We’re going to turn, then, to Redaction Criticism. What is Redaction Criticism? When you look at some definitions, redaction is the activity of a redactor. That brings the question of, “What’s a redactor?” Well, we could say, “A person who does redaction.” But we’ll say, “A synonym for editor.” And then Redaction Criticism is a type of biblical study concerned with the activity of redactors, or editors. Norman Perrin in his little booklet, *What is Reaction Criticism*, on page one says, “It is concerned with studying the theological motivation of an author, as this is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing and modification of traditional material, and in the composition of new material, or the creation of new forms within the traditions of early Christianity.”

I’m going to give you a very quick sketch here of Redaction Criticism. It is a relatively recent development in liberal New Testament criticism for which we give a quick review. We talked earlier about the Synoptic Problem in source criticism. Since the second century there had been debate and discussion regarding the similarities and differences among the Gospels and how to explain them. By the late 19th century, a sort of consensus had been reached called the two-document theory with Q and Mark as sources of Matthew and Luke. This type of work is called Literary, or Source Criticism. [As for] the historical reliability of the Gospels, this discussion went on in parallel with the Synoptic Problem. There became especially sharp debate with the rise of theological liberalism in the 19th century. By the end of that century, so around 1900, most liberals felt Mark was the most reliable Gospel, and except for its miracles, basically historical. Welhelm Wrede, in his *Messianic Secret*, 1901, argued that Mark was not reliable history, but theologically motivated to present Jesus as Messiah, though Jesus never
claimed to be such.

Then Form Criticism arose in the New Testament studies just after World War II in Germany. Its pioneers were Carl Schmidt, Martin Dibelius, and especially Rudolph Bultmann. They accepted Wrede’s claim that Mark made up his own framework, and they tried to go beyond the Gospels to study the period of oral transmission. Most form critics claim that between Jesus’ life and the writing of the Gospels, much material was invented, and much was changed.

Well, that brings us to Redaction Criticism. Redaction Criticism seeks to round out the critical analysis of the Gospels by filling in areas overlooked by Form Criticism and Source Criticism. It studies the work of the Gospel editors, especially their theological motivation in compiling oral materials to form written accounts, or in combining and editing written materials to form their Gospels. So Form Criticism is up here about the oral tradition; Source Criticism is down here about Mark and Q and their relationship to Matthew and Luke; and Redaction Criticism is looking at what Mark does in choosing traditions and modifying them, and what Q does in choosing tradition and modifying it; and especially what Matthew and Luke do in selecting material out of Mark and Q.

Redaction Criticism was foreshadowed in the work of Wrede and Bultmann, but especially in R.H. Lightfoot’s Baton Lecture, 1934. R.H. Lightfoot is to be distinguished from J.B. Lightfoot from the 19th century who was a much more conservative man. However the real flowering of Redaction Criticism came from Germany just after World War II. So [while] Form Criticism comes out of Germany just after World War I, Redaction Criticism comes out of Germany just after World War II. The works involved here are Gunter Bornkamm and his work on Matthew in 1948, and following Hans Conzelman and his work on Luke in 1954, and Wille Markson in his work on Mark in 1956. More recently, Redaction Criticism is spread to the study of Q and of John. Robert Gundry’s work on Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art in 1982 represents a spread of the method in the evangelical circles for which Gundry was actually
voted out of the Evangelical Theological Society. Gundry feels that Matthew invented some of his incidents in his Gospel to make theological points; namely, the visit of the magi and the killing of the babies. Gundry may be the most radical evangelical here, but he’s certainly not alone.

Methodology of Redaction Criticism

Let’s think a little about methodology in Redaction Criticism. How does Redaction Criticism operate? The following steps give us sketch of the procedures involved. Redaction Criticism is concerned to examine the editing work of, typically, one editor at a time, anyway. So you carefully compare all differences between a given gospel and its parallels. So, for instance, say you’re going to look at the redacting work of Matthew, let’s say, for which you mean the author of the Gospel Matthew, which Gundry, I think, did think it was Matthew. I have to check that, as I don’t remember that now. So you would compare Matthew with Mark and Luke and note where differences occur in each of their accounts to attempt to discover those differences which are the result of the editorial activity of the writer under study. Which of these are things that Matthew did? So when you’re comparing Mark’s account with Matthew’s account, is this what Matthew did to it or not? That sort of thing.

Typically then, you have to assume some sort of order in the relationship of the Gospels. Almost invariably the assumption is the two document theory which, among actual researchers in the Gospel, in those kind of questions, is certainly the majority view but is not a vast majority view. But when you get down to Redaction Criticism, that’s what the vast majority of scholars are going with. That two document model holds that Matthew used Mark and Q. Then, secondly, you assume the writer has no other sources, or at least that his own contribution can be distinguished by style. Then you compare statistics on style to recognize the author’s contribution in areas where it would otherwise be uncertain. So you’ve
looked at the differences, and now you’re trying to distinguish for the particular example we’re thinking Matthew’s work, etc. Then thirdly, you study these detailed differences to determine the author’s theological motivation for introducing these differences. Once you’ve figured out what those are, you locate texts which interpret these motivations and then you interpret the whole Gospel in terms of these texts and motivations.

Fourthly, you reconstruct the author’s outlook, his circumstances, his group and his audience. That is what the Germans call sitz im leben, or “life situation” of the author, etc. Marxan, in working with the redaction criticism in Mark, is typical in seeing three sitz im leben—three life situations—in a given Gospel passage. There’s first of all the ministry of Jesus. Marxan and all these others would admit Jesus existed and that he really did things like they say so, and what some of the sitz im leben, one sitz im leben, is the minister Jesus. But then there’s the background of the sources, and those would be Mark and Q and proto-Mark, or various sorts of things of that sort: what is their sitz im leben? And then you got the redactor, the background of the Gospel writer, the sitz im leben of that person. So for Marxan that would be Mark, for Gundry that would be Matthew, etc.

Results of Rhetorical Criticism

We’re not going to go through that in detail; this is just a short presentation at the end of a course, but what are some results of Redaction Criticism in liberal circles? We know very little about the life of Jesus. But we can reconstruct lots of diverse groups in early Christianity. In conservative circles, Redaction Criticism is much more restrained among evangelicals, but with the work of Gundry and others, it’s beginning to introduce the idea that not all narratives describe events which really occurred. Matthew for Gundry becomes a kind of Midrash, a term borrowed from rabbinic nomenclature: an imaginative retelling or invention of events that makes various theological points.
Evaluation of Redaction Criticism

Well, we will give an evaluation of Redaction Criticism. I start out with a few favorable comments because we’re going to talk about some problems later on. First of all, favorable: the Gospel writers did select incidents, materials about Jesus, which they chose to record. Presumably, they also condensed this material. So John 20:30-31 and John 21:25 tells us, you know, there’s lots of material out there and I’ve selected this to help you see Jesus as Messiah so that you might have life in his name. And Luke 1:1 refers to compiling an account.

Secondly, any detailed study of the gospel is bound to produce some valuable insights. The approach does study the Gospels in great detail. And thirdly, the gospel writers apparently did emphasize various features of Jesus’ ministry in their selection and presentation as we may see by comparing their gospels. Matthew emphasizes Jesus as the king messiah, coming in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy to set up a kingdom of heaven and makes these parallels between Jesus and Israel. He preserves the substantial discourses of Jesus. Mark emphasizes Jesus’ actions and brief words to answer the question, who is this man? In fact, this is asked by different people in the path of the Gospel Mark. His answer is: he’s the Messiah, he’s the Son of God. Luke has an emphasis on historicity, as you see in his prologue and eye witness testimony to Jesus. He had an interest in social relationships: in Gentiles, women, and the poor, and has illustrative parables. John had emphasis on Jesus’ significance, both individual and cosmic, and his person as revealed in his words and miracles. John has more symbolism, more allegorical parables, but still the same Jesus. These emphases do give us insight into the theological concerns of the writers. So those are favorable comments. They did select materials. Any detailed study will produce valuable insights: the Gospels did apparently emphasize various features of Jesus’ ministry, etc., and these emphases do give us insight into theological concerns of the Gospel writers.
There are some serious problems however. Some of the results that form critics get, even a form critic like Gundry, are alarming. We get, first of all, a rejection of historical details. Wrede said Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah. Perrin, who is strictly more of a redaction critic, says we know little about Jesus. Here’s what his statement looks like.

That redaction criticism makes the Jesus search very much more difficult, is, of course, immediately obvious with the recognition that so much material of the Gospels must be ascribed to the theological motivation of an evangelist or of an editor of the tradition, or a prophet or a preacher of the church. We must come to recognize that the light foot will fully and absolutely come behind. The Gospels do, indeed, give us only a whisper of Jesus’ voice. Is this practice what we must take as our starting point? The assumption is the Gospels offer us at the starting point direct information of the theology of the early church and not about the teaching of the historical Jesus.

All of that on page 69 of *What is Redaction Criticism?* And then, just a few pages further on, the conclusion: don’t base faith on him. “The real cutting edge of the impact of redaction criticism is the fact that it raises very serious questions, indeed, about that which has normally motivated life of Jesus research. It raises above all the question as to whether the view of the historical Jesus as the locus of revelation and the central concern of Christian faith is, in fact, justifiable” (page 72). That’s Norman Perrin, very much a mainline liberal.

Robert Gundry, a somewhat—shall we say—radical evangelical, says the visit of the wise men and Egypt never happened, pages 26, 32, 34, 35 of his commentary. I’ll read out these:

Matthew now turns to a visit of the local shepherds. Luke 2: 8-20 into admiration of Gentile magi from foreign parts. Just as the women besides Mary in the genealogy pointed forward to the Gentiles in the church, so
also the coming of the magi previews the entrance of disciples being sent to all nations into the circles who acknowledge Jesus as the king of the Jews and worship him as God.”

All that is on page 26.

“Then when he’s coming in chapter 2 verse 13, to carry on the motif of flight from persecution, Matthew changes the going up to Jerusalem by the whole family, Luke 2:22 into a flight from Egypt,” page 22.

Then let’s jump on to pages 34 and 35. Matthew pursues Mosaic typology further with an episode of the Pharaoh slaughtering the male babies of the Israelites at the time of Moses’ birth. To do so he changes the sacrificial slaying of a pair of turtledoves for two young pigeons to place at the presentation of the day Jesus at the temple, Luke 2:24. Compare Leviticus 12, 6-8. In the Herod slaughtering of the babies in Jerusalem and Bethlehem, the sorrow of the babies’ mothers corresponds to the sword that was going to pierce the heart of Mary according to Simeon’s prediction at the presentation of the temple, Luke 1:35. Compare Matthew 2:18. Herod’s massive crimes made it easy for Matthew to manipulate the dominical tradition in the study,” (pages 34, 35). So that’s the rejection of recorded historical detail. The alarming feature we see is the generation of hypothetical historical details.

Billy Marxan in The Setting of Mark has described, like Perrin on pages 38 and 39, in thus carrying Redaction Criticism to its furthest limit. Marxan, perhaps, points the way to a still future day and work. “This new departure is the conception that the Markan theology reflects a situation in Galilee in the year 66 A.D., at the beginning of the Jewish war against Rome.” Marxan believes that the Christian community of Jerusalem had fled from Jerusalem to Galilee at the beginning of the war, that there they were waiting the parousia, which they believed to be eminent. The Gospel Mark, Marxan claims, reflects the situation in theology. So, for example, the present ending of the Gospel at 16:8 is the true
ending. Mark did not intend to go on to report resurrection appearances in Galilee. The references to Galilee in 14:25 and 16:7 are not references to the resurrection at all, but to the *parousia*. Mark expects this event to take place immediately in his own day.

It is not our purpose here to defend or debate with Marxan the correctness of his insight with regard to the place and time of the composition of Mark’s gospel. Our concern is to point out that here we are moving beyond Redaction Criticism itself to a still newer stage, a stage in which we work from a theological insight we’ve been able to determine to the historical situation in which that insight arose, of generational, hypothetical, historical details.

Gundry, on the background of the Gospel of Matthew (This is page 5 and 6 of Gundry, noting Matthew’s emphases), “We can infer the situation in which he wrote and the purposes for which he wrote. This will also reveal a theology characteristic of his Gospel. Matthew shows great concern over the problem of a mixed church. The church has grown large from the influx of converts from throughout all nations (Matthew 28:18-20). But these converts include false as well as true disciples.”

Then he cites a bunch of passages by verse and chapters there. "The distinction between them is coming to light through the persecution of the church (Matthew 5:10-12). This persecution does not have its source through the Roman government, but among the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem. Matthew constantly exposes and heightens their guilt (2 citations in Chapter 27 and 28). True disciples are suffering with endurance; some of them had to flee for their lives. False disciples, on the other hand, are making public disclaimers of Jesus in order to avoid persecution. At their head, false disciples have false prophets who appear to be subtle ecclesiastics (i.e. church officials whose easy going attitudes and policies of accommodation have reserved them from the hardships of itinerate ministry). These false prophets seemed to have come into the church from the Pharisaical sect and the scribal occupations.”
Look at all that information about the book of Matthew, where’d he get it? They assume that various remarks in Jesus’ mouth are allusions to these things.

A third alarming feature is the addition of a genre of historical fiction descriptor. Perrin says, page 75, “The Gospel of Mark is the prototype, which others follow, and is a mixture of historical reminiscence, interpreted tradition and the free creativity of prophets and evangelists.” It is, in other words, a strange mixture of history, legend and myth. It is this fact which Redaction Criticism makes unmistakably clear. Gundry calls it “midrash,” or “haggada,” but compares it to modern historical novels, which combine truth and fiction (pages 630 and 632 in his commentary).

Fallacies of Rhetorical Criticism

Well, those are the examples of some alarming phenomena that are occurring, but behind them some methods are suspect. We categorize these under varies different headings which we’ll call fallacies. They’re not fallacies in the typical larger sense. The terminology is my own, but the methodological problems are noted by many others of whom C.S. Lewis, a professional literary critic, is a prominent example, and I quote from him on a number of occasions.

I call the first fallacy in methodological Redaction Criticism--the "Sand-Foundation" fallacy. Redaction Criticism builds an elaborate methodology on questionable assumptions, which should be carefully reexamined when they produce such results. One of these assumptions is the Two-Document Theory of the Gospels. A second one is, for Gundry, the total dependence of Matthew on Mark and Q. So he assumes that Matthew has no sources but Mark and Q, and so he has to generate the wise men visit out of the material that he thinks Luke has preserved from Q regarding the shepherds and the visit of the temple, etc.

A second problem is what I call the "Explanation Fallacy," and in this we have the assumption that any explanation is to be favored over ignorance. This is a problem both for Redaction Criticism on the liberal side and sometimes harmonization on the conservative side. Sometimes we just don’t know the
answer! So, we can say, “Here are the problem passages and we think these can be harmonized by this way or, perhaps, by this way or this way, but we don’t have time machines. We don’t know for sure, but anyway, I favor this one; but I wasn’t there, all right?”

You’re getting that same kind of phenomenon going on with Redaction Criticism, though they don’t always tell you that there are other alternatives there. Lewis says—this comment in his essay on criticism in the book on stories, pages 132 and 133—“Nearly all critics (he says) are prone to imagine that they know a great many facts relevant to a book, which, in reality, they don’t know.”

The author, Lewis, who had been an author and had his books reviewed, inevitably perceived their ignorance because he alone knew the real facts.

[Continuing with Lewis:] "There was a very good instance of this lately in the review of Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings*. Most critics assumed that it must be a political allegory and a great many assumed that the ring must be the atomic bomb. Anyone who knew the real history of the composition knew that this was not only erroneous, but impossible, chronologically impossible—that is that Tolkien had already written into the Ring before any civilians knew of the atomic bomb. Others assumed that the mythology of the romance had grown out of the children’s story of the Hobbit.

"Now, of course, nobody blames the critics for not knowing these things; how should they? The trouble is they don’t know that they don’t know! A guess leaps into their minds, and they write it down without even noticing that it is a guess. Here, certainly, the warning to all of us as critics is very clear and alarming. Critics of 'Piers Plowman' and the 'Faerie Queen' make gigantic constructions about the history of these compositions. Of course, we should all admit that all constructions are conjectural, and as conjectures you may ask, 'Are they not, some of them, probable?' Perhaps they are, but the experience of being reviewed has lowered my estimate of their probability because when you start by knowing the facts, you find that the constructions are very often totally wrong. Apparently their
chances of being right are very low, even when they are made along very sensible lines.

“Hence, I cannot resist the conviction that similar guesses about the dead seem plausible only because the dead are not there to refute them. Five minutes conversation with the real Spencer or the real Langlen, the authors of 'Faerie Queen' and 'Piers Plowman, might blow the whole laborious fabric into smithereens” (that’s pages 132, 133). So, it’s better not to know the answer and know we don’t know, than to know the wrong answer.

A third problem is what I call the "Dissertation Fallacy." Ph.D. industry drives this problem. The need of Ph.D. candidates to write their dissertation on something new and academic can lead to rejecting a straightforward explanation for an involved one, [which means] rejecting recorded history for reconstructed history, rejecting direct evidence for indirect evidence. The result is a new sort of allegorizing (you remember Perrin’s remark on page 42).

The questions, answers and teachings are on the lips of Jesus and Peter, but [critics say] the titles involved are from the Christological vocabulary of the early church. Although the character are secondary so the pericopes bear names and designations derived from the circumstances of the ministry, Jesus, Peter, the multitude, they also meekly represent the circumstances of the early church. Jesus is the lord addressing the church; Peter represents fallible believers who confess correctly, yet go on to interpret their confession incorrectly; and the multitude is the whole church membership for whom the general teaching, which follows, is designed.

So we come to the all-important point so far as redaction critical view of the narrative is concerned. It has the form of a story of a historical Jesus and his disciples, but a purpose in terms of the risen Lord and the church (page 42). Note the response of Lewis, saying [in] the article of criticism in his book on stories, “Where the critic seems to me most often to go wrong is the hasty assumption of an allegorical sense; and as reviewers make this mistake about contemporary
works, so in my opinion scholars often make it yet about the old ones. I would recommend both, and I would try to reserve in my own critical practices these principles. First, that no story can be devised by the wit of man, which cannot be interpreted allegorically by the wit of some other man. The Stoic interpretations of primitive mythology, the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament, the medieval interpretations of the classics all prove this. Therefore, too, the mere fact that you can allegorize the work before you is in itself no proof that it is an allegory. We ought not to proceed to allegorize any work until we have plainly set out the reasons for regarding it as allegory at all (page 140, 141).

A fourth problem I see is what I call the "Argument from Silence Fallacy." If a particular incident appears in only one gospel, the writer must have invented it rather than having additional information. Let’s compare this to a Lewis' remark on page 131. “Negative statements are, of course, particularly dangerous for the lazy or harried reviewer, and here it is a lesson for us all as critics. One passage out of the whole “Faerie Queen” will justify you saying that Spencer sometimes does so and so. Only an exhaustive of reading and an unerring memory will justify the statement that he never does so. This everyone sees. What more easily escapes one is the concealed negative in statements apparently positive. For example, in any statement that contains a predicate ‘new,’ one says lightly that something which Dunn or Stern or Hopkins did was new, thus committing themselves to the negative that no one had done it before, but this is beyond one’s knowledge; taken rigorously, it’s beyond anyone’s knowledge. Again, things we are all apt to say about the growth or the development of the poet may often imply the negative that he wrote nothing except what came down to us, which no one knows. If we had what now looks like an abrupt change in his manner from poem A to poem B might turn out not to have been abrupt at all.” So the fact that a given gospel writer does not mention some detail does not guarantee that he does not know it.

A fifth problem is what I call the "Psychoanalytic Fallacy." A critic can infer the author’s motivation from his writing. Differences between the gospels are
tendentious other than accidently on matters of emphasis. Here Lewis says a good remark on that, page 134. “Another type of critic who speculates about the genesis of your book is the amateur psychologist. Here’s a Freudian theory of literature, [which] claims to know all about your inhibitions. He knows which unacknowledged wishes you are gratifying, and here one cannot claim to start by knowing all the facts. By definition, you, the author, are unconscious of the things he professes to discover. Therefore the more loudly you disclaim them, the more right he must be. Though, oddly enough, if you admitted them, that would prove him right, too, and there is further difficulty. One is not therefore free from bias, for this procedure is entirely confined to hostile reviewers. And now that I come to think of it, I have seldom seen it practiced on a dead author except by a scholar who intended in some measure to debunk him.”

Some examples: Lewis, on the origin of his novel Perelandra, [and] on his stories (page 144), Lewis is talking to some other writers of his time; Brian Aldiss is the one who shows up here. Lewis says, “The starting point of the second novel, Perelandra, (this is in his science fiction trilogy) was my mental picture of the floating islands; the whole of the rest of my labors, in a sense, consisted of building up a world in which floating islands could exist. And then, of course, the story about an averted fall developed. This is, because you know, having gotten your people to this exciting country, something must happen.” Aldiss says, “But I’m surprised that you put it this way around. I would have thought you would have constructed Perelandra for the didactic purposes.” Lewis, “Yes, everyone thinks that. They’re quite wrong.”

The "Intellectual Snobbery Fallacy": We all tend to envy those with more prestige than we have. Here, usually, university liberals intend to look down on those with less, especially conservatives of some sort.

Well, those are my six fallacies, if you like; problems with the methodology of Redaction Criticism.
Conclusions on some Redaction Criticism

The comments above should not be taken as an argument for anti-intellectualism. Rather, it’s a call for a sober assessment of our own abilities and for a fear of God, who, according to 1 Cor. 3:19, “Takes the wise in their craftiness” and against whom, according to Proverbs 21:30, “There is no wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel.”

Course Conclusion

Well, that’s our discussion for Redaction Criticism. Now we want, rather briefly, to pull together some conclusions about gospel history as a whole [and] about this whole course. We’ve looked at several topics relevant to the matter of the historical accuracy of the gospel, [and] in particular, the Synoptic Gospels. We’ve looked at modern views about Jesus, and we have seen that people have all kinds of views about Jesus. The Jehovah’s Witness say that Jesus is not God; the Mormons says Jesus was God, but you can be too; the old liberals say that Jesus was divine like all men are, like Harry Emerson Fostic’s mother was, etc. All these views have only tangential connections with the Bible; all are new forms of idolatry, which may be comfortable, but not any good to help you in a jam since the gods made to enforce these views do not actually exist. We also looked at very historical views, of which the Jesus Seminar is the most current fad. They claim to use the historical data; but, in fact, they pick the points they like from it.

This brings us to historical data about Jesus. In your reading, I had assigned my students to read Gregory Boyd, “Cynic, Sage or Son of God?” or Lee Strobel, “The Case for Christ.” You may have noticed that early pagan sources tell us very little about Jesus. We do see them admitting it’s historical, something that liberals would not like to admit: Messianic claims, miracles works and such. Jewish materials reflect a negative reaction against Christ, just as the New Testament says Jewish opponents of Jesus responded, and just as the Old Testament predicted they would. They were not able to deny his existence and the profound impact [he made], and [they] still cannot explain away the fulfillment of Old Testament
prophecy and Jesus.

Why is there so little about Jesus in non-Christian sources? We don’t know for sure. Perhaps it is like the media situation today. We frequently see the media avoiding reports on things that they don’t like, particularly when it is difficult to give them a negative spin. As regard to the New Testament testimony about Jesus, Paul is writing in the mid-50s, and it is very tough to get around. His testimony provides fine details about Christ in places within a general picture that is consistent with the gospel pictures.

That brings us to three: the gospels are principle sources about Jesus. The gospels contain over 100 pages of details about Jesus. By size, age and provenance, they are our principal sources for any kind of historical study about him. The external evidence is quite firm regarding their authors, matching the names we find on the titles of each, with no evidence for any other suggestions. Except for John, these are not the names one would have chosen if names were being invented. The external evidence for the dates and order of writing of the gospels must be discarded by liberals in order to maintain the Two-Document Theory. Even so, the theory does not really do a better job of explaining the internal evidence than the suggestions we’ve proposed, which anchors the gospel content in the apostolic teaching. At nearly a 2000 year distance, we cannot answer all alleged contradictions in the gospel material, but we can make suggestions for them which are consistent with historical reliability. We should not let concern over such matters lead us into adopting views with far more problems, thus becoming like those who strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. These matters are not just academic, they have influenced all liberal pastors, most large denominations, the secular media and many of the people you would try to reach for Christ, especially those who have received a university education. They have caused many Christians who have been exposed to such material to live in doubt of the gospel date about Jesus. They have led many people to reject Christianity altogether and are used by most religions in opposition to Christianity. We must
press the evidence and call people to live responsibly in light of it.

Well, that’s the Synoptic Gospels for this course. Thank you for your attention.