
The Materials and the Task

We have realized both the priority of Mark and its thoroughly theological nature, and we have realized that the synoptic tradition consists of various sayings and stories that once existed independently but have now been collected and edited. Thus, the present task is to trace the history of those individual units. By carefully analyzing each unit, one can discern what is an editorial comment, what is a secondary addition, and what belonged to the original unit. One must understand these units and their development as responses to particular settings in life, to needs of the early church. Bultmann acknowledges that pericopes can not always “be classified unambiguously” (4), and he admits a certain amount of circularity regarding discerning the original form and establishing *Sitz im Leben*. He will begin by analyzing the units.

I. The Tradition of the Sayings of Jesus

A. **Apophthegms.** For B., these are “sayings of Jesus set in a brief context” (11). Hence, while they could be called stories, B. classes them with sayings because their original core often consists of a saying of the Lord around which a story has grown.

1. **Controversy Dialogues and Scholastic Dialogues.** B. analyzes controversy stories and scholastic dialogues, showing that often, a saying occasions the development of a story, while at other times, an independent story and an independent saying get attached to one another in the tradition. Sometimes, the stories and sayings were organic units given only basic editorial remarks in order to be fit into the Gospels. B. subdivides them into the following categories:
   a. *Occasioned by Jesus’ healings*
   b. *Otherwise occasioned by the conduct of Jesus or the disciples*
   c. *The Master is questioned (by the disciples or others)*
   d. *Questions asked by opponents*

2. **Biographical Apophthegms.** These are units centered on a saying in the context of a story that appears to describe the course of the character’s (s’) life, such as stories of calling disciples (Mark 1:12-20 par.; 2:14) or of Christ blessing children (Mark 10:13-16 par.)
   a. *Addendum:* the Syro-Phoenician Woman and the Centurion from Capernaum, which B. regards as variants on the same theme.

3. **The Form and History of Apophthegms**
   a. *Controversy Dialogues.* In general, the sayings in these stories give rise to an imaginary context that makes the saying more vivid. Thus, if any part of these dialogues goes back to Jesus, it is the saying, which is the focal core of the story. Indeed, Jesus Himself must have taught as a Rabbi. Often the saying takes the form of a counter-question or metaphor, sometimes accompanied by Scripture. Abundant analogies exist in the Rabbinic material, which also show similar developments. These dialogues developed in a Palestinian setting and reflect the Church’s disputes and defends their practices. One need only note that often the disciples are...
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attacked and need defending. Thus, sayings attributed to Jesus, usually defending a basic principle or tendency, are put into concrete narrative form, and as the tradition develops, the “opponents” are made more and more concrete (often made specifically “Scribes and Pharisees”) and are more vilified.

b. **Scholastic Dialogues.** Unlike the controversy dialogues, these need no specific action to cause dialogue but can arise from Jesus being “questioned by someone seeking knowledge” (54). These units were also developed in a Palestinian setting; they tend to be unitary in composition. They, too, have a productive element, for often a dominical saying is given a context by placing a question in the mouth of a disciple.

c. **Biographical Apophthegms.** Saying tends to come at the end of the story. These episodes are not historical but ideal. A truth is clothed in a metaphorical life situation. The Rabbinic tradition offers many analogies. While many have a Palestinian origin, some may contain a saying that is Palestinian in a Hellenistic garb; other units may be entirely Hellenistic. They are “best thought of as edifying paradigms for sermons” (61).

d. **Form and History of the Apophthegm in General.** The focus is the saying, around which a situation has been built. The units display a narrative economy, tending to lack specifics. Characters tend to be types. At the more primitive stage, the saying is caused by “something that happens to Jesus” (except the call of the disciples), while in later stages Jesus initiates (66).

**B. Dominical Sayings.** These are sayings most likely to have been entirely independent in the tradition. They did not “constitute an essential part of the story as direct speech” (69). They are subdivided according to content.

1. **Logia** (Jesus as the Teacher of Wisdom)
   a. **Form of the Logia in general.** B. distinguishes “between constitutive and ornamental motifs” (70). The former are basic sayings, and the latter includes such stylistic modes and embellishments such metaphor, parallelism, antithesis, etc. B. then subdivides the logia, providing examples of each from the OT:
      i. Principles
         a. Material formulation (i.e. some material thing is the subject)
         b. Personal formulae (persons are the concern of the saying)
         c. Blessings
         d. Arguments a maiore ad minus
      ii. Exhortations
      iii. Questions
   b. **The Synoptic Material.** Despite ambiguities regarding certain sayings, B. now attempts an exhaustive classification of Synoptic wisdom logia.
      i. Principles
         a. Material Formulations.
         b. Personal Formulations
         c. Blessings
         d. Arguments *a maiore ad minus*
      ii. Exhortations.
iii Questions
iv. Longer Passages
c. *Form and History of the Logia.* Most of these units probably began as proverbs and received elaboration through structural elaboration, the addition of: an illustration (sometimes becoming detailed), a “different but similar” saying (82), an analogous formulation, an extra bit of edifying material designed for the particular unit, and introductory material. Very rarely can logia be traced with confidence to Jesus, though they are most likely historical when they express his particular character or are calls to repentance or proclaim the kingdom of God. In many cases, secular proverbs have been found to be useful paranetic material by the Church. During the development of the tradition, they take on specifically Christian significance, such as when they are referred to Christ. Also, by virtue of being placed in specific contexts the logia take on new meanings, and this is particularly true of metaphorical logia, whose meanings are often fully dependent on context. In such cases, the original meaning of the logia cannot be reconstructed. The origin of this material is the wisdom tradition and popular morality and piety, though the selection of many logia corresponds to specific concerns of the Church.

2. **Prophetic and Apocalyptic Sayings.** Subdivided as follows:
   a. *Preaching of Salvation*
   b. *Minatory Sayings*
   c. *Admonitions.*
   d. *Apocalyptic Predictions*
   e. *The History of the Tradition.* These logia tend to derive from the Jewish tradition, but now they do not speak merely of the future but of the present in-breaking of a new age. Also, many units have been thoroughly revised by the Church. Since the Church regarded all dominical sayings as words of a living and risen Lord, there was no need to distinguish between the prophetic utterances of Christians and sayings of the “historical” Jesus, and thus many of these logia probably originated from Christian prophecy and were later ascribed to Jesus. In determining whether or not a unit has a Christian origin, one must consider the degree to which it concerns “the Person of Jesus” or “the lot and interests of the Church,” and the degree to which it expresses a “characteristically individual spirit” (128). As with other logia, even those units taken over from tradition take on new meaning in a new context, and introductory material must be added.

3. **Legal Sayings and Church Rules**
   (a) *Survey and Analysis*
   A survey of how sayings relating to the “Law or Jewish piety” were edited by the evangelists. In general, Matthew and Luke edit Mark’s more original form to suit their needs. At times there is also evidence of secondary expansion in Q (131). To the legal sayings also belong sayings with a “legal style” (sentences whose first clause has a condition) (132); sayings which cite a proverb or scripture to uphold the new “outlook over against the old” (136); and sayings which provide prescriptions for the Christian community (138).
   (b) *The History of the Material*
   Dominical sayings are collected, given new form, and further enlarged by additions and development. Jewish sayings are also gathered and adapted into the collection of the Church. Both of these types are attributed to Jesus who as the risen Lord speaks to the Church (145-6). These sayings have their primary origin in the debates of the Church. Most editing of the
material belongs to the written phase of transmission (148). Lastly, legal sayings and Church rules were gathered into a catechism (149).

4. ‘I’ Sayings

References to Jesus typically indicate editorial activity (150). In many of these sayings it is the risen Lord who is understood to be the speaker (151). These sayings portray Jesus not only as prophet but as “Messiah and Judge of the world” (151). Some Son of Man sayings are not Church products but originate in the primary tradition (152). Sayings where Jesus plays a significant role are classified as “I-sayings a parte potiori.” These sayings include references to Jesus’ future coming (most likely products of the Church) (152; 155) and “I-sayings” that have “no independent character” but are joined to a narrative (157f). The multiplication of “I sayings” in the tradition suggests an editorial origin (162). Though they began in the Palestinian Church the “I-sayings” primarily result from the Hellenistic Church (163).

5. Similitudes and Similar Forms

(a) Survey and Analysis

The sayings of Jesus in the synoptic tradition are largely un-Hellenistic and originate in an Aramaic environment. The artistic form of language in the similitudes is uniform. Concrete expression is given to “ideas and conditions, characters and commands” (166). Elements common to this form include hyperbole and the use of comparisons and images (167). Metaphors and “figures” compose a significant portion of the similitudes. The boundary line between similitudes and parables is at times difficult to discern (174). Applications found in either are typically secondary editing (170-1; 175). Original parables tend to not have any application. Hints of the delay of the Parousia also point to editorial activity (176). Exemplary stories (Good Samaritan, The Rich Fool, Rich Man and Lazarus), while having no figurative element, have a formal relationship to parables (178).

(b) Form and History of the Material

Several changes occur in the transmission of the similitudes. “Stereotyped” phrases in Matthew are due to the hand of the evangelist (180). The similitude often begins with a question, demonstrating its similarity to the mashal and its “argumentative” character (180). What begin as questions often develop into stories (180). If the similitude begins with “as” or “. . . is likened unto . . .” there is usually a relative clause after the comparative noun. Similitudes beginning with a rhetorical question often have a gnomic future tense (181). The point (not the application) of the similitude is marked by “(Amen) I say to you all.” The endings of the similitudes are varied, some ending with questions, some without any application (182). Commonly, a similitude has an application attached to it. While most of these applications are editorial additions (as are the introductions), some of them can be original (Lk. 17.10; Mt. 13.49f; 18.35; 21.31) (184). The detailed interpretations of the Sower and the Tares are secondary, shown by the inclusion of explicit Christian terminology (ho logos) (187). Similitudes tend to be concise: a minimum of characters appear (usually only two main persons, sometimes three); only two people speak or act at a time; there is a single p.o.v. (188-9); characters are typically portrayed by their behavior and not merely an attribute (189); feelings and motives are only mentioned if absolutely essential (189). Laws of popular story-telling such as repetition and “end stress” govern the similitudes (191).

Placing the similitude into a new context (Good Samaritan) provides the similitude with a new introduction. This placement alone is enough to give the similitude a new and different
meaning (The Unmerciful Servant) (193). We must then always ask if the evangelists have provided the authentic context for the similitude (194). A general tendency of the tradition is to allegorize the similitudes (199). The original meaning of many similitudes is thus impossible to ascertain (199). An authentic similitude of Jesus must contain a “contrast between Jewish morality and piety”, a “distinctive eschatological temper” and “no specifically Christian features.” (205).

II. The Tradition of the Narrative Material

A. Miracle Stories

1. Miracles of Healing

Some apophthegms contain reports of healing miracles, the latter having been subordinated to the point of the apophthegem (Healing on the Sabbath, Exorcism of Demons, Healing of Ten Lepers, Syro-Phoenician Woman, Centurion) (209). Other healing miracles contain clear evidence of editorial redaction (209-215).

2. Nature Miracles

These stories (Stilling of the Storm, Walking on the Water, Feeding of the Crowds, Miraculous Catch of Fish, Cursing the Fig Tree, and the Coin in the Fish’s Mouth) contain evidence of editorial redaction (215-218).

3. The Form and History of Miracle Stories

The miracles in the Synoptics are intended to provide proof of Jesus’ messianic authority and divine power (219). Miracle stories contain common elements. The “exposition” of the story portrays the seriousness of the need for a healing. This can be accomplished through describing the length of the sickness, the dangerous character of the disease, the ineffective treatment of other physicians and the doubt displayed towards the healer (221). It is common for the actual miraculous event to not be described. Often the healing is effected by a physical touch (222). When a word is given to effect healing it is often in “strange, incomprehensible sounds” or a foreign language (222-3). Healings at a distance are “particularly miraculous.” A demonstration of the actual healing buttresses its reality. Lastly, the miracle often creates a certain impression upon those who witness it (225). In the NT, miracle stories have their own “history in the tradition” (226). Exorcism stories were significant proofs to the Church that Jesus was the Messiah (226). A tendency of the tradition is the “increase of the miraculous element” (228). Not only do MT. and Lk. Narrate miracles that do not occur in Mk. and Q, but the former insert details that amplify the miracles as they are recorded in Mk. and Q. Adducing parallels between the Synoptic miracle accounts and those found in other literature can indicate how certain motifs were integrated into the NT miracle tradition (230-1).

(a) Exorcisms of Demons

Parallels to exorcisms in the Synoptics are found in Jewish and Hellenistic literature (231-2).

(c) Other Healings

Parallels to miracles of healing occur in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Roman literature (232-3).

(d) Raisings from the Dead
Parallels to people being raised from the dead occur in the Mekilta, though much closer ones are found in the Hellenistic tradition (233).

(d) Nature Miracles
Synoptic nature miracles find parallels in rabbinic materials, the Hellenistic tradition, Buddhist stories from India, and Roman accounts (234-8).

Such parallels are not considered to be the source for the Synoptic miracle stories (238-9). Rather, the parallels help identify how the “miracle stories came into the Synoptic tradition” (239). It is important to distinguish between the Palestinian and Hellenistic stages of the tradition. Though some miracles were attributed to Jesus in the former phase, the former have a Hellenistic origin (239-40). Differences between Mark and Q demonstrates this reality. Miracles are scant in Q because there Jesus is an “eschatological preacher of repentance and salvation, the teacher of wisdom and law” while in Mark he is “the very Son of God walking the earth.” (241). The portrait of Jesus in Q is drawn from a Palestinian milieu while that in Mark emerges from the Hellenistic tradition (241). We can likewise “assume” a Hellenistic origin for the miracles in Matthew and Luke. Certain tendencies are observable in the tradition of miracle stories: a “novelistic” interest arises towards the characters in the stories which results in skepticism towards characters who are given names (Lazarus, Bartimaeus); editorial links are created to connect the miracle accounts with other stories in the tradition; geographical references are inserted to elaborate details.

B. Historical Stories and Legends
Legends are “those parts of the tradition which are not miracle stories in the proper sense, but instead of being historical in character are religious and edifying” (244).

1. Analysis of the Material
   (a) From the Baptism to the Triumphal Entry
Much of the material included here has undergone extensive Christian editing. That the baptism comes from a Hellenistic origin is evident by its absence in Q (which knows other traditions of John the Baptist) (251). The dialogue between Jesus and the tempter in Q reflects rabbinic disputations (254).

(b) The Passion Narrative
B. uses Traditionsgeschichte to analyze the main events of the Markan Passion narrative (PN), relating them to the other synoptic gospels. He looks for traditional elements, and tests the historical value of the story. Passages analyzed:
Mk 14:1f; Mk 14:10f: Conspiracy and Judas’ Betrayal: no independent tradition, no historical narrative.
Mk 14:3-9: Anointing at Bethany: insertion between 14:1f and 14:10f. In tradition was an apophthegm. Editorial work makes it in a biographical legend.
Mk 14:22-25: The Institution of the Lord’s Supper: cult legend behind Mk 14:22-25. Tradition has been better preserved in Lk, but that does not establish the historicity of the scene. John might have a more primitive account of the Last Supper (it is not thought of as a Passover meal; no cult legend).
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Mk 14:26-31 par.: The Road to Gethsemane and the Foretelling of Peter’s Denial: independent unit. Tradition behind this passage is a historical account with legendary traits. Importance of Lk 22:31f: shows that many of the components of the Passion had a separate tradition; Lk’s tradition knows nothing of Peter’s denial.

Mk 14:32-42: Jesus in Gethsemane: individual story of a legendary character. V. 41b and 42: addition by Mark. 41a was the impressive climax of the story.

Mk 14:43-52: The Arrest: originally the sequel to 27-31. Fulfillment of the first part of Jesus’ prophecy. V. 50 and 51 are fragments of an old Tradition, no longer understood by Mt and Lk.

Mk 14:53-54. 66-72: Peter’s Denial: fulfillment of the second part of the prophecy in 27-31. Mk 14:55-64 has been inserted into the story of Peter. Story of Peter is legendary and literary.

Mk 14:55-64: Trial and Judgement by the Sanhedrin: Markan secondary explanation of the brief statement in 15:1. Vv. 57-59 are secondary. Story originally intended to show that Jesus was condemned on account of his Messianic claim. Lk 22:66-71 combines Mk’s account with his own source (v. 66).

Mk 14:65 par.: The Ill-treatment of Jesus: scattered piece of tradition. Mk has put it at an unfortunate place. May have originally followed the arrest.

Mk 15:1-27 par.: Delivery to Pilate, Sentence and Crucifixion: not a unitary composition. Lk produces an edited version of Mk for the trial. Mt and Lk introduce some legendary features. Mk’s story of the crucifixion is a legendary editing of an ancient historical narrative.

Mk 15:29-32: Mocking of the Crucified: legendary formulation on the basis of a prophetic proof.

Mk 15:33-39: The Death of Jesus: account strongly disfigured by legend.

Mk 15:40-41: The Women as Witnesses: no historical value.

Mk 15:42-47: The Burial: historical account, only indication that relates it to Easter: v. 66.

THE HISTORY OF THE TRADITION OF THE PASSION

B. reviews his presentation of the PN and argues that it could not have been an organic unity. Rather, it was made up of several distinct pieces that the evangelists put together in order to create the stories we read today. However, these individual elements were fashioned into a coherent form very early, as the Kerygma (Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33) shows. Close to it was a short narrative of historical reminiscence about the Arrest, Condemnation and Execution of Jesus.

B. presents two proofs that the PN was made up of individual elements: the existence of doublets and the fact that Mt and Lk introduce and suppress some elements in the text. He goes on to present the composition of Mk: Mk knew of a primitive narrative (arrest, condemnation by Sanhedrin and Pilate, journey to the cross, crucifixion and death). Mk added one introduction (Mk 14:27-31). It was joined, through Mk 14:26, with stories around the Lord Supper. Mk added an introduction (Mk 14:1f. 10f). Later, insertion of Mk 14:3-9. 32-42. 55-64. B. does not say when the account of the crucifixion was fashioned, or when the closing section in Mk 15:40f. 42-47 was added.

B. does the same work with Lk. One cannot reconstruct an older PN from Lk. Lk knew Mk, but also had individual elements of tradition (accounts of the Last Supper, the prophecy of the betrayal, the disciples’ flight). In addition to Mk, Lk used an account of Peter’s denial and of the trial before the Sanhedrin. Most probable hypothesis: Lk made use, alongside Mk, of another – and probably older – edition of the PN used by Mk.
B. presents the most important motifs that made up the legend of the PN: proof from prophecy and use of the OT (betrayal by Judas, but specifically crucifixion); legendary elements whose aim is apologetic; pure novelistic motifs; motifs with paraenetic purpose; dogmatic motifs (based on the conviction of the Early Church that the Passion responded to the idea that Jesus suffered and died as the Messiah); finally motifs of cult (especially Lord Supper).

(c) *The Easter Narratives*

For B., Mk 16:1-8 is a secondary formulation that does not fit with either the preceding sections of Mk or the supposed end of Mk, which related the appearance of Jesus in Galilee. Mk presents a very reserved legend. It will develop further in Mt and Lk. In Lk, only Lk 24:13-35 (The Walk to Emmaus) has the character of a true legend. The outline of the story is the same as the one of the oldest stories of the appearance of God. Other units in Mk and Lk (Mt 28:11-15; Mt 28:16-20; Lk 24:36-49; Lk 24:50-53) are self-conscious literary work.

B. divides the Easter stories in two groups: stories of the empty tomb (which all go back to Mk 16:1-8) and stories of the appearance of the risen Lord. He starts by analyzing stories of the empty tomb (Mk 16:1-8). The point of the story is to prove the reality of the resurrection of Jesus by the empty tomb. Mark adds a second point, through the discourse of the angel: to charge the women and send the disciples to Galilee where the risen Lord will appear to them. Originally the two motifs had an independent origin. Empty tomb stories are completely secondary.

B. distinguishes two motifs in the stories of the appearance of the risen Lord: first, the proving of the Resurrection by the appearance of the risen Lord and second, the missionary charge of the risen Lord. The latter is a late achievement of Hellenistic Christianity (aspect of the universal mission).

(d) *The Infancy Narratives, etc.*

**Mt 1:18-25: The Birth of Jesus:** part of Matthew’s source. Originally, semitic report as a basis of the story. Hellenism transformed it (virgin birth).


**Lk 1: The Birth of John the Baptist and the Annunciation:** no connection between Lk 1 and 2. Lk connects both and uses sources (Meeting of Elizabeth and Mary). The two psalms are Jewish eschatological hymns.

**Lk 2:1-20: Birth of Jesus and Announcement to the Shepherds:** Lk uses the census motif to combine the historical and legendary traditions. Legend of Hellenistic-Christian origin.

**Lk 2:22-40: Presentation in the Temple:** independent individual story in which Lk intervenes.

**Lk 2:41-52: Jesus in the Temple:** independent story without relationship to what precedes it. Many parallels; oldest is the Egyptian story of Setme Chamois.

**SUPPLEMENT**

**Mk 6:14-20 par.: Death of the Baptist:** legend with no Christian characteristics. Mk took it over from Hellenistic Jewish tradition. We can find pagan parallels.

2. **Concerning the History of the Material**
B. will summarize the work he has done on the preceding passages and argue that they could not have been conceived as a unity. He affirms that the legendary motifs found in the Easter and infancy stories are of diverse origins and have been modified differently. B. finds OT influences mainly in Lk 1 and 2. This OT influence underlines the importance of Jewish-Hellenistic Christianity in the making of the Gospels. There are also specifically Christian motifs that arose from the faith of the early Church (particularly in the Easter Narratives). B.’s concludes as follows: the legendary portions of the Gospel tradition express mainly Christian faith and ideas grown out of the Messianic movement.

**SUPPLEMENT: Summary of the Technique of the Story**

Here, B. will review several techniques used by the evangelists to tell their story:
- from the Apophthegms, evangelists retain the conciseness of the story.
- throughout the gospels, B. points out the law of scenic duality: the stories are almost always involving Jesus and one other interlocutor. B. says that latter in the tradition, there will be a tendency to differentiate and individualize the characters of a story.
- the motives and feelings of Jesus and others are seldom referred to.
- sometimes one can see novelistic tendencies in small details.
- use of direct speech.
- law of repetition
- use of the number three
- especially important is use of the number two: specifically when two persons are used as nominal figures (two men did this and that).

### III. The Editing of the Traditional Material

B. takes up the task of *Redaktionsgeschichte*. He will look only at the composition of the Gospels and will work with the two-source theory.

**A. The Editing of the Spoken Word**

1. **THE COLLECTION OF THE MATERIAL AND THE COMPOSITION OF SPEECHES**

The different evangelists used the speech material and connected it together. He starts by reminding us that the editing of the speech material started quite early, when one mashal was joined to another. In the later written tradition, B. shows the process was quite primitive: add one small unit to another, on the basis of content or likeness. B. lists several motifs used in the making of series of sayings: ordering of the material; association by formal relationship; association by catchword.

2. **THE INSERTION OF THE SPEECH MATERIAL INTO THE NARRATIVES**

B. will analyze the different ways in which Mk, Mt and Lk inserted speech material in the narratives of the Gospels. He insists to say that the speech material was modified again by being inserted in the narratives. According to him, apophthegms could very easily be introduced into
narratives because they had been uttered in historical circumstances originally. However sometimes, the evangelists had to find a situation in the life of Jesus where they could give them a fixed time and place. Some situations were created.

B. The editing of the Narrative Material and the Composition of the Gospels

B. will argue that the editorial activity of the evangelists partly took the individual material so far as to create a connected narrative. Because of the way the evangelists edited the material, B. thinks it is necessary to attempt the description of the gospels as a whole. He will do it by paying attention to two elements: the literary-historical and the theological.

1. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

B. will present a summary view of how Mk constructed his Gospel. Through Mk’s gospel, he can tell that the most ancient traditions consisted of individual sections, and that the connecting together is secondary. B. specifies that Mk has not used as source that would have already portrayed a coherent picture of the life of Jesus. He then goes on to present the several elements that Mk used to create his own story of Jesus: simple linking in succession; place connection; temporal linking. For B., these elements allow Mk to give his collection the appearance of a story coherent geographically, chronologically and materially. B. also adds that the editorial activity of Mk did not only consist of literary motifs, but was also dogmatic. In Mk, the life of Jesus is represented as a series of revelation, but at the same time a veil of secrecy covers this life (the messianic secret). For B. this marks the purpose of Mk: write a work that unites the Hellenistic kerygma about Christ with the tradition of the story of Jesus.

2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW

B. will show that Mt tries to build a more coherent story than Mk and fill in the gaps left by the markan narrative. But this continuity, B. insists, is only appearance. Also, B. will say that Mt’s gospel is basically the same in form as Mk. He will look at the main following differences: Mt has joined the sayings of Q to the presentation of Mk; Mt has added legendary material (especially Passion, infancy narrative)
This does not alter the picture of Jesus: portrayal of Jesus as a teacher and healer. B. thinks that the feeling that Mt is so different from Mk is related to the fact that Mt has introduced a grouping of material to give his gospel the impression of a catechism. B. will also demonstrate the Jewish aspect of Mt. B. concludes by presenting the particular aspects of Mt’s gospel: uniformity of mood, the joining together of Mk and Q.

3. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

Lk is particularly concerned to produce a well-knit context for the story of Jesus. He will use two means for that: insist on the immediate temporal continuity; draw attention with some introductory phrase to the fact that the following section belongs to a larger context. B. also remarks that Lk relates the Jesus’ events with secular history. B. shows that Lk differs from Mt in that he does not interlace his sources but he puts them alongside one another. B. will show that Lk also modifies Mk in the fact that he introduces a new section: the report of journeying (begins
at 9:51). But Jesus is still thought of as a teacher and a healer. B. will show that Lk’s chief interest is literary. B. does not believe that Lk lets his dogmatic interest show in his work. B. concludes by saying that Lk is the climax of the history of the Synoptic tradition: Lk edits and connects isolated sections into a coherent unit.

Conclusion

B. analyzes what one can say about the Gospel from the point of view of the history of literature. None of the sources Mk uses can be qualified as Gospel. Mk is our first Gospel type. The Gospel is a product of the Hellenistic Church. B. will discuss two factors that are at its origin: the Hellenistic Church taking over the Palestinian tradition; new motives in the Hellenistic Church which produced the shaping of the traditional material into a Gospel (fidelity to the Christian kerygma). B. then proceeds to examine whether there are analogies to the form of the Gospel (no parallels in the Greek tradition). For B. the emergence of the gospels is comprehensible only in the light of a lerygma which proclaims a man who lived in the flesh as the Lord. B. will insist on the uniqueness of the Gospel and describes it as an original creation of Christianity.