

The Stilling of The Storm:
“Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole
truth, and nothing but the truth?”
Do the Witnesses Agree?



Micah Greiner
GRE311: Synoptic Gospels
Dr. Jakob Heckert

Introduction

It would be easy to imagine the headlines of the newspapers around 30 A.D., were they to have existed at that time: Sea of Galilee – **Unusually Strong Storm CALMED by Little-known Man from Nazareth!** The Galileans were used to those storms – the ones that came crashing down from the nearby mountains, descending upon the Sea of Galilee with ferocious speed, whipping up storms of epic proportions. However, we shall see in the pages to come that this storm was not quite ordinary – for several reasons.

As the culminating project of the Synoptic Gospels class at Concordia University, Ann Arbor, this paper will show the results of the hours of work and study done by the author over the past semester. Its goal is to critically analyze one section, a pericope¹, of Scripture by studying the textual variants presented by Kurt Aland in Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum,² compiling and comparing the analysis of various commentators, and drawing a conclusion of his own based on that study.

The pericope, having been compiled according to the professor's guidelines, will be divided into topical units and analyzed individually. The analysis of each unit will include appropriate variant analysis, involving textual criticism and translation as necessary; comparative analysis of the commentators, as appropriate; and any needed summary interpretation by the author. Throughout all of this, there will be a special focus on how the Gospel accounts agree or disagree with each other and how the various commentators have dealt with that. At the conclusion of the paper, the author will summarize his own position on the synoptic problem as it is found in this selected pericope.

¹ #90 – Matthew 8:23-7, Mark 4:35-41, and Luke 8:22-5

² Aland, Kurt, ed. (1997) *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 15th Ed. Gesamtherstellung Biblia-Druck GmbH: Stuttgart, Germany, pg. 120.

Unit By Unit Analysis³

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης·
διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

This unit, all of which is directly from Mark 4:35, has no textual variants. Using the historical present in λέγει, Mark opens up the account in vivid, concrete details: “on *that* day, as it became *evening*” (italics mine). It was accepted by the early church fathers and modern conservative scholars that Mark was the student and scribe of St. Peter, and accordingly, Mark’s vivid details in his gospel reflect Peter’s first hand experience. This is one example that favors such a view. Mark uses διέλθωμεν, a hortatory subjunctive – both inviting and commanding: “Let us go” – to introduce the journey across the Sea of Galilee that would soon become something unique.

Of all the commentators studied for this paper, R.C.H. Lenski⁴ gives the most attention to this particular unit. He points out that immediately prior to this account, Mark has Jesus speaking to a great multitude of people from within a boat on the Sea of Galilee, and accordingly, “on that day” directly links that account with the stilling of the storm.⁵ Mark also adds immediately before this unit (Mark 4:34) that Jesus had spent some time after teaching the parables explaining those same parables to His disciples. However, Lenski points out that most often, Matthew and Mark select the material for their accounts “without regard for chronology...Both evangelists thus record groups of connected events in a free manner, according to their significance and not merely according to their sequence in time. This creates problems in harmony but affords no

³ NOTE: Only those units that contain textual variants that the author deems to be significant will show such studies of the textual variants.

⁴ Lenski, R.C.H. (1946). *The Interpretation of St. Mark’s Gospel*. The Wartburg Press: Columbus, OH, pp. 196-204.

⁵ Ibid. pg. 197.

justification for the charge that the evangelists openly contradict each other, which they never do.”⁶

This author agrees with Lenski on this point. Matthew has grouped his account of the stilling of the storm with other miracles indicative of Jesus’ divine power⁷, Mark has it presented in the chronological sequence previously described, and Luke has it in a similar, although less detailed, chronological account. It would seem logical that the differences seem between the gospels do not show each other to be incorrect but rather point to the different theological purposes each of the gospel writers had, as directed in their writing by the Holy Spirit.

καὶ (LK: Ἐγένετο δὲ) ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτὸς ἐνέβη (MT: ἐμβαντι αὐτῷ | MK: παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν) εἰς (MK: ἐν) τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης, καὶ ἀνήχθησαν.

This unit, drawn from Matthew 8:23, Mark 4:36, and Luke 8:22, has a few textual variants to be considered – all from the verse in Mark. As the chart here indicates, the

variant reading alters the form of the first verb to match that of the second. The

Verse 36 – Unit One							
Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ ἀφέντες (ἀφίουσιν) τὸν ὄχλον (καὶ) παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν							
<i>Textual Support</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
P ^{45vid}	Papyrus	Caesarean	III	565	Miniscule	Caesarean	IX
D	Uncial	Western	V	700	Miniscule	Caesarean	XI
W	Uncial	Western	V	2542	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIII
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	pc	Pauci Codice		V
f ¹³	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII	it	Translation	Western	

external support for this is fairly good, however it appears to be an attempt to improve the ease of reading for the clause: making a flexible participle into a concrete verb. As such,

⁶ Lenski, *St. Mark*, pg. 197

⁷ Healings of the centurion, Peter’s mother-in-law, and many others (Mt. 8:5-17); casting the demons out of a man in Gergesea (some textual variance on this name) (Mt. 8:28-34); and more healings after that

the variant is not adopted. The second variant alters the word order, adding a definite verb. Looking at that and the external evidence, there is not enough support there to give

a logical reason to

accept this

particular variant.

The final textual

variant is a small

Verse 36 – Unit Two							
Aland's Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα μετ' αὐτοῦ (ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ)							
Textual Support							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
C ²	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
D	Uncial	Western	V	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	Ⲙ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
f ¹³	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII	sy ^h	Translation	Byzantine	

change to the diminutive form of πλοῖα. As seen from the textual evidence, this change

Verse 36 – Unit Two							
Aland's Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα μετ' αὐτοῦ (ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ)							
Textual Support							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
E	Uncial	Byzantine	VI	L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII
F	Uncial	Byzantine	IX	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
G	Uncial	Byzantine	IX	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
H	Uncial	Byzantine	VI	pm	Miniscule	Byzantine	--

came late, and

as such, has

little support

for the change.

I agree with

Aland⁸ here.

The commentators differ with each other on several points concerning this rather lengthy unit: two of which are more significant – why Jesus chose to cross the sea and what is meant by ὡς ἦν, or “as He was.” William Arndt approaches the nautical trip from the perspective of Jesus’ humanity: “Jesus had taught for hours; now He was weary. The quickest way of dismissing the crowds was to leave them.”⁹ Matthew Henry sees it according to Jesus’ divinity: “...he chose to cross the lake, that he might have occasion to manifest himself the God of the sea as well as of the dry land, and to show that all power

⁸ Aland, Kurt, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*.

⁹ Arndt, William F. (1956). *Bible Commentary: The Gospel According to St. Luke*. Concordia Publishing House: St. Louis, MO, pp. 236.

is his, both in heaven and in earth.”¹⁰ The second point of difference falls more to the linguistic side, rather than the systematic (which nature of Christ was the focus). Henry interprets “as He was” to refer to Jesus being in the same dress as He had preached in, not bring along another cloak for the trip.¹¹ Paul E. Kretzmann and Lenski see it in a similar way: that they took Him along without special provision: food or refreshments of any kind. Heinrich A.W. Meyer views that clause slightly differently: “ὡς ἦν τῷ πλοίῳ ... [is] to be taken together; *as He was in the ship*...without delay for further preparation they take possession of Him.”¹²

The author would draw on all of the commentators in his interpretation. The trip certainly could have had two purposes in Jesus’ mind: to give Him an opportunity for break from His taxing labors as well as to give Him an opportunity to show those nearest to Him His divine power and authority. The author agrees with Lenski in terms of chronology (Jesus spoke parables from the boat, explained them to the disciples separately, and later made the trip across the sea), and accordingly, would agree with his interpretation of “as He was,” namely, as He was tired and weary from His labors. On an additional note, the reoccurrence of διέλωμεν is the result of the different order of Matthew and Luke rather than a second command of Jesus.

πλεότων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν.

This small unit has no textual variants and is found only in Luke 8:23a. Here, Luke mentions that Jesus was sleeping before introduction the element of the storm, an order opposite to that of Matthew and Mark. This point is mentioned by most of the

¹⁰ Henry, Matthew (1721 org.?). *Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Whole Bible*. MacDonald Publishing Company: McLean, VA, pg. 110.

¹¹ Ibid. pg. 474

¹² Meyer, Heinrich A.W. (1884). *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of Mark and Luke*. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, NY, pp. 58.

commentators. Most of the commentators also noted how the words of this unit “forcefully...portray the true humanity of the Savior”.¹³ Lenski adds, “The peaceful sleep of Jesus is due to the perfect absence of fear in his heart and to his absolute trust in God.”¹⁴ The author concurs on these points.

καὶ ἰδοῦ γίνεται λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου (MT: σεισμός μέγας ἐγένετο |
LK: κατέβη) εἰς τὴν λίμνην (MT: ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ)

This unit – comprised of Matthew 8:24a-b, Mark 4:37a, and Luke 8:23b – has one significant textual variant found in the Markan text. This variant reads the two words

μεγάλη
ἀνέμου
in a
reversed
order.
The

<u>Verse 37 – Unit One</u>							
Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ γίνεται λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου (ἀνέμου μεγάλη)							
<u>Textual Support</u>							
<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	[E]	Uncial	Byzantine	VI
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	[F]	Uncial	Byzantine	IX
892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	[G]	Uncial	Byzantine	IX
1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI	[H]	Uncial	Byzantine	VI
1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320	[579]	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII
א	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII	[1424]	Miniscule	Byzantine	IX/X

external evidence is significant, except that the second half is questionable and the supportive texts are from a fairly late date and isolated area. Internally, there is no strong support one way or another, and as such, based on the inadequacy of the external evidence, I would support the reading chosen by Aland.

The major point of contention among the commentators regarding this unit concerns the occurrence and intended meaning of σείσμος in the Matthean text.

¹³ Arndt, pg. 236.

¹⁴ Lenski, R.C.H. (1946). *The Interpretation of St. Luke’s Gospel*. Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, MN, pp. 463.

Herbert C. Alleman says that the use of that word “seems to indicate that the storm was accompanied by an unusually big tidal wave caused by seismic disturbance”;¹⁵

Kretzmann sees it as “literally an earthquake of the sea”;¹⁶ while Lenski considers it to be poetical language referring to the tossing water, an “earthquake” of water.¹⁷

One additional point of interest concerns Jesus’ relation to the storm. Henry points out: “Christ could have prevented the storm”!¹⁸ And therefore, He allowed the storm for the sakes of the disciples. He also says, “Christ’s business is to *lay storms*, as it is Satan’s business to *raise* them.”¹⁹ Contrastingly, Lenski states: “Some commentators think that more than natural causes were involved in this storm. We see no necessity for making the devil...responsible for this storm.”²⁰ Both commentators and this author agree that it is within the providence of God to control the happenings of nature; however, Henry seems to claim that the non-“good” things of nature, such as storms, are the results of the devils work. While the author agrees that the devil, with God’s permission, can certainly direct storms, he agrees with Lenski in the point that nothing about this storm indicates that it is the devil’s product. In fact, it seems more likely that Christ Himself brought this storm along to strengthen the weakness of His disciples’ faith!

καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλον εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ὥστε ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον (MT: ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ κυμάτων) καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνευον.

This unit – compiled from Matthew 8:24c, Mark 4:37b-c, and Luke 8:23c – has one variant, found in the section from Mark. This variant appears to be an attempt by

¹⁵ Alleman, Herbert C. ed. (1944). *New Testament Commentary*. The Muhlenberg Press: Philadelphia, PA, pp. 182.

¹⁶ Kretzmann, Paul E. (?). *Popular Commentary of the Bible: The New Testament: Volume 1*. Concordia Publishing House: St. Louis, MO, pp. 46, 185-6, 309-10.

¹⁷ Lenski, R.C.H. (1943). *The Interpretation of St. Matthew’s Gospel*. The Wartburg Press: Columbus, OH, pp. 344-51.

¹⁸ Henry, pg. 110.

¹⁹ Ibid. pg. 661.

²⁰ Lenski, *St. Matthew*, pg. 346.

Verse 37 – Unit Two							
Aland's Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
ὥστε ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον (ὡστε αὐτο ἡδη γεμιζεσθαι)							
<i>Textual Support</i>							
<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
W	Uncial	Western	V	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	Ϡ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
<i>f</i> ^{1,13}	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII/XIII	sy ^h	Translation	Byzantine	
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX				

scribes to
alleviate the
redundancy
of the words
τὸ πλοῖον.
The external

evidence is from a wide variety of text types, but not from a very early date. Based on that and the internal evidence that favors the more difficult (i.e. redundant) reading, I would not accept this variant.

At this section, Lenski argues that the words of each of the gospel writers argue for their literary independence: “Mark has the waves crashing into the boat and filling it, Luke that they were filling it and placing it in jeopardy, Matthew that the boat was covered by the waves.”²¹ These differences show how each writer was mindful of the same event, yet describing it uniquely – none being more correct or less correct than another. Kretzmann adds the most unique aspect of this situation, one that all the Gospel writers include: despite the “tornadolike storm ... accompanied with ... a turbulent upheaval of the waters...Jesus slept”!²² There was no argument among the commentators as to the fact that it was simply amazing that Jesus was sleeping amidst this great storm. (Luke has already mentioned that Jesus was sleeping, while Mark and Matthew introduce it in the next unit.)

καὶ (MT: δὲ) ἦν αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ τροσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων
(MT: ἐκάθειδεν).

²¹ Lenski, *St. Mark*, pg. 199.

²² Kretzmann, pg. 310

This unit contains the comments from Matthew 8:24d and Mark 4:38a about Jesus and His sleeping during the storm. In its one major textual variant, the external evidence

is strong. The change is a reversal of word order:

Verse 38 – Unit One							
<i>Aland's Text (Variant Reading):</i>							
καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν (2 1) ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ							
<i>Textual Support - Variant</i>							
<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
D	Uncial	Western	V	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
W	Uncial	Western	V	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	Ⲑ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
f ^{1.13}	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII/XIII	sy ^h	Translation	Byzantine	
<i>Textual Support – Aland's Text</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	579	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
C	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	2427	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIV?
Δ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX				

from αὐτὸς ἦν to ἦν αὐτὸς. The flexibility of Greek word order allows for either of the two, and therefore, more attention is paid to the external evidence. It can be seen from the chart here that the textual support for the variant, though not quite as old, comes from more widespread text types. Based on this, I disagree with Aland, as represented in the unit compilation just above.

According to Henry, this is on the only place in the Bible that we hear of Christ actually sleeping! “...he slept to show that he was really and truly man...He slept not so much with a desire to be refreshed, as with a design to be awakened.”²³ This focus on Christ’s divinity contrasts slightly with Kretzmann who, quoting Martin Luther, says, “...the evangelist wants to show us Christ as real, natural man that has body and soul, and therefore had need of eating, drinking, and sleeping...”²⁴ However, the truth that each states does not necessarily conflict: Jesus, being true God and true man, certainly would have been tired and in need of rest after a hard days work, yet He also certainly was

²³ Henry, pg. 110.

²⁴ Kretzmann (quoting Luther, 13, 1627), pg. 46.

mindful of the needs of His disciples and could have used His sleeping for the strengthening of His disciples' faith.

The other point of distinction among the commentators here refers to the nature of Jesus' "pillow." The Greek-English Lexicon defines προσκεφάλαιον as either "pillow" or "a sailor's cushion."²⁵ G.C.D. Howly prefers the second definition: "Upon the boat's cushion (provided for the guest of honour, and placed at the stern, away from the splashing of the waves), Jesus rested His head, and fell asleep."²⁶ Kretzmann considers the "pillow" to be a "low bench or railing";²⁷ and Lenski, "literally, 'the thing for the head,' the article indicating that this pillow was always there."²⁸ The ramifications of this distinction are relatively small: whether Jesus rested on a bench or a cushion of honor, *He still slept in the midst of a fierce storm!* It is that point that the author believes to be the emphasis of the gospel writers.

καὶ (LK: δὲ) προσελθόντες ἤγειραν (MK: ἐγείρουσιν |

LK: διήγειραν) αὐτὸν (MK: καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ) λέγοντες·

Compiled from Matthew 8:25a, Mark 4:38b, and Luke 8:24a – this unit has four variants of particular interest. Within the text from Matthew's account, there is little to say whether

either of the variants or Aland's reading is

Verse 25 – Unit One							
Aland's Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ προσελθόντες (¹ οι μαθηται ² οι μαθηται αυτου) ἤγειραν αὐτὸν							
<i>Textual Support – Variant¹</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
C ²	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
f ¹³	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII	ϞϠ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI	h	Codices Latini		V

²⁵ Bauer, Walter, ed. (1979). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd Ed. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.

²⁶ Howley, G.C.D. ed. (1952). *A New Testament Commentary: based on the Revised Standard Version*. 2nd Ed. Pickering & Inglis LTD: London, pp. 183.

²⁷ Kretzmann, pg. 185.

²⁸ Lenski, *St. Mark*, pg. 199.

correct.

Also, in

the

parallel

passages,

neither the

<i>Textual Support – Variant²</i>							
C*	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	al	alii codice		
W	Uncial	Western	IV	b	Codice Latini		V
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	g ¹	Codice Latini		VIII/IX
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	(q)	Codice Latini		VI/VII
f ¹	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII	vg ^{cl}	Translation	Western	VI/V
205	Miniscule	Byzantine	XV	sy	Translation		IV/V
1424	Miniscule	Byzantine	IX/X	mae	Translation		III
<i>Textual Support – Aland's Text</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	lat	Translation		IV/V
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	sa	Translation		III
33 ^{vd}	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	bo	Translation		III
892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX				

variants nor the words themselves are found. Two verses previous to this, the disciples are mentioned, and so there would not be a need to have them expressly written in again – there would be no conflict in antecedents. It would seem, therefore, that the shorter reading, Aland's, would more likely be the original.

The next two variants come from Mark's account. Offering two different ways to harmonize this text with Luke's gospel, the variants actually have more external support

<u>Verse 38 – Unit Three</u>							
<i>Aland's Text (Variant Reading):</i>							
<i>καὶ ἐγείρουσιν (¹ διεγείραντες ² διεγείρουσιν) αὐτὸν</i>							
<i>Textual Support – Variant¹</i>							
<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
D	Uncial	Western	V	565	Miniscule	Caesarean	IX
W	Uncial	Western	V	700	Miniscule	Caesarean	XI
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	pc	Pauci Codice		
f ¹³	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII	it	Translation	(Old Latin)	
<i>Textual Support – Variant²</i>							
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
C	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
f ¹	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII	ⲁⲓ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX				
<i>Textual Support – Aland's Text</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	Δ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	2427	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIV?
C	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	al	alii codice		

than Aland's choice. Yet, based on the internal evidence, pointing to the variants as attempts to harmonize, I would agree with Aland's choice.

On this section, the commentators were nearly singing in chorus on the point that it was amazing that the disciples, *skilled sailors and fishermen*, had to come to Jesus, a man who “had never sailed a boat,”²⁹ for help! Arndt adds that any normal storm would not have terrified the disciples, and therefore, this storm, though not caused by demonic forces, was certainly stronger than the usual storms that they would have dealt with in the past. His next point draws some distinction, however, “The disciples undoubtedly did not ponder His strange serenity; they were in danger, and in alarm and terror they awoke Him.”³⁰ Kretzmann sees the situation differently: “They may have hesitated for some time out of respect for their beloved Teacher.”³¹ Yet, regardless of whether they waited or not, the disciples, realizing their inability to save themselves, fell upon their only Hope: the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

κυριε (MK: διδάσκαλε | LK: ἐπιστάτα επιστάτα) σῶσον,
οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα;

These words of the disciples are the compilation of Matthew 8:25b, Mark 4:38c, and Luke 8:24b. There is one unit of variation in that section of Matthew and two in Luke that will be addressed. The first, from Matthew, adds the pronoun “us” after the pleading

command	<u>Verse 25 – Unit Two</u>							
	Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
“Save!”	κύριε, σῶσον (ἡμας)							
“Since σώζειν in the New Testament	<u>Textual Support - Variant</u>							
	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
	L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
	W	Uncial	Western	V	Ϝ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
	Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	latt	Translation		IV/V
	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI	sy	Translation	Byzantine	IV/V
	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV				

²⁹ Lenski, *St. Mark*, pg. 200.

³⁰ Arndt, pg. 236.

³¹ Kretzmann, pg. 46.

seldom

<i>Textual Support – Aland’s Text</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	205	Miniscule	Byzantine	XV
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
C	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	pc	Pauci Codice		
f ^{1,13}	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII/XIII	bo ^{mss}	Translation		III
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX				

stands

without

an object, the addition of a supplementary ἡμᾶς was made early in a wide variety of witnesses. That it should have been deleted, if present in the original text, appears to be unlikely.”³²

The first variant from the units of variation from Luke, although well supported externally, seems to be a simplification – it would not make sense to double the word, but

to remove one

seems to be a

plausible scribal

action. The

second variant

appears to be an

attempt to

harmonize the

Verse 24 – Unit One							
Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
λέγοντες· ἑπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα ¹ (¹ ἐπιστάτα ² κυριε κυριε), ἀπολλύμεθα							
<i>Textual Support – Variant¹</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	1424	Miniscule	Byzantine	IX/X
W	Uncial	Western	V	2542	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIII
13	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII	al	alii codice		
(205)	Miniscule	Byzantine	XV	lat	Translation		IV/V?
579	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII	bo	Translation	Alexandrian	III?
700	Miniscule	Caesarean	XI	Cyr	Fathers	Alexandrian	444
<i>Textual Support – Variant²</i>							
D	Uncial	Western	V	(e)	Codice	Byzantine (?)	V

text with the parallel passage in Matthew. As a result, the author will adopt neither of the two variants from Luke.

Interestingly, this section, with three different quotations of the disciples’ cries brought a rather small amount of attention from the commentators. Rather than the historical critics jumping on this “discrepancy,” it was those most strongly confessional that addressed the issue and that in very positive way. Of the cry, “all the synoptists record the cry that they are actually perishing [ἀπολλύμεθα], their condition is

³² Metzger, Bruce M. (1971). *A Textual Commentary On the Greek New Testament*. 3rd Ed. United Bible Societies: New York, pp. 22-3.

desperate.”³³ However, that is the only word that is shared among any of the Gospels: prior to that one common word, each account records a different cry! It is Lenski again that gives the reason: there were several men in that boat, not to mention all those in the other boats that were with them – it is far from likely that they all cried out the same words in unison!³⁴ In fact, the Synoptic Gospels record very accurately what likely occurred: each man cried out in his own way, with the common thread being “We are perishing!” Rather than serve as evidence against the independence of the Synoptic Gospels, this difference supports that theory.

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι;

This response of Jesus is only recorded as such here by Matthew – Mark and Luke record Jesus’ rebuke of the disciples *after* rebuking the wind and the waves. Such a variance gives evidence to those who favor redaction criticism: analyzing the Gospels with a focus on the individual authors’ theological purposes and editorial comments and deletions. Such an opinion seems to be evident in Alleman:

Matthew’s chief interest, however, lies not in the stilling of the storm, which is mentioned only incidentally, but in the words of Jesus, addressed to the disciples before he arose and rebuked the winds and the sea... Their [the disciples’] lack of faith was the cause of their fear, and the strengthening of their faith was a greater miracle than the stilling of the storm.³⁵

While it is certainly true that Jesus’ major concern was for the faith of His disciples, Alleman seems to *downplay* Christ’s *Divinity*! It is in fact one of the main intentions of the historical critics to “weed out” the stories of the miracles – assuming them to be exaggerated stories passed around by the early church. While Alleman does not deny the miracle of the stilling of the storm, he certainly tries to draw attention away from it.

³³ Lenski, *St. Luke*, pg. 464.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Alleman, pg. 183.

Henry presents a similar explanation for this situation:

He does not chide them for disturbing him with their prayers, but for disturbing themselves with their fears. Christ reproved them first, and then delivered them; this is his method, to prepare us for a mercy, and then to give it to us.³⁶

As does Meyer:

Bengel observes: “Animos discipulorum prius, deinde mare composuit,” “He calmed the minds of His disciples first, and then the sea.” Unquestionably more original than Mark and Luke; not a case of transforming into the miraculous (Holtzmann). The miraculous does not appear till after the disciples have been addressed.³⁷

Kretzmann addresses it in this way: “Christ’s first thought is for the faith of the disciples, not for the alleviation of their fear.”³⁸ Finally, Lenski, drawing upon his earlier assertion that Matthew and Mark do not bind themselves to the laws of chronology, asserts that Mark and Luke, recording the rebuke after calming the storm, “seem to have the true order of these acts.”³⁹

If Matthew and Luke were to have drawn from Mark and the “Q” document, as Source Criticism – and her children: Form Criticism and Redaction Criticism – purports, it would not make logical sense for one to “correct” Mark’s error while the second did not. Would Matthew, a disciple, and Peter, the disciple from whom Mark drew his information, disagree on an event at which they were both present? Why would Luke, who thoroughly investigated his sources, not find the same error in Mark that Matthew had? Such arguments do not hold ground here; Lenski seems to have the best answer: Mark and Luke followed chronology, while Matthew adjusted for focus.

καὶ τότε (LK: δὲ) ὁ διεγερθεὶς (MT: ἐγερθεὶς) ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ

³⁶ Henry, pg. 110.

³⁷ Meyer, Heinrich A.W. (1884). *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of Matthew*. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, NY, pp.187.

³⁸ Kretzmann, pg. 46

³⁹ Lenski, *St. Matthew*, pg. 347

(MT: τοῖς ἀνέμοις) καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσῃ: σιώπα, πεφίμωσο.

This section, drawing from Matthew 8:26b, Mark 4:39a, and Luke 8:24c, has one unit of variation in Luke that is of importance. This variant, matched by an identical variant in Mark, appears to be a scribal correction – an attempt to harmonize the text with Matthew.

Though

the variant

has one

more

manuscript

in its favor

Verse 24 – Unit Two							
Aland's Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς (εγερθεὶς) ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ							
<i>Textual Support - Variant</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
D	Uncial	Western	V	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
W	Uncial	Western	V	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
ψ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX/X	Ϡ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
f ¹	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII				
<i>Textual Support – Aland's Text</i>							
Ⲑ ⁷⁵	Papyrus	Alexandrian	III	Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX
Ⲙ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	f ¹³	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX

and more widespread text types, those that support Aland's text are older; that combined with the internal evidence suggests that the variant is not to be accepted.

The commentators focus on two of the words in this entire section: the words of Jesus. Only recorded in Mark⁴⁰ (If the two source theory were true, why would Matthew and Luke leave out *the words of Jesus?*), they prove to be of great importance.

The mere word of Jesus was enough. Two words are enough, the asyndeton makes them both stronger. First the durative present σιώπα, “be silent and keep so right along.” Then one of the only two perfect imperatives in the New Testament, πεφίμωσο, the force of which is: “Put the muzzle on and keep it on!”⁴¹

Henry voices something similar: “Moses commanded the waters with a rod; Joshua, with the ark of the covenant; Elisha with the prophet's mantle; but Christ with a word.”⁴² Their importance aside, the commentators vary on their interpretation of those words:

⁴⁰ Knox, Ronald (1954). *A Commentary on the Gospels*. Sheed & Ward: New York, NY, pg. 82.

⁴¹ Lenski, *St. Mark*, pg. 201.

⁴² Henry, pg. 111.

Henry: “*Be silent, be dumb*”
 Knox: “*Silence, be muzzled*”
 Kretzmann: “*Be quiet, hold your peace*”
 Lenski: “*Be silent and keep so right along; put a muzzle on it and keep it on*”

Of these, Lenski’s carries the richest meaning but would be cumbersome to read and, perhaps, difficult to understand for a young reader.

καὶ ἐπόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος (LK: ἐπαύσαντο) καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

This miraculous response to Jesus’ words is recorded in Matthew 8:26c, Mark 4:39b, and Luke 8:24d. Within those three, there is one unit of textual variance in Luke

that should be noticed. While there is a wide variety of textual support for this variant, it also seems to

Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ ἐπαύσαντο (ἐπαύσατο) καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη							
<i>Textual Support - Variant</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	13	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII
E	Uncial	Byzantine	VI	205	Miniscule	Byzantine	XV
F	Uncial	Byzantine	IX	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
G	Uncial	Byzantine	IX	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
H	Uncial	Byzantine	VI	<i>pm</i>	permulti codice		
W	Uncial	Western	V	lat	Translation		IV/V?
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	sa	Translation		III
<i>f</i> ¹	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII	bo ^{ms}	Translation		III

be a grammatical correction: perhaps the scribes thought that the plural verb (ἐπαύσαντο), referring to a singular subject (κλύδωνι), should also have been singular (ἐπαύσατο). In this case, the more difficult reading that Aland has chosen is more likely to be the original.

There is little disagreement among the commentators: what happened here was not natural. The use of the aorist ἐγένετο indicates immediate action in response to Jesus’ command. That just as suddenly as the storm had come upon them it was gone is as amazing as the fact that the waters themselves were calm immediately. “...when a storm ends and the wind ceases to blow, the agitated waters normally continue their churning for a considerable time. It was evident that there had been a divine

intervention.”⁴³ Kretzmann adds, “...at once there was a great quietness, all the more noticeable after the rushing turmoil of a few minutes before.”⁴⁴ It is clear: this course of events was miraculous!

καὶ (LK: δὲ) εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί δειλοί ἐστε; ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;
οὐπω ἔχετε πίστιν;

Matthew recorded Jesus rebuking the disciples before rebuking the storm; Mark (4:40) and Luke (8:25a) do so afterwards. There are four variants of note; the first three are from Mark. The external support for each is minimal compared to that of Aland’s

Verse 40 – Unit One							
Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί ‘δειλοί ἐστε; οὐπω ¹ (¹ δειλοι εστε ουτως; πως ουκ ² δειλοι εστε ουτως; ³ ουτως δειλοι εστε; ουπω) ἔχετε πίστιν;							
<i>Textual Support – Variant¹</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
C	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	Ϝ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	(f)	Codice Latini		VI
1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI	sy ^{(p),h}	Translation	Western	V/VI
<i>Textual Support – Variant²</i>							
W	Uncial	Western	V	(e q)	Codice Latini		V/VI/VII
<i>Textual Support – Variant³</i>							
ⲡ ^{45vid}	Papyrus	Caesarean	III	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
f ^{1,13}	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII/XIII	2542	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIII
205	Miniscule	Byzantine	XV	pc	Pauci Codice		
<i>Textual Support – Aland’s Text</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	(1424)	Miniscule	Byzantine	IX/X
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	700	Miniscule	Caesarean	XI
D	Uncial	Western	V	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
Δ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX	2427	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIV?
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	pc	Pauci Codice		
565	Miniscule	Caesarean	IX	lat	Translation		IV/V?
(579)	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII	co	Translation		III?

reading. Additionally, the difficult reading of Aland’s is more likely to be the original.

The final variant is found in Luke’s account. It can be seen that the verb was supplied for

⁴³ Arndt, pg. 237.

⁴⁴ Kretzmann, pg. 185.

an elliptical clause. Grammatically, either way of writing the clause is acceptable, but it is

less likely that

a verb would be

deleted than

added.

Therefore, the

more difficult

grammar and

older

manuscripts

favor Aland's choice.

Verse 25 – Unit One							
Aland's Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ποῦ (ἐστίν) ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;							
<i>Textual Support - Variant</i>							
<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
D	Uncial	Western	V	1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI
f ¹³	Miniscule	Caesarean	XIII	1506	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	ⲉⲓ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
892 ^c	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX				
<i>Textual Support – Aland's Text</i>							
Ⲱ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	f ¹	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	579	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	700	Miniscule	Caesarean	XI
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	892*	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
W	Uncial	Western	V	1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	2542	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIII
ψ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX/X	al			

Once again, the commentators take note of the difference between Matthew and

the other gospel writers concerning where the rebuke of the disciples is placed. Knox

says,

A special feature in Mark's account of the storm is the for of our Lord's question, "Have you *still* no faith?" This would perhaps have been out of place in Matthew's narrative, where the incident (for whatever reason) is placed at the very beginning of our Lord's ministry.⁴⁵

Contrastingly, Bernhard Weiss states:

As we saw in Mark iv. 39, 40, Luke describes how Jesus, as soon as He awakens, first rebukes the wind and the waves; and only after both have become quiet and the sea has become calm, He asks the disciples what had become of their faith, i.e., their trust in the protection of God.⁴⁶

The author has already addressed this in a previous section and remains convinced the

same: Mark and Luke follow the chronology more closely and Matthew has made an

alteration for focus of his message.

⁴⁵ Knox, pg. 82.

⁴⁶ Weiss, Bernhard (1906). A Commentary on the New Testament. Funk & Wagnalls Company: New York, NY, pp. 68.

Another point of interest is the form of Jesus question to them. Matthew recorded Jesus as calling the disciples “men of little faith,” ὀλιγόπιστοι; Mark and Luke record His words a bit differently: “Have you still no faith?” and “Where is your faith?” respectively. All of the commentators agree that Jesus is not questioning whether His disciples had faith, but using an exaggerated question to focus on the *weakness of their faith* – it was as weak as if it were not there. “The weakness of faith and of discernment on the part of the disciples ... appears in Mark most strongly of the Synoptics.”⁴⁷ “More than a dozen times Mark mentions this weakness. Undoubtedly the chagrin and deep humility of Peter caused him to dwell upon this point so often in his account of the days and the Gospel of Jesus.”⁴⁸

(MK: καὶ) οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐφοβήθησαν (LK: φοβηθέντες) φόβον μέγαν
καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες (MK: ἔλεγον)·

This section relates the reaction of the disciples to the miracle they had just witnessed. Of Matthew 8:27a, Mark 4:41a, and Luke 8:25b, there are two textual variants

that should
be con-
sidered and
are shown
in the
following
chart. The

Verse 25 – Unit Three							
Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν ἔλεγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους ¹ (1 2 3 1 ² 1)							
<i>Textual Support – Variant¹</i>							
Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date	Symbol	Manuscript Form	Text Type	Date
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII	1424	Miniscule	Byzantine	IX/X
Ξ	Uncial	Alexandrian	VI	2542	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIII
ψ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX/X	al	alii codice		
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	it	Translation	Western	IV/V?
579	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII	vg ^{cl}	Translation	Western	IV/V
892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	sy ^h	Translation	Western	V/VI
1342	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV				
<i>Textual Support – Variant²</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	sa ^{ms}	Translation		III

second variant simply seems to be an attempt to harmonize with the parallel passage in Matthew; the first is a bit more difficult: Aland does not offer the support for his text

⁴⁷ Meyer, pg. 59.

⁴⁸ Kretzmann, pg. 185.

choice and that of the variant is fairly good. Based on internal evidence, I would DISAGREE with Aland: the variant reading is more difficult (ambiguous: does πρὸς ἀλλήλους refer to λέγοντες or ἐθαύμασαν?) and does not as closely resemble the parallel passage in Mark (although Aland’s text does leave a difference in verb form).

The commentators agree to the nature of the fear and astonishment found within οἱ ἄνθρωποι, the men. About this, Lenski comments: “Matthew notes the astonishment [of the men], Mark the fear, and Luke both fear and astonishment.”⁴⁹ According to the two-source theory, Matthew and Luke would have drawn from Mark and the “Q” document for their information. If “Q” had “astonishment” and Mark had “fear,” why would Matthew choose “astonishment” over “fear” instead of including both, as Luke did? The logic of the historical critics holds no ground here.

Lenski also added: “The disciples were not afraid of Jesus, did not run from him, but now looked upon him with the greatest awe.”⁵⁰ These responses are those of men who recognize the supernatural in their midst.

τίς ἄρα (MT: ποταπός) οὗτος ἐστὶν ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι (MK ὁ ἄνεμος |
LK: τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει) καὶ ἡ θάλασσα (LK: τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ)
ὑπακούουσιν (MK: ὑπακούει) αὐτῷ;

The final section of this pericope – the verses Matthew 8:27b, Mark 4:41b, and Luke 8:25c – have three significant variants to examine in the verse from Mark.

<u>Verse 41 – Unit Two</u>							
Aland’s Text (<i>Variant Reading</i>):							
καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ ¹ ² ὑπακουουσιν ³ ὑπακουουσιν αὐτῷ)							
<u>Textual Support – Variant^d</u>							
<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Manuscript Form</u>	<u>Text Type</u>	<u>Date</u>
⋈	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	205	Miniscule	Byzantine	XV

⁴⁹ Lenski, *St. Mark*, pg. 203.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

C	Uncial	Alexandrian	V	2542	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIII
Δ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IX	<i>pc</i>	Pauci Codice		
<i>f</i> ^{1,13}	Miniscule	Caesarean	XII/XIII				
<i>Textual Support – Variant²</i>							
D	Uncial	Western	V	i	Codice Latini		V
<i>ff</i> ²	Codice Latini		V	q	Codice Latini		VI/VII
<i>Textual Support – Variant³</i>							
A	Uncial	Byzantine	V	(1342)	Miniscule	Alexandrian	XIII/XIV
W	Uncial	Western	V	(1506)	Miniscule	Byzantine	1320
Θ	Uncial	Caesarean	IX	Ϡ	Miniscule	Byzantine	XII
33	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX	lat	Translation		IV/V
1006	Miniscule	Byzantine	XI	bo	Translation		III?
<i>Textual Support – Aland's Text</i>							
κ	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	892	Miniscule	Alexandrian	IX
B	Uncial	Alexandrian	IV	2427	Miniscule	Byzantine	XIV?
L	Uncial	Alexandrian	VIII				

These three variants all seem to make an attempt to correct an aspect of grammar: giving a compound subject a plural verb (This “correct” construction is also found in the parallel passages) or altering the word order. While Aland’s external textual support is not greater than the rest, the internal evidence – the difficulty of his reading – is in his favor. As such, I would agree with him.

In this final section of the pericope, the commentators attempt to answer the question that the Gospel writers leave open: “Who is this man that the winds and the sea obey Him?” With resounding clarity, Kretzmann declares: “The man Jesus is the almighty God. With His human voice He restored peace in the uproar of the elements. His human nature possesses also the divine glory and majesty.”⁵¹ Ending the account with such a question poses no problem for Lenski either, for “there was no need to record the answers,”⁵² for the only answer is God Himself. And in a concluding fashion, Henry

⁵¹ Kretzmann, pg. 186.

⁵² Lenski, *St. Luke*, pg. 467.

proclaims, “Others pretended to cure diseases; but he only undertook to command *the winds*”⁵³ – “wild, lawless elements”!⁵⁴

Conclusion

Having deeply examined this section of Scripture, the claims of the historical critics – source, form, and redaction critics – seem to find no basis. Those texts that would have seemed to favor their arguments were analyzed and explained linguistically and theologically in a satisfactory manner. The result of this was that this particular pericope, instead of having its differences point to a theory of interdependence, showed clearly that the writers worked independently from one another. As Lenski says, “A comparison of the narratives of the three synoptics is highly interesting for showing the independence of each account.”⁵⁵ The differences between the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, instead of invalidating the credibility of their witness, serve to enrich the picture that each of them paint, giving a vivid portrayal of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ – a man, once little known, who holds the power over all the world in His hands and yet gives special attention to the faith and life of each individual He calls His own!

⁵³ Henry, pg. 111.

⁵⁴ Kretzmann, pg. 185.

⁵⁵ Lenski, *St. Matthew*, pg. 345.

References

- Aland, Kurt, ed. (1997) Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. 15th Ed. Gesamtherstellung Biblia-Druck GmbH: Stuttgart, Germany.
- Aland, Kurt, ed. (1993). The Greek New Testament. 4th Ed. Biblia-Druck: Stuttgart, Germany.
- Alleman, Herbert C. ed. (1944). New Testament Commentary. The Muhlenberg Press: Philadelphia, PA, pp. 182-3, 255-6, 324.
- Arndt, William F. (1956). Bible Commentary: The Gospel According to St. Luke. Concordia Publishing House: St. Louis, MO, pp. 236-8.
- Bauer, Walter, ed. (1979). A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 2nd Ed. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.
- Henry, Matthew (1721 org.?). Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible. MacDonald Publishing Company: McLean, VA, pp. 109-11, 474-6, 659-61.
- Howley, G.C.D. ed. (1952). A New Testament Commentary: based on the Revised Standard Version. 2nd Ed. Pickering & Inglis LTD: London, pp. 183.
- Knox, Ronald (1954). A Commentary on the Gospels. Sheed & Ward: New York, NY, pp. 13, 82, 145.
- Kretzmann, Paul E. (?). Popular Commentary of the Bible: The New Testament: Volume 1. Concordia Publishing House: St. Louis, MO, pp. 46, 185-6, 309-10.
- Lenski, R.C.H. (1946). The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel. Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, MN, pp. 462-67.
- Lenski, R.C.H. (1946). The Interpretation of St. Mark's Gospel. The Wartburg Press: Columbus, OH, pp. 196-204.
- Lenski, R.C.H. (1943). The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. The Wartburg Press: Columbus, OH, pp. 344-51.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1971). A Textual Commentary On the Greek New Testament. 3rd Ed. United Bible Societies: New York.
- Meyer, Heinrich A. W. (1884). Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of Mark and Luke. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, NY, pp. 58-9, 360-1.
- Meyer, Heinrich A. W. (1884). Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of Matthew. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, NY, pp.186-8.
- Trenchard, Warren C. (1998). Complete Vocabulary Guide to the Greek New Testament.

Rev. Ed. Zondervan Publishing House: Grand Rapids, MI.

Voelz, James W. (1993). Fundamental Greek Grammar. 2nd Ed. Concordia Publishing House: St. Louis, MO.

Weiss, Bernhard (1906). A Commentary on the New Testament. Funk & Wagnalls Company: New York, NY, pp. 66-8.