CHAPTER EIGHT
FROM THE LAST SUPPER TO THE ARREST

In their accounts of Jesus’ actions from the end of the last supper up to and including his arrest, the third and fourth gospels have the following points in common: (a) the disciples are explicitly mentioned as accompanying Jesus as he leaves the meal (Lk. 22. 39b, Jn. 18. 1); (b) Jesus’ goal is not called Gethsemane; (c) the place where Jesus was arrested is mentioned as one frequented by him (Lk. 22. 39a, Jn. 18. 12); (d) Jesus is arrested at the conclusion of the scene in which his assailants come upon him (Lk. 22. 54, Jn. 18. 12; συλλαμβάνω appears in both places); the disciples’ use of force therefore represents an effort to prevent his arrest, not to free him, as in Matthew and Mark; ¹ (e) the rôle of Judas’ kiss is reduced as over against Matthew and Mark; ² (f) the right ear of the highpriest’s slave is cut off; ³ (g) the disciples do not flee. ⁴

¹ Zurhellen, op. cit., p. 40, maintains that Luke and John do not here agree, i.e. that Lk. 22. 54 presupposes the arrest as already having occurred, showing that Luke merely omitted to mention the arrest in v. 48. But ἐκδίκησεν in v. 49 (D’s reading of γενόμενον is clearly secondary) reveals the incorrectness of this view.

² John omits it entirely. Luke mentions it in 22. 48—but unlike Matthew and Mark doesn’t mention the agreement between Judas and his companions as to what it was to signify. (That this latter really is necessary is shown by the fact that D syri felt called upon to supply it in Luke’s text.) As for 22. 48, it is a question whether it represents Jesus’ response to the kiss as it is being delivered (so Zurhellen, op. cit., p. 49, and Bernard and Klostermann in their commentaries, ad loc.) or whether with these words Jesus warns Judas to desist from the particular wickedness of a betrayal by means of a kiss, i.e. he prevents the kiss therewith (so Dibelius, op. cit., p. 202 and—following Moffatt—Manson, op. cit., ad loc.). The fact that the kiss is not actually mentioned as occurring favors the latter interpretation, in which case Luke agrees with John that the kiss did not occur.

³ Grant, op. cit., p. 297, cites the fact that τὸ δὲξιὸν in both Lk. 22. 50 and Jn. 18. 10a comes at the end of a sentence, and concludes from this that probably in both cases it constitutes a late addition to the text. But there is no manuscript evidence to support this view; and, if τὸ δὲξιὸν did not originally form part of at least one of the two accounts, how is its existence in either gospel to be explained?

⁴ One minor agreement may further be mentioned: τὸ δικαστήριον occurs in Lk. 22. 40 and Jn. 18. 2. In addition, there is a similarity of construction between
The first two of these elements are, in Luke, separated from the scene of the arrest by the incident of Jesus' praying and the disciples' sleeping, but it will be convenient to deal with them in connection with the elements centering about Jesus' arrest.

Before trying to evaluate the significance of these agreements, it is important to realize the differences that exist between the Lucan and Johannine accounts of the arrest. In Luke Jesus speaks to Judas concerning the kiss, the disciples ask Jesus if they may use force to defend him, the ear wound is healed by him, and in several sentences (vv. 52 f.) he points out the injustice of what his assailants are doing. John brings none of this, instead he recounts, as Luke does not, that Judas comes accompanied by Roman soldiers and their commander, that Jesus twice asks them whom they seek and upon their answering says twice that he is the man, that they thereupon fall to the ground, that Jesus intercedes on behalf of his disciples, and that Peter and Malchus are the names of the two involved in the ear incident. In view of these divergences, the agreements between the two gospels appear to be isolated ones, occurring in the midst of basically different contexts. We shall see whether further examination confirms this impression. Such an examination will have two goals: first, to determine whether the evidence points to Luke's and John's having drawn on a common source or on two similar sources here, or to John's having drawn on Luke; second, to determine the historical value of the material on which the two accounts agree.

As far as Luke is concerned, there are two possibilities: either he derived these elements from a non-Marcan source, or they are the product of his own pen. In connection with two of them, the answer is clear. The notice in Lk. 22. 39 that Jesus went to the Mount of Olives as was his custom derives from, as it agrees with, that in 21. 37 f. (according to which Jesus while in Jerusalem spent his days in the temple teaching and his nights in the Mount of Olives), which clearly stems from Luke's pen ¹ and represents his

Lk. 22. 40: ἔδωκε δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸ ἐσόμενον . . . , and Jn. 18. 4: Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἶδος πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ' αὐτὸν . . .

¹ Mark associates Jesus both with the Mount of Olives (11, 1, 13, 13, 14, 26) and Bethany (11, 1, 11, 11 f., 14, 3) during his period of activity in Jerusalem; Luke's preference for the former has to do with the association in the Marcan tradition of Bethany with the anointing of Jesus, which incident Luke (see above) brings according to another tradition which has nothing to do with that village.