

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1948

The Latter Judean and Latter Perean Ministry of Christ in the Light of Recent Research

Willard Herman Stark

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_starkw@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stark, Willard Herman, "The Latter Judean and Latter Perean Ministry of Christ in the Light of Recent Research" (1948). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 240.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/240>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE LATER JUDEAN AND LATER PERSEAN MINISTRY
OF CHRIST IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Willard Herman Stark
May 1948

Approved by:

W. Arndt

M. H. Franmann

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Outline	111
Introduction	v
I. The Relation of the Gospels	1
II. Background of St. Luke's Gospel and Its Sources .	7
III. The Historicity of the Later Judean and Later Perean Ministry of Christ	12
IV. The Chronology of This Section	42
Bibliography	60

THE LATER JUDEAN AND LATER PEREAN MINISTRY
OF CHRIST IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH

(Outline)

Controlling Purpose: To show that the later Judean and later Perea ministry of Christ as recorded in Luke 9:51-18:14 is historically and chronologically correct.

I. The relation of the Gospels.

A. The Gospels differ.

1. They are not merely historical or biographical.
2. They are a history of our salvation and therefore not measurable by human yardstick.
3. They are written for different purposes from certain points of view.

II. Background of St. Luke's Gospel and its sources.

A. Luke is the author.

B. It is written at an early date.

C. Luke was a thorough historian.

D. There are many theories as to Luke's sources.

III. The historicity of the later Judean and later Perea ministry of Christ.

A. Three objections that this is not a Perea section.

1. The name Perea is due to a mistranslation.
2. It is the result of harmonists trying to harmonize the Gospels as inspired.
3. It records a Samaritan journey.

B. Our view: This section records three journeys to Jerusalem identical with those mentioned by John.

1. Some object that Luke and John do not agree in any of their parts.
2. Some believe they disagree only in regard to the Perea ministry of Christ.
3. Objections are raised to the three-journey hypothesis.

C. Objections to the historicity of this section because of the lack of geographical details.

1. It is merely development of tradition.
2. Luke fits in events here that did not fit in elsewhere.

3. Our view: The lack of geographical development is probably due to Luke's unfamiliarity with the area and his thorough way of writing history.

D. Some say it is merely repetition of events that happened earlier.

1. Many of the incidents suggest the Galilean setting.

2. Our view: In the life of Jesus there were many similar incidents.

IV. Chronology of this section.

- A. Key dates that help us determine the time of Jesus' ministry.
- B. The length of Jesus' ministry.
- C. Various views on the chronology of this section.
 1. It is a logical and moral sequence rather than chronological.
 2. It is chronological for the most part.
 3. It is not at all chronological.
 4. It is completely chronological.
- D. Luke's preface gives us clues on the matter.
- E. Our conclusion: Luke wrote in a chronological order as far as he could determine the order of events.

INTRODUCTION

Since the time of the first harmony of the Gospels, there has ever been disagreement over the section in the Gospel of St. Luke 9:51-18:14 which is the section peculiar to Luke. This section has been discussed and rediscussed; it has even been kicked around at times. Some have held that this is a section of Luke's own manufacture in which he places material that does not fit in anywhere else in the structure of St. Mark which he is said to be using; some say it is a great confusion on his part in that he wishes to represent Jesus as going to Jerusalem, having left Galilee for the last time but that he forgets himself and before long pictures Jesus as in Galilee again. Many raise the objection that he is vague in regard to names of cities and all geographical references and that therefore this section is unconnected and unchronological in character and a compilation and repetition of events that have happened before. But despite all this argumentation on this section, to our utter amazement and disappointment we have found only one article that deals exclusively with it. It seems as if this section is a virtual "hot potato" which many grasp courageously enough, but soon drop again reverting to some other subject on which

there is more material and not as much conjecture. For the most part, the typical treatment of this section simply is to state that this section of Luke is commonly called the "Perean section" but that this is, indeed, a misnomer, for it is neither Perean nor even a travel document. They say the only safe thing to call it is "the Central section of Luke."

This "hot potato" we have set out to discuss to the satisfaction of ourself and of some readers. We will attempt to show the relation of the Gospels to one another: that they are not historical biographies but are written each for a special purpose and from a certain view point. Therefore, there will be various accounts; one will dwell particularly on one phase of Christ's life and another on some other phase. But each is true in every detail. We shall show that there is no disagreement between the Synoptic Gospels nor even between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. The Gospels complement and corroborate each other in such a way that a more complete and more certain picture of the life of our Savior may be had. In the second part we shall try to determine the sources of Luke and see whether thereby we may get any clues as to the existence of this section peculiar to Luke. We shall show in the third part, that the later Judean and later Perean ministry of Christ is a historical fact, and in the fourth part, we shall discuss the chronology of this section. To this end may the Lord grant us His grace.

THE LATER JUDEAN AND LATER PEREAN MINISTRY OF CHRIST IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH

I. The Relation of the Gospels

The section in Luke which is peculiar to him and which we shall use as the basis of our discussion of the later Judean and later Perea ministry of Christ is often considered a great distortion. Scholars with a critical bent contend that because this section differs from that of any other account in the Gospels it is historically incorrect. This objection we should like to answer by showing the unique relation of the Gospels, that they are written to complement each other, i.e., each Gospel is written from a certain point of view and to certain specific readers, who must be approached differently. In the first place, we should point out that when we look at this section we must keep in mind that the Gospels are not merely historical or biographical accounts but are a history of our salvation; therefore, they are not measurable by a human yardstick. These men believe this section to be historically unsound because the Gospels are very much in harmony until we come to this section in Luke, which alone records these incidents. Our contention is that silence on the part of an evangelist does not imply lack of information. Zahn, I think gives us the right approach to this problem when he says,

"As is often the case in the popular treatment of complex historical development, intermediate steps are omitted."¹

In other words, departures were made in accordance with their special point of view. This does not mean or imply that the evangelists' knowledge, in this case Matthew and Mark, was limited to their particular outline in regard to this section. Westcott upholds this view when he points out that objections are always based on the assumption that the Gospels are complete biographies. "Omissions of one or other or series of events or discourses is not equivalent to an exclusion of them, unless it can be shown that the two supplementary records are inconsistent."²

Therefore, it is important that we understand the point of view and purpose of the sacred writers when we try to harmonize this section of Luke with the rest of the evangelists' accounts. It is true we shall not be able to answer all questions of chronology nor even of harmony but with a little better insight as to their purpose this section of Luke, too, will fit into the picture.

What were the purposes of the evangelists as they wrote their Gospels? Edersheim sums up the different purposes of the Gospels somewhat like this: Matthew presented the

1. Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, III pp. 166 f.

2. Brooke Foss Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, sixth ed., p. 285.

discourses and teachings of Jesus; his Gospel was written to the Jews and brought out the fact, time and time again, that Jesus is the Messiah. Mark presented a rapid survey of the history of Christ and dealt mainly with the Galilean ministry. John, Jesus' intimate, emphasized the Eternal Son as the Word dealt almost exclusively with the Jerusalem ministry. And Luke complements the narratives in the other two Synoptic Gospels (Matthew and Mark) and supplements them by tracing the ministry in Perea which the others do not do. In this respect it also forms a transition to the Fourth Gospel of the Judean Ministry. Then he goes on to say, "If we may venture a step further: The Gospel by St. Mark gives the general view of the Christ; that by St. Matthew the Jewish, that by St. Luke the Gentile, and by St. John the Church's view."³

When we look at the Gospel of St. Matthew we find that it must have been written to the Jews--the whole approach indicates it. Matthew wanted to show the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah even though He did not come in might and splendor as they had expected. He was born a lowly Nazarene, and He made Capernaum of the Galileans the center of His activity. Matthew shows that He must proceed from Galilee and His main activity must be in that country to fulfill prophecy. He also shows that Jesus' Galilean ministry should not cause offense, for they, the Jews, had forced Him out of Judea.⁴ Therefore,

3. Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, pp. 127-128.

4. Joh. Ylvisaker, The Gospels, p. 12.

we find that Matthew hardly touches the Judean and Perea ministry of Christ.

The Gospel of Mark on the other hand was written to the mighty and proud Romans who had just heard the Gospel preached to them by Peter. How could this Gospel be made appealing to them? Were not the Jews laughed off as a sorry people? Could a man from this "despicable slave-folk" be the Savior? The Romans ridiculed this Savior and the Christians who accepted Him. How could this Jesus have been true God when He could not even save Himself? Upon such a scene comes Mark. What would be most appealing about Jesus to this people? Of course it would be His many wonderful miracles. Therefore, he concentrates on them showing a Savior who never ceased doing miracles. And then he showed that this wondrous Person, with all His power, gave up His life without a struggle. Even a hardened Roman could worship such a Savior.⁵

The Gospel of St. Luke was unquestionably written to the Gentiles. He wanted to stress that the Gospel is for all men--for the world. With this purpose in mind, he traces the genealogy of Christ back to Adam while Matthew traces it only as far as Abraham. And so we can readily see why this section peculiar to Luke was included. Here Luke could show that the Gospel was meant for them too, and he did. In Luke 10:1 the Seventy are told to go to every city and bring the Gospel to all the people in the villages and cities while in

5. Ibid., pp. 16-20.

the other Gospels the disciples were told to avoid the Samaritans. In the story of 9:51-56 Jesus reprimanded James and John for wanting to call down God's wrath upon the unfriendly Samaritans. In 17:11-19 we have the story of the ten lepers who were healed: only the Samaritan thanked Jesus for His gracious act. And we have the stories in this section of the Good Samaritan, the Pharisee and the Publican, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Penny and the Prodigal Son.⁶ When we examine the purpose of Luke we can understand why he would include this section of the later Judean and later Perea ministry of Christ. It fits in so perfectly that immediately a new light is thrown on this section. Luke wanted to show all men, no matter whether they were Gentiles or Jews, that Jesus came to minister unto them too, and how better could he do this than by dwelling on the period of Jesus' ministry in Judea and Perea which the other evangelists had all but left untouched.

This, then, is the point we wish to make: the peculiar section of Luke's Gospel which we are going to discuss does not mean disagreement with the other Gospels; it does not mean that the other evangelists' knowledge did not extend to these events but that it is in keeping with the purpose of Luke to show that the Gospel is for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews. There is perfect harmony between all four Gospels. If this harmony seems lost for a moment, we shall,

6. Ibid., pp. 20-23.

after some searching, find that there are no contradictions; one statement does not rule out another by a different evangelist. The peculiar section of Luke is historically sound; it is not an insertion; it is not a repetition but is in harmony with the other Gospels and can readily be brought into the structure of Mark and Matthew who picture Jesus as going to Jerusalem for His crucifixion almost immediately after he sets foot in Trans-Jordan Perea. But the historicity of this section we shall discuss in greater detail in one of the following parts of our thesis.

Having spoken of the harmony of the Gospels and having shown the different specific purposes of the evangelists which account for their difference in material presented, let us look a bit more closely at the Gospel of St. Luke, which demands our particular attention. Let us briefly sketch the background of this Gospel and determine the sources for it, which will, indeed, throw more light on the matter in this section peculiar to Luke.

II. Background of St. Luke's Gospel and Its Sources

To get a better perspective of the section which is pertinent to our discussion, it is only proper that we have a bit of an understanding of the background of the Gospel in which it is found. It is quite certain that the author is Luke. Most scholars, nearly all of them, are agreed that Luke wrote this Gospel and also the Acts of the Apostles. Robertson says, "The external evidence is unanimously in favor of Luke as the author of the Gospel and the Acts . . . The Lukan authorship of both Gospel and Acts has been universally recognized since 140 A.D. Since it is all one way, it is needless to cite it. Specific statements of the Lukan authorship occur in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and the Muratorian Canon."¹

Of Luke himself, we know little, except that Paul indicates he is a Gentile and that he may have been a brother of Titus.

When was the Gospel written? There is every indication that it was written early. The eschatological passages in it do not indicate a date later than 70 A.D. as some argue, nor is there any other strong argument for a late date.

1. A. T. Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, pp. 6 f.

Harnack emphasizes, ". . . it seems now to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical work were written while St. Paul was still alive."² Good authorities have set the date at about 57 or 58 A.D.

This early date for the Gospel gives a strong presumption in favor of the historical value of the book, because there was less time for legends to grow and the author was nearer to his sources of information. Ramsay states, "You may press the words of Luke in a degree far beyond any other historian's, and they stand the keenest scrutiny and the hardest treatment, provided always that the critic knows the subject and does not go beyond the limits of defence and justice."³

What kind of a historian was Luke? We get a good glimpse of Luke's method of research from his preface. Indications are that Luke was a thorough scholar. This gives us all the more confidence in this section of Luke (9:51-18:14). It could not have been sandwiched-in haphazardly. Luke says he was going to write in an orderly way using what others had written before and also using reports of eye-witnesses and conversations with people who were benefited from Jesus' ministry. Robertson pictures Luke's study this way, "It is

2. Adolph Harnack, Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels, p. 124, quoted in Robertson, op. cit., p. 37.

3. Ramsay, Bearing of Recent Discovery, p. 89, quoted in Robertson, op. cit., p. 41.

not hard to see the pile of notes of conversation or of investigation lying near at hand. Here are papyri rolls of previous monographs on various phases of the life of Christ. Luke himself sits by his own roll spread out before him. He writes after he has gotten ready to write and with all available data at hand."⁴

When we come to the problem of Luke's sources the theories are as varied and as many as there are scholars. There are three prevalent theories: 1. Luke used Mark's Gospel and the Logia or Quelle; 2. Some hold he used only the oral traditions; 3. Streeter's Proto-Luke hypothesis.

Our opinion is that Luke's sources for the Perean section were the reports he received from eye-witnesses, his conversations with people who had benefited from Jesus' ministry, and other investigations. This also would explain the lack of geographical and chronological data which may have become vague in the minds of those telling him what they knew of Jesus in the territory that Jesus ministered. Also, there may have been conflicting stories as to where and when these incidents occurred. Luke, being the historian that he was, probably thought it best to leave out names of places where there was uncertainty. The possibility of a separate source containing the narrative of the Perean journey we also do not rule out. Such may have been the case, but would it account satisfactorily for the lack of notes of time and

4. Robertson, op. cit., p. 43.

place?

The prevalent view seems to be that Luke used Mark and the Logia, which were sayings of Jesus collected into what modern scholars also call "Quelle." In favor of this view we have scholars like Robertson, Goguel, Ropes, Goodspeed, Luce and many others. On the other hand, we have men like Westcott and Fahling defending the oral tradition theory. To uphold their view they cite the great gap in Luke which covers the period of Matthew 14:22-16:13 and Mark 6:45-8:27. Fahling says that proponents of the "dependence theory" are quite silent at this point. He says it is an indication that the evangelists wrote independently of each other.⁵ Westcott thinks that the peculiarities and similarities which occur in Luke when compared with the other Gospels are completely without pattern and therefore, the hypothesis of some common written source for the Gospels falls flat.⁶ However, there is too much evidence, it seems, in the Gospels themselves pointing to the priority of Mark. Practically all of Mark is reproduced in Matthew or Luke, or both; and slightly more than half of Mark's actual words reappear. "The view that Mark is the earlier, and formed the foundation of Matthew and Luke, is not now seriously challenged."⁷

However, Luke must have had other sources. This we see from this section in Luke, and it is certainly indicated in

5. Adam Fahling, A Harmony of the Gospels, p. 93.

6. Westcott, op. cit., p. 207.

7. H. K. Luce, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. xi.

his preface. Some believe that he had a special source containing a journey for this section which they call "P" or Perean. This source must have been rich in parabolic and narrative discourses.⁸ It is evident that Luke had heard many oral accounts. He may have spoken to Mary, the mother of Jesus, who pondered all these sayings and incidents in her heart, and perhaps, also to John's disciples. He may also have examined legal documents and any number of other sources.

Luke was not indiscriminate in the use of his material. If he had followed every story he would have had a composite of fables and legends hard to duplicate anywhere for exaggeration and for general inaccuracy. As Robertson points out, "That Luke did not follow old wives' fables and foolish legends is proven by a comparison of his books with the apocryphal lives of Jesus."⁹

All these facts give us a great deal of confidence in this section of Luke. Luke knew whereof he was writing. He was careful, he sifted, he examined, he studied, and he deliberated to get the story down correctly. And in this section, which is not found in the other Gospels, we dare believe he was even more careful to put things down as they really happened. Having determined this, we are now ready to make a study of the historicity of this section.

8. H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, II, p. 373.

9. Robertson, op. cit., p. 49.

III. The Historicity of the Later Judean and Later Perean Ministry of Christ

The unique section of Luke (9:51-18:14) has been variously described. Some of the earlier students of this section in Luke have called it a "gnomology," a collection of proverbial sayings in a travel narrative. Advocates of this theory are men like Marsh, Eichhorn, Kuinzel and so essentially also Westcott. Over a century ago already, a pious Catholic by the name of Hug, raised the objection that this was not a connected history, but detached fragments which might well be called a "collectanea." This "collectanea" recorded the beginnings of at least two journeys from Galilee to Jerusalem, but did not finish them. Hug said, "When we are thinking to see Jesus soon in Jerusalem, we unexpectedly find him elsewhere, and in fact farther away from Jerusalem than at the commencement of his journey."¹

Schleiermacher said it was not a "gnomology" but called it a "travel section" or "travel narrative," but he agreed with Hug that it contained much other material. Part of the work he referred to a Perean journey. This gave currency to the two most popular designations of this section in Luke:

1. Hug, Introduction to the N.T., p. 453, quoted in C. C. McCown, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," in Journal of Biblical Literature, LVII, Part I, (March 1938), p. 51.

the "travel narrative" and "Perean section." Some have called it the "Samaritan ministry." With those who held the theory of Marcan priority the fashionable title among the critical students became "interpolation." This is the term Holtzmann and Carl Weizäcker used in their epoch-making studies of 1863 and 1864. We find that also in recent commentaries and introductions there is a great degree of variation in the designations of this section and in the authors' estimates of its historical and geographical accuracy. "What is its real character," asks McCown? "The problem concerns the purpose and value of the third Gospel, and its solution is fundamental to an account of Jesus' ministry and an estimate of his aims and his character."²

As we study this section we find that there are countless attacks upon its historicity. Objections are profuse and varied. There are some who go so far as to say that Jesus never even entered Perea when we read in Matt. 19:1 and Mark 10:1 that Jesus "came into the borders of Judea and beyond Jordan." In fact, Olmstead's contention is that the term "Perean" is due to a mistranslation. What Mark actually says is that Jesus comes "into the frontier of Judea and Trans-Jordan." While, he insists, Matthew is even more explicit when he says, "he came into the frontier of Judaea-Trans-Jordan." This view is still more substantiated, he believes, when we compare Luke 17:11--"passing between Samaria

2. McCown, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

and Galilee." He says there cannot be the slightest doubt as to the meaning; Jesus did not enter Perea, the exact equivalent of Trans-Jordan--He merely followed along the border of Perea, that is, down the Jordan valley, but on the west side of the river to avoid the territory of Antipas. The fact that most of the written material assigned by the harmonists to this Perean ministry consists of the huge block which Luke copied from his own main source also helps to prove the absurdity of a Perean ministry.³

Then we have those who place the responsibility for the idea of a Perean ministry on the Gospel harmonists. McCown believes the only reason why a Perean ministry is advocated is to "harmonize" the Gospel accounts "as if each were a verbally inspired historical record." Among his arguments are these: it is hard to base such an opinion on Mark's notice that Jesus crossed the Jordan on His last journey to Jerusalem (10:1), and Matthew mistakes Judea to be beyond Jordan (19:1). These harmonists merely wanted to find a place in Mark's outline for Luke's long "travel narrative." But, he insists, the account does not fit into the outline of Mark at all. Furthermore, if Luke would have wanted to give the impression of a Perean ministry he certainly would have used Mark 10:1 with its "peran tou Iordanou."⁴

3. A.T. Olmstead, "The Chronology of Jesus Life", in Anglican Theological Review, Vol. XXIV, (1942), pp. 21-22.

4. McCown, op. cit., pp. 61-64.

Then there are a good number of scholars who believe that Luke intended to present a "Samaritan ministry." Bultman's view is that Luke does not wish to leave the journey to Jerusalem so undescribed as Mark has it, therefore, he inserts references to Samaria. But, he says, his presentation is unskillful, for though in Samaria, He is surrounded with the same people and questioned by the same opponents as in Galilee. He is invited to dinner by Pharisees; goes into a synagogue; Antipas tries to arrest Him; and finally, as in Mark, He comes to Jericho. Where Luke got the idea is difficult to ascertain, they assert. Perhaps, he hit upon the notion of his own accord, and gave the Samaritan locale to the story of 9:52-56 himself, or, perhaps, he decided to let the journey pass through Samaria because it was suggested to him by the story of 9:52-56.⁵ Loisy believes the "Samaritan journey" to be the idea of a redactor as a prefiguration of the conversion of the Gentiles, but this is based on the false idea of the redactor that Luke 9:52 indicated a long interval, while Luke meant to indicate a rapid journey to the capital.⁶

McCown suggests that Luke had material that took Jesus to Samaria and he had other material that he did not want to discard or place into the Galilean ministry. "Because of an established tradition as to Jesus' last journey, he had to

5. C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, p. 455.

6. Loisy, Luc., p. 284, quoted in Montefiore, op. cit., p. 455.

take Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem by way of Jericho, when he combined his material with Mark . . . He conceived the idea that there was a ministry in Samaria and found his materials made it possible to construct a marvellously symmetrical and progressive plan in the life and ministry of Jesus. In the author's intention, then, this is a 'Samaritan ministry.'"⁷

Streeter⁸ and McCown are agreed that the only safe name by which this section can be called is "Central section." Their contention is this, that it is neither a travel narrative nor a Samaritan journey nor a Perea section. McCown asserts quite vigorously, "Luke's central section is not a true travel narrative, though it is constructed as such. For the modern student it is a collection around a travel motif. It was never intended to be regarded as a 'Perea section,' the fictitious journey was never supposed to run through Perea, and the section was never intended to record a 'Perea Ministry.'"⁹ He believes its contents rather belong in either Jerusalem or Galilee.

These three contentions against the historicity of a Perea ministry, viz., 1. That the term is due to a mistranslation of peran tou Iordanou; 2. That it is the result of harmonists trying to harmonize the accounts as inspired; and 3. That it was a Samaritan journey shall claim our first

7. McCown, op. cit., p. 64.

8. B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 203.

9. McCown, op. cit., p. 64.

consideration.

As to the first argument, it is our contention that it is quite arbitrary and, perhaps, even a bit naive. To deny that there was no later Perea ministry at all, even with the evidence of Matt. 19:1 and Mark 10:1, goes far beyond the bounds that most scholars, and even critics have set. In the first place, the translation cited previously has little or no basis for justification. Other facts are also against it. Surely, Jesus did again go to Perea after His Galilean ministry, for John 10:40 speaks plainly enough, (beside the references in Matthew and Mark), "And (He) went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptiz_ed and there abode." Jesus must have gone to Perea. Any contentions to the contrary seem futile and arbitrary. On the basis of John 10:40-42 Fahling says, that Jesus was charged with blasphemy and they tried to stone Him, but Jesus escaped, left the Temple and the city and departed beyond the Jordan, to the place where John had begun his early ministry of baptism. Jesus remained here for the next few months. In fact, Fahling points out, after Christ's rejections in Galilee, Samaria, and Judea, Perea was the only place left in the land of Israel which was still open to Him before His final presentation to the nation at the Passover. That Jesus spent some time there and that His stay was not exactly private we also learn from the Fourth Gospel, for it tells us that many resorted to Him there. They made comparisons between Jesus and His forerunner, when they said (John 10:41),

"John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true." "And whereas in Jerusalem neither Jesus nor John was generally accepted, the result of the ministry of Jesus in Perea was that many believed on Him there."¹⁰

But it is not enough to show that there actually was a later Perean ministry; our task is to prove the historicity of the unique section in Luke, and that it is, for the most part, a record of Christ's ministry in Perea. Fahling says we know nothing of this Perean period unless we presume that these chapters in Luke speak of this period.¹¹ We believe we need not presume, but that we can find our solution to this problem in the narrative of St. John, which fits remarkably into that of St. Luke. St. John mentions three appearances of Christ in Jerusalem during that period: at the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7:10), at the Feast of Dedication (10:22-42), and His final entry, which is referred to by all the evangelists. Although St. John confines himself exclusively to the happenings in and about Jerusalem, yet, Edersheim points out, St. John on two out of the three occasions either mentions, or gives sufficient indication, that Jesus left Jerusalem for the country east of the Jordan. They are indicated by the word "again" in John 10:19 and in the words of verse 39, "They sought again to take Him," which point to a previous similar attempt and flight east of the Jordan.

10. Adam Fahling, The Life of Christ, pp. 457-458.

11. Ibid.

Edersheim evidently feels the "again" indicates similar action before His previous flight to Perea, to distinguish it from the early Perea ministry of Jesus. St. John also records a journey to Bethany, (though not to Jerusalem), for the raising of Lazarus. After this a council arose against Jesus in Jerusalem which caused Him to withdraw from Judean territory into a district "near the wilderness," which is probably the one up north where John had been baptizing and Christ had been tempted, and to which He afterwards withdrew.¹² He regards this "wilderness" as on the western bank of the Jordan, and extending northward towards the eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee.¹³

We quote Edersheim: "If St. John relates three appearances of Jesus at this time in Jerusalem, St. Luke records three journeys to Jerusalem,¹⁴ the last of which agrees in regard to its starting point, with the notices of the other Evangelists,¹⁵ always supposing that we have correctly indicated the locality of 'the wilderness' whither, according to St. John 11:54, Christ retired previous to his last journey to Jerusalem."¹⁶ Although we cannot localize Ephraim, Edersheim believes that the statement "near the wilderness" affords us enough general notice of the situation of Ephraim, for we

12. Cf. Luke 4:1, 16; 7:24.

13. Cf. Luke 8:29.

14. Luke 9:51; 13:22; 18:31.

15. Matt. 19:1; Mark 10:1.

16. Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, pp. 126-127.

are told of only two wildernesses in the New Testament, that of Judea in the far South, and that in the far North of Perea, or perhaps in the Decapolis, to which Luke refers as the scene of the Baptist's labors, where Jesus was tempted, and to which He afterwards withdrew.¹⁷ He continues:

We can therefore, have little doubt that St. John refers (11:54) to this district. And this entirely accords with the notices by the other Evangelists of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem, as through the borders of Galilee and Samaria, and then across the Jordan, and by Bethany to Jerusalem.

It follows . . . that St. Luke's account of the three journeys to Jerusalem fits into the narrative of Christ's three appearances in Jerusalem as described by St. John. And the unique section in St. Luke supplies the record of what took place before, during, and after those journeys, of which the up-shot is told by St. John.¹⁸

Thus we see that in the view of Edersheim, this section in Luke deals with the Perean ministry of Jesus.

As to the Samaritan journey hypothesis, there is little evidence that Luke ever had the intention of making this a "Samaritan journey." In fact, scholars are more and more discrediting the idea that Jesus spent much time in Samaria at all. If we use the three-journey plan, we are able to give the two references to Luke in this section interpretations that are more in keeping with the Greek text. Especially is this true in regard to the reference in Luke 17:11. Most scholars are now taking the dia meson to be translated

17. Ibid., p. 127.

18. Ibid.

"between." Most good grammarians take this reading as "between" for this is the general translation of dia with the accusative. However, to be fair, we must point out that a good authority such as Thayer, in his Greek-English Lexicon, takes dia meson to mean "through." He does this on the basis of its usage in classical Greek poetry.

But how do the two translations fit into the story? McCown points out that if taken as "through the midst of," Jesus is going backward now, going to Jerusalem by proceeding in the opposite direction. "Since this is absurd it is taken generally as 'between' and the mention of Samaria before Galilee is explained as due to the emphasis which the story puts upon the one Samaritan¹⁹ or it is said that Jesus was going east toward Perea and the country on the right was first named."²⁰ However, Robertson argues to the contrary, that Ephraim was probably in the northern part of Judea and so it is reasonable to suppose that Jesus went "northward through Samaria into the southern or southeastern part of Galilee, so as to fall in with the pilgrims going from Galilee through Perea to Jerusalem" for the Passover.²¹ This, he says, explains the use of Samaria first, which seems strange otherwise in a journey to Jerusalem.

Others like H. A. W. Meyer and Basil Matthews believe that Jesus changed His course after the repulse of the

19. So B. Weiss, H. J. Holtzmann, and Loisy.

20. McCown, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

21. A. T. Robertson, A Harmony of the Gospels, p. 120.

Samaritans recorded in Luke 9:51-56.²² To these explanations of the two Samaritan references we subscribe. Luke did not have the slightest intention of picturing a Samaritan journey when Jesus was refused by the Samaritans we are told, "they went to another village" (9:56). And in Luke 17:11 Jesus and His group of disciples journeyed in the narrow strip of land between Galilee and Samaria on the way to Jerusalem.²³

To those who deny that this is a travel account we would but urge that they look at this section a bit more closely. "Travel" seems to be the keynote of this section, for in the first verse we find Jesus turning His face steadfastly from Galilee toward Jerusalem (9:51,53). The first night He gets to Samaria, where He is rebuffed and goes to some small village (9:52,56). There are repeated notices throughout this section intended to maintain a sense of motion. Jesus is on the road when some momentarily ardent disciple comes seeking to follow Him (9:57), an expression which suggests, as Zahn says, days, if not weeks, of travel. Later, as they journey, they come to the village of Mary and Martha (10:38). Again He is "in a certain place," praying (11:1), surely this is another place. Luke's picturesque

22. Basil Matthews, *A Life of Jesus*, p. 312.

23. Matthews, *op. cit.*, pp. 312-313 says, "(They) walked down along the borderland where the Samaritan frontier marched with that of the Jewish people. Jesus led the way through a gorge that runs east towards the Jordan valley." On this road running along the winding side of a rocky ravine that divided the land of the Samaritans from that of the Jews they met the ten lepers.

language heightens the sense of movement by letting the reader see Jesus enter the house to dine with the Pharisee and later come out again to the thronging multitudes (11:37, 53; 12:1).²⁴

We have referred to the fact that there seems to be a remarkable connection and correspondence between Luke and John, in regard to the Perea section. This conviction becomes all the more certain with further study of the matter. On this basis, too, we can assert that Gospel harmonists had a right to take Luke's unique section as a Perea journey, for it fits into the outline of the other Gospels remarkably well. Taking the three journeys to Jerusalem mentioned by John in 7:2ff.; 11:17f. and the final Passover as corresponding to the mention of Jesus going to Jerusalem by Luke in 9:51; 13:22; and 17:11 presents by far the least number of difficulties. It answers a great number of objections raised. However, there are still a large number of scholars who believe Luke and John do not agree; in fact, they say they seem to contradict one another. Of this we shall now speak and attempt to show that these charges are false.

In the first place, there are those who contend that John does not agree with Luke even outside this section; moreover, John is said to be entirely contradictory to the other Gospels and therefore, the conclusion is drawn, that either John is correct and the Synoptic Gospels wrong or

24. McCown, op. cit., p. 53.

vice versa. Olmstead assumes that John is the only correct Gospel. He comes to this conclusion by means of the Babylonian Chronology by which he and his co-workers claim they have determined the exact date of the crucifixion. They have also determined that the Passover in 30 A.D., the year of Christ's crucifixion, fell on the Sabbath. Therefore, John is the only correct Gospel for he speaks of Friday as the preparation of the Passover instead of the preparation of the Sabbath.²⁵

To this charge we answer that calendar study has never yet given any decisive answers to problems of this nature. We cannot throw out the harmony between Luke and John in this section on such argumentation.

There are other objections--some regard John as in error, for they feel that the locality and mode of the Lord's teachings differ from that in the Synoptics. Westcott calls this "as much an undesigned coincidence as a difficulty." They fit the writer's viewpoint, and there is no discrepancy between the same people and what they said in the various accounts. We must remember that the Gospels are complementary, not contradictory.²⁶ Some point out that the length of time indicated in John is three years, while the others only indicate one year. We quote Westcott again, "It is enough that

25. A. T. Olmstead, "The Chronology of Jesus' Life", in the Anglican Theological Review, XIV, (1942), p. 6 f.

26. Westcott, op. cit., p. 288.

the Synoptists at least allow that the ministry of our Lord may have been as long and as diversified as St. John relates." Old writers found that John supplied details of chronology which the Synoptists lacked or left unnoticed. In fact, the time in the Synoptics, which is suggested only, is too short, for there are too many events mentioned to be compressed into a single year, nor is there enough time for proper development of the disciples' faith; nor is there enough time for the journeys on both sides of the Jordan, to Tyre and Sidon and the missions of the Apostles and the Seventy; for the transition of the people's hope to hatred.²⁷ We cannot throw out John's Gospel on this objection.

But there are charges, (and these are at present of prime interest to us), that Luke and John do not agree in respect to the Perea section in Luke under discussion. In the first place, they say, it is impossible to reconcile Luke 17:11 with the explanation we have offered of Jesus' three journeys to Jerusalem according to references in John 7:2; 10:22 and 12:1 and 10:40 where we find Jesus beyond Jordan after the Feast of Dedication; and 11:17 where we find Jesus going to Bethany and then His withdrawal to Ephraim until He goes to the Passover in 11:54. They say John would have mentioned it if Jesus had gone back to Galilee. But we agree with Robertson that this is not necessarily the case unless it fell in with his plan to do so. Hence, no conflict need

27. Ibid., pp. 288-289.

exist. John permits this by his break in 11:54. Jesus probably went back to Galilee from Ephraim, whither he had withdrawn. There He joined the pilgrims going through Perea to avoid going through Samaria on their way to the Passover. "This supposition is not improbable, as Robinson and McClellan urge, but very natural; it makes Luke and John both agree, and allows Luke 9:51 to mean that Jesus then left Galilee as a field of operations."²⁸

However, this theory makes the journey in Luke 9:51 identical with the one in John 7:2-10, viz., to Tabernacles. To this Andrews raises three objections: 1. The Lord refused to go with His brethren in John 7:6 which, he says, opposes the idea of Luke 9:51. But he overlooks the fact that Jesus did not wish to go with His brothers who were unfavorable to Him but that He was intent on going all the time.²⁹ 2. The manner of His going in John is secret and in Luke public. But the secrecy merely means avoiding the main caravan routes which Luke suggests in His starting through Samaria. The messengers that He sent out were not heralds but preparers. 3. In John Jesus seems to go rapidly and in Luke slowly. This is not necessarily true. "Nor is it necessary to connect the sending of the seventy (Luke 10:1ff.) with this journey," Robertson maintains. Furthermore, "it is not necessary to fill out every detail in this programme and show where Jesus

28. Robertson, Harm. of the Gos., p. 278.

29. Luke 9:51--"he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem."

was between Tabernacles and Dedication. The main outlines remain clear and harmonious and are fairly satisfactory. This combination of Luke and John preserves the integrity of both narratives and fills up a large blank that would otherwise exist in these closing months of the Saviour's life."³⁰

This combination of Luke and John also answers another objection that is raised against the historicity of this section, viz., how can one account for the difference of Luke from Matthew and Mark, who picture Jesus going to Perea immediately after leaving Galilee with nothing intervening, and a little later bring us to the triumphal entry into Jerusalem and the final Passover; while Luke, on the other hand, after completing his account parallel with Matthew and Mark of the Galilean ministry, describes Jesus going from Galilee, not into Perea immediately, but to Jerusalem via an intended trip through Samaria? John 7:2-10 helps us solve the problem agreeing with Luke. Jesus goes in secret from Galilee to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles, six months before the final Passover. Then Luke goes on with sayings and actions by Jesus and finally becomes parallel with Matthew and Mark again. We know that Luke greatly condensed the narrative of the post-Galilean ministry, (the withdrawals of Jesus), giving to it only 9:10-50 while Matthew gives 14:13-18:35 to it and Mark 6:30-9:50. It is quite evident that Luke condensed this in order to make room for the mass of matter which,

30. Robertson, Harm. of the Gos., p. 279.

for the most part, is peculiar to him.³¹

This, then, is the upshot of our showing the combination of Luke and John--it shows by their agreement in regard to the Perean ministry that it is a historical fact. All questions, or nearly all, can be answered by this arrangement. This section of Luke describes three journeys of Jesus which Luke depicts as one, whole, unified journey to Jerusalem. When the section is taken as depicting one journey only there are definitely problems: the questions arise whether this section is historically correct and in chronological order. Then it does take on the appearance of a compilation, or an incoherent account written by some novice historian who throws about names and places and events in a haphazard manner. We feel that the three-journey hypothesis leaves little doubt as to the historicity of this section. There is no evidence at all that Luke was not aware of the fact that he was recording incidents occurring in three separate journeys of Christ, nor is there anything that would militate against such a supposition on our part.

Before going on we should like to discuss one other objection to the plan which we have adopted, i. e., the three-journey hypothesis. We have referred to scholars who accept, and insist upon, the one-journey arrangement. They regard this whole narrative in Luke as pertaining to the last journey to Jerusalem for the last Passover. Such scholars are

31. John A. Broadus, "Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew", in An American Commentary on the New Testament, pp. 393-394.

Andrews, Greswell, Lewin, McClellan and Farrar. Others take it as the journey to the Feast of Tabernacles or Dedication. They adduce the following arguments:

1. They say the words of Luke 9:51, "when the days were being completed that he should be received up," imply that the end was drawing near and He was going to Jerusalem to meet it. This we grant is true, but Robertson points out they are drawing the wrong inference. The vague expression "the days were being completed" does not necessarily involve a period of merely a few weeks, but it could well include as much as six months. Jesus had spoken much of this to His disciples and it was uppermost in His mind. This journey could easily be as early as Tabernacles.³² As to the meaning of the expression, "that he should be received up," it is quite generally agreed the words refer to His Ascension. The only notable exception here is Wieseler who takes it to mean when the days drew to an end in which He found a taking up, or reception, in Galilee.³³

2. They insist that the departure in Luke 9:51 is the final one from Galilee. Robinson urges that it has to mean a final departure from Galilee, but Robertson argues that it may simply mean that He left Galilee as a "sphere of activity." It does not mean that He never entered Galilee again, for Robertson asserts that Luke 17:11 expressly says that Jesus

³². Robertson, Har. of the Gos., p. 277.

³³. Karl Wieseler, Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelium, p. 297.

went "through the midst of Samaria and Galilee."³⁴ Although we disagree with this reading of dia meson, the case is not weakened. Even if we take dia meson to mean "between" Samaria and Galilee, (as we do), it cannot be denied that Jesus set foot once more on the soil of Galilee from which He had taken leave. But Robertson's explanation, which implies that Jesus on this last journey did not enter Galilee as a sphere of activity, fully takes care of the objection. But the one-journey proponents have a problem of their own on their hands. They will have to resort to some device to explain Jesus' presence on the border of Samaria and Galilee. McClellan strives to justify his view that this is one journey by referring part of John 10:40 to the departure from Galilee, and the other part to the Perea ministry after a diversion of considerable length into Samaria and back into Galilee.³⁵ This argument seems quite futile. There are far fewer problems if we adhere to the three-journey theory.

However, in regard to the historicity of this section, there is yet another argument, briefly alluded to before, that is very frequently and consistently set forth. Critics ask, if this section is really historic, why there is such a lack of geographical development; such a paucity of local color; why there is such a lack of transitional phrases; and why does Luke use the vague expression "certain place" so

34. Robertson, Harm. of the Gos., p. 277.

35. Ibid., p. 278.

often instead of being specific as he is on other occasions? To answer this they say it must have been a compilation of loose material by Luke, since it is omitted by the other three Gospels. This question we shall attempt to answer, although, at the outset we must caution the expectant reader that here there is a problem which we cannot answer with hard, fast statements; we can only present an explanation which satisfactorily answers the problem for ourselves.

Goguel objects that in this section "Jesus seems to be continually moving on towards Jerusalem but there is no well-marked geographical development, and the section as a whole is not homogeneous. It bears all the marks of a compilation." Three times Jesus is said to set His face toward Jerusalem (9:51; 13:22; 17:11) and each time it is stated as though it had not yet been mentioned, although in 9:52 He is said to have reached a Samaritan village indicating that He left Galilee. Incidents not indicating a change of place imply entirely different situations and there are never any transitional phrases; therefore, his conclusion is that this section of Luke must be studied according to each one of the isolated elements of which it is composed.³⁶

Moreover, in regard to the Perea ministry, he asserts the Synoptists do not give a clear account of the conditions under which Jesus left Galilee for Judea. Luke mentions this departure several times but seems to get it all confused

³⁶. Maurice Goguel, The Life of Jesus, Trans. by Olive Wyon, p. 149.

and scattered "under the influence of the idea that Jesus went up to Jerusalem in order to accomplish the divine plan of his death." Goguel says Luke is not able to weld into a coherent unity the records of Jesus departing for Judea. Luke 13:31,32 is an incident that has already been mentioned, namely, that the Pharisees counsel Jesus to depart, for Herod seeks to kill Him. When He receives this message He is working in Galilee--Luke forgets that he had already mentioned His departure for Jerusalem. Goguel does not spare Luke but accuses him of being a dullard, not grasping the meaning of this incident, for he depicts Jesus as peacefully pursuing His ministry in Galilee until Luke 17:11-19 where He seems to be on the road to Jerusalem again as He heals the ten lepers. But even here, he says, He is not definitely out of Galilee but seems on the edge of Galilee since nine of the lepers were Jews and only one a Samaritan. And immediately after (17:20ff.) Jesus is in conversation with the Pharisees. This would be impossible during the journey through Samaria; so it must have happened in Judea or Galilee. He insists Luke has taken no trouble to connect his incidents.³⁷

In fact, Goguel sees in the analysis of the Gospel narratives, on the departure from Galilee, development of tradition in this order: 1. First people thought Jesus left Galilee because of the hostility of Herod. 2. But the early

37. Ibid., pp. 392-394.

Church felt uneasy about the idea of Jesus yielding to the threats of Herod, so they came to the conclusion that Jesus went to Jerusalem to preach in a more important sphere.

Therefore, John devises the triumphal entry into the city.

3. In the third stage, Jesus is pictured as knowing what would happen, so He goes up to Judea to fulfill the divine purpose. The triumphal march was then transformed into a march to execution but not completely lacking are details representing Him as preaching and fleeing from Herod.³⁸ The contention, then, is that this section is not historical but reflecting a tradition.

In reply, we must point out that Goguel's difficulty lies in trying to make of this section one journey. What he calls a jumbled mess on the part of Luke can be satisfactorily explained, as we have done, by taking this section as embodying and indicating three journeys to Jerusalem with which St. John is entirely in accord. This will remove many of the difficulties. Among other things it also explains why Jesus encountered the ten lepers, nine of whom were Jews, and one a Samaritan.³⁹

As to the development of tradition on this point--such a supposition is altogether unfounded. This was the natural sequence in Jesus' life--from loud acclaim, to luke-warmness,

38. Ibid., p. 399.

39. At this point our interpretation of dia meson, as "between" the borders of Samaria and Galilee comes in good stead; otherwise it would be difficult to explain the circumstance of there being Jews and a Samaritan together.

to open rejection. Any, and all, of the pictures of Jesus in the Gospels are true, but the presentation depends upon the specific aim of the writer. For example, the triumphant entry of Jesus was indeed a joyous occasion which we still observe with joy on Palm Sunday, but in the eyes of another writer it could also be filled with deep pathos, marked by the tears of Jesus over the obstinate city, which we also never lose sight of in our presentation of the story. A few days later we find Jesus suspended on the cross, dying. He was crucified simply because He did not act like the hero they had pictured Him to be. He had disappointed the people when He told them His kingdom was not of this world. There was no development of tradition here--this is the history of Jesus' life. Even in our times we have seen the rise and fall of political leaders--why then should it have been impossible with Jesus, even though He was the Son of God incarnate? The historicity of this section cannot be attacked for a moment on the theory that this is a development of tradition.

There are some critics, such as McCown, who has written an article specifically on the topic of Luke's geography in this section, who accuse Luke not only of omission of geographical details but also of "inexactitude, ineptitude, and positive errors of . . . geography."⁴⁰ Yet they admit, (which makes it all the more difficult for us to explain the

40. McCown, op. cit., p. 55.

almost complete lack of local color in this section), that Luke "contains far more geographical allusions than any other of the Gospels . . . He (Luke) mentions Syria, Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene. He names every city mentioned in Mark except Caesarea Philippi and adds Sarepta, Nain, Siloam, Arimathea, and Emmaus. He mentions Jerusalem thirty times." He uses the word polis forty times and koomee (village), twelve times, far more often, proportionately, than Mark and Matthew. Luke loved geographical notes.⁴¹

But how can we explain the inconsistency of Luke? Is this section perhaps a compilation of material for which Luke had no other place, therefore the lack of names? We have various suggestions, some of them coming from McCown himself, who criticizes Luke severely. He says that for Luke geography and topography serve merely as literary devices. He is not interested in itineraries as were travellers, both Christian and non-Christian, at a slightly time. To this we shake our head negatively--outside of this section there is every every indication that Luke took his geography very seriously and painstakingly tried to determine it. This cannot be the answer. We must look elsewhere. To us the answer seems to lie in the fact that Luke undoubtedly, was altogether unfamiliar with the region in which Jesus ministered according this particular section. This view is also suggested by McCown, Harnack and other scholars. McCown believes Luke

41. Ibid., pp. 55-56.

had definite geographical knowledge only of the country between Caesarea Stratonis and Jerusalem. He had not even seen Galilee.⁴²

However, need this lack of geographical data really seriously contradict the historicity of this section? Our conclusion after careful study, is that this is not the case. In fact, this lack of geographical data is to us all the more proof that Luke was the best of historians. He wrote only of things of which he was certain; where there was the least bit of doubt he would not guess or take a wild gamble, hoping to be right. He had conclusive evidence that the incidents occurred, but of the location there may have been doubt or contradictions among his various sources which were probably oral reports from eye-witnesses. We feel that Luke made a special effort to find material on this period of Jesus' ministry which the other evangelists had neglected. Since there was no written source for this material, he gathered his information very carefully and then recorded it. This is also indicated in his preface. This lack of names, which occurs only in this section of Luke's Gospel, is to us the proof of the historicity of this section. A mediocre historian, or a fake, would have scattered geographical details in a hit-or-miss fashion to give his account the appearance of genuineness. Luke is different. With him there is no speculation but only facts.

42. Ibid., p. 56.

But there remains yet another serious objection to the historicity of this section and that is that this is merely a repetition of events that occurred earlier in the Galilean ministry but are placed here by Luke. Ropes says, "In it are contained varied paragraphs, parables, and incidents, many of them, it would appear, from the Galilean period. They are set with an occasional hint of the journey, but in reality arranged so as to present, as in the earlier portion of the Gospel, the great and wide growth of Jesus' fame and the public appreciation of him, together with the heightened contrast of opposition to him and of aggressive attitude and procedure on his part. These combined make the tragic outcome in Jerusalem natural and inevitable."⁴³

The claim is that many particular incidents suggest the Galilean setting and therefore do not belong here. McCown lists these points: 1. The woes pronounced on Chorazin and Bethsaida (10:13) should be pronounced somewhere in their neighborhood as He does in Matthew 11:21. 2. The saying regarding the slaughter of Galileans by Herod and the falling of the Tower of Siloam would be more appropriate in Galilee or Jerusalem. 3. "Teaching in the synagogue, invitations from Pharisees to dine, allusions to possible followers, the presence of lawyers, scribes, and Pharisees, a threat from Herod Antipas, allusions to tax gatherers and sinners, the sending out of the Seventy and the parable of the good

43. James Hardy Ropes, The Synoptic Gospels, p. 86.

Samaritan, are impossible in Samaria."⁴⁴

The first argument mentioned by McCown does appear to bear a bit of logic. Why Jesus should pronounce His woes on three small villages along the shore of the Sea of Galilee at this time is difficult to ascertain. At this point we can only speculate. During His Galilean ministry, Jesus did encounter severe opposition at these places and thus He pronounces these woes on them before He sends out the Seventy, as a demonstration of the fate that will befall cities of like demeanor. We may assume that at best, some of the Seventy were from Galilee and knew the cities mentioned. The point Jesus wishes to make is: There is utter destruction and severest punishment in store for those who have had the the Gospel preached to them but have consistently spurned it.

The second argument barely deserves any attention. Jesus certainly could have referred to these incidents far removed from the place of their occurrence. How often do we not refer to incidents that have happened far from us, even on the other side of the globe, in our teaching?

The difficulty of the third argument is removed by taking this section as the narrative of three journeys to Jerusalem. The incidents did not have to occur in Samaria. This solves the problem.

Also called repetitions of incidents which Mark has placed in the Galilean setting are: 1. The sending of the

44. McCown, op. cit., p. 57.

seventy paralleled by that of the Twelve.⁴⁵ 2. "He that is not with me is against me."⁴⁶ 3. The Beelzebul controversy⁴⁷ and 4. Parable of the mustard seed.⁴⁸

To show that these are not the same incidents that have been placed earlier by other evangelists, let us look at some of them and see whether the objections are justifiable. In regard to the accusation of being in league with Beelzebul⁴⁹ it should be pointed out that it is perfectly natural that this blasphemous accusation be made in Galilee, perhaps, even more than once, and then should be repeated a year or so afterward in Judea or Perea again. It is also natural that Jesus should make substantially the same reply. These things can be expected to happen to a traveling religious teacher. In addition to this the occurrences after these incidents are quite different in this section from the earlier ones in Galilee. Thus we must suppose quite a break in Mark and Matthew from the Feast of Tabernacles on.⁵⁰ Most scholars agree that Jesus often did similar miracles on similar or different occasions; so it isn't at all possible to say that these are the same incidents which happened in an earlier period but are repeated by Luke. Fahling comments, "As it happens to others in public life, so also in the extended

45. Mk. 6:6-11; Lk. 9:1-5; Mt. 10:1.

46. 11:23; Mt. 12:30; cf. 9:50 which equals Mk. 9:40.

47. 13:18f.; Mk. 4:30ff.; Mt. 13:3ff.

48. McCown, op. cit., p. 57.

49. Cf. also Lk. 11:14-36; Matt. 9:34 & 12:22-37; Mk. 3:19-30.

50. Broadus, A Harmony of the Gospels, Rev. by A.T. Robertson, 8th ed., pp. 113 f.

ministry of our Savior there was a recurrence of circumstances which gave occasion to a similarity of actions or replies."⁵¹

In regard to this accusation Robertson says that this portion of Luke is his distinctive contribution to the ministry of Christ in addition to his account of the nativity. Luke had condensed the account of the withdrawals from Galilee, apparently to make room for a more detailed description of another phase of Christ's ministry. "Matthew and Mark almost confine themselves to the ministry in Galilee, while Luke thus devotes the bulk of his narrative to what seems to be a later ministry, after Jesus has left Galilee. It is hardly likely that this account should be a mere jumble of scattered details."⁵²

Furthermore, Broadus points out that Wieseler,⁵³ Tischendorf, Ellicott, G. W. Clark and others speak of three journeys to Jerusalem. They say this whole section of Luke belongs to the last six months of our Lord's ministry, and is located in Judea and Perea. So it must be distinct from that in Galilee narrated by the three Synoptists and the similar events and discourses should not be taken as identical but repetitions, for Jesus unquestionably often repeated the same things.⁵⁴

51. Fahling, The Life of Christ, p. 427.

52. Robertson, A Har. of the Gos., p. 277.

53. Wieseler was the first to discover the similarity and identity of the three journeys to Jerusalem in Luke and John.

54. Broadus, "Comm. on the Gosp. of Matt." in An Amer. Comm. on the N.T., I, p. 394.

It is our belief that all efforts to undermine the historicity of this section in Luke have failed and this section seems all the more to record the later Judean and later Perea ministry just as it occurred. We believe that all objections have been fairly met and refuted and that the plan we have chosen satisfactorily answers the difficulties.

IV. The Chronology of This Section

Having discussed the historicity of this section in Luke in quite some detail, let us turn our attention to the chronology of this section. When we come to the point of Luke's chronology, we encounter a barrage of criticism. The prevailing cry is that this is an altogether unchronological and unconnected series of events. We find a few, very few scholars, who believe this section to be completely and absolutely chronological in arrangement; a few more venture to say that Luke is chronological as far as is expedient but does not slavishly follow a chronological outline. But the former view has by far the greater number of adherents.

In order to establish the exact time of the period of Jesus' ministry under discussion we should like to give a background of key dates in the life of Jesus from which we compute the time of His ministry, especially the period which claims our particular attention.

Nearly all systems of computing the time of Jesus' life are based upon the date of Jesus' birth, although some have done it by means of figuring from the day and year of His crucifixion. We shall follow the former method.

When was Jesus born? From Matthew and Luke we know that He was born before the death of Herod the Great. From Josephus we learn that Herod died in the 37th year after his

appointment to rule by Rome. His coronation took place in 714 A.U.C. The 37th year would bring us to the year 750/1 as the year of his death. 750 A.U.C. is four years previous to the present era of the system introduced by Dionysius Exiguus, or 4 B.C. Jesus must have been born a reasonable interval before the death of Herod when we look at the events that happened between His birth and the flight to Egypt to evade the wrath of Herod in the slaughter of the innocents.

We receive further aid in computing the date of Jesus' birth from the statement in John 2:19,20 that when Jesus was in Jerusalem at the Passover and said to the Jews, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." The Jews replied that it took forty-six years to build the temple and now he wanted to raise it up in three days? This gives us an important clue, for Josephus tells us that reconstruction of the temple began in the 18th year of Herod's rule. Thus the reconstruction began about 734 A.U.C. Since the temple was already forty-six years in building at the time of this incident, the date was 780. This happened two or three months after His baptism and Luke informs us that Jesus was about thirty years old at His baptism and started His public ministry soon after, so the year of His birth would be 750 or 749 A.U.C., which would be about 4 or 5 B.C. in our system of figuring. This date seems quite reliable, for both clues lead to the same conclusion.¹

1. Ylvisaker, op. cit., pp. 29,30.

From this we compute further dates. When Jesus appears at the Passover at the age of twelve it is 8 A.D. At the Passover in 27 A.D., Jesus makes His first public appearance in the cleansing of the temple. In John chapter four, we find Jesus going through Samaria and Galilee and verse 35 tells us it was four months before the harvest. The harvest generally occurred in the middle of April in Palestine,² so the time would be about 27 A.D. in December. This leads us to the conclusion that Jesus spent eight months in Judea between the cleansing of the temple and the journey through Samaria. Beginning in December, 27 A.D., Jesus journeyed through Samaria to Galilee and then journeyed to Jerusalem for the unnamed feast of John 5. Here Jesus hears of John's imprisonment and preaches as the "Prophet of Galilee, mighty in word and deed" from the summer or fall of 28 A.D. to late in 29 A.D.³

He is in Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles in the Fall of 29 A.D. and at the Feast of Dedication in December of the same year. From here He goes to Perea and spends about three and one-half months there until His retirement to Ephraim. From there He makes His last journey to Jerusalem for the Final Passover in April of 30 A.D.

Thus we conclude that the Perea ministry of Jesus occurred during a period of about six months between the Feast of Tabernacles in 29 A.D. and the Passover of 30 A.D. This

2. Keil, Archaeology, par. 18, quoted in Ylvisaker, op. cit., p. 33.

3. Ylvisaker, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

is the view of most conservative scholars who take the Perea section as historically and chronologically correct. The view that the statement in Luke 9:51, "when the time was come that he should be received up" indicates only a few weeks until Jesus' death we have already discussed. This statement does not necessarily mean a few weeks. We have pointed out that it could well include as much as six months.

Another consideration under chronology is the length of Jesus' entire ministry. The Synoptists all suggest, upon casual investigation, a ministry of about a year. However, they in no way demand such an interpretation. There is ample room in each to support a ministry that extends over a greater period of time. In contrast to the Synoptic Gospels the Fourth Gospel clearly furnishes information of a ministry that lasted well over two years at the minimum. Some critics of Scripture, therefore, draw either of these conclusions: either the Fourth Gospel has erred or the Synoptics supply misleading information. Another method is to call certain chronological statements of this Gospel interpolations or take them as proverbial. Two examples are John 6:4 and 4:35. Therefore, we shall briefly discuss the length of Jesus' ministry which will throw more light, perhaps, on Luke's chronology in the Perea section.

There are those who believe Jesus' ministry extended over a period of only one year. To arrive at this conclusion, and to keep the harmony of the Gospels, they exclude the

reference to the Passover in John 6:4 as "the crassest of interpolations." Olmstead contends that with this interpolation out of the way, John presents the same ministry of approximately one year as do the other Gospels, and we can accept an important chronological statement of Luke.⁴ On the basis of the Babylonian Chronology he has calculated Jesus' ministry to have had the exact length of 475 days.⁵

We shall not devote more time and space to other views on a shorter ministry of Jesus but present the views on the longer which we feel are conclusive.

Jesus ministry must have been longer than one year for in it occurred at least three Passovers, according to John 2:13; 6:4 and 12:1ff. Any attempts to reduce the ministry of Jesus to a year by taking the three references to the Passover as referring to the same one fall flat, for they are separated by the unknown feast (5:1); Tabernacles (7:2), and the Dedication (10:22). Irenaeus observes, "that three occasions of the Passover are not included within one year every person must acknowledge."⁶

Zahn points out that a ministry lasting only one year could not be upheld even if the Fourth Gospel did not exist. These are some of his arguments to uphold this statement:

1. No Synoptist gives a chronological statement of Jesus'

4. Olmstead, "The Chron. of Jesus Life," in Ang. Theol. Rev., XXIV, (1942), p. 6 ff.

5. Olmstead, Jesus in the Light of History, p. 280,

6. George OGG, The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus, p. 29.

first appearance which can possibly justify this limitation of His ministry. 2. Luke 3:23 indicates more than one year. "No intelligent writer would say of a man who ceased to work at the end of the same year in which his work began, 'he was when he began about thirty years old.'" 3. According to Matt. 12:1; Mark 2:23 and Luke 6:1 Jesus witnessed the beginning of a harvest in the midst of His Galilean ministry long before His crucifixion. This could not have been in autumn or winter for the beginning of harvest was contemporaneous with the Passover so at least one year must have elapsed. 4. Luke 13:34 also Matt. 23:37 indicate repeated attempts to save the people of Jerusalem from their doom.⁷

To reduce it to one year by taking John 4:35 proverbially also fails, because if it is taken proverbially it can only refer to the period between seed time and harvest in Palestine but this is ruled out, for the two are separated by at least five to six months.⁸

Our conclusion then is that Jesus' public ministry lasted over two years. This also upholds our arguments on the historicity of the Perean section which we took to be the history of three journeys to Jerusalem over a period of six months. If Jesus' ministry would be taken as lasting only one year, this view would be untenable.

But now we come to the heart of the matter of chronology. Is this section a progression of events in the order in

7. Zahn, Intr. to the New Test., pp. 168-169.

8. Ibid., p. 30.

which they occurred, or is it a jumble of details? Does it give a geographical, as well as a temporal progression? This question is indeed difficult to answer definitely. A simple "yes" or "no" does not seem to be the solution. There are those who hold that this is entirely chronological as far as time and geography are concerned. There are those who say it is altogether unchronological and some say it is, generally speaking, chronological, although there are deviations here and there. There are almost as many opinions on this question as there are authors.

First of all, let us look at some of the objections to this section as being chronological. Westcott makes this section of Luke the criterion in deciding that all of the Gospels are, in general, not chronological. St. Luke, he believes, is the least connected Gospel of them all, as is indicated by the great series of events in the last journey to Jerusalem (chap. 11-17). This, therefore, is to him, one of the strongest arguments against the observance of time by the evangelists and a striking example of their mode of connecting events. He feels that Luke brings in many incidents in this section that other evangelists place earlier and in different connections.⁹ His conclusion is this, ". . . the whole section proves, by the absence of historical data and the unity of its general import, that a moral and not a temporal sequence is the law of the Gospels. For it is possible

9. Westcott, op. cit., p. 352.

to trace throughout this part of the narrative a contrast between the true and the false people of God, between the spiritual and the literal Israel."¹⁰

McCown limits his comment on chronology to Luke, unlike Westcott, who uses this section as a basis for deciding Gospel chronology in general, but his conclusions are much the same as Westcott's when he says, "Luke was far more interested in the logical than in the chronological or geographical sequence of the materials." He believes the "journey" is merely a device, "an indispensable link in the chain of events which takes Christianity from Nazareth to Rome." The "journey" takes the reader along with Jesus "to its foreshadowed climax of tragedy and triumph." In other words, it is an extended example of Luke's use of suspense."¹¹

Farrar thinks this section mainly refers to a single journey but for unity of subject or other causes, the sacred writer may have woven in some events or utterances belonging to some earlier or later period. He believes, however, that for the most part it is chronological, for occasional repetitions of discourse are a natural supposition in the life of our Lord. Yet, he believes, the facts narrated even by St. Luke, are not, and do not claim to be, strictly chronological. For proof of this assertion he points to the visit of Jesus to Mary and Martha (10:38-42); the warnings against Antipas by the Pharisees (13:31-35); and the trip to Jerusalem

10. Ibid., pp. 376-377.

11. McCown, op. cit., p. 65.

"through the midst of Samaria and Galilee" (17:11-19). Furthermore, "the notes of time and place throughout are of the vaguest possible character, evidently because the form of the narrative is here determined by other considerations (see 10:1; 11:1,14; 12:1,22)", etc. He believes Luke followed historical sequence as far as possible but he "often groups events and discourses by spiritual and subjective considerations."¹²

Basil Matthews takes this section as chronological for the most part, but when we get to the "story" section, where Jesus meant to teach His disciples by means of stories, we have no way of knowing whether these were chronological or not. His contention is that "most of these stories are reported by Luke only from an unknown source. Luke did not know, nor can anyone now tell exactly at what place or when or in what precise order Jesus told the stories. These things matter little. The stories and their meaning are the great thing."¹³

Sanday takes this section to be unchronological for the most part, referring especially to the seven or eight weeks which remain to be accounted for between October and Dedication. Another stumbling stone is the statement that Jesus returned to Galilee, for Luke 9:51 seemed to indicate a final withdrawal from it.¹⁴

There are those who believe Luke is not at all chronological.

12. F. W. Farrar, Life of Christ, p. 424.

13. Matthews, op. cit., p. 335.

14. W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, p. 128.

Hodgson maintains that we do not know how many days or weeks or months separated the events nor do we know the sequence. Luke seems to have followed one of his sources until a convenient break occurred and then followed another source.¹⁵ Kraeling sums up his opinion of Luke thus, ". . . Luke is trying hard to play the historian, and if he never quite succeeds in the role, we shall not think less of him for having tried."¹⁶

However, to get a balanced picture of this subject we must also note that there are scholars who take this section as chronological. Meyer, in refuting De Wette, who takes this section as an unchronological and unhistorical collection of evangelical material which Luke did not know how to insert anywhere else and therefore threw together in this place, defends Luke in a unique manner. He says that if this were the case it would be quite contrary to the assurance that Luke gives us in 1:3 that he is going to write in order. To Meyer Luke's variation in sequence of events from that of Matthew and Mark proves further he is writing chronologically. "He (Luke) must actually have found the chronological arrangement of what is recorded in this large section as belonging to the end of the sojourn in Galilee, and this must have determined his special treatment, in respect of which he intersperses at 13:22 and 17:11 hints for enabling the reader to

15. Leonard Hodgson, And Was Male Man, pp. 143-144.

16. Carl H. Kraeling, "Olmstead's Chronology of the Life of Jesus," in Anglican Theological Review, XXIV, (1942), p. 335.

make out his whereabouts in the history."¹⁷

Goodspeed likewise comes to the fore for Luke in showing that he is not altogether the failure as a historian that some would make him out to be. He points out that what once was thought an eccentricity on the part of Luke when he said, "in the 15th year of the emperor Tiberius," has been found to be just the way the papyri were dated in the first century. In fact, he says, we owe our only definite information about dates in the Gospel story to Luke. Luke is a cultivated man, acquainted with literary habits of his day, giving in his preface purpose, dedication, and source, and he is concerned about dates and reigns.¹⁸

We should point out that the historicity and chronology of this section fit together like hand in glove. If we deny the chronological accuracy of this section altogether, undoubtedly, and necessarily, the historicity of this section will fall with it. If we deny the historicity of this Perea section, the conclusion must inevitably follow that this also is a chronological mistake. Since this is the case, it is proper to repeat Robertson's statements which concern both the historicity and chronology of this section. Robertson answers the charge of Robinson and others who say that this section is a summing up of events which happened before,¹⁹

17. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

18. Edgar J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 183, 185.

19. Such incidents as the healing of a demoniac (Luke 11: 14-36) and the blasphemy following.

by pointing out that it is not at all clear that these are the same events that are recorded earlier in Matthew and Mark. Jesus often did similar miracles and repeated similar saying. This is Luke's distinctive contribution to the ministry of Christ, for he condensed the account of the Galilean account to narrate more fully these incidents in Jesus' life. He points out that the charge is untenable in view of Luke's express statement that he was going to write an orderly narrative. "In no real sense could this be true, if this large section is dislocated in time and order of events."²⁰

With this unchronological plan mentioned above, the critics often combined the idea that this entire section refers to one journey to Jerusalem either to the last Passover or for Tabernacles or Dedication. The triple reference to a journey by Luke therefore argues for triplications in Luke, they say. Robertson then advances the theory of the three corresponding journeys to Jerusalem by Luke and John to prove the critics' assumption to be faulty, and thereby demands that this section be taken as a chronological series of events.²¹ Broadus also refuses to yield to Robinson's theory that this section is a loosely arranged mass of material. His argument against it is also based on Luke's preface.²² Therefore, before we draw our conclusions on the matter, it would seem well to explore Luke's preface a bit more closely,

20. Robertson, A Harm. of the Gosp., p. 276, 277.

21. Ibid., pp. 277-278.

22. Broadus, "Comm. on the Gosp. of Matt.," in An Am. Comm. on the N.T., I, p. 394.

for hints as to what Luke really had in mind when he said, "to write unto thee in order."

Did Luke mean chronological order or did he mean an orderly account consisting of proper grouping of pertinent material? This is a problem of exegesis and interpretation. If we could once and for all answer this question, there would be little need of discussing the chronology of this Perean section any further.

In the original the words read: parekolouthēkoti anōthen pasin akribōos kathexēs soi grapsai. Bruce takes it to explain how Luke desired to carry out his plan: "He wishes to be exact, and to write in an orderly manner." Godet, Meyer, Weiss, Hahn and others take it to mean chronological order whether it is carried out successfully or not. Schanz holds that the chronological aim applied only "to the great turning points of the history, and not to all details."²³

Bruce continues, "Observe the historical spirit implied in all Lk. tells about his literary plan and methods: inquiry, accuracy, order, aimed at at least; vouchers desired for all statements. Lk. is no religious romancer, who will invent at will, and say anything that suits his purpose."²⁴

However, Bruce seems to take a somewhat different view in his introduction to the three Gospels in the same work, when he says:

23. Alexander B. Bruce, The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll, I, p. 459.

24. Ibid.

It may be affirmed, indeed, that throughout this Gospel the interest in historic sequence or in the causal connection of events is weak. Sometimes, as in the incident of Christ's appearance in the synagogue of Nazareth, the author, consciously and apparently with deliberate intention, departs from the chronological order. Whatever, therefore, he meant by kathexees in his preface, he cannot have intended to say that he had made it a leading aim to arrange his material as far as possible in the true order of events.²⁵

Robertson contends that the preface indicates clearly that Luke wished to write a chronological narrative. When Luke says "many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative," Plummer thinks dieegeesin, (narrative) implies more than mere notes or anecdotes but it is carrying through a connected story to the end (cf. Sirach 6:35; II Macc. 2:32).²⁶ In fact, we get a complete picture of Luke as a historian from his preface, according to Robertson. He sees it this way: Luke has all the documents lying around him, but he is not yet ready to write. He began writing only after he traced the course of all things accurately from the first (pareekol-outheekoti anoothen pasin akriboos kathexees). Some take the verb as indicating that he was a constant follower of the Twelve but this is ruled out. Blass says,²⁷ "Polybius and other Hellenistic authors employ the verb in the sense of studying, and there can be no doubt that Luke's use is the same." Luke meant that he had instituted a process of research in his inquiries concerning the life of Christ that

25. Ibid., p. 45.

26. Plummer, Comm. p. 3, quoted in Robertson, Luke the Hist., p. 49.

27. Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 18, quoted in Robertson, Luke the Hist., p. 51.

covered "all things."²⁸

But Luke adds one other word, akriboos. This word is quite pertinent; it means he had done it accurately. "There is no idle boast in these three qualifications for his task. In a straightforward way Luke reveals his literary method. He has aimed at full research and accurate use of his material. He has not dumped it all out in anecdotal form with no appraisal of its value. He has weighed the worth of the information before he told it. He has tried to tell as it happened."²⁹

Furthermore, says Robertson, Luke declared it his purpose to write "in order." What kind of order is it? He admits that Luke does not say it is chronological order, but that is what one naturally thinks it to be. Blass³⁰ takes it to be a full recital without important omissions, a complete series rather than chronological sequence. Ramsay³¹ believes it to mean "a rational order, making things comprehensible, omitting nothing that is essential for full and proper understanding." Such an order would be chronological in its main features, Robertson points out. Plummer thinks that Luke generally aims at chronological order but does not follow it slavishly. Robertson adds, "The outstanding feature of Luke's Gospel is its completeness. It charms one with its

28. Robertson, Luke the Hist., p. 51.

29. Ibid.

30. Blass, op. cit., pp. 18 f., in Robertson, Luke the Hist. in the Light of Res., p. 53.

31. Ramsay, Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?, p. 14, in Robertson, Luke the Hist., p. 53.

sheer beauty and power."³² His conclusion, with special regard to the Perean section, might be summed up in these words of his: "It is hardly likely that this account should be a mere jumble of scattered details. Especially is this unlikely in view of Luke's express statement (1:3) that he was going to write an orderly narrative. In no real sense could this be true, if this large section is dislocated in time and order of events."³³

But before we draw our conclusions on this matter we should like to present our own comments on the preface of Luke as regards chronology in Luke, especially in this section. Luke followed all his reports back to as near the source as possible, this seems to be indicated in parakoloutheo which Thayer defines: "To follow up a thing in mind so as to attain to the knowledge of it, i. e., to understand." Luke had studied the documents and source materials before him and understood whereof he wrote.

Luke wrote accurately (akriboos). The word may have a parallel usage in Matt. 2:8 where Herod commands the wise men to search out the place where Jesus is so that he too may go and "worship" Him (porauthentes exetasate akriboos). exetazoo has the meaning of "examining strictly." What was the purpose of the akriboos? Undoubtedly to mark out exactly the place where Jesus was. We suggest that this meaning may have been in Luke's mind when he used it. This, however, is

³². Robertson, Luke the Hist., p. 54.

³³. Robertson, A Harm. of the Gos., pp. 276-277.

difficult to understand, when we find such a lack of geographical and chronological data in this section. No doubt, Luke wanted to write in as good a chronological order as possible and give locations of incidents wherever he could-- this he did throughout his Gospel until he came to this section where the information was lacking as to exact places and time. His lack of familiarity of the area Jesus traversed in His Perea ministry plus Luke's reluctance to make any statements of which there was the slightest doubt account for this fact. kathexees is generally translated "in order" or "orderly." We prefer the former. Luke wished to tell the story as it happened. Such is the use of the word when Peter said he would tell the disciples his vision in the order in which it occurred (Acts 11:4). Even if Peter meant he would tell it "step by step" as most scholars take it, the idea of progression from beginning to end still remains.

Therefore, in view of the arguments pro and con previously examined, and using the information found in Luke's preface, it is our belief that Luke wanted this Gospel to be written in the best chronological order possible. Therefore, for the most part, it is chronologically correct. We admit however, that there are considerations which present difficulties to this view. One of the difficulties to us is the grouping of the parables and stories. It seems highly improbable that Jesus would in His teaching, use so many of His parables in a span of a few days, which He seems to do in chapters 15 and 16. We do not, however, deny that the

particular need may have demanded this procedure.

As to the progression of His journey and the incidents, we feel they are in the chronological order. Certainly we cannot subscribe to the assertion that this section is a jumble of details thrown in at this place since they fitted no where else in the account. In view of Luke's fondness for historical data and because of the words of his preface, we cannot believe that suddenly in this section he should have had such a change of heart to make this a compilation of odd events. This section is a history of our Lord's life during the later Judean and later Perea ministry and is chronological for the most part.

Bibliography

- Broadus, John A., A Harmony of the Gospels, Rev. by A. T. Robertson, eighth edition, New York, George H. Doran Co., 1903.
- Broadus, John A., Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, in An American Commentary on the New Testament, ed. by Alvan Hovey, Philadelphia, The American Baptist Publication Society, I, c. 1886.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain, The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll, Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., I, (No date).
- Cartledge, Samuel A., A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament, Grand Rapids, Mich., Zondervan Pub. House, third edition, 1941.
- Creed, J. M., The Gospel According to St. Luke, London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1930.
- Edersheim, Alfred, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., II, 1943.
- Fahling, Adam, A Harmony of the Gospels, Grand Rapids, Zondervon Pub. House.
- Fahling, Adam, The Life of Christ, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1946.
- Farrar, Frederic W., Life of Christ, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1874.
- Goguel, Maurice, "Luke and Mark: With a Discussion of Streeter's Theory", in Harvard Theological Review, XXVI, (January, 1933), 1-55.
- Goguel, Maurice, The Life of Jesus, Trans. by Olive Wyon, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1944.
- Hodgson, Leonard, And Was Made Man, New York, Longman's Green and Co., 1928.
- Hunter, A. M., Introducing the New Testament, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1945.
- Kraeling, Carl H., "Olmstead's Chronology of the Life of Jesus," in Anglican Theological Review, XXIV, 1942, p. 334-354.

- Luce, H. K., The Gospel According to St. Luke, Cambridge, At the University Press, 1936.
- Matthews, Basil, A Life of Jesus, New York, Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931.
- McCown, C. C., "The Geography of Luke's Central Section", in Journal of Biblical Literature, LVII, Part I, (March, 1938), 51-66.
- Meyer, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, New York, Funk and Wagnalis, II, 1884.
- Montefiore, C. G., The Synoptic Gospels, London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1927.
- Ogg, George, The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus, Cambridge, At the University Press, 1940.
- Olmstead, A. T., Jesus in the Light of History, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1942.
- Olmstead, A. T., "The Chronology of Jesus Life", in Anglican Theological Review, XXIV, (1942), 1-26.
- Robertson, A. T., A Harmony of the Gospels, New York and London, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1922.
- Robertson, A. T., Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- Ropes, James Hardy, The Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1934.
- Sanday, W., Outlines of the Life of Christ, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1919.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman, The Four Gospels, London, Macmillan and Co., 1930.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Cambridge, Macmillan and Co., sixth edition, 1851.
- Wieseler, Karl, Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelien, Hamburg, Friedrich Perthes, 1843.
- Ylvisaker, Joh., The Gospels, Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1932.
- Zahn, Theodor, Introduction to the New Testament, Trans. from third edition, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, III, 1909.