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Abstract

Since the eighteenth century, various hypotheses have been proposed by scholars in an attempt to solve the Synoptic Question. Most of these scholars have used more or less the same Greek text, yet they have come up with different conclusions. So, the question arises whether it is possible to find a trend in the manuscripts dating up to the fifth century which sheds additional clues on the relationships among the Synoptic Gospels. To address this, I have taken the text of the 27th edition of Nestle-Aland as the basis for analysis through the use of the colour-coded scheme proposed by the Karawara Gospels Project. However, in the same colour-coding exercise, the variant readings from the relevant manuscripts are also displayed. This facilitates the identification of any particularities.

Since the Synoptic Gospels contain too much to cover within the constraints of this research project, there is a need to select enough material to make the study relevant. The passion narrative has been selected on the basis of its content and the generally agreed closeness of the texts in all three Synoptic Gospels. So, all the sections, as defined in the Aland Synopsis, in the Triple Tradition are colour-coded and analysed. The relevant variant readings in these sections are also taken into consideration. To display the colour-coding more accurately, it was found that a commonly used and available format is more appropriate since printing is still not a viable alternative. Thus, all the colour-coded sections, as found on the attached CD-ROM, are converted into the PDF format and the Adobe Acrobat Reader, widely available through the Internet, can be used to view them. This study has pointed out that in spite of the commonly agreed closeness of the texts, that of Luke varies quite markedly from the other two.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

This study is concerned with the relationship of the Synoptic Question to textual criticism. It will look at how these two areas of research intersect and seek to gain further understanding into the composition of the text of the Synoptics. In order to undertake such a study, it is necessary to base it on a Greek text which is widely used and respected in the scholarly world. The Nestle-Aland 27th Edition (NA27) or “Standard Text” (as it is often called) fits this description well. Amongst the scholars, it is widely recognised as being the authoritative Greek text offering the significant variants in its critical apparatus. The Alands make the following comments (1987, 35 – 36):

… this Greek text serves as the base for new translations as well as for revisions of earlier translations in modern languages, i.e., it is in effect the foundation to which the whole contemporary Church looks in formulating expressions of faith. … Many will undoubtedly feel strongly inclined to make improvements here and there in the “Standard Text.” This temptation should be resisted despite the insinuation that the “Standard Text” is merely another new Textus Receptus, comparable to the text of our ancestors from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries.

Since the NA27 has such a wide usage and is recognised as the “Standard Text”, it is appropriate to ask whether scholars may come up with different conclusions if the variant readings published are also taken into consideration. The question that has to be considered is whether variant readings have an impact
on the perceived relationships among the Synoptic Gospels: would scholars change their conclusions if the variant readings show a trend that has not previously been considered by them? In other words, does the text as it is in $\text{NA}^{27}$ represent the most likely reading? If it does, how can the variations in the text help in a better understanding of the Synoptic Question? While it is not expected that a definitive answer to the Synoptic Question will be found, the aim of this study is to find whether textual criticism can bring some additional light to the Synoptic Question.

Some scholars, such as Griesbach, have argued that there is a close relationship between textual criticism and the Synoptic Question. However, as far as it is known, there has not been any significant study to quantify the extent to which the choice of text has affected the hypotheses formulated for the Synoptic Question. Metzger brought to the attention of his readers that they have to take into consideration certain criteria when variant readings are evaluated. When internal evidence is looked at, he recommends taking the following factors into account (Metzger, 1992: 210):

(1) the style and vocabulary of the author throughout the book,

(2) the immediate context,

(3) harmony with the usage of the author elsewhere, and, in the Gospels,

(4) the Aramaic background of the teaching of Jesus,

(5) the priority of the Gospel according to Mark, and

(6) the influence of the Christian community upon the formulation and transmission of the passage in question.
Thus, there is recognition that there is a link between textual criticism and the Synoptic Question. Metzger points out clearly that the priority of the Gospel of Mark is one of the factors taken into consideration when evaluating a variant reading. So, one of the assumptions of the editors of the NA 27 (of whom Metzger is one) in reaching textual decisions on what is most likely to be the original text is Markan priority. This has the potential of creating a certain ‘circularity’ between one’s view of Synoptic origins and the establishing of the text of the New Testament:

1. The choice of reading is based on Markan priority, which is reflected in the text.

2. The text is used as the basis for proving Markan priority.

Thus, this research project will highlight variant readings, as flagged by the Aland Synopsis, which make the text of one Gospel parallel to that of another Gospel. This will indicate what impact the adoption of readings not based on a view of Markan priority may have on the formulation of hypotheses of the origins of the Synoptic Question.

Taking these issues into account, resources based on the NA 27 text with variant readings listed are the most appropriate to use. However, the way in which Greek New Testaments are generally printed does not allow the reader to evaluate whether a reading is appropriate or not. While the critical apparatus does give the major variant readings, it is very difficult to actually see those differences, since all these alternative readings are printed at the bottom of the page. This is also the case in the Aland Synopsis, which has an extensive critical apparatus but it, too, is printed at the bottom of the page. The Aland Synopsis was found to be appropriate for this study and thus it will be used as the basic reference.
Many have found that the way in which parallel texts are displayed in the widely used Aland Synopsis is an invaluable tool for the study of the Synoptic Question. It provides a good visual representation of the degree of commonality across the synoptic gospels. However, the underlying Greek text (established for the Nestle-Aland 27th Edition) is based on an editorial committee’s decisions, some of which are in dispute. Whilst it may represent the best text possible at this moment in time and its editors were among the best textual critics of their day, these editors often differed among themselves as to what reading represented the best text. Bruce Metzger makes the following comments (1994: vi – vii):

Frequently, it had happened that the members of the Committee differed in their evaluation of the textual evidence, and thus many readings were adopted on the basis of a majority vote. In special cases, when a member holding a minority opinion had strong feelings that the majority had seriously gone astray, opportunity was given for him to express his own point of view.

It is therefore important to evaluate how much impact such variant readings have by displaying both the commonality in the NA27 text and the major variant readings from the best extant manuscripts in a form that is more user-friendly than the printed text with variants shown at the foot of the page.

One promising means of displaying this information is the World Wide Web. In recent years, there has been an explosion in the use of the World Wide Web to display a wide variety of information. Technology is such that it is possible to use tools already available to present information in an easy-to-see format enabling the user to determine quickly the trend in the data displayed. However, this rapid advance in technology has sparked off the publishing of many software products to enable such presentation of information. This has resulted in non-standard tools. For
example, even though the HTML (HyperText Markup Language) language is supposed to be standard across all platforms, different browsers (programs like Microsoft Internet Explorer or Mozilla Firefox to convert HTML to display on the screen) show the information differently. The challenge is to find a tool that will enable the presentation of the commonality in the Synoptic Gospels as well as the major variant readings in a format that is accessible to as many people as possible.

The ideal solution would have been to integrate the text and the variant readings into a database. This would then give the possibility of easily reproducing the presentation and also of easily programming variations in the way in which the presentation is shown, so as to highlight some issues. This can be taken further by programming into the system ways and means of determining how different texts can impact the relationship among the Synoptic Gospels. However, this also requires the integration of a Greek morphological database as well. This is beyond the scope of this dissertation. It also requires much more time than is available for this study. The high cost of such Greek morphological databases as are commercially available indicates the complexity of such an exercise. Thus, to make it possible to finish this dissertation within the time constraint allowed, the colour-coding of the Greek text and display of the variant readings had to be carried out manually. Nevertheless, it would be invaluable to have a complete tool to allow the analysis of the text to be carried out. Such a tool would provide scholars with the ability to test the impact of the text on their hypotheses.

Therefore, this research project will look at commonality among the Synoptics with an analysis of how variant readings may impact our understanding of the relationship among these Gospels through the Passion Narrative.
What is the Passion Narrative? And why …

The word *passion* is derived from the Latin word *passio* meaning ‘suffering’. Thus, when the passion of Christ is referred to, it has a general meaning of the suffering and death that Christ endured. So, for the purpose of this dissertation, the passion narrative will loosely be defined as the events leading to, and including, the death of Jesus Christ on the cross.

In general, scholars tend to consider the passion narrative as the material covered by the pericopae that have been included in this dissertation, beginning with the Premeditation of Jesus’ Death. For example, the Aland *Synopsis* contains sections 305 (“Jesus’ death is premeditated”: Mark 14:1 – 2 and parallels) to 351 (“The guard at the tomb”: Mark 15:42 – 47 and parallels) under the heading of the passion narrative. France (2002: 547 – 669) sets out his commentary on the *Gospel of Mark* for this topic as follows:

1. Setting the scene for the passion.
   a. The Passover and the Priests (14:1 – 2)
   b. The anointing of Jesus (14:3 – 9)
   c. The Priests and Judas (14:10 – 11)

2. Last Hours with the disciples.
   a. The Last Supper (14:12 – 25)
   b. Prediction of the Disciples’ failure (14:26 – 31)
   c. Jesus’ prayer in Gethsemane (14:32 – 42)
3. The arrest and trials of Jesus.
   a. The arrest (14:43 – 52)
   b. The Jewish trial (14:53 – 65)
   c. Peter’s repudiation of Jesus (14:66 – 72)
   d. The Roman trial (15:1 – 15)

4. The crucifixion, death and burial of Jesus.
   a. The soldiers’ mockery (15:16 – 20)
   b. The crucifixion (15:21 – 32)
   c. The death of Jesus (15:33 – 39)
   d. The burial and the Witnesses (15:40 – 47)

However, Brown (1994: 37) prefers not to include the Last Supper because he claims that “those who wish to reflect, study, or preach about the passion generally do not think of the Last Supper or the resurrection as part of the subject matter – ‘passion’ means suffering, and Jesus’ ‘agony in the garden’ marks the beginning of his suffering which leads to the finale of his death and burial”. He further writes (1994: 37):

Another argument for commencing the PN (Passion Narrative) with Gethsemane comes from within the flow of the Gospel story: throughout the ministry, including the Last Supper, Jesus has held the initiative and proclaimed God’s kingdom as he deemed best; but now, at least on the visible level, others take the initiative, for the Son of Man is given over into their hands. Despite the defensibility of delimiting the area on which this book comments, I would caution readers that the evangelists themselves may have had a different understanding of what constituted Jesus’ passion. One can detect that in part from the way the passion fits into the structure of each Gospel.
While it is a valid argument to start the passion narrative with Gethsemane, the way in which the authors of the Synoptics introduce their passion narrative indicates that they each see this as a turning point in their gospels. From what Brown has argued above, it is clear he recognises that his decision to start the passion narrative with the event in Gethsemane is not the only way to do so. He invites the reader to listen to what the authors of the Gospels have to say. So, when this is considered, it can be seen that Luke closes off the previous section with the same theme that he started it, namely, with the people interested in what Jesus was teaching them. Luke now introduces a new topic by referring to a new timeframe, the feast of Unleavened Bread and Passover.

Matthew ends the previous section using the same words that he uses to end all of his discourses - Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἔτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτων. He then provides the setting for the Passion Narrative as the Passover. Mark also introduces his passion narrative with a new “temporal setting that contrasts with the last one” (Gundry 1993: 801). Thus, it is feasible to begin the Passion Narrative with the pericopae as suggested by the Aland Synopsis.

For the purpose of this dissertation, a decision had to be made as to what had to be included in the study. The material to be used had to be extensive enough to be significant but also not so large as to make it beyond the scope of this project. For example, it was simply not possible to use the Synoptics in their totality as a basis for this project even though this would provide the potential for a more accurate result. But, because of the complexity of the data to be analysed and the amount of data that had to be handled, it was impossible to use the three Synoptic Gospels in full. It was
therefore desirable to find a section of the Gospels which would have a reasonable number of parallel texts in the Triple Tradition.

Some of the narratives could be excluded straight away. For example, the birth narrative is not extensive enough and it is also not present in the Gospel of Mark. Such is also the case with the Sermon on the Mount where only Matthew and Luke have some similarities but not much of the material is covered in Mark. There are also significant differences in their contents. Matthew has the Sermon on a Mount whereas Luke’s setting is a Plain.

Others are more extensive and there is a significant number of parallel texts in the Triple Tradition. One that falls into this category is the Ministry of Jesus in Galilee. It covers about three chapters of Mark and Luke. However, the parallel texts in Matthew do not have much in common with the other two Synoptics in regards to its order. Whilst this may not appear to be significant in itself, it can potentially have the problem of whether the text chosen as a parallel text is really a parallel. As an example, if section 35 (Teaching in the Synagogue at Capernaum) is considered, it can be seen that Mark 1: 21-22 is parallel to Luke 4: 31 – 32. However, for Matthew, the “secondary parallel” is taken from two different chapters; namely, 4: 13 and 7: 28 – 29. The question that can be asked in this section is whether the text of Matthew is parallel to those of Mark and Luke.
When all of these are considered, the passion narrative emerges as the most
appropriate block of sections in the Aland Synopsis to analyse. Apart from the
Johannine Farewell Discourses (sections 317 to 329) most of the sections are not
only Triple Tradition but most are also in order in all three Synoptics. Thus, they
constitute an almost perfect block of text to study and analyse. It is possible that the
text for the passion narrative has been preserved more faithfully by the authors than
any other because its message was regarded as central to the whole ministry of Jesus
Christ. When summarising the Gospel of Mark, Achtemeier, Green and Thompson
argue (2002: 125):

When the Gospel is viewed as a whole, most noticeable is its concern to portray
the ministry of Jesus as a relentless progression of events leading to the
Crucifixion of the Messiah. Fully one-third of the Gospel is given over to the
events of Jesus' last days, marked by repeated prophecies of his coming suffering and death and a detailed and picturesque presentation of his passion.

More than this, one encounters, already in the earlier chapters, intimations, implicit and explicit, of swelling malice against Jesus. ... Clearly, from Mark's vantage point, the ministry of Jesus cannot be understood apart from the cross, which casts its shadow back across the whole Gospel.

Furthermore, in the discussion about the source(s) of the passion narrative, there is constant mention of the closeness of the texts in the Synoptics. Edwards, in his commentary on the Gospel of Mark, writes (2002: 410):

These chapters [14 and 15] correspond more closely, particularly in sequence of events, to the passion narratives of Matthew and Luke, indicating that the passion narrative had been shaped into a structural unit before Mark received it. Nevertheless, the presence of three sandwich conventions in chap. 14 and one in chap. 15 are evidence that Mark is not simply transmitting tradition but also interpreting it for his purposes.

Though Evans is only covering the Gospel of Mark, his remark can be applied to all three Synoptic Gospels (2001: 351 – 352):

The Markan Passion Narrative 'is the most closely articulated in the Gospel' (Taylor, 524). Nothing else in Mark compares with it; even the day in Capernaum consists of no more than a few brief pericopes. The Passion Narrative, in contrast, provides a series of closely related events, many of which are clearly associated with Jerusalem and its environs, especially the temple precincts. Form critics have long recognised the cohesion of this material.

However, Luke’s text appears to be somewhat different from Mark’s and Matthew’s. While the content / subject matter of the pericopae matches that of Mark and Matthew, the text itself is quite different. The style and words used are, on the
whole, quite unique to Luke. So, the question that can be asked is whether or not this affects the choice of this block of text for analysis.

Senior suggests that, while the passages of Matthew and Mark are close to one another (1989: 9 – 10):

In the case of Luke, changes of order in the sequence of events and more notable deviations from the story line established by Mark (and followed by Matthew) have led some scholars to suggest that Luke had access to another major source for his Passion story other than that of the Gospel of Mark. … my own opinion is that the special character of Luke’s Passion narrative is due to his creative reinterpretation of Mark's account”.

Soards agrees with this when he claims 1987: 123):

He (Luke) wrote his Gospel, rewriting Mark, in order to alter subtly the image of Jesus and the impact of his Passion. This explanation is particularly persuasive because it takes into account the theological harmony between the Lukan Passion Narrative and the rest of Luke’s Gospel.

In spite of the fact that the text of Luke’s passion narrative seems to be somewhat different from Matthew and Mark, there are strong indications that they do represent a good block of text for the purpose of this project. Therefore, the pericopae that are covered in this study are taken from Matthew chapters 26 and 27, Mark chapters 14 and 15, and Luke chapters 22 and 23. As only pericopae from the Triple Tradition will be looked at, the following sections of the Aland Synopsis are considered:

305 – Jesus’ Death is Premeditated
307 – The Betrayal by Judas
308 – Preparation for the Passover
311 – The Last Supper
315 – Peter’s Denial Predicted
330 – Gethsemane
331 – Jesus Arrested
332 – Jesus before the Sanhedrin
334 – Jesus Delivered to Pilate
336 – The Trial before Pilate
339 – Jesus or Barabbas?
341 – Pilate Delivers Jesus to be Crucified
343 – The Road to Golgotha
344 – The Crucifixion
345 – Jesus Derided on the Cross
346 – The Two Thieves
347 – The Death of Jesus
348 – Witnesses of the Crucifixion
350 – The Burial of Jesus
Chapter 3

Methodology

Triple Tradition

The scope of this dissertation has necessarily led to a limitation of the amount of text that can be analysed. The initial stage involved finding the appropriate sections of the Synoptics to analyse. However, it was also necessary to pinpoint enough material to make the study as relevant as possible. Several possibilities were considered. It was found that the passion narrative provided the ideal base for such a study. Scholars generally considered that the material for the Passion Narrative found in each of the Synoptics is quite similar in content. This has led to comments like this, from Brown (1994: 40):

In the shared material the wording among the Synoptics is so much the same that we must posit a relationship based in large part on one author’s having seen a written form of the other’s work. … Matt and Luke drew the outline, substance, and much of the wording of their PNs from Mark’s, making adaptations (grammatical, stylistic, theological) and adding some special material. This is clearly the majority view among scholars.

Thus, the passion narrative appeared to be most appropriate for this exercise. The chapters involved would be Matthew 26 and 27, Mark 14 and 15, and Luke 22 and 23. Nevertheless, even when these were considered, it was found that certain parts of each of the Gospels would have to be dropped. Since only the relationships among the three Gospels were being looked at, much of the material which did not have any parallel with the other two would not be of any use. Furthermore, material belonging to the double tradition could also be dropped from the analysis. At an
early stage, it was observed that the double tradition sections in the passion narrative belong mostly to the relationship between Matthew and Mark. Assuming that these had proceeded through a knowledge by one of the other, the double tradition material could be ignored. This basically left the triple tradition material for detailed analysis.

Witnesses Considered

Just as the amount of text has to be considered, so does the number of witnesses that are going to be looked at. There are far too many manuscripts to take each one into account in the study. So, it was decided that to be included, the manuscripts will have to be dated in the first five centuries of the Common Era. However, completeness of the manuscripts for the passion narrative has also to be taken into consideration. With this in mind, the following codices have been found to be suitable:

1. Ξ – Sinaiticus – 4th Century – Complete for the passion narrative
2. A – Alexandrinus – 5th Century – Complete for the passion narrative
3. B – Vaticanus – 4th Century – Complete for the passion narrative

On top of this, whenever there were significant variant readings in the papyri, they were also taken into account, since some of these are dated quite early. The following were included:


3. $\mathcal{P}64$ – ca. 200 – Contains Matthew 26:7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33.


**Colour-coding**

In the early stages of the study of the Synoptic Question, scholars appreciated the usefulness of displaying agreements among the Gospels in such a way that the relationships were obvious. However, the facilities available did not allow them to make use of colour printing. So, the use of underlining, italics and bold characters were widespread. When colour printing became more accessible, the idea shifted to finding an easier way of visually identifying these agreements. But there were still limitations in the printing equipment used and the colour-coded texts did not show clearly the extent of the agreement. For example, words unique to a particular Gospel were simply printed in black and words having common roots but different morphological forms were simply indicated with means like underlining or italics. These approaches to demonstrating the relationships in the text mostly made use of a Synopsis where the texts of the Synoptic Gospels were shown in adjoining columns. They were lined up in such a way that the parallel texts were printed, as far as possible, on the same line and in the same relative position on that line. This allowed the reader to see the relationships in the text more distinctly.
Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26:17 Τῇ δὲ Πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ Τῷ ἱησοῦ λέγοντες, Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν σοι φαγεῖν τῷ Πάσχα;</td>
<td>14:12 Καὶ Τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τῷ Πάσχα ἔθουν, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Αὐτοῦ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγης τῷ Πάσχα;</td>
<td>22:7 Ἡλθὲν δὲ Ἡ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, [μιᾷ] ἡ ἐδει θέωσαι τῷ Πάσχα. ὁ ἄρσεν ἐπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην εἶπὼν, Πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε ἢμῖν τῷ Πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In very few cases the texts, like Farmer’s *Synopticon*, were simply printed and coloured sequentially; that is, printed like any Greek New Testament with the text coloured according to a colour-coding scheme. This was an attempt by the authors to be as impartial as possible and not to show any favour towards a particular hypothesis or theory. However, most of these methods do not visually provide a good picture of the actual agreement in the texts considered. After considering these methods and some published on the Internet, the one designed by the Karawara Gospels Project was selected.

**The Karawara Gospels Project**

The colour-coding scheme used by the participants in the Karawara Gospels Project displayed the agreements in a very clear and straightforward way. It made a clear distinction between instances of exact morphology and the use of the same word with a different morphological form. It also made it easier to see the result visually since the agreements and the unique words were each represented according
to a pre-set colour scheme. Thus, the extent to which the texts agreed with each other was readily available.

This colour-coding scheme was designed by Dr Richard K. Moore and applied to all four Gospels by a small team between May 1987 and October 1988. According to a paper describing the methodology, the scheme used had a very clear and concise objective:

The colour-coding systems … offer a simple method for colour-coding each vocable in the Greek text of the four canonical Gospels. … While there is a variety of media available for adding colour to a printed text today, the use of colour pencils is the medium advocated here as that offering the greatest advantages. … Since the purpose of the present paper is to explain a simple and practical method for studying the Gospels objectively, the constraints of time and space have limited applications of the method to a few illustrations at the macro level. In closing, however, it needs to be emphasised that the system advocated has enormous benefits at the micro level, the level of the individual section or pericope. Indeed, at both levels it is a method which will enhance a student’s familiarity with the Gospels themselves, an approach which can help in assessing theories about the literary relationships among the Gospels without the need for a prior commitment to any one of them. (Moore, 1992: 3-8)

The group made use of Aland Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, which was based on the 26th Edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek text. The Synopsis divides the four Gospels into sections, with each one displaying parallel texts from each of the four Gospels in adjacent columns and common words are, as far as possible, placed on the same line and in the same position on the line. This is an example of Section 305:
Figure 3.2

The Colour-coding Scheme

The emphasis is mainly on the Synoptic Gospels. Each one of the three is allocated a primary colour. Words that are unique to a particular Gospel are shaded in the colour allocated to that Gospel. This provides a visual identification of words falling into this category. The colour allocated to each of the Synoptic Gospels is:
Words common to any two of the three Gospels are shaded in the colour resulting from a mixture of the two primary colours representing those two Gospels. Thus, the three possible combinations for the three Synoptic Gospels are:

- Matthew and Mark ................. Purple (Blue + Red)
- Mark and Luke ....................... Orange (Red + Yellow)
- Matthew and Luke ................. Green (Blue + Yellow)

Words in the exact form in all three Gospels are coloured Brown (which is the result of mixing the three primary colours).

To demonstrate words having the same roots but different morphological forms in two or more of the Gospels, the same colour scheme is used. But instead of shading the word, this feature of the word is displayed by underlining it in the appropriate colour. So in those cases, in addition to the word being shaded in its appropriate colour to show its agreement with another gospel, it is also underlined in the colour that indicates its links to the same word though in a different morphological form in the third gospel. For example, if we have λέγων in Matthew and Mark but ζηλεύων in Luke, then the word in Matthew and Mark is shaded Purple, in Luke it is shaded Yellow. In all three Gospels, the word is underlined in Brown.
Once the colour-coding has been completed, the agreements or otherwise are clearly visible to the reader. It is also possible to collect the relevant statistics by physically counting the number of words shaded and underlined for each colour. Thus, it provides a very accurate method of analysing the texts of the Synoptic Gospels. There are comparatively few words where the colour-coding can be disputed. While this method has proven to be very useful, it has a major drawback. Since it was carried out manually, it was very difficult and time-consuming to reproduce another copy. Each participant in the project manually colour-coded a copy of the Aland Synopsis. As a result, there are only three copies of the colour-coded texts in the whole world. It is also not practical to introduce the variant readings in the colour-coding since these are located at the bottom of the page in the Aland Synopsis. As a result of this, it was decided to modify the colour-coding scheme slightly so that it could be computerised. This modified method was the basis of a dissertation submitted in 1999 as part of the requirement for the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity with Honours at Murdoch University (Chan Chim Yuk, 1999).

A Modified and Partially Computerised Version

The colour-coding of the Karawara Gospels Project was to be modified in order to make it suitable for the personal computer environment. For example, in the manual system, the words in the Aland Synopsis were printed in black and coloured pencils were used to shade them. This was changed in the computerised version where the words were actually displayed or printed in the appropriate colour. As the purpose of the dissertation, which made use of that computerised version, was to analyse the Sayings of Jesus, these were highlighted in yellow, providing a visual contrast between the sayings and the narratives surrounding them. Furthermore, the
limitations of the tools used on the personal computer made it necessary to change
the underlining of words in a different morphological form to “boxing” of those
words. The reason was to provide flexibility so that the files could be read by most
available word processors. So the files generated were in Rich Text Format (RTF).
At that time, the underlining feature in word processors could only be carried out
using the same colour as the word being underlined. This could have been modified
through fairly intensive programming in Microsoft Word but it could not be
implemented in the RTF-generated file. Therefore, in order to achieve the required
result and to keep the flexibility of the RTF file, the “boxing” of words was preferred.
It proved to be simpler to program and implement in RTF than to underline words in
different colours.

So, the computerised version of the Karawara Gospels Project used a slightly
modified colour scheme. For words that were unique to each of the Synoptic
Gospels,

Matthew ......................... Blue
Mark ......................... Red
Luke ......................... Grey

(since Yellow is barely visible when printed on white paper).

For words that were common to two or more Gospels,

Matthew and Mark ............. Cyan
Matthew and Luke ............. Green
Mark and Luke ............. Brown
Cyan was used for words common to Matthew and Mark because when in printed form purple could hardly be distinguished from red. There was a similar problem with red and orange. So, for words common to Mark and Luke, brown was used and for words common to all three Synoptic Gospels, black was used. This achieved a result that was close to the manual process, though it was still not entirely satisfactory.

**An Updated Presentation Style**

While the ideal situation is to fully computerise the presentation of the colour-coding, it has not proven to be completely feasible. Initially, the method used to present the commonality among the Synoptics made use of some of the new features in the Microsoft WORD 2000 word processing package. These include facilities like the use of a wider range of colours and also the possibility of underlining a word in a different colour. For example, the word may be coloured blue but have a purple underlining.

However, though the format is adequate, it has a major drawback. When the document is displayed on the screen, the colours used are quite distinct and are very easily recognisable. But such is not the case when the document is printed. Against a white background, it is difficult to read words coded in some of the colours, like yellow. It is also difficult to differentiate between some of the others, like purple and blue. The printout was also tested using the highest resolution possible from an available printer, an EPSON Stylus Color 400 and then a higher quality printer, an
EPSON Stylus Photo 830U. Though the colours are slightly more distinguishable, the problem is still there.

As a result, it was important to find another method to display the results. At the same time, the format in which the project was to be presented on completion was also taken into consideration. Since printing was no longer a viable option, the object of the exercise was to find a solution that would facilitate access to the colour-coded text on the screen. This had to make use of software that is commonly available and at the same time is an industry standard. After considering products like Microsoft WORD 2000 with a viewer, and Adobe Acrobat, it was decided that the use of HTML (HyperText Markup Language) was the most appropriate solution for the initial phase, that is, the actual colour-coding. Any Internet Browser (like Microsoft Internet Explorer and Mozilla Firefox) and most Word Processing packages can read this. Thus, the resulting documents can be displayed on any computer with access to the Internet.

After experimenting with various colour combinations, the most appropriate format was found to be colour against a dark background. This brings out the colour variations in the best possible way. However, one of the major drawbacks is that it is still not possible to underline a word in a different colour from the word itself. For example, if the word is to be red in colour, it cannot be underlined in purple to indicate that it shares the same root as Matthew. With the definition of XML (eXtended Markup Language) and its implementation by the major companies in the publishing industry (like Microsoft), this will become an option. However, the full implementation of XML is still some way ahead. In the meantime, those words with a common root will be tagged in the appropriate colour through the use of a
subscripted diamond (♦) before the word. Another major problem is the automatic use of kerning in Microsoft FrontPage (used to format the colour-coded text). FrontPage will automatically calculate and insert a variable space between characters in order to make the document look better. This tends to make it difficult to line up common words in parallel texts.

In spite of the problems described above, the display of colour-coded text was found to be better presented using HTML. When the variant readings are also displayed underneath the NA\textsuperscript{27} text, it is much easier to see some of the characteristics of the manuscripts used. For example, in Section 311 of the Aland Synopsis, it can clearly be seen how the Codex Alexandrinus (A) has more or less the same words in Matthew 26:28 and Mark 14:24b whereas the other manuscripts have different words. As a result of this, it is possible to find that the variant readings can potentially have an impact on the commonality among the Synoptic Gospels.

However, the latest version of the Microsoft Internet Explorer (version 6) has produced an unexpected problem for the colour-coding described earlier. For normal typing, each character occupies a character-space. In order to display accents, the Greek font occupies a character-space and then uses the backspace character so that the accent is placed above the letter. For example, if we have ô, we actually have two character-spaces but the backspace character is used to place the accent above. What the browser does in the new version is to ignore the backspace character so that the accent is no longer above the required letter and the character-space used by the accent is actually displayed. This required a new solution to be found.
One of the options considered was to restrict viewing of the colour-coded text to specific versions of browsers. This was not considered acceptable since not everyone viewing the colour-coded text would have the same version of a browser. Consequently, a different product had to be found. Such a solution must also be commonly available and flexible enough to provide most of the facilities required in the colour-coding process. It was also important that the sections that had already been colour-coded, could readily be ported into the new system with a minimum of time and effort.

After a period of trial and error, one of the products found to be the most appropriate was Adobe Acrobat. With the version then available, Adobe Acrobat 5.05, it was possible to meet most of the requirements of colour-coding the Greek text, including the underlining of a word in a different colour from the word itself. The only drawback, which will cause it to be more time-consuming, is that the colour-coding has to be carried out in another program, like Microsoft WORD or FrontPage. Adobe Acrobat can then be used to convert the file into a PDF format. The widely available and free (in terms of cost) Adobe Acrobat Reader can display the file in exactly the way in which it was saved. Adobe Acrobat actually saves any required fonts, such as the Greek font with the document, so that there is no need for the user to install anything apart from the Acrobat Reader program itself. This is the format that has been used in the colour-coding that is included on a CD-ROM with this dissertation.

In addition to the colour-coding and the display of the variant readings, it also became clear that there is a need to visually distinguish the common elements and differences in the text. To achieve this, the NA reading is displayed on top of the table and for each of the witnesses, there is a tag showing the following:
Passion Narrative

For example, for Matthew 26:1b, the table (in black), has this appearance:

For each line, there is space for up to three variants to be tagged. Thus, it is possible to show up to three variants for each verse or part thereof. In the above example, the variant displayed is not found in N, A and B; the
verse is a lacuna in C; and in D, though the verse is present, the word is missing. With this visual display of the variant readings, it is possible to see, and also to gather statistics, identifying the trend in each of the witnesses under consideration.

**Detailed analysis of each Aland Section**

Each analysis of an Aland section consists of the following steps:

1. A summary of the section, with the differences in the three texts documented. When considering each of the texts, Matthew and Mark are generally considered together and are referred to as Matthew / Mark. This is due to the closeness of the texts of Matthew and Mark. However, significant differences between these two texts are also taken into account. In general, the differences between Matthew and Mark are taken from Hagner’s commentary on Matthew 14 – 28 (1995). The differences between Matthew / Mark and Luke are mostly from Bock’s Commentary on Luke 9:51 – 24:53 (1996).

2. An initial and brief colour-coding of the section is carried out in order to determine the degree of commonality in the texts. Since the complete colour-coding of some of the sections can take a lot of time, a simple one is carried out simply to provide an idea of how the texts from the Synoptics are related to each other. This colour-coding is not the final one and is only very basic in approach. For example, all the common words are colour-coded and also some of those with common roots.

3. The variant readings in each of the three gospels have been analysed. These variant readings are those listed in the critical apparatus of the Aland *Synopsis*
and also the Nestle Aland, 27th Edition, *Novum Testamentum Graece*. It is understood that not all of the variant readings are included in the list, but it is assumed that the most important are. Since some of the witnesses have lacunae, like C with Luke 22:19 – 23:25 missing, this has to be taken into consideration when analysing the colour-coding.

4. For three sections that are considered as a separate chapter in the thesis, an in-depth analysis of the texts is carried out and written down. In these sections, observations about the differences in the texts and the variant readings are fully documented. The sections that have been included in this way are: (1) Section 330 – Gethsemane, (2) Section 332 – Jesus Before the Sanhedrin, and (3) Section 347 – The Death of Jesus. These sections have issues that are considered worthy of further exploration and analysis.

5. Commentaries and other references are consulted and the significant arguments and comments are also written down. However, because the work of R.E. Brown (1994) *The Death of the Messiah* is so detailed in the Passion Narrative, it has been referenced the most. At the time of writing, Brown mentioned his intention of consulting every available reference in order to cover the widest possible material on the subject. In his preface he writes, “no previous work has required research so lengthy or a bibliography so ample” (1994: vii).

Once the detailed analysis has been completed, all the variants are extracted from each of the sections and grouped into what constitutes the chapter entitled “Observations”. For each section, the variants are tabulated. Section 305 provides an example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA$^{27}$ Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:3</td>
<td>oι ἁρχιερεῖς καὶ oι πρεσβύτεροι</td>
<td>Various Witnesses: add either oι γραμματεῖς or oι φαρισαῖοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{R}$, A, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:2</td>
<td>ἔσται θόρυβος</td>
<td>A: Order of the words is reversed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: $\mathfrak{K}$, B, C and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5

By showing the support for the NA$^{27}$ text and also the variant readings, it has facilitated the analysis through the observation of the pattern displayed. For example, an observation made is that in the majority of cases, the text of NA$^{27}$ is supported by B.
Passion Narrative
Chapter 4

Detailed Analysis of Sections

Section 330: Gethsemane


This scene of Jesus praying in the garden of Gethsemane is one of the best known in his earthly ministry. An examination of the texts of Matthew, Mark and Luke reveals that Luke’s account of the prayer of Jesus does not contain as many details as those of Matthew and Mark. However, Matthew and Mark share much in common. This has caused several scholars to ask questions about possible sources. Bock (1996: 1753) writes:

The passage’s sources are much discussed, with two resulting options: an appeal to additional sources or the view that Luke has rewritten either Mark 14:32-42 or Matt. 26:36-46 in a more concise form.

Bock (1996: 1754) also lists ten major differences between Luke and Matthew/Mark. These differences are:

1. Both Matthew and Mark mention that the place Jesus goes to pray is called Gethsemane, whereas Luke only says that he goes to the Mount of Olives to pray, as he usually does.

2. Matthew and Mark say that Jesus goes to pray and simply asks the three disciples to stay there and wait until he comes back. However, in Luke, Jesus asks the disciples with him to pray that they will not come into temptation
and then goes to pray. This warning of the temptation is repeated in 22:46. Matthew (26:41) and Mark (14:38) have this warning only after the first time he goes away to pray.

3. Luke does not provide the names of the disciples who accompany him to the Mount of Olives to pray but both Matthew (26:37) and Mark (14:33) mention that the disciples are Peter, James and John (the two sons of Zebedee, in Matthew).

4. Both Matthew (26:37-38) and Mark (14:33-34) mention that Jesus becomes agitated and is grieved before he goes away from the disciples to pray. He also displays his emotion when he comes back and sees them sleeping. These are missing in Luke.

5. Luke (22:41) is the only one to give an idea of the distance that Jesus goes away from the disciples to pray (a stone’s throw), whereas Matthew (26:39) and Mark (14:35) say only that he goes a little further from the disciples. Luke (22:41) is the only one to mention that Jesus kneels down to pray. Matthew (26:39) writes that Jesus throws himself on the ground. (Note: NIV translates this as “he fell with his face to the ground”. Evans (2001: 410) mentions that a better translation is simply, “fell on his face”. Mark (14:35) also writes that Jesus throws himself to the ground. Evans (2001: 410) translates this as, “he fell on the ground”).

6. Luke uses direct speech for the prayer of Jesus, whereas both Matthew and Mark use a mixture of direct and indirect speech for the prayer.
7. The content of Luke 22:43-44 is unique to Luke. There Jesus is said to be helped by angels and his sweat is like drops of blood. (Note: Among scholars, dispute about the originality of these two verses is very widespread. Those who deny the originality of these verses include Fitzmyer, Nolland, Ehrman, Soards and Westcott).

8. When Jesus comes back after his first prayer in Matthew (26:40) and Mark (14:37), he addresses Peter only. However, in Luke (22:45-46), he is found to be speaking to all of the disciples present.

9. Matthew (26:41) and Mark (14:38) report Jesus saying to Peter that though the spirit is willing, the flesh is weak. This is not found in Luke at all.

10. Matthew writes about Jesus going away from the disciples to pray three times (26:39, 42, 44). Mark differs slightly from Matthew. In contrast, Luke has only one prayer (22:41-43).

Nolland (1993: 1081-1082) comments that though Luke’s account of this prayer is basically the same as that of Mark, there are a lot of differences among them. He further states (Nolland, 1993: 1081):

No consensus has emerged as to whether Luke has severely edited his Markan source or is dependent upon another source here (perhaps with some secondary dependence on Mark and certainly with some editing of his own).
Hagner (1995: 780-781), coming from the perspective that Matthew has used Mark as his source, looks at the differences between Matthew and Mark. He mentions that Matthew follows Mark quite closely and then gives a list of differences:

1. The major omissions of Matthew from Mark’s text:
   a. In verse 39, ἵνα εἰ δύνατόν ἐστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἢ ὥρα
   b. In verse 39 also, πάντα δύνατά σοι
   c. In the same verse, he does not use the Aramaic word, Ἄββα
   d. In verse 40, he does not have the first question to Peter, Σίμων, καθεύδεις;
   e. In verse 43, he omits the statement, καὶ οὐκ ἠδείσαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ.
   f. In verse 45, “Matthew omits Mark’s somewhat puzzling ἀπέχει, it is enough (Mark 14:41)” (Hagner, 1995: 780).

2. Matthew has the following additions to Mark’s text:
   a. In verse 36, he adds, μετ’ αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
   b. At the end of the same verse, he adds ἀπελθόν ἐκεῖ.
   c. In verse 38, and also in verse 40, he has μετ’ ἐμοῦ after the verb γρηγορεῖτε.
   d. In verse 39, he uses Πάτερ μου instead of Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ.
   e. In verse 40, he adds πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς “avoiding Mark’s slightly abrupt syntax” (Hagner, 1995: 781).
   f. In verse 42, he adds ἐκ δεύτερου to indicate specifically the second time Jesus goes away to pray.
g. In the same verse, he provides the content of the prayer Πάτερ μου, εἰ ὁ δύναται τὸ τοῦ παρελθέν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πίω, γενηθῆτω τὸ θέλημά σου, whereas Mark simply says that προσήχετο τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἴπών. In verse 44, Matthew uses this phrase from Mark to indicate the third prayer.

h. In verse 45, he again adds πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς “thereby bringing about parallelism with v40” (Hagner, 1995: 781).

3. Matthew’s substitutions for Mark’s words:

a. In verse 37, he replaces the specific names with καὶ τοὺς δύο γιους Ζεβεδεάιου.

b. In the same verse, he changes ἐκθαμβεῖσαι to λυπεῖσαι.

c. In verse 39, he substitutes Mark’s τῆς γῆς for πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.

d. In verse 45, he uses ἤγγικεν instead of Mark’s ἠλθεν.

Marshall (1978: 828-829) gives some of the differences that he sees between Luke and Matthew / Mark. He comments that Luke’s account of the prayer on the Mount of Olives is much simpler in construction and content than Mark’s. Then, he briefly discusses the possible sources that Luke may have used:

But the question of the interpretation of the narrative cannot be isolated from that of its sources. This is heightened by the textual uncertainties of vs. 43-44, which, if genuine, stress the real conflict in the heart of Jesus that is overcome by heavenly help and his own persevering prayer; in general commentators find that the words fit in with Luke’s thought, while textual critics point to the very strong textual evidence against them. If they are original, they may be in whole or part the work of Luke. But this point is related to whether Luke is here dependent on Mk. or upon another source. Since Luke had Mk. before him in
any case, the question is not easy to answer. It is further complicated by the great uncertainty regarding the origin of Mark’s narrative: 1. successive redactions of a primitive narrative; 2. combination of two parallel sources; 3. Marcan creation on basis of isolated fragments of tradition. Moreover, we have a separate tradition about the incident in Heb. 5:7f. The disentangling of this problem is beyond our province here. … if a simpler narrative lies behind Mk., the possibility that Luke has been influenced by a variant form of this tradition cannot be ruled out.
Then Jesus went with them to a place called Gethsemane; and he said to his disciples, "Sit here while I go over there and pray." 37 He took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be grieved and agitated. 38 Then he said to them, "I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and stay awake with me." 39 And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed, "My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not what I want but what you want." 40 Then he came to the disciples and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, "So, could you not stay awake with me one hour? 41 Stay awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." 42 Again he went away for the second time and prayed, "My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, your will be done." 43 Again he came and found them sleeping, for their eyes were heavy. 44 So leaving them again, he went away and prayed for the third time, saying the same words. 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. 46 Get up, let us be going. See, my betrayer is at hand."

Table 4.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Notes</th>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSION NARRATIVE</td>
<td>Matthew 26:36 - 46</td>
<td>Then Jesus went with them to a place called Gethsemane; and he said to his disciples, &quot;Sit here while I go over there and pray.&quot; Then he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be grieved and agitated. Then he said to them, &quot;I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and stay awake with me.&quot; And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed, &quot;My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not what I want but what you want.&quot; Then he came to the disciples and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, &quot;So, could you not stay awake with me one hour? Stay awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.&quot; Again he went away for the second time and prayed, &quot;My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, your will be done.&quot; Again he came and found them sleeping, for their eyes were heavy. So leaving them again, he went away and prayed for the third time, saying the same words. Then he came to the disciples and said to them, &quot;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. Get up, let us be going. See, my betrayer is at hand.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 36,
  - μετ’ αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς χορὸν λεγόμενον Γεθσεμανὶ καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καθάπερ αὐτοῦ ἦς [οὗ] ἀπελθὼν ἔκει προσεύξῳμαι. 37 καὶ παραλαβὼν τῶν Πέτρου καὶ τοὺς δύο γυνῶν Ζεβεδαίου ἥραξεν λυπεῖος καὶ ἀσημοενὶ. 38 τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περίλυπος ἔστω ἢ ψυχή μου ἔως θανάτου· μείνατε ὦδε καὶ γρηγορεῖ μετ’ ἐμοῦ. 39 καὶ προελθὼν μικρῶν ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ προσευξόμενος καὶ λέγων, Πάτερ μου, εἰ δύνατον εστίν, παρελθέω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τούτον· πλὴν ὡς ἡ ἐκείνη ἀλλ’ ὡς σύ. 40 καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ εὐρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεδούσας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ὕποιες ὡς ἔσχεσας μίαν ἄραν γρηγορῆσαι μετ’ ἐμοῦ; 41 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύξεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεύμα πρόδοσον ἢ δὲ σάρξ ἀσθενής. 42 πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου ἀπέλθει προσημέντα λέγων, Πάτερ μου, εἰ οὐ δύναται τούτο παρέλθειν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτό πώς, γενθήσετι τὸ θέλημα σου. 43 καὶ ἐλθὼν πάλιν εἶδεν αὐτοὺς καθεδούσας, ἤσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβηρημένοι. 44 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπέλθει προσημέντα ἐκ τρίτου τῶν αὐτῶν λόγων εἰπὼν πάλιν. 45 τότε ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθεδούσα [τὸ] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπέσεις· ἢδον ἡγικεῖν ἢ ὡρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται εἰς χείρας ἀμαρτωλῶν. 46 ἐγείρεσθαι ἀγωμέν· ἢδον ἡγικεῖν ὁ παραδίδος με.

Then Jesus went with them to a place called Gethsemane; and he said to his disciples, "Sit here while I go over there and pray." Then he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be grieved and agitated. Then he said to them, "I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and stay awake with me." And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed, "My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not what I want but what you want." Then he came to the disciples and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, "So, could you not stay awake with me one hour? Stay awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Again he went away for the second time and prayed, "My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, your will be done." Again he came and found them sleeping, for their eyes were heavy. So leaving them again, he went away and prayed for the third time, saying the same words. 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. Get up, let us be going. See, my betrayer is at hand."
is not the one that has the support of four out of the five witnesses (excluding the papyri) considered. Hagner (1995: 779) states that this variant reading is probably due to “the influence of the Markan parallel”. \(\text{\textbullet} \) and \(\text{C}^*\) do not have the word \(\alphaυτ\omega\) after \(\kappaα\thetaισα\tauε\).

- \([\omega]\) (before \(\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\lambda\theta\dot{\omega}ν\)) – \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{53}\)}\) and A have \(\omegaυ\ \tilde{\alpha}ν\), \(\text{\(\mathit{K}\)}\) and \(\text{\(\mathit{C}\)}\) omit the word altogether, and \(\text{\(\mathit{D}\)}\) has \(\tilde{\alpha}ν\).

- \(\epsilonκ\epsilonι\ \pi\rho\sigma\sigmaε\upiota\xiω\mu\alphaι\) – \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{53}\)}\), \(\text{\(\mathit{K}\)}\) and \(\text{\(\mathit{B}\)}\) support the text of \(\text{\(\mathit{NA}^{27}\)}\) whereas A and C have the reverse order of the words, \(\pi\rho\sigma\sigmaε\upiota\xiω\mu\alphaι\ \epsilonκ\epsilonι\).

- \(\checkmark\) In verse 38,
  - \(\delta\dot{\omega}c\ \kappaαι\ \gamma\rho\eta\gamma\rho\omega\varepsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\) – \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{37}\)}\) has an additional \(\delta\epsilon\) in front of this phrase.

- \(\checkmark\) In verse 39,
  - \(\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\dot{\omega}ν\) – \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{53}\)}\), \(\text{\(\mathit{A}\)}\), \(\text{\(\mathit{C}\)}\) and \(\text{\(\mathit{D}\)}\) have \(\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\dot{\omega}ν\), and the \(\text{\(\mathit{NA}^{27}\)}\) text is the same as that of the manuscripts \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{37.45}\)}\) and \(\text{\(\mathit{B}\)}\).

- \(\Pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\) – \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{53}\)}\) does not have \(\mu\alphaυ\) after it. In the critical apparatus of the Aland \(\text{\(\mathit{Synopsis}\)}\), it indicates that this makes the reading of Matthew parallel to that of Luke. Hagner (1995: 780) comments that this is “by the probable influence of the parallel in Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42”.

- \(\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{a}\acute{t}ω\) – \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{53}\)}\) and \(\text{\(\mathit{B}\)}\) have \(\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{a}\acute{t}ω\), an alternative form of the aorist, with no difference in meaning.

- \(\checkmark\) In verse 40,
  - \(\kappaαι\ \epsilonι\rho\iota\acute{s}ε\kappaει\) – In \(\text{\(\mathit{D}\)}\) \(\alphaυτ\omega\) precedes this phrase.

- \(\pi\alpha\chi\acute{o}\acute{s}α\tauε\) - A reads \(\pi\alpha\chi\acute{o}\acute{s}α\) and the Aland \(\text{\(\mathit{Synopsis}\)}\) critical apparatus has a comment that this variant makes the reading parallel to Mark 14:37. \(\text{\(\mathit{G}^{37}\)}\) has \(\pi\alpha\chi\acute{o}\acute{s}α\nu\tauεs\) instead.
In verse 41,
- εἰσέλθητε – P37 has ἐλθητε. The Aland Synopsis flags this variant reading as making this verse parallel to Mark 14:38.

In verse 42,
- ἀπελθῶν – P37 does not have this word.
- λέγων – B does not have the word λέγων.
- Πάτερ – P37 does not have μου after it.

In verse 43,
- πάλιν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς – The order of these words differs in A which reads εὗρεν αὐτοὺς πάλιν. The reading of NA27 is supported by Ξ, B, C, and D.

In verse 44,
- πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσημέχατο – This reading is also that of Ξ, B, C, and D. However, A reads ἀπελθὼν προσημέχατο πάλιν whereas P37 has only the two words ἀπελθὼν προσημέχατο.
- ἐκ τρίτου – These words are not found in P37, A and D.
- εἰπὼν – A, C and D do not contain πάλιν after it and the text of NA27 is supported by P37, Ξ and B. Hagner (1995: 775) argues:

πάλιν, the last word of the Greek sentence, may by different punctuation become the first word of the next sentence (ν45), thereby avoiding the awkwardness of two occurrences of the word in the same sentence. Many witnesses (A C D W...), on the other hand, omit this πάλιν altogether, in order to avoid the repetition of the word.

In verse 45,
- μαθητᾶς – D has an additional αὐτοῦ after this word.
• λοιπόν – B and C do not have τὸ in front whereas NA²⁷ has the same reading as ℃³⁷, A and D.

• έδω ήγγικεν – B has the additional word γὰρ between these two words.

Mark 14:32 - 42

They went to a place called Gethsemane; and he said to his disciples, "Sit here while I pray." 33 He took with him Peter and James and John, and began to be distressed and agitated. 34 And he said to them, "I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and keep awake." 35 And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. 36 He said, "Abba, Father, for you all things are possible; remove this cup from me; yet, not what I want, but what you want." 37 He came and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, "Simon, are you asleep? Could you not keep awake one hour?" 38 Keep awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." 39 And again he went away and prayed, saying the same words. 40 And once more he came and found them sleeping, for their eyes were very heavy; and they did not know what to say to him. 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. 42 Get up, let us be going. See, my betrayer is at hand."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ἴσωμα Γεθσημανὶ καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Καθίσατε ὅδε ἕως προσεύξωμαι. 33 καὶ παραλαμβάνειν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ιωάννην μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡρέτα ἐκθαμβίζεται καὶ ἀδημονεῖν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περίλυπος ἔστην ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως γενάκια: μείνατε ὅδε καὶ γηρηγορεῖτε. 35 καὶ προελθὼν μικρῶν ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ προσῆξετο ἵνα εἰ δύνατόν ἔστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, 36 καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἁββά ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δύνατά σου: παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τούτο ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ ἀλλ’ οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλα τί οὖ, καὶ ἐρχεται καὶ εὐρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεδοὺντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σίμωνι, καθεδείεις: οὐκ ἴσχυσας μίαν ἡμέραν γηρηγορήσαι, 38 γηρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύξεσθε, ὅνα μὴ ἔληστε εἰς περισσόν τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σάρξ ἀθενής, καὶ πάλιν ἀπέλθων προσήξατο τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον εἰπών, 40 καὶ πάλιν ἔλθων ἐλεύθερον αὐτοὺς καθεδούντας, ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβρανόμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν τί ἀποκρίθωσιν αὐτῶ. 41 καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθεδέεται τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἠλθε· ἡ ὥρα, ιδοὺ παραδίδοσιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν, 42 ἐγείρεσθε ἀνωμέν· ιδοὺ ὁ παραδίδος με ἡγγικεν.</td>
<td>They went to a place called Gethsemane; and he said to his disciples, &quot;Sit here while I pray.&quot; 33 He took with him Peter and James and John, and began to be distressed and agitated. 34 And he said to them, &quot;I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and keep awake.&quot; 35 And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. 36 He said, &quot;Abba, Father, for you all things are possible; remove this cup from me; yet, not what I want, but what you want.&quot; 37 He came and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, &quot;Simon, are you asleep? Could you not keep awake one hour?&quot; 38 Keep awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.&quot; 39 And again he went away and prayed, saying the same words. 40 And once more he came and found them sleeping, for their eyes were very heavy; and they did not know what to say to him. 41 He came a third time and said to them, &quot;Are you still sleeping and taking your rest? Enough! The hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. 42 Get up, let us be going. See, my betrayer is at hand.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Textual Notes: The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 32,
  - For τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ D has the word αὐτοῖς. The Aland Synopsis comments that this makes this verse in Mark parallel to Luke 22:40.
  - προσεύξομαι – D reads προσεύξομαι instead.

- In verse 33,
  - Ἰάκωβον and Ἰωάννην – Ν, C and D do not have the article τῶν in front of the proper names. The NA\textsuperscript{27} text indicates that the inclusion of the article is uncertain and these are printed within square brackets. The critical apparatus also indicates that A and B include the article before the proper names.
  - ἄδημοιεῖν – D\* has the reading ἀκηδειμοιεῖν instead.

- In verse 34,
  - καλ – D has τότε in its place and makes this phrase parallel to that in Matthew 26:38.

- In verse 35,
  - προελθὼν – is the reading of Ν, and B whereas A, C and D have the word προελθὼν instead. It is worth noting that the editing committee has chosen a reading which has less support but this makes the texts of Matthew 26:39 and Mark 14:35 more similar.
  - ἔπιπτεν – A and C use ἔπεσεν whereas D has the words ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον and this, according to the Aland Synopsis, makes the verse parallel to Matthew 26:39 at this particular place.
  - ένα εἰ δυνατὸν ἔστιν παρέλθῃ - D reads εἰ δυνατὸν ἔστιν ἣνα παρέλθῃ instead.
  - ὁρα – D also has the additional word αὕτη after.
In verse 36,
- δυνατά σοι - D follows with είσων.
- παρένεγκε - Ν, A and C read παρένεγκαι instead.
- τὸ ποτήριον τούτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ - D has a different order: τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.
- For οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλα τί σὺ D reads οὐχ ὁ ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλα ὁ σὺ Θέλεις.

In verse 37,
- ἵσχυσας - D uses the word ἵσχυσαι and is the same as in Matthew 26:40.

In verse 38,
- ἐλήθη - Ν², A, C and D have the word, εἰσέλθητε which makes it closer to that used in Matthew 26:41 and Luke 22:46. The NA²⁷ text is supported only by Ν* and B. This provides a good example of the editorial committee applying the text-critical principle that manuscripts are to be weighed, not counted.

In verse 39,
- τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν - D does not have this phrase.

In verse 40,
- πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὑρέν αὐτοῦς - This reading is supported by Ν, B and D. A and C read ὑποστρέψαι εὑρέν αὐτοὺς πάλιν.
- αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί - A and D read οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν.
- καταβαρυνόμενοι - D uses καταβαρυμένοι, Ν* has καταβεβαρμένοι, whereas C has βεβαρμένοι (used in Matthew 26:43).

In verse 41,
- τὸ λοιπὸν - A, C and D do not have the article and, according to the Aland Synopsis, this makes the reading parallel to that of Matthew 26:45. While the
critical apparatus flags this variant as a parallel, it is interesting to note that the article is in the Matthew text but within square brackets.

- ἀπέχειν ἧλθεν – D contains τὸ τέλος καὶ between the two words.
- τὰς χεῖρας – A does not have the definite article.

➢ In verse 42,
- ἠγγίκεν – K and C use the aorist ἠγγίσεων instead of the perfect tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ Ὀρος τοῦ Ἑλαιῶν, ἦκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί. 40 γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου ἐπίνειν αὐτοῖς, Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσέλθησιν εἰς πειρασμῶν. 41 καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεστάθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ ἁλῶν βολήν καὶ θεῖς τὰ γόνατα προσήχετο 42 λέγων, Πάτερ, εἰ βούλεις παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποιήμαν ἀπ' ἑμοῦ πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σω τιν γινέσθω. 43 ὃθεν δὲ αὐτῷ ἠγγέλος ἀπ' ὀφρανῶν ἐνυπαγόμενον αὐτῶν. 44 καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρώσαν αὐτὸς ὡσεὶ ἱδρώματος καταβὰλλοντος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. 45 καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἔλθων πρὸς τοὺς μαθηταίς ἐφευ γιομένους αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, 46 καὶ ἐπίνειν αὐτοῖς. Τί καθεδόθη; ἀνασταντες προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθησι εἰς πειρασμῶν.</td>
<td>He came out and went, as was his custom, to the Mount of Olives; and the disciples followed him. 40 When he reached the place, he said to them, &quot;Pray that you may not come into the time of trial.&quot; 41 Then he withdrew from them about a stone’s throw, knelt down, and prayed. 42 &quot;Father, if you are willing, remove this cup from me; yet, not my will but yours be done.&quot; 43 Then an angel from heaven appeared to him and gave him strength. 44 In his anguish he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down on the ground. 45 When he got up from prayer, he came to the disciples and found them sleeping because of grief, and he said to them, &quot;Why are you sleeping? Get up and pray that you may not come into the time of trial.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Textual Notes**: The variant readings in this passage are:

➢ In verse 39,
- ἐπορεύθη - D has ἐπορεύετο.

➢ In verse 40,
- τοῦ τόπου - D lacks the definite article.
• εἰσελθεῖν – D reads εἰσέλθητε, whereas B* does not have the word at all.

➢ In verse 41,

• καὶ αὐτὸς - D has αὐτός δὲ instead.
• προσηύχετο – D has προσεύχετο, whereas Ῥ75 and Ξ have προσεύχατο.

➢ In verse 42,

• παρένεγκε - A has παρένεγκειν.
• τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον – A has the reading τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, whereas Ξ* has τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο. The reading of NA27 is supported by Ῥ75, Ξ2, B and D.
• εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μή τὸ θέλημά μου ἄλλα τὸ σὸν γινέσθω. – The order of the words in D differs from the other witnesses and it does not have πλὴν. It reads μή τὸ θέλημά μου ἄλλα τὸ σὸν γινέσθω εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.

➢ Verses 43 and 44,

The Aland Synopsis indicates that these two verses are most probably not original. This omission is supported by Ῥ60vid, Ῥ75, Ξ1, A, and B.

COMMENTS

This section contains several important differences between Matt / Mark and Luke. An analysis of these differences may contribute to the clarification of some of the textual and source issues. As a basis for this analysis, the ten differences provided by Bock (1996: 1754), and listed at the beginning of this section, will be considered here.
1. Place of Prayer (Line 7)

Matthew (26:36) and Mark (14:32) provide the name of the place where Jesus goes to pray; namely, Gethsemane. Luke simply says that Jesus goes, as he usually does, to the Mount of Olives. Hagner (1995: 782) comments that Gethsemane is a transliteration of a Hebrew word which means an oil press. He also says that it is probably an olive orchard and located on the lower slopes of the Mount of Olives. Evans (2001: 408) gives further information on the place by saying that the Mount of Olives “was traditionally a place of prayer (Ezek 11:23; 2 Sam 15:32), and it was the place where God would appear in judgment (Zech 14:4)”. Bock (1996: 1756) mentions that Luke “omits the reference to Gethsemane, perhaps because he frequently lacks Semitic terms”. Brown (1994: 148-149) also suggests that Luke does not use the name because this is “consonant with his avoidance of exotic Semitic names and expressions”.

Note: This in itself is not enough to argue that Luke is using another source here. Bock (1996: 1757) suggests that together with the other differences, there is much evidence for Luke to have been working with another source for this pericope. He further writes: “the reference is too brief to appeal to a separate source, especially since Luke tends to have unspecified locale”.

2. Advice to Pray (Lines 13-14, 43-45)

Luke (22:40) says that Jesus asks his disciples to pray so that they will not come into temptation before he himself goes away from them to pray. This advice is repeated in Luke 22:46. Matthew (26:41) and Mark (14:38) have this advice only at
the end of Jesus’ first prayer. Bock emphasises the importance for the disciples to pray in this instance (1996: 1757):

Jesus fears that the disciples will deny him, a very real danger, since Satan wants to sift them like wheat. This is more than a trial. Satan is trying to lead them to defect. Prayer will protect them from unfaithfulness and will encourage them to faithfulness and perseverance. Prayer is important because it expresses a need for God, a desire to depend on him and to rest in his care. This attitude is what the disciples need in the face of these difficult moments. In fact, in this context the present imperative Προσεύχεσθε suggests that this is to be a constant attitude, since Jesus repeats the call to pray in 22:46. ... The way to faithfulness in the midst of hostile rejection of Christ is a dependent spirit that communes with God.

While Luke’s emphasis before Jesus goes away to pray is an advice for his disciples to pray for themselves, Matthew (26:38) and Mark (14:34) stress the need to watch: γρηγορεῖτε. This is also the instruction before they are asked to pray that they do not enter into temptation. Gundry (1993: 854) writes that the disciples are given the instruction to keep awake and watch on his behalf so that Jesus may devote himself completely to pray “through his emotional distress”. He further says, referring to verse 42, that Jesus wants to know about the arrival of Judas so that he can go and meet him. Hagner (1995: 783) argues that Jesus is asking for his disciples’ moral support so that he does not have to face this difficult time on his own. He also finds a parallel to this instruction in the night of vigil referred to in Exodus 12:42. Nolland (1993: 1083) states that Jesus is asking his disciples to pray so that “in the coming crisis the disciples may be spared troubles that take them beyond their capacity to cope”.
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3. Names of the Disciples (Lines 15-16)

Matthew and Mark provide the names of the disciples who accompany Jesus, but Luke does not. There is also the distinction between Mark, who gives all three names, and Matthew, who simply speaks of Peter and the two sons of Zebedee. It is interesting to note that there are nine references to the sons of Zebedee in the Synoptic Gospels:

Matthew: 4:21, 10:2, 20:20, 26:37, 27:56
Mark: 1:19, 3:17, 10:35
Luke: 5:10

Of these occurrences, Matthew has two of these as part of the calling of the Twelve (Matthew 4:21 and 10:2), Mark has two as well (Mark 1:19 and 3:17) and the only reference in Luke is in verse 5:10. Further, it can be seen that Matthew uses this phrase more frequently to refer to James and John than the other Synoptic Gospels. Matthew has only one occurrence of the two brothers being named without reference to Zebedee (Matthew 17:1). However, such is not the case for Mark where there are three references to the sons of Zebedee (Mark 1:19, 3:17 and 10:35) but six references to James and John together (Mark 1:29, 5:37, 9:2, 10:41, 13:3, and 14:33). The situation is similar in Luke. He uses the names of the two brothers together in four instances (Luke 6:14, 8:51, 9:28 and 9:54). Thus, it is not surprising to note that Matthew is the only one to say that Peter is accompanied by the two sons of Zebedee and Mark actually provides all three names. Brown observes that Matthew, similar to what Mark is doing here, names the three disciples at the transfiguration. However, in this scene, Matthew considers that only Peter is important. “In v. 41 the Matthean Jesus will address Peter in the plural, for among the disciples only he has a representative role” (Brown, 1994: 148).
4. Grief of Jesus (Lines 18-21)

In Matthew (26:37 – 38) and Mark (14:33 – 34) there is mention of Jesus’ agony and grief as he goes away to pray. This show of emotion before prayer is not found in Luke. Brown (1994: 156) considers that this display of distress by Jesus is because “he foresees his disciples scandalised and scattered by his arrest and death, after they have betrayed and denied him. The very thought of this is enough to kill him, and he will ask God to be delivered from such a fate”. However, this is quite different in Luke. Brown says (1994: 157):

Luke offers no portrait of Jesus in distress; rather, very much in command, Jesus simply instructs his disciples to pray by way of an anticipating accompaniment to his own prayer. … In part this Lucan portrait is coloured by the desire to have Jesus in his passion revealed as a model to Christian sufferers and martyrs.

5. Jesus Goes Away to Pray (Lines 22-24)

There are two differences: (1) the distance Jesus goes away to pray, and (2) the way in which Jesus prays. Luke (22:41) says that Jesus goes a stone’s throw away from the disciples whereas Matthew (26:39) and Mark (14:35) only say that Jesus goes a bit further to pray. Bock (1994: 1758) suggests that the distance is a “figurative description of several yards” and he also comments that this is “an example of the narrative use of space to communicate emotion”. Brown (1994: 164) argues that, in Luke:

while that distance would allow the disciples still to have contact with Jesus, it is not possible to judge whether they would both have seen and heard him or just have seen him, and whether ‘stone’s throw’ implies less distance than indicated
by Mark’s ‘a little’ and thus solves for Luke how the disciples were able to know how Jesus prayed.

Then there is the description of how Jesus is praying. Luke says that Jesus kneels down to pray whereas Matthew / Mark state that he falls down on his face / to the ground to pray. Bock (1994: 1758) writes that Jesus kneels in humility before the Father and differs from the “common habit of standing for prayer”. Brown (1994: 165) comments:

By substituting “on his face” and by using the aorist tense for the verb, Matt 26:39 slightly softens Mark’s picture of Jesus’ distress. Matt did this previously in 26:37. Luke also softens the Marcan picture by having Jesus kneel, a position that is the more normal one for Christian prayer … Luke is interested in Jesus as a model of prayer for his future followers.

Note: Bock (1994: 1758) notes that the details that Luke provides, like the stone’s throw and kneeling to pray, suggests “the influence of an additional source or the presence of some editorial shortening or both”.

6. Direct / Indirect Speech for Prayer (Lines 27-30, 47-51, 57-59)

While Luke (22:42) uses direct speech for the prayer of Jesus, Matthew / Mark use a mixture of direct and indirect speech. The prayer of Luke is close to the direct speech of Mark 14:36. Mark has the Greek transliteration, \( \text{'Aββα} \), of the Aramaic word but Luke simply has \( \text{Πάτερ} \). Brown reports extensively on the scholarly discussions surrounding this Aramaic word. Here is his summary:

All three NT uses of \( \text{'Aββα} \) (Mark 14:36; Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15) seem to confirm it as an emphatic form used vocatively, since they accompany it with the Greek equivalent \( \text{ō πατήρ} \), a nominative used vocatively. … thus Jesus claimed a special, familiar relationship to God as his Father beyond the general
relationship postulated in contemporary Judaism. (Brown, 1994: 172) … we should note that Mark’s \( \text{Αββά} \) \( \text{ο πατήρ} \) has gone beyond the ipsissima verba of Jesus, for he certainly did not pray at the same time in Aramaic and Greek. It reflects an Aramaic prayer form that he probably did use, transliterated into Greek to be used in Christian prayers, and then finally translated for those who spoke only Greek – Matt and Luke, who drop Mark’s \( \text{Αββά} \), represent a further development where the foreign Semitic term is dispensed with in praying. That exactly the same formula appears in Gal and Rom suggests strongly that Mark has placed on Jesus’ lips a Hellenistic Christian prayer formula. (Brown, 1994: 175)

Evans argues that Jeremias’ picture of Jesus’ use of “Abba, Father” as representing the intimate way children address their fathers, has been strongly challenged in recent years. Barr argues (1988: 46):

> It is fair to say that \( \text{Αββά} \) in Jesus’ time belonged to a familiar or colloquial register of language. But in any case it was not a childish expression comparable to ‘Daddy’: it was more a solemn, responsible, adult address to a Father.

Many scholars now think that this cry of “Abba, Father” by Jesus “is a mark of filial obedience. Faced with a severe testing, Jesus cried out \textit{Abba! Father!} and then proclaimed his willingness to seek God’s will, not his own” (Evans, 2001: 413).

In the prayer that they attribute to Jesus, Luke and Mark use the phrase \( \text{παρένεγκε} \, \text{τούτο} \, \text{τὸ} \, \text{ποτήριον} \, \text{ἀπ’} \, \text{ἐμοῦ}. \) Matthew uses a slightly different phrase \( \text{παρελθάτω} \, \text{ἀπ’} \, \text{ἐμοῦ} \, \text{τὸ} \, \text{ποτήριον} \, \text{τούτο}. \) Bock mentions that the debate on this subject is around the use of the two words – Luke / Mark \( \text{παρένεγκε} \) and Matthew \( \text{παρελθάτω}. \) He writes (1994: 1760):
It seems better to read Matthew as being more exact here, with Mark and Luke summarizing. In other words, Jesus is requesting a potential alteration in God’s plan, where the cup of wrath is dispensed with – but only if it is possible and within God’s will. … He makes known the desire of his heart to God, but his primary concern is to accomplish God’s will.

Nolland summarises his argument by saying (1993: 1084):

Whatever we make of the request for the removal of the cup, what stands finally as fundamental for Jesus is the will of God his Father; to this he commits himself. Over against his own will, which has come to expression in the initial request, he sets this more basic commitment.

**Note**: Nolland here suggests (1993: 1083):

If Mark is the source for the statement about the will of God, Luke has preferred to link with πλήν, ‘but / only/ yet/ nevertheless’ (as often), and has formulated the clause in a more abstract manner (cf. Acts 21:14; since the wording is so close to that of a clause of the Matthean form of the Lord’s Prayer [Matt 6:10], we must also reckon with the possibility that Luke is reflecting the language of his second source here).

Soards (1987: 71 – 72) argues that the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are due to the influence of “common oral prayer tradition”.


The indication, from the Aland Synopsis, is that these two verses are most probably not original. There has been much scholarly debate about them. Nolland (1993: 1080-1081) comments about the possibilities of these two verses:

The tradition was certainly known by the time of Justin Martyr. The arguments for and against inclusion are finely balanced. Both addition and removal are explicable in terms of arguments over Christology. Much of the language is
quite in line with Lukan use, but at the same time the material has an emotional
tone that is otherwise quite absent from the Lukan account of the Gethsemane
scene. The chiasmic structure of the Lukan account counts against the verses,
but not absolutely, since Luke appears to have inherited the chiasm and has
(slightly) disturbed it in other ways. After an earlier move in critical opinion
toward accepting the verses, the more recent trend has been to question their
presence in the original text of Luke. I have excluded them primarily on the
basis of the emotional tone of the verses and secondarily on the basis of the
chiasm.

Marshall, too, agrees with the fact that there are strong arguments both for
and against the omission of these two verses. He notes (1978: 831-832): “the
authorities that include the verses are a frequent Western combination, and those that
exclude them are old and diverse”. However, he concludes that the internal evidence
inclines us to accept the verses as original, but with very considerable hesitation”.
Bock (1996: 1755) argues that whether one sees these two verses as original or not,
there is a chiasmus from verse 22:40 to 22:46, with 22:43 being at the centre. This
chiasmus looks like this:

a  commands to pray (22:40b)
b  withdraws to pray (22:41a)
c  kneels to pray (22:41b)
d  prays (22:41c – 42)
e  is empowered by an angel (22:43)
d’  prays more earnestly (22:44)
c’  rises from prayer (22:45a)
b’  returns from prayer (22:45b)
a’  commands to pray (22:46)
He further says (1996: 1755):

The key theme is that God responds concretely to prayer by the faithful – an emphasis that is dependent on 22:43-44 being present, thus providing a structural symmetry that may suggest the longer text’s originality. A simpler chiasmus for the shorter text lacks any focus on divine provision and simply highlights prayer.

Ehrman and Plunkett (1983: 413) use the chiasmus argument to prove otherwise. Their chiasmus looks like this,

**Introduction** – Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, ἡκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί. (22:39)

A – γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου ἔστη αὐτοῖς, Προσεύχησθε μὴ εἰσέλθεῖν εἰς πείρασμόν. (22:40)

B – καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολῆν (22:41a)

C – καὶ θεῖς τὰ γόνατα (22:41b)

D – προσηύχησε τέλην, Πάτερ, εἰ βούλεις παρένεγκε τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω. (22:41c-42)

C’ – καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς (22:45a)

B’ – ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς (22:45b)

A’ – εὗρεν κοιμομένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχησθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πείρασμόν. (22:45c-46)

They conclude: “it should be clear that vv. 43-44 stand out from this pattern as an appendage, intruding into an otherwise clear and concise chiasmus” (Ehrman and Plunkett, 1983: 413). Brown states (1994: 181): “on purely textual grounds, because
of P⁶⁶ and P⁷⁵, I would judge that the weight of the evidence moderately favors omission”.

**Note:** Bock suggests (1996: 1764):

The absence of a parallel (in the other synoptic gospels) and the issue of Christology raised in the remark makes inclusion the more difficult reading, though the decision is not absolutely clear. With the inclusion of the verses, additional weight is given to the argument for the presence of a source, since the disjunction with 4:13 suggests that Luke is not emphasizing a point here.

Brown, after considering the various witnesses, concludes (1994:180-181):

The Alexandrian witnesses to the NT tend to omit it, while the Western, Caesarean, and Byzantine witnesses tend to include it. It was already absent from some copies of Luke in the late 2d cent., but also known to mid- and late-2d cent. church writers and translators.

He further points out (Brown, 1994:183):

Would a later Christian copyist have been more likely to add or to delete this passage? The question assumes that the action that led to the present textual situation was deliberate, for the passage is too long to have been omitted by accident. Moreover, the motivation for addition or deletion was probably theological, since it is unlikely that a copier of Luke omitted it simply because he did not find it in Matt or Mark; indeed in the latter part of the 2d. cent., when the passage was already known by some writers and ignored by others, all copyists may still not have had the three Gospels for comparison.
8. Peter or All Disciples Present (Line 41)

Here, Matthew (26:40) and Mark (14:37) mention that Jesus comes back after the first prayer and addresses Peter. In contrast, Luke says that Jesus speaks to the disciples who are present. Bock states (1996: 1762):

Luke’s broad reference here seems to summarize the exchanges with the disciples. In this respect, Luke is more compact. This verse may well represent a Lucan summarization and evaluation of the disciples’ exhaustion.

Note: Bock notes (1996: 1763): “despite these small differences, it is likely that at this point the source is the same. All agree that after the first moment of prayer, Jesus issues the warning”.

9. The Spirit and the Flesh (Lines 45-47)

Mark 14:38 and Matthew 26:41 both have the saying about the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak. This is not found in Luke.

10. Three Rounds of Prayers Against One in Luke

Matthew has three rounds of prayer, Mark has two rounds but has Jesus talking with the disciples at three different times between the two prayers. He does not have Jesus going away three times to pray but has “three points of contact with the disciples” (Bock, 1996: 1754). They start with the words, “and he said to …”. In verses 34 and 41, he is speaking to all of the disciples present and in verse 37, he is addressing Peter. On the other hand, Luke has only one round of prayer. Marshall considers the differences between Matthew / Mark and Luke in this prayer of Jesus and writes (1978: 827 - 831):

Such is the brief scene in Lk. It is simpler in construction and content than the similar scene in Mk. It is bracketed by the command to the disciples, which they
fail (at this stage) to keep, but which Jesus himself carries out. … Where Mark has the prayer of Jesus twice, once in indirect and once in direct speech, Luke has one simple statement in direct speech, which is largely parallel to Mk. 14:36.


Although Luke’s text here is parallel to Mark and (despite some stylistic vocabulary changes) is surely drawn from Mark, overall the Lucan passage has a distinctive thrust. In Mark/Matt Jesus’ prayer to the Father has received no detectable answer, and so Jesus will pray several more times. … In Luke the Mount of Olives prayer has been greatly truncated and leads smoothly into an equally truncated arrest … The shortened Lucan version, besides sparing the disciples, makes Jesus the dominant figure spotlighted in both the prayer and the arrest.

**OBSERVATIONS**

On the textual side, this section contains two important issues. The first one concerns the choice of text by the editing committee of the NA$^{27}$. The following observations have been made during the analysis of the variant readings for each pericope:

- **Matthew 26:36** – τοίς μαθηταῖς – Ν, A, C and D have the reading τοίς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ whereas the NA$^{27}$ text is supported only by B. The variant reading makes this phrase parallel to the text of Mark.
- **Matthew 26:39** – Πάτερ – $^53$ does not have μου after it. The critical apparatus of the Aland Synopsis notes that this variant reading makes this reading of Matthew parallel to that of Luke.
• Matthew 26:40 – ἵσχύσατε - A reads ἵσχύσας and the Aland Synopsis critical apparatus notes that this variant makes the reading parallel to Mark 14:37.

• Matthew 26:41 – εἰσέλθητε – P37 has ἔλθητε and the Aland Synopsis flags this variant reading as making the word parallel to that in Mark 14:38.

• Mark 14:34 – καὶ – D has τότε in its place and this makes the phrase parallel to that in Matthew 26:38.

• Mark 14:35 – προελθὼν – is the reading of Ψ and B whereas A, C and D have the word προσελθὼν instead. In this case, the editing committee has chosen to print a reading which makes the texts at Matthew 26:39 and Mark 14:35 more similar. This is in contrast with most cases where the reading chosen makes the texts of Matthew and Mark different. The common factor between this instance and that of Matthew 26:36 is that the readings chosen by the committee are supported by B.

• Mark 14:38 – ἔλθητε – Ψ, A, C and D have the word εἰσέλθητε which makes it closer to that used in Matthew 26:41 and Luke 22:46. The NA27 text is supported only by Ψ* and B. Here again, the choice of the reading appears to have been influenced by what B reads.

It can be argued from these observations of the variant readings that there has not been a consistent approach to choosing the more difficult reading. In this section, there are two cases, Matthew 26:36 and Mark 14:38, where the words chosen make the texts at Matthew and Mark different. There is one case, Mark 14:35, where the choice of the word actually makes the text of Mark parallel to that of Matthew. The words published by NA27 have been chosen on the principle that manuscripts are to be weighed, not counted. In this case, the readings of B have been given more weight that those of the other witnesses.
The second major issue in this section is the inclusion / omission of Luke 22:43-44. Although many scholars have written extensively about this, no absolute conclusion has yet been reached. For example, several scholars have used the chiasmus argument and yet reached opposite conclusions. The NA²⁷ prints these two verses in double square brackets to indicate that their originality is highly improbable. While some have argued that these verses are typical Lukan material, others have seen them as not being Lukan. In this instance, therefore, it can be seen that scholars have used the same data and yet reached very different conclusions. Nevertheless, scholars generally agree that Matthew and Mark are closer to each other than Luke.

Section 332: Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Peter’s denial)

Matthew 26: 57-68; Mark 14: 53-65; Luke 22: 54-71

Following his arrest, Jesus appears before the Sanhedrin. This represents the first step in Jesus’ condemnation and sentence to be crucified. This narrative also includes the denial of Jesus by Peter in Luke’s account. Jesus is portrayed as still in full control of what is happening. This is summarised by Bock (1996: 1775):

The trial proceeds in a focused way, with only one witness (Jesus), only one answer (his claim that he will sit at God’s right hand), and only one result (conviction). The leadership convicts Jesus on the basis of his own testimony.

This section demonstrates one of the problems that authors of Synopses face. In Mark and Matthew, the denial of Jesus by Peter appears only after the pericope in
the section. However, Luke places it right at the beginning of the narrative. The Aland Synopsis handles this somewhat awkwardly. It places the Mark / Matthew parallel to this incident in the next section whereas the Lukan narrative is included here. In general, the commentaries have the accounts of Mark and Matthew grouped as that of the Aland Synopsis. However, there are differences in how Luke is handled. Bock (1996) does it in the same way as Aland since he tends to use the Aland section as a guide for dividing Luke’s text into pericopes. However, Nolland (1993) and Marshall (1978) separate this section into Peter’s denial, the mockery of Jesus by the people and then, the appearance before the Sanhedrin.

In this section, the texts of Matthew and Mark are once more quite close to each other. Nolland writes about the main differences between Luke and Matthew / Mark (1993: 1092):

The sequence continues to parallel Mark, though Luke offers no equivalent to Mark’s report of the fleeing of all the disciples or of ‘a certain young man’ whom those who arrested Jesus tried also to take into custody. Also, having introduced Peter, Luke continues immediately with the denials rather than first reporting a hearing before the high priest (Luke’s version of this encounter is delayed until daybreak).

He then makes an interesting observation on the possibility of a source unique to Luke in this pericope. He further argues (1993: 1092):

It is relatively easy to account for most of the Lukan text as redaction of Mark 14:54, 66-72. There is, however, one good reason for thinking that this solution may be too simple. In Notes above, Luke 22:62 is accepted as part of Luke’s text. If this is right, then, since the wording is identical to Matt 26:75, the presence of this verse guarantees that Luke (and Matthew) had access to a separate account of the denial of Peter. This raises the possibility that Luke
22:61a is also dependent upon the source. Thus we cannot rule out the possibility that other distinctive features in Luke’s version of the individual denials are to be traced back to his second source (Matthew stays rather closer to Mark, so there is no possibility of characterizing the second source on the basis of shared features between Matthew and Luke).

Bock (1996: 1776) notes the following differences between Luke and Matthew/Mark:

1. Luke has only one appearance of Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Luke 22:66-71) whereas Mark has two (Mark 14:53, and Mark 15:1).

2. Luke does not have the accusation concerning the Temple (Mark 14:57-59).

3. The Sanhedrin does not directly condemn Jesus in Luke (Mark 14:64).

4. Luke has the account of Peter’s denial in one place (Luke 22:54-62) whereas Matthew / Mark have it in two sections (Matthew 26:58, 26:69-75; Mark 14:54, 14:66-72).


6. In Luke, the role of the slave girls in accusing Peter is less than the account of Matthew / Mark (Luke 22:56; Matthew 26:69,71; Mark 14:66, 69).

Bock also draws attention to the following (1996: 1776):
Another topic of much discussion is authenticity, with all of the following being questioned: the number of Jewish trials, the timing of Peter’s denials, the sequence of cock crowings, the possible sources of information about Jesus’ testimony, and the issue of the Sanhedrin’s not having power to give the death penalty. Most tend to view Luke’s account as more precise than Matthew’s or Mark’s.

Hagner (1995: 795-796) observes that Matthew follows Mark closely and that there is no lengthy addition or omission. He lists the following differences between Matthew and Mark:

1. The omissions of Matthew from the text of Mark are:
   a. In verse 57, Matthew does not refer to πάντες οἱ ἄρχεις (Mark 14:58).
   b. In verse 58, Matthew does not have “and he was warming himself at the fire” Mark 14:54), which is considered as an unnecessary detail.
   c. In verse 63, Hagner claims that the words τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ (Mark 14:61) are unnecessary in the high priest’s question.
   d. In verse 67, Matthew does not have the phrase “and to blindfold him” (Mark 14:65).

2. Hagner (1995: 795) argues that “several minor agreements with Luke against Mark (e.g., in vv 58, 63, 68) are most probably the result of the overlapping influence of oral tradition”.

3. He observes that for unknown reasons, in verses 60-63 there are mainly omissions whereas in verses 63-67 there are numerous additions to Mark’s text. So, the omissions of Matthew 26:60-63 from Mark’s text are:
a. In verses 60 and 61, Matthew does not have the two references to the testimony of the false witnesses being contradictory. Hagner (1995: 795) mentions that “Matthew in fact omits Mark’s reference to his accusers as ἐψευδομαρτύρον κατ’ αὐτὸς, ‘bearing false witness against him’, and his added ὄστερον, ‘finally’ (v60), distinguishes the two witnesses from the false witnesses just previously mentioned”.

b. In verse 61, he does not have the reference to the Temple as one that is made with hands τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον, and also the one built after three days, ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον, (Mark 14:58) which, according to Hagner, prepares “the way for the words about the temple to refer secondarily to the body of Christ and its resurrection” (Hagner 1995: 796).

c. In verse 63, καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν, Mark 14:61 has been omitted because Matthew considers this phrase as unnecessary since Jesus was silent.

4. Matthew has the following additions to Mark’s text:

a. In verse 57, Matthew provides the subject of those who led Jesus away, Οἱ κρατήσαντες. He also gives the name of the high priest Καϊάφας (Mark 14:53).

b. In verse 58, he adds ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος.

c. In verse 59, he adds the word (Mark 14:55), ψευδομαρτυρίαν.

d. In verse 61, he adds Δύναμι.

e. In verse 63, Matthew introduces the high priest’s question with Ἑξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰωάντος ἴνα ἔμην εἶπης (Mark 14:61).
Hagner (1995: 796) adds that that gives “a certain gravity to the important question that follows”.

f. In verse 64, he also has πλὴν λέγω ἵμιν which is said to be introducing the allusion to Daniel 7 (Hagner 1995: 796).

g. In verse 65, he adds the words ἐβλασφήμησεν and ἵδε νῦν (Mark 14:63).

h. In verse 67, Matthew has the additional phrases εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ and ἵμιν, Χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε; in verse 68.

5. Matthew’s substitution of Mark’s words are:

a. In verse 60, he uses δόο instead of Mark’s τινες (14:57).

b. In verse 63, he substitutes τοῦ θεοῦ for Mark’s τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ.

c. In verse 64, he uses Σὺ εἶπας instead of Mark’s ἔγω εἶμι.

d. In verse 65, Matthew substitutes τὰ ἰμάτια for Mark’s (14:63) τοὺς χιτῶνας.

e. In verse 66, Matthew has δοκεῖ instead of Mark’s φαίνεται (14:64).

f. In verse 67, he simplifies Mark’s (14:65) phrase οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτῶν ἔλαβον into οἱ δὲ ἐράπισαν.
Matthew 26:57 - 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καΐφαμ τὸν ἁρχιερέα, ὅπου οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι συνήχθησαν. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἤκολούθη ἀυτῷ ἀπὸ μακρῷ ἐως τῆς ἁλῆς τοῦ ἁρχιερέως καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἔσω ἐκάθεντο μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἱδέων τὸ τέλος. οἱ δὲ ἁρχιερεῖς καὶ τὸ συνεδρίον ὅλων ἔξῆσθον ψευδομαρτύρων κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅπως αὐτὸν θανατώσωσιν, καὶ οὐχ εἶρον πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων. ὑστερον δὲ προσελθόντες ὅδω εἶπαν, Οὕτως ἔφη, Σύναμεν καταλύσας τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδόμησας. καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἁρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνεται τί οὕτως σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐσίωσα, καὶ ὁ ἁρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωτικοῦ ἵνα ἥμιλν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ ἐήθης ὁ Ἱσραήλ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Σὺ εἶπας πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς διέθεσεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα καθίσῃς ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἔρχῃς ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. τότε ὁ ἁρχιερεὺς διέρρησεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ λέγων, ἑβασφημησας τί ἐπὶ χρείαν ἔχωμεν μαρτύρων; ἢν νῦν ἴδον θανάτου ἐστίν. ἤπειραν ἐν νομιμότητι τῆς βλασφημίας. τί ἴμην δοκεῖ; οἱ δὲ ἀποκριζόντες εἶπαν, Ἔνοχος ἦς ἀνατόμος ἐστίν. τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἐφέσωσαν λέγοντες, Προφήτευσον ἥμιν, Ἰησοῦ, τίς ἐστίν ο ναὸς σε; Προβλέπες τὸν και Μεσία! Ποίαν τούτων τῶν διδάσκων σε;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Those who had arrested Jesus took him to Caiaphas the high priest, in whose house the scribes and the elders had gathered. But Peter was following him at a distance, as far as the courtyard of the high priest; and going inside, he sat with the guards in order to see how this would end. Now the chief priests and the whole council were looking for false testimony against Jesus so that they might put him to death, but they found none, though many false witnesses came forward. At last two came forward and said, "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days.' " The high priest stood up and said, "Have you no answer? What is it that they testify against you?" But Jesus was silent. Then the high priest said to him, "I put you under oath before the living God, tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God." Jesus said to him, "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." Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "He has blasphemed! Why do we still need witnesses? You have now heard his blasphemy. What is your verdict?" They answered, "He deserves death." Then they spat in his face and struck him; and some slapped him, saying, "Prophesy to us, you Messiah! Who is it that struck you?"

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 57,
  - Καΐφαμ – D has the spelling of this proper noun as Καΐφαν.

- In verse 58,
  - ἀπὸ (before μακρόθεν) – Ν and C do not have this word.
In verse 59,

- οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς – A and C have καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι after this phrase. The NA$^{27}$ text is supported by Ξ, B and D.
- αὐτὸν θανατώσουσιν (subjunctive aorist) – C$^{2}$ and D reads αὐτὸν θανατώσουσιν (indicative future). A has a different word order, θανατώσουσιν αὐτὸν. The NA$^{27}$ text has the support of Ξ, B and C*vid.

In verse 60,

- καὶ οὐχ εὗρον πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων – Α, C$^{2}$ and D keeps the first word of the verse (καὶ) in the same place but the next two words (οὐχ εὗρον) are placed at the end of this sentence, καὶ πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων οὐχ εὗρον. Ξ, B and C support the reading of the NA$^{27}$ text.
- προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων – C reads ψευδομαρτύρων προσελθόντων but on the whole, the NA$^{27}$ text has the most support (Ξ, Α, B and D).
- δῶ – A, C and D have the additional word ψευδομάρτυρες after δῶ. Note: The reading of the NA$^{27}$ has the support of Ξ and B only.

In verse 61,

- Οὐτοῖς ἔφη – D has the reading τοῖς ἥκοισαμεν λέγοντα – this variant of D makes it closer to the text of Mark 14:58 as flagged by the Aland Synopsis.
- οἰκοδομήσαι – Ξ$^{2}$ and C have αὐτὸν in front of this word. A and D have the reading οἰκοδομήσαι αὐτὸν. Note: Only B supports the reading of NA$^{27}$ but the editorial committee has decided that this reading is more likely to be the original.

In verse 63,

- ὁ ἄρχιερεὺς – A, C and D have the verb ἀποκριθεὶς before this noun. Note: In this case as well, the NA$^{27}$ has the support of Ξ$^{2}$ and B only.
Passion Narrative

- Ἐξορκίζω – D has the word ὄρκίζω instead.
- τοῦ θεοῦ – C* has an additional τοῦ ζωντος placed after τοῦ θεοῦ.

➤ In verse 64,
- λέγω ὕμν – D has ὅτι after these two words.

➤ In verse 65,
- αὐτῷ λέγων – A and C*vid have an additional ὅτι after αὐτῷ λέγων, whereas N* has Ἰδε. The reading of NA27 is the same as N2, B, C2 and D.
- μαρτύρων – N has the word μαρτυρίων instead.
- τήν βλασφημίαν – A and C has an additional αὐτοῦ after this word. The NA27 text is supported by N, B and D.

➤ In verse 66,
- ἀποκριθέντες – D has the reading of ἀπεκρίθησαν πάντες καὶ.

➤ In verse 67,
- οί – D uses ἄλλοι instead.
- ἐράπισαν – D has an additional word at the end of the verse: αὐτῶν.
They took Jesus to the high priest; and all the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes were assembled. 54 Peter had followed him at a distance, right into the courtyard of the high priest; and he was sitting with the guards, warming himself at the fire. 55 Now the chief priests and the whole council were looking for testimony against Jesus to put him to death; but they found none. 56 For many gave false testimony against him, and their testimony did not agree. 57 Some stood up and gave false testimony against him, saying, "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands.' " 59 But even on this point their testimony did not agree. 60 Then the high priest stood up before them and asked Jesus, "Have you no answer? What is it that they testify against you?" 61 But he was silent and did not answer. Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One?" 62 Jesus said, "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.' " 63 Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "Why do we still need witnesses? 64 You have heard his blasphemy! What is your decision?" All of them condemned him as deserving death. 65 Some began to spit on him, to blindfold him, and to strike him, saying to him, "Prophesy!" The guards also took him over and beat him.

**Table 4.2.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Καὶ ἀπῆγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα, καὶ συνέρχονται πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. ⁵⁴ καὶ οἱ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακράθεν ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ἔως ἐσὼ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θερμαίνομενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. ⁵⁵ οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὁ λύον τὸ συνάγων ἐζήτουν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἠρώσκον. ⁵⁶ παλλότα γὰρ ἐφευδομαρτύροιν κατ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦσαν αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν. ⁵⁷ καὶ τινὲς ἀναστάτου ἐφευδομαρτύροιν κατ’ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες ⁵⁸ ὅτι Ὁμιλεῖ ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἑγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τούτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀλλὸν ἀρχιεροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω. ⁵⁹ καὶ οὐκ ἐντός ἦσαν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. ⁶⁰ καὶ ἀναστάτα ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσῳ ἐπήρωσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων, Οὐκ ἀποκρίνεται ὁ νόμος ὅτι οὗτος, καὶ ἐντός ἦσαν οἱ αὐτοὶ 
| They took Jesus to the high priest; and all the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes were assembled. 54 Peter had followed him at a distance, right into the courtyard of the high priest; and he was sitting with the guards, warming himself at the fire. 55 Now the chief priests and the whole council were looking for testimony against Jesus to put him to death; but they found none. 56 For many gave false testimony against him, and their testimony did not agree. 57 Some stood up and gave false testimony against him, saying, "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands.' " 59 But even on this point their testimony did not agree. 60 Then the high priest stood up before them and asked Jesus, "Have you no answer? What is it that they testify against you?" 61 But he was silent and did not answer. Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One?" 62 Jesus said, "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.' " 63 Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "Why do we still need witnesses? 64 You have heard his blasphemy! What is your decision?" All of them condemned him as deserving death. 65 Some began to spit on him, to blindfold him, and to strike him, saying to him, "Prophesy!" The guards also took him over and beat him.

Table 4.2.2
Textual Notes: The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 53,
  - τὸν ἂρχιερέα – A has the proper name Καίαφαν after, which makes this verse closer to that of Matthew 26:57.
  - συνέχονται πάντες – A and B have αὐτῷ between these two words, C has πρὸς αὐτὸν whereas the NA²⁷ text is supported by Ν and D.
  - οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς – A has the words in a different order, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, which is the order in Matthew 26:57.

- In verse 54,
  - ἔσω – D does not have this word.
  - συγκαθήμενος – D has καθήμενος instead.
  - καὶ θερμαινόμενος – D does not have the conjunction καὶ.

- In verse 55,
  - εἰς τὸ θανατώσαι – D has these two words ἵνα θανατώσουσιν.
  - ήμισκον – Ν, A and C use the alternate spelling εὑρισκόν. Note: NA²⁷ has the same reading as B and D.

- In verse 56,
  - ἐφευσομαρτύρουν – D has the variant reading καὶ ἠλεγον.

- In verse 57,
  - καὶ τίνες – D has the reading καὶ ἄλλοι.

- In verse 58,
  - Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος – Ν only has εἶπεν.
  - τοῦτον – D does not have this word.
  - ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω – D has the reading ἀναστήσω ἀχειροποίητον.
In verse 59,

- Ἰην ἄν – D has the words in the order, ἄν Ἰην.

In verse 60,

- εἰς μέσον – D has the additional article τὸ between these two words.
- τί οὕτοι – B has the reading ὅτι οὕτοι.

In verse 61,

- ὁ δὲ ἔσιώπα – Ν and A have ὁ δὲ Ἰηροῦς ἔσιώπα and this makes the reading the same as Matthew 26:63. D differs and has ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔσιγα.
- οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδὲν – A and D read οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο. The text of NA^{27} is the same as Ν, B and C.
- πάλιν ὁ ἄρχιερεύς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν – D does not have this phrase.
- καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ – D has the reading καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἄρχιερεύς.
- τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ – Ν* uses τοῦ θεοῦ (which makes this reading parallel to Matthew 26:63) whereas A has τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ.

In verse 62,

- εἶπεν – D reads ἀποκριθείς λέγει αὐτῷ.
- ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον – A has the words in this order: καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν.
- καὶ ἐρχόμενον – D does not have this phrase.

In verse 63,

- αὕτοῦ λέγει – D has the additional conjunction καὶ between the two words.

In verse 64,

- ἰκοῦσατε – Ν has the reading ἴδε νῦν ἰκοῦσατε.
- φαίνεται – D uses the word δοκεῖ instead. This reading is that of Matthew 26:66.
• ἐνοχὸν εἶναι θανάτου – The order of these words differs in the various witnesses. A reads ἐνοχὸν θανάτου whereas D has the reading ἐνοχὸν θανάτου. The NA²⁷ has the same reading as Ν, B and C.

➢ In verse 65,

• καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον – D does not have this phrase.
• αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον – A has the reading τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.
• κολαφίζειν – D has the word ἐκολαφίζον.
• λέγειν – D uses the word ἔλεγον.
• καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται – D does not have this phrase.
Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest’s house. But Peter was following at a distance. When they had kindled a fire in the middle of the courtyard and sat down together, Peter sat among them. Then a servant-girl, seeing him in the firelight, stared at him and said, “This man also was with him.” But he denied it, saying, “Woman, I do not know him.” A little later someone else, on seeing him, said, “You also are one of them.” But Peter said, “Man, I am not!” Then about an hour later still another kept insisting, “Surely this man also was with him; for he is a Galilean.” But Peter said, “Man, I do not know what you are talking about!” At that moment, while he was still speaking, the cock crowed. The Lord turned and looked at Peter. Then Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said to him, “Before the cock crows today, you will deny me three times.” And he went out and wept bitterly. Now the men who were holding Jesus began to mock him and beat him; they also blindfolded him and kept asking him, “Prophesy! Who is it that struck you?” They kept heaping many other insults on him. When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people, both chief priests and scribes, gathered together, and they brought him to their council. They said, “If you are the Messiah, tell us.” He replied, “If I tell you, you will not believe; and if I question you, you will not answer. But from now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God.” 70 All of them asked, “Are you then, the Son of God?” He said to them, “You say that I am.” Then they said, “What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips!”

Table 4.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἠγαγόν καὶ εἰσήγαγον εἰς τὴν οίκιαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· o δὲ Πέτρος ἤκολούθηκε μακρόθεν.</td>
<td>Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest’s house. But Peter was following at a distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιαψάντων δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ συγκαθαίροντων ἐκάθισεν ὁ Πέτρος μέσος αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>When they had kindled a fire in the middle of the courtyard and sat down together, Peter sat among them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἠδοκία δὲ αὐτῶν παλιότερη τὰς καθήμενοι πρὸς τὸ φῶς καὶ ἀτενίσασα αὐτῷ εἶπεν, Καὶ οὗτος ὁ ἄντω ἦν·</td>
<td>Then a servant-girl, seeing him in the firelight, stared at him and said, “This man also was with him.” But he denied it, saying,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὃ δὲ ἤριεματο λέγων, Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτὸν, γυναῖ.</td>
<td>“Woman, I do not know him.” Then another little later someone else, on seeing him, said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ ἔτερος ἠδοκὸν αὐτὸν ἔφη, Καὶ σὺ εἰς αὐτῶν εἰ, ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη, Ἀνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί.</td>
<td>“You also are one of them.” But Peter said, “Man, I am not!” Then about an hour later still another kept insisting,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ διαστάσει ὁ ὁδεγὸς ὁ ἄρας μιᾶς ἄλλος τὶς διασχιζόμενο τῶν λόγων, Ἔπε’ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ οὐ τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἦν, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος ἦστιν.</td>
<td>“Surely this man also was with him; for he is a Galilean.” But Peter said, “Man, I do not know what you are talking about!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, Ἀνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα αὐτὸν λέγεις, καὶ παραχρήμα ἐπὶ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ.</td>
<td>At that moment, while he was still speaking, the cock crowed. The Lord turned and looked at Peter. Then Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said to him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸν ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Ὑπὲρ ἐλεκτορά ἐφώνησεν σήμερον ἀπαρνήσθη με τρίς.</td>
<td>“Before the cock crows today, you will deny me three times.” And he went out and wept bitterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔξελθων ἔξω ἐκλάσθη πικρῶς.</td>
<td>Now the men who were holding Jesus began to mock him and beat him; they also blindfolded him and kept asking him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς οἱ συνεχόμενοι αὐτὸν εἶπαν αὐτῷ ἀδέρτως, καὶ περικαλύμμασεν αὐτὸν ἐπιρρώποι ἔβαλαν, τις ἔστιν ὁ παῖς σε;</td>
<td>“Prophesy! Who is it that struck you?” They kept heaping many other insults on him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔτερα πολλά βλασφημοῦσες ἔβαλαν εἰς αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people, both chief priests and scribes, gathered together, and they brought him to their council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ ὡς εἶχεν ἡμέρα, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβύτερον τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀπήγαγαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνδέρμον αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>They said, “If you are the Messiah, tell us.” He replied, “If I tell you, you will not believe; and if I question you, you will not answer. But from now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God.” All of them asked, “Are you, then, the Son of God?” He said to them, “You say that I am.” Then they said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγοντες, Προφήτευον, τίς ἔστιν ὁ παῖς σε;</td>
<td>“You say that I am.” Then they said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔτερα πολλὰ βλασφημίωσε οὐκ εἰς αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>“What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβύτερον τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀπήγαγαν αὐτόν εἰς τὸ συνδέρμον αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>Now the men who were holding Jesus began to mock him and beat him; they also blindfolded him and kept asking him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγοντες, Εἶ σὺ εἰ ὁ Χριστὸς, εἶπόν ημῖν, εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἐὰν ἴμην εἶπο, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃτε· ἔ ᾶν δὲ ἐρωτήσας, οὐ μὴ ἀποκρύψητε.</td>
<td>“Prophesy! Who is it that struck you?” They kept heaping many other insults on him. When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people, both chief priests and scribes, gathered together, and they brought him to their council. They said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δὲ ἐσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ.</td>
<td>“If you are the Messiah, tell us.” He replied, “If I tell you, you will not believe; and if I question you, you will not answer. But from now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God.” All of them asked,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ πάντων, Ἔὰν οὐ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ο δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη, Ἐμείς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι.</td>
<td>“Are you, then, the Son of God?” He said to them, “You say that I am.” Then they said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ πάντων, Ἔὰν οὐ εἰς ἄρθρωμας ἐχρείαν; αὐτῷ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>“What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.3
Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 54,
  - καὶ εἰσῆγαγον - D does not have this phrase.
  - τὴν οἰκίαν - A and D have τὸν οἶκόν.
  - ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν - D has the additional words αὐτῷ ἀπὸ between these two words. This makes this variant the same as the reading in Matthew 26:58.

- In verse 55,
  - περιαψάντων δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ συγκαθισάντων - A has the reading, ἀψάντων δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ συγκαθισάντων αὐτῶν, whereas D reads ἀψάντων δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ περικαθισάντων. The NA²⁷ text is the same as Ῥ²⁷, Ἱ and B.
  - ὁ Πέτρος - D uses a conjunction before the proper noun, καὶ ὁ Πέτρος whereas Ῥ²⁷ does not have the article ὁ in front of the proper noun Πέτρος.
  - μέσῳ - Ἱ and A have the words ἐν μέσῳ and D has the word μετ'. The text of NA²⁷ has the support of Ῥ²⁷ and B.
  - αὐτῶν - D has θερμαίνομενος at the end of the verse. This is the word used at Mark 14:54.

- In verse 57,
  - ἡρνήσατο λέγων - A and D* have αὐτῶν between these two words. The reading of NA²⁷ is supported by Ῥ²⁷, Ἱ, B and D².
  - Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτῶν, γύναι - The order of the words differs in several witnesses. A has γύναι, οὐκ οἶδα αὐτῶν whereas D has οὐκ οἶδα αὐτῶν. Ῥ²⁷, Ἱ and B support the reading of NA²⁷.

- In verse 58,
  - ἔφη, Καὶ οὐ ἔξ αὐτῶν εἶ - D has the reading, ἔπειnte τὸ αὐτὸ.
• Πέτρος ἔφη – Ἰερά από τον δεύτερο τόμον και D have εἶπεν. A reads Πέτρος εἶπεν. The reading of NA\textsuperscript{27} is supported by \textit{P}\textsuperscript{75}, \textit{K} and B.

➤ In verse 59,
- διαστάσης – D has the nominative διαστήματος, instead of the genitive.
- λέγων, Ἐπί αληθείας – D has the phrase, ἔπι αληθείας λέγω.
- ἦν – \textit{K} does not have this word.

➤ In verse 60,
- ο λέγεις – \textit{K} and D have the reading, τι λέγεις.

➤ In verse 61,
- καὶ στραφεὶς – D reads στραφεὶς δὲ.
- κύριος – D has the proper noun, Ἰησοῦς.
- καὶ υπεμνήσθη – \textit{P}\textsuperscript{69} has the reading τότε υπεμνήσθη.
- ὁ Πέτρος – D does not have the proper noun.
- ῥήματος – A and D have λόγου. And the text of NA\textsuperscript{27} has the support of \textit{P}\textsuperscript{69,75}, \textit{K} and B.
- ὅτι Πρὶν – \textit{P}\textsuperscript{69} and D do not have the conjunction ὅτι.
- Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα – B reads Πρὶν ἢ ἀλέκτορα.
- σήμερον – A and D do not have this word. The Aland Synopsis has a comment to indicate that this variant reading makes this part of the verse parallel to Matthew 26:75 and Mark 14:72. However, the NA\textsuperscript{27} has the support of \textit{P}\textsuperscript{75}, \textit{K} and B.
- ἀπαρνήση με τρίς – D has the reading τρίς ἀπαρνήση με μὴ εἰδέναι με.

➤ In verse 62,
- ἔξω ἐκλαυσεν – A has the proper noun ὁ Πέτρος between these two words.
Passion Narrative

In verse 63,

- Καὶ οἱ – D has οἱ δὲ instead.
- αὐτὸν – A has the proper noun τὸν Ἡρῴδην. The NA²⁷ text is also that of Ψ⁷⁵, Ξ, B and D.
- δέροντες – D does not have this word.

In verse 64,

- αὐτὸν – A and D have the additional words ἐπιτούν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ.
  The NA²⁷ text is supported by that of Ψ⁷⁵, Ξ and B. Note: The Aland Synopsis has an indication in the critical apparatus to show that the variant readings of A and D are parallel to the equivalent words in Mark 14:65. While this is true of the four words αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ, there is only one other word, ἡρῴδησθαι, which is parallel between this verse in Luke and the one in Mark.
- ἐπηρῴτων λέγοντες – D has ἔλεγον in the place of these two words, Ξ and A have the reading ἐπηρῴτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες. The reading of NA²⁷ has the support of Ψ⁷⁵ and B.

In verse 65,

- ἕτερα – D has the conjunction ἀλλὰ.
- αὐτὸν – D uses the plural reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῖς.

In verse 66,

- ἐγένετο ἡμέρα – Ξ has these two words in reverse order.
- ἀρχιερεῖς τε – D has the reading καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς.
- ἀπήγαγον – A uses the word ἀνήγαγον and the NA²⁷ text is the same as Ψ⁷⁵, Ξ, B and D.
- αὐτῶν – A has the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτῶν.
In verse 67,

- *El* – D does not have this word.
- εἶπον ἡμῖν. εἶπεν δὲ – A has the reading εἶπεν ἡμῖν. εἶπεν δὲ. D has a shorter reading, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν and the text of NA\textsuperscript{27} is supported by \textit{P\textsuperscript{75vid}}, \textit{X} and B.

In verse 68,

- ἡδὲ δὲ – A has an additional conjunction καὶ after these two words and D has only ἡδὲ. The reading of NA\textsuperscript{27} has the support of \textit{P\textsuperscript{75}}, \textit{X} and B.
- ἀποκριθήτε – At the end of the verse, after ἀποκριθήτε, A and D have the phrase μοι ἡ ἀπολύσετε. The reading of NA\textsuperscript{27} has the support of \textit{P\textsuperscript{75}}, \textit{X} and B.

In verse 70,

- *El* – D does not have this word.
- δὲ – A has the conjunction οὖν instead.
- οὖν – D does not have this conjunction.
- πρὸς αὐτοῦς ἔφηʹ – D has the reading εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

In verse 71,

- ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν – The order of these words in \textit{X} and A differs: χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας. D has a slightly different reading, χρείαν μαρτύρων ἔχομεν. The NA\textsuperscript{27} reading is the same as \textit{P\textsuperscript{75}} and B.
- αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἥκοισαμεν – D reads ἥκοισαμεν γὰρ.
COMMENTS

This section contains some significant differences between Matt / Mark and Luke. These differences, as provided by Bock (1996: 1776), and listed at the beginning of this section, are as follows:


   This raises the issue of sources for the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. Luke has one trial whereas Mark / Matthew have two. Bock argues (1996: 1791):


Bock summarises the solutions offered by scholars in three categories (1996: 1791 - 1792):

1. One of the Gospel writers got it wrong. However, those who proposed this solution could not agree on who was not right, Mark / Matthew or Luke. This is the most unlikely approach to this question since the narrative from Luke appears to be less detailed. Luke did not include the false witnesses and the testimony about destroying the Temple. Bock writes (1996: 1791): “the possibility of additional sources and differing literary perspectives makes this approach too facile”.
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2. There was only one meeting of the Sanhedrin but because it happened at dawn, Matthew / Mark said that it happened at night whereas Luke described it as happening in the morning. Each account thus takes a different point of view. Most proponents of this solution say that this is a source issue and that Luke used Mark and his own unique source as the basis of his narrative. Soards supports this argument and summarises the composition of this section by Luke (1987: 105):

Luke knew an independent oral tradition that lies behind 67a-e, and he reworked Mark in conjunction with this tradition by composing 68a-b. He transposed and edited the saying in 69. He formed a separate, climactic question at 70a-b using transposed Markan material (14.61) and at 70c-d he composed an answer to this second question using ideas from Mark 14.62 and 15.2, perhaps under the influence of oral tradition. It seems most likely that Luke introduced this section by composing 66a-d using ideas from Mark 14:53b and perhaps 15.1.

3. “There were two meetings, or perhaps two parts to a single meeting: one an evening trial (Matthew and Mark), the other the official declaration of guilt where the key evidence was reviewed (Luke)” (Bock, 1996: 1791).

In his comments on Mark 15:1, France reconciles these two trials by saying (2002: 626):

Mark wants us to see the morning decision not as a separate event after an interval, but as the direct continuation of the Sanhedrin hearing narrated in 14:53-65 (compare Luke's narrative which details the Sanhedrin proceedings in the morning, οὐκ ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, after Peter's denial and the cockcrow,
whereas Mark and Matthew give the details at night and merely a summary in the morning).

Brown (1994: 629-632) discusses this issue by taking into consideration two words in Mark 15:1 – one is συμβούλιον, and the other is a variant reading which follows. He considers three main variant readings:

1. συμβούλιον ἐτοιμάσαντες – Codices Sinaiticus, Ephraem Rescriptus
2. συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες – Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Koine texts
3. συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν – Codices Bezae, Koridethi, OL, Origen

The first point of contention among scholars is the meaning of the Greek word συμβούλιον. Brown argues that while one of the meanings of the word is “council, consultation or meeting”, it can also refer to “what goes on in or emerges from such a meeting: ‘counsel, plan, decision’.” (Brown, 1994: 630). He further remarks that the only other use by Mark of this word does not clarify the meaning of this word. He also comments (Brown, 1994: 630):

A choice as to which textual reading is preferable and whether symboulion can mean “decision” affects what is being described by Mark/Matt. Probably the majority of scholars have assumed that a new or second meeting of the Sanhedrin is involved. Some would contend that it is this second, morning meeting that Luke 22:66-71 reports, and that such a second meeting brings Mark/Matt into conformity with Mishna Sanhedrin 4.1 with its rule that another trial session was necessary for imposing a capital sentence. Both of those observations are invalid. Luke’s morning session contains much of the same material as the Mark/Matt night session and is almost surely the product of Luke’s rewriting; Luke offers no support for reading a second session into Mark.
Brown argues that the variant reading συμβούλιον ἐτοιμάσαντες is preferred by a substantial number of scholars and this does not suggest a second trial. However, some scholars also argue that the scribes created this variant reading so that they could remove the idea of a second trial from the text. But the use of ποιήσαντες makes it a more difficult reading and thus, more likely to have been changed by the scribes. ποιήσαντες does not necessarily indicate a second trial. It is an aorist and could have been used here to recapitulate what happened at the night meeting. Brown (1994: 631) writes, “A resumptive or recapitulative would be necessary at this stage because Mark interrupted his narrative of the Sanhedrin session to tell of Peter’s denials”. So Brown rejects the idea of a second meeting and argues that Mark is simply recapitulating what he had said earlier about the Sanhedrin trial.

2. Luke does not have the accusation concerning the Temple (cf. Mark 14:57-59).

Brown (1994: 432) notices that Luke does not have one of the two main themes in Mark / Matthew’s narrative of the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. This main theme is the witnesses’ accounts of the statement made by Jesus concerning the destruction of the Temple. However, a similar issue is used by Luke in another trial by the Sanhedrin – that of Stephen in Acts 7:48. The question is whether Luke has actually shifted this from the narrative of Mark to the book of Acts.

Senior (1989: 99 – 100) is of the opinion that Luke has used the account of Mark as the basis for his but has heavily redacted it to concentrate on some of the themes which are important to him:

Luke continues and intensifies the motif of rejection in this scene. He screens from Mark’s account other considerations such as the false testimony concerning Jesus’ threats against the temple (see Mk 14:56-59). Luke is aware
of this material since it appears as part of the leaders’ accusations against Stephen in Acts … But here in the Passion story Luke does not swerve in this direction. This may be partly due to Luke’s reverence for the Jerusalem temple; he is more positive about Jerusalem than the other evangelists. But even more important is the evangelist’s concentration on the central issue of Jesus’ identity and rejection of him by the Sanhedrin.

Neyrey (1985: 71) argues that Luke’s account of the trial differs from that of Mark in both content and function. He explains the absence of the Temple charges by saying, “Luke has streamlined the narrative to focus on Jesus’ testimony before the solemn assembly of Israel”. In Luke 22:66 – 71, Neyrey sees Luke demonstrating the rejection of Jesus’ testimony by the whole of Israel which is represented here by Israel’s official legal court. He further makes the point that Jesus is portrayed as a prophet whose word is always rejected, just like those in the Old Testament. Thus, there is no need for Luke to concentrate on the charges but instead focus on the testimony of Jesus.


At the end of the trial of Jesus in Matthew / Mark, there is mention of the Sanhedrin finding him guilty, and deserving to die. However, Luke does not say anything about the outcome of the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin. Brown analyses this and asks the question whether Luke is aware of what Mark has written in 14:64 (1994: 527 – 530): “All of them condemned him as deserving death”. Brown argues that Luke appears to agree with Mark when he mentions in Luke 24:20, “and how our chief priests and leaders handed him over to be condemned to death and crucified him”. He writes (1994: 528):

Overall, then, in the last part of the trial (22:69-71) I would judge that Luke was reshaping Marcan material and had no independent tradition in which the
Sanhedrin session ended differently. ... Indications scattered through Luke-Acts show that Luke took for granted an essential element of the trial, namely, a Jewish judgment against Jesus, and assumed that such a judgment had been preached by the apostles. ... In Mark/Matt the high priest has dominated the proceedings against Jesus and virtually told his colleagues what they must judge ... dutifully the Sanhedrin members tell the high priest what he wants to hear.

4. Luke has the account of Peter’s denial in one place (Luke 22:54-62) whereas Matthew / Mark have it in two sections (Matthew 26:58, 26:69-75; Mark 14:54, 14:66-72).

Luke writes about the denial of Peter altogether in one account. However, Matthew and Mark both introduce the setting in an earlier verse and then tell of Peter’s denial later in the narrative. Brown makes some interesting observations (1994: 611 – 614):

Perhaps nowhere else in the PN [passion narrative] do the Gospels agree so much in the overall flow of the story as in the denials of Peter. ... the minor details vary widely, but in sixteen of seventeen points of comparison there is a comparability of sequence. Even in details Matthew is close to Mark, and so there is no reason to posit an independent source for Matt. ... I too judge Luke to be dependent on Mark in this scene and see no need for an independent source.

However, this dependence of Luke on Mark does not have overall support of all scholars. Some, like Bultmann, see in this account of the denial of Jesus by Peter use of an independent source since the details in Luke are significant enough. Others, namely Perry and Osty, think that Luke’s account is closer to that of John than Mark.
Brown (1994: 611) argues that, “John offers the only likelihood of a Gospel account of the denials independent of Mark”.


The mockery of Jesus is placed in three different settings by the Gospels. Matthew / Mark place this account after Jesus has been found guilty by the Sanhedrin, Luke has this before the trial by the Sanhedrin, whereas John tells it before Jesus is sent to Caiaphas. Brown makes some observations about the variant readings for this pericope (1994: 572 – 573):

A spate of variant textual readings in the ancient Greek mss. and in the versions shows that the scribes of that period were already troubled by the Gospel differences. In the Greek underlying my translation, for instance, Mark has “spit on him” and “cover his face”, while Matt has “spat on his face”. But Codex Bezae and some versions read “spit in his face” in Mark, omitting the covering; and Codex Koridethi and some minuscules combine the two readings into “spit in his face and cover his face”! The Codex Koridethi reading of what is said to Jesus in Mark includes “Who is it that hit you?” in agreement with Matt and Luke. There are other examples of what would normally be recognized as attempts to harmonize. Yet serious modern scholars argue that unless one accepts these rather poorly attested readings of Mark, one cannot explain Matt and Luke as dependent on Mark.

He concludes his analysis of the differences by arguing that the way in which Matthew and Luke can be seen as dependent on Mark is to recognise the fact that “in certain well-remembered phrases, oral tradition perdured” (Brown, 1994: 573). While this may explain the textual issues here, nevertheless it does not provide a good explanation of the differences in setting in each of the Gospels.

1. Verses 63a – 64c are the result of Luke’s “thorough redaction” of Mark 14:65.
2. Verse 64d comes from oral tradition.

Soards further comments that this redactional exercise by Luke effectively brings this narrative of the mocking of Jesus into the same order as that of his prediction of his passion in Luke 9:22. He also says that Luke has achieved three things through his editing of Mark’s account (Soards, 1987: 103):

1. Jesus’ courage is accentuated by having Peter's cowardice precede.
2. Deep irony is inherent in Luke’s narrative when Peter remembers that Jesus prophesied his denials, and then, the men holding Jesus imply he is no prophet with their mocking game.
3. After Peter’s denials and the treatment that Jesus suffers, the readers might expect him to be easy prey for the Assembly.


Each of the three Gospels uses slightly different phrases concerning what the slave girl(s) said:

- Matthew – 26:71 ἐξελθόντα δὲ εἰς τὸν πύλωνα εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἄλλη καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἑκέι, Οὗτος ἦν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου. “Then he went out to the gateway,
where another girl saw him and said to the people there, "This fellow was with Jesus of Nazareth.""

- Mark – 14:67 καὶ ἴδε τὸν Πέτρον θερμαίνομενον ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει, Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἔσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. “When she saw Peter warming himself, she stared at him and said, "You also were with Jesus, the man from Nazareth."”

- Luke – 22:56 ἴδε αὐτὸν παιδίσκη τις καθήμενον πρὸς τὸ φῶς καὶ ἀνενίασα αὐτῷ εἶπεν, Καὶ οὗτος σὺν αὐτῷ ἦν. “Then a servant-girl, seeing him in the firelight, stared at him and said, "This man also was with him."”

Section 347: The Death of Jesus


The death of Jesus on the cross is central to the Christian message. It is through this death that salvation is possible. Hagner summarises this event (1995: 842-843):

The death of Jesus is not only the climax of the passion narrative but also the climax of Jesus’ earthly work. The Gospels are books of “good news” primarily because of what is accomplished through the death of Jesus. Here we come to the gospel. At the heart of the story is Jesus’ death in fulfilment of God’s will and for the salvation of the world. But the death of God’s Son involves impenetrable mystery. … Matthew’s account of the death itself is nevertheless simple, sober, and restrained in character.

Senior (1989: 138) also remarks that “the climax of the Passion story comes with the death of Jesus. Luke paints this scene with sharp, quick strokes”. In this section as
well, the details in Matthew and Mark on what happens at the death of Jesus are close.

Bock has included this pericope, as also the previous two, in the block of text, Luke 23:26 – 49. So, for the verses under consideration here, he has made the following comments:

1. Luke 23:45 uniquely has a second reference to darkness.

2. Luke 23:45 mentions the tearing of the temple veil at a different point in the narrative (Mark 15:38 = Matt. 27:51).

3. Luke neither mentions nor records the content of Jesus’ first cry from the cross (Mark 15:34 = Matt. 27:46, using Ps. 22:1 [22:2 MT]).


5. Luke 23:46 uniquely records the content of Jesus’ second cry from the cross, using Ps. 31:3 [31:6 MT].

6. Luke does not record the earthquake that took place when Jesus died or the subsequent resurrection of many saints (Matt. 27:51-53).


Hagner has a different division of the narrative. He considers this pericope as divided into two, namely, Matthew 27:45 – 50 (entitled ‘The Death of Jesus’) and Matthew 27:51 – 54 (entitled ‘Special Events Following the Death of Jesus’).

1. In verse 45, Matthew begins the verse with Ἄπω instead of γενομένης (Mark 15:33).

2. In verse 46, the changes are:
   a. Matthew makes use of the preposition followed by the accusative, peri δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὄραν, whereas Mark uses the dative without a preposition καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὀρᾷ. (Mark 15:34).
   b. He has the Hebrew Χλι Χλι instead of Mark’s Aramaic Ελῳ Αλῳ, in spite of the fact that the remaining words of the cry of Jesus are in Aramaic. Hagner argues that “this was probably done to produce a closer phonetic similarity with Χλίαν of v 47 and so to produce a more plausible narrative.” (1995: 843).
   c. He does not have the word μεθερμηνεύομενον which Hagner says is unnecessary (1995: 843).
   d. Matthew uses the vocative, Ὁ θεός instead of Ὁ θεός.
   e. In the same quotation (from Psalm 22:1), Matthew follows the LXX translation by using ἵνατί instead of εἰς τί (Mark 15:34).

3. In verse 47, he makes the following changes:
   a. He changes Ἰδε (Mark 15:35) to ὁτι.
   b. He also adds οὗτος which, according to Hagner, gives “the sentence more balance by providing a subject” (1995: 843).
4. In verse 48, Matthew expands the word τίς (Mark 15:36) by providing more details. He adds the word εὑθέως, and then has εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν followed later by λαβὼν.

5. In verse 49, there are two differences:
   a. Matthew begins with the phrase οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ εἶλεγον whereas Mark introduces the direct speech with only λέγων (Mark 15:36).
   b. He also changes καθελεῖν (Mark 15:36) to σῶσων.

6. In verse 50, Matthew has the changes:
   a. He adds the word πάλιν.
   b. He substitutes κράξας for ἀφεὶς (Mark 15:37).
   c. He uses ἀφήκεν τὸ πνεῦμα instead of Mark’s verb, ἔξεπνευσεν.

7. In verse 51, Matthew Καὶ ἴδοι τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη ἀπ’ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω εἰς δύο follows Mark 15:38, Καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπ’ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω almost verbatim. The only differences are: Matthew adds ἴδοι and some of the words are in a different order.

8. Verses 52 and 53 are unique to Matthew.

9. In verse 54, Matthew is substantially different from Mark 15:39:
   a. He does not have the phrase, ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ.
   b. He adds the phrase, καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
   c. He also adds the phrase, τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα.
d. He uses ἐκατόνταρχος instead of κεντυρίων.

e. He also adds the fact that the centurion and the soldiers were, ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα.


Matthew furthermore has the centurion and his soldiers (hence a plurality of witnesses) make the statement about Jesus as ‘the Son of God’ (v 54), attributing it not, as in Mark, to the manner of Jesus’ death but to the spectacular events referred to in vv 51b-52.

g. Matthew places θεὸς υἱός immediately after ἀληθῶς and then, puts ὁ οὖσας at the end of the sentence. These changes have “heightened the impact of the statement in comparison with its form in Mark 15:39” (Hagner, 1995: 848).

h. Matthew does not have the noun ὁ ἀνθρωπός and “this is consonant with the stronger form of the Matthean statement” (Hagner, 1995: 848).


But with some rearrangement, some omissions and a certain amount of change in wording. … All of this can plausibly be explained as due to Lucan editing, and the case for a separate passion narrative used by him is at its weakest here.
Passion Narrative

Matthew 27:45 – 54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 ἀπὸ δὲ ἐκτὸς ὀρας σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἔως ὀρας ἐνάτης. 46</td>
<td>45 From noon on, darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon. 46 And about three o’clock Jesus cried with a loud voice, “Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?” that is, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὀραν ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ιησοῦς φωνὴ μεγάλη λέγων, Ἡλι ήλι λεμα</td>
<td>When some of the bystanders heard it, they said, “This man is calling for Elijah.” 48 At once one of them ran and got a sponge, filled it with sour wine, put it on a stick, and gave it to him to drink. 49 But the others said, “Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come to save him.” 50 Then Jesus cried again with a loud voice and breathed his last. 51 At that moment the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. The earth shook, and the rocks were split. 52 The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised. 53 After his resurrection they came out of the tombs and entered the holy city and appeared to many. 54 Now when the centurion and those with him, who were keeping watch over Jesus, saw the earthquake and what took place, they were terrified and said, “Truly this man was God’s Son!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφεὶς ἄξωσαν αὐτόν. 48 καὶ εὐθείας ὀραμὼν εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ λαβὼν σπόνγον πλήσασι τὸ ὄξως καὶ περιθέες καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν. 49 οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον, Ἀφεὶς ἱδομεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλιας σώσων αὐτὸν. 50 ὁ δὲ Ιησοῦς πάλιν κράζας φωνὴ μεγάλη αἰθήκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. 51</td>
<td>51 Καὶ Ἰσαὰκ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἔσχισθαι ἀπ’ ἄνωθεν ἐκάτωτερον τὴν ἑρμήνευσαν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐνεπάνωσθήσαν καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, 53 καὶ ἐξελοῦσας ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσήλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοὶ. 54 ὁ δὲ ἐκατώνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱδοῦντες τῶν σεισμῶν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν αὐτοῖς, λέγουσι, Ἴλαβος θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὔτος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 τίνες δὲ τῶν ἐκεί ἑστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἡλιας φωνεῖν οὕτως. 48 καὶ εὐθείας ὀραμὼν εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ λαβὼν σπόνγον πλήσασι τὸ ὄξως καὶ περιθέες καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν. 49 οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον, Ἀφεὶς ἱδομεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλιας σώσων αὐτὸν. 50 ὁ δὲ Ιησοῦς πάλιν κράζας φωνὴ μεγάλη αἰθήκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. 51</td>
<td>51 Καὶ Ἰσαὰκ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἔσχισθαι ἀπ’ ἄνωθεν ἐκάτωτερον τὴν ἑρμήνευσαν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐνεπάνωσθήσαν καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, 53 καὶ ἐξελοῦσας ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσήλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοὶ. 54 ὁ δὲ ἐκατώνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱδοῦντες τῶν σεισμῶν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν αὐτοῖς, λέγουσι, Ἴλαβος θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὔτος.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 45,
  - ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν – Ν1 has the reading ἐφ’ ὄλην τὴν γῆν and Ν* does not have this phrase.
  - ὀρας ἐνάτης – D has these two words in the reverse order, ἐνάτης ὀρας.

- In verse 46,
  - ἀνεβόησεν – B has ἔβοησεν which comes from the simple verb βοώω instead of the compound verb ἀναβοῶ.
• ηλι ηλι – Ν and B use the words ελω ελω. This variant reading makes these two witnesses parallel to the reading in Mark 15:34. The NA27 text is supported by A and D.

• λεμα σαβακθανι – This Aramaic transliteration is handled differently by the various witnesses: D* uses λαμα ζαφθανι; A has λιμα σαβακθανι; and B possibly has λεμα σαβακθανι (as indicated by the Aland Synopsis with B in brackets). The NA27 reading has the support of Ν.

➢ In verse 47,
• έστηκότων – A and D have the alternative form, έστωτων (participle perfect active genitive masculine plural). Ν, B and C support the reading of the NA27.

• δτι – Ν and D do not have this conjunction.

➢ In verse 48,
• εξ αυτων – Ν does not have this phrase.

• τε – D does not have this conjunction.

➢ In verse 49,
• ελεγον – B and (D) have the aorist είπαν instead of the imperfect. The NA27 text has the support of Ν, A and C.

• σώσων – Ν* has the infinitive form σώσαι, while D has the reading καλ σώσει.

• At the end of the verse, Ν, B and C have the additional sentence, ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτού τὴν πλευρὰν, καλ έξηλθεν ὕδωρ καλ αίμα which is very close to the reading of John 19:34. The NA27 reading has the support of A and D. Note: It does appear that support for the inclusion of the additional sentence is very strong when we consider the fact that, from the witnesses under consideration, only A and D have the reading that the NA27 has adopted.
In verse 51,

- \( \dot{\alpha} \pi\prime \dot{\alpha} \nu\omega\theta\varepsilon\nu \dot{e}\omega\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}\tau\omega \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{o}\delta \) – The order of the words varies in witnesses: A and C\(^3\) have the phrase \( \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{o}\delta \dot{\alpha} \pi\prime \dot{\alpha} \nu\omega\theta\varepsilon\nu \dot{e}\omega\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}\tau\omega \); \( \mathbf{\xi} \) has \( \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{o}\delta \dot{\alpha} \nu\omega\theta\varepsilon\nu \dot{e}\omega\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}\tau\omega \) and D has a slightly different phrase, \( \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{o}\delta \mu\acute{e} \acute{r} \acute{e} \acute{h} \acute{a} \dot{\alpha} \nu\omega\theta\varepsilon\nu \dot{e}\omega\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}\tau\omega \). The NA\(^{27}\) text is supported by B and C\(*\).

In verse 52,

- \( \dot{\alpha} \nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma\chi\theta\varepsilon\sigma\alpha\nu \) – C\(^3\) has the alternative, \( \dot{\eta} \nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma\chi\theta\varepsilon\sigma\alpha\nu \); A has the singular \( \dot{\alpha} \nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma\chi\theta\) and C\(*\) has \( \dot{\eta} \nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma\chi\theta\).

- \( \dot{\eta} \gamma\acute{e}\rho\theta\varepsilon\sigma\alpha\nu \) – A and C have the singular form, \( \dot{\eta} \gamma\acute{e}\rho\theta\) whereas the NA\(^{27}\) reading is also that of \( \mathbf{\xi} \), B and D.

In verse 53,

- \( \epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{h}\acute{e}\theta\omicron\nu \) – D has the simple verb \( \dot{\eta} \mu\acute{h} \theta\omicron\nu \). \( \mathbf{\xi} \) does not have this verb or the conjunction \( \kappa\acute{a} \) which follows.

In verse 54,

- \( \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\acute{m}e\nu\alpha \) – B and D have the present form of the verb \( \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\acute{m}e\nu\alpha \), whereas the aorist, as in the NA\(^{27}\) text, is found in \( \mathbf{\xi} \), A and C.

- \( \theta\acute{e}o\acute{u} \upsilon\acute{i} \dot{\omicron} \acute{z} \acute{h} \acute{u} \acute{n} \) – while B and D have the word order \( \upsilon\acute{i} \dot{\omicron} \acute{z} \theta\acute{e}o\acute{u} \acute{h} \acute{u} \) \( \mathbf{\xi} \)\(*\) has the phrase \( \upsilon\acute{i} \dot{\omicron} \acute{z} \acute{h} \acute{u} \theta\acute{e}o\acute{u} \).
Mark 15:33 – 39

**NA²⁷**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kai γενομένης ὃρας ἐκτες σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ’ ὧλην τὴν γῆν ἑως ὃρας ἐνάτης. 34 Kai τῇ ἑνάτῃ ὃρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰσαοὺς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. Ἐλοι Ελοι, λέμα σαβαχθάει.</td>
<td>When it was noon, darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon. 34 At three o’clock Jesus cried out with a loud voice, “Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?” which means, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>καὶ τινὲς τῶν παρεστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον, Ἰδε Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ.</td>
<td>When some of the bystanders heard it, they said, “Listen, he is calling for Elijah.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ὅ ὃς καὶ γεμίσας σπόγγον ἔξωσεν καλαμίῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν λέγων, Ἀφετε ἰδοὺν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καθελείν αὐτὸν. 37 ὁ ὁ Ησαοὺς ἀφείς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξέπνευσεν. 38 Καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπ’ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω. 39 Ἰδών δὲ ὁ κυνηγός ὁ παρεστήκως εἰς ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὃτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν, Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.</td>
<td>And someone ran, filled a sponge with sour wine, put it on a stick, and gave it to him to drink, saying, “Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come to take him down.” Then Jesus gave a loud cry and breathed his last. And the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. Now when the centurion, who stood facing him, saw that in this way he breathed his last, he said, “Truly this man was God’s Son!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NRSV**

When it was noon, darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon. 34 At three o’clock Jesus cried out with a loud voice, “Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?” which means, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” When some of the bystanders heard it, they said, “Listen, he is calling for Elijah.” And someone ran, filled a sponge with sour wine, put it on a stick, and gave it to him to drink, saying, “Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come to take him down.” Then Jesus gave a loud cry and breathed his last. And the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. Now when the centurion, who stood facing him, saw that in this way he breathed his last, he said, “Truly this man was God’s Son!”

**Table 4.3.2**

**Textual Notes**: The variant readings are:

- In verse 33,
  - καὶ γενομένης – A and C have the reading γενομένης δὲ.
  - ὅλην τὴν γῆν – After ἐφ’, D uses the genitive ὅλης τῆς γῆς instead of the accusative.

- In verse 34,
  - ἑνάτῃ ὃρᾳ – A and C have the definite article τῇ between these two nouns: ἑνάτῃ τῇ ὃρᾳ.
  - ἐβόησεν – D has the verb ἐβῶνησεν.
  - ὁ Ἰσαοὺς – D does not have this proper noun.
  - μεγάλῃ – A and C have an additional word after this adjective: λέγων. This makes the wording closer to Matthew 27:46.
- Passion Narrative -

- Ελωι ελωι – D has the spelling ηλι ηλι, which is the reading of Matthew 27:46.

- λεμα σαβαχθανι – B uses the transliteration, λαμα σαβαχθανι (or possibly λαμα ζαβαχθανι, as indicated by Aland); A has the reading λιμα σαβακθανι; D has λαμα ζαβαθανι. The NA²⁷ reading has the support of Ν and C. **Note:** D has the same variant reading as in Matthew 27:46.

- ὁ θεός μου – A does not have the personal pronoun μου.

- ὁ θεός μου – B does not have the second occurrence of this phrase, ὁ θεός μου.

- ἐγκατέληπτες με – C has the reverse order of these two words, με ἐγκατέληπτες; A reads με ἐγκατέλειπτες; D has the reading ὠνείδισας με. The NA²⁷ text is supported by Ν and B.

- In verse 35,

  - παρεστηκότων – Ν and D have the form παρεστώτων. B has the verb ἐστηκότων; and A has an additional adverb ἐκεῖ, after the verb ἐστηκότων. This makes A and B closer to the reading of Matthew 27:47. **Note:** C is the only witness that supports the reading of the NA²⁷.

  - ἀκούσαντες – C does not have this verb.

  - ἤδε – A uses the alternative word, ἴδοι, which has the same meaning; C has the conjunction ὅτι, which is also the reading of Matthew 27:47; and D does not have this word.

  - φωνεῖ – D has the additional pronoun οὗτος at the end of the verse.

- In verse 36,

  - δραμὼν δέ – D has the reading καί δραμὼν.

  - τις – A, C and D have the same word as used in Matthew 27:48: εἰς.
• [καὶ] γεμίσας – B has only the second word, γεμίσας. D has the reading καὶ πλήσας which are the words used in Matthew 27:48; the NA$^{27}$ reading has the support of Ν, A and C.

• περιθελς – A and C have the variant reading περιθελς τε. D has the verb ἐπιθελς.

• ἔποτιζεν αὐτόν λέγων – D does not have this phrase.

• ᾿Αϕετε – Ν and D have the singular form of the verb, ὕΑϕες, instead of the plural.

➢ In verse 38,

• εἷς δύο – D adds some precision to the sentence by having the additional word, μέρη.

• ἀν’ – Ν, A and C have the full version of the word, ἀπὸ. The NA$^{27}$ text is supported by B and D.

➢ In verse 39,

• ἐξ ἐναυτίας αὐτοῦ – D uses the word, ἐκεῖ.

• ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν – A and C have the variant reading, ὅτι οὕτως κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν. D has the reading, οὕτως αὐτόν κράξαντα καὶ ἐξέπνευσεν. Ν and B support the reading of the NA$^{27}$.

• οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος – A and C have a different order of the words: ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὕτως.

• υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν – A and C read υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ. D has θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν. Ν and B support the NA$^{27}$ text.

**NOTE:** A and C have the same variant readings in several instances (9 times) in this pericope.

Table 4.3.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 44,
  - Καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἔκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ’ ὅπλην τὴν γῆν ἦς ὄρας ἐνάτης. 45 τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπότος, ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον. 46 καὶ φωνὴς φωνῆς μεγάλη ἦ τὸ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἄρτερ, εἰς χείράς σου παρατίθημα τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τότε δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. 47 Ἰδὼν δὲ οἱ ἑκατοντάρχαι τὸ γενόμενον ἔδοξαν τὸν θεὸν λέγων, ὁ Ουρασίας οὗτος ἡμῖν ἦν. 48 καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενόμενοι ὤχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρῆσαι τὰ γενόμενα, τύποι τούτων τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον.

- In verse 45,
  - τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπότος – A, C3 and D do not have this word; the NA27 text has the support of Π75, B and C*. 
  - ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον – The whole sentence is lacking in D.

NA27 | NRSV
---|---
44 Καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἔκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ’ ὅπλην τὴν γῆν ἦς ὄρας ἐνάτης. 45 τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπότος, ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον. 46 καὶ φωνὴς φωνῆς μεγάλη ἦ τὸ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἄρτερ, εἰς χείράς σου παρατίθημα τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τότε δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. 47 Ἰδὼν δὲ οἱ ἑκατοντάρχαι τὸ γενόμενον ἔδοξαν τὸν θεὸν λέγων, ὁ Ουρασίας οὗτος ἡμῖν ἦν. 48 καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενόμενοι ὤχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρῆσαι τὰ γενόμενα, τύποι τούτων τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον.

44 It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon, while the sun's light failed; and the curtain of the temple was torn in two. Then Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit." Having said this, he breathed his last. When the centurion saw what had taken place, he praised God and said, "Certainly this man was innocent." And when all the crowds who had gathered there for this spectacle saw what had taken place, they returned home, beating their breasts.
In verse 46,

- φωνή μεγάλη ὑ Ἡσυχίας – C has a different order of the words, ὑ Ἡσυχίας φωνή μεγάλη. D has the reading, φωνή μεγάλη ὑ Ἡσυχίας.
- παρατίθεμαι – D has παρατίθημα whereas the NA^27 text has the support of ℗^75, A, B and C.
- D has the additional sentence at the end of the verse, καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη. This sentence is also found in verse 45 and is parallel to Matthew 27:51 and Mark 15:38.

In verse 47,

- Ἰόν ὅ ἐκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον – C* has the reading Ἰόν ὅ ἐκατοντάρχης τὸ γεγονός. D reads καὶ ὁ ἐκατοντάρχης φωνήσας.
- ἐδόξαζον – ℗^75c, A and C have the aorist form of the verb, ἐδόξασεν. The NA^27 text is supported by ℗^75*, Χ, B and D.
- ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν – The order in D is δίκαιος ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος.

In verse 48,

- ὁχλοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην – D has the reading, ἐπὶ θεωρία ὁχλοὶ.
- θεωρήσατε τὰ γενόμενα – A does not have this phrase whereas the NA^27 reading is supported by ℗^75, Χ, B, C and D.
- τύπτοντες – C^2 has the additional pronoun ἐκατότον after this word.
- τὰ στήθη – D has the variant reading: καὶ τὰ μέτωπα.
COMMENTS

Some have called “the Gospel” the death of Jesus on the cross (Hagner, 1995: 843). Hagner further comments (1995: 842): “the death of Jesus is not only the climax of the passion narrative but also the climax of Jesus’ earthly work”. As such, it is expected that much attention is given by the Gospel writers to both content and sequence of events. But, as Neyrey writes (1985: 129): “no reader of the Synoptic accounts of Jesus’ death can fail to note the distinctiveness of Luke’s version”. He continues by saying that his aim is to recover “Luke’s redaction of this episode in Jesus’ passion by a careful identification of the omissions, additions and changes made to the Markan account and by identifying distinctive Lukan themes and patterns” (1985: 129). So it is not surprising that Luke contains some significant differences with Matthew / Mark. These differences are provided by Bock (1996: 1838) and are as follows:

1. Luke 23:45 uniquely has a second reference to darkness.

Luke appears to be clarifying what he means by the darkness he mentions in the previous verse. This is not found in Mark and appears to be part of his redaction. Brown analyses this aspect extensively. He (1994: 1039) observes that scribes would also have been puzzled by this and that was why manuscripts have the two basic variant readings:

1. τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλειπόντος – aorist (or occasionally pres.: ἐκλειπόντος) genitive absolute: P75, Codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Ephraem rescriptus, some sahidic witnesses.
• Translation (a): the sun having been eclipsed.
• Translation (b): the sun having failed.

2. καὶ ἑσκοτίσθη ὁ ἡλίος – coordinated main clause: Codices Alexandrinus, Bezae, Koridethi; Marcion; Latin and Syriac witnesses; Koine tradition.
• Translation (c): and the sun was darkened/obscured.


Because … there is a major astronomical problem about positing an eclipse of the sun at the time of Jesus’ death, the second reading is much easier (even as is translation [b] of the first reading) and for that reason may have been favored by scribes eager to improve the acceptability of the passage. The first Greek reading has more impressive textual support and should be given preference under the rule of choosing as original the more difficult reading.


Luke is the only account which mentions the temple veil being torn here. Matthew and Mark both have this event happen later in their account of the crucifixion, after the physical death of Jesus. Bock (1996: 1861) explains this arrangement by Luke “as topical so as to place all the cosmic portents together. … These stylistic and editorial differences allow the accounts to complement one another”.

Brown finds that when Luke relocated the tearing of the temple veil between the darkness over the earth and the final words of Jesus, he has produced an ambiguity.
He argues that the translation of δὲ can produce two potential interpretations:

1. and – a conjunctive sense – “it [the rending of the veil] retains some of its negative force and is joined to the darkness that preceded it as a double sign of divine displeasure” (Brown, 1994: 1103). He favours this interpretation because he thinks that when Luke places this rending of the veil here, he joined this with the darkness in order to offer “a patter of dire portents in the heavens and on the earth” (1994: 1103). He also insists (1994: 1103 – 1104):

   That arrangement suited Lucan theology in another way. At the Lucan Sanhedrin trial there was no prediction that Jesus would destroy the sanctuary, and so at the cross there was no need to portray a fulfilment of that prediction after Jesus’ death. In Luke’s outlook the Temple did not lose its sacred value through anything that happened in Jesus’ lifetime, for the story of that life began and ended with a scene in the Temple complex. … By changing the Marcan picture where the rending of the veil was God’s violent response to the death of Jesus, Luke has avoided desacralizing the Jewish sanctuary at the time of death. The rending of the sanctuary veil before Jesus’ death is a forewarning that the continuing rejection of Jesus will bring the destruction of the holy place, especially when rejection comes to the point of killing those (like Stephen) who proclaim him.

2. but – an adversative sense – “it [the rending of the veil] has acquired positive force and is joined to Jesus’ last words as a contrasting positive reaction to the darkness” (Brown, 1994: 1103). Brown states (1994: 1104):

   If one gives an adversative thrust to the de of v. 45b (“But the veil of the sanctuary was rent in the middle”), one can interpret this phenomenon as a reaction to the darkness over the whole earth: The veil has been rent so that Jesus can go from the surrounding darkness through to his Father to place his
spirit into his Father’s hands, as he himself says immediately after the veil is torn.

However, Brown does not support this translation because he thinks that it does not pay sufficient “attention to the exact wording that Luke has used” (1994: 1105).

3. Luke neither mentions nor records the content of Jesus’ first cry from the cross (Mark 15:34 = Matt. 27:46, using Ps. 22:1 [22:2 MT]).


5. Luke 23:46 uniquely records the content of Jesus’ second cry from the cross, using Ps. 31:3 [31:6 MT].

These three differences between Luke and Matthew / Mark are all about the words spoken at the cross. Neyrey comments (1985: 142 - 147):

One of the most striking redactional changes in Luke crucifixion scene is his replacement of Jesus’ dying words. According to Mk 15:34, Jesus cried out “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” - a cry based on Ps 22. Luke replaced that cry with a prayer to God, “Father, into your hands I commit my spirit” (23:46), a prayer based on Ps 31:5. … By dying with a prayer to God on his lips, Jesus shows the new covenant community the proper way to die, viz., with faith in God to save him from death. … Luke was also making an important theological statement when he recorded that Jesus prayed a psalm at his death, a prayer of faith in God.

Brown argues that in spite of the fact that the words used by Luke are very different to those of Mark, there is a good basis for thinking that Luke is actually editing the text of Mark. He writes (1994: 1067):
Passion Narrative

Before the death of Jesus Luke groups the darkness over the whole earth and the rending of the sanctuary veil. These two negative apocalyptic signs, taken over by Luke from Mark, symbolize God’s judgment on those who have mocked Jesus in 23:39-39. Jesus’ last words (23:46) are connected to these signs by an “and” – in response to them he cries out to his Father his words of trust and dies without apprehension. … As for wording, the softening of Mark’s portrayal begins already with Luke’s preference for the verb “to cry out” over Mark’s “to scream”. The latter is too violent an action to be attributed to the Lucan Jesus. Luke follows Mark’s lead in having the dying Jesus pray in the language of the psalter but chooses Ps 31:6 over 22:2.

6. Luke does not record the earthquake that took place when Jesus died or the subsequent resurrection of many saints (Matt. 27:51-53).

While all three Gospels mention the darkness which prevailed over the earth and the rending of the sanctuary veil (though in Luke this happens at a different place), Matthew is the only Gospel which mentions other supernatural phenomena happening at the death of Jesus. He includes the following signs:

1. The ground was made to quake.
2. The rocks were split open.
3. The tombs were opened.
4. Many bodies of saints who had died were raised.
5. Those who were raised entered into the holy city.
6. They were seen by many.

Brown observes that those signs can be separated into two groups. The first one groups signs 1 to 4 from the list above and Brown (1994: 1138) suggests that “the vivid, imaginative character of the phenomena suggest a pre-Matthean poetic piece
circulating in popular circles”. He further says that the last two signs are different in construction from the first four and are more like Matthew’s own style of writing. Matthew is most probably adding his own commentary to the first four signs.

7. **Luke 23:47 quotes the centurion as declaring Jesus’ innocence instead of his divine sonship (Mark 15:39 = Matt. 27:54).**

   If Luke is dependent on Mark in this event, then he has changed the centurion’s confession from “God’s Son” to “this man was innocent”. Brown believes that Luke is dependent on Mark but that he changes this to fit the structure of his Gospel (1994: 1164):

   In Mark that very high evaluation of Jesus was prompted by God’s startling intervention after Jesus’ death ( rending of the sanctuary veil). But what precedes the confession in Luke is Jesus’ trusting prayer to his Father, something less likely to lead to a full acknowledgement of Jesus’ divinity. Moreover, in terms of having a Gentile confess Jesus, Luke could be more flexible than Mark/Matt because of the range offered by his planned Book of Acts.

8. **Luke 23:48 uniquely records the crowd watching and mourning.**

   This group of people witnessing the death of Jesus on the cross is only mentioned in Luke. Brown (1994: 1167 - 1170) suggests that Luke introduces this group of people close to where the death has occurred as opposed to the disciples and the women standing at a distance to observe what has happened. Brown also comments that there is no need to suggest that Luke is using a special source here since the account is typical of “his arrangement, wording, and theology” (Brown, 1994: 1167).
Chapter 5

Analysis of Other Sections

Section 305: Jesus’ Death is Premeditated

Matthew 26: 1 – 5; Mark 14: 1 – 2; Luke 22: 1 – 2

Generally, scholars begin the Passion Narrative with this pericope. The three passages considered in this section are similar in content in that they provide a new time frame for what is to follow and also, the fact that the temple leadership is plotting against Jesus. In contrast to this opposition by the Jewish leaders, the ordinary people are more supportive of him. Nevertheless, this similarity is not reflected in the vocabulary used by each author. Bock (1996: 1701) makes the following comments:

One major difference is that Luke lacks the Bethany anointing (Matthew 26:6-13 = Mark 14:3-9 = John 12:1-8). … The literary benefit of the omission is that Judas’ betrayal is told without interruption. What is lost is the contrast between Judas’ behavior and the woman’s faithful actions. … The outline of this oft-told tradition was the same, but the details were handled with some freedom of expression. Most see Luke simply abbreviating Mark 14:1 in Luke 22:1-2

Luke is not specific with his dating of the event. He says that the feast of Unleavened Bread ἕννετερα (drew near). Nolland (1993: 1027) comments on Luke’s use of ἕννετερα by saying that “perhaps he intends with this to suggest that Passover represented some kind of climax point in connection with the thus far thwarted machinations of the Jewish authorities”. On the other hand, Matthew and Mark are
both very specific, pointing out that the account was \[\text{μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας (after two days)}\]. However, Mark and Luke mention both the feast of Unleavened Bread and the Passover, whereas Matthew indicates that it was only the Passover. Davies and Allison (1997: 3: 437) argue that “the omission of Mark’s ‘and the feast of Unleavened Bread’ is probably not a correction but reduction of redundancy (as often)”. Hagner (1995: 753) claims that the mention of the feast of Unleavened Bread is not necessary because it was not needed by the intended Jewish readers of the Gospel of Matthew.

Luke specifically mentioned that \[\text{ἡ ἐορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα (the feast of Unleavened Bread, the one called Passover)}\] whereas Mark considers these as two separate feasts and links them with \[\text{kai}\]. Passover is celebrated on the night of the 14 to 15 Nisan to commemorate the emancipation of the people of Israel from slavery in Egypt. On that night, “all the firstborn of Egypt died and the firstborn of Israel were ‘passed over’. The next day Israel began its journey to the promised land. The Passover was the time when the nation reflected on its deliverance, as families held a meal to recall the event, sing, and offer thanks and sacrifices to God” (Bock 1996: 1702). The origin of the feast of Unleavened Bread is uncertain. It is celebrated for seven days (15 to 21 Nisan). “The seven day Mazzot feast was an agrarian festival which was adopted by Israel only in Canaan. … It is now impossible to determine the original religious meaning of the Mazzot festival. Israel early read into it historical significance, connecting it with the Exodus” (Windisch, TDNT 2:902). There is general agreement among scholars that during New Testament times these two feasts were generally considered to be the same.

In the OT, the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread are usually differentiated. The Passover offerings were slaughtered on Nisan 14, and the
Passover meal took place on the evening of Nisan 15, whereas the Festival of Unleavened Bread began on Nisan 15, and lasted until Nisan 21. The feasts were distinct, but obviously closely related. ... The terminological imprecision of both Marcan phrases and their parallels in Matthew and Luke is plain. In particular, a clear distinction between Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread is not maintained. Also Nisan 14 is referred to as the first day of Unleavened Bread/days of unleavened bread (Mark; Matt) and simply as the day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread (Luke). ... The imprecision of terminology relating to Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread is equally as evident in sources outside of the NT and roughly contemporary with it. Josephus consistently blurred the distinction between the two. (Smith 1991: 33 – 35).

An interesting observation is that Luke 22:2a has 10 words out of 11 which are exactly the same as in Mark 14:1b (which contains 13 words). But Mark 14:1b has only 3 words which are exactly the same as Matthew 26:4 (which contains 9 words). On the other hand, Mark 14:2 has 6 words (out of 11) which are exactly the same as Matthew 26:5 (which has 13 words). But Luke 22:2b only has 2 words (out of 4) with common roots to Matthew 26:5 and Mark 14:2. So, it does seem that Luke 22:2a is parallel to Mark 14:1b whereas Matthew 26:5 is parallel to Mark 14:2. This observation is not obvious when the statistics for whole pericopae are considered.

It can also be observed that Matthew has quite a substantial number of words which are not found in the other two gospels. Matthew has 54 unique words (out of 70). When these are taken into consideration, they give an indication how Matthew has either used another source of his own or has written in such a way that his narrative brings forth his message. First of all, this pericope starts with a typical “Matthean formula that marks the end of the (previous) discourse” (Hagner 1995: ...
It ends the last discourse of Jesus and indicates that this is the start of a new section of the gospel. After that, he provides the setting of what is to happen later by giving a time frame, that is, that the Passover is to be two days later. Hagner (1995: 753) comments:

Matthew has juxtaposed Jesus’ own statement concerning what is to befall him and the reference to the Jewish authorities contemplating how they might bring about his death. … These transitional verses set the direction of the conclusion of the Gospel. Jesus, after concluding his final teaching discourse, returns to the subject of his death, something that takes on a new degree of imminence with the mention of the counsel taken by the Jewish authorities.

Thus, through these five verses, Matthew sets the scene for his version of the passion narrative.

Benoit and Boismard (1980: 370-371) use this section (their section 312) in order to support their hypothesis of the inter-relationship among the gospels. They argue that the most difficult text to reconcile is that of Matthew. The author of that gospel writes that the high priests and the scribes decided not to kill Jesus during the festival in order to avoid trouble with the people. However, Jesus’ arrest and death happened exactly during the festival. Mark avoids this problem by placing his emphasis on the deceit and not on the festival. He implies that Jesus will be arrested and put to death during the festival but the Jewish leaders will need to use deceit in order to avoid a riot among the people. Luke drops both the deceit of the Jewish leaders and the death of Jesus during the feast. Therefore, by applying the principle that “le texte le plus difficile doit être le plus authentique (the most difficult reading of a text must be the original one)” (1980: 371), Benoit and Boismard conclude that the text of Matthew 26:4b-5 forms the basis of the intermediate Marcan text, and has also been used unchanged by the ultimate redactor of Matthew.
Hagner mentions the following differences between Matthew and Mark (1995: 753):

1. In verse 2, Matthew has the following,
   a. He changes the mention about the Passover being two days ahead into a direct speech from Jesus himself.
   b. He does not have the phrase καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα, which is “not needed for his Jewish readers” (Hagner, 1995: 753).
   c. He adds a note that Jesus said that the Son of Man “will be handed over to be crucified”.

2. In verse 3,
   a. Matthew provides the location where the Jewish leaders are meeting, 
      εἰς τὴν ἁύλην τοῦ ἁρχιερέως.

3. In verse 4,
   a. Matthew uses συνεβουλεύσαντο instead of Mark’s ἐξήτουν (Mark 14:1).
Matthew 26:1 – 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kai ἐγένετο ὅτε ἔτελεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, 2 Ὅδε τε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι. 3 Τότε συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερείου τοῦ λεγομένου Καϊάφα 4 καὶ συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα τόν Ἰησοῦν ὅλως κρατήσαι καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι. 5 ἔλεγον δὲ, Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα μὴ θόρυβος γένηται ἐν τῷ λαῷ.</td>
<td>1 When Jesus had finished saying all these things, he said to his disciples, 2 &quot;You know that after two days the Passover is coming, and the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified.&quot; 3 Then the chief priests and the elders of the people gathered in the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, 4 and they conspired to arrest Jesus by stealth and kill him. 5 But they said, &quot;Not during the festival, or there may be a riot among the people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- At the end of verse 1 and the beginning of verse 2,
  - αὐτοῦ ὁδατε – D does not have these two words.

- In verse 3,
  - Several manuscripts add either καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς or καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι.
    
    However, the words as they are in the NA²⁷ text are supported by ℓ⁴⁵, Θ, Α, B and D.
  - τοῦ λαοῦ – lacking in B*.
  - Καὶάφα – D has the proper noun Καὶάφα instead.

- In verse 4,
  - καὶ ἀποκτεῖνωσιν – B* does not have these words.
Mark 14:1 – 2

NA²⁷ | NRSV
---|---
1 Ην δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, καὶ ἔζητον οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτῶν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν. ² εἶλεγον γὰρ, Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μήποτε ἔσται θόρυϐος τοῦ λαοῦ. | 1 It was two days before the Passover and the festival of Unleavened Bread. The chief priests and the scribes were looking for a way to arrest Jesus by stealth and kill him; ² for they said, "Not during the festival, or there may be a riot among the people."

Table 5.1.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this pericope from Mark are:

- In verse 1,
  - καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα – D does not have this reading.
  - ἐν δόλῳ – These two words are not in D.

- In verse 2,
  - γάρ – A and C² use the conjunction δὲ instead.
  - Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μήποτε – D has the variant reading μήποτε ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ.
  - ἔσται θόρυϐος – The order of the words is reversed in A, but Κ, B, C and D have them as in the NA²⁷ text.

Luke 22:1 – 2

NA²⁷ | NRSV
---|---
1 Ἡγγιζεν δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἄζυμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα. ² καὶ ἔζητον οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὸ πῶς ἀνέλλωσιν αὐτῶν, ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν. | ¹ Now the festival of Unleavened Bread, which is called the Passover, was near. ² The chief priests and the scribes were looking for a way to put Jesus to death, for they were afraid of the people.

Table 5.1.3
Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 1,
  - ἒγγίζειν – In D, the imperfect ἒγγίζειν is replaced with the aorist ἔγγισεν.

- In verse 2,
  - καὶ ἐξῆτον οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς – The word order differs slightly in D which reads, οἱ δὲ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς ἐξῆτον.
  - ἀνέλωσιν – D uses the verb ἀπολέσωσιν which is from ἀπόλλυμι.

Section 307: The Betrayal by Judas

Matthew 26: 14-16; Mark 14: 10-11; Luke 22: 3-6

This section follows Matthew and Mark’s account of the anointing of Jesus in Bethany that is not in Luke. This omission from Luke provides the reader with a continuation of the story of the plotting by the Jewish leaders to get rid of Jesus through to his betrayal by one of his own disciples.

Matthew and Mark both introduce Section 307 with quite a few similar words – seven out of twelve words in Matthew and seven out of eleven in Mark. However, the order in which these words is found in these two gospels is different. Those who support Markan priority argue that Matthew has carried out changes to the Markan text in order to suit his literary style.

When the text of Luke is taken into consideration, it will be seen that he uses a substantial number of words that have the same roots as in Mark and Matthew. But the major difference is that Luke explains Judas’ action as that of Satan: ἔισηλθεν δὲ
While this idea is not shared by the other Synoptics, at John 13:27 Satan is also considered to be the perpetrator of Judas’ act. This has prompted scholars to argue that Luke has been influenced by the pre-Johannine tradition or that John makes use of Luke as one of his sources. However, Marshall (1978: 787) argues: “Luke’s contacts with John are to be explained in terms of common traditions”. Whatever the source, the question is, “What does it mean?”. Bock (1996, vol 2: 1703-1704) explains that while the meaning of this phrase is not certain, it is intended to convey that: “Judas came under the control of the spiritual personification of evil, Satan. Judas acts and is responsible, but Satan is the impetus”. Marshall (1978: 788) argues that Luke shows here that there is more than a human decision behind the passion of Jesus and the early church could see no other explanation as to what Judas did.

Matthew and Mark mention that Judas goes to the chief priests in order to betray Jesus to them. However, Matthew has direct speech rather than narrative. But Luke is the only one to mention that the στρατηγοί (the officials or temple police) are also involved in the incident. Marshall (1978: 788) comments that the textual variations “are due to the unusual nature of the word. Στρατηγός occurs 5x in Acts to refer to Roman magistrates; it is also used in the singular for the ruler of the Temple, the priest next in authority after the high priest. Here in the plural it refers to the temple police”. It should also be noted that apart from its use in Luke and Acts, this word does not appear elsewhere in the New Testament. Bock (1996, vol 2: 1705, n. 9), says that this Greek noun appears ten times in the New Testament and is used solely by Luke in his Gospel and Acts. However, a “related verb appears seven times in the writings by Paul, James, Peter and Luke”. Though the exact meaning of the noun is uncertain, as indicated above by Marshall, “suggestions about the identity
of the temple officials range from temple police to accountants of the temple treasury” (Nolland, 1993: 1030). It is possible that the latter has been suggested due to the fact that they are linked here with the money that Judas is being offered for the task. However, Nolland further comments that this cannot be the case since “their importance here is surely related to their ability to set in motion the arrest of Jesus rather than to their access to funds from the temple treasury to pay Judas for his betrayal” (1993: 1030).

Matthew is also unique in his portrayal of the betrayal by actually making Judas ask for money in a direct speech. Hagner (1995: 761) claims that Matthew intentionally indicates that the motive behind Judas’ betrayal is money, since he asks the chief priests how much they are willing to pay him. In a textual note, he mentions the fact that the verb used by Matthew, ἐστησαν, can be also be translated as “weighed out”. There is thus the possibility that Matthew is actually paving the way for him to connect this act of Judas with Zechariah 11:13 (which is quoted in Matthew 27:3) by also providing the exact amount of money involved (thirty pieces of silver). Mark and Luke do not say anything about Judas asking for money but state that after the authorities heard his proposal, they decided (Luke) or promised (Mark) to give him money.

All three gospels then set in motion the events that will lead to Jesus’ crucifixion. They all write that Judas begins to seek for the right opportunity to betray Jesus. However, they differ slightly in the details that they provide. Mark simply says that Judas starts to look for an opportunity to betray Jesus. Matthew indicates the importance of this act by using his favourite phrase ἀπὸ τὸτε “indicating a clear turning point in the narrative” (Hagner 1995: 761). On the other
hand, Luke writes that Judas agrees to the deal with the high priests and the temple
officials and also adds ἀπερ πνον αὐτοῖς in order to explain how the concerns of the
Jewish leaders (as expressed by Mark 14:1-2) are alleviated by the deal. Nolland
(1993: 1030) argues that Luke adds this in order to sort out this concern for the
leaders “to act surreptitiously and to keep the action against Jesus out of the view of
the throngs of festival pilgrims. It also answers to the Lukan emphasis on the role of
Jesus’ popularity with the public in placing a check on the plans of the Jerusalem
hierarchy”.

Hagner (1995: 760-761) notes: “Matthew continues to follow Mark, in this
case somewhat freely”. Then, he summarises the differences between Matthew and
Mark:

1. In verse 14,
   a. Matthew has an additional Τότε at the beginning of the verse.
   b. He moves εἰς τῶν δώδεκα to the beginning of the verse for
      emphasis, according to Hagner (1995: 760).
   c. He changes Mark’s Semitic Ισκαριώθ (Mark 14:10) to the
      Grecized Ισκαριώτης (as in Luke 22:3).

2. In verse 15,
   a. Matthew alters Mark’s narrative (Mark 14:10) into direct speech,
      “inserting the phrase ‘what will you give me?’ thereby adding
      pecuniary considerations to Judas’ motive” (Hagner, 1995: 760).
   b. He omits ἄκουσαντες ἔχαρσαν (Mark 14:11).
   c. He substitutes ἐστησαν for ἐπηγγείλαντο (Mark 14:11).
d. He also specifies the amount that the authorities agree to pay Judas, τριάκοντα ἀργύρια. Hagner (1995: 760) notes that this sets up the use of Zechariah 11:13 later in his narrative.

3. In verse 16,
   a. Matthew inserts ἀπὸ τότε at the beginning of the verse.
   b. He uses the accusative of the noun εὐκαιρία instead of the adverb εὐκαίρως (Mark 14:11).


### Matthew 26:14 – 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NA27</strong></th>
<th><strong>NRSV</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Τότε παρευθεὶς εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Ίούδας Ἰσκαριώτης, πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς ἐίπεν, Τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι, καγώ ἢ μὲν παραδώσω αὐτόν; οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια. 15 καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἔζητε εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτόν παραδῶ.</td>
<td>14 Then one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, went to the chief priests 15 and said, &quot;What will you give me if I betray him to you?&quot; They paid him thirty pieces of silver. 16 And from that moment he began to look for an opportunity to betray him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.2.1**

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings for this section of Matthew are confined to D:

- In verse 14,
  - the name of Judas Iscariot is written Σκαριώτης instead of Ἰσκαριώτης.
- In verse 15,
  - αὐτοῖς is used after εἶπεν.
Passion Narrative

- the type of silver coins is specified with σπατῆρας instead of ἀργύρια.

- In verse 16,
  - there is an additional αὐτοῖς at the conclusion of the verse.

Mark 14:10 – 11

Table 5.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA(^{27})</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ ἐίς τῶν δώδεκα ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῶ αὐτοῖς. 11 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἔχαρσαν καὶ ἐπηγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι. καὶ ἐζήτησε πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδῷ.</td>
<td>10 Then Judas Iscariot, who was one of the twelve, went to the chief priests in order to betray him to them. 11 When they heard it, they were greatly pleased, and promised to give him money. So he began to look for an opportunity to betray him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes: The variant readings for these two verses are:

- In verse 10,
  - Ἰσκαριώτης – in A and C\(^2\) the name is spelt Ἰσκαριώτης. D has the same spelling, Σκαριώτης, as it has in Matthew.
  - ὁ ἐίς – in place of these words D reads ἐκ. It is also interesting to note that where the original scribe of Ν had only ἐίς, a later copyist (Ν\(^2\)) has both words (ὁ ἐίς) as in the NA\(^{27}\) text.
  - αὐτὸν παραδῶ – D has the reading προδῶ αὐτὸν. The form προδῶ (2\(^{nd}\) Aorist Subjunctive, 3\(^{rd}\) Person Singular of προδίδωμι) is not found in the entire text of NA\(^{27}\). The only other occurrence of this word is the form προεῖδωκεν which is found in Romans 11:35. Ν and C have the variant reading αὐτὸν παραδῶ.
Table 5.2.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 3,
  - καλούμενον – A and C have ἐπικαλούμενον whereas Ν, B and D support the reading of the NA27 text.

- In verse 4,
  - τοῖς ἄρχιερεσιν – C has the additional καὶ γραμματεύσιν after these two words.
  - καὶ στρατηγοῖς – D does not have this phrase.
  - αὐτοῖς παραδῷ αὐτῶν – A changes the order of these words to αὐτῶν παραδῷ αὐτοῖς whereas D replaces them with παραδοὺ αὐτῶν.

- In verse 5,
  - ἄργυριον – A and C change the singular form to the plural ἄργυρια.

- In verse 6,
  - ἄτερ ὀχλοῦ αὐτοῖς – D does not have the pronoun αὐτοῖς whereas the other major manuscripts under consideration (𝔓75, Ν, A, B and C) have all three words, as in NA27.
Section 308: Preparation for the Passover

Matthew 26: 17-20; Mark 14: 12-17; Luke 22: 7-14

This section is the first part of the account of the Last Supper. It deals with the preparation of the last meal that Jesus is going to have with his disciples. For the past few decades, scholars have been arguing about whether this meal is a Passover meal or not. It is generally accepted that the Synoptics clearly indicate that it is the Passover meal. However, the Gospel of John presents it as one taken before the Passover. Leon Morris (1992: 653-654) summarises the different positions offered as follows:

1. The two accounts are in conflict and the one from the Synoptics is to be preferred.

2. The two accounts are in conflict but the preferred one is from John.

3. The Last Supper is the Passover meal as specified in the Synoptics and the account from John can be reconciled with them.

4. John’s account is the correct one and the Passover took place at the time that John indicated. Thus, the meal described in the Synoptics is not the Passover but this can be reconciled with John’s account.

5. The calendars used by John and the Synoptics are different. It has been suggested that John is using the official calendar (that is, the one used by the Temple officials) whereas the accounts of the Synoptics are based on the one used by Jesus and his disciples.
In his commentary on the Gospel of John, Morris (1995: 684-695) gives additional notes on these proposed solutions. After providing extensive reasons argued by the many scholars in order to support their position, Morris indicates his support for the fifth suggestion. He argues that:

A point in favor of the calendar divergence view is that the accounts of the Last Supper make no mention of the lamb nor of such characteristic Passover dishes as the bitter herbs. If the Temple authorities held to one view of the correct day for the Passover and if Jesus and his followers held with those who accepted an alternate view, then they would not have been able to obtain a lamb duly sacrificed at the temple and their celebration would necessarily differ from what might have been expected. (Morris, 1995: 694)

While scholars, such as Morris, have argued that harmonization of the Synoptics with John’s account is necessary, there is certainly the need to read or listen to each gospel writer separately. Each writer has a message to convey to his readers and that message is the nucleus of his gospel. However, Mann argues (Mann, 1986: 3-4):

While it is true that our four existing documents were compiled for diverse audiences, and that these audiences to some extent dictated the varying emphases and preoccupations of the four evangelists, nevertheless all four works assume a ministry of Jesus within the confines of the Covenant people of Israel.

Though the details may differ from one another, there are common elements among the four gospels, and these include the Passion Narrative. Keener concludes his discussion on the timing of the Passover by arguing (1999: 623):

Calendrical differences may allow us to harmonize John and the Synoptics, but most likely John has simply provided a theological interpretation of Jesus’
death, considering the way he opens Jesus’ ministry with the temple cleansing so that the shadow of passion week may cover the whole period.

There is a need to appreciate the message of the gospel writer without comparison with the others. Davies and Allison (1997: 456) reflect this in their discussion of whether the last supper was a Passover meal by saying: “but whatever the historical fact, Matthew’s point of view is clear: the last supper was Passover”.

Another observation that can be made about this section is the way in which each gospel writer has developed his message. If the length of each of the passages is considered, it can be seen that Matthew has 69 words, Mark has 106 and Luke has 107. Davies and Allison (1997: 456) provide the following differences between Matthew and Mark:

Matthew has made several interesting changes to Mark. He has (i) greatly abbreviated; (ii) referred to ‘the disciples’ in general rather than two in particular; (iii) omitted both the man with a water jar and mention of an upper room and in general made the scene less picturesque; (iv) inserted ‘my time is at hand’; (v) turned a question of Jesus into a statement; and (vi) added an apparent allusion to Exodus and so underlined the new exodus theme.

Hagner (1995: 763) gives a more detailed list of the differences between Matthew and Mark. He comments that though Matthew shows signs of dependence on Mark, he has abbreviated it quite substantially. He then gives the following differences:

1. In verse 17,
   a. Matthew omits ἴμπερα (Mark 14:12).
   b. He also omits the phrase ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουν. Hagner (1995: 763) writes: “Matthew may have been bothered by the fact that the first day
of the feast of Unleavened Bread was 15 Nisan while the lambs were sacrificed on 14 Nisan”.

c. He omits ἄπελθοντες (Mark 14:12).

2. Matthew does not have most of the material in Mark 14:13 – 16. Hagner (1995: 763) observes: “in contrast with this [the omission], Matthew preserves from Mark only that the disciples were to go into the city to a certain man and tell him that the teacher says he wants to eat the Passover there with his disciples”.

3. In verse 18,
   a. He adds the phrase, Ὅ καιρός μου ἐγγύς ἔστιν.

Hagner goes on to argue (1995: 763):

It is perhaps surprising that Matthew here abbreviates Mark as much as he does. The reason is not that he has any objection to the material but more probably that he is pressed to conserve space; Mark’s details are not necessary at this point. This is in keeping with Matthew’s practice throughout the Gospel in his use of Mark.

Bock (1996: 1708) summarises the differences between Luke and Mark by saying:

There are two differences between Mark and Luke. (1) in Luke, Jesus initiates the discussion about the meeting place, while in Mark the disciples ask where the meal is to be held, a remark that Luke has in response to Jesus’ initiation of the discussion. Luke appears to be more complete at this point. (2) Luke alone identifies the two disciples as Peter and John.

With so many changes in such short passages, the question is whether Matthew and Luke have really “made several interesting changes to Mark”. Can such a statement
be substantiated in these passages? Is it possible, in this case, that each gospel writer has received the tradition through a separate source (possibly oral) and then written his passage down instead of postulating that Matthew and Luke used Mark as their source? In his comments on the last supper in Luke, Bock (1996: 1716) writes: “the sources behind these events are hard to establish with certainty. The problem parallels other passages in the passion accounts and suggests that Luke had access to multiple sources”. Mann, a supporter of the Griesbach hypothesis, argues: “the parallels are such that commentators are sharply divided as to the historical reliability of these critical verses” (1986: 561). It can be argued that for these passages, the arguments for and against each of the synoptic hypotheses fail to reach any decisive conclusion.

The Boismard-Lamouille Synopsis (Section 337) differs from the Aland Synopsis for this section. It considers the last verse for each gospel passage of Aland Section 308 as forming part of the following section. It is also interesting to note that the Boismard-Lamouille Synopsis is not the only one to differ from Aland in the division of the verses into sections here. An overall majority of the commentators on the Synoptic gospels, including Bock, Marshall, Nolland and Evans, place the last verse of each of the gospels with the next section. They are of the view that verses 20 of Matthew, 17 of Mark and 14 of Luke are actually the beginning of the last supper itself. It can be seen from the content of the verses that it does make sense to include them with the section on the last supper.
Matthew 26:17 – 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες, Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα; ὃ δὲ εἶπεν, Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὸν δείνα καὶ εἴπατε αὐτῷ, ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει, ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγὺς ἐστίν, πρὸς σὲ ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου. 18 καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὡς συνέταξαν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. 19 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης ἀνέκειτο μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Textual Notes: These are the variant readings: |
| ➢ In verse 17, |
|   • λέγοντες – A and E have αὐτῷ after λέγοντες . |
| ➢ In verse 18, |
|   • A does not have the phrase ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει. |
| ➢ In verse 20, |
|   • Ν and A have the additional word μαθητῶν after δώδεκα. |
Mark 14:12 – 17

On the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover lamb is sacrificed, his disciples said to him, "Where do you want us to go and make the preparations for you to eat the Passover?" So he sent two of his disciples, saying to them, "Go into the city, and a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him, and 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?' He will show you a large room upstairs, furnished and ready. Make preparations for us there." So the disciples set out and went to the city, and found everything as he had told them; and they prepared the Passover meal. When it was evening, he came with the twelve.

Table 5.3.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 12,
  - οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ – D does not have the pronoun αὐτοῦ after οἱ μαθηταὶ.
  - ἀπελθόντες ἔτοιμασομεν – D contains σοι after these two words.

- In verse 13,
  - δύο τῶν μαθητῶν – D has ἐκ between δύο and τῶν μαθητῶν.
  - καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς – D has λέγων instead.

- In verse 14,
  - ἔν – A, B and D have ἄν instead.
  - τὸ κατάλυμα μου – A does not have the pronoun μου after τὸ κατάλυμα.
  - τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φέγγω – D reads μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγομαι τὸ πάσχα.
In verse 15,
- μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἔτοιμον – D has οἰκόν ἐστρωμένον μέγαν instead of μέγα ἐστρωμένον. A and D does not have the word ἔτοιμον.
- καὶ ἐκεῖ – A does not have the leading καὶ whereas ฿ and D use the compound word κάκει.

In verse 16,
- οἱ μαθηταὶ – A, C and D have an additional αὐτῷ after these two words whereas the reading of NA27 is supported by ฿ and B.
- εὕρον – D has ἐποίησαν instead.

In verse 17,
- Καὶ ὀψίας – D reads ὀψίας δὲ instead.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἦν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἄζυμων, [ἐν] ἦν ἐδει δύσασθαι τὸ πάσχα. 8 καὶ ἀπεστείλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην εἰπὼν, Πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν. 9 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ποῦ τέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν; 10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων ἵματων εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσει ὑμῖν ἀνθρώπος κεράμῳ ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπράξεται, 11 καὶ ἐρεῖ τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας, Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος, Ποῦ ἔστω τὸ κατάλημα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; 12 κακεύνοις ἦμιν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· εἰκετοιμάσατε. 13 ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἶρήκει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἤτοιμασαν τὸ πάσχα. 14 Καὶ ὥστε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ.</td>
<td>Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed. 8 So Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, &quot;Go and prepare the Passover meal for us that we may eat it.&quot; 9 They asked him, &quot;Where do you want us to make preparations for it?&quot; 10 &quot;Listen,&quot; he said to them, &quot;when you have entered the city, a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him into the house he enters 11 and say to the owner of the house, 'The teacher asks you, &quot;Where is the guest room, where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?&quot;' 12 He will show you a large room upstairs, already furnished. Make preparations for us there.&quot; 13 So they went and found everything as he had told them; and they prepared the Passover meal. 14 When the hour came, he took his place at the table, and the apostles with him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 7,
  - τῶν ἄζυμων – D contains τοῦ πάσχα instead. Bock (1996: 1714) comments: “this reading is clearly secondary since it ignores the context’s idiom and corrects what seemed to be a difficult reference to Unleavened Bread. The scribe did not know the Jewish idiom and made the change”.

- In verse 8,
  - D has an additional τὸν in front of Πέτρον.

- In verse 9,
  - D has an additional σοι at the end of the verse and B ends the verse with σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα.

- In verse 10,
  - D does not have αὐτοῖς after εἶπεν.
  - εἰσελθόντων – D differs from the other witnesses and has εἰσερχόμενον instead.
  - συναντήσει – C has ὑπαντήσει and D has ἀπαντήσει.
  - κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων – The order of the words in D is βαστάζων κεράμιον ὕδατος.
  - The words εἰς ἦν, as in NA27, are found in Ν and B and C. A reads οὗ ἦν whereas D has οὗ.

- In verse 11,
  - τῆς οίκιας – After these two words, Ν has the additional word λέγοντες.
  - Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος – D does not have σοι in the phrase.
  - τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα – Ν and C read τὸ κατάλυμα μου ὅπου τὸ πάσχα instead.
Section 311: The Last Supper

Matthew 26: 26-29; Mark 14: 22-25; Luke 22: 15-20

This section is the account of the Last Supper. It deals with what happens during the last meal that Jesus had with his disciples and as such is considered one of the most important events in Jesus’ ministry. It is also considered to be the basis of how the Last Supper is celebrated in churches today. Nevertheless, there are several names commonly used today to describe this practice.

One of the most widely used is the Holy Communion. The King James Version (KJV), and the New King James Version (NKJV) as well, translate the Greek word κοινωνία as communion. Marshall (1980: 15) comments that this translation has made the term communion to be applied to this event during a church service. However, modern translations of the New Testament (apart from the NKJV) have preferred to use words like “participation” (NIV, RSV) or “sharing” (NRSV,
Another term that is also commonly used is the *Lord’s Supper*. This is taken from Paul’s description of a common meal in 1 Cor 11:20, *κυριακὸν δείπνον*. Some churches, like the Brethren, use the term *Breaking of Bread* as used in Acts 2:42 (*τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου*) and 1 Cor 10:16 (*τὸν ἄρτον ὥν κλαῖμεν*). Other churches (like the Anglican) use the term *Eucharist*. This is derived from the Greek word *εὐχαριστεῖν* which means “to give thanks”. This is based on the thanksgiving prayers that are said as part of the consecration of the elements of bread and wine during the service. According to Marshall (1980: 15): “this term apparently became the favourite one in the early church (Did. 9:1, 5; Ign. Phld. 4; Smyr. 8:1), and it is the source for the adjective ‘eucharistic’ which is a useful addition to our theological vocabulary of technical terms”. Though the term *Holy Communion* is not exactly what the Greek word means, it will be the term used in this analysis since it is widely used in churches today.

Can the Last Supper be equated to the Holy Communion? While it can be argued that the Last Supper formed the basis of the Holy Communion, the relationship between the Gospel records of the Last Supper and the practice of Holy Communion is complex. Kodell argues (1988: 22):

The early Christian community’s experience of the Eucharist has influenced the way the Last Supper is presented in the biblical accounts. The result is that the New Testament model for the Eucharist is really two models, converging in the Christian liturgical tradition from two different but interacting sources: the Last Supper and the Lord’s Supper. The distinction is between the final meal Jesus shared with his disciples before he died and the community re-enactment of that meal after Jesus’ death and resurrection. Some unravelling of the accounts is needed to trace the developments from the Last Supper to the Lord’s Supper.

Along the same line of argument, Marshall writes (1980: 16-17):
When we turn to the New Testament to look for information about the Lord’s Supper, we find that at first sight the evidence is extremely meagre. If Paul’s first letter to the church at Corinth had not survived, and if that church had not needed to be admonished about the behaviour of some of its members at the meal, we should know next to nothing about how the meal was celebrated in the early church. … It is important to remember that these accounts (in the three Synoptic Gospels) describe the Last Supper; they are therefore not direct witnesses for the procedure followed at the Lord’s Supper, although the way in which the last meal of Jesus is described may well have been influenced by the use of the narrative to provide a pattern for the church to follow.

In order to come up with his conclusion on the link between the Last Supper and the Holy Communion, Marshall looked at the background of the religious meals within the Jewish community in the first century. Using the Old Testament practice as the basis of his analysis, he argues that at such a meal, “the religious aspect was expressed by the giving of thanks to God at both the beginning and the end” (Marshall, 1980: 19). He also observes that this pattern of thanksgiving to God for the food and drink is certainly that in practice during the time of Jesus and the early church. Then, having analysed the passages in the Synoptic Gospels concerning the Last Supper, he concludes that while the original wording of the texts cannot be established, the description of what happens during the meal and the sayings of Jesus are “remarkably unaffected by this uncertainty” (Marshall, 1980: 56). But the question asked by Marshall is whether the claims of the Synoptic Gospels, that the Last Supper is a Passover meal, are valid. He proceeds to an in-depth analysis of the passages and concludes (Marshall, 1980: 75) that Jesus indeed has a Passover meal with his disciples but holds it twenty-four hours ahead of the official Jewish date. Jesus is able to do so because the Pharisees and the Sadducees have different calendars and differ by one day for the Passover meal.
Hagner (1995: 771) states that Matthew’s text is very close to that of Mark, then gives the following differences between the two:

1. In verse 26,
   a. Matthew has the imperative, *δάγγετε*. Hagner (1995: 771) says that in Matthew’s Gospel this is a natural addition “but the present pericope is the only eucharist narrative with this imperative”.

2. In verse 27,
   a. Matthew changes Mark’s statement (Mark 14:23) into an imperative, Πέτε *εξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*. Hagner (1995: 771) comments that this brings “about parallelism with the imperative ‘eat’ (v 26) no doubt through liturgical influence”.

3. In verse 28,
   a. Matthew adds *εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτίων* “implied in the preceding phrase ‘poured out for many,’ but made explicit only in Matthew” (Hagner, 1995: 771).

4. In verse 29,
   a. Matthew qualifies the meeting of Jesus again with his disciples, *μεθ’ ἑμῶν*, in the Kingdom of God.
   b. For Mark’s τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 14:25) he substitutes τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου.
   c. He also drops Mark’s ἀμὴν (Mark 14:25) “which thereby avoids the common formula (but it is difficult to know why)” (Hagner, 1995: 771).
Passion Narrative

Textual Comments

The most significant and debated variant in this section is that involving the passage from Luke. The fifth century Codex Bezae, commonly known as D, forms part of a group of manuscripts referred to as the Western text. This text has the greatest number of variant readings from what is generally accepted as the text of the Gospels and Acts. These variant readings take the form of additions to or omissions from the text of the majority of manuscripts. Westcott and Hort called those omissions from D the Western Non-Interpolations. Snodgrass (1972: 369) writes:

In these few readings they had no doubt that the Western text preserved the original reading and that the tendency of scribes to make their texts as full as possible accounted for the interpolations in all other manuscripts. In other words, on the basis of D and its non-Greek allies, Wescott and Hort omitted verses or portions of verses that appear in all or nearly all other manuscripts.

Westcott and Hort include Luke 22:19b-20 as one of the Western Non-Interpolations and thus, they claim that it is likely that this was part of the original text.

Fitzmyer (1985: 1387-1388) identifies six forms of the text-tradition, some of which also include verses 17 and 18. These six forms are:

1. One is called the long-text (verses 17-20) and manuscripts that support this text include P 75vid, A, B, C K, L, T, W, X, Δ, Θ, Π, Ψ, 063, f 1,13, Vulgate, many minuscules, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian and Georgian.

2. Another is called the short-text (verses 17-19a) and is supported mainly by D and some of the older Latin version (a, d, f12, i, l).
3. b and e of the older Latin version, with some minor differences, have the verses in the order of 19a, 17 and 18.

4. The Curetonian Old Syriac version also contains some minor differences in the order of the words and the order of the verses are 19, 17 and 18.

5. The Sinaitic Old Syriac version has the text of the long version (without the cup being mentioned in verse 20) but the order of the verses is 19, 20a, 17, 20b, 18.

6. The Syriac Peshitta and some copies of the Bohairic version have verses 17 and 18 missing.

While it can be seen from the list that the majority of extent manuscripts supports the so-called long-text, nevertheless many scholars adopted the short-text until the 1950’s when this position was strongly challenged. Proponents of the short-text have generally used the following arguments to back their claims (Marshall, 1978: 800):

1. The shorter text is briefer and more difficult than the longer text. 2. The longer text can be explained as due to assimilation to 1 Cor. 11:24 and Mk. 14:24b, whereas it is hard to see why an original long text should have been abbreviated. 3. The style of vs. 19b-20 is not Lucan. 4. Luke’s aversion to ‘ransom’-theology (cf. 22:27, diff. Mk. 10:45) precluded him from incorporating sacrificial ideas into his understanding of the death of Jesus. 5. Redactional study suggests that the shorter text can be explained in terms of Lucan editing of Mk. to change an account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper into an account of Jesus’ last Passover meal.
The shorter text was not only supported by numerous scholars but was also the text published by Nestle (until the 25th Edition) and the British and Foreign Bible Society (2nd Edition). This was also adopted by some English versions, namely, the RSV (until its revision in 1972) and the NEB.

However, in the past few decades overall support has been for the longer text of Luke as a result of extensive studies by scholars like Jeremias and Schürmann. The arguments that have been formulated to support the longer text are (Marshall, 1978: 800):

1. The shorter text is supported by only one Greek manuscript and thus, is unlikely to be original.

2. The longer text is based on 1 Cor. 11 but has some differences. It is thought that this reflects a more primitive version.

3. The omission of verses 19b-20 results in a difficult narrative since 19a “can hardly have stood on its own”.

4. Jeremias (1966: 156 – 169) contends that “the omission in the shorter text may have been due to an attempt to preserve the secrecy of the words of institution”. Marshall disagrees with this point of view, claiming that “it is hard to see why this motif did not affect the text of Mt. and Mk.”. Marshall also comments that Schürmann argues that the manuscripts might have contained the shorter text in order to reflect the liturgical practice of the second century. Another explanation for the shorter text is
that “confusion may have arisen as a result of Luke’s earlier mention of a cup shared by the disciples” (Marshall, 1978: 800).

5. Proponents of the longer text find it difficult to accept the argument that Luke had an aversion to the ransom theology and thus changed Mark’s text in order to reflect this. They use Acts 20:28 to support this: “Keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God that he obtained with the blood of his own Son”.

These arguments demonstrate the strength of the arguments in favour of the longer text. This has caused some commentators to make remarks like: “given the lengthy list of external witnesses to the long text, one wonders why Westcott and Hort were able to exert such influence, for their decision was followed by other critical texts, versions and numerous scholars” (Fitzmyer, 1985: 1388) or “the external evidence for the longer text is overwhelming” (Marshall, 1978: 800). While this may be the case, there is no general consensus on the longer text. This is reflected the comment made by Metzger (1994: 176), a member of the Editorial Committee of the NA27 and UBS 4th Editions:

The weight of these considerations was estimated differently by different members of the Committee. A minority preferred the shorter text as a Western non-interpolation. The majority, on the other hand, impressed by the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence supporting the longer form, explained the origin of the shorter form as due to some scribal accident or misunderstanding.
Matthew 26:26 – 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA^{27}</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοῦσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν, Δάβιδε φάγετε, τούτο ἔστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε εἰς αὐτοῦ πάντες, 28 τούτῳ γὰρ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυσάμενον εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. 29 λέγω δὲ ἤμι, ὦ μὴ πίω ἀπ’ ἄρτῳ τοῦ γενέτευρος τῆς ἁμετάβαλτης ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ’ ἢμῶν καὶ θυσιάσω ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.</td>
<td>26 While they were eating, Jesus took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to the disciples, and said, &quot;Take, eat; this is my body.&quot; 27 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, saying, &quot;Drink from it, all of you; 28 for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. 29 I tell you, I will never again drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this passage of Matthew are:

- In verse 26,
  - ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν – D has these three words in a different order: αὐτῶν δὲ ἐσθιόντων.
  
  - A has τὸν in front of ἄρτον, whereas the NA^{27} text is supported by ℞^{45}, ℳ, B, C and D.
  
  - καὶ εὐλογήσας – A and E use καὶ εὐχαριστήσας. The NA^{27} indicates in its critical apparatus that there is a parallel to the word used in Luke 22:19. Hagner (1995: 770) comments that some manuscripts are probably influenced by the parallel in Luke but also points out that Matthew uses the word εὐχαριστήσας in verse 27.

- δοῦσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς – ℳ*, A and C read ἐδίδοσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ whereas ℞^{37,45vid}, ℳ¹, B and D have the same text as the NA^{27}.  
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In verse 27,

- \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\text{ivd,45}\), A, C and D have τὸ before ποιήσων. Hagner (1995: 770) notes that “some important witnesses (P^{45} A C D K \Gamma j^{13}) include the definite article τὸ. The tendency of scribes would have been to add rather than delete the definite article”. Metzger (1994: 54) supports this comment.

- καὶ εὐχαριστήσας – A and C do not have καὶ before εὐχαριστήσας.

In verse 28,

- A and C have τὸ before τῆς διαθήκης whereas the NA²⁷ text is supported by \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\), \(\kappa\), B and D. Hagner (1995: 770) adds that the definite article produces “an attributive adjectival phrase, ‘the blood of the covenant’, which is much smoother than the accepted text. For that reason, it is probably not original”.

- A, C and D have the word καὶνής between the words τῆς διαθήκης. Morris (1992: 660) argues that this is probably not in the original reading since the idea that the new covenant of Jeremiah 31 is in mind “is clear from the fact that Jesus goes on to speak of the forgiveness of sins”. Hagner (1995: 771) says that scribes have added this word “almost certainly from the parallel in Luke 22:20; 1Cor 11:25”. Metzger (1994: 54) argues: “the word καὶνής has apparently come from the parallel passage in Luke (22.20); if it had been present originally, there is no good reason why anyone would have deleted it”. The NA²⁷ text is supported by \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\), \(\kappa\) and B.

In verse 29,

- οὐ μὴ – A and C have ὅτι before οὐ μὴ whereas \(\mathcal{P}^{45}\), \(\kappa\), B and D do not, as is the case with the NA²⁷ text.

- ἐκ τοῦτου τοῦ γενήματος – \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\), \(\kappa\), and C read ἐκ τοῦτου γενήματος.

- πίνω – \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\) and D use πίω.
Mark 14:22 – 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Кαὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἐκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάφητε, τούτῳ ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τούτῳ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. 25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὅσιόν τις τῆς ἡμέρας ἑκείνης ὅταν αὕτῳ πίνω καὶ τῆς ἃμερας ἀπελθεῖν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.</td>
<td>22 While they were eating, he took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them, and said, &quot;Take; this is my body.&quot; 23 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, and all of them drank from it. 24 He said to them, &quot;This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. 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.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 22,
  - Ν* and C have ὃ Ἰησοῦς before ἄρτον. The text of NA²⁷ is supported by Ν¹, B and D.
- In verse 23,
  - A has τὸ before ποτήριον.
- In verse 24,
  - τῆς διαθήκης – A reads τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, D* reads τῆς διαθήκης and the text of NA²⁷ is also the reading of Ν, B, C and Dε. Metzger (1994: 95) writes: “it is much more likely that καινῆς is a scribal addition, derived from the parallel accounts in Luke 22.20 and 1Cor 11.25, than that, being present originally, it was omitted from Ν B C L Θ Ψ 565 itk cop sa ms bo geo¹”.
  - ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν – The order of the words in D is ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. A has περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον (which is parallel to Matthew 26:28) whereas the reading of NA²⁷ is the same as that in Ν, B and C.
In verse 25,

- οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω – K and C do not have the word οὐκέτι and D reads οὐ μὴ πρόσθω πεῖν. Metzger (1994: 95) argues: “the absence of οὐκέτι from K C L W al is probably to be accounted for as a result of scribal assimilation to the parallel passage in Matthew (26.29)”. A and B support the text of NA.27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἑπτυθοῦμαι ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ’ ἑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. 16 λέγω γὰρ ἑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 17 καὶ δεξαμενός ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. 18 λέγω γὰρ ἑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἕως ἄν γενήσετο τῆς ἁμαρτχῆς ἥτοι ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. 19 καὶ λαμβάνω ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλαμψε καὶ ἐδόκειν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἔμμην ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὅσα ἔμεινε μετὰ τὸ δεσποτῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καὶ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐν τῷ ἀματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυσάμενον. | He said to them, "I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; 16 for I tell you, I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." 17 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." 19 Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 20 And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, "This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood."

Table 5.4.3

**Textual Notes**: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 16,
  - οὐτί οὐ μὴ φάγω – C* and D do not include the word οὐτί.
  - οὐ μὴ φάγω – C reads οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω and D οὐκέτι μὴ φάγομαι whereas the NA²⁷ text is also the reading of Ῡ⁷⁵νδ, Ν, A and B. Metzger adds (1994: 147):
    
    It appears that copyists inserted οὐκέτι in order to alleviate an otherwise abrupt saying (cf. the preferred text of Mk 14.25). If the word were present originally, there is no satisfactory explanation to account for its absence from Ῡ⁷⁵νδ Ν A B L Ὺ f¹ it² cop⁴⁰⁴ bo al .

- αὐτό – A, C² and D have ἔξι αὐτοῦ instead and the NA²⁷ text is also that of Ν, B and C*.

- πληρωθῇ – D has the words καῖν ὑπὲρ βρόθη instead.
Passion Narrative

➢ In verse 17,

- ποτήριον – A and D have an additional τὸ in front of ποτήριον.
- Λάβετε τοῦτο – Ν* does not have τοῦτο after Λάβετε.
- καὶ διαμερίσατε – D excludes καὶ before διαμερίσατε.
- εἰς ἑαυτοὺς – This reading of the NA²⁷ is also that of Ν², B and C; A and D have ἑαυτοῖς, and Ν* has ἀλλήλοις.

➢ In verse 18,


> It is not clear whether ὦτι should be read; Ἰ P75vid B C D L f1 pc e; Synopsis; (UBS) omit it, and since the temptation to assimilation to Mk. 14:25 and Lk. 22:16 and to Lucan style was strong, the omission should probably be accepted.

- ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν – While the NA²⁷ text is the reading of Ἰ P75vid, Ν and B, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is not in the reading of A and C whereas D places the phrase before οὐ μὴ πίω. Marshall argues (1978: 799): “ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν corresponds to Mk. οὐκέτι (contrast Lk. 22:16) and is probably Lucan.”

- οὐ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, the NA²⁷ text, is the reading of Ν, B and Cvid whereas A and D have the word ὦτου instead of οὐ. Marshall (1978: 799) claims that the use of οὐ is Lucan and this differs from Mark’s phrase τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὦταν which is “closer to an Aramaic formulation with its pleonastic demonstrative”.

- ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθη – The order of the words in the phrase differs in D which has ἐλθη ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
In verse 19,

- A has ἀνέβητε before τὸ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα.
- εἰς τὴν ἐκείνην ἀνάμνησιν – B* does not include εἰς in the phrase.

In verse 20,

- καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως – A reads ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον instead.

Section 312: Jesus Foretells His Betrayal


In Matthew and Mark, this section precedes the actual account of the Last Supper whereas Luke places it after. The texts of Matthew and Mark are very similar to one other, especially Mark 14:21 and Matthew 26:24. Furthermore, verse 25 of Matthew is not found in Mark and there are also other additions, about which Hagner writes (1995: 766):

Matthew further adds details of the setting in v20, the poignant κύριε, “Lord”, in v22 (cf. Mark 14:19) and in v23 the words τὴν χεῖρα, “the hand”, as well as the emphatic οὗτος με παραδώσει, “this one will betray me”, at the end of the verse (cf. Mark 14:20). Matthew thus again preserves and modifies his source.

On the other hand, whilst Luke’s account of this event is similar in content, the words used are quite different. Marshall (1978: 807) says that there are three suggestions made about the relationship between the text of Mark (thus also Matthew) and Luke:
1. Luke has transposed the narrative by Mark and used different wording. The main proponent of this view is Schürmann.

2. Luke is using his special source (in this case, it is the account of the Last Supper). This is the view of Rehkopf.

3. This is a combination of the above two points. The suggestion, by Taylor, is that Luke is following his special source, but has used Mark for verse 22.

There is no definite answer to this question and Marshall (1978: 808) concludes that Luke is most probably editing his source, which is close to the text of Mark, but has been influenced by the wording of Mark, “with which of course he was familiar”. Nolland (1993: 1058) argues that there are two main reasons why Luke may not be using Mark as his source:

1. The Gospel of John also locates the betrayal of Jesus after the meal.

2. The response of the disciples is to question one another rather than each one questioning Jesus, as in Mark.

Bock (1996: 1733-1735) suggests that there is possibly more than one tradition concerning the betrayal of Jesus by Judas. He claims that Luke (and for that matter John as well) reverses the order of the events surrounding the betrayal as portrayed in Matthew and Mark. He summarised the issue by arguing:

all the matters discussed at the meal in order to give the meal a prominent position and to present the final remarks as a unit, as a final testament. He thus delayed raising the betrayal issue until after the meal and reduced its report to a bare minimum. One advantage of this move is that it adds a dramatic contrast with the subsequent dispute about greatness (22:24-30). In the midst of Judas’s betrayal, the disciples are bickering about issues that are off the mark. They miss what Jesus came to show. … So Luke’s account is expressed uniquely in a unique locale, though it is similar to John 13:22. Luke’s account looks like a summary of what the other accounts record with more detail.

Textual Comments

This section does not have variant readings that can be considered significant. However, some observations can be made from these variants. It can be seen from the textual comments that Evans mentions a variant that the NA27 text did not include in its critical apparatus. Evans (2001: 369) observes that in Mark 14:20, A has the additional words ἐλπίς χείρα which makes it closer to Matthew 26:23. In the following verse in Mark, Ψ, A, C and D have the word ἴν between the words καλὸν αὐτῷ which makes the reading exactly the same as that in Matthew 26:24. Only B supports the text of NA27. Though this is not a reading that can be classified as important, we can observe that the NA27 text has given more weight to the reading of B than most of the other witnesses considered in this project which have the additional word. In both of these cases, the NA27 text has opted for a reading for Mark that makes it less similar to that of Matthew.
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Matthew 26:21-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA(^{27})</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με.</td>
<td>21 and while they were eating, he said, &quot;Truly I tell you, one of you will betray me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 καὶ λυπούμενοι οὐφόρα ἔρχοντο λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕκαστος, Μήτε ἐγώ εἶμι, κύριε;</td>
<td>22 And they became greatly distressed and began to say to him one after another, &quot;Surely not I, Lord?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυπλιῶν αὐτὸς με παραδώσει.</td>
<td>23 He answered, &quot;The one who has dipped his hand into the bowl with me will betray me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάρχει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ δὲ οὐ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ σὺ ἔγενητή σου ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.</td>
<td>24 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.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ἰουδᾶς ὁ παραδίδωσις αὐτῶν εἶπεν, Μήτε ἐγὼ εἰμί, Ῥαββί; λέγει αὐτῷ, Σὺ εἶπας.</td>
<td>25 Judas, who betrayed him, said, &quot;Surely not I, Rabbi?&quot; He replied, &quot;You have said so.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 21,
  - ὑμῖν ὅτι – \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\) and \(\mathcal{P}^{45}\) do not have the word ὅτι.

- In verse 22,
  - λέγειν αὐτῷ – \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\text{vid}, \mathcal{P}^{45}\) and D do not have the pronoun αὐτῷ.
  - εἰς ἕκαστος – The NA\(^{27}\) text is supported by \(\mathcal{K}\), B and C. \(\mathcal{P}^{45}\) and D read εἰς ἐκ αὐτῶν whereas \(\mathcal{P}^{64}\text{vid}\) does not have these words at all.

- In verse 23,
  - μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυπλιῶν – The order of the words differs in a few manuscripts. \(\mathcal{P}^{37}, \mathcal{P}^{45}\) and D read τὴν χεῖρα μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τρυπλιῶν whereas C reads μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τρυπλιῶν τὴν χεῖρα. The text of NA\(^{27}\) is the same as \(\mathcal{P}^{64}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{A}\) and B.

- In verse 24,
  - ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου – D has οὖν between ὁ μὲν and υἱὸς.
In verse 25,

- λέγει αὐτῷ – Ἡβ have ὁ Ἰησοῦς after these two words.

Mark 14:18-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἔσθιόντων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με ὁ ἔσθιός μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. 19 ἢρξαντος λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς κατὰ εἷς. Μήτι ἐγώ; 20 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Εἰς τῶν ὀδώρεις, ὁ ἐμπαπτόμενος μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον. 21 ὃς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτού, οὐκ ἐὰν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι᾽ οὗ ὁ ὦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδόται· καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἔγεννηθη ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνος.</td>
<td>18 And when they had taken their places and were eating, Jesus said, &quot;Truly I tell you, one of you will betray me, one who is eating with me.&quot; 19 They began to be distressed and to say to him one after another, &quot;Surely, not I?&quot; 20 He said to them, &quot;It is one of the twelve, one who is dipping bread into the bowl with me. 21 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.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 18,
  - ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν – A has εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς instead and D has λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
  - ὁ ἔσθιόντων – B reads τῶν ἔσθιόντων.
  - Evans (2001: 369) comments that some Syriac manuscripts have an additional ‘Ἀμὴν and he argues that this “reflects Johannine influence”.

- In verse 19,
  - ἢρξαντο – C has καὶ before ἢρξαντο whereas A and D have οἱ δὲ. The NA²⁷ text is supported by Ἡβ and B.
  - εἷς κατὰ εἷς – A and D read εἷς καθ’ εἷς whereas C reads εἷς ἕκαστος which is parallel to Matthew 26:22.
• Μὴ τι ἐγὼ – Several manuscripts have additional words after Μὴ τι ἐγὼ - D has καὶ ἄλλος, Μὴ τι ἐγὼ, A has εἰμι, ῥαββί; καὶ ἄλλος, Μὴ τι ἐγώ which is very close to the reading of Matthew 26:22. The reading of NA²⁷ is also that of Ν, B and C.

➢ In verse 20,
• εἶπεν – D reads λέγει instead of εἶπεν, and A reads ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.
• τῶν δώδεκα – A and D have an additional ἐκ before τῶν δώδεκα and the text of NA²⁷ is supported by Ν, B and C.
• ἐμβαπτόμενος – D differs from other manuscripts by having ἐμβαπτόμενος instead of ἐμβαπτόμενος. While the NA²⁷ does not mention this, Evans (2001: 369) writes that A and other “late authorities” have the additional words τὴν χεῖρα which forms a parallel with Matthew 26:23.
• τὸ τρύβλιον – B and C* have ἐν between the words τὸ τρύβλιον.

➢ In verse 21,
• ὑπάγει – Evans (2001: 369) comments that D, W and a few “late authorities” have παραδίδοται instead of ὑπάγει. This variant reading is not mentioned in NA²⁷.
• ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου – D does not have this phrase.
• καλὸν αὐτῷ – Ν, A, C and D have ἦν between the words καλὸν αὐτῷ which makes the reading parallel to the Matthew 26:24. Only B supports the text of NA²⁷.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 πλὴν ἵδον ἢ χείρ τοῦ παραδόντος με μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης. 22 ὅτι ὁ νεός μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐκ ἂν ἂν ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ ὃν ὁ παραδίδοται. 23 καὶ αὐτὸ [[ηρέμων συζητέων πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ τὸ τίς ἄρα εἶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὃ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν.</td>
<td>21 But see, the one who betrays me is with me, and his hand is on the table. 22 For the Son of Man is going as it has been determined, but woe to that one by whom he is betrayed!” 23 Then they began to ask one another, which one of them it could be who would do this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 21,
  - μετ’ ἐμοῦ – D does not include these two words.
  - ὅτι ὁ νεός μὲν – This text reads καὶ ὁ μὲν νεός in A.
  - κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον πορεύεται – The order of the words differs in A, which reads πορεύεται κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον.
  - D excludes τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

Section 313: Precedence Among The Disciples And The Reward of Discipleship


In this section, Matthew and Mark are out of order. However, because triple tradition material is being considered, this section has been included for analysis. In Luke, this teaching of Jesus follows the Last Supper whereas in Matthew and Mark
this is found on the journey to Jerusalem. Bock (1996: 1736 – 1737) considers two views of this difference in the setting:

First, Luke places the account here to raise an issue that was a point of contention throughout Jesus’ ministry. The relocation may have been indicated in a tradition outside of Mark and Matthew. Since the importance of unity was a major feature of the Last Supper, Luke notes this point here. Thus, the topic of greatness was one that plagued the disciples and that Jesus addresses on numerous occasions. … Another option is that only one incident is given two different settings. Luke has simply moved the Zebedee tradition and reformulated it. The problem with this suggestion is that it is not clear why Luke would hesitate to relate this event in its earlier setting and place it here without a clear reason for doing so. … The difference in wording in the Lucan account also stands against this suggestion. It is more likely that this was a major theme reiterated in Jesus’ ministry in similar terms on at least two occasions.

Fitzmyer (1985: 1411 – 1412) writes that this account in Luke has no parallel in the other Synoptic Gospels, “but then they have no discourse at it. Parts of the verses (25-26) have a parallel earlier in the Marcan Gospel (10:42-45), and parts of vv. 28,30 have an echo in Matt 19:28. The result is that this Lucan episode is composite.” He also argues that the close location between this discussion about who is the greatest and the betrayal of Jesus by Judas demonstrates the futility of such questioning by the disciples.

Marshall (1978: 810 – 818) divides this pericope into two separate sections. Verses 24 to 27 are titled “Precedence among the Disciples” and verses 28 to 30 have the title of “The Future Role of the Twelve”. He makes the statement:
The account in Lk. is purely a dialogue; in Jn. similar sayings occur in the context of an acted parable which could have given rise to them. The same lesson is found in Mt. 23:1-11, and there is similar teaching in Mk. 9:35 par. Lk. 9:48, and especially in Mk. 10:41-45. This last passage is omitted by Luke, and the present passage is so similar to it, despite the differences in wording, that the question of the relationship of the two is a pressing one. While a number of scholars (e.g. Finegan, Überlieferung, 13f.) think that Luke has given an edited version of Mk. here, it would be unlike Luke to hold over a Marcan passage in this way, and the differences in wording indicate that he is not dependent on Mk. Nevertheless, the parallelism in structure suggests that there is some link between the passages. (Marshall, 1978: 811)

Later, Marshall (1978: 815) claims that for Luke 22: 28 – 30, the parallel in Matthew 19:28 is regarded by a majority of scholars as being closer to the original form. He further notices that Matthew does not have anything like Luke 22: 29 – 30a and that it is unlikely to be due to Luke’s redaction. Therefore, he argues that it is most likely that the two evangelists are using different sources for these verses.

Davies and Allison (vol 3, 1997: 85) comment that Matthew uses Mark 10:35-45 as his source. This Marcan pericope can be divided into two, where “Vv. 41-2a are probably Markan, Vv. 42d-4 a pre-Markan unit of uncertain origin to which Mark or his tradition added v. 45.” (Davies and Allison, vol 3, 1997: 85). In a footnote, they also make the statement that Luke does not have a parallel to Mark 10:35-40 and then write, “did the evangelist disapprove of the unflattering picture of the apostles and/or the limitation of Jesus’ authority?” (vol 3, 1997: 84).

Evans (2001: 119 – 125) also considers Mark 10:35 – 45 as one unit. In his commentary on these verses, he writes that each of Jesus’ three predictions of his
passion in Mark is followed by a teaching. In this case, the teaching is on true service and the possibility of suffering of his disciples. He then summarises his observations of verse 45:

Boiled down, the controversies surrounding v 45 are three in number: (1) the unity of the saying and its relationship to vv 35-44; (2) the relationship of the saying to Second Isaiah, especially the Suffering Servant Song of Isa 52:13-53:12; and (3) the authenticity of the saying. All three of these disputed elements are in various ways related to one another. The position taken in this commentary is that the saying was originally a unit, that it was part of the whole pericope that makes up vv 35-45, that themes from Second Isaiah do indeed lie behind it, and that the saying derives from Jesus. (Evans, 2001: 120).

Hagner (1995: 579) considers Matthew 20: 20 – 28 as one pericope. He observes that Matthew 20: 24 – 28 is very close to Mark 10: 41 – 45, except for these minor changes:

1. In verse 24,
   a. Matthew omits the word ἠρξαντο (Mark 10:41).

2. In verse 25,
   a. He omits δοκοντες (Mark 10:42).
   b. He also omits αὐτῶν after οἱ µεγάλοι (Mark 10:42).

3. In verse 26,
   a. He substitutes ἐσται for Mark’s ἐστιν (Mark 10:43).
4. In verse 27,
   a. He uses ἰμών δοῦλος for πάντων δοῦλος (Mark 10:44).

5. In verse 28,
   a. He changes γὰρ (Mark 10:45) to ὡσπερ.

Matthew 20:24-28, 19:28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Ἐκτὸς ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δῶν ἀδελφῶν. 25 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν, Ὑμᾶς ἂν ἄρχωντες τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατακυριεύοντες αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιὰζοντες αὐτῶν. 26 ὤχι οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλʼ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρώτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος. 27 ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἠλθεν διακονήσει αὐτῷ διακονήσει καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον αὐτὶ πολλῶν.</td>
<td>When the ten heard it, they were angry with the two brothers. 25 But Jesus called them to him and said, “You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. 26 It will not be so among you; but whoever wishes to be great among you must be your servant, 27 and whoever wishes to be first among you must be your slave; 28 just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19:28 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἤμειν ἀκολουθησαντές μοι ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθήη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθήησεν καὶ ἤμεις ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. 19:28 Jesus said to them, “Truly I tell you, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man is seated on the throne of his glory, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Table 5.6.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 24,
  - ἠγανάκτησαν – Ν uses ἠρέσαντο ἠγανακτεῖν instead. This makes these two words parallel to the text of Mark 10:41.
In verse 25,

- εἶπεν – D has the additional word αὐτοῖς after εἶπεν.
- κατακυριεύουσιν – B has the future tense κατακυριεύσουσιν instead of the present κατακυριεύουσιν.

In verse 26,

- ἔσται – C has δὲ before ἔσται. B and D use ἔστιν instead of ἔσται.
- ἔν – B and D have ἄν instead.
- ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι – The order of these words differs in some manuscripts. B reads μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν γενέσθαι whereas C has μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

In verse 27,

- The word ἄν is found in NA27 (based on Κ, B, and D). However, C has ἐὰν.
- ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος – B reads εἶναι ὑμῶν πρῶτος instead.
- ἔσται – B and E have ἔστω instead.

At the end of verse 28,

- D has an additional sentence, part of which is close to Luke 14:8-10. Metzger (1994: 43) notes: “This interpolation is a piece of floating tradition, an expanded but inferior version of Lk 14.8-10”.

In verse 28 of Chapter 19,

- αὐτοῖς – D uses αὐτῷ instead.
- Κ and D have αὐτοὶ instead of ὑμεῖς, which is in B and C.
### Mark 10:41-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἄγανακτεῖν πρὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.</td>
<td>41 When the ten heard this, they began to be angry with James and John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Κυρίος λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκουσίς ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακρίνουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>42 So Jesus called them and said to them, &quot;You know that among the Gentiles those whom they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 οὐχ οὗτος δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ἰμίῳ, ἀλλὰ δὲν ἂν θέλη μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ἰμίῳ, ἐστιν ἰμίῳ διάκονος,</td>
<td>43 But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 καὶ δὲν θέλῃ ἐν ἰμίῳ εἶναι πρῶτος ἐσται πάντων δοῦλος:</td>
<td>44 and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ ζωὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔλθεν διακοινωθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακοινήσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύστρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.</td>
<td>45 For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Textual Notes

The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 41,
  - οἱ δέκα — D has λοιποῖ between the words οἱ δέκα.
- In verse 42,
  - καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Κυρίος — A reads ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς instead.
- In verse 43,
  - δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ἰμίῳ — D does not have δὲ before ἔστιν ἐν ἰμίῳ.
  - A and C<sup>3</sup> have ἐσται instead of ἔστιν, as in NA<sup>27</sup> and supported by Ξ, B, C* and D. Commenting on this, Metzger (1994: 91) states:

  The future tense, which is supported by A C<sup>3</sup> Ξ Χ Π and most minuscules (followed by the Textus Receptus), appears to be a scribal amelioration designed to soften the peremptory tone of the present ἔστιν.

  It is also possible that the future may have arisen from assimilation to ἐσται in the next line.
Evans (2001: 113) also remarks that the future tense may have been taken from Matthew 20:26 and “copyists (including the Matthean evangelist) may have felt that the future tense was appropriate for a discussion that pertained to eschatological things”.

- ἔσται – Χ and C have ἔστω instead.

In verse 44,

- ἂν – A and C contain ἂν instead.

- ἐν ὑμῶν εἶναι – These words in NA\textsuperscript{27} are supported by Χ, B and C*. D reads ὑμῶν εἶναι whereas A and C\textsuperscript{3} have ὑμῶν γενέσθαι.

- πάντων – D uses the word ὑμῶν instead of πάντων which makes this verse similar to Matthew 20:27.

**Table 5.6.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA\textsuperscript{27}</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Εγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεκία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μεῖζων, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσαν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιαζόμενοι αὐτῶν εὑρήγεται καλοῦνται. 26 ἤμεις δὲ ὅπως ἀνήκατε ὑμεῖς ἐκεῖνοι ἡτανόμενοι, ἂν ἐγένετο ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος καὶ ὁ ἤγοιμενὸς ὡς ὁ διακονοῦν. 27 τὸ γὰρ μεῖζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονοῦν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμὶ ὡς ὁ διακονοῦν. 28 ἤμείς δὲ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἑμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου: 29 κἀγὼ διατίθημαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διεσάτο μοι ὁ πατὴρ μου βασιλεύαν, 30 ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τρεπέντος μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ καθήσασθε ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φιλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.</td>
<td>24 A dispute also arose among them as to which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest. 25 But he said to them, &quot;The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. 26 But not so with you; rather the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like one who serves. 27 For who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who serves? Is it not the one at the table? But I am among you as one who serves. 28 &quot;You are those who have stood by me in my trials; 29 and I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, 30 so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Textual Notes:** The variant readings in this passage are:

- **In verse 24,**
  - ὅτε καὶ – Ἡ.
  - αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι – D reads ἀν εἶη instead.

- **In verse 25,**
  - οἱ ἐξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν – Ν* reads οἱ ἀρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ.

- **In verse 26,**
  - ὁ νεώτερος – These words differ in Ἡ, which does not have the article, and D, which uses μικρότερος.
  - διακονῶν – D has διάκονος instead of διακονῶν.

- **In verse 27,**
  - D has μᾶλλον ἦ for τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἦ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ.
  - ὅτε ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι – D uses γὰρ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ἔλθεν οὐχ ώς ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἄλλ᾽.
  - ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι – A has a different word order: εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. The NA27 text is supported by Ἡ, Ν, B and D.

- **In verse 28,**
  - ὑμεῖς ὅτε ἐστε – D reads καὶ ὑμεῖς ηὗξησθε ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ μου ώς ὁ διακονῶν instead.

- **In verse 29,**
  - ὑμῖν καθώς – A has διαθήκην between the words ὑμῖν καθώς.
  - ὁ πατέρ – D does not have μου after these two words.
In verse 30,

- ἐσθήτε – Ν, A and D² use the word ἐσθήτε instead of ἐσθήτε, which is the reading of NA²⁷ and supported by ℶ⁷⁵, B and D*.

- D does not have μοι after τῇ βασιλείᾳ.

- ἐπὶ θρόνων – Ν² and D have δώδεκα between these words which make their texts of Luke more like that of Matthew.

- τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες – ℶ⁷⁵ and B support the text of NA²⁷ for this phrase. Ν, A and D have a different word order, κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς.

Section 315: Peter’s Denial Predicted

Matthew 26: 30-35; Mark 14: 26-31; Luke 22: 31-34

Aland includes Matthew 26:30 and Mark 14:26 as part of this section. However, some commentaries consider this as the ending of the institution of the Last Supper. Hagner writes (1995: 774): “at the end of the Passover meal, the fourth and final cup was drunk and the conclusion of the Hallel (Pss 113-18, with various allusions to salvation) was sung. It is very probably the singing of those prescribed Psalms that is referred to here”.

The reading of Matthew and Mark is so close that comments like the following are not uncommon: “Matt’s differences from Mark here are almost surely redactional, even in the Scripture citation, so that one is justified in speaking of a Mark/Matt account” (Brown, 1994: 126). Hagner (1995: 776) supports this by saying that Matthew follows his source very closely but does not abbreviate Mark as much as he usually does.
Hagner (1995: 776) provides the main differences between Matthew and Mark in two sections. First, he gives the following “significant deletions”:

1. In verse 34, Matthew leaves out:
   a. σὺ σήμερον, Mark 14:30, “both words being redundant”.
   b. ἦ δὲ, Mark 14:30, “being unnecessary after πρὶν”.
   c. δὲ, Mark 14:30, “which would have introduced an unnecessary complication”.

2. In verse 35, Matthew does not have ἐκπερισσῶς, Mark 14:31, “although it is difficult to know why unless it is because in the next sentence all the disciples spoke ὡμοίως, similarly”.

He then provides the following “unusual number of additions” by Matthew:

1. In verse 31, Matthew adds:
   a. ὅμεις, and the phrase ἐν ἡμοί ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταῦτη, “thereby supplying the specific identity of the subject as well as the reason and the occasion referred to by the main verb”.
   b. τῆς ποιμνὴς, to Mark 14:27, in the quotation of Zechariah 13:7, “bringing about closer agreement with the LXX (according to Alexandrinus) and relating the flock more closely to ποιμένα”.

2. In verse 33, Matthew adds:
   a. ἀποκριθῆς, which is unnecessary but “in keeping with his style”.
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b. οὐδὲποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι, Mark 14:29, “thereby repeating the verb and with the two verbs providing added emphasis”.

3. In verse 35, Matthews adds οἱ μαθηταὶ, Mark 14:31, “to emphasize the disciples’ claim of loyalty”.

However, the text of Luke in this section is quite different from Matthew and Mark. Brown notes (1994: 126):

The outlook of the Lucan passage is almost diametrically opposite to that of the other Gospels, for it congratulates the disciples on their fidelity! It also predicts a favourable future for them at Jesus’ table, but this is partially like the Mark/Matt prediction that after the resurrection Jesus will go before them to Galilee.

As can be observed by this section in the Aland Synopsis, the verses Luke 22:31-32 do not have any parallel in Matthew and Mark. This has prompted Nolland to observe (1993: 1070):

Luke uses these verses rather than the material in Mark 14:27 to anticipate the coming time of crisis for the disciple band. There is broad scholarly agreement that Luke is not creating freely here but drawing on a distinctive source (or sources). What has proved more difficult, given the considerable level of apparent Lukan intrusion, is to find agreement about the scope of the original tradition.

However, Luke 22:33-34 appears to have a parallel in Mark 14:29-31. But the extent to which Luke has used Mark as his source is still disputed. Marshall (1978: 818) observes that scholars are divided as to whether both verses of Luke 22:33-34 are derived from Mark, only verse 34 is from Mark, or even neither verse is
from Mark. On the other hand, Nolland (1993: 1071) states: “the materials in Luke 22:33-34 are mostly taken to be a rewriting of Mark 14:29-31. There are, however, just enough coincidences with John 13:37-38 to raise the question of a second source here as well”.

---

### Matthew 26:30 - 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Καὶ ἔσησαντες ἔξηλθον εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαίων. 31 Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ ἸΗσοῦς, Πάντες ἤμεις σκανδαλίσθησαθεν ἐν ἐμοί ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταῦτη, γέραται γὰρ, Πατάξεω τοῦ ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης. 32 μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξον ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 33 ἀποκρίθης δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐὰν πάντες σκανδαλίσθησονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλίσθησομαι. 34 ἐφ' ἀυτῷ ὁ ἸΗσοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με. 35 λέει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, Κἂν δὲ μὴ με σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὡμοίως καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταί εἶπαν.</td>
<td>30 When they had sung the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives. 31 Then Jesus said to them, “You will all become deserters because of me this night; for it is written, ‘I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.’ 32 But after I am raised up, I will go ahead of you to Galilee.” 33 Peter said to him, “Though all become deserters because of you, I will never desert you.” 34 Jesus said to him, “Truly I tell you, this very night, before the cock crows, you will deny me three times.” 35 Peter said to him, “Even though I must die with you, I will not deny you.” And so said all the disciples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 5.7.1

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 31,
  - διασκορπισθήσονται – \(\text{\textit{P}}^{37,45}\) and D use the singular διασκορπισθήσεται instead of the plural διασκορπισθήσονται.

- In verse 32,
  - ἐγερθηναί – \(\text{\textit{P}}^{53}\) does not have τὸ in front of ἐγερθηναί.

- In verse 33,
  - εἶπεν – \(\text{\textit{P}}^{53}\) does not have αὐτῷ after εἶπεν.
• Ei πάντες – Ν* has καὶ between Ei and πάντες. In the critical apparatus of the Aland Synopsis, it indicates here that this variant makes the reading of Matthew parallel to that of Mark.

• ἐν σοί, ἔγω – This reading differs in C, which has ἐν σοί, ἔγω δὲ and in ₱53, where it is ἔγω ἐν σοί. Hagner (1995: 775) comments that the reading in ₱53 results in this translation: “If all fall away, I myself will never fall away because of you”.

➤ In verse 34,

• αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς – ₱37 has καὶ between αὐτῷ and ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

• ἐν ταύτῃ – ₱37 and D do not have ἐν before ταύτῃ.

• ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι – ₱37vid.45 read ἀλεκτοροφωνίας instead.

• τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με – This phrase differs in some witnesses. In Ν*, the order of the words changes to τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ and in A, the order is ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. However, in ₱53, B and C, the order is the same except that the middle word is ἀπαρνήσει.

➤ In verse 35,

• ἀπαρνήσομαι – A reads ἀπαρνήσομαι instead.

• καὶ πάντες – A has δὲ in front of καὶ πάντες. The reading of the text in NA27 is supported by Ν, B, C and D.
When they had sung the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives. And Jesus said to them, "You will all become deserters; for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered.' But after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee." Peter said to him, "Even though all become deserters, I will not." Jesus said to him, "Truly I tell you, this day, this very night, before the cock crows twice, you will deny me three times." But he said vehemently, "Even though I must die with you, I will not deny you." And all of them said the same.

Table 5.7.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 27,
  - καί – D has Τότε instead of Καί at the beginning of the verse.
  - Πάντες οἰκονομίζεσθε – D also has ὑμεῖς between Πάντες and οἰκονομίζεσθε. The Aland Synopsis comments that this variant makes the verse in Mark parallel to Matthew 26:31.
  - After the word οἰκονομίζεσθε, A and C² contain the phrase ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ. Evans (2001: 398) and the Aland Synopsis note that with the addition of this phrase, this verse is more closely parallel to Matthew 26:31.
- In verse 29,
  - έφη – D reads λέγει instead.
  - Εἰ καί – in A, the order of the words is καί εἰ. However, D has καί ἐὰν.
  - οἰκονομίζομαι – D has the reading οἰκονομίζωσιν instead.
  - D also has the additional words οὗ ὁ οἰκονομίζεσθαι at the end of the verse.
• Evans (2001: 398) also lists other variant readings that are not in the Aland Synopsis. He writes that some Syriac manuscripts read ḫφας instead of Πέτρος. He also says that several later manuscripts add ἐν σοὶ after ὁκανθαλισθῶσονται, making this phrase the same as in Matthew 26:33.

➢ In verse 30,

• σὺ σήμερον – D does not have these two words, whereas N and C do not have σὺ.

• ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ – This phrase differs in A which reads ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ.

• ἥ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι – N and D do not have ἥ δις in front of ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι, making this phrase similar to that in Matthew 26:34.

• με ἀπαρνήσῃ - A reads ἀπαρνήσῃ με as in Matthew 26:34.

➢ In verse 31,

• ὁ δὲ – A and C contain the name Πέτρος after the words ὁ δὲ.

• ἐκπερισσῶς – A has the word ἐκπερισσῶς instead.

• ἐλάλει – A and C read ἐλέγεν instead.

• ἐλέγεν – A has the additional word μᾶλλον after ἐλέγεν.

• ἀπαρνήσωμαι – N, B and C* read ἀπαρνήσωμαι.

• καὶ πάντες – B does not have δὲ in front of καὶ πάντες.
## Luke 22:31 - 34

**Table 5.7.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Notes</th>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In verse 31,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• θ, A and D have the additional phrase εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος at the beginning of the verse. Nolland (1993: 1069) comments that this reading could be the original one.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Simon, Simon, listen! Satan has demanded to sift all of you like wheat, 32 but I have prayed for you that your own faith may not fail; and you, when once you have turned back, strengthen your brothers.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Σίμων Σίμων – θ has only one Σίμων.</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 And he said to him, &quot;Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death!&quot; Jesus said, &quot;I tell you, Peter, the cock will not crow this day, until you have denied three times that you know me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In verse 32,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• καὶ σὺ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας – D reads σὺ δὲ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας καὶ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• στήριζον – D has στήριζον instead. θ, A and B support the reading of NA²⁷.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In verse 33,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ὁ δὲ εἶπεν – A has εἶπεν δὲ instead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In verse 34,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• οὐ φωνήσει – A and D have μὴ between οὐ and φωνήσει.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ἔως – D reads ἔως ὅτου whereas A has πρὶν ἦ, which makes the verse closer to the readings of both Matthew 26:34 and Mark 14:30. θ and B support the reading of NA²⁷.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The readings of \( \text{N} \) and B, \( \mu \varepsilon \ \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \nu \eta \sigma \eta \ \varepsilon \iota \delta \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \), support that of NA\(^{27} \).

However, A differs and has \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \nu \eta \ \mu \eta \ \varepsilon \iota \delta \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \ \mu \varepsilon \).

Section 331: Jesus Arrested


After the narrative of what happened at the garden of Gethsemane, we now move to the events leading to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. In this section, Jesus’ statement about his betrayal by Judas becomes reality and he is arrested by the soldiers (or servants / slaves) of the high priest. Nevertheless, the picture given to us by all three gospel writers is of someone who is still in control of the situation in spite of what lies ahead of him.

The texts of Matthew and Mark are once more quite close to each other. In spite of the many differences between Luke and Matthew/Mark, Nolland states, in strong terms (1993: 1086):

Luke again follows the Markan sequence here, and despite the detailed argumentation of Rehkopf, there is little to stand against the view that Luke is primarily editing his Markan source. There are however, a number of indications that Luke may have had access to other traditions.

He then continues to argue that Luke’s version of Jesus’ arrest has very close links with that of John.

Bock (1996: 1765-1766) provides the following details found in Matthew/Mark but missing in Luke:

2. A note of scriptural fulfilment (Matthew 26:56, Mark 14:49).

3. The flight of the disciples on Jesus’ arrest (Matthew 26:56, Mark 14:50).

He continues with a list of details unique to Luke:


2. The remark from the disciple who draws his sword (Luke 22:49).


4. The healing of the ear with the specific detail that it is the right one (Luke 22:50-51).

Marshall adds more to the differences between Luke and Matthew/Mark. He comments (1978: 834):

The differences between this narrative and that of Mark are conspicuous. The action of Judas is emphasised and the crowd falls initially into the background. It becomes clear only when Jesus addresses Judas that the kiss is meant as a means of betrayal, Mark’s explanation being omitted. In Mk. the actual arrest preceded the retaliation by the disciples, but in Lk. (and Jn.) the order is reversed. The healing of the wounded ear is new. Then at the end it emerges that the arresting party is not merely sent by the authorities but actually includes them; Jesus’ final remark to them is peculiar to Lk. There is no mention of the flight of the disciples.

Hagner (1995: 787-788) states that Matthew is again very close to the text of Mark. He provides a list of the differences between Matthew and Mark:
1. The main differences between Matthew and Mark:
   a. Matthew has verses 26:52-54, which Mark does not. Hagner makes the remark that this may be due to Matthew’s special source.
   b. Matthew does not have the equivalent of Mark 14:51-52, the reference to the young man wearing nothing but a linen cloth.

2. The other omissions of Matthew from Mark’s text:
   a. In verse 47, τῶν γραμματέων, as a result of abbreviating Mark’s text (14:43).
   b. In the same verse, he does not have the word εὖθυς, (Mark 14:43) which is considered to be redundant with the genitive absolute construction.
   c. Verse 48 lacks καὶ ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς (Mark 14:44), probably because Matthew considers this “unnecessary” (Hagner, 1995: 787).
   d. In verse 49, he does not have the word ἔλθων, which is not necessary with προσελθὼν coming later in the verse (Mark 14:45).
   e. In verse 55, he drops the words, πρὸς ὑμᾶς, probably to abbreviate Mark (14:49).

3. Matthew has the following additions to Mark’s text:
   a. In verse 47, he has πολῖς when referring to the crowd and also τοῦ λαοῦ when referring to the elders (Mark 14:43).
c. In verse 50, he adds the sentence, ὅ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐταίρε, ἐφ' ὅ πάρει (cf. Mark 14:45). This causes him to have to add, τότε προσελθόντες, and ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν to the verse.

d. In verse 51, he has καὶ ἱδοῦ, and ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, “one of the few times in Matthew’s redaction of Mark that he adds something not obviously useful or necessary” (Hagner, 1995: 788) (Mark 14:47).

e. In verse 55, he adds Ἔν ἐκεῖνη τῇ ὥρᾳ and ἐκαθέζομην (Mark 14:48-49).

f. In verse 56, he adds τοῦτο δὲ ὅλων γέγονεν (Mark 14:49).

4. Matthew’s substitutions for Mark’s words:

a. In verse 48, he uses σημεῖον instead of Mark’s σύσσημον (14:44).

b. In verse 49, he substitutes τῷ Ἰησοῦ for Mark’s αὐτῷ (14:45), as also Luke.

c. In verse 55, he uses τοῖς ὄχλοις instead of Mark’s αὐτοῖς. (14:48).

Note: Nolland writes (1993: 1087): “various studies have pointed to a series of difficulties in the Markan text that seem to point to its composite nature. There is, however, no real consensus on the source implications of these difficulties”. Bock (1996: 1774) also mentions the fact that the differences between Luke and Matthew/Mark suggest that Luke was not simply editing what Mark wrote, but also getting “input from a distinct source or sources”.
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Table 5.8.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 48,
  - ἐὰν (before φιλήσω) – P, S and A read ἔιν.

- In verse 49,
  - προσέλθων τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπεν – P and C add αὐτῷ to this phrase.

Matthew 26:47 - 56

While he was still speaking, Judas, one of the twelve, arrived; with him was a large crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests and the elders of the people. 48 Now the betrayer had given them a sign, saying, "The one I will kiss is the man; arrest him." 49 At once he came up to Jesus and said, "Greetings, Rabbi!" and kissed him. 50 Jesus said to him, "Friend, do what you are here to do." Then they came and laid hands on Jesus and arrested him. 51 Suddenly, one of those with Jesus put his hand on his sword, drew it, and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off his ear. 52 Then Jesus said to him, "Put your sword back into its place; for all who take the sword will perish by the sword. 53 Do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels? 54 But how then would the scriptures be fulfilled, which say it must happen in this way?" 55 At that hour Jesus said to the crowds, "Have you come out with swords and clubs to arrest me as though I were a bandit? Day after day I sat in the temple teaching, and you did not arrest me. 56 But all this has taken place, so that the scriptures of the prophets may be fulfilled." Then all the disciples deserted him and fled.
• Χαίρε, ραββί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτὸν. 50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ – \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\)

does not have this phrase.

➢ In verse 50,

• Ἐταίρε, ἐφ᾽ ὁ πάρει – The order of the words differs in D: ἐφ᾽ ὁ πάρει Ἐταιρε

➢ In verse 51,

• τῶν – \(\mathcal{P}^{37}\) does not have this word.

• μετὰ Ἰησοῦ – B reads μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

• ἀφείλεν – D has an additional word καὶ in front.

➢ In verse 52,

• τὴν μάχαιράν σου – A and C have a different word order: σου τὴν μάχαιράν.

The NA\(^{27}\) text is supported by \(\mathcal{K}\), B and D.

• μαχαῖρῃ – B\(^2\) and D have the alternative spelling MAXAIPA \([= μαχαίρε]\). \(\mathcal{K}\), A, B\(^*\) and C support the reading of the NA\(^{27}\) text.

➢ In verse 53,

• δοκεῖς – C\(^*\) vid reads δοκεῖ σοι.

• παραστήσει μοι – \(\mathcal{K}\)* has the additional word ὁδὲ.

• ἄρτι – A, C and D place this word after δύναμιν which is found earlier in the verse. The NA\(^{27}\) text is supported by \(\mathcal{K}\) and B.

• πλείω – \(\mathcal{K}\)^2, A and C read πλείους. \(\mathcal{K}\)*, B and D have the same reading as the NA\(^{27}\).

• πλείω δώδεκα – η is found between these two words in A and C. The NA\(^{27}\) text is supported by \(\mathcal{K}\), B and D.

• λεγιονάς ἀγγέλων – \(\mathcal{K}\)*, A and C read λεγ(ε)σων ἀγγέλων whereas \(\mathcal{K}\)^2 reads λεγεών ἀγγέλους.
In verse 54,

- \(\text{πληρωθῶσιν} - \text{D has πληρωθήσουσιν}.\)
- \(\deltaέι - \text{C has ἔδει}.\)

In verse 55,

- \(\text{καθ’ ἡμέραν} - \text{A, C and D have the additional words πρὸς ἰμάζ}. \) The reading of NA\(^{27}\) is the same as \(\Xi\) and B.
- \(\text{ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκον} - \text{This is the reading of } \Xi \text{ and B}. \) The order of these words differs in the other witnesses considered. A reads ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ whereas C and D have ἐκαθεζόμην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκον.

In verse 56,

- \(\text{μάθηταί} - \text{B has an additional } \\upsilonτου after this word.\)
### Mark 14:43 - 52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίγεται Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ἔξυλων παρὰ τῶν ἁρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. 44 δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδοσός αὐτῶν σύσσημον αὐτῶς λέγων, Ὑδέν ὅν φιλήσῃ αὐτὸς ἐστίν, κρατήσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς. 45 καὶ ἔλθων εὐθὺς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει, Ὑββί, καὶ κατεφιλήσατε αὐτῶν. 46 οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτὸν. 47 εἰς δὲ τοὺς παραστηκτοὺς σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἐπαισοῦν τῶν δοῦλον τοῦ ἁρχιερέως καὶ ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ᾱώταρον. 48 καὶ ἀποκριθέεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστήν ἐξῆλθατε μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ἔξυλον συλλαβεῖν με; 49 καθ’ ἡμέραν ἠμένων πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκοντος καὶ οὐκ ἐκράτησατε με· ἀλλ’ ἡν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. 50 καὶ ἀφεύνετε αὐτὸν ἐφυγον πάντες. 51 Καὶ νεκρίσασθος τις συμπαθοῦσε αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος συνόδα ἐπὶ γυμνῷ, καὶ κρατοῦσαν αὐτόν. 52 ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν συνόδα γυμνὸς ἐφυγεν.</td>
<td>Immediately, while he was still speaking, Judas, one of the twelve, arrived; and with him there was a crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders. 44 Now the betrayer had given them a sign, saying, &quot;The one I will kiss is the man; arrest him and lead him away under guard.&quot; 45 So when he came, he went up to him at once and said, &quot;Rabbi!&quot; and kissed him. 46 Then they laid hands on him and arrested him. 47 But one of those who stood near drew his sword and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off his ear. 48 Then Jesus said to them, &quot;Have you come out with swords and clubs to arrest me as though I were a bandit? 49 Day after day I was with you in the temple teaching, and you did not arrest me. But let the scriptures be fulfilled.&quot; 50 All of them deserted him and fled. 51 A certain young man was following him, wearing nothing but a linen cloth. They caught hold of him, 52 but he left the linen cloth and ran off naked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.8.2**

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings for these verses are:

- In verse 43,
  - Καὶ εὐθὺς – A has the words Καὶ εὐθέως whereas D only has Καὶ.
  - Ἰούδας – A and B have ὁ in front whereas Ξ, C and D have the same reading as NA<sup>27</sup>.
  - Ἰούδας – A has ὁ Ἰςκαριώτης after, whereas D has Ἰςκαριώτης.
  - ὄχλος – A, C and D have the additional word πολῆς after, making the reading parallel to that of Matthew 26:47.
  - παρὰ τῶν ἁρχιερέων – B has ἀπὸ τῶν ἁρχιερέων instead and this makes the reading parallel to that of Matthew 26:47.
• τῶν γραμματέων – A and C do not have τῶν.
• τῶν πρεσβυτέρων – Ν* and A do not have τῶν.

In verse 44,
• δεδώκει – D has the aorist ἔδωκεν instead.
• σύσσημον – D has σημεῖον, which is the word used in Matthew 26:48.
• ἀπάγαγε – A and C have the aorist ἀπαγαγεῖ.
• ἀσφαλῶς – D has an additional αὐτὸν before ἀσφαλῶς.

In verse 45,
• ἐλθὼν εὐθὺς – D does not have these two words.
• ἐλθὼν εὐθὺς – A uses the word εὐθὺς for εὐθὺς.
• αὐτῷ λέγει – A reverses the order of these two words.
• Ἄραββί – C² has the additional word, Χαίρε, which makes it closer to Matthew 26:49. A has the word Ἄραββί twice and the NA²⁷ text is the same as that of Ν*, Β, Ν* and D.

In verse 46,
• τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν – is the reading of Ν², Β and D, whereas Ν* and C use τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν. A is more explicit and reads ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν.

In verse 47,
• εἰς δὲ τὰς τῶν παρεστηκότων - Ν and A have the reading εἰς δὲ τῶν παρεστηκότων whereas D has καὶ τις. B and C support the NA²⁷ text.
• τὴν μάχαιραν – D does not have the article τὴν.
• ωτάριον – A and C have the same word as Matthew 26:51, ὀτάριον. The NA²⁷ text is the same as that of Ν, Β and D.

In verse 48,
• καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς – D has only ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
• ὖς – D does not have this word.

➤ In verse 50,

• καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἐφυγον πάντες – A and D have the words in this order: καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν πάντες ἐφυγον. The NA²⁷ text is supported by K, B and C.

➤ In verse 51,

• Καὶ νεανίσκος τις – D has the phrase νεανίσκος δὲ τις whereas A reads Καὶ εἰς τις νεανίσκος. K, B and C have the same reading as the NA²⁷ text.

• συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ – D has the phrase ἤκολούθησεν αὔτῳ whereas A reads ἤκολούθησεν αὔτῳ.

• καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτὸν – A and C² have the phrase καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτὸν οἱ νεανίσκοι and K, B, C*vid and D have the same reading as the NA²⁷ text.

➤ In verse 52,

• ἐφυγεν – A and D have ἀπ’ αὐτῶν after.
While he was still speaking, suddenly a crowd came, and the one called Judas, one of the twelve, was leading them. He approached Jesus to kiss him; 48 but Jesus said to him, “Judas, is it with a kiss that you are betraying the Son of Man?” 49 When those who were around him saw what was coming, they asked, “Lord, should we strike with the sword?” 50 Then one of them struck the slave of the high priest and cut off his right ear. 51 But Jesus said, “No more of this!” And he touched his ear and healed him. 52 Then Jesus said to the chief priests, the officers of the temple police, and the elders who had come for him, “Have you come out with swords and clubs as if I were a bandit? 53 When I was with you day after day in the temple, you did not lay hands on me. But this is your hour, and the power of darkness!”

Table 5.8.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 47,
  - “Ετι - D has an additional word after: δὲ. The NA text is the same as \( \mathfrak{P} \), N, A and B.
  - ὁχλος - D has πολὺς after ὁχλος. It is interesting to note that D has this additional word in both Mark and Luke, making its text parallel to that in Matthew.
  - λεγόμενος - Ιούδας - D has the reading, καλοῖμενος - Ιούδας - Ισκαριοθ.
  - προῆρχετο - \( \mathfrak{P} \) uses the word προηρχέτο whereas D has the word προῆγεν.
  - ἔγχυσεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσαι αὐτόν - \( \mathfrak{P} \) and D have the phrase ἐγγύσας ἐφύλησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
- Passion Narrative -

- **αὐτόν** – Following this word, D has the phrase, τοῦτο γὰρ σημεῖον δεδώκει αὐτοῖς ὃν ἐὰν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν. Though not identical, this variant makes D closer to the reading of Matthew 26:48.

  - In verse 48,
    - ΄Ησοῦς δὲ – A and D have the reading, ὁ δὲ ᄄΗσοῦς, which is the same as Matthew 26:50. The NA27 text is the same as P75, s and B.
    - αὐτῷ, ὸιῶδα – s* has only αὐτῷ, whereas D has τῷ ὸιῶδα.

  - In verse 49,
    - ἐσόμενον - D has γενόμενον instead.
    - Κύριε – D has τῷ κυρίῳ, whereas A has αὐτῷ, Κύριε.

  - In verse 50,
    - τοῦ ᾄρχησιν ὁ δοῦλον - P75, A and D have a different word order: τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ᾄρχησιν. The reading of NA27 is supported by s and B.
    - τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ – A has the reading αὐτοῦ τὸ οὖς, whereas D has the reading αὐτοῦ τὸ ὦτίον which makes it parallel to Matthew 26:51. The reading of NA27 is supported by P75, s and B.

  - In verse 51,
    - ἀφάμενος τοῦ ὦτίου ἵππατο αὐτόν – D has a different phrase: ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἰππατὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ.

  - In verse 52,
    - ΄Ησοῦς – D does not have this word.
    - ἐπ’ – s* has πρὸς instead.
    - τοῦ ἱεροῦ – D has the words τοῦ ἱεροῦ.
    - ἐξήλθατε – A has the word ἐξεληλύθατε instead.

- 186 -
In verse 53,

- καθ’ – D has τὸ before this word.
- μεθ’ ἢμών ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ – D has a different word order: ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ μεθ’ ἢμών.
- ἐστίν ἢμών – A has the reading ἢμών ἐστίν. Ν* has only ἐστίν.
- ἡ ἔξωσία – D does not have the article ἡ.
- τοῦ σκότους – D reads τὸ σκότος.

Section 334: Jesus delivered to Pilate

Matthew 27: 1-2; Mark 15: 1; Luke 23: 1

Once the Sanhedrin has decided that he is guilty of the charges, Jesus is taken to Pilate. In this section, the commentaries differ in their division of pericopae. Nolland considers Luke 23:1 – 5 to be one pericope and titles it, “Jesus brought before Pilate” (Nolland, 1993: 1113). Marshall and Bock also view Luke 23:1 – 5 as forming a pericope. Evans takes Mark 15:1 – 15 as forming this pericope with the title “Jesus before Pilate” (Evans, 2000: 468). He then argues that these verses can be divided into two groups; namely, verses 1 – 5 where Jesus is handed over to Pilate and verses 6 – 15 when Pilate allows the crowd to decide what will happen to Jesus. On the other hand, Hagner uses the same division as Aland.

The texts of Matthew and Mark are quite close to each other. Bock (1996: 1809) gives the following differences among the three texts:
1. Matthew and Mark just mention the morning session with Pilate, whereas Luke provides a certain number of details of that session.

2. Matthew writes that the chief priests and the elders of the people decide to put Jesus to death, bind him and take him to Pilate.

3. Mark says that the chief priests, elders and scribes consult together, bind Jesus and take him to Pilate. There is no mention of their wish to put Jesus to death.


   Luke has no exact vocabulary or syntactic overlap, though he refers to Pilate and speaks of the whole company leading Jesus to him. Perhaps out of respect for Jesus, Luke never notes that he is bound (similar to his omission about blasphemy in 22:66-71). Given the total difference in wording without any real difference in sense, this verse looks as if it came from another source, though the Lucan expressions make this less than certain.

Hagner (1995: 808) says that Matthew is again dependent on Mark. He gives the following differences between Matthew and Mark:

1. In verse 1, Matthew has the following differences,
   a. He changes the beginning of verse 1 to the genitive absolute, Πρωίας δέ γενομένης.
   b. He does not have εὐθὺς, which Hagner considers to be unnecessary.

d. He inserts the word πάντες before οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς.

e. He qualifies οἱ πρεσβύτεροι with τοῦ λαοῦ.

f. He omits the others involved in the incident, as mentioned in Mark: καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὄλου τὸ συνέδριον. Hagner (1995: 808) argues that Matthew probably considers this as “an overstatement though there seems to be no reason for the omission of the scribes, except abbreviation, since they are earlier mentioned as involved in the proceedings”.

g. Matthew adds the reason for the meeting: κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὡστε θανατώσαι αὐτόν.

2. In verse 2,

a. He replaces the name of Jesus with the pronoun αὐτόν. This is due to the fact that he has used the name Jesus at the end of the previous verse.

b. He adds the title τῷ ἡγεμόνι to Pilate’s name.

### Matthew 27:1 - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Πρωίας δὲ γενομένης συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὡστε θανατώσαι αὐτόν ² καὶ δήσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπέηγαγον καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι.</td>
<td>When morning came, all the chief priests and the elders of the people conferred together against Jesus in order to bring about his death. ² They bound him, led him away, and handed him over to Pilate the governor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9.1
Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- **In verse 1,**
  - έλαβον – D uses the word ἐπόηραν instead. Hagner (1995: 808) comments that this is as a result of “the influence of the parallel in Mark 15:1”.
  - ὠστε – D has the words ἵνα θανατώσωμι in the place of this word.

- **In verse 2,**
  - παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ – A and C³ have the additional pronoun αὐτῶν between these two words. The NA²⁷ text has the support of Ν, B and C*.
  - παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ – After the variant reading in the previous item, A and C have the proper noun Πόντιος. The NA²⁷ text reflects Ν and B.

Mark 15:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NA²⁷</strong></th>
<th><strong>NRSV</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ εὐθὺς προὶ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὀλίγον τὸ συνεδρίον, ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.</td>
<td>As soon as it was morning, the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council. They bound Jesus, led him away, and handed him over to Pilate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- **In verse 1,**
  - εὐθὺς – A and D have the word εὐθέως. εὐθὺς is used in the NA²⁷ text as well as in Ν, B and C.
  - εὐθὺς προὶ – A has the additional words ἐπὶ τὸ between these two words, whereas the NA²⁷ text is supported by Ν, B, C and D.
• ποιήσαντες – Ν and C have the reading ἐτοιμάσαντες and D uses the words ἐποίησαν καὶ.

• γραμματέων – Ν and D have the article τῶν in front of the noun.

• ἀπήγαγαν – C and D use the word ἀπήγαγον which is also used in Matthew 27:2. D also has the additional phrase εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν after this word.

• Πιλάτῳ – A has the article τῷ before the proper noun.

Luke 23:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÃ27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ ἀναστὰν ἀπὸν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον.</td>
<td>Then the assembly rose as a body and brought Jesus before Pilate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

➢ In verse 1,

• τῶν Πιλάτου - D does not have the article.

Section 336: The Trial before Pilate


After Jesus has been taken to Pilate, he is interrogated by the latter. Once again, Jesus shows that he is in complete control of what is happening. He does not show any of the agony that he showed in the Garden of Gethsemane, but handles the interrogation in a calm and calculated way in spite of the fact that the trial seems to be based on unfounded accusations. Bock states (1996: 1806):
All the proceedings that follow are unjust. Jesus is reckoned as a criminal, though he has done nothing worthy of punishment (Luke 22:37, alluding to Isa. 53). The major blame falls on the Jewish leadership because they push the issue after Pilate’s verdict of innocence. Nonetheless, Pilate is also responsible for ignoring his verdict (Acts 4:25-27), as are the people for their support of the execution. In presenting the trial, only Luke notes the specific charges.

Again, the texts of Matthew and Mark are close to each other. Hagner (1995: 817) provides the following differences between Matthew and Mark:

1. In verse 11, Matthew contains the following differences,
   a. He has the opening sentence, Ὅδε Ἰησοῦς ἐστάθη ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ἥγεμόνος “because of the previous interlude concerning Judas and the potter’s field” (Hagner, 1995: 817).
   b. For Mark’s ὁ Πιλάτος (Mark 15:2) he has ὁ ἥγεμων.
   c. He lacks the phrase ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ from Mark, which Hagner thinks is because Matthew regards it as unnecessary.

2. In verse 12,
   a. He does not have the word πολλά (Mark 15:3) when he considers the accusations against Jesus. Hagner (1995: 817) says that he, instead, adds οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο to focus on Jesus’ silence.
   b. He also adds the presence of καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, which is “in keeping with his usual dual reference to ‘chief priests and elders’ (cf. 26:3, 47, 57; 27:1, 3, 20)”.
3. In verse 13,
   a. Matthew has a shorter version by leaving out Mark’s question (Mark 15:4): Οὐκ ἀποκρίνητος οὐδὲν;
   b. While in Mark the accusations of the Jewish leadership are made in the form of a statement, in Matthew it is a question that Pilate asks Jesus.

4. In verse 14,
   a. He changes Mark’s οὐδὲν (Mark 15:5) to πρὸς οὐδὲ ἐν ῥήμα.
   b. He adds the additional word λίαν to θαυμάζειν in order to emphasise the amazement.
   c. He replaces the proper noun, τὸν Πιλάτον (Mark 15:5) with τὸν ἡγεμόνα.


The content of Luke 23:1-5 has a good deal of Lukan language and reflects Lukan concerns, so it could easily be accounted for on the basis of Lukan redaction of the Markan account. There is, nevertheless, a significant case to be made for the influence of additional tradition. (i) beyond v 3, where the language is close, there are surprisingly few language contacts between Luke 23:1-5 and Mark 15:1-5. (ii) Bailey (Traditions Common, 64-65) has identified ten (not equally weighty) features of Luke 23:1-25 in common with the Johannine account, three of which involve vv 1-5. … (iii) If Luke is composing on the basis of Mark, then it is hard to account for the loss of παρέδωκαν, “handed over”, from Luke 23:1, when this verb plays such a role in the Lukan passion predictions (9:44; 22:22; 24:7; 18:32 [specifically in connection with
handing over to the Gentiles]; and cf. 20:20). A second source does seem likely.

Matthew 27:11 – 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ὢ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔστάθη ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ἡγεμόνος; καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ ἡγεμὼν λέγων, Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὦ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔφη, Σὺ λέγεις. 12 καὶ ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁρματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο. 13 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, ὦκ ἀκούες πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῖσαι; 14 καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδὲ ἐν ῥήμα, ὡστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λιαν.</td>
<td>Now Jesus stood before the governor; and the governor asked him, “Are you the King of the Jews?” Jesus said, “You say so.” 12 But when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he did not answer. 13 Then Pilate said to him, &quot;Do you not hear how many accusations they make against you?&quot; 14 But he gave him no answer, not even to a single charge, so that the governor was greatly amazed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10.1

**Textual Notes**: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- **In verse 11**, 
  - ἔστάθη – A uses the active voice ἐστή instead of the passive which is the reading of B, B and C, as well as the NA²⁷ text.
  - ὦ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔφη – A and B have an additional pronoun αὐτῷ after the phrase.

  The NA²⁷ reading has the support of B.

- **In verse 12**, 
  - πρεσβυτέρων – A and B¹ have the definite article τῶν before the noun.

- **In verse 14**, 
  - οὐδὲ ἐν – D does not have the negative adverb, οὐδὲ.
Mark 15:2 – 5

NA²⁷ | NRSV
--- | ---
καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλάτος, Ἔντι ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ λέγει, Ἔντι λέγεις. ¹ καὶ κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά. ² ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων, Οὐκ ἀποκρίνεται οὐδέν; Ἐνδιόσοσα σου κατηγοροῦσαι. ³ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, ὅπως θαυμάζεως τὸν Πιλάτον.

Pilate asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" He answered him, "You say so." ³ Then the chief priests accused him of many things. ⁴ Pilate asked him again, "Have you no answer? See how many charges they bring against you." ⁵ But Jesus made no further reply, so that Pilate was amazed.

Table 5.10.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- In verse 2,
  - ὁ δὲ – D uses the conjunction καὶ in place of these two words.
  - αὐτῷ λέγει – A has the reading εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

- In verse 3,
  - κατηγόρουν – D has the present tense κατηγοροῦσιν instead of the imperfect.

- In verse 4,
  - πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν – Ν and A have the reading πάλιν ἐπηρώτησε αὐτὸν, the aorist tense instead of the imperfect. The NA²⁷ text is supported by B.
  - λέγων – Ν* does not have this verb.
  - οὐδέν – B* does not have this pronoun.
  - κατηγοροῦσιν – A uses the verb καταμαρτυροῦσιν, the same verb used in Matthew 27:13. However, the NA²⁷ reading has the support of Ν, B, C and D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἤρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, Τοῦτον εὑραμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἐνὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυλύσαντα φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι καὶ λέγοντες ἕαυτὸν Χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι. ³ ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν λέγων, Σὺ εἰ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ἔφη, Σὺ λέγεις. ⁴ ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ὑπάτους, Ὑδεῖν εὑρίσκω αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ. ⁵ οἱ δὲ ἐπίσχυον λέγοντες ὅτι Ἀνασεῖται τὸν λαὸν διδάσκοντος καθ’ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀρέσκειτο ἀπὸ τῆς Παλιλαίας ἑως ὧδε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| They began to accuse him, saying, "We found this man perverting our nation, forbidding us to pay taxes to the emperor, and saying that he himself is the Messiah, a king." ³ Then Pilate asked him, "Are you the king of the Jews?" He answered, "You say so." ⁴ Then Pilate said to the chief priests and the crowds, "I find no basis for an accusation against this man." ⁵ But they were insistent and said, "He stirs up the people by teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee where he began even to this place."

Table 5.10.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 2,
  - ἡμῶν - A does not have this pronoun, whereas the NA²⁷ text has the support of Ἑ, B and D.
  - φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι – The NA²⁷ text together with Ἑ and B have the words in this order. However, D reads φόρους διδόναι Καίσαρι and A has Καίσαρι φόρους διδόναι.
  - καὶ λέγοντα – A and D do not have the conjunction.
  - ἕαυτὸν – B has αὐτὸν instead of the reflexive version of the same pronoun.

- In verse 3,
  - ἠρώτησεν – A and D use the same word as in Matthew 27:11 and Mark 15:2: ἐπηρώτησεν. However, the NA²⁷ reading has the support of Ἑ, B.
  - ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ἔφη – Ἑ does not have the pronoun, αὐτῷ.

- In verse 5,
  - ἐπίσχυον - D uses another verb ἐνίσχυον, but with a similar meaning.
• φτι – D does not have the conjunction.

• οῶν – Σ has the word ὕλων instead.

• διδάσκων – Σ* does not have this verb.

• Τουδείας – D uses the noun γῆς instead of the proper noun.

• καὶ ἀρέσκειν – P75, A and D do not have the conjunction καὶ. It should be noted here that the reading of NA²⁷ is supported by Σ and B.

Section 339: Jesus or Barabbas?


Pilate, after he has interviewed Jesus, offers to the crowd a choice of one person whom they want to be freed: Jesus, whom many considered as a teacher, or Barabbas, who is said to be like a modern day terrorist. However, the crowd cries out for the release of Barabbas and this is the confirmation of Jesus’ condemnation to die on the cross.

Bock provides the following comments in his analysis of each of the verses:

[On verse 23:18] – The verse is unique to Luke, though Matt. 27:20-22 = Mark 15:11-13 covers the same ground. In the other Synoptics, Pilate raises a question to get the crowd's response; here the crowd is already speaking up. The leadership persuaded (Matt. 27:20) or stirred up (Mark 15:11) the crowd to ask for Barabbas, so Luke seems to be relating the detail more directly. (Bock, 1996: 1829)

[On verse 23:20] – Luke portrays a battle of wills: the people against Pilate. In Mark 15:11 = Mark 27:20, the crowd was spurred on by the leadership, but
Luke places the blame on the group that caused Pilate to change his mind. (Bock, 1996: 1829-1830)

[On verse 23:21] – The double present imperative σταύρον σταυρον is emphatic and is unusual for Luke. The syntax makes it hard to see a source related to Mark or John. Mark 15:13 = Matt. 27:22 has only one cry. (Bock, 1996: 1830)

[On verse 23:22] – Pilate here offers a double declaration of innocence and asks (in wording like Mark 15:14 = Matt. 27:23) what evil “this one” has done. The Lucan word order is closer to Matthew than to Mark, but only Luke refers to Jesus as “this one”. (Bock, 1996: 1831)

[On verse 23:23] – With more detail than Mark 15:14b = Matt. 27:23b has, Luke notes that clamor’s success. The other Gospels say that the crowd shouted out all the more that “he be crucified” (Matthew) or to “crucify him” (Mark). In different words all the Synoptics say the same thing. (Bock, 1996: 1832)

Nolland (1993: 1129) says that there are very few similarities in the texts between Luke and Matthew/Mark except for the “general sense”. The texts of Matthew and Mark are again close to each other. Hagner (1995: 821-822) gives the following differences between Matthew and Mark:

1. In verse 15, Matthew contains the following changes,
   a. He includes the following phrase, εἰσόθεν ὁ ἄγεμνος, which is not in Mark 15:6.
   b. He substitutes τῷ δῶρῳ for Mark’s αὐτοῖς (Mark 15:6).
2. In verse 16,
   a. Matthew simply describes Barabbas as \textit{δέσμιον ἐπισημον}. Mark’s description (15:7) is more detailed: \textit{μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος οὖν ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποιήκεισαν}.

3. In verse 17,
   a. Matthew has a shorter version, \textit{συνηγμένων αὐτῶν}, for Mark’s \textit{καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς} (Mark 15:9).
   b. He also changes Mark’s \textit{τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων} (Mark 15:9) to \textit{Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστὸν}. Hagner (1995: 821) claims that in this instance, Matthew is “emphasising less the political and more the religious dimension of Jesus’ identity as the anointed one of Israel”.
   c. In Matthew, the question asked by Pilate is whether to release Jesus or Barabbas, whereas in Mark the question is only about releasing Jesus.

4. In verse 19,
   a. Matthew has this statement about a message received by Pilate’s wife in a dream, which Mark does not refer to at all.

5. In verse 20,
   a. He has a reference to \textit{καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι}, which is also found in verses 12 and 41.
   b. Matthew has the phrase, \textit{τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν}, at the end of the verse.
6. In verse 21,
   a. Matthew has an additional question in this verse, which makes the total number of questions become three for Mark’s two.
   b. He uses the title, ὁ ἡγεμών, instead of Mark’s proper noun, ὁ Πιλάτος (Mark 15:14).

7. In verse 22,
   a. Here again, as in verse 17, Matthew changes Mark’s τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, (Mark 15:12) to Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν.
   b. Matthew has the simpler phrase, λέγουσιν πάντες, for Mark’s οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἐκράζουν (Mark 15:13).

8. In verse 23,
   a. Matthew does not have the proper noun, ὁ Πιλάτος which Mark has in Mark 15:14.

After considering this account in all three Gospels Brown (1994: 788-789) has the following comments on their similarities / differences:

Among the Synoptics Mark’s account is basic. The longer account in Matt is for the most part a close following of Mark … Luke’s account is also longer than Mark’s, but what it covers is quite different. If we leave out Luke 23:17 as a later copyist’s gloss, what pertains to Barabbas in 23:18-19 is a major abbreviation of Mark. … Functionally, then, Pilate has the role in Luke that Pilate’s wife has in Matt: Gentile proclamation of Jesus’ innocence while the Jewish authorities and crowds/people are opting for the release of the guilty Barabbas.
Matthew 27:15 – 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Ἐχων δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>Now at the festival the governor was accustomed to release a prisoner for the crowd, anyone whom they wanted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>16 At that time they had a notorious prisoner, called Jesus Barabbas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν;</td>
<td>So after they had gathered, Pilate said to them, &quot;Whom do you want me to release for you, Jesus Barabbas or Jesus who is called the Messiah?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>18 For he realized that it was out of jealousy that they had handed him over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>19 While he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent word to him, &quot;Have nothing to do with that innocent man, for today I have suffered a great deal because of a dream about him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>20 Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds to ask for Barabbas and to have Jesus killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>The governor again said to them, &quot;Which of the two do you want me to release for you?&quot; And they said, &quot;Barabbas.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν.</td>
<td>22 Pilate said to them, &quot;Then what should I do with Jesus who is called the Messiah?&quot; All of them said, &quot;Let him be crucified!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22 ἔχειν δὲ τὸ δέημιν ἑπτήμονα λεγόμενον Ἱησοῦν Βαραββᾶν. | 23 Then he asked, "Why, what evil has he done?" But they shouted all the more, "Let him be crucified!"

Table 5.11.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 15,
  - δὲ ἐφηθήν – D has the definite article τὴν between these two words.
  - ἔνα τῷ ὀχλῷ δέημιν – The order of these words in D is slightly different: ἔνα δέημιν τῷ ὀχλῳ.

- In verse 16,
  - Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν – K, A, B and D do not have the proper noun Ἰησοῦν.

Note: It is worth noting here that there is overall support for the omission of the proper noun. Nevertheless, the NA²⁷, though flagging it as uncertain, has
printed the text possibly due to the fact that the more difficult reading would be its inclusion.

➤ In verse 17,

• οὖν – D has the conjunction δὲ instead.

• Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν – Ν, A, and D only have Βαραββᾶν whereas B has the reading τὸν Βαραββᾶν. Note: It is also worth noting here that there is again an overall support for the omission of the proper noun. Here also, the NA\textsuperscript{27} text, though flagging the reading as uncertain, has printed the text possibly due to the fact that the more difficult reading would be the inclusion of the proper noun Ἰησοῦν.

➤ In verse 21,

• Τὸν Βαραββᾶν – A and D do not have the definite article Τὸν before the proper noun whereas the reading of the NA\textsuperscript{27} text is supported by Ν and D.

➤ In verse 22,

• ποιήσω – D has the subjunctive plural of the verb, ποιήσωμεν.

➤ In verse 23,

• ὁ δὲ ἐφη – A has the reading ὁ δὲ ἤγεμὼν ἐφη and D has a completely different phrase λέγει ἀυτοῖς ὁ ἤγεμὼν. The NA\textsuperscript{27} text is supported by B.
### Mark 15:6 – 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δέσμιον ἃν παρείτων.</td>
<td>Now at the festival he used to release a prisoner for them, anyone for whom they asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ἤν δὲ ὁ λέγομεν Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος δίτινες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποίηκεσαν.</td>
<td>7 Now a man called Barabbas was in prison with the rebels who had committed murder during the insurrection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς.</td>
<td>For he realized that it was out of jealousy that the chief priests had handed him over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων, Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων;</td>
<td>But the chief priests stirred up the crowd to have him release Barabbas for them instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ἐγένεσθαι γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεσαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.</td>
<td>12 Pilate spoke to them again, &quot;Then what do you wish me to do with the man you call the King of the Jews?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μάλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.</td>
<td>13 They shouted back, &quot;Crucify him!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἀπεκρίθη ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς. Τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω [ὅν ἔλεγεν] τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων; | 14 Pilate asked them again, "Why, what evil has he done?"
| 13 οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἐκράζαν, Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. | But they shouted all the more, "Crucify him!"
| 14 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς, Τί γὰρ ἐποίησεν κακόν; οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐκράζαν, Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. | 14 Pilate asked them, "Why, what evil has he done?" |

### Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- In verse 6,
  - δὲ ὑομὴν – D has the definite article, τὴν, between these two words.
  - ὁν παρηγοῖντο – D has the reading ὁν ἰδοῦντο and Ν<sup>2</sup>, Β<sup>2</sup>, and C read ὁν ἰδοῦντο. The NA<sup>27</sup> text is supported by Ν<sup>*</sup>, Α, and Β<sup>*</sup>.

- In verse 7,
  - στασιαστῶν – A uses συστασιαστῶν instead. The reading of NA<sup>27</sup> is the same as that of Ν, Β, C and D.
  - φόνον πεποίηκεσαν – Ν has the phrase φόνον τἶνα πεποίηκεσαν. D has the reverse word order, πεποίηκεσαν φόνον.
In verse 8,

- **ἀναβάς** – D has the adjective ὅλος after this word, whereas Ξ², A and C have the verb ἀναβάς. The NA²⁷ text is supported by Ξ* and B.
- **αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς** – D has the additional pronoun αὐτὸν between these two words.
- **ἐποίει αὐτοῖς** – A, Cavid and D have the adverb ἀεὶ before these two words.

The reading of the NA²⁷ is also that of Ξ and B.

In verse 9,

- **ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων** – D has the phrase ἀποκριθεῖς αὐτοῖς λέγει.
- **ὑμῖν** – D does not have this pronoun.

In verse 10,

- **ἐγινώσκεν** – A uses ἐπεγινώσκεν, Ξ* has ἐγινώκεν and D has ἔβεβλευ.
- **παραδεδώκεισαν** – A reads παρεδώκεισαν, whereas D has παρέδωκαν.
- **οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς** – B does not have this noun. **Note**: The Aland Synopsis indicates that the omission of this noun makes the reading parallel to that of Matthew 27:18.

In verse 11,

- **ἐνέσεισαν** – D has a different verb ἔπεισαν but with a similar meaning.

In verse 12,

- **πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν** – A has a different word order: ἀποκριθεὶς πάλιν εἶπεν, D has the phrase ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν. The NA²⁷ reading is supported by that of Ξ, B and C.
- **[θέλετε]** – Ξ, B and C do not have this word whereas its inclusion, which the NA²⁷ flags as being doubtful, is supported by A and D.
• [ὡς λέγετε] – This reading is also flagged as doubtful by the NA

λέγετε, whereas these two words are missing in A and D.

➢ In verse 13,

• πάλιν ἐκραζαν – A has the additional verb πάλιν ἐκραζαν λέγοντες after these two words, and D has the reading ἐκραζαν πάλιν λέγοντες.

➢ In verse 14,

• αὐτοῖς – This pronoun is not found in Ν.

• ἐποίησεν κακὸν – Ν, B and C have the order of these two words reversed: κακὸν ἐποίησεν. Though not noted in the Aland Synopsis, this variant reading makes the whole sentence Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν; in Mark parallel with that of Matthew 27:23.

• ἐκραζαν – A and D have the imperative form of the verb ἐκραζοῦν, whereas Ν has the word λέγοντες after.

**Luke 23:17 – 23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NA</strong></th>
<th><strong>NRSV</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 ἀνέκραγον δὲ παιπιλήθει λέγοντες, Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἤμιν τὸν Βαραββᾶν. 19 ὡστὶς ἦν διὰ στάσιν τυπα γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον βληθείς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, 20 πάλιν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος προσεφώνησεν αὐτοῖς θέλουν ἀπολύσαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 21 οἱ δὲ ἐπεφώνουσιν λέγοντες, Σταῦρον σταῦρον αὐτῶν. 22 ὁ δὲ τρίτον εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν αὐτὸς; οὐδὲν αἰτίων θανάτου εὑρὼν ἐν αὐτῷ παραγένειας οὐν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω. 23 οἱ δὲ ἐπεκείντο φωναῖς μεγάλαις αὐτοῖς σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ κατίσχειαν αὐτοῖς φωναὶ αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>18 Then they all shouted out together, &quot;Away with this fellow! Release Barabbas for us!&quot; 19 (This was a man who had been put in prison for an insurrection that had taken place in the city, and for murder.) 20 Pilate, wanting to release Jesus, addressed them again; 21 but they kept shouting, &quot;Crucify, crucify him!&quot; 22 A third time he said to them, &quot;Why, what evil has he done? I have found in him no ground for the sentence of death; I will therefore have him flogged and then release him.&quot; 23 But they kept urgently demanding with loud shouts that he should be crucified; and their voices prevailed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11.3
**Textual Notes**: The variant readings in this passage are:

- Verse 17 is not printed in the NA^{27}, as is the case in Ἐφ., A and B. However, Ν has the sentence ἀνάγκην δὲ εἶχεν ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς κατὰ ἐσορτῆν ἐνα, which makes it like Mark 15:6/Matthew 27:15. **Note**: Bock states (1996: 1834):

  The textual evidence suggests that 23:17 is not original to Luke. … The verse is not considered original because many of the manuscripts supporting it are late, it appears in two locations, and it has different wording. The discrepancy about location suggests a late addition to make Luke like Mark 15:6 = Matt. 27:15.

- In verse 18,
  - ἀνέκραγον - A and D use the first aorist ἀνέκραξαν, whereas the NA^{27} text has the support of Ἐφ., Ν, and B.
  - τὸν Βαραββᾶν – A does not have the article τὸν in front of the proper noun and the NA^{27} reading is supported by Ἐφ., Ν, B and D.

- In verse 19,
  - βλήθείς – Ν¹, A and D have the perfect tense form of the verb, βεβληθέντος and Ν* does not have the verb at all. **Note**: The NA^{27} text has the same reading as Ἐφ. and B. While the support can be considered as good, the variant reading also has very good support in Ν¹, A and D.
  - ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ – A and D have the variant reading ἔν φυλακῇ.

- In verse 20,
  - αὐτοῖς – D uses the accusative form of this pronoun αὐτοῖς, while A does not have it. The NA^{27} reading has the support of Ἐφ., Ν, and B.

- In verse 21,
  - ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες - D simply has the verb ἐκραξαν.
• σταύρον σταύρον – A uses the aorist tense, σταύρωσον σταύρωσον. The NA\textsuperscript{27} text is also shared with Ψ\textsuperscript{75}, Ε, B and D.

❯ In verse 22,

• οὐδὲν αίτιον – D has the words οὐδεμίαν αίτιαν instead.

• εὑρον – D has the present tense of this verb: εὑρίσκω.

• αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω – D reverses the order of these two words: ἀπολύσω αὐτὸν.

❯ In verse 23,

• αὐτὸν σταυρωθήραι – In this case as well, D reverses the order of the two words, σταυρωθήραι αὐτὸν. B has the same order of words as in the NA\textsuperscript{27} but uses σταυρώσαι instead of σταυρωθήραι.

• At the end of the verse, A and D have the additional words, καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων. The NA\textsuperscript{27} reading has the support of Ψ\textsuperscript{75}, Ε, and B. (Note: Ψ\textsuperscript{75}, Ε, and B – five times in this section when all three witnesses have the same reading as the NA\textsuperscript{27}).

Section 341: Pilate delivers Jesus to be crucified

Matthew 27: 24-26; Mark 15: 15; Luke 23: 24-25

Pilate gives in to the will of the Jewish crowd. He condemns Jesus to be crucified and releases Barabbas. Though the pericopae for this section are quite short (two verses in Matthew and Luke and only one for Mark), the details provided in each of the Gospels differ.

Bock gives the following comments for the verses in Luke:
[On verse 23:24] – Luke lacks any mention of Pilate’s doing the crowd a favor (Mark 15:15), nor does he make any effort to explain Pilate’s motive. He simply leaves the impression that Pilate succumbed to Jewish pressure. Matthew 27:24-26 describes the motive in detail: when Pilate saw that he was getting nowhere and that a riot was starting, he took some water and symbolically washed his hands of the affair. He told the people that this man’s blood was on their hands, and they accepted responsibility for Jesus’ blood. (Bock, 1996: 1832)


While the content of Matthew 27:24-25 is unique, verse 26 has some similarities to Mark. Hagner (1995: 826) mentions that the only difference between Matthew 27:26 and Mark 15:15 is that Matthew does not have the phrase, ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι, found in Mark (though Matthew has ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος in verse 27:24).
Matthew 27:24 – 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Notes</th>
<th>NA\textsuperscript{27}</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24 So when Pilate saw that he could do nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took some water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, “I am innocent of this man’s blood; see to it yourselves.” 25 Then the people as a whole answered, “His blood be on us and on our children!” 26 So he released Barabbas for them; and after flogging Jesus, he handed him over to be crucified. | \[\begin{array}{l}
\text{So when Pilate saw that he could do nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took some water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, “I am innocent of this man’s blood; see to it yourselves.”} \\
\text{Then the people as a whole answered, “His blood be on us and on our children!”} \\
\text{So he released Barabbas for them; and after flogging Jesus, he handed him over to be crucified.}
\end{array}\] | \[\begin{array}{l}
\text{So when Pilate saw that he could do nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took some water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, “I am innocent of this man’s blood; see to it yourselves.”} \\
\text{Then the people as a whole answered, “His blood be on us and on our children!”} \\
\text{So he released Barabbas for them; and after flogging Jesus, he handed him over to be crucified.}
\end{array}\] |

Table 5.12.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 24,
  - \(\text{άπέναντι}\) – B and D use the preposition, \(\text{κατέναντι}\), which has a similar meaning. The reading of the NA\textsuperscript{27} text is supported by Ν and A.
  - \(\text{εἴμι ἀπό}\) – D has the pronoun \(\text{ἐγὼ}\) between these two words.
  - \(\text{τοῦτού}\) – Ν has the reading, \(\text{τοῦ δικαίου τοῦτού}\). The reading of the NA\textsuperscript{27} is also that of B and D.

- In verse 26,
  - \(\text{παρέδωκεν ἵνα}\) – Ν\textsuperscript{1} and D have the additional pronoun \(\text{αὐτοῖς}\) between these two words.
  - \(\text{σταυρωθῆ}\) – D has the reading \(\text{σταυρώσωσιν αὐτῶν}\) instead.
### Mark 15:15

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA(^{27})</strong></td>
<td><strong>NRSV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος τῷ ὀχλῷ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν, καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.</td>
<td>15 So Pilate, wishing to satisfy the crowd, released Barabbas for them; and after flogging Jesus, he handed him over to be crucified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 5.12.2

**Textual Notes**: The variant readings are:

- In verse 15,
  - βουλόμενος τῷ ὀχλῷ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι – The order of these words is different in \(\s\) and C: βουλόμενος ποιῆσαι τὸ ἱκανὸν τῷ ὀχλῷ. D does not have this phrase and the NA\(^{27}\) text is supported by A and B.
  - καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας – D has a reading parallel to that of Matthew 27:26: τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν while B reads παρέδωκεν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας.


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA(^{27})</strong></td>
<td><strong>NRSV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 καὶ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινεν γενέσθαι τὸ αἴτημα αὐτῶν: 25 ἀπέλυσεν δὲ τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον βεβηλιμένον εἰς φυλακὴν δὴ ἤτοιντο, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>24 So Pilate gave his verdict that their demand should be granted. 25 He released the man they asked for, the one who had been put in prison for insurrection and murder, and he handed Jesus over as they wished.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 5.12.3
Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 24,
  - καὶ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινεν - A has the reading ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινεν whereas D has the same words as A but differs in the order of these words: ἐπέκρινεν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος.

- In verse 25,
  - διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον – D reads ἔνεκα φόνου.
  - εἰς φυλακὴν – Φ, A and C have the article, τὴν, between these two words, whereas the NA27 reading has the support of Ρ, B and D.

Section 343: The Road to Golgotha


After Jesus has been flogged, he now makes his way to Golgotha where he will be crucified. All three Gospels have Simon of Cyrene carrying the cross of Jesus. However, most of the material from Luke is unique.

Bock makes the following comments on this section:

Luke 23:26-32 is made up of three pieces of material (Aland 1985: §343). The remark about Simon carrying the cross in 23:26 (paralleled in Matt. 27:31b-32 = Mark 15:20b-21) is clearly traditional material. The scene with the mourning women (23:27-31) is unique to Luke and is best seen as special Lucan material.
Nolland states the fact that there is no consensus on the tradition history of the material unique to Luke. After analysing what other scholars have written on the subject, he concludes (Nolland, 1993: 1135):

On balance, it would seem best to attribute to Luke only minor redactional changes but to recognize that a complex history of compilation lies behind this material (some part of which may have been at Luke’s hands), with (i) vv 27-28 providing the original core unit here, (ii) to which v 29 has been added as a separately transmitted saying of Jesus, and (iii) to which in turn vv 30 and 31 have been added as, respectively, scriptural and proverbial exposition.

### Matthew 27:31b – 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31b ... καὶ ἀπῆγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρώσαι. 32 Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον ἀνθρωπον Κυρηναίον ὀνόματι Σίμωνα, τοῦτον ἠγάρευσαν ἵνα ἁρῇ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>31b ... Then they led him away to crucify him. 32 As they went out, they came upon a man from Cyrene named Simon; they compelled this man to carry his cross.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 5.13.1 |

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 31,
  - καὶ – D* does not have this conjunction.

- In verse 32,
  - Κυρηναῖον ὀνόματι – D has an additional phrase between these two words: εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ.
Mark 15:20b-21

**NA**

| 20b | καὶ ἔξαγοσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτὸν. 21 Καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν παρέγοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναίον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ’ ἀγροῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἄλεξανδροῦ καὶ Ῥουφοῦ, ἵνα ἀρη τὸν σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ. |
| NRSV | ... Then they led him out to crucify him. 21 A certain man from Cyrene, Simon, the father of Alexander and Rufus, was passing by on his way in from the country, and they forced him to carry the cross. |

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings are:

- In verse 20,
  - ἔξαγοσαν – A simply has the uncompounded verb ἔγοσαν.
  - ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν – A, C and D have the indicative future of the verb: σταυρώσωσιν.
  - αὐτὸν – ἔ and D do not have this pronoun.

- In verse 21,
  - παρέγοντα τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναίον – D has the variant reading: τὸν Σίμωνα παρέγοντα τὸν Κυρηναίον.
  - ἀπ’ – D uses the full word ἀπο.
26 As they led him away, they seized a man, Simon of Cyrene, who was coming from the country, and they laid the cross on him, and made him carry it behind Jesus. 27 A great number of the people followed him, and among them were women who were beating their breasts and wailing for him. 28 But Jesus turned to them and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children. 29 For the days are surely coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never nursed.' 30 Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'Fall on us'; and to the hills, 'Cover us.' 31 For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?" 32 Two others also, who were criminals, were led away to be put to death with him.

Table 5.13.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 26,
  - καὶ ὡς - D has ὡς δὲ instead.
  - ἀπήγαγον - B uses ἀπήγαγον.
  - Σίμωνα τινα Κυρηναίου ἐρχόμενον – The order of the words varies in C and D which read: τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναίου ἐρχόμενον. The reading of A is Σίμωνος τινος Κυρηναίου ἐρχομένου. The NA27 reading has the support of 9, Ν and Β.

- In verse 27,
  - αὐτῷ πολὺ πλήθος – D has the following reading: τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῷ.
  - γυναικῶν – D has the nominative γυναικές.
  - αἱ – C3 has an additional conjunction: καὶ.
Passion Narrative

➢ In verse 28,
  • πρὸς αὐτὰς [ὁ τὸς Τ] Ησοῦς – C and D read [ὁ τὸς Τ] Ησοῦς πρὸς αὐτὰς, whereas ℋ75, ℋ
    *2 and B have the reading πρὸς αὐτὰς Ησοῦς. The NA27 text is supported by
    ℋ1 and A.
  • ἐπ’ ἐμέ – D has the additional words μηδὲ πεινῇτε after these words.
  • πλὴν – D has the alternative conjunction ἀλλ’.
  • ἐπ’ … ἐφ’ … ἐπὶ – D does not have these three prepositions.
➢ In verse 29,
  • ἵδον – ℋ75 and D do not have this word.
  • ἔρχονται ἡμέραι – ℋ and C reverse the order of these two words while D has
    the reading ἔλευσονται ἡμέραι.
  • αἱ στεῖραι – ℋ does not have the definite article.
  • αἱ κοιλάει – ℋ75, A and D do not have the definite article.
  • ἐθρεψαν – ℋ2 and D have the composite word ἐξεθρεψαν. A has the verb
    ἐθήλασαν. The NA27 reading has the support of ℋ75, ℋ, B and C*.
➢ In verse 30,
  • πέσετε – ℋ2 and C* have the alternative way of spelling the imperative aorist
    tense of the verb πίπτω: πέσατε.
➢ In verse 31,
  • τῶν ὕγρων – B and C do not have the definite article τῶν. The reading of NA27
    is supported by ℋ75, ℋ, A and D.
  • ταῦτα – C has the singular form, τοῦτο.
  • γένησαι – D has the future tense, γενήσαται.
Passion Narrative

➤ In verse 32,

- κακούργοι δύο – A, C and D have the reverse order of these two words, δύο κακούργοι. The text of NA27 is supported by ᾦ75, Ν and B. Bock notes (1996: 1867):

Some manuscripts (ᾔ75, Ν and B) read ἕτεροι κακούργοι δύο (other criminals two), which appears to identify Jesus as a criminal ... Most manuscripts (A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, family 1, family 13, Byz) read ἕτεροι δύο κακούργοι (others, two criminals) reversing the word order so as not to view Jesus as a criminal. Because the second reading thus looks like a clarification, most take the harder first reading as original.

Section 344: The Crucifixion


This section is about the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. The details about the event are close and once more, Luke is shorter than Matthew / Mark.

Here, Bock does not follow the pericopae divisions of the Aland Synopsis. He has Luke 23:26 – 49 as one section, though he recognises that there are four subunits in the pericope. For the verses from Luke that are being considered in this section, he has the following comments:

3. Luke 23:33 uses a different term for the criminals (κακούργος, as opposed to ἁντιδιός in Mark 15:27 = Matt. 27:38) and mentions them at a different point in his narrative.

4. Luke 23:34 uniquely records Jesus’ prayer to forgive the sin of his executioners.

5. Luke does not mention the time that the crucifixion began (Mark 15:25), although he and Mark mention the time that it became dark (Luke 23:44 = Mark 15:33). (Bock, 1996: 1837)

Nolland also has a different division in his pericope for the crucifixion. He has Luke 23:33 – 38) as one section and titles it “Jesus Crucified and mocked”. He also points out that he has simply considered those verses as one unit for convenience but that, according to him, this section could have included the verses up to verse 43 (Nolland, 1993: 1142). He makes the following observations on the section:

After going his own way in 23:26-32, Luke returns here to the Markan sequence. The case for a second Lukan source here is fairly weak, but given the extensive evidence for the presence of a second Lukan source for the passion materials up to this point, it is hard not to believe that at least a large part of this second source material has come from a connected passion narrative. In turn, it is possible that such a narrative lacked an account of the crucifixion. For this reason, even rather modest evidence should be allowed to tip the scales in favor of a second Lukan source here. (Nolland, 1993: 1142)

Hagner has a different division of the narrative as well. He considers this pericope to consist of Matthew 27:32-37. Hagner (1995: 833) provides the following differences between Matthew and Mark:
1. In verse 32, Matthew has the following changes:
   a. He does not have Mark’s information about Simon from Cyrene:
      ἐρχόμενον ἀπ’ ἀγοῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ῥουφοῦ (Mark 15:21).
   b. He carries out a “general recasting of the opening sentence together with the use of εὐρον” (Hagner, 1995: 833), and also omits the expression παράγωντά τινα.

2. In verse 33, Matthew substitutes:
   a. The verb ἔλθοντες for φέρουσιν αὐτὸν (Mark 15:22).
   b. λέγομενος for μεθερμηνευόμενον (Mark 15:22).

3. In verse 34, he makes the following changes:
   a. He adds πιεῖν to Mark 15:23.
   b. He also adds γευσόμενος which, according to Hagner, provides “a reason for his refusal to drink” (Hagner, 1995: 833).
   c. He changes ἐσμυρνισμένον (Mark 15:23) to μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον “in order to bring about agreement with Ps 69:22” (Hagner, 1995: 833).

4. In verse 35, Matthew uses the subordinate participle σταυρώσαντες in the place of σταυροῦσιν (Mark 15:24).
5. In verse 36, there are substantial differences:
   a. Matthew does not have the phrase ἐν’ αὐτὰ τις τί ἀρη (Mark 15:24).
      He also lacks the whole verse of Mark 15:25: ἤν δὲ ὠφα τρίτη καὶ
      ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτῶν.
   b. Further, he adds καὶ καθήμενοι ἐπέρουν αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ which “takes the
      place of the omitted Mark 15:25 and prepares for subsequent
      references to the soldiers” (Hagner, 1995: 833).

6. In verse 37, Matthew has the following additions:
   a. καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ.
   b. συντός ἐστιν Ιησοῦς.

**NOTE:** The prayer of Jesus (Luke 23:34), [[ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν, Πάτερ, ἂφες
αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.]], is missing from all the early manuscripts, (א75,
B, D*) except א. As a result of this, there has been widespread discussion about the
authenticity of this prayer. Nolland argues (1993: 1141-1142):

Because of this early and widespread negative witness, its authenticity is
frequently questioned. Given, however, Luke’s conscious paralleling of the
deaths of Jesus and Stephen, it is hard to see how Luke could have produced
Acts 7:60 without being aware of a tradition like v 34a. And if he is aware of
such a tradition, since the language in which it is presented in v 34a makes
such a good Lukan fit, the best explanation of its presence in many MSS is that
Luke put it there. The deletion of the half verse is likely to reflect a belief that to
have executed Jesus was beyond forgiveness (but not so to have executed
Stephen).
Marshall looks at what scholars have said about this issue and makes the following observations (1978: 867-868):

1. The combination of early MS evidence against its inclusion is particularly impressive, and leads to the supposition that it is a western interpolation into the text. On the other hand, there are cases in Luke where internal and external evidences stand in opposition and internal evidence may be favoured.

2. If the saying is genuine, it is impossible to account for its wilful excision. It reflects too well how Christians regarded the attitude of Jesus. However, scribes could have thought that the events of AD 66-70 showed that a prayer attributed to Jesus had not been answered.

3. The saying could have been modelled on Acts 7:60. However, it is more likely that Acts 7:60 was modelled on this saying so that Stephen is seen to follow the pattern of Jesus in his martyr death.

4. The saying breaks the connection between 23:33 and 34b. However, it could be argued that 34b is deliberately placed to emphasise the callousness of the executioners.

5. The saying is not based on any Old Testament prophecy and is unlikely to be a Christian invention.

6. The motif of forgiveness for sins of ignorance, and the thought of Jesus giving a last chance to the Jews fits in with Lucan thought. Instead of
confessing his own sins, Jesus prays with respect to the sins of his executioners.

7. Sayings by Jesus are found in each main section of the Lucan crucifixion narrative (23:28-31, 43, 46); the lack of such a saying at this point would disturb the pattern.

8. The language is Lucan.

Thus, he concludes: “the balance of the evidence thus favours acceptance of the saying as Lucan, although the weight of the textual evidence against the saying precludes any assurance in opting for this verdict” (Marshall, 1978: 867-868).

Before he begins to cover the various discussions about Luke 23:34a, Brown gives an interesting observation about what he calls the “Seven Last Words of Jesus”. He notes (1994: 971):

After Jesus had been crucified, he speaks once in Mark/Matt, three times in Luke, and three times in John. … (*1) Mark 15:34; Matt 27:46; (*2) Luke 23:34a; (*3) Luke 23:43; (*4) Luke 23:46; (*5) John 19:19:26-27; (*6) John 19:28; (*7) John 19:30. If we treat Mark/Matt as a unity, no saying in one of the three Gospel records is found in another. Even the very last word of Jesus uttered just before he dies is not the same in Mark/Matt, in Luke, and in John – functionally we have three different attempts to have a saying capture Jesus’ final outlook on his role in God’s plan.

Brown then goes on to extensively discuss the meaning and authenticity of Luke 23:34a. He concludes:
Overall, after surveying the pros and cons, I would deem it easier to posit that the passage was written by Luke and excised for theological reasons by a later copyist than that it was added to Luke by such a copyist who took trouble to cast it in Lucan style and thought. Except perhaps in Jewish-Christian circles, there would have been few 2d-cent. copyists anxious to have Jesus pray for forgiveness for the Jews. (Brown, 1994:980)

### Table 5.14.1

**Textual Notes**: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- **In verse 33**, 
  - τόπον λεγόμενον – B has the definite article τὸν before each of these two words.
  - ὁ – A contains the masculine, ὃς instead of the neuter.
  - Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος – The order of the words in A is λεγόμενος Κρανίου Τόπος and N⁴ and D have only Κρανίου Τόπος. The NA²⁷ text is supported by N⁴ and B.

---

### Matthew 27:33 – 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NA²⁷</strong></th>
<th><strong>NRSV</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 Καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὸ ἐπάνω λεγόμενον Γολγοθά, ὃ ἐστιν Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος, 34 ἐδωκαν αὐτὸ πιεῖν ὁλίγον μετὰ χολῆς μειμένουν· καὶ γευόμενος οὐκ ἠθέλησεν πιεῖν. 35 σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν διεμείρασαν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλῆρον, 36 καὶ καθήμενοι ἔτηρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεί. 37 καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην. Οὕτως ἔστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.</td>
<td>32 And when they came to a place called Golgotha (which means Place of a Skull), 34 they offered him wine to drink, mixed with gall; but when he tasted it, he would not drink it. 35 And when they had crucified him, they divided his clothes among themselves by casting lots; 36 then they sat down there and kept watch over him. 37 Over his head they put the charge against him, which read, “This is Jesus, the King of the Jews.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In verse 34,

- ἔδωκαν – D has an additional conjunction at the beginning of the verse, καὶ.
- οἶνον – A uses the word ὕξος, which is the one used in Psalm 69:22; the NA\textsuperscript{27} text is also the reading of Χ, B and D.
- ἠθέλησεν – Χ\textsuperscript{1} and A have the imperfect ἠθελεν, whereas the aorist of the NA\textsuperscript{27} text has the support of Χ\textsuperscript{*}, B and D.

In verse 35,

- βάλλοντες – Χ, A and D have βάλλοντες instead.

### Mark 15:22-26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA\textsuperscript{27}</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολοθύντα κότον, ὥστε τὸν καὶ τὸ ἡλικὸν τοῦΤόπου</td>
<td>22 Then they brought Jesus to the place called Golgotha (which means the place of a skull).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 καὶ ἐδίδουσιν αὐτῷ ἐμφυρμοκεραυνὸν ὕξον ὃς δὲ οὐκ ἠλαβεν.</td>
<td>23 And they offered him wine mixed with myrrh; but he did not take it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρον ὑπ’ αὐτὰ τις τί ἄρη.</td>
<td>24 And they crucified him, and divided his clothes among them, casting lots to decide what each should take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ἦν δὲ ὡρα τρίτη καὶ ἐστάφυσαν αὐτὸν.</td>
<td>25 It was nine o’clock in the morning when they crucified him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 καὶ ἦν ἡ ἔπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγραμμένη, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.</td>
<td>26 The inscription of the charge against him read, “The King of the Jews.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.14.2**

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings are:

- In verse 22,
  - φέρουσιν – D has the verb ἤγουσιν which has the similar meaning of ‘bringing’.
  - τὸν – A, C\textsuperscript{*} and D do not have this article.
  - τὸπον – Χ\textsuperscript{*} does not have this noun.
• Ο̣ – Ν uses the word ὅπερ instead.

• μεθερμηνευόμενον – A and B have the masculine form μεθερμηνευόμενος.

The reading of NA²⁷ is supported by Ν, C and D.

➢ In verse 23,

• ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ – A, C² and (D) have πείνειν after these two words. The Aland Synopsis flags that this variant reading makes the verse closer to the reading of Matthew 27:34. The text of NA²⁷ is also that of Ν, B and C*.

• δὲ δὲ – D has the conjunction καὶ, whereas A and C have the reading ὅ δὲ.

The NA²⁷ text is supported by Ν and B.

➢ In verse 24,

• σταυρῷσιν αὐτῶν καὶ – Ν, A, C and D have the reading σταυρῶσαντες αὐτῶν which makes the text closer to Matthew 27:35, as flagged by the Aland Synopsis. Note: The NA²⁷ has the support of B only.

• τίς τί ἄρῃ – D does not have this phrase.

➢ In verse 25,

• ὠρὰ τρίτη – A and C* both have these words in reverse order.

• καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν – D has the variant reading, καὶ ἐφύλασσον.

➢ In verse 26,

• καὶ ἦν ἦ – D* has the reading, ἦν δὲ.

• ὁ βασιλεὺς – D has the phrase ὁ ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς which makes it parallel to the reading of Matthew 27:37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA(^{27})</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 καὶ ὅπερ ἠλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον, ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς κακούργος, ἐὰν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὄν ὃ ἐς ἀριστερὰν. 34 [[ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.]] διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους.</td>
<td>33 When they came to the place that is called The Skull, they crucified Jesus there with the criminals, one on his right and one on his left.(^{34}) Then Jesus said, &quot;Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they are doing.&quot;(^{34}) And they cast lots to divide his clothing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14.3

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 33,
  - ἠλθον - D has the composite verb ἀπῆλθον instead. The NA\(^{27}\) text has the overall support of \(\varphi\)^{75}, \(\kappa\), B, C and D.
  - καλούμενον - C uses the verb λεγόμενον which has a similar meaning.
  - κακούργος - D has the additional adverb ὀμοῦ after this word.
  - ἀριστερὰν - C\(^{*}\) has the reading εὐσωμάμων.

- In verse 34,
  - [[ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.]] – The NA\(^{27}\) flags this whole sentence as unlikely to be original. \(\varphi\)^{75}, \(\kappa\)^{1}, B and D\(^{*}\) do not have the sentence and this makes the text closer to that of Matthew 27:35 and Mark 15:24. \(\kappa\)^{*} \(^{2}\), (A), C and D\(^{2}\) include this reading.
  - διαμεριζόμενοι – D has διεμερίζοντο.
  - ἔβαλον – D has βάλλοντες.
  - κλήρους – \(\varphi\)^{75}, \(\kappa\), B, C and D have the singular form, κλήρον. A is the only witness which supports the NA\(^{27}\) reading. Note: The plural form makes the text closer to both Matthew 27:35 and Mark 15:24.
Section 345: Jesus Derided on the Cross


Following the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the Synoptics give details on the mockery that he has to face while on the cross. “The taunting of Jesus on the cross is the last human indignity he must face. In this pericope the motif of sarcastic unbelief continues. Perhaps the taunts and challenges also presented Jesus with his last hour of testing” (Hagner, 1995: 837). The details about the mocking of Jesus on the cross are very close in Matthew and Mark.

As noted in the previous section, Bock differs slightly from the Aland Synopsis. He groups Luke 23:26 – 49 as one section with this being broken down into four subunits. He makes the following observations for the verses under considerations in this section:

1. Luke 23:35 briefly refers to the spectators, but does not supply the contents of their mocking: taunts about Jesus’ saying that he would destroy the temple and raise it up in three days (Mark 15:29-30 = Matt. 27:39-40). (Luke exhibits a similar silence at Jesus’ trial.)

2. Luke 23:35 speaks only of the rulers and does not name the chief priests, scribes, and elders (Mark 15:31 = Matt. 27:41).

3. Luke 23:35 mentions that the rulers mock Jesus with reference to being the Chosen One, rather than calling him the King of Israel (Mark 15:32 = Matt. 27:42).


Hagner has a slightly different division of this pericope. He considers verse Matthew 27:44 as part of this pericope. Hagner writes that the text of Matthew is very close to that of Mark. He (1995: 837-838) notes the following differences between Matthew and Mark, apart from “minor changes and differences in word order” (1995: 837):

1. In verse 38, Matthew contains the following changes:
   a. He replaces Mark’s καὶ Mark (15:27) with τότε.

2. In verse 40, Matthew has the following differences:
   a. He does not have the emotive Οὐά (Mark 15:29).
   b. He also inserts the phrase, εἶ νιδός εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ.

3. In verse 41, he makes the following changes:
   a. He omits πρὸς ἀλλήλους from Mark 15:31.
   b. He also adds καὶ πρεσβυτέρων which, according to Hagner, provides “here complete representation of the Sanhedrin” (Hagner, 1995: 837).
4. In verse 42, Matthew carries out the following changes:
   a. He omits ὁ Χριστὸς (Mark 15:32), “perhaps wanting to refer only to the title included on the titulus above Jesus’ head” (Hagner, 1995: 838).
   b. He includes the verb ἐστιν which, according to Hagner (1995: 838), “understood by Mark”.

5. The Old Testament quotation πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν, ὑσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν (Psalm 22:8) of verse 43 is unique to Matthew.


The added v. 28, providing a quotation from Is. 53:12, occurs only in comparatively late witnesses, and is apparently a gloss reflecting Lk. 22:37, though in a different context and with a different introduction.

Matthew 27:38 – 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λῃσταὶ, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνίμων.</td>
<td>Then two bandits were crucified with him, one on his right and one on his left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Οἱ δὲ παραπορεύομενοι ἐβλασφήμουσιν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, Ὄ καταλύσων τὸν ναὸν καὶ ἐν τριοίν ἡμέρας οἰκοδομήν, σῶσον σεαυτόν, εἰ νύσθεν εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ καταβῆθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταύρου.</td>
<td>Those who passed by derided him, shaking their heads and saying, “You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself! If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 40 Ὅμως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαιξομένοις μετὰ τῶν γραμματεῶν καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἐλέγον, Ἀλλοις ἐσώσασθε, ἕαυτόν οὐ δύναται σώσαι βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ· ἐστίν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσουμε ἐπὶ αὐτὸν. | "All you who passed by derided him, shaking their heads and saying, “You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself! If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross.”"
| 41 In the same way the chief priests also, along with the scribes and elders, were mocking him, saying, “He saved others; he cannot save himself. He is the King of Israel; let him come down from the cross now, and we will believe in him.” |
| 42 Τοίχος καὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὑσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτὸν ἐπεν γὰρ ὅτι Θεὸν εἶμι νύσθεν. | “He saved others; he cannot save himself. He is the King of Israel; let him come down from the cross now, and we will believe in him.”

Table 5.15.1
Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 39,
  - τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν – D uses the singular τὴν κεφαλὴν instead of the plural.

- In verse 40,
  - ’Ο καταλύων – D has an additional particle of interjection Ὅλα to express scorn.
  - εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ – B has the reading θεοῦ εἰ.
  - [καὶ] – Ν² and B do not have this conjunction for which the NA²⁷ text has the support of Ν⁺, A and D.

- In verse 41,
  - καὶ οἱ ἁρχιερεῖς – The conjunction καὶ is not in Ν, or A; it is preceded by δὲ in D and the NA²⁷ reading is supported by B.
  - καὶ πρεσβύτεροι – D has the noun Φαρισαῖοι, whereas the NA²⁷ is supported by Ν, A and B.
  - ἔλεγον – D has the present participle form of the verb: λέγοντες.

- In verse 42,
  - βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ – A has the additional conditional particle εἰ.
  - πιστεύσομεν – Ν has the subjunctive aorist form of the verb πιστεύσομεν, instead of the indicative future and this makes the verb parallel to that of Mark 15:32. A has the indicative present form πιστεύσομεν.
  - ἐπὶ αὐτῶν – A and D use the dative αὐτῶ, without the preposition ἐπὶ. The reading of the NA²⁷ is also that of Ν and B.

- In verse 43,
  - πέποθεν – D has the conditional particle εἰ in front of this verb.
  - τὸν θεόν – B uses the dative form τῷ θεῷ following the preposition, ἐπὶ.
Passion Narrative

- νῦν – A has αὐτὸν and D reads νῦν αὐτὸν. The NA27 text is supported by Ξ and B.

Mark 15:27-32a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο λητασίς, ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωδήμων αὐτοῦ. 28 29 Καὶ οἱ παρασκευάζοντες ἔβλασφήμισαν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, ὃτα ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἐν τρισάριῳ ἡμέραις, 30 σώσου σεαυτόν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. 31 ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπαιζοντες πρὸς ἄλλον μὲτὰ τῶν ἱερατεύων ἐλέγον, ὁλοίς ἐσώσεσθε, εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ δύνασθαι σώσασθαι. 32 ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν.</td>
<td>27 And with him they crucified two bandits, one on his right and one on his left. 28 29 Those who passed by derided him, shaking their heads and saying, &quot;Aha! You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself, and come down from the cross!&quot; 31 In the same way the chief priests, along with the scribes, were also mocking him among themselves and saying, &quot;He saved others; he cannot save himself. 32 Let the Messiah, the King of Israel, come down from the cross now, so that we may see and believe.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- In verse 27,
  - σταυροῦσιν – B has the aorist form of the verb ἔσταυρωσαν and D has the present passive form, σταυροῦνται.
  - αὐτῶν – C3 and D do not have this pronoun.
- In verse 29,
  - παρασκευάζοντες – D has παράγοντες.
  - αὐτῶν – D does not use this pronoun.
  - οἶκος ὑμῶν ἐν τρισάριῳ ἡμέραις – The readings differ in the witnesses: Ξ and C have the phrase ἐν τρισάριῳ ἡμέραις οἶκος ὑμῶν, A has τρισάριῳ ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν, D has οἰκοδομῶν τρισάριῳ ἡμέραις, and the NA27 has the support of B.
Luke 23:35 – 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kai eiσtηkei o laos theωrωn. exemukthηrion de kai oι arχontes λεγουνtes, &quot;Allous έσωσεν, σωσάτω έαυτων, eι ουτως έστιν ο Χριστός του θεου ο έκλεκτος. 36 ενπαιζαν δε αυτω και oι στρατιώται προσερχόμενου, δοξα προσφέροντες αυτω 37 και λέγοντες, Eι συ ει ο βασιλεύς των Ιουδαίων, σωσον σαυτον. 38 ήν δε και επιγραφη επ αυτω, Ο βασιλεύς των Ιουδαίων ουτως.</td>
<td>And the people stood by, watching; but the leaders scoffed at him, saying, &quot;He saved others; let him save himself if he is the Messiah of God, his chosen one!&quot; 36 The soldiers also mocked him, coming up and offering him sour wine, 37 and saying, &quot;If you are the King of the Jews, save yourself!&quot; 38 There was also an inscription over him, &quot;This is the King of the Jews.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 35,
  - θεωρων - D has the verb ὑρων instead.
  - ἐξεμυκτήριζον - D uses ἐμυκτήριζον, the uncompounded form.
  - καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες - D simply has the pronoun αὐτῶν. A has the longer reading καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σὺν αὐτῷ. The NA²⁷ has the support of 873, B (without the conjunction καὶ), B and C.
• λέγοντες – D has the reading καὶ ἔλεγαν αὐτῷ.

• ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὕτως ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ – The readings differ in three of the witnesses under consideration. Ἱ75 has the reading ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω οὐαυτόν, εἰ οὕτως ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; B has ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω οὐαυτόν, εἰ οὕτως εἰ υἱὸς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; and D has ἔσωσας· σεαυτὸν ὁ σώσας, εἰ υἱός εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ Χριστὸς εἶ.

➢ In verse 36,

• ἐνέπαιξαν – A, C and D have the imperfect form of this verb, ἐνέπαιξαν whereas the aorist form of the NA27 is also used by Ἱ75, Ν, and B.

• καὶ – Ν does not have this conjunction.

• ὃς προσφέροντες αὐτῷ – C3 has the reading καὶ ὃς προσφέροντες αὐτῷ; D has ὃς τε προσέφερον. The NA27 text is shared by Ἱ75, Ν, A, B and C*.

➢ In verse 37,

• καὶ λέγοντες, Εἰ σὺ εἰ – D reads λέγοντες, Χαῖρε.

• Εἰ σὺ εἰ – A does not have the conditional particle εἰ.

• ὁσῶν σεαυτὸν – D has the reading περιτιθέντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκάνθινον στέφανον. This variant reading is very close to Mark 15:17.

➢ In verse 38,

• καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ – C and D have an additional article ή before the noun ἐπιγραφὴ.

• ἐπ’ αὐτῷ – The readings differ in the following witnesses: Ν*ـ have ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν ἐλληνικός ῥωμαϊκοὶ ἑβραῖκοι; A has ἐπιγεγραμμένη ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν ἐλληνικός καὶ ῥωμαῖκος καὶ ἑβραῖκοι; C3 has γεγραμμένη ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν ἐλληνικός καὶ ῥωμαϊκοὶ καὶ ἑβραῖκοι; D has ἐπιγεγραμμένη ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν ἐλληνικός ῥωμαϊκοὶ ἑβραῖκοι. The
Passion Narrative

NA\textsuperscript{27} reading has the support of G\textsuperscript{75}, S\textsuperscript{1} and B. \textbf{Note:} The Aland Synopsis flags these variant readings as causing this verse of Luke to be parallel to a reading from Matthew or Mark. However, apart from the verb \textit{επιγραμμένη} (Mark 15:26), the other words in the variants do not have any equivalent in either Matthew or Mark.

- ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων οὗτος — C has the phrase ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων; A has the reading οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων; the NA\textsuperscript{27} text is supported by G\textsuperscript{75}, S and B.

Section 346: The Two Thieves


The subject matter in this section is about the two thieves who are crucified with Jesus. The verses in Matthew and Mark are close to each other, but Luke differs considerably.


This exchange [Luke 23:39] is found only in Luke, though it is similar to Matt. 27:44 = Mark 15:32, where both criminals are said to reproof (ὡνείδιζον) Jesus. The absence of any positive note in the other Gospels has caused great speculation. In fact, Luce (1933: 351) goes so far as to call the Lucan account unhistorical. Plummer (1896: 533-34) notes three possible explanations for this difference:
1. At the start both criminals revile Jesus, but the second criminal is later impressed with Jesus and changes his mind. This old explanation goes back to Origen, Chrysostom, and Jerome.

2. In the other Synoptics, the criminals reproach Jesus for not doing enough against Rome, while in Luke only one robber sarcastically taunts Jesus. This view assumes that the robbers are Zealots or political insurrectionists, which is not clear in any of the accounts.

3. Each approach reflects different sources (Plummer’s view). The other Synoptics treat the criminals as a group and depict only their reviling. Luke has an additional source that is aware of the positive response of the one robber.

Views 1 and 3 are not incompatible. In fact, both are probably the case.

For this section, Hagner (1995: 833) notes only one difference between Matthew and Mark: The insertion, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λῃσταὶ (Mark 15:32), “thus resuming the subject of verse 38 and making it easier for the reader to realize the identity of these last mockers” (Hagner, 1995: 838).

Matthew 27:44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \text{NA}^{27} )</th>
<th>( \text{NRSV} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λῃσταὶ οἱ συσταυρωθέντες σὺν αὐτῷ ὑνείδιζον αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>The bandits who were crucified with him also taunted him in the same way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 44,
  - συσταυρωθέντες – D has σταυρωθέντες instead.
• σὺν αὐτῷ – A does not have the preposition σὺν. The NA²⁷ text has the support of K, B and D.

Mark 15:32b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32 καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ ὄνειδιζον αὐτόν.</td>
<td>32 Those who were crucified with him also taunted him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- In verse 32b,
  - σὺν αὐτῷ – A and C do not have the preposition σὺν; D does not have these two words. The NA²⁷ has the support of K and B.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA²⁷</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 Εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτὸν λέγων, ὦφις σὺ εἷς ὁ Χριστός; σῶσον σεαυτόν καὶ ἡμᾶς. 40 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἔτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη, ὦδὲ φοβῆ σὺ τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ, 41 καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαιῶς, ἠξία γὰρ ὢν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὕτως δὲ οὐδὲν ἀτοπον ἐπράξει. 42 καὶ ἠλεγεν, Ἰησοῦν, μὴ ἔσοβητί μου ὅταν ἔλησθις εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου. 43 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἦμην σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἔση ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.</td>
<td>39 One of the criminals who were hanged there kept deriding him and saying, &quot;Are you not the Messiah? Save yourself and us!&quot; 40 But the other rebuked him, saying, &quot;Do you not fear God, since you are under the same sentence of condemnation? 41 And we indeed have been condemned justly, for we are getting what we deserve for our deeds, but this man has done nothing wrong.&quot; 42 Then he said, &quot;Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.&quot; 43 He replied, &quot;Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in Paradise.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16.3
Textual Notes: The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 39,
  - κρεμασθέντων - D does not have this word.
  - λέγων – B and D do not have this word. The NA²⁷ text has the support of ℶ⁷⁵.
  - Οὐχὶ σὺ εἴ ο Χριστός; σώσον σεαυτόν καὶ ἡμᾶς. - D does not have these two sentences.
  - Οὐχὶ – A and C³ have the particle εἴ. The NA²⁷ reading is supported by ℶ⁷⁵, Ν, B and C*.

- In verse 40,
  - ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἡφι – A, C² and D have the reading ἐπέτιμα αὐτῷ λέγων and the NA²⁷ reading is also used by ℶ⁷⁵, Ν, and B.
  - Οὐδὲ – Ν* has the negative particle οὐ whereas D has ὅτι οὐ.
  - εἴ – C* has the 1st person plural form ἔσμεν instead of the 2nd person singular form. D has the reading εἴ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν.

- In verse 41,
  - καὶ – C* does not have this conjunction.
  - ἀπολαμβάνομεν – C* has ἀπελάβαμεν.
  - ἀτοπον – D has the pronoun πονηρόν which has a similar meaning. This variant reading is very close to Mark 15:17.

- In verse 42-43,
  - ἔλεγεν, Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθης εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου. ⁴³ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἄμην σοι λέγω – A and C² have the reading ἔλεγεν, τῷ Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου κύριε ὅταν ἔλθης ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. ⁴³ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦ, Ἄμην σοι λέγω; D has the reading στραφεὶς πρὸς τὸν κύριον εἶπεν αὐτῷ, μνήσθητί μου ἐν ἔκεινη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐλεύσεως σου. ἀποκριθεὶς
Section 348: Witnesses of the Crucifixion

Matthew 27: 55-56; Mark 15: 40-41; Luke 23: 49

There are now some indications of the identity of those who are watching, at a distance, what is happening. It is interesting to note that all three Gospels mention that many, if not most, of those watching are women. At this point as well, scholars have handled grouping of the verses into pericopae differently. France prefers to include Mark 15:40 – 41 with the burial of Jesus; he writes (2002: 661):

The two verses describing the presence of the women at Golgotha (vv. 40-41) are frequently joined with the preceding pericope as the conclusion of the crucifixion scene. Like many such bridging passages in Mark, they can be linked either way. I have linked them rather with the account of the burial of Jesus for two reasons, first because v. 39 brings the story of Jesus’ trial and death to so effective a climax that it seems something of an anticlimax to include these additional verses in the same pericope, but secondly and more importantly because the women are introduced here not just as an incidental detail of the crucifixion scene, but as the linking group mentioned again both in v. 47 and in 16:1.

Evans differs from the Aland Synopsis in that he has grouped Mark 15:20b – 41 under the title of “The Crucifixion of Jesus” (2001: 491). As mentioned briefly in the previous three sections, Bock has gathered Luke 23:26 – 49 as one section, while recognising the fact that it consists of four subunits. Marshall also considers Luke
23:49 as part of the account of Jesus’ crucifixion. He considers this pericope about the death of Jesus to be Luke 23:44 – 49.

For Luke 23:49, Bock makes the following comments:


2. Luke 23:49 mentions that the women were present, but does not identify them other than to note that they are from Galilee (Mark 15:40 – 41 = Matt. 27:55 – 56) (Bock, 1996: 1838)

Hagner argues that Matthew relies heavily on Mark 15: 40 – 41. He also writes that Matthew has reordered the text of Mark and has also abbreviated it in the process. Hagner (1995: 854) shows the following differences between Matthew and Mark:

1. In verse 55, Matthew substitutes ἐκεῖ for καὶ (Mark 15:40).

2. In verse 56,
   a. Matthew omits τοῦ μικροῦ after the name James (Mark 15:40).
   b. He substitutes Σαλώμη (Mark 15:40) with ἥ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου. Hagner argues that “Matthew apparently wishes to identify this ‘Salome’ or to substitute a better-known woman” (1995: 854).

3. Matthew has left out the whole phrase καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβόσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα from Mark 15:41.

**NOTE:** Bock lists 23 major differences between the text of Luke (23:26 – 49) and Matthew / Mark. He also makes the observation that only 54 out of 269 words in
Luke have a match in Mark (though he does not mention whether the matches are exact ones or are from the same root but different in form). He surveys what other scholars have said about these differences and writes:


Matthew 27:55 – 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NA</strong></th>
<th><strong>NRSV</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 Ἡσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσα, αἳ τινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ; 56 ἐν αἷς ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ὀικῶν Ζεβεδαίου.</td>
<td>55 Many women were also there, looking on from a distance; they had followed Jesus from Galilee and had provided for him. 56 Among them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17.1
Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 55,
  - ἐκεῖ – D has the conjunction καὶ; Ν has the compound word κάκει.
  - ἀπὸ – A does not have this preposition.

- In verse 56,
  - Μαρία – C has the alternative spelling of the proper name, Μαριὰ. This is the case for both occurrences of the name in this verse.
  - Ἰωσὴφ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ – A, B, and C read Ἰωσὴφ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ; D<sup>C</sup> has Ἰωσὴφος μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ; Ν<sup>*</sup> has ἡ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ ἡ Μαρία ἡ.

The NA<sup>27</sup> text is supported only by (Ν<sup>2</sup>) and D*.

Mark 15:40 – 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 Ἡσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαν, ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἱακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσὴφος μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη, 41 αἱ ὄσε ἧν ἐν τῷ Γαλιλαῖῳ ἠκολούθουσαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἔδηκον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβάσασαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.</td>
<td>40 There were also women looking from a distance; among them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome. 41 These used to follow him and provided for him when he was in Galilee; and there were many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- In verse 40,
  - αἱ καὶ – C<sup>2</sup> and D have ἦν, whereas A and C<sup>*</sup> have ἦν καὶ instead of the conjunction καὶ.
  - Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ – B and C use the proper name Μαριὰ in the place of Μαρία.
• Ἰακώβου – A has the parallel reading to Matthew 27:56: Ἰ τοῦ Ἰακώβου. D does not have the article, Ἰ.

• Ἰωσήφος – B has an additional article, Ἰ. Ἰ*, A and C have the proper name Ἰωσήφ. The NA27 reading has the support of Ἰ2 and D.

➢ In verse 41,

• αἱ – A and C have the conjunction καὶ. D reads αἱ καὶ. The text of the NA27 is supported by Ἰ and B.

• καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ – C and D do not have this phrase.

**Luke 23:49**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 ἐιστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὀρῶσαί ταῦτα.</td>
<td>49 But all his acquaintances, including the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance, watching these things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17.3

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings in this passage are:

➢ In verse 49,

• αὐτῷ – Ἰ, C and D use the genitive αὐτοῦ instead of the dative. The reading of the NA27 has the support of Ὑ75, A* and B.

• ἀπὸ μακρόθεν – A and C do not have the preposition, ἀπὸ. The NA27 text has the support of Ὑ75, Ἰ, B and D.

• γυναῖκες – In Ὑ75 and B, the noun is preceded by the definite article, αἱ.

• συνακολοθήσασι – A and D use συνακολοθήσασι, The NA27 reading is supported by Ὑ75, Ἰ, B and C.
Section 350: The Burial of Jesus


The last section in the analysis of the Passion Narrative is about the burial of Jesus. Apart from the fact that Mark 15:44 – 45 are not represented in Matthew or Luke, the narratives are quite close to one another. However, the agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark (omitting Mark 15:44 – 45) does not have a simple answer. Evans gives a survey of what some scholars have said (2001: 515-516):

Hagner (Matthew 2: 857) believes that Matthew had these verses before him but chose to omit them. Likewise, Fitzmyer (Luke 2:1523) believes that Luke also omitted these verses. But it is hard to account for their complete omission in both of these Gospels. Such an agreement with each other while differing from Mark (with Markan priority assumed) is not easily explained. Bultmann is probably correct that the draft of Mark used by Matthew and Luke did not contain this material, which may have been added later to explain how it was that permission would have been given to take down a crucifixion victim the very day that he had been crucified – indeed, after hanging on the cross only a few hours. … The original edition of Mark probably did not have vv 44 – 45 because Palestinian Jewish Christians were familiar with this custom (as also was Pilate).

Bock follows the Aland Synopsis in the way he divides the pericope. He argues that Luke has the “basic traditional material with parallels in Mark 15:42 – 47 = Matt. 27:57 – 61” (Bock, 1996: 1871). For these verses from Luke, Bock has also the following comments:

Unique to Luke are the note that the women are from Galilee and the detail that the tomb had never been used before (Matthew is close to this by saying the tomb is new). The other Synoptics tell us that Mary Magdalene and “the other”
Mary (Matthew) or Mary mother of Joses (Mark) were there. Luke lacks some details: Joseph getting up courage (Mark 15:43), Pilate checking on Jesus’ death (Mark 15:44 – 45), the purchase of the linen shroud (Mark 15:46a), the rolling of the stone (Mark 15:46b = Matt 27:60), and the guards (Matt. 27:62 – 66). Most agree that Luke had access to additional material and chose to leave out some traditional details. (Bock, 1996: 1871)

Hagner states that Matthew is here fairly close to the text of Mark and is only about half as long as Mark. The most significant difference is his omission of Mark 15:44 – 45a (Hagner, 1995: 857):

The biggest departure from the Markan text involves the omission of Mark 15:44-45a concerning Pilate’s inquiry about whether Jesus was in fact dead (omitted also by Luke). Matthew apparently felt no need to defend the death of Jesus against a theory that Jesus may only have appeared to be dead and later revived in the coolness of the tomb. Matthew’s concern was to answer the claim that Jesus’ body had been stolen.

He mentions the following differences between Matthew and Mark (1995: 857):

1. In verse 57, Matthew has the following changes:
   a. He does not have Mark’s chronological information. He does not have Ἡδή and the phrase ἔπει ἦν παρασκευή ὡς ἐστιν προσάρθτων (Mark 15:42).
   b. He substitutes ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος for εὐσχήμων βουλευτής (Mark 15:43). Hagner notes that Matthew probably does not want to “associate Joseph with the enemies of Jesus (cf. Luke’s necessary

c. He is more explicit by replacing Ἰην προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 15:43) with ἐμακαρισθεύη τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

d. Matthew does not have ἦςομα (Mark 15:43).

2. In verse 58, Matthew changes ἐδώρησατο τὸ πτώμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ (Mark 15:45) to ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδοθῆναι.

3. In verse 59, he modifies Mark 15:46:

   a. He omits the verb, ἀγοράσας.
   
   b. He changes ἐνείλησεν to ἐνετύλιξεν.
   
   c. He adds καθαρᾷ.

4. In verse 60, Matthew has the following differences:

   a. He adds τῷ καυτῷ ἀυτοῦ to the noun μνημεῖα.
   
   b. He also adds μέγαν to the noun λίθον. Hagner argues that these two additions are made to emphasize “the security of the tomb” (1995: 857).
   
   c. He ends the verse by adding ἀπῆλθεν.

5. In verse 61, Matthew makes the following changes:

   a. He simply describes the second Mary as ἡ ἀλλή instead of ἡ Ἰωσήτος (Mark 15:40, 47).
   
   b. He substitutes καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου for ἐθεάρων ποί τέθειται.
NOTE: For Luke 23:50, Marshall observes that Luke does not have Mark’s mention of the time at the beginning of the narrative but “transfers it rather awkwardly to follow the actual burial in v. 54 … This change may reflect use of a different source in vs. 54f., since it is difficult to see any good reason for the change” (1978: 879).

Matthew 27:57 – 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA27</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57 Ὄψις ας δὲ γενομένης ἤλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλοῦσιος ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθείας, τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ, δς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ· 58 οὗτος προσῆλθόν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἰήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τότε ὁ Πιλάτος ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδοθῆναι. 59 καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἐντύλιξεν αὐτὸ [ἐν] σωμάτω καθαρῷ 60 καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ ὁ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήλθεν. 61 ἢν δὲ ἔκει Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία καθήμεναι ἀπέναντί του τάφου.</td>
<td>57 When it was evening, there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who was also a disciple of Jesus. 58 He went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus; then Pilate ordered it to be given to him. 59 So Joseph took the body and wrapped it in a clean linen cloth 60 and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn in the rock. He then rolled a great stone to the door of the tomb and went away. 61 Mary Magdalene and the other Mary were there, sitting opposite the tomb.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18.1

Textual Notes: The variant readings for this section of Matthew are:

- In verse 57,
  - ἐμαθητεύθη – A and B have the active form, ἐμαθῆτευσεν instead of the passive. The NA27 text is supported by Ψ, C and D.

- In verse 58,
  - προσῆλθόν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἰήσατο – D has the variant reading προσῆλθεν τῷ Πιλάτῳ καὶ ἰήσατο.
• ἀποδοθῆναι – At the end of the verse, A, C and D have the noun τὸ σῶμα.

The NA²⁷ text is supported by Ξ and B.

➤ In verse 59,
  • [ἐν] – The NA²⁷ flags this reading as uncertain. This decision is justified by the fact that Ξ, A and C do not have this word and only B and D (amongst the witnesses considered) have it.

➤ In verse 60,
  • αὐτὸ – This pronoun is not found in Ξ.

➤ In verse 61,
  • Μαριῶμ – A and D have Μαρία. The NA²⁷ text has the support of Ξ, B and C.
  • ἀπέναντι – D has καταπέναντι.
Mark 15:42 – 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 Καὶ ἡδὲ ὁμιλιάς γενομένης, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευὴ ὁ ἐστιν προσαββατηκόν, ἐλθὼν ᾿Ιοσὴφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ ᾿Αριμαθαίας εὐσχῆμων βουλευτῆς, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προοδευκόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τολμῆσας εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πιλᾶτον καὶ ἤτραξε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ᾿Ιησοῦ. 44 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἦδὲ τέθηκεν καὶ προσκαλεούμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἐὰν πάλιν ἀπέθανεν. 45 καὶ γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος ἐδώρησε τὸ πτώμα τῷ ᾿Ιωσήφ. 46 καὶ ἀγοράσας συνδόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείληκεν τῇ συνδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μυμηλῷ ὁ ἦν λεικοτομμένον ἐκ πέτρας καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθου ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μυμηλίου. 47 ἢ δὲ Ἡλεία ἡ ᾿Μαγδάλην̣ καὶ Ἡλεία ᾿Ιωσήθος ἐθεώρουν πού τέθεται.</td>
<td>42 When evening had come, and since it was the day of Preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, 43 Joseph of Arimathea, a respected member of the council, who was also himself waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. 44 Then Pilate wondered if he were already dead; and summoning the centurion, he asked him whether he had been dead for some time. 45 When he learned from the centurion that he was dead, he granted the body to Joseph. 46 Then Joseph bought a linen cloth, and taking down the body, wrapped it in the linen cloth, and laid it in a tomb that had been hewn out of the rock. He then rolled a stone against the door of the tomb. 47 Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses saw where the body was laid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18.2

Textual Notes: The variant readings are:

- In verse 42,
  - προοδευκόμενος – D reads πρὶν σάββατον; A and B<sup>2</sup> have the reading πρὸς σάββατον.

- In verse 43,
  - ἐλθὼν – D has the indicative mood ἤλθεν, as used in Matthew 27:57.
  - [ὁ] – B and D do not have this definite article, whereas the NA<sup>27</sup> text has the support of Ν, A and C.
  - ᾿Αριμαθαίας – Ν<sup>C</sup> and D use an alternate spelling of the proper noun, ᾿Αριμαθίας.
  - καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν – The order of the words in D is slightly different: ἦν καὶ αὐτὸς.
  - εἰσῆλθεν – D has the simple verb ἠλθεν.
• τὸν Πιλάτου – A, C and D do not have the definite article τὸν, whereas the
NA27 reading has the support of K and B.
• σῶμα – D uses a word with a similar meaning: πτῶμα.

➢ In verse 44,
• ἔθαύμασεν – K and D have the imperative form ἔθαύμαζεν.
• εἰ πάλαι – B and D have the variant reading εἰ ἤδη.
• ἀπέθανεν – D uses the simple verb τέθνηκεν instead of the compound.

➢ In verse 45,
• ἀπὸ – D has another preposition: παρὰ.
• πτῶμα – A and C have the word σῶμα. D has the reading πτῶμα αὐτοῦ. The
NA27 reading has the support of K and B.
• Ἰωσήφ – B uses the alternate way of spelling the proper name: Ἰωσήφ.

➢ In verse 46,
• καὶ ἀγοράσας – D has the reading ὁ δὲ Ἰωσήφ.
• καθελὼν – A and C use the conjunction καὶ before this word; D has the verb
as used in Matthew 27:59: λαβὼν.
• τῇ σινδώνι – D reads εἰς τὴν σινδώνι.
• ἔθηκεν – (A) and C* have the compound verb κατέθηκεν. The NA27 reading
has the support of K, B and C2.
• μνημείῳ – K and B use the same word as Luke 23:53: μνῆματι. The NA27
text is supported by A, C and (D).
• ἐκ πέτρας – D has the reading ἐκ τῆς πέτρας.
• μνημείον. – At the end of the verse, D has the additional phrase καὶ ἀπῆλθεν.
The verb ἀπῆλθεν is the one used by Matthew 27:60.
In verse 47,

- Ἰωσῆτος – D uses another proper name Ἰακώβου, C has Ἰωσή, and A Ἰωσήφ. \(\text{N}^2\) and B support the reading of the NA\(^{27}\).

- ἔθεωρον ποῦ – The variant reading for D is ἔθεσαντο τὸν τόπον ὅπου.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA(^{27})</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνὴρ ὄνοματι Ἰωσῆφ</td>
<td>Now there was a good and righteous man named Joseph, who, though a member of the council,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων [καὶ] ἄνὴρ ἁγάθος</td>
<td>had not agreed to their plan and action. He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ δίκαιος</td>
<td>came from the Jewish town of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὗτος ὦκ ἄν Συγκατατεθηκέναι ἡ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ Πράξῃ ἄνω ἀπὸ Ἁρμαθαίας πόλεως</td>
<td>Ἄριμαθαίας, de προσεδέχετο τὴν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὥστε πασχάλιαν τοῦ θεοῦ,</td>
<td>βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, (^{52}) οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἰησοῦτο τῷ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ καθέλων ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ Συνδόν καὶ ἔθηκεν ἄνω ἐν μνήμῃ λαξευτῷ ὦκ</td>
<td>καὶ ἔθεσαν τὸ σῶμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐκ οὐδεὶς οὕτω κείμενος. (^{54}) καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον</td>
<td>ή παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν. (^{55}) Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνέλιθυται ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῶ, ἔθεσαν τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἔθηκεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, (^{56}) ὑποστρέφασαν δὲ ἥτοιμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ μύρα. Καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον Σύγχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.18.3**

**Textual Notes:** The variant readings in this passage are:

- In verse 50,
  - [καὶ] ἄνηρ – The conjunction καὶ is not found in A and B; both words are lacking in D. The reading of the NA\(^{27}\) is supported by \(\text{P}^{75}\), \(\text{N}\) and (C).
  - καὶ δίκαιος – B does not have the conjunction καὶ.

- In verse 51,
  - συγκατατεθηκέναι – \(\text{N}\), C and D have the word συγκατατεθηκέναι.
Passion Narrative

- 'Αριμαθαίας – D uses the alternate spelling of the proper name: 'Αριμαθίας.

- προσδέχετο – A has the reading καὶ προσδέχετο καὶ αὐτὸς. The NA\textsuperscript{27} text has the support of \textit{ϧ}, B, C and D.

➢ In verse 52,
- οὗτος – D* does not have this word.

➢ In verse 53,
- ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ – A reads αὐτὸ ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ. D has ἐνετύλιξεν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν, whereas the NA\textsuperscript{27} text has the support of \textit{ϧ}, B and C.
- αὐτὸν – \textit{ϧ}\textsuperscript{75} and A have the word αὐτὸ. The NA\textsuperscript{27} text is supported by \textit{ϧ}, B, C and D.
- μνήματι λαξευτῷ – D has a reading closer to Mark 15:46: μνημείῳ λεξατομημένω.
- οὐπω – \textit{Ϫ} and C have another adverb with a similar meaning: οὐδέπω. The NA\textsuperscript{27} has the same reading as \textit{ϧ}\textsuperscript{75}, A, and B.
- κείμενος – At the end of the verse D has the sentence καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν μνημείῳ λίθον ὃν μόνης εἴκοσι ἑκατέρου.

➢ In verse 54,
- καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν. – The whole verse is different in D. It reads ἦν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα πρὸ σάββατον.

➢ In verse 55,
- Κατακολουθήσασας – D has the form Κατακολούθησαν.
- αἱ γυναῖκες – For the definite article αἱ, D uses δῶ; \textit{Ϫ}, A and C do not have the article. The NA\textsuperscript{27} reading is supported by \textit{ϧ}\textsuperscript{75} and B.
- ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας – D uses the preposition ἀπὸ instead of ἐκ.
• συνελημθυναί ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ – A and C² place αὐτῷ after συνελημθυναί; D does not have the pronoun αὐτῷ. The NA²⁷ text is also that of ܐ, B and C*vid.

• μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα – D has the word μνήμα in the place of this phrase.

➢ In verse 56,

• ὑποστρέψασι δὲ – C² has the reading καὶ ὑποστρέψασι, whereas C* has only ὑποστρέψασι.

• κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν – D does not have this phrase.
Chapter 6

Observations

In order to see the impact of the variant readings on the text of the NA\textsuperscript{27}, it is useful to have a summary of the major variant readings in each of the sections considered. Those readings which are based on common words like καὶ or δὲ are not taken into account unless they are found to be significant.

Section 305 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA\textsuperscript{27} Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:3</td>
<td>οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι</td>
<td>Various Witnesses: add either οἱ γραμματεῖς or οἱ φαρισαῖοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: (9^45), A, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:2</td>
<td>ἔσται θάρυσσος</td>
<td>A: Order of the words are reversed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: A, B, C and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 307 –

### Section 308 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:12</td>
<td>ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν</td>
<td>D: ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν σοι (Matthew 26:17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:16</td>
<td>οἱ μαθηταὶ</td>
<td>A, C and D: οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:17</td>
<td>Καὶ ψύξας</td>
<td>D: ψύξας δὲ (Matthew 26:20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support:
- Matthew 26:17
- Matthew 26:20

### Section 311 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:26</td>
<td>δοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς</td>
<td>Ν*, A and C: ἐδίδοσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:27</td>
<td>ποτήριον</td>
<td>Π⁴⁵, A, C and D: τὸ λαβὼν ποτήριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:28</td>
<td>τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης</td>
<td>A and C: τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:28</td>
<td>τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης</td>
<td>A, C and D: τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:29</td>
<td>οὐ μὴ πίω</td>
<td>A and C: ὁτι οὐ μὴ πίω (Mark 14:25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:29</td>
<td>ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος</td>
<td>Π⁴⁵, Ν*, and C: ἐκ τούτου γενήματος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:22</td>
<td>λαβὼν ἄρτον</td>
<td>Ν* and C: ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:25</td>
<td>οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω</td>
<td>Ν and C: οὐ μὴ πίω (Matthew 26:29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D reads οὐ μὴ πρόσθω πείν
### Passion Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Luke 22:16 | οὐ μὴ φάγω | C: οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω  
D: οὐκέτι μὴ φάγομαι |
|          | Support: Ἑ, A and B |                |
|          | Support: Ἑ, B and C* |                |
D*: ἀλλήλοις |
|          | Support: Ἑ², B and C |                |
| Luke 22:18 | Ἰστι ὁ μὴ πίω | Ἑ, B, C and D: οὐ μὴ πίω |
|          | Support: Ἑ, A and B |                |
D: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ μὴ πίω |
|          | Support: Ἑ, B and D |                |
| Luke 22:18 | οὐ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ | A and D: ὁτῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ |
|          | Support: Ἑ, B and C* |                |
(Mark 14:22) |
|          | Support: Ἑ, A, B and D |                |

### Section 312 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:22</td>
<td>λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑκαστός</td>
<td>Ἑ, Ἑ, Ἑ and D: λέγειν εἰς ἑκαστός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ἑ, B and C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Matthew 26:22 | λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑκαστός | Ἑ and D: λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑκ αὐτῶν  
Ἑ⁶⁴vid: λέγειν αὐτῷ |
|          | Support: Ἑ, A and B |                |
| Matthew 26:23 | μετ’ ἐμοῦ τὴν χείρα ἐν τῷ τριβλίῳ | Ἑ, Ἑ, Ἑ and D: τὴν χείρα μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τριβλίῳ  
C: μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τριβλίῳ τὴν χείρα |
|          | Support: Ἑ⁶⁴, Ἑ, A and B |                |
| Mark 14:19 | ἡρῴαντο λυπεῖσθαι | C: καὶ ἡρῴαντο  
A and D: οὐ δὲ |
|          | Support: Ἑ and B |                |
### Mark 14:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Masoretic Text</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰς κατὰ εἰς</td>
<td>eis kata eis</td>
<td>A and D: εἰς καθ’ εἰς</td>
<td>C: εἰς ἑκαστὸς (Matthew 26:22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support:** A, B, C

### Mark 14:19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Masoretic Text</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μήτι ἐγώ</td>
<td>Mteti egow</td>
<td>D: καὶ ἄλλος, Μήτι ἐγώ</td>
<td>A: εἰμι, ῥαββί; καὶ ἄλλος, Μήτι ἐγώ (Matthew 26:22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support:** K, B, C

### Mark 14:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Masoretic Text</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τῶν δώδεκα</td>
<td>twon dodeka</td>
<td>A and D: ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support:** K, B, C

### Mark 14:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Masoretic Text</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καλὸν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>kalon autow</td>
<td>δ, A, C and D: καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>(Matthew 26:24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support:** B

### Section 313 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 20:24</td>
<td>ἤμαται ἁμαρτήσαι</td>
<td>Ν: ἠρέσαντο ἁγανακτεῖν (Mark 10:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 20:26</td>
<td>ἐσται ἐν ὑμῖν</td>
<td>C: δὲ ἐσται ἐν ὑμῖν, B and D: ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:44</td>
<td>ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι</td>
<td>D: ὑμῶν εἶναι, A and C3: ὑμῶν γενέσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:30</td>
<td>ἵνα ἐσθήτε καὶ πίνητε</td>
<td>Ν, A and D2: ἵνα ἐσάβητε καὶ πίνητε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:30</td>
<td>τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες</td>
<td>Ν, A and D: κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: K, B and D*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Texts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section 315 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA²⁷ Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matthew 26:34 | τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με | Ν*: τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ  
Α: ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς  
Γ, Β and C: τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με |
| Mark 14:30   | οὐ σήμερον ταύτη τῇ νυκτί | D: ταύτη τῇ νυκτί  
(Matthew 26:34)  
Ν and C: σήμερον ταύτη τῇ νυκτί (Matthew 26:34) |
| Mark 14:30   | ἡ δίς ἀλέκτωρα φωνήσαι | Ν and D: ἀλέκτωρα φωνήσαι  
(Matthew 26:34) |
| Mark 14:31   | οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσωμαι | Ν, Β and C*: ἀπαρνήσωμαι |
| Luke 22:31   | Σίμων Σίμων  
Support: Γ⁷⁵ and Β | Ν, Α and D: εἴπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Σίμων Σίμων |
| Luke 22:34   | ἀλέκτωρ ἐως τρίς  
Support: Ν and Β | D: ἐως ὅτου  
Α: τρίν ἡ (Matthew 26:34, Mark 14:30) |
| Luke 22:34   | με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι  
Support: Ν and Β | Α: ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με |

## Section 330 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA²⁷ Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matthew 26:36 | τοῖς μαθηταῖς  
Support: Β | Ν, Α, C and D: τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (Mark 14:32) |
| Matthew 26:36 | [οὐ] ἀπελθὼν  
Γ, and A: οὐ ἀπελθὼν  
Ν and C: ἀπελθὼν  
D: ἀν ἀπελθὼν | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 26:36</th>
<th>ἐκεῖ προσεύξωμαι</th>
<th>A and C: προσεύξωμαι ἐκεῖ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{P}^33$, $\mathcal{K}$ and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:39</td>
<td>προσελθὼν</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}^33$, $\mathcal{K}$, A, C and D: προσελθὼν (Mark 14:35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{P}^{37,45}$ and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:40</td>
<td>ἰσχύσατε</td>
<td>A: ἰσχύσας (Mark 14:37) $\mathcal{P}^{37}$: ἰσχύσαντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:41</td>
<td>εἰσέλθητε</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}^{37}$: ἐλθήτε (Mark 14:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:44</td>
<td>λόγον εἰπὼν πάλιν</td>
<td>A, C and D: λόγον εἰπὼν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{P}^{37}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:45</td>
<td>[τῷ] λοιπὸν</td>
<td>B and C: λοιπὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{P}^{37}$, A and D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:33</td>
<td>καὶ [τὸν] Ἰάκωβον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰωάννην</td>
<td>$\mathcal{K}$, C and D: καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: A and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:34</td>
<td>καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>D: τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς (Matthew 26:38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:35</td>
<td>προσελθὼν</td>
<td>A, C and D: προσελθὼν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{K}$ and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:35</td>
<td>ἐπιπτεν</td>
<td>A and C: ἐπεσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: ἐπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Matthew 26:38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:36</td>
<td>παρένεγκε</td>
<td>$\mathcal{K}$, A and C: παρένεγκαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:38</td>
<td>ἔλθητε</td>
<td>$\mathcal{K}^2$, A, C and D: εἰσήλθητε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{K}^*$ and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:40</td>
<td>πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὑρεν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>A and C: ύποστρέψαι εὑρεν αὐτοῖς πάλιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: $\mathcal{K}$, B and D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark 14:41  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:48</td>
<td>ἄν φιλήσω</td>
<td>Ψ, and A: ἕναν φιλήσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:52</td>
<td>τήν μάχαιράν σου</td>
<td>A and C: σου τήν μάχαιράν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: κ, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:52</td>
<td>μάχαιρῃ</td>
<td>B and D: μάχαιρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: κ, A, B* and C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:53</td>
<td>οὐ δύναμαι παρακάλεσαι τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι ἄρτι πλείω</td>
<td>A, C and D: οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι πλείω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: κ and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:53</td>
<td>μοι ἄρτι πλείω</td>
<td>κ, A and C: πλείους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: κ*, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:53</td>
<td>πλείω δώδεκα</td>
<td>A and C: πλείῳ ἢ δώδεκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: κ, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:53</td>
<td>λεγιώναις ἀγγέλων</td>
<td>κ*, A and C: λεγ(e)ωνων ἀγγέλων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κ²: λεγεωνων ἀγγέλους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:55</td>
<td>καθ’ ἡμέραν</td>
<td>A, C and D: καθ’ ἡμέραν πρὸς ὑμᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: κ and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Matthew 26:55 | ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκον | A: ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ  
C and D: ἐκαθεζόμην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκον  
Support: Ν and B |
| Mark 14:43 | Ἰούδας | A and B: ὁ Ἰούδας  
Support: Ν, C and D |
| Mark 14:43 | ὁχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν | A, C and D: ὁχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν (Matthew 26:47) |
| Mark 14:43 | παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων | B: ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων  
(Matthew 26:47) |
| Mark 14:44 | σύσσημον | D: σημεῖον (Matthew 26:48) |
| Mark 14:46 | τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶν | Ν* and C: τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶν  
A: ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῶν  
Support: Ν², B and D |
| Mark 14:47 | εἰς δὲ τῶν παρεστηκτῶν | Ν and A: εἰς δὲ τῶν παρεστηκτῶν  
D: καὶ τίς  
Support: B and C |
| Mark 14:47 | ὁμάρχον | A and C: ὁμῖον  
(Matthew 26:51)  
Support: Ν, B and D. |
| Mark 14:48 | Ἰησοῦς δὲ | A and B: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς  
Support: Ψ⁷⁵, Ν and B.  
A and D: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς (Matthew 26:50) |
| Mark 14:50 | καὶ ἀφεντες αὐτῶν ἐφυγον πάντες | A and D: καὶ ἀφεντες αὐτῶν πάντες ἐφυγον  
Support: Ν, B and C |
A and D: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς  
Support: Ψ⁷⁵, Ν and B |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt; Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:59</td>
<td>οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς</td>
<td>A and C: οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:59</td>
<td>αὐτὸν θανατώσωσιν</td>
<td>C&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; and D: αὐτὸν θανατώσωσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ, B and C&lt;sup&gt;*vid&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A and C: θανατώσωσιν αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:60</td>
<td>καὶ οὕς εὐροὶ πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων</td>
<td>A, C&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; and D: καὶ πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων οὕς εὐρον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ, B and C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:60</td>
<td>προσελθόντες δύο</td>
<td>A, C and D: ψευδομάρτυρες δύο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:61</td>
<td>οἰκοδομήσαι</td>
<td>Ψ&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; and C: αὐτὸν οἰκοδομήσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: B</td>
<td>A and D: οἰκοδομήσαι αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:63</td>
<td>ὁ ἄρχιερεὺς</td>
<td>A, C and D: ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄρχιερεὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:65</td>
<td>τὴν βλασφημίαν</td>
<td>A and C: τὴν βλασφημίαν αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ, B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:53</td>
<td>συνέχονται πάντες</td>
<td>A and B: συνέχονται αὐτῷ πάντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ and D</td>
<td>C: πρὸς αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:53</td>
<td>τὸν ἄρχιερα</td>
<td>A: τὸν ἄρχιερα Καίσαρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Matthew 26:57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:55</td>
<td>ἡφύσικον</td>
<td>Ψ, A and C: εὕρισκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: B and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:61</td>
<td>οὐ δὲ ἐσιώπα</td>
<td>Ψ and A: οὐ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐσιώπα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Matthew 26:63)</td>
<td>(Matthew 26:63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐσίγα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:61</td>
<td>οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδὲν</td>
<td>A and D: οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ψ, B and C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:64</td>
<td>φαίνεται</td>
<td>D: δόκει (Matthew 26:66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:54</td>
<td>ἡκολουθεῖ μακρόθεν</td>
<td>D: ἡκολουθεῖ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Matthew 26:58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Passion Narrative


Luke 22:55  αὐτῶν  D: αὐτῶν θερμαίνομενος  (Mark 14:54)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:2</td>
<td>παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ</td>
<td>Α and C*: παρέδωκαν αὐτῶν Πιλάτῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: Ν, B and C*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 336 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA(^{27}) Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:4</td>
<td>πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν</td>
<td>Ν and A: πάλιν ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:4</td>
<td>κατηγοροῦσιν</td>
<td>A: καταμαρτυροῦσιν (Matthew 27:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν, B and C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:3</td>
<td>ἤρωτησεν</td>
<td>A and D: ἐπηρώτησεν (Matthew 27:11 and Mark 15:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: P75, Ν, and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:5</td>
<td>καὶ ἄρξάμενος</td>
<td>Π75, A and D: ἄρξάμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 339 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA(^{27}) Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:16</td>
<td>Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν</td>
<td>Ν, A, B and D: Βαραββᾶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:17</td>
<td>Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν</td>
<td>Ν, A, and D: Βαραββᾶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: τὸν Βαραββᾶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:21</td>
<td>τὸν Βαραββᾶν</td>
<td>A and D: Βαραββᾶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:23</td>
<td>ὁ δὲ ἔφη</td>
<td>A: ὁ δὲ ἡγεμῶν ἔφη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: B</td>
<td>D: λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ ἡγεμῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mark 15:6 | δὲν παρησίωντο | D: δὲν ἂν ἦτοιντο  
Support: Ñ*, A, and B*  
Ñ2, B2, and C: ἀνπερ ἦτοιντο |
| Mark 15:8 | ἀναβάς | D: ἀναβας ὅλος  
Support: Ñ* and B  
Ñ2, A and C: ἀναβάσις |
| Mark 15:8 | ἐποίει αὐτοῖς | A, C*nd and D: ἐποίει αὐτοῖς  
Support: Ñ and B |
| Mark 15:10 | ἐγίνωσκεν | D: ἠδει (Matthew 27:18) |
| Mark 15:10 | οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς | B does not have this noun.  
(Matthew 27:18) |
| Mark 15:11 | ἀνέσεισαν | D: ἐσεισαν (Matthew 27:20) |
| Mark 15:12 | Τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω  
Support: A and D  
Ñ, B and C: Τί οὖν ποιήσω |
| Mark 15:12 | ποιήσω [δὲν λέγετε] τὸν βασιλέα  
Support: Ñ, B and C  
B: ποιήσω λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα  
A and D: ποιήσω τὸν βασιλέα |
| Mark 15:14 | ἐποίησαν κακῶν | Ñ, B and C: κακῶν ἐποίησαν |
| Mark 15:14 | ἐκραξαν | A and D: ἐκραξαν  
Ñ: ἐκραξαν λέγουσες |
| Luke 23:18 | ἀνέκραγον  
Support: ß75, Ñ and B  
A and D: ἀνέκραγαν |
| Luke 23:19 | καὶ φῶνον βληθεὶς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ  
Support: ß75 and B  
Ñ1, A and D: καί φῶνον βεβλημένος ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ  
Ñ*: καὶ φῶνον ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ |
| Luke 23:23 | καὶ κατίσχον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν  
Support: ß75, Ñ and B  
A and D: καί κατίσχον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων |
### Section 341 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt; Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:24</td>
<td>ἀπείναντι</td>
<td>B and D: κατέναντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν and A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:15</td>
<td>βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιήσαι</td>
<td>Ν and C: βουλόμενος ποιήσαι τὸ ἱκανὸν τῷ ὄχλῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: A and B</td>
<td>D: Phrase missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:15</td>
<td>καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας</td>
<td>D: τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν (Matthew 27:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:25</td>
<td>εἰς φυλακὴν</td>
<td>Π&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;, Α and C: εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν, Β and D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 343 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt; Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:20</td>
<td>ξινα σταυρώσωσιν</td>
<td>A, C and D: σταυρώσωσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:26</td>
<td>Σίμωνα τὶνα Κυρηναίον ἐφρωμένον</td>
<td>C and D: τὶνα Σίμωνα Κυρηναίον ἐφρωμένον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Π&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;, Ν and B</td>
<td>A: Σίμωνος τινος Κυρηναίου ἐφρωμένου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:28</td>
<td>πρὸς αὐτὰς ὃς Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>C and D: ὃς Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτὰς Π&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;, Ν *&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; and B: πρὸς αὐτὰς Ίησοῦς ἐφρωμένου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; and A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:29</td>
<td>ἔρχονται ἡμέραι</td>
<td>Ν and C: ἡμέραι ἔρχονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: ἔλευσονται ἡμέραι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:29</td>
<td>αἱ κοιλίαι</td>
<td>Π&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;, A and D: κοιλίαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:29</td>
<td>ἔθρεψαν</td>
<td>Π&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;, Ν, B and C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Π&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;, Ν, B and C*</td>
<td>C&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; and D: ἐξέθρεψαν Α: ἔθλασαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 344 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matthew 27:33 | Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος | A: λεγόμενος Κρανίου Τόπος
Support: Ξ*2 and B                                                                 |
| Mark 15:22  | ἐπὶ τῶν Γολγοθῶν | A, C* and D: ἐπὶ Γολγοθῶν
Support: A and B                                                                 |
| Mark 15:22  | μεθερμηνεύμενον | A and B: μεθερμηνεύμενος
Support: Ξ, C and D                                                                 |
| Mark 15:23  | ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ | A, C* and (D): ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ πιεῖν
Support: Ξ, B and C*                                                                 |
| Mark 15:23  | δὲ δὲ | D: καὶ
Support: Ξ and B                                                                 |
| Mark 15:24  | σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ | Ξ, A, C and D: σταυρώσαντες αὐτὸν (Matthew 27:35)
Support: B                                                                 |
| Mark 15:26  | ὁ βασιλεὺς | D: οὗτος ἐστίν ὁ βασιλεὺς
(Matthew 27:37)                                                       |
| Luke 23:34  | [[ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.]] | \(\mathcal{P}^{75}, \Xi, B\) and D*: missing
Support: \(\mathcal{P}^{75}, \Xi*2, (A), C\) and D^2                                           |
| Luke 23:34  | κλήρους | \(\mathcal{P}^{75}, \Xi, B\), C and D: κλήρους
(Matthew 27:35 and Mark 15:24)                                                       |
### Section 345 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA²⁷ Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:40</td>
<td>[καὶ] κατάβησθι</td>
<td>N² and B: κατάβησθι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: N, A and D</td>
<td>A and D: πιστεύσομεν αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mark 15:32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:41</td>
<td>καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς</td>
<td>N and A: οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: B</td>
<td>D: δὲ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:42</td>
<td>πιστεύσομεν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν</td>
<td>A and D: πιστεύσομεν αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: N and B</td>
<td>(Mark 15:32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:43</td>
<td>ῥυσάσθω νῦν</td>
<td>A: ῥυσάσθω αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: N and B</td>
<td>D: ῥυσάσθω νῦν αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:29</td>
<td>οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέρας</td>
<td>N and C: ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: B</td>
<td>οἰκοδομῶν τρισὶν ἡμέρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:36</td>
<td>ἐνέπαιξαν</td>
<td>A, C and D: ἐνέπαιξαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: 𝔅⁷⁵, N, and B</td>
<td>D: περιτυθέντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκάθιστον στέφανον. (Mark 15:17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 346 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA²⁷ Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:32</td>
<td>συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ ὑνείδιζον</td>
<td>A and C: συνεσταυρωμένοι αὐτῷ ὑνείδιζον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: N and B</td>
<td>D: συνεσταυρωμένοι ὑνείδιζον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: 𝔅⁷⁵</td>
<td>D: συνεσταυρωμένοι ὑνείδιζον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:40</td>
<td>ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη</td>
<td>A, C² and D: ἐπετίμα αὐτῷ λέγων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support: 𝔅⁷⁵, N, and B</td>
<td>D: συνεσταυρωμένοι ὑνείδιζον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jesus said to him, "If you are the Son of God, save yourself and all these people." (Mark 15:34)

Support: A and D

Section 347 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:46</td>
<td>ἡλι ἡλι</td>
<td>Ν and B: ελωι ελωι (Mark 15:34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support: A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:46</td>
<td>λεμα σαβασθανι</td>
<td>D*: λαμα ζαφθανι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: λιμα σαβασθανι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B (possibly): λεμα σαβασθανι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:47</td>
<td>ἐστηκωτων</td>
<td>A and D: ἐσττωτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν, B and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:49</td>
<td>ἔλεγον</td>
<td>B and (D): εἴπαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support: Ν, A and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:49</td>
<td>Ἡλιας σώσων αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>Ν, B and C: Ἡλιας σώσων αὐτῶν. ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἔξηλθεν ὅδωρ καὶ αἷμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support: A and D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Matthew 27:51 | ἀπ’ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω εἰς δύο | Support: B and C* | A and C\(^1\): εἰς δύο ἀπ’ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω  
\(\text{S}: εἰς δύο ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω  
D: εἰς δύο μέρη ἀπὸ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω\) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:52</td>
<td>ἡγέρθησαν</td>
<td>Support: (\text{S}, \text{B} \text{and D})</td>
<td>A and C: ἡγέρθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:54</td>
<td>γενόμενα</td>
<td>Support: (\text{S}, \text{A} \text{and C})</td>
<td>B and D: γενόμενα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Matthew 27:54 | θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν | Support: \(\text{B} \text{and D}: υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν  
\(\text{S}^*: υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ\) |
| Mark 15:34 | λειμα σαβαχθανι | Support: \(\text{S} \text{and C}\) | B: λαμα σαβαχθανι (or possibly λαμα ζαβαχθανι)  
A: λιμα σαβακθαι | |
| Mark 15:34 | ἐγκατέλιπες με | Support: \(\text{S} \text{and B}\) | C: με ἐγκατέλιπες  
A: με ἐγκατελειπες  
D: ωινείδιας με |
| Mark 15:35 | παρεστηκτὼν | \(\text{S} \text{and D}: \text{παρεστώτων}\) | B: ἐστηκτὼν  
A: ἐστηκτων ἐκεῖ |
| Mark 15:36 | καὶ γεμίσας | Support: \(\text{S}, \text{A} \text{and C}.\) | B: γεμίσας;  
D: καὶ πλήσας (Matthew 27:48) |
| Mark 15:38 | ἀπ’ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω | Support: B and D | \(\text{S}, \text{A} \text{and C}: ἀπὸ ἀνωθεν ἔως κάτω\) |
| Mark 15:39 | ὁτι οὔτως ἔξεπενευσεν | Support: \(\text{S} \text{and B}\) | A and C: ὁτι οὕτως κράξας ἔξεπενευσεν  
D: οὕτως αὐτῶν κράζαντα καὶ ἔξεπενευσεν |
| Mark 15:39 | υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν | Support: \(\text{S} \text{and B}\) | A and C: υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ  
D: θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν |
<p>| Luke 23:44 | ἦν ἁδη ωσελ | Support: (\text{S}^75, \text{B} \text{and C}*) | (\text{S}, \text{C}^1 \text{and D}: ἦν ωσελ) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:45</td>
<td>τοῦ ἡλίου ἔκλειψέν το</td>
<td>A, C^3 and (D): καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἡλίος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 348 –**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA^27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matthew 27:56 | Ἰωσήφ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ | A, B, and C: Ἰωσήφ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ  
D C: Ἰωσήτος μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ  
N*: Ἡ Μαρία ἢ Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ Μαρία ἢ |
| Mark 15:40 | αἱς καὶ | C^2 and D: αἱς ἢν  
A and C*: αἱς ἢν καὶ |
| Mark 15:40 | Ἰωσήτος | B: Ἰωσήτος  
A and C: Ἰωσή |
| Mark 15:41 | αἱ | A and C: καὶ  
D: αἱ καὶ |
| Luke 23:49 | οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ | Ν, C and D: οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ |

**Section 350 –**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>NA^27 Reading</th>
<th>Variant Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:57</td>
<td>ἐμαθητεύθη</td>
<td>A and B: ἐμαθητέεσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Greek Text</td>
<td>Parallel Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:61</td>
<td>Μαριάμ</td>
<td>A and D: Μαρία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:43</td>
<td>Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας</td>
<td>B and D: Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:43</td>
<td>πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτον</td>
<td>A, C and D: πρὸς Πιλάτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:45</td>
<td>πτῶμα</td>
<td>A and C: σῶμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: πτῶμα αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:46</td>
<td>συνόδον καθελὼν αὐτὸν</td>
<td>A and C: συνόδον καὶ καθελὼν αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: συνόδον λαβὼν αὐτὸν (Matthew 27:59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:46</td>
<td>καὶ ἔσηκεν αὐτὸν</td>
<td>(A) and C*: καὶ κατέσηκεν αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:46</td>
<td>ἐν μνημείῳ</td>
<td>A and B: ἐν μνήματι (Luke 23:53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:47</td>
<td>Ἰωσήφ</td>
<td>D: Ἰακώβου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C: Ἰωσήφ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Ἰωσήφ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: ὑπάρχων ἀγαθός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: δύο γυναῖκες</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7

Conclusions

J.K. Elliott (1990: 348) introduces his article, ‘The Relevance of Textual Criticism to the Synoptic Problem’, with this paragraph:

Detailed study of the Synoptic Problem involves the careful comparison of the Greek text of the Gospels. Insofar as printed editions of the Gospels vary, it is not surprising that in some respects the conclusions drawn from one text may differ from conclusions drawn from a different text.

He then concludes (1990: 359):

The carefully selective apparatus in his [Greeven's] edition and indeed in that of Aland enables the careful scholar to exercise his own editorial freedom. It is vital that those who work on the Synoptic Problem utilize the apparatus. Without it, statistics and arguments about parallels may be incorrect, distorted and create biased conclusions … Only when one is armed with the information available from such tools can one confidently assert which text is textually uncertain and which text firm.

While J.K. Elliott’s statement above, that “it is not surprising that in some respects the conclusions drawn from one text may differ from conclusions drawn from a different text”, does have many reasons why it is appropriate for the study of the Synoptic Question, it has also proven to be difficult to substantiate. It is a known fact that proponents from both sides of the two most widely supported hypotheses, the two-source hypothesis and the two-gospel hypothesis, have both used basically
the same data and yet have reached different conclusions. Some of the scholars have used slightly different texts, but overall these differences cannot account for the opposing views adopted by them.

It is possible that attempts have been made to provide a solution which is too simple for the complexity of the data under consideration. Thus, none of the solutions proposed so far has answered all the questions that have arisen through studies in the way in which the texts of the Synoptics relate to one another. As a result of this, over the years scholars have tried to iron out the problems by adding to the two main hypotheses proposed. In his closing comment in the ‘Symposium on New Testament Studies: A Time for Reappraisal’, G.R. Osborne (2001: 150) writes:

There are no certainties in life. It must be said that scholarship, like all other earthly endeavours, runs in fads especially in the post-Enlightenment setting. … certainty is impossible, and it is good for us to be “iron sharpening iron” as we debate the proper approach to interpreting the Gospels on the basis of the sources they used.

So the immediate objective is not to come up with definitive conclusions to the questions still pending. From the huge amount of published material on the Synoptic Question, it can be argued that the way in which the Synoptics relate to one another is not simple. Each group of pericopae, such as the Passion Narrative, may have its own answer to the Synoptic Question. Thus, this study deals mainly with observations about how textual issues may contribute towards a better understanding of how the texts of the Synoptics originated, in particular, their inter-relationships.
Luke’s Main Source

The text of the Passion Narrative has generally been considered to contain more common elements among the Synoptics than any other text. R.P Martin (1972: 140) argues: “the most assured result of Form Criticism is that the Passion story was written and preserved as a connected sequence at a time before the canonical gospels were composed as literary wholes”. This implies that the gospel writers must have had access to this written form of the Passion Narrative and have used this as a source for their own gospels. This assumption may not be accepted as fact by all scholars but it is generally agreed that the Passion Narrative’s text is the closest among the Synoptics. In spite of this observation, when Luke is taken into consideration, it is easy to see that his text differs extensively from the other two Synoptic Gospels.

Proponents of the two leading theories concerning the Synoptic Question have all argued that Luke’s text is based on one or other of the Synoptic Gospels; that is, Luke has used either Matthew (the two-gospel hypothesis) or Mark (the two-source hypothesis) as his source. I. Howard Marshall (1970: 57) comments: “on one point at least there is a considerable measure of unanimity among scholars. This is that Luke made use of the Gospel of Mark as a basic source in the writing of the Gospel”. He continues by saying that even then, there have been several strong challenges to this assumption by those who support the Griesbach Hypothesis. The challenge for supporters of Markan Priority comes mainly from difficulties in accounting for the minor agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark.
### Table 7.1

The table above has been compiled from the statistics generated by the Karawara Project. The following explain the headers of Tables 7.1 and 7.2:-

**SQE#** is the number of the section from the Aland *Synopsis*
Passion Narrative

**Number of words** (the figures in the white boxes and in normal type) – this is a count of the words in the text of each gospel as they relate to the other two Synoptic Gospels. For example, if the word is found only in Matthew, it is counted in the **MT** column and if it is common to both Matthew and Mark, it is counted in the **MT / MK** column.

The following explains the heading of each column:-

**MT** is the material unique to Matthew

**MK** is the material unique to Mark

**LK** is the material unique to Luke

**MT / MK** or **MK / MT** is the material common to Matthew and Mark

**MK / LK** or **LK / MK** is the material common to Mark and Luke

**MT / LK** or **LK / MT** is the material common to Matthew and Luke

**MT/MK/LK** or **MK/MT/LK** or **LK/MT/MK** is the material common to Matthew, Mark and Luke.

**Percentage (rounded to the nearest whole number)**

**PN** is the statistics for all sections in the Passion Narrative

**SG** is the statistics for the whole of the Synoptic Gospels

**PN(T)** is the statistics for sections in the Triple Tradition for the Passion Narrative

**TT** is the statistics for sections in the Triple Tradition (inclusive of the PN) for the whole of the Synoptic Gospels
As can be seen from Tables 7.1 and 7.2, the statistics for the Passion Narrative are slightly different from those for the whole of the Synoptic Gospels. Here are some observations from this table:

- **Comparing the statistics for the Passion Narrative and the whole of the Synoptic Gospels**
  
  - The material unique to Matthew and Mark is 10% and 9% lower respectively for the Passion Narrative, when compared to the whole of the Synoptic gospels, whereas for Luke it is 4% higher.
While the percentage gives a good idea of the variation, it is even more striking that the material unique to Luke in the Passion Narrative is 77% of the text, whereas it is only 40% for Mark and 52% for Matthew.

The material common to Matthew and Mark is at 15% and 25% for the whole of the Synoptic gospels whereas it goes up to 33% and 39% in the Passion Narrative. For Luke, the reverse happens. The material common to Matthew and Luke goes down from 13% in the whole of the Synoptic gospels to 3% for the Passion Narrative. The same thing can be seen between Luke and Mark where it goes down from 10% to 6%.

There is not much variation in the statistics for the material common to all three Gospels. However, it is worth noting that the material common to all three Synoptic Gospels in Luke increases by 5% (from 9% to 14%) – which represents more than a 50% increase.

- Comparing the statistics for the Passion Narrative and the whole of the Synoptic Gospels in the Triple Tradition

The material unique to Matthew goes down from 53% in the whole of the Synoptic gospels to 47% in the Passion Narrative. For Mark, it also goes down from 46% to 39%. The picture is different for Luke. It actually goes up from 60% to 70%.

The material common to Matthew and Mark goes up substantially for the Passion Narrative. In Matthew it is up from 21% to 36% and for Mark it
Passion Narrative

is up from 25% to 39%. However, for Luke it actually goes down from 11% to 5% (for LK / MT) and from 10% to 7% (for LK / MK).

- As is the case above, there is also not much variation in the material common to all three gospels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>MT / MK</td>
<td>MT / LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN(T)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3

If the comparison is changed slightly – that is, the material is presented in the order shown in Table 7.3 – it appears that the Passion Narrative in the Triple Tradition closely follows the trend shown for the Synoptic Gospels in the Triple Tradition. Nevertheless, there is one thing which is consistent – there is an indication that the material unique to Luke is still very high in the Passion Narrative. This applies to both cases when only the Triple Tradition is considered and when all the sections are looked at. It can be argued therefore that while the texts of Matthew and Mark both show a marked increase in commonality, this trend is reversed for
Passion Narrative

Luke. In fact, in the Passion Narrative the material unique to Luke is higher, both in the Triple Tradition and when compared to the whole of the Synoptic gospels.

The question that is relevant in this case is: If the Passion Narrative was already in circulation when Luke was writing his gospel, and he had a copy of Mark as his source, why is his text so markedly different from Mark’s? The same question can be applied to Matthew. The extent to which the text of Luke differs from the other two gospels points to one possibility in terms of his sources. While Luke may have been using Matthew or Mark as his source, he has not used them as his primary source. He must have had access to some other sources which he has used as his primary source while Matthew or Mark were only his secondary source. It is known that Luke was not an eyewitness to the accounts that he writes in his Gospel (Luke 1:1-4). Thus, he must have relied on outside sources to obtain his information. These sources may have been oral tradition or written material circulating at that time.

The order in which the pericopae appear in each of the gospels shows clearly that there is a link between Luke and the other two Synoptic gospels. For example, early in Luke’s gospel, the pericopae follow the order of Mark against Matthew. Then, when it stops following the order of Mark, it starts following the order of Matthew until Jesus and his disciples go to Jerusalem together for the last time. In the Passion Narrative all three Synoptic gospels follow a very similar order. However, it is the order of Luke’s pericopae which differs most from the other two gospels. Thus, the proposal is that Luke has made use of Mark’s (or Matthew’s) material (even though he has redacted it quite heavily in some cases) and has generally used Mark’s (or Matthew’s) order as the basis for his own order of
While for the purpose of this dissertation, the text in the triple tradition has been the one considered the most, the uniqueness of Luke’s text is also apparent in the other narratives as well. This is also clearly seen in the statistics presented for all the sections of the Synoptic gospels. This further reinforces the need to differentiate between Luke’s primary and secondary sources. Proposed solutions to the Synoptic Question all appeal to various combinations of known or hypothetical sources. These include the Synoptic Gospels themselves, Q, L, M and oral tradition.

However, the reason normally provided for the difference in Luke’s text is that in producing his gospel Luke has heavily redacted his sources. For example, Bock (1996: 1654) observes, from his analysis of Luke 21: 5 – 38: “many attribute all the uniquely Lucan material to Luke’s own redaction”. It is only when it is too difficult to explain the different text of Luke that some come to the conclusion that Luke has access to a different source. This is especially more difficult to substantiate in the Passion Narrative where the texts are generally expected to be close to one another. Thus, it makes more sense to consider that although Luke has access either to Mark or to Matthew as one of his sources for the triple tradition material, he uses it only as a secondary reference, but relies more heavily on some other source/s as his primary source/s.
The **NA$^{27}$ Text**

The NA$^{27}$ text appears to have relied heavily on B and to a lesser extent on $\mathbf{\mathit{\kappa}}$. It can most frequently be observed that where the variant reading is not a minor one, in the majority of cases, the NA$^{27}$ adopts the text of B. In many of these cases, $\mathbf{\mathit{\kappa}}$ also supports it.

On the other hand, NA$^{27}$ frequently has different readings from the texts of both A and D. To a lesser extent, NA$^{27}$ also differs quite markedly from C.

In terms of the papyri, in Matthew the NA$^{27}$ text is not uniformly supported by $\mathbf{\mathit{\phi}}$ and $\mathbf{\mathit{\varphi}}$. They contain approximately as many readings treated as variants in the NA$^{27}$ text as they do support the text adopted for NA$^{27}$. However, in the case of Luke the readings of $\mathbf{\mathit{\varphi}}$ have mostly been adopted for NA$^{27}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 22:50</th>
<th>τοῦ ἄρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον</th>
<th>Support: $\mathbf{\mathit{\kappa}}$ and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mathbf{\mathit{\phi}}$, A and D: τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἄρχιερέως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 23:5</th>
<th>καὶ ἀρξάμενος</th>
<th>Support: $\mathbf{\mathit{\kappa}}$ and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mathbf{\mathit{\varphi}}$, A and D: ἀρξάμενος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 23:25</th>
<th>εἰς φυλακήν</th>
<th>Support: $\mathbf{\mathit{\kappa}}$, B and D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mathbf{\mathit{\phi}}$, A and C: εἰς τὴν φυλακήν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 23:31</th>
<th>τῷ ἱγρῷ</th>
<th>Support: $\mathbf{\mathit{\phi}}$, $\mathbf{\mathit{\kappa}}$, A and D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B and C: ἱγρῷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall trend is that Ν and B generally have the same reading, and in most cases, they support the NA27 reading. The only cases where \( \text{P}^{75} \) and B diverge in their agreement are the six instances listed above. There are very few cases where one or more of A, C and D support the NA27 text against that of Ν and / or B. In the great majority of cases where one or more of A, C and D support the NA27 text, it is also supported by one or more of \( \text{P}^{75} \) and B.

It appears that there are two groups of witnesses in the ones under consideration. On the one hand, there are \( \text{P}^{75} \) (for Luke), Ν and B. On the other hand, there are A, C and D. According to the dates provided by editors of the NA27, the papyrus \( \text{P}^{75} \) is a third century witness and both Ν and B are from the fourth century. On the other hand, A, C and D are all from the fifth century. Thus, the text of the first group of witnesses, for which the NA27 shows a clear preference, is considered to be older than the manuscripts of the second group. As such, it is reasonable to assume that texts of that period would be closer to the original text. So it is not surprising that the NA27 text clearly has a preference for the first group of witnesses. In fact, it would be surprising if the editors did not have that preference.
The Parallels

There are 46 cases where the variant readings involved make the particular texts closer or parallel to the readings in a different Gospel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 20:24</th>
<th>ἤγανάκτησαν</th>
<th>Ν: ἤρξαντο ἄγανακτεῖν</th>
<th>(Mark 10:41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:36</td>
<td>τοῖς μαθηταῖς</td>
<td>Support: B</td>
<td>Ν, A, C and D: τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:39</td>
<td>προσέλθων</td>
<td>Support: P, B</td>
<td>Ν, A, C and D: προσέλθων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:40</td>
<td>ἵσχύσατε</td>
<td>A: ἵσχύας</td>
<td>(Mark 14:37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:41</td>
<td>εἰσέλθητε</td>
<td>Ν: ἔλθητε</td>
<td>(Mark 14:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:42</td>
<td>πιστεύσομεν ἐπὶ αὐτὸν</td>
<td>Support: Ν and B</td>
<td>A and D: πιστεύσομεν αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:46</td>
<td>ηλι ηλι</td>
<td>Support: A and D</td>
<td>Ν and B: ἐλῳ ἐλῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:12</td>
<td>ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν</td>
<td>D contains ςοι after these two words</td>
<td>(Matthew 26:17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:17</td>
<td>Καὶ ὁψίας</td>
<td>D: ὁψίας δὲ (Matthew 26:20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mark 14:19 | εἰς κατὰ εἰς | A and D: εἰς καθ’ εἰς  
C: εἰς ἐκαστὸς (Matthew 26:22) |
| Mark 14:19 | Μὴ τι ἐγὼ  
Support: Ν, B and C | A: εἰμι, ῥαββί; καὶ ἄλλος, Μὴ τι ἐγὼ  
(Matthew 26:22) |
| Mark 14:21 | καλὸν αὐτῷ  
Support: B | Ν, A, C and D: καλὸν ἢν αὐτῷ  
(Matthew 26:24) |
| Mark 14:25 | οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῶ  
Support: A and B | Ν and C: οὐ μὴ πῶ  
(Matthew 26:29) |
| Mark 14:30 | σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ  
D: ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ  
(Matthew 26:34)  
Ν and C: σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ (Matthew 26:34) | |
| Mark 14:30 | ἦ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι  
Ν and D: ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι  
(Matthew 26:34) | |
| Mark 14:34 | καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς  
D: τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς  
(Matthew 26:38). | |
| Mark 14:35 | ἔπιπτεν | D: ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον  
(Matthew 26:38) |
| Mark 14:41 | τὸ λοιπὸν | A, C and D: λοιπὸν  
While the critical apparatus flags this variant as a parallel, it is interesting to note that the article is in the Matthew text (26:45) but within square brackets. |
| Mark 14:43 | ὅχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν | A, C and D: ὅχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν (Matthew 26:47) |
| Mark 14:43 | παρὰ τῶν ἁρχιερεῶν | B: ἀπὸ τῶν ἁρχιερεῶν (Matthew 26:47) |
| Mark 14:44 | σύσσημον | D: σημείον (Matthew 26:48) |
| Mark 14:47 | ὀτάριον | A and C: ὦτίον  
Support: 9 75, 8  and B. (Matthew 26:51) |
| Mark 14:48 | Ἰησοῦς δὲ | A and D: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς  
Support: 9 75, 8  and B. (Matthew 26:50) |
| Mark 14:53 | τῶν ἁρχιερεῶν | A: τῶν ἁρχιερεῶν Καϊάφαν (Matthew 26:57) |
| Mark 14:61 | ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα | 8  and A: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐσιώπα (Matthew 26:63) |
| Mark 14:64 | φαίνεται | D: δοκεῖ (Matthew 26:66) |
| Mark 15:4 | κατηγοροῦσιν | Α: καταμαρτυροῦσιν  
Support: Ν, B, C and D. (Matthew 27:13) |
| Mark 15:10 | ἐγινώσκεν | D: ἦδει (Matthew 27:18) |
| Mark 15:10 | οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς | B does not have this noun. (Matthew 27:18) |
| Mark 15:11 | ἀνέσειαν | D: ἐπείσαν (Matthew 27:20) |
| Mark 15:14 | ἐποίησεν κακόν | Ν, B and C: κακόν ἐποίησεν  
(Matthew 27:23) |
| Mark 15:15 | καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας | D: τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν (Matthew 27:26) |
| Mark 15:24 | σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ | Ν, A, C and D: σταυρώσασιν η ἀυτὸν (Matthew 27:35)  
Support: B |
| Mark 15:26 | ὁ βασιλεὺς | D: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς (Matthew 27:37) |
| Mark 15:36 | [καὶ] γεμίσας | B: γεμίσας;  
Support: Ν, A and C.  
D: καὶ πλήσας (Matthew 27:48) |
| Mark 15:46 | Συνδόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν | D: συνδόνα λαβὼν αὐτὸν (Matthew 27:59) |
| Mark 15:46 | ἐν μυθήματι | Ν and B: ἐν μυθήματι  
Support: A, C and (D)  
(Luke 23:53) |
| Luke 22:34 | ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τριώς | D: ἕως ὅτου  
Support: Ν and B  
A: πρὶν ἦ (Matthew 26:34, Mark 14:30) |
Support: Գ and B |
| Luke 22:54 | ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν | D: ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Matthew 26:58) |
| Luke 22:55 | αὐτῶν | D: αὐτῶν θερμαινόμενος (Mark 14:54) |
| Luke 23:3 | ἐπηρώτησεν | A and D: ἐπηρώτησεν (Matthew 27:11 and Mark 15:2)  
Support: Գ and B |
Support: A |

Table 7.5
Passion Narrative

From the cases above, it can be seen that 38 out of the 46 involve Mark and Matthew. In these instances, the texts adopted for the NA\textsuperscript{27} are those that make the reading not parallel with the other.

In three of the eight cases where Luke is involved, the texts of both Matthew and Mark are parallel. In six cases, Luke is parallel to Mark.

In all three cases, the texts adopted for Luke by the NA\textsuperscript{27} have good support from $\mathfrak{N}$ and B and in two cases, the readings are also supported by $\mathfrak{P}\textsuperscript{75}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 27:46</th>
<th>ηλι ηλι</th>
<th>\textit{Support: A and D}</th>
<th>$\mathfrak{N}$ and B: ελων ελων (Mark 15:34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:46</td>
<td>ἐν μνήμει</td>
<td>\textit{Support: A, C and (D)}</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{N}$ and B: ἐν μνήμει (Luke 23:53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6

In the three instances shown in Table 7.6, though the variant reading has the support of $\mathfrak{N}$ and B, the NA\textsuperscript{27} has the same reading as A and / or D. It is extremely rare for the NA\textsuperscript{27} to take the reading of A and / or D over that of $\mathfrak{N}$ and B.
As discussed earlier, the text of Luke is markedly different from those of Matthew and Mark. This is also reflected in this discussion of the parallel texts in that there is only one out of forty six variant readings (Mark 15:46) which makes the text parallel with that of Luke.

Conclusions

The fact that the text of the NA ²⁷ is closely related to those of Π and B provides a good basis on which some observations can be made. The reasoning is that if the NA ²⁷ is based on a particular family of existing manuscripts, then the variant readings from the other families of manuscripts give a trend of what some of the scribes may have potentially been thinking or assuming. Therefore, a study of the major variant readings found in the critical apparatus of the NA ²⁷ can provide an indication of that trend. While the study of this project has necessarily been restricted, nevertheless, the trend observed for the Passion Narrative may well reflect the tendency for the whole of the Synoptic Gospels.

Two things have been particularly apparent throughout the study:– (1) the text of Luke is substantially different from that of Matthew / Mark, and (2) there is only one variant reading for Mark which causes the text to be parallel to Luke. This indicates the possibility that the scribes were aware and conscious of the way in which the Synoptic Gospels relate to one another. The mere fact that they have not produced a significant number of variant readings of Matthew / Mark which make the text parallel to Luke seems to indicate that they did not consider Luke to be linked to Matthew / Mark. The number of variant readings from Luke which make the text parallel with Matthew / Mark is an issue that has to be investigated further.
It may be the case where the greater availability of the Gospel of Matthew has led to the scribes being more familiar with it than with Luke. But the number of variant readings that make Luke parallel with Mark is slightly higher than those which make Luke parallel with Matthew. Thus further research is needed in order to find an explanation for this trend. However, when variant readings are considered for Matthew and Mark, the link between the two gospels is clearly demonstrated by the large number of variant readings that makes Matthew parallel to Mark, and vice versa, even though the NA\textsuperscript{27} has rejected a number of these readings for its text.

A possible explanation is that because the wording of Luke is so different from that of Matthew / Mark, there is less likelihood of similar wording being (often unconsciously) substituted during the copying process to make Matthew / Mark parallel with Luke. On the other hand, when either Matthew or Mark is being copied, familiarity with the other one of these gospels no doubt often resulted in (unconscious) substitution of that text.

Nevertheless, there is a clear indication that there are some links between Luke and Matthew / Mark, the very close order of events being one of the main indications. From a study of the texts of the Passion Narrative in the Synoptic Gospels, it is also conceivable that the scribes of the manuscripts were conscious of the strong link between Matthew and Mark but not with Luke. Without the tools available to scholars now, the scribes could not have distinguished the links existing with Luke so readily.

Therefore, as discussed above, the strong possibility is that there is a need to separate Luke’s sources into a primary source and a secondary source. It is possible
that the big difference in the text of Luke can be due to his use of this *primary* source/s. Otherwise, Luke may too easily be classified as a fabricator of events for his gospels. However, this is contrary to his own claims:

Luke 1:1 Since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, 2 just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, 3 I too decided, after investigating everything carefully from the very first, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, 4 so that you may know the truth concerning the things about which you have been instructed. (NRSV)
Appendix 1

Colour-coded Texts

The attached CD-ROM contains the colour-coded Greek texts in PDF format. This can be viewed through the widely available and free Acrobat Reader. If required, there is a copy of the program for a Windows PC on the CD-ROM. Simply install the program onto your computer. For the Apple Macintosh, there is a version available on the Acrobat website – www.acrobat.com.
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