

HISTORICAL TRADITION IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

C. H. DODD



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE

LONDON NEW YORK NEW ROCHELLE

MELBOURNE SYDNEY

4. THE ARREST

In Mark, the predictions of the desertion of the Twelve and of Peter's denial (already discussed) are conceived as being uttered in conversation on the way from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives. The next act of the drama begins with the arrival at χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεὶ (xiv. 32). This is the scene of the events now to be portrayed. They fall into two main groups:

- (1) The prayer of Jesus and the sleep of the disciples.
- (2) (a) Betrayal and arrest;
(b) the attack on the High Priest's slave;
(c) protest of Jesus and flight of the disciples;
(d) escape of a young man.

The last episode is peculiar to Mark and has left no trace elsewhere. For the rest, Matthew follows Mark closely, as a rule with far-reaching verbal agreement, inserting a few significant additions without disturbing the Marcan scheme. Literary dependence is certain.

Not so with Luke. His divergences from Mark are considerable and raise acutely once again the question of a second source. In this respect, however, there is a marked difference between parts (1) and (2). In Luke xxii. 40-6, which covers the same ground as Mark xiv. 32-42, though much more briefly, verbal agreements are few.¹ The expression προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ (εἰς)έλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν is common to both. In Luke it closes the whole scene, but it also occurs in a slightly different form at the beginning: προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. This at once gives a somewhat different emphasis: the scene is from the first a πειρασμός for the disciples; in fact it is the 'sifting' of which they have been warned a few verses back, in Luke xxii. 31. As there Jesus prayed for Peter under trial, so now he urges them all to pray, and himself sets the example. The

¹ Comparison is complicated by the presence of variant texts in Luke. Verses 43-4, though attested by $\aleph D \Theta$ and others, are absent from many authorities, while others insert them in the parallel passage of Matthew. If these verses are included in the text, the divergence from Mark is emphasized. But even if they are omitted, the proportion of words common to both is not great. Out of 171 significant words in Mark xiv. 32-42, Luke has only 18 (as compared with 123 in Matthew). The 18 may be increased to 23 if we count the repeated προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. Even so they do not amount to more than 32 per cent of Luke's shorter text, 23.5 per cent of his longer text; while of Matthew's 195 words 63 per cent are Marcan.

THE NARRATIVE

logical development is plainer in Luke. The wording of the prayer agrees with Mark in the words, παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, but its second clause is not very close to Mark, rather closer to Matthew. Beyond this there is no verbal agreement apart from indispensable words like προσεύχεσθαι and καθεύδειν. Mark's keyword γρηγορεῖτε is missing. Altogether Luke is far briefer, and yet he finds room for such a phrase as ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὥσει λίθου βολήν—which does not look as if he were deliberately abbreviating an account which lay before him. Still less is it like an abbreviator if verses 43-4 are to be accepted as part of the genuine text. They portray the distress of Jesus, in terms differing entirely from Mark's corresponding description (xiv. 33-4), and an answer to the prayer, of which Mark knows nothing. In short, there is no sufficient reason to believe that Luke used Mark at all in this section (for the two clauses common to both are such as would be likely to occur even in independent forms of tradition), and there is good reason to believe that the second source which we recognized in the preceding section is still the basis of the Lucan narrative. The question may be raised, whether Luke does not represent a more primitive state of the tradition. Mark is here very elaborate. His presentation lends itself to the enforcement of one of the most constant themes of Christian *paraenesis*: the theme of 'sleeping' and 'waking'.¹ The threefold return of Jesus to find his disciples asleep, while he is praying in deep distress of soul, is well calculated to impress upon the reader the enormity of the sin of which they are guilty, and of which Christians may be similarly guilty if they do not obey the call to 'awake out of sleep'. The gnomic phrase, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής, fits well this paraenetic character of the *pericopé*.²

In the second part of this section the relations of Mark and Luke are different. The verbal agreements are more substantial,³ and the general conception of the scene is the same. There are good grounds for holding that here Luke had Mark before him, though it remains possible that some of his minor peculiarities (in xxii. 48, 52, 53b) may betray the continued use of an alternative form of tradition alongside of Mark. Such a second

¹ See *Parables of the Kingdom* (Nisbet, 1961), pp. 122-5 ((Collins, 1961), pp. 115-18).

² 'A fine piece of rhetorical prose, drawn perhaps from a Christian sermon' (W. L. Knox, *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, vol. 1, p. 126).

³ The common expressions are by no means all such as are inevitable in recording the same matters: note αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, the unnecessary εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, εἰς τις (which occurs again in Mark xiv. 51, but nowhere else in the Lucan writings), and the curious expression for removing an ear, ἀφείλεν.

(L
γῆ
Ri
of
Kεε
2
imn
Iepq
Johr
sugg
3 J
uncoi
them.
4 V
know.
grown
special

THE ARREST

source might account for the striking additions which Luke, in his highly abbreviated version, has nevertheless made to the material which he has in common with Mark, namely (a) the question, Κύριε εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; (b) the stroke on the *right* ear, the rebuke, ἔατε ἕως τούτου, and the healing of the wound; (c) the pregnant saying, αὕτη ἐστὶν ὡμὼν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους.

We now turn to the Fourth Gospel. The transitional sentence (xviii. 1) which brings Jesus and his disciples to the scene of the arrest differs from Mark significantly. Mark (having earlier recorded that after supper they made for the Mount of Olives) now records their arrival at 'a plot of ground called Gethsemane'. John says nothing about the Mount of Olives and does not mention the name Gethsemane. Instead, he says that Jesus went with his disciples πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν Κέδρων¹ ὅπου ἦν κῆπος, which they entered; adding that it was a place to which he often resorted with his disciples (cf. Luke's κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, of the retirement to the Mount of Olives—which however perhaps does not mean exactly the same).² There is no contradiction between the two statements: a party on the way from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives would certainly cross the Kidron. But equally certainly John could not have learnt this from Mark. If he had before him the name Γεθσημανεὶ, there seems no good reason why (with his penchant for local names) he should not have copied it,³ even if he felt obliged to add that the plot so named was in fact not an oliveyard (as the name might seem to suggest, if it represents *ῥῶ-ῥῶ*, 'oil-press'), but a garden!⁴ If we regard the description as the result of

¹ Ὁ χειμάρρος τῶν Κέδρων, 'Wady of Cedars', is obviously a popular attempt (based on the sound) to give an intelligible meaning in Greek to the name *ῥῶ-ῥῶ* (much as the Welsh mountain Yr Eifl has been given the English name The Rivals, suggested by the sound of the name in Welsh). It occurs sometimes in MSS. of the LXX, which elsewhere have χειμάρρος Κεδρών. Josephus has χειμάρρος Κεδρώνος (*Ant.* viii. 17). The name occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.

² Luke xxii. 39 probably refers back to xxi. 37 where the proceedings of the period immediately preceding the fatal Passover are summarized: ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ὑλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν. John xviii. 2, πολλάκις συνήχθη Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, would suggest that the garden was used as a rendezvous.

³ Luke also has omitted the name Gethsemane. Luke had no liking for these uncouth Semitic names; he has omitted Γολγοθᾶ also; but John is fond of using them.

⁴ Whether κῆπος could be used in a broad sense to cover an oliveyard I do not know. Normally it seems to mean a plot where herbs, vegetables and flowers are grown, as distinct from a shrubbery or plantation (παράδεισος), as well as from the specialized ἀμπέλων, συκῶν, ἐλαιῶν (cf. Amos iv. 9). Yet the παράδεισος in which

'editing' or 'correcting' Mark, it would seem a singularly pointless proceeding, with no possible interest for readers at Ephesus in the late first century. The whole matter is trivial, and for that reason it appears to me one of the strongest pieces of evidence we have yet found that John was here writing in independence of Mark, and yet on the basis of good information, probably handed down in a separate strain of tradition.

The opening scene of this act of the drama according to Mark is missing from the Johannine Passion narrative, which contains neither the prayer of Jesus nor the sleep of the disciples. There is an apparent echo of the Marcan phrase ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν, with which the scene terminates as the actors move on to a fresh scene, at an altogether different point in the narrative (John xiv. 31). To this I shall return presently. There is also what might well be a reminiscence of Synoptic language in the words in which Jesus repudiates the attempt to resist his arrest: τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ οὐ μὴ πίνω αὐτό; (xviii. 11). This recalls the wording of the prayer, which in all three Synoptics has the keyword ποτήριον, though Matthew alone has the verb πίνειν. John, it might be said, has drawn a veil over the scene from motives of reverence,¹ and, omitting the inward struggle, has turned the final acceptance into an overt declaration. There is force in this; but the idea of the Passion as a 'cup' to be drunk is not confined to this context. It occurs also in Mark x. 38-9 (τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω). The background of the expression is to be found in such prophetic passages as Isa. li. 17-23, Jer. xxxii. 1-17 (xxv. 15-31), where the ποτήριον is a symbol for the terrible judgements of God.² Such passages are echoed in Rev. xiv. 10, xvi. 19, etc. The sacramental use of the word (Mark xiv. 23, 1 Cor. xi. 25) kept the idea of the 'cup' as symbol of the sufferings of Christ always in mind. It is therefore not

Susanna was falsely said to have misbehaved (36), and which contained trees (including a σχίνος (51) and a πρίνος (58)), is also called κήπος, and you could grow ῥάμνοι in a κήπος (Ep. Jer. 71). To 'correct' χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανὲ into κήπος would in any case be mere pedantry.

¹ Not theological motives; John is no docetist; see pp. 123-4, 325-6.

² In Jer. xxxii. 1 sqq. (xxv. 15 sqq.) the word of the Lord comes to the prophet: λάβε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ ἀκράτου τούτου ἐκ χειρός μου, καὶ ποτιεῖς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη... καὶ ἐρεῖς, Οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος, Πιόντες τῖσθε. It seems impossible not to suspect that such expressions lie behind the liturgical language of Matt. xxvi. 27: λαβὼν ποτήριον... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. The 'cup' of suffering is accepted by Christ, and given by him (the κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ) to his disciples. Because Christ has drunk it, it is the 'cup of salvation' (cf. Ps. cxv. 4: ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι καὶ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου ἐπικαλέσομαι). We ought not to be surprised to find the symbolism of 'drinking the cup' at any point, in any branch of the tradition, where the Passion of Christ is in view.

THE ARREST

necessary to trace the idea of 'drinking the cup' in John xviii. 11 to any particular passage in the other gospels; it is intrinsic to the total tradition.

These considerations go far to qualify the *prima facie* case for the dependence of John on the Synoptics at this point. They gain weight when we observe that there is evidence that John was not ignorant of the tradition of the prayer of Jesus, but knew it in a non-synoptic form.

The passage in question is xii. 27-8, which has been widely recognized as in some sort an equivalent for the Gethsemane *pericopé* in the Synoptics.¹ The core of it is a prayer which passes through two stages closely parallel to the two stages of the prayer in Gethsemane. The Lucan form lends itself best to comparison:

Luke xxii. 42	John xii. 27-8
Πάτερ . . . παρένεγκε τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἅπ' ἐμοῦ	Πάτερ σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης (cf. Mark xiv. 35: προσεύχεται ἵνα . . . παρέλθῃ ἅπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα)
μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω	Πάτερ δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα

The language has a Johannine stamp; ὥρα, δοξάζειν, ὄνομα, though none of them is peculiar to this gospel, are favourite expressions. But the underlying conception is the same as in the Synoptics.² So far, the phenomena might be explained by a Johannine re-writing of the Synoptic account. But there are further facts to be taken into account.

In John xii the passage opens with an allusion to Ps. xli. 7, ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐταράχθη (in John, νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετάρακται, cf. xiii. 21, Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι). In Mark it opens with an allusion to the preceding verse of the same psalm: ἵνα τί περίλυπος εἶ, ἡ ψυχὴ (in Mark, περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου (xiv. 34)).³ The coincidence proves that in both gospels Jesus is conceived as speaking in the character of the Righteous Sufferer of the psalm. Both therefore give expression to the same conception of the

¹ Some critics, strangely, have treated it as a parallel to the Transfiguration. The only point in common is the *bath qol*, which however has a different content in each case. Otherwise in form and content there is no resemblance, except in so far as the concept of the δόξα of Christ comes into both. But see next note.

² Christ glorifies the Father by completing His work (xvii. 4), and the work is completed in his passion and death (xix. 30), for the ἐντολή of the Father, which the Son obeys, is to 'lay down his life' (x. 17-18). This is the θέλημα of the Father which the Son seeks (v. 30), which he came to do (vi. 38), and which, while he is on earth, is his βρῶμα (iv. 34). It is thus that the sacrificial death of Christ (his self-dedication, xvii. 19) is his glory, because in it (in his full acceptance of the Father's θέλημα) the Father is glorified. Thus, in the context of Johannine thought, there is no substantial difference between θέλημα τὸ σὸν γινέσθω and δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα..

³ See pp. 38, 42-3.

Passion. Yet dependence of John on Mark here seems to be out of the question.

Further, in Mark there is no answer to the prayer. In Luke (longer text) there is an answer: ὥφθη αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. Similarly in John there is an answer: ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, on which bystanders comment, ἄγγελος αὐτῷ λελάληκεν. That this could have been modelled on Luke is not to be supposed, yet there is surely some common background. We have already seen reason to believe that Luke and Mark are following independently separate forms of tradition. Here we discern a third form of tradition behind John, a tradition having some more or less remote affinity with Luke's.

But that is not the end of the story. There is a passage in Heb. v. 7-8 which describes the prayer of Jesus 'in the days of his flesh'. Most commentators have rightly seen in it an allusion to the prayer before the Passion as we have it in the Synoptics. The passage is written in the rhetorical style characteristic of this author, and we cannot expect any marked verbal resemblances to our other accounts, but the movement of thought is similar: there are three stages: (a) prayer accompanied with great mental stress, (b) an answer to prayer, (c) the achievement of the perfection of obedience. In substance, the first and third stages correspond with all our other accounts, the second with Luke and John. Echoes of language are slight. In Hebrews Christ offers supplications πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου. For δυνάμενον compare Mark xiv. 36 πάντα δυνατά σοι (contrasted with the hypothetical εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, Matt. xxvi. 39; εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν, Matt. xxvi. 42; Luke has nothing of the kind); and for σώζειν compare John xii. 27, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης: the verb σώζειν does not occur in the Synoptic context. The mental distress accompanying the prayer is described by both Mark and Luke, in widely different terms (Mark, ἀδημονεῖν, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, in Luke ἀγωνία). Neither is echoed in Hebrews, which speaks of κραυγὴ and δάκρυα, both unknown to the gospels. But here as in the gospels we catch unmistakable echoes of the psalms of the Righteous Sufferer. In Ps. xli. 4 (the same psalm echoed in Mark and John) the Sufferer complains, ἐγενήθη τὰ δάκρυά μου ἄρτος ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, and declares, σωτήριον τοῦ προσώπου μου ὁ θεός μου. . . παρ' ἐμοὶ προσευχὴ τῷ θεῷ τῆς ζωῆς μου, and similarly in Hebrews Christ offers prayers and supplications πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου.¹ In a still more

¹ The echo is of thought rather than of language; yet if we put together all the expressions which seem to be more or less clearly echoed, within only six verses of

THE ARREST

important Passion psalm (xxi. 25) the Sufferer proclaims, ἐν τῷ κερκαγένοι με πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσήκουσέν μου, and similarly in Heb. v. 7 Christ offers prayers μετὰ κρῦγῆς, and is heard—εἰσακουσθεῖς. These psalms, we recall, were accepted in the primitive Church as a prophetic picture of the sufferings of Christ. Their language entered into the story of his Passion, probably at the earliest stage of oral tradition, and it can still be recognized in the gospels. Ps. xli, in particular, underlies the three accounts of the prayer of Jesus which we are examining, in Mark, John and the epistle to the Hebrews, although no two of these have the same phrases.

There are thus strong grounds for believing that an account of the prayer of Jesus before his Passion formed part of the central and primitive tradition, and was preserved in as many as four variant forms, which have entered into the canonical writings of the New Testament. It is therefore one of the most strongly attested elements in the gospel story. Each writer has in greater or less measure remoulded the tradition as it reached him, in accordance with his own style and aim: Mark has developed it in the direction of *paraenesis*; Luke (or a supplementer of Luke) has heightened the emotional colouring; the author to the Hebrews has adorned it in his own rhetorical manner; and John has clothed it in the language of his distinctive theology.

Whether this incident formed part of the general scheme of Passion narrative from the first is another question. The use made of it in Hebrews shows how readily it might have been handed down as an independent unit, and the strongly didactic element in the Marcan version suggests that it had a history in Christian *didaché* apart from its connection with the Passion story. Conceivably therefore John may have taken over a form of Passion tradition which lacked this feature. Yet its connection with the Passion is so intimate that even where it was repeated in isolation the hearers must have been aware that it took its place in the sequence of incidents leading to the cross. It would be in no way surprising if John deliberately moved it from its original setting, preferring to give it a place in a passage where he is preparing his readers for the Passion narrative by exhibiting its meaning in various aspects.¹

this psalm, it becomes difficult to resist the conclusion that the psalm as a whole has played a part in the shaping of the tradition: verse 4, δάκρυα, Heb.; verse 6, περίλυπος ἡ ψυχὴ, Mark; verse 6, σωτήριον ὁ θεός μου, John, Hebrews; verse 7, ἡ ψυχὴ ἐταράχθη, John; verse 9, προσευχὴ τῷ θεῷ τῆς ζωῆς μου, the general idea common to all, the verb in the Synoptics.

¹ See *Interpretation*, pp. 373-9.

THE NARRATIVE

But we have still to consider the other phrase which suggests *prima facie* that John was acquainted with Mark. The words in which Mark has made the transition from the first to the second scene of this act in the drama, ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν, reappear in a different context in John xiv. 31.¹ In Mark, Jesus puts an end to the conversation with his disciples with the words, 'Bestir yourselves; let us advance; look, the traitor is at hand!' In John it is not the human adversary who approaches, but the power of evil whose instrument he is: ἔρχεται ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων, to which Jesus adds, ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν. There is no consequent movement in space; the advance upon the enemy is Christ's own resolve to do the Father's will: καθὼς ἐνετείλατό μοι ὁ πατήρ οὕτως ποιῶ (John xiv. 31). Here therefore, as in Mark though in a different way, there is an inner connection between the acceptance of the will of God and the advance on the enemy. The natural setting of the words ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν would seem to be that which Mark has given them. The motives which may have led John to give them a different setting, supposing him to have been acquainted with something like Mark's narrative, are not altogether difficult to discern, in view of his known tendencies.

If we now review the whole problem presented by the comparison of John and the Synoptics at this point, we seem led to the conclusion that the Passion tradition which John followed probably did contain something corresponding to the Marcan scene of the prayer of Jesus and the sleep of the disciples, but he has preferred to transfer its essential elements to other contexts, leaving the scene of the arrest to be presented in terms of a highly dramatic confrontation between Jesus, now completely isolated, and his adversaries; a confrontation conceived wholly in the spirit of that acceptance of the will of God which is the motive both of the prayer of John xii. 27-8 and of the moment of resolve in xiv. 30-1. That John had a source other than the Synoptics for the prayer of Jesus we have seen to be highly probable, and it is likely enough that the watchword ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν was not confined to any one form of tradition.²

With the appearance of Judas and the posse John falls into line with the Synoptics, and xviii. 3-13 corresponds with Mark xiv. 43-50 and the Synoptic parallels, but there are substantial differences in the way the story

¹ See *Interpretation*, pp. 406-9.

² It is perhaps worth observing that the use of the verb ἐγείρεσθαι does not necessarily imply that the Johannine tradition contained a scene in which the disciples were asleep, for although it is frequently used of waking from sleep it is also used of bestirring oneself from a state of inactivity. In Mark the disciples are already awake when the words ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν are used.

THE ARREST

is told. The common nucleus tells how Judas arrived with a body of armed men to make the arrest, how Jesus confronted them, how one blow was struck in his defence, and how he was taken into custody. The order of events differs slightly, Luke and John agreeing in placing the actual arrest at the end, while in Mark (followed by Matthew) Jesus is already in custody before the blow is struck and before he makes his protest. This is a minor difference; in the main the story is the same. Verbally, the closest resemblances are in the episode of the attack on the High Priest's slave: I will discuss this presently.¹ There is partial agreement between John and Mark also in the description of the party sent to make the arrest. According to Mark it was an ὄχλος² παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (*scil.* the Sanhedrin, consisting of these three 'estates'). According to John it contained ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ ἐκ τῶν φαρισαίων ὑπηρέτας. Allowing for John's (apparently mistaken) view that the Pharisees were a constitutional body parallel with the priesthood, this does not differ from Mark. Luke, on the other hand, brings the ἀρχιερεῖς on the scene in person, accompanied by the στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, whom we might regard as officers commanding John's ὑπηρέται, if these are to be understood as the temple police. According to Mark (and Luke) the party was armed with swords and truncheons (μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ξύλων), according to John, more vaguely, with weapons (ὅπλα). He adds that they bore lights (μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων). This feature might equally well be a piece of independent information or an intelligent inference. That it corresponds with the facts need not be doubted.³

There is, however, one really significant difference. John says that the party included a σπεῖρα under the command of a χιλιάρχος. Normally this should mean a cohort (at this time usually 600 men) under a *tribunus militum*. Σπεῖρα, however, is also used for the manipule, a subdivision of the cohort. If a whole battalion under its commanding officer was turned out to effect the arrest, the authorities must have gravely overestimated the

¹ See pp. 77-80.

² In Mark ὄχλος does not appear to convey the meaning of a disorderly mob, which it often (though by no means always) bears in classical Greek. He seems to mean by it no more than a considerable, but indefinite, number of people gathered together. There is therefore no necessary contrast between a disorderly mob in Mark and a disciplined cohort in John.

³ The objection that lights would be unnecessary on a night of full moon (which is urged against the credit of the Johannine version of the story) is captious. We do not know that it was not a cloudy night, and in any case, if you are searching for a person supposed to be hiding in a garden it would be a wise precaution to be provided with lights.

strength of the adherents of Jesus, and expected more formidable resistance. Even a maniple, say 200 men, would seem a very ample provision. Perhaps the evangelist had no very accurate acquaintance with Roman military terminology.¹ But in any case he would certainly have us believe that Roman troops were among the party which came upon Jesus and his disciples in the garden, and (xviii. 12) that they co-operated with the temple police in making the arrest. There is no hint of this in any of our other sources. It raises difficulties when we try to relate it to the subsequent proceedings in court. But the question we are asking here is whether there is reason to suppose that the evangelist had authority for his account of the arrest in non-Synoptic tradition, and so far as the presence of Roman troops is concerned, there seems to be no material for answering that question. All we can say is that there does not appear to be any recognizable theological or apologetic motive for the introduction of the Romans at this point. That in general this evangelist is much more aware than the others of the imperial authorities as a factor in the situation is certainly true, but at this stage we have no means of knowing whether this represents a tendency of his own, or had its roots in the tradition he was following. This matter had better be left for discussion at a later point.²

After the introduction of Judas and the posse the Johannine narrative temporarily loses contact with the Synoptic. There is no betrayal with a kiss, and no word is spoken either by Judas to Jesus, as in Mark, or by Jesus to Judas, as in Matthew and Luke. Judas does not in any way identify Jesus as the person to be arrested (as he does pointedly in Mark). His function is, to all appearance, solely to direct the party to the place where he knew Jesus was to be found (xviii. 2). Similarly in Acts i. 16 he is described as ὁδηγὸς τοῖς συλλαβοῦσιν Ἰησοῦν. The context in Acts is deeply penetrated with 'testimony' material,³ and seems to belong to the

¹ Mark brings on the σπεῖρα at a later stage. After Pilate had pronounced sentence the soldiers (*scil.*: the small detachment which had been engaged in guarding the Prisoner during the trial) called together ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν into the Praetorium. Did Mark seriously mean that the entire battalion of 600 men was assembled for this scene of brutal buffoonery? Or did he think only of a considerable body of troops? How large a force did the author of Judith (xiv. 11) envisage when the men of Israel ἐξήλθοσαν κατὰ σπεῖρας?

² See pp. 112-15, 118-20.

³ Acts i. 20 cites Ps. lxviii. 26, cviii. 8. The latter psalm is not a source of testimonies, unless verse 25, ἐσάλευσαν κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν, be supposed to be echoed in Mark xv. 29, κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς, which however is closer to Ps. xxi. 8. But Ps. lxviii has yielded several Passion testimonies: verse 4 is cited in John xv. 25, verse 10a is cited in

same general shape. That Jo minimize his a tradition v priests, so a kiss.

In any ca Judas to i identity. T details are torches a confront of his f character or not scene t underl

(i) taken πάντ form (i is i Gc ac Jo e

soldiers and Judas, the δι (13:27), encounter the one w

The presence of the disci
utmost significance, and their
the phrase used in LXX Isaiah
44:1-2; 49:7).¹⁰⁰ Those choser

of salvific intervention in l
application of the term ἐξελεξί
13:18; 15:16, 19), also indicat
have been chosen by Jesus is to

the setting of the 'hour' (13:1), i
his betrayal and its fulfilment. In
purpose of the calling of Israel to
Yahweh as the truly incomparabl

the past will, once again, fill th
nilarly, in view of the connect
betrayal (13:18-19) and the arr

he acceptance of his ἐγώ εἰμ
y as the one who, by means
romises of eschatological s

passages, and Jesus' discip
because they will themse
armed 'the Jews' in con

vis ἐγώ εἰμι claim (8:24
ss (8:28; cf. 3:14; 12:
ins to unfold, and it

unce of Jesus' death (c
cutive part in the pro
les to believe that th
fe to others.

cing ἐγώ εἰμι, εἰ
3: ὅτι ἀπὸ ἐ
Gospel, 199f., i
ations in John 1
n as the servan
and to do what

e took
or, or to
I followed
adas by the
of the traitor's

story, no need for
d and discloses his
nor's manner. The few
st: the armed men with
eir sudden recoil as Jesus
mself up to secure the escape
the product of that sense for
all through this gospel. Whether
orical, it certainly brings the whole
o note certain characteristic motives

pains to observe that Jesus was in no way
foreknew all that was to befall him (ἐξῆς
xviii. 4). This is in fact presupposed in all
ative, but it is like our author to make it explicit.
If up to death of his own sovereign will. Again, it
els that Jesus freely accepted his fate as the will of
e Scriptures;¹⁰¹ but here the voluntary character of his
into strong relief, in accordance with the doctrine of
A theological motive, we may say, has selected this
e common tradition, and isolated it for special emphasis.
: repeated ἐγώ εἰμι (xviii. 5, 6, 7), with which Jesus makes him-
wn to his opponents, can hardly have failed to carry, for the
plus, mysterious overtones, even although in itself it means no
e than 'I am the man you are looking for—Jesus of Nazareth!'

John 8: 17 and verse 10b in Rom. xv. 3, verse 21a is echoed in Matt. xxvii. 34, verse
xix recalled in Mark vi. 36 and expressly cited in John xix. 28 (see also *According*
to the Synoptists, 99-100).

¹⁰¹ This is the implication of Mark xiv. 49, where Jesus, after protesting against the
use of violence to arrest him, adds, ὅτι ἡ ἐκλογὴ μου οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν ὀπλίᾳ—'Let the
'voluntaries be fulfilled'.

¹⁰² The doublet repetition of the significant phrase may be compared with the
doublet repetition of ἡ σὺν τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς in vv. 10, 11, 12. In each place an expression
entirely normal in the circumstances is given a special importance by a repetition
which is sufficiently unusual to draw the reader's attention.

(iv) Jesus gives himself up to save his disciples: the Good Shepherd, seeing the wolf coming, lays down his life for the sheep (x. 15). Here John has expressly called attention to the fulfilment of Christ's own words, οὐς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδέν (xviii. 9). I have elsewhere¹ shown that this note is not open to the suspicion of having been added by a redactor who misunderstood the meaning of xvii. 12. It is entirely in this evangelist's manner to see, in apparently matter-of-fact incidents, 'signs' of deeper realities. The self-surrender of Christ to save his disciples from the police is, *sub specie aeternitatis*, no other than the sacrifice by which he saves mankind from darkness and death. Both are the expression of the love with which God loved the world.

It seems clear, therefore, that motives arising out of the Johannine theology have influenced this part of the Passion narrative. This, however, does not foreclose the question, whether or not the evangelist was working upon material derived from tradition. If so, it must have been independent of the Synoptic tradition.

I have already noted, as regards points (i) and (ii), that all forms of tradition are unanimous in representing Jesus as aware of his approaching fate, and as meeting it voluntarily in a spirit of self-sacrifice. So far, the theological colouring amounts to no more than added emphasis. The use of the expression, ἐγὼ εἰμι, although it is patent of a profound theological purport, is not necessarily a product of the evangelist's theology, any more than it is in vi. 20, where it occurs also in the Marcan parallel. John delights in such double meanings. The test-passage is that which describes the recoil of the assailants before the presence of Jesus. But it is just here that apparent reminiscences of passages in the Old Testament suggest that the evangelist is working on traditional material. When Jesus made himself known, we are told, ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπασαν χαμαὶ (xviii. 6). Now in Psalm xxxiv. 4—a psalm which has yielded several *testimonia*,² including one cited by John in xv. 25—the Righteous Sufferer prays, ἀποστραφείησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ καταισχυνθείησαν οἱ λογιζόμενοί μοι κακά.³ Again, in Ps. xxvi. 2, another 'Passion'

¹ See *Interpretation*, pp. 423–33.

² Ps. xxxiv. 11, ἀναστάντες μάρτυρες ἄδικοι, cf. Mark xiv. 57, καὶ τινες ἀναστάντες ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ; Ps. xxxiv. 16, ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με μυκτηρισμόν, cf. Luke xxiii. 35, ἐξεμυκτήριζον οἱ ἄρχοντες.

³ Cf. also Ps. xxxix. 15, ἀποστραφείησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἐντραπήσαν οἱ θέλοντές μοι κακά. This Psalm has yielded the important *testimonium* cited in Heb. x. 5–9.

THE ARREST

psalm,¹ the Sufferer declares, according to the LXX, οἱ ἐχθροὶ μου αὐτοὶ ἡσθάνθησαν καὶ ἔπεσαν. The Hebrew runs, כָּשְׁלוּ וַיִּפְּלוּ, 'they stumbled and fell', which is somewhat closer to the Fourth Gospel.² It seems, therefore, that the Johannine description has behind it those psalms which played so large a part in the formation of the Passion tradition, and whose language colours so much of that of the Passion narrative in this and other gospels. That is to say, behind the Johannine theology of this passage we can discern once again the more primitive conception of Christ as the Righteous Sufferer of prophecy. If so, then there is strong ground for believing that John is drawing upon tradition, as he is in other places where the primitive stock of 'testimony' scriptures is laid under contribution. In that case, we are justified in concluding that the picture of the assailants recoiling before their intended victim, though it is here made to serve a theological purpose, was an integral part of one form of tradition.

In all our gospels the account of the arrest includes an attack on the posse, in which a slave of the High Priest is injured. The setting of the episode varies. In Mark, followed by Matthew, it follows the apprehension of the Prisoner, and has the aspect of an attempted rescue.³ In Luke and John it precedes the arrest, and looks like an attempt to prevent it. In the description of the blow, and there alone, there is some measure of verbal agreement among the four. For the purpose of comparison we may place Mark and John side by side.

Mark xiv. 47	John xviii. 10
εἰς τῶν παρεστηκότων	Σίμων Πέτρος
σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν	ἔχων μάχαιραν εἰλκυσεν αὐτήν
ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον	καὶ ἔπαισεν τὸν τοῦ
τοῦ ἀρχιερέως	ἀρχιερέως δοῦλον
καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ	καὶ ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ
τὸ ὠτάριον (ν.λ. ὠτίον)	τὸ ὠτάριον (ν.λ. ὠτίον) ⁴

¹ Ps. xxvi. 12, ἐπανέστησάν μοι μάρτυρες ἄδικοι, cf. Mark xiv. 57. For John, the repeated use of the verb ὑψοῦν with reference to the vindication of the Sufferer (verses 5, 6) would be significant.

² If the attractive, though poorly attested, reading ἀπῆλθεν . . . ἔπεσεν should be adopted, the allusion to the psalms would still be pertinent; the whole body of the Sufferer's adversaries (οἱ λογιζόμενοι, θέλοντές, μοι κακά) would then be incorporated in the person of the traitor.

³ But perhaps it was an act of defiance rather than defence. An injury is inflicted upon the servant, as surrogate for his master, which would have disqualified the latter from performing his sacred office (D. Daube, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xi, part 1 (1960), pp. 59-61).

⁴ It is not certain whether Mark and John agree in the word for 'ear', or whether ὠτάριον is to be read in the one and ὠτίον in the other. It is possible that in both

Matthew and Luke differ from Mark and John in using the verb *πατάσσειν* instead of *παίειν*. Matthew agrees with Mark in using the verb *(ἀπο)σπέν* where John has *ἐλκύειν*, and Luke says nothing about the 'drawing' of the weapon. Where all three Synoptics use the somewhat odd expression *ἀφείλεν* for the removal of the ear, John has the more natural *ἀπέκοψε*. But John agrees with Luke against the others that it was the *right* ear that suffered. Further, whereas the Synoptics do not name the assailant but describe him merely as one present, or one of the adherents of Jesus,¹ John knows that it was Simon Peter, as he also knows the name of the injured man, *Μάλχος*.

After the 'removal' of the ear, Mark has nothing further to say of the episode. According to Luke, Jesus used the somewhat enigmatic words, *ἔατε ἕως τούτου*—meaning, probably, 'Let them have their way as far as this', and in any case implying disapproval of the attack—and he then healed the injured ear. Of the healing the others know nothing, but the expression of disapproval is more clear and emphatic in Matthew and John. Both report an order to sheathe the weapon, but in different terms:

Matt. xxvi. 52

ἀπόστρεψον τὴν μάχαιράν σου
εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς

John xviii. 11

βάλε τὴν μάχαιραν
εἰς τὴν θήκην

Matthew then gives an aphorism, *πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται*, which betrays the use of the story for purposes of ethical instruction.² He adds a saying about legions of angels without parallel elsewhere, and concludes with a dogmatic statement about the fulfilment of prophecy.³ Of all this John has nothing. After the command

ὥτιον is due to assimilation to Matthew, where all MSS. give this reading. Luke has *οὗς*.

¹ Mark's *εἰς τῶν παρεστηκότων* is indeterminate; it might mean 'a bystander'; that Mark conceived others to have been present beside the Twelve and the posse, is clear from the episode of the *νεανίσκος*. Matthew has interpreted it as meaning one of those who accompanied Jesus, *εἰς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ*. Luke similarly speaks of *ὁ ἐκ τῶν μετὰ*, one of whom uses his sword.

² The epigrammatic generalization is comparable in form with the aphorism which Mark has introduced into the Gethsemane *pericopé*, *τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής* (Mark xiv. 38). Both are probable evidence that the form of tradition lying behind each of these gospels had had a prior history in the context of Christian *didaché*. The didactic motive persists in what follows in Matthew.

³ The difference between Mark and Matthew here should not be overlooked. Mark's *ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί*, 'Let the scriptures be fulfilled', is the direct expression of a personal and ethical resolve. Matthew's *πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί, ὅτι οὕτως δεῖ γενέσθαι* (xxvi. 54), followed by *τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα*

to sheathe th
in terms wh
Matthaean,
they are the
αἱ γραφαί.

Briefly,
sions μάχ
and Luk
avoiding
words τ
though
represe
Mattha
expres
John
word

Th
assa
stril
imj
Jol
so
cc
v
r

THE ARREST

to sheathe the sword, Jesus expresses his acceptance of the Father's will, in terms which (as we have seen)¹ recall the Marcan, and still more the Matthaean, rendering of the prayer in Gethsemane, while in substance they are the equivalent of the concluding words in Mark: *ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί*.

Briefly, then, John agrees with all the Synoptics in the use of the expressions *μάχαιρα*, and *τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*, with Mark against Matthew and Luke in the verb *παίειν*, with Matthew and Mark against Luke in avoiding the term *οὖς*, and with Luke against Matthew and Mark in the words *τὸ δεξιόν*. That is the extent of verbal agreement. In substance, though not in words, the Johannine account agrees with the Lucan in representing the attack as an attempt at defence, not rescue, and with the Matthaean in giving a direct order to sheathe the weapon. In the final expression of acceptance of the will of God (as declared in the Scriptures) John goes with Mark (rather than Matthew), in spirit though not in words, while Luke has nothing to correspond.

There is here no sufficient ground for inferring that the story of the assault on the slave was derived from the Synoptic Gospels, in spite of the striking verbal resemblance in the clause describing the actual blow. It is impossible to treat any one of the Synoptics as the primary source of the Johannine version of the narrative, since he is sometimes closer to one and sometimes to another of the three. Once again, the hypothesis of literary conflation of documentary sources seems less probable than that of variation within an oral tradition. It does not appear that theological motives have been at work. The one original contribution which John makes to the narrative is the naming of the assailant and his victim. It is customary at the present time to regard the insertion of names into a narrative in which the persons are elsewhere anonymous as a symptom of 'legendary development'. That story-tellers do delight in individualizing their characters by supplying them with names is certainly true; but it is not true that the line of development is always in that direction, nor are the names supplied always fictitious. In the Gospels, Mark's Jairus has lost his name in Matthew, his Bartimaeus in Matthew and Luke, and his Alexander and Rufus have vanished from both. On the other hand, in introducing Caiaphas for Mark's vague *ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς* Matthew has certainly not invented a fictitious name. It is therefore not legitimate to assume

πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί τῶν προφητῶν (xxvi. 56), is conceived in the form of dogmatic instruction. John is more akin to Mark than to Matthew here.

¹ See above, pp. 68-9.

from the outset that the identification of the assailant as Simon Peter and of the slave as Malchus is fictitious. If we are to take account of the general probabilities of the situation, we should reflect that if there were two swords among the Twelve, as Luke says there were (xxii. 38), it is more than likely that Peter had one of them, and if he had, he was (so far as we know him) not the man to let it rest in its sheath.¹ This is an inference, and an inference which the Fourth Evangelist might have made as readily as we do. If, on the other hand, there was a tradition to this effect, it is not difficult to see why it might have been covered over at a time when Peter was a marked man (cf. Acts xii. 3, 17) and it was not politic to let him be represented as a man of violence—above all, as one who deliberately affronted the High Priest in the person of his servant (if that be the true significance of the injured ear). As for Malchus, the name may well be fictitious, and the introduction of his kinsman in the group round the fire in the High Priest's courtyard (xviii. 26) may be no more than a dramatic touch of verisimilitude. On the other hand, if there was present at the palace (xviii. 15) a μαθητής who was γνωστός τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ (and I see no *a priori* reason for rejecting the statement),² then we have a channel through which knowledge of the man's name might have passed into Christian tradition. So far as I can see we have no sufficient evidence for either accepting or rejecting the names of Peter and Malchus as traditional.

To sum up:

1. The second act of the Passion drama in John begins with a topographical note which would be pointless as a correction of Mark, and indicates with fair certainty the use of a different strain of tradition.
2. Although there is here no account of the prayer of Jesus, a comparison of John xii. 27-9 with relevant passages in other New Testament writings makes it probable in the highest degree that John had a distinct form of tradition about the prayer, and reasonably probable that it was part of the Passion tradition as it reached him. Its displacement could be understood on the basis of his known practice.

¹ As we noted above, Peter's action in the Garden is consistent with his offer to die *for* his Master (as in John xiii. 37), rather than to die *with* him (as in Mark xiv. 31; Matt. xxvi. 35; Luke xxii. 33). This evidence might be interpreted in more than one direction. If John chose (for some reason not obvious to us) to make Peter the champion of his Master when he was in danger, he would naturally make the necessary adjustment in the form of Peter's profession of loyalty. But it is equally plausible, at least, to suppose that the tradition which John followed was itself consistent in this respect, and different from that followed by the Synoptics. ² See below, pp. 86-8.

THE ARREST

3. The introduction of Roman troops into the scene of the arrest has no obvious theological or apologetic motive, and may or may not be derived from a special strain of tradition.

4. The account of the assault on the High Priest's servant resembles Mark so closely that we could well believe it to be derived from Mark, but that the immediate context contains features resembling at one point Matthew and at another Luke, as well as other passages in Mark. These phenomena seem to point to the kind of variation that arises within an oral tradition, rather than conflation of documentary sources.