

DID JESUS WANT TO BE REMEMBERED?

ADAM HARDIE

**Dissertation submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of MRes in
Theology and Religious Studies**

October 2016

ABSTRACT

This study will evaluate as to whether the Historical Jesus wanted to be remembered. In addition - if Jesus wanted to be remembered - we will also examine how Jesus' method to preserve his memory compared with other ancient figures. This investigation will propose that Jesus wanted his life to be remembered, using similar methods to how God demonstrated that he wanted to be remembered in the Old Testament.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Roland Deines, who has provided important comments and proposals to improve my research and the progression of my dissertation. Furthermore, he has taught me so much in regards to the history of early Christianity and Judaism and made me realise how humble we should be when carrying out historical research. Thus, I could not thank him enough for his support over these last two years.

Lastly, I would like to thank Christ without whom I would never be able to undertake this study (Matt 7:24).

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife for her immense support over these last two years. She has had no easy ride, giving the fact I have undertaken this dissertation on top of working full-time, she has remained supportive and I could not thank her enough.

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in this study - unless otherwise stated – follow the format in P. H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE (p.1)

INTRODUCTION: DID JESUS WANT TO BE REMEMBERED?

1.1 Introduction (p.1)

1.2 Survey of Literature (p.1)

1.3 Assumptions (p.2)

1.4 Contemporary Scholarship on Jesus and Remembrance (p.3)

(a) James D. G. Dunn

(b) Richard Burridge

(c) Rainer Riesner

1.5 Summary of Findings (p.5)

1.6 Methodology (p.5)

(a) Aim

(b) Thesis Outline

CHAPTER TWO (p.7)

HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

2.1 Introduction (p.7)

2.2 Gospel Genre (p. 9)

2.3 Graeco-Roman Biography and history (p.9)

(a) The Novel

(b) Encomium

(c) The Synoptics Sub-Genre

2.4 Authorship (p. 13)

(a) Why Matthew, Mark and Luke?

(b) Papias and Irenaeus

(c) Papias Sources

(d) Papias Reliability

(e) Mathew, Mark and Luke

2.5 Sources (p. 20)

(a) Internal Evidence

(b) External evidence

(c) Matthew, Mark and Luke

2.6 Use of Sources (p. 26)

2.7 Oral Transmission and Memory (p. 27)

(a) False Memories

(b) Oral Societies and Memory

2.8 Summary (p. 33)

CHAPTER THREE (p.33)

ANCIENT REMEMBRANCE: REMEMBRANCE IN GRAECO-ROMAN AND JEWISH LITERATURE

3.1 Introduction (p.33)

3.2 Remembrance in Graeco-Roman Literature (p. 34)

(a) Individuals That Wanted their Life to be Remembered

(b) Individuals That Wanted Their Life to be a Distant Memory

3.3 Remembrance in Second Temple Jewish Literature (p. 37)

(a) Individuals That Wanted Their Life to be Remembered

3.4 Remembrance in the Old Testament (p. 38)

(a) Evidence That God Wanted to be Remembered

3.5 Summary (p. 39)

CHAPTER FOUR (p. 40)

JESUS' LAW AS A MEMORIAL AND REMEMBRANCE OF JESUS

4.1 Introduction (p. 40)

4.2 Jesus and the Law (p. 41)

(a) Oaths and Vows

(b) Objections to the View that Jesus Contradicted the Law on Oaths

(c) Retaliation

(d) Objections to the View that Jesus Contradicted the Law on Retaliation

(e) Summary

4.3 Historicity (p. 46)

(a) Oaths

(b) Retaliation

(c) Summary

4.4 Authority of Jesus (p. 52)

4.5 Jesus, Law and Remembrance (p. 54)

4.6 Summary (p. 55)

CHAPTER FIVE (p. 55)

THE LAST SUPPER AS A MEMORIAL AND REMEMBRANCE OF JESUS

5.1 Introduction (p. 55)

5.2 Elements of the Last Supper and Jesus Remembrance (p. 58)

- (a) “This is My Body”

- (b) “This is My Blood”

5.3 Last Supper and Passover (p. 61)

- (a) Objections

- (b) Other Jewish Meals

- (c) Last Supper as a Passover Meal

5.4 The Last Supper Historicity (p. 68)

- (a) Objections

- (b) Paul “Receive” and “Pass on”

- (c) The Gospels

- (d) Summary

5.5 Last Supper as a Memorial and Remembrance of Jesus (p. 71)

5.6 Summary (p. 73)

CHAPTER SIX (p. 73)

CONCLUSION: DID JESUS WANT TO BE REMEMBERED?

6.1 Summary of Findings (p. 73)

6.2 Future Research (p. 77)

BIBLIOGRAPHY (p. 78)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: DID JESUS WANT TO BE REMEMBERED

1.1 Introduction

The Historical Jesus has fascinated scholars for centuries; debating who he was, what were his aims and his life in general. This initially started with H. S. Reimarus, who was the first scholars of his day his to write an historical outset on the life of Jesus.¹ Following Reimarus, Jesus' life continued to be critically evaluated by others,² which then led to the first/old quest of the historical Jesus by Albert Schweitzer.³ In more recent scholarship (the third quest) the debate continues; however, unlike the previous quests, its central element is correctly placing Jesus into Judaism.⁴

Within the third quest and gospel studies in general, some modern scholars have argued how the Jesus tradition in the Synoptics and also the genre of the Synoptics, demonstrates how there was a real need in early Christianity to preserve and remember Jesus.⁵ However, from an academic and historical point of view, the question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered is a fresh insight into historical Jesus studies.

The question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered is important for two main reasons. Firstly, if Jesus wanted to be remembered it proves another perspective as to why the early Christians set out to preserve his memory and write narratives on his ministry and life. Secondly, if Jesus did not want to be remembered, then it begs the questions as to why the early church wanted to remember him, but also why many Christians and Muslims continue to remember him to this very day.

1.2 Survey of literature

¹ Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, trans. W. Montgomery (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910), 13.

² See Schweitzer, *Historical Jesus*, 97-180. Famous scholars such as David F. Strauss, Bruno Bauer, Ernest Renan have evaluated and constructed a life of Jesus.

³ Schweitzer, *Historical Jesus*, 1-402.

⁴ Craig L. Blomberg, *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction and Survey* (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2009), 210.

⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 184-186; 882. Richard A. Burridge, *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), 73-77. Rainer Riesner, "From the Messianic Teacher to the Gospels of Jesus Christ." In *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmen and Stanley E. Porter (Boston: Brill, 2011), 410-415.

For this study, the Synoptic gospels and Paul's letter to the Corinthians have been chosen as the main sources. Matthew, Mark and Luke are the earliest gospels on the life of Jesus and share a common theme with very similar content; thus, considered to be the more historical documents for constructing Jesus' life.⁶ Furthermore, Paul, who wrote his letter to the Corinthians earlier than any of the gospels, contains an early and relevant tradition for understanding Jesus and remembrance (1 Cor 11:23).⁷ Therefore, because of the reasons outlined, the Synoptics and Paul will be the main sources used to identify if Jesus wanted to be remembered.

Sole dependency on the Synoptics and Paul as the main sources, could be argued as limiting the scope to understand as to whether the historical Jesus wanted to be remembered, since so many other ancient sources illustrate many various sayings and events of Jesus' life. However, most of these sources are dated to the second century and later, with an aim of recording Christian fiction.⁸ The Gospel of John could be used as a source used to evaluate as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered, since it is used by many scholars for constructing the life of Jesus.⁹ However, it will not feature in this study due to limited word count.¹⁰

1.3 Assumptions

The amount of work that has been achieved in scholarship cannot all be discussed during this thesis. Thus, certain arguments, that have a general consensus of being factual, will be treated as read and assumed as historically true. Firstly, there are very good reasons to conclude that the Synoptics and some of Paul's sayings on the Jesus traditions are the earliest sources for constructing the historical Jesus and that they date to the first century.¹¹ Thus, this thesis will assume that the Synoptics and Paul are first century sources. Lastly, there are also very good reasons to assert that Paul wrote at least seven of the thirteen letters ascribed to him in the

⁶ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 41.

⁷ Raymond F. Collins and Daniel J. Harrington, *First Corinthians* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 199), 425.

⁸ Craig S. Keener, *Historical Jesus of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009), 52-58. James D. G. Dunn, *Neither Jew nor Greek: Christianity in the Making*, vol 3 (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015), 151-159.

⁹ The gospel of John is generally considered to be a minor source for constructing the life of Jesus. James Crossley, *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 62-63. Although Crossley does come to the conclusion that John is a minor source for constructing the historical Jesus. Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 358-471. John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol 1 (London: Doubleday, 1991), 168-177.

¹⁰ John contains much dissimilarity with the Synoptic tradition; thus, it would take up considerable space in answering the research question.

¹¹ Dale C. Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 17.

New Testament cannon.¹² Thus, since Paul's letter to the Corinthians will be referenced as a source to help answer the question to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered and is included into these seven letters ascribed to Paul, this chapter will assume that Paul wrote letter.

1.4 Contemporary scholarship on Jesus and remembrance

We have already alluded to the question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered as a fresh approach. In this part of the chapter I will highlight some scholars who seem to allude indirectly to how Jesus wanted to be remembered. However, what will be shown is that this is more related to how Jesus wanted his words to be remembered and not necessarily his life.

(a) James D. G. Dunn

In his book, *Jesus Remembered*, Dunn has provided an in depth analysis of the remembered Jesus. However, Dunn's chapter 8.1 (*Jesus the Founder of Christianity*) is a clear example of how he aims to also prove that Jesus may have wanted to be remembered. Dunn sets out by arguing that Jesus was a teacher who had disciples (learners), which was a relationship bound by understanding, remembering and passing on the traditions. Thus, Dunn writes: "The relation between Jesus and his disciples was remembered as one between teacher and taught, with the implications, as such, the disciples understood themselves to be committed to remember their teacher's teachings."¹³

Dunn proposes that this continuation of the teacher tradition was continued into the post Easter church, as seen with Paul, but also that the disciples were to 'bear witness' of Jesus' ministry and resurrection.¹⁴ Dunn does not directly state that the teacher tradition is evidence that Jesus wanted to be remembered; however, his reference to the disciples understanding the need to pass on the traditions, is an indirect way of stating that Jesus wanted his sayings to be recalled by his followers.¹⁵ Dunn's reasoning is faulty, since Jesus wanting the traditions to be remembered does not necessarily mean he wanted his life to be remembered. Furthermore, Dunn continues by expressing how the Lord's Supper, which Paul had passed on, was to remember Christ - "do this in remembrance of me" (1 Cor 11:24-25; Luke 22:19).¹⁶ Although Dunn views the saying statement as not a "merely cognitive act of recollection,"¹⁷ he does not

¹² Arland J. Hultgren, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011), 1-2.

¹³ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 177.

¹⁴ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 178.

¹⁵ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 178;181.

¹⁶ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 178.

¹⁷ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 178.

evaluate as to whether it was actually said by the historical Jesus. Dunn seems to be alluding to how *remembering* was a function to remember Jesus and traditions.¹⁸

Much of Dunn's analysis in 'Jesus Remembered' is focused on the Jesus traditions and how the disciples remembered/wanted to remember Jesus.¹⁹ Therefore, although Dunn indirectly alludes to how Jesus wanted his words to be remembered it is only a small part of his lengthy book that discusses this aspect and does not directly tackle the question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered.

(b) Richard A. Burridge

In his book 'Imitating Jesus: And Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics', Richard Burridge has provided a persuasive insight into how imitating Jesus was not just merely following his words, but also his deeds.²⁰ Burridge devotes much of his book to Christians imitating Jesus and only a small percentage as to whether Jesus wanted to be mimicked. Burridge argues that Jesus wanted to be imitated similar to how Jewish rabbis expected their students to learn Torah - which was through words - but also by mimicking their actions.²¹ Thus, Burridge states that Jesus' own call to discipleship (Mark 1:17) included imitating his actions as well as remembering his words.²² Although Burridge does not explicitly state that Jesus wanting to be mimicked was in the context of remembrance; this was often the case in the ancient world, but usually by the follower(s) of an individual and not the individual themselves.²³ Thus, like what has been evaluated in Dunn's work, Burridge is also virtually silent on whether Jesus wanted his life to be remembered. Burridge, devotes much of his work on the followers of Jesus (past and present), and their remembrance of him.

(c) Rainer Riesner

Rainer Riesner has provided an emphatic analysis on how the followers of Jesus would have learnt and remembered Jesus' teachings and formally passed on the traditions similar to that of other Jewish teachers and students.²⁴ However, Riesner, similar to Dunn, argues that Jesus was a teacher who also wanted his words to be remembered, since the Jesus of the Synoptics

¹⁸ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 179.

¹⁹ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 882. Dunn confirms that his study into the Jesus traditions demonstrates that the earliest Christianity wanted to remember Jesus.

²⁰ Burridge, *Imitating Jesus*, 73.

²¹ Burridge, *Imitating Jesus*, 74.

²² Burridge, *Imitating Jesus*, 74.

²³ Chapter three will demonstrate how imitating individuals (Tacitus life of Agricola) was to preserve memory.

²⁴ Riesner, "Messianic Teacher," 410-415.

orders his followers to act upon his words and keep them.²⁵ Riesner does not directly link the saying found in Synoptics back to the historical Jesus; however, his allusion to the saying being part of the “pre-Easter tradition”, makes one think he sees it as historical.²⁶ However, Riesner’s analysis is similar to that of Dunn’s, as he is also trying to prove the reliability of the Jesus traditions in the Synoptics and that the early Christians wanted to remember his words and not necessarily his life.²⁷

1.5 Summary of findings

The three scholars above are the closest that one comes to anything being put forward about how Jesus wanted his life to be remembered. However, their analysis is still far short of what would be considered evidence to demonstrate that Jesus wanted his life to be remembered. Dunn and Rienser are evidence of how there has been a far greater interest on how Jesus was remembered and not necessarily on whether he wanted to be remembered. Thus, as already stated, the question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered is a fresh insight within historical Jesus studies.

1.6 Methodology

(a) Aim

As previously mentioned the main question to this thesis is did Jesus want to be remembered? Furthermore, a sub question will be answered – continuing from the main question – which is if Jesus wanted to be remembered then how does his remembrance compare to other Jewish, Graeco-Roman and Divine figures? We will propose that Jesus wanted his life to be remembered. Furthermore, we will also argue that Jesus’ actions to preserve his memory, is similar to the religious elements and practises used by God to indicate that he wanted to be remembered.

(b) Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 will evaluate the reliability of the Synoptic gospels. This chapter will not cast any new insights into the gospels being more or less reliable. It will analyse what scholars say about the Synoptics as sources and what arguments are more convincing, which will contribute to the reliability of the sayings that demonstrate Jesus wanted to be remembered in chapters four and five. Firstly, the chapter will analyse the genre of the Synoptics and whether they are trying to write history. Secondly, evaluate the authorship of the Synoptics, to gain an

²⁵ Riesner, “Messianic Teacher,” 416.

²⁶ Riesner, “Messianic Teacher,” 416.

²⁷ Riesner, “Messianic Teacher,” 405-446.

understanding if there is evidence to the traditional and conservative claim that Matthew the tax collector wrote the Gospel of Matthew, John Mark the disciple of Peter wrote the Gospel of Mark and if Luke the companion of Paul wrote the Gospel of Luke. To best answer the gospel authorship, this part of the chapter will critically evaluate the internal evidence in the Synoptics and the external evidence from early church testimonies. Thirdly, we will analyse what sources the Synoptics used for constructing their narratives and whether they were based on eyewitness testimony. Fourthly, we will evaluate how the Synoptics used their sources for constructing their narratives. Lastly, critically evaluate the reliability of oral sources, by analysing oral transmission and memory to then understand the impact this has on the Synoptic tradition and the historical Jesus.

Chapter 3 will analyse the various forms of individual remembrance in Graeco-Roman biographies/histories, second temple Jewish literature and the Old Testament. The aim is to demonstrate that whilst many individuals wanted to be remembered, there were individuals who did not want their memory to live on after they had died. Therefore, it should not be assumed that Jesus wanted his life to be remembered or forgotten once he passed away. Furthermore, identifying that individuals wanted to be remembered or forgotten is of most importance to this chapter and to the question of whether Jesus wanted to be remembered, since it will prove vital to when comparing Jesus' remembrance to other ancient figures. Furthermore, the chapter will also identify that another major form of remembrance was that of individuals/groups wanting to remember a particular individual. The reason for discussing this form of remembrance is to highlight that an individual did not have to speak of self-remembrance for an individual and/or groups to then want to preserve their memory.

Chapter four is the first chapter to evaluate and answer the question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered. Firstly, the chapter will demonstrate that the Law in the Torah was not just dictated by the Law giver (God) to then be practised and upheld, but that he also wanted the Israelites to remember his actions at Egypt through his Law. Secondly, the chapter will seek to identify if Jesus brought forth new laws through his sayings on oaths (Matt 5:33-37) and retaliation (Matt 5:38-42; Luke 6:27-30) in Matthew and Luke Sermon on the Mount/Plain. Thirdly, evaluate the historicity of Jesus' teaching on oaths and retaliation and whether they were taught by Jesus within the vicinity of a mountain. Fourthly, identify whether Jesus was a law giver or just a mere messenger. Lastly, evaluate whether Jesus wanted to therefore be remembered and what comparisons can be made between Jesus' remembrance and remembrance of God in the Old Testament.

Chapter five will continue in examining whether Jesus wanted to be remembered. However, the chapter will analyse whether the Last Supper served as a memorial by Jesus for his remembrance similarly to how God wanted to be remembered through the Passover meal. Firstly, the chapter will identify that Passover in the Old Testament served as a memorial to remember the Exodus and God's actions to liberate the Israelites from bondage in Egypt. Secondly, we will analyse whether the Last Supper was a new Passover meal. Thirdly, we will identify whether the elements of the Last Supper ritual served as a remembrance of Jesus. Fourthly, evaluate whether the Last Supper can be traced back to the historical Jesus. Lastly, is to evaluate as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered through the Last Supper and similarly to chapter four, asses what comparisons can be made to Jesus' remembrance and other ancient figures.

Chapter six will conclude the findings of the investigation as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered, complete with possible research questions that contribute to this study and that also emerge from this investigation.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PRIMARY SOURCES

2.1 Introduction

This study will now turn to a difficult task, which is to analyse the nature and origin of the Synoptic gospels. To understand what derives from the past is fraught with difficulty, since historical events are not repeatable like what you would find in a scientific laboratory.²⁸ Thus, historical criticism is needed to provide method to determine what most likely came from the past. Furthermore, an historian's world view can have an impact on how one views an ancient text that claims to have come from God or possesses miracle stories, which then leads to different conclusions.²⁹ In the study of the Synoptics, scholars have to come to different conclusions in regards to the origins of the gospels, which have contributed to the various views many have come to in regards to Jesus' life.³⁰

²⁸ Darrell L. Bock, *Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 153.

²⁹ Bock, *Historical Jesus*, 153.

³⁰ Schweitzer, *Historical Jesus*, 222-265. Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 125-140. Schweitzer and more recently Ehrman, have argued that Jesus is an apocalyptic prophet. See N. T. Wright, *How God Became King: Getting to the Heart of the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 2012), 50-100. Michael F. Bird et al., *How God Became Jesus: The Real Origins of Belief in*

The study of the origin of the gospels has been a widely debated subject matter, especially since the rise and application of form criticism to the Synoptics in the early 20th century. The German form critics of Rudolf Bultmann, Martin Dibelius and Karl Ludwig Schmidt asserted that the gospels were a mix of the earliest oral traditions and the later traditions of the early church.³¹ The form critics assumed that the interpretations of Jesus in the written traditions came from later Christians.³² This becomes more apparent in the crucial role of the *Sitz Im Leben* (“life situation”) in the form critical model, which identifies how sayings, events, miracles and worship evolved out of the needs of the early church.³³ Following the rise of the form critics, Ernst Käsemann – student of Rudolf Bultmann – formed a criterion to differentiate between authentic sayings of Jesus and post-Easter inventions, which he called the criterion of dissimilarity.³⁴ Käsemann argued that whatever sayings come from Jesus in the Synoptics that are dissimilar to both Judaism and early Christianity, most likely comes from the historical Jesus.

In more recent scholarship, John P. Meier has created five persuasive criteria for the authenticity of sayings by Jesus in the Synoptics; embarrassment, discontinuity, Multiple Attestation, Coherence and Rejection and execution.³⁵ Some scholars have come to a more conservative approach to the gospels. For example Richard Bauckham has expressed how the Synoptics are based upon eyewitness testimony; a more traditions and conservative approach.³⁶ Similarly, James D. G. Dunn has stressed how the traditions of the Synoptics are reliable and portray the historical Jesus.³⁷

The above demonstrates the importance of assessing the Synoptic gospels as sources for the life of Jesus. Although it does not necessarily answer the research question, it contributes to

Jesus' Divine Nature (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 19-162. Simon J. Gathercole, *The Pre-Existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 1-344. Wright, Bird, Evans, Gathercole and Hill are examples of scholars who have come to the conclusion that Jesus thought of himself as God. See John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Peasant* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 421-422. Crossan has come to the conclusion that Jesus was a Jewish cynic peasant.

³¹ Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 4. Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. William Barclay (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1971), 4. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *The Place of the Gospels in the general History of Literature*, trans. Byron R. McCane (South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2002), 39-40.

³² Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 4. Dibelius, *Tradition*, 4. Schmidt, *Gospels*, 40. See also Chris Keith, *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee* (London: T & T Clark, 2011), 33.

³³ Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 4. Dibelius, *Tradition*, 7.

³⁴ Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1964), 15-47.

³⁵ For a more in depth description of the five criteria see, John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew; Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1 (London: Doubleday, 1991), 168-177.

³⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 114-289.

³⁷ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 137-209; 881-884.

how we should approach the gospels when evaluating sayings by Jesus, which imply that he wanted to be remembered.

2.2 Gospel Genre

In the early twentieth century, the rise of form criticism had become a dominant perspective within gospel studies. Rudolf Bultmann asserted that the gospels were a unique form of literature; not similar to that of biography, since the gospels reflected upon myth, where as biography recorded history.³⁸ However, more recently, Richard Burridge's persuasive work *What Are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* has demonstrated the close relationship the gospels share with biography. Burridge argues that two of the synoptic gospels contain Jesus' birth (Luke and Matthew), his death, show similar lengths to other biographies, characterisation of Jesus through words and deeds, and that the gospels are based and categorised around one person (Jesus).³⁹ Furthermore, Thomas Hägg has illustrated that what makes a biography, is that the subject is the main character within the story, with the work being centred on them.⁴⁰ In relation to the Synoptics, Jesus is mentioned more times than any other character and is at the heart of the gospel narratives. Thus, It seems reasonable to assert that based on the arguments of Burridge and Hägg that the Synoptics fit into the genre of Graeco-Roman biography. However, this does not mean that the gospels are writing history, since biographies crossed the boundaries into other genres.

2.3 Graeco-Roman Biography and history

Graeco-Roman Biography is a flexible genre that generally passes into the boundaries of other genres; novel, encomium, history and memoirs.⁴¹ Thus, due to the flexibility of biography, the sub-genre plays a vital role in the aims of the author and trying to tell truth. For example, below will demonstrate the aim of an encomium and the novel sometimes means that the author of a biography crossing into one of these genres will write fiction rather than fact.

(a) The Novel

³⁸ Rudolf Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 373-374.

³⁹ Richard Burridge, *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), 185-210.

⁴⁰ Tomas Hägg, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 148.

⁴¹ Richard Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 62-63.

Novels may retain some reliable information, but are essentially prose fiction, basing their stories upon a woman and man undergoing a long journey, experiencing near death situations and being captive by robbers.⁴² These biographies that cross over into novel are classified ‘fringe’ due to their striking similarities.⁴³ The life of Aesop and the Alexander Romance are examples of two biographies on the fringe. Romance is minimal in both lives, which is different to the ancient novel; however, the two biographies have similarities with the novel on travel and adventure.⁴⁴

(b) Encomium

Many biographies of the Greek and Roman world emphasised their motive to praise their subject. These biographies crossed into the genre of Encomium (εὐλογία).⁴⁵ What is most striking of these lives is the need to change or leave out information that portrays the subject in a negative light, since this goes against the aim of portraying the subject in a moral manner. For example, Isocrates mentions nothing on the murder of Evagoras.⁴⁶ Xenophon wrote about Agesilaus in his *Hellenica* and his biography of Agesilaus; yet similar stories in the two works are different in detail, and the gist of the events could even be interpreted differently, since the biography could not portray Agesilaus in a negative light. Therefore, Xenophon changed the story in the biography to reflect praise and not historical fact.⁴⁷ Biographies that therefore cross into encomium – although historical truth is still part of the biography – there is an interest to sometimes change the truth of the story.

(c) The Synoptics Sub-Genre

⁴² Gareth Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14.

⁴³ Niklas Holzberg, *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*, trans. Christine Jackson-Holzberg (London: Routledge, 1995), 14.

⁴⁴ See Karla A. Grammatiki, *Fiction on The Fringe: Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age* (Boston: Brill, 2009), 17. Karla Grammatiki has persuasively argued that Aesop is transported from city to city being sold as a slave and popping up in different courts, where he finally states his desire to travel the world. Grammatiki likewise with the Alexander Romance emphasizes how a great number of cities are conquered, where fictitious and real conquests mix together. Furthermore Grammatiki notes that the confusion of dates and geography in the two novelistic biographies, where different conquests are interrupted by others are frequent, yet the narrative still flows smoothly.

⁴⁵ Richard Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 62-64.

⁴⁶ Richard Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 259.

⁴⁷ See John Dilery, *Xenophon And The History Of His Times* (Ney York: Routledge, 1995), 117. Dilery rightly demonstrates how writing to praise the individual takes over from historical truth: “The conclusion of the account of the expedition of Agesilaus in Asia in the encomium also differs from that found in the history. In the *Hellenica*, Agesilaus is faced with a problem: most of his troops want to stay in Asia rather than go to fight fellow Greeks (4.2.5). This contrasts sharply with the corresponding passage from the Agesilaus: there we learn the Greeks of Asia are so loyal to Agesilaus they willingly follow him back to Greece in order to go help the Lacedaemon (Ages 1.38).”

Comparisons have been made to place the gospels within the genres of encomium and novel biography.⁴⁸ However, Jesus' ministry, being firmly placed in first century Palestine, is not similar to mythical travel and trickster motive of the novelistic biographies.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the inclusion of Jesus as a Messiah being crucified is by no means what you would find in an encomium. There is no doubt that the gospels are theological documents, with apologetic aims for the present church communities.⁵⁰ However, does this theology and need for the present reflect history?

Marcus Bjorg has come to the conclusion that the gospel authors are not trying to write historical narratives, but symbolic narratives created for a metaphorical purpose.⁵¹ Bjorg believes that the miracle stories in the Synoptics are theological statements, similar to that of parables and not history.⁵² Furthermore, Bjorg stresses, that a saying by Jesus should be taken metaphorically when the narrative looks like fiction.⁵³ Bjorg's reasoning is based upon post-modernism and its treatment of the divine in history, since Bjorg is merely stating what he believes and not what the gospel authors believed.⁵⁴ Thus, to appeal to miracles as a reason for the Synoptic authors not writing history is unconvincing.

There are very good reasons to assert that the gospels were in fact trying to write history. In more recent studies, Richard Bauckham has persuasively demonstrated how the gospels contain similar names to the popular Palestinian first century Jewish names, known from ossuaries and ancient Jewish texts during the time of Jesus.⁵⁵ Furthermore, Bauckham argues

⁴⁸ See Lawrence M. Wills, *The Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John and the Origins of the Gospel Genre* (London: Routledge, 1997), 1-22. Lawrence asserts the similarities in structure, character, and language of the gospels towards Jesus and the Life of Aesop, means the gospels are novelistic biographies. In regards to the gospels being an encomium biography, see P.L. Schuler, *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 75.

⁴⁹ See also Mark Goodacre, "Lawrence M. Wills, *The Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John and the Origins of the Gospel Genre* (London ; 1997), review by Mark Goodacre," *JBL* 119, (2000): 134. Goodacre rightly points out that the similarities between Jesus and Aesop are far from striking, as Aesop had no disciples and was a slave.

⁵⁰ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:167.

⁵¹ Marcus Borg, *Jesus: Uncovering the Life, Teachings, and Relevance of a Religious Revolutionary* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006), 57.

⁵² Marcus Borg, *Jesus*, 57-69. Borg is not the only person who has come to this conclusion. See also, John Dominic Crossan, *A Long Way From Tipperary* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2009), 167-168.

⁵³ Borg, *Jesus*, 51-62.

⁵⁴ The gospel authors certainly believed in miracles and therefore would have believed Jesus' miracles to be historically and theologically true.

⁵⁵ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 67-92. Bauckham has persuasively argued how the Jewish names of the Diaspora were different to that of the Jewish names of Palestine. Thus, Bauckham argues, unless the gospels were trying to tell us accurate history, then it seems bizarre why Luke would go to that level of detail and accuracy to assign names being used in first century Palestine to the characters in his gospel.

how the Synoptics seem to be closer to that of histories, since they are written in living memory of the eyewitnesses', when true history was perceived to be written.⁵⁶

Eugene Lemcio has demonstrated how the post-Easter Jesus terminology is separated from the earthly Jesus within the Synoptics. Thus, Lemcio persuasively notes how the vocabulary and words common to both periods bear a different nuance in the gospels.⁵⁷ Moreover, the way the Synoptics speak of matters such as mission, discipleship, and salvation are also different from post-Easter Christianity.⁵⁸ This demonstrates the Synoptics coherence with the pre-Easter and post-Easter Jesus, places them closer to the method of recording history.

Samuel Byrskog has persuasively argued how Luke followed the best practise of correct historiography, which historians used for constructing their work. Byrskog has shown that Greek and Roman historians believed that 'seeing' an event and 'participating' in an event was the most reliable form of evidence.⁵⁹ However, Byrskog is quick to note that historians were aware that they themselves were not omnipresent and therefore relied also on eyewitnesses as their source of information.⁶⁰ Therefore, according to Byrskog, Luke was following the best practises of a historian when appealing to eyewitness accounts for constructing his gospel (Luke 1:1).⁶¹

Not all scholars have agreed with Byrskog, Loveday Alexander has compared Luke's preface to the "scientific tradition" of the technical and professional writings of mathematics, engineering and medicine.⁶² The problem that has arisen from Alexander's study is that some scholars have come to the conclusion that scientific prefaces do not reliably respect tradition

⁵⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 8.

⁵⁷ See Eugene E. Lemcio, *The Past of Jesus in the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1-2. In addition to Lemcio's study, an example can be found in the way that the pre-Easter Jesus refers to himself in the synoptics, that does not correspond to how early Christians referred to him. Jesus calls himself "son of man" (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) throughout the synoptics. However, in the post-Easter literature of the New Testament he is only referred to as "υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου" on only one occasion (Acts 7:56).

⁵⁸ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 276. For example, Bauckham illustrates how in Matthew's gospel the disciples should only preach to the "House of Israel" (Matt 10:6). However, post-resurrection, Jesus tells his disciples to go preach to all the nations (Matt 28:19).

⁵⁹ Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History - History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 64.

⁶⁰ Byrskog, *Story as History*, 64.

⁶¹ Byrskog, *Story as History*, 64.

⁶² Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: literary convention and social context in Luke 1, 1-4 and Acts 1, 1*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 102-115. For a response to Alexander see Sean A. Adams, "Luke's Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander," *JGRChJ* 3 (2006): 178-189. Adams points out that Josephus dedicates his work to Greeks and the Barbarians (*J.W.* 1.16), Luke's preface is no different in length to other prefaces in historiography and Luke's use of "autopsy" is parallel to other historians.

compared to the historians.⁶³ However, this seems to be an incorrect interpretation of Alexander's reasoning; Alexander states: "Respect for tradition is a prime value in scientific texts, and especially respect for the passing on of tradition by direct personal contact from master to disciple."⁶⁴ Therefore, If one is to categorise Luke's gospel into the scientific tradition, the reliability of Luke's method to portray history should be still be upheld. Although Alexander's analysis of Luke is convincing, due to the similarities Luke's preface shares with historiography, especially his use of eyewitnesses firmly places Luke's gospel into historiography. Therefore, Luke's gospel as a biography empirically and methodologically crosses over into the genre of historiography.

Based on the studies of Bauckham, Lemcio and Byrskog, it seems clear that the intention of the authors of the Synoptics was to write history. Thus, it seems reasonable to classify the Synoptics as historical biographies.

2.4 Authorship

The titles of the Synoptics as we see them in the New Testament today τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κατὰ Μάρκος, Ματθαῖος, Λουκᾶς were added later by the early church;⁶⁵ therefore, the Synoptics are anonymous to the extent that the author's names are not revealed in the text. However, this is not uncommon within ancient literature, since many authors did not disclose their names within the text.⁶⁶ Thus, the question as to who wrote the Synoptics is best answered through evaluating the external evidence.

(a) Why Matthew, Mark and Luke?

The apocryphal gospels in the second century would attribute a gospel to one of the apostles to give it more weight.⁶⁷ Therefore, the reason for the early church choosing the names Matthew, Mark and Luke could also be for similar reasons and to challenge these later

⁶³ See, Theodore J. Weeden Sr, "Polemics as a Case for Dissent: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Jesus and the Eyewitnesses," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 213.

⁶⁴ Loveday Alexander, "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing," *NovT* 28 (1986): 71.

⁶⁵ Robert H. Stein, *Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 1.

⁶⁶ See Richard Bauckham, "Gospels before Normativization: A Critique of Francis Watson's Gospel Writing," *JSNT* 37 (2014): 197. Furthermore, Tacitus in his *Life of Agricola*, Lucian in the *Life of the Demonax* and Nepos in his *Life of Atticus* do not disclose their names within the text. See also Armin D. Baum, "The Anonymity of the New Testament History Books: A Stylistic Device in the Context of Greco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature Author," *NovT* 50 (2008): 120-142. Although Baum argues that the anonymity of the Synoptics should be compared to that of the OLD TESTAMENT, it is plausible that the synoptic anonymity was because of gospels following similar practises to other anonymous Graeco-Roman biographies, but also their belief in continuing in biblical history.

⁶⁷ Ehrman, *Apocalyptic Prophet*, 41-44.

gospels that were claiming to have been written by apostles.⁶⁸ However, there seems to be good reasons for associating the traditional names of Mark and Luke to the second and third gospels respectively.

In relation to Luke's gospel, Lee Martin McDonald has expressed how the author's use of "we" in the book of Acts (Acts 16.10-17; 20.5-21),⁶⁹ in the first person plural, was to show that he was a participant in the journeys of Paul and not simply used for conventional purposes.⁷⁰ Furthermore, McDonald has persuasively identified how other ancient writings made use of the first person plural "we" to indicate their participation in the event.⁷¹ Although the "we" passages still demonstrate anonymity in regards to the name of the author, Luke is associated in the New Testament as a companion of Paul (2 Timothy 4:11, Colossians 4:14). Therefore, the "we" formula in the book of Acts, and Luke being his companion, made complete sense to why the early church recognised Luke as the author of the second gospel.

It also appears bizarre that the early church would assign Luke to the third gospel for apologetic purposes. Luke is not exactly a prominent name mentioned in the New Testament, it would have made much more sense to assign Barnabas to Luke-Acts, seeing as he frequently featured as a companion of Paul on his journeys in Acts and Paul's letters (Acts 4:36; 9:27; 11-15; 1 Cor. 9:6, 1 Gal. 2:1-13). Thus, it seems rather odd why the early church would assign Luke to the third gospel if he was not in fact the author.

Similarly to Luke, Mark is not a name of great credentials, seeing as he was not one of the twelve or some outside disciple during Jesus' ministry. Furthermore, the early church fathers believed that Peter was the main eyewitness to Mark's gospel (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15). Thus, it seems bizarre why they would go to all that trouble to explain how Peter was in fact just a source behind the gospel and not just make the claim that he was in fact the author, since it would make the gospel much more attractive for its audience.

Matthew's gospel is slightly different, as it is traditionally attributed to an eyewitness (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.11.8-9), that being the Matthew of the twelve

⁶⁸ Ehrman, *Apocalyptic Prophet*, 41-44.

⁶⁹ See Dunn, *Neither Jew nor Greek*, 49-50. Dunn states how it is generally considered in scholarship that Luke-Acts was written by the same author.

⁷⁰ Lee Martin McDonald and Stanley E. Porter, *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000), 292.

⁷¹ McDonald and Porter, *Early Christianity*, 292. Examples used by McDonald are as follows: Polybius, 36.12, 12.27.1-6; Lucian, *History* 47; Homer *Odyssey* 12.402-405.

who was a tax collector (Matt 9:9). Therefore, unlike Mark and Luke, it seems reasonable why the early church would assign Matthew as the author of the first gospel.

(b) Papias and Irenaeus

The earliest attestation to the authors of the Synoptics collectively, comes from Irenaeus in the mid-late second century. Irenaeus confirms to the traditional authorship that Matthew, Mark, and Luke wrote the first three gospels. (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.11.8-9) However, since Irenaeus is writing 80-120 years after the gospels were written, and his sources are unclear, it is difficult to accept Irenaeus as a reliable source, especially since his statement on the synoptic authors is very apologetic.⁷² Furthermore, Irenaeus is not the earliest testimony to the first and second gospel. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, provides the earliest testimony to the authors of Matthew and Mark's gospel:⁷³

“The Elder used to say this: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote down accurately everything he remembered, though not in order, of the things either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord or followed him, but afterward, as I said, followed Peter, who adapted his teachings as needed but had no intention of giving an ordered account of the Lord's sayings. Consequently Mark did nothing wrong in writing down some things as he remembered them, for he made it his one concern not to omit anything that he heard or to make any false statement in them.” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15)

“Therefore Matthew put the *logia* in an ordered arrangement in the Hebrew language, but each person interpreted them as best he could.” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16).

It could be argued that Papias is not speaking of the canonical Matthew and Mark, since it seems at first glance that he believes that they contain only the *logia* (sayings) of the Lord, where as the Matthew and Mark of the New Testament narrate sayings, events and actions.⁷⁴ However, the phrase *logia* of the Lord used by Papias must be taken in parallel to the earlier phrase “things either said or done by Christ”.⁷⁵ Thus, it is likely that Papias is speaking of the canonical Matthew and Mark.

In relation to Matthew, Richard Bauckham has provided a valid interpretation to Papias' statement on the origin of the first gospel. Bauckham states that Papias seems to be referring to a Hebrew original that had then been translated into Greek by Christian scribes.⁷⁶

⁷² Ehrman, *Apocalyptic Prophet*, 43-44.

⁷³ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 12. Papias' work, titled *Exposition of the Logia of the Lord*, is unfortunately lost, and only survives in the writings of Irenaeus and Eusebius.

⁷⁴ Bart D. Ehrman, *Peter, Paul and Mary Magdalene: The Followers of Jesus in history and Legend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 8-9.

⁷⁵ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 222-223.

⁷⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 226-228.

Moreover, according to Bauckham, Papias seems to state that these scribes distorted the order of the gospel, since the most natural way to translate διάλεκτος with ἡρμήνευσεν in the same statement is that it means language.⁷⁷ To understand if Matthew originally wrote his gospel in Hebrew is to internally examine whether the Greek Matthew is a translation.

Raymond A. Martin has persuasively outlined various methods to determine as to whether a source is translated from a Semitic original.⁷⁸ However, the problem with a Semitic Matthew is there is no indication that the gospel is a translation, since Matthew frequently quotes Mark's Greek, the word for word similarities between Matthew and Mark, and there being no evidence to multiple Greek translations of a Semitic Matthew in the manuscript tradition. Therefore, based on the analysis above it is very unlikely that the canonical Matthew was a translation.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, there are Jewish works that claimed to be translations from Hebrew; yet, still based upon Greek literature.

Josephus believed that his *Antiquities of the Jews* was a direct translation from the Hebrew Bible (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.17). However, Josephus' intention to translate from the Hebrew Bible was still not the outcome, since he made much use upon the Greek translation.⁸⁰ Josephus changed many details and revised the order of the material.⁸¹ Thus, when Papias' views on Matthew are compared to Josephus, if the Greek versions that Papias speaks of had corrupted the order of Matthew's Hebrew original, made use of Mark's Greek and the LXX, it does not make it unbelievable that the gospel of Matthew we have today is a translation of a Semitic original.

Papias' early attestation to Matthew being the author of the second gospel should not be merely discounted, especially since he knew Greek probably better than most scholars today, as Dale Allison notes:

“Presumably they knew the Greek language better than most, if not all, modern scholars; and they all, it would appear, took canonical Matthew to be the translation of a Semitic original. Is

⁷⁷ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 228.

⁷⁸ Raymond A. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004), 4-43. Martin outlines seventeen methods to show that a Greek work is translated from a Semitic language.

⁷⁹ See also W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 12.

⁸⁰ Andre Pelletier, “The Letter of Aristea and the Septuagint,” in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gaohe Hata. (Leiden; Brill, 1989), 99.

⁸¹ Shaye J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 24.

it then out of the question that our gospel is indeed a translation, perhaps of a Semitic original enlarged by the later addition of Greek Mark and other materials?”⁸²

To sum up, based on the inconclusive analysis as to whether Papias was historically correct regarding Matthew’s gospel being of Hebrew origin, it begs the question as to how reliable is Papias as source, and who were his sources?

(c) Papias Sources

An important quote to understand where Papias derived his information from can be found in Eusebius:

“I will not hesitate to set down for you (sing.), along with my interpretations, everything I carefully learned then from the elders and carefully remembered, guaranteeing their truth. For unlike most people I did not enjoy those who have a great deal to say, but those who teach the truth. Nor did I enjoy those who recall someone else’s commandments, but those who remember the commandments given by the Lord to the faith and proceeding from the truth itself. And if by chance someone who had been a follower of the elders should come my way, I inquired about the words of the elders-[that is,] what [according to the elders] Andrew or Peter said (εἶπεν), or Philip, or Thomas or James, or John or Matthew or any other of the Lord’s disciples, and whatever Aristion and the elder John, the Lord’s disciples, were saying (λέγουσιν). For I did not think that information from books would profit me as much as information from a living and surviving voice.” (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.3-4).

The language of Papias is similar to the second century Gnostic Basilides. Basilides claimed that he was the disciple of Glaucias, who was the interpreter of Peter (Clement, *Strom.* 17.7).

However, he was more than likely using the Petrine aspect found in Papias as a counter to what was already known in Alexandrian circles, that Mark was the interpreter of Peter.⁸³

Furthermore, it is more than likely that Basilides used the template from Papias as an apologetic motive, since Papias seems to be talking of a time previous to the completion of his writings. Therefore, if Basilides was writing in the early second century, then it is far more likely that he was using the work of Papias than the other way round. In addition, the various traditions recorded in the second century on Basilides, calls into question as to whether Glaucias, being the ‘interpreter of Peter’, is valid. Irenaeus connects Basilides with Simon Magus and Menander (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.24.3-70, whereas the Basilidians believed their teachings had come from the apostle Matthias (Clement, *Strom.* 7.108).⁸⁴ Thus, Papias was

⁸² Allison and Davies, *Matthew*, 1:12.

⁸³ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 237-238. Dunn, *Neither Jew nor Greek*, 752.

⁸⁴ See Michael F. Bird, “Mark: Interpreter of Peter and Disciple of Paul”, in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences* ed. Joel Willitts and Michael F. Bird (London: T & T Clark, 2011), 61.

not appealing to eyewitness testimony for apologetic or theological reasons and was in fact trying to show that he was writing history.

The ambiguous part of the Papias fragment is the separation of John the Elder and Ariston from Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John and Matthew who are all classified as the disciples of Jesus when on earth. Bauckham notes that the distinction lies between the aorist “ἔπεν” and the present “λέγουσιν”.⁸⁵ Bauckham furthers his interpretation stating that at the time which Papias is speaking, he seems to refer to Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John and Matthew as already dead and could only learn from the elders on what these disciple taught, where as John the Elder and Ariston were still alive and teaching – somewhere other than Hierapolis – and Papias could learn from their disciples.⁸⁶ The problem is if Papias had written his work in the early second century and two disciples of Jesus were still living, that would make them very old and implausible to believe that they were actually eyewitnesses to Jesus. Thus, Bauckham has pointed out that there is a distinction between the time Papias is writing from and the time at which he is writing.⁸⁷ Therefore, the time to which Papias refers to most of the disciples of Jesus being dead, but two were still living, is the time about which Papias writes, which is in the late first century when Matthew and Luke were/or had been written.⁸⁸ As a result, Papias was in a position to question and listen to the disciples who were witnesses’ to John and Ariston, meaning his information falls into the category of Oral History, which was to seek eyewitness testimony to record fact.⁸⁹ However, as will be shown, Papias’ information is not always reliable.

(d) Papias Reliability

It has already been identified how Papias’ statement on Matthew’s gospel being originally written Hebrew is questionable. Yet it does not get any easier when assessing the traditions that he derives back to Jesus; his account is as follows:

“When the just rise from the dead and reign; when also the creation renovated and freed will abundantly produce a multitude of all foods out of the rain from the heaven and the fertility of the earth: as the presbyters who had seen John the Lord’s disciple remembered hearing from

⁸⁵ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 15-17.

⁸⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 15-17.

⁸⁷ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 17-20.

⁸⁸ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 18

⁸⁹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 31. See also, Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (London: James Currey, 1985), 12-13 and Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating our pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 87. Vansina and Tonkin have convincingly demonstrated how oral history is more reliable than oral tradition, since it is based upon eyewitness testimony or when a literate work is written during the time of living memory, when eyewitness testimony could be obtained.

him how the Lord used to teach about times and say, The days will come when vines come up each with ten thousand branches and on each branch ten thousand twigs and on each twig ten thousand shoots and on each shoot ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed will give twenty-five measures of wine. And when one of the saints picks a cluster, another will shout, “I am a better cluster; pick me, bless the Lord through me.” Similarly a grain of wheat will produce ten thousand ears, and each ear will have ten thousand grains, and each grain ten pounds of pure flour; and the other fruits and seeds and herb in like proportions; and all the animals, using those foods which are taken from the ground, will become peaceful and harmonious, subject to men with all subjection.

This is what Papias, hearer of John and colleague of Polycarp, a man of ancient times, attests in writing in the fourth of his books, of which there are five in all.” (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 33.3-4)

The similarities between the Papias tradition above and other Jewish apocalyptic work of the era are striking (2 Bar 29.5b, 1 En. 10.18-19). However, it is not as simple as making the accusation that Papias is indebted to Jewish/Christian millennium apocalyptic thought, as has been suggested.⁹⁰ Papias’ remark “Similarly a grain of wheat will produce an abundance of food of all kinds from the dew of heaven and from the fertility of the earth” seems to be exegetically dependant on Genesis 27.28.⁹¹ Dennis MacDonald has persuasively argued that the Greek word lying behind “abundance” found in both Irenaeus and the LXX is *πληθος*, a translation of the Hebrew *רִב*, associated to the Palestinian Aramaic word for “Myriad” or “ten thousand”.⁹² Therefore, the eschatological tradition should be seen in light of Genesis 27.28. Moreover, It is possible that Jesus’ reference in Mark, that he would not drink wine again until he was in the kingdom of God with his disciples (Mark 14.25), Jesus turning water into wine (John 2.1-12), and the style of the parable of the mustard seed (Mark 4.30-32) was interpreted and expanded upon by Papias against other material - this material being Jewish apocalyptic work of the era.⁹³ Interpreting sayings in light of other material was not uncommon to the Gospel of John.⁹⁴ Thus, it is unconvincing to associate with Papias with merely copying from other apocalyptic works of the time. However, although Papias may be expanding upon other sayings, compressing them and expanding upon them to form Jesus, the Synoptics nor even Paul and John portray Jesus as some who held to a millennium

⁹⁰ See David E. Aune, Jesus, *Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 241.

⁹¹ Dennis R. MacDonald, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias’s Exposition of Logia about the Lord* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 27.

⁹² Macdonald, *Shipwrecked Gospels*, 27.

⁹³ See William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark’s Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing plc, 2015), 207.

⁹⁴ See Richard Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 108. See also, Helmut Koester, *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (New York: Walter deGruyter, 2000), 185.

apocalyptic belief. Thus, it is very unlikely that Jesus actually said the tradition recorded in Papias.

To sum up, the Papias fragment of a utopian eschatology, demonstrates that the Jesus traditions that came from Papias are not necessarily *ibbismm vox*, and that he transformed Jesus into something that he is not, by compressing and expanding upon certain sayings to make Jesus fit his own theology/philosophy. Although Papias may claim to record eyewitness testimony, the way he then shapes the traditions demonstrates that he cannot always be trusted. Thus, to trust Papias' traditions, other independent sources must agree with Papias.

(e) Matthew, Mark and Luke

The external evidence in relation to Papias and authorship is very ambiguous, since there is no clear evidence that Matthew originally wrote in Hebrew or that Jesus ever taught a utopian theology. However, there are other solid external reasons for accepting that Mark and Luke were the authors of the second and third gospels. As already reiterated in 2.4, the early church not choosing eyewitnesses or more prominent figures as the authors - especially when other gospels coming on the scene were assigning eyewitnesses as their authors - makes no sense unless historically true. Thus, it is plausible to assert that Mark and Luke wrote the second and third gospel.

In regards to Matthew, it is unclear as to who wrote the first gospel of the New Testament, since the evidence is so ambiguous.

Although there are good reasons to assert that Mark and Luke were in fact the authors of the second and third gospel, it does not mean they are reliable. Mark and Luke being non-eyewitnesses means they must have used sources for their narratives. Similarly, since the author to the first gospel cannot be identified, understanding where the Jesus traditions come from has to be evaluated.

2.5 Sources

In modern scholarship, the two source hypothesis has become one of the leading methods in regards to the sources of the Synoptics.⁹⁵ According to this hypothesis, Matthew and Luke used the earliest gospel Mark, a lost sayings gospel (Q), along with M (Unique literature to

⁹⁵ See, Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 131.

Matthew) and L (Unique literature to Luke) to construct their narratives.⁹⁶ However, this approach has been criticised. Mark Goodacre argues that Luke used Matthew as his source; thus, dispensing with Q.⁹⁷ Although there are very good reasons to believe that Matthew and Luke used Mark as a source, I will not be critiquing whether or not Q exists and to what extent it exists in this part of the thesis. I will be mainly analysing the arguments put forward by Richard Bauckham in his book *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* and as to whether there is any internal evidence that the gospels used eyewitness sources, since Bauckham's arguments have shed new light on how to view the origins of the gospels and their sources. Furthermore, I will also look into the external evidence through Papias, to evaluate his statement as to whether Mark used Peter as a source (Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 3.39.15).

(a) Internal Evidence

Bauckham has proposed a term that he himself has created called *inclusio of eyewitness testimony*, as evidence to show how Mark and Luke communicated their source(s) to their audience.⁹⁸ In relation to Mark's gospel, Bauckham's argument is built around how Peter features in the story. He argues how Peter (original name being Simon until being changed by Jesus) is the first disciple named following the outset of Jesus' ministry (Mark 1.16-18) and also the last character mentioned at the end of the gospel (Mark 16.7).⁹⁹ Furthermore, Bauckham states that Peter/Simon is named 26 times throughout Mark's gospel, more than any other individual bar Jesus.¹⁰⁰ Therefore, Bauckham argues that Mark places Peter at the beginning and end of his gospel and involves Peter in much of the narrative to indicate that he was the main source.¹⁰¹

Bauckham also defends his *Petrine inclusio* in light of the other three gospels that also frequently mention Peter. Bauckham rightly states how Peter is not mentioned as frequently in Matthew and Luke as in Mark.¹⁰² However, as Bauckham rightly points out, the ratio of Peter being mentioned to the amount of words narrated in John's gospel is greater than the ratio of Mark's use of Peter.¹⁰³ Bauckham recognises that John, like Mark, placed Peter at the

⁹⁶ Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (Tennessee: B&H Publishing Group, 1992), 28.

⁹⁷ Mark S. Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 58-62.

⁹⁸ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 124-172.

⁹⁹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 124-125.

¹⁰⁰ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 125-126.

¹⁰¹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 125-126.

¹⁰² Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129.

¹⁰³ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129.

beginning and end of his gospel to also function as an *inclusio of eyewitness testimony*.¹⁰⁴ However, Bauckham persuasively argues that an anonymous disciple (the beloved disciple) and Andrew are named before Peter at the beginning of the gospel (John 1.40).¹⁰⁵ Similarly, towards the end of John's gospel, the last time Peter and the beloved disciple are mentioned, the beloved disciple is this time named after Peter (John 21:22-23).¹⁰⁶ Thus, Bauckham argues that John, respecting the *Petrine inclusio*, develops his own *inclusio* of the beloved disciple; therefore, including the *Petrine inclusio* into that of the *inclusio* of the beloved disciple.¹⁰⁷

In regards to Luke's gospel, Bauckham argues that Luke indicates the woman as his main source through the *inclusio* device.¹⁰⁸ Bauckham backs up his argument by demonstrating how the women are introduced into the account very early in the Galilean ministry (Luke 8:2-3), where as Matthew and Mark do not refer to the women until later on in their respective gospels (Matt 20:20, Mark 15:40).¹⁰⁹ Bauckham furthers his argument, stating how Matthew and Mark refer to the women at the cross, where as Luke reserves the information about the women towards the end of the story, when the women visit the empty tomb (Luke 24.10).¹¹⁰ Bauckham also illustrates how Luke, like John, incorporated the *Petrine inclusio* into his own work (Luke 4.38, 24.34).¹¹¹ Thus, according to Bauckham, Luke brings the *inclusio* of Peter into the *inclusio* of the women to show respect to the testimony of Peter in Mark's gospel, but to also indicate that the woman were his main source.¹¹²

Bauckham defends his theory by arguing how the *inclusio of eyewitness testimony* was used by other biographers. He provides two examples, the *Life of Alexander* by Lucian of Samosata and the *Life of Plotinus* by Porphyry, which are two biographies that contain similarities to the gospels, in that they are both about a religious individual.¹¹³ Firstly, in regards to Lucian's *Life of Alexander*, Bauckham points out that Lucian claims to have been an eyewitness of Alexander, but for only a small part of his life.¹¹⁴ Therefore, Bauckham asks "But from what source or sources did Lucian gain the rest of his information about

¹⁰⁴ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129.

¹⁰⁵ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129.

¹⁰⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129.

¹⁰⁷ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129.

¹⁰⁸ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 129-131.

¹⁰⁹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 131.

¹¹⁰ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 131.

¹¹¹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 131.

¹¹² Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 131.

¹¹³ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 132-145.

¹¹⁴ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 134.

Alexander?”¹¹⁵ Bauckham argues that the likeliest candidate was the Roman aristocrat and contemporary of Alexander, Rutilianus.¹¹⁶ Bauckham argues that like the *Petrine inclusio* in Mark’s gospel, Rutilianus is the first character to be mentioned bar Alexander, the last to be mentioned by name at the end of the story, and mentioned significantly more than any other person in the narrative bar the subject (Alexander).¹¹⁷ In regards to Porphyry’s life of Plotinus, Bauckham asserts that Porphyry makes it clear that Amelius - a disciple to Plotinus like Porphyry - was a major eyewitness within his story,¹¹⁸ like Rutilianus, Bauckham states how Amelius is the first character to appear in the story, mentioned for the final time at the end of the story after the death of Plotinus and is also made known than any character bar the subject (Plotinus).¹¹⁹ Thus, Bauckham states, that although Porphyry was also a source to the narrative, he use the *inclusio* device to make his readers aware that Amelius was a main source.¹²⁰

Bauckham’s analysis on the *inclusio of eyewitness testimony* device in Mark and Luke is highly persuasive, especially when compared to other biographies. Thus, Bauckham’s theory is evidence to eyewitness testimony behind Mark and Luke. However, Bauckham’s *inclusio* device has not been accepted by all scholars and has been criticised.

Fin Daamgard finds the *inclusio of eyewitness testimony* device proposed by Bauckham as unconvincing, asserting that the fact Mark mentions Peter at the beginning and end of his story, is probably indicative of the important role Peter has in Mark as a character and not as

¹¹⁵ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 134.

¹¹⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 136. In addition, Bauckham proves some background to Rutilianus that he was consul in 146, a propagandist for Alexander, married Alexander’s daughter and Lucian claimed to have known Rutilianus personally and advised him against the marriage. See also Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth and Esther Eidinow, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 59. Hornblower asserts that Rutilianus as the source for Alexander is generally based on the fact that Alexander personally knew Rutilianus.

¹¹⁷ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 136.

¹¹⁸ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 141-142. Bauckham notes that although Porphyry used Amelius as a source, he also personally knew Plotinus. Thus, to make people aware that he was no lesser student than Amelius he would bracket Amelius and himself (“Amelius and I”) or would state “we”, to indicate joint status as the disciples closest to Plotinus.

¹¹⁹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 144. See also Paul Kalligas, *The "Enneads" of Plotinus* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014), 6. Kalligas has pointed out how Amelius was a major witness to parts of Porphyry’s biography, especially the first years Plotinus taught in Rome. Kalligas also mentions how other minor characters such as Eustochius, who witnessed the illness and death of Plotinus, was the source for Porphyry (2.12, 13 and 29). What is interesting is how Porphyry mentions Eustochius as a personal friend and doctor when giving the account of Plotinus’ death (7.4). Thus, it is plausible that minor characters and witnesses are mentioned when an author has used them as source for something they did not witness themselves. See also, Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 283-285. Bauckham discusses this regarding minor characters in the synoptics, such as Bartimaeus being the participant and source for Mark in relevance to his sight being regained.

¹²⁰ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 144.

the source of the tradition.¹²¹ However, Bauckham seems to address this by showing how Amelius and Rutilianus are major eyewitnesses to Lucian and Porphyry's biographies of their given subject. The similarities between the structure of Amelius, Rutilianus, the beloved disciple, the women and Peter within the works already mentioned is striking and seems to follow a similar pattern.

Eric Eve disagrees with Bauckham's theory, since Jesus is clearly the most popular character and not Peter in Mark's gospel.¹²² The problem with Eve's response is it does not reflect Bauckham's argument. Bauckham is reflecting upon the most popular character mentioned throughout the biography bar the subject, and how these characters are placed at the beginning and end of the biographies. Furthermore, Eve argues that Mark narrates the events from Jesus' point of view and not that of Peter.¹²³ Eve's response, although interesting, is not persuasive. Plutarch in his *Life of Caesar*, most likely uses Asinius Pollio as a source from chapter 13 onwards and mentions him as a direct witness to some of events during Caesar's life (32.7). Nevertheless, Plutarch does not tell v32.7 from the perspective of Pollio, but from the view point of Caesar.¹²⁴

Stephen Patterson doubts Bauckham's arguments, illustrating them as dubious and not in line with recent works on the style of Mark's gospel.¹²⁵ Patterson finds it difficult to understand why Mark did not use the "we" perspective?¹²⁶ Furthermore, Patterson finds it difficult to understand why the gospels in general do not claim to write in the first person like the Gospel of Thomas or as those who witnessed a revelation from Jesus, like the Apocryphon of James or John.¹²⁷ However, in his response, Bauckham persuasively argues how Patterson does not take into account the literacy devices of ancient historiography and biography, since Ancient Greek and Roman biographies (genre of the gospels) rarely quote themselves from the first person, even when using eyewitness sources.¹²⁸

¹²¹ Fin Daamgard, *Rewriting Peter as an Intertextual Character in the Canonical Gospels* (London: Routledge, 2015), 19.

¹²² Eric Eve, *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 145.

¹²³ Eve, *Behind the Gospels*, 146. Eve quotes Jesus' curse of the fig tree (Mark 11: 12) as an example of Mark telling the story not from Peter's point of view but from Jesus' point of view.

¹²⁴ Christopher Pelling, *Plutarch Caesar: Translated With Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 45.

¹²⁵ Stephen J. Patterson, "Can You Trust a Gospel? A Review of Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 203.

¹²⁶ Patterson, "Can You Trust a Gospel," 203.

¹²⁷ Patterson, "Can You Trust a Gospel," 203.

¹²⁸ Richard Bauckham, "In Response to My Respondents: *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* in Review," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 243-244.

The objections to Bauckham's approach are unconvincing. Therefore, Bauckham has demonstrated that there are good internal reasons for Mark and Luke using eyewitness sources. However, in relation to Matthew's gospel, there seems to be no internal evidence that he was dependant on eyewitness sources.

(b) External evidence

Since Papias believed Matthew's gospel to have been written by an eyewitness he does not shed light onto the sources of the gospel and is all together silent in regards to Luke. However, in relation to Mark, Papias did not just illustrate a tradition on the authorship of Mark; he also spoke of Mark's main source, Peter (Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 3.39.15). Although it has been noted that Papias cannot always be trusted, it is improbable to believe that based on the internal evidence pointing to Peter as the main source that Papias just made up that Peter was behind the second gospel. The sources (the Elders) of Papias were most likely aware of the *inclusio* device in Mark's gospel, or knew from their own knowledge and communication with the other eyewitnesses.

(c) Matthew, Mark, and Luke

The sources for Matthew's gospel go as far as what has already been discussed generally in scholarship.¹²⁹ However, Richard Bauckham's *inclusion of eyewitness testimony* demonstrates the strong internal evidence for Mark and Luke being dependant on eyewitness sources. Furthermore, in relation to Mark, the external evidence (Papias) is consistent to the *Petrine inclusio* in Mark, that Peter was the eyewitness behind Mark's gospel. However, it should not be assumed that Mark and Luke were solely dependent on eyewitness testimony.¹³⁰ Although the sources to the Synoptics has been analysed, how the Synoptics used their sources to construct their narratives is another question.

2.6 Use of Sources

Christoper Pelling has provided some examples of how Plutarch shaped his material in his biography of Julius Caesar, so that it told the story and conveyed the interpretations from

¹²⁹ It has already been noted that Matthew was most likely dependant on Mark, and as will be demonstrated in chapter 4, he was also dependant on multiple oral and written sources.

¹³⁰ It has already been noted that Luke was also dependant on Mark, and as will be shown in chapter 4, Luke like Matthew, was also dependant on multiple oral and written sources.

what he wanted to express to his audience.¹³¹ Some of these examples can be applied to how the authors of synoptic shaped their material:

1. **Chronological compression/Telescoping:** A comparison of Matthew and Mark's account on the exorcism of the gentile woman's daughter (Mark 7:24-30 and Matt 15:21-28), demonstrates how Matthew has compressed the story of the exorcism that is found in Mark, and at the same time expanded on the dialogue between Jesus and the gentile woman. Matthew compressed Mark's account to fit what he desired necessary, which meant expressing more on the dialogue.
2. **Transfer of actions from one character to another:** In the healing of the centurion's servant there is a contradiction between Matthew and Luke on who sends the centurion's servant. Luke states how the centurion sends some elders of the Jews to Jesus to ask him to heal his servant (Luke 7:1-10). However, Matthew narrates the story by having the centurion himself go to Jesus and make the request in person (Matt 8:5-13). Seeing as though Luke and Matthew would have used a similar source for constructing their accounts, it seems as though Matthew simplifies the narrative by transferring what one character said and placed it on another.
3. **Creation of a context:** Luke in his infancy narrative tried to be a clever historian, by making the theological and novelistic infancy narrative twined into an historical narrative. Luke's reason for Joseph and Mary's return to Bethlehem is because of the world census, where all were to be registered to his own town. (Luke 2:1-4) Although many difficulties exist with Luke's census, one striking problem is the census was supposedly for the entire Roman world (οἰκουμένην) and each person had to go to their ancestral home. However, there here is no such statement made in any Greek, Roman or Jewish source.¹³² It would seem implausible to assert that a single world census would not be mentioned in any other source, since it would have severe economic effects, especially if everyone had to go their ancestral home.¹³³ Therefore, the Lukan census was most likely an invention to get Jesus to be born in Bethlehem to fulfil prophecy.¹³⁴

¹³¹ Adapted from Pelling, *Plutarch Caesar*, 56-58. C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's Adaptation of His Source-Material," *JHS* 100 (1980): 131. See Maria Teresa Schettino, "Use of Historical Sources" in *A Companion to Plutarch*, ed. Mark Beck. (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 425-426. Schettino asserts how Plutarch used a wide range of material from the historians when constructing his lives of individuals; adapting his material in accordance with his aim to portray the moral character of the individual.

¹³² Fredrick James Murphy, *An Introduction to Jesus and the Gospels* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 331.

¹³³ Murphy, *Jesus*, 331.

¹³⁴ Murphy, *Jesus*, 331.

4. **Differences of interpretation:** Jesus' teaching that a prophet lacks on honour in his hometown, seems to be interpreted differently in Matthew and Mark (Matt 13:57-58, Mark 6:4-5). Mark states "Then Jesus said to them, Prophets are not without honor, except in their hometown, and among their own kin, and in their own house. **And he could do no deed of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them.**" (Mark 6:45), where as Matthew, Jesus states "And they took offense at him. But Jesus said to them, Prophets are not without honor except in their own country and in their own house. **And he did not do many deeds of power there, because of their unbelief.**" (Matt 13:57-58). Matthew has interpreted the story differently to Mark, since he has abbreviated and eliminated any possibility that Jesus could be viewed as less than master of the situation.¹³⁵

Similarly to Plutarch, and other ancient historians and biographers, the gospel authors shaped their material to tell a story that fitted their interpretations as believers in Jesus. This is not to then assume they are not telling history, but as Byrskog has rightly pointed out, history and story are entwined together- the story is told as history, and the history is told as story.¹³⁶ Thus, the gospels are not just repeating what they have heard or have read, but they are also re-interpreting and editing the history to fit their story.¹³⁷

2.7 Oral Transmission and Memory

To know what is historical, one must also interact with how individuals and groups remember the past. Antony Le Donne rightly notes:

"Like water, it is impossible to hold the past in our fingers. What we "save" from the current is not past, but something else; the past cannot be preserved. What is left in the wetness of our palms is an impression of what was once there. Memory is the impression left by the past, not the preservation of it. In memory, we do not re-experience the past. What we experience is the impact left by the past."¹³⁸

¹³⁵ W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 2 (Edinburg: T & T Clark, 1991), 460.

¹³⁶ Byrskog, *Story as History*, 256-265.

¹³⁷ Byrskog, *Story as History*, 176-189.

¹³⁸ Anthony Le Donne, *The Historical Jesus: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It?* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011), 24.

Memory is not just about remembering; memory requires perception, perception requires interpretation and thus memory requires interpretation. Our minds do not merely preserve data about the past. We remember through the interpreted and reinterpreted ever changing present.¹³⁹

How we remember certain words in the past may change in the present, yet we view the present into the past. Anthony Le Donne provides an excellent modern example of how this memory distortion may take shape. Le Donne states that a person who believes a certain milkshake to not be classified a pudding is caused based upon a perception in his social environment.¹⁴⁰ However, Le Donne states, if this person was to visit England, and over extended period the social group and environment he was now in, referred to the milkshake as pudding, it is not hard to imagine that when referring back to the past, he associates the milkshake with pudding.¹⁴¹ Therefore, remembering the past can be affected by the present and the social environment.

Maurice Halbwach's who formed the term 'collective memory' asserts how the past is remembered based upon the present and the social setting from one is within.¹⁴² Although Halbwach's view of memory is persuasive, his radical claim that one can only remember within a social content is not.

Barry Schwartz, a modern day scholar on collective memory, in contrary to Halbwach's, asserts how the past also shapes our understanding of the present.¹⁴³ Schwartz has persuasively argued how different perceptions of Abraham Lincoln had developed through time and varying communities. Schwartz states that during the life of Abraham Lincoln, most people could find something that they disliked about him, mainly due to the civil war itself.¹⁴⁴ Lincoln's antislavery campaign and the rights of blacks were treated separately, a far cry from what would today be deemed morally acceptable.¹⁴⁵ The view of Lincoln being 'great' was not really perceived until it was latched onto by publicists in the First World War to portray him as a great role model, to propagate courage, honour and freedom into the

¹³⁹ Le Donne, *Jesus*, 24-25.

¹⁴⁰ Le Donne, *Jesus*, 27.

¹⁴¹ Le Donne, *Jesus*, 28.

¹⁴² Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38, 183.

¹⁴³ Barry Schwartz, "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," *ASR*, 56 (1991): 221-222.

¹⁴⁴ Barry Schwartz, *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of Memory* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 31.

¹⁴⁵ Schwartz, *Lincoln*, 3-5.

American people. Thus, Schwartz has persuasively identified how the memories of Lincoln had been shaped by the needs of the social context of the present, but also the past shaped the understanding of the present.

What can be identified is that groups and individuals remember the past differently, yet recognise the consistencies between their own and others memories. Collective memory presumes the ability to share, discuss and negotiate.¹⁴⁶ However, although memory and its role in remembering differ from various groups and individuals, the constant relation between the past and the present can also lead to false memories.

(a) False memories

Most people today will understand the frailty of memory; yet the way we socialise with each other and talk to each other demonstrates it is vital to what we experience and remember. Daniel L. Schacter defines false memories as “recollections that are distorted or, in extreme cases, involve remembering events that never happened”.¹⁴⁷ Elizabeth Loftus who has written extensively on eyewitness testimony, has argued how eyewitnesses testimony is not always accurate. Loftus illustrates an example of gunmen who shot down a bodyguard and cashier. However, the problem – as Loftus points out - is there were varying statements from eyewitnesses on who the gunmen were.¹⁴⁸ Loftus continues, stating that when the police had initially arrested two suspects, four of five eyewitnesses were unconvinced on the identification of the gunmen and testified to having limited visual contact of the gunmen at the shooting.¹⁴⁹

What is remarkable is Loftus then states how the eyewitnesses went from being so unsure about the identification of the two gunmen, to being absolutely convinced that they had got the right people.¹⁵⁰ The contradictory statements on the identifications of the eyewitnesses, to then four of five eyewitnesses who then believed the two suspects to be the gunmen is an example of false memory, memories that did not happen, but what the eyewitness imagined and then placed into reality. Furthermore, Judith Redman rightly points out that “While eyewitness accounts provide useful information about what happened, many factors can

¹⁴⁶ Rafael Rodriguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory; Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text* (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 47.

¹⁴⁷ Daniel L. Schacter, *The Cognitive Neuropsychology of False Memories* (East Sussex: Psychology Press Ltd, 1999), 124.

¹⁴⁸ Elizabeth F. Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 1-2.

¹⁴⁹ Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony*, 1-2.

¹⁵⁰ Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony*, 2.

influence both how accurate and how complete any account might be. What happens at the time of the event and afterwards can affect the accuracy and completeness of the account”.¹⁵¹

Richard Bauckham has defended memory through his use of re-collective memory.

Bauckham asserts how flashbulb memories from an autobiographical perspective are largely enough reliable.¹⁵² However, psychological experiments have demonstrated that flashbulb memories are not entirely accurate. Stephen R. Schmidt produced an experiment on the vivid imagery of individual testimonies on the September terrorist attacks on the world trade centre (911). 493 individuals were chosen, and were given a questionnaire on September the 12th.

211 of the original 493 individuals completed the questionnaire again in November.

Peripheral questions such as what did you have for lunch, and central questions such as what were you doing were asked in the questionnaire. 100% of students recalled central and peripheral vivid details on the event on the first memory test. In November 83% were still able to give these details. However, the accuracy from the participants was considerably weak. Only 47% of students were able to recall what they had stated on their first memory test in September.¹⁵³ Thus, contrary to the assertion made by Bauckham, flashbulb memories can also be unreliable.

Bauckham rightly asserts that we are more likely to remember unique/unusual events.¹⁵⁴

However, although the event may be remembered, the details and we then process them in our memory through time is not always the case. Loftus' example of the robbery is a unique event for the eyewitnesses; yet the detail of identifying of the robber by the eyewitnesses changed throughout time.

What this has demonstrated is memory can be distorted, either we forget the details as time goes on, or the present distorts how we remember the past. However, does the evidence of false memories have any bearing on the Jesus traditions?

(b) Oral Societies and Memory

¹⁵¹ Judith C. S. Redman, “How Accurate Are Eyewitnesses? Bauckham and the Eyewitnesses in the Light of Psychological Research,” *JBL* 129 (2010): 190.

¹⁵² Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 330.

¹⁵³ Stephen R. Schmidt, *Extraordinary Memories for Exceptional Events* (London: Psychology Press, 2012), 51-53.

¹⁵⁴ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 341.

The examples provided by Schmidt and Loftus on false memories are modern day examples. However, Jesus was a teacher and his disciples were learners from their teacher,¹⁵⁵ whereas the people witnessing the robbery in the example provided by Loftus are not learners of the robbery.

The early church was obsessed with eyewitness testimony, even outside the gospels. Paul in his letter to the Corinthians speaks of receiving traditions from what is most likely eyewitness testimony (1 Cor 11:23, 1 Cor 15:1, 1 Cor 7:4). Although the eyewitnesses could not be everywhere, the Christian church communities that were set up by Paul, wanted Paul's message to be consistent to what was being taught by the eyewitnesses (Gal 1: 1-24). Furthermore, Luke states how he received his material through eyewitnesses (Luke 1:1-2).

The twelve would have recalled and shared their memories of Jesus together during his life and after he had died. Jesus sending them out on mission during his own lifetime demonstrates the importance of making sure that what Jesus said and did was consistent to what he had spoken. (Mark 6:7-12) Furthermore, Jesus spoke in parables that were easily memorable for listeners.¹⁵⁶ Craig S. Keener has persuasively argued how Jewish students would be encouraged to memorise the Torah and would memorise the sayings of their teacher.¹⁵⁷ Burridge provides an example in the Talmud of how students were to not just learn the Rabbis sayings, but also imitate their actions to better understand the Torah.¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, recalling Eugene Lemcio's argument that the Synoptic authors differentiate between pre-Easter terminology and post-Easter terminology for Jesus,¹⁵⁹ it demonstrates that the gospels were not merely affected by the present when recording the past. However, although there was a need to memorise the Jesus sayings, false memories did play its part in the Synoptic tradition

Recalling the examples of Schmidt and Loftus, although their experiment and examples are not prime comparisons to Jesus and his disciples, some of Jesus' sayings and events in the Synoptics, when compared to one another, contain discrepancies that could be explained through memory. For example, Jesus' sermon in Mathew and Luke contain discrepancies.¹⁶⁰ However, what is interesting is how in both sermons the gist of the event is

¹⁵⁵ Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 149.

¹⁵⁶ Riesner, "Messianic Teacher," 419.

¹⁵⁷ Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 149.

¹⁵⁸ Burridge, *Imitating Jesus*, 73-74

¹⁵⁹ See Chapter 2.

¹⁶⁰ I discuss in chapter four the discrepancies found between the Sermon the Mount and Sermon on the Plain.

the same. Furthermore, in relation to Loftus' modern example, the eyewitnesses to the robbery remembered the gist of the event, even though they may have differed on the identity of the shooter. Therefore, oral tradition and memory must not be seen as something that is fixed and does not contain variation. As James D G Dunn has put it:

“It is not that there is no originating impulse that gave birth to the tradition. In at least many cases we can be wholly confident that there were things Jesus said and did that made an impact on his disciples, a lasting impact. But properly speaking, the tradition of the event is not the event itself. And the tradition of the saying is not the saying itself. The tradition is at best the witness of the event, and as there were presumably several witnesses, so there well may have been several traditions, or versions of the tradition, from the first. We can speak of an originating event, but we should certainly hesitate before speaking of an original tradition of the event.”¹⁶¹

Werner Kelber rightly asserts how the sayings of Jesus would have had an initial impact on one or more of the original audiences of Jesus.¹⁶² However, Kelber states that it may have been heard slightly different by others of that audience and therefore retold in different versions from the initial stage.¹⁶³ Therefore, if Jesus spoke a saying twice, the first one does not become the ‘original version, and the second does not become a ‘variant’.¹⁶⁴ Each speech is a new way of stating the same saying with the same intention¹⁶⁵

It also must be recalled that the Synoptics were also trying to write history. Jan Vansina has compared different forms of traditions within various genres of literature that has shown that historical traditions are far more accurate, and have less variability than epochs and set speeches. Vansina remarks “Two versions of a historical story told by Gakaniisha (Rawanda) in 1952 and 1957 differ less than the versions of the epic of Alijaga Stoevic.”¹⁶⁶ Thus, oral stories within an oral culture can change over time, but also remain reliable and consistent to its message.

Dunn rightly concludes the following regarding the memories and traditions of the gospels are “the same yet different”.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶¹ James D. G. Dunn, *The Oral Gospel Tradition* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 56.

¹⁶² Werner H. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark Paul and Q* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), 30.

¹⁶³ Kelber, *Gospel*, 30.

¹⁶⁴ Kelber, *Gospel*, 30.

¹⁶⁵ Kelber, *Gospel*, 30.

¹⁶⁶ Vansina, *Oral Tradition*, 53.

¹⁶⁷ Dunn, *Oral Gospel*, 165.

To sum up, memory and its effect on the oral tradition and the historical Jesus is hugely important. Memory proves that it cannot just be assumed that because the Synoptics may have used eyewitnesses that false memories did not become apparent in their traditions.

2.8 Summary

This chapter has demonstrated that it is implausible to speak of the reliability of the gospels in generic terms. Firstly, the authorship of Matthew and whether he used eyewitness sources is inconclusive. Secondly, although there are good reasons to assert that the second and third gospels were written by Mark and Luke (close followers of disciples/apostles) and that they based a much of their gospels on eyewitness testimony, the way sources were used suggests that the gospels are not exactly eyewitness testimony, since at times they re-interpret, edit, and compress the traditions to fit their own story. Furthermore, the Synoptics invent stories for theological reasons to fulfill prophecy, which makes their story coherent and apologetic. Lastly, although memorising saying, actions and events within the Jewish teacher-student relationship is more than likely to be stronger than the modern day examples, inconsistencies can still form in oral societies. However, this is natural, since sayings may be said more than once and in different way; thus, giving rise to varying forms of the same saying. Although discrepancies can arise in oral societies in the transmission process, the study by Vansina demonstrates that the gist of the story remains. Thus, even with the Synoptics, as Dunn has shown, the gist of the similar stories is retained.

This evaluation of the primary sources has also demonstrated that the Synoptics are not trying to write fiction or myth, but trying to tell history. Although their use of sources is not what a modern scholar may want for trying to understand what Jesus said verbatim, they are consistent with the best practise used by historians to write good historiography. Thus, when evaluating sayings that may prove that Jesus wanted to be remembered, the sayings will need to be rigorously critiqued to understand what derives from Jesus.

CHAPTER THREE

ANCIENT REMEMBRANCE: REMEMBRANCE IN GRAECO-ROMAN AND JEWISH LITERATURE

3.1 Introduction

There are many ancient texts that could be analysed to understand the extent to which individuals in the ancient world wanted to be remembered. However, Jesus was a Jew in first century Palestine; therefore analysing the texts which are closer to the gospels and also Jesus, is of most importance to the research question. Firstly, the chapter will investigate remembrance in the Greek and Roman biographies and histories, since first century Roman Palestine had an influence on Jewish thought/culture and that the gospels fall into the genre of Greek and Roman biography. Secondly, Second temple Jewish literature will also be analysed to understand ancient Jewish figures and remembrance. Lastly, investigate God and remembrance in the Old Testament.

The different sets of literature (Graeco-Roman and Jewish) will look into three aspects of ancient remembrance: firstly, the author of the works or groups that wanted to remember an individual, secondly, individuals that wanted their lives to be remembered and lastly, individuals that wanted their lives to be a distant memory.

The main aim of this chapter is to demonstrate that many individuals wanted their memory to be preserved. However, it is to also demonstrate that it should not be taken for granted that everyone wanted to be remembered, but there were individuals who wanted to be forgotten.

3.2 Remembrance in Graeco-Roman Literature

(a) Individuals That Wanted Their Life to be Remembered

In Plutarch's biography of Julius Caesar, Julius Caesar compares himself to Alexander, which leads him to make an indirect claim to remembrance. He understood that Alexander at his own age had conquered many nations, but he (Julius Caesar) had not done anything memorable (Plutarch, *Caes.* 11.6.) Thus, Julius Caesar's indication that he lacked memorable achievements indirectly demonstrates that he wanted to be remembered.

There is good a reason to believe that Cicero wanted to be remembered, Howard Williams's states:

"For Cicero, when writing to his friend Lucceius, text was king. Cicero speaks of his desire to be remembered and his hope that posterity will talk of him. The best way to achieve this immortality, at least in the context of this letter, is a history outlining Cicero's achievements to be written by Lucceius".¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ Howard Williams, *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies* (New York: Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).

Suetonius illustrates a comment made by Augustus and how he wanted to be remembered because of his self-belief in transforming Rome, “I found it of brick, but left it of marble” (Suetonius, *Aug.* 28.22-23).¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, nothing is more convincing than his list of achievements on bronze tablets, placed in front of the mausoleum as evidence that Augustus wanted to be remembered.¹⁷⁰

Verginius Rufus believed his memory was to be preserved on his grave. According to Pliny, Rufus himself had stated that the divine and immortal action of his life should be recorded upon his own tomb, containing vindication of himself for the saving of Rome (Pliny. *Ep.* 6.10). Thus, the inscription is a statement of achievement for people to then remember him, similar to that of Augustus and the mausoleum.

Horace, in his third book of Odes, states how a statue was built in his image through what he had achieved (Horace, *Carm.* 3.30). Horace admirably describes the monument being more lasting than bronze (Horace, *Carm.* 3.30). Horace believed that he would not completely perish and his memory would live on (most likely because of his statue).¹⁷¹

The evaluated literature in this section demonstrates that various figures in the Graeco-Roman world wanted to be remembered and how certain memorials were therefore created or built to try and preserve their memory. However, it should not be assumed that everyone wanted to be remembered.

(b) Individuals That Wanted Their Life to be a Distant Memory

Nepos in his biography of his teacher Atticus illustrates an interesting encounter he had with Atticus, where Atticus rejected the erection of a statue built in his image (Nepos, *Att.* 3.2). Nepos never states that the statue is to be associated with the memory of Atticus. However, it is plausible to conclude that the statue would have related with honouring Atticus, as

¹⁶⁹ Josiah Osgood, *Claudius Caesar: Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 171. Josiah Osgood rightly states that Augustus wanted to be remembered as a builder, wanting others to live up to his example

¹⁷⁰ Suna Güven, “Displaying the Res Gestae of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All Author(s),” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57 (1998): 30. Sune Güven illustrates further: “Although the original inscription is lost, the purpose and the intended location are explicitly stated in introduction to a copy in Ankara: ‘A copy is set out below of ‘The Achievements of the Divine Augustus, by which he brought the world under the empire of the Roman people, and of the expenses which he bore for the state and people of Rome’; the original is engraved on two bronze pillars set up at Rome. Composed entirely in the first person, it presented the life of Augustus the way he wished to be remembered.”

¹⁷¹ See also, Greg Woolf, “Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire,” *JRS* 86 (1996): 25. Woolf asserts “Monuments, the Ode implies, if they lasted long enough and were prominent enough, would preserve the fame of the commemorated, acting like mnemonics to trigger memories and perhaps speech.”

monuments/statues were usually built to preserve the memory of an individual, as Nathan Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx note:

“A fundamental feature of the Roman republican cultural memory, then, is the “monumental memory” developed in the third and second centuries, the arrangement and evolution of this core area of cultural memory, i.e, the public spaces in the centre of the city, the temples and altars, statues, and other images of all kinds, as well as the semantics of the symbolism and the messages and stories contained therein. In the cityscape of *memoria* in stone and (some) marble that was Rome, the heroes mentioned above, who made its history, were permanently on display and thus, in the full sense of the word, omnipresent. They and their memorable deeds and achievements were the core and kernel of Rome’s monumental memory; they colonized the public spaces of the city through all kinds of memorials, such as buildings and victory monuments, dedications of spoils and statues, in particular on the Capitol, in the Comitium and the Forum.”¹⁷²

Therefore, it is conceivable that Nepos is rejected remembrance of himself. One explanation for this is that Atticus could have simply rejected the notion of being remembered specifically by stone, since Atticus came through the Platonic school believing that it is the soul who thinks/wills and not the man.¹⁷³ However, according to Nepos, Atticus also rejected any funeral pomp. (Nepos, *Att.* 22.4) Funerals were a way of reflecting, remembering, and honouring the dead.¹⁷⁴ Therefore; it is plausible that Atticus rejection of the sculpture and funeral pomp is not merely rejecting his memory being preserved by stone, but indirectly stating that he did not want to be remembered.

Although Atticus did not want to be remembered, Nepos through his eulogy characterized Atticus as a moral example, which provides a good incentive that Nepos wanted to remember Atticus (Nepos, *Att.* 15.1; 11.1). Thus, Nepos’ life of Atticus is evidence of an individual that did want to be remembered and yet his contemporise still wanted his memory to be preserved.

Porphry’s biography of Plotinus is another example of an individual (Plotinus) that wanted their memory to be forgotten once they had died. Plotinus rejected the opportunity to have a sculpture made of him, as he was ashamed to be in/have a body and material impression (Porphry, *Plot.* 1-2). Plotinus rejection of material impression - like Atticus – is most likely due to his theory comprising of expression and an immaterial soul. Plotinus believed that the soul cannot take on, or have material impression, because it is not material and impressions

¹⁷² Nathan Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx, *A Companion to the Roman Republic* (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2011), 482.

¹⁷³ See, Edward W. Warren, “Memory in Plotinus,” *CQ*, 15 (1965): 252 – 260.

¹⁷⁴ See, Nigel Wilson, *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece* (London: Routledge, 2006), 204.

cannot fulfill or explain the soul's expression of its objects.¹⁷⁵ Thus, it is plausible to assert, that like Atticus, Plotinus rejection of the sculpture is evidence that he did not want to be remembered. However, what is bizarre is Porphyry stresses that Plotinus wanted his work (the *enneads*) to be arranged in orderly fashion by Porphyry. This demonstrates that an individual that wanted their words to be remembered does not necessarily mean that they wanted their life to be remembered. Thus, in relation to historical Jesus studies, scholars who have identified that Jesus wanted his words to be remembered (see chapter 1.4), does not necessarily mean he wanted his life to be remembered.

Although Plotinus did not want to be remembered, Porphyry, like Nepos, wanted to still preserve the memory of his subject, as he tells his readers that his biography explains Plotinus' philosophical achievements (Porphyry, *Plot.* 9-10; 14) and he also seems to support the idea of a sculpture being designed in the image of Plotinus (Porphyry, *Plot.* 1).¹⁷⁶

The importance of Atticus and Plotinus, especially in relation to the Jesus remembrance question, is that it proves individuals wanted to be forgotten but at the same time their closest followers and relatives wanted them to be remembered. Thus, it cannot just be assumed that because Jesus' followers wanted his life to be remembered, that Jesus himself wanted his memory to be preserved.

3.3 Remembrance in Second Temple Jewish Literature

(a) Individuals That Wanted Their Life to be Remembered

In Josephus *Antiquities*, Herod had a vision to be remembered through building the temple. The temple, which was described by Josephus as glorious and perfect, was to serve as a memorial for Herod, so that his memory would be everlasting (Josephus, *Ant.* 11.1-4).¹⁷⁷

Josephus' autobiography is an example of a Jew who wanted to be remembered through achievements.¹⁷⁸ Josephus boasts how he came from a noble family. (Josephus, *Life* 1.1-11) He states how people would marvel at his ability to develop his learning. (Josephus, *Life* 2.1-4) He boasts of his knowledge at such a young age, since he was able to understand the sects of Judaism (Josephus, *Life* 2.5). Thus, Josephus way of praising and boasting of himself

¹⁷⁵ R. A. H. King, *Aristotle and Plotinus on Memory* (Berling: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 115.

¹⁷⁶ It has already been demonstrated that monuments and statues were a way of reflecting upon and preserving the memory an individual.

¹⁷⁷ Herod's own method to preserve his memory is similar to that of Augustus, since Herod believed that the building of a temple would act as a visual reminder; therefore, preserving his memory amongst his people.

¹⁷⁸ Josephus wanting to be remembered through his achievements is similar to that of Augustus and Julius Caesar.

demonstrates that he wanted to be remembered for positive reasons that could lead others to emulate him.

In relation to Jesus, although Jewish material is slim in regards to individuals stating that they wanted to be remembered, Herod and Josephus are examples of Jewish figures that wanted to be remembered and initiated a method they believed would preserve their memory. Thus, it demonstrates that Jews wanting to be remembered was not foreign to second temple Judaism.

3.4 Remembrance in the Old Testament

(a) Evidence That God Wanted to be Remembered

Remembrance in the Hebrew Bible mainly occurs directly to God. Remembrance of God's acts of deliverance in the Exodus is repeated throughout the Hebrew Bible; more than any other subject.¹⁷⁹ This is mainly due to the Passover and the festival of unleavened bread, since these two religious festivals were celebrated annually by Jews and served as a memorial to remember God delivering them from Egypt:

“The Lord said to Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, This month shall mark for you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year for you. Tell the whole congregation of Israel that on the tenth of this month they are to take a lamb for each family, a lamb for each household. If a household is too small for a whole lamb, it shall join its closest neighbour in obtaining one; the lamb shall be divided in proportion to the number of people who eat of it. Your lamb shall be without blemish, a year-old male; you may take it from the sheep or from the goats. You shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month; then the assembled congregation of Israel shall slaughter it at twilight. They shall take some of the blood and put it on the two doorposts and the lintel of the houses in which they eat it. They shall eat the lamb that same night; they shall eat it roasted over the fire with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Do not eat any of it raw or boiled in water, but roasted over the fire, with its head, legs, and inner organs. You shall let none of it remain until the morning; anything that remains until the morning you shall burn. This is how you shall eat it: your loins girded, your sandals on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and you shall eat it hurriedly. It is the Passover of the Lord. For I will pass through the land of Egypt that night, and I will strike down every firstborn in the land of Egypt, both human beings and animals; on all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments: I am the Lord. The blood shall be a sign for you on the houses where you live: when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague shall destroy you when I strike the land of Egypt. **This day shall be a day of remembrance for you. You shall celebrate it as a festival to the Lord;** throughout your generations you shall observe it as a perpetual ordinance. Seven days you shall eat unleavened bread; on the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses, for whoever eats leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day shall be cut off from Israel. On the first day you shall hold a solemn assembly,

¹⁷⁹ See also, Benjamin G. Wold, “Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Exodus, Creation, and Cosmos,” in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium*, ed. Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 212; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 49.

and on the seventh day a solemn assembly; no work shall be done on those days; only what everyone must eat, that alone may be prepared by you. **You shall observe the festival of unleavened bread, for on this very day I brought your companies out of the land of Egypt: you shall observe this day throughout your generations as a perpetual ordinance.**” (Exod. 12.1-17)

The author of Exodus 12 indicates just how central the Passover and the Exodus is to memory and the theme of remembrance.¹⁸⁰ Thus, as highlighted above, through the elements of the Passover meal and the seven-day festival of unleavened bread, God wanted the Jews to remember what he done for them in Egypt.

3.5 Summary

The examination of remembrance in the Graeco-Roman and Jewish literature has demonstrated that individuals who wanted their memory to be preserved was of importance. However, it seems as though remembrance is spoken more often in the Graeco-Roman literature than Jewish literature. This is most likely due to much of the Graeco-Roman biographies crossing into the genre of encomium, and Romans being uncertain regarding the afterlife.¹⁸¹

The many various memorials to preserve memory and how it is spoken of in the various literatures mentioned above, proves the importance of this investigation. Firstly, both Graeco-Roman and Jewish literature confirms that individuals wanted to be remembered. Secondly, the biographies of Atticus and Plotinus demonstrate that some individuals in the ancient world wanted to be forgotten; yet their followers still wanted their memory to be preserved.

The silence in the Jewish literature on individuals wanting to be forgotten may cause one to then assume that Jesus would have wanted to be remembered. However, there is only a small pool of second temple Jewish literature of individuals who spoke of preserving memory. Thus, it should not be assumed that Jesus wanted to be remembered.

The analysis also highlighted the many forms of memorials individuals would use to initiate remembrance of themselves or others: Monuments, architecture, achievements, autobiographies, memorial meals and biographies. This demonstrates that there was usually

¹⁸⁰ See, Wold, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 49.

¹⁸¹ Penelope J. E. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 120. Davies notes: “For a society whose beliefs about an afterlife were pessimistic if admittedly uncertain, this form of immortality may have offered the possibility of greater performance than any glided promise of a hereafter, and for many the most obvious way to construct a living memory was through a funeral monument.”

always something formed or created to imply a remembrance theme. Thus, in relation to Jesus and remembrance, it is plausible to assume that when answering the question as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered, he would have most likely created some form of memorial for his remembrance.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NEW LAW AS A MEMORIAL AND REMEMBRANCE OF JESUS

4.1 Introduction

The last chapter highlighted that an individual wanting to be remembered was about their names being printed in history. This would most likely be through a memorial that was created for the purpose of the individual wanting to be remembered and thus forecasting their memory to be preserved. The attention will now turn to Jesus and evaluate as to whether he wanted to be remembered through his teachings on the Law.

In the Old Testament, the Law was first given to Moses by God on Mount Sinai (Exod 19:20-25), which was to be upheld and practised by all Jews. However, the Law was not just something to be merely practised, but was to also serve as a memorial and method for remembering God's deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt (Num 15:40-41; Exod 13:9). Furthermore, this also seems to be upheld during the time of Jesus, as Josephus similarly expresses the importance of recalling God and the benefits (Law) that he bestowed upon the Israelites, due to their deliverance from Egypt (Josephus, Ant. 4.212). The Law was therefore dictated by God as a practise that served as a remembrance for his actions in Egypt, which also continued to be valued and upheld during the time of Jesus. This then serves as a premise to ascertain as to whether Jesus, like God in the Old Testament, also wanted to be remembered through his teachings on the Law.

We will propose that Jesus imitated God giving of the Law on Mount Sinai by contradicting and intensifying some of its aspects and thus creating new laws. Furthermore, it will demonstrate that Jesus was not just reiterating these new laws on the authority of God – similar to Moses – but on his own authority and dictating them as commandments, placing them on equal status to that of the words of God in the Old Testament. Thus, this chapter will argue that Jesus' new Laws serve a similar premise to that of God in the Old Testament, which was to also serve as remembrance. Therefore, through Jesus' new laws he wanted to be remembered.

To prove the hypothesis true, the chapter will initially seek to identify as to whether Jesus was in fact contradicting or intensifying the Law, since it would seem unlikely that if Jesus was reaffirming all of its aspects that he was creating anything new.¹⁸² Two laws that will be evaluated, is Jesus' teaching on oaths (Matt 5:33-37) and retaliation (Matt 5:38-42; Luke 6:27-30). Secondly, we will ascertain the historicity of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain, since Matthew places Jesus' teachings on oaths and retaliation on a mountain and similarly with Luke in regards to retaliation.¹⁸³ Thirdly, the chapter will ascertain as to whether Jesus' teachings on the Law in Matthew and Luke's Sermon on the Mount/Plain was dictated on his authority, or if he was merely re-iterating the Law as a messenger. Lastly, we will collate and evaluate the evidence to understand if there are historical reasons to suggest that Jesus wanted to be remembered through the Law. Furthermore, if the evidence does indeed suggest that Jesus wanted to be remembered, then we will seek to establish how Jesus' remembrance can be compared with God.

4.2 Jesus and the Law

(a) Oaths and Vows

The word 'oath' in Ancient Judaism is for an individual/group to call upon God as a witness to the truth of their claim, especially when there is ambiguity surrounding the truth of the statement.¹⁸⁴ Unlike an oath, a vow is addressed directly to God with a gift that is pleasing to him, or alternatively, an individual/group promises to abstain from an object or action.¹⁸⁵ However, both oaths and vows share a common similarity, which is to establish definitive facts in the name of God.¹⁸⁶ The blurry boundary lines between both oaths and vows made it

¹⁸² Some scholars assert that Jesus contradicted or significantly intensified the Law, see John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Volume 4, Law and Love* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 198. N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), 287-296. However, some scholars have disagreed with this line of thought, asserting that Jesus' teachings was consistent with the Law, see James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel: insight from the Law in earliest Christianity* (Journal for the study of the New Testament. Supplement series 266; London : T&T Clark International, 2004), 82-123. E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah : Five Studies* (London: Fortress Press, 2016), 1-134. Geza Vermes, *Jesus in the Jewish World* (London: SMC Press, 2010), 22-30.

¹⁸³ What with be highlighted in the historicity section is that Luke contradicts Matthew and has Jesus teach to the crowds and disciple in the vicinity of a mountain.

¹⁸⁴ John P. Meier, "Did the Historical Jesus Prohibit All Oaths? Part 1," *JSHJ* 5 (2007):179.

¹⁸⁵ Meier, "All Oaths," 179. See also Jacob Neusner, *Comparative Hermeneutics of Rabbinic Judaism, The, Volume Three: Seder Niziqin* (New York: Academ Studies in the History of Judaism, 2000), 305-306. Neusner highlights many other differences between oaths and vows within the rabbinical literature: Firstly, an oath was public where as a vow was private; secondly, an oath is governed by the Law of the torah, where as a vow is not; thirdly, an oath cannot be made the transgresses the commandments of the Torah, where as taking a vow can concern various aspects of Jewish life and Law.

¹⁸⁶ Neusner, *Rabbinic Judaism*, 304-305.

incredibly difficult to differentiate both terms in Ancient Judaism.¹⁸⁷ Thus, when attempting to find parallels to Jesus' view of oaths in Jewish texts – unless fundamentally clear – examples of both oaths and vows needs to be considered.

Jesus during his famous Sermon on the Mount states that oaths are not to be practised, but a simple yes or no is sufficient (Matt 5:33-37). Oaths are spoken of throughout the Old Testament¹⁸⁸ and unlike certain practises, such as divorce, which is permissible if the husband no longer favours his wife (Deut 24:1), few examples exist in the Torah where oaths are mandatory.¹⁸⁹ Thus, when trying to assert that Jesus was a Law abiding Jew, serious problems arise, as John Meier rightly asserts:

“One sees immediately the larger problem posed by Jesus' supposed prohibition of oaths. To prohibit all oath-taking was not only to abrogate an institution permitted by the Law, as in the case of divorce. Prohibiting oaths unavoidably involved abrogating individual commandments in the Torah that enjoined oaths in specific situations. To be sure, these were commandments of casuistic rather than apodictic Law. Nevertheless, they were commandments of the written Torah.”¹⁹⁰

Moreover, even within second temple literature, oaths continued to be upheld. Ben Sirah frequently speaks directly against the immorality of profanities (Sir.23.9-11). Meier rightly notes that the *Damascus Document* illustrates how oaths are to be fulfilled within the Qumran community.¹⁹¹ Furthermore, Meier states how the Qumran documents illustrate how oaths are dealt with between two individuals in a private setting, without any authority of the community being present.¹⁹² Meier also asserts that the Essenes refer to the solemn oaths that

¹⁸⁷ See, Meier, “All Oaths,” 180. Meier states that in two OLD TESTAMENT texts 2 Samuel 3:35 and Psalms 132:1-5 there is practically no distinction between the oath and the vow. Furthermore, Meier express how Inside the Temple Scroll found at Qumran, the vocabulary and content for the oath and the vow is interweaved; therefore, making both terms seem identical (11QTemple 53.9–54.5). Moreover, Meier asserts that Josephus speaks of κοῤῥῶν as an oath in Apion 1.22 §167; however, in his Antiquities 4.73, Josephus treats κοῤῥῶν as a vow.

¹⁸⁸ See, Meier, “All Oaths,” 179. Meier has provided examples of the various types of oaths within the OLD TESTAMENT that Jesus prohibits: “An assertory oath solemnly affirms—with God as the speaker's witness—the truth about some past or present event, action or state of affairs: e.g., ‘I did not commit adultery’ (cf. Num. 5.11-31) or ‘I am not in possession of the stolen goods’ (cf. Exod. 22.6-12). A promissory oath refers instead to some future action or state of affairs: e.g., ‘I will fulfil your commission by journeying to a foreign land and arranging a marriage for your son’ (cf. Gen. 24.1-9).”

¹⁸⁹ See, Meier, “All Oaths,” 181. Meier provides examples when oaths are compulsory: “Especially prominent are (i) the oath taken to attest a person's innocence and therefore to absolve him of the obligation to pay damages after animals entrusted to his care have died or suffered injury (see Exod. 22.9-10 [ET 22.10-11]); and (ii) the oath administered by a priest to a wife suspected by her husband of adultery (see Num. 5.11-31).”

¹⁹⁰ Meier, “All Oaths,” 181.

¹⁹¹ See, Meier, “All Oaths,” 184. Meier quotes the *Damascus Document* as his evidence, with every binding oath that anyone imposes upon himself should be fulfilled as sanctioned by the Torah (4Q271 fragment 5, Column 2, line 8-10).

¹⁹² See Meier, “All Oaths,” 184. Meier quotes the Qumran manuscript as evidence (CD 15.1-4; 9.8-12).

accompanied entrance into the community.¹⁹³ Philo seems to prohibit swearing, due to its inanity and suspicion of one being untrustworthy (Philo, Decalogue 84). However, he still expresses that keeping an oath is still a second best option (Philo, Decalogue 84). Thus, to Philo, as long as God is not called upon to witness a lie, then an oath is by no means unlawful (Philo, Decalogue 85).

The above underlies the significance of oaths and vows in second temple Jewish thought and its importance for God as its witness. Thus, Jesus seems to be contradicting the law on Oaths. However, not all scholars are convinced.

(b) Objections to the View that Jesus Contradicted the Law on Oaths

Jonathan Klawans, in his response to Meier's article on oaths, has made an intriguing comparison with Ben Sirah and Jesus' statement on oaths. Klawans asserts that Ben Sirah prohibits oaths, because they lead to sin if deceitfully used under the name of God.¹⁹⁴ However, in his response to Klawans, Meier provides a convincing response, stating that Ben Sirah is merely prohibiting multiplication of oaths and false oaths.¹⁹⁵ Thus, it is plausible to assert that Ben Sirah does not prohibit oath taking.

James Crossley has argued that the avoidance of oaths in ancient Judaism was not perceived to be in conflict with the Deuteronomy 23:22.¹⁹⁶ However, Crossley fails to identify that the preceding verse to Deut 23:22 states how one should not abandon a vow that is made to God (Deut 23:21); thus, the context implies that oaths are acceptable within the Torah. Furthermore, Crossley also appeals to Philo and Josephus, stating how both authors portray the Essenes as abstaining from oaths.¹⁹⁷ Crossley recognises that Philo and Josephus are in error regarding the Essenes perspective on oaths; however, what is important to Crossley, is they both could appeal to the Essenes abstinence of oaths – which would have been controversial - yet did not speak negatively of the community.¹⁹⁸ Crossley's argument is persuasive, but does not take into account the aim of Josephus' writing and the context of Philo. Josephus frequently speaks of actions and beliefs in a neutral tone even when contrary

¹⁹³ Meier, "All Oaths", 184. Meier quotes the Qumran manuscript as evidence (1QS 1.18–2.19; CD 15.5-13).

¹⁹⁴ Jonathan Klawans, "The Prohibition of Oaths and Contra-scriptural Halakhot : A Response to John P. Meier," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 45-46. Klawans quotes Sir.23.9-11 as his evidence.

¹⁹⁵ John P. Meier, "The Historical Jesus and Oaths: A Response to Donald A. Hagner and Jonathan Klawans," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 55.

¹⁹⁶ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 102. Crossley basis his argument on Deut 23:22.

¹⁹⁷ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 102. Crossley references Philo, *Every Good Man is Free* 84; Philo, Decal. 84; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.135.

¹⁹⁸ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 102.

to his own personal agenda.¹⁹⁹ In regards to Philo, he does not seem to state that the Essenes prohibit oaths, but recommended that care should be taken when avoiding them.²⁰⁰

To conclude, the objections to the position that Jesus' statement on oaths contradicted the Law are unconvincing. Thus, it seems reasonable to assert that Jesus' teaching on oaths was contradictory to the Law given by God in the Old Testament and also Jewish beliefs in second temple literature. Thus, Jesus was creating a new law on oaths.

(c) Retaliation

Jesus' teaching on retaliation (Matt 5:38-42; Luke 6:27-30), like oaths, also appears to contradict an aspect of the Law given to the Israelites on Mount Sinai. In Exodus 21: 23-25, concerning retaliation, we read "If any harm follows, then you shall give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." However, when we read the *lex talionis* in Matthew and similarly in Luke, Jesus seems to intensify this Law.

Matt 5:38-42	Luke 6:27-30
"You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' But I say to you, Do not resist an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also; and if anyone wants to sue you and take your coat, give your cloak as well; and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go also the second mile. Give to everyone who begs from you, and do not refuse anyone who wants to borrow from you.	"But I say to you that listen, Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. If anyone strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from anyone who takes away your coat do not withhold even your shirt. Give to everyone who begs from you; and if anyone takes away your goods, do not ask for them again.

In comparison to the Exodus account where you are to give what is required, Jesus seems to argue that you are to give more than what is required of you. Thus, in Matthew and Luke, Jesus has significantly intensified the law on retaliation. Furthermore, Craig Keener has persuasively argued that Jesus seems to contradict the Law in Matthew 5:40 and Luke 6:29. Keener states that many peasants had only one outer cloak;²⁰¹ thus, to give it up would lead to

¹⁹⁹ Josephus' remarks on Jesus contain no personal/subjective opinions within the passage that may reflect negatively on Jesus or Christians (Josephus, Ant. 18.64).

²⁰⁰ See, Dan G. McCartney, *James* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 245.

²⁰¹ Keener, *Matthew*, 198. Keener quotes Hom. *Od.* 14.513-14 and Babrius 131.10-11 as his evidence.

nudity, which was considered dishonourable in a Jewish Palestinian Society.²⁰² Keener states further, that the cloak which formed a double bedding at night, was according to the Torah unpermitted to be taken from a poor man overnight.²⁰³ Thus, Keener argues that Jesus is demanding his followers to give up the one possession that the Law legally protects from being seized.²⁰⁴ Thus, it is plausible to assert that Jesus intensified the law on retaliation, but also contradicted certain aspects. However, like oaths, not all scholars are convinced that Jesus contradicted the law on retaliation.

(d) Objections to the View that Jesus Contradicted the Law on Retaliation

James Crossley depicts Jesus as not contradicting the position of the Torah in regards to retaliation, but simply opposing an interpretation of Exodus 21:24.²⁰⁵ Crossley states that there are various interpretations of the *lex talionis* in ancient Judaism.²⁰⁶ Therefore, Crossley portrays Jesus as opposing the violent/literal interpretation of Exodus 21:24, similar to that of Josephus, who opposes the violent view of the *lex talionis*, in favour of settling through financial compensation.²⁰⁷ Crossley's analysis is highly persuasive for understanding the various interpretations of Exodus 21:24; However, financial compensation is never mentioned by Jesus and he does not seem to be opposing the violent interpretation of Exodus 21:24, since he asserts that if one is to strike you on the cheek then turn the other (Matt 5:39; Luke 6:29).²⁰⁸ Furthermore, the perspective of Jesus is not revenge or payback in any form; it is for the believer to give more than what is expected.²⁰⁹

To sum up, Crossley's objection to the position that Jesus' statement on retaliation contradicted the Law is unconvincing. Thus, it seems reasonable to assert that Matthew and Luke's Jesus intensifies and contradicts Exodus 21:24 and second temple Jewish customs.

²⁰² Keener, *Matthew*, 198. Keener quotes Gen 3:7, 10-11; 9:22; Jub.3:21-22, 30-31; 7:8-10, 20; 1QS 7.12 as his evidence.

²⁰³ Keener, *Matthew*, 198. Keener quotes Exodus 22:26-27 and Deut 24:12-13 as his evidence.

²⁰⁴ Keener, *Matthew*, 198. Moreover, Keener asserts that if pressed literally, Jesus' view on retaliation as a whole implies that his followers should not take anyone to court.

²⁰⁵ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 102.

²⁰⁶ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 103. Crossley quotes Josephus who gave two interpretations, one being a literal interpretation that accepts bodily maiming, and the other being a metaphorical interpretation that accepts financial compensation. (*Josephus Antiquities*. 4.280) Crossley gives an example from the book of Jubilees with a more literal interpretation (*Jubilees* 4.31), where Cain killed Abel with a stone; therefore Cain was also killed with a stone. Crossley then gives examples from rabbinic literature, where the financial compensation interpretation seems to be more popular (*Neof.Exod.21.24*).

²⁰⁷ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 103.

²⁰⁸ See Craig A. Evans, *Matthew* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 131.

²⁰⁹ Craig A. Evans, *The Bible Knowledge Background Commentary: Matthew-Luke*, Vol. 1 (Colorado: Victor, 2003), 118-119. Evans makes an interesting comparison to Jesus and Seneca (De Ira 2.34.1-5).

(e) Summary

The above analysis demonstrates that Jesus in Matthew and Luke contradicted and intensified the law on retaliation and oaths. Although, there have been convincing responses, there seems to be more evidence and more persuasive reasons to come to the conclusion that Jesus contradicted the law on oaths and retaliation. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Jesus was continuously a law breaker, as many of his teachings are in fact consistent with the Law.²¹⁰ Thus, these new laws taught by Jesus are intertwined into the Law as a new set of practises. However, this does not necessarily mean that the teaching on oaths and retaliation can be traced back to the historical Jesus.

4.3 Historicity

Both Matthew and Luke include Jesus' teaching on some aspects of the Law in the vicinity of a mountain. However, problems arise when comparing the two accounts.

Stanley Porter has recently asserted that the variations that exist between the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain prove it likely that Matthew and Luke were speaking of two separate events.²¹¹ Jesus teaching the same saying(s) more than once is probable and should not be discounted. However, the problem with Porter's view is he does not take into account memory theory, oral performance and even literary criticism as another possibility for the variation in the sayings. Memory studies, as shown in chapter one, demonstrates how sayings can change with only the gist of the event being retained. Furthermore, if Matthew and Luke's respective accounts on Jesus' sermon were in fact separate events, then it is very difficult to explain how they both contain similar sayings and actions of Jesus immediately after Jesus had finished his teachings on the mountain.²¹² Thus, the similar sequence of events that followed the Jesus' sermon in Matthew and Luke makes it improbable to come to the conclusion that they were both re-telling two different but similar events.

The variations between the setting of the sermon in Matthew and Luke are not easily resolved. In Matthew, when Jesus notices the crowd, he ascends up the mountain (Matt 5:1). However,

²¹⁰ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 82-123. Although I have found Crossley's evaluation on Jesus' teaching on oaths and retaliation unconvincing, he has persuasively demonstrated elsewhere in his analysis that many of Jesus' teachings were in fact consistent with the Law,

²¹¹ Stanley E. Porter, *When Paul Met Jesus: How an idea Got Lost in History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 139.

²¹² Following Jesus' sermon, Matthew includes the healing of a centurion's servant (Matt 8:5-13), Jesus stilling the storm (Matt 8:23-27) and the healing of the Gadarene Demoniacs (Matt 8:28-34). Similarly, Luke follows Jesus' sermon with the healing of centurion's servant (Luke 7:7-10), Jesus stilling the storm (Luke 8:22-25) and the healing of the Gadarene Demoniacs (Luke 8:26-31).

in Luke, Jesus ascends up the mountain to call the twelve disciples (Luke 6:12-16) and then descends onto a level plain with there being a great crowd in the distance who had come to hear him. (Luke 6:17-19). There is a clear contradiction in terms of the initial stage, did Jesus ascend up the mountain to commence his teachings on the Law or did he descend? Further tension arises as to whether Jesus was on the mountain when he verbally distributed his teachings as in Matthew or off the mountain on a level plain as in Luke. Proposals have been made to harmonize the differing accounts;²¹³ However, this has not proved convincing. Firstly, going up the Mountain (Luke 6:12) would naturally then involve going down and leaving the mountain (Luke 6:17).²¹⁴ Secondly, “level” (πεδινόϋ) in v17 of Luke’s gospel is not stated anywhere else in the New Testament, but frequently used in the LXX in contrast to the hill or country. Thus, Luke most likely intended “level” (πεδινόϋ) to be lower ground adjacent to the Sea of Galilee.²¹⁵ Lastly, if Jesus healed the sick and disabled it would seem unlikely that they were able to walk up a mountain.²¹⁶ Furthermore, there is further ambiguity surrounding whom Jesus is addressing in both Matthew and Luke. Matthew does not specify whether Jesus addresses the crowds or his disciples during his sermon (Matt 5:2). However, in Luke, Jesus states that he is addressing his disciples (Luke 6:20) and the crowd (Luke 6:27).

The contradictions question the historicity of the respective accounts on Jesus’ sermon. However, there are multiple reasons to explain the contradictions. Firstly, it could be that Mathew and Luke redacted their respective accounts. Secondly, their traditions came through a different chain of oral tradition. Thirdly, it could be that Matthew and Luke’s accounts came through the same chain of tradition, but due to memory and how we recall and repeat events, variation occurred. Thus, to understand if Jesus spoke on oaths and retaliation within the setting of a mountain/hill is to analyse the sources.

(a) Retaliation

Both Matthew and Luke contain similar sayings about Jesus’ teaching on the Law. Matthew contains many of these in the Sermon on the Mount, whereas in Luke, some are found in his Sermon on the Plain and others scattered throughout his gospel.²¹⁷ Thus, Luke places Jesus’

²¹³ See, Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1992), 196. Similarly, see also, Benedict Viviano, *Matthew and His World: The Gospel of the Open Jewish Christians: Studies in Biblical Theology* (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2007), 271.

²¹⁴ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:422.

²¹⁵ James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015), 190.

²¹⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:422. See also Robert Horton Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 66.

²¹⁷ For examples see Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 231-233.

teaching on the Law at different stages of his ministry. A major view is that Luke and Matthew used Q as their source for Jesus' sermon.²¹⁸ Scholars, who adopt this hypothesis, answer the stylistic and structural differences through Matthew and Luke's redaction of Q or both authors containing variant versions of Q. Another perspective is Luke was solely dependent on Matthew's Sermon on the Mount;²¹⁹ however, this view is not as well attested in scholarship. Moreover, in more recent studies, Matson and Goodacre - arguing for Luke's sole dependency on Matthew for Jesus' sermon – have asserted that Luke organised Jesus' sayings based upon a topical structure and not chronology.²²⁰ Goodacre and Matson analysis has convincingly demonstrated that Luke had used Matthew's gospel as a source and re-arranged much of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. Thus, it is plausible that Matthew's account is chronologically the more historical account making it probable that if Jesus spoke of retaliation and oaths, it was in the vicinity of a mountain/hill. However, though Goodacre and Matson have rightly demonstrated that Luke used Matthew as a source and re-arranged Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, the comparison between Jesus' teaching on retaliation in Matthew and Luke, calls into question as to whether Luke was solely dependent on Matthew for Jesus' sermon, see table below.²²¹

Matt 5:38-42	Luke 6:29-31
Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. ἐγὼ δὲ	τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγὸνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην , καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ

²¹⁸ See, Ulrich Luz, *Studies in Matthew*, trans. Rosemary Selle (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005), 44-45. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:421. John S. Kloppenborg, Q, *the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (London: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 22-27.

²¹⁹ M.D. Goulder, *Luke-A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; JSNT Supp 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989). J. Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976). E. Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew* (JSNT Supp 92; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

²²⁰ See Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002), 105-120. Goodacre asserts how the combination of Luke 11.2-4, (Matt 6.9-13) and Luke 11.9-13, (Matt 7.7-11) create a coherent unit of prayer, that suitably fits into the context of Jesus' own reference to fatherhood of God (Luke 10.21-22). Goodacre persuasively asserts how Luke omits the antithesis bar Love your enemies, by drawing in the beatitudes, woes and Love your enemies into a coherent structure about persecution. See also Mark Matson, "Luke's rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount," Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000 (Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series, 39; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Series, 2000), 623-50. Matson, similar to Goodacre, asserts how Luke has structured the material found in Matthew according to a coherent context. For reviews on Goodacre, see John S. Kloppenborg, *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 83. Kloppenborg has responded to Goodacre, arguing that the structure of Matthew and Luke cannot be reconciled if one advocates a Lukan dependence on Matthew for Jesus' Sermon. Kloppenborg asserts that it becomes inconceivable to provide an adequate reason to why Luke would have moved Matt 6:22-23 to 11:34-36 in his own gospel. However, it seems Kloppenborg does not adequately represent or respond to Goodacre's line of argument, that the structure of Matthew and Luke's gospel is arranged in accordance with a certain topic and not necessarily chronology. See also Christopher Tuckett, "The Case against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem by Mark Goodacre," *NovT* 46 (2004): 401-403. Paul Foster, "Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?," *NovT* 45 (2003): 313-337.

²²¹ Table adapted from Dunn. See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 232.

λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ’ ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα σου, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον· καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἕν, ὕπαγε μετ’ αὐτοῦ δύο. τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς. ³⁸ “You have heard that it was said, ‘An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’ ³⁹ But I say to you, Do not resist an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also; ⁴⁰ and if anyone wants to sue you and take your coat, give your cloak as well; ⁴¹ and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go also the second mile. ⁴² Give to everyone who begs from you, and do not refuse anyone who wants to borrow from you.	ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης. παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει. καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως. ²⁹ If anyone strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from anyone who takes away your coat do not withhold even your shirt. ³⁰ Give to everyone who begs from you; and if anyone takes away your goods, do not ask for them again. ³¹ Do to others as you would have them do to you.
---	--

Jesus saying on retaliation, as highlighted above, demonstrates the differences in style and vocabulary between both Matthew and Luke.²²² It is plausible to assert that these differences are best explained by their use of multiple sources for constructing their accounts. For example, Matthew’s Jesus states that “if anyone wants to sue you and take your coat (χιτῶνά), give your cloak (ἱμάτιον) as well” (Matt 5:40). However, Luke’s Jesus seems to contradict the sequence of the saying found in Matthew, “from anyone who takes away your coat (ἱμάτιον) do not withhold even your shirt (χιτῶνα)” (Luke 6:29). The best explanation for the differences is best explained through oral sources and not literary dependence or redaction, since details in oral transmission would naturally change.²²³ Based on the evidence that Luke

²²² The Greek brings out much of the differences between Matthew and Luke compared to the English translation (NRSV). See also, Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 303. Tuckett argues that Matthew 5:38-48 is presented as a single unit by Matthew to form his last antithesis. However, for a response to this line of argument, see also, Burridge, *Imitating Jesus*, 215-216. Burridge rightly asserts that Jesus’ separate use of “Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη... ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν” (Matt 5:38-42; 5:43-48) make it likely that Matthew presents Jesus as teaching the last antithesis as two distinct units. Thus, Luke compresses love of enemies and retaliation into one formed saying by Jesus; whereas, Matthew has separated 5:38-42; 43-48 into two separate units.

²²³ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 231-238. Although Dunn seems to accept Q (singular) as a source used by Matthew and Luke for Jesus’ sermon, he affirms that Luke and Matthew were also using separate oral sources, with Jesus’ teaching on retaliation in both accounts being evidence of this.

re-arranged Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (literary dependence) and the details of the sayings found in both accounts of Jesus' teaching on retaliation containing variation (oral dependence), makes it likely that Matthew and Luke used multiple and early sources for constructing their accounts on Jesus' sermon and his teaching on retaliation.

The use of multiple sources by Matthew and Luke, the minor differences in details that can be explained through oral transmission or chronological compression,²²⁴ the fact Luke states he derived much of his information from eyewitness sources (Luke 1:1)²²⁵ and the fact the *lex talionis* was practised but also debated during the time of Jesus, makes it is likely that the teaching on retaliation goes back to the historical Jesus.

(b) Oaths

Matthew is the only source that solely refers to oaths as a saying that derived from Jesus. However, the letter of James also appears to allude to oaths. (James 5:12). James does not explicitly link the teaching back to Jesus, but there are good reasons to believe that James received it from the Jesus tradition.²²⁶ The two accounts are as follows:

Matt 5:33-37	James 5:12
Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὁμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ Θεοῦ· μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστιν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλέως· μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὁμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν. ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναί, οὐ οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν. ³³ “Again, you have heard that it was said to those of ancient times, ‘You shall not swear falsely, but carry out the vows you have made to the Lord.’ ³⁴ But I say to you, Do not swear at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, ³⁵ or by the earth, for it is his footstool, or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of	Πρὸ πάντων δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ὀμνύετε, μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον· ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ Ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ Οὐ οὐ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν πέσητε. ¹² Above all, my beloved,^[a] do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or by any other oath, but let your “Yes” be yes and your “No” be no, so that you may not fall under condemnation.

²²⁴ Dunn, *Jesus remembered*, 233-234.

²²⁵ Bauckham's persuasive analysis as shown in chapter 2, makes it likely that the eyewitnesses were the women followers of Jesus.

²²⁶ See, Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 4:202-204.

the great King. ³⁶ And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make one hair white or black. ³⁷ Let your word be ‘Yes, Yes’ or ‘No, No’; anything more than this comes from the evil one.	
---	--

The variation in the two different accounts, demonstrates that Matthew and James were dependant on either a varying oral source or a varying written source, making it likely that the two accounts are multiply and independently attested.²²⁷

Therefore, since the accounts are early, come through different forms of transmission, and fit into a pre 70AD setting on what was being debated during this time in First Century Judaism,²²⁸ it is likely that the teaching on oaths, like retaliation, goes back to the historical Jesus.

(c) Summary

Based on the evidence in regards to sources, There are very good reasons to therefore assert that the teachings on oaths and retaliation goes back to the Historical Jesus. However, there are also good reasons from a memory and learning perspective that the teachings would have been retained in the early church. Although memory theory has shown that we can have false memories or even just remember the gist of an event/saying or action, memory studies, especially semantic memory seems to support the authenticity of Jesus’ sermon. Semantic memory, which typically reflects strong memory preservation, is usually based on multiple learning.²²⁹ Furthermore, the hippocampus (important component of the brain for the formation of memory) has been identified as being equally active for both unique and repeated events, where the event is personal and emotional to the individual/group.²³⁰ It has already been pointed out that the law was to be practised and remembered by all Jews; therefore, Jesus’ teachings on the Law would have been likewise vital for learning.

²²⁷ Meier, “All Oaths,” 200-204. Meier has persuasively argued that Jesus’ prohibition of oaths is multiply and independently attested, due to the varying but similar traditions of oaths being found in Mathew 5:34 and James 5:12.

²²⁸ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 4:199-200. Meier also rightly notes in regards to oaths, that Jesus’ total prohibition of oaths was in contradiction to what these individuals, groups and even the Torah asserted. Meirs contrinues by stating that even in the earliest stages of the Christian movement, oaths was still not totally prohibited (Rev 10:6; Heb 6:16). Thus, Meier argues that the discontinuity between Judaic customs and early Christian practise of oaths makes it likely that Matthew 5:34 is historical.

²²⁹ Howard Eichenbaum, “An Information Processing Framework for Memory Representation by the Hippocampus” in *The Cognitive Neurosciences*, ed. Michael S. Gazzaniga (London: MIT Press, 2014), 701.

²³⁰ Morris Moscovitch et al., “Functional neuroanatomy of remote, episodic memory,” in *Handbook of Episodic Memory*, ed. Ekrem Dere et al . (London: Elsevier, 2008), 239-270.

Furthermore, the richness of the radical nature of Jesus' perspective on the Law would have been personal and emotional to the disciples, as the Law was something the Jews practised daily and was integral to their daily life.

To sum up, the evidence outlined above demonstrates that the teachings on oaths and retaliation derive from the historical Jesus. Moreover, the identification that Matthew and Luke place Jesus in the vicinity of a mountain when speaking on some aspects of the law, and the evidence outlined in this section that Matthew is the more historically correct chronology makes it likely that Jesus spoke on retaliation and oaths within the vicinity of a mountain/hill.

4.4 Authority of Jesus

Jesus' teachings on the Law makes one question on whose authority he was able to make such claims. His authoritative statement "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) is repeated thirteen times in the Sermon on the Mount.²³¹ Moreover, "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) or "Truly, I say unto you" (Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν) is a common statement made by Jesus throughout the synoptics.²³² A prominent view has been to compare "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) with the messenger-formula in the Old Testament "Thus says the Lord".²³³ However, the formula is in itself absent from use within any early Jewish literature and Jesus attests his authority to be in himself and not in God unlike "Thus says the Lord".²³⁴ Thus, to compare "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) with the messenger-formula is unreasonable without further qualification.

David Aune has persuasively and rightly noted that Jesus' "I say to you" is not unique to Jesus himself and is a mere form of authority onto another.²³⁵ However, some of Aune's examples are tenuous in comparison to Jesus' use of "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν). For example, Aune's illusion to Paul's statement "I say" (λέγω ἐγώ) is unconvincing, since Paul

²³¹ See Matt 5:18, 20, 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; 6:2, 5, 16, 25, 19.

²³² Listed are a few sporadic examples of "ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν" being used in the synoptics: Matt 10:15, 23; 13:17; 18:3; Mark 3:28; 9:1; 10:29; 12:43; Luke 4:24; 6:27; 12:44; 18:29.

²³³ Joachim Jeremias, "Characteristics of the Ippissima Vox," in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and Scott McKnight, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 113.

²³⁴ David Edward Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 164

²³⁵ Aune, *Early Christianity*, 164-165; 392-393. Aune provides various examples in Christian and Jewish literature. Here is just a few listed: John the Baptist in Matthew 3.9, Paul in Romans 11.13; 1 Corinthians 6.5; 15.51; Galatians 5.2; 1 Thessalonians 4.15, Shepherd of Hermes Mandates 4.3.6, Baldas to Job Testament. Job 37.1, Reuben to his family Testament. Reuben 1.7, Isaac to his sons Jubilees 36.11. See also, M. Eugene Boring, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991), 164.

believed that everything he had written was commanded by the Lord (1 Cor 14:34).²³⁶

Furthermore, Aune's appeal to the general use of 'I say' or 'I tell you' that was used to confirm a testimony of an event that occurred as truthful from a non-religious point of view, as in Test.Reuben 1.7, does not correspond to that of a Messianic teacher who asserts authority on religious aspects.

E. P. Sanders compares Jesus' statement with the rabbinical statement 'say' with the legal statement 'and concerning...we say...' illustrated in 4QMMT (4Q394-399).²³⁷ Similarly, Morton Smith has compared Jesus' authoritative statement to rabbinical literature, stating that Jesus is not claiming authority far exceeding that of the rabbis.²³⁸ However, Sanders' and Smith's evaluation is unconvincing. Byrskog has persuasively argued how Jesus' use of "it was said" (ἐρρέθη) is what determined Jesus to then make the proceeding statement "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν).²³⁹ Furthermore, Byrskog rightly asserts how there is no counterpart within the rabbinical or Qumran literature with that of Jesus' use of "it was said" (ἐρρέθη) and then "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν).²⁴⁰ Thus, Byrskog rightly states that it is insufficient to isolate certain elements of Jesus' authoritative saying, and then locate parallels.²⁴¹ Moreover, Byrskog concludes that Jesus' use of "it was said" (ἐρρέθη) to represent the vital point in structurally determining and shaping "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) in the Sermon on the Mount, is a construction that portrays Jesus as teacher with absolute authority over anyone.²⁴² Similarly, David Daube has convincingly identified that the tone of "I say unto you" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) from Jesus is far different to that of any rabbi:

"The tone is not academic but final, prophetic, maybe somewhat defiant. Nor is there any reasoning. The correct attitude is simply stated 'But I say unto you, That whoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement', with no argument *a minori ad maius* or the like. The point is that, in Matthew, we have before us, not a scholarly working out by

²³⁶ See Joseph Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (London: Yale University Press, 2008), 292. Although Fitzmyer's comparison of 1 Cor 7:34 is with Paul's statement 'οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος' in 1 Cor 7:10, the same outcome relates to Paul's statement "λέγω ἐγώ".

²³⁷ E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah : Five Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 93.

²³⁸ Morton Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1956), 27-31.

²³⁹ Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community* (CBNTS 24; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994), 295.

²⁴⁰ Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 295

²⁴¹ Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 296

²⁴² Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 296

some Rabbis of a progressive interpretation as against a conceivable narrow one, but a laying down by Jesus supreme authority.”²⁴³

Thus, Jesus’ “I say unto you” (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν) saying as perceived in the Sermon on the Mount/Plain is to demonstrate how Jesus himself is the ultimate authority on the Law and new laws. In addition to Matthew’s Jesus portraying himself as a teacher with sole authority, Jesus in Matthew believed that his words were of equal status to that of God in the Old Testament, as James D. G. Dunn right states:

“Where the prophet said, The beauty of the earth will fade, ‘but the word of our God will stand forever’ (Isaiah 40.6), Jesus said, ‘Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away’ (Mark 13.31). His words were the foundation for life and basis of final judgement (Matt 7.24-7/ Luke 6.47-9; Mark 8.38/ Luke 9.26).”²⁴⁴

Furthermore, Samuel Byrskog has made an interesting and persuasive case for Matthew presenting Jesus’ teachings as ἐντολή (commandments) in the Sermon on the Mount to denote equal status to that given by God in the Torah.²⁴⁵

To sum up, it is plausible to assert that Jesus thought he had overall authority on the law and these new laws. Furthermore, it seems reasonable that Jesus thought his new laws were on the same par as the Law in the Old Testament. Thus, Jesus thought of his teachings as equal to the status of God.

4.5 Jesus, Law and Remembrance

²⁴³ David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1956), 58.

²⁴⁴ James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1997), 79.

²⁴⁵ Byrskog, *Jesus Teacher*, 291-294. Byrskog states Matthew often uses the term “commandments” (ἐντολή), to denote the status given by God in the Torah. There is a consistent connection between ἐντολή and units depicting Jesus as teacher (19:7; 22:36, 38, 40) or the opponents’ teaching activity (15:3-9). The commandments constitute the normative basis of teaching about legal matters. Matthew regards some of Jesus’ teaching as commandments (Matt 28:20). It is therefore conceivable that the expression “one of the least of “these commandments” refers to some of Jesus’ teaching. Byrskog persuasively argues how Jesus believed that his words in the Sermon on the Mount were also “these commandments” and that it should not just be limited to the Torah. Byrskog states that 7:24-26 is strongly reminiscent of 5:18. However, Byrskog rightly notes that the main difference is that it is the words of Jesus (7:24-26), not the one iota or one stroke of a letter (5:18) that will remain. However, Byrskog asserts that the possibility of a parallel significance of Jesus’ words and commandments emerges from the parallel between God’s word and God’s commandment in 15:3, 6. Thus, Byrskog notes that the implication would be that “these commandments” are actually the words of Jesus contained in the Sermon on the Mount and Matthew thus portrays Jesus’ teaching on the Sermon on the Mount as commandments. Thus Byrskog asserts how Jesus in Matthew’s gospels believes his teachings to be equal to that of God.

Jesus' new law on oaths and retaliation that was dictated on his own authority and within the vicinity of a mountain is evidence that Jesus imitated the story of the God and the Law at Mount Sinai. However, Jesus did not merely mimic the role of God, but of God and Moses. Jesus portrayed the role of Moses, by teaching and dictating the Law within the vicinity of a mountain/hill, but also the role of God, as Law giver and the one who had the up most authority on the Law and new laws. Furthermore, it has already been identified that the Law in the Old Testament was not just to be practised but also to remember God. Therefore, Jesus imitating God's role in the Exodus makes it plausible to assert that Jesus wanted his new laws - which intertwined into the Law – to be practised and now also serve as a remembrance of him alongside God. Thus, it is plausible to assert that Jesus wanted to be remembered similarly to how God in the OLD TESTAMENT wanted to be remembered.

4.6 Summary

This chapter has identified that Jesus taught new laws in the vicinity of a mountain, which he dictated on his own authority, making him a law giver. These actions carried out by Jesus demonstrate that he mimicked the roles of God and Moses giving of the Law in the Old Testament. Thus, seeing as God wanted the Law to be practised but also serve as remembrance of him, it is plausible to assert that Jesus saw his new Laws as not just mere practise, but also to serve as his remembrance.

The main practises put in place by ancient persons to demonstrate that they wanted to be remembered (See Chapter 2) are not similar to how Jesus formed his remembrance. Jesus' imitation of the role of God as law giver demonstrates that the way Jesus aimed to preserve his memory was similar to that of God in the Old Testament.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE LAST SUPPER AS A MEMORIAL AND REMEMBRANCE OF JESUS

5.1 Introduction

The Last Supper is the final aspect to be investigated in this thesis to demonstrate that Jesus wanted to be remembered. It was the final meal of many meals that Jesus had during his ministry which symbolised the final ultimate feast in the kingdom of God.²⁴⁶

²⁴⁶ See Meier, *Historical Jesus*, 1:303. Meier's argument is based upon Jesus' statement that he would never drink wine again until the arrival of the new Kingdom.

The previous chapter on Jesus and the Law demonstrated that Jesus' remembrance mimicked how God placed his remembrance in history, as the Law was not just a mere practice but a memorial towards God as a sign to remember him for what he had done for the Israelites in Egypt. Thus Jesus' new law/commandments were to be practised, but also served as a memorial for the remembrance of his life. This chapter will assert that the Last Supper was intended as a new Passover meal, created by Jesus to form a memorial for his remembrance, and continue in demonstrating that Jesus depicted his remembrance in a manner similar to that of God in the Old Testament, but through Jesus' new Passover.

The main piece of evidence which demonstrates that Jesus wanted to be remembered is his statement related in Paul's letter to the Corinthians and also Luke's gospel "Do this in remembrance of me" (ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν) (1Cor 11:24-25). However, Luke 22:19b-20 is not found in all Lukan manuscripts, as the saying is excluded from some early Western manuscripts,²⁴⁷ which has lead to some scholars to regard the saying as being inauthentic.²⁴⁸ Although some of the arguments for the shorter text are compelling, the many manuscripts from different text types that support the longer reading makes it plausible to assert that Luke 22:19b-20 is original.²⁴⁹ The evidence for a Jew using a religious festival as a memorial for his/her own remembrance seems to be non-existent in Jewish literature during

²⁴⁷ For a list of manuscripts that exclude the saying see Bart D. Ehrman, *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Boston: Brill, 2006), 157.

²⁴⁸ See, B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*, 2nd edn. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886), 295. Westcott and Hort classify Luke 22:19b-20 as a 'Western non-interpolation'. See also, Ehrman, *Textual Criticism*, 157-178. Ehrman's expresses two main points. Firstly, there is difficulty in explaining the origin of the shorter reading. Lastly, Ehrman stresses that Luke does not hold to the belief that Jesus' death was sacrificial but martyrdom. Moreover Ehrman asserts that Luke goes out of his way to ensure that Jesus is represented as a martyr, since when quoting Isaiah 53 he never references the suffering servant being "wounded for our transgressions". Thus, Ehrman concludes that Luke would therefore not include the cup. Ehrman's first objection is persuasive; however, his second objection is less than convincing, as it could then just postulate other beliefs of Luke. For example, Luke's illustration of Jesus' teaching on retaliation, which is only stated once by Luke, if a textual variant existed, then it could make scholars then question if Luke believed Jesus to have spoken so abruptly regarding the Law. Furthermore, Ehrman's second objection fails to explain why Luke excluded the symbolism of the bread? Since "This is my body" does not necessarily mean Jesus' death is for the sins of mankind. See also, D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 155. Parker argues that the shorter reading should be favoured, since the longer version harmonises the wording of both Mark and Paul. Parker's objection is persuasive; however, it is only if you accept that Luke could not have included liturgical words into his account or was not using multiple sources, that Parker's reasoning could be accepted. It has already been demonstrated in this thesis that Luke was aware of and used multiple oral and written sources for constructing his narrative. Thus, it seems perfectly reasonable to accept that Luke could have written the longer reading.

²⁴⁹ See, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X – XXIV: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, 2nd ed., (Garden City: Doubleday, 1986), 1388. In addition, Fitzmyer rightly asserts that the restoration of the two cups forms an easier reading of the Lukan account. See also, Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic words of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 144. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 306.

the second temple period. Jakob J. Petuchowski has challenged this perspective, asserting that Hillel wanted Passover to be in remembrance of himself as well as of God.²⁵⁰ However, Petuchowski's argument is far from convincing, as the more plausible interpretation is that Hillel's followers are the ones who stated that Passover should be in remembrance of Hillel, whereas Hillel wanted the Temple to be remembered.²⁵¹ Thus, Jesus' statement of remembrance through a festival ritual is unique to other figures in second temple Judaism.

The lack of evidence for an individual Jew wanting to be remembered through a religious festival raises the question as to whether "Do this in remembrance of me" is historical. Firstly, Valeriy Alikin argues that the words could be a theological comment introduced into the text/tradition, since it presupposes the custom of drinking the cup.²⁵² However, Alikin's reasoning for the saying to be a theological embellishment is unconvincing, since there are good reasons to assert that Jesus was aware that his death was imminent; therefore, a farewell element to repeat and remember Jesus' life and death is plausible.²⁵³ Secondly, Alikin rightly points out that the remembrance statement of Jesus in Paul and Luke could be a theological addition to the tradition/text, especially since to remember Jesus would have been pivotal to Paul's theme of remembrance (1 Cor 11:2-3). It has been argued that the absence of the memorial passage in Matthew, and Mark could also be argued as the memorial saying being a post-Easter tradition.²⁵⁴ Due to the disputes for the authenticity of "Do this in remembrance of me" (ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν), further analysis needs to be undertaken to understand whether the statement is historical and if Jesus wanted the Last Supper to function for his remembrance.

Two aspects need to be investigated to provide a clear indication as to whether the Last Supper was a memorial for Jesus' self remembrance and "Do this in remembrance of me" (ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν) being historical. Firstly, to evaluate as to whether the Last

²⁵⁰ Jakob J. Petuchowski, "“Do This in Remembrance of Me” (I Cor 11:24)," *JBL* 76 (1957): 296-297.

²⁵¹ Yitzhak Buxbaum, *The Life and Teachings of Hillel* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2008), 301.

²⁵² Valeriy Alikin, *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering: Origin, Development and Content of the Christian Gathering in the First to Third Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 119.

²⁵³ See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 796-797. Dunn has persuasively argued that Jesus' mission was causing tension towards the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem, which would not have been unknown to Jesus; therefore, more than likely, he would be aware of the possibility of arrest and death. Furthermore, Dunn rightly points that Jesus' expectation of suffering most likely grew out of an awareness of the fate of the prophets of the OLD TESTAMENT, who were rejected and killed but also remembered. Dunn also raises the awareness that Jesus would have known of the death of John the Baptist, who was killed by Herod for also causing tension and irritating the customs of those in the upper Jewish hierarchy. See also, E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1995), 258-260; 264-265. Sanders has rightly addressed that Jesus' actions in the temple, which were most likely anti-temple, would have made Jesus well aware of his imminent arrest and death.

²⁵⁴ Howard I. Marshall, *Last Supper & Lord's Supper*, 1st ed. (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005, 1980), 53.

Supper was a Passover meal, since Passover was as memorial to remember God for delivering the Israelites from bondage (Exodus 13:3-5).²⁵⁵ Secondly, to comprehend as to whether the elements of the Last Supper portray a remembrance theme.

5.2 Elements of the Last Supper and Jesus remembrance

(a) “This is My body”

Jesus’ meal began with a blessing of the bread (Matt 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24) similar to the traditional blessing of the bread at Passover.²⁵⁶ Following the blessing, Jesus broke the bread and gave it to his disciples to eat, symbolising his own body as the bread. (Matt 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24).

The breaking of the bread, as a representation of Jesus’ body, can be found in two distinct forms containing minor differences. In Matthew and Mark Jesus blesses (εὐλογέω) the bread, yet in Paul and Luke Jesus gives thanks (εὐχαριστέω) over the bread. However, the differences are minor in understanding the historicity of the passage and whether Jesus wanted to be remembered.

To understand how Jesus’ remembrance might be symbolised through the unleavened bread is to evaluate the role it played in the Old Testament. Unleavened bread in the Torah (especially Passover) was always explained in the context of the remembrance of slavery, the Exodus and God (Exod 12:15-17; Num 28:16-18; Deut 16:3-8).²⁵⁷ Thus, Jesus’ body being

²⁵⁵ Remembrance of God was still at the centre of the festival during the time of Jesus (Joesphus, Ant. 2.317, War. 4. 402).

²⁵⁶ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 609. See also Marshall, *Last Supper*, 21-23. Marshall bases much of his reasoning from the Mishnah (m. Pes. 10.1-5).

²⁵⁷ “Seven days you shall eat unleavened bread; on the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses, for whoever eats leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day shall be cut off from Israel. On the first day you shall hold a solemn assembly, and on the seventh day a solemn assembly; no work shall be done on those days; only what everyone must eat, that alone may be prepared by you. You shall observe the festival of unleavened bread, for on this very day I brought your companies out of the land of Egypt: you shall observe this day throughout your generations as a perpetual ordinance.” (Exod 12:15-17).

“On the fourteenth day of the first month there shall be a Passover offering to the LORD. And on the fifteenth day of this month is a festival; seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten. On the first day there shall be a holy convocation. You shall not work at your occupations.” (Num 28:16-18)

“You must not eat with it anything leavened. For seven days you shall eat unleavened bread with it—the bread of affliction—because you came out of the land of Egypt in great haste, so that all the days of your life you may remember the day of your departure from the land of Egypt. ⁴ No leaven shall be seen with you in all your territory for seven days; and none of the meat of what you slaughter on the evening of the first day shall remain until morning. ⁵ You are not permitted to offer the Passover sacrifice within any of your towns that the LORD your God is giving you. ⁶ But at the place that the LORD your God will choose as a dwelling for his name, only there shall you offer the Passover sacrifice, in the evening at sunset, the time of day when you departed from Egypt. ⁷ You shall cook it and eat it at the place that the LORD your God will choose; the next morning you may

symbolised through unleavened bread can be interpreted as him expressing his own theme of remembrance.

(b) “This is My Blood”

Following Jesus symbolising the bread as his own body, Jesus took a cup and told his disciples to drink from it to symbolise his blood of the covenant (Matt 26:27-28, Mark 14:23-24, 1 Cor 11:25). Jesus' actions with the cup contain similarities to that of God/Moses' establishment of the covenant in the Torah. The cup (most likely containing wine) at the Last Supper (Matt 26:27, Mark 14:23, 1 Cor 11:25) was an integral element of the Jewish Passover (m. *Pesah*. 10.1). Jesus' identification of the cup with “Do this in remembrance of me” (αἴμα μου τῆς διαθήκης) in the three accounts, presents a similar concept to Moses' reference to “the blood of the covenant” (Exod. 24:8). Furthermore, Jesus' image of his blood being “Poured out” (ἐκχυννόμενον) in sacrifice (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20) is similar to the imagery in Exodus, in which the blood of the peace offerings is “thrown against” or “poured out onto” the altar (Exod. 24:6). Both institutions of the respective covenants by God/Moses and Jesus are images of a sacrificial libation of blood, by which the covenant is established and preserved. Thus, Jesus is describing his blood as being “poured out” in conventional terms, just as an ancient Jewish priest “poured out” the blood of a sacrificial animal (Leviticus 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34).²⁵⁸ The only main difference between the Last Supper and Mount Sinai is that the covenant at Sinai was sealed through the blood of animals, whereas the covenant at the Last Supper was inaugurated and sealed through the offering of Jesus' own blood.²⁵⁹ However, this is not to say that there are no differences between the accounts of Jesus and the cup in the respective account of the Synoptics and Paul.

The three accounts contain variations that could lead to varying interpretations of what Jesus may have said during his ritual with the cup. Firstly, a key difference between the Synoptics and Luke/Paul is whether Jesus spoke of “The new covenant” (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25) or “The covenant” (τῆς διαθήκης) (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24). The latter seems to portray Jesus in observance of the covenant through Moses, whereas Paul's Jesus is

go back to your tents.”⁸ For six days you shall continue to eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day there shall be a solemn assembly for the LORD your God, when you shall do no work.” (Deut 16:3-8)

²⁵⁸ Eugene M. Boring, *Mark: A Commentary* (London: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 391.

²⁵⁹ Brad Pitre, *Last Supper* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 95. See also Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2013), 258. In addition to Pitre's comments, Allison rightly states: “Through blood Moses was the mediator of the old covenant. Through blood Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant.”

substituting the Mosaic covenant with a new covenant. James Crossley has proposed that Mark and Matthew give a more plausible and historical account to what Jesus would have said, as Paul's account is highly liturgical and original to Paul.²⁶⁰ However, a new covenant is not foreign to second temple literature, since the Damascus Document found in the Cairo Genizah states how the Essene community had entered into a new covenant (CD^a 6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12). Moreover, the idea of a new covenant is also rooted in the Old Testament (Jeremiah 31:31-34). Thus, Jesus' establishment of the covenant in his own blood is not simply re-confirming the covenant in the exodus account.²⁶¹ Secondly, the synoptics assert the covenant blood to have been "Poured out" (ἐκχυννόμενον) for others (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24). However, Matthew expands on the saying, expressing that Jesus' blood of the covenant was also "For the forgiveness of sins" (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν). The new covenant was a vital aspect for the forgiveness of sin within Jeremiah 31:31-34; thus, it is completely plausible to assert Jesus thought the new covenant in his blood was to forgive sins. Dale Allison has proposed that it is more likely Matthew is alluding to Exodus 24:8 than Jeremiah 31:31-34.²⁶² However, It seems reasonable to assert that Matthew and Mark are both alluding to Exodus 24:8 and Jeremiah 31:31-34, as there is a clear identification of a new covenant in their Last Supper traditions that is most likely derived from Jeremiah 31:31-34.²⁶³ The variations between the accounts are apparent but can easily be reconciled. Understanding that the language of forgiveness of sins through a new covenant was not foreign to Jesus' day - making it plausible to believe it came from Jesus - will help understand whether Jesus symbolised the cup as the blood of the new covenant for the forgiveness of sins as a memorial for his own remembrance.

Jesus' establishment of the new covenant through his own blood is not straight forward for concluding that Jesus wanted to be remembered. The covenant was central to the Exodus narrative, as it represented the freedom that Israelites had to worship God, as Matthew Myer Boulton rightly points out:

²⁶⁰ Crossley, *Mark's Gospel*, 51. Crossley's argument is favoured in trying to demonstrate that Jesus was a law abiding Jew, who never wanted to abolish/contradict the Law of Moses.

²⁶¹ See also, Nicholas Perrin, "The Last Supper," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels 2nd ed.*, ed. Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove: IVP Academic Press, 2013), 496-497. Brant Pitre, *Last Supper*, 96. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 513.

²⁶² Dale C. Allison, *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 474.

²⁶³ Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). 242. Maurice Casey has persuasively identified how in some later Jewish sources the covenant blood and Passover blood together, was the sacrificial ritual for the redemption of the Jewish people out of Egypt.

“The reason given in Exodus 1–15 for Israel’s liberation is not so that they might be unfettered in some abstract sense, but precisely so that they might be free to worship God in the wilderness, and that freedom comes to fruition in the blood ceremony in Exodus 24.”²⁶⁴

Thus, the blood poured out on the altar was to remember God liberating the Israelites from Egypt, his commandments and to worship him as their God (Exodus 24:8-9). There are very good reasons to assert that Jesus believed that his life was a new Exodus.²⁶⁵ Therefore, it is plausible to assert that Jesus’ cup ritual, symbolising a new covenant in his blood for the forgiveness of sins, was to serve as a memorial for the remembrance of Jesus’ death on the cross but also his life as the new Exodus.

5.3 Last Supper and Passover

The elements of the Last Supper clearly indicate that Jesus symbolised his own remembrance. However, to gain further clarification on the matter, and provide further evidence to Jesus’ remembrance is to understand if the Last Supper was a (new) Passover meal.

The Synoptic gospels clearly indicate that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. (Mark 12:16; Luke 22:7-13; Matt 26:17-19). Thus, some scholars have continued to observe that that the Last Supper was a Passover or new Passover meal.²⁶⁶ However, some scholars, though recognising that the gospels identify the Last Supper as a Passover meal, come to the conclusion that Jesus’ final meal was more of a general Jewish festive meal.²⁶⁷

(a) Objections

Scholars who doubt the Last Supper as a Passover meal have made some interesting points that need to be addressed before asserting the Last Supper was in fact a (new) Passover meal.

²⁶⁴ Matthew Myer Boulton, “Supersession or Subsession? Exodus Typology, the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover Meal,” *SJT* 66 (2013): 26.

²⁶⁵ For a persuasive analysis on Jesus viewing his life as a new Exodus, see Boulton, “Exodus Typology,” 25-27. See also, Allison, *New Moses*, 97, 198-201. Although Allison does not necessarily discuss if Jesus himself saw his life as a new Exodus, he has convincingly demonstrates that this was the thought of early Christians and Matthew’s Jesus. See also, Jindřich Mánek, “The New Exodus in the Books of Luke,” *NovT* 2 (1957): 8-23. See also, Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus and Mark* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 221-256.

²⁶⁶ See Jeremias, *Eucharistic words*, 41-61, Wright, *Victory of God*, 555-558. Marshall, *Last Supper*, 75-75. Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 297-299.

²⁶⁷ Scot Mcknight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005), 260-265. Gerd Theissen and Annette Metz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (London: SCM, 1998), 426-427. Jonathan Klawans, “Was Jesus’ Last Supper a Passover Sedar?” *Biblical Review* 17 (2001) 24-33.

1. The bread eaten at Passover was unleavened bread (ἄζυμος) (Exod. 12:15-17), yet the Synoptics use the term bread (ἄρτος) for the breaking of bread. Thus, it has been argued that if Jesus' final meal was a Passover meal with his disciples, unleavened bread would have been eaten and not leavened bread.²⁶⁸ However, ἄρτος can mean unleavened bread; Josephus and Philo simply used the term ἄρτος for unleavened bread (Josephus, Ant. 3.142; Philo, Spec. 2.161). Furthermore, the LXX also translates unleavened bread as ἄρτος (Exodus 29:2; Leviticus 2:4; Numbers 4:7).²⁶⁹
2. In the early Christian communities, the Last Supper was celebrated weekly (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2; Revelation 1:10), whereas Passover was celebrated annually. This has often been used as a basis for the Last Supper not being a Passover meal.²⁷⁰ However, the evolution of the Eucharist in Paul and Acts can easily be explained by Jesus' final meal being a new Passover, based around the death of Jesus and not a mere copy of the Jewish Passover.²⁷¹
3. A major doubt to the Last Supper being considered a Passover meal is the chronological differences between John and the Synoptics. John seems to believe that Jesus' final meal with his disciples was the day before the Passover meal, (John 13:1-2) and therefore a day earlier than the Synoptics. Some scholars have favoured the chronology of John over the Synoptics due to greater plausibility; therefore, concluding that Jesus' final meal was not a Passover meal.²⁷² Attempts have been made to harmonise the Johannine and Synoptic chronology. Annie Jaubert has attempted to resolve the contradiction through calendar differences, asserting that Jesus and his disciples followed the solar calendar of the Qumran community, whereas the Pharisees and Sadducees followed a lunar calendar.²⁷³ However, the problem with such a theory is there is no evidence in the gospels that Jesus followed a different

²⁶⁸ Mcknight, *Jesus and His Death*, 269.

²⁶⁹ See Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 436.

²⁷⁰ Eugene M. Boring, *An Introduction to the New Testament: History, Literature, Theology* (Louisville: WJK, 2012), 142. See also Geza Vermes, *Christian Beginnings: From Nazareth to Nicea* (London: Yale University Press, 2013), 75.

²⁷¹ See also Hugh Anderson, *Gospel of Mark* (London: Oliphants, 1976), 308.

²⁷² Helen K. Bond, *The Historical Jesus: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: T & T Clark, 2012), 148. Bond 's reasoning for favouring Johannine and Pauline Christology is shaped by what she advocates as historical inconsistencies in the Synoptics: Jesus being arrested on the very night of Passover, no mention of bitter herbs and the lamb during the Last Supper meal, and the difficulty for Joseph of Arimathea to have bought a linen shroud. See also, Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 772-773. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:428-429. Raymond E. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 2 vols. Anchor Bible (NJ: Doubleday, 1996), 555-556. John D. Crossan, *Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 547-548.

²⁷³ Annie Jaubert, *Date of the Last Supper* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1965).

calendar to the official calendar of the chief priests.²⁷⁴ Had Jesus followed the Qumran calendar, it would have made an excellent opportunity for the Jewish leaders to question him on his observance, especially when the solar calendar of Qumran would have been judged as illegal.²⁷⁵

D. A. Carson has attempted to harmonise John and the Synoptics, asserting that “Now before the festival of the Passover” (Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα) in John 13.1²⁷⁶ relates to the footwashing only and not the supper. Thus, according to Carson, this is most likely due to the theological themes that develop in John, to invite his audience into the footwashing ritual as an anticipation of Jesus’ own climatic Passover act as the Lamb of God.²⁷⁷ Carson’s argument is unconvincing and does not seem to be consistent with John’s narrative. Carson correctly notes that John is highly theological; however, it does not seem plausible to then assume that John is speaking of the footwashing and not the meal in John 13.1, especially when the footwashing and the supper are woven into a continuous narrative (John 13.2-6).

Jeremias has tried to harmonise John and the Synoptics, stating that there was no real Aramaic terminology for ‘day of preparation for the Passover’; therefore, the more likely translation in English is Friday of Passover week.²⁷⁸ Maurice Casey has persuasively responded to the claims made by Jeremias, stating that the Hebrew and Aramaic expressions within early Jewish texts indicate that the eve of Passover would be the correct translation, similar to that of the eve of the New Year in the modern world.²⁷⁹ Casey illustrates further that δὲ Παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα in John 19:14 is similar to the Syriac translation of John. 19:14²⁸⁰ Thus, Casey concludes, that though the Aramaic expression for evening and Παρασκευὴ in the Greek are different, Παρασκευὴ became the standard term to use for preparation on Sabbaths and festivals.²⁸¹ In addition to Casey’s arguments, if John meant anything else other than “eve of the Passover” he would have made a clearer statement and elaborated further.

²⁷⁴ Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 374. Keener makes a compelling argument that Jesus does not seem to follow a different calendar in other festivals reported by John (John 2:13; 7:2; 10:22).

²⁷⁵ Jerome Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988), 54.

²⁷⁶ D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991), 460-462.

²⁷⁷ Carson, *John’s Gospel*, 460-462.

²⁷⁸ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 80.

²⁷⁹ Maurice Casey, *Is John’s Gospel True* (London: Routledge, 1996), 23.

²⁸⁰ Casey, *John’s Gospel*, 23.

²⁸¹ Casey, *John’s Gospel*, 24.

Jeremias provides another explanation to the chronological differences, by appealing to John's statement that the Sabbath was a high day (John 19:31).²⁸² According to Jeremias, John was not describing the high day as a Passover meal and the Sabbath, as often assumed, but the *sheaf-offering* (Lev. 23:11) and the Sabbath.²⁸³ Jeremias points out how the *sheaf-offering* in the Mishnah was practised on Nisan 16.²⁸⁴ Thus seeing as the Passover meal is the day before *sheaf-offering*, Jeremias concludes that both John and the Synoptics have Jesus crucified on Nisan 15, making both John and the Synoptics consistent with the Last Supper being a Passover meal.²⁸⁵ Jeremias has provided a persuasive argument to the chronological problem; however, he has failed to take into account the stronger evidence for what day the sheaf offering fell on during the time of Jesus, and other literary problems faced with asserting the high day as a Sabbath day and the *sheaf-offering*. Firstly, as Étienne Nodet rightly states, the *sheaf-offering* came a day after the Sabbath.²⁸⁶ Secondly, if John was referring to the preparation of the *sheaf-offering* then he would surely make it more explicit. Thirdly, the absence of the Sabbath being a high day in the Synoptics is evidence of the problems faced when attempting to harmonise John and the Synoptics, since it would seem likely that the Synoptics would also mention Jesus crucifixion being carried out on a high-day, seeing as Passover and the Sabbath were important religious events. The attempts to harmonise the chronology of the Last Supper in John and the Synoptics have proven insufficient on historical grounds. It seems clear that John and the Synoptics illustrate Jesus' death on the day before the Sabbath. Yet it is plausible to assert that John places Jesus' final meal the day before Passover (Nisan 13), whereas the Synoptics place Jesus' final meal on the day of Passover making it a Passover meal (Nisan 14).²⁸⁷ The most plausible explanation for the chronological differences is John had theological implications for placing the Last Supper before the Passover. John believed Jesus to be the "Lamb of God" (John 1:29); therefore, placing

²⁸² Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 81. Jeremias rightly asserts that a 'high day' was when a festival fell on the same day as the Sabbath.

²⁸³ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 81.

²⁸⁴ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 81.

²⁸⁵ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 81.

²⁸⁶ For a further discussion on the Passover falling on the Sabbath and the start of the *sheaf-offering* see Étienne Nodet, "Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Herodians" in *Handbook for the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1518. Furthermore, Nodet quotes the OLD TESTAMENT and Babylonian Talmud as evidence that the *sheaf-offering* came a day after the Sabbath (Lev. 23:11; b. *Menah* 65b).

²⁸⁷ See Craig A. Evans, *The Bible Knowledge Background Commentary: John's Gospel, Hebrews-Revelation* (Eastbourne: Victor, 2005), 120. Casey, *John's Gospel*, 24.

Jesus' death at the same time as the lambs being slaughtered would be fitting to his own theological belief.²⁸⁸

James D.G. Dunn, recognising the theological reasons for John placing Jesus' death at the same time as the slaughter of the Passover lambs, seems to still favour the Johannine chronology, since John was reflecting his theology into what actually happened historically.²⁸⁹ The problem with this view is John distorts the chronology of other events, placing them elsewhere to fit his theological motives. For example, John's cleansing of the temple (John 2:13-16) is placed at the beginning of the gospel, yet there are very good reasons to believe that the cleansing of the temple and anti-temple behaviour was the main reason for Jesus being arrested.²⁹⁰

Based on the analysis above, the chronological order in the Synoptics for the Last Supper is more likely to be historical.²⁹¹ Thus, the chronological differences of the Last Supper in the Synoptics and John, is not a valid reason to assert the Last supper was not a Passover meal.

4. An argument similar to the previously stated objection is that Paul's statement that Jesus is the "Passover lamb" (1 Cor 5:8) could be taken as Paul believing that Jesus was crucified during the Passover. However, one should be cautious to assert that Paul is making a historical claim that Jesus died on the same day as the Passover feast. Jeremias rightly notes that Paul's comparison of Jesus to the Passover lamb is more likely linked to Jesus' broader sayings about himself during the meal than to the actual time of his crucifixion.²⁹²
5. The most persuasive argument for identifying the Last Supper as an alternative Jewish meal, is Jesus' arrest and trial being carried out during the Passover (Matt 26:47-68; Mark 14:43-65; Luke 22:47-71). Some scholars have argued that it is very unlikely that Jesus would have eaten the Passover meal and then get arrested all on the same

²⁸⁸ For a more detailed discussion for theological reasons of John placing Jesus crucifixion during the time of the Passover lambs being slaughtered See Gerry Wheaton, *The Role of Jewish Feasts in John's Gospel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 89-91. Wheaton gives further examples of John is aligning Jesus not just to the servant of Isaiah (Isaiah 53) but also the Passover lamb. Though some of Wheaton's examples are less convincing, the statement in John that Jesus' bones remain unbroken parallels the paschal requirement of Exodus 12:4 and 19:33-36 is convincing and demonstrates John's theological theme of showing Jesus as the 'Lamb of God'.

²⁸⁹ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 772.

²⁹⁰ See E. P. Sanders, *Historical Jesus*, 258-260, 265. Dale B. Martin, "Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous," *JSNT* 37 (2014): 9-15. See also Casey, *John's Gospel*, 10. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988), 30. Casey and Brown persuasively argue that John places the temple at the beginning of his gospel for theological reasons to show that Jesus had replaced the temple.

²⁹¹ Brant Pire, *Last Supper*, 440.

²⁹² Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 7. See also Howard Marshall, *Last Supper*, 64-65.

night, since it was unlawful in second temple Judaism to hold a trial during a religious festival according to what is found in the Mishnah and Philo (Philo. *Migration*. 16.91; m. *Betzah* 5.2).²⁹³ However, Philo is most likely speaking solely of the Sabbath, seeing as though the context of 16.91 is in regards to the seventh day. In regards to the Mishnah, judging in a court of law is not outright forbidden, but a careful reading of the text shows that it is optional. This means that it is not entirely prohibited to trial someone during a festival. Furthermore, the Mishnah should be treated with caution in regards to Jesus' trial, as the Mishnah was composed much later than Jesus' trial and describes how the Jewish rules would bend the laws to fit their own goal.²⁹⁴ There is also an example of trials being carried out on a festive day. Josephus records how Joshua Ben Hananiah entered the temple area during a festival and spoke of the doom for Jerusalem. He was then arrested by the Jewish leaders and beaten. Once the beating was finished, he was then handed over to the Roman governor to be interrogated, but unlike Jesus who was sentenced to death, Joshua Ben Hananiah was released (Josephus, *J.W.* 6.300-305).

To sum up, it is thus plausible to conclude that Jesus' trial is not valid evidence for the Last Supper not being a Passover meal.

(b) Other Jewish meals

The Last Supper has also been compared with other Jewish meals, as an indication that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal. Therefore, analysing the various meals that have been compared with Last Supper is necessary before considering the Last Supper as a Passover meal.

Kiddush

Kiddush means sanctification, and is a blessing which was said at the beginning of a Sabbath meal or feast day.²⁹⁵ The Last Supper being compared to a Kiddush meal was upheld by some scholars in late 19th and early 20th century.²⁹⁶ However, Jeremias has pointed out that the *Kiddush* was not a meal, but a Jewish ritual that combined the blessing of the wine at the

²⁹³ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:396. Mcknight, *Jesus and His Death*, 269.

²⁹⁴ Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 314.

²⁹⁵ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 26

²⁹⁶ G. H. Box, "Antecedents of the Eucharist," *JTS* 3 (1901-1902): 357-369. See also Jeremias, *Eucharistic words*, 28. Jeremias provides various examples of the outdated view.

beginning of the meal with the breaking of bread.²⁹⁷ Therefore, if Jesus was implying a *Kiddush* blessing this would not affect the Passover character of the Last Supper, as the Mishnah stipulates that the *Kiddush* would have been said over the wine at Passover (m. *Pesah*. 10.2).

Haburah

The Last Supper as a *Haburah* meal has been perused and asserted by Hans Lietzmann and Gregory Dix.²⁹⁸ The meal was shared weekly amongst Jewish groups following religious and special occasions such as weddings and circumcision.²⁹⁹ Bradley Billings has summed up the argument up well, that the main reason for stressing the Last Supper as a *Haburah* meal is the fact the Lord's Supper in Acts and Paul was a weekly activity (Paul and Acts).³⁰⁰ However, as noted, the Last Supper was not in absolute conjunction with the Passover, but a new Passover to be celebrated in wait of the kingdom of God. Furthermore, it seems unreasonable to place the Last Supper in conjunction with a *Haburah* meal when all Jewish meals would have religious solemnity whether the meal was taken as an individual or in a group.³⁰¹ Thus, it is unconvincing to uphold to the Last Supper being a *Haburah* meal.

Farewell Meal

In more recent scholarship, it has been argued that Jesus' final meal is similar to the Jewish farewell meal found at Qumran, due to Jesus' understanding that his imminent death was at hand.³⁰² Though a farewell meal is persuasive, seeing as Jesus knew his time was coming to an end, there is no evidence to suggest a Jewish farewell meal existed in second temple Judaism.³⁰³ However, it is plausible that a farewell formula could have been part of the Passover meal (Matt 26:18-19).

(c) The Last Supper as a Passover meal

²⁹⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 27-29.

²⁹⁸ Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, trans. Dorothea H.G. Reeve; with introduction and further inquiry by Robert Douglas Richardson (Leiden: Brill, 1979), XVII. See also Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), 87 -89.

²⁹⁹ Bradley Billings, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20): An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 67. Billings quotes the Mishnah as evidence to the backgrounds of the *Haburah* meal (m. *Ber*. 6.6).

³⁰⁰ Billings, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, 67.

³⁰¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 30.

³⁰² Mcknight, *Jesus and His Death*, 264; 273. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:398-399. Meier's arguments (reclining from the table, drinking wine, celebrating with hymns) are similar to what Jeremias uses to prove that it was a Passover meal. Thus, it shows the difficulty in trying to identify whether Jesus celebrated a Passover meal or not without the gospels stating that it was a Passover meal.

³⁰³ Pitre, *Last Supper*, 324.

The objections to the Last Supper being a Passover meal and the Last Supper being an alternative Jewish meal to the Passover has proven to be unconvincing. As already stated, the Synoptic gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke illustrate how Jesus and his disciples prepared for the Passover meal. Thus, due to there being no hard evidence that the preparation for Passover and the Last Supper derived from separate traditions, it seems unreasonable to why the Synoptics then need to repeat that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.³⁰⁴ The Synoptics were not trying to prove that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, rather they narrated about the aspects of the meal which were beneficial to the audience; how and why Jesus died.³⁰⁵ Furthermore, The Passover meal during the time of Jesus varied in practise, it was not until post AD 70 that the Passover meal became standardised.³⁰⁶ Nevertheless, Jeremias has persuasively argued for a common theme that was identified in most Passover meals that are consistent with the Last Supper being identified as a Passover meal: Meal at night in Jerusalem, blessing and breaking of bread, blood of the covenant, the cup of blessing, reclining at the table, singing hymns.³⁰⁷

To sum up, the mere identification that the Last Supper was a Passover meal in the Synoptics, and the similar elements of the Last Supper and Passover, it seems reasonable to assert that the Last Supper was in fact a Passover meal. However, Jesus re-interpreted the Passover, placing himself at the centre of the elements and blessings; Thus, making his final meal a new Passover meal.³⁰⁸

5.4 Last Supper Historicity

The symbolic form of the Last Supper account being attested in the Synoptics, Paul and the Didache, has lead E. P Sanders in his book ‘The Historical Figure of Jesus’ to conclude that the Last Supper is cemented in historical fact when it comes to historical Jesus studies.³⁰⁹ However, not all scholars agree with Sanders, and have come to the conclusion that the Last Supper is fictional.

(a) Objections

³⁰⁴ Casey, *Mark's Gospel*, 228-237. Although Casey's argument is focused on Mark, the same argument can be applied to Matthew and Luke who both state that Jesus and his disciples prepared for the Passover meal

³⁰⁵ Casey, *Mark's Gospel*, 237. See also chapter 3.1 in this thesis on the use of sources in ancient biographies and histories, where it has been demonstrated that historians and biographers were selective on what they would include in their literary work.

³⁰⁶ Joel B. Marcus, “Passover and Last Supper Revisited,” *NTS* 69 (2013): 303-324.

³⁰⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 41-62.

³⁰⁸ See Boulton, “Exodus Typology”, 27-29.

³⁰⁹ See Sanders, *Historical Jesus*, 263-264.

1. The content of the Last Supper in Paul and the Synoptics has come under vast scrutiny due to their differences with Didache 9-10. Valery Alikin has expressed the difficulty in confirming the historicity of the institution of the Eucharist, since the Didache has no reference to the institution of the Last Supper by Jesus, and no interpretation of the bread and wine as his body and blood.³¹⁰ However, it seems the Didache assumes the traditional core (Bread and Wine) and is simply attesting to a liturgical element of thanksgiving.³¹¹ The Didache is similar to John's gospel; stating nothing about the Last Supper, but showing knowledge of the bread and wine to develop theological ideas.³¹² Thus, Alikin and others who conclude that the differences between the traditions found in the Synoptics/Paul and the Didache as evidence against the historicity of the Last supper have proven to be unconvincing.
2. Jesus symbolising the cup/blood as his blood could be deemed immoral and unlawful in Jewish law (Lev. 10:10-12.); thus, signifying the unhistorical nature of the elements displayed by Jesus in the synoptic and Paul. However, the symbolic context is far too strong for the disciples to assume they were literally drinking blood and eating flesh.³¹³

(b) Paul "Receieve" and "Pass on"

Paul states how he had received a tradition of Jesus' final meal from the Lord (1 Cor 11:23). Paul quotes the tradition in response to unacceptable behaviour found in the churches at Corinth when celebrating the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:17-22).³¹⁴ Paul's account of the Last Supper, which is the earliest written account in possession, is as follows:

"For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." (1 Cor 11.23-26)

³¹⁰ Alikin, *Earliest History*, 119

³¹¹ Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 360-367.

³¹² Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 360-367.

³¹³ Maurice Casey, "No Cannibals at Passover!," *Theology* 96 (1993): 199-205.

³¹⁴ See Alikin, *Earliest History*, 114.

Paul uses the technical terms παραδίδομι and παραλαμβάνω for “receiving” and “Passing” on traditions (Oral transmission).³¹⁵ Josephus uses such Greek terms in regards to Jewish tradition (Josephus, *Ant.* 297). Gordon Fee expresses that similar phrases can also be in the rabbinical tradition *qibbel* “receive” and *masar* “pass on” found in later rabbinic sources.³¹⁶ Therefore, these phrases may have also been technical terms from Paul’s Jewish heritage.³¹⁷ However, it has been argued that the attestation to these rabbinic terms in pre 70AD Jewish sources in Hebrew/Aramaic is non-existent.³¹⁸ Although, since Josephus and Paul were trained in Jewish scripture and Jewish customs of the day (Josephus, *Life* 2; Phil 3:5) It would seem likely that the Greek terms derive from their Jewish heritage.

The technical formula for ‘receiving’ and ‘passing on’ traditions through oral transmission does not qualify as evidence that Paul received the Last Supper from the twelve. A view amongst some scholars is that Paul believed he received his account of the Last Supper through a revelation; consistent with Paul’s assertion to have received the gospel not from man but as a direct revelation from Jesus (Gal 1:15-17).³¹⁹ However, it is more likely that Paul in Gal 1:15-17 is not referring explicitly to Jesus’ teachings, but the message of redemption through the life and death of Christ.³²⁰ Furthermore, Paul never states that he received the Last Supper tradition by revelation, as he does in Gal 1:15-17.³²¹

Francis Watson has challenged the argument that Paul used the technical formula in 1 Cor 11:23 to demonstrate that he received the traditions through a natural chain of transmission, as Paul was a believer in God, and receiving traditions from the divine and passing onto humans is spoken of throughout the Old Testament.³²² Furthermore, Watson stresses that there is no mention of the twelve as participants within the tradition, which is why Paul refers to the Lord being the source of the Lord’s Supper.³²³ Watson’s remarks are not convincing, as Craig Keener rightly notes that Jewish teachers sometimes claimed to have received a *halakah* from

³¹⁵ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 437.

³¹⁶ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 607. Fee quotes m. *Abot.* 1.1 and m. *Pseah* 2.6 as evidence.

³¹⁷ Raymond F. Collins and Daniel J. Harrington, *First Corinthians* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 426.

³¹⁸ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 409.

³¹⁹ See Francis Watson, “‘I Received from the Lord...’ Paul, Jesus, and the Last Supper,” in *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways Into an Old Debate*, ed. Todd D. Still (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), 103-122. Geza Vermes, *Authentic Sayings of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 2004), 304.

³²⁰ See also Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 545-546.

³²¹ F F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 110. Bruce persuasively asserts how Paul also believed the tradition of the Lord’s Supper was at the same time something the Lord had commanded him to write. (1 Cor 14:37). Thus, Paul received the Lord’s Supper through a process of oral transmission, but according to Paul the Lord in his glory maintains and confirms the tradition by his spirit.

³²² Francis Watson, “I Received from the Lord,” 107.

³²³ Watson, “I Received from the Lord”, 107.

Sinai (I.e. through Moses) even though it was commonly understood that the tradition was mediated through authorities.³²⁴

In chapter 2 of the thesis, it has already been highlighted that the most convincing argument to whom Paul received his Jesus traditions from was in fact the twelve. Thus, the Last Supper tradition should be treated as being originally transmitted by the twelve, making it extremely likely to be historical.

(c) The Gospels

In addition to Paul, the Synoptics themselves are also evidence for the Last Supper being historical. Firstly, alluding back to Chapter 2, it has been identified that Mark and Luke used eyewitness sources for constructing their gospels. Moreover, Maurice Casey has convincingly demonstrated how Mark's account of the Last Supper was a literal translation of an Aramaic source, which places the root of the tradition into the primitive Jerusalem church.³²⁵ Despite the fact Casey does not trace Mark to an eyewitness source (Peter), this would be consistent with the perspective that Mark used Peter as his source. Secondly, Jesus and his disciples participating in Passover, is something most Jews would do during the first century. Lastly, the fact that all three gospels attest to the Last Supper in a consistent manner demonstrates that Jesus' final meal was a common tradition known to various communities as something historical to Jesus.

(d) Summary

To sum up, the arguments favouring the historicity of the Last Supper in the Synoptics and Paul make it likely that Jesus had a final meal with his disciples, where Jesus symbolised bread and wine to his own body and blood, initiating the new covenant.

5.5 Last Supper as a Memorial and Remembrance for Jesus

Now the investigation into the Jesus' final meal has shown that it was a new Passover meal and can be traced back to Jesus' life, the question as to whether the Last Supper demonstrates that Jesus wanted to be remembered can be answered.

The remembrance theme of the elements at the Last Supper and the role they played in symbolizing Jesus makes it likely that he wanted the elements to serve as a memorial for his

³²⁴ See Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 299. Keener quotes B. Kid. 30a, bar.; Eccl. Rab. 1.10, meg. Pes. 110b.

³²⁵ Casey, *Mark's Gospel*, 219-249.

remembrance. Furthermore, as already reiterated in the introduction to this chapter and also in chapter two, the Passover meal served as a memorial remember God and his actions during the Exodus. The identification that Jesus saw the his final meal as a new Passover Meal, with him being central to its actions, makes it likely that Jesus wanted the Last Supper to serve as a memorial to remember his life and death.

In the introduction to the chapter it had been identified that there were valid reasons to dispute the authenticity of “do this in remembrance of me”. However, the identification of the Last Supper being a (new) Passover, along with the elements of the bread, the cup and the new covenant demonstrates that these aspects alone demonstrate that Jesus wanted to be remembered.³²⁶ Thus, the absence of “do this in remembrance of me” in Matthew and Mark is most likely because it was already self-evident to them that Jesus wanted to be remembered. Maurice Casey rightly states: “The command ‘Do this in memory of me’ seems intended to make explicit in Luke and Paul what was already doubtless regarded as self-evident in the tradition of Mark and Matthew”.³²⁷

Furthermore, Howard Marshall, expanding upon Heinz Schürmann’s argument, has provided a convincing argument to the authenticity of “do this in remembrance o me” within the Pauline Last Supper tradition. Marshall expresses that it would seem fairly unreasonable to assert that if Jesus never wanted the meal to be repeated or himself remembered, then the early church would never have continued to observe and practise the Lord’s Supper as a communal meal.³²⁸ In addition to Marshall’s argument, Jesus teaching how his followers should pray continued to be practised in the post-Easter church (Did. 8:2).³²⁹ Thus, religious practises, taught by Jesus, that were to be continued in daily life, were still being practised in the post-Easter church. To sum up, based on the analysis above, it is reasonable to conclude that “do this in remembrance of me” can be traced back to Jesus. Thus, it is plausible to assert that do

³²⁶ Although it has been identified that the Last Supper was a Passover meal and its importance for the argument of Jesus remembrance is pivotal, even if one does not accept the case put forward, it can clearly be shown the meal had taken place during the festival period, which in itself gave rise to memory and reflection of what God had to release the Israelites from bandage in Egypt. See Mcknight, *Jesus and His Death*, 334.

³²⁷ Casey, *Mark’s Gospel*, 237.

³²⁸ Marshall, *Last Supper*, 51-52.

³²⁹ There are very good reasons to support the historicity of the Lord’ Prayer, which demonstrates the early church continuous practise in important religious aspects that had been vital to Jewish life. For insightful analysis into the authenticity of the Lord’s Prayer, see N.T. Wright, “The Lord’s Prayer as a Paradigm for Christian Prayer,” in *Into God’s Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 146. Brad Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of Atonement* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 154-157. Mcknight, *Jesus and His Death*, 110-111.

this in remembrance of me” also proves that Jesus wanted to be remembered through his followers eating and drinking the new Passover meal.

5.6 Summary

The investigation into the Last Supper has identified that Jesus wanted to be remembered. Jesus’ actions in the temple were a clear sign for him to provide a farewell aspect within the Passover meal. Jesus intended his final meal to symbolize the new Exodus with the arrival of the kingdom of God through his death. The meal focused on Jesus’ actions with the bread and cup, the Passover story, and Jesus’ own story, and wove these two into one.³³⁰ Jesus established his remembrance through the elements of the bread and cup, along with his statement to “do this in remembrance of me”. Thus, Jesus’ final meal served as a memorial for the remembrance of his life and death, which was to be upheld and practised by his followers once he had died. Furthermore, Jesus’ remembrance theme within the Last Supper does not just prove that he wanted to be remembered, but also the comparison that can be made between Jesus’ method of preserving his memory and other figures.

Jesus’ remembrance in the Last Supper shares common similarities with Octavian, since both wanted to be remembered through a banquet. However, since Jesus’ remembrance comes out of a Jewish ritual, there are more dissimilarities than similarities between Jesus’ Last Supper and Octavian’s remembrance banquet. The more plausible comparison is God, since he wanted the Passover to serve as a memorial, to remember him and what he had done for the Israelites in Egypt. However, Jesus plays two roles: firstly, the teacher and prophet who dictates how the new Passover is to be practised; similar to Moses dictating the festival of Passover and Unleavened Bread to the Israelites (Exodus 12:1-48), Secondly, he plays the role of God as in the Old Testament, as Jesus dictates the Passover on his own authority with himself at the centre of the new meal. Thus, Jesus’ life and death is to be remembered by those who believe in him, similar to how God wanted the Jews to remember him delivering the Israelites from bondage.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Findings

³³⁰ Wright, *Victory of God*, 434.

This study has evaluated as to whether the historical Jesus wanted to be remembered, but also, if the research question is true, then what comparisons can be made with Jesus' view to be remembered and other ancient figures who also wanted to be remembered?

The research question – from my own analysis – appears to answer a gap in historical Jesus studies to this day. It has been discussed in Chapter 1 how studies on Jesus and remembrance have been primarily focused on how he was remembered by his followers. Although there has been research into Jesus as a teacher, this does not necessarily prove that he wanted his life to be remembered.

In chapter 2 the study evaluated the Synoptics to understand their origins, reliability and whether they are trying to write history. Although it does not answer the research question, the importance of evaluating the sources had been outlined, since many scholars have come to different conclusions on who Jesus was as a person and what were his aims. The chapter demonstrated that the genre of the gospels is biography, but that they were also trying to write history; thus, making the Synoptics historical biographies on the life of Jesus. Furthermore, it has been shown that it seems plausible to assert that Mark and Luke were in fact written by the traditional authors and appealed to eyewitness sources. However, the evidence to the authorship of Matthew and whether he used eyewitness sources is inconclusive. Moreover, the research has shown that the Synoptics used their sources similar to that of Plutarch, since they would compress, create and change the detail from their own sources to reflect to fit their story of Jesus. Therefore making it difficult to know what goes back to the historical Jesus. We have also analysed the key role memory plays with how much we remember and what we remember, which has proven to have had a positive but also negative impact on the details of an event and the event as a whole. It has been shown that although we remember some aspects we witness, we also forget or even contradict ourselves as time progresses (false memories). Although it has been demonstrated that Jesus was a teacher and the disciples were learners - which gives more weight to preserve the memories of Jesus – it has also been expressed that even in the Synoptics scholars have identified that memory plays an effect on how the stories of Jesus are told, re-told and remembered, which is why the gist of similar sayings or actions of Jesus in the Synoptics are the same but the details may be different.

Chapter 2 has identified that the Synoptics cannot be spoken of in a general sense when speaking of reliability, as to say Matthew, Mark or Luke is reliable is completely subjective. For example, if the crucifixion of Jesus is historical, but many of the details are redacted, does

that mean the Synoptics are reliable or unreliable? Thus, the chapter has shown that it is unreasonable to speak of the gospels as reliable or unreliable in a general sense, but the sayings and actions of Jesus in the gospels must be still critically evaluated based on what can be said of them as sources.

In chapter three, the study analysed Ancient Graeco-Roman and Jewish world figures on remembrance and preserving memory and how this could then be compared to Jesus and remembrance. Three different aspects of remembrance were put forward: individuals that wanted to be remembered, individuals that wanted their life to be forgotten and groups/individuals who wanted to remember an individual. The study demonstrated that there was significant interest in preserving the memory of the individual. Furthermore, and more importantly to the research question, both Greek, Roman, Jewish and the God of Israel wanted to be remembered. The study also demonstrates that certain individuals (Plotinus and Atticus) wanted their lives to be a distant memory, proving that the question of whether Jesus wanted to be remembered should not be taken lightly. The study also demonstrates that individuals would symbolise their remembrance through a ritual (banquets, festivals), something materialistic (Statues, monuments, autobiographies, religious buildings) or even through their own achievements. In addition, when it was an individual or groups wanting to preserve the memory of an individual, it may have been through a biography (Isocrates, Xenophon) or imitation (Tacitus life of Agricola). This then led to the discussion as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered.

In chapter four, the study set out to analyse as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered through his teachings on the Law. Firstly, we established that God in the Old Testament depicted his remembrance through his Law, which he dictated to Moses on Mount Sinai. Secondly, when turning to the Matthew and Luke, we demonstrated that Jesus' view on oaths and retaliation significantly intensified and contradicted the Law and also second temple Jewish interpretations of the Law. Thirdly, the chapter demonstrated that the teaching on oaths and retaliation can be traced back to the historical Jesus and that they were also dictated in the vicinity of a mountain. Lastly, we also established that Jesus also taught these new laws on his own authority. Furthermore, he also placed them on an equal basis to that of the Law in the Old Testament, since he depicted his new laws as commandments. Thus, his new laws were incorporated into the Law. What the chapter demonstrated as a whole, is that Jesus' dictation of new laws on his own authority in the vicinity of a mountain is similar to that of story of God and his giving of the Law in the Old Testament where it also served as a

remembrance to God, proving it likely that Jesus wanted to be remembered through his new Law. Thus, Jesus' remembrance is similar in comparison to the God of the Old Testament.

In chapter five we continued to analyse as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered; however, this time it was looking at the Last Supper (Jesus' final meal). The Last Supper is most likely the most straight forward passage for proving as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered, since in the accounts of Paul and Luke, Jesus states "Do this in remembrance of me". However, seeing as though there are good reasons for concluding that this saying could be theological or liturgical, it could not simply be stated as coming from the Historical Jesus. Therefore, we set out to analyse as to whether the elements of the last Supper portray a remembrance theme and if the Last supper was a Passover meal, since Passover was to remember God and the Exodus. This would then provide an insight as to whether the remembrance theme of the Last Supper demonstrates that Jesus wanted to be remembered and also if it is then likely to assert that "do this in remembrance of me" is historical. Firstly, we demonstrated that both the bread and the wine symbolised a remembrance theme in Jewish meals including Passover. Furthermore, since the elements are to represent Jesus body and blood metaphorically, it is plausible to assert that it was his remembrance theme. Secondly, we demonstrated that the Last Supper was a new Passover meal, which also suggests a remembrance theme. However, since Jesus was central to the Last Supper it was also demonstrated that the new Passover was to serve as a remembrance of Jesus. Thirdly, based on the historical analysis, we confirmed that it is plausible to assert that the Last Supper can be traced back to the historical Jesus. Fourthly, based on the fact the elements of the Last Supper and a new Passover represented a remembrance theme of Jesus, we identified that it seems plausible to assert that "do this in remembrance of me" can be traced back to the historical Jesus. Thus, Jesus wanted his followers to remember him through continuing the practise of the new Passover meal. Lastly, we have also established that Jesus' method to preserve his memory is similar to that of god in the Old Testament, since both wanted to be remembered through a Passover meal. However, the difference, is Jesus played two roles, that of Moses, as he taught his followers the actions and meanings of the Last Supper and also God, as he is central to the meal and wanted it to serve as a memorial for his remembrance.

The results from this thesis thus prove the hypothesis true, that Jesus wanted to be remembered, but also that his theme of remembrance is similar in comparison to that of God in the Old Testament. Thus, it seems plausible that after Jesus' death his followers were aware that he wanted to be remembered, which could be an explanation for why the Synoptics chose

the genre of biography and why not just mere sayings of Jesus were remembered and passed on to other Christians.

6.2 Future research

Out of the analysis from this study, other research can be undertaken to further demonstrate that Jesus wanted to be remembered. I stated in the Introduction to the study that I would not be using the Gospel of John to prove that Jesus wanted to be remembered, due to limited word count. However, since many scholars use the Gospel of John as another source for evaluating Jesus' life (see chapter 1) then a future study could be investigated with the question 'Did Jesus Want to be Remembered in John's Gospel?'

Another question that emerges from this study – that does not contribute as to whether Jesus wanted to be remembered – is an identity and Christological question. It has been demonstrated that Jesus mirrored the themes God used to express that he wanted to be remembered. Thus, a question that emerges is 'What Does Jesus' Remembrance Demonstrate that Jesus Believed to be Divine?'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Sean A. "Luke's Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander," *JGRChJ* 3 (2006): 177-191.

Aland, Kurt., and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: literary convention and social context in Luke 1, 1-4 and Acts 1, 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Alexander, Loveday "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing," *NovT* 28 (1986): 71.

Alikin, Valeriy. *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering: Origin, Development and Content of the Christian Gathering in the First to Third Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Allison, Dale C. *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Allison, Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2013.

Allison, Dale C. *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Anderson, Hugh. *Gospel of Mark*. London: Oliphants, 1976.

Aune, David E. *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Aune, David Edward. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006.

Bauckham, Richard. *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Bauckham, Richard. "In Response to My Respondents: *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* in Review," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 225-223

Baum, Armin D. "The Anonymity of the New Testament History Books: A Stylistic Device in the Context of Greco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature Author," *NovT* 50 (2008): 120-142.

Bird, Michael F., Craig A. Evans, Simon J. Gathercole, Charles Hill and Chris Tilling. *How God Became Jesus: The Real Origins of Belief in Jesus' Divine Nature*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Bird, Michael F. "Mark: Interpreter of Peter and Disciple of Paul", in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences*, edited by Joel Willitts and Michael F. Bird, 30-61. London: T & T Clark, 2011.

Billings, Bradley. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20): An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Blomberg, Craig L. *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction and Survey*. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2009.

Bock, Darrell L. *Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Bond, Helen K. *The Historical Jesus: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Borg, Marcus. *Jesus: Uncovering the Life, Teachings, and Relevance of a Religious Revolutionary*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006.

Boring, Eugene M. *Mark: A Commentary*. London: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

Boring, Eugene M. *An Introduction to the New Testament: History, Literature, Theology*. Louisville: WJK, 2012.

Boring, M. Eugene. *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991.

Boulton, Matthew Myer. "Supersession or Subsession? Exodus Typology, the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover Meal," *SJT* 66 (2013): 18-29.

Box, G. H. "Antecedents of the Eucharist," *JTS* 3 (1901-1902): 357-369.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.

Bruce, F F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic tradition*, translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.

Burridge, Richard A. *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007.

Burridge, Richard. *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.

Buxbaum, Yitzhak. *The Life and Teachings of Hillel*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2008.

Byrskog, Samuel. *Story as History - History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Byrskog, Samuel. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. CBNTS 24; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994.

Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991.

Casey, Maurice. *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Casey, Maurice. *Is John's Gospel True*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Casey, Maurice. "No Cannibals at Passover!," *Theology* 96 (1993): 21-36.

Cassius Dio Cocceianus. The Roman History: The Reign of Augustus. trans. Ian Scott-Kilvert; With an Introduction by John Carter. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.

Charlesworth, James H. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. London: Doubleday, 1983.

Clement of Alexandria. trans. G. W. Butterworth. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Collins, Raymond F., and Daniel J. Harrington. *First Corinthians*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 199.

Crossan, John Dominic. *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*. San Francisco: Harper, 1994.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Peasant*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

Crossan, John D. *Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Crossan, Dominic. *A Long Way From Tipperary*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2009.

Crossley, James. *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.

Crossley, James G. *The Date of Mark's Gospel: insight from the Law in earliest Christianity*. Journal for the study of the New Testament. Supplement series 266; London : T&T Clark International, 2004.

Daamgard, Fin. *Rewriting Peter as an Intertextual Character in the Canonical Gospels*. London: Routledge, 2015.

Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1956.

Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 1. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 2. Edinburg: T & T Clark, 1991.

Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*, translated by William Barclay. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1971.

Dilery, John. *Xenophon And The History Of His Times*. Ney York: Routledge, 1995.

Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.

Donne, Anthony Le. *The Historical Jesus: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It?* Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011.

Drury, J. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.

Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1997.

Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

Dunn, James D. G. *Neither Jew nor Greek: Christianity in the Making*, vol. 3. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Oral Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.

Edwards, James R. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Boston: Brill, 2006.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Peter, Paul and Mary Magdalene: The Followers of Jesus in history and Legend*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Eichenbaum, Howard. "An Information Processing Framework for Memory Representation by the Hippocampus" in *The Cognitive Neurosciences*, edited by Michael S. Gazzaniga, 679-690. London: MIT Press, 2014.

Evans, Craig A. *Matthew*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Evans, Craig A. *The Bible Knowledge Background Commentary: Matthew-Luke*, Vol. 1. Colorado: Victor, 2003.

Evans, Craig A. *The Bible Knowledge Background Commentary: John's Gospel, Hebrews-Revelation*. Eastbourne: Victor, 2005.

Evans, Craig A. *The Historical Jesus: Jesus' Mission, Death and Resurrection*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Eve, Eric. *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke X – XXIV: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, 2nd edition. Garden City: Doubleday, 1986.

Foster, Paul. “Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?,” *NovT* 45 (2003): 313-337.

Franklin, E. *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew*. JSNT Supp 92; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Gathercole, Simon J. *The Pre-Existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006.

Goodacre, Mark. “Lawrence M. Wills, *The Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John and the Origins of the Gospel Genre*, (London: Routledge, 1997), review by Mark Goodacre,” *JBL* 119, (2000): 134.

Goodacre, Mark S. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. New York ; London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.

Goulder, M.D. *Luke-A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; JSNT Supp 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

Grammatiki, Karla A. *Fiction on The Fringe: Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age*. Boston: Brill, 2009.

Gundry, Robert Horton. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Güven, Suna. “Displaying the Res Gestae of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All Author(s),” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57 (1998): 30-45.

Hägg, Tomas. *The Art of Biography in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hawlbachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*, translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Herodotus. The Histories. trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt; Revised With Introduction and Notes by John Marincola. London : Penguin Books, 2003.

Holmes, Michael W. *Apostolic Fathers in English*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Holzberg, Niklas. *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*, translated by Christine Jackson-Holzberg. London: Routledge, 1995.

Horace. The Odes of Horace. trans. Jeffrey H. Kaimowitz; introduction by Ronnie Ancona. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Hornblower, Simon., Antony Spawforth and Esther Eidinow. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hultgren, Arland J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011.

Isocrates. trans. George Norlin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Jaubert, Annie. *Date of the Last Supper*. Staten Island: Alba House, 1965.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Characteristics of the Ipissima Vox," in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research*, edited by James D. G. Dunn and Scott McKnight, 107-114. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic words of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Josephus, Flavius. Josephus: The Essential Writings. trans. Paul L. Maier. Grand Rapids: Kregel Pub, 1988.

Josephus, Flavius. The Life of Josephus. trans. Steve Mason. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003.

Kalligas, Paul. *The "Enneads" of Plotinus*. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1964.

Keener, Craig S. *Historical Jesus of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.

Keener, Craig. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Kelber, Werner H. *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark Paul and Q*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997.

King, R. A. H. *Aristotle and Plotinus on Memory*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Klawans, Jonathan. "The Prohibition of Oaths and Contra-scriptural Halakhot : A Response to John P. Meier," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 33-58.

Klawans, Jonathan. "Was Jesus' Last Supper a Passover Sedar?" *Biblical Review* 17 (2001)24-33.

Kodell, Jerome. *The Eucharist in the New Testament*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.

Kloppenborg, John S. Q, *the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus*. London: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

Kloppenborg, John S. *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Koester, Helmut. *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. New York: Walter deGruyter, 2000.

Lemcio, Eugene E. *The Past of Jesus in the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lietzmann, Hans. *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, translated by Dorothea H.G. Reeve; with introduction and further inquiry by Robert Douglas Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Loftus, Elizabeth F. *Eyewitness Testimony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Luz, Ulrich. *Studies in Matthew*, translated by Rosemary Selle. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005.

Macdonald, Dennis R. *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

- Mánek, Jindřich. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NovT* 2 (1957): 8-23.
- Marcus, Joel B. "Passover and Last Supper Revisited," *NTS* 69 (2013): 303-324.
- Marshall, Howard I. *Last Supper & Lord's Supper*, 1st edition. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005, 1980.
- Martin, Dale B. "Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous," *JSNT* 37 (2014): 3-24.
- Martin, Raymond A. *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004.
- Matson, Mark. "Luke's rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount," Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series, 39; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Series, 2000.
- McCartney, Dan G. *James* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009).
- McDonald, Lee Martin and Stanley E. Porter. *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000.
- Mcknight, Scot. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- Meier, John P. "Did the Historical Jesus Prohibit All Oaths? Part 1", *JSHJ* 5 (2007):175-204.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1. London: Doubleday, 1991.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volume 4, Law and Love*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Meier, John P. "The Historical Jesus and Oaths: A Response to Donald A. Hagner and Jonathan Klawans," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 49-58.
- Moscovitch, Morris., Gordon Winocur, Lee Ryan and Lynn Nadel. "Functional neuroanatomy of remote, episodic memory," in *Handbook of Episodic Memory*, edited by Ekrem Dere, Alexander Easton, Lynn Nadel and Joe P. Huston, 239-270. London: Elsevier, 2008.
- Murphy, Fredrick James. *An Introduction to Jesus and the Gospels*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005.

Nepos, Cornelius. *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. trans. Nicholas Horsfall. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Neusner, Jacob. *Comparative Hermeneutics of Rabbinic Judaism, The, Volume Three: Seder Niziqin*. New York: Academic Studies in the History of Judaism, 2000.

Nodet, Étienne. "Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Herodians" in *Handbook for the Historical Jesus*, edited by Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 1495-1544. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Osgood, Josiah. *Claudius Caesar: Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Parker, D. C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Patterson, Stephen J. "Can You Trust a Gospel? A Review of Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 203.

Pelletier, Andre. "The Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint," in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gaohe Hata, 99. Leiden; Brill, 1989.

Pelling, Christopher. *Plutarch Caesar: Translated With Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Pelling, C. B. R. "Plutarch's Adaptation of His Source-Material", *JHS* 100 (1980): 131.

Penelope J. E. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Perrin, Nicholas. "The Last Supper," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels 2nd edition*, edited by Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown and Nicholas Perrin, 492-501. Downers Grove: IVP Academic Press, 2013.

Petuchowski, J. "'Do This in Remembrance of Me' (I Cor 11:24)," *JBL* 76 (1957): 293-298.

Philo. trans. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Pitre, Brad. *Last Supper*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Pitre, Brad. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of Atonement*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Pliny, The Younger. Epistles, Book 2. ed. Christopher Whitton. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Plotinus. Enneads. trans. A. H. Armstrong. Rev. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Plutarch. Lives. trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Porter, Stanley E. *When Paul Met Jesus: How an idea Got Lost in History.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Redman, Judith C. S. "How Accurate Are Eyewitnesses? Bauckham and the Eyewitnesses in the Light of Psychological Research," *JBL* 129 (2010): 190.

Riesner, Rainer "From the Messianic Teacher to the Gospels of Jesus Christ." In *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, edited by Tom Holmen and Stanley E. Porter, 405-446. Boston: Brill, 2011.

Rodriguez, Rafael. *Structuring Early Christian Memory; Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text.* London: T & T Clark, 2010.

Rosenstein, Nathan., and Robert Morstein-Marx, *A Companion to the Roman Republic.* West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Sanders, E. P. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah : Five Studies.* London: SCM Press, 1990.

Sanders, E. P. *The Historical Figure of Jesus.* London: Penguin, 1995.

Schacter, Daniel L. *The Cognitive Neuropsychology of False Memories.* East Sussex: Psychology Press ltd, 1999.

Schettino, Maria Teresa. "Use of Historical Sources" in *A Companion to Plutarch* edited by Mark Beck, 426-426. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Schmeling, Gareth. *The Novel in the Ancient World.* Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *The Place of the Gospels in the general History of Literature*, translated by Byron R. McCane. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2002.

Schmidt, Stephen R. *Extraordinary Memories for Exceptional Events.* London: Psychology Press, 2012.

Schuler, P.L. *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Schwartz, Barry. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of Memory*. London: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Schwartz, Barry. "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," *ASR*, 56 (1991): 221-222.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910.

Smith, Morton. *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1956.

Stein, Robert H. *Gospel of Mark*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008).

Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. Tennessee: B&H Publishing Group, 1992.

Suetonius. Lives of the Caesars. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. Rev: With New Introduction by K. R. Bradley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Tacitus, Cornelius. ed. A. J. Woodman; With Contribution From C. S. Kraus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Tacitus, Cornelius. Annals. trans. Cynthia Damon. London: Penguin, 2012.

Telford, William. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing plc, 2015.

The Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version. London: HarperCollins, 1997.

The Mishnah. trans. Herbert Danby. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Theissen, Gerd., and Annette Metz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. London: SCM, 1998.

Tonkin, Elizabeth *Narrating our pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Tuckett, Christopher. "The Case against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem by Mark Goodacre," *NovT* 46 (2004): 401-403.

Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Vermes, Geza. *Authentic Sayings of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 2004.

Vermes, Geza. *Christian Beginnings: From Nazareth to Nicea*. London: Yale University Press, 2013.

Vermes, Geza. *Jesus in the Jewish World*. London: SMC Press, 2010.

Vermes, Geza. *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1962.

Viviano, Benedict. *Matthew and His World: The Gospel of the Open Jewish Christians: Studies in Biblical Theology*. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2007.

Warren, W. "Memory in Plotinus," *CQ* 15 (1965): 252 – 260.

Watson, Francis. "'I Received from the Lord....' Paul, Jesus, and the Last Supper," in *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways Into an Old Debate*, edited by Todd D. Still, 103-124. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007.

Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Weeden Sr, Theodore J. "Polemics as a Case for Dissent: A Response to Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 213.

Westcott B. F., and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*, 2nd edition. London: Macmillan & Co., 1986.

Wheaton, Gerry. *The Role of Jewish Feasts in John's Gospel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Williams, Howard. *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

Wills, Lawrence M. *The Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John and the Origins of the Gospel Genre*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Wilson, Nigel. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Wold, Benjamin G. “*Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Exodus, Creation, and Cosmos*”, in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold, 47-74. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 212; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007)

Woolf, Greg. “Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire,” *JRS* 86 (1996): 22-39.

Wright, N. T. *How God Became King: Getting to the Heart of the Gospels*. London: SPCK, 2012.

Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: SPCK, 1996.

Wright, N.T. “The Lord’s Prayer as a Paradigm for Christian Prayer,” in *Into God’s Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker, 132-154. Grand rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Xenophon. Hiero ; Agesilaus ; Constitution of the Lacedaemonians ; Ways and means ; Cavalry commander ; Art of horsemanship ; On hunting ; Constitution of the Athenians / Xenophon. trans. E.C. Marchant and G.W. Bowersock. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.