felix “executed many of their leaders . . .” (Witmer 92)
   6. John the Baptist
      1. “The crowds he drew [show he was] viewed as a prophet . . .” (Mark 1:2-9; 6:14-16; 11:33b; Luke [Q] 7:26-28; John 1:19-28) (Wit­mer 92)
      2. Herod Antipas viewed him as a threat and executed him. (Matt 11:12-15; Mark 11:27b-33) (Witmer 92)
   7. Joshua ben Hananiah
      1. In ad 62, ben Hananiah “began to utter woes against Jerusalem.” (Witmer 93)
      2. “He was killed during the outbreak of the Jewish War . . .” (Witmer 93)
   8. conclusion
      1. “These movements were in fact deeply rooted in the symbolism of Jewish history. The gathering of the Israelites in the wilderness, the crossing of the Jordan River . . ., and the crumbling of the walls of Jericho . . . are linked with the Israelites’ defeat of their political enemies.” (Witmer 94)
         1. “This is also paralleled by Jesus riding into Jerusalem at Passover and deliberately recalling Zech 9:9.” (Witmer 94 n 186)
         2. Zech 9:9b, “Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on a donkey, on a colt, the foal of a donkey.”
      2. “This was not lost on the Roman authorities, who recognized these movements for what they were and quickly stamped them out.” (Witmer 94)

exorcisms in Judaism

1. **possession in the OT**
   1. prophecy and healing
      1. “The link between prophets and healing [goes back to] Moses . . .” (Witmer 51 n 153)
         1. Moses “builds a bronze serpent in Num 21:1-9 to heal those Israelites who had been bitten by poisonous snakes.” (Witmer 51 n 153)
      2. Elijah and Elisha “performed healings and resuscitations . . .” (Witmer 51 n 153)
         1. Elijah: 1 Kgs 17:17-22
         2. Elisha: 2 Kgs 4:32-34; 2 Kgs 5:1-14
      3. “. . . miracles in the Jewish world often served as confirmation of a prophetic call or mission . . .” (Kolenkow “Miracle and Prophecy” 1470-1506) (Witmer 51 n 153)
         1. Moses and Aaron “do signs in Exod 7 . . .” (Witmer 51 n 153)
         2. Elisha suggests “that his healing of Naaman the Syrian would confirm that “there is a prophet in Israel”” (2 Kgs 5:8). (Witmer 51 n 153)
      4. “Two aspects of Israelite prophecy are especially relevant for our study: its ecstatic nature, and the relationship between its emergence and the formation of Israel as a state and its development as an agrarian society.” (Witmer 55)
   2. prophecy and ecstaticism
      1. charismatic vs. ecstatic prophecy
         1. charismatic prophecy: “prophets are chosen because of particular gifts (including charisma, a personal call, and a religious message) which are recognized and supported by others in the society . . .” (Witmer 55 n 175)
         2. ecstatic prophecy: “spirit possession or trance . . .” (Witmer 55)
      2. Certain expressions indicate that prophets experienced spirit possession. (Witmer 56)
         1. “the word which I saw” (Amos 1:1)
         2. “the word which came/was to me” (Joel 1:1; Hos 1:1; Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1)
         3. “the spirit entered into me” (Ezek 2:2; 3:24)
         4. “the hand of the Lord fell upon me” (Ezek 1:3; 3:13, 22; 8:1; 33:22; 37:1; 40:1; Isa 8:11; 1 Kgs 18:46; 2 Kgs 3:15; Jer 15:17)
         5. “the spirit lifted me up” (Ezek 8:3; 11:1, 24; 43:5)
         6. “the heavens were opened and I saw visions of God” (Ezek 1:1)
      3. visions
         1. Isa 6; Jer 1:13-15; Amos 7:1-9; 8:1-6; 9:1-4; Mic 1:1
         2. “Visions need not necessarily imply spirit possession.” But most “who reported visions also appear to have experienced some kind of ecstatic trance.” (Witmer 56)
            1. Jer 1-4; Amos 7, 8, 9
         3. Ezekiel
            1. Three visions “utilize language associated with ecstatic trance . . .” (Witmer 56)

Ezek 1:1, “the heavens were opened and I saw visions of God.”

Ezek 8:1-4, “the hand of the Lord God fell upon me there. . . . 3 and the spirit lifted me up between earth and heaven, and brought me in visions of God to Jerusalem . . . 4 And the glory of the God of Israel was there, like the vision that I had seen in the valley.”

Ezek 37:1, “The hand of the Lord came upon me, and he brought me out by the spirit of the Lord and set me down in the middle of a valley; it was full of bones.”

* + - * 1. Ezekiel experienced spirit travels. (Ezek 1; 2:1-3; 3:12-15; 37) (Witmer 56)
    1. terms for prophets
       1. *nabi* (נָבִיא): this “is often associated with behavior that is trance-like, and in fact is at times used to compare prophets to madmen or drunks.” (1 Sam 18:10-11; 2 Kgs 9:11; Hos 9:7; Jer 23:9; 29:26) (Witmer 56)
       2. *Ro*’*eh* (“also suggestive of trance or spirit possession”) is only appied to Samuel (1 Sam 9:9-11) and “those associated with Belaam.” (Witmer 57)
          1. “In 1 Sam 19:18-24 Saul experiences another trance which results in him lying naked and unable to move for a day and a half.” (Witmer 57 n 189)
       3. *Hoseh* (“also suggestive of trance or spirit possession”) means “seer” or “visionary.” (Witmer 57)
    2. voluntary and involuntary trance
       1. voluntarily initiated: in 2 Kgs 3:15-20, Elisha “asks for a musician to facilitate a trance . . .” (Witmer 57)
       2. involuntarily induced: in 1 Sam 10, Saul “falls into a trance . . . when he encounters a band of prophets playing musical instruments . . .” (Witmer 57)
    3. sons of the prophets
       1. 1 Sam 9:9; 1 Kgs 20:35; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7, 15; 4:1, 38; 5:22; 5:1; 9:1
       2. “Sons of the prophets” means “bands of prophets.” (Witmer 59 n 196)
       3. social critique
          1. “The role of these groups was often to critique the wealthy aristocracy, especially their exploitation of the poor . . ., “those least equipped to survive the transition from a traditional way of life . . .”” (Blenkinsopp *History of Prophecy* 5) (Witmer 59)
          2. examples (Witmer 59)

Samuel 1 Sam 8:11-18; 9:9

Elijah (opposed Ahab) 1 Kgs 18-19, 21 (Naboth’s vineyard)

false prophets 1 Kgs 22:10-12 (enter trance and prophesy victory)

Elisha (opposed Ahab) 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 15; 9-10

Isaiah Isa 3:15-25

Amos Amos 2:6-8; 3:15; 4:1-3; 6:1-7; 9:8-14

Jeremiah (opposed Jehoiachim) Jer 28; 36; 38

* + - 1. ecstaticism
         1. “. . . the prophetic guilds led by Samuel, Elijah and Elisha were situated in the lower socio-economic stratum.” (2 Kgs 4:1-7, 38-41) (Wit­mer 59)
  1. Tobit (200-100 bc)
     1. A young woman, Sarah, “is plagued by the demon Asmodeus, who has killed each of her previous seven husbands on their wedding night before the marriages could be consummated. In response to Sarah’s prayers, God sends the angel Raphael to help.” Raphael travels with young Tobias to Sarah’s house, instructing him “to remove the organs (gall, heart and liver) of a large fish . . . [Tobias marries Sarah, then] uses the smoke from the burning heart and liver to repel the demon on their wedding night. As a result Asmodeus flees to the remotest parts of Egypt where he is pursued by Raphael and bound hand and foot.” (Witmer 44)
     2. Tobit is “the earliest case of something that is close to spirit possession in Jewish texts.” (Witmer 45)
     3. Tobit is also the only “encounter with an evil spirit during this period outside of the New [44] Testament Gospels where a demon is named.” (Witmer 44-45)
     4. “Note the connection between demons and that which is foreign or “other,” in this case, Egypt.” (Witmer 44)
        1. “. . . unclean is linked with “other” . . .” (Witmer 49)
        2. Mastema (*Jub*. 48:17) and Beliar (*T*. *Jos*. 20:2) are associated with Egypt. (Witmer 111)
        3. “. . . removal of a demon to an appropriate location [is] a common means of dealing with demons . . .” (Smith “Towards Interpreting” 428-29) (Witmer 44 n 111)
     5. an exorcism?
        1. “. . . rituals are followed” (smoke to repel, binding to disable). (Witmer 44)
           1. “The use of herbs, oil, mud, roots, smoke [as in Tobit], salt, water, strong smells or sounds, or magical words thought to possess special powers to draw out the spirits, are understood to be effective against evil spirits cross-culturally.” (Parrinder “Exorcism” 230-33) (Witmer 26 n 22)
           2. Fumigation is also “a treatment for demons.” (*T*. *Sol*. 5:9; 4Q197 4.1.13) (Witmer 44 n 112)
     6. not an exorcism?
        1. The text does not say anyone was possessed by Asmodeus. (Witmer 44)
        2. No direct address or command is recorded. (Witmer 44)
           1. Only after ad 1 do we see “first-hand accounts of exorcism that involve a direct verbal encounter between the exorcist and possessing spirit.” (Witmer 45)
           2. Perhaps “treatments for exorcism evolved over time, with direct commands coming later, around the first century ce . . .” (Witmer 44 n 112)

1. **modified dualism in intertestamental literature**
   1. Jews lived under Persian domination from 539-332 bc.
      1. The Persian religion was Zoroastrianism. Zoroastrians believed in absolute dualism: a good god (Ahura Mazda) and an evil god (Ahriman) are both omnipotent and locked in eternal battle. Humans’ moral decisions influence which side is winning.
      2. Zoroastrianism influenced Judaism, which developed a modified dualism: God is the only deity, but Satan is very powerful.
   2. Jews lived under Greek domination from 332-63 bc.
      1. Brenk (“In the Light of the Moon” 2088-91) attributes the shift from absolute monotheism to modified dualism “at least partly to Plato’s ideas, which increasingly link demons [*daimonia*, both good and bad] with the human soul.” (Witmer 34 n 60)
   3. William F. Albright (*From the Stone Age to Christianity* 279): “modified dualism . . . offers a simpler and more intelligent solution of the problem of evil than any other ever proposed.”
   4. With the shift from monotheism to modified dualism, “The notion that evil spirits might take possession of human beings appears to have developed during the Second Temple period . . .” (Witmer 34)
      1. example: in Gen 22, God causes Abraham to almost sacrifice Isaac.
         1. But in *Jubilees* (c. 150 bc, 17.16), Mastema, leader of the demons, is responsible (though he acts under God’s orders). (Witmer 34 n 60)
      2. example: in Exodus, God hardens Pharaoh’s heart and kills the first-born sons.
         1. But in *Jubilees* (49.2), Mastema does these things. (Witmer 34 n 60)
      3. example: in 1 Sam 16-19, God sends an evil spirit to afflict Saul.
         1. 1 Sam 16:14, “Now the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord tormented him.” See also 16:23, 18:10, 19:9.
         2. But in Josephus (*Ant*. 6.168), the afflicting spirits are “troubling demons,” and David “drives out” the evil spirit. (Witmer 43 n 103)
   5. “Within the dualistic universe of the Second Temple period and within early Christianity, it was Satan who took on the role of the opponent of God.” (Witmer 34)
2. **marginality in intertestamental literature**
   1. The Dead Sea Scrolls and many pseudepigrapha have a “marginal perspective, whereby evil spirits are associated with the religious or political “other.”” (Witmer 36)
   2. Spirit affliction was connected “with political oppression on the ground.” (Witmer 41)
3. **Dead Sea Scrolls**
   1. The *Apocryphal Psalms* (11Q11) refer “to four Psalms, one of them Psalm 91, which contain words of protection against evil spirits.” (Witmer 45)
   2. *4QExorcism* (4Q560 1.1-4, 200-100 bc) “appears to contain a direct encounter between exorcist and demon and so provides tentative evidence of both spirit possession and exorcism . . .” (Witmer 45)
4. **NT exorcisms outside the gospels**
   1. Only two exorcisms occur in the NT outside of the gospels.
   2. Acts 16:16-18, “One day, as we were going to the place of prayer, we met a slave-girl who had a spirit of divination and brought her owners a great deal of money by fortune-telling. 17 While she followed Paul and us, she would cry out, “These men are slaves of the Most High God, who proclaim to you a way of salvation.” 18 She kept doing this for many days. But Paul, very much annoyed, turned and said to the spirit, “I order you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.” And it came out that very hour.”
   3. Acts 19:13-19, “Then some itinerant Jewish exorcists tried to use the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits, saying, “I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul proclaims.” 14 Seven sons of a Jewish high priest named Sceva were doing this. 15 But the evil spirit said to them in reply, “Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are you?” 16 Then the man with the evil spirit leaped on them, mastered them all, and so overpowered them that they fled out of the house naked and wounded. 17 When this became known to all residents of Ephesus, both Jews and Greeks, everyone was awestruck; and the name of the Lord Jesus was praised. 18 Also many of those who became believers confessed and disclosed their practices. 19 A number of those who practiced magic collected their books and burned them publicly; when the value of these books was calculated, it was found to come to fifty thousand silver coins.”
5. **Josephus**
   1. Josephus recounts an exorcism (*Ant*. 8.45-48) that is “the only extant account of exorcism found in Jewish literature of the first century . . .” (Witmer 45)
   2. Josephus (*Ant*. 8.45-48): “I have seen a certain Eleazar, a countryman of mine, in the presence of Vespasian, his sons, tribunes and a number of other soldiers, free men possessed by demons and this was the manner of the cure: he put to the nose of the possessed man a ring which had under its seal one of the roots prescribed by Solomon, and [45] then, as the man smelled it, drew out the demon through his nostrils, and when the man at once fell down, adjured the demon never to come back into him, speaking Solomon’s name and reciting the incantations which he had composed. Then, wishing to convince the bystanders and prove to them that he had this power, Eleazar placed a cup or foot-basin full of water a little way off and commanded the demon, as it went out of the man, to overturn it and make known to the spectators that he had left the man.” (Qtd. in Witmer 45-46)
   3. Jesus does not use “aids in his exorcisms, either smoke, roots or magic rings.” (Witmer 46)
6. **rabbinic literature**
   1. Hanina ben Dosa (c. ad 1-100)
      1. Hanina was from Arav (10 miles north of Nazareth). He was a pupil of Johanan ben Zakkai.
      2. Hanina did miracles among “the rural peasant population of Galilee . . .” (Witmer 51)
         1. immunity to poisonous snakebites
         2. foreknowledge of how illnesses would end
         3. healing at a distance
      3. But “no exorcisms are associated with him.” (Witmer 52)

exorcisms in Greece and Rome

1. **spirit beliefs**
   1. *Daimonia* (δαιμόνια) could be good: they could be “muses who inspired creativity in writers or artists or prophetic utterances.” (Witmer 34)
   2. But Greco-Roman texts also associate “evil with what is marginal . . .” (Witmer 30)
2. **wandering charismatics**
   1. Several cynics were wandering charismatics in Syria and Palestine. (Wit­mer 50)
      1. Gadara, “a day’s walk from Nazareth” (5-6 mi SE of the Sea of Galilee), was “a centre of cynic philosophy.” (“Cynicism,” *Wikipedia*)
      2. (Nazareth is 18.6 miles from the Sea of Galilee; Gadara is 5-6 miles southeast of the Sea of Galilee.)
         1. Menippus (200s bc) (born in Gadara; lived in Thebes, Greece)
         2. Meleager (fl. 90s bc) (born in Gadara, grew up in Tyre, lived on Cos)
         3. Oenomaus (ad 100s) (born in Gadara)
      3. Peregrinus Proteus (ad 95-165) (c. 120-40, an Ebionite Christian in Pella, Macedonia)
      4. Only Peregrinus is known to have performed an exorcism. (Lucian of Samosata *The Passing of Peregrinus* 10-11) (Witmer 50)

1. **Apollonius of Tyana** (c. ad 30-98)
   1. Apollonius was an itinerant neo-Pythagorean philosopher who “performed both healings and exorcisms.” (Witmer 52)
   2. Philostratus (c. 170-c. 247), in *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (c. 217), describes two exorcisms. (Witmer 52)
   3. first exorcism
      1. Apollonius, speaking in Athens, is interrupted by a young man laughing and shouting. Apollonius surmises that the youth has a demon. (Witmer 54)
      2. Philostratus (*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 4.20): “When Apollonius looked at the spirit, it uttered sounds of fear and fury such as people being burned alive or tortured do, and it swore to keep away from the youth and not to enter into any human. But Apollonius spoke to it as an angry householder does to a slave who is wily, crafty, shameless, and so on, and told it to give a proof of its departure. It replied, “I will knock that statue over,” indicating one of the statues around the Royal Columnade, where all this was taking place. When the statue first moved slightly, then fell, the outcry at this and the way people clapped in amazement were past description. The youth, as if waking up, rubbed his eyes, looked at the sun’s beams, and won the respect of all the people gazing at him. From then on he no longer seemed dissolute, or had an unsteady gaze, but returned to his own nature no worse off than if he had taken a course of medicine. He got rid of his capes, cloaks and other fripperies, and fell in love with deprivation and the philosopher’s cloak, and stripped down to Apollonius’s style.” (Qtd. in Witmer 54)
      3. Instead of ordering the demon to leave, Apollonius’ gaze frightens it into leaving. (Wit­mer 54)
      4. Apollonius’ demand for proof (tipping over the statue)
         1. This “is somewhat similar to the request by the demons in Mark 5:12 to be sent into the pigs . . .” (Witmer 55)
         2. It is even more like Eleazar’s request (Josephus *Ant*. 8.45-48) that the demon tip over a basin of water. (Wit­mer 55)
      5. crowds’ response
         1. As in Jesus’ exorcisms, the crowd is amazed. (Witmer 55)
         2. But by comparsion “the response of the crowds in the Gospels seems almost subdued.” (Witmer 55)
      6. the youth
         1. The youth takes up Apollonius’ lifestyle, that of a wandering sage. (Witmer 55)
         2. Similarly, the Gerasene demoniac asks to follow Jesus. (Witmer 55)
            1. Mark 5:18, “As he was getting into the boat, the man who had been possessed by demons begged him that he might be with him.”
   4. second exorcism
      1. Philostratus (*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 4.38) relates how Apollonius, while traveling in India, is approached by the mother of a sixteen-year-old boy. She says “that her son has become possessed by the spirit of a dead soldier which often drives the boy into desert places and tries to injure him. The mother is concerned for his safety, but has been threatened by the demon not to bring the boy for help lest he throw him off a cliff. Apollonius’ treatment involves handing the woman a letter, addressed to the demon, which he states will prevent the demon from hurting the boy.” Philostratus does not state the letter’s contents, but presumably it contained a threat. (Cotter *Miracles* 84-85) (Witmer 53)
      2. Exorcism through a surrogate precluded directly confronting the demon. (Wit­mer 53)
         1. Twice Jesus heals through a surrogate. (Witmer 53)
            1. Matt 8:5-13//Luke 7:1-10//John 4:46b-54, centurion’s servant
            2. Mark 7:24-30, Syrophoenician girl (an exorcism)
      3. The exorcism is through a letter. (Witmer 54)
         1. In no other exorcism, Greek or Jewish, does a letter remove a demon. (Witmer 54)
      4. “The characteristics of the possessed boy correspond to those associated with spirit possession across cultures: a change in the voice, eyes and behavior of the possessed person.” (Witmer 54)
      5. “The description of the demon as the ghost of a fallen soldier reflects the widespread belief in the ancient world that the spirits of the dead could possess people.” (Janowitz *Magic in the Roman World* 34-35) (Witmer 54)
   5. “There is some question about the originality of some of the healings and exorcisms described in *Life* because of their similarity to some of Jesus’ healings and exorcisms.” (Witmer 53 n 163)
2. **Syrian exorcist** (c. 125-c. 180)
   1. Lucian of Samosata (*Philops*. 16, c. ad 150): some can “free possessed men from their terrors by exorcising the spirits . . . everyone knows about the Syrian from Palestine, the adept in it, how many he takes in hand who fall down in the light of the moon and roll their eyes and fill their mouths with foam; nevertheless, he restores them to health and sends them away normal in mind, delivering them from their straits for a large fee. When he stands beside them as they lie there and asks: ‘Whence came you into his body?’ the patient himself is silent, but the spirit answers in Greek or in the language of whatever foreign country he comes from, telling how and whence he entered into the man; whereupon, by adjuring the spirit and if he does not obey, threatening him, he drives him out. Indeed, I actually saw one coming out, black and smoky in colour.” (Qtd. in Witmer 47)
   2. “. . . requesting information from a demon in order to gain control over it was a common practice . . .” (Witmer 48)
      1. “These questions were typically about origin, name, or the way in which the demon could be controlled.” (Witmer 48)
      2. Once the exorcist has the information, he can remove the spirit. (Witmer 48)
      3. Mark 5:9, “Then Jesus asked him [the Gerasene demoniac], “What is your name?” He replied, “My name is Legion; for we are many.””
3. **Diogenes Laertius** (c. 170-c. 250)
   1. Diogenes Laertius (c. ad 250, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 8.32): “The whole air is full of souls which are called genii [δαιμόνια] or heroes; these are they who send men dreams and signs of future disease and health . . .; and it is to them that purifications and lustrations, all divination, omens and the like, have reference.” (Qtd. in Witmer 34)
4. **summary**
   1. “. . . the three most common elements identified in exorcisms in the Greco-Roman world were: (1) a confrontation between the demon and exorcist in which the exorcist forces the possessing spirit to reveal something about [159] itself; (2) a command to come out; and (3) proof that the spirit has left.” (Witmer 159-60)
   2. “. . . characteristics of exorcisms more generally in Jewish and Greco-Roman literature of the period . . . [include] a command to come out, a struggle, and the amazement of the crowd.” (Witmer 184)

JESUS AS AN EXORCIST

Jesus was an exorcist

1. **criteria of authenticity**
   1. “Evidence of a belief in malevolent spirit possession and of Jesus’ role as an exorcist are attested in multiple forms (sayings, narratives and controversies) . . .” (Witmer 17)
   2. Beliefs in spirit possession and in Jesus as exorcist are found in “multiple independent sources (Mark, Q, M, L) . . .” (Witmer 17)
   3. Also, “there is coherence in the Gospel accounts between first-hand reports of exorcisms and other traditions that refer to them indirectly.” (Witmer 17)
   4. “We can, therefore, be fairly certain that exorcism and healing belong to the earliest traditions about Jesus.” (Witmer 17)
2. **Jesus as prophet**
   1. Jesus “was identified by the synoptic writers and likely identified himself with the prophetic tradition.” (Witmer 55)
      1. Mark 6:4-5, “Jesus said to them, “Prophets are not without honor, except in their hometown . . .” 5 And he could do no deed of power there . . .”
      2. Mark 6:14-16, “King Herod heard of it, for Jesus' name had become known. Some were saying, “John the baptizer has been raised from the dead; and for this reason these powers are at work in him.” 15 But others said, “It is Elijah.” And others said, “It is a prophet, like one of the prophets of old.” 16 But when Herod heard of it, he said, “John, whom I beheaded, has been raised.”
      3. Luke 4:24, “And he said, “Truly I tell you, no prophet is accepted in the prophet’s hometown.”
      4. Matt 11:7-14; 21:11; Luke 7:24-30; 13:33; John 4:9
   2. “More importantly, some of Jesus’ own experiences parallel the ecstatic experiences of Israelite prophets as well as those of healers and visionaries across cultures.” (Witmer 55)
      1. Jesus may have “experienced involuntary trance or spirit possession at his call during his baptism and trials, and his ability to heal and exorcize demons [may have been] linked to this initial experience of spirit possession.” (Witmer 57)
   3. Jesus’ role as a prophet “was linked with his ability to heal and exorcize demons . . .” (Witmer 102)
      1. The “identification of Jesus with Elijah and Elisha in Luke 4:24-27, who themselves functioned as both prophets and healers, further strengthens the association between his role as prophet and that of healer.” (Witmer 102)
      2. Luke 4:25-27, “there were many widows in Israel in the time of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, and there was a severe famine over all the land; 26 yet Elijah was sent to none of them except to a widow at Zarephath in Sidon. 27 There were also many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha, and none of them was cleansed except Naaman the Syrian.””
3. **terms for possessing spirits**
   1. “Three terms are generally used in the four strands of tradition that refer to exorcism (Mark, Q, L and M) to describe possessing entities: “unclean spirit” (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον), “demon” (δαιμόνιον), and “evil demon” (δαιμόνιον πονήρον).” (Witmer 153)
   2. “. . . Mark shows a preference for “unclean spirit,” using it in every account of exorcism . . .” (Witmer 153)
   3. Q uses “both “unclean spirit” and “demon,” and Matthew and Luke make use of both terms, but show a preference for “demon.” (Witmer 153)
   4. “Matthew and Luke use “unclean spirit” and “demon” interchangeably . . . . . . but Matthew especially prefers demon.” (Witmer 153 n 10)

Jesus’ exorcisms

1. **number of Jesus**’ **exorcisms**
   1. Jesus’ 6 exorcisms (Wilkinson 66-68)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *exorcism* | *citations* | *disease* | *initiator* | *witnesses* | *motive* | *method* |
| Capernaum  demoniac | Mark 1:21-28; Luke 4:31-37 | major  epilepsy | the sick | crowd |  | command |
| Gerasene  demoniac | Matt 8:28-34 (2 Gad­arene demoniacs); Mark 5:1-20; Luke 8:26-39 | acut  mania | the sick | disciples; swineherds |  | command |
| Syrophoen­ician girl | Matt 15:21-28 (Canaanite girl); Mark 7:24-30 | no  symptoms | mother | at a distance: no witnesses | request for mercy; faith | at a  distance |
| epileptic boy | Matt 17:14-21; Mark 9:14-29; Luke 9:37-43a | major  epilepsy | father | disciples; crowd; scribes | request for mercy; faith | command |
| mute  demoniac | Matt 9:32-34; Matt 12:22-24 (blind and mute); Luke 11:14-16 | mutism | unknown | crowds; Pharisees |  | command? |
| Mary  Magdelene | Mark 16:9; Luke 8:2 | no  symptoms | unknown | none mentioned |  |  |

* 1. Jesus’ 4 exorcisms (Witmer 151)
     1. Witmer does not count the mute demoniac or Mary Magdalene as exorcisms.
        1. Q had the exorcism of a mute demoniac (Matt 12:22-24; Luke 11:14-16). From it Matthew created another exorcism (Matt 9:32-34). (Witmer 179 n 140)
        2. Mark and Luke refer to, but do not narrate, the exorcism of Mary Magdalene’s 7 demons.
     2. “All four of the exorcisms . . . are attested in Mark . . .” (Witmer 151)
        1. Matthew omits the Capernaum demoniac.
        2. Luke omits the Syrophoenician girl.

1. **Capernaum demoniac**
   1. Mark 1:21-28 (//Luke 4:31-37), “They went to Capernaum; and when the sabbath came, he entered the synagogue and taught. 22 They were astounded at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. 23 Just then there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit, 24 and he cried out, “What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God.” 25 But Jesus rebuked him, saying, “Be silent, and come out of him!” 26 And the unclean spirit, convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him. 27 They were all amazed, and they kept on asking one another, “What is this? A new teaching—with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him.” 28 At once his fame began to spread throughout the surrounding region of Galilee.”
   2. “Cry out” “expresses a sense of extreme agitation or [157] fear . . .” (BDAG 66) (Witmer 157-58)
   3. “What do you have to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth?” “is probably intended to function as a defensive strategy on the part of the demon.” (Witmer 158)
   4. “What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth?” The demon “attempts to ward off Jesus by revealing knowledge of his name and relationship to God . . .” (Witmer 159)
   5. “Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are”: this also indicates fear. (Witmer 161)
   6. Jesus’ command has “three aspects . . . Jesus rebukes the demon, and the specific form the rebuke takes is the order to be silent and to come out of the man.” (Witmer 162)
   7. “Convulsing” and “crying out” imply violent struggle. (Witmer 163)
   8. “. . . the negotiation between exorcist and spirit is found in other cultural traditions . . .” (Witmer 164)
   9. If “the possessed man . . . was experiencing some difficulties socially, the role of the spirit would be to express these difficulties . . . The person with the spirit is changed in the process, but so are others who participate through their presence. . . . since the act of exorcism itself draws attention to issues raised by those who are possessed by spirits [165] . . . [opposition will come] from those who do not want social change to occur, generally the social elite.” (Witmer 165-66)
2. **Gerasene demoniac**
   1. Mark 5:1-20 (//Matt 8:28-34; Luke 8:26-39), “They came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gerasenes [Matthew: Gadarenes; some late manuscripts: Gergasenes]. 2 And when he had stepped out of the boat, immediately a man [Matthew: two demoniacs] out of the tombs with an unclean spirit met him. 3 He lived among the tombs; and no one could restrain him any more, even with a chain; 4 for he had often been restrained with shackles and chains, but the chains he wrenched apart, and the shackles he broke in pieces; and no one had the strength to subdue him. 5 Night and day among the tombs and on the mountains he was always howling and bruising himself with stones. 6 When he saw Jesus from a distance, he ran and bowed down [Luke: fell down] before him; 7 and he shouted at the top of his voice, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me.” 8 For he had said to him, “Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!” 9 Then Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” He replied, “My name is Legion; for we are many.” 10 He begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country. [Luke: They begged him not to order them to go back into the abyss.] 11 Now there on the hillside a great herd of swine was feeding; 12 and the unclean spirits begged him, “Send us into the swine; let us enter them.” 13 So he gave them permission. And the unclean spirits came out and entered the swine; and the herd, numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and were drowned in the sea. 14 The swineherds ran off and told it in the city and in the country. Then people came to see what it was that had happened. 15 They came to Jesus and saw the demoniac sitting there, clothed and in his right mind, the very man who had had the legion; and they were afraid. 16 Those who had seen what had happened to the demoniac and to the swine reported it. 17 Then they began to beg Jesus to leave their neighborhood. 18 As he was getting into the boat, the man who had been possessed by demons begged him that he might be with him. 19 But Jesus refused, and said to him, “Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and what mercy he has shown you.” 20 And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him; and everyone was amazed.”
   2. Gerasa vs. Gadara
      1. Gerasa is 33 miles from the Sea of Galilee, so Gerasa is “difficult to reconcile . . . with pigs drowning in the lake.” (Witmer 168)
      2. Gadara was 5-6 miles from the Sea of Galilee. (Witmer 168)
      3. “If the pig incident was added later, the location of Gerasa would only have become a problem at that time, which would explain why Matthew felt it necessary to make the change to Gadara.” (Witmer 168)
   3. bowed down before him
      1. Mark says the demoniac knelt down before Jesus, “which may imply worship . . .” (Witmer 178)
      2. But Luke simply has him fall down in front of Jesus. (Witmer 178)
      3. Maybe Luke “preserves an earlier tradition since Mark’s theological language implies a higher Christology.” (Witmer 178)
      4. The falling down was probably understood as being “overcome by Jesus’ power.” (Witmer 178)
   4. he shouted at the top of his voice
      1. The Capernaum demoniac (Mark 1:23-27) and the epileptic boy (Matt 17:17-18; Mark 9:20) also cry out in a loud voice.
   5. son of the Most High God
      1. Only one other time in the NT is “Most High God” used in relation to spirit possession and exorcism.” (Witmer 180)
         1. Acts 16:16-18, “One day, as we were going to the place of prayer, we met a slave-girl who had a spirit of divination and brought her owners a great deal of money by fortune-telling. 17 While she followed Paul and us, she would cry out, “These men are slaves of the Most High God, who proclaim to you a way of salvation.” 18 She kept doing this for many days. But Paul, very much annoyed, turned and said to the spirit, “I order you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.” And it came out that very hour.”
         2. “Here too the title seems to designate a special relationship with God that endows Paul with power over spirits. It may also be part of the possessing spirit’s attempt to defend itself against Paul by identifying him.” (Witmer 180)
      2. Though many think “son of the Most High God” is non-Jewish, Irina Levinskaya (*Book of Acts* 83-103) notes that its occurrence in the LXX over 110 times “points to a predominantly Jewish” origin. (Witmer 180)
      3. Levinskaya “argues that its use by non-Jews was limited to Judaizing gentiles (God-fearers), which may suggest that Mark’s possessed man and the servant girl Paul encountered in Phillippi are being portrayed as either Jews, God-fearers or proselytes.” (Witmer 180)
      4. “. . . being “the son of the Most High” need not necessarily imply messianic status . . .” (Witmer 180)
      5. But “Son of the Most High” “does indicate a strong connection with the divine, and possibly power over spirits.” (Witmer 180)
   6. two attempts to exorcize
      1. There is “a struggle between Jesus and the invading spirit [that suggests] that Jesus may not have always been immediately successful in his attempts to exorcize unclean spirits.” (Witmer 185)
      2. The chronological order is:
         1. Mark 5:8, Jesus “had said to him, “Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!” (First exorcism attempt.)
         2. Mark 5:7, the demoniac says, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me.”
         3. Mark 5:9, “Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” He replied, “My name is Legion; for we are many.””
         4. Mark 5:13, Jesus “gave them permission. And the unclean spirits came out and entered the swine . . .” (Second exorcism attempt.)
      3. Similarly, in Mark 8:22‑26, Jesus tries twice to heal the blind man of Bethsaida. (Perhaps that is why the episode is not in Matthew and Luke.)
   7. Legion
      1. A Roman legion had about 6000 men. (Witmer 170 n 92)
      2. “It is possible, of course, that Mark’s use of the “Legion” does not refer to the Roman army at all, and is simply intended to describe the large number of demons.” (Witmer 175)
   8. swine
      1. Gerd Theissen (*Gospels in Context* 110): the man is “ruled by a legion of unclean spirits and living in unclean places: in the tombs. Probably he represents the Gentiles as such, since the unclean spirits enter the swine [171] . . . [Here is] the political aspect of the conflict: the demon . . . as “legion” . . . represents a whole army.” (Qtd. in Witmer 171-72)
   9. drowning in the Sea
      1. “. . . that spirits were thought to be afraid of water . . . is suggested by the large number of textual references to demons in desert locations . . .” (Witmer 169)
         1. Lev 16:5-10, “He [Aaron] shall take from the congregation of the people of Israel two male goats for a sin offering . . . 7 He shall take the two goats and set them before the Lord at the entrance of the tent of meeting; 8 and Aaron shall cast lots on the two goats, one lot for the Lord and the other lot for Azazel. 9 Aaron shall present the goat on which the lot fell for the Lord, and offer it as a sin offering; 10 but the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be presented alive before the Lord to make atonement over it, that it may be sent away into the wilderness to Azazel.”
         2. Tob 8:3, “The odor of the fish so repelled the demon that he fled to the remotest parts of Egypt. But Raphael followed him, and at once bound him there hand and foot.”
         3. Luke 11:24-26, “When the unclean spirit has gone out of a person, it wanders through waterless regions looking for a resting place . . .”
         4. In Apollonius of Tyre’s second exorcism (see above), “The demon is also said to drive the boy into desert places.” (Witmer 54)
      2. If water was dangerous to demons, “the descent of the pigs into the lake could suggest either destruction of the spirits [or at least] a disempowering of them.” (Witmer 170)
      3. Or “entering the water would have been seen as evidence of a simple transference of the spirits from one locale to another (from the man to the pigs, and then into the water), rather than destruction of the spirits.” (Witmer 169)
      4. The transference and drowning also demonstrate the cure. (Witmer 170)
      5. “. . . the pigs end up in the same place as Pharaoh’s armies (Exod 14:23-15:5) . . .” (Carter *Matthew and the Margins* 213) (Witmer 173)
      6. The Roman tenth legion, “which bore the standard of the boar, [was] stationed in Syria from 6 ce onwards . . . it also protected the cities on the eastern shore of the lake [including Gadara].” (Witmer 171)
      7. “Assuming Jews would have associated oppressive Roman rule, enforced by troops bearing the symbol of the boar, with pigs, which were viewed as unclean, . . . pigs drowning in the sea would then represent the desire by the locals to see the Roman legions destroyed, whether or not a herd of pigs was actually destroyed historically.” (Witmer 174)
   10. why the crowd asks Jesus to leave
       1. This “is difficult to explain without the drowning of the pigs.” (Witmer 169)
       2. Perhaps they were afraid: the “transfer of the demons to the pigs . . . could indicate that Jesus was . . . an extremely powerful exorcist, and the request to leave would make some sense as a response of fear.” (Witmer 169)
       3. Perhaps they were angry: “One might also imagine that the loss of a herd of swine would not be viewed particularly well by the community . . .” (Witmer 169)
3. **Syrophoen­ician girl**
   1. Mark 7:24-30 (//Matt 15:21-28), “From there he set out and went away to the region of Tyre. He entered a house and did not want anyone to know he was there. Yet he could not escape notice, 25 but a woman whose little daughter had an unclean spirit immediately heard about him, and she came and bowed down at his feet. 26 Now the woman was a Gentile, of Syrophoenician origin. She begged him to cast the demon out of her daughter. 27 He said to her, “Let the children be fed first, for it is not fair to take the children’s food and throw it to the dogs.” 28 But she answered him, “Sir, even the dogs under the table eat the children’s crumbs.” 29 Then he said to her, “For saying that, you may go [for 29a Matthew has: “Woman, great is your faith!”]—the demon has left your daughter.” 30 So she went home, found the child lying on the bed, and the demon gone.”
   2. Meier (*Marginal Jew* 2.651, 659-61) notes that, in form, the story is “a healing at a distance, rather than an exorcism . . .” (Witmer 192 n 177) Healings at a distance:
      1. centurion’s servant (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10)
      2. royal official’s son (John 4:46-54)
   3. The Capernaum and Gerasene demonaics are adults; but the Syrophoen­ician girl and the epileptic boy are children, with a parent intervening. (Witmer 185)
   4. Tyre
      1. The Tyrians “were bitter enemies of the Jews . . .” (Josephus *C*. *Ap*. 1.70) (Witmer 194)
         1. Prejudice against Tyrians “was most certainly reflected in Jesus’ response to the wo­man.” (Theissen *Gospels in Context* 66-80) (Witmer 195)
         2. “. . . during the Jewish War these tensions exploded into the slaughter and imprisonment of Jewish citizens.” (Josephus *War* 2.478) (Witmer 194-95)
      2. “. . . Jesus operated at the margins of Jewish society, both geographically and socially.” (Witmer 201)
   5. the mother
      1. Mark describes the woman as “a Gentile, of Syrophoenician origin.” Matthew describes her as “a Canaanite.”
      2. Mark’s “Greek” and “Syrophoenician” combines “cultural and geographic origins . . . and was a common way of describing people . . .” (Witmer 198)
         1. Acts 4:36, “There was a Levite, a native of Cyprus, Joseph, to whom the apostles gave the name Barnabas . . .”
         2. Acts 18:2, “There he found a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus . . .”
      3. “Matthew’s use of “Canaanite” likely reflects his interest in depicting gentiles as subservient to Jews by evoking the political and religious distance between the early Israelites and their Canaanite neighbors, and may thus indicate a desire to portray the woman in a negative light.” (Witmer 198)
      4. “Based on the double designation of Greek and Syrophoenician, we may surmise that the woman was a Hellenized person with Syrian origins and thus probably from the upper stratum of society, since hellenization was most prominent among this group.” (Witmer 198)
      5. “Upper-stratum status is also suggested by Mark’s use of κλίνη (bed) rather than κράβαττος (a mat made of straw and associated with the poor) for the girl’s bed.” (Witmer 198)
   6. the girl
      1. Other than Mary Magdalene, this is the only possessed female. (Witmer 199)
      2. “Since, according to Danker [BDAG 461], θυγάτριον (“little girl,” v. 25) is a term of endearment and can also be used to refer to a girl of marriageable age, it is possible that the girl was actually a young woman of thirteen to fifteen years, making women’s issues around marriage a possible factor in the spirit possession.” (Witmer 199)
   7. the mother and Jesus’ exchange
      1. “. . . Matthew has expanded the exchange between Jesus and the woman . . . [The additions include] Jesus’ initial refusal to answer the woman, the disciples’ request for Jesus to send the woman away, and a statement by Jesus that he has been sent only to the house of Israel.” (Witmer 197)
         1. Being sent only to Jews suggests Matthean redaction “to emphasize the primary place of the Jews in salvation.” (Witmer 199)
         2. Matthew generally avoids “having Jesus interact with non-Jews and demonstrates a desire to limit Jesus’ mission to Israel.” (Witmer 197)
            1. e.g., Matt 10:5-6, “These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions: “Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, 6 but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.””
         3. Matthew may also “emphasize Jesus’ initial hesitancy to help a gentile in order to highlight his subsequent acceptance of doing so, which Matthew attributes to the woman’s faith and uses to point to the later inclusion of the gentiles in the Jesus movement.” (Witmer 197)
      2. “dogs”
         1. “. . . in the ancient world, dogs were generally viewed with contempt.” (Isa 56:10-11; Ps 58:7-9) (Witmer 200 n 223)
         2. But “Jesus’ comment may simply affirm his own sense of priority; first the children (Jews) should be fed, and then the dogs (gentiles) . . .” (Witmer 200)
      3. Some interpret Jesus’ initial refusal “as a test of faith . . .” (Witmer 192 n 180)
      4. “Some have seen it as a creation of the early Christian community for the purpose of legitimating the gentile mission . . .” (Witmer 192)
      5. Perhaps Jesus “was initially expressing a prejudice toward the woman and refusing to heal her daughter because of the fact that bread (here symbolizing food in general) was literally being taken from Galilee (which was mostly Jewish) and put into the mouths of the inhabitants of Tyre.” (Witmer 200)
      6. “Surprisingly, the woman acknowledges the validity of Jesus’ comment, and provides a witty response . . . Her answer demonstrates both humour and steely determination. While she accepts Jesus’ categories and her inferior status to both Jesus and, by implication, the Jews, she nevertheless persists in her request for healing.” (Witmer 201)
      7. Theissen (*Gospels in Context* 79): “the miracle would not consist in healing someone far away, but in the overcoming of an equally divisive distance, that between nations and cultures, in which the divisive prejudices . . . have a real basis . . .” (Qtd. in Witmer 196)
4. **epileptic boy**
   1. Mark 9:14-27 (//Matt 17:14-21; Luke 9:37-43), “When they came to the disciples, they saw a great crowd around them, and some scribes arguing with them. 15 When the whole crowd saw him, they were immediately overcome with awe, and they ran forward to greet him. 16 He asked them, “What are you arguing about with them?” [Matthew omits Mark 9:14c-27.] 17 Someone from the crowd answered him, “Teacher, I brought you my son; he has a spirit that makes him unable to speak; 18 and whenever it seizes him, it dashes him down; and he foams and grinds his teeth and becomes rigid; and I asked your disciples to cast it out, but they could not do so.” 19 He answered them, “You faithless generation, how much longer must I be among you? How much longer must I put up with you? Bring him to me.” 20 And they brought the boy to him. When the spirit saw him, immediately it convulsed the boy, and he fell on the ground and rolled about, foaming at the mouth. 21 Jesus asked the father, “How long has this been happening to him?” And he said, “From childhood. [Matthew omits Mark 9:19-21.] 22 It has often cast him into the fire and into the water, to destroy him; but if you are able to do anything, have pity on us and help us.” 23 Jesus said to him, “If you are able!—All things can be done for the one who believes.” 24 Immediately the father of the child cried out, “I believe; help my unbelief!” [Matthew omits Mark 9:23-24. Luke omits Mark 9:21-24.] 25 When Jesus saw that a crowd came running together, he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to it, “You spirit that keeps this boy from speaking and hearing, I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again!” 26 After crying out and convulsing him terribly, it came out, and the boy was like a corpse, so that most of them said, “He is dead.” 27 But Jesus took him by the hand and lifted him up, and he was able to stand. 28 When he had entered the house, his disciples asked him privately, “Why could we not cast it out?” [Matthew adds “faith the size of a mustard seed.”] 29 He said to them, “This kind can come out only through prayer.”” [Luke omits Mark 9:28-29.]
   2. Here a demon is clearly associated with illness. (See Witmer 119-20, 146, 151-52 *supra*.) (Witmer 185)
      1. deafness and muteness: Mark 9:17, 25.
         1. Matt 9:32-34 and Matt 12:22 (Beelzebul controversy: blind and mute))//Luke 11:14 (Beelzebul controversy) also link muteness with spirit possession. (Witmer 186)
      2. “possibly epilepsy”: Mark 9:18, 20, 22, 26. (Witmer 185)
         1. “. . . the symptoms of spirit possession and epileptic seizure appear to be conflated.” (Witmer 48)
         2. “This is one of the few cases in the Gospels where the condition described so clearly fits a clinical illness as recognized by Western medicine. . . . [Epilepsy is] a reason­able assumption.” (Witmer 188)
         3. Matthew distinguishes demoniacs and epileptics. (Witmer 189)
            1. Matt 4:24, “they brought to him . . . demoniacs [δαιμονιζομένους], epileptics [σεληνιαζο­μένους], and paralytics . . .”
         4. Matthew attributes epilepsy to demon possession. (Witmer 189)
            1. Matt 17:15, 18, “Lord, have mercy on my son, for he is an epileptic [σεληνιάζεται] . . . 18 And Jesus rebuked the demon [δαιμόνιον] . . .”
      3. “In the other exorcisms and in general summaries of Jesus’ public activities, healings and exorcism are distinguished.” (Witmer 186 n 160)
         1. Matt 8:16-17//Mark 1:32, 34//Luke 4:40-41; Matt 4:24; 12:15-16//Mark 3:10-11//Luke 6:17-19; Matt 10:1//Mark 6:13//Luke 9:1-2; Matt 11:5//Luke 7:21; Luke 13:32 (L); see also Acts 5:16; 8:7; 10:38.
   3. The dispute between some scribes and the crowd implies “that others were also attempting to remove the unclean spirit.” (Witmer 187)
      1. Other Jewish exorcists operated in Galilee. (Witmer 187)
         1. Mark 9:38-41 (//Luke 9:49-50), “John said to him, “Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, and we tried to stop him, because he was not following us.” 39 But Jesus said, “Do not stop him; for no one who does a deed of power in my name will be able soon afterward to speak evil of me.””
         2. Luke 11:19, “if I cast out the demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your exorcists cast them out?”
   4. symptoms of possession
      1. The symptoms occur repeatedly (Mark 9:17-18, 20, 22, 25-26):
      2. muteness (17, 25); deafness (25); crying out (26)
      3. convulsing (20, 26); rigidity (18); foaming mouth (18, 20); grinding teeth (18)
      4. throwing down (18, 20), into fire and water to kill the boy (22); rolling about (20)
      5. Similar symptoms appear in the Capernaum and Gerasene demoniacs.
      6. “In all three cases, Matthew and Luke have generally downplayed the violence.” (Witmer 189)
         1. Perhaps they reduced the demoniacs’ “violence or vulgarity . . . out of fear that it might lead to accusations that Jesus was operating as a magician.” (Witmer 189)
   5. “I command you” (Mark 9:25c, ἐγὼ ἐπιτάσσω σοι)
      1. “I command you” “is known from incantations in the Greek Magical Papyri.” (*PGM* 7.331) (Witmer 190)
   6. “come out of him, and never enter him again!”
      1. “The idea that demons could return even after being exorcized is also assumed . . .” (Witmer 190)
      2. See the returning demon (Matt 12:43-45//Luke 11:24-26).
   7. “healed”
      1. That Matthew (17:18) and Luke (9:42) say the boy was “healed” shows “there was not always a clear distinction in the first-century mind between an exorcism and a healing . . .” (Witmer 190)
   8. “little faith”
      1. In Matthew and Mark “the story concludes with the disciples questioning Jesus about why they were unable to cast the spirit out. While Mark has Jesus emphasize the difficulty of the boy’s case, stating that this type of demon can only be driven out by prayer, Matthew stresses their lack of faith.” (Witmer 191)

references to Jesus as exorcist

1. **introduction**
   1. Some “NT material either refers to Jesus’ exorcisms or suggests he was himself spirit possessed, but . . . does not involve first-hand descriptions of exorcism.” (Witmer 97)
2. **baptism and temptation**
   1. “The careers of many healers and exorcists across cultures begin with trance, spirit possession, or illness, which is followed by a period of trials. During this time, the initiate may learn to control his/her own spirits and, once this has been achieved, he/she is then able to control the spirits of others. Thus, the healer’s ability to exorcize spirits and to heal is directly linked to this initial experience of spirit possession and a period of suffering or the completion of trials.” (Witmer 104)
3. **Beelzebul controversy**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Matt 12:22-37 | Mark 3:20-35 | Luke 11:14-28 |
| *exorcism*: |  |  |
| exorcism of a blind mute | too crowded to eat | exorcism of a mute |
|  | family thinks he is out of his mind |  |
| *accusation*: |  |  |
| he exorcizes by Beelzebul | he has Beelzebul; exorcizes by him | he exorcizes by Beelzebul |
|  |  | demanding a sign from heaven |
| *Jesus*’ *response*: |  |  |
| Jesus knows their thinking |  | Jesus knows their thinking |
| kingdom divided | kingdom divided | kingdom divided |
| by whom do your exorcists …? |  | by whom do your exorcists …? |
| if by the Spirit of God I exorcize |  | if by the finger of God I exorcize |
| strong man’s house | strong man’s house | strong man’s castle |
| not with me is against me |  | not with me is against me |
| unforgiveable sin | unforgiveable sin |  |
|  |  | unclean spirit returns with seven |
| tree and fruit |  |  |
| speaking from good/evil treasure |  |  |
|  | who are mother and brothers? | blessed the womb and breasts |
| Also Matt 10:25, “it is enough for the disciple to be like the teacher, and the slave like the master. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more will they malign those of his household!” | | |
| John has no exorcisms; but in John, Jesus is accused of having a demon in 7:20, 8:48, 8:52, and 10:20. | | |

* 1. “Beelzebul” combines “Baal” (“Lord”; also the name of the Canaanite god of weather) and “zebul” (“prince”). (Witmer 113)
  2. “. . . the connection between exorcism and accusations of demon possession has been confirmed across cultures as a way for those in power to discredit their opponents.” (Witmer 132)

1. **summary statements**
   1. Of the 12 summary healings of groups, 4 mention exorcisms.
   2. at Capernaum (Matt 8:16-17; Mark 1:32-34; Luke 4:40-41)
   3. on a Galilean tour (Matt 4:23-25; Mark 1:39; [Luke 4:44, no healings or exorcisms])
   4. beside the Sea of Galilee (Matt 12:15-16 [no exorcisms]; Mark 3:10-12; Luke 6:17-19)
   5. in answer to the Baptist (Matt 11:1-6 [no exorcisms]; Luke 7:18-23)
2. **sending the twelve**
   1. Mark 6:7-13 (//Matt 10:1, 5-15; Luke 9:1-6), “He called the twelve and began to send them out two by two, and gave them authority over the unclean spirits. . . . 13 They cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many who were sick and cured them.” (The Q version does not refer to demons [Matt 10:7-8, 10b-13//Luke 10:5-9].)
   2. “This pericope . . . has often been assigned to the early church [132] . . . However, one must ask why the early [church] cast out demons in the first place, if Jesus had not done so.” (Witmer 132-33)
3. **strange exorcist**
   1. Mark 9:38-41 (//Luke 9:49-50), “John said to him, “Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, and we tried to stop him, because he was not following us.” 39 But Jesus said, “Do not stop him; for no one who does a deed of power in my name will be able soon afterward to speak evil of me.””
4. **return of the seventy**
   1. Luke 10:17-20, “The seventy returned with joy, saying, “Lord, in your name even the demons submit to us!” 18 He said to them, “I watched Satan fall from heaven like a flash of lightning. 19 See, I have given you authority to tread on snakes and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing will hurt you. 20 Nevertheless, do not rejoice at this, that the spirits submit to you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.””
5. **Mary Magdalene**’**s seven demons**
   1. Luke 8:1-3, (L) “The twelve were with him, 2 as well as some women who had been cured of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary, called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out, 3 . . . and many others . . .”
6. **reply to Herod Antipas**
   1. Luke 13:31-33, (L) “some Pharisees came and said to him, “. . . Herod wants to kill you.” 32 He said to them, “Go and tell that fox for me, ‘Listen, I am casting out demons and performing cures today and tomorrow, and on the third day I finish my work.”
   2. Jesus’ response “implicitly connects his eventual fate in Jerusalem, his role as a prophet, and his healings and exorcisms.” (Witmer 142)
7. **returning demon**
   1. Luke 11:24-26 (//Matt 12:43-45), “When the unclean spirit has gone out of a person, it wanders through waterless regions looking for a resting place, but not finding any, it says, ‘I will return to my house from which I came.’ 25 When it comes, it finds it swept and put in order. 26 Then it goes and brings seven other spirits more evil than itself, and they enter and live there; and the last state of that person is worse than the first.”
8. **the blind mute**
   1. Matt 12:22, “Then they brought to him a demoniac who was blind and mute; and he cured him, so that the one who had been mute could speak and see.”
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# Part 3:

# The Synoptic Gospels as Historical Sources

## History in Scripture

Grelot, Pierre. *The Bible*, *Word of God*: *A Theological Introduction to the Study of Scrip­ture*. Trans. Peter Nickels. New York: Desclee, 1968. (French: *La Bible*, *parole de Dieu*. Tournai: Desclée.) (115-24, 129-38, 353-56.)

object and method of historical science

. . . during the 19th and early 20th centuries, . . . [it] was thought that history could be given the status of a science by patterning its object and methods after the model of the natural sciences. The historian was consequently required to present a perfectly objective picture of the past, practically, that is, a photograph of events, considered as things [115] in themselves, impartially observable and describable with exactness in their separate details. True history meant exact history. Criticism of sources was regulated accordingly: mercilessly casting aside all subjective elements which ancient witnesses and narrators could have mixed into their accounts, the historian was supposed to retain only the residue, which in his eyes would constitute the objective fact, reduced perhaps to a skeleton, but at least critically certain.

This was a chimerical and even partially false conception of history, as recent historians have pointed out. What is in fact an event? Is it simply a collection of details laid side by side, which could have existed independently of human subjectivity? Is it not rather what constitutes the unifying principle of those details, that is, finally, a human experience, lived by an individual or a more or less extensive group (at most, by the whole human race), observed by the historian on a scale more or less large according to the breadth of the human group whose reactions he intends to analyze? Undoubtedly there is in this human experience a part consisting of objective elements observable from without and materially verifiable; but their sense and meaning, which is what constitutes their human interest, goes beyond this simple materiality. By the same token, in historical science, exactness of the details in question is subordinate to the proper significance of the experience of which they are a part; it is the apprehension of the latter that formally constitutes the objective truth of history.[[61]](#footnote-61)117 So the subjective cannot be eliminated without in the same act emptying history of its content. It is, moreover, precisely the subjective that confers on history its genuine human interest. Why, in effect, do we strive to know the past of our race, if not to find some of the possibilities of existence realized there, possibilities which are virtually our own? What we uncover through history is not [116] a dead past; it is ourselves, grappling with time just as men of the past did. Here history . . . reveals to us man in his concrete condition, facing situations in which he must realize his earthly destiny. It is impossible to write history without at the same time developing a philosophy of history. Those who claim most loudly to do it no less profess faith unconsciously in the system which governs their thought and their life.

The historian’s labor over his sources, therefore, cannot take the form of a critical reduction which aims to free them of their subjective elements. It is on the contrary a matter of deeply comprehending those human subjective elements, whose discovery and verification, in those determined circumstances, constitutes the essence of the event, beyond the sensible phenomena which go to make it up. Evidence is therefore more interesting in the measure that its author was more involved in the event he reports. It is, of course, necessary to be careful to interpret it correctly, by taking into account the witness’ point of view, by marking its limitations if necessary, and especially by comparing it with that left by other participants.[[62]](#footnote-62)121 The method sketched out here differs profoundly from that of the natural sciences. First of all, it deals principally with individual facts which are never repeated exactly, and which cannot be totally related to general laws, even when certain psychological or social mechanisms play an obvious role in them.[[63]](#footnote-63)122 Then too, the [117] object to be grasped does not pertain to the order of things which can be measured and reduced to formulas. That object is man himself, not in general as in physiology or metaphysics, but in the particular facts of his individual and social existence which reveal the depth of his being. Historical study, then, requires much psychological intuition, an understanding sympathy with men of the past, whose experience must be relived in order to communicate it to readers of today. Under this last aspect, historical study belongs less to science than to philosophy and to art . . . that implies a continual intervention of subjective factors in sorting and selecting data, in order to organize it into a continuous narrative and so render it intelligible.[[64]](#footnote-64)123

In such a perspective, what becomes of exactness of material details, of the sensible phenomena which form the external appearance of the facts? It is not a matter of sacrificing them, but of putting them in their proper place. Far the important thing in history is the global truth of the whole in which phenomena go together and take on a meaning—in other words, the truth of the human experience in which they figured. Certainly, to remain true, the picture of the whole cannot be reconstructed arbitrarily, at the whim of individual fantasy. But, on the one hand, its focal point might be a more or less extensive human experience (that of an individual, of a restricted group, of a state, of the whole world), and that will considerably modify the significance of the details which come into play. On the other hand, the further one departs from that center, the more the truth of the picture adjusts itself to a progressively larger area of approximation, of summary and conventional phraseology. But how could it be otherwise, since full recovery of all the details is impossible to realize, and still less their restitution in a narration. It is obvious, therefore, that in the account of a witness, just as in that of a professional historian, not all details have the same weight; they do not stand [118] out with the same degree of affirmation. *True* history must not be confused with *exact* history. On the one hand, it can be true by accomodating itself to the inexactness of details, if the details in question are not central to the event; absolute exactness, for the rest, surpasses human possibility. On the contrary, critical history might gather the exact details without being true, if in recounting a past human experience and making a qualitative judgment about it, it misses the essential point, or imposes on the details an interpre­tation that contradicts the testimony of the participants. And these are the opposite poles of historical positivism.

the historical import of scripture

In relation to the plan of salvation, unique object of the teaching of Scripture, human history is in a very different situation from that of the natural sciences. On the one hand, the word of God is an event which survives in time, and the signs that accredit it are likewise events. On the other, it was in a series of events that the salvation of mankind was realized, not only because it was consummated in the death and ressurrection of Jesus Christ, but because it comports the progressive institution, in the midst of human societies, of a unique society in which man enters into communion with God. That is why Christian doctrine, contrary to all the mysticisms of evasion which seek a means of escape from history, is built around a mystery which becomes present to us by inserting itself in history: the incarnation of the word of God, “born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, raised from the dead on the third day.” This intimate connection between revelation and human historical experience explains why history occupies such an important place in Scripture. It is therefore out of the question to exclude history from its teaching, but it is necessary to see exactly how it is contained therein.

In the first place, Scripture never considers human history except under the aspect of relations between God and men. These relations take place within an historical society: Israel, then the Church. Consequently, the experience of that society, which includes observable aspects very similar to those encountered elsewhere, nevertheless takes on a meaning which is progressively revealed by the word of God. The events which make it [the experience of that society] up manifest the acts of God in time; it is for this reason that the sacred books record them, not so much to record the part which the people of God took in the general story of mankind, as to bear witness to their practical experience and revelation of the ways of God, who leads men to salvation and unveils [119] the ultimate meaning of his [mankind’s] existence. The result of this is that human history becomes sacred history, and it is formally as sacred history that it is the object of teaching in the Bible.

It follows too that the respective importance of all the elements which make up sacred history (personalities, contingencies, concrete details of every kind) cannot be measured by the norms which profane historians use; the sacred historians make their judgment on the basis of the plan of salvation they intend to present. And it would be absurd to put all the episodes which the biblical narrations contain on the same footing, from the adventures of the outlaw David to the death of Christ, as if this simple juxtaposition sufficed to indicate the genre of teaching they contain. In reality, the testimony of the sacred authors has less to do with the materiality of these raw facts than with their relation to the mystery of salvation, with the significance that flows from them. If it is true every historical account aims, on the basis of the evidence, to relive the experience of men of other times, the inspired historians seek to reach a second level of depth. For they see in the former only an outer covering and a support of a spiritual experience, more important than the complex of phenomena that underlie it, since the relation of man with God in the plan of salvation is there concretely revealed. That is the objective reality they strive to manifest. But it is a supernatural objectivity, which by definition is beyond the scope of scientific history!

In order to bring out that presence of the plan of salvation in time, the sacred writers make a judgment—at least implicitly—on the significance of the human facts they relate. Now in more than one instance, it is necessary to examine their account from a distance in order to be aware of that judgment, for the place they allot to sensible details is not always proportionate to their respective importance. For example, the accounts of the adventures of the outlaw David [1 Sam 18-30] and of the revolt of Jehu [2 Kgs 9-10] are more detailed and often more exact than that of the apparitions of the risen Christ. Does that mean that the teaching imparted in them is more abundant or of better quality? [120] Not at all, for the scope and significance of the episodes in question appear only as part of a larger whole: the life of David, the elect of God, and the drama of Israel, a sinful people. At what level, then, is the positive teaching that the sacred authors intended to impart, and which demands an assent of faith, to be found? Is it at the level of these grand themes, in which shorter episodes play their proportionate part? Or at the level of the details themselves, materially exact in the cases considered here, but void of religious significance outside the larger framework in which they have been placed? There can be no doubt about the reply: details must be examined from the height of the full accounts. Likewise, it would be fallacious to hold that the Edomite document reproduced in Gn 36:9-43 becomes *ipso facto* an object of faith because it is cited by Scripture. Actually its relation to sacred history cannot be understood except in relation to two other facts: David’s conquest of Edom (2 S 8:13-14; cf. Nb 24: 17 ff.), a manifestation of the power conferred by God on his chosen one, and the mystery of divine election, which fell to Isarel rather than to its brother nation (cf. Gn 25:19-34; 27-33; 35-36; Ml 1:2; Rm 9:13). This meditation on the meaning of history, which remains at the level of a very incomplete revelation, required a concrete representation from the Edomite past to nourrish its development, and it was to fill that need that it settled upon the short account taken from the archives of Edom. Does that mean that it puts emphasis on the details of that account with the intention of transforming them into an object of faith? Not in the least, for it makes use of them, without altering them, for what they can contribute to clarifying what was really the object of the faith of Israel: Israel’s election and the religious significance of David’s victories. In short, the sacred writers are interested in history as a mystery, no matter what might be the nature of the materials they use to relate its sensible aspect. . . .

These remarks do not mean that historical phenomena as such lie outside the sacred authors’ intentions, but that their use of them is subordinate to a more important element. Who will deny, for example, that the mystery of Christ, king of the nations from the moment of his birth, is the essential affirmation to which the tradition of the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem in the account of Mt 2:1-12 is ordered? That mystery is indeed the direct object of Christian faith, whereas the Magi episode in itself pertains to it only indirectly. Still it must be kept in mind that every reflection on the [121] meaning of history supposes the reality of the facts which are reflected upon. One might, in this particular case, ask what exactly is under consideration: is Mt 2:1-12 a reflection on the infancy of Christ, or on the journey of the Magi? And if the evangelist intended above all to present concretely Christ as king of the nations, does he nonetheless attribute the character of historical fact to the episode he gathered from Christian tradition? But if it is permissible, and even necessary, thus to investigate the exact intentions of the sacred authors, it would be wrong to see in their presentation of sacred history a purely mental construction, destined solely to transmit religious ideas and to illustrate the faith. There are narrations of that sort, Job or Jonah, for example. But such cannot be the case of those which intend to recount the acts of God here below. These latter have a global historical purpose, which cannot be put in doubt without distorting Jewish and Christian faith.

. . . as a recent *Monitum* from the Holy Office put it [some opinions about history “endanger the native historical and objective truth of Sacred Scripture.” (See *CBQ* 23 (1961) 465; *AER* 145 (1961) 137.) (122 n. 133)]. . . . In appealing to the “*germana veritas historica et objectiva*” of Scripture, the Holy Office ruled out two grave errors: 1) that which would see in the biblical accounts which narrate the history of salvation merely legendary narrations, [122] totally dominated by the ideas they transmit, without a real foundation in the human experience they pretend to relate; 2) that which would consider the supernatural realities, in which those accounts find the principle which explains the facts, as totally subjective interpretations of faith, without foundation in the divine world into which faith introduces man. . . .[[65]](#footnote-65)134

Let us draw up a provisional conclusion. The history lived by the people of God always carried with it, as a human experience, a supernatural significance which conferred on it its true value. Apprehension of that significance was never a spontaneous perception of human genius, and still less the artificial creation of a faith without objective foundation, but the fruit of a revelation brought by God’s messengers. It was to make that knowledge available, with every [*sic*] increasing depth, that the sacred writers recorded the recollection of the corresponding events. Then they tirelessly made use of the account of them, under forms which sufficed for their doctrinal purpose even though they do not correspond to our modern concept [123] of history. This last point merits a more detailed examination. Here we will note only that the biblical authors, in order to emphasize the significance of a fact in the plan of salvation, often resorted to literary methods very different from those a modern theologian would employ. If, here and there, whole chapters of theology can be found (Jg 2:10-23; 2 K 17:7-23), more often religious reflection is an integral part of other accounts, themselves displaying a wide variety of forms. This is already enough to indicate that Scripture’s teaching in the field of history is surprisingly complex. [124]

the problem of history in the bible

. . . the problem of literary forms in which historical testimony is presented remains intact. For in every age and in all civilizations there is no genre as complex as history. It would be naive to imagine that the [129] inspired writers accepted in advance the scientific norms to which we are accustomed, either in regard to the objectivity of evidence and sources, or to the impartiality of the account; first of all, because our particular preoccupations cannot be transposed to oriental antiquity, and secondly, because that would be to suppose a theory of scientific history which is highly subject to reservations. . . .

*Types of history*

The aim of the historical genre considered in its most general aspect is to preserve live the remembrance of past human experience, either orally or in writing, whether at the level of rudimentary documentation or of masterly syntheses. But there are a thousand ways of doing that, each corresponding to the mentality and degree of culture of a given social group. All the methods applied to that end are admissible from the moment that they are commonly accepted.

A few examples chosen from the great works of western literature will suffice to give an idea of this diversity of methods. They pass, according to the case, from popular legend, in which the reality is dressed in a robe of fiction (Lucretius’ history explaining the fall of the last Etruscan king of Rome), to the minute descriptions whose details have all been verified[[66]](#footnote-66)166 (Fustel de Coulanges, *La cité antique*), from the epic expansions in which the wondrous plays a part (the death of Roland at Roncevaux in the *Chanson de Roland* compared with Eginhard’s chronicle) to an account which clarifies the entanglement of human responsibilities (Thucydides’ *History of the Peloponnesian War*). At a certain level of civilization and for certain classes of facts, the legend[[67]](#footnote-67)168 and the epic are therefore normal methods of [130] preserving recollections, as numerous examples from oriental and classical antiquity as well as the Middle Ages show. Between such cases and that of the chronicle written by a firsthand witness of the facts he recounts (the case of Joinville describing the figure of St. Louis), there are a multitude of intermediate forms: moralizing histories which report only one aspect of the facts in order to draw a lesson from them, stories of eponymous heroes which absorb the history of social groups, etiological accounts which explain a fact of civilization (custom, rite, place name, relation between peoples) by succinctly recalling its origin, etc. Besides, in each particular case, a number of factors modify the exactness and the function of the details which fill out the narrations. It is furthermore only rarely that they have an exclusively historical value; usually it is necessary to analyze them from several angles in order to extract their content.

Since these methods of writing existed with full right in ancient literatures, there is no reason why biblical literature ought to reject them. It was sufficient that they should be capable of being adapted to the didactic purpose, always religious, of the sacred authors, permitting them to present a picture of the past that suited their purpose. This statement does not bring those authors’ veracity into question, but it leaves open the question of the literary forms they used. That must be closely examined in each particular case.

*History in the Old Testament*

The historical genre in the Old Testament is essentially manifold, according to the nature of the events to be narrated, the materials available to do that, the lessons to be inculcated in those accounts, the literary conventions to be followed.

Here are some examples taken from the Pentateuch. Its narrations do intend to recount a real history: that of the plan of salvation which emerges from the history of Israel. But their constituent material is drawn from sources (oral or written) which range the full length of the degrees noted above. But the inspired writers did not modify the nature and literary form of those sources when they appropriated their content to revelation. Granted that in subordinating and adapting them to their own message, they were guided by the infallible instinct of their charism; but that does not mean [131] that they have passed on to us accounts that can be immediately utilized in a critical history of Israel. From the legendary epic [small caps are by Hahn] of the flood biblical historians draw a typical example of a catastrophe which manifests the actualization of the judgment of God in human history. That is a religious reinterpretation which leaves intact all the problems posed by the corresponding Mesopotamian tradition. [The following is a story of an eponymous ancestor:—Hahn] The eponym Cain, the supposed ancestor of the Cainites, serves to recall the barbarity of the desert in prehistoric times and the fratricidal quarrels which are a general feature of human history (Gn 4:1-16). [Here is a moralizing history:—Hahn] The history of Joseph has taken the form of a didactic narration, related to wisdom literature by its moralizing purpose and redactional methods; that must be kept in mind when extracting from it useful elements for a critical history, and that will surely give rise to a discussion in which opinions will differ. Jos 10:12-113 has fortunately preserved a fragment of an epic poem used by the narrator in his account of the battle of Gibeon; that fragment throws light on the exact genre of the prose account (10:10-14) which imitates its procedures. With that example in mind, the grand prose epic of the exodus from Egypt (Ex 5-14), which is obviously a composite, can be better understood: Yahweh is its central hero, and everything is calculated to exalt his victory over Pharaoh, exactly as in the lyric pieces which celebrate that victory in other ways (Ex 15:2-17; Ps 77:14-21; 78:12-31. 43-54; 106:7 ff.; 114; Is 63:8-13, etc.).

All of these texts belong to history from a certain point of view; they even furnish a good documentation, unjustly rejected by a radical criticism which, for the rest, is in decline. But their historical truth is not to be found at the level of anecdotal details placed side by side; it is not to be confused [132] with a material exactness that does not go beyond the level of sensible phenomena. To grasp it, two elements must be taken into consideration: the accepted customs of writing proper to each narration, and the didactic intent which relates the event in question to the plan of salvation of which it becomes a part. This is a complex procedure, which excludes any *a priori* definition of the historical genre, but all undue generalization as well. It is not because Simeon and Levi personify collectivities in Gn 34 that the same can be said of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; it is not because the etiological account of Jg 2:1-5 is an artificial construction based on the place name Bochim that that in Gn 28:10-19 does not prove an historical connection between the holy place of Bethel and the ancestors of Israel during the patriarchal age; and so on, case by case. From this perspective it becomes easier to state precisely the relation of Gn 3 to history. That account is not in any sense a realistic representation of the sin of original times as seen from an external point of view, but a substantial recollection in which the psychology of temptation is adorned with an abundance of judiciously chosen symbols. Placed at the beginning of human history, this image of the typical sin (the pretension to “know good and evil” without reference to the law of God) lays the premise in wisdom style for a theological reflection for which the New Testament supplies the conclusion: the first use of human freedom, man’s first choice before God, was, therefore, a refusal! That is substantially the fact, related to the presence of sin in history, which the account allows us to grasp; but it presents only a conventional representation of that fact, so much more meaningful as it aims to express what the essence of sin is.

The manifold nature of the historical genre should not be restricted to ancient texts only, as if the compositions of a later age were necessarily close to our own manner of writing. That is true of a document like the internal history of David’s reign and that of his successors [the “succession narrative,” 2 Sam 9-20, 1 Kgs 1-2], a masterpiece composed by an eyewitness to the facts, whose theological intentions remain remarkably discrete. But alongside this, narrative forms which employ the miraculous in order to render the supernatural sensible to their readers still persist: the midrash on the exodus contained in Ws 16-18 outdoes in that regard even the older accounts. In addition, the narrative genre tended to develop in the [133] direction of didactic fiction, in which historical realism is lost sight of (Judith, Esther, whatever might have been their traditional starting point). Even in the books of Kings and Chronicles the materials are different, and those who used them did not have the same understanding of their task as historians. Everyone is aware of the chronological problems raised by the books of Ezra and Nehemiah: in ordering the content of his records as he did, did the Chronicler intend to take responsibility for a problem of dates? A comparison of the two books of Maccabees, when possible, leads to a firsthand grasp of the method proper to each of the two authors. But in modern criticism’s estimation, neither the apologetic history of the first book of Maccabees, influenced by older biblical accounts and by Greek historiography at once, nor the moving history of the second book, which aims to edify and sometimes recurs to the miraculous, are free of weaknesses. Everything depends upon a correct understanding of the intent of each author within his own limitations and according to the conventions he followed (compare 1 M 4:28-35 with 2 M 11:5-12).

These are only a few examples. They suffice to show that the simple juxtaposition of accounts drawn from the Bible in our classic Bible histories, which were more respectful of a fixed letter than they were careful to understand their real meaning, is a deception which plays into the hands of modern critics.

*History in the New Testament*

The social and cultural milieu in which New Testament history took form cannot be likened either to Israel at the time of the judges, nor to that of the Solomonic court, nor to that of the Babylonian captivity, nor finally to any of the milieux in which the books of the Old Testament were born. This means that its historical forms are quite different. The recollections preserved there can be divided into two distinct groups: those which concern Jesus Christ, the central object of [134] Christian faith, and those which concern the origins of the Church (Acts and occasional allusions in the letters). These two categories pose different problems, for their relation to the mystery of faith is not the same.

Recollections concerning the origin of Christianity are in part preserved in firsthand accounts: the Pauline letters and the “we-sections” of Acts. That does not mean that these passages require no critical examination, for a particular man’s point of view does not necessarily express the full complexity of a situation, especially if that man is engaged in a controversy (the case of the letter to the Galatians, for example). As for secondhand information (for example, in Ac 1-15), it requires sympathetic understanding, but possesses no less a very diverse character. The worth of its details therefore varies in the same degree, for the inspired historian’s degree of affirmation is ruled by two elements: his specifically religious point of view and the nature of the materials he happens to be using. If the conversion of Cornelius in Ac 10:1-11:18 takes place before the founding of the church at Antioch (11:19-21), the reason is not one of chronology (11:19 is connected to 8:3), but a reason of another kind: Peter and the mother church of Jerusalem retain their precedence when a question arises over the admission of a pagan into the Church without obliging him to pass through Judaism. Luke’s intention on this point, so clear from a reading of chap. 15, must be respected.

As for the problem of the gospel narratives,[[68]](#footnote-68)187 . . . overall, they intend to preserve the memory of a real historical person, of his deeds and his words, of his meaningful acts and of the final fate that consummated his life. The central point of the apostolic preaching (in St. Paul as well as the Acts) is actually the identity of the Lord of faith and Jesus of Nazareth, known through the tradition of his witnesses.[[69]](#footnote-69)188 The whole problem is to know how those witnesses, and oral tradition after [135] them, and finally the authors of the gospel syntheses, preserved that memory, under what forms they gave its features literary fixation at dates that probably range the full length of the 1st century.[[70]](#footnote-70)189 Posing this question does not call into doubt the veracity of the accounts in question; it is just a matter of striving to understand them intelligently, as the recent instruction of the Biblical Commission [April 21, 1964, see *CBQ* 26 119641, 307 ff.] on the historical truth of the gospels recommends. In sum, the crystallization of memories did not have as its essential purpose to recount the history of Jesus in order to satisfy the curiosity of the faithful,[[71]](#footnote-71)191 but to nourish their faith by giving them a concrete acquaintance with his person.

Besides, there is no gospel passage in which a didactic intent other than historical cannot be discerned, dogmatic, moral, apologetic, liturgical, etc. It would be strange if that did not leave its mark in some way on their literary texture, for the manner of writing surely goes hand in hand with the intended teaching. History and doctrine do not exclude one another, they overlap; but it follows that not all accounts depend on the same laws. It is not a matter of suspecting them of deforming history in order to twist them into ideological theses, nor is there a question of defending at any cost the material exactness of all the details they include. It is a matter of staking out their rules of composition. Through such an analysis one will certainly arrive at a better estimation of the limits of the historical knowledge it is possible to have about Jesus. But what does that matter, as long as . . . the mystery underlying that human experience, so full of meaning, is reached? Actually there are few passages that pose the same problems. The visit of the Magi to Bethlehem, the story of the Annunciation, [136] that of the baptism of Christ, that of the triple temptation, the healing of Jairus’ daughter according to St. Mark and that of the man born blind according to St. John, the account of the last supper, etc., do not fall under the same literary laws. The gospel, even when it aims to impart knowledge of Jesus Christ as a person in human history, is a manifold genre. To understand its import correctly our minds must assume a flexible attitude toward this great variety.

Scripture, therefore, does not teach history as the councils teach dogma or decree canon law: such a statement is only a matter of common sense. Let us beware of carrying over into this particular field methods of reasoning that are suitable for others. To interpret as dogma the historical import of the inspired texts is to expose oneself to dreadful misinterpretations. The geometric mind of the logicians must here give way to a more flexible mentality.

conclusion

It should be apparent what meaning should be given to the Thomistic adage: *Quidquid in sacra Scriptura continetur*, *verum est* [“whatever is contained in scripture is true”]. In this context, *continetur* does not mean the mere material presence of a proposition in the sacred books, even excluding those which the author obviously does not accept as his own (“There is no God!” says the fool in his heart . . .). St. Thomas had in mind the formal teachings passed on by the sacred writers under the influence of their charism. That does not reduce either the extent of inspiration or that of inerrancy; but it is an incitement to appreciate properly the extent of formal teachings. These, in fact, are not the result of an analysis of the phrases contained in the texts. They depend on the three factors we have enumerated: the formal object of revelation, which determines the point of view of all biblical assertions; the progress of revelation, which introduces a relative factor into the formulation of doctrine; and the diversity of literary genres, which indicate the intent of each text.

From this point of view, so much more exact than that of the 13th century, or even that of the opening of the 20th, [exegetes can] devote themselves to their proper tasks: to expound the content of revelation as it is found in Scripture, and, with the help of Scripture, to stake out the path to faith. [137]

historical criticism

. . . Under the name of historical criticism two clearly distinct questions are often treated together: that of the historical context in which each book was composed, and that of the material any of them might furnish for the use of historians.

*Historical Origin of the Sacred Books*

To make a proper literary criticism of any works, it is important to know in what circumstances, in what milieu, they were composed. The problems [353] of authorship, date, literary authenticity, etc., must be resolved by positive methods which exclude any dogmatic or antidogmatic prejudice. In this field, Jewish tradition and that of the ancient Church had preoccupations quite different from our own. It is very possible that they have preserved interesting information, which ought to be accepted and appreciated for what it is worth. But it still must be interpreted critically, for these traditions did not have our concern for thoroughness and accuracy; they were content with broad views and outlines where we would prefer precise distinctions. To accept without question the positions they have passed on to us in matters that do not jeopardize the faith would not be proof of one’s authentic traditional mind; often it would mean canonizing the opinion of a rudimentary historical criticism which is totally insufficient in modern eyes. Theology would therefore find no profit in them. On the other hand, it cannot but gain from a better reconstruction of the literary history of the Bible. Not only do the texts become clearer when their historical context and their authors are known, but the ways of the divine pedagogy are understood proportionally better as a detailed knowledge of the stages of the development of revelation is gained.

Two examples will help to make this point clear. Judaism passed on to us the notion that the Pentateuch was a finished work during the time of Moses. But the activity of God in the Old Testament is undeniably better manifested in the history of its formation as critical study has today revealed it to us, even if the modern explanation still includes a measure of hypothesis. The tradition which owes its beginning to Moses did not remain fixed in the midst of a history in which nothing stirred; it developed organically, adapting itself to the needs of changing times in order to continue to play its role within the people of God. Similarly, the life and thought of the apostolic community in their relation to the gospel received from Christ are more clearly manifested through the history of the formation of the gospels, from the stage of oral preaching to the final edition of our four short books, than in the conservative view which considered them as independent works, hardly even rooted in the milieu which produced them. The degree of hypothesis which remains in this reconstruction of the past corresponds to the degree of approximation which every historical work includes; it stimulates research without endangering the faith in the least. [354] It goes without saying that one must proceed with caution in this delicate field, for important matters are at stake. But prudence does not justify mental laziness, and even less blindness to the real problems that arise. Only the conscientious and loyal work of Catholic critics can make possible a discussion among equals with historians who do not share their faith.

*Reconstruction of Biblical History*

Historical criticism has also another task: on the basis of the evidence provided by the Bible and that which extra-biblical sources and archeology add to it, it is charged with reconstructing the history of the two Testaments with as much precision as modern methods permit. Christian faith is, of course, certain of the historical foundations on which it rests, whether it be a question of the history that preceded Christ, that of Christ himself, or that of the primitive Church. It is certain that the scriptural evidence gives it a true and faithful knowledge of its history. But this general certainty leaves untouched a multitude of questions of detail, for the historical truth of Scripture needs to be understood properly. We have seen above the general approach to be taken to it, and how it differs from the scientific exactness for which modern historians strive. It is from this point of view that the texts ought to be studied critically in order to bring to light their exact meaning. For there are a thousand ways of representing the human experiences which bear the mark of God’s work here below; all of them are true, if they are understood properly. But it cannot be expected that all of them present the same external description of the facts; their diversity must be respected if they are to be understood properly.

Once this principle is admitted, a vast field of investigation opens up. For while it is true that the very demands of faith introduced into the literature of Israel and of primitive Christianity an interest in history which can scarcely be found in other religious literatures, their recording of the past was [355] always conditioned by cultural conventions very remote from our own. The documentation must be interpreted according to its own conventions, if it is to be allowed to deliver its own message. This rule is as valid for the books of the Old Testament as it is for the gospels, which in any case give us a very imperfect acquaintance with the life of Christ. Measuring the limits of our knowledge, realizing what problems remain to be solved, attempting to unify a piecemeal documentation by resorting to hypotheses—all of these undertakings can enter into exegesis without questioning the foundations or the certainty of faith. Just as it would be unreasonable to introduce into such criticism prejudices inspired by rational positivism, so it would be absurd to shackle progress in the name of an erroneous theology of the word of God and a false concept of inerrancy.

The self criticism which contemporary historians have undertaken in regard to their methods, and the passing of a narrow concept of history as science which misunderstood the human reality it set out to study, have made a great contribution toward clarification of the situation. The historian’s approach to a past which can never be fully captured has become both more prudent and more humble, more careful in constructing hypotheses, and more respectful of its sources than was the case at the beginning of this century. But even granted this, there remains much to be done before the history of the two Testaments is scientifically reconstructed in all its details, not only as regards political and social facts, but as regards ideas and religious life. And how can the value of this last aspect, of critical studies for theology escape anyone? Is it not the history of revelation itself which thus is clarified, in proportion as the points of its insertion in time and place are more precisely identified? It is therefore a fundamental task of Catholic exegetes to undertake historical criticism; its importance cannot be overemphasized. No appeal to the light of faith can modify its basic rules, because by unfolding in a truly human history, the economy of salvation assumed the condition of all earthly things. In order that reflection on the biblical message might uncover the signs of its presence in the world, it must be able to rest on this positive study, carried out with as much care as for any other event of human history. The stakes are such as to leave no room for mediocrity. [356]

## Some Comments on the Concept of History

Paul Hahn

What does “history” mean? I can think of several definitions. “History” can mean:

1. past events (“Oh, that’s history now”)
2. the evidence of past events (fossils, skeletons, pottery, stone inscriptions, Louis XVI’s letters, Mozart’s symphonies) (“A fascinating piece of history has just been discovered in Wales”)
3. an account of past events (“He’s written a history of the Sino-Tibetan War”)
4. the collectivity of all accounts of past events (“Here is where we keep our history”)
5. the discipline whose products are accounts of past events (“I’m majoring in history”)
6. the method used in the discipline of history (“You’re doing history, not anthropology”).

Instances of “history” (or the adjective “historical”) in Jesus research reflects this variety of meanings.

History as “an account of past events” means that an account is based on historical realities. This definition will include such narratives as the account of the ten plagues prior to the exodus; the Succession Narrative (2 Sam 9-20, 1 Kgs 1-2); the gospel of Mark; and the first two chapters of Galatians. I see no problem in calling each of these an instance of the overarching genre of “history.” But there are nevertheless quite evident differences among these instances of history—among other things, differences in the degree to which they incorporate legendary materials, i.e., items or events that lack reference to “historical realities.”

It should especially be noted how easy it is in gospel research to equivocate between “history” as past events and “history” as accounts of past events. In the statement, “The gospels are not history in the modern sense,” “history” seems to mean “accounts of past events”; but the qualifier, “in the modern sense,” raises the question of methodology. If by “modern” is meant “in the modern period” (Renaissance and after), then the evangelists certainly did not employ modern historical methodology; it did not exist in their day. But this in turn raises the question, “How does ancient historical method differ from modern historical method?”

Another statement from a student paper is, “The gospels are not a systematic recounting of events *per se*.” The gospels are certainly recountings of events, so the denial of the applicability of this description to the gospels must be because of the words “systematic” and “*per se*.” But the gospels are certainly systematic in the sense that they recount events “in order” (as Luke says, 1:3). So the applicability to the gospels of the predicate, “not a systematic recounting of events *per se*,” must be because the gospels are not *only* or not *primarily* a systematic recounting of events (this, I suspect, is what is meant by “*per se*”). Here again, the crucial question seems to be, “How does ancient historical method differ from modern historical method?”

Every work of history is a combination of data (events asserted actually to have happened) and interpretation of the data; even the choices of which words to use in describing a past event interpret the event to some extent. A “history in the modern sense,” no less than a history of ancient times, includes interpretation. Joachim Jeremias’ book, *The Parables of Jesus*, for example, is a work of history (it is a recounting of events), and it is a combination of data and interpretation; if it were pure data, it could not be criticized for its interpretation of the events it recounts, as for example Bernard Brandon Scott, in *Hear Then the Parable*, criticizes its interpretation. So the difference between ancient history and modern history is not that ancient history lacks data and modern includes them, or that ancient history has interpretation and modern does not. Rather, the difference lies in the fact that modern history’s effort to maximize fact and minimize interpretation is *more careful*. Modern history, in other words, is more careful in its efforts to ensure that the events it asserts happened correspond to events that did in fact happen.

Were ancient historians less careful because they cared less about whether the events they related actually happened? To some extent this may have been the case. For example, the evangelists’ overriding purpose was not to relate data but an interpretation of data (John 20:31, Jesus’ signs “are written so that you may come to believe”). The gospels, originally the preaching of the Church, are religious or theological interpretations of what happened.

But, even if historical accuracy was not their primary intention, it does not follow that it was not a secondary intention. Probably less care was taken in ancient times than in modern because historians lacked the modern understanding of history and the modern tools of history.

## A History of Gospel Research, c. 1750-1950
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1. **the beginnings of historical criticism of the Bible** (**eighteenth century**)
   1. “Though prepared for by the religious criticism of the English Deists, historical criticism of the Bible was not introduced into theology from outside but was largely developed within theology.” (Zahrnt 37)
   2. Early exponents of biblical criticism included Alphonse Turretini (of Geneva, 1728) [38] and Johann Jakob Wettstein (of Basle, c 1750). (Zahrnt 38-39)
   3. Exponents from 1750 to 1850 included: Johann August Ernesti (a Leipsig philologist and theologian); Johann Salomo Semler (of Halle, “the real founder of the critical study of the Bible in Germany”); [39] Johann Jakob Griesbach (Semler’s pupil); [40] and David Friedrich Strauss. [41] (Zahrnt 39-41)
   4. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (of Wolfenbüttel, 1778) “probably believed little during his life, and still less at the end. But his contribution to theology and the Church, right up to the present day, is his inexorable demand for sincerity . . .” (Zahrnt 36)
   5. “These are voices over the space of about a century. During this century an enormous change has taken place. . . . We usually express this by distinguishing between ‘Old Protestantism’ and ‘Neo-Protestantism’. . . . there can now be no serious theological work which excludes the critical theological method.” (Zahrnt 42)
   6. “There was a manifest contradiction between what historical investigation discovered about Jesus of Nazareth and what the Church said of him . . .” (Zahrnt 43)
2. **nineteenth-century liberal lives of Jesus**
   1. “. . . the watchword of the scholars of the ‘Quest’ [for the historical Jesus] ran ‘From the Biblical Christ to the Historical Jesus.’ [44] . . . In the same way as a picture restorer carefully strips off one layer after another to expose the original painting, so the scholars of the ‘Quest’ removed one layer of tradition after another . . .” (Zahrnt 44-45)
   2. “The nineteenth-century quest [58] . . . attempted to cut away the theological interpretations of his life, and thus to present us with the historical Jesus as he was in the first century. . . . But there was a greater problem that besieged the original quest. It was found not so much in its desire to find the “bare facts” as in its general orientation, which dictated what it would allow in the category of fact. Thus, the miraculous or prophetic was rejected or rationalized . . .” (Charles Anderson 58-59)
   3. “‘The Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son.’ So runs the most famous sentence in Adolf von Harnack’s lectures *What is Christianity* [Eng. trans., p. 144] . . .” (Zahrnt 45) In “the nineteenth-century lives . . . we had presented to us Jesus the humanist.” (Charles Anderson 69)
   4. “Around the turn of the century [c 1900] a certain consensus was reached concerning the approach [to the reconstruction of Jesus’ life.] [5] . . . There was the conviction that the historical reconstruction could be the basis for a contemporary philosophy of life. . . . Whenever the kingdom of God could not be interpreted in the sense of a timeless ideal, the eschatological proclamation was devaluated as being merely conditioned by Jesus’ own times.” (Conzelmann 5-6)
   5. criticisms
      1. “We should be wary of any attempt to trace Jesus’ psychological development. This was one of the serious limitations of the old quest. Most contemporary critics tend to see the fault of such a procedure in the nature of the sources. The real limitation here would appear rather to be in the nature of the personality. If Jesus was the person that the New Testament uniformly represents him to have been, then the use of analogy to trace his psychological development is out of the question.” (Charles Anderson 54)
      2. “The Quest of the historical Jesus was a failure. It had to be a failure, both historically and theologically. Historically, because it is neither the aim of our Gospels nor within their scope to provide the material for a biography of Jesus. . . . Even the earliest material . . . is determined by faith in him. . . . [Theologically,] because it attempted to [make] an historical reconstruction, the so-called ‘historical Jesus’, the immediate object of faith.” (Zahrnt 47)
      3. “The image of the historical Jesus which was now being developed . . . was largely governed by [presuppositions] almost all of which at closer inspection prove to be determined by the neo-humanist myth of the nineteenth century. Behind this myth stood a decided view of history, a view which was a hazy, historical pantheism. It was [48] thought that the divine goal of the historical process was the gradual triumph of the powers of the True, the Good and the Beautiful, which were understood to permeate history after the analogy of natural forces. Mankind is making its way step by step from a state of nature to civilization. . . . Every now and then individuals appear in history who carry within themselves these supernatural powers to an extraordinary degree.” (Zahrnt 48-49)
      4. “Hence in liberal theology Jesus became a moral exemplar and a religious teacher, and the Kingdom of God which he proclaimed became an inner kingdom of values . . .” (Zahrnt 49)
      5. “This picture of Jesus presented by liberal theology [49] suffers from an inner contradiction. . . . it was tacitly assumed that Jesus had an authority, and this authority was a remnant of precisely that traditional christological belief which liberal theology sought to exclude.” (Zahrnt 49-50)
      6. “. . . if faith must have a teacher and an exemplar, why not Socrates, why not Kant, why not Goethe?” (Zahrnt 50)
      7. “Liberal theology was in the last resort quite unable to give a satisfactory historical explanation of the death of Jesus.” (Zahrnt 50)
      8. “Its [liberal theology’s picture of Jesus’] failing was not that it was too critical but that it was not critical enough.” (Zahrnt 51)
   6. Ethelbert Stauffer’s *Jesus and His Story*, though published in German in 1957, is really a resumption of the old quest. [99] As in the best seller *The Bible Was Right*, “a detailed description of the [98] [Jewish and Hellenistic] environment gives an illusion of historical reliability. . . . ancient coins, inscriptions, papyri and other archaeological finds become disguised proofs of the truth of Christianity. . . . such books [are a return to] the old Quest . . . We can only agree with Carl Heinz Ratschow in his verdict on Stauffer’s book: ‘Once again we are given a “Life of Jesus”, the connecting links in which have been freely invented, as the texts provide no continuity of cause and effect.’” (Zahrnt 99)
3. **Albert Schweitzer**
   1. “In Schweitzer’s picture, Jesus was . . . a man with remarkable, strange, dark fears and thoughts, an unworldly apocalyptic figure who came to grief. . . . It is important ‘that we free ourselves from our present circumstances by a powerful hope and will for the Kingdom of God, a hope which scorns things as we see them. We must find . . . peace in faith in the invincible power of the moral spirit, and we must spread this faith . . . round about us . . .’ [Schweitzer, *Quest* 396; this passage is not in the English translation.] With these words Schweitzer puts forward basically the same ideas as the liberal scholars with whom he finds fault—with one difference, that he does not attach them to the historical Jesus.” (Zahrnt 53)
   2. “The most honest of all these [nineteenth-century] lives was doubtless the one of Schweitzer, for he developed his most fully on the basis of all the Gospel materials. But due to his naturalistic point of departure, he presented us with a picture of Jesus that was more to be pitied than reverenced.” (Charles Anderson 69)
4. **history-of-religions school** (**late 1800s/early 1900s**)
   1. “The History-of-Religions School protested against all tendencies to modernize the ideas of Jesus. This school . . . laid stress on the central significance of eschatology in his thought (Johannes Weiss, Albert Schweitzer).” (Conzelmann 6)
   2. “It was not orthodoxy which overcame the liberal investigation [but] historical criticism. This criticism refused to be governed by the presuppositions of its own time and . . . placed Jesus firmly in *his* time . . . Thus the confidence of the liberals . . . gave way to the scepticism of the historians of religion . . .” (Zahrnt 55)
   3. “Its [Christianity’s] origin was associated with the powerful religious movement which at that time flooded the West in a deluge from the East. This deluge . . . was made up of a mixture of the most disparate elements, Late Jewish, Greek and Oriental; Rabbinic Judaism and Hellenistic Jewish enlightenment, Stoic ethics and the Greek mystery religions, asceticism and gnosis, intellectual reflection and ecstatic mysticism. [56] . . . The more the environment of the New Testament was examined, the more parallels were discovered, . . . until finally Christianity . . . merged into the religious confusion . . .” (Zahrnt 56-57)
   4. “Some sought to explain the phenomenon of Jesus chiefly from Late Judaism, . . . particularly from Late Jewish apocalyptic . . . This led to the so-called ‘consistent-eschatological interpretation’, which stressed the radical otherness and futurity of the Kingdom of God in the preaching of Jesus.” (Zahrnt 55)
   5. “. . . others concentrated on stressing the ideas . . . of Hellenism . . . They formed the ‘History of Religions School’ in the strict sense.” [56] Representatives of this narrower school were Wilhelm Heitmüller, Hermann Gunkel, and Wilhelm Bousset. (Zahrnt 56-58)
   6. In Bousset’s *Kyrios Christos* (1913), “Jesus became ‘Kyrios’, ‘Lord’, only on Hellenistic soil and under Hellenistic influences . . . The place . . . of the great transformation was thus liturgy, the cult. . . . Here as everywhere the cult ousted history. What this Jesus . . . once was . . . became unimportant. . . . ‘What is purely historical can never be of any effect, but only the present, living symbol in which one’s own religious conviction is presented in a transfigured form.’” (*Kyrios Christos* [1921] 75.) (Zahrnt 58)
      1. “This is basically the old assertion of idealism, applied to the history of primitive Christianity: it is not history but metaphysics that brings salvation.” (Zahrnt 59)
      2. “But in that case why was the person of Jesus not abandoned? Why was there still any interest at all in his historical form? . . . Why could they not simply say with the New Testament scholar P. W. Schmiedel: ‘It would not make any difference to my faith were it to turn out that Jesus never lived’?” (Zahrnt 59)
      3. “[Ernst] Troeltsch’s answer . . . runs approximately thus: Each religious community needs a concrete centrepoint . . . Men want more than myth, they want real, vivid life. A symbol is only a symbol for men of faith if it is a real man . . . The ‘historical Jesus’ is therefore necessary . . . for reasons of social-psychology.” (Troeltsch and Max Weber lived in the same house in Heidelberg.) (Zahrnt 59)
   7. “. . . In the context of the treatment of the New Testament by the History of Religions School, Paul especially—John was generally liked better—became the ‘perverter of the Gospel of Jesus’.” (Zahrnt 60)
      1. According to Hermann Gunkel, “It is not the Gospel of Jesus that is a syncretistic religion, but the Primitive Christianity of Paul and John.” (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Ver­ständnis des Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: 1903. 88.) (Zahrnt 60)
      2. “Paul Wernle as a young student once heard this word ‘perverter’ used by his teacher William Wrede, and thereafter he seems never to have discarded it. For later he describes Paul as . . . presenting Jesus to the Greeks in the form of a dramatic myth . . .” (Zahrnt 60)
      3. Wrede called Paul “the second founder of Christianity.” (*Paulus*. Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher. Tübingen: 1904. 1.5-6.) According to Wrede, “There remains only one explanation: Paul already believed in such a heavenly being, in a divine Christ, before he believed in Jesus.” (Zahrnt 61)
   8. Rudolf Otto
      1. Otto, Rudolf. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*: *A Study in the History of Religion*. 1938. Rev. ed. Trans. Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf. Lutterworth Library 9. London: Lutterworth, 1943. (German: *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*. Munich: Beck, 1934. 2nd. ed., 1954).
      2. “Rudolf Otto believed that he could discover the structure of Jesus’ self-understand­ing by the motif of the History-of-Religions School.” (Conzelmann 9)
      3. “Otto, with a background in the History of Religions School, sought to grasp the structure of Jesus’ knowledge of himself. He reached roughly the following result: Jesus connected the ideas about the heavenly Son of Man from the Enoch Apocalypse [see Daniel 7:13-14] and the idea of the Suffering Servant of God of Deutero-Isaiah [Isa 53] with the concept of the Kingdom of God and referred all this to himself—This is what I am. This claim was then vindicated by his death and resurrection.” (Zahrnt 80)
      4. “Otto and his followers thus seemed to have succeeded in tracing the essentials of the picture of Christ held by the community back to Jesus himself and therefore to have established the continuity between Jesus’ knowledge of himself and the faith and dogma of the Church without a gap.” (Zahrnt 80)
      5. However, “This . . . solution cannot be demonstrated . . . by a critical examination of the sources.” (Zahrnt 80)
   9. But, as Church historian Karl Holl said “in his epoch-making article ‘Primitive Christianity and the History of Religions’: ‘Precisely when Christianity is dissolved into its constituent parts, there arises a question which in my view is imperative: what was there about Christianity that led it to triumph over the other religions?’ [62] . . . Other religions offered a high moral idealism or a deep mysticism; other religions worshipped a ‘Kyrios’, a ‘Lord’, who was born of a virgin, died and rose again; other religions promised redemption and guaranteed participation in the divine life through sacraments. . . . Why not another religion? Why not finally a standard religion?” (Zahrnt 62-63)
   10. Once “scholars had got over the first stage, in which they could see nothing but resemblances and dependences, they began to work out . . . the unique peculiarities of Christianity . . . [In Christianity,] the myth has given place to history. The basic difference between the Gospels and the cult legends which we find elsewhere in antiquity is their interest in history. [64] . . . [In Christianity] we have not the eternal event of myth but unique, unrepeatable history . . .” (Zahrnt 64-65)
   11. “The more uncertain the ground proved, the more radical historical criticism became. And vice versa, the more radical historical criticism became, the more uncertain the ground proved.” (Zahrnt 67)
   12. “. . . the radical sceptic Franz Overbeck . . . held a theological chair right up to his sixtieth year, despite his complete unbelief . . .” (Zahrnt 67)
5. **Karl Barth’s dialectical theology** (**1918-c**. **1950**)
   1. In Barth’s *Epistle to the Romans* (1918), “God and man are set apart at extremes by an ultimate emphasis on the holiness of God.” (Zahrnt 68)
   2. “Barth’s criticism is directed much more against religious men than against the ungodly. . . . All religions . . . are nothing but a ‘divinization of man and a humanizing of God’ . . . God is always the ‘wholly Other’.” (Zahrnt 69)
   3. “It is not that Barth would reject historical criticism on principle, but [that] There has been quite enough talk about historical problems raised by the Bible—the time for that is past. ‘. . . have done with a battle that once had its time but has now *had* it! The special *content* . . . with which the writers of these stories and those who stood behind them were concerned, the Biblical *object*’ [is] God’s returning towards man in Jesus Christ.” (Zahrnt 70)
   4. In Christ, “the divine has touched the world . . . ‘as a tangent touches a circle’. But precisely at this needle-fine point, which is no point, but an event, . . . theology has its only sufficient basis.” (Zahrnt 71)
   5. “Since it has pleased God to speak, all theology as human words about God can only be a stammering imitation of God’s words about himself, a rethinking of his thoughts. . . . This is really . . . as laughable an undertaking as an attempt to draw a bird in its flight.” (Zahrnt 71)
   6. “Barth had once been Harnack’s pupil in Berlin and had sat in his seminars.” [72] Nevertheless, he does not dwell on the difficult historical questions . . .” [71] “Barth’s sole concern was, as he said, to see *through* history into the eternal spirit of the Bible. But did he really only see *through* history? Did he not also see *round* it? If God has spoken in Jesus Christ, then the speaking of God must have some relation to history.” [73] “It was therefore a good thing that Karl Barth’s new theological approach after the First World War was accompanied by [the] ‘form critical method’ . . .” [74] (Zahrnt 71-74)
6. **form criticism** (**1919-c**. **1950**)
   1. “An additional step was taken . . . when scholars sought by methodical analysis to determine the contribution of the early church to the formation of the gospels.” (Conzelmann 8)
   2. “. . . each of the three leading form critics wrote a life of Jesus.” (Conzelmann 9)
   3. Form criticism “started from the recognition that the Evangelists were not primarily writers, but collectors . . . The form critics therefore attempted . . . to discover how the tradition about Jesus was shaped before the Evangelists took it up . . .” (Zahrnt 74)
   4. “. . . it was the unanimous result . . . that the oldest tradition about Jesus was in the form of pericopes . . . Each is formed in accordance with certain rules. . . . details of place and time . . . were largely the inventions of the evangelists. The only exception is the Passion narrative . . .” (Zahrnt 74-75)
   5. “. . . If the laws which governed the formation of the various small types of pericope are to be recognized and the motives for their origin understood, they must be seen in [a] ‘*Sitz im Leben*’, i. e. the concrete occasion for which the community used and formed this tradition. The chief occasion was, of course, preaching.” [75] That preaching was the decisive motive had been recognized by Herder 150 years earlier: “Christianity did not begin with the writing of the gospels, but with the proclamation of past and future things, with exegesis, teaching, consolation, admonition, *preaching*. . . . The Gospel as a whole consisted of individual sections, of narratives, parables, sayings, pericopes.” (Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Collected Works*, Ed. B. Suphan. 1880. 19.196-97, 382, 273 n., 198-99, 209-11, 213-14, 417-18, 391.) [76] “Of course the word ‘preaching’ must not be taken in too narrow a sense; it must include everything pertaining to the proclamation . . ., liturgy and catechesis, apologetic and polemic, community discipline and scriptural exegesis.” (Zahrnt 75-76)
   6. Form criticism seems to suppose “that the community only subsequently constructed a general picture of Jesus . . ., whereas it is generally the case in history that the totality, the integrated picture of a great personality, is not made up afterwards, but is there from the start, from the time when the person was alive. This [76] is surely right. [As] Martin Kähler wrote: ‘. . . the complete personality of our Lord confronts us in every brief story.’” (Zahrnt 76-77)
   7. Because “the earliest small elements . . . had their *Sitz im Leben* in the life of the community and particularly in its worship, . . . There were religious impulses and motives behind the Jesus tradition from the beginning. There never was a picture of Jesus independent of faith. [77] . . . All reminiscences are illuminated by the resurrection of Jesus.” (Zahrnt 77-78)
7. **kerygma theology**
   1. Martin Kähler
      1. “There is a distinction in [Kähler’s title, *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic*, *Biblical Christ*] and throughout the works of Bultmann between the *historisch*, the thing that merely happens and lies buried in the past, and the *geschichtlich*, the thing that both happens and is significant.” (Zahrnt 82 n. 1)
      2. According to Kähler, “a person is historical in his work. . . . the real historical Jesus, that is, historically effective, is not . . . ‘Jesus as he really was’, this uncertain remnant of a process of critical subtraction. The real historical figure is the Christ of preaching and faith . . . ‘The real [Jesus is] the effective . . . Christ . . .’” (Zahrnt 83)
      3. “This Christ of faith and preaching confronts us [in] the Bible. Thus the Biblical Christ is the really historical Christ [83] . . . ‘we must believe the assertion of the Apostles and the New Testament writings—further than that, theology cannot go.’” (Kähler, *The So-Called Historical Jesus* 49 [of the German].) (Zahrnt 83-84)
      4. “Kähler’s whole interest lay in keeping the decision of faith in Jesus Christ independent of the course of historical study and thus of the ‘learned papacy of historians.’” (Zahrnt 84)
      5. “Käsemann (“Das Problem des historischen Jesus” 82 n. 2) rightly feels that Kähler’s book . . . has never really been refuted . . .” (Zahrnt 82 and n. 2)
   2. Rudolf Bultmann
      1. “Rudolf Bultmann has in the last resort done little more than to implement the beginning made by Kähler, providing it with an historical basis by means of form criticism and developing it into a more precise system. . . . He constantly repeats that faith may not search back behind the kerygma to secure historical reliability . . .” (Zahrnt 84)
         1. “. . . we may not go behind the kerygma, using it as a ‘source’ . . . to reconstruct an ‘historical Jesus’.” (*Glauben und Verstehen*, 1.208.) (Zahrnt 84)
         2. “. . . to raise again the problem of how this preaching arose historically . . . would be to tie our faith in the word of God to the results of historical research. The word of preaching confronts us as the word of God. It is not for us to question its credentials. It is we who are questioned, we who are asked whether we will believe the word or reject it.” (*Kerygma and Myth*. Ed. Hans Werner Bartsch. London: 1953. 41.) (Zahrnt 85)
         3. “The historical problem is scarcely relevant to Christian belief in the resurrection.” (*Kerygma and Myth* 42.) “Any counter-questioning as to the proclamation’s right to its claim means that it is already rejected.” (Zahrnt 85)
      2. “Thus Bultmann in the name of the kerygma disputes the relevance of the historical Jesus to faith. His theology has therefore not unjustly been described as a *kerygma theology*. . . . Thus faith is concerned only with the kerygma and precisely in this way reveals itself as pure faith, by believing the kerygma although this kerygma may not be proved by historical means.” (Zahrnt 86)
      3. “Of course for Bultmann, Jesus Christ is not a timeless idea or an eternal symbol, but event, fact, person, happening . . . ‘The kerygma does not proclaim general truths, a timeless idea, . . . but an historical fact.’ [*Glauben und Verstehen* 1.208] . . . Of course Bultmann also maintains the identity between the earthly Jesus and the proclaimed Christ.” (Zahrnt 86)
      4. “Now as is well known, Bultmann has done more historical-critical work on the Gospels than almost anyone else and has therefore himself inquired behind the kerygma to establish what in fact happened and who Jesus really was, what he said and what he did. We have only to think of his book *Jesus and the Word* and the first section of his *Theology of the New Testament*, in which he deals with the proclamation. [Paul] Althaus therefore asks [in *Das sogennante Kerygma und der historische Jesus*, *Zur Kritik der heutigen Kerygma-Theologie*. Gütersloh: 1958] whether in Bultmann’s writings there is not a rift between the historian of *Jesus and the Word* and the systematic theologian of the kerygma theology. . . . Bultmann himself writes: ‘The Jesus of history is not kerygma, any more than my book on Jesus was.’” (*Kerygma and Myth* 117) (Zahrnt 87)
      5. “Thus Bultmann’s historical-critical work seems to have only a negative significance for his kerygma theology, in demonstrating the impossibility of any historical foundation for the kerygma and removing any possible support from faith. . . . [This is] a theological presupposition and [a] hidden presupposition which leads to the radical nature of his criticism. Anyone who holds that the demonstration of genuine Jesus-material in the gospels is theologically so insignificant, indeed even dangerous, is unlikely to find a great deal of it. . . . The mere assertion of the coming of Jesus is sufficient for him as a presupposition of the kerygma. This is the reason for [87] Bultmann’s predilection for St. John’s Gospel, in which (at least according to Bultmann’s interpretation) the concept of revelation is so radical that it concentrates completely on the mere fact of Jesus’ coming as the Revealer without giving any indication of the content of the revelation: ‘Thus it turns out in the end that Jesus as the Revealer of God reveals nothing but that he is the Revealer.’” (*Theology of the NT* 2.66) (Zahrnt 87-88)
      6. Bultmann rejects historical vindication of the kerygma because “acceptance of historical incidents . . . is not faith. This is also the real motive for Bultmann’s ‘de-mythologizing’ of the New Testament, and not . . . rational criticism of the past mythical world-view of the Bible.” (Zahrnt 88)
      7. “Bultmann goes on to assert that it is not only impossible to know more about Jesus than the mere “that,” but it is illegitimate from a Christian perspective. The attempt to discover the Jesus of history by means of historical research and as a result to find a basis for faith is to ground faith in a “work.” [63] . . . “Our radical attempt to demythologize the New Testament is in fact a perfect parallel to St. Paul’s and Luther’s doctrine of justification by faith alone . . . Like the doctrine of justification [it] destroys every false security and every false demand for it [security] on the part of man, whether he seeks it in his good works or in his ascertainable knowledge.”“ (Quotation from Bultmann, Rudolf. “Bultmann Replies to His Critics.” In *Kerygma and Myth*. Ed. Hans Werner Bartsch. Trans. Reginald H. Fuller. London: SPCK, 1964. 1.210-11.] (Charles Anderson 63-64)
      8. “Bultmann’s theological position emerges still more clearly if we see it against the background of the whole intellectual movement of our time.” (Zahrnt 91)
         1. “We could make a synoptic table, in which the following phenomena would appear almost side by side: abstract art, atonal music, the reduction to a minimum of scenario, plot and action in a prominent trend of the modern theatre, the lack of descriptiveness in many scientific expressions which can only be expressed in formulae and can only be comprehended by purely mathematical thinking, existentialism in philosophy, and finally the de-mythologizing of the New Testament in theology. . . . in place of what we can imagine and grasp with our senses, for example melody, imagery, space and time, we have figures, notations, formulae, rhythms, outlines and contours.” (Zahrnt 91)
         2. “. . . with the general anthropocentric trend of the Enlightenment . . . even the history of man was drawn into his subjectivity. All historical events were henceforward regarded only as expressions of the human condition. The peak of this radical humanism was reached in . . . Dilthey, Heidegger, Gogarten, Bultmann and others.” (Zahrnt 92)
      9. “The question, however, is whether . . . Bultmann does not open the way to an impermissible ‘de-historicizing’ of the Christian revelation . . .” (Zahrnt 89)
         1. “Why should the basis of the Christian proclamation not in that case be a myth, any idea? [90] . . . [The] kerygma threatens to become a general, timeless truth, and faith is eventually dependent upon itself.” [91] . . . For him [Bultmann] the history of Jesus is only relevant for faith as this mere fact. As though there could be a ‘fact’ without content! History is never made up only of the mere fact of an event, for this fact always includes the questions ‘who?’, ‘how?’, ‘where?’, ‘when?’, and ‘what?’.” (Zahrnt 90-91, 93)
         2. “Bultmann does not deny the strict concern of the kerygma with Jesus, the earthly man, the crucified [89] one . . . [But] in his writings the Jesus of the kerygma has hardly any concrete, personal, clearly perceptible features.” (Zahrnt 89-90)
         3. ““The historical fact is always part of history; without it there is neither historical reality nor historical existence. [93] . . . the identity between the earthly Jesus and the risen Lord . . . is required simply by our ‘*sensus historicus*’, our innate historical consciousness. In hearing a ‘proclamation’ or a ‘testimony’ each of us first reacts with . . . Did it really happen like that?” (Zahrnt 93-94)
         4. “Paul Althaus writes: ‘According to the New Testament the Word became flesh. . . . In kerygma theology the word became—kerygma.’” (*Das sogennante Kerygma und der historische Jesus*. Zur Kritik der heutigen Kerygma-Theologie. Gütersloh: 1958. 27.) (Zahrnt 90)
         5. “Günther Bornkamm’s criticism is therefore justified: ‘Jesus Christ has become a mere saving act and ceases to be a person.’” (“Mythos und Evangelium.” *Theologische Existenz heute*. N.F. 26. Munich: 1951. 18.] (Zahrnt 90)
         6. “Wolfhart Pannenberg . . . in his much-quoted article ‘Saving Act and History’ . . . recalls theology . . . to the priority of historical reality over all faith and all kerygma.” (“Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte.” *Kerygma und Dogma* (1959) 218 ff., 259 ff.) (Zahrnt 92)
8. **realized eschatology school**
   1. “Because of the impression that form criticism had led into a blind alley or into excessive resignation, some scholars tried anew to arrive at a constructive-synthetic account.” This resulted in “the school of “realized eschatology” (C.H. Dodd, William Manson, T.W. Manson), starting from a new overall understanding of the message of the kingdom of God.” (Conzelmann 9)
   2. “True, the form critical method is used in England, but . . . the form-critical analysis is usually countered by a synthesis, a complete, coherent picture of Jesus, the outlines of which are drawn from the investigations of Rudolf Otto . . .” (Zahrnt 80)
   3. “Apparently scholars were, for the time being, coming to a far-reaching, international consensus, namely, that Jesus understood himself in the sense of a combination of the Son-of-man and Servant-of-God ideas, and that he connected these concepts with the idea of the kingdom of God and linked them to his own person.” (Conzelmann 10)
   4. “The new hypothesis believed it was able to show that the faith of the early church, in its essence, specifically in its interpetation of the person of Jesus, went back to Jesus himself.” (Conzelmann 10)
   5. However, “there remains the historical question of whether this new picture of Jesus can be verified by the sources . . .” (Conzelmann 11)
9. **the new quest for the historical Jesus**
   1. On the new quest, see, e.g.: Anderson, Hugh. *Jesus and Chris­tian Origins*: *A Commentary on Modern Viewpoints*. New York: OUP, 1964.
   2. See also “the series of rather specialized and technical studies” of Fuchs, Ernst. *Studies of the Historical Jesus*. Trans. A. Scobie. Studies in Biblical Theology 42. London: SCM; Naperville: Allenson, 1964. (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 179)
   3. The most famous pupils of Bultmann were Ernst Käsemann, Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Ebeling, Ernst Fuchs, and Hans Conzelmann. (Zahrnt 95)
   4. The “new quest of the historical Jesus,” called for by Ernst Käsemann in 1953, “is really more concerned with Jesus’ teachings and view of existence than with his career or biography . . .” (Reumann, “Introduction,” in Conzelmann ix)
   5. Ernst Fuchs was one “of the German pioneers . . . of the so-called ‘New Quest of the Historical Jesus’ . . .” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 25)
   6. Because “the Gospels do not offer us a consecutive chronological account of Jesus’ career,” “new questers” concentrate on Jesus’ words. (Hugh Anderson 45)
   7. “Bultmann affirms: ‘We must of course do without one thing: we can no longer discern the character of Jesus, the graphic impression of his personality and his life.’ [*Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*. 3rd ed. Berlin: 1960. 42.] In Bornkamm’s book [*Jesus of Nazareth* 24], however, we read: ‘. . . what the Gospels report [is] distinguished by an authenticity, a freshness and a distinctiveness . . .’ . . . This again is almost reminiscent of the words of Martin Kähler: [97] ‘[From the gospels] there confronts us the [consistent] picture of a man.’ [*The So-Called Historical Jesus* 71-72.] . . . what Kähler . . . sensed more naively and intuitively, Bornkamm tested critically . . .” (Zahrnt 97-98)
   8. “The occasion and justification for an inquiry into the history of Jesus is the plain simple fact that the testimony about Jesus Christ has been handed down to us in the form of Gospels. . . . these Gospels . . . put the proclamation of Christ within the framework of the earthly life of Jesus. This is the more surprising as in the Epistles . . . the history of Jesus is reduced to a minimum and almost everything is concentrated on the redemptive significance of his death and resurrection. The Gospels [100] . . . ascribe their kerygma to the earthly Jesus . . . therefore, the kerygma is not anonymous.” (Zahrnt 100-101)
   9. Historical investigation of Jesus “is not simply a question of the curiosity underlying all science, as N.A. Dahl thinks [101] . . . What historical study can and must do [is] reveal the *claim* he made . . . For this *claim* to revelation [103] . . . must go back to Jesus himself [104] . . . We must use this method [historical study] to demonstrate the historical connection between the Jesus of history and the Christ of proclamation.” (Zahrnt 101, 103-104, 106)
   10. According to Ebeling, ‘It is impermissible in christology to make any statement about Jesus which does not have its foundation in the historical Jesus and is not limited to expressing who the historical Jesus is.’ [“Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und das Problem der Christologie.” In *Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*. 56th year, 1959, Supplement 1. 24.] This has a number of consequences for our interpretation of christological dogma, and Ebeling is not afraid to draw these consequences: either we must reduce dogmatic statements about Christ to what may with historical justification be predicated of Jesus, or we must interpret dogmatic statements about Christ in such a way that they do not conflict with what can be vindicated by history. . . . the historical Jesus in this way becomes the ‘criterion’, i.e. the content, norm and measure of christology . . .” (Zahrnt 105)
   11. Bornkamm’s *Jesus of Nazareth* is a good example of the new quest. On pp. 52-59, “the reader should note what is omitted . . .” (Hugh Anderson 37)
       1. Almost nothing is said about Jesus’ infancy, because the infancy narratives are “largely legendary . . .” (Hugh Anderson 37)
       2. Almost nothing is said about Jesus’ “hidden life” (childhood and youth), because the sources say nothing about this. (Hugh Anderson 37)
       3. “There is no playing of the “personality game” with the Jesus of the Gospels. No facing him with those slightly absurd questions beloved of modern educational employment agencies. Has he leadership qualities? A developed sense of responsibility? Is he a good mixer? Does he cooperate well with both equals and seniors? Has he a sense of humor? The Gospels are in fact simply not interested in Jesus’ personality in anything like that sense.” (Hugh Anderson 37)
   12. Little is said in the new quest of the “self-consciousness” of Jesus. “Did he think of himself as Messiah? As Son of Man? As Son of God? Did he go up to Jerusalem at last with specific intent to die, constrained by the ideal of the Suffering Servant of Israel prophesied of old by Isaiah? On these matters the Gospels give hints, no more. They yield no conclusive answers.” (Hugh Anderson 37)
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1. **on history and the gospels**
   1. “. . . the fundamental problem of all theological work is still *history*.” (Zahrnt 13)
   2. “. . . *History is composed of fact and interpretation*. We may apply it more directly to the Gospels . . . in this way: *The Gospels are a combination of history* (*in the sense of fact*) *and kerygma* (*interpretation*). In the preceding sentence we used the word “history” in the more restricted sense of fact, because it is often set up in this way as opposed to the kerygma by contemporary kerygmatists. [“Kerygmatists” is one of Anderson’s designations for the followers of Bultmann.] . . . Furthermore, any historical writing of necessity must contain both fact and interpretation. They vary in quantity in relation to one another. If the particular writer emphasizes the facts, we have a chronicle. If he emphasizes the interpretation, we have a romance. [58] . . . . . . the fault of Bultmann and his successors has been their overemphasis on the element of interpretation . . . the exponents of the new quest have in a measure reopened the historical question, but even with them the greatest emphasis remains with the kerygma.” (Charles Anderson 58, 60)
   3. “When we go to church we are unwilling to leave our intellectual capabilities at the door. If that happens, faith becomes just that blind, desperate acceptance of incredibilities. True, with God nothing is impossible, but this is not to say that everything possible is of God. . . . for us there is only *one* reality, the reality which surrounds us . . .” (Zahrnt 22)
   4. “All these events [concerning Christ] . . . do not occupy a position at the beginnings of Christianity in the same way as other definite events, words, acts and persons stand at the beginning of a process of historical development as its origin and starting point. In other words, they do not set this process in motion and then themselves sink back into the past. The unique historical origin of Christianity is ascribed permanent, authoritative, absolute significance: what happened once is said to have happened once for all and therefore to have continuous efficacy.” (Zahrnt 27)
   5. “As ‘*historia sacra*’, the so-called ‘salvation history’ [as] distinguished from ‘*historia profana*’, ‘world history’, [28] . . . Jesus Christ was made an historical abnormality.” (Zahrnt 28-29)
   6. “It [the Bible] is therefore not to be understood as a unity in the sense that all—Moses, Elijah, Jesus and Paul—say the same thing.” (Zahrnt 42)
   7. “Hardly anything else has made so great a contribution to the secularization of the world [as] historical understanding. This historical understanding is not merely a new method for an individual discipline [23] . . . At the beginning of the seventeenth century Grotius [Hugo Grotius, Dutch jurist] composed a great work on international law (*De iure belli et pacis*), the first of its kind. In it he says that the law has validity ‘*etsi Deus non daretur*’. Even if God did not exist! . . . Heisenberg has summed up the result of the whole of this development in one short phrase in his Munich paper, now become famous: ‘Man encounters only himself.’ This phrase characterizes the consummation of the modern era (but not its conclusion). [24] . . . the development of historical thought [threatens] to relegate the Christian faith [to] something ‘purely historical’, something which can be understood and explained in just the same way as other historical phenomena. [32] . . . [If] even the revelation of God is subject to the doubts which surround any historical event, how can it still serve as a ground of faith? [33] . . . the spear of history . . . had inflicted the wound . . .” (Zahrnt 23-24, 32-33, 43)
   8. “The acute shortage of sources for Jesus’ career . . . we may deem exceedingly unfortunate . . . Where objective data are lacking, subjective judgment and imagination are liable to be given free play.” (Hugh Anderson 3)
   9. “Jesus himself, we must remember, wrote nothing, nor was anything written about him while he was still alive.” (Hugh Anderson 3)
   10. “If Jesus himself had written even one “Gospel,” it would have greatly simplified the historian’s task and restricted the possibilities. Obviously it is the scantiness of the materials on Jesus and the complex character of the sources . . . that have enabled the writing of so many books about him, expressing countless divergent opinions . . .” (Hugh Anderson 23)
   11. “But perhaps for too long too many have expected too much from these documents [the four gospels]. We have imagined that they should place in our grasp the figure of Jesus “as he really was in himself” as an isolated and idealized individual. [22] . . . we hope to extract from them the “timeless essence” of his life in capsule form and in one easy lesson . . .” (Hugh Anderson 22-23)
   12. “. . . for history has a lot to do with impact and reaction, impression and response, relationship and encounter between person and person. . . . [Quite] properly the historian seeks to catch the first level of impressions that Jesus made on various groups of people in Judaea and Galilee during his ministry.” (Hugh Anderson 23)
   13. “. . . the most we may look for by way of history in the Gospel tradition is not all that was in Jesus “as he was in himself,” but the varying responses he evoked from the folk he met through the different impressions he made on them.” (Hugh Anderson 23)
   14. The thirty years between Jesus and the writing of Mark “is after all a relatively short time. Not long enough, to be sure, for the traditions of Jesus’ words and deeds to have been shaped and reshaped by the “collective consciousness” of the community in a fashion so uncontrolled that all trace of his history is lost! Besides, eyewitnesses of his ministry are involved in handing down these same traditions. And as to the words of Jesus . . . he often couched them in a form that could be easily memorized . . .” (Hugh Anderson 36)
   15. “. . . only the individual traditions . . . can be used as primary sources. Even among these, authenticity must be questioned from case to case.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 15)
   16. “. . . we cannot reconstruct an outer and inner development.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 15)
   17. “One discovers [15] nothing about his appearance, his human character, his habits, nothing about the commonplace things in his life.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 15-16)
   18. “. . . the epiphany stories (baptism, transfiguration) . . . reveal absolutely nothing about inner experiences of Jesus; they are constructed from the post-Easter perspective of the church’s faith.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 16)
   19. “. . . the prophecies of his “passion” . . . are dogmatic assertions about the necessity of the passion as this was conceived by the church after his death.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 16)
   20. “The real question is, Did the Gospel writers interpret the facts correctly? Do we have in the Gospels an accurate accounting of what happened in the first century *and* an accurate interpretation of those happenings?” (Charles Anderson 59)
   21. “Of course historical study . . . can never establish that God acted in the history of Jesus and that this history is the final, decisive revelation of God in the world. [103] . . . Historical scholarship . . . can destroy the grounds of faith, but it cannot supply them. . . . Historical study may be able to demonstrate that Jesus made a claim to revelation. That this claim is a claim on me here and now, however, is no longer a matter of historical investigation . . . but of my faith.” (Zahrnt 103-104)
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1. **Hugh Anderson**
   1. “The acute shortage of sources for Jesus’ career . . . we may deem exceedingly unfortunate . . . Where objective data are lacking, subjective judgment and imagination are liable to be given free play.” (Hugh Anderson 3)
   2. “Jesus himself, we must remember, wrote nothing, nor was anything written about him while he was still alive.” (Hugh Anderson 3)
   3. “If Jesus himself had written even one “Gospel,” it would have greatly simplified the historian’s task and restricted the possi­bilities. Obviously it is the scantiness of the materials on Jesus and the complex character of the sources . . . that have enabled the writing of so many books about him, expressing countless diver­gent opinions . . .” (Hugh Anderson 23)
   4. “But perhaps for too long too many have expected too much from these documents [the four gospels]. We have imagined that they should place in our grasp the figure of Jesus “as he really was in himself” as an isolated and idealized individual. [22] . . . we hope to extract from them the “timeless essence” of his life in capsule form and in one easy lesson . . .” (Hugh Anderson 22-23)
   5. “. . . history has a lot to do with impact and reaction, im­pres­sion and re­sponse, relationship and encounter between person and person. . . . [Quite] properly the historian seeks to catch the first level of impressions that Jesus made on various groups of people in Judaea and Galilee during his ministry.” (Hugh Anderson 23)
   6. “. . . the most we may look for by way of history in the Gospel tradition is not all that was in Jesus “as he was in himself,” but the varying responses he evoked from the folk he met through the different impressions he made on them.” (Hugh Anderson 23)
   7. The thirty or forty years between Jesus’ death and the writing of Mark “is after all a relatively short time. Not long enough, to be sure, for the traditions of Jesus’ words and deeds to have been shaped and re­shaped by the “collective consciousness” of the community in a fashion so uncontrolled that all trace of his history is lost! Besides, eyewitnesses of his ministry are involved in handing down these same traditions. And as to the words of Jesus . . . he often couched them in a form that could be easily memorized . . .” (Hugh Anderson 36)
2. **Hans Conzelmann**
   1. “. . . only the individual traditions . . . can be used as primary sources. Even among these, authenticity must be questioned from case to case.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 15)
   2. “. . . we cannot reconstruct an outer and inner development.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 15)
   3. “One discovers [15] nothing about his appearance, his human charac­ter, his habits, nothing about the commonplace things in his life.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 15-16)
   4. “. . . the epiphany stories (baptism, transfiguration) . . . reveal absolutely nothing about inner experiences of Jesus; they are constructed from the post-Easter perspec­tive of the church’s faith.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 16)
   5. “. . . the prophecies of his “passion” . . . are dogmatic asser­tions about the necessity of the passion as this was conceived by the church after his death.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 16)

## The Reliability of the Synoptic Tradition (Schadewaldt)

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang. “The Reliability of the Synoptic Tradition.” In Hengel, Martin. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985. 89-113. (German: “Die Zuverlässigkeit der synoptischen Tradition.” *Theologische Beiträge* 13 (1982) 198-221.)

Main thesis of the article: “. . . if, as often in philology, we make a comparison in terms of good tradition, bad tradition, and very good tradition, . . . the Synoptic Gospels, are very good tradition.” (Schadewaldt 111)

“Wolfgang Schadewaldt (1900-1974) was a classical philologist. [85] . . . The lecture included here is one which Wolfgang Schadewaldt gave in November 1966 to the theological faculty in Hamburg; it was preceded by a number of colloquia in Tübingen.” (Hengel *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* 85, 87)

“. . . Bultmann attempts to find a way to the basic category which is decisive for him, his predecssors and his successors: the reformulation of the words and actions of Jesus by the community, the so-called ‘community tendency’.” (Schadewaldt 92)

“. . . what would we now know about what Jesus said and did had not this community or . . . its prominent figures, the apostles, like Peter, handed information down to us and preserved it for us?” (Schadewaldt 92)

“. . . this criticism [Bultmann’s] does not draw a clear enough distinction between the first apostles, like Peter, who were still direct witnesses, and the communities which had already been formed . . ., although it is clear that there is such a tradition of witnesses even behind Paul.” (Schadewaldt 93)

“Oral transmission can be an indication of a particular kind of living tradition in which, in some circumstances, the productive aspect of transmission and existential concern, in this instance the interest of faith, is stronger than mere preservation. . . . However, oral transmission can also be a very accurate, fixed tradition, a clear reproduction of the original . . .” (Schadewaldt 93)

“. . . in the nineteenth century the Homeric parable was interpreted in very much the same way as it is interpreted here by Jülicher, Bultmann and others. However, in Homeric scholarship this view of the nature of the parable was already refuted in the early 1920s, above all by Hermann Fränkel in a fine book (*Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, 1921) . . . Eberhard Jüngel, in his excellent book *Paulus und Jesus* (Tübingen 21964), has dealt admirably with these issues, especially on pp. 94f., where he refutes Jülicher, and then again on pp. 129ff., where (in connection with the unforgettable hermeneutical investigations of Ernst Fuchs) he implicitly observes that in speaking of the parables, Bultmann, too, has basically kept to Jülicher’s standpoint. . . . in the wake of Hermann Fränkel a considrable literature has grown up around the parables in Homer. [E.g.,] Bruno Snell, *Entdeckung des Geistes* (Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen, Hamburg 31955). Jüngel knows all this and quotes it.” (Schadewaldt 94)

“When, say, the fall of Hector is compared with the fall of an oak, or when a hero is compared with a lion going out after prey—the Homeric parable, too, is not intended to make understandable something that otherwise would be incomprehensible. The fall of a hero is completely understandable and not open to misunderstanding. . . . This [comparison] puts us in mind [94] of the oak as a mighty and powerful tree. Opening up a perspective in both directions reveals the third feature in the two aspects, what they have in common—not as a *tertium comparationis*, but as their basic substance, their foundation. Homer’s parables disclose the heart of the matter. In the parable in which Hector falls like an oak we have not only a characterization of his violent fall—what does fall like an oak?—but also a characterization of what Hector is: he is a man like an oak. All this is a complex totality. And that is always the case. Animals are truer to nature than human beings; human beings are odd, they have many aspects, presenting now one and now another. . . . the decisive feature of these parables is the way in which they disclose being . . . the present character of a person—the fact that he behaves in such and such a way—appears in the context of the parable in terms of what is always the case.” (Schadewaldt 94-95)

“The parables of Jesus are related above all to . . . the gospel, the coming of the kingdom of God. Almost all the parables, and at any rate the original parables, are connected with the coming of the kingdom of God. Jesus himself calls the realization of the kingdom of God a mystery in Mark 4.11 . . . of coruse the parable conceals. But what we have here is what I would want to call a ‘revelatory concealment’. Revelation can conceal and concealment [95] can reveal. It was Goethe above all who . . . kept stressing the nature of being as a manifest mystery. There are circumstances which can only be expressed adequately in the form of a revelation which conceals, and I believe that the ‘mysteries’ of Jesus are such situations. Not because the one who talks about such circumstances wants to be mysterious . . . Jesus cannot speak adequately about the coming of the kingdom of God unless he primarily uses the form of parable as a revelation which conceals.” (Schadewaldt 95-96)

“However, there is another factor here . . ., something of a ‘challenge’ . . . these passages are constantly accompanied with phrases like ‘You do not hear with your ears or see with your eyes’ . . . [In the] interpretation of the parable of the Sower . . . the decisive factor here is the receiving, the hearing, the perception. . . . [Though] the ‘interpretation’ (Mark 4.18f.; Matt. 13.22) . . . is usually contested, [96] . . . the parable ityself shows that this is what Jesus meant: . . . in the ‘good earth’, the fruitful earth, the seed is accepted—indeed not only accepted, but *received*. . . . the interpretatin of the parable of the Sower . . . I take to be an authentic historical interpretation by Jesus because of the weight of its pronouncement . . .” (Schadewaldt 96-97)

A parable “draws into its orbit the person who has ears to hear. We thus see how this person who hears performs a first act of deep commitment . . . It is really the case, as Jüngel puts it, that when Jesus tells the parables of the kingdom of God and these parables are perceived, the coming of the kingdom of God takes place.” (Schadewaldt 98)

“We move on to the parables of the mustard seed, the leaven, the seed growing secretly, the parable of the thief in the night and so on. [98] . . . There is in fact no more wonderful process—as our own experience will confirm—than the process of growth. This mysterious fact of something coming about imperceptibly before our eyes with unprecedented power—there is indeed no greater power than that which is regularly exercised in the spring, when everything comes back again: it is an inexorable power, but one which is silent, still, gentle, incomprehensible. So there is hardly a better image for the mystery of the coming of the kingdom of God than that of growth. . . . The parables which I have mentioned here certainly do not derive from community tendencies, but all belong in the teaching of Jesus as we know it also from elsewhere, the teaching of the coming of the kingdom of God.” (Schadewaldt 98-99)

“Jesus did miracles, but not like other miracle workers. He always refused to make his miracles his credentials. Rather, . . . the miraculous, is quite specific and at the same time somehow significant beyond the individual healing, the individual miracle. These ‘miracles’ convey something: the lame walk, the blind see, the deaf hear, the old promise is fulfilled. That means that the kingdom of God is on the way, is somehow already there. Thus the miracles are somehow like the parables—concealing yet revealing . . . it is no accident that Jesus does not want these miracles to be talked about, since in his view there is more to them than the magic of miracles . . .” (Schadewaldt 100)

“. . . when we read the Synoptic Gospels, we cannot be other than captivated by the experiential vividness with which we are confronted. The conditions of their time stand before us: nature, the landscape of Palestine, the Sea of Galilee . . . I know of no other area of history-writing, biography or poetry where I encounter so great a wealth of material in such a small space. Think of all the landscapes; think of all the personalities . . . People praise the wealth of imagery in Homer . . ., in Plato . . . in Shakespear, and also in Dante and Goethe. Elsewhere, however, it is very rare, and the works I have just mentioned are on the whole large-scale works . . . but how has it got there [100] . . .? . . . there might be an indication of its origin in . . . Acts 1.22f. [election of Matthias as a witness from the beginning] . . . direct involvement in the life of the historical Jesus was the basic condition for the apostolate of the earliest apostles.” (Schadewaldt 100-101)

“In reading the Synoptic Gospels we come across sayings of Jesus or situations [which] contain theological and kerygmatic nuclei. These are the tiniest little nuclei, preformations. It would be natural to claim that here we have the germs of later things. But [with] New Testament scholars . . . the sayings are thought to be late, secondary.” (Schadewaldt 103)

“. . . ‘on the way’ [is] more than literary decoration. Jesus’ whole life was made up of travelling . . .” (Schadewaldt 102)

“. . . there is something which I would like to call the unmistakable aroma of truth. There is an unmistakable smell of truth. There is a way in which a situation or a saying can be shaped which shows that it does not come from a community, a collective, but is a situation which once happened, a word which was once spoken.” (Schadewaldt 105)

“. . . I have never understood, nor can I understand now, why Protestant theologians try so hard to find a way round the famous note [about Mark] by Papias in Eusebius. . . . Eusebius, who . . . was a very conscientious historian and philologist, says of Papias, who lived about 130, that he still knew the immediate disciples of the Lord (and Eusebius did not make this kind of thing up himself!). . . . precisely the character attributed to the Gospel of Mark, namely that it is post-Pauline and biassed [*sic*] against Peter, indicates to me that almost everything in the Gospel of Mark comes quite directly from Peter. . . . Only Peter himself can have told how directly after his own confession he sought to keep his Lord from suffering, and the same is true of the account of the denial. Any other members of the early communities would be horrified to tell someting of this kind about Peter. [107] . . . This basic human fact of commitment followed by failure and then revival indicates Peter’s greatness and power and thus at the same time lends truth to what is said of him, and of Jesus. . . . the basic content of the stories about Peter, which are authentic history, is also preserved in the other Synoptic Gospels. Mark too arranged his material, as we know, but it seems to me that the important thing is the basic content of what he arranged.” (Schadewaldt 107-108)

“I propose to discuss the doubt cast on the veracity of oral tradition, the problem of oral tradition. I have in fact made a thorough study of oral tradition; the Homeric legends, about which I have also written a short book, gave me occasion for this. There is a very fine book by a Dane called Lestøl (*The Origin of the Icelandic Family Saga*). [108] . . . see now T. Boman, *Die Jesus-Überlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde*, Göttingen 1967). . . . [In Sozomen I 11,] A sermon was preached on the story of the paralysed man who was let down trhough the roof on a bed or a couch. . . . Instead of using the word κράββατος for bed or couch, the preacher chose a more refined one (σκίμπους). One of his congregation immediately called out, ‘Are you better than the one who said κράββατος?’” (Schadewaldt 108-109)

“We must add another concept or, better, fact to that of oral tradition: memory. . . . people keep acting as though the perhaps forty years which had elapsed between the death of the Lord and the Gospels [109] was a period of three hundred years. I keep hearing the words, ‘in the course of tradition’. A human brain can bridge that . . .” (Schadewaldt 109-110)

“. . . we often see it [form criticism] used on a mistaken assumption: people always act as though what is expressed in a form is less real. That is quite wrong. Something can be moulded into a form a hundred times and still be quite real. Indeed, even today we put everything in forms. . . . Whether it is unreal or not depends on quite different circumstances, and not on [110] the ‘wicked’ form. . . . It is quite clear that in fact we can detect a tendency towards shaping, theological shaping; we can see that quite clearly when we compare Matthew with Mark and then again with Luke . . . The only question is how far we go in this direction.” (Schadewaldt 110-111)

The “nineteenth-century . . . historicist conception” of biography emphasized facts, causality, “compensating plausibility,” psychologizing, and [111] inner development. But ancient biographers did not base themselves on “causality, plausibility and inner development (this was only a nineteenth-century development) but on two things, πράγματα and λόγοι . . . [That] is right. If we have a correct understanding of the events, above all the situation, i.e. the pattern of events, and the λόγοι, then we have the best that one can say about a historical phenomenon. . . . with Bultmann and others all these things are . . . refuted. However, they are not refuted by a rejection of the method, but by a rejection of the word of scripture.” (Schadewaldt 111-112)

“Käsemann wants to put the brute facts, as he calls them, on one side and says that these brute facts make sense only through a new understanding and a new decision. I beg to differ. My view is that these . . . brute facts have an energy, a concentration, a form which gives them a concentrated, alarming, evocative power just as they stand, as facts, words and situations in the Gospel.” (Schadewaldt 112)

# Part 4: The Historical Jesus

## References to Jesus Outside the Synoptic Gospels:

## John’s Gospel

1. “In the search for the historical Jesus [John’s gospel] is of no use whatsoever . . . Insofar as the world rejects him and true salvation, this rejection is reduced to a “no” [17] spoken by the “Jews” as a whole . . .” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 17-18)
2. John wrote “a theological interpretation of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Though he makes use of the gospel as a literary form, his main concern is . . . to *reinterpret* the ministry in the light of his faith . . .” (Howard Clark Kee, Franklin W. Young, and Karlfried Froehlich, *Understanding the New Testament*, 2nd ed. [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965] 329.) So John is more a meditation on the synoptic type of gospel than a gospel of the synoptic type.

## References to Jesus Outside the Synoptic Gospels:

## Pagan Sources

Goguel, Maurice. *The Life of Jesus*. Trans. Olive Wyon. New York: Macmillan, 1945. (French: *La Vie de Jésus*. Paris: Payot, 1932.) Scriptural quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version.

1. **Tacitus**, *Annales* 15.44: “In order to destroy the rumor [which accused him of having set fire to Rome] he [Nero] invented a charge of guilt, and inflicted the most appalling tortures on those who were hated on account of their abominations, and who were called Christians by the multitude. This name comes to them from Christ, whom the Procurator Pontius Pilate, under the rule of Tiberius, had handed over to the torture. Repressed for the moment, this detestable superstition broke out anew, no longer simply in Judaea, where the evil arose, but at Rome, into which there flows all that is horrible and shameful in the whole world, and finds many people to support it.” (Goguel 94-95)
2. **Suetonius**, *Life of Claudius* 25.4: “He expelled from Rome the Jews who, under the influence of Chrestos, did not cease to agitate.” (Goguel 97)
   1. Probably “the Jewish circles in Rome had been agitated by the preaching of the Gospel . . .” (Goguel 98)
   2. “. . . the Christians seem to have been called Χρηστιανοί at Rome and not Χριστι­αν­οί . . .” (Goguel 98) In the only three occurrences of “Christians” in the New Testament (Acts 11:26, 26:28, 1 Pet 4:16), Codex Sinaiticus has Χρηστι­ανοί, and Codex Vaticanus has Χριστι­ανοί. (Goguel 98 n. 1)

## References to Jesus Outside the Synoptic Gospels:

## Jewish Sources

Klausner, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth*: *His Life*, *Times*, and *Teaching*. Trans. Herbert Danby. New York: Macmillan, 1925. (Hebrew: Jerusalem, 1922.) (Scriptural quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version.)

passages from josephus

1. **introduction**: Flavius Josephus (Joseph ben Mattathiah) was born in ad 37-38. He was a Pharisee and a priest; he became a historian, an interpreter of the history of Judaism for the Romans of his day. His two major works are *The Antiquities of the Jews* (ad 90s) and *The Jewish War*. (Klausner 55)
2. **passage 1** (suspected Christian additions are in italics): “Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, *if it be lawful to call him a man*. For he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. *He was the Messiah*; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first ceased not [so to do], *for he appeared to them alive again the third day*, *as the divine Prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him*; and the race of Christians, so named for him, are not extinct even now.” (*Antiquities* 18.3.3) (Klausner 56)
   1. Some scholars think that this whole passage was later added to Josephus’ writings by a Christian: these scholars assume that Josephus would have avoided mentioning Christianity altogether because to mention it would require mentioning Jewish messianic ideas—and mentioning those to a Roman audience at a time when Domitian was persecuting Jews (c. ad 93) would not have been wise. (Klausner 56-57)
   2. But the presentation of a Jewish figure in terms that Gentiles could understand is typical of Josephus. Thus Jesus is “a wise man” (Josephus elsewhere in his writings says John the Baptist was “a good man”); Jesus is “a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure” (Josephus elsewhere says John “called upon the Jews to exercise virtue”). (Klausner 58)
   3. “Albert Réville rightly urges that no Christian interpolator would speak of Jesus as “a wise man” [nor] be satisfied to apply to Jesus the general term “wonderful works” [nor give] Christians such a name as “race” or “tribe” (φῦλον), with its nuance of contempt.” (Klausner 58) So the passage (excluding the suspected Christian additions, in italics) is probably genuine.
3. **passage 2**:”Ananias called a Sanhedrin together, brought before it James, the brother of Jesus who was called the Christ, and certain others . . . and he caused them to be stoned.” (*Antiquities* 20.9.1) (Goguel *Life of Jesus* 77, not Klausner)
   1. This passage is probably from Josephus’ hand and not from a later Christian who “touched up” Josephus’ *Antiquities* to make it refer to Christ. For one thing, “there was never any reason for any Christian to interpolate such statements: they contain nothing in praise either of James or Jesus; Josephus . . . does not belaud the doings of James . . ., nor defend him against the charge brought against him.” (Klausner 59)
   2. “Réville rightly urges that no Christian would write of Jesus ‘who was called (λεγομέν­ου) the Messiah’ . . .” (Klausner 59)
4. **conclusions**: what the evidence from Josephus teaches us about Jesus
   1. “. . . from neither [reference to Jesus in Josephus’ works] do we learn much about Jesus . . .” (Klausner 60)
   2. “. . . yet even from these fragmentary statements we at least receive confirmation of his and his brother James’ existence, of his career as a wonder-worker and teacher, and of his terrible death—his crucifixion at the hands of Pilate with, at least, the consent of the principal Jews.” (Klausner 60)

passages from the talmud

1. **introduction**: The *Talmud* is a many-volume collection of Jewish lore and wisdom; its contents largely date from Jesus’ time to ad 500. Though Jesus is mentioned a number of times in the Talmud, most references to him date from 200-500 and are historically worthless. Only references that probably date from c. ad 1-200 are included here, and only those which Klausner considers to be genuine.
2. **Sanh. 43a** (italic words in square brackets are from the Munish MS of the *Dikduke Sof*’*rim*): “On the eve of Passover they hanged Yeshu [*of Nazareth*] and the herald went before him for forty days saying, ‘[*Yeshu of Nazareth*] is going forth to be stoned because he has practised sorcery and beguiled and led astray Israel. Let everyone knowing anything in his defence come and plead for him.’ But they found nothing in his defence and hanged him on the eve of Passover.” (Klausner 27)
   1. “The *Talmud* authorities do not deny that Jesus worked signs and wonders, but they look upon them as acts of sorcery. We find the same thing in the Gospels: ‘And the Scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub, and, By the prince of the devils he casteth out devils’ [Mark 3:22 par.] . . .” (Klausner 28)
   2. “That it was as a seducer and beguiler that Jesus was put to death was clear to the *Tannaim* [rabbis from c. ad 1-200], for in their days his disciples had become a separate Jewish sect which denied many of the religious principles of Judaism; therefore their teacher, Jesus, had beguiled them and led them astray from the Jewish faith.” (Klausner 28)
   3. “. . . according to [the gospels] the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin was finished hurriedly . . . the statement about the herald has an obvious “tendency,” and it is difficult to think that it is historical.” (Klausner 28)
3. **Gitt. 56b-57a**: “Onkelos son of Kalonymos, son of Titus’ sister, [a pagan,] . . . raised up Jesus by spells and said to him: What is the most important thing in the world? He said to him, Israel. He asked, And how if I should join myself with them? He said to him, Seek their good and do not seek their harm; everyone that hurts them is as if he hurt the apple of God’s eye. He then asked, And what is the fate of that man? He said to him, Boiling filth. A *Baraita* [tradition from the period c. ad 1-200] has said: Everyone that scoffs against the words of the wise is condemned to boiling filth. Come and see what there is between the transgressors in Israel and the prophets of the nations of the world.”
4. **Yeb. 4.3; 49a**: “R. [= “rabbi”] Shimeon ben ‘Azzai said: I found a genealogical roll in Jerusalem wherein was recorded, ‘Such-a-one is a bastard of an adulteress.” (Klausner 35)
   1. “That Jesus is here referred to seems to be beyond doubt . . . the statement must necessarily have referred to someone well-known,” and the reference to “such-a-one” rather than to “Jesus” by name is “to be explained by their [the rabbis’] general unwillingness to refer to him . . .” (Klausner 34-36)
   2. The belief that Jesus was “a bastard of an adulteress” became common in Judaism. “. . . from an early date, the name ‘Pantere,’ or ‘Pandera,’ became widely current among the Jews as the name of the reputed father of Jesus.” 38 Probably “‘Pantere’ is a corrupt travesty of Παρθένος, virgin. The Jews constantly heard that the Christians . . . called Jesus by the name “Son of the Virgin,” υἱὸς τῆς Παρθένου; and so, in mockery, they called him “Ben ha-Pantera,” i.e. son of the leopard. [Gradually] “Pandera” was thought to be [the proper name] of his father, and since this is not a Jewish name, there arose the legend that the natural father was a foreigner; and . . . it was concluded that Miriam, the mother of Jesus, committed adultery with a soldier, and, of course, with a Roman soldier, since there were Roman legions in Judaea at the time.” (Klausner 24)
5. **T. Yeb. 3.3**: “They asked R. Eliezer, ‘What of such-a-one as regards the world to come?’ He said to them, ‘You have only asked me about such-a-one. . . . What of a bastard as touching inheritance?—What of him as touching the levirate duties? What of him as regards whitening his house?—What of him as regards whitening his grave?’—not because he evaded them by words, but because he never said a word which he had not heard from his teacher.” (Klausner 36)
   1. “Büchler maintains that R. Eliezer’s answer to the question whether Jesus had any share in the world to come was, like his answer to the other questions, in the affirmative.” (Klausner 37)
   2. “But if . . . we regard his answer as ambiguous, ‘neither yes nor no,’ we can [conclude that] the *Tannaim*, the successors of the Pharisees, were at the end of the first Christian century, far from regarding Jesus as [nothing] more than ‘a transgressor in Israel,’ and were still accustomed to come into close religious touch with the Christians.” (Klausner 37) The next quotation also supports this conclusion.
6. **Ab**. **Zar**. **16b-17a**; **T**. **Hulin 2**.**24** (italic words in square brackets are from the Munich MS of the *Dikduke Sof*’*rim*): “Our teachers have taught: When R. Eliezer [*the Great*] was arrested for *Minuth* [heresy, here Christianity] they brought him to the tribunal for judgment. The Procurator said to him, Does an old man like you busy himself with such idle matters? He answered, I trust him that judges me. So the Procurator thought that he spoke of him, whereas he spoke of his heavenly Father. The Procurator said to him, Since you trust in me you are acquitted. When he returned home his disciples came in to console him, but he would not accept their consolations. R. Akiba said to him, Suffer me to tell you one thing of what you have taught me. He answered, (Say on). He said, Perhaps [*a word of*] *minuth* came upon you and pleased you and therefore you were arrested. He answered, Akiba, you have reminded me! Once I was walking along the upper market of Sepphoris [a city in Galilee] and found one [*of the* *disciples of Jesus of Nazareth*]; and Jacob of Kefar Sekanya was his name. He said to me, It is written in your Law, ‘Thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot, etc.’ What was to be done with it—a latrine for the High Priest? But I answered nothing. He said to me, So [*Jesus of Nazareth*] [the *Tosefta*, which contains a parallel version of this passage, here reads, “Yeshu ben Pantere” instead of “Jesus of Nazareth”] taught me: ‘For of the hire of a harlot has she gathered them, and to the hire of a harlot shall they return;’ from the place of filth they come, and unto the place of filth they shall go. And the saying pleased me, and because of this I was arrested for *Minuth*. And I transgressed against what is written in the Law: ‘Keep thy way far from her’—that is *Minuth*; ‘and come not nigh the door of her house’—that is the civil government.” (Klausner 37-38)
   1. Klausner accepts this reference as historical.
      1. Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus was born ad 30-40, “a short time after Jesus was crucified. So it is not impossible that he should have spoken with one of Jesus’ actual disciples . . .” 39 The disciple may even have been James the Lord’s brother (“James” is English for “Jacob”). (Klausner 41-42)
      2. “. . . there can be no doubt that the words, ‘one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth,’ and ‘thus Jesus of Nazareth taught me,’ are . . . both early in date and fundamental in their bearing on the story . . .” (Klausner 38)
      3. Quite some time must have occurred between the meeting with the disciple (perhaps c. 60) and Eliezer’s arrest (perhaps c. 95, Domitian’s persecution), “since R. Eliezer had forgotten the meeting and R. Akiba had to remind him of it . . .” (Klausner 39)
      4. “There is no attempt in the story to pour contempt on Jesus; on the contrary, the saying reported in the name of Jesus pleases the great Tanna.”
      5. It is true that Jesus’ teaching in the gospels concerns mostly ethics and personal piety, not legalistic matters (the hire of a harlot and the latrine). But
         1. “Pharisaic methods of exposition are by no means foreign to him . . .” (Klausner 42) See Mark 12:35-37//Matt 22:41-45//Luke 20:41-44, “The Lord said to my lord . . .”
         2. Jesus “had been hailed by the title ‘Rabbi’ and ‘Mari’ just like any Pharisaic Rabbi . . .” (Klausner 43) (“םרי is the Κύριε of the Gospels . . .” 43 n. 91)
         3. Jesus spoke easily of routine bodily functions (see Matt 15:17//Mark 7:19, “whatever goes into the mouth enters the stomach, and goes out into the sewer [ἀφεδρών, “latrine”]). (Klausner 43)
      6. Eliezer seems definitely to have had sympathies with the Christian movement. (Klausner 44)
         1. “. . . R. Eliezer was not able to deny Jesus a share in the world to come . . .” (Klausner 44) See T. Yeb. 3.3, quoted above.
         2. Some of Eliezer’s sayings are like Jesus’: “Everyone who has a morsel of food in his basket and says, What shall I eat tomorrow? is of little faith” (Sota 45b, cf. Matt 6:30-34); “Do thy will in heaven above and give comfort to them that fear thee here below and do what is good in thine eyes” (Berachoth 29b; *Tosefta* Ber. 3.2; cf. the Lord’s Prayer and the acclamation [Luke 2:14], “Glory to God in the highest and peace to his people on earth”). (Klausner 44)
         3. “Perhaps such similarity caused his [Eliezer’s] arrest for *Minuth*. R. Eliezer’s connexion with Christianity was certainly distasteful to his neighbors,” as the next quotation shows. (Klausner 44)
7. **Shab**. **116a-b**: “Imma Shalom was the wife of R. Eliezer and sister of Rabban Gamaliel. There lived near her a *philosoph* who had the reputation of never taking a bribe. They [Imma Shalom and R. Gamaliel] sought to make a mock of him [the *philosoph*]. She sent him a lamp of gold. They came before him. She said to him, ‘I desire that they give me a share in the family property.’ He said to them, ‘From the day when you [Israelites] were exiled from your land, the Law of Moses has been taken away, and the law of the *Evangelion* has been given, and in it is written, ‘A son and a daughter shall inherit alike.’ The next day he [R. Gamaliel], in his turn, sent to him a Lybian donkey. He (the *philosoph*) said to them, ‘I have looked further to the end of the book, and in it is written, “Where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit.”‘ She said to him, ‘Let your light shine as a lamp.’ [*i*.*e*. the bribe of the Lybian donkey has prevailed over the bribe of the golden lamp].” (Klausner 44)
   1. “. . . neither the wife nor the father-in-law of R. Eliezer felt easy at the friendly relations existing between R. Eliezer and the *Minim* [Christians]; and so they sought to hold up to ridicule the Christian *Philosoph* . . .” (Klausner 45)
   2. “. . . there is a still subtler intention . . . to show that there was something equivocal in the relation of Jesus and the Christians to the Law. . . . we may deduce from Jesus’ words that he did not come to set aside the ceremonial laws [Klausner here cites Matt 5:17, “Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill”], although many other verses of the Gospels [e.g., Matt 5:31-42, Mark 7:15] speak of their annulment by Jesus. The early *Tannaim* perceived this inner contradiction, and Imma Shalom and her brother wished to expose it to R. Eliezer and so alienate him from *Minuth* altogether.” (Klausner 45)
8. **conclusions**: what the evidence from the Talmud teaches us about Jesus
   1. “. . . it is unreasonable to question either the existence of Jesus . . . or his general character as it is depicted in the . . . Gospels. This is the single historical value which we can attribute to the early *Talmudical* accounts of Jesus.” (Klausner 20)
   2. “. . . we see from them the attitude to Jesus and his teaching of the first generation of the *Tannaim* who lived after the Destruction [of the temple, ad 70], and who counted among them the most learned and pious of the nation. This attitude does not display the same bitter hatred and hostility which we find later, when the Christian peoples . . . began to oppress and persecute the Jews . . .” (Klausner 46)
   3. Up to c. 100, “Jesus was a true Jew: he may have been ‘an Israelite who had sinned,’ or ‘a transgressor in Israel,’ yet he remained an Israelite in every respect . . . he is described as one of the Scribes and *Tannaim*, who expounded the Scriptures . . . but his [inconsistent] attitude to the Law . . . aroused the ire and the severe condemnation of the *Talmud* authorities.” (Klausner 46-47)

## References to Jesus Outside the Gospels:

## The Agrapha

(SAYINGS OF JESUS RECORDED ELSEWHERE THAN THE FOUR GOSPELS)

Jeremias, Joachim. *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*. 1957. Trans. Reginald H. Fuller. 2nd Eng­lish ed. Lon­don: SPCK, 1964. (German: *Unbekannte Jesusworte*. 3rd ed. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1963.)

1. **agrapha in the New Testament**
   1. sayings of the earthly Jesus (of these, Jeremias only accepts 1 Thess 4:16-17 as genuine)
      1. Acts 20:35 (Paul is speaking), “In all this I have given you an example that by such work we must support the weak, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, for he himself said, ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’”
      2. Rom 14:14, “I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean.” Cf. Mark 7:15.
      3. 1 Cor 7:10, “To the married I give this command—not I but the Lord—that the wife should not separate from her husband . . .” Cf. Mark 10:11-12.
      4. 1 Cor 9:14, “In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel..” Cf. Matt 10:10.
      5. 1 Cor 11:24-25, “and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, ‘This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.’ 25In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.’” Cf. Mark 14:22-24.
      6. 1 Thess 4:16-17, “For the Lord himself, with a cry of command, with the archangel’s call and with the sound of God’s trumpet, will descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first. 17Then we who are alive, who are left, will be caught up in the clouds together with them to meet the Lord in the air; and so we will be with the Lord forever.” Cf. Matt 24:30-31.
   2. sayings of the risen Lord (Jeremias accepts none of these as genuine)
      1. The risen Jesus addresses disciples a number of times in the New Testament. An example is 2 Cor 12:9a, “but he said to me, ‘My grace is sufficient for you, for power is made perfect in weakness.’” The other instances are: Acts 1:4-5, 7-8; 9:4-6, 10-12, 15-16; 18:9-10; 22:7-8, 10; 22:18, 21; 23:11; 26:14-18; Rev 1:11, 17-20; 2-3 (the letters to the seven churches in Asia Minor); 16:15; 22:10-16; 22:20.
      2. Of the hundreds of agrapha in later Christian tradition, many of them probably derive from this source: “the stock of traditional material was expanded . . . by sayings allegedly derived from direct revelations of the exalted Christ. This explains how there existed from the outset a great variety of traditions about Jesus outside the four Gospels and competing with them.” [4] But even more agrapha are likely to have arisen because heretical Christians (e.g., gnostics) put revealed truths “into the mouth of Jesus . . . to find sanction for sectarian tenets.” (Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings* 26-27)
2. **the 18 genuine agrapha**: Jeremias accepts 18 agrapha as genuine. Some are embedded in long passages; some require extended discussion. Here I only give five examples.
   1. “He that is near me is near the fire; he that is far from me is far from the kingdom!” (*Gospel of Thomas* 82)
   2. “No man can obtain the kingdom of heaven that has not passed through temptation.” (Tertullian, *De baptismo* 20)
   3. “Man is like a wise fisherman, who cast his net into the sea and drew it up from the sea full of small fish. Among them the wise fisherman found a good large fish. He threw down all the small fish into the sea; and he chose the large fish without hestitation. He that has ears to hear, let him hear.” (*Gospel of Thomas* 8)
   4. “They that are with me have not understood me.” (*Acts of Peter* 10)
   5. “And never be joyful, except when you look upon your brother in love.” (*Gospel of the Hebrews*, in Jerome, *In Ephes*. 5.3-4)
3. **conclusions**: what the agrapha teach us about Jesus
   1. positive conclusions: On surveying the 18 genuine agrapha:
      1. “We are at once struck by the prominence of the conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees, the relatively large number of apocalyptic sayings, and above all the amount of space occupied by the ethical teaching, in particular . . . the commandment of love.” (Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings* 120)
      2. “On the other hand there are no sayings concerning . . . the offer of forgiveness and salvation to sinners. The reason for this is most probably that all the known sayings of Jesus on those subjects were already included in the four Gospels.” (Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings* 120)
      3. “Common to all these sayings is their tremendous and arresting earnestness . . . and their sense of majesty and authority.” (Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings* 120)
   2. negative conclusion: “The real value of the tradition outside the Gospels is that it throws into sharp relief the unique value of the canonical Gospels themselves. If we would learn about the life and message of Jesus, we shall find what we want *only* in the four canonical Gospels.” (Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings* 121)

## The Chronology of Jesus’ Life

Metzger, Bruce M. “The Chronology of the Life of Jesus Christ.” In *The New Testament*: *Its Background*, *Growth*, *and Content*. 1965. 2nd ed. enlarged. Nashville: Abingdon, 1983.

In the Greco-Roman world several methods of reckoning eras were commonly employed. One which came into wide use counted the number of years from the founding of the city of Rome (a.u.c. = *ab urbe condita*). During the first half of the sixth century a.d. a new method of reckoning time was proposed by a Scythian monk named Dionysius. He must have been a little man, for he is generally called Dionysius Exiguus (“Denys the Little”). Held in high respect as a theologian, mathematician, and astronomer, Dionysius took the birth of Jesus Christ as the starting point for the Christian era. Dates were now computed “in the year of the Lord” (a.d. *=* *anno Domini*). By the time of Charlemagne (about a.d. 800) Dionysius’ system had supplanted the mode of reckoning the years a.u.c. Unfortunately, however, Dionysius erred in his calculations by at least four years. Instead of correlating Jesus’ birth with a.u.c. 754, he should have placed it sometime prior to a.u.c. 750, which was the year of the death of Herod the Great. The actual year of the Nativity is therefore sometime prior to 4 b.c. (how much prior will be discussed below). By the time that Dionysius’ error was discovered, it was too late to attempt to rectify the mistake and to alter all previously dated documents.

It should be noted that there is no year 0, and therefore from 1 b.c. to a.d. 1 is one civil year; and from 4 b.c. to a.d. 4, for example, is seven years.

For the historian three pivotal dates to be determined in the life of Jesus Christ are the date of his birth, the date of his baptism and of the beginning of his public ministry, and the date of his crucifixion. If these [102] three dates can be ascertained, it will be possible to reckon other events in his life as so many years before or after them. The scanty and sometimes conflicting evidence in the Gospels, however, makes it exceedingly difficult to attain certainty for any of these pivotal dates.

1. the date of the birth of jesus

The New Testament provides no precise information concerning the year, the month, or the day of the Nativity. A fixed point from which to start is the fact that Jesus was born before the death of Herod the Great; for, according to Matt. 2:1-9, Herod was troubled by the arrival of the Wise Men asking where the king of the Jews had been born. From Josephus we learn that Herod died on or before passover, a.u.c. 750 (that is, on or before April 4, 4 b.c.). How long before this date Jesus was born is not known. Matthew and Luke tell of certain events that occurred between his birth and Herod’s death, including the presentation at the temple forty days after his birth, the visit of the Wise Men, the flight into Egypt, and the murder of the male children in Bethlehem. Whatever view is taken of the order of these events they can scarcely have occupied less than two or three months.[[72]](#footnote-72) Therefore the birth of Jesus took place no later than January of 4 b.c. or December 5 b.c., and it may have occurred up to two years earlier (Matt. 2:16). [Matt 2:16, Herod “sent and killed all the children in and around Bethlehem who were two years old or under, according to the time that he had learned from the wise men.”]

The custom of celebrating December 25th as the birthday of Jesus did not arise until about the third or fourth century. Prior to that time it was customary to celebrate January 6th as the time of the coming of the Wise Men. According to the Lucan account (2:1-20), Jesus was born when Judean shepherds were out-of-doors at night. Since the rainy season in Palestine usually begins in December, it is not likely that this was the month of the Nativity. When it was we do not know. Some have thought that the choice of December 25th may have had a connection with the pagan celebration of the *Dies Solis Invicti* (“Day of the Invincible Sun”). Although there is no proof, it may be that the early church chose this date to celebrate the birth of Jesus in order to provide Christians [103] with an alternative festival in place of the one held in honor of the sun-god, who was often identified with Mithra.

2. the date of the baptism of jesus and the beginning of his public ministry

Several pieces of evidence bear upon the date of the baptism of Jesus and the beginning of his public ministry. Luke places the beginning of John the Baptist’s preaching in the wilderness “in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar” (Luke 3:1). Though this chronological datum appears to be simple and unambiguous, its exact interpretation is disputed. Tiberius Caesar had been exercising co-regency with Augustus Caesar in the years just prior to the latter’s death in August a.d. 14, but he did not come to full imperial authority until September 17, a.d. 14. We do not know whether Luke intends to include the period of co-regency or not. If he does not, the fifteenth year of Tiberius’ reign was a.d. 29. In Syria, however, it was customary to date regnal years from October l, so that the second year of Tiberius’ reign would have begun on October 1, a.d. 14; his fifteenth year therefore would have run from October 1, a.d. 27 to September 30, a.d. 28. If a period of co-regency was included, a correspondingly earlier date is required.

The Gospels provide two other chronological data, neither of which is altogether specific. Immediately after his account of the baptism of Jesus, Luke states that “Jesus, when he began his ministry, was about thirty years of age” (Luke 3:23). If Jesus was born about 5 or 4 b.c. this would be about a.d. 26 or 27. At the season of passover not long after Jesus’ baptism, the fourth gospel represents the Jews as saying that the reconstruction of the temple complex was forty-six years in building (John 2:20). Since, according to Josephus, Herod the Great began the work of reconstruction in the eighteenth year of his reign (*i*.*e*. 20 or 19 b.c.), the forty-sixth year would be a.d. 27 or 28.

In the light of these somewhat conflicting data, it appears that Jesus was baptized and began his public ministry sometime between about a.d. 26 and 28; a date early in 27 is perhaps as likely as any.

3. the date of the crucifixion of jesus

The length of Jesus’ ministry and, consequently, the year of his death are to be fixed by the number of passovers which elapsed from the time [104] of his baptism. As was mentioned earlier, if we had only the synoptic Gospels, we might infer that Jesus’ ministry lasted but one year. John, however, refers to at least three passovers (2;13; 6:4; 13:1), and it is highly probable that the feast referred to in John 5:1 was also a passover. If so, Jesus’ ministry included four passovers, at the last of which he died.

If, then, Jesus was baptized early in a.d. 27, his first passover thereafter was in April of that year, and he died in the spring of a.d. 30. (Those who think that John 5:1 does not refer to a passover, date Jesus’ death in a.d. 29).

The chronology of the last week is complicated by a difference in dating the last supper. According to John 13:1 and 29, the last supper was held prior to the feast of the passover. The synoptics, on the other hand, treat the last supper as a passover celebration (Matt. 26:19; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:13).

This discrepancy has occasioned much debate as to whether (1) the synoptics are right and John is wrong; or (2) John is right and the synoptics are wrong; or (3) whether there is a way of harmonizing the two traditions. Perhaps the least unsatisfactory solution of the problem is to assume that the two traditions reflect divergent methods of calculating the passover. It is known that the sect at Qumran followed a solar calendar, according to which the passover always fell on a Wednesday. Most Jews, however, followed a lunar calendar, according to which in a.d. 30 the full moon fell either on Thursday, April 6, or on Friday, April 7. Since Jewish authorities in the time of Jesus determined the beginning of the month by observation of the new moon, when the weather was cloudy opinion might differ as to the exact time that the celebration should take place. It is possible, therefore, that different groups of Jews celebrated passover that year according to two different reckonings, and that both are reflected in the Gospels.

The hour of the crucifixion is variously given by different evangelists. According to Mark 15:25 Jesus was crucified at the third hour (= 9:00 a.m.). According to John 19:14 the trial before Pilate was not quite over by the sixth hour (= noon), and therefore the crucifixion took place still later.

Attempts have been made to prove that John used a different mode of reckoning the hours of the day from that in common use, namely that he calculated from midnight to midday (so that when John says “sixth [105] hour” he means 6:00 a.m. and the discrepancy vanishes). But there is no evidence to support such a supposition, which has the appearance of a fiction proposed by despairing harmonizers. Others have suggested that, since the apostles carried no watches, different persons estimated the time quite diversely. But, for writers who seem to be intent on giving the time with some exactness, a discrepancy involving about four hours seems to be greater than one would think probable. Perhaps, with Jerome in the fourth century, we may presume that an error has crept into the transmission of the manuscripts of either John or Mark. Since the Greek letter which stands for 3 is the gamma (Γ) and the character which stands for 6 is the digamma (Ϝ), a sleepy copyist, early in the transmission of the text of the New Testament, may have mistaken one for the other.

All four Gospels put the crucifixion on Friday and date the resurrection three days later. It was usual among the Jews, with whom a new day begins at sunset, to reckon time inclusively and to count parts of days as whole days. Therefore the time from Jesus’ death Friday afternoon until sunset on Friday was counted as one day, Saturday was the second day, and the period from sunset on Saturday until early Sunday morning was the third day.

The uncertainty about dates in the life of Jesus arises from the circumstance that most early Christians were not interested in details of chronology. In their eyes far more important than dates was the assurance that, according to God’s prearranged plan (Gal. 4:4-5), the Savior of the world and the Lord of the church had come into the world, had taught, suffered, died, and was gloriously raised from the dead (Acts 10:37-41; 26:22-23). [106]

[Conclusions: birth, 7-4 bc; baptism and beginning of the public ministry, early ad 27; crucifixion, ad 30.]

## Major Events in the Life of Jesus

Anderson, Hugh, ed. *Jesus*. Great Lives Observed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Braun, Herbert. *Jesus of Nazareth*: *The Man and His Time*. Trans. Everett R. Kalin. Philadelphia: For­tress, 1979. (German: *Jesus*: *Der Mann aus Nazareth und seine Zeit*. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1969.)

Conzelmann, Hans. Jesus: *The Classic Article from RGG3 Expanded and Updated*. Trans. J. Raymond Lord. Ed. and intro. John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973. (German: “Jesus Christus.” *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*: *Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. Ed. Kurt Galling et al. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1959. Vol. 3. Vol. 3 cols. 619-53.)

1. **birth**
   1. date
      1. Jesus’ birth during Herod the Great’s reign (died 4 bc) is more likely than Luke 2:1-3, which associates Jesus’ birth with a census that occurred in ad 5-6. (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 24)
      2. “. . . we may gather that Jesus was born shortly before the death of Herod the Great in 4 b.c. . . .” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 24)
      3. “The star of the Magi is said to be an allusion to the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces in 7 B. C. But one thereby arbitrarily replaces the account of a miraculous moving star with a constellation. . . . Besides, it is uncertain whether Jesus was born at all during the reign of Herod the Great (thus before 4 B. C.).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 23)
   2. “son of David”
      1. “The oldest assertions about Jesus’ descent occur in confessional statements which designate him as son of David (Rom. 1:3-4; 2 Tim. 2:8; cf. Mark 10:48; 11:10; 12:35-37).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
      2. “At first this designation was a theologumenon; later there was the attempt to verify it historically by drawing up genealogies (Matt. 1:1 ff.; Luke 3:23 ff.).” 27 Matthew and Luke agree that Jesus is the son of David. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 26)
         1. The genealogies are unhistorical. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
            1. They are inconsistent with the Old Testament material. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
            2. They contradict. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27-28)
         2. “Originally they led to Joseph as the father of Jesus. Later they are combined with the motif of the virginity of Mary (*ante partum*). Neither motif (Jesus as son of David and the virgin’s son) reckons with the pre-existence of Christ.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
   3. Jesus’ family
      1. “Reliable information about the family of Jesus is meager.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
      2. Mary
         1. “We are told the name of his mother, Mary.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
         2. Mary belonged to the early Christian community but was not prominent: Acts 1:14. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
         3. “Paul does not mention her.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
      3. brothers and sisters
         1. “brothers and sisters”: Mark 6:1-3//Matt 13:55-56. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
         2. “James”: 1 Cor 15:7, Gal 2:9, Acts 15. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
         3. Other brothers were also prominent: 1 Cor 9:5. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
   4. virgin birth
      1. “Paul (Gal. 4:4) still knew nothing about a special birth from a virgin . . . Mary as a virgin (Luke 1:34f.) [is] in tension with . . . Luke 2:1-14, in which the motif of the virgin was originally lacking. . . . features from the world of the Hellenistic-oriental savior-figures . . . are applied to Jesus.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 25)
      2. Matthew and Luke agree that Jesus was born of a virgin. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
      3. “Actually the stories of the virgin birth compete with those of the baptism and the transfiguration; they all originally describe a particular time when the divine sonship of Jesus was first established.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 28)
   5. birthplace
      1. Nazareth: in Mark 1:9, “Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee.” Mark calls Jesus a “Nazarene” in 1:24, 10:47, 14:67, 16:6. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 26)
      2. Bethlehem: found only in Matt 1-2 and Luke 1-2. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 26)
         1. “Bethlehem as the place of birth . . . derives from Jewish Christian theology . . . From the stereotyped designation “Jesus of Nazareth” one could deduce that Nazareth was Jesus’ birthplace.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 24)
         2. Matthew’s view that Joseph and Mary lived in Bethlehem and moved to Nazareth via Egypt is an “artistic construction.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
         3. census: “Luke has no accurate idea of the census . . . as much for the date as for the manner . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
            1. “The first census in Judea (not Galilee!) took place in A. D. 6/7 (note the date!). This fact is certain on the basis of unequivocal statements in Josephus (*Antiquities* 17.355 [17.13.5]; 18.1-10 [18.1.1]; 20.102 [20.5.2]; *Jewish War* 7.253 [7.8.1]). For only this picture fits the historical situation (take-over of Judea, with direct Roman rule, after the deposition of Archelaus in A. D. 6).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
            2. “The attempts to prove an earlier census (during the time of Herod the Great) are unsuccessful . . . Luke himself knows of only *one* census (Acts 5:37), and . . . he again gives its designation inexactly.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 27)
2. **childhood**
   1. Aramaic as mother tongue: “He spoke Aramaic. Research has still not clarified the precise nature of the dialect he spoke.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 27)
   2. brothers: “It seems certain to me that he had brothers and that his mother and brothers did not understand him (Mark 3:31-35).” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 25) Mark 3:31-35, “Then his mother and his brothers came; and standing outside, they sent to him and called him. 32A crowd was sitting around him; and they said to him, “Your mother and your brothers and sisters are outside, asking for you.” 33And he replied, “Who are my mother and my brothers?” 34And looking at those who sat around him, he said, “Here are my mother and my brothers! 35Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother.”“
   3. Galilee
      1. “That he was born and reared a Jew is scarcely in doubt—despite the fact that his homeland of Galilee (the name denotes “circle of Gentiles”) was subject to the strongest Gentile influences and numbered in its population only a small Jewish minority, and despite recurrent efforts to prove his Aryan origin (e.g. by Houston St. Chamberlain, *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. John Lees, I [1910], 200ff.).” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 24)
      2. Galilee “had become, since the first deportations by the Assyrians [c. 721 bc], largely controlled by foreigners and foreign investments. Still, however, in its rural core Galilee may have always remained predominately Jewish. It was re-Judaized by the Maccabees. In Josephus it appears as a center of political activity (Judas the Galilean). Jesus’ teaching, however, does not deduce anything causal from the economic (*latifundia* [“Latin, the large landed estates, often owned by absentee landlords”—18 n. 36) and political relationships there. When in his parables he takes up images from economic life, it happens without a polemic note.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 18)
3. **John the Baptist**
   1. “. . . only Jesus, Peter, and Paul are mentioned more often in the New Testament than he [John the Baptist] is.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 34)
   2. date of the beginning John the Baptist’s public ministry: “The gospels present only one single direct chronological statement: according to Luke 3:1-2, John the Baptist appeared in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, i.e., probably A. D. 28 (so E. Stauffer). But we do not know how Luke arrives [20] at this date; is it through his own calculation or from a source? The synchronization in which the statement stands is, moreover, laden with inconsistencies. Further, it is not clear what the time period is between the appearance of the Baptist and that of Jesus. Luke, of course, obviously regards it as brief . . . still the approximate time reference is given correctly, for the date does tally with the assertions about other persons. We know the period of the reign of Herod the Great (until 4 B. C.) and of his sons, Archelaus (until A. D. 6); Herod Antipas, Jesus’ ruler (until A. D. 39; cf. Luke 13:31 ff.; 23:6 ff.); and Philip (until A. D. 34; cf. Mark 6:17, where, admittedly, there is some underlying confusion). Pilate was governor A. D. 26-36. The synchronization mentioned above and also the passion narrative name the high priests Annas (A. D. 6-15, also influential after that time) and Caiaphas (A. D. 18-36).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 21)
   3. “A special problem is the relationship of John the Baptist to the group at Qumran. Their geographical proximity (the wilderness/Jordan) is in itself striking. Further, John radicalized the notion of obedience. This he motivated by imminent eschatological expectation, and called Israel to repentance. But he founded no organization to confer a sense of salvation. He practiced asceticism, but did not make it a condition of salvation. In the place of constant ritual purification he put a single baptism.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 19)
   4. “For the Baptist Jesus had apparently the highest respect (see Matthew 11:7-14; Luke 7:24-30). In fact Jesus came to look upon him as the returned Elijah who was to prepare the people of God for the advent of the Messiah (Mark 9:9-13; Matthew 17:9-13).” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 35)
   5. “That Jesus submitted to John’s baptism . . . might well be historically accurate.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 25)
   6. All four gospels report that Jesus was baptized by John, but this is “legend.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 31)
   7. It is “historical fact” that “Jesus emerged out of the Baptist’s movement [31] . . . Jesus must have taken a positive stand concerning the Baptist. Nowhere is the Baptist opposed.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 31-32)
   8. Jesus acknowledged “John’s proclamation of the kingdom of God and call to repentance [31] . . . [Jesus] continues the Baptist’s eschatology and preaching of repentance.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 31-32)
   9. But there are differences: when Jesus returned from the wilderness,
      1. he “did not take over John’s ascetic habits (Matt. 11:19/Luke 7:34) . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 32)
      2. He “did not baptize (in spite of John 5:22; cf. 4:1).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 32)
      3. He did perform miracles “(no miracles are reported of the Baptist).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 32)
      4. “. . . Jesus does not withdraw from the world into the wilderness. Here there is an understanding of his work which clearly contrasts it with that of the Baptist.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 30)
   10. The fourth gospel depicts the work of John the Baptist and the work of Jesus as overlapping chronologically; thus the fourth evangelist thinks of the relation between them according to the precept, “He must increase, I must decrease” (John 3:30). Mark depicts Jesus as beginning his public ministry only after John’s imprisonment, so that “he steps into the breach which occurs”; thus Mark thinks of John as a forerunner in salvation history. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 31)
4. **public ministry**
   1. date of the beginning of the public ministry
      1. “The chronology of Jesus’ ministry is an intricate problem. The Gospels offer very few specific notices of dates.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 24)
      2. “Exceptional is Luke’s attempt at a precise dating in [3:1-2] . . .” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 24) Luke 3:1-2, “In the fifteenth year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, and Herod was ruler of Galilee, and his brother Philip ruler of the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias ruler of Abilene, 2during the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness.”
      3. See also Luke 3:23, “Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his work.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 24) “According to Luke 3:23 Jesus was about thirty years old when he made his public appearance. Still, this [24] assertion is too general and appears too late to be reliable. John 2:20 [“The Jews then said, “This temple has been under construction for forty-six years, and will you raise it up in three days?”“] mentions the forty-sixth year of the construction of Herod’s temple, i.e., the year A. D. 27/28.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 24-25)
   2. length of the public ministry
      1. “The Gospel of John knows of three Passovers (John 2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:55; the feast at 5:1 which is not more fully identified is identical with the Passover of 6:4, since chapters 5 and 6 should be transposed). Beyond this, John mentions one feast of Tabernacles (7:2) and one feast of the Dedication (10:22). John thus thinks of a time span of more than two full years.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 21)
      2. The Synoptics know of only one Passover. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 21-22)
      3. “In favor of the Johannine dating one could cite the fact that the Markan . . . geographical schematization . . . symbolizes a theological fact (so Ernst Lohmeyer): Galilee is the humble land of eschatological promise, but Jerusalem is the place of hostility. . . . This observation, of course, does not prove the accuracy of the Johannine chronology.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 22)
      4. “The saying in Matthew 23:37/Luke 13:24 (“Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered together your children . . .”) appears to intimate that Jesus had appeared in Jerusalem several times . . . It could, however, be interpreted also as referring to a single, longer stay. . . . Actually the saying . . . is not a [22] historical saying of Jesus. The speaker originally was a suprahistorical subject, Wisdom.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 22-23)
      5. “Furthermore, because it is easier to fit the one-year ministry of the synoptics into the three-year scheme of John rather than the other way around, a history of Jesus’ three-year ministry is usually constructed, with the content and order coming largely from the synoptics.” (Achtemeier, *Mark* 11)
      6. “The net result of all this is that the ministry of Jesus falls in the period around A. D. 30. For the purposes of the historian such a degree of accuracy is exact enough.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 25)
   3. locale of the public ministry
      1. Mark’s “geographical framework . . . is a redactional constructon . . . Mark has then worked his material partly into the form of an itinerary . . .” His structure is: (1) “action in Galilee”; (2) travel narrative; (3) “passion in Jerusalem . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 29)
      2. Nevertheless, “historical information stands behind this.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 29)
         1. “There is . . . no doubt that Jesus first appeared in Galilee.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 29)
            1. “Capernaum, above all, is firmly anchored in the tradition.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 29)
            2. “From Galilee was derived the core of his followers”: Mark 14:70 and John 1:44. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 29)
         2. Jesus would no doubt have traveled from Galilee to Judea. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 29)
            1. “In John a few traditions also point to Samaria (chap. 4).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 30)
            2. But since the Lukan travel narrative “has to be located not in Samaria but in Galilee and Judea . . . the account as a whole is a Lukan construction.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 30)
   4. miracles
      1. “In comparison with the surrounding religious environment these “miracles” are distinctive in that they are almost never punitive miracles.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 28)
      2. “That Jesus healed the sick . . . appears extremely probable to me.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 28)
      3. “But certain pious people who were in contact with the divine world, pious rabbis as well as extra-biblical, Hellenistic-oriental sages and magicians (Pythagoras and Apollonius of Tyana, for example), had the reputation of being capable of such deeds.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 28)
      4. “The healing of the blind person in Egypt through the emperor Vespasian also has double attestation (Tacitus, *History* 4.81; Suetonius, *Vespasian* 7) in ancient extra-biblical literature. Now in my view we dare not with rationalistic narrow-mindedness deny the facticity of all ancient healing miracles. The healings performed by Jesus occurred just as surely as those in the shrine of Asclepius at Epidaurus, where the votive tablets certainly do not represent any fraud. . . . Today we have to understand extraordinary events as . . . subject to the conditions of human health and medical knowledge.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 29)
      5. “In addition to miracles of healing, there were the so-called nature miracles. I am not inclined to assume that these so-called nature miracles actually happened [29] . . . [Skepticism] is confirmed by the considerable variation in the way the miracles are described. Thus throughout Mark’s gospel, for example, Jesus’ deeds are described in half-medical, half-magical terms! Jesus employs saliva to effect a cure (Mark 8:23); he uses Aramaic formulas that sound foreign to the Greek readers, who would thus consider them efficacious (Mark 5:41; 7:34). And the second gospel depicts the demonic character of illnesses with particular emphasis (Mark 2:4; 5:3-6, 8-10; 9:20-24). All these techniques and magical features are missing in the gospel of Matthew and for the most part also in Luke. That a healing power emanated physically from Jesus’ body (as in Mark 5:27-34; Luke 8:44-48) was not acceptable to the first evangelist (cf. Matt. 9:20-22), and Matt. 8:16 emphasizes that Jesus drove out demons “through the word.” The direction in which the reports were changing is clear: from a half-magical, half-psychophysical action dependent on faith to a miraculous activity that always operates free of magic, through the word, and that is not dependent on psychophysical procedures. In addition, an earlier stage of the tradition has Jesus respond to what the situation imposes on him; in a later stage Jesus himself takes the initiative.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 29-30)
   5. disciples
      1. arguments for the existence of disciples in general
         1. A “circle of followers . . . is quite likely, since the rabbis at that time also were surrounded by their disciples . . .” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 31)
         2. “. . . in the old pieces of traditional material he appeared primarily alone (cf. the tension between the framework and the older tradition in such places as Mark 1:21, etc.).” (See Rudolf Bultmann *History of the Synoptic Tradition* 343-44.) But “In the early bits of tradition he appears surrounded by these [disciples] (Mark 9:14 ff.; 10:13 f., etc.) . . . The later tradition has stereotyped the picture so that Jesus now appears constantly surrounded by this circle . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 33)
         3. Jesus probably solicited some of his disciples (though the gospel call narratives are largely legendary). “He also had followers who came to him of their own accord; that is, in any case, presupposed in Matt. 8:18-22 par.”(would-be disciples, who in Matthew approach Jesus).” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 31)
         4. “Jesus’ disciples . . . never become independent teachers . . . After Jesus’ death . . . “discipleship” becomes a figurative expression . . .” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 31)
      2. arguments against the existence of the twelve
         1. “There is no specific activity by this circle.” 34 There is the “sending forth” in Mark 6:6 ff., but no effects are reported. “The twelve operate largely as . . . actors in a play with walk-on roles.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34)
         2. “Hence, there is doubt whether this group existed as a closed circle already in the lifetime of Jesus and was not rather called together through an appearance of the Risen One (1 Cor 15:5).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34)
            1. See Maurice Goguel *Jesus*. 337-41 (34 n. 68). (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34 nn. 68, 69)
            2. See Bultmann *History of the Synoptic Tradition* 343-44. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34 nn. 68, 69)
         3. The “call narratives supply legendary embellishment as a comparison of Mark 1:16-20 with Luke 5:1-11 shows.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 31)
         4. “. . . a special group of twelve followers does not come from the fact that there were twelve actual identifiable disciples, but from the concept that Jesus, as the Messiah for the endtime, would have with him those who in the endtime will rule over the twelve tribes of Israel.”; and Jesus as messiah is a later addition (see above). (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 31)
         5. “. . . authorities reappear who make binding regulations about behavior and decide which individuals do or do not belong to the community . . . In an individual local tradition, it is Peter who is empowered to decide (Matt. 16:19), while in a later tradition it is the disciples as a group (Matt. 18:18 par.). The author of the third gospel and Acts then reduces the number of real authorities to twelve, who alone now bear the title “apostle.”“ (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 72)
         6. “We can identify . . . two opposing tendencies . . . in the synoptic portrait of the disciples . . .” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 32)
            1. “. . . the disciples get better and better.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 32)
            2. “. . . the behavior of the disciples grows worse . . . so that the magnitude of the grace conferred on them strikes the eye with ever greater intensity.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 32)
      3. arguments for the existence of the twelve
         1. “Already for Paul “the twelve” is a fixed concept (1 Cor 15:5).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34)
         2. Judas’ depiction “as a member of this group would not have been invented.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34)
         3. The group “constitutes anticipatory representation of the eschatological people of the twelve tribes of Israel [see Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30]. . . . this purely eschatological conception of the people of God is in clear contrast with the later idea held by the early Christian community of a “church” and must, therefore, be attributed to Jesus himself (so Kümmel [*Promise and Fulfillment*]).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34)
            1. But the genuineness of Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30 is disputed. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 34)
            2. Also, in Matt 19:28//Luke 22:30 “the twelve do not represent the nucleus of a people of God to be organized on earth, but are appointed heavenly “judges” for the future.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 35)
5. **journey to Jerusalem**
   1. Suggested excerpt: on Jesus’ motive for the journey to Jerusalem: Goguel, *Jesus*, 399. (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 71 n. 1)
   2. passion-resurrection predictions: Some say that if Jesus went up to Jerusalem with the intention of dying, then he was suicidal. “Yet quite possibly Jesus did ponder at length the harsh and bitter fate of many of the prophets . . . Quite possibly, therefore, the recurrent predictions [72] . . . are not entirely prophecies after the event created by the Church but do contain a historical kernel. Almost certainly Jesus went up to Jerusalem in order to bring home to the very heart of the ancestral citadel of Jewish faith his message of the coming kingdom of God: and almost certainly he was well aware of the dire peril attendant on the enterprise.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 73)
6. **triumphal entry**: suggested excerpt: on the triumphal entry and cleansing the temple: Bornkamm, *Jesus*, 158-159. (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 73 n. 2)
7. **passion in general**
   1. “. . . Jesus’ death, or in Pauline terms, the cross . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 95)
   2. date
      1. “The story of the Passion proper opens with a chronological note at Mark 14:1, which has no connection with anything [74] that goes before it: “It was now two days before the Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread.” It seems that the Passion narrative . . . was the first part of the Gospel story to be set down in writing as an ordered and coherent whole.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 74-75)
      2. “We are on better historical ground for the dating of the passion. The tradition (Synoptic and Johannine) is in agreement that Jesus died on a Friday and was raised from the dead on a Sunday (Mark 15:42; Matt. 27:62; Luke 23:54; Mark 16:1 par.; John 19:31; 20:1). Of course, according to the Synoptics this Friday was the fifteenth day of the Passover month of Nisan [Mark 14:12 ff. par.]; according to John [13:1, 29; 18:28; 19:31] it was the fourteenth day. . . . It is not possible to harmonize the two datings (not even with the assumption that two different calendars were used). In favor of the Synoptic dating is the general consideration that its presentation stands nearer the facts than the Johannine. [23] Its chronology would be proved accurate if Jesus’ last meal really were a Passover meal. But it is first conceived as such in the secondary framework of the account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. One must therefore reckon with the possibility that the death of Jesus was subsequently transferred to the fifteenth of Nisan in order to be able to represent the Last Supper as a Passover. With this position one must also hold that the execution of Jesus took place on the feast day (though one cannot maintain with certainty that such would be impossible; Dalman, J. Jeremias). In general, the Johannine chronology is preferable, especially since it still appears to shine through in Mark 14:1-2 (Dibelius). To be sure, there is a christological motif involved here too: Jesus is executed at the time when the paschal lambs are slaughtered, i.e., he dies as the true paschal lamb (John 19:36; cf. 18:28).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 23-24)
      3. “In which year did the fourteenth or fifteenth of Nisan fall on a Friday? Unfortunately the question cannot be answered with certainty since the beginning of the spring month of Nisan was not calculated astronomically, but was ascertained empirically through the observation of the light of the new moon. One possibility is that Friday, 15 Nisan A. D. 30 = April 7, 30 (a weaker possibility: Friday, 14 Nisan, 30). For further possibilities one may consult the tables in Joachim Jeremias’s *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* [p. 38].” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 24)
   3. “What events in this composite passion narrative may we hold to be historical?” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 33) “In any case, it is more certain that Jesus went to Jerusalem in order to place before his people in their very center, at the place of the temple and of the highest authorities, a final decision.” (Conzelmann 85)
8. **last supper**
   1. synoptics: last supper on 14 Nisan (Passover meal), death on 15 Nisan.

John: last supper on 13 Nisan, death on 14 Nisan (= when lambs were slaughtered). (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 75)

* 1. “That Jesus was betrayed by a follower . . . appears to be historical. But is his *name*, Judas, also historical? Mark 14:20 does not give the name.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 34)
  2. “. . . the Lord’s Supper in its present form is a cult legend . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83)
  3. “The last supper (Mark 14:22-24) might be a reading back into Jesus’ last days of the Lord’s supper celebrated in Hellenistic Christian congregations. For the meal bears the stamp of Hellenistic sacramental piety and is hard to square with religious thought in Palestine, including Qumran. That it was a Passover meal can only be deduced from Mark 14:12-16 and parallels and not from the account containing the words of institution, and, therefore, this is totally secondary.” 34 “Apart from this institution account, there is no reference in the passion narrative to the expiatory significance of Jesus’ death.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 34, 35)

1. **Gethsemane**
   1. “The historicity of the Gethsemane scene becomes questionable when one considers who could have heard this prayer of Jesus.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 34)
   2. “The historicity of the Gethsemane scene becomes questionable when one considers who could have heard this prayer of Jesus.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 34)
2. **trials**
   1. Suggested excerpt on the trial narratives: Maurice Goguel, *Jesus*, 464-474. (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 76 n. 3)
   2. “. . . the church possessed no eyewitness report of the trial.” [83] But “At several places there may still be traces of an eyewitenss report . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83-84)
      1. Mark 14:51, “A certain young man was following him, wearing nothing but a linen cloth. They caught hold of him . . .”
      2. Mark 15:21, “They compelled a passer-by, who was coming in from the country, to carry his cross; it was Simon of Cyrene, the father of Alexander and Rufus.”
      3. Perhaps Mark 15:40, “There were also women looking on from a distance; among them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome.”
   3. historicity in the trial narratives
      1. Paul Winter (Jewish; *On the Trial of Jesus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961) argues that the trial accounts tend to exculpate Pilate and the Romans and blame the Jews. “. . . since the Sanhedrin in Jesus’ time possessed competence to try capital cases and so had no need to have recourse to Pilate for the execution of Jesus, and since in fact Jesus was executed in the Roman fashion, as laid down by Roman law, the whole story of the hearing before the Jewish High Court is unhistorical.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 76)
      2. But N. Sherwin-White (classical scholar, specialist in law; *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: OUP, 1963) asserts that “the Sanhedrin had no jurisdiction in captial cases, . . . the Sanhedrin session and the condemnation for blasphemy are historical, and . . . the Jewish leaders then turned to Pilate and put pressure on him, if not on the political charge of sedition against Jesus then on the religious charge.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 76)
      3. According to Maurice Goguel (*Jesus* 464-74), the Sanhedrin lacked authority to try capital cases, the Sanhedrin trial is nevertheless historical, and the initiative for the arrest came from Pilate and the Romans. (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 76 or 77)
      4. “It was natural, when looking at the whole matter in retrospect, that the assumption would be that the main point of the proceedings had been the messiahship of Jesus.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83)
      5. “Scriptural proof shapes the account more strongly in the passion narrative than in the other parts of the gospels (noted by Dibelius).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83) (See Dibelius *From Tradition to Gospel* 184-89. Also “Das historische Problem der Leidensgeschichte.” In Dibelius’ *Botschaft und Geschichte*. 1953 1.248-57.) (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83, 83 n. 150)
      6. “. . . entire scenes . . . are created out of Old Testament texts.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83)
         1. “. . . (e.g., Jesus before Herod, Luke 23:6-16) . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 83)
         2. Also Mark 15:34, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” (nrsv) “. . . this saying . . . showed that the death of Jesus was a fulfillment and thereby overcame the scandal of the cross.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 84)
   4. the Sanhedrin trial
      1. “. . . the trial before the Jewish Sanhedrin (Mark 14:55-65 par.) [is historically questionable]. Even the trial before Pilate is a Christian, and thus secondary, composition. The real cause of Jesus’ condemnation is hard to explain. For someone to declare himself to be the Messiah was in Jewish eyes not a crime worthy of death. The superscription on the cross is unjewish in its formulation and appears to be an unhistorical Christian depiction that flows from the confession of Jesus as the Messiah. Jesus may have appeared to the Romans as a bringer of political unrest. Jewish opponents, enraged by his disquieting admonitions, may have underscored for the Romans that the strongly apocalyptic thrust of Jesus’ preaching (pp. 36-43) was politically dangerous.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 34)
      2. “Did it [the Sanhedrin] have the right to impose the death penalty (Lietzmann)?” [85] But “the trial of Jesus does not correspond to Jewish criminal procedure presented in the Mishnah, Tractate Sanhedrin. In order to remove the discrepancy there are three major possibilities.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 85-86)
         1. “One could assume that the interrogation of Jesus was not an actual criminal case.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 86)
         2. “Secondly one could assume that the stipulations were ignored at the trial of Jesus.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 86)
         3. “Or one could assume that the Sanhedrin regulations (of the Mishnah) had at that time not yet been put in force (so Josef Blinzler). The third possibility is doubtless the correct one: what we have in the court rules of the Mishnah is an ideal construction.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 86)
      3. “. . . if it did pronounce such a sentence, wasit necessary for this judgment to be ratified by the Roman procurator [Dibelius]?” [85] But Dibelius is surely wrong: “the method of execution ought itself to prove that Pilate pronounced the death sentence and did not simply give the command for execution. The inconsistency which exists in the fact that then two trials = legal proceedings stand alongside each other is removed through awareness of the literary character of the report.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 85)
      4. “. . . was the Sanhedrin required, as a general practice, to surrender jurisdiction over all capital proceedings to the procurator? In the last-mentioned case, the interrogation of Jesus before this Jewish court would not have been a legal proceeding resulting in a decision, but would have had a fact-finding character.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 85)
      5. “. . . christological interest . . . dominates in the account. There was scarcely any feeling of accountability for legal detail and judicial plausibility. According to the view of the Synoptic narrative, both the Sanhedrin and Pilate condemned Jesus.” There was, therefore, only one trial. (Conzelmann *Jesus* 86)
   5. the Roman trial: “Naturally his appearance [in Jerusalem] must have been interpreted by the leadership of the people as an attack on the foundations of religion and the nation. So, just as it is narrated, they seized him with the aid of one of the disciples (Judas Iscariot) and handed him over to the Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate, who at that particular time was residing in the city.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 84-85)
3. **death**
   1. “. . . we may gather that Jesus . . . died possibly during the Passover of a.d. 28.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 24)
   2. Suggested excerpt: on the death of Jesus: Maurice Goguel, *Jesus* 545 (“excellent”). (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 86 n. 11)
   3. “The form of death, crucifixion, . . . Roman justice used on criminals and slaves.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 33) “It is [historically] established that Jesus was executed by the Romans (and not by the Jews) since crucifixion is a Roman form of [84] capital punishment and not a Jewish one.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 84-85)
   4. The synoptics say that Jesus died on the 15th of Nisan, but John says the 14th of Nisan. “The 14th of Nisan might well be the more likely date.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 33)
   5. “Jesus’ last words [34] . . . the earliest stage of the tradition might be represented by Jesus’ wordless cry (Mark 15:37) . . .” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 35)
4. **burial**: “In the light of the attested Jewish practice of burying criminals by throwing them into a common grave like so many animal carcasses, the doubt persists whether there is any historical core at all in the existing burial accounts in the gospels.” (Braun *Jesus of Nazareth* 35)

## Jesus’ Teachings

Braun, Herbert. *Jesus of Nazareth*: *The Man and His Time*. Trans. Everett R. Kalin. Philadelphia: For­tress, 1979. (German: *Jesus*: *Der Mann aus Nazareth und seine Zeit*. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1969.)

1. **Jesus**’ **view of the endtime**
   1. “The blood that has been poured out unjustly “shall be re­quired of this generation” (Luke 11:51, rsv), according to an authentic saying of Jesus. This genera­tion, then, was to be the last . . . Jesus falls in line with those Jewish groups who expected the end of the world in their own genera­tion (the Qumran community, for example . . .).” (Braun 36)
   2. “The “reign of God” is at the heart of Jesus’ proclamation about the end. The expres­sion comes from the Jewish [36] expectations about the end . . . As Jesus attains increas­ingly greater dignity, the reign of God (Mark 9:1) becomes the reign of Jesus (Matt. 16:28), who is seated on his throne in splendor (Matt. 19:28). . . . The reign of God is coming in the near future. A disinterested calculation in which drawing up time­tables replaces the personal involvement of heart and mind is, of course, out of the question: “Why does this genera­tion seek a sign? Truly, I say to you, no sign shall be given to this generation” (Mark 8:12 par., rsv). The later community, which is prompted to make cal­culations due to the non-occurrence of the imminent parousia, rejects such calculations as temptations and casts this rejection into the form of a saying of Jesus: “But about that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, not even the Son; only the Father” (Mark 13:32 par., rsv).” (Braun 36-37)
   3. “Here a feature of the original end-expectation of Jesus appears to have survived, a feature that, as far as I can tell, is unique to him alone and distinguishes his hopes for the end from those of his Jewish en­vironment, namely, that the end comes suddenly and, therefore, threaten­ingly . . .” (Braun 37)
   4. “. . . expecta­tion of the imminence of the end . . . repre­sents a pol­i­tical issue . . . This may have played a role in the execution of Jesus.” (Braun 38)
   5. Son of man: “In the earlier form of the sayings [the “Son of Man”] is distin­guished from the “I” of the speaker, Jesus . . . sayings in which the Son of man is not Jesus himself [do] go back to Jesus himself.” (Braun 38)
   6. “The Son of man does not come in soundless silence. Jewish apocalyptic provides the colors [38] . . . The appearance of false prophets, wars among the nations, earthquakes, famine, persecution and hatred for Jesus’ followers, and the desecra­tion of the temple in Jerusalem inau­gu­rate the end events (Mark 13:5-23 par.). . . . The prayer not to have to face this trial and the prayer for deliverance from the power of the evil one, the sixth (Luke 11:4 par.) and the probably inau­thentic seventh (only in Matt. 6:13) petitions of the Lord’s Prayer, point to these tribulations at the endtime. . . . the celes­tial powers are shaken, and then the Son of man appears, accompanied by his angels, the trumpet sounds, and the Son of man gathers about him those who are his (Mark 13:24-27 par.).” (Braun 38)
   7. “Of course, these new things occur on this earth. What is very likely an authentic saying of Jesus expresses his expec­tation that without delay he would drink wine “new” with his followers in the reign of God (Mark 14:25 par.). In view of the new day Jesus calls the poor, hungry, and sorrowing blessed (Luke 6:20f.). [39] . . . The rest will experience a fate like that of the unfaithful slave who is severely pun­ished for his unfaithfulness when his master returns unex­pectedly (Luke 12:46 par.). Jesus himself could have issued such a warning. On the basis of its Easter faith, the commu­nity perceived in a saying such is this an admoni­tion to wait faithfully for the Lord *Jesus*, for the Son of man *Jesus* and for *his* imminent coming.” (Braun 40)
   8. “Jesus appears to have . . . believe in the resurrection of the dead (Mark 12:26 par.).” (Braun 40)
   9. “The imminence of the kingdom . . . is not secret instruction kept from outsid­ers as it was in the Qumran community.” (Braun 41)
   10. “. . . this imminent expectation of Jesus . . . was mistak­en.” (Braun 41)
   11. “. . . Jesus did not intend to give information about the imminent end but to summon people because of it. That this intention is not nul­lified by the disappearance of the imminence of the end appears to have already been recog­nized by the third evangelist when he has Jesus say, “you cannot tell by observation when the reign of God comes. There will be no saying, ‘Look, here it is!—or there!’; for in fact the reign of God is within your group” (Luke 17:20f., according [42] to its most likely meaning). . . . substan­tial portions of his proclama­tion remain valid even when their apocal­yp­tic point of view is lost. The synop­tics . . . present many sayings . . . not tied inseparably to the nearness of the end.” (Braun 42-43)
2. **repentance**
   1. “What counts is the deed, not just talk [see Luke 6:46, Matt. 21:28-31]. In all of this Jesus is one with the Jewish thinking of his time.” (Braun 44)
   2. “. . . “unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Phari­sees” . . . In keeping with a common Jewish way of speaking, this greater [44] righteous­ness, this doing far better, is referred to in several synoptic texts as conver­sion, as “repentance” . . . what is meant, as the context shows, is not an emotional religious experience but a deci­sive turning of the will to obedi­ence.” (Braun 44-45)
   3. ““Is it permitted to do good or to do evil on the Sabbath, to save life or to kill?” (Mark 3:4, neb). As so often in the synoptics, what Jesus requires is so understandable and clear that apparently all that is necessary is this question that clarifies the situation. For this very reason we en­counter in the synoptics fundamental sayings of Jesus in question form.” (Braun 46)
   4. “True obedience . . . is responsive to the situation. There­fore, express injunctions to observe cultic regulations are almost totally absent from the synop­tics. The obedient person is not bound to any blueprint, no table of individ­ual details. Thus the obedient are called “the free sons” (Matt. 17:26), perhaps by Jesus himself. [46] . . . The individu­al must decide for himself, for he is accountable for what he does. . . . the suffering that in some circum­stances is con­nected to this obedience becomes the “cross” . . . In the seriousness about repentance which we have sketched thus far, Jesus’ point of departure is Jewish: a person serves God by obeying. But [47] Jesus goes beyond Jewish thinking when he frees this obeying of its formal and juridical dimensions [and] calls the individual to make his own obedient decision . . .” (Braun 46-48)
   5. The parable of the Pharisee and the publican (tax collector) “is a moving proclamation of grace, even for the impious. No Jew would have been offended by that. But people were offended [48] [because] here the claim is made that religious seriousness, uncom­promising obedience can become very danger­ous for a person. . . . the Pharisee observed with preci­sion the religious obligations he enumer­ates.” (Braun 48-49)
   6. The Pharisee in the Pharisee and the publican, or the elder brother in the prodigal-son parable: “The only thing wrong is . . . their self-understanding makes them contemptu­ous of the “brother” who has done wrong and leads them to the opin­ion that they remain obedient on their own. They see them­selves as self-sufficient in their obedience and piety. Thus their serious-minded obedience to the torah becomes *the* spiritual peril. To give up *this* accursed serious-minded­ness, this rigid obedience, this is the true repentance that is demanded. . . . [For Judaism, the idea] that serious-minded obedience to the torah could be danger­ous for anyone not only was inconceivable to them, but was a real source of offense from this “friend of tax collectors and sinners” (Matt. 11:19 par.).” (Braun 49)
   7. “. . . “receive the kingdom of God like a child” [Mark 10:­15]. Children are fitting teach­ers—a thoroughly unjewish view— . . . because of their capacity . . . to accept a gift. We should realize how we have received without limit . . . true repen­tance specifically renounces a claim of reward.” (Braun 50)
   8. “. . . ambiguity in the way the concept of reward is used in the synoptic tradition may not be eliminated with one stroke by declaring that the exclu­sion of the concept of reward is characteristic of authentic words of Jesus while the reintro­duction of the concept of reward is the work of the community . . .” (Braun 51)
      1. “. . . Jesus himself still appears to have used fear as a motive in his preaching . . .” (Braun 51)
      2. However, “A parable like the one about the same reward for all (Matt. 20:1-15) can help us . . . In this para­ble Jesus shows that the person who accepts employment actu­ally does receive his reward. This reward is not a matter of a claim . . . In short, striving after rewards is overcome not by rigorous elimination of reward termi­nol­o­gy but precisely by employing it.” (Braun 51)
3. **cultic matters**
   1. ““Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you cleanse the outside of the cup and of the plate, but inside they are full of extortion and rapacity” (Matt. 23:25 par., rsv). The tenor of this saying that very likely goes back to Jesus himself is clear: attention to ritual details . . . dare never replace true observance . . .” (Braun 53)
   2. Qumran “warns in its documents against the notion that true purity could ac­tually be achieved ritual­ly. [53] . . . Jesus does not himself sharpen the purity regulations as the Qumran community did. “There is nothing that goes into a person from the outside which can make him ritually unclean. Rath­er, it is what comes out of a person that makes him un­clean” (Mark 7:15, tev). These . . . words . . . run counter to . . . even the Old Testament . . . distinction between clean and unclean animals and foods . . . The extreme unjewishness of this position assures the authen­ticity of . . . Mark 7:15. . . . [The] reproach directed against him, that he is a friend of tax collectors and sinners (Matt. 11:19 par. . . .), puts it beyond ques­tion that Jesus associated with the religious out­casts.” (Braun 54)
   3. “. . . a tendency in the course of the transmission,” if re­versed, shows “that Jesus was a faithful Jew after all . . .” (Braun 55)
      1. See Matt. 5:17-19 par.
      2. Matt. 23:23b par.: “. . . a person should practice jus­tice, mercy, and faithfulness without omitting even the proper tithing of herbs . . .” (Braun 55)
   4. baptism
      1. “That the earthly Jesus instituted baptism during his life is at any rate asserted by no text in the gospels. Christian baptism is thus a very old tradition that grew out of the early Christian communi­ty.” (Braun 55)
      2. “To be sure, Jesus was baptized by John the Baptist (Mark 1:9-11 par.); that is very likely historical. It follows from [55] Mark 11:27-33 and parallels that Jesus pointed to John’s baptism as a key to an understanding of himself and consequently esteemed it. But is this esteem an esteem for ritual? . . . The baptism of John, which a person received only once, was intended as a preparation for the imminent last judgment. Therefore it was considered, certainly also in Jesus’ mind, unef­ficacious and mean­ing­less if willingness for proper behavior and true obedience was lacking (Matt. 3:7-10 par.). The baptism of John conveyed no ritual or cultic purity.” (Braun 55-56)
   5. Eucharist
      1. “Synoptic accounts of table fellow­ship reveal that Jesus had meals with his followers and hearers . . . After Je­sus’ death his followers continued these meals [Acts 2:46] . . . [This was] a simple “breaking of bread,” as Acts puts it fre­quently. [56] These repasts were simply “the original early Chris­tian common meals anticipating the end . . .” (Braun 56-57)
      2. “The Palestinian community then interpreted the death of Jesus specifi­cally as an atoning death . . .” (Braun 57)
      3. “. . . and the Hellenistic communi­ty understood these meals on the pattern of the meals cel­e­brated all around them in connection with the mystery religions . . . the institution of this sacrament, per­ceived in Hellenistic terms, is [then] set back into the last hours of Jesus’ life . . . [Jesus] established no priests with special qual­i­fications enabling them to administer the sacra­ments.” (Braun 57)
      4. “Paul . . . adopted the Hellenistic, mystery religion understanding of the sacraments . . .” (Braun 57)
   6. Jesus’ attitude toward the temple: “Esteem for the temple appears to be presupposed by Matt. 23:16-22, [which] forbids swearing by the temple . . . The cleansing of the temple . . . could have been an actual event in the life of Jesus. [57] . . . Jesus’ acknowl­edgment of the priests’ jurisdiction over the healing of lepers (Mark 1:44f. par. and else­where) ap­pears to exclude a fun­da­mental rejection of the Jewish priesthood on Jesus’ part. It is quite probable that Jesus did not totally reject the temple but more likely showed some reserve over against its sacrificial system. . . . he cleansed it. [So] The temple was significant for him . . .” (Braun 57-58)
   7. Jesus’ attitude toward the sabbath
      1. “There is only one saying in the synoptics that deals positively with sabbath obser­vance by presupposing it even during the crisis experienced by those who are fleeing at the endtime (Matt. 24:20). This saying can be clearly recognized as a product of the Jewish Chris­tian community, since the other texts without exception report only Jesus’ critical attitude toward the sabbath. Jesus heals a man with a withered hand (Mark 3:1-6 par.); he heals a [58] deformed woman (Luke 13:10-17), a man with dropsy (Luke 14:1-6), and all these healings occur on the sabbath. . . . Jesus did perform healings on the sabbath. And, what is more, there is not a sin­gle case in which the healing could not have been post­poned until sundown without harm to the person who was ill. . . . [Even with] the disci­ples who pluck grain . . ., their hunger really involved no threat to their lives . . .” (Braun 58-59)
      2. In “the arguments with which Jesus [59] explains his behavior . . . we have, with a high degree of probabili­ty, authentic sayings of Jesus which were then inserted by the tradition into typical sabbath scenes. With Jesus all casuistry, all “ifs” and “buts,” are totally disre­garded, for human beings are involved. “The sab­bath is made for people and not people for the sabbath” (Mark 2:27). This actually does radical vio­lence to the per­ception of a pious Jew.” (Braun 59-60)
      3. “. . . according to Jewish belief, God and all the an­gels observe [the sabbath] in heaven with ritual preci­sion . . . That the Chris­tians who trans­mitted these words were shocked by them is only too understand­able. Only Mark (2:27) offers this radical assertion and even he not in all manuscripts. Matthew and Luke omit the saying en­tirely.” (Braun 60)
      4. scriptural arguments for Jesus’ position
         1. “. . . even David . . . and his companions ate the bread [Mark 2:25-26] . . .” (Braun 61)
         2. Hosea 6:6 says, “I desire mercy and not sacrifice” (Matt. 12:7).” (Braun 61)
         3. Even “priests violate the com­manded sabbath rest through their ritual functions on the sabbath and are nevertheless considered guiltless (Matt 12:5).” (Braun 61)
      5. Jesus “has authority over the sabbath because he is the Son of man (Mark 2:28 par) . . . This post-Easter argu­ment . . . diminishes the radicality of the original statement, in which superiority over the sabbath was given not to the Messiah in particular but to people and their needs (Mark 2:27).” (Braun 62)
   8. Jesus’ attitude toward prayer
      1. In some sayings Jesus “maintains the usual Jewish stance: God hears prayers; one dare not address him me­chan­ically . . . Even the Lord’s Prayer . . . is not differ­ent from pious Jewish thought. Address­ing God as “Fa­ther,” while not common, is also attested in Jewish texts as are the prayer’s petitions for God’s honor, the coming of his reign, food, forgive­ness, help in the afflic­tion at the end time. The form of the Lord’s Prayer can be called unjewish insofar as its brevity distin­guishes it . . .” (Braun 62)
      2. “. . . that God knows the suppli­ant’s needs . . ., taken to its logical conclu­sion, elimi­nates the necessi­ty for any petitionary prayer . . .” (Braun 63)
      3. In “the demand to pray all the time (Luke 18:1-5) . . . what is expected here is a prayer­ful attitude, a recog­nition that in the final analysis a person lives as one who receives.” (Braun 63)
   9. Jesus’ indifference to legal niceties
      1. “. . . Jesus does not advocate cultic observances [e.g., ritual purity, temple and sacrific­es, sabbath, festival dates, fixed times for prayer]. One cannot thereby declare that Jesus acts like an iconoclast. The temple continues to deserve respect, the priests maintain their roles . . . [But] he treats them with indifference. This indiffer­ence, however, is not for its own sake. Its intention . . . is serving people.” (Braun 63)
      2. ““Man, who gave me the right to judge or to divide the property between you two?” [tev] . . . is typical of Je­sus’ juridical indif­fer­ence.” (Braun 65)
      3. “. . . juridical thinking that weighs things out” is un­comfortable with the statement that “the person desiring to be first . . . should assume the role of servant and slave . . .” (Braun 65)
      4. In Luke 13:1-5 (the Galileans killed by Pilate and the collapse of the tower of Siloam), “a catastrophic earth­ly misfortune, in a thorough­ly unjewish fashion, is not regarded as a special punish­ment specifi­cal­ly commensu­rate with the person’s wicked life . . .” (Braun 66)
      5. “Jesus totally rejected an oath to attest the truth of a statement; yes and no should be sufficiently depend­able (James 5:12 possibly preserves an old tradition stemming from Jesus himself).” (Braun 66)
      6. “Jesus’ unjuridical way also emerges clearly from a proper under­standing of his extreme formulations. They never designate the region within which disobedience lies while stipulating that beyond certain borders dis­obedience need no longer be feared. Thus Jesus does not say that a covetous look at someone else’s wife is for­bid­den while a covetous thought about her is surely not forbidden (Matt. 5:28 par.).” (Braun 66)
      7. “. . . when Jesus summons to total obedience, he never makes a demand such as this: keep, without excep­tion, *all* the [66] regulations! The only saying that points in this direction [is] Matt. 5:17-19 . . . When it is a question of individual points, we usually have before us a later stage of the Christian tradition that falls back into a certain casuistry.” (Braun 66-67)
      8. “The subtle distinction that a vow is not binding when the person swears by the temple or the altar in the temple but only when the vow is sworn on the gold in the temple or the gift on the altar, Jesus opposes with the full weight of his sarcasm (Matt. 23:16-19), while the [68] community tradition adds some rather prosaic in­struc­tion (Matt. 23:20-22).” (Braun 68-69)
      9. “This indifference to religious law on Jesus’ part was now followed by a reintroduc­tion—halting and still non­comprehensive, to be sure—of casuistry, i.e., of reli­gious law. . . .” (Braun 70)
      10. “Jesus himself forbids anger (Matt. 5:22a) as Judaism had before him. Later tradition (v. 22b,c) casuistic­ally lists the individ­ual insults against one’s neigh­bor—”numskull,” “godless one”—that are specifically forbidden . . .” (Braun 70)
      11. “Jesus himself unconditionally forbids a man to di­vorce his wife (Luke 16:18; Mark 10:11). Matthew (5:32; 19:9) [adds] an exception . . . Jesus uncondi­tionally forbids swearing an oath . . . The subsequent tradition lists the individu­al phrases which in swear­ing dare not replace the name of God: heaven, earth, Jerusalem, one’s own head . . .” (Braun 71)
      12. “The one invited guest . . . who does not [have] proper clothing and who is thus thrown out (Matt. 22:11-14) . . . is an insertion by the first evange­list. Now, in the evolving history of the primitive community, the need arose for the moral exclusion of the disobedi­ent.” (Braun 68)
          1. “In agreement with Jewish religious thinking, Jesus’ simple rule states: if your neighbor does something bad to you, you should rebuke him for his error, and if he repents his error, you should forgive him (Luke 17:3). In Matthew (18:15-17) this simple process has become . . . a series of specified steps . . .” (Braun 71)
          2. “If an earlier stage of tradition declared blasphemy against Jesus unforgiv­able, because thereby God’s reality, his Holy Spirit, was itself attacked (Mark 3:28-30), a later stage of tradition begins to intro­duce distinctions: an uninformed outsider can blas­pheme Jesus and still not commit an unforgiv­able sin; but whoever knows about Jesus and blasphemes him anyway, that is, he who acts contrary to his own convic­tions, and thereby precisely against the Holy Spirit, will find no forgive­ness when he blasphemes (Matt. 12:31f.; Luke 12:10).” (Braun 71)
          3. “. . . authorities reappear who make binding regula­tions about behavior and decide which individuals do or do not belong to the community . . . In an individ­ual local tradition, it is Peter who is empowered to decide (Matt. 16:19), while in a later tradition it is the disciples as a group (Matt. 18:18 par.). The author of the third gospel and Acts then reduces the number of real au­thor­ities to twelve, who alone now bear the title “apostle.”“ (Braun 72)
   10. celibacy: “The highly eschatological mood of this saying [Matt 19:12, eunuchs for the kingdom] . . . and at the same time the saying’s accent on the individual . . . makes it appear conceiv­able to me that this saying does [stem] from Jesus him­self.” (Braun 77)
4. **possessions**
   1. Jewish background
      1. in rabbinic Judaism: “. . . the pious Jew . . . trea­sured being well off. . . . Thus in official Judaism we encoun­ter the renunciation of posses­sions only as an exception . . . to obtain the means for the study of the law.” (Braun 80)
      2. at Qumran
         1. “. . . they [the Essenes] did not have at all times in their de­vel­op­ment the same attitude toward posses­sions. But at the time of the composi­tion of the *Manual of Discipline*, [a novice] put all his goods at the community’s disposal.” (Braun 80)
         2. “. . . influences of the Qumran community on Jesus and the synop­tics on this subject are therefore also worthy of serious con­sideration. Neverthe­less, the differences are considerable . . .” (Braun 87)
            1. The *Manual of Discipline* “demanded of all members, ri­gidly and without exception, the surren­der of posses­sions. The historical Jesus calls for the selling of possessions in specific instances not as an absolute law and not without exception . . .” As elsewhere in Jesus’ genuine sayings (see above, “indiffer­ence to legal niceties”), each person “is treated as an individ­ual and not sub­jected to a general rule.” (Braun 87)
            2. “. . . the pious person [87] at Qumran . . . re­ceived a finan­cial guaran­tee, even if modest . . . the fol­lower of Jesus [who] gave away his posses­sions . . . was without outward security. . . . to be poor was not primarily a sociological matter for Jesus. For him it meant to stand in never-ending depen­dence on God.” (Braun 87-88)
   2. “Jesus’s way of life appears to have been unpre­ten­tious. His relation­ship to material possessions must at least be called reserved. The third evangelist has shifted his attitude toward the negative . . . But Jesus was clearly no ascetic . . . He is slandered as a “glutton” and “drunkard” and reproached for associ­at­ing with the unrighteous [26] . . . cultic purity did not have a particularly high religious value for him.” (Braun 26-27)
   3. ““Blessed are you poor . . .” might well be an authentic saying . . . Al­ready in the Old Testament book of Psalms, the poor, the oppressed set their hope on God in a special way. In Jesus’ eyes their need is their opportunity. The “tax col­lectors and sinners” with whom Jesus associ­ated are in no sense financially poor—quite the con­trary. . . . Their lack of religious status, that is *their* need . . .” (Braun 81)
   4. “Riches are spiritually dangerous.” Jesus said to the very rich man (Mark 10:17-22), “You lack one thing; go, sell what you have, and give to the poor . . .” (Braun 82)
   5. But “this demand to renounce possessions was not made univer­sal . . . Matthew has Jesus demand that the rich young man renounce his pos­ses­sions only if he wishes to be perfect. This mirrors a twofold stance toward possessions within the community, renunciation, which is consid­ered more praisewor­thy, and keeping possessions, which is less highly esteemed (Matt. 19:21) . . .” (Braun 83)
   6. “. . . followers of Jesus have houses of their own: Peter (Mark 1:29 par.), Levi (Mark 2:15 par.), Mary and Martha (Luke 10:38) . . . the anointing . . . betrays no ascetic tenden­cies regarding luxury (Mark 14:3-7 par.).” (Braun 84)
   7. “. . . at the beginning of their disciple­ship they [the disci­ples] left their possessions behind, in fact, as Mark and Matthew empha­size, *all* their posses­sions (Mark 10:28 par.). So also, unlike official Judaism, Matthew has Jesus contrast earthly and heavenly treasure (Matt. 6:19-21). For Matthew and Luke, serving God and mammon are mutually exclu­sive (Matt. 6:24 par.); the Christian who gathers treasure for himself forgoes treasure with God (Luke 12:21).” (Braun 84)
   8. possessions in Luke-Acts
      1. Luke traces the total renunciation of possessions of the early community (Acts 2:44-45, 4:32-35) back to Jesus (Luke 5:11; 14:12-14, 21; 12:31, [85] 33-34; 14:33; 16:19-26). “. . . in Luke alone (16:9, 11) Jesus calls wealth something unrigh­teous.” (Braun 85-86)
      2. But “Even Luke’s rigorism about poverty . . . remains at the level of . . . idealizing the primitive communi­ty, and, in the com­munity for which Luke writes, it did not have any socio­logical conse­quences that would be compa­rable to the poverty struc­ture in the Qumran community . . .” (Braun 87)
5. **duties toward neighbors**
   1. “. . . Jesus’ demands toward one’s neighbor . . . the vocabu­lary pertinent to this area is extremely sparse in the synop­tics.” (Braun 89)
   2. “A large part of the Jesus tradition in the synoptics re­quires love for one’s neighbor in the manner and intensity with which official Jewish cir­cles—thus excluding the Qumran community—also did. This group of sayings is untypical of Jesus . . . Nevertheless, it is certainly possible that there are authentic words of Jesus among them . . . these admoni­tions . . . are character­ized by a naive and unremitting reflection about rewards.” (Braun 90)
      1. Matt 5:21-22, hurtful words and anger (Braun 91)
      2. Matt. 5:23-24, recon­cile before sac­rifice (Braun 91)
      3. Matt 2:25-26, reconcile on the way to the judge (Braun 91)
      4. Matt 7:12, gol­den rule (Braun 91)
   3. “little ones”
      1. Receive the little ones (Matt 18:10; 10:42; Mark 9:37 par.; Mark 9:41).
      2. Mark 9:42 par., bet­ter a millstone.
      3. These sayings “speak of the “little ones” and also of the disciples, addressed as “you.” That helps us understand who is meant by the “little ones” in these sayings: originally probably real children, then insignifi­cant, easily imperiled disciples.” (Braun 91)
   4. “Probably Jesus himself enjoins: the brother who does wrong should be forgiven without limit [Matt 18:23-35; Luke 11:4, 17:3-4] . . . The Jewish faith already con­nected God’s forgiveness with human forgiveness.” (Braun 92)
   5. “Jesus himself warns against . . . exploitation of . . . depen­dent people (Matt. 23:25 par.; Mark 12:40), and even the community . . . (Mark 10:19) . . . Just as Judaism knows humility as the true way to greatness, the Jesus tradition also . . .(Mark 10:43f. par.; Mark 9:35 par.) . . . (Luke 14:7-10) . . . (Luke 14:11 par.) . . . to invite . . . the poor and sick (Luke 14:12-14) . . . Jewish texts also recom­mend this practice. It further corresponds to Jewish theo­logical thinking to link love for God and one’s neighbor as the Jesus tradition does (Mark 12:28-31 par.). All these acts of love in the Jesus tradition that are consistent with Jewish thought can be viewed in one of two ways: they can be understood in the sense of an action that seeks reward and gain, this in a Jewish manner (cf.p.11); but they can also be under­stood in such a way that the community, taking the details from the Jewish code of behavior, neverthe­less keeps in mind all along the line Jesus’ fundamental rejection of thinking of rewards (cf. pp. 48-49).” (Braun 93)
   6. “Jesus’ call to love one’s neighbor goes beyond the level of official Judaism . . .” (Braun 93)
   7. “The Jesus tradition demands more than the rabbis and yet remains on the level of the demands at Qumran on the follow­ing points . . . The Qumran communi­ty did not proclaim the indissolubility of marriage as Jesus does. Neverthe­less . . . the Qumran community also intensified the Jewish mar­riage ethic, whether through the demand for an unmar­ried, monastic existence or through the prohibition of polygamy or of marry­ing one’s niece.” (Braun 94)
   8. “. . . to forgive a guilty brother is important for Jesus as well as for Judaism . . . Jesus . . . adds the helpful ser­vice of openly telling him his fault (Luke 17:3). The commu­nity tradition then developed this directive . . . (Matt. 18:15-17) . . . to win the guilty . . . is not found in the usual Jewish texts . . . but the Manual of Discipline . . . agrees with Matt. 18:15-17 almost word for word.” (Braun 95)
   9. “(Matt. 23:23) . . . the Pharisees . . . tithing of herbs is castigated because these . . . people neglect the weighty matters in the law, proper behavior, mercy, and faithful­ness . . . the principle issue for Jesus is . . . proper behav­ior toward one’s neighbor . . . here also . . . the Qumran community . . . was actually guided by view­points that remind one of Jesus. The Qumran texts . . . that cultic purity . . . is worthless if proper behavior does not go hand in hand with it.” (Braun 96)
   10. “Finally, we have to consider Jesus’ injunction to support the poor through the sale of everything one has (Mark 10:17-22 par.) . . . the Manual of Disci­pline . . . surren­der of . . . possessions . . . Damascus Document . . . an intensi­fied support of the poor, financed by a high assess­ment of its mem­bers.” (Braun 96)
   11. “. . . we now come to . . . love for one’s neighbor with a clearly anti-Jewish orienta­tion.” (Braun 96)
   12. The “prohibition of judging (Matt. 7:1) . . . contradicts broad Jewish teaching . . . The neighbor is not subject to my judgment; he stands or falls on his own. Therefore, self-defense against the neighbor is abolished: if he strikes me on the right cheek, I should offer him the left as well . . .” (Braun 97)
   13. “The Jewish texts also admonished people to perform servic­es obligingly and willingly. However, they casuistically set the extent to which one is obligated . . . The wording of the individual statements does not, for instance, mark off the extent—the left cheek, the second mile, the coat . . .” (Braun 97)
   14. “Judaism did occasionally forbid hatred toward God’s crea­tures and could occasionally recommend prayer for enemies and the imitation of God who repays evil with good. But rabbis considered hatred allowable to a certain extent, the love for one’s enemy was not really commanded by them. In fact, [in] the Manual of Discipline . . . hatred against the outsid­ers . . . is expressly commanded . . . they [the Christian community] have Jesus pray for his enemies from the cross (Luke 23:34) . . . with Jewish martyrologies the martyr never prayed for his tormentors . . . The love for one’s enemies which Jesus commanded meant personal enemies but it also meant even more—one’s religious enemies.” (Braun 98)
   15. “. . . the great parable of the last judgment (Matt 25:31-46) . . . here, by means of the myth of the disclosure at the last judgment . . . Jesus is the kind of world judge who desires no personal honor, who rather is to be found only where people comply with what he desires (Luke 6:46).” (Braun 100)
   16. “The community understood Jesus when, in contrast to the zealous . . . piety of the Phari­sees and the Qumran commu­ni­ty, it portrays him as rebuking the disciples who would like to call down from heaven severe punishment . . .” (Braun 100)
   17. On Luke 9:51-56: “This regulation made provision for the legal possibility of a Jew freeing himself of a financial obliga­tion through a vow formula that pledged the financial value in question to the temple treasury. The transfer to the temple did not actually need to occur; speaking the vow formula in itself relieved the vower of the financial obligation. The hardship which this practice created for those with justifiable claims is evident. There were Jewish scribes who attempted to mitigate the problem. The qumran community expressly forbid this practice when it concerned the right of a worker to receive his pay.” (Braun 100)
   18. “A similar idea—that an obligation toward God dare not destroy one’s obliga­tion to others—underlies the sabbath healings . . . people are more important than the religious holiday . . . the Damascus Document . . . prohibited kill­ing a person who violates the sabbath . . . Jewish service to God that was now put to use for service to people signi­fied a revolutionary . . . directive . . .” (Braun 101)
   19. “Very likely Jesus himself characterized his mission as restricted to the Jews (Matt. 15:24). Fundamentally the Gentiles, designated in a Jewish manner as “dogs” in com­parison to the Jews, the “children,” appear to lie beyond his horizon. Thus Jesus’ outlook is still preserved also by the primitive Jewish Christian Community (Matt. 8:11-12 par.). An early community tradition also forbids early Christian missionaries to go to Gentiles and Samaritans (Matt. 10:5). For this entire period the definition must stand: total openness toward a non-Jew as neighbor had not yet been achieved; it basically remained within the sphere of the Jewish restriction; it occurred from time to time and was relative.” (Braun 102)
   20. “This relative, non-fundamental openness to the non-Jewish neighbor probably goes back to Jesus. The parable of the good Samaritan . . . probably originated with Jesus himself . . . one’s enemy . . . extends the concept of neighbor to all of humanity. But . . . Jewish texts . . . about one hundred years after Jesus, also define the neighbor . . . simply as a fellow human being . . . the essential signifi­cance of Jesus does not lie here . . . It is not the defi­nition but the manifest urgency that is the center of Jesus’ procla­ma­tion of love for one’s neighbor.” (Braun 102)
   21. “Jesus . . . occasionally acts contrary to the Old Testa­ment itself, as in the prohibition of divorce, the prohibi­tion of retaliation, and the command to love one’s enemy.” (Braun 103)
   22. “. . . in this chapter it was unavoidable that we returned to previously treated issues, questions about cultic mat­ters, reli­gious law, marriage, and posses­sions. For . . . Love for one’s neighbor is actually the center of the way of life commanded by Jesus.” (Braun 104)
   23. In the synoptic gospels, “only the third evangelist uses this term [“grace”].” (Braun 105)
   24. “There was a man who hired workers to harvest his vineyard . . . (Matt. 20:1-15). This parable, going back to Jesus himself, clearly shows that here grace is the sovereign gift that a person receives without claim or merit. It is offensive because its reception excludes one’s own achieve­ments and well-founded claims. In this way a person learns obedience that consists in unlimited existence for others: as one who has been accepted without limit, as one who can claim nothing and may still live and work.” (Braun 108)
   25. “There is a creditor who has two debtors. One owes him five hundred denarii, the other fifty. Neither can pay. The creditor cancels what each owes. “Which of the two will love the giver more?” asks Jesus at the conclu­sion of this probably authentic parable (Luke 7:41f.). It is evident that thankful­ness and love grow out of receiving. [God] makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust . . . Every person has a share in the basic gifts of life . . . This primal generosity is meant to attract a person to similar generos­ity . . . Love for one’s enemy grows out of occurrence of world­wide generosi­ty.” (Braun 109)
   26. “There is a king who wishes to settle accounts with his slaves. One of them owes him . . . ten thousand talents . . . the king orders the sale of this slave . . . the slave . . . begs . . . the debt is canceled. The same slave . . . meets one of his fellow slaves, who owes him one hundred denarii. He . . . has the debtor put in prison . . . Full of anger the master now hands the slave over for punish­ment (Matt. 18:23-34) . . . a person . . . is already living on the basis of great forgiveness when he is called on to grant a little forgiveness. The lack of willingness to forgive is rooted in the failure to recognize our own situation.” (Braun 110)
   27. “. . . the prodigal son, Luke 15:25-32 . . . the elder brother is really the lost son. His error was long-stand­ing, only it now actually came to light for the first time. He had always served the father with the hidden understand­ing that he was doing some­thing special and with the secret expecta­tion that it would pay off one day in a special way.” (Braun 110)
   28. “. . . the elder brother was expecting a reward . . . true obedience . . . is not something anyone accomplishes on his own, but it happens when a person receives love. Love is not gained through obedient performance; rather, the recep­tion of love makes it possible for the first time to be truly obedient. This sequence was, to be sure, thorough­ly uncommon for Judaism at that time.” (Braun 111)
   29. “Thus it is no wonder that the older sequence, first achievement, then grace, can find an echo in the synoptics. One probably has to understand Luke 7:47a in a sense of this old sequence: “Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much” (RSV) . . . in the parable itself (Luke 7:41-42) . . . *because* the creditor has canceled the debt, the debtors love him.” (Braun 111)
   30. “. . . the tax collector is accepted not because he has amended his ways . . . but because he knows that he is lost and in his lostness he hopes (as his prayer dramatically de­monstrates, Luke 18:10-14).” (Braun 111)
   31. “. . . Zac­chaeus [must] experience salvation before he can announce restitu­tion . . .” (Braun 111)
   32. indirect Christology: “Was he only the announcer of this newly discovered se­quence: a person can love only when he receives love, when he knows that he is loved? Or . . . do Jesus’ person and the attitude someone takes toward him form an intrinsic part of the grace he proclaims?” (Braun 112)
       1. “. . . we must disregard both the messiahship that the commu­nity ascribed to him, and that he himself probably did not claim (cf. pp. 25f.), as well as the Easter faith (for fur­ther details see pp. 116f.). Jesus himself probably did not speak of the atoning and salvific significance of his death and of his Resurrection. The two synoptic sayings about the atoning power of his death (Mark 10:45 par. and the words connected with the Lord’s Supper, Mark 14:24 par.), as well as the threefold predic­tion of his death and Resur­rection (Mark 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33f. par.) are later formu­la­tions . . .” (Braun 113)
       2. “. . . we should dismiss the tendency to . . . try to find hidden within every possible saying and parable of Jesus the significance of his person. That means . . . that Jesus considers that behavior like that of the Samaritan who helps the endangered man or of the father who opens the door to his son who had failed is also possible for people who have no direct connection with his person . . . Jesus has come to seek and to save the lost (Luke 19:10). This and similar generalizing formulations go beyond what the his­torical Jesus really said . . .” (Braun 113)
   33. “. . . the opponent’s word of reproach . . . “Behold, a glutton and a drunk­ard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners” (Matt. 11:19), is surely not a formula­tion by the communi­ty but an early tradition. Jesus did live as a friend of religious and social outcasts. Jesus did not simple preach. He practiced openness and love toward others that he demanded, and particularly toward those whose life was threatened, who had no future.” (Braun 114)
   34. “His behavior empowered and encouraged to true love for their neighbor those who themselves were at the point of giving up. It is very likely historical that he pronounced the forgiveness of sins to such individuals in their par­ticular situation “on earth” (Mark 2:10) . . .” (Braun 115)
   35. “Where does he get the authority for so intense a demand of love . . . The usual answer is . . . because he was God’s son, as was shown by his Resurrection . . .” (Braun 116)
   36. “. . . can Jesus make us accountable in our present situa­tion . . . the usual answer . . . he, as the Son of God, whom death could not hold, possesses eternal power.” (Braun 116)
   37. “. . . yet . . . this . . . does not correspond to the true concept of authority . . .” (Braun 116)
   38. “. . . authority . . . wins and commands from a person . . . uncoerced assent . . . because it advocates a posi­tion. This position is able to bind the hearer without compulsion and thus to confer authority on the speaker. A reference to something outside itself can neither estab­lish nor cancel it.” (Braun 117)
   39. “Whoever opposed what he wanted did it at the price of being unable to silence the inner voice that then said, but he really was right.” (Braun 117)
   40. “. . . Jesus . . . authority . . . binds the hearer in a specific situation but that cannot and indeed dare not bind him in other instances, for example, in the area of Jesus’ expec­ta­tion about the end and its nearness . . . Jesus’ authority cannot be a blank check on which any word of Jesus whatso­ever may be written.” (Braun 118)
   41. “. . . the church should have no fear that here it is a question of an authority . . . always affirmed anew and chosen on the basis of the power of its position to con­vince.” (Braun 118)
   42. “Indeed, there appears to have been an early tradition that, without reference to the tomb and the tree days, says that the crucified one has been exalted, without expressly mentioning his Resurrection (Phil. 2:9 Heb 1:3, and else­where in Hebrews).” (Braun 121)
   43. “For Paul . . . the Resurrection of Jesus is important be­cause it, as an endtime event, inaugurates the imminent resurrection of believ­ers.” (Braun 122)
   44. “. . . the present, and perhaps not original, beginning of Acts (1:3) . . .” (Braun 122)
   45. “The belief in the Resurrection is an early Christian form of expression, a form of expression conditioned by its environment, for the authority Jesus had attained over these people. Today we shall not be able to regard this form of expression as binding on us. But the authority of Jesus that this form of expression wishes to convey can very well be binding for us today.” (Braun 122)
   46. “The way of Jesus can also be painted in the New Testament with reference to the time prior to his life on earth, in an opposite direction, so to speak, from that of resurrec­tion and ascension . . . the logos . . . (John 1:3; Heb. 1:2) . . .” (Braun 123)
   47. “. . . titles . . . keeps reaching . . . higher and higher. Jewish titles of dignity form the start of the development . . . he is the Messiah; not at first the Messiah who had already come but the Messiah who will come soon at the impending end of days. As Messiah he is then the offspring of David, born of Bethlehem. Indeed, according to Jewish belief he can, precisely as the Messiah, also be called the Son of God. He becomes identified with the Son of man to whom he pointed in his preaching, at first as another person distin­guished from himself (cf.p.38). (Braun 124)
   48. “In regard to the question of the relation of the historical Jesus to the Christ proclaimed by the Church, the question of the Christological titles used by Jesus in the Gospels or ap­plied to him is crucial.” (Hugh Anderson *Jesus* 178) See:
       1. Taylor, Vincent. *The Names of Jesus*. London: 1954.
       2. Cullmann, Oscar. *Christology*.
       3. Fuller, Reginald. *Foundations of* . . . *Christology*.
       4. Higgins, A.J.B. *Jesus and the Son of Man*.
       5. Tödt, H.E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Trans. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1963.
       6. Manson, William. *Jesus the Messiah*. Philadelphia: 1946.
       7. Manson, T.W. *The Servant Messiah*. Cambridge: CUP, 1953.
   49. “As the message was then proclaimed to Hellenistic-oriental non-Jews, the forms of expression for Jesus’ authority also changed. Old forms are omitted: Paul, for example, no longer speaks of Jesus as the Son of man. Other old forms attain a new content . . . by means of the translation . . . “Christ,” there now arose among Greeks the proper name “Jesus Christ.” The Son of God, in Jewish belief equated with the Messiah and subordi­nated to god, now attains . . . increased divine dignity. Above all, new titles now emerge: Jesus as the kyrios, the Lord . . . a divine being. Like kyrios, logos in John 1:1 is such a divine designa­tion.” (Braun 124)
   50. “The titles . . . cannot establish Jesus’ authority; rath­er, they seek to express and point to Jesus’ authority.” (Braun 124)
   51. “. . . we should guard against questioning or judging a person’s Christiani­ty on the basis of whether, to choose the two favorite test questions, he holds Jesus to be the Son of God and believes in Jesus’ Resurrection. And . . . we should not shrink back anxiously but answer clearly: in the literal sense in which these terms are used in the New Testament, I cannot accept them. If I wanted to accept them, I would have to accept ancient thought forms and concepts along with them.” (Braun 125)
   52. “The objector would like to see the step taken from the acceptance here and there of the actions and words of Jesus to a total acceptance of Jesus, which expresses itself in the dogmatic forms supplied by the New Testament. But he should be careful lest this endeavor put him, at a decisive point, in conflict with the New Testament itself! There is a blanket acknowledgment of the kyrios, the Lord Jesus, that in his name preaches, transmits religious experiences, and gives aid but that is, nevertheless, worthless, because it omits doing what is right: the community has Jesus issue such a warning (Matt. 7:21-23).” (Braun 126)
   53. “. . . what becomes of love for God? What becomes of prayer to God? . . . “love for God” or “love to God” . . . The noun occurs only in Luke 11:42 . . . In Mark 12:28-34 and paral­lels, all three synoptics juxtapose love for God and love for people, as Helle­nistic Judaism had already, and use the verb “to love God.” But these are then all the passages in the first three gospels that deal with love for God.” (Braun 130)
   54. “. . . the rich questioner . . . (Mark 10:17-22) . . . the first through the third command­ments which speak of love for God, are so-called first table, the specifically reli­gious portion of the command­ments, are missing . . . (Matt. 5:21-48) . . . for purposes of ecclesi­astical instruc­tion, Jesus’ demand . . . is contrasted with . . . the past . . . in Matthew 6 and 7, the specifi­cally reli­gious themes of fasting and praying are in a . . . in the words of Jesus the subject is constantly God, even if love for God is not specifi­cally mentioned . . . why love for God is explicitly encountered so seldom in the synoptics . . . God is . . . loved by . . . such behavior as . . . serves the neighbor in a very concrete way . . . the apocryphal saying of Jesus: “If you have seen your brother, then you have seen your God” (Clement of Alexan­dria, Stromata 1.19). The juxtaposi­tion of . . . love for God and love for one’s neighbor . . . in Mark 12:28-34 . . . is . . . only an apparent juxtaposition.” (Braun 131)
   55. “Jesus . . . interpret love for God in terms of love for one’s neighbor . . . tendencies . . . even in the synoptics are in the process of changing prayer . . . from a specifi­cally ritual obser­vance to a persistent attitude . . .” (Braun 132)
   56. “. . . Epictetus taught . . . a person striving only for things over which he actually has control and not allowing himself to be pulled away by his emotions . . . but for Epicte­tus a compas­sionate sympathy for a neighbor’s misfor­tune belonged expressly to such emotions.” (Braun 132)
   57. “But if in the Jesus tradition service to God is service to one’s flesh and blood neighbor, then how can one speak of grace of God? . . . the man who at midnight . . . ful­fills the request . . . to get rid of the intruder (Luke 11:5-8). Or . . . the father who .. gives . . . the bread and the egg . . .(Matt. 7:7f) . . . The meaning is clearly this: giving by people repre­sents, however weakly, the giving of God. The actual experience a person can have of receiving some­thing is able to provide important assistance in enabling him to see himself as someone who is totally and unconditionally a receiver.” (Braun 133)
   58. “God shows grace in that people assume the role of the physician who is there for the sick (Mark 2:17 par.).” (Braun 134)
   59. “. . . a decisive addition is . . . still required . . . the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-24) . . . consider . . . the possibil­ity that . . . things happened quite differently . . . The son, his rights restored, shook his head sadly and said: “That is all well and good, father; but I cannot get over what I have done, that I was like that.” In order for a person to be really accepted, it is abso­lutely neces­sary that he accepts himself. Put pointedly: he must learn to get along with this wicked person who he himself is; he must learn humility . . . to eat of the father’s fatted calf.” (Braun 134)
   60. “God is not the basis for his acceptance of himself; he is rather the event that here occurs . . . God is included in his self accep­tance . . .” (Braun 135)
   61. “In the environment around Jesus, “God” can also be the expression for the fact that the pious person should hate and should earn his salvation by his own obedience.” (Braun 136)
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1. **Jesus**’ **knowledge of ordinary events**
   1. texts showing ignorance
      1. Luke 2:46, “After three days they found him in the temple, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions.”
      2. Luke 2:52, “And Jesus increased in wisdom and in years, and in divine and human favor.”
      3. Mark 5:30, 32 (//Matt 9:22//Luke 8:45, 47), “Immediately aware that power had gone forth from him, Jesus turned about in the crowd and said, ‘Who touched my clothes?’ . . . 32He looked all around to see who had done it.”
   2. texts showing extraordinary knowledge
      1. telepathy (what others’ are thinking)
         1. Mark 2:6-8 par, “Now some of the scribes were sitting there, questioning in their hearts, 7’Why does this fellow speak in this way? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?’ 8At once Jesus perceived in his spirit that they were discuss­ing these questions among them­selves; and he said to them, ‘Why do you raise such questions in your hearts?’”
         2. Mark 9:33-35 par, “he asked them, ‘What were you arguing about on the way?’ 34But they were silent, for on the way they had argued with one another who was the greatest. 35He sat down, called the twelve, and said to them, ‘Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all.’”
         3. John 2:24b-25, “he knew all people 25and needed no one to tes­tify about anyone; for he himself knew what was in every­one.”
         4. John 6:64bc, “For Jesus knew from the first who were the ones that did not believe, and who was the one that would betray him.”
         5. John 16:19, “Jesus knew that they wanted to ask him, so he said to them, ‘Are you discussing among yourselves what I meant when I said, “A little while, and you will no longer see me, and again a little while, and you will see me”?’”
         6. John 16:30, [the disciples say,] “Now we know that you know all things, and do not need to have anyone question you; by this we believe that you came from God.”
      2. clairvoyance (what is happening elsewhere)
         1. Mark 11:2, “Go into the village ahead of you, and immedi­ately as you enter it, you will find tied there a colt that has never been ridden; untie it and bring it.”
         2. John 1:48, “Nathanael asked him, ‘Where did you get to know me?’ Jesus an­swered, ‘I saw you under the fig tree before Philip called you.’”
      3. precognition (what will happen in the future)
         1. Mark 14:13-14, “Go into the city, and a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him, 14and wherever he en­ters, say to the owner of the house, ‘The Teacher asks, Where is my guest room where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?’”
         2. Matt 17:27, [Jesus says to Peter,] “go to the sea and cast a hook; take the first fish that comes up; and when you open its mouth, you will find a coin; take that and give it to them [collectors of the temple tax] for you and me.”
         3. John 6:71, “He was speaking of Judas son of Simon Iscariot, for he, though one of the twelve, was going to betray him.”
         4. John 10:18, “No one takes it [my life] from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. I have received this com­mand from my Father.”
         5. John 13:11, “For he knew who was to betray him; for this reason he said, ‘Not all of you are clean.’”
2. **Jesus**’ **knowledge of religious matters**
   1. Jesus’ knowledge of the scriptures
      1. Jesus could read the Bible
         1. John 7:15, “The Jews were astonished at it, saying, ‘How does this man have such learning, when he has never been taught?’”
         2. Luke 4:16b-17, “He stood up to read, 17and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was given to him. He unrolled the scroll and found the place where it was written . . .”
         3. cf. also general admiration for his authority
            1. Matt 7:29, “for he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.”
            2. Matt 22:16, “So they sent their disciples to him, along with the Herodi­ans, saying, ‘Teacher, we know that you are sin­cere, and teach the way of God in accordance with truth, and show deference to no one; for you do not regard people with partiality.’”
      2. citations of scripture involving a mistake
         1. John 7:38, “and let the one who believes in me drink. As the scripture has said, ‘Out of the believer’s heart shall flow rivers of living water.’”
         2. Mark 2:26, “He entered the house of God, when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat, and he gave some to his compan­ions.”
         3. Matt 23:35, “so that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar.”
      3. uncritical use of scripture
         1. Mark 12:36 par, “David himself, by the Holy Spirit, de­clared, ‘The Lord said to my Lord, “Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet.”‘“
         2. Matt 12:39-40 (//16:4, Luke 11:29-32), “An evil and adulter­ous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. 40For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea mon­ster, so for three days and three nights the Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth.”
      4. interpretations that go beyond the literal sense: John 10:33-36, “The Jews answered, ‘It is not for a good work that we are going to stone you, but for blasphemy, because you, though only a human being, are making yourself God.’ 34Jesus answered, “Is it not written in your law, ‘I said, you are gods’? 35If those to whom the word of God came were called ‘gods’—and the scrip­ture cannot be annulled—36can you say that the one whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world is blaspheming because I said, ‘I am God’s Son’?”
      5. “. . . theologians [who] are convinced that . . . Jesus could not have been limited in what he knew . . . can simply say that . . . His know­ledge of the Bible was perfect, but he conformed to the her­men­eu­tics of his time . . .” (Brown “How Much” 99)
   2. Jesus’ use of contemporary religious concepts
      1. demonology: “some of the cases . . . of demon possession seem to be instances of natural sickness. . . . Jesus himself is portrayed as [having] primitive ideas.” (Brown “How Much” 55)
         1. Mark 9:17-18 (epilepsy), “Someone from the crowd answered him, ‘Teacher, I brought you my son; he has a spirit that makes him unable to speak; 18and whenever it seizes him, it dashes him down; and he foams and grinds his teeth and becomes rigid; and I asked your disciples to cast it out, but they could not do so.’”
         2. Mark 5:4 (insanity), “for he had often been restrained with shackles and chains, but the chains he wrenched apart, and the shackles he broke in pieces; and no one had the strength to subdue him.”
         3. Matt 12:43-45 (//Luke 11:24-26), “When the unclean spirit has gone out of a person, it wanders through waterless regions looking for a resting place, but it finds none. 44Then it says, ‘I will return to my house from which I came.’ When it comes, it finds it empty, swept, and put in order. 45Then it goes and brings along seven other spirits more evil than itself, and they enter and live there; and the last state of that person is worse than the first. So will it be also with this evil generation.”
         4. But see *Christianity and Demonology*, by the Sacred Congregation for the Doc­trine of the Faith. (In *Catholic Desktop Library*. Pauline Books and Media, 1994. Soft­ware, hence no page numbers.): “. . . Christ, and even more so the apostles, belonged to their times and shared the current culture. Nevertheless, because of His divine nature and the revelation which He had come to communicate, Jesus tran­scended His milieu and His times: He was immune from their pressure. Moreover, a reading of the Sermon on the Mount is sufficient to convince one of Jesus’ freedom of spirit as much as of His respect for tradition. . . . In declaring “Do not imagine that I have come to abolish the Law or the prophets. l have come not to abolish but to complete them” (Mt. 5:17), Jesus expressed without ambiguity His respect for the past. The following verses (19‑20) confirm this impression. But His condemnation of the act of divorce (Mt. 5:31), of the law of “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” (Mt. 5:38), etc., show His total independence rather than a desire to sum up the past and complement it. This is even more true of His condem­nation of the Pharisees’ scrupulous attachment to the traditions of the ancients (cf. Mk. 7:1‑22).”
      2. afterlife: in particular, “the materialistic images that he uses in the few instances where he does speak of the subject.” How much of this language did Jesus mean as figurative? (Brown “How Much” 56)
         1. Mark 9:43-48 (//Matt 25:41), “If your hand causes you to stum­ble, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life maimed than to have two hands and to go to hell, to the unquenchable fire, 44where their worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched. 45And if your foot causes you to stumble, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life lame than to have two feet and to be thrown into hell, 46where their worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched. 47And if your eye causes you to stumble, tear it out; it is better for you to enter the kingdom of God with one eye than to have two eyes and to be thrown into hell, 48where their worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched.”
         2. Matt 8:12 (cf. 13:42), “while the heirs of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”
         3. Luke 16:24, 26, “He called out, ‘Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am in agony in these flames.’ . . . 26Be­sides all this, between you and us a great chasm has been fixed, so that those who might want to pass from here to you cannot do so, and no one can cross from there to us.’”
         4. Matt 8:11, “I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven . . .”
         5. Luke 13:28, “There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abra­ham and Isaac and Jacob and all the proph­ets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrown out.”
         6. Mark 13:26, “Then they will see ‘the Son of Man coming in clouds’ with great power and glory.”
         7. Mark 14:62, “I am; and ‘you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power,’ and ‘coming with the clouds of heav­en.’”
      3. apocalyptic: how much of this language did Jesus mean as figura­tive? (Brown “How Much” 58)
         1. Mark 13:7-8 par, “When you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is still to come. 8For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in vari­ous places; there will be famines. This is but the begin­ning of the birthpangs.”
         2. Mark 13:24-25 par, “But in those days, after that suffering, the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, 25and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will be shaken.”
3. **knowledge of the future**
   1. Jesus is described as a prophet.
      1. Mark 6:15, “But others said, ‘It is Elijah.’ And others said, ‘It is a prophet, like one of the prophets of old.’”
      2. Luke 7:16, “Fear seized all of them; and they glorified God, saying, ‘A great prophet has risen among us!’ and ‘God has looked favor­ably on his people!’”
      3. John 6:14, “When the people saw the sign that he had done, they began to say, ‘This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world.’”
   2. foreknowledge of his passion and resurrection: “. . . how much repre­sents the *ipsissima verba* and how much represents clarifica­tion by the evan­gelist in the light of the subsequent event? . . . Genuine detailed fore­know­ledge is superhuman; unshakable conviction is not necessarily beyond human powers.” (Brown “How Much” 60)
      1. Mark 8:31-33 par, “Then he began to teach them that the Son of Man must undergo great suffering, and be rejected by the elders, the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. 32He said all this quite openly. And Peter took him aside and began to rebuke him. 33But turning and looking at his disciples, he rebuked Peter and said, ‘Get behind me, Satan! For you are setting your mind not on divine things but on human things.’”
      2. Mark 9:30-32 par, “They went on from there and passed through Galilee. He did not want anyone to know it; 31for he was teaching his disciples, saying to them, ‘The Son of Man is to be betrayed into human hands, and they will kill him, and three days after being killed, he will rise again.’ 32But they did not understand what he was saying and were afraid to ask him.”
      3. Mark 10:32-34 par, “They were on the road, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was walking ahead of them; they were amazed, and those who followed were afraid. He took the twelve aside again and began to tell them what was to happen to him, 33saying, ‘See, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death; then they will hand him over to the Gentiles; 34they will mock him, and spit upon him, and flog him, and kill him; and after three days he will rise again.’”
      4. John 3:14, “And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilder­ness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up . . .”
      5. John 8:28, “When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will realize that I am he, and that I do nothing on my own, but I speak these things as the Father instruct­ed me.”
      6. John 12:32, “And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself.”
      7. John 2:19, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.”
      8. Matt 12:39-40, “But he answered them, ‘An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. 40For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster, so for three days and three nights the Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth.’”
         1. But Luke 11:29-30, 32 is more original: “This genera­tion is an evil generation; it asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of Jonah. 30For just as Jonah became a sign to the people of Nineveh, so the Son of Man will be to this generation.’ . . . 32The people of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, because they repented at the proclama­tion of Jonah, and see, something greater than Jonah is here!”
         2. And cf. Matt 16:4, “An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of Jonah.”
      9. foreknowledge of Judas’ betrayal (but “we could scarcely base a theory of Jesus’ foreknowledge on these sayings alone”). (Brown “How Much”)
         1. early in the ministry: John 6:70-71, “Jesus answered them, ‘Did I not choose you, the twelve? Yet one of you is a devil.’ 71He was speaking of Judas son of Simon Iscariot, for he, though one of the twelve, was going to betray him.”
         2. at the last supper
            1. Mark 14:21 par, “For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that one by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been better for that one not to have been born.”
            2. John 13:18, 21b, “I am not speaking of all of you; I know whom I have chosen. But it is to fulfill the scripture, ‘The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me.’ . . . 21bVery truly, I tell you, one of you will betray me.”
         3. at Gethsemane
            1. Mark 14:41, “He came a third time and said to them, ‘Are you still sleeping and taking your rest? Enough! The hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sin­ners.’”
            2. Matt 26:45, “Then he came to the disciples and said to them, ‘Are you still sleeping and taking your rest? See, the hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.’”
            3. John 18:4, “Then Jesus, knowing all that was to happen to him, came for­ward and asked them, ‘Whom are you looking for?’”
   3. foreknowledge of the destruction of Jerusalem
      1. Mark 13:2 par, “Do you see these great buildings? Not one stone will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down.”
      2. Mark 13:14, “But when you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand), then those in Judea must flee to the mountains . . .”
      3. Matt 24:15, “So when you see the desolating sacrilege standing in the holy place, as was spoken of by the prophet Daniel (let the reader under­stand) . . .”
      4. Luke 21:20, “When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near.”
   4. foreknowledge of the parousia
      1. an immediate parousia
         1. a parousia during the ministry: Mark 6:7, 30 (//Matt 10:23), “He called the twelve and began to send them out two by two, and gave them authority over the unclean spirits. . . . 30The apostles gathered around Jesus, and told him all that they had done and taught.”
         2. a parousia immediately after Jesus’ death
            1. Mark 14:25, “Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.”
            2. Mark 14:62, “I am; and ‘you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power,’ and ‘coming with the clouds of heaven.’”
            3. Luke 23:42-43, “Then he said, ‘Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.’ 43He replied, ‘Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in Para­dise.’”
            4. John 14:3, “And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, so that where I am, there you may be also.”
      2. sayings that imply an interval between Jesus’ death and the par­ousia
         1. sayings that do not mention the parousia
            1. references to a church or community life
            2. references to missionary activity
            3. the growth parables
            4. orders to baptize or commemorate the eucharist
         2. a parousia in the lifetime of Jesus’ hearers
            1. Mark 13:30, “Truly I tell you, this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place.”
            2. Mark 9:1 (//Matt 16:28), “And he said to them, ‘Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see that the kingdom of God has come with pow­er.’”
            3. John 1:51, “you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.”
            4. John 21:22, ““If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you? Follow me!”
         3. a delayed parousia
            1. Matt 24:48, “But if that wicked slave says to himself, ‘My master is de­layed . . .’”
            2. Matt 25:5, 19, “As the bridegroom was delayed, all of them became drowsy and slept. . . . 19After a long time the master of those slaves came and settled accounts with them.”
         4. a delayed parousia, preceded by apocalyptic signs
            1. Mark 13, Matt 24-25, Luke 21
         5. a parouisa the time of which cannot be foretold
            1. Jesus himself does not know: Mark 13:32, “But about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”
            2. the disciples cannot know the time

Matt 24:42-44 (//Luke 12:39-40), “Keep awake therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming. 43But understand this: if the owner of the house had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have stayed awake and would not have let his house be broken into. 44Therefore you also must be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an unexpected hour.”

Matt 24:50 (//Luke 12:46), “the master of that slave will come on a day when he does not expect him and at an hour that he does not know.”

Matt 25:13, “Keep awake therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour.”

Luke 17:20-21, “Once Jesus was asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was coming, and he answered, ‘The kingdom of God is not coming with things that can be observed; 21nor will they say, “Look, here it is!” or “There it is!” For, in fact, the kingdom of God is among you.’”

* + 1. discussion
       1. Mark 13:32, “about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”
          1. Christ’s human knowledge was free from ignorance and error. [*sententia certa*]
          2. Christ’s freedom from ignorance was denied by the Arians, Nestorians, and Agnoetes (monophysitic sect c ad 500s). (Ott, *Fundamentals* 165)
          3. “. . . the Fathers generally acquitted Christ’s human soul of ignorance and error . . .” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)
          4. The Agnoetes’ chief opponent, Patriarch Eulogius of Alexandria, taught: “Christ’s humanity which was taken up in the hypostasis of the inaccessible and substantial wisdom of Christ cannot be ignorant of anything of the past or of the future.”
          5. Gregory the Great approved Eulogius’ teaching, basing it on the hypostatic union: knowledge from Christ’s divine nature communicates to his human nature.
          6. Augustine interpreted Mark 13:32 to mean that Christ knew the day and hour but willed not to reveal it. Acts 1:7, “It is not for you to know the times or periods that the Father has set by his own authority.”
          7. Gregory the Great said it meant that Christ as man knew the day and hour but did not know this from his human nature.
       2. Jesus did not expect the second coming soon.
          1. Matt 12:41; 13:2413:24-33; 24:14, 21, 31; 24:48; 25:5, 19; Luke 17:22; 21:24.
       3. Statements that suggest Jesus expected the second coming soon refer to
          1. revelation of his power for the punishment of his enemies (Matt 10:23, destruction of Jerusalem)
          2. revelation of his power for extending the kingdom of God on earth (Matt 16:28, Mark 9:1, Luke 9:27)
          3. revelation of his power for the reward of heaven (John 14:3, 18, 28; 21:22)
          4. The context shows that Matt 24:34 refers to omens of the parousia, including the judgment of punishment on Jerusalem.

Matt 24:34, “this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place . . .”

1. **Jesus**’ **understanding of himself and of his mission**
   1. Jesus as “Messiah”
      1. answer to the high priest
         1. Mark 14:62, “I am; and ‘you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power,’ and ‘coming with the clouds of heaven.’”
         2. Matt 26:64, “You have said so. But I tell you, From now on you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven.”
         3. Luke 22:67, “They said, ‘If you are the Messiah, tell us.’ He replied, ‘If I tell you, you will not believe . . .’”
         4. Cf. John 10:24-25, “So the Jews gathered around him and said to him, ‘How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Messiah, tell us plainly.’ 25Jesus answered, ‘I have told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father’s name testify to me . . .’”
      2. Jesus’ unreserved acceptance of “Messiah”
         1. John 4:25-26, “The woman said to him, ‘I know that Messiah is coming’ (who is called Christ). ‘When he comes, he will proclaim all things to us.’ 26Jesus said to her, ‘I am he, the one who is speaking to you.’”
      3. indirect acceptance
         1. Matt 23:10, “Nor are you to be called instructors, for you have one instruc­tor, the Messiah.”
         2. at the baptism
            1. Mark 1:11, “And a voice came from heaven, ‘You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased.’”
            2. Matt 3:17, “And a voice from heaven said, ‘This is my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased.’”
            3. Luke 3:22, “and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form like a dove. And a voice came from heaven, ‘You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased.’”
   2. Jesus as “Son of God”
      1. Mark 10:18, “Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone.”
      2. Mark 13:32, “But about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”
      3. Matthew 11:27 (//Luke 10:22), “All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.”
      4. Mark 12:6 (//Matt 21:37//Luke 20:13), “He had still one other, a beloved son. Finally he sent him to them, saying, ‘They will respect my son.’”
      5. often in John
         1. John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”
         2. John 8:58, “Jesus said to them, ‘Very truly, I tell you, before Abraham was, I am.’”
         3. John 10:30, “The Father and I are one.”
         4. John 14:9, “Have I been with you all this time, Philip, and you still do not know me? Whoever has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, ‘Show us the Fa­ther’?”
         5. John 5:18, “For this reason the Jews were seeking all the more to kill him, because he was not only breaking the sabbath, but was also calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God.”
         6. John 10:33, “It is not for a good work that we are going to stone you, but for blasphemy, because you, though only a human being, are making yourself God.”
      6. See the virgin birth in Matt 1-2 and Luke 1-2: “God Himself begot Jesus.” (Brown “How Much” 92)
   3. conclusions
      1. “The question “Did Jesus identify himself as Messiah?” is des­cribed as the question of Jesus’ messianic self-conscious­ness. Yet consciousness is not always the same as express knowledge; [93] . . . consciousness is often an intuitive aware­ness and thus is distinct from an ability to express by formu­lating concepts and words, which is generally what people mean when they speak of knowledge.” (Brown “How Much” 93-94)
      2. “Messiah” could have been used by Jesus to describe his salvific mission to men. Though “there is insufficient evidence that Jesus claimed the title or that he fully accepted it . . ., this would not necessarily imply that he had no consciousness of a salvific mis­sion to men (the type of mission that the Church called Messiah­ship when it had reinterpreted that term in a spiritual way).” The same would be true for other titles attributed to Jesus by the Church: “servant,” “savior,” etc., [94] and also for “son.” “. . . it is *possible* that in his lifetime Jesus never came to full use of this image. Still this does not necessarily mean that he was not conscious of the reality behind the relation­ship we call Sonship.” (Brown “How Much” 95)
      3. “. . . an irreducible historical minimum in the Gospel presentation of Jesus is that he claimed to be the unique agent in the process of establishing God’s kingship [96] . . . [He] did declare sins forgiven, modify the Law of Moses, violate the Sabbath ordi­nances, offend against proprieties (eat with tax collectors and sinners), make stringent demands (forbid divorce; challenge to celibacy and to leave family ties), defy common sense (encouragement to turn the other cheek)—in short, teach as no teacher of his time taught. And if one allows that he worked miracles—an allowance that has sound exegetical backing, no matter how much it offends liberal philo­sophical presupposi­tions—then . . . he acted against evil with a power that went far beyond the range of ordinary experience. All of this certainly implies a conscious­ness of a unique ministry to men. . . . Moreover, the certainty with which Jesus spoke and acted implies a con­sciousness of a unique relationship to God.” (Brown “How Much” 96-97)
      4. Also, “we should emphasize that there is no indication in the Gospels of a develop­ment of Jesus’ basic conviction.” (Brown “How Much” 98)
   4. addendum: the time of the second coming
      1. dogma: no one knows the time of the second coming. (*sententia certa*) (Ott)
      2. scripture
         1. Mark 13:32, “about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”
            1. “Christ’s human knowledge was free from positive ignorance and from error.” [*sententia certa*] (Ott, *Fundamentals* 165)
            2. Christ’s freedom from ignorance was denied by the Arians, Nestorians, and Agnoetes (monophysite sect, ad 500s). (Ott, *Fundamentals* 165)

The Arians “held that the Logos did not know the day of the General Judgment in order to show that He was a creature . . .” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)

“In the struggle against the Arians . . ., individual Fathers [Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria] ascribed ignorance to Christ’s soul.” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)

But against Agnoetism “the Fathers generally acquitted Christ’s human soul of ignorance and error . . .” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)

“The leading exponent of this error was the Deacon Themistios of Alexandria.” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 165)

The Patriarch Eulologius [*sic*] of Alexandria, the chief opponent of the Agnoetes, teaches: “Christ’s humanity which was taken up in the hypostasis of the inaccessible and substantial wisdom of Christ cannot be ignorant of anything of the past or of the future” (Photius, Bibl. Cod. 230 n. 10).” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)

“Pope Gregory the Great approved the teaching of Eulogius, basing it upon the Hypostatic Union, from which Christ derives a communication of the knowledge from His Divine to His human nature.” (D 248; cf. “The Libellus emendationis (N 10) of the Gallic Monk Leporius.”) (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)

* + - * 1. The Fathers offer three principal interpretations of Mark 13:32.

“. . . the inadmissible mystic interpretation (the Son = the Body of Christ) . . .” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 166)

Christ knew the day and hour, but it was God’s will not to reveal it (Augustine). Acts 1:7, “It is not for you to know the times or periods that the Father has set by his own authority.”

Christ as man knew the day and hour but “did not have this knowledge from his human nature (Pope Gregory the Great); D 248.” (Ott, *Fun­da­ment­als* 166)

* + - 1. Jesus did not expect the second coming to be soon. See Matt 12:41; 13:2413:24-33; 24:14, 21, 31; 24:48; 25:5, 19; Luke 17:22; 21:24. (Ott, *Fundamentals* 488)
      2. Statements that suggest Jesus expected the second coming soon refer to “the revelation of His power, whether it be for the punishment of His enemies (Mt. 10, 23: destruction of Jerusalem) or for the extension of the Kingdom of God on earth [Matt 16:28, Mark 9:1, Luke 9:27] or for the reward of His faithful ones in the blessedness of Heaven [John 14:3, 18, 28; 21:22]. “The words of Mt. 24, 34 [“this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place”] refer, according to the context, to the omens of the parousia, among which already the judgment of punishment on Jerusalem is counted.” (Ott, *Fundamentals* 488)
      3. 1 Thess 5:1-2, “concerning the times and the seasons, brothers and sisters, you do not need to have anything written to you. 2For you yourselves know very well that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night.”
      4. 2 Thess 2:1-3, “As to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our being gathered together to him, we beg you, brothers and sisters, 2 not to be quickly shaken in mind or alarmed, either by spirit or by word or by letter, as though from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is already here. 3Let no one deceive you in any way; for that day will not come unless the rebellion comes first and the lawless one is revealed, the one destined for destruction.”
      5. 2 Pet 3:8-10, “do not ignore this one fact, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like one day. 9The Lord is not slow about his promise, as some think of slowness, but is patient with you, not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance. 10 But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, and then the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fire, and the earth and everything that is done on it will be disclosed.”
      6. Rev 3:3, “If you do not wake up, I will come like a thief, and you will not know at what hour I will come to you.”
      7. Rev 16:15, “See, I am coming like a thief! Blessed is the one who stays awake and is clothed, not going about naked and exposed to shame.”

## Jesus’ Knowledge (Urban)

Urban, Linwood. *A Short History of Christian Thought*. New York: OUP, 1986.

Jesus’ divine nature is omniscient. But his human nature is not omniscient; it has limited knowledge. Since Jesus had a human mind, may­be some of his state­ments are untrust­wor­thy. (Urban 91)

Some theologians have suggested that we should attribute in­stances of Jesus’ ignorance to his humani­ty and instances of his supernatu­ral knowledge to his divinity. [90] But this cre­ates a Nestorian (that is, a schiz­ophrenic) Jesus. 91 [Nestorius taught that the union of divine and human in Jesus was only a “con­junc­tion”: God and Jesus “rode around” together inside Jesus’ body, but they were not ultimately one person. His understanding of Jesus was condemned at a worldwide meeting of bishops at Ephesus in AD 431. According to orthodox Christianity (as stated at another world­wide meeting of bishops 20 years later, at Chalce­don), the divine and human natures in Jesus, though certainly not “mixed to­ge­ther,” nevertheless are “inseparable”: Jesus is one person.] (Urban 91)

Thomas Aquinas (d. AD 1274) proposed that it was always Jesus’ humanity that spoke to us. His divine nature never spoke to us directly but always as Jesus’ human nature. But, Aquinas added, Jesus’ human nature is a per­fected human nature: all of the la­tent potentialities of human nature are fully devel­oped in Jesus’ human nature. His human nature, therefore, while not om­nis­cient, never­theless did have (a) the beatific vision (the direct ap­pre­hension of God that the saints in heaven have) and (b) an in­fused know­ledge of the past and the future. (Urban 91)

Some theologians countered that, since one es­sen­tial pro­perty of human nature is fal­­libility, Aquinas was attributing error to Jesus. Aquinas responded that, yes, fallibility is a pro­perty of all humans and therefore a property of Jesus’ human nature; but fallibility is only the *capacity* to commit error. Aquinas was not claiming that Jesus was infallible (in­capable of error), only that Jesus was iner­rant (he did not in fact ever make a mis­take). Making mis­takes is not nec­es­sary in hu­mans; the saints in heaven are inerrant, yet they are still hu­man beings. (Urban 92)

## Indirect Christology

1. **Hans Conzelmann**
   1. Conzelmann, Hans. *Jesus*: *The Classic Article from RGG3 Expanded and Updated*. Trans. J. Raymond Lord. Ed. and intro. John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973. (German: “Jesus Christus.” *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*: *Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. Ed. Kurt Galling et al. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1959. Vol. 3 cols. 619-53.)
   2. “The connection of salvation with the person of Jesus lies simply in the fact that *he* offers this salvation [51] . . . [This is] Indirect Christology . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 51-52)
   3. “His [Jesus’] person is included in the interpretation of the commandment: “But *I* say to you.”“ (Conzelmann *Jesus* 61)
   4. “Jesus understands himself as the one who makes the *final* appeal. His place is unique, since after him nothing more “comes”—but God himself. . . . He teaches about the will of God . . . first in his own conduct: in breaking through the cultic legislation . . ., in the sovereignty of proclaiming salvation to sinners, publicans, and prostitutes, and judgment to the self-assured.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 50)
   5. “The manner and method [of presenting his teaching shows that] Jesus includes his own person in the event [the coming of the kingdom].” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 70)
   6. “In eschatology, too, we meet with “indirect” Christology. [The kingdom] is not yet here. But it already casts its light in that it becomes operative in Jesus.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 70)
   7. “. . . the relationship with God is understood [in Jesus’ teaching] to be established by God unilaterally (and mediated through Jesus).” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 56)
   8. “Jesus understands his preaching as an invitation in God’s own name.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 57)
   9. “. . . Jesus does not represent his own relationship to the coming of the kingdom *directly*, as he himself shows [by not applying to himself titles like “messiah”] . . . Rather he does so . . . through his call to repentance, his interpretation of the command of God, through the disclosure of God’s immediacy for sinners and the poor. His “Christology” then is an indirect one.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 46)
   10. Jesus’ references to God as *his* Father do not indicate “consciousness of his being the Son in a unique way . . . [Still,] Jesus possessed the consciousness of a singular bond with God. But here, too, it must be maintained that this expresses itself (only) indirectly.” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 48)
   11. “The meaning of the “parables of growth” might lie in the fact that in them the kingdom is represented as future but that this futurity cannot be represented apocalyptically; rather, it is experienced as a present effect in the ministry of Jesus. In interpreting these parables one must include the “present” being spoken of in them and the one who is speaking . . .” (Conzelmann *Jesus* 87)
2. Günther Bornkamm
   1. Bornkamm, Günther. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Translated by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James Robinson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1959; New York: Harper and Row, 1960. (German: *Jesus von Nazareth*. 1956. 8th ed. Urban Bücher series. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969. The English is from the 3rd ed.)
   2. The tradition occasionally refers to Jesus as “prophet (Matt 21.11, 46; Mark 8.28; etc.). Yet Jesus “differs from the customary ways of a prophet.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 56)
      1. “A prophet has to produce his credentials, somehwat as did the prophets of the old covenant in telling the story of their calling and in accompanying their message with the sacred prophetic sayings: “. . . says the Lord . . .”“ (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 56)
      2. “Jesus, on the other hand, never speaks of his calling, and nowhere does he use the ancient, prophetic formula.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 56)
      3. “Even less do we find any trace of that self-justification typical of the apocalyptic visionaries of later Judaism, who claim the authority of ecstatic states of mind and visions, secret revelations of the next world, and miraculous insight into God’s decrees. Jesus refuses to justify himself and his message in [56] this way.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 56-57)
   3. Jesus “is at the same time a rabbi, who proclaims the divine law, who teaches in synagogues, who gathers disciples, and who debates with other scribes in the manner of their profession and under the same authority of scripture. . . . [Yet] This rabbi differs considerably from the other members of his class.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 57)
      1. “Even external facts reveal this difference. Jesus does not only teach in the synagogues, but also in the open . . . And his followers are a strange crowd. Even those people are amongst them whom an official rabbi would do his best to avoid: women and children, tax collectors and sinners.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 57)
      2. “Above all, his manner of teaching differs profoundly from that of the other rabbis.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 57)
         1. “A rabbi is an interpreter of Scripture. . . . Their authority is always thus a derived authority. Jesus’ teaching, on the other hand, never consists merely in the interpretation of an authoritative given sacred text . . .” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 57)
         2. Instead, in Jesus’ teaching “The reality of God and the authority of his will are always directly present, and are fulfilled in him. There is nothing in contemporary Judaism which corresponds to the immediacy with which he teaches. [57] . . . Jesus draws into the service of his message the world of nature and the life of man, and those everyday experiences which everyone knows and shares, without using the established structure of sacred traditions and texts. The listener is never obliged to look for premises which would give meaning to Jesus’ teaching . . . This directness, if anything [is], is part of the picture of the historical Jesus. He bears the stamp of this directness right from the very beginning.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 57-58)
   4. “What the Gospels report on numerous individual occasions about Jesus’ attitude to and influence on the different people he encounters is [also] important in this context. We are not concerned here with the question whether all these scenes can claim historical reliability, [but rather with the fact that] tradition has caught an essential feature of the historical Jesus, a feature which accords exactly with what we have said about his way of teaching. Every one of the scenes described in the Gospels reveals Jesus’ astounding sovereignty in dealing with situations according to the kind of people he encounters. This is apparent in the numerous teaching and conflict passages, in which he sees through his opponents, disarms their objections, answers their questions, or forces them to answer for themselves.” (Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 58)
3. **Raymond Brown**
   1. Brown, Raymond E., SS. “How Much Did Jesus Know?” In Brown, Raymond E., SS. *Jesus*, *God and Man*: *Modern Biblical Reflections*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967.
   2. “. . . an irreducible historical minimum in the Gospel presentation of Jesus is that he claimed to be the unique agent in the process of establishing God’s kingship over [96] men. He proclaimed that in *his* preaching and through *his* deeds God’s kingship over men was making itself felt. From the beginning of Jesus’ ministry to the end he exhibited unshakable confidence that he could authoritatively interpret the demands that God’s kingship puts on men who are subject to it. . . . he brooked no opposition. He could and did declare sins forgiven, modify the Law of Moses, violate the Sabbath ordinances, offend against the proprieties (eat with tax collectors and sinners), make stringent demands (forbid divorce; challenge to celibacy and to leave family ties), deny common sense (encouragement to turn the other cheek)—in short, teach as no teacher of his time taught. And if one allows that he worked miracles—an allowance that has sound exegetical backing, no matter how much it offends liberal philosophical presuppositions—then . . . he acted against evil with a power that went far beyond the range of ordinary experience. All of this certainly implies a consciousness of a unique ministry to men. . . . Moreover, the certainty with which Jesus spoke and acted implies a consciousness of a unique relationship to God.” (Brown, *Jesus*, *God and Man* 96-97)
4. **Archibald Hunter**
   1. Hunter, Archibald M. *The Parables Then and Now*. London: SCM, 1971. Rpt. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
   2. Hunter, Archibald M. *Interpreting the Parables*. London: SCM, 1971; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.
   3. The parables of Jesus contain “implicit Christology . . .” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 25) Some of the parables “contain implicit Christology—veiled hints of who he knew himself to be.
   4. “None of the parables deals directly with Jesus’ person—though the Wicked Vinedressers comes very near to doing so. But Christological overtones are audible in, say, small parables like the Stronger Man or the Apprenticed Son [both are in John], in the great parables of Luke 15, in John’s parable of the True Shepherd and Luke’s of the Great Supper, as well as in the Two Builders and the Last Judgment in Matthew.” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 25)
   5. “. . . the most convincing statement of [indirect Christology] is to be found not in the work of the German pioneers (like Fuchs) of the so-called ‘New Quest of the Historical Jesus’ but in C. W. F. Smith’s *The Jesus of the Parables* which came out in 1948, roughly a decade before ‘the New Quest’ got under way. As Smith shows, in his parables and especially those he uttered on the way to make his final challenge in Jerusalem, we see Jesus . . . saying things which none short of the Messiah had the right to say . . .” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 25)
   6. In *The Parables of Jesus*, Jeremias “has been at pains to bring this point [indirect Christology] out when it arises.” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 25)
   7. We should “keep our ears open for this note of sovereign authority . . .” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 25)
   8. The Wedding Guests (Mark 2:19-20) is “a veiled claim to Messiahship. ‘My disciples are as light-hearted as a wedding party. And why not? Kingdom time is no time for mourning.’ [*sic*] (Some scholars think that Mark 2.20 cannot go back to Jesus because it speaks of his death. But [Jesus] knew himself to be the Servant Messiah . . . Verse 20 may well echo Isa. 53.8 where, in the LXX, the verb *airetai*, ‘taken away’, is used.)” (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 50)
   9. “Although in these parables [on God’s mercy—laborers in the vineyard, two sons, two debtors, great supper, lost sheep, lost coin, prodigal son] Jesus advances no open Christological claim [he] says in effect: ‘It is because God is like this that I act as I do.’” (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 51)
   10. The prodigal son “is a veiled hint that its teller is acting for God . . . ‘What I am doing,’ Jesus says in effect, ‘represents God’s nature and [60] will. In my ministry God’s love for the penitent sinner is being actualized.’ So the parable . . . is a veiled assertion of Jesus’ authority. He is claiming to be God’s agent and envoy . . . [He] reconciled a prodigal race to God.” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 61)
   11. In the saying on the doctor and the sick (Mark 2:17), the clause, “For I did not come . . .” is “one of those sayings in which the secret of his presence in the world is disclosed . . .” (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 52)
   12. In the great supper/marriage feast, “the ‘servant’ is a veiled reference to Jesus himself . . .” (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 57)
   13. Matt 7:24, 26//Luke 6:47: “‘My words’, he says. No prophet ever spoke like this. What a tremendous claim! . . . [He] tells them that he has laid down principles of action which they will neglect at their eternal peril.” (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 74)
   14. “No full length parable survives to tell how the Messiah conceived the purpose of his dying; but the Gospel tradition preserves three miniature parables which take us some way into the secret . . .” (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 88)
       1. the Cup (a “saying”: Mark 10:38, 14:36) (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 88)
       2. the Baptism (Mark 10:38//Luke 12:50) (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 88)
       3. the Ransom (Mark 10:45) (Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* 88)
   15. “Jesus did not utter his full purpose—which was God’s purpose—in [any] parable. He uttered it [when] he cried in triumph, ‘It is finished!’ . . . there came a time when words . . . were of no avail, when only a deed could effect what God had sent him to do.” (Hunter, *Parables Then and Now* 61)
5. **Christopher Tuckett**
   1. Tuckett, Christopher. “Introduction: The Problem of the Messianic Secret.” In Tuckett, Christopher, ed. *The Messianic Secret*. Issues in Religion and Theology 1. London: SPCK; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
   2. Bultmann presented Jesus “as the prophet of the End-time whose message signified the presence of the eschatological time of salvation (Bultmann, 1951, 3-32). For Bultmann this implicitly involved a Christology.” (Tuckett *Messianic Secret* 10)
6. **Hans Windisch**
   1. Windisch, Hans. *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount*: *A Contribution to the Historical Understanding of the Gospels and to the Problem of Their True Exegesis*. Trans. S. MacLean Gilmour. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951. (German: *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1937.)
   2. “. . . there are a number of indirect testimonies [in the Sermon on the Mount] to the Messianic character of the preacher. . . . the Beatitudes . . . assert that he has come who renews the promises of the prophets . . .” (Windisch, *Meaning of the Sermon* 127)
   3. “The sayings to disciples about the salt and the light are grounded in the conviction that they have recieved from him a power that brings salt and light into the world.” See 4:16, “the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light,” 5:16, “let your light so shine before men,” and 10:27, “What I tell you in the dark, utter in the light . . .” (Windisch, *Meaning of the Sermon* 127)
   4. “. . . Messianic consciousness. The following are found [in the Sermon on the Mount]: One saying of a master to his disciples (ch. 5:11 [“Blessed are you when men revile you”] with its “for my sake”); one “I have come” saying (ch. 5:17 [“Think not that I have come to abolish the law”] [cf. ch. 10:34 (“Do not think that I have come to bring peace”)]; five “Truly, I say” sayings (chs. 5:18, 26; 6:2, 5, 16); three sayings with “I say to you” (chs. 5:20; 6:25, 29); the six antitheses with “But I say to you” (chs. 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44); a pair of sayings about “these words of mine” (ch. 7:24 [house on rock], 26 [house on sand]); one saying indicating self-consciousness as “Lord” and “Son” (ch. 7:21 [“Not every one who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven”]); and one saying in which Jesus speaks as world judge (ch. 7:22 [“On that day many will say to me, ‘Lord, Lord’”]). In the main Jesus speaks in the Sermon on the Mount withy the authority of a teacher.” (Windisch, *Meaning of the Sermon* 138)
   5. “The Sermon on the Mount is an ethic of obedience that is based on two cardinal propositions, that God now proclaims his will by means of Jesus, and that the devout and pious man must now obey it.” (Windisch, *Meaning of the Sermon* 120)
   6. “The only questions are whether Messiahic motives appear in the Sermon itself, and where they are to be discovered. . . . In the introduction (ch. 5:3-16) the Messianic “I” . . . occurs only in the second of the Beatitudes . . .: “Blessed are you when men shall reproach you . . . for my sake.” . . . The first main section dealing with the Law (ch. 5:17-48) . . . by virtue of his own [125] authority he gives new commandments in six antitheses . . . It is the Messiah who stands before us. . . . However, it is only the impressive introduction (“But I say unto you”) that the personality of the speaker plays any role. . . . The “I” of the speaker occurs only in the introduction to the sayings about anxiety (ch. 6:25) . . . The only other appearance in the Sermon of the “I” and of the self-consciousness of the speaker is in the eschatological conclusion. Here on earth he is called “Lord.” His “name” makes possible prophetic utterance, exorcism, and the performance of “mighty works.” In the future he will preside at the judgment and will reject all whom he does not “know” [126] . . . In addition there are a number of indirect testimonies to the Messianic character of the preacher. The Christ of the Sermon on the Mount therefore appears [127] before us as expositor of the Law, legislator, prophet, future world judge, and Lord of the new religious community. The Christology of the Sermon on the Mount does not go beyond this . . . This Christ is not the redeemer and mediator in the true, Pauline meaning of those titles, or in the meaning of the sayings in Matt. 20:28m [“to give his life as a ransom for many”] and ch. 26:28 [“my blood . . . poured out for many”]. Sayings that promise redemption are not lacking, but it is a redemption from the false authority of the rabbis and of the scribes, . . . a redemption from oppressive anxieties . . . the redemption offered is redemption by means of the true message about God and his will. In addition there is the eschatological redemption as it is promised and solicited in the Beatitudes and in the Lord’s Prayer. It is not, however, a redmeption from the Law . . . It is not a redemption by mystical support from God or by a divine power that he communicates . . . There is obviously no place within the framework of the Sermon on the Mount for the cross or for the Spirit. [128] . . . There is one reference to it [Jesus’ role as mediator] in the phrase, “For my sake,” in ch. 5:11, which may well have been added to the Beatitude under the influence of ch. 10:32 [“So every one who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven”]. The only other instances [are 7:21, “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ shall enter the kingdom of heaven,” and 7:22-23, “On that day many will say to me, ‘Lord, Lord’ . . .”]. . . . there are a number of indirect testimonies [in the Sermon on the Mount] to the Messianic character of the preacher. . . . the Beatitudes . . . assert that he has come who renews the promises of the prophets . . . The sayings to disciples about the salt and the light are grounded in the conviction that they have recieved from him a power that brings salt and light into the world.” See 4:16, “the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light,” 5:16, “let your light so shine before men,” and 10:27, “What I tell you in the dark, utter in the light . . .” “He knows how one is adequately to serve God; how one is to pray to him . . . He knows . . . which way is the way to life. . . . All these are not specifically Messianic functions. They are also the functions of the prophet and the wise man. . . . The Christ of the Sermon on the Mount therefore appears [127] before us as expositor of the Law, legislator, prophet, future world judge, and Lord of the new religious community. The Christology of the Sermon on the Mount does not go beyond this . . . Jesus is “Lord” because he has proclaimed new commandments that his followers are to obey . . . this exhausts the Christology of the Sermon on the Mount. This Christ is not the redeemer and mediator in the true, Pauline meaning of those titles, or in the meaning of the sayings in Matt. 20:28m [“to give his life as a ransom for many”] and ch. 26:28 [“my blood . . . poured out for many”]. Sayings that promise redemption are not lacking, but it is a redemption from the false authority of the rabbis and of the scribes, . . . a redemption from oppressive anxieties . . . the redemption offered is redemption by means of the true message about God and his will.” (Windisch, *Meaning of the Sermon* 124-129)
7. **Heinz Zahrnt**
   1. Zahrnt, Heinz. *The Historical Jesus*. Trans. J.S. Bowden. London: Collins; New York: Harper and Row, 1963. (German: *Es begann mit Jesus von Nazareth*. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1960.)
   2. Indirect Christology has to do with Jesus’ “directness.”
   3. “. . . Bultmann’s well-known assertion that Jesus’ call to decision implies a christology, no longer seems a sufficient description of this unity [between Jesus’ message and his person].” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 109-110)
   4. “Jesus seems to have appeared as a prophet or a rabbi. . . . [But] A prophet usually refers to . . . the word which he has received from God . . . A rabbi has to interpret the scriptures . . . Jesus on the other hand says, ‘. . . but *I* say to you.’” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 111)
   5. “Jesus put forward an unprecedented demand without a word of vindication. It is . . . therefore of course immediately contestable.” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 111)
   6. “In describing this characteristic of Jesus’, the Gospels often speak of his ‘authority’. This word ‘authority’ is surely itself a christological interpretation [111] . . . [But] In all recent works on the problem of the historical Jesus . . . ‘directness’ occurs over and over again. . . . What is the source of this directness in all Jesus’ words and actions? It is connected with his proclamation of the imminent Kingdom of God. . . . Jesus is not himself the Kingdom of God, but the imminence of the Kingdom of God is most closely connected with his own appearance. [112] . . . he knows himself to be the herald of the Kingdom of God through whose word the judgment and mercy, doom and salvation of mankind are decided . . .” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 112-113)
   7. “Thus the question of the time of the final coming of the Kingdom of God (which used to play so great a part in Apocalyptic) falls into the background; it is replaced by the ‘being there’ of the one who now announces the Kingdom in the present. [113] . . . in all that Jesus says and does, he confronts man directly, immediately, without any medium, through himself with God. Conzelmann puts this in precise terms: ‘. . . Jesus understands his preaching as an invitation in God’s own name.’” See Conzelmann, Hans. “Zur Methode der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.” P. 12. Trans. in Braaten, Carl E., and Roy A. Harrisville, eds. *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ*: *Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1964, 54-68.) (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 114)
   8. “If, however, it is Jesus who brings about and establishes this ‘directness’ to God, then it follows that a man’s relationship to God is bound up with his relationship to Jesus himself. . . . This is precisely why Jesus summons men to follow him. . . . By the appearance of Jesus, the present is made the time of salvation and therefore the time of decision. [114] . . . In what he does, he stakes his own existence for men and hands himself over to them. This demonstrates his [love].” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 114, 116)
   9. “In view of these elements in the tradition, the question of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus and the titles which he claimed for himself, once so important to the scholars of ‘The Quest,” become historically and theologically irrelevant.” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus*, *Historical Jesus* 116)
      1. “Günther Bornkamm leaves the question of the messianic consciousness of Jesus, which played a central part in the old Lives of Jesus and frequently provided their starting point, right to the end of his book *Jesus of Nazareth*.” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 110)
      2. “He did not claim a title and thus make his own person the subject of his preaching. He did not say ‘I am the Messiah’, ‘the Son of God’, or ‘the Son of Man’, [110] ‘and because this is what I am, such and such follows and you must therefore believe this and do that. . ..’” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 110-111)
      3. As Ernst Käsemann writes: ‘The only category which does justice to his claim is completely independent of the question whether he himself did or did not, use and claim it. It is that which was given to him by his disciples, namely the title “Messiah.”‘ (“Das Problem des historischen Jesus” 206.) (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 117)
      4. “For the mere fact that Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah is extraordinarily characteristic of him and confirms his uniqueness. At the same time it is evidence that the hidden, indirect claim which underlies all his words and actions cannot be invented by others, but goes back to Jesus himself.” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 117)
   10. “Because Jesus, without office or title, acted as though he himself stood in God’s place, he was crucified by those who, with office and title, were appointed to watch over the will of God. Jesus’ claim was the cause of his death.” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 118)
   11. “Generally, the death of a man, even if it takes the form of an execution, need not repudiate his words. On the contrary, it can even strengthen and confirm them. We can see this with Socrates [118] . . . Jesus, however, is another matter. *His* proclamation forms an indivisible unity with his person, his word presupposes his presence. For this reason the disciples after his death could not simply detach the content of his proclamation from his person as a general truth and use it in a ‘free’ way as preaching material . . .” (Zahrnt *Historical Jesus* 118-119)

## Jesus’ Resurrection

Notes from Habermas and Flew

Habermas, Gary, and Antony G.N. Flew. *Did Jesus Rise from the Dead*? *The Resurrection Debate*. Ed. Terry L. Miethe. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.

1. **bibliography**
   1. Bradley, F.H. *The Presuppositions of Critical History*. Oxford: OUP, 1874.
   2. Habermas, Gary R. *Ancient Evidence for the Life of Jesus*: *Historical Records of His Death and Resurrection*. Nashville: Nelson, 1984.
   3. Habermas, Gary R. *The Resurrection of Jesus*: *An Apologetic*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980; Lanham: UP of America, 1984. Pp. 114-171 review natural­istic theories of miracles. (Habermas and Flew 30 n. 20)
   4. O’Collins, Gerald. *What Are They Saying about the Resurrection*? New York: Paulist, 1978.
   5. Schaaffs, Werner. *Theology*, *Physics and Miracles*. New York: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin, 1970.
   6. Trueblood, David Elton. *Philosophy of Religion*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. Pp. 195-202 say that restricting truth to epistemological data sets up criteria that are themselves nonempirical. (Habermas and Flew 30 n. 19)
2. **presuppositions**
   1. We will construe *resurrection*, or rising from the dead, literally and physi­cally. (Habermas and Flew 3)
   2. If Jesus did rise from the dead, then he is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. (Habermas and Flew 3)
   3. It is hardly possible to believe in Christianity without accepting a literal resurrec­tion. (Habermas and Flew 3)
   4. Habermas and Flew agree “to limit this debate to the historicity of Jesus’ Resur­rection and not to extend the topic to God’s exis­tence, scripture, or other such areas [although] the Resurrection has implica­tions for these subjects . . .” (Habermas and Flew 15)
3. **against resurrection** (chapter: “Negative Statement: Antony G.N. Flew”)
   1. general arguments against miracles: the general argument con­cerns the difficulty of estab­lish­ing the occurrence of any miracle. (Habermas and Flew 4)
      1. Hume: the general argument is based on Hume’s first *Enquiry*, though it has two major faults. (Habermas and Flew 4)
         1. By “denying both natural necessity and natural impossibili­ty, Hume disqualifies himself from distinguishing the genu­inely miraculous from the highly unusual or merely marvel­ous.” (Habermas and Flew 4)
         2. Hume sees no alternatives except “accusing a witness of perjury [or] conceding that the testimony of that witness constitutes an accurate account of what actual­ly happened. The truth is that the possibilities of honest error are enormous . . .” (Habermas and Flew 4)
      2. Bradley: the argument from the presuppositions of critical history (from F. H. Bradley, *The Presuppositions of Critical History*, Oxford: 1874) has three presup­po­sitions. (Habermas and Flew 5)
         1. “. . . surviving relics from the past cannot be interpreted as histori­cal evidence, except insofar as we presume that the same funda­mental regularities obtained then as still obtain today . . .” (Habermas and Flew 5)
         2. “. . . in trying to determine what actually happened, histo­ri­ans must employ as criteria all their knowledge of what is probable or im­probable, possible or impos­sible . . .” 5 (Yet historians “ought to be ever ready, for sufficient reason, to correct their assump­tions about what is pro­bable or improbable, possible or impossi­ble.” 6) (Habermas and Flew 5, 6)
         3. “. . . because the word *miracle* must be defined in terms of natural necessity and natural impossibility, the application of these criteria inevitably precludes proof of a miracle.” (Habermas and Flew 5)
         4. conclusion: “however unlikely it may seem that all the witnesses were in error, the occurence of a genuine miracle is, by defini­tion, nat­urally impossible.” (Habermas and Flew 6)
      3. “. . . a strong idea of a natural order is essential if there is to be room for the notion of a miracle as an overriding of that order by a supernatural power. Apologists suggest­ing that scientists since Einstein have abandoned the search for laws of nature stating physical necessities and physical impossibilities are, therefore, betraying their own cause, and are also mistaken about where sci­ence is going.” (Habermas and Flew 6)
   2. **particular arguments against the resurrection**
      1. Here we deal with “the inadequacies of the evidence actually avail­able in the present case.” (Habermas and Flew 4)
      2. The twelve disciples were Jews. “Everyone concerned, therefore, believed . . . that God had in the past sent prophets to the people of the Covenant, the authenticity of whose message had been en­dorsed by the conspicuous working of miracles . . . their restless search . . . for passages in the Jewish Bible that might be inter­preted as prophecies referring to their own time . . . can result in false history [8] . . . the search for prophe­cies and their fulfill­ments can get in the way of the discovery and the recording of historical truth.” 8-9 For example: the messiah must have been descended from David (see the irreconcilable genealogies in Matthew and Luke), must have been born in Bethlehem, must have been born of a virgin (which makes the genealogies irrelevant). (Habermas and Flew 9)
      3. There is no documentation for the life and death of Jesus that is truly contemporary with him. “. . . there is also a lamentable lack of evidence about both the authors and the dates of those composi­tions that we do have.” (Habermas and Flew 10)
      4. “. . . if the Mosaic God really did reveal himself in Palestine in the early a.d. 30s, then he manifestly did not intend . . . that revelation to get through to all humanity . . .” (Habermas and Flew 10)
      5. To warrant disbelief, it is “sufficient to show that no evidence has been presented so strong as to call for a radical shakeup of the ordinary presuppositions of critical history. We have no alternative but to continue in the presumption that anything that is accepted as being naturally impossible did not happen.” (Habermas and Flew 11)
      6. incompatibilities between the gospels and 1 Cor 15
         1. 1 Cor 15 says that Jesus appeared first to Peter. None of the gospels reports a first appearance to Peter. 12 [Haber­mas disagrees: “Contrary to Dr. Flew’s statement, the ap­pearance to Peter (listed by Paul) is recorded in Luke and is also an early creed, as even Bultmann [*TNT*, 1.45] at­tests.” 24] (Habermas and Flew 12, 24)
         2. 1 Cor 15 says that Jesus appeared to more than 500 brethren at once, the majority being still alive when Paul was writ­ing. The gospels either had not heard of this or did not accept it. (Habermas and Flew 12)
      7. In 1 Cor 15, Paul assumes “that his own visionary experience on the read to Damas­cus was of exactly the same type as all its perceived predecessors. But [Paul] interpreted his own vision on the road to Damascus as seeing Jesus in a nonpysical body. . . . seeing spiri­tual bodies is indiscernible from having visions to which no mind-in­de­pendent realities correspond.” (Habermas and Flew 12)
      8. “This [the resurrection] is regarded by the church as an event in space and time (cf. the list of witnesses in 1 Cor. 15:3 ff.). [But] history cannot establish the facticity of the resurrection. It can only estab­lish that men testified that they had seen Jesus alive after his death.” (Conzelmann *Je­sus* 94)
4. **for resurrection** (chapter: “Affirmative Statement: Gary R. Habermas”)
   1. refutation of the general arguments against miracles
      1. “I make a distinction here between miracles and miracle-claims because demonstrat­ing the former involves God’s actual existence and is hence beyond the agreed scope of this debate.” (Habermas and Flew 29 n. 2)
         1. “For an apol­ogetic that argues from Jesus’ Resurrection to God’s existence and theology, see”: Habermas, Gary R. *The Resurrection of Jesus*: *An Apologetic*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980; Lanham: UP of America, 1984. (Habermas and Flew 29 n. 2)
      2. General arguments against miracles have five major problems. (Habermas and Flew 16)
         1. “. . . it is an unjustified assumption that whatever occurs in the world must automati­cally be a natural event having a natural cause. Such an assumption ignores the fact that if a historical miracle occurred it would have to occur in nature. Therefore, to always expand the laws of nature belies a naturalistic prejudice.” (Habermas and Flew 16)
         2. “. . . naturalistic attempts [to discredit miracles] fre­quent­ly fail by assuming [16] that which needs to be proven, namely, that all events are indeed natural ones.” 16-17 It is true that miracles have never occurred only if all re­ports of miracles are false; but opponents of miracles can conclude that all reports of mir­acles are false only if they assume before­hand that mir­acles cannot occur. The argu­menta­tion is circular. (Habermas and Flew 16-17)
         3. The issue is not the strength of the laws of nature but the existence of the super­natural. “. . . no matter how strong the natural system is, it is useless to build a case on it if nature is not the supreme reality.” (Habermas and Flew 17)
         4. It is “the current view in physics that the laws of nature are statistical. That is, these laws describe what general­ly oc­curs. But laws do not cause or keep anything from happening. As a re­sult, these laws should not be utilized as any sort of barrier to the occurrence of miracles.” (Habermas and Flew 18)
         5. “. . . to require repeatable, empirical evidence as the only or major epistemologi­cal test for truth sets up criteria that are themselves nonempirical and that rule out, a prio­ri, vast ranges of reality. Miracles cannot be ruled out by this method because the methodology rules itself out in the process.” 18 “For some similar ideas, see David Elton Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion* (New York: Harper and Broth­ers, 1957), 195-202.” (Habermas and Flew 18, 30 n. 19)
   2. particular arguments in favor of the resurrection
      1. refutation of naturalistic theories
         1. Each naturalistic theory is refuted by the known historical facts. (Habermas and Flew 20)
         2. The 19th century liberals “refuted each other’s theories, leav­ing no viable natural­istic hypotheses.” (Habermas and Flew 20)
            1. Albert Schweitzer refuted Hermann Reimarus’ fraud theory. 21 “. . . the stolen body and fraud theories are disproven by the disciples’ transformation, both because this change shows that the disciples really believed that Jesus rose from the dead and because of the probability that a group of such liars would not be willing to become martyrs. Similar­ly, Paul would not have been convinced by such fraud.” (Habermas and Flew 21, 26)
            2. David Strauss refuted the swoon theory of Karl Venturini and Heinrich Paulus. 21 “. . . the swoon theory is ruled out both by the facts concerning Jesus’ death and by Paul’s conver­sion.” (Habermas and Flew 21, 25)
            3. Friedrich Schleiermacher and Paulus criticized, and Theodor Keim decimated, Strauss’ hallucination theory. [21] “The disciples’ experiences disprove the hallucination and other subjective theories because such phenomena are not collec­tive or contagious, being observed by one person alone and taking place at a wide variety of [25] times and places. The psychological preconditions for hallucinations are also lacking. Paul’s experience also rules out these theories because of his psychological frame of mind.” (Habermas and Flew 21, 25-26)
            4. Otto Pfleiderer criticized the legendary or mythological theory. 21 “That it was the disciples and other early wit­nesses who had these experi­ences likewise rules out legend or mythological theories, because the original teaching con­cerning the Resurrection is therefore based on the testimony of real eyewitnesses (as with the creed in I Cor. 15:3ff.) and not on later leg­ends. Paul’s experience likewise cannot be explained by legends, because such could not account for his conversion from skepticism.” (Habermas and Flew 21, 26)
      2. key evidences for Jesus’ resurrection
         1. Almost all critical his­tor­ians accept these evidences as actual, histori­cal occur­rences. 19 “Although critical doubts may be present with regard to other issues in the New Testament, the known facts . . . are sufficient to show that Jesus rose from the dead.” (Habermas and Flew 19, 27)
         2. Jesus died from crucifixion; he was buried, in a tomb; and the tomb “was discov­ered to be empty just a few days later.” 19 (Note: scholars disagree more on the histori­cal certain­ty of the empty tomb than on the other facts here listed. 19) (Habermas and Flew 19)
         3. “Jesus’ death caused the disciples to despair and lose hope.” 19 They became “doubters who were afraid to identify themselves with Jesus . . .” (Habermas and Flew 20)
         4. The disciples “had real experi­ences that they believed were literal appearances of the risen Jesus.” 19 These experi­ences are “The pivotal fact” [20], “The key evidence” [22]. (Habermas and Flew 19, 20)
         5. These experiences trans­formed the disciples; they became “bold proclaim­ers of his death and Resurrection . . .” (Habermas and Flew 20)
            1. The resurrection “was central in the early church preaching . . .” (Habermas and Flew 20)
         6. The disciples were even “willing to die for this belief [i.e., Jesus’ resurrection].” (Habermas and Flew 20)
            1. They preached Jesus’ resur­rection shortly after his death. (Habermas and Flew 22)
            2. They preached the resurrection in Jerusalem. (Habermas and Flew 20, 22)

Jerusalem is “where Jesus had died shortly before.” (Habermas and Flew 20)

In Jerusalem the disciples endured “re­peated confronta­tions with the authorities . . .” (Habermas and Flew 22)

* + - 1. “. . . the Jewish leaders could not disprove their message even though they had both the power and the motivation to do so.” (Habermas and Flew 22)
      2. The church came into existence. (Habermas and Flew 22)
         1. It was “founded by monotheistic, law-abiding Jews . . .” (Habermas and Flew 22)
         2. Though Jews, Sunday was their “primary day of worship.” (Habermas and Flew 20) (cf. 22)
      3. Two skeptics, James and Paul, “became Christians after having experiences that they also believed were appearances of the risen Jesus.” (Habermas and Flew 22)
         1. “James, the brother of Jesus and a skeptic, was converted to the faith when he also believed he saw the resurrected Je­sus.” 20 “. . . even if the appear­ance to James had not been recorded by Paul (1 Cor 15:7), such would still have to be postulated anyway in order to account for both James’s con­version and his subse­quent promotion to an authroitative position in the early church.” (This idea is from Fuller, Reginald. *The For­ma­tion of the Re­surrec­tion Narra­tives*. New York: Macmil­lan, 1971. 37.) (Habermas and Flew 20, 22)
         2. “The same is even more emphatically true concerning Paul” [22]: Paul was not just a skeptic but a persecutor of Chris­tians, yet he was “converted by an experience that he [too] believed to be an appearance of the risen Jesus.” (Habermas and Flew 22, 20)
    1. conclusion: “when the early and eyewitness experiences of the disciples, James, and Paul are considered, along with their corre­sponding transformations and their central message, the historical Resurrection becomes the best explanation for the facts . . . There­fore, it may be concluded that the [22] Resurrection is a probable historical event.” (Habermas and Flew 22-23)
  1. 1 Cor 15:3-8
     1. In 1 Cor 15:3-8, “Paul recorded an ancient creed concerning Jesus’ death and Resurrec­tion. That this material is traditional and pre-Pauline is evident from the technical terms *delivered* and *received*, the parallelism and somewhat stylized content, the proper names of Cephas and James, the non-Pauline words, and the possibility of an Aramaic original.” (Habermas and Flew 23)
        1. Thus Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Trans. Norman Perrin. London: SCM, 1966. 101-03.
        2. Thus Fuller, Reginald. *The For­ma­tion of the Re­surrec­tion Narra­tives*. New York: Macmil­lan, 1971. Ch. 2 p. 30 n. 38.
     2. “In fact, Fuller, Hunter, and Pannenberg “date Paul’s receiving of this creed from three to eight years after the Cruci­fixion itself. . . . the creed itself would be even earlier . . . And the facts upon which the creed was originally based would be earlier still.” (Habermas and Flew 23)
        1. Thus Fuller, Reginald. *The For­ma­tion of the Re­surrec­tion Narra­tives*. New York: Macmil­lan, 1971. 48.
        2. Hunter, Archibald M. *Jesus*: *Lord and Savior*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976. 100.
        3. Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Jesus*—*God and Man*. Trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe. Library of Philosophy and Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974. 90. (German: *Grundzüge der Christologie*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1964.)
     3. “Paul also adds that the other eyewitnesses had likewise been testifying concerning their own appearances of the risen Jesus.” (1 Cor 15:11, 14, 15) (Habermas and Flew 23)
     4. “. . . Luke 24:34 is believed to be based on tradition perhaps as early as that of the creed recorded by Paul . . .” (Habermas and Flew 24)
     5. C.H. Dodd “has shown that the gospels also contain early traditions of Jesus’ resurrection: “Matthew 28:8-10, 16-20, John 20:19-21, and, to a lesser extent, Luke 24:36-49 . . .” (Habermas and Flew 24)
        1. Dodd, C.H. “The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels,” in *More New Testament Studies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968)
     6. “. . . the combined testimony of the New Testament is that Jesus rose [24] bodily, but that this body was changed.” (Habermas and Flew 24-25)
        1. See Raymond Brown, “The Resurrection and Biblical Criticism,” *Common­weal* 87 (November 24, 1967) 233. 31 n. 48.
  2. the shroud of Turin

Notes from Zahrnt

Zahrnt, Heinz. *The Historical Jesus*. Trans. J.S. Bowden. London: Collins; New York: Harper and Row, 1963. (German: *Es begann mit Jesus von Nazareth*. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1960.)

1. Easter cannot be merely “one part of Christian truth, the assur­ance, say, of our own eternal life. Easter concerns the *whole* of the Christian faith. . . . Christianity stands or falls by the re­surrection of Jesus from the dead. . . . True, there are other events in the Christian creeds which transcend the bounds of ascertainable history, such as the Virgin Birth, the Descent into Hell and the Ascension. These events, however, by no means pos­sess [120] the same status and the same significance as the Re­sur­rec­tion. They are mentioned only in a very few New Testament passag­es, most of which are relatively late (Paul for example knows nothing of them).” (Zahrnt 120-21)
2. “Wolfhart Pannenberg rightly says: ‘The outlook for Christianity would be bleak if the resurrec­tion of Jesus was in reality not an historical fact.’ Of course historical research can never provide a basis for belief in the resurrection of Jesus. It can, however, give a reasoned explanation of whatever is open to reason and mark out the limits within which the decision must be one of faith.” (“Jesu Geschichte und unsere Geschichte.” In *Radius 1959*. 3.21.) (Zahrnt 123)
3. The most reliable account of the resurrection appearances is 1 Corin­thians 15:3-5.
   1. 1 Cor 15:3-5, “For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, 4 and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, 5 and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve.”
   2. “It is as precise as it is brief; it contains no more than the chief appear­ances of the Risen Christ. Paul [has] handed on what he himself has already received . . . Paul wrote I Corin­thians in . . . 56 or 57 . . . Jesus died in 30 or 33; Paul’s conversion took place about . . . 35. Paul must have received the formu­lation . . . soon after . . . Thus only a short space of time lies between . . . this formulation and the events . . . no more than ten years . . .” (Zahrnt 126)
   3. “In von Campenhausen’s judg­ment, this report fulfils ‘all the require­ments of historical reliability which in the circum­stances can be demanded of a text of this sort.’” 126 (Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, “Der Ablauf der Osterereig­nisse und das leere Grab,” in Sitzungsbe­richte der Heidel­berger Akademie der Wissen­schaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1958, no. 2, rpt. in *Tradition und Leben*, Gesam­melte Aufsätze, 1960. Of this work, Zahrnt says, “Hans Freiherr von Campen­hausen, the Church his­torian from Heidel­berg, [has a] much-discussed disserta­tion on ‘The course of the Easter events and the Empty Tomb’. . .” (Zahrnt 126, 122)
   4. “There is a further guarantee. Paul gives the names of the witnesses and explicit­ly adds that most of them are still alive. This subjects his report to control. In addition, he knew the chief witnesses personally. He sought out Peter and James in Jerusalem [Gal 2:1-14] . . . Paul was therefore also informed at first hand of what he handed on to the Corinthi­ans.” (Zahrnt 127)
   5. At the end of I Corinthians, Paul quotes “Maranatha”—”Our Lord, come.” “The fact that Paul uses an Aramaic prayer in a letter written to a Greek-speaking community shows that its phraseol­ogy was generally known . . . The phraseology must therefore be stereo­typed. Now this particular formula­tion cannot have originated on Greek-speaking soil—how could a Greek-speaking community come to produce an Aramaic prayer? This therefore leads us to the conclusion that Jesus was not first exalted to the position of ‘Lord’ in Antioch, when Christianity moved into the Helle­nistic world and came under the influence of certain ideas of Greek religion; he must have been called upon and [127] revered as the exalted Lord even in the primitive Aram­aic-speaking community. In other words, we can with some cer­tainty fix the origin of the Easter faith in Jerusalem. Once again we approach very nearly in time to the event itself.” (Zahrnt 127-28)
4. “The Easter narratives contained by the four Gospels are much later and historically much less reliable . . .” (Zahrnt 128)
   1. None of the canonical gospels “tells *how* Jesus rose from the dead. . . . the passages in which we might expect a descrip­tion of how the re­surrec­tion hap­pened merely hint at it by saying that the stone was rolled away and the tomb left open.” (Zahrnt 128-29)
   2. the empty tomb
      1. All four Gospels tell about the “empty tomb.” “Paul on the other hand knows nothing of it. . .” (Zahrnt 130)
      2. Von Campenhausen (in “Der Ablauf der Osterereignisse” 20 ff.) “seeks support [for the historicity of the empty tomb] principally from the Marcan tradi­tion [as] the oldest . . .” (Zahrnt 131)
         1. Mark “ends not with great joy [but with] fear and ter­ror—a sign how old this text is.” (Zahrnt 131)
         2. In von Cam­pen­hausen’s view, “a characteris­tic of the account is its ‘marked re­straint’.” (Zahrnt 131)
            1. Mark’s ending “has no ‘tendency towards the mir­ac­ulous or the fantastic’. . . . Only the angel, whom the women see in the tomb, is ‘doubt­less a legend­ary feature’.” (Zahrnt 131)
            2. “The most striking fea­ture is the lack of an ap­pearance of Christ at the tomb.” (Zahrnt 131)
            3. If a legend had developed to support Jesus’ re­sur­rec­tion, it “would not have been so ‘meagre and rough’, [and] three women . . . ac­cor­ding to the Jewish law of the time were not eligible to give evidence . . .” (Zahrnt 132)
      3. Therefore, “the report of the empty tomb itself and of its early discov­ery must be allowed to stand. There is much to be said in support of it and little definite and convincing against it; it is therefore probably histori­cal.” (Zahrnt 132)
      4. But “the empty tomb is no sufficient proof.” (Zahrnt 132)
         1. “. . . a man returned from the dead . . . occur[s] in many sagas.” 133 (On the other hand, “Ebeling writes, ‘The Resurrection directs us not to some nebulous and dis­tant mythical realm, but to a sharply circum­scribed place in history’ [*The Nature of Faith* (London: 1961) 65.] . . . Thus the resurrection of Jesus is basically different from the ‘resurrec­tion’ of other cult deities . . . at the time.” (Zahrnt 133, 126)
         2. “. . . no histori­cal arguments, however excellent, will convince the unbeliever. He will always be able to object that the resurrec­tion of Jesus was . . . con­scious­ly or unconsciously the unauthorized realiza­tion of a wish.” 133 (Consciously: “It has more than once been held [that] the disciples . . . made the tomb empty (by stealing and hiding the corpse of Jesus) to save their Lord’s lost cause.” (Zahrnt 133, 132)
      5. “The believer is asked by historical criticism . . . to see that it [faith] rests on the ‘invisi­ble’ and thereby re­mains faith.” 133 “. . . the historian cannot verify that Jesus rose from the dead. He can only verify that Peter and the other disciples main­tained that Jesus had risen and had ap­peared to them. This affirmation by the disciples that the Risen One had appeared to them is the final point which the historian can verify.” (Zahrnt 133, 125)
      6. Still:
         1. “At the death of Jesus the disciples were in no way ‘dis­­posed’ towards belief in his resurrection . . .” (Zahrnt 134)
            1. “. . . within the circle of Jesus’ disciples there was a remarkable change of mood in the course of a few weeks. [123] . . . Even the Roman historian Taci­tus, a writer who can hardly be sus­pected of fav­ouring the cause of Chris­tianity, wrote this in his *Annals* [15.44] after des­cribing the ex­e­cution of Jesus by the procura­tor Pontius Pilate: ‘A most mischievous superstition thus checked for the mo­ment, again broke out.’ . . . ‘some­thing’ must have happened . . . ‘some­thing’ which caused them to spread abroad [124] the ‘Chris­tian’ pro­clama­tion and to found a communi­ty.” (Zahrnt 123-25)
            2. The resurrection appearances do not occur to those who believe, but “to those who become believers in that very event. . . . the resurrec­tion appearances . . . do not presuppose faith in the Risen One, they create it.” (Zahrnt 134)
         2. “I believe” in the second part of the creed—the part about Jesus—is not followed by the assertions “*that* Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, *that* he was born of the Virgin Mary, *that* he suffered . . . In­stead it runs: *who* was con­ceived by the Holy Ghost, *who* was born of the Virgin Mary, *who* suffered . . . In short, Chris­tians do not believe in a number of more or less demonstrable historical *facts*—­they believe in the *person* of Jesus Christ. Thus they do not even believe in the ac­counts of the Resurrection, but in the Risen One. . . . This faith in the Risen One was there before the ac­counts of his resurrec­tion. . . . the Risen One . . . made such an impact on his followers . . . that they were awakened to faith . . .” (Zahrnt 135)

## Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship

unedited

Borg, Marcus J. “Portraits of Jesus in Contemporary North American Scholarship (with Addendum).” In *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994. (First published, without addendum, in *Harvard Theological Review* 84.1 (1991) 1-22.)

Five portraits of Jesus by North American scholars published in the 1980s demonstrate the strength of the current resurgence in Jesus scholarship and disclose the central questions dominating the current discussion.’ These portraits (by E.P Sanders, Burton Mack, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, the present writer, and Richard Horsley) demonstrate that, after decades of relative disinterest, a “third quest” for the historical Jesus is under way.’ Each portrait or *Gestalt* is interesting in its own right as a construal of the traditions about Jesus and as an exercise in historical reconstruction. Taken together, they illustrate the range of options in contemporary Jesus scholarship and point to the likely focal points of Jesus research in the 1990s.

The Context: The Renaissance in Jesus Research

It is illuminating to set these five construals of Jesus in the context of the current renaissance in Jesus research.’ Two traits of the renaissance are particularly important.

First, the question of Jesus and eschatology has again risen in North American scholarship. In the 1980s, it became clear that the eschatological consensus that had dominated much of this century’s Jesus research, beginning with Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer and continuing through Rudolf Bultmann into the mainstream of scholarship, had seriously eroded. The former consensus saw Jesus as an eschatological

prophet and sought to understand his mission and message within the framework of imminent eschatology. Though it affirmed both a present and future dimension to Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom, it typically subordinated the present to the coming kingdom, understood as a dramatic transcendent intervention in the imminent future. Moreover, this expectation was seen as the heart of Jesus’ message and the conviction animating his mission.

More than half of the scholars polled in two North American samples no longer think that Jesus expected the imminent end of the world in his generation.’ James M. Robinson described this development as “the fading of apocalyptic” and as a “paradigm shift” and “Copernican revolution” in the discipline.’ Though the old consensus has not yet been replaced by a new one, non-eschatological understandings of Jesus are emerging, as are nonobjective and this-worldly understandings of eschatology.

Second, the 1980’ produced a great increase in our understanding of the social world of first-century Palestine. To some extent this was due to discovery, publication, and analysis of new archaeological and manuscript material. To an even greater extent, it was due to the accelerating use of methods and models from other disciplines, especially the social sciences, cultural anthropology, and the history of religions.” These models and methods enable us to see existing material in new (and typically more interrelated) ways. We thus not only know more “facts” about first-century Palestine, but we also understand the dynamics of that social world better.

These two characteristics of the renaissance provide the framework for describing the five portraits that follow. In each case, the portrait is sketched and then related to the two questions of eschatology and Jesus’ relationship to his social world. First, what role does eschatology play in each image or construal of Jesus? Is it central, denied, or integrated into another overarching image of Jesus? Second, how is Jesus seen in relationship to his social world? Is his social world of little or no consequence to him, or is it central to understanding his activity, message, and aim?

The Five Portraits

*E*.*P*. *Sanders*

E.P Sanders’s *Jesus and Judaism* is probably the best known of the five sketches.’ According to Sanders, Jesus was an eschatological prophet standing in the tradition of Jewish restoration theology. Jesus believed that the promises to Israel would soon be fulfilled: the eschatological restoration of

be brought about by a dramatic intervention by God, involving the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the coming of a new (or renewed) temple.

The method by which Sanders arrives at this conclusion is important. He correctly notes that most scholars begin their investigation of Jesus with the sayings traditions, which typically leads into a historical quagmire. Sanders argues that a different starting point is desirable: a set of indisputable or nearly indisputable “facts” about Jesus. He believes that it is possible to establish such a set.

One of these facts (Sanders lists eight) is “controversy about the temple.”‘ Using as his point of departure the dramatic episode in which Jesus turned over the tables of the moneychangers and the sellers of sacrificial doves, Sanders locates the action within the framework of Jewish restoration eschatology.” Taken together with the tradition that Jesus spoke of destroying the temple and building a new one, Jesus’ action in the temple was a symbolic destruction of the temple in anticipation of a new (or renewed) temple to be built by God as the center of a restored Israel.”

Jesus’ action in the temple thus becomes the cornerstone of Sanders’s construction of a thoroughly eschatological Jesus. In accord with the restoration theology he embraced, Jesus not only expected the destruction and divine rebuilding of the temple, but also a messianic age on earth, centered in Jerusalem, including a new social order that would be ruled over by Jesus and the Twelve.” Moreover, Jesus expected all of this soon. Thus, for Sanders, imminent eschatology is central to Jesus’ own self-understanding and mission.”

Sanders’s picture of Jesus’ relationship to his social world is shaped by another theme of his work. Building on his detailed understanding of Jewish law and its function in first-century Palestine, Sanders is critical of how much modern scholarship portrays Jesus’ relationship to Judaism.” He argues that many scholars have operated with a caricature of Jewish law, seeing it as a burdensome and often trivial legalistic system devoid of grace.

To some extent this misunderstanding is based on an inadequate knowledge of Jewish sources. To a greater extent, it is the result of seeing the issue of law through the lens of the Lutheran contrast between law and grace.” Jesus is understood as one who affirmed grace and love in contrast to a system saturated by judgment and law. Modern scholarship has thus often spoken of Jesus *against* Judaism rather than Jesus *within* Judaism.

Sanders protests against this. His main concern is to emphasize the Jewishness of Jesus. However, his insistence on Jesus’ congruity with Judaism affects his view of Jesus’ relationship to his social world. With *Tesus set firmly* within the framework of Jewish restoration eschatology

and in close proximity to the Jewish law, there is little that puts Jesus in conflict with his Jewish contemporaries. Sanders grants that Jesus’ self-claim and his proclamation that “the wicked” would be admitted to the coming kingdom without going through the procedure of repentance might have been offensive to some and that Jesus’ threat against the temple would have been offensive to many. Moreover, the fact that Jesus spoke of a kingdom and had followers might have made the ruling elite nervous. But there were no other significant points of tension between Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries .s

Thus, although Sanders seeks to place Jesus firmly within a Jewish social world, Jesus ends up having very little to do with it. Jesus’ relationship to it remains abstract, almost ideological. Sanders relates him to the world of ideas: the ideas of Jewish restoration theology and the Jewish law understood as “covenant nomism.” Within both of these, according to Sanders, Jesus fits nicely. But precisely because Jesus differs so little from his social world, he seems remarkably unconcerned with it. He is not very interested in the historical direction of his people or about the shape of Jewish life. Rather, it is Jesus’ ideas about eschatology and his acting out his convictions about a new temple that get him in trouble. Indeed, Jesus is so unconcerned about his social world that he is curiously other-worldly, or perhaps better, next-worldly.

As with all the works we shall survey, this brief summary does not do justice to the intricate argument and exegetical insight of Sanders’s book. It is also the most academically traditional of the five portraits of Jesus and stands unambiguously within the formerly dominant eschatological consensus. Moreover, his construal exhibits striking resemblances to Albert Schweitzer’s.’6 Like many of this century’s scholars, Sanders finds Jesus to be essentially apolitical, that is, not concerned with the shape and shaping of his social world.

*Burton Mack*

Burton Mack sketches a very different image of Jesus in his book *A Myth of Innocence*: *Mark and Christian Origins*.” Mack’s book is a provocative study of Christian origins up to the time of Mark’s gospel. It includes a history of Jesus movements and “Christ cults” in the first century as well as a detailed study of the primary forms in which the synoptic tradition took shape, all in the context of illuminating the gospel of Mark. Thus most of the book is not about Jesus, and Mack does not regard himself primarily as a Jesus scholar. Nevertheless, what Mack calls a “softly focused characterization of Jesus” emerges.’e It is an image of Jesus as a “Cynic sage” or “Cynic teacher,” more Hellenistic than Jewish, in a thoroughly Hellenized Galilee.’”

Mack’s construal of Jesus is the polar opposite of Sanders’s: Jesus is neither esrhatnlnvical nor verv Jewish. How Mack arrives at these jude-
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ments is as important as the judgments themselves. First, he argues that the oldest layer of the Jesus tradition is sapiential, consisting of aphorisms, parables, and a few *cbreiai* embedded in pronouncement stories. This judgment is based to a large extent on Mack’s understanding of the relationship between texts (both form and content) and social groups. He argues that the multiplicity of forms in the gospels suggests a multiplicity of early Jesus groups. Each group formed its own distinctive memory of Jesus.

Because these “several traditions of memory cannot be merged into a single, coherent picture,”z’ they cannot all be viewed as equally early. Earliest is a characterization of Jesus as a clever teacher of a worldmocking wisdom. His teaching was marked by “aphoristic speech, a touch of humor, a critical stance over against social pretensions and cultural conventions, and a dare to be different, if not outrageous. ,12 Because of the parallels to Hellenistic Cynic material, this earliest layer suggests that Jesus is best seen as a wandering Cynic sage.

Second, Mack argues that apocalyptic (understood as end-of-theworld expectation) does not belong to the earliest layers of the Jesus tradition. Rather, the earliest layers were buoyant and optimistic; only as the Jesus groups went “through a period of tussle and setback” and “a later period of polemic and compensatory reaction” did themes of judgment and apocalyptic enter the tradition.” Indeed, it is primarily Mark who introduces an apocalyptic framework into the story of Jesus.”

Third, Mack distances Jesus not only from apocalypticism but also from Judaism. In his work, he employs what might be called the criterion of social formation: if a text reflects a concern with one group defining itself over against another group, the text belongs to the stage of social formation that Mack sees as occurring only after Jesus’ death and resurrection.” Therefore, texts that reflect any significant engagement with Judaism or Jewish groups tell us about the various Jesus groups as they developed their own self-understandings and ideologies in the decades after Jesus’ life. They do not tell us about Jesus.

Thus, though Jewish by birth and upbringing, Mack’s Jesus is not involved in the issues of the Jewish social world.”‘ Though Jesus’ Cynicstyle teaching contained a social critique, it was a general, clever, and often playful ridiculing of the preoccupations that animate and imprison people. There was no engagement with specifically Jewish concerns or institutions. Jesus had no mission vis-a-vis Judaism; he neither criticized nor sought to reform or renew it. He did not call people into community; his message was for individuals. The kingdom of which Jesus spoke was more likely the “Cynic’s ‘kingdom”‘ than any specifically Jewish notion of “kingdom of God.”“

Thus Mack’s Jesus was a striking teacher, a gadfly or mocker, who dined in private homes with small groups of people. His clever teach

ing caught the imagination of some, enough so that they continued the practice of eating together after his death; from this emerged the various Jesus groups. Jesus himself had no sense of mission or purpose; in an important sense, he was aimless” Only a core of wisdom teaching, stripped of any world-ending or world-building elements, is authentic to Jesus.

Much of Mack’s portrait of Jesus is consistent with the image of Jesus that has emerged from the massive scholarship on the parables and aphorisms of Jesus in the last two decades: Jesus as a teacher of subversive wisdom who undermined his world’s assumptions. Moreover, like Mack, many of these scholars have stressed a non-eschatological understanding of Jesus” Mack differs in that he separates Jesus from his Jewish world. The thoroughgoing skepticism created by his perception of the relationship between texts and social history is also unique. His method creates a minimalist portrait.” Indeed, his construal is the most historically skeptical of these five.

Thus Sanders and Mack represent opposite poles in the current discussion of Jesus. Far from standing in a stream of Jewish restoration eschatology, Mack’s Jesus stands on the very margin of Judaism. Yet the two portraits share an important feature. In neither case is Jesus’ involvement with his social world significant. For Sanders, Jesus’ social world provided him with the ideology of restoration theology; for Mack, Jesus’ social world was thoroughly Hellenized. Neither sees Jesus in significant conflict with his social world or passionately concerned for it. For Sanders, Jesus is so much within Judaism that there is no significant conflict with it; for Mack, Jesus is too much outside of Judaism for there to be such a conflict.

In each of the next three portraits, however, Jesus’ relationship to his social world is central. Like Sanders, all agree that Jesus is deeply Jewish. Unlike Sanders, they see Jesus in considerable conflict with the dominant ethos and institutions of his social world and as the originator of an intro Jewish renewal movement with an alternative vision of Jewish life and community. Though they are conflictual portraits, they are not pictures of Jesus against Judaism. Jesus was not against Judaism any more than were Jeremiah and the other prophets. Moreover all three see the alternative that Jesus affirmed as grounded in the Jewish tradition. Thus, though they affirm that Jesus advocated a transformation that engaged the social structures of his day, they see Jesus as a definitely Jewish voice within Judaism.

*Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*

Though feminist scholarship in North America has not yet produced a book-length study of the historical Jesus, Elisabeth Schiissler Fiorenza’s *In Memory of Her* (1983) contains a comprehensive sketch.” Schiissler [24] Fiorenza presents a picture of Jesus as a wisdom prophet and founder of a Jewish renewal movement with a socially radical vision and praxis. Jesus and his movement were intrinsically sociopolitical, challenging both the ideology and praxis of the dominant ethos of the Jewish social world.

Schüssler Fiorenza’s work reflects the changes occurring within the discipline in three ways. She notes with approval the shift from a theological paradigm to a more historical one, from “almost sixty years of focusing predominantly on theological-kerygmatic issues” to the historical task of searching for “the social context and matrix of early Christian literature.”“ She uses an interdisciplinary approach, especially “new integrative heuristic models” drawn from the sociology of religious movements.” Finally, her angle of vision is feminist; she brings to her reading of New Testament texts the awareness that these texts are both androcentric and patriarchal.” These texts not only “see” from a male perspective, but to varying degrees reflect the patriarchal social world out of which they come. A critical feminist reading therefore does not see the texts themselves as normative (theologically or historically), but seeks to reconstruct the social reality behind the texts.

In her portrait of Jesus, Schüssler Fiorenza defines that social reality as the movement around Jesus.-” Using sociological models as a way of ordering data from the earliest traditions, she sees the group around Jesus as “an inner-Jewish renewal movement.” As “an alternative prophetic renewal movement within Israel”“‘ and intrinsically sociopolitical, it articulated an alternative ethos and followed an alternative social praxis.

The sociopolitical characteristics of Jesus’ vision and movement are most clearly seen in a dialectic with the dominant ethos of the Jewish social world. That ethos was expressed in the image of Israel as a “kingdom of priests and holy nation,” and its central symbols were temple and Torah.” In the social system purity and holiness became correlated with the hierarchical structure of a patriarchal society.3s

Jesus and his movement challenged the purity system, offered an alternative interpretation of Torah and temple, and practiced inclusive wholeness in “a discipleship of equals,” one of her most frequent epithets for the movement. Its praxis was marked by festive table-sharing. As a social movement, it specifically included the impoverished and destitute, the sick and crippled, tax collectors, outcasts, and prostitutes. This egalitarian praxis was intended as an alternative ethos for Israel, subverting and intruding upon the dominant ethos. It was an alternative life-style not simply for individuals, but for a community.39

Schüssler Fiorenza’s feminist perspective enables her to see the movement’s challenge to patriarchy. Given that our texts are androcentric, the traces of women’s stories found in them indicate that women played a [25]

much larger role in the movement than has typically been recognized. She argues convincingly that women were prominent among the first followers of Jesus in the “discipleship of equals,” and that they were the central figures in the early Christian missionary movement.

She finds an antipatriarchal thrust to the antifamily texts and to the text prohibiting calling anybody on earth “father.” They call one away from the patriarchal family (and patriarchy itself) as the center of identity and security.¢° She finds Jesus’ use of the image of God as father to be iconoclastic: to say that God is father means that there are no other fathers, just as the confession of God’s lordship means there are no other lords .41 She correlates Jesus’ frequent use of the wisdom form “parable,” in which he speaks of the “gracious goodness of God,” with texts in which Jesus speaks of the wisdom of God as “Sophia, ,42 and argues that Jesus perceived God “in a woman’s *Gestalt* as divine *Sophia*. 141 She concludes that the earliest movement understood Jesus “as Sophia’s messenger and later as Sophia herself” and xhat Jesus probably understood himself “as the prophet and child of Sophia.”44

This provocative suggestion about Jesus’ own self-consciousness as the prophet and child of Sophia should not obscure the more basic outline of her construal of Jesus. Unlike Sanders and Mack, she sketches a portrait of Jesus as deeply engaged with his social world. It was not just the background for his activity (whether as restoration prophet or as Cynic), but his central concern.

For Schüssler Fiorenza, Jesus was a “wisdom prophet” in two senses. First, he was a prophet of wisdom in that he was a spokesperson for Sophia. Second, Jesus was a social prophet who subverted the dominant structures of the time with a different vision of reality and human community.” His proclamation of the gracious goodness of God called into existence “a discipleship of equals” based upon “a vision of inclusive wholeness.” His purpose was the creation of such a community within Israel for the sake of the renewal of Israel.

Imminent eschatology plays little role in Schüssler Fiorenza’s construal. Rather, she integrates eschatology into her image of Jesus as a socially radical wisdom prophet and movement founder. Though affirming a form of the formerly dominant eschatological consensus, she emphasizes the presentness of the kingdom. In Jesus’ ministry, “eschatological salvation and wholeness” were “already experientially available. “4” The coming of the kingdom already had social impact: Jesus’ “praxis and vision of the *basileia* is the mediation of God’s future into the structures and experiences of his own time and people. “47

Though she acknowledges that Jesus’ *basileia* language also refers to a future in which death and suffering will be no more, this expectation plays no significant role in her image of Jesus and his movement. It was not an “end-of-the-world” movement; rather, Jesus was concerned with [26]

a this-worldly transformation of Jewish life. It was not about a future reversal soon to come, but about a reversal that was already happening. Her eschatology is thus this-worldly or transformist.

*Marcus J*. *Borg*

My own portrait of Jesus is developed in two books, *Conflict*, *Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (1984), and *Jesus*: *A New Vision* (1987).as In these two books, a sketch of Jesus with four main strokes emerges: he was a charismatic healer or “holy person,” a subversive sage who undermined conventional wisdom and taught an alternative wisdom, a social prophet, and an initiator of a movement the purpose of which was the revitalization of Israel.

The last two are the subject of my 1984 book. It contains two major arguments, the first of which is suggested by the title. The book is a study of the conflict traditions in the synoptic gospels, in the context of a Jewish social world the dominant ethos of which was holiness. The result is a picture of Jesus as more political than we are accustomed to. Jesus was political in the sense of being concerned with the shape and direction of the historical community of Israel 49

Central to this portrait of Jesus is an understanding of the cultural dynamics of his social world. I argue that the dominant ethos of the Jewish social world in first-century Roman Palestine, its cultural paradigm or core value, was holiness, understood as purity.” Holiness generated a social world ordered as a purity system, with sharp boundaries not only between places, things, and times, but also between persons and social groups. The ethos of holiness had become embodied in a politics of holiness. Within this context, conflicts about holiness and purity were political: the historical shape and direction of Israel were at stake.

I then examine the synoptic traditions’ reports of conflict over holiness issues: table fellowship, sabbath conflicts, purity texts, and temple controversy. Two claims emerge: Jesus radically criticized holiness as the paradigm structuring his social world; and he advocated compassion as the alternative paradigm for the transformation of Israel’s life. Jesus replaced “Be holy as God is holy” with “Be compassionate as God is compassionate.”“

Compassion, like holiness, was firmly grounded in the Jewish tradition. The conflict between Jesus and his Jewish opponents was thus an intra-Jewish conflict (with the elite who represented the dominant ethos) about how to interpret the tradition. It was a hermeneutical struggle with sociopolitical consequences. Thus, like Schnssler Fiorenza but without specifically feminist elements, I portray Jesus as deeply engaged in his social world, relating to it as prophet and revitalization movement founder.51

The second argument in my 1984 book is a case for a non

eschatological understanding of Jesus. I argue that imminent eschatology (understood as involving the traditional eschatological events of divine intervention, judgment, resurrection, and beginning of a new world or age, all occurring in a publicly visible or objective way) was not part of the message of Jesus.

This case rests on three supporting points. First, with the erosion of the “coming Son of man” sayings as authentic Jesus sayings, there is very little exegetical basis for affirming that Jesus had an imminent eschatology.” Second, the element of crisis in the synoptics is more plausibly understood in historical terms. To some extent, this argument is a corollary of seeing Jesus’ deep involvement with his social world, which draws him away from other-worldly eschatology. Third, belief in the imminent end of the world among the followers of Jesus arose with belief in the second coming, which clearly developed after Jesus’ death. I conclude that the image of Jesus as eschatological prophet is mistaken and misleading. As a prophet, Jesus was much more concerned about Israel’s historical direction and shape than about a kingdom beyond the eschaton.

In my 1987 book, a more comprehensive, general treatment, I add two further strokes to this portrait of Jesus. In addition to being a social prophet and movement founder, he was also a “holy person” and sage or wisdom teacher.

This book uses a cross-cultural and interdisciplinary typology of religious personality types that help order the traditions about Jesus. The understanding of holy person is derived from the history of religions, cultural anthropology, and psychology of religions’ It designates a person experientially in touch with the holy who also becomes a mediator of the holy.” There are many ways of describing this religious personality: mediator of the numinous, technician of the sacred, charismatic healer, delegate of the tribe to the other world, spirit warrior, or person of power. All share a vivid sense of another reality and the ability to mediate that reality.

When “holy person” is seen as a phenomenological category, it is clear that such figures were central in the Jewish tradition, from Moses and Elijah through the prophets to charismatic healers near the time of Jesus such as Hanina ben Dosa and Honi the Circle-Drawer. 56 Jesus clearly belongs among them.” He had an experiential relationship to the spirit (as numinous, a phenomenological rather than doctrinal or trinitarian category), and this realization is central to his historical identity: a charismatic healer with a vivid sense of the reality of God. Indeed, it is tempting to see him as a Jewish mystic.”

Second, I argue that he was also a sage, a teacher of wisdom. Here I accept the image of Jesus as a teacher of a world-subverting wisdom that has emerged in the parables and aphorisms scholarship of the last twenty [28] years. Setting that work in the context of a cross-cultural understanding of conventional wisdom, I argue that Jesus’ wisdom both subverted conventional wisdom (the broad way) and invited his hearers to an alternative path (the narrow way). Thus Jesus’ message contains both subversive and alternative wisdom, namely, a vision of life centered in spirit.

With the images of holy person and sage added to prophet and movement founder, a fairly full portrait of Jesus results, an image that integrates much of the Jesus tradition. He was a charismatic healer who also felt called to a public mission that included radical criticism of the dominant ethos of his social world and affirmation of another way. He spoke as both a subversive sage and a prophet and initiated a movement whose purpose was the revitalization of Israel.’-’ In short, Jesus was a charismatic wisdom prophet and movement initiator.

*Richard Horsley*

More emphatically than any other North American scholar, Richard Horsley has made Jesus’ engagement with his social world central to his portrait of Jesus. The most prolific contemporary Jesus scholar, Horsley has published four books since 1985. Two are studies of the firstcentury Jewish social world: *Bandits*, *Prophets*, *and Messiahs* (1985) and *The Liberation of Christmas*: *The Infancy Narratives in Social Context* (1989). Two concern Jesus and the Jesus movement directly: *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence* (1987) and Sociology *and the Jesus Movement* (1989).6° In these works, Horsley portrays Jesus as a social prophet standing in the radical prophetic tradition of Israel.

Like Sanders, Horsley stresses the necessity of locating Jesus firmly within the context of first-century Jewish Palestine. However, Horsley understands that context in materialist rather than idealist terms. That is, the context is not a set of ideas (about the Messiah, the temple, restoration eschatology, the law, etc.), but the concrete social situation.

His perception of the social situation is provided by studies of preindustrial peasant societies and the social dynamics operating between rural peasants and urban, ruling elites. When applied to our ancient data, these studies suggest a more concrete picture of first-century Jewish Palestine. It was a colonial situation of class struggle and conflict between economically oppressive urban, ruling elites and economically oppressed rural peasants (perhaps 90 percent of the population).” The social situation generated a variety of social bandits and popular prophets, and the spiral of violence (which moves from institutional violence to protest to counter-repression to revolt) was under way.

This situation of colonial oppression existing between the Jewish, Herodian, and Roman ruling groups and the bulk of the people becomes the context for the Jesus traditions. What emerges is a picture of

Jesus as a social revolutionary involved with the peasant population of Palestine. Standing in the covenantal-prophetic tradition of Israel, Jesus took the side of the poor and indicted the ruling elites. He threatened the temple, the symbolic as well as economic center of the Jewish social world, and criticized the high-priestly establishment who had made it “an instrument of imperial legitimation and control of a subjected people. “2

Although Jesus was opposed to domination by Rome and to the priestly aristocracy’s collaboration with Rome, he did not organize a political revolution, but a social revolution. Horsley stresses the importance of this distinction: a political revolution is “top down,” involving a change of leadership; a social revolution is a change in society from the “bottom up.”“ For Jesus, the social revolution and restoration of Israel were to begin through the reorganization and renewal of village society in accord with the egalitarian covenantal tradition of Israel.

Horsley’s thorough social contextualization of the Jesus tradition is evident in his treatment of the “radical” sayings of Jesus. The sayings about forgiveness of debts, lending without regard to repayment, and giving up possessions were not intended for itinerant Cynics or for an elite group of wandering charismatics 6’ Neither are they to be understood in a framework of eschatological renunciation. Rather, they were intended as guidelines for ordinary people in local communities. They were part of the program of socioeconomic cooperation that Jesus envisioned as he sought to reorganize village society into relatively autonomous communities of solidarity.”‘ Similarly, in Jesus’ context the traditions about “loving one’s enemy” refer to relationships of solidarity within the community.66 Moreover, these local communities were to be egalitarian; hierarchical and patriarchal relationships were abolished.”‘

Finally, Horsley also gives a social reading to the difficult saying about the disciples sitting on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes. He argues that “judging” is better translated as “liberating/redeeming/ establishing justice for” and refers the saying to the twelve administering justice in the restored Israel 6s

Horsley subsumes eschatology into his portrait of Jesus as a social revolutionary in two ways. First, he sees apocalyptic texts as having a historical orientation and gives them a sociopolitical reading. Arising out of conditions of oppression, such texts have three functions: remembering past deliverances, creatively envisioning a radically different and better life, and critically demystifying the established order by stripping the ruling class of divine authority and exposing its demonic character.69 Apocalyptic texts express “in ordinary contemporary language eager hopes for an anti-imperial revolution” to be brought about by God.’° They do not have an other-worldly orientation, but express the hope for a this-worldly transformation. [30]

Second, Horsley argues for a primarily this-worldly understanding of the kingdom of God. He speaks of it as a political metaphor that refers to a historical transformation already under way, a society or people already coming into existence.” The kingdom meant wholeness of life in a community marked by “a new spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance.”

At only one point does a vestige of imminent eschatology remain, and Horsley integrates it by returning to his distinction between social and political revolution. Horsley argues that Jesus expected God to complete the social revolution Jesus had begun by bringing about the “top down” political revolution: “God would soon judge the oppressive imperial regimes. ,71 Imminent end-of-the-world language thus refers to a coming dramatic change in political control, to be accomplished by God. Yet it seems that it would be easy for Horsley to eliminate imminent eschatology. It plays no fundamental role in his construal of Jesus; it is neither the foundation of Jesus’ self-understanding, nor the motivation behind his mission, nor the primary content of his message. Rather, it is assimilated to a picture of Jesus as a social prophet passionately engaged in shaping his social world.’ Like Schassler Fiorenza, Horsley’s understanding of eschatology is thus this-worldly and transformist.

Conclusions and Prospects

These five portraits disclose the vitality of contemporary mainstream Jesus scholarship in North America as well as its range and diversity. With regard to the two questions central to the renaissance in Jesus research - Jesus and eschatology, and Jesus’ relationship to his social world-the five portraits diverge considerably. One is boldly cast in the mold of imminent eschatology (Sanders). Two explicitly deny imminent eschatology (Mack and Borg), with one of them denying eschatology to Jesus altogether (Mack).” Two (Schiissler Fiorenza and Horsley) articulate a this-worldly and transformist eschatology by integrating eschatology into a sociopolitical reading of the Jesus traditions. Regarding Jesus’ relationship to his social world, two deny any sociopolitical purpose to Jesus’ activity (Sanders and Mack); the other three argue that such engagement was crucial for the historical Jesus, indeed at the center of his activity and purpose. These agreements and disagreements point to what are likely to be focal points of Jesus research in the 1990s.

First, the eschatological debate will continue. Indeed, it is perhaps only beginning to be engaged. The news that the eschatological consensus has collapsed is bringing scholarly discussion of the relationship between Jesus and eschatology into the foreground again.

Central to this discussion will be a clarification of what is meant

when one uses the term “eschatology.” Does it intrinsically have to do with the end of the world, as its traditional association with “the last things” would suggest? What is meant by “end of the world”? Is it to be defined as involving the end of the earth, the physical universe, entailing a meltdown of the elements, what might be called a molecular or nuclear eschatology? If so, there is very little end-of-the-world eschatology in either the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament.’’ But surely that restricts the meaning of “end of the world” too much. Can it legitimately be used of any major world-changing event, so that the tearing down of the Berlin wall can be referred to as an eschatological event? That seems too broad. Or is it legitimate to use it to refer to an internal event in the life of an individual, so that end of the world is both internalized and individualized, and to claim that this is what it means to say that the message of Jesus was eschatological? Is any position that affirms an afterlife to be labeled eschatological? Or is it legitimate to use “end” in a teleological sense, so that any position that affirms an ultimate purpose, hope, or ideal vision is eschatological?

This range of meanings of eschatology and end of the world has produced serious confusion in the discussion. Twenty years ago, the French scholar J. Carmignac lamented that eschatology had lost all precise exegetical meaning and suggested that it be dropped from our vocabulary.” That is probably unrealistic; we seem stuck with the term. We can insist, however, that one specify the sense in which one is using these terms.” What is being affirmed or denied when one does or does not ascribe an imminent eschatology to Jesus ?79

A related question concerns how we are to understand “kingdom of God” in Jesus’ message. When the eschatological consensus was intact, the phrase had a clear meaning: it referred to the coming messianic kingdom, and/or to the power (reign) of God by which that kingdom would be established. With the collapse of the imminent eschatological consensus, there is no longer a clear framework for locating the meaning of kingdom of God. If Jesus’ use of kingdom language did not pertain to the imminent end of the world, how are we to understand it?

Necessary for this clarification is a fresh and thorough investigation of the varieties of eschatology and kingdom language in ancient Judaism at the time of Jesus. For example, how often are the eschatologies of noncanonical apocalypses associated with the imminent end of the world?” Scholarship may have been misled by the imminent end-of-theworld emphasis of Daniel and Revelation, as if they were typical of the apocalyptic genre and consciousness. And what is the range of uses of kingdom language in first-century Judaism?”

Second, the question of Jesus’ relationship to his social world is likely to become more central. More remarkable than the disagreement among the five portraits about this question is the agreement among three of [32] them (Schüssler Fiorenza, Borg, and Horsley) that Jesus’ ministry had a strong sociopolitical dimension. The three see Jesus’ teaching and activity as both a protest against the dominant ethos of the Jewish social world and as an affirmation of an alternative vision.

This emphasis upon the sociopolitical is fresh in Jesus scholarship. Few mainstream portraits of Jesus have stressed a radical sociopolitical edge to his mission; rather, most scholars of the history of Jesus have tended to deny that Jesus had any significant involvement in sociopolitical questions. To a large extent, this was because they saw only two alternative models: Jesus was either an anti-Roman revolutionary (the Zealot hypothesis) or an apolitical nonrevolutionary. Scholars have generally denied the first and affirmed the second.” A third alternative has now become prominently visible: Jesus as deeply sociopolitical, though not as an advocate of armed revolt against Rome.”

The contrast between this sociopolitical understanding of Jesus and individualistic and/or imminent eschatological understandings of Jesus is considerable. It generates a number of research questions that are likely to receive increased attention. Do we think Jesus was concerned with community, or was his vision of human existence radically individualistic? Was there conflict between Jesus and some of his Jewish contemporaries, and if so, what was it about? What was his relationship to the temple? Did he seek the revitalization of Israel? Or do we think all of these were nonissues for him? Are conflict elements in the synoptic tradition all products of conflict between the Jesus movement and Jewish groups in the second half of the first century?”

Finally, the two questions of eschatology and social world are related. The kind of eschatology ascribed to Jesus affects how one sees his relationship to his social world. Sanders’s eschatology of imminent radical divine intervention, like Schweitzer’s, distances Jesus from anything political.” So also do most versions of existentialist eschatology, with their thorough internalization and individualization of the end of the world. Consistently in Jesus scholarship an emphasis on imminent eschatology has led to a deemphasis on human community and history. Thus two of the questions central to the renaissance in Jesus research - Jesus’ eschatology and his relationship to his social world-are intertwined.

John Dominic Crossan

Since I finished this essay in 1991, another book of major significance has been published by a North American scholar: John Dominic Crossan’s *The Historical Jesus*: *The Life o f a Mediterranean Jewish* [] *Peasant*.sc It could be the most important book on the historical Jesus since Albert Schweitzer’s *Quest of the Historical Jesus* at the beginning of this century, both because of its brilliance, elegance, and freshness, and because of its likely effect on the discipline. Crossan has also written a more popular version, which he affectionately refers to as his “baby Jesus” book, to be published in late 1993 as *Jesus*: *A Revolutionary Biography*.s’ With these two books, Crossan has established himself as the premier Jesus scholar in North America. In the following remarks, I will focus on two matters of equal importance: method and results.

*Crossan*’*s Method*

Crossan begins his 1991 book by commenting that historical Jesus research has become “something of a scholarly bad joke.” To counteract this, he pays very careful attention to method, one of the most remarkable features of his book. His method is essentially twofold: the first for assessing what may be attributed to Jesus, and the second for interpreting what that material means.

His method for deciding what goes back to Jesus seeks to be as objective and quantitative as possible. He uses an explicitly archaeological model, involving two steps. The first step involves “layering,” or establishing a stratigraphy of the Jesus tradition. He layers the written traditions about Jesus into four strata:

Layer One: 30 to 60 C.E. Layer Two: 60 to 80 C.E. Layer Three: 80 to 120 C.E. Layer Four- 120 to 150 C.E.

Into the earliest layer, he puts Q, early Thomas, the genuine letters of Paul (without 2 Corinthians, Philemon, and Philippians), a miracles collection, and a few minor and perhaps questionable sources. In passing, it is noteworthy that the gospel of Mark drops out of layer one.

The second step in his archaeological model involves quantification, or counting the number of independent attestations of material attributed to Jesus in each layer. He does this by arranging the traditions about Jesus into “complexes.” A complex, for example, is all sayings referring to “kingdom and children,” and he asks “How many times is each complex independently attested?” He then assigns to each complex two numbers, separated by a slash mark: the number to the left is the stratum or layer in which the complex is first found, and the number to the right is the number of independent attestations. Thus, for example, the complex “kingdom and children” is 1/4, which means “first stratum, four independent attestations.” The general rule that emerges from this: [34] the lower the number to the left and the higher the number to the right, the greater claim a saying has to be something like something Jesus said. This part of Crossan’s method is essentially a tightened and refined version of a method that has long been used by Jesus scholars: the “criterion of multiple attestation.” This does not minimize Crossan’s achievement, but shows his continuity with earlier Jesus scholarship. It is interesting that his primary criterion is not the “criterion of dissimilarity” (one can accept as authentic to Jesus only that which is dissimilar from both Judaism and early Christianity) that dominated much of Jesus research immediately prior to the current renaissance.

The second part of Crossan’s method focuses on the interpretation of material found in the earliest layer. Here Crossan sets what we can know about Jesus and the environment of first-century Jewish Palestine within a multi-disciplinary and cross-cultural context. Models and insights drawn from cultural and social anthropology, medical anthropology, the sociology of colonial protest movements, the dynamics and structure of pre-industrial peasant societies, honor-shame societies, patron-client societies, and so forth, dominate the pages of his book. The breadth of Crossan’s reading outside the traditional boundaries of Jesus scholarship and the intelligent and illuminating use to which he puts it are most impressive.

This makes his book a goldmine of information about interdisciplinary models and insights, quite apart from how Crossan himself uses them (though I happen to think he uses them quite well). Moreover, in addition to containing all these models, Crossan’s use of them will, I think, become a model. Indeed, I think he has significantly changed the discipline with this book - a simply “historical” quest for the historical Jesus will no longer do. Thus, in this part of his method, we see the most comprehensive use yet of the multi-disciplinary approach that is characteristic of the present renaissance in Jesus scholarship.

*Results*: *Crossan*’*s Construal of Jesus*

What picture of Jesus emerges in Crossan’s book? I will put it in a sentence and then unpack it: Jesus was a Jewish Cynic peasant with an alternative social vision.

First, Jesus was a *peasant* whose primary audience was peasants. To some extent simply an identification of social class, this emphasis also has two immediate implications for Crossan. It means that Jesus was not of the scribal class and therefore did not have scribal skills or scribal awareness. In all likelihood, Jesus did not know Scripture *as texts*, neither reading nor quoting Scripture. Moreover, his message and activity had to make sense to peasants. It could not have been too “heady” or theoretical, but must have been much more concrete. To use a phrase from Crossan’s forthcoming popular book on Jesus, Jesus’ message must [] not have been as “talky, preachy, speechy” as much of scholarship has presented it.

Second, Jesus was a *Jewish Cynic*, with adjective and noun equally important. He was both like and unlike Hellenistic Cynic teachers. To paraphrase Crossan closely, both Jesus and the Hellenistic Cynics taught and enacted a shattering of convention: both involved practice, not just theory; both involved a way of looking and dressing, eating, living, and relating. The primary difference between Hellenistic Cynic sages and Jesus is that they were urban, active in the marketplace, and individualistic; Jesus spoke to rural peasants and had a social vision.

Third, that social *vision* was embodied in the two most characteristic activities of Jesus: “magic and meal,” “free healing” and “open commensality.” Together, they disclose what Crossan calls Jesus’ “corporate plan” and alternative “social vision.”

*Magic*. Jesus was a healer. Crossan’s preferred term is “magician,” which, he emphasizes, he uses in a neutrally descriptive and nonpejorative sense. He uses “magician” in part because it is provocative, but also because it fits: a magician is “somebody else’s” healer. That is, a magician is a healer operating outside of recognized religious authority, and therefore outside of the system. Once again to paraphrase Crossan closely, magic is “religious banditry”: magic is to religion as social banditry is to politics. Social banditry challenges the ultimacy and legitimacy of political power, and magic challenges the ultimacy of established religious power. Magic is subversive, unofficial, unapproved, and often lower-class religion.

One comment before I turn to Crossan’s treatment of meal: it is striking how much importance Crossan assigns to Jesus as healer. No recent scholar, at least not in North America, has made Jesus’ healing activity so centrally important.”

*Meal*. Here Crossan emphasizes the “open commensality” of Jesus, often called by other scholars the “table fellowship” of Jesus. It is directly connected to Crossan’s emphasis upon magic or healing: in exchange for free healing, Jesus and his followers would be given a meal by peasants. It was not *payment* for healing (though it tended to become that as the tradition developed, when local hospitality came to be understood as the “wages” of the wandering charismatics). Rather, for Jesus and his earliest followers, open commensality embodied an alternative social vision. To eat with others without regard for social boundaries, Crossan argues, subverted the deepest boundaries society draws: between honor and shame, patron and client, female and male, slave and free, rich and poor, pure and impure. Thus, for Crossan, magic and meal together, free healing and common eating, “embodied a religious and economic egalitarianism that negated the hierarchical and patronal normalcies of Jewish religion and Roman power.” 89

Finally, Crossan’s construal of Jesus is non-eschatological. To be more precise, Crossan denies an apocalyptic eschatology to Jesus. The “coming Son of man sayings” are rejected. Though John the Baptizer was apocalyptic, Jesus was not. Jesus did not understand the kingdom of God as an apocalyptic event in the near future, but as a mode of life in the immediate present. The kingdom of which Jesus spoke was a sapiential kingdom, not an apocalyptic kingdom.

Thus, though with differences of nuance, Crossan’s sketch of Jesus belongs to the same family of portraits as those sketched by Horsley, Schüssler Fiorenza, and myself. It departs from the previously dominant eschatological consensus, and affirms a social vision that shattered the taken-for-granted conventions of his day.”

*Notes*

1. A version of this article was presented at the International Meeting of the SBL in Vienna in August 1990.

2. N. Thomas Wright has described the 1980s as bringing forth a “third quest” of the historical Jesus, succeeding the “first quest” of the nineteenth century and the “second quest” (or “new quest”) of the 1950s and 60s. See Wright and Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation o f the New Testament 1861-1986* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 379-403.

3. See my essay, “A Renaissance in Jesus Studies,” *Theology Today* 45 (1988): 280-92 [chapter 1 in the present volume]. See also James Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism* (New York: Doubleday,1988), 9-29, 187-207, 223-43.

4. See my “A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus,” *Foundations and Facets Forum* 2, no. 3 (1986): 98-99 [and in the present volume pp. 5960].

5. In a paper presented at the International Meeting of the SBL in Vienna in August 1990, Robinson further described the imminent eschatological understanding of Jesus as an “old model which is frayed and blemished, with broken parts, a Procrustean bed in which the discipline squirms,” and proposed instead a sapiential model.

6. So fruitful is this development that it marks a new era in Jesus scholarship. As Bernard Brandon Scott remarked at the meeting of the SBL in Chicago in December 1984: “The historical quest of the historical Jesus has ended; the interdisciplinary quest has just begun.” For a bibliography of over 250 works that use interdisciplinary approaches, see Daniel Harrington, “Second Testament Exegesis and the Social Sciences: A Bibliography,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 18 (1988); 77-85.

7. E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

8. Ibid., 11. The other seven are: (1) Jesus was baptized by John the Baptist; (2) Jesus was a Galilean who preached and healed; (3) Jesus called disciples and spoke of there being twelve; (4) Jesus confined his activity to Israel; (5) and he was crucified by Roman authorities. After his death, (6) his followers continued as an identifiable movement, and (7) at least some Jews persecuted some parts of the new movement.
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# Part 5: Appendices

## Outline of Mark for Memorization

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 *preparation for ministry*  John the Baptist  Jesus’ baptism  tempta­tion  *Galilean ministry*  initial proclamation  call of the four  miracles  Capernaum demoniac  Peter’s mother-in-law  evening healings  leper  2 controversy stories  paralytic  eating with sinners  fasting  plucking grain  3 withered hand  summary  choosing the twelve  Beelzebul  mother and brothers  4 parables  sower  purpose of parables  interpretation of the sower  hidden lamp, etc.  seed growing secretly  mustard seed  purpose of parables  miracles  stilling the storm  5 Gerasene demoniac  Jairus’ daughter and the wom­an with a hem­orrhage  6 rejection at Nazareth  mission of the twelve  Herod and the death of John the Bap­tist  feeding the 5000  walking on water  7 clean and unclean  Syrophoenician woman’s daugh­ter  deaf mute  8 feeding the 4000 | demand for a sign  feedings dialogue  blind man of Bethsaida  Peter’s confession  *travel narrative*  1st passion-resurrection pre­dic­tion  sacrifices of discipleship  9 transfiguration  epileptic boy  2nd passion-resurrec­tion pre­dic­tion  who is greatest  strange exorcist  sayings on offenses and salt  10 divorce  let the little children  rich man; on riches  3rd passion-resurrection pre­diction  James and John’s request  blind Bartimaeus  11 *Judean ministry*  triumphal entry  fig tree and cleansing the tem­ple  by what authority  12 wicked tenants  taxes to Caesar  Sadducees’ resurrection ques­tion  greatest commandments  David and the Messiah  beware of the scribes  widow’s coins  13 Little Apocalypse  14 *passion narrative*  before and during the Last Supper  Gethsemane  arrest  Sanhedrin trial  Peter’s denials  15 trial before Pilate  mocking  crucifixion  burial  16 *resurrection narrative*  women at the tomb |

## Overview of the Structure of the Synoptic Gospels

*chapters in* Matthew, Mark, and Luke:

i. **prologue** 1:1-4

ii. **infancy narratives** 1-2 1-2

1. **preparation for ministry** 3 1 3
2. **Galilean ministry**
   1. early ministry
      1. before Capernaum 4 1 4
      2. at Capernaum 4 4
      3. after Capernaum 1-3 5-6
   2. sermon on the mount/plain 5-7 6
   3. Matthew’s miracle narrative 8-9
   4. Matthew’s mission discourse 10
   5. John the Baptist and teachings 11-12 7
   6. controversies 12 3
   7. parable discourse 13 4 8
   8. miscellaneous 14 5-6 8-9
   9. Luke’s great ommission 14-16 6-8
3. **travel narrative**
   1. before Luke’s travel narrative 16-18 8-9 9
   2. Luke’s travel narrative 9-18
   3. the synoptic travel narrative 19-20 10 18-19
4. **Jerusalem ministry** 21-25 11-13 19-21
5. **passion narrative** 26-27 14-15 22-23
   1. before the last supper 26 14 22
   2. the last supper 26 14 22
   3. arrest and trials 26-27 14-15 22-23
   4. crucifixion and death 27 15 23
6. **resurrection narrative** 28 16 24

## Synopsis of the Synoptic Gospels

*Matthew* *Mark* *Luke*

Prologue

(*Luke 1*)

**1** 1 prologue

Infancy Narratives

(*Matt 1-2*, *Luke 1-2*)

5 promise of John the Baptist’s birth

26 annuncia­tion

39 Mary’s visit to Elizabeth

57 birth of John the Baptist

**1** 1 genealogy (3.23-38)

18 birth of Jesus **2** 1 birth of Jesus

**2** 1 adoration of the magi 8 adoration of the shepherds

21 circumcision and presentation

13 flight to Egypt, slaughter

of the innocents, return

22 childhood at Nazareth 39 childhood at Nazareth

41 the boy Jesus in the temple

Preparation for Ministry

(*Matt 3-4*, *Mark 1*, *Luke 3-4*)

**3** 1 John the Baptist **1** 1 John the Baptist **3** 1 John the Baptist

7 John’s preaching of repentance 7 John’s preaching of repent­ance

10 John’s replies to questioners

11 John’s messianic preaching 7 John’s messianic preaching 15 John’s messianic preaching

(14.3-4) (6.17-18) 19 imprisonment of John

13 baptism of Jesus 9 baptism of Jesus 21 baptism of Jesus

(1.2-17) 23 genealogy

**4** 1 temptation 12 temptation **4** 1 temptation

Galilean Ministry

a. *Early Ministry*

before Capernaum

(*Matt 4*, *Mark 1*, *Luke 4*)

12 journey into Galilee at John’s 14 journey into Galilee at John’s 14 journey into Galilee at John’s

arrest arrest arrest

13 Jesus’ preaching of repentance 14 Jesus’ preaching of repentance

14 teaching in synagogues

(13.53-58) (6.1-6a) 16 rejection at Nazareth

18 call of the first disciples 16 call of the first disciples (5.1-11)

at Capernaum

(*Mark 1*, *Luke 4*)

(4.13, 7.28-29) 21 teaching in Capernaum syn- 31 teaching in Capernaum syn-

agogue agogue

23 Capernaum demoniac 33 Capernaum demoniac

(8.14-15) 29 Peter’s mother-in-law 38 Peter’s mother-in-law

(8.16-17) 32 healing the sick at evening 40 healing the sick at evening

35 Jesus leaves Capernaum 42 Jesus leaves Capernaum

after Capernaum

(*Mark 1-3*, *Luke 5-6*)

23 preaching tour in Galilee 39 preaching tour in Galilee 44 preaching tour in Judea

(4.18-22) (1.16-20) **5** 1 call of the first disciples

(miraculous draught of fishes)

(8.1-4) 40 leper 12 leper

(9.1-8) **2** 1 paralytic 17 paralytic

(9.9-13) 13 call of Levi 27 call of Levi

(9.14-17) 18 fasting; new patch, new wine 33 fasting; new patch, new wine

(12.1-8) 23 plucking grain on the sabbath **6** 1 plucking grain on the sabbath

(12.9-14) **3** 1 withered hand 6 withered hand

(12.15-21)(4.24-5.2) 7 Jesus heals multitudes (6.17-20a)

(10.1-16) 13 choosing the twelve 12 choosing the twelve

b. *Sermon on the Mount/Sermon on the Plain*

(*Matt 5-7*, *Luke 6*)

23 crowds follow Jesus (3.7-13a) 17 crowds follow Jesus

**5** 3 beatitudes 20 beatitudes and woes

13 salt of the earth (9.49-50) (14.34-35)

14 light of the world

15 hidden lamp (4.21) (8.16) (11.33)

17 the law and the prophets (16.16-17)

**six antitheses**

21 1. murder and wrath

23 reconcile before altar

25 reconcile before court (12.57-59)

27 2. adultery and lust

29 remove hand or eye (=18.8-9) (9.43-48)

31 3. divorce (=19:9) (10:11-12) (16.18)

33 4. oaths

**love of enemies**

(5.39-42) 27 love of enemies

38 5. retaliation 29 retaliation

(7.12) 31 golden rule

(5.46) (5.45) 32 love of enemies

43 6. love of enemies

**piety, public and secret**

**6** 1 almsgiving

5 prayer

7 long prayers

9 Lord’s Prayer (11.1-4)

14 forgive to be forgiven

(=18.35)

16 fasting

19 treasures in heaven (12.33-34)

22 the sound eye (11.34-36)

24 God and mammon (16.13)

25 anxiety (12.22-32)

**judging** **judging**

**7** 1 judge not 37 judge not

2b the measure you give (4.24-25) 38 the measure you give

(15.14) 39 blind leading the blind

(10.24-25) 40 disciples not above his teacher

3 speck and log 41 speck and log

6 pearls before swine

7 ask, seek, knock (11.9-10)

9 give son a serpent (11.11-13)

12 golden rule (6.31)

13 the narrow gate (13.23-24)

15 wolves in sheep’s clothing

16 by their fruits (=12.33) 43 by their fruits

(12.34-35) 45 mouth and heart

21 saying “Lord, Lord” 46 saying “Lord, Lord”

22 exclusion from the kingdom (13.25-27)

24 two houses 47 two houses

c. *Matthew*’*s Miracle Narrative*

(*Matt 8-9*)

**8** 1 leper (1.40-45) (5.12-16)

5 Capernaum centurion **7** 1 Capernaum centurion

11 widow of Nain’s son

14 Peter’s mother-in-law (1.29-31) (4.38-39)

16 sick at evening (1.32-34) (4.40-41)

18 would-be followers (9.57-62)

23 stilling the storm (4.35-41) (8.22-25)

28 Gadarene demoniac (5.1-20) (8.26-39)

**9** 1 paralytic (2.1-12) (5.17-26)

9 call of Matthew (2.13-17) (5.27-32)

14 fasting; new patch, new wine (2.18-22) (5.33-39)

18 Jarius’ daughter/woman with (5.21-43) (8.40-56)

a hemorrhage

27 two blind men (10.46-52) (18.35-43)

32 mute demoniac (=12.22-24) (3.22) (11.14-15)

35 teaching, preaching, and healing (6.6) (8.1)

36 like sheep without a shepherd (6.34)

37 the harvest is great (10.2)

d. *Matthew*’*s Mission Discourse*

(*Matt 10*)

**10** 1 mission of the twelve (3.13-19, 6.7-11) (6.12-16, 9.1-5, 10.1-12)

17 future persecutions (13.9-13) (12.11-12=21.12-19, 6.40)

**fearless confession**

26 hid made manifest (12.2-3)

28 whom to fear (12.4-5)

29 sparrows, hairs of the head (12.6-7)

32 acknowledging and denying Jesus (12.8-9)

34 divisions within households (12.51-53)

37 hating one’s relatives (12.26)

38 take up one’s cross (12.27)

39 he who loses his life for my sake (17.33)

40 he who receives you recieves me (10.16)

42 giving a cup of water (9.41)

e. *John the Baptist and Teachings*

(*Matt 11-12*, *Luke 7*)

**11** 1 continuation of the journey

2 John the Baptist’s question 18 John the Baptist’s question

and Jesus’ reply and Jesus’ reply

7 Jesus’ witness concerning 24 Jesus’ witness concerning

John John

20 woes on Galilean cities (10.12-15)

25 exultation of Jesus (10:21-22)

28 “come unto me”

**12** 1 plucking grain on the sabbath (2.23-28) (6.1-5)

9 withered hand (3.1-6) (6.6-11)

15 Jesus heals multitudes (3.7-12) (6.17-19)

(26.6-13) (14.3-9) 36 sinful woman

**8** 1 ministering women

f. *Controversies*

(*Matt 12*, *Mark 3*)

19 Jesus is thought mad

22 Beelzebul (blind and mute 22 Beelzebul (11.14-23)

demoniac = 9.32-34)

31 sin against the Holy Spirit 28 sin against the Holy Spirit (6.43-45)

33 good and bad fruit (6.43-45)

38 sign of Jonah (8.11-12) (11.16, 29-32)

43 seven spirits return (11.24-26)

46 Jesus’ true kindred 32 Jesus’ true kindred (8.19-21)

g. *Parable Discourse*

(*Matt 13*, *Mark 4*, *Luke 8*)

**13** 1 sower **4** 1 sower 4 sower

10 reason for parables 10 reason for parables 9 reason for parables

18 interpretation of the sower 13 interpretation of the sower 11 interpretation of the sower

(5.15) 21 lamp under a bushel 16 lamp under a bushel

(10.26) 22 hid made manifest 17 hid made manifest

23 he who has ears

(7.2) 24 the measure you give

(13.12) 25 to him who has 18 to him who has (=19.26)

26 seed growing secretly

24 weeds among the wheat

31 mustard seed 30 mustard seed (13.18-19)

33 leaven (13.20-21)

34 Jesus’ use of parables 33 Jesus’ use of parables

36 interpretation of the weeds

44 hid treasure

45 pearl

47 net

51 treasure new and old

h. *Miscellaneous*

(*Matt 14*, *Mark 5-6*, *Luke 8-9*)

(12.46-50) (3.31-35) 19 Jesus’ true kindred

(8.23-27) (4.35-41) 22 stilling the storm

(8.28-34) **5** 1 Gerasene demoniac 26 Gerasene demoniac

(9.18-26) 21 Jairus’ daughter/woman with 40 Jairus’ daughter/woman with

a hemorrhage a hemorrhage

53 rejection at Nazareth **6** 1 rejection at Nazareth (4.16-30)

(10.1-14) 6b mission of the twelve **9** 1 mission of the twelve

**14** 1 Herod and Jesus’ identity 14 Herod and Jesus’ identity 7 Herod and Jesus’ identity

3 death of John the Baptist 17 death of John the Baptist (3.19-20)

30 return of the twelve 10 return of the twelve

13 feeding the five thousand 32 feeding the five thousand 11 feeding the five thousand

i. *Luke*’*s* “*Great Omission*”

(*Matt 14-16*, *Mark 6-8*)

22 walking on water 45 walking on water

34 healings at Gennesaret 53 healings at Gennesaret

**15** 1 clean and unclean **7** 1 clean and unclean (11.­37-41)

21 Canaanite woman 24 Syrophoenician woman

31 healing a deaf mute and others

29 healing the lame, maimed,

blind, and dumb

32 feeding the four thousand **8** 1 feeding the four thousand

**16** 1 Pharisees seek a sign 11 Pharisees seek a sign (11.16, 12.54-56, 11.29)

(=12.38-39)

5 leaven of the Pharisees 14 leaven of the Pharisees (12.1)

7 recalling the two multiplica- 16 recalling the two multiplica-

tions tions

22 blind man of Bethsaida

Travel Narrative

a. *Synoptic Travel Narrative*

(*Matt 16-18*, *Mark 8-9*, *Luke 9*)

13 Peter’s confession 27 Peter’s confession 18 Peter’s confession

21 first passion prediction 31 first passion prediction 22 first passion prediction

24 take up one’s cross, etc. 34 take up one’s cross, etc. 23 take up one’s cross, etc.

**17** 1 transfiguration **9** 2 transfiguration 28 transfiguration

10 coming of Elijah 11 coming of Elijah

14 epileptic boy 14 epileptic boy 37 epileptic boy

22 second passion prediction 30 second passion prediction 43 second passion prediction

24 payment of the temple tax

**18** 1 Jesus calls a child 33 Jesus calls a child 46 Jesus calls a child

(10.42) 38 strange exorcist 49 strange exorcist

6 millstone round the neck 42 millstone round the neck

8 cutting off hand 43 cutting off hand

49 salted with fire

(5.13) 50 tasteless salt (14.34-35)

10 lost sheep (15.3-7)

15 reproving a sinning brother (17.3)

19 where two or three are gathered

21 forgiving seven times (17.4)

23 unforgiving servant

b. *Luke*’*s Travel Narrative*

(*Luke*’*s* “*Great Insertion*”)

(*Luke 9-18*)

(19.1-2) (10.1) 51 decision to go to Jerusalem

52 rejection at Samaritan village

(8.18-22) 57 would‑be disciples

(9.37-38)(10.7-16) **10** 1 mission of the seventy

(11.20-24) 13 + woes on Galilean cities

(10.40) 16 + he who hears you hears me

17 return of the seventy

(11.25-27) 21 + exultation of Jesus

(13.16-17) 23 + prophets and kings desired

to see

(22.34-40) (12.28-34) 25 great commandment

29 + good Samaritan

38 Mary and Martha

(6.9-13) **11** 1 Lord’s prayer

5 + importunate friend

(7.7-8) 9 + ask, seek, knock

(7.9-11) 11 + serpent for fish

(12.22-23) 14 dumb demoniac

(12.24-29) (3.22-27) 15 + Beelzebul

(12.30) 23 + he not with me is against me

(12.43-45) 24 + seven spirits return

27 + blessing of Jesus’ mother

(12.38-42) (8.11-12) 29 + sign of Jonah

(5.15) (4.21) 33 + hidden lamp

(6.22-23) 34 + sound eye sayings

37 at a Pharisee’s table

(15.1-9) 39 + woes to Pharisees

45 + woes to lawyers

53 summary: scribes and Phar-

isees lie in wait

(16.5-6) (8.14-15) **12** 1a thousands trod each other

1b + leaven of the Pharisees,

hypocrisy

(10.26) 2 + hid made manifest

(10.28) 4 + whom to fear

(10.29) 6 + sparrows, hairs of head

(10.32) 8 + acknowledging and denying

Jesus

(12.31-32) (3.28-30) 10 + blaspheming the Holy Spirit

(10.19-20) (13.11) 11 + Holy Spirit will speak

through you

13 + request to divide inheritance

15 + beware covetousness

16 + rich fool

(6.25-34) 22 + anxiety about necessities

(6.19-21) 33 + treasure in heaven

(24.42-51) 35 + watchful servants (= ten

virgins)

39 + if householder had known of

thief

40 + Son of man at an unexpected

hour

41 + wise and wicked stewards

47 + severe and light beatings

48 + where much is given

(10.34-36) 49 + I came to cast fire; I have

a baptism

51 + not peace but divided

households

(16.2-3) 54 + interpreting the sky and the

present time

(5.25-26) 57 + settle on the way to court

**13** 1 Galileans’ blood and tower in

Siloam

6 fig tree parable

10 setting: synagogue on sabbath

11 + crippled woman (13.15 =

watering animals)

(13.31-32) (4.30-32) 18 + mustard seed

(13.33) 20 + leaven parable

22 setting: journeying

(7.13-14) 23 + narrow gate

(25.10b-12) 25 + closed door (= ten virgins)

(7.22-23) 26 + depart, you evildoers (=

Lord, Lord)

(8.11-12) 28 + gnashing teeth and the

messianic banquet

(19.30) (10.31) 30 + last will be first

31 Pharisees warn against Herod

(23.37-39) 34 + lament over Jerusalem

**14** 1 setting: at a ruler’s table

2 + man with dropsy (14.5 =

rescuing animals)

7 + take the lowest place

11 + everyone who exalts himself

12 + when you give a feast,

invite the poor

(22.1-10) 15 + great supper

25 setting: Jesus turns to great

multitudes

(10.37) 26 + hating one’s relatives

(10.38) 27 + bearing one’s cross

28 + tower builder

31 + rash king

33 + renounce all

(5.13) (9.50b) 34 + salt

(9.10-11) (2.15-16) **15** 1 eating with tax collectors and

sinners (=5.29-30)

(18.12-14) 3 + lost sheep

8 + lost coin

11 + prodigal son

**16** 1 + unjust steward

8b + sons of this age, sons of

light

9 + make friends by unrighteous

mammon

10 + he who is faithful in little

11 + being faithful in the un-

righteous mammon

12 + being faithful in that which

is another’s

(6.24) 13 + serving two masters

14 + Pharisees’ hypocrisy

(18.4, 23.12) 15 + what is exalted among men

(=14.11, 18.14)

(11.13) 16 + the law and the prophets

were until John

(11.12) 16 + entering the kingdom

violently

(5.18) 17 + law will not pass away

(5.32, 19.9) (10.11-12) 18 + divorce

19 + rich man and Lazarus

(18.7) (9.42b) **17** 1 + temptations are sure to come

(18.6) (9.42a) 2 + causing a little one to

stumble

(18.15) 3 + rebuking a sinning brother

(18.21-22) 4 + forgiving seven times

(17.20, 21.21) (11.22-23) 5 + faith as a grain of mustard

seed

7 + servant from the field

serves table

10 + we are unworthy servants

11 setting: between Samaria and

Galilee

12 + ten lepers

20 + kingdom is in the midst of

you

(24.23) (13.21) 21 + “Lo, here!” or “There!”

22 + you will desire to see one

of the days

(24.26) 23 + they will say, “Lo, there!”

(24.27) 24 + as the lightning

(8.31) 25 + but first he must suffer

(24.37-39) 26 + as in the days of Noah

28 + as in the days of Lot

(24.17-18) (13.15-16) 31 + on the housetop and in the

field

32 + remember Lot’s wife

(10.39, 16.25) (8.35) 33 + whoever would gain his life

will lose it (=9.24)

34 + two in bed, one taken

(24.41) 35 + two grinding, one taken

37 + “Where, Lord?”

(24.28) 37 + eagles

**18** 1 + unjust judge

9 + Pharisee and tax collector

(18.4, 23.12) 14 + everyone who exalts himself

(=14.11)

c. *Synoptic Travel Narrative* (*cont*’*d*.)

(*Matt 19-20*, *Mark 10*, *Luke 18-19*)

**19** 1 marriage and divorce **10** 1 marriage and divorce (16.18)

13 blessing the children 13 blessing the children 15 + blessing the children

16 rich young man 17 rich young man 18 rich young man

**20** 1 laborers in the vineyard

17 third passion prediction 32 third passion prediction 31 third passion prediction

20 James and John’s request 35 James and John’s request (22.24-27)

29 blind Bartimaeus 46 blind Bartimaeus 35 blind Bartimaeus

**19** 1 Zacchaeus

(25.14-30) 11 pounds

Jerusalem Ministry

(*Matt 21-25*, *Mark 11-13*, *Luke 19-21*)

a. *Miscellaneous*

(*Matt 21-23*, *Mark 11-12*, *Luke 19-20*)

**21** 1 triumphal entry **11** 1 triumphal entry 28 triumphal entry

39 prediction of Jerusalem’s

destruction

10 Jesus surveys the temple 11 Jesus surveys the temple 45 Jesus surveys the temple

18 cursing the fig tree 12 cursing the fig tree

(21.12-13) 15 cleansing the temple 47 cleansing the temple

20 meaning of the cursed fig tree 20 meaning of the cursed fig tree

23 by what authority 27 by what authority **20** 1 by what authority

28 two sons

33 wicked tenants **12** 1 wicked tenants

**22** 1 marriage feast (14.16-24)

15 tribute to Caesar 13 tribute to Caesar 20 tribute to Caesar

23 Saddducees on resurrection 18 Sadducees on resurrection 27 Sadducees on resurrection

34 great commandment 28 great commandment (10.25-28)

41 Lord said to my Lord 35 Lord said to my Lord 41 Lord said to my Lord

**23** 1 woes to the Pharisees 37 woes to the Pharisees 45 woes to the Pharisees

(see 11:39-52)

37 lament over Jerusalem (13:34-35)

b. *Eschatological Discourse*

(*Matt 24*, *Mark 13*, *Luke 21*)

41 widow’s mite **21** 1 widow’s mite

**24** 1 prediction of the temple’s **13** 1 prediction of the temple’s 5 prediction of the temple’s

destruction destruction destruction

4 signs of the parousia 5 signs of the parousia 8 signs of the parousia

9 beginnings of the troubles 9 beginnings of the troubles 12 beginnings of the troubles

(see 10:17-22, 30) (see 17:7, 11, 12)

15 desolating sacrilege 14 desolating sacrilege 20 destruction of Jerusalem

(see 17:31)

23 culmination of the troubles 21 culmination of the troubles

26 day of the son of man (17:23-24, 37)

29 parousia of the son of man 24 parousia of the son of man 25 parousia of the son of man

32 fig tree parable 28 fig tree parable 29 fig tree parable

34 time of the parousia 30 time of the parousia 32 time of the parousia

(24:42) 33 end of the discourse (12:38, 40)

34 end of the discourse

37 be watchful (17:26-27, 34-35)

42 watchful householder (12:39-40)

45 faithful and wise servant (12:42-46)

**25** 1 ten virgins (12:35-36) (13:25)

14 talents (19:12-27)

31 last judgment

37 Jerusalem-ministry summary

Passion Narrative

(*Matt 26-27*, *Mark 14-15*, *Luke 22-23*)

a. *Before the Last Supper*

(*Matt 26*, *Mark 14*, *Luke 22*)

**26** 1 conspiracy against Jesus **14** 1 conspiracy against Jesus **22** 1 con­spiracy against Jesus

6 anointing at Bethany 3 anointing at Bethany (see 7:36-50)

14 betrayal of Judas 10 betrayal of Judas 3 betrayal of Judas

17 preparation for Passover 12 preparation for Passover 7 preparation for Passover

b. *The Last Supper*

(*Matt 26*, *Mark 14*, *Luke 22*)

20 the traitor 17 the traitor 14 the traitor

21 betrayal foretold 18 betrayal foretold (22:21-23)

26 institution of the last supper 22 institution of the last supper 15 institution of the last supper

(26:21-25) (14:18-21) 21 betrayal foretold

(19:28) (20:25-28) (10:42-45) 24 greatness in the kingdom

(26:31-35) (14:27-31) 31 Peter’s denial prophesied

35 two swords

c. *Arrest and Trials*

(*Matt 26-27*, *Mark 14-15*, *Luke 22-23*)

30 to Gethsemane 26 to Gethsemane 39 to Gethsemane

31 Peter’s denials foretold 27 Peter’s denials foretold (22:31-34)

36 agony 32 agony 40 agony

47 arrest 43 arrest 47 arrest

57 to the high priest 53 to the high priest 54 to the high priest

58 Peter in the courtyard 54 Peter in the courtyard 55 Peter in the courtyard

(26:69-75) (14:66-72) 56 Peter’s denials

(26:67-68) (14:65) 63 Jewish mocking

(27:1) (15:1) 66 assembly at daybreak

(26:57) (15:53) 66 assembly of the Sanhedrin

59 trial before the Sanhedrin 55 trial before the Sanhedrin 67 trial before the Sanhedrin

67 Jewish mocking 65 Jewish mocking (22:63-65)

69 Peter’s denials 66 Peter’s denials (22:56-62)

**27** 1 Jesus delivered to Pilate **15** 1 Jesus delivered to Pilate **23** 1 Jesus delivered to Pilate

3 death of Judas

11 trial before Pilate 2 trial before Pilate 2 trial before Pilate

6 trial before Herod

15 sentencing 6 sentencing 17 sentencing

27 Roman mocking 16 Roman mocking (23:26)

d. *Crucifixion and Burial*

(*Matt 27*, *Mark 15*, *Luke 23*)

32 way of the cross 21 way of the cross 26 way of the cross

33 crucifixion 22 crucifixion 33 crucifixion

45 death of Jesus 33 death of Jesus 44 death of Jesus

57 burial 42 burial 50 burial

62 guards at the tomb

Resurrection Narrative

(*Matt 28*, *Mark 16*, *Luke 24*)

**28** 1 empty tomb **16** 1 empty tomb **24** 1 empty tomb

11 bribing the soldiers

16 appearance in Galilee

18 great commission (2 4:47-49)

13 Emmaus

36 appearance in Jerusalem

47 great commission

50 ascension

9 longer ending
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66. 166 There naturally remains a measure of hypothesis in the presentation, because the raw facts had to be interpreted in order to become a part of the final synthesis. But that is the common fate of all historical knowledge. [130 n. 166] [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. 168 Legend as a literary genre, therefore, needs revaluation. The contempt the 19th century had for it (and for the myth as well) was a consequence of that pretentious positivism which spread everywhere the reign of its naive conception of history as science. It should only be remarked that the problem of legends is not simple, for they can have several sources. Some of them rise out of history; others are only ancient myths that have degenerated into tales; still others are a mixture of the two. Judgment must be made piece by piece in each particular case. [130 n. 168] [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. 187 . . . We will not now enter into a detailed discussion of the various genres to which the gospel narratives might belong. . . . [135 n. 187] [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. 188 . . . Thus the modernist approach to the problem, which artificially opposed the Jesus of history to the Jesus of faith, has become outmoded . . . [135 n. 188] [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. 189 The question of date is important, for the long oral transmission of a tradition evidently influences its literary form and the preciseness of its details. The narrative of the last supper, which was substantially fixed very early (1 Co 11:23-25 displays a tradition of it which Paul most likely received in the circle in which he was baptized), is one problem; another is that of Matthew’s infancy narratives, which belong to the latest redactional layer of the gospel, and which were until then transmitted orally . . .; still different is the problem of the Johannine narratives, which reached their final form quite late, even if traces of the tradition on which they depend can be found earlier . . . [136 n. 189] [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. 191 This is the purpose of the apocryphal gospels; they are acknowledged to be of little worth . . . [136 n. 191] [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. It is not likely that the Magi had come with their rich gifts prior to the presentation at temple, otherwise Joseph and Mary would not have been justified in pleading poverty as an excuse for making the cheaper of the two permissible offerings (Luke 2:22-24; compare Lev. 12:8). Therefore it is quite anachronistic to represent (as some artists have done) the Magi as present with the shepherds adoring the newborn babe. [103 n. 1] [↑](#footnote-ref-72)