Master of Sacred Theology Thesis   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1962

The Lucan Prologue and Central Section - A Study of Luke's Literary Method

James Ilten
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ilich29@comcast.net

THE LUCAN PROLOGUE AND CENTRAL

SECTION: A STUDY OF

LUKE'S LITERARY METHOD

———————

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

———————

by

James B. Ilten

June 1962

18471

Approved by: *Martin H. Scharlemann*
　　　　　　　　　　　Advisor

Frederick W. Danker
　　　　　　　　　Reader

SHORT TITLE

THE LITERARY METHOD

IN LUKE 9:51-18:14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Almost everyone studying the Gospel according to St. Luke, even, cursory readers, are fascinated by the content and construction of the "central section," a body of material peculiar to St. Luke, 9:51 - 18:14. The Lucan framework is apparently historically and geographically inaccurate; much of the material seems to have been ripped from its original setting and placed within this narrative of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem.

Various names have been suggested for Luke 9:51 - 18:14, which already indicate the difficulty in determining the reason for the author's arrangement of these materials. Schleiermacher designated it as a "travel narrative" or the "Perean section."[1] Even the source critics are not agreed as to the name of this section. Hawkins and Montefiore consider this body of material peculiar to St. Luke as "the Great Interpolation," or "Insertion," but Streeter believes St. Luke used a non-Marcan source for his basic narrative and inserted the Marcan material into this framework. However, most are agreed that there is a definite disorder of materials. It has

---

[1]C. C. McCowan, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVII (March, 1938), 51. McCowan mentions that a number of writers consider this "central section" a "gnomology," a collection of proverbial sayings in a travel narrative (Marsh; Eichhorn; Kuinoel; Westcott).

2

been called a "jumble" of fragments (Bacon); a "catch-all"
(Bruno Bauer); "a hodgepodge" (Guignebert); "a pell-mell chaos"
(Loisy); "a regular lumber-yard of confused pieces" (Strauss);
"a pigeon-hole" stuffed full of odds and ends (Wellhausen).[2]

This apparent disorder becomes all the more remarkable
when one considers the fine literary style and historical
arrangement of the larger portion of Luke-Acts. Conzelmann,
T. W. Manson, Vincent Taylor, Otto Piper and others are aware
of this fact and have given a theological interpretation to
the selection and arrangement of materials in Luke's "central
section." Unfortunately many of these theological interpre-
tations are based on a study of the immediate context of the
"central section" without too much consideration for the wider
context of Luke-Acts. For example, Evans considers this "cen-
tral section" a "Christian Deuteronomy," a listing of striking
parallels but not in keeping with the general tenor and theme
of Luke-Acts.[3] The Exodus motif of Otto Piper, that the "cen-
tral section" is parallel to the wilderness wanderings of
Israel, may have some correlation to the structure of Luke-
Acts;[4] but Jindrich Manek compares the forty days of Jesus'

---

[2]Walter E. Bundy, Jesus and the First Three Gospels: an
Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition (Cambridge, Mass.:
Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 329.

[3]C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel,"
Studies in the Gospels, D. Nineham, editor (Oxford: Blackwell,
1955), pp. 42-50.

[4]Otto A. Piper, "Unchanging Promises," Interpretation,
II (1957), 3-22. Cf. similar interpretations advanced by Gustaf
Wingren, "'Weg,' 'Wanderung' und verwandte Begriffe," Studia
Theologica, III (1950), 111-123; Jindrich Manek, "The New Exodus
of the Books of Luke," Novum Testamentum, II (1957), 8-23.

resurrection appearances to the forty years of Israel in the wilderness.[5] Conzelmann compares the Lucan account to a period of instruction in the way of suffering, preparation for the cross and death (middle-of-time), motivated by the events on the Mount of Transfiguration; however, he categorically relegates the Gentile mission to the end-time, which is ushered in on Pentecost.[6]

It is the contention of this writer that, although these various theological interpretations may offer a partial explanation to the enigma of Luke's "central section," they do not adequately account for the diversity or arrangement of material. It is the writer's thesis that Luke may have selected a part of his materials for the "central section" from a collection of pericopae used to train missionaries in the early Church. That such a written or oral tradition existed before St. Luke wrote his Gospel may be inferred from St. Paul's sermon at Antioch in Pisidia, "But God raised him from the dead; and for many days he appeared to those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses to the people" (Acts 13:30,31). The latter statement would seem pointless if there were no historical connection between "witnessing" and "those who came up with him from Galilee to

[5]J. Manek, "The New Exodus of the Books of Luke," Novum Testamentum, II (1957), 19: "The declaration about the presence of the Resurrected Lord for forty days has as prototype the forty years' journey of Israel to the Promised Land."

[6]Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954), pp. 46f.

Jerusalem." Furthermore, this passage may help explain Luke's geographical framework in the "central section."

The twenty-fourth edition of Nestle is the basic Greek text for this dissertation.[7] It should also be noted that the writer bases his thesis on two principal assumptions. First, Luke-Acts, as the rest of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, is God's inspired Word to His Church. Second, the pericopae in St. Luke's "central section" have an original setting in the historical life of Jesus.

This writer will demonstrate that to a certain extent one may determine Luke's method of editing his source materials. The application of this method to the "central section" may offer some clue in regard to its arrangement.

Because of the scope the writer is limited to a critical analysis of the framework and general setting of Luke's "central section." This analysis will be considered against the background of Luke-Acts and the mission outreach of the apostolic Church at the time St. Luke wrote his Gospel. After evaluating various interpretations for the apparent incongruity of Luke's "central section," the writer will weigh the theological significance of the Lucan inclusion of a great number of the _logia_ of our Lord within the framework of His last journey to Jerusalem.

---

[7]D. Eberhard Nestle, _Novum Testamentum Graece_ (24th edition; Stuttgart: Wuerttemberg Bible Press, 1960).

Although one may be justified in calling Luke 9:51 to 18:14 a "travel narrative" or "the Samaritan section," the writer along with Evans and McCowan will follow Canon Streeter's suggestion and use the designation "central section."[8] The immediate context of the "central section" will also be considered because some feel that this may provide the motivation for including the material peculiar to Luke.

Klostermann would like to begin this section as early as Luke 8:1,[9] but there is no indication that Jesus was on His way to Jerusalem. K. L. Schmidt[10] and most of the other critics begin their analysis of Luke's "central section" at 9:51 because this is the first reference to the journey to Jerusalem and the first section peculiar to Luke in this particular series of narratives. However, Conzelmann believes that the Transfiguration narrative provides the theological framework for the trip.[11] This writer considers Luke 9:51 the

---

[8]Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels (2nd edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 203: "The only safe name by which one can call it is the 'Central Section'--a title which states a fact but begs no questions."

[9]Erich Klostermann, Die Evangelien in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919), 468-556.

[10]Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch and Son, 1919), pp. 246f.

[11]Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 51: "Durch diesen [9:18-50] wird die Reise als Gang zum Leiden dargestellt; eben das unterscheidet sie von der vorangehenden Wanderung."

beginning of the "central section" but will include the
immediate context (9:18-50) mainly because of Conzelmann's
contribution.[12]

The conclusion of Luke's "central section" is even more
difficult to determine. The "central section" is usually
terminated at 18:14 because this verse concludes a long sec-
tion peculiar to Luke. However, Jesus is still on His journey
to Jerusalem, and the Zaccheus narrative (19:1-11) is also
peculiar to Luke. K. L. Schmidt concludes the travel narra-
tive with 19:27 because he feels that 19:28 is a later inter-
polation to extend the narrative which Luke brings to a close
with his reference that Jesus "was near to Jerusalem" (19:11).[13]
However, there is no textual evidence that 19:12ff. is a later
interpolation; "near" is a relative term, at least indicating
that the goal has not been reached. Finally, it should be
pointed out that Schmidt does not consider the sources, only
the connecting links.

Although one may conclude the section with Jesus' weeping
over Jerusalem (19:41-44), the writer includes the cleansing
of the temple (19:45-46) because Lohmeyer considers this one
of the reasons for Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.[14] In order to
consider these various theological interpretations it is

---

[12]Infra, pp. 70f.

[13]Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 263f.

[14]Ernst Lohmeyer, Kultus und Evangelium (Goettingen:
Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1942), p. 107.

therefore well to include 9:18-50 and 19:29-46 in the immediate context of Luke's "central section."

Luke 9:18 to 19:46 may be divided into seventy sections or pericopae. "Pericope" is used in form criticism and considered a neutral term as far as the content is concerned. The writer prefers this term because the current usage of "pericope" may imply "a collection of lessons"; it is quite probable that Luke had several collections at his disposal (Luke 1:1-4).

Chapter II of this thesis will consider the origin of the Lucan sources.

Chapter III is a critical analysis of Luke's apparent method of editing source materials.

Chapter IV considers the literary style and setting of the material peculiar to St. Luke.

Chapter V is an evaluation of various theological interpretations for the Lucan composition of the "central section." The writer will also propose that Luke may have included the missionary pericopae in his "central section" to give the Lord's sanction to the missionary movement in the Church (Acts 13:30,31).

Chapter VI offers the conclusion that a written or oral collection of missionary logia would at least partially explain Luke's selection and arrangement of material peculiar to him. St. Luke's missionary interest and his reluctance to

tamper with his sources accounts for much of the apparent
incongruity of the "central section."

The writer hopes that this study will move others to
reconsider the missionary motif of Luke's "central section"
and apply it to the evangelism programs of the Church of
today. At least our study will seriously question the possi-
bility of considering Luke 9:51 to 18:14 a mere "hodgepodge"
of materials!

CHAPTER II

THE ORIGIN OF THE LUCAN SOURCES

The Availability of Written Sources at the
Time of Writing for the Third Gospel

Scholars are generally agreed that the composition of
Luke-Acts is the work of one author, although some question
the identity of the author.[1] However, patristic evidence
supports the Lucan authorship; the Anti-Marcionite Prologue
(160-180 A.D.), the Muratorian Canon (c.170 A.D.) and Irenaeus
(c.185 A.D.) state that Luke "the beloved physician" (Col. 4:14),
a companion of St. Paul on his missionary journeys, was the
author of the Third Gospel.[2]

On the other hand, there is little agreement in regard
to the time of writing for Luke-Acts and the interval between
the composition of the two books. C. S. C. Williams suggests
even the possibility that the final draft of the Third Gospel
was written after the composition of Acts.[3] Patristic evidence

---

[1]Cf. A. H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the
New Testament (2nd edition revised by C. S. C. Williams;
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 92, n. 1.

[2]Cf. ibid., pp. 28-30, which offers the full quotations
of this patristic evidence.

[3]C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of The
Apostles (New York: Harper, c.1957), p. 12: "Luke composed an
early draft of Gospel material which he sent to Theophilus as
his 'first treatise'; this was not necessarily 'Proto-Luke'
as B. H. Streeter and V. Taylor have defined that document.
Then Luke may have composed Acts after obtaining a copy of
Mark's Gospel, some of the phrases of which are echoed in Acts

is of little value in fixing the date of writing.[4] That the

internal evidence apparently offers no conclusive proof for

the period of composition is indicated by the fact that com-

mentators appeal to it to support an early (60-63, 64-70 A.D.),

intermediate (75-85 A.D.), or late (c.100 A.D.) date. How-

ever, the weight of the evidence seems to favor the early

date.[5]

---

but not repeated in the 'parallels' to Mark in the third
Gospel. Then on the basis of Mark's chronology, he revised
the 'early draft', thus producing the third Gospel as we
have it, intending perhaps to revise Acts later but being
prevented from doing so." Williams finds support for his
thesis in an article by H. G. Russell, "Which was first, Luke
or Acts?," Harvard Theological Review, XLVIII (1956), 167ff.

[4]McNeile, loc. cit.; F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles
(2nd edition; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952),
p. 10.

[5]The chief support for the late date is the indication
from Acts 5:34ff. and Luke 3:1,2 that Luke was probably at
least familiar with Josephus' Antiquities, dated c.93 A.D.
(cf. Antiquities XX.5; XIX.v.1; XX.vii.1). However, the
dissimilarities should lead one seriously to question Luke's
dependence on Josephus; it is possible that they may have used
a common source. Cf. T. W. Manson, "The Life of Jesus: A
Survey of the Available Materials; (3) The Work of St. Luke,"
Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XXVIII (1944), pp. 400f.:
After studying the evidence Manson concludes, "In a word, the
theory requires us to suppose that Acts v.36f., is based on
Josephus: I cannot see how any intelligent person could
possibly produce Acts. v. 36f., as it is usually interpreted,
out of the passage in Josephus." A. R. C. Leaney, Luke (New
York: Harper, c.1958), p. 10, and McNeile, op. cit., p. 37,
also believe that Luke's dependence on Josephus is unlikely.
    The intermediate date is supported by a number of
scholars, including McNeile, op. cit., p. 34 (c. 80-85 A.D.);
A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel
according to St. Luke (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1922),
p. xxxi, (75-80): Supporters of this date believe that
Luke 21:20-24 is best taken as a reference to the destruction
of Jerusalem; the fact that John is mentioned ahead of James
in Luke 8:51; 9:28; Acts 1:13, may be explained if Luke wrote
after John had become the better known of the two (however,

This writer believes that the final draft of the Third
Gospel, whether completed before or after the composition of
Acts, was most likely written before the destruction of
Jerusalem. In the light of the prominent role that "Jerusalem"
plays in Luke-Acts it is not probable that Luke would omit an

---

this writer believes that Luke may have listed John first
because he might have been a close acquaintance and perhaps
one of the "eyewitnesses" of Luke's sources) cf. infra, p. 30;
the later dates account for the occasional use of ὁ κύριος
to designate Jesus; Plummer feels that the most cogent argu-
ment for a later date is the reference to "the many" in the
Lucan prologue (cf. infra, p. 13).

This writer recognizes that the intermediate date is a
possibility but favors the early date; at the present time
the internal evidence gives more weight to the period 60-70 A.D.
W. Arndt, The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia
Publishing House, 1956), pp. 21-23, N. Geldenhuys, Commentary
on the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1951),
pp. 30-35, and A. Leaney, op. cit., p. 9, support the early
date. The following evidence, although not conclusive, seems
to favor the early date.

1. In the light of Luke's close association with Paul
(Col. 4:14; Philemon 24; 2 Tim. 4:11) it is difficult to
understand why he would remain reticent concerning his martyr-
dom. Perhaps Luke may have intended to end Acts with Paul's
imprisonment in Rome, a fitting climax to the spreading of the
Gospel from Jerusalem "to the end of the earth" (Acts 1:8).
On the assumption that this may have been Luke's purpose, or
that he intended to write a third volume, F. F. Bruce still
contends that the abrupt ending is best explained by the early
date: "we are still left wondering how Paul's appeal fared,
and what happened to him afterwards. A few sentences would
have sufficed to give us this information. As it is, after
the careful and detailed account of the events leading up to
the trial, we are left in ignorance of the trial itself. It
is almost as if the Third Gospel had come to a sudden end on
the eve of our Lord's appearance before Pilate" (op. cit., p. 11).

2. Luke does not refer to any of Paul's letters.
Although the "Pauline corpus" may not have been collected
until the end of the first century, yet from the very begin-
ning Paul intended that at least some of his letters should be
circulated (Gal. 1:2; Col. 4:16; cf. 2 Pet. 3:15,16).

3. Luke offers no explicit reference to the destruction
of Jerusalem, although some believe that it is implied in
Luke 19:43,44; 21:20-24; cf. infra, p. 12.

explicit reference to its destruction.[6] Luke 21:20-24 may

imply the destruction of the city, but Gilmour's suggestion

is also plausible:

> The verses may betray a familiarity on Luke's part
> with events in Jerusalem just before the siege.
> According to Eusebius (Church History III.5.3), the
> Christian community in the city withdrew at that
> time to Pella in Perea in response to a warning
> given to their leaders "by revelation".[7]

A study of the synoptic problem seems to indicate that Luke is

dependent on Mark's Gospel, at least for the final draft.[8] If

this is the case, then Luke's Gospel must be dated after the

writing of Mark (64-69 A.D.).[9] However, this traditional date

is not conclusive; B. H. Streeter and Pierson Parker prefer

an earlier date.[10]

---

[6]W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A Concordance to the
Greek Testament (3rd edition; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark,
1950), pp. 473ff. Luke refers to "Jerusalem" thirty times;
compared with the references in the other Gospels this number
is quite high. Matthew, written for Jewish Christians pre-
sumably in Palestine, has only twelve references to "Jerusalem";
Mark, eleven; John, thirteen. In the Acts Luke has sixty-four
references to "Jerusalem."

[7]S. MacLean Gilmour, Introduction and Exegesis to the
Gospel according to St. Luke, in The Interpreter's Bible (New
York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1952), VIII, p. 367.

[8]Cf. infra, p. 27 ff.

[9]McNeile, op. cit., pp. 30-32.

[10]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (2nd edition; London:
Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 150, dates Mark c.60 A.D.
Pierson Parker, The Gospel Before Mark (Chicago: University
of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 165, believes that Mark was
written "early in the seventh decade" at a time when the so-
called "Judaizing controversy" was at white heat (p. 5).

It is frequently reasoned that St. Luke could not have
had "many" sources available if he wrote his Gospel early in
the seventh decade. Certainly no one would argue the obvious
point that at a later date Luke would have more written
sources at his disposal, but it does not logically follow that
Luke would have few if any written sources in the early 60's.
It is true that because of the imminence of the parousia, the
Jewish oral tradition and the abundance of eyewitness during
the first thirty years after our Lord's ascension, there seems
to have been little reason for writing the sayings of the Lord
merely to preserve the record. However, the devotional and
instructional value of a written record must have been obvious
to at least some of the first generation Christians. Written
documents would have been of inestimable value in their
missionary program, especially in the predominantly Gentile
congregations. Moreover, the Greek-speaking people were
literary, and St. Luke was writing primarily for them.

In regard to the availability of written sources of the
Gospel tradition in 60-70 A.D. the remarks of C. H. Dodd are
apropos:

> How early the tradition of the sayings of Jesus began
> to be written down, it is hard to say. At a guess, I
> should suspect it was not long after the Church moved
> into Greek-speaking countries. The Greeks were a
> bookish people, like ourselves, and liked to have
> things in writing. So by degrees they compiled fly-
> sheets with a few sayings on some special topic. Then
> the fly-sheets were brought together into more compre-
> hensive collections. It seems certain that there was
> a considerable number of collections of sayings of
> Jesus in circulation (underscoring added). Some of
> them were used in the composition of the Gospels.
> Some of them only from quotations elsewhere. A few

fly-sheets of rather later date have turned up among
finds of the Church's system of Christian education;
and this was essentially a system of teaching by word
of mouth.[11]

This indicates that in the early 60's it was possible for Luke

to use "many" sources (1:1), probably including some written

documents which may comprise part of Luke 9:51 to 18:14.

A Study of the Source-References
in the Lucan Prologue

Luke explicitly refers to his sources in the prologue to

the Third Gospel (Luke 1:1-4). This prologue, Luke's unique

contribution to our understanding of Gospel writing, is trans-

lated and then analyzed by this writer:

Inasmuch as many have taken in hand carefully to
compile a narrative concerning the things which
have been accomplished among us, just as those who
from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants
of the word handed them down to us, it seemed good
to me also, having investigated all things care-
fully from the beginning, to write an orderly
account, most noble Theophilus, in order that you
may fully know the certainty concerning the things
in which you have been informed.

"Inasmuch as" ($\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\dot{\eta}\pi\epsilon c$) is classical Greek, a term used

nowhere else in the New Testament. Blass-Debrunner points

out that this term is used "with reference to a fact already

known."[12] "Many" ($\pi o\lambda\lambda o\dot{\iota}$) should be taken at its face value

---

[11]C. H. Dodd, About the Gospels (Cambridge: University
Press, 1950), pp. 17f.

[12]F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New
Testament, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 238, #456:3.

and not interpreted as meaning possibly "not more than a few."[13] By using κἀμοί (1:3) Luke adds himself to the "many," so there is no indication in the text that he finds any objections to the content or manner of writing done by his predecessors, but a subtle approval. Mark may also be included in the "many," but Plummer considers this doubtful.[14] However, it is generally accepted that Luke used Mark as one of his primary source materials. Arndt also believes Luke made use of Mark, but he feels that Mark should be included in the group of eyewitnesses mentioned in Verse Two rather than in the reference to the "many":

> At once the question arises whether Luke includes Matthew and Mark among the "many" writers to whom he refers in 1:1. The answer, so it seems to me, must be an emphatic no. What our first two Evangelists present would be regarded by Luke as a part of the Apostolic testimony, the testimony given by those who from the beginning had been eyewitnesses and servants of the Word, and not as belonging to the products of the numerous authors who tried to reproduce the accounts of the Apostles. Matthew was himself an Apostle, and Mark in his Gospel, according to the unanimous report of antiquity, wrote what another Apostle, Peter, had preached. Hence, because Luke sharply differentiates between the witness of the Apostles and the literary ventures

---

[13]Martin Dibelius, Gospel Criticism and Christology (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1935), p. 30: "The preface to Luke's Gospel is written in the contemporary style of literary dedications. For that reason we must not lay too much stress in our exegesis upon every expression in this preface, especially if it is found in other writings of that style and is manifestly conventional. This applies to the [31] mention of 'many' predecessors; there is no need to presume more than a few."

[14]Plummer, op. cit., pp. xxiii-xxiv, feels that Luke may not have used the Second Gospel because of his omission of Mark 6:5 and the large section of Mark 6:45-8:9, material

of others based on the Apostolic narrative, we cannot look upon our Matthew and Mark as belonging to the "many" of 1:1.[15]

This "emphatic no" seems to deserve more evidence. The writings of the "many" should not be categorically considered as "the literary ventures of others based on the Apostolic narrative." Arndt seems to draw a fine line between the "Apostolic testimony" of Matthew and Mark and "the products of the numerous authors who tried to reproduce the accounts of the Apostles." There is no indication that the "many" received the tradition secondhand. They could have received firsthand information from the apostles to the same degree and manner as Mark received his information from Peter.

Luke and the "many" may have consulted Matthew, who as one of the Twelve would be considered an eyewitness "from the beginning" (1:2). However, Luke probably did not have a written account of the first Gospel at his disposal; synoptic criticism indicates that Matthew and Luke most likely worked independently of one another's Gospel record.[16]

---

which would support the purpose of Luke's Gospel. Cf. Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954), pp. 41-44; George Barton, "The Question of 'Ur-Marcus' Once More," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), p. 241.

[15]William Arndt, The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), p. 9.

[16]Cf. Plummer, op. cit., p. xxiv, who lists several factors which lead him to the conclusion "that Lk. was not familiar with our First Gospel, even if he knew it at all." There is no reason to assume that Luke had to be written before the first Gospel, as Julian Love concludes in his book The Gospel and The Gospels (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c. 1953), p. 22. It is probably safe to say that Matthew and Luke were written at about the same time, but neither writer made use of the other.

However, the case is different with Mark. Some conjecture that he may have been an eyewitness to some of the events in our Lord's ministry (Mark 14:51,52); but he can hardly be considered one of the eyewitnesses "from the beginning" if this phrase must refer exclusively to the apostles, the Twelve called by our Lord. Only if "from the beginning" has a wider frame of reference may one include Mark in Luke 1:2.

That "apostolic testimony" is a sine qua non for authentic Gospel writing cannot be assumed from Luke's prologue. There is no indication that Luke would consider Mark's Gospel any more or less authentic than the writings of the "many." Luke merely relates a well-known fact that "many" had undertaken to "carefully compile" (ἀνατάξασθαι) a narrative; their work was not slipshod (καθὼς, "just as," also indicates exactness). The fact that their writings went out of existence when the more comprehensive canonical writings became popular does not ipso facto mean that they were invalid primary sources and not inspired by the Holy Spirit. Let it be said that in the second century this "apostolic testimony" was an essential criterion for the inclusion of a book in a corpus which by the end of the fourth century had developed into our present canon. But there is absolutely no evidence that this "apostolic criterion" was considered essential by the New Testament writers themselves. One should not equate the "inspiration" of a writer by the Holy Spirit with "apostolic testimony."

It is interesting to note in this connection that several later European Latin versions (a,q) and the Gothic add after the Κἀμοὶ in Luke 1:3 "et spiritui sancto." Did a copyist add these words merely because they occur in Acts 15:28, or did he want to differentiate the "inspired" Third Gospel from the "non-inspired" πολλοί (1:1)? There is no textual support for this addition, probably due to later Tendenz.

The word Ἐπεχείρησαν, "set one's hand to," does not imply an "unsuccessful attempt" to write a Gospel account; nor does the context necessarily imply this. All that need be implied is that Luke finds the writings of the "many" lacking in scope, not necessarily in quality. Luke intends to write a more comprehensive account.

The content of these writings was the actual facts (first-hand information concerning the words and deeds; the meaning would be the same if Luke had used Ἐπμάτων instead of πραγμάτων) "which have been accomplished among us" (1:1). This is the only time Luke uses πληροφορέω; elsewhere in the New Testament it occurs only five times as a verb (all Pauline: Rom. 4:21; 14:5; Col. 4:12; 2 Tim. 4:5,17); four times as a noun (Col. 2:2; 1 Thess. 1:5; Hebr. 6:11; 10:22). In most of these cases the apparent meaning is "fully assured"; 2 Tim. 4:5,17, "accomplished." However, it seems to the writer that the perfect participle aptly combines both meanings: "things which have been accomplished among us, which lasting effect works full assurance in us."

The "things accomplished" need not refer only to "the days of his flesh" (Hebr. 5:7, from our Lord's birth to His ascension, but also to the fulfillment of the Lord's promises (Luke 24:47-49; John 14 and 16), recorded in the first portion of Acts. The fact that Luke added his own personal testimony (the "we" passages: Acts 16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16) does not rule out the possibility that he originally intended the prologue to serve as an introduction to Luke-Acts.[17] Later on under the guidance of the Holy Spirit he could have decided to add his own testimony.

The classical Greek in Luke 1:2 is difficult to translate into modern idiom; it is perhaps better to render the aorist active παρέδοσαν as a passive: "just as they were handed down to us" (so also the RSV). Luke gives no indication that παρέδοσαν refers to either written tradition or oral transmission or to both. The latter is probably the case. "To us" (ἡμῖν), as in Luke 1:1, probably refers to the early Church, which would include Luke, the "many" and at least some of the readers of the Third Gospel. If this interpretation is correct, then the Church was the recipient of all that had been handed down by "the eyewitnesses from the beginning." This would also

___

[17]Cf. infra, p. 45, for evidence to support the common authorship of Luke-Acts and the "we" passages in Acts; for the Lucan prologue as an introduction to both Luke and Acts, cf. McNeile, op. cit., p. 93: "There is little doubt that the preface prefixed to his Gospel was intended to cover both the Gospel and Acts, and that Acts i opens with a secondary preface introducing his second volume." Cadbury, Beginnings of Christianity, II (1922), 491f., is quoted in support of this statement. Arndt, op. cit., p. 38, takes exception to this.

mean that the "many" did not necessarily check with the eye-
witnesses. The writings of the "many" would be primary
sources for Luke to the extent that they transmitted the oral
or written accounts of the eyewitnesses.

"From those who were from the beginning eyewitnesses and
servants of the word" (1:2) is usually understood as referring
only to the apostles because of ἀπ' ἀϲχῆϛ.[18] However, "from
the beginning" is a relative term. Does Luke mean from the
very beginning of Jesus' ministry, His baptism? Was he possibly
thinking of the commissioning of the disciples or of those who
were with Jesus on the road to Jerusalem? Jesus' ministry
covered only 3½ years at the most. Looking back thirty years,
Luke may be referring to any of the disciples who had been eye-
witnesses to Jesus, no matter what time within that short
period they had met him, as long as they joined the circle of
witnesses before Jesus' suffering and death. Many of the
"five hundred"(1 Cor. 15) cannot be considered "eyewitnesses
from the beginning" if they became followers of Christ only
after the resurrection.

Discipleship before the resurrection of our Lord seems
to have been one of the criteria for belonging to Luke's group
of "eyewitnesses" (1:2). The suggestion that ἀπ' ἀϲχῆϛ may not

_____

[18]According to Geldenhuys, op. cit., p. 56, ἀπ' ἀϲχῆϛ refers
to the beginning of Christ's ministry, as the same expression
in John 15:27 indicates; so also Plummer, who also refers to
John 15:27; 16:4 (op. cit., p. 4). Arndt is more exact in
associating "from the beginning" with Acts 1:22 (ἀϲξάμϵνος ἀπὸ
τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου), although the identical expression is not
used (op. cit., p. 40).

refer to the <u>beginning</u> of Jesus' ministry is partially based
on St. Paul's sermon at Antioch in Pisidia:

> But God raised him from the dead; and for many days
> he appeared to those who came up with him from Galilee
> to Jerusalem, who are now witnesses to the people
> (Acts 13:30,31).[19]

The objection to this is that St. Paul does not call these
"witnesses" (μάςτυςες) "eyewitnesses" (αὐτόπται). However,
this need not be an "either-or" proposition. The "witnesses"
were "those who went up with him" (τοῖς ϊναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ),
a phrase which implies eyewitnessing.

Dr. Arndt associates ἀπ' ἀςχῆς with Acts 1:22, "begin-
ning from the baptism of John."[20] This phrase most likely
refers to the public ministry of John the Baptist, which over-
lapped with the first part of Jesus' ministry. It is likely
that the disciples of John continued his baptism (Acts 19:3),
but this longer period could not be the meaning of Acts 1:22
because that would make Peter's phrase "until the day when he
was taken up from us" superfluous. What is most significant
is the fact that at least several disciples, including Justus
and Matthias, accompanied the Twelve apostles from the very
beginning of Jesus' ministry.[21]

---

[19]Cf. <u>infra</u>, pp. 71ff., for a critical analysis of this
passage; also Conzelmann, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 27.

[20]Arndt, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 40.

[21]W. Manson, <u>The Gospel of Luke</u> (London: Hodder and
Stoughton, 1930), p. 2; although Manson interprets "handed
down" (Lk. 1:2) as a reference to oral tradition, he does not
limit the "eyewitnesses" to the apostles: "The authority to

One must conclude that even though ἐπ'ἀρχῆς (1:2) may refer to "the beginning of Jesus' ministry," this does not limit the "eyewitnesses and servants" to the apostles. It is also possible that Mark had been in the company of Justus and Matthias "beginning from the baptism of John" (Acts 1:22).

These "eyewitnesses" were also "servants of the word from the beginning." The context indicates that the "word" is the kerygma of Jesus Christ, not the incarnate Logos of the Fourth Gospel. The eyewitnesses were in every way subject to the "word"; their testimony is reliable. As "servants" they had the same respect for the Gospel as did St. Paul (Gal. 1:6-9).

Luke "investigated carefully (ἀκειβῶς) all things (πᾶσιν)." The perfect participle παρηκολουθηκότι indicates that Luke had completed his painstaking research before he decided to write (there is no need to consider ἔδοξε an epistolary aorist). Luke does not say explicitly what he meant by "all things." Luke probably included some of the writings of the "many" in his research, especially the primary sources. The κἀμοὶ seems to indicate that Luke intended to use the literary method of the "many," at least as far as their careful compilation of the accounts received from the eyewitnesses is concerned. As in the case of the "many,"

_____

which everything was referred was the testimony of original eyewitnesses who were in the service of the Gospel Message, and this would extend normally from the baptism of Jesus to the day when he was taken up (Acts 1:21). It is clear that, so far as Luke's knowledge went, no apostle or original eyewitness had himself committed anything to writing."

Luke's account may be considered a primary source (from the historical point of view) to the extent that he faithfully compiles the testimony of the eyewitnesses. Luke intended to give Theophilus "certainty" (ἀσφάλειαν) in regard to these things (πραγμάτων); to achieve this Luke would use at least what he considered were reliable sources.

St. Luke writes an "orderly" (καθεξῆς) account, a "consecutive narration in place of the haphazard presentation of facts which was only too common in that age."[22] The term itself may refer to any arrangement, but in relation to ἄνωθεν, "from the beginning," chiefly a chronological arrangement would be meant.[23] However, it is quite possible that ἄνωθεν means "from the top," referring to the orderly data that Luke had already listed (logically or chronologically) "from the top down." The content of the Third Gospel, especially the "central section," indicates that Luke was not a slave to his chronological order.

The prologue indicates that Theophilus not only held some high rank (κράτιστε) but also was probably well educated. Luke first convinces him of the reliability of his sources and method of writing before he states his purpose: that Theophilus

---

[22]Ibid., p. 2: And furthermore, "He may have known from private sources that the versions of Christian history which had previously reached Theophilus left something to be desired."

[23]McNeile, op. cit., p. 89: "The word ἄνωθεν 'from the first' (i.3) seems to mean from the beginning of the common apostolic tradition; and this was certainly the ministry of the Baptist (see Acts 1.21f.), which was the earliest point at which eyewitnesses (Lk. i.2) could communicate facts."

might "fully know ($\overset{\prime}{\epsilon}\pi\iota\gamma\nu\overset{\wedge}{\omega}s$) the certainty ($\overset{\prime}{\alpha}\sigma\varphi\overset{\prime}{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$) con-
cerning things ($\pi\epsilon\grave{\iota}$ $\overset{\prime}{\omega}\nu$) in which you have been informed."

$\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\nu$ most likely refers to $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$(1:1), the words
and deeds of Jesus fulfilled in the early Church.

The technical term "instruct" is probably a later usage;
one should not use the term to surmise that Theophilus was
already a Christian. It may be that Theophilus had heard, or
had been informed of several Christian writings ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\nu$, in
the sense of "books," or "treatises"; cf. Acts 1:1, $T\grave{o}\nu$ $\mu\grave{\epsilon}\nu$
$\pi\epsilon\widehat{\omega}\tau\sigma\nu$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\sigma\nu$) and inquired of Luke about their reliability.

Although the prologue is addressed to an individual, the
content of the Third Gospel indicates that Luke intended it
for a wide circulation, for all classes of people throughout
the Gentile world.

Luke pictures the creative Spirit present throughout the
history of the Church (1:41ff.; 1:67ff.; 4:18; 11:13; 24:49).
In this regard Filson states that a more appropriate title for
the "Acts of the Apostles" would be the "Acts of the Holy
Spirit."[24] As Luke was guided by the Spirit in his research,

---

[24]Floyd V. Filson, Opening the New Testament (2nd edition;
Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), p. 74: "The risen Christ,
before he leaves his followers at the ascension, promises to
send them the Holy Spirit to guide and uphold them. At Pente-
cost he sends the Spirit to the waiting, worshiping church,
and from that time the Spirit leads them. At every decisive
step the story refers to his guidance. This book is really
'The Acts of the Holy Spirit,' who carries out God's work
through human agents."

he was directed to see the "divine side" of history; in this respect Bundy calls Luke's view of history "supernatural."[25]

Luke "investigated all things carefully from the beginning" to bring to the whole world a universal Savior who had compassion for humanity. Concerning the purpose of the Third Gospel Hauck says: "The Jewish horizon from which the Gospel had sprung has faded, but Jesus appears as the universal Savior of humanity."[26]

On the basis of this analysis the following conclusions may be restated:

1. The "many" had already undertaken the compilation of source material (Luke 1:1).

2. Luke probably used the same literary method as the "many," but he planned to make his account more comprehensive (1:3).

3. The original "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" represent the wider circle of disciples who had accompanied the Lord during His ministry (1:2).

---

[25]Walter E. Bundy, Jesus and the First Three Gospels: an Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 4: "Luke's preface makes it clear that he takes a supernatural view of history. He intends to write about 'those matters which have been fulfilled among us.' What he is about to report is the realization of a providential plan and purpose. This providential conception of history has dominated the works of historical writers down to modern times. The body of Luke's Gospel also makes it clear that his conception of history includes miracle--the direct intervention of the Divine into the processes of nature and into the course of human events. In this Luke is simply sharing a conception common in the ancient and medieval worlds."

[26]Friedrich Hauck, Das Evangelium Des Lukas, in Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (Leipzig: Deichert, 1934), III, 10: "Der juedische Horizont, aus dem das Ev entspring, verlaszt. Jesus erscheint als der allgemeine Heiland der Menschheit."

4. These "eyewitnesses" <u>handed</u> <u>down</u> to the early
   Church ($ημῖν$) the "things which have been
   accomplished among us"; they may have been
   handed down <u>orally</u> or in <u>written</u> <u>form</u>; but
   <u>probably</u>, both.

5. As in the case of the "many," Luke's account
   may be considered a primary source (from the
   historical point of view) to the extent that
   he faithfully compiles the testimony of the
   eyewitnesses.

6. Mark might possibly be one of the "eyewitnesses
   from the beginning" but only because he
   accompanied the Lord in the wider circle of the
   disciples, not because "he was the interpreter
   of Peter."

7. Luke used the testimony of the "eyewitnesses"
   for his source material and probably referred
   to some of the writings of the "many," especially
   the primary sources.

8. Luke wrote his Gospel as an authentic, compre-
   hensive (but not exhaustive), orderly account
   of the word and works of our Lord to convince
   his readers that Jesus is indeed "the universal
   Savior of humanity."

CHAPTER III

LUKE'S METHOD OF EDITING SOURCE MATERIALS

A study of the synoptic Gospels supports the assumption that part of the tradition he received from the original eye-witnesses (Luke 1:2) was in written form. There are a little over two hundred verses common to Matthew and Luke that are not found in Mark. It is unlikely that one copied the material from the other, because it appears in different contexts. It is also not too probable that both obtained all two hundred verses from oral tradition, because in Matthew this material is scattered throughout while in Luke it is written in large blocks. This seems to indicate that the material was derived from a common written source like "Q" or from several written sources.

Scholars are generally agreed that the "Q" hypothesis offers the best solution to the synoptic problem. However, as Streeter himself is willing to admit, the content of "Q" cannot be established for certain:

> The Q hypothesis, however, can be pressed too far.
> (1) Where the versions of saying in Matthew and Luke differ considerably, the probability is high that one (or both) of the two versions did not come from Q.
> (2) Matthew probably omitted some sayings of Q which Luke retained, and vice versa. (3) Short epigrammatic sayings would be likely to circulate separately by word of mouth. Hence all attempts at a reconstruction of Q must be tentative.[1]

---

[1]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (2nd edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 153.

Moreover, one should not get the impression from source criticism that all the oral tradition used by Luke was limited to these "short epigrammatic sayings." Even though there are large blocks of material common to Matthew and Luke in the Third Gospel, one must admit the remote possibility pointed out by Perry that Luke may have written in a notebook the oral traditions which he had gathered earlier.[2]

On the basis of these studies the writer accepts the more probable view that one of the traditions handed down to Luke was the written source "Q." One should also consider the possibility that Luke wrote a first edition of the Third Gospel, a combination of "Q" and "L" (material peculiar to Luke) which Streeter called "Proto-Luke."[3] Proto-Luke is quite probable if one accepts a later date for the Third Gospel. Although this theory may oversimplify Luke's research, the literary method described in the prologue (Luke 1:1-4)

---

[2]A. M. Perry, "The Growth of the Gospels," in General Articles on the New Testament, The Interpreter's Bible (New: York: Abingdon Press, c.1951), VII, 65: "Although it seems unlikely that a literary man, such as the author of this Gospel shows himself to be, would have had much recourse to oral tradition gathered in the very process of composing his Gospel, it is not impossible that the block of materials in Luke 14:1-17:37 was taken from the evangelist's notebook of oral traditions, gathered earlier. . . . His method of incorporating them in blocks suggests that they were for the most part in written form."

[3]Cf. Streeter, op. cit., pp. 150ff.; Perry, op. cit., p. 66; C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), I, lxiv.

would still apply to a first edition.[4] However, it is more significant how Luke handled this particular group of sources.

Assuming that Luke had the Second Gospel as a written source and used the same procedure in selecting and editing his "Q" materials, it is safe to conclude that he edited them in this manner:

1. Luke had a tendency to follow one source at a time ("blocks" of Marcan, "Q" and Lucan materials).

2. In most cases he arranges the material in their original order (Luke 1:3).

3. He generally avoids conflation.

Although one may use these points as a guideline in studying the theoretical sources of Luke's Gospel, one must use extreme caution in making them a general rule.

For example, in Luke 19 the pericopae are apparently arranged rather loosely: first a source peculiar to Luke (19:2-10), followed by "Q" (?, 19:12-27), Mark (19:30-40), "Q" (19:42-44) and Mark (19:45-46). In respect to the second point another exception to the rule may be noted in the Passion narrative. Although Luke carefully follows Mark in the earlier part of his Gospel, he does not follow Mark's Passion narrative in order.[5] In these cases Luke may be using another written or

---

[4]C. S. C. Williams also considers the possibility of Luke's writing an early draft ("Q" and "L") of the Third Gospel; cf. supra, p. 9. For a study of various theories on Proto-Luke cf. P. Winter, "The Proto-Source of Luke I," Novum Testamentum, I (1956), 184-199.

[5]Another example of Luke's shift in the Marcan chronology is Jesus' Nazareth visit, Luke 4:16-30 (Mark 6:1-6); cf. D. T. Rowlingson, "The Jerusalem Conference and Jesus' Nazareth Visit," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXI (1952), 69-74.

oral source. This possibility is suggested by the fact that in Luke and John, Jesus while in the upper room forewarns Peter of his denial (Luke 22:31-34; John 13:38), but in Matthew and Mark this warning is placed on their way to Gethsemane (Matt. 26:33-35; Mark 14:29-31). However, one should note that the similarity between Luke and John in this particular pericope is limited to the geographical reference.

Because Luke on occasion switches the order of Mark, one should not overemphasize Luke's following the original order of his sources. It cannot be assumed that Luke's block sections of "Q" always follow the order of "Q."

However, in regard to the third point--that Luke generally avoids conflation--one treads on safer ground. In keeping with his prologue (1:3) Luke presents an accurate record of his sources. The well-educated historian, who probably had a better historical background than either Mark or Matthew, did not attempt to alter his sources. Although Luke may have been aware of the geographical and historical discrepancies resulting from his logical arrangement of source materials, especially in the "central section," he chose not to edit or conflate the sources; he faithfully transcribed the original tradition.[6]

_____

[6]T. W. Manson, "The Life of Jesus: A Survey of the Available material; (3) The Work of St. Luke," Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XXVIII (1944), 393. However, Pierson Parker arrives at this conclusion: "Unlike the latter [Matthew], Luke has apparently put Q on a level with his other sources, has adhered more closely to its structure, and has kept more of its content. At the same time he has been freer than the

In a sense this conclusion would make Luke less critical than Mark and Matthew, certainly less original, or creative. However, one should realize that Matthew (and probably also Mark, if he may be counted as one of the eyewitnesses and to the degree that Peter assisted him) was one of the "eyewitnesses from the beginning" (Luke 1:3). They could have created, conflated and criticized their materials without arousing the doubts of a Theophilus. From the purely historical point of view Luke, writing secondhand (Lk 1:1-4), most likely would not choose to take that liberty with his sources. If Theophilus knew Luke, he probably also would have known that Luke was not an "eyewitness from the beginning." For that reason Luke refers to his sources and method of writing in the prologue to his Gospel. If this assumption is granted, then one may consider Luke a compiler, or at least an editor. Bundy makes the observation that Luke's faithful transcription of his sources is in reality an aid to the critical student.[7]

---

redactor of Matthew in adapting the Q style and vocabulary to those of his other sources and of his Gospel as a whole"; The Gospel Before Mark (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 156.

[7]Walter E. Bundy, Jesus and the First Three Gospels: an Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 3: "Luke is no more critical of his materials than are Matthew and Mark; if anything, he is less so. Luke shows less independence and originality in his use of transmitted materials. Mark selects, arranges and treats materials in such a way that they serve his dogmatic purposes and dramatic designs. Matthew conflates and assimilates his sources to such an extent that the result is often something new and different. Luke is dominated by his

The writer has assumed that Luke also used Mark's Gospel as one of his written sources. In using this source Luke probably considered Mark an "eyewitness from the beginning." One need not conclude that Luke used a mutilated copy of Mark or an "Urmarcan" source to explain why Luke omitted a large section of Mark (6:45-8:26).[8]

Chiefly because of Streeter's comprehensive study of the synoptic problem, most scholars today accept the priority of the Second Gospel. According to Streeter's calculations Luke retains 53 per cent of the actual words of Mark; Matthew, 51 per cent.[9] What is even more striking, however, is their different method of handling the Marcan source. Although Matthew uses 90 per cent of the subject matter of Mark and Luke uses only 55 per cent (approximately), Luke still uses more of the actual words of Mark than does Matthew. This indicates that Luke presents proportionately more of the Marcan details. Because much of this Marcan material appears in block sections, it is rather safe to assume that Luke generally avoids conflation.

If one has gone this far in admitting the possibility of source criticism of the Third Gospel, one should also consider the feasibility of written sources behind the material peculiar

---

sources to an extent that Matthew and Mark are not. For the critical student, this is a fortunate circumstance; for, on the whole, in Luke the basic sources have survived with less change and in purer form than is the case in Matthew and Mark" [underscoring added].

[8]Cf. supra, pp. 15; 29f.

[9]Streeter, op. cit., p. 160.

to Luke. At this point many of the source critics have gone wild; Hirsch's diagram of the sources behind the synoptic Gospels looks like a modern road map.[10] It becomes difficult, if not impossible, to analyze sources which are not in existence. One may accept Mark as a written source for Luke and submit it to a critical analysis; one may also work with the hypothetical "Q" source because of the material common to Matthew and Luke but not found in Mark. But if one assumes that there were written sources behind the material peculiar to Luke, how may these be analyzed?

First of all, in dealing with theories it must be acknowledged that all conclusions are tentative until proved by definite facts. The less data available, the more hypothetical the thesis. However, regarding the possibility of written sources behind the material peculiar to Luke, one need not work in a vacuum. It has been demonstrated that Luke does not as a rule conflate his sources but faithfully transcribes them. Therefore any marked differences in wording and style within the pericopae peculiar to Luke may indicate different sources; whether it is safe to assume that some of these sources were written would depend on the consistency of the change in wording and style.

Alfred Perry lists five criteria for indicating an author's dependence upon a written source:

---

[10]Emanuel Hirsch, Fruehgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1941), II, 339.

1. Resemblance of the contents: telling the same
   stories.

2. Resemblance in continuity: telling the stories
   in the same order.

3. Similar sentence structure and word order: tell-
   ing the stories in the same way.

4. Extensive agreement (50 per cent to 60 per cent)
   in the words used.

5. Agreement in using unusual words or harsh con-
   struction.[11]

Of course, it is impossible to lay a written source along side
of the material peculiar to Luke and apply these criteria; but
one can apply these criteria to the individual pericopae of the
material peculiar to Luke to see whether it comes from the same
source or from two or more sources. If one follows this pro-
cedure, it is assumed that Luke's editing was at a minimum.

If the material peculiar to Luke is composed of a number
of written sources that have been faithfully compiled by Luke
with little change, then in the analysis this body of material
should not be used to demonstrate Luke's literary style, at
least not at the outset. It has been assumed that Matthew
made freer use of his materials because he was an "eyewitness
from the beginning" (Luke 1:2).[12] If one accepts the Lucan
authorship of Acts (as the writer does), then one also may
reasonably assume that Luke would be more original, creative

---

[11]A. M. Perry, "Jesus in Jerusalem," Journal of Biblical
Literature, II (1924), 62.

[12]Cf. supra, pp. 31f.

(literary) in his own eyewitness accounts (the "we" passages in Acts) than in his compilation of sources received from the "eyewitnesses from the beginning."

It might be debated whether the "we" passages in Acts are long enough to determine Luke's style and use this as a criterion for determining the Lucan style in the material peculiar to the Third Gospel. There are definite limitations, but in Chapter IV the writer will presently note a few peculiarities of style in these passages which may serve as some guideline.

The theories of Formgeschichte by and large are too subjective to be of much use in analyzing the oral traditions to determine their Sitz im Leben. Actually their "forms" are more literary than historical. K. L. Schmidt strips the historical setting from the narratives and often transplants them with his own theory on how the community of the early Church must have lived.[13] The Formgeschichtler often assigns the framework to the Gospel writers or even to later editors.[14]

As early as 1932 in a critical analysis of Karl Schmidt's Rahmen, C. H. Dodd punctured Schmidt's theory that the summary

[13]Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919); cf. also Rudolf Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957), p. 384f.

[14]Willi Marxsen, Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktiongeschichte des Evangeliums (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 7-17. The redactors arranged the historic materials in their "Groszevangelien" to meet the problems of their own age (kerygma not history).

statements in Mark's Gospel are editorial and not traditional.[15]
Dodd noted that the pericopae do not fit into the summary
framework perfectly; therefore he concludes that both the
pericopae and the summary framework existed in the tradition.
Furthermore, Dodd deduced that if one takes Schmidt's summary
statements (with the exception of Mark 4:33-34) one gets a
continuous narrative summary of Jesus' ministry: 1:14-15,21-22,
39; 2:13; 3:7b-19; 6:7,12-13,30. Examples of such summaries
in the apostolic kerygma are Acts 10:37-41; 13:23-31.

Some of the suggestions of Bultmann may be helpful in
determining Luke's literary style but offer little aid in the
consideration of Luke's sources. One should note Bultmann's
theory on Luke's procedure in editing the narrative stories.
According to Bultmann Luke stresses the immediate temporal
connection of one scene with the previous.[16] Another Lucan
characteristic is that he introduces a new historical section

---

[15]C. H. Dodd, "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative,"
Expository Times, XLIII (1931-32), 396-400.

[16]Bultmann, op. cit., p. 384, points out that Luke edits
the narrative stories in two ways: "1. Lk hebt den unmittelbaren
zeitlichen Zusammenhang einer Szene mit der vorhergehenden
hervor. 2. Charakteristischer noch fuer Lk ist es, dasz er
die Empfindung hat, ein wie falsches Bild es gibt, wenn alle
Stuecke gleichmaeszig in einen unmittelbaren zeitlichen
Zusammenhang gesetzt werden, wie es bei Mk ansatzweise geschieht
und bei Mt weiter durchgefuehrt wird. Lk weisz, dasz die
wenigen mitgeteilten Geschichten nicht den Gang der Ereignisse
vollstaendig beschreiben, sondern nur Beispiele, Illustrationen
bieten; und er macht daher sehr haeusig durch eine Eingangs-
wendung darauf aufmerksam, dasz das folgende Stueck innerhalb
eines groeszernen Zusammenhangs spielt. Dafuer waehlt er die
aus der LXX gelaeufige Formel καὶ ἐγένετο , die schematisch
besonders viele Mk-Geschichten bei Lk. einleitet."

(one that has no immediate temporal connection with the
previous narrative) with the familiar LXX formula καὶ ἐγένετο.

The Formgeschichte Schule at least opened the door for
others to reinterpret the historical settings of the pericopae.
Influenced by this school Jeremias has explained some of the
double applications of the parables of our Lord, whether alle-
gorical or hortatory, by placing them in one of the two Sitze
im Leben: the original historical setting or the setting in
the primitive Church.[17]   Willi Marxsen, however, believes that
this historical framework should be considered a third Sitz im
Leben.[18]   Thus according to Marxsen the tradition went through
several redactions: the original setting; the primitive Church;
the redactor of these materials (his hand may be traced in the
connecting links); the Lucan text.   In the Lucan prologue the
ἡμῖν in 1:1,2 is mot likely the early Church, which Marxsen
would probably consider the second Sitz im Leben.   If this is

---

[17]Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), p. 20.

[18]Willi Marxsen, Der Evangelist Markus (Goettingen:
Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956), p. 12: "Nicht nur das Itinerar
und die szenischen Verknuepfungen sind eingeschlossen, sondern
ebenfalls die Umgestaltungen im Text, soweit solche erkennbar
sind.   Dieser Rahmen soll aber nun nicht einfach historisch
abgebaut werden, wie es bei der Formgeschichte fast immer
gescheht, sondern er ist redaktionsgeshichtlich zu befragen auf
seinen 'Sitz im Leben' hin [underscoring added].
"Wenn J. Jeremias den 'ersten Sitz im Leben,' der in der
einmaligen Situation der Wirksamkeit Jesu liegt, von dem
'zweiten Sitz im Leben' unterscheidet, der durch die Situation
der Urkirche gegeben ist und den die Formgeschichte zu
ermitteln sucht, dann geht es jetzt um den 'dritten Sitz im
Leben.'"

the case, then the purpose for Luke's writing to Theophilus
(1:3) may be considered part of a third _Sitz_ _im_ _Leben_.

A possible indication of Luke's use of primary sources
is that his record of the parables of our Lord is relatively
free of allegory especially in the materials peculiar to him.
After his critical study Jeremias arrives at this conclusion:

> But these allegorizations are probably without excep-
> tion not the work of Luke, but spring from the tradi-
> tion lying behind him, since they are almost all to
> be found in the other Synoptists. Moreover, the alle-
> gorizing expressions and verses exhibit very few of
> the linguistic peculiarities of Luke. But above all,
> the Lucan special material in its rich collection of
> parables shows, so far as I can see, no examples of
> allegorical interpretation [underscoring added].[19]

In comparing this finding with a similar study of Matthew and
Mark, Jeremias implies that the material peculiar to Luke is
in the main based on a primary source:

> We arrive thus at a strange result: the discourse-
> material in Matthew and Luke, the Marcan material,
> the special Matthaean material, the gospel as we
> have it in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, all con-
> tain allegorical interpretations, but the Lucan
> special material has none. From the fact that the
> allegorical interpretations can be recognized as
> almost entirely secondary, it would seem that the
> whole parabolic material was originally as free
> from allegorizing interpretations as is the special
> Lucan material [underscoring added].[20]

One question which is often raised in regard to Luke's
handling of his source is whether or not he used Mark's Gospel
as the main source for his framework, or general outline.
Streeter does not feel that Luke used Mark as a basic text.
His argument is that Luke begins and ends his Gospel with

---

[19]Jeremias, _op. cit._, p. 68.

[20]_Ibid._, p. 69.

material peculiar to him; secondly, Luke does not follow the
Marcan chronology in Jesus' Nazareth visit (Luke 4:16-30) and
omitted a large section of Mark (8:45-8:26). Streeter feels
that Hawkins' term "great interpolation" should not be used
of this section because Luke is not using Mark as a basic
framework, i.e., his first and main text; Streeter concludes:

> The distribution of Marcan and non-Marcan sections
> suggests rather the hypothesis that the non-Marcan
> material formed the framework into which extracts
> from Mark were 'interpolated' by the editor of the
> Gospel.[21]

This theory is generally not accepted outside of the
British school for certain obvious reasons. First, Luke does
not begin with Marcan material because the Second Gospel intro-
duces the reader to Jesus at His baptism, the beginning of His
public ministry; Luke points out in his prologue that he
"investigated all things accurately from the beginning"
(ἄνωθεν , Luke 1:3). Second, we have a definite chrono-
logical order in Mark which Luke usually follows, but such an
order cannot be traced in the "Q" material. Third, as
Rowlingson has pointed out, Luke may be acquainted with the
Marcan order even where he digresses from Mark:

> Luke makes two concessions to the Marcan chronology
> which show that he is aware of Mark's sequence of
> events: he introduces the recognition on the part of
> the audience of Jesus' previous work in Capernaum
> (4:23), even though, contrary to Mark, he does not
> describe it in detail until after the visit (4:31ff.
> corresponding to Mark 1:21ff.); and he generalizes
> Mark's statement of Jesus' preaching in 1:14-15 to

---

[21]Streeter, op. cit., p. 199.

> make it include widespread activity in Galilee
> (Luke 4:14-15). Thus, to believe that in this
> instance Luke has produced a creative revision
> of his Marcan source is preferable to the theory
> that he has an entirely different version which
> he has substituted bodily for Mark.[22]

This seems to indicate to the writer that it is very difficult

at least to assert that Luke had to follow a main source for

his chronological outline.

It is quite possible that Luke established his own order

based on the oral and written traditions that he had "investi-

gated [them] accurately from the beginning" (Luke 1:2,3). It

is true that Luke probably realized that compiling the various

eyewitness accounts without following a basic source would not

give him a precise chronology. This bothers our modern scien-

tific point of view which depends on minute historical accuracy,

but it is doubtful whether Luke shared this concern. Secular

historians during that period apparently were not concerned

with precise chronological order, either (e.g., Josephus;

Tacitus). For his day Luke was an accurate historian. Luke

was concerned that the events during our Lord's ministry did

actually take place--and within a certain period.[23] It has

already been pointed out that Luke's "orderly" (καδεξῆς)

account possibly means that he faithfully transcribed his

sources. That Luke compiled these sources does not mean a

"word-for-word" dictation, or copying; the fine literary style

---

[22]Rowlingson, op. cit., p. 70.

[23]Cf. infra, pp. 54f.

of Luke-Acts indicates that Luke used his own choice of words and phrases whenever he felt that the material warranted such a change.

Even though one may not wish to concede that Luke was not concerned with the precision of his chronology, one should grant this possibility at least for the Jewish tradition of his sources. Because this point is often overlooked, it merits the support of Daube's critical study:

> Among the factors which contributed to the attitude of the evangelists the most important may well have been a principle of interpretation we know to have been applied by R. Ishmael's school in dealing with haggadic, non-legal, points of the Old Testament: "There is no before and after in Scripture." The Bible, that is, frequently puts a later event before an earlier; the order of events in reality is not always reflected in the order of events in the Bible (Cfr. the inverted order of the vision and call in Ezekiel 1).[24]

Daube concludes his analysis with this pertinent statement:

> It is unlikely that an exactitude which was considered to be absent from the Old Testament, and to be slighted, for example, by Ezekiel for the sake of a higher message he had to convey, was eagerly striven after by the religious story-tellers of the Talmudic era. The evangelists must have wished for much freedom in the matter of chronological arrangement, in order to emphasize ideas of greater importance in their eyes; and their license was warranted by tradition.[25]

From this observation one may at least assume that in determining his chronological order Luke may not have used a main source (such as Mark or "Q") at all.

---

[24]David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Anthion Press, 1956), p. 408.

[25]Ibid., p. 413.

In concluding this consideration of Luke's method of handling his sources, the following recapitulation may be helpful:

1. Synoptic criticism offers the rather convincing argument that Luke used Mark as one of his written sources.

2. It is also possible, but not as convincing, that the "Q" sayings represent another written source for Luke; it is more plausible that "Q" is a combination of written and oral sources.

3. Luke edited these sources in this manner; He had a tendency to follow one source at a time; in most cases he arranges the materials in their original order; he generally avoids conflation. Especially this last point can be adequately demonstrated.

4. Although Luke used his own style, he faithfully transcribed his sources in the manner of an editor.

5. He compiled his sources in an orderly arrangement but with the purpose that they would convey to the reader the great truth that Jesus is the "universal Savior of humanity."

6. For Luke, following a strict chronology was secondary to arranging his material to meet this purpose.

7. In determining his chronological order Luke may not have used a main source (such as Mark or "Q") at all.

8. Assuming that Luke did not conflate but faithfully transcribed his sources, it may be possible to detect at least traces of a written source (or sources) in the material peculiar to Luke.

9. Although the form-critical school has contributed little to a proper historical investigation of possible written sources nevertheless it has pointed out the need for our distinguishing the original historical setting from that of the primitive Church. Jeremias used this principle in concluding that the allegorical interpretations are almost entirely secondary (i.e., belonging to the primitive Church rather than to the original historical setting).

10. Jeremias' conclusion strengthens the supposition that the original source material may also be detected in the material peculiar to Luke: although

all the Gospels contain allegorical interpretations, <u>the material peculiar to Luke has none.</u>

11. In analyzing the style of the material peculiar to Luke, it would be proper and perhaps more accurate to compare its style to that of the "we" passages in Acts, as far as that is possible.

12. Finally, it may be possible to apply Perry's five criteria to the individual pericopae of the material peculiar to Luke in order to determine tentative source patterns or continuity.

Because of Luke's fidelity to his sources one would expect him to be more free in expressing himself whenever he records his personal testimony. This is obviously the case in the Lucan prologue (even though patterned after the prefaces of classical historians like Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius) and the "we" passages (Acts 16:10-17;20:5-21:18; 27:1-28:16). These stand in marked contrast to other sections which abound in Hebraic idiom. Charles Torrey, James Montgomery and Matthew Black are probably correct in assuming that these passages may indicate a primitive Aramaic tradition, but this evidence can hardly be used to reconstruct Aramaic Gospels of which our present Gospels are a translation.[1] The writer believes it is at least safe to accept F. F. Bruce's generalization:

_____

[1] C. C. Torrey, _The Four Gospels_ (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933, 1947), reconstructs a written Aramaic original for the Greek Gospels; cf. James A. Montgomery, "Torrey's Aramaic Gospels," _Journal of Biblical Literature_, LIII (1934), for a detailed review and defense of Torrey's position. Perhaps the most recent and comprehensive study in this field is the work of Matthew Black, _An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts_ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), a comparison of the Gospels to the Christian Palestinian Syriac, the later but more popular Galilean and Jerusalem Targums and the alleged Aramaisms in NT variant readings, especially the Codex Bezae.

CHAPTER IV

THE LITERARY STYLE AND SETTING OF

THE MATERIAL PECULIAR TO ST. LUKE

Luke's Literary Style

Because of Luke's fidelity to his sources one would expect
him to be more free in expressing himself whenever he records
his personal testimony. This is obviously the case in the
Lucan prologue (even though patterned after the prefaces of
classical historians like Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius)
and the "we" passages (Acts 16:10-17;20:5-21:18; 27:1-28:16).
These stand in marked contrast to other sections which abound
in Hebraic idiom. Charles Torrey, James Montgomery and
Matthew Black are probably correct in assuming that these
passages may indicate a primitive Aramaic tradition, but this
evidence can hardly be used to reconstruct Aramaic Gospels of
which our present Gospels are a translation.[1] The writer
believes it is at least safe to accept F. F. Bruce's generali-
zation:

---

[1]C. C. Torrey, The Four Gospels (New York: Harper and
Brothers, 1933, 1947), reconstructs a written Aramaic original
for the Greek Gospels; cf. James A. Montgomery, "Torrey's
Aramaic Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIII (1934),
for a detailed review and defense of Torrey's position. Per-
haps the most recent and comprehensive study in this field is
the work of Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels
and Acts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), a comparison of the
Gospels to the Christian Palestinian Syriac, the later but
more popular Galilean and Jerusalem Targums and the alleged
Aramaisms in NT variant readings, especially the Codex Bezae.

We are probably right in concluding that where Luke's
Greek is idiomatic he is composing freely, and that
where his Greek is Semitizing, he is either imitating
the style of the LXX or following one of his sources
with considerable fidelity.[2]

For this reason the analysis of Luke's literary style will be

based primarily on the "we" passages in Acts.[3]

Dr. Arndt makes a comparison of the more characteristic

Hebraic and Greek idioms in the Third Gospel which is noted

here with some references added.[4] The Hebraic expressions

include:

1. $\overset{\prime}{E}\gamma\acute{e}\nu\epsilon\tau o$ with $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ and the finite verb, or with
   the infinitive.

2. $\pi\epsilon\acute{o}\acute{o}\omega\pi o\nu$ with prepositions.

---

[2]F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 1952), p. 26.

[3]For a critical evaluation of the "we" passages in Acts,
cf. C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles
(New York: Harper, c.1957), pp. 5-7; Williams believes that
the author of the Third Gospel and of the "we" passages in
Acts is one and the same: "There are twenty-one words and
phrases in the New Testament found only in the we-sections and
in the rest of Acts; and there are sixteen words and phrases
peculiar to the we-sections and to the Third Gospel, ten of
which occur also in the remainder of Acts, some several times;
also, not counting words and phrases characteristic of Luke,
there are words and phrases, twenty-eight in all, 'found in
the we-sections and also used predominantly, though not
exclusively, in the rest of Acts or Luke or either of them'
(Sir John Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 1899, 152f.)."

[4]William Arndt, The Gospel According to St. Luke (St.
Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), pp. 25f. Cf. Bruce M.
Metzger, "The Language of the New Testament," in General
Articles on the New Testament, The Interpreter's Bible (New
York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1951), VII, 48; for a detailed
listing of Lucan characteristics cf. Kendrick Grobel, "Idio-
syncracies of the Synoptists in Their Pericope Introductions,"
Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940), 406.

3. Periphrastic constructions (the participle with forms of $εἶναι$) e.g., Luke 1:7,10,22; 2:26,33,51; 4:16,17,20,31,38,44; 5:16,17,29; 6:12; 8:40; 9:32, 45,53; 11:14; 13:10,11; 14:1; 15:1; 18:34; 19:47.

4. The participles of $ἔχομαι$ or $προσέρχομαι$ connected with the main verb e.g., $προσελθόντες εἶπατε$, Luke 13:32.

5. $Εἷς$ in place of the indefinite $τὶς$, Luke 8:22.

6. The noun $υἱὸς$ with the genitive, Luke 10:6.

7. The participle of $προστίθημι$ to express the idea of "again," Luke 19:11.

8. The conjunctive $Καὶ αὐτὸς$, "and he."

The third Gospel includes the following expressions in the pure Greek idiom:

1. In keeping with Greek sentence structure, the main verb is frequently placed at the end of the sentence.

2. Sentences linked together with $δέ$ instead of $Καὶ$.

3. Subordination of finite verbs (hypotatic instead of paratatic arrangement.

4. The use of the optative, e.g., Luke 1:29,62; 3:15; 6:11; 8:9; 9:46; 15:26; 18:36; Acts 5:24; 10:17; 17:11; 21:33; 25:20.

5. Attraction of the relative pronoun, e.g. Luke 1:4; 2:20; 3:19; 5:9; 9:36,43; 12:46; 15:16; 23:41; 24:25; Acts 1:1; Acts 1:22; 3:21,25; 10:39; 22:10; 23:9.

6. Indirect questions are prefaced with the article.

Plummer adds the use of $τε$ to this list (Luke 2:16; 12:45; 15:2; 21:11; 22:66; 23:12).[5]

If one makes a superficial study of these idioms in Luke-Acts, one comes to the general conclusion that although the

---

[5]A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1922), p. 11.

Hebrew and Greek idioms are interspersed throughout, there is
a larger proportion of Hebraic expressions in the narratives
with a Palestinian background, and the stories with Gentile
background have a proportionately larger number of pure Greek
idioms. Geldenhuys makes this observation:

> In his descriptions of stories with a Jewish back-
> ground Luke is Semitising throughout, but in stories
> with a Greek background (as repeatedly occur in Acts)
> he writes in a purely Greek style.[6]

So also Plummer, but in a little more objective vein:

> In the Acts the change from the more Hebrew portion
> to the more Greek portion takes place gradually,
> just as in the narrative there is a change from a
> Hebrew period (l.-v.), through a transitional period
> (vi.-xii.), to a Gentile period (xiii.-xxviii.).[7]

The question is whether this change in idiom is intentionally
stylistic, as Geldenhuys suggests, or another indication that
Luke is faithfully transcribing his sources. Arndt probably
has the more correct answer, that Luke's peculiar style is due
to both his knowledge of the LXX and his fidelity to the
sources.[8] It is not too likely that Luke intentionally used
the Hebraic idiom merely as a literary style to reflect the
Jewish milieu; if this were the case, one would expect him to
be more consistent. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind

---

[6]N. Geldenhuys, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), p. 37. Geldenhuys is quite convinced
that Luke intentionally wrote in the Hebraic idiom, a style
copied from the LXX and the Aramaic oral traditions and trans-
lations; this latter admission is close to saying that Luke
possibly transcribed Aramaic sources.

[7]Plummer, op. cit., p. xlix.

[8]Arndt, op. cit., pp. 25f.

that Luke was writing for the Greek-reading people in the
Gentile world. One could just as well argue that Luke would
have liked to be consistent in his use of pure Greek idiom,
the lingua franca, to express the truth that Jesus is the
"universal Savior of humanity," but that he was prevented from
carrying out his plan because of his fidelity to the tradition
of the eyewitnesses.

Many studies have been made by form critics in an attempt
to prove that the peculiarities of an author's style are more
pronounced in the framework (connecting links) than in the
pericopae themselves. A good example of such an attempt is
Kendrick Grobel's summary:[9]

NUMBER OF VERSES INVOLVED			OCCURRENCE OF PECULIARITIES		
Intro-ductions	Whole Gospel	Ratio	Intro-ductions	Whole Gospel	Ratio
Mt 143	1071	13%	75	302	24% in 13% of Gospel
Mk 97	651	15%	37	96	38% in 15% of Gospel
Lk 186	1149	16%	163	484	33% in 16%

Grobel concludes:

This statistical study strongly corroborates the view
of the Formgeschichtler that the greatest author-
activity of the synoptic writers took place in the
connecting (or separating) verses that introduce the
originally separate pericopes. The pericope-intro-
ductions of each gospel, taken as a class, are twice
as Matthean, Markan, Lucan as the bodies of their respec-
tive pericopes, also taken as a class.[10]

---

[9]Grobel, op. cit., p. 410.

[10]Ibid., p. 410.

However, Grobel's study should be discarded for two simple reasons: first, the division between the connecting material and the traditional material is arbitrary; second, the peculiarities of an author may be explained partially by his fidelity to the sources. Grobel does not even consider this as a possibility.

More convincing than Grobel's theory is that of Prof. Dodd's. He has demonstrated that the framework of the Second Gospel, taken consecutively, offers a continuous narrative which is similar in content to the primitive kerygma recorded by Luke in Acts 10:37-41; 13:23-31.[11] However, such a framework cannot be traced in Luke's Gospel; this is especially true of the "central section." A study of this section indicates that Luke does not seem to alter the chronological and geographical references which are apparently a part of his source, but he also adds his own references whenever he feels that it is necessary for the continuity of the narrative. The possible sources behind Luke 9:51-10:24 listed in Chapter VI demonstrates how Luke in editing his sources tends to link them together by duplicating the geographical or chronological references in the source; this duplication of thought or wording may be connected to the preceding or to the subsequent source. In this way Luke successfully bridges his sources without destroying their original setting; his procedure

---

[11]C. H. Dodd, "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative," Expository Times, XLIII (1931-32), pp. 396-400; supra, p. 36.

would be similar to that of a musician who modulates from one key to another.

Instead of comparing the differences in style between the connecting links and pericopae, it may be more profitable to compare the styles of the theoretical sources. If there is a marked difference in the proportion of the number of Greek or Hebraic idioms, this may give some indication of the origin of the source, or the original setting.

To illustrate the feasibility of this procedure the writer has selected the usage of "Jerusalem" in the Gospels and Acts because of its significance for Luke. The following listing is based on Moulton and Geden:[12]

Greek form:	Mark	Matthew	Luke	Acts	John
Ἰεcουσαλήμ	0	1	26	39	0
Aramaic form:					
Ἰεcοσόλυμα	10	11	4	25	12
Ἰεcοσολυμεῖται	1	0	0	0	1
Total usage:	11	12	30	64	13

Luke's wide usage of "Jerusalem" already indicates that the city must have had special significance for him, especially compared with its relatively infrequent usage in the other Gospels. But what is more impressive is the fact that only Luke uses the Greek form for "Jerusalem" with the exception

---

[12]W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, editors, A Concordance to the Greek Testament (3rd edition; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1950), pp. 473f.

of one reference in Matthew (23:37, which is identical to Luke 13:34, considered part of the theoretical "Q" source.

By way of contrast Luke uses the Aramaic form for "Jerusalem" only four times, while the other evangelists use the form throughout their Gospels. It is understandable that Luke would want to use the Greek form for his Greek readers, but why doesn't he use it throughout his writings? His choice is not likely one of literary style because the Greek form occurs in many narratives with Jewish background. Certainly one must agree that Luke prefers the Greek form (65 out of the 94 times in Luke-Acts; as high as 26 out of 30 times in the Gospel). It is also true that Luke could have changed the Aramaic forms in the theoretical written sources to the Greek and still faithfully transcribe the source. But in many instances, so it seems to the writer, Luke kept the original Aramaic form either unintentionally or by design.

It is also noteworthy that whenever the Aramaic form is used in the Third Gospel, it is located in material peculiar to Luke (2:22; 13:22; 19:28; 23:7). This seems to indicate a primary source, even though the last three are considered "connecting links."

The Aramaic forms for "Jerusalem" in Acts (25 times) may indicate Luke's fidelity to his sources, even its use in the oral tradition. One is struck by the frequency of the Aramaic form in the last half of Acts (the "Gentile period"). The Aramaic form occurs four times in the second "we" passage (Acts 20:16; 21:4,15,17). The first reference is a doubtful

reading; the Codices Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, E (Basel)
and the Tischendorf edition have the Greek form. Acts 21:4
is used in indirect speech: "Through the Spirit they told
Paul not to go on to Jerusalem"; this offers conclusive proof
that the Aramaic form of "Jerusalem" need not indicate a
written source. This passage may indicate that the Christians
at Tyre were predominantly Aramaic-speaking. Acts 21:15,17,
however, is Luke's own testimony; in keeping with his wide
usage of the Greek form, one would also expect it here. The
explanation may be that Luke intentionally uses the Aramaic
form because he is drawing a parallel between Paul's journey
to Jerusalem and Jesus' last journey in his "central section."
The remaining Aramaic "Jerusalem" forms are in the direct
speech of Paul or reflect the Jewish background of his source.

This isolated word study does not prove anything except
that a comprehensive study of this nature may aid the source
critic in differentiating the materials of the composition.

The Setting of the Material Peculiar to St. Luke

The material peculiar to St. Luke accounts for about one-
half the content of the Third Gospel. The special character-
istics are derived chiefly from this material, most of which
are grouped in Luke's "central section," Luke 9:51 - 19:44.[13]

_____

[13]William Manson, The Gospel of Luke (London: Hodder and
Stoughton, 1930), p. xviii, lists all the material peculiar
to Luke.

The "central section" emphasizes prayer (9:18,29; 11:1ff.; 18:1-14); the Gentile mission (9:51-56; 10:1-20); disciple-ship (9:57-62); concern for the outcast (10:30-37; 15:1ff.); especially the teachings of the Lord, which are presented against the background of a journey. At this point the writer is concerned not with the content itself, which is reliable history based on the testimony of those "who were eyewitnesses from the beginning" (Luke 1:2), but with the selection and arrangement of his sources.

Is the "central section" arranged in chronological order, or is Luke primarily concerned with a topical arrangement? At first glance it seems that Luke is interested in neither. Montefiore says,

> It is perhaps the simplest hypothesis to suppose that Luke put in his big insertion the majority of those sayings, parables, and anecdotes for which his sources afforded him no indication of place or time.[14]

Streeter says:

> The "order" which he speaks of in his preface does not mean chronological order so much as literary form, or, as we should say, "construction." The resultant scheme is a threefold division of the Gospel into a Galilean, a Samaritan, and a Judean section. The long non-Marcan section, Lk. ix.51-xviii.14, is somewhat vaguely represented by Luke as a series of wanderings through Samaria in the general direction of Jerusalem. The notion that Luke thinks of it as the journey through Peraea which Mark records is a misconception.[15]

_____

[14]C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), I, xcii.

[15]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (2nd edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 423.

C. C. McCown comments: "It is a major falsification of history to picture Jesus as making a long tour in Samaria."[16] Similar statements on Luke's "inaccuracy" in the "central section" could be made ad infinitum. To what degree or in what sense may such remarks be justified, if at all?

Luke's handling of his sources in the "central section" in no way detracts from his accuracy as a historian. Recent archaeological discoveries beyond any doubt support the historicity especially of the book of Acts, so one may expect a similar reliability in the handling of the material in the Third Gospel if both books were written by Luke.[17] In fact, Luke more than any other evangelist gives us the historical setting for the Gospel; Arndt writes:

> If we try to analyze somewhat more the distinctive traits of Luke's presentation, one thing that strikes us at once is his interest in dates and other historical features. He is the only one of the Evangelists who fits the life of Christ into the framework of contemporary world events, synchronizing what happened in Palestine with what occurred elsewhere in the Roman Empire.[18]

All this leads one to agree wholeheartedly with Plummer that "the accuracy of Luke is such that we ought to require very

---

[16]C. C. McCown, "Gospel Geography: Fiction, Fact and Truth," Journal of Biblical Literature, LX (1941), p. 17.

[17]Cf. J. A. Thompson, "Luke the Historian," Archaeology and the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), pp. 85-112.

[18]Arndt, op. cit., p. 27.

strong evidence before rejecting any statement of his as an unquestionable blunder."[19]

However, it still becomes quite evident, especially in the "central section," that although Luke at times keeps the original setting of his sources, he seems to alter the historical and topographical context. Perry and others feel that the original setting for the following was most likely in Jerusalem: Luke 10:30; 10:38-42; 18:10; 19:47; 20:1; 21:37,38; 22:39; 23:5.[20] Some of these settings may be debated, but it is most unlikely that "a lawyer stood up" (10:25) somewhere on the road to Jerusalem. Tatian, Zahn, Klostermann identify this lawyer with the one in Mk. 12:28-31 and Matt. 22:34-40, who is in Jerusalem; Klostermann believes that Luke most likely placed the parable in Samaria because of the reference to the Samaritan.[21] However, note how this reference again underscores Luke's fidelity to his sources: even though Luke places the parable in another context, he does not alter the topographical setting in his source ("stood up" according to Arndt

---

[19]Plummer, op. cit., p. 50.

[20]A. M. Perry, "An Evangelist's Tabellae: Some Sections of Oral Tradition in Luke," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), p. 18.

[21]Erich Klostermann, Die Evangelien, in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919), p. 480: "Dasz Lc die Geschichte, statt sie in der jerusalemischen Zeit zu belassen, hier einreiht, wo Jesus eben vorher in Samarien erschienen ist (9:52), koennte durch die Figur des Samariters in der nur bei Lc ueberlieferten ad vocem πλησίον angeschlossenen Parabel veranlaszt sein; obschon gerade auch diese selbst mit der Ortsangabe v. 30 eher nach Jerusalem zu weisen scheint."

seems to imply rising "for a question or participation in an argument,"[22] a situation more likely to occur in a synagogue than on the road).

The following references are further indication that Luke preserves much of the original setting of his sources even though he arranges this material in a different context. It is quite likely that much of the material in the Samaritan section had its original setting in Galilee. One would assume that the "Chorazin and Bethsaida" pericope (10:13-15) was originally spoken in their neighborhood, as our Lord does in Matt. 11:21. The milieu of much of the teaching source material suggests Galilee, or possibly Jerusalem, but Samaria is not likely. The reference to Pilate's slaughtering the Galileans (13:1), the threat of Herod Antipas (13:32,33), the crowds that follow Jesus (11:14,29; 12:1,13,54; 14:25), the presence of lawyers, scribes and Pharisees all suggest possibly a Galilean setting, especially if one considers the fact that Luke omits the "northern ministry" recorded in the Marcan narrative.[23]

---

[22]Arndt, op. cit., p. 288.

[23]Lohmeyer and Lightfoot believe that Luke does not want to emphasize our Lord's teachings in Galilee because Jerusalem is the place of revelation and marks the beginning of the primitive Church (1:8), while Mark seems to stress the Galilean origin of the Urgemeinde; cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, Galilee und Jerusalem (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1936), pp. 24, 36f., who favors Mark as the more authentic tradition that the founding Church (Urgemeinde) was located in Galilee. Cf. R. H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine (New York: Harper's, 1938); Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954), p. 113. Also cf. infra, p. 64.

The geographical references in the "central section" have always been a crux interpretum. Although there are many references about a continuous journey to Jerusalem, Jesus and His disciples do not seem to be making any progress; Luke 17:11 ("On the way to Jerusalem he was passing along between Samaria and Galilee") is probably the same locality mentioned in Luke 9:51.

Josephus (Vita 52) mentions that it takes only three days to travel from Galilee to Jerusalem. Dalman gives ample evidence that there must have been at least three main routes (the "western," "middle" and "eastern") from Galilee to Jerusalem. He feels that Luke must have had the "middle" road in mind; this route was not only the shortest but also the safest because "it went all the time through inhabited localities."[24] "Passing through" (Luke 17:11) may mean "to pass across" if this corresponds with the Aramaic 'abar; however, Dalman prefers the translation "in the midst of," which would then refer to the "middle" road.[25] However, the problem still remains that in some circuitous fashion Jesus had to cross over to the "eastern" route beyond the Jordan and then to Jericho. The original setting of the last journey must have included this "eastern" route.

---

[24]Gustaf Dalman, Sacred Sites and Ways, translated from the German by Paul Levertoff (New York: Macmillan Co., 1935), p. 210.

[25]Ibid., p. 211: "The Palestinian Syriac translation most probably expresses the right meaning of the Evangelist by rendering: 'bemis' at shamerayin ugelila'--'in the midst of

Most commentators believe that Luke is not interested in the chronological or geographical order of Jesus' last journey. Major believes that this section simply reflects Luke's interest in travel and is therefore used as a literary device.[26] Gilmour offers a similar explanation: "By this literary device the Third Evangelist found a place for a wealth of teaching tradition that was probably undated and without context in his source."[27] After noting that Luke is historically-minded and interested in geographical terms, McCown reaches the conclusion that Luke's carelessness and inconsistency must be due to his literary interest:

> The conclusion is inescapable 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 later time. . . . His geographical settings were intended to give life and color to the pictures he was drawing. They are a literary artifice like the pastoral scenes of Hellenistic and Roman poets.[28]

Bultmann considers the following geographical references as editorial links: Luke 9:57; 10:38; 13:22; 14:25; 17:11; 18:35;

Samaria and Galilee.'" Cf. Vincent Taylor, "The Life and Ministry of Jesus," in General Articles on the New Testament, Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1951), VII, 134, for the probable historical setting.

[26]H. D. Major, T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1946), p. 252.

[27]S. MacLean Gilmour, Introduction and Exegesis to the Gospel according to St. Luke, in The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1952), VIII, 180f.

[28]McCown, op. cit., p. 56.

19:1,11; he believes that these are more or less patterned
after Mark 9:30; 10:17,32,46.[29]

Others attempt to explain the circuitous journey by
harmonizing it with the evidence in the Fourth Gospel. Pere
Lagrange, by using the "parallels" in John 7:1,2 and 10:22
divides the "central section" into two visits, which took
about two months, a theory Schleiermacher suggested a century
ago.[30] There are still a number who would like to divide the
"central section" into three journeys so that Luke 9:51, 13:22
and 17:11 would correspond to John 7:1,2; 10:22 or 11:17 and
12:1.[31]

This "three-journey" theory is based on the supposition
that there may be a common tradition behind the third and
fourth Gospels. Even taking into account that the Fourth
Gospel most likely reflects a knowledge of Luke, it is quite
possible that Luke received much of the material peculiar to
him from John, the son of Zebedee, long before the Fourth Gos-
pel was written. Hauck points out at least a dozen similari-
ties between the material peculiar to Luke and John.[32] Nicklin

---

[29]R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition
(Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957), p. 360.

[30]C. C. McCown, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section,"
Journal of Biblical Literature, LVII (1938), 61.

[31]Cf. Vincent Taylor, op. cit., pp. 133f; Maurice Goguel,
The Life of Jesus (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p. 250; Thomas
Nicklin, Gospel Gleanings (London: Longmans, Green, 1950),
p. 119.

[32]Friedrich Hauck, Das Evangelium des Lukas, in Theo-
logischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (Leipzig: Deichert,

believes that this similarity may be expanded to include even the arrangement of some of the material; but his order is superficial (cf. Luke 12:32 and John 10:2-16; Luke 16:31 and John 11; Luke 11:13; 12:12 and John 14:16,26).[33]

The "three-journey" theory must still be considered a rather arbitrary arrangement. Luke does not refer to a Perean ministry, and John has no account of the progress of Jesus' last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. Several scholars consider "Bethabara beyond Jordan" and "Ephraim in the country of the wilderness" extremely doubtful in location and historicity.[34]

A little more refined but still considered a literary device is the division of the Gospel into three main sections: Galilee (3:1-9:50), Samaria (9:51-19:27) and Jerusalem (19:28-24:53).[35] However, this still does not adequately explain the wealth of material peculiar to Luke in this "Samaritan" section,

---

1934), III, 7, notes the following similarities between Luke and John: Lk 9:22 and Jn 12:27; Lk 9:37 and Jn 1:21; Lk 9:51 and Jn 7:1; Lk 9:52ff.; 17:11 and Jn 4:4; Lk 10:38 and Jn 12:2f.; Lk 16:30 and Jn 11:11ff; Lk 19:38 and Jn 12:13; Lk 22:3 and Jn 13:2,27; Lk 24:6 and Jn 20:17.

[33]Nicklin, op. cit., p. 102; he also associates Luke 10:30 with John 8:48, "You are a Samaritan and have a demon."

[34]C. C. McCown, "The Geography of Jesus' Last Journey to Jerusalem," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), 108; he also refers the reader to W. F. Albright, Annual of the American School of Oriental Research, IV (1922-23).

[35]Streeter, op. cit., p. 14; C. C. McCown, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," op. cit., p. 63.

and it fails to account for the stress Luke places on the journey to Jerusalem.

All attempts to explain Luke's "central section" as a literary device or to arbitrarily divide the material into several journeys may help explain <u>how</u> Luke arranged his source material, but they fail to interpret the <u>why</u>, the theological reasons for Luke's selection and arrangement.

Several interpreters have undertaken a theological consideration of Luke's "central section," and their findings will be summarized and evaluated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

This chapter illustrates the complexity of the content of the "central section." Many theological interpretations have been presented to explain why Luke included so many of the logia of our Lord within the framework of His last journey to Jerusalem. After listing the more significant of these interpretations, the writer will attempt a brief evaluation and then offer his own interpretation.

Among the more noteworthy of the theological interpretations one may include the following:

1. The "double witness" substantiates the narrative (Morgenthaler).

2. Jerusalem is the place of revelation (Lightfoot; Lohmeyer; <u>per contra</u>, Conzelmann; Elliott-Binns; Marsh).

3. Luke wishes to contrast the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem (Bousset, Mann; Nicklin).

4. Jerusalem has cultic significance (Jeremias; Lohmeyer).

5. The "central section" is a New Testament "exodus," parallel to the wilderness wanderings of Israel (Manek; Piper; Wingren).

6. The "central section" is a Christian Deuteronomy (C. F. Evans; A. M. Farrer).

7. The purpose of Jesus' journey was to fulfill His Messianic claim (Dodd; Jeremias; Lohmeyer).

8. The "central section" is a period of preparation for Jesus' suffering and death (Conzelmann; Stanley; Taylor).

CHAPTER V

VARIOUS THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS

FOR THE "CENTRAL SECTION"

This chapter illustrates the complexity of the content of the "central section." Many theological interpretations have been presented to explain why Luke included so many of the _logia_ of our Lord within the framework of His last journey to Jerusalem. After listing the more significant of these explanations, the writer will attempt a brief evaluation and then offer his own interpretation.

Among the more noteworthy of the theological interpretations one may include the following:

1. The "double witness" substantiates the narrative (Morgenthaler).

2. Jerusalem is the place of revelation (Lightfoot; Lohmeyer; _per_ contra, Conzelmann; Elliott-Binns; Marxsen).

3. Luke wishes to contrast the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem (Bousset, Manek; Nicklin).

4. Jerusalem has cultic significance (Jeremias; Lohmeyer).

5. The "central section" is a New Testament "exodus," parallel to the wilderness wanderings of Israel (Manek; Piper; Wingren).

6. The "central section" is a Christian Deuteronomy (C. F. Evans; A. M. Farrer).

7. The purpose of Jesus' journey was to fulfill His Messianic claim (Dodd; Jeremias; Lohmeyer).

8. The "central section" is a period of preparation for Jesus' suffering and death (Conzelmann; Stanley; Taylor).

This listing would seem to indicate at a glance that Luke probably had several theological reasons for including various sources in his "central section." All of the above interpreters would readily admit this, but they usually prefer to stress one interpretation more than the other.

Morgenthaler has noted that Luke's fondness for double words, sentences and phrases is not merely a touch of literary refinement but also in larger contexts a double "witness" to authenticate his sources.[1] He suggests that Luke's preference for doublets may be the reason for the omission of "Galilee" in Acts 1:8.[2] According to Morgenthaler's theory Luke is concerned with the witness to the events, even though he is not interested in being "exact" in regard to geography and chronology, especially in the "central section." The double witness substantiates the narrative; therefore he considers the commissioning of the seventy a doublet (10:1). Luke offers two listings of the Apostles (Luke 6; Acts 1); John the Baptist sent two disciples to Jesus (Luke 7:18; both Peter and John are sent to prepare the Passover (Luke 22:7); two men appear at the open grave of our Lord (Luke 24:4) and immediately after His ascension (Acts 1:10). Luke 17:11 is considered a doublet of Luke 9:51,52.

There can be no doubt that these doublets are part of Luke's literary style. His frequent pairing of names may be

---

[1]Robert Morgenthaler, Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis (Zuerich: Zwingli, 1949), II, 9, 11, 25.

[2]Ibid., p. 35.

due to the underlying need for two witnesses (Peter and John; Paul and Barnabas; Paul and Silas), but Philip works only in Samaria (Acts 8) and Paul is alone in Athens (Acts 17). It is assumed that "two" may be the minimum number for Christ's presence, but this logion is peculiar to Matthew (18:20), nor does its context imply the withholding of Christ's presence from an individual Christian if he is apart from the group.

Lohmeyer's theory is that Luke may have shifted the northern Galilean ministry to the Samaritan section for the same reason that he omitted the Galilean resurrection appearances; Luke wanted to trace the beginnings of the primitive Church back to Jerusalem rather than to Galilee.[3] Lohmeyer believes that the original Church (Urgemeinde) was located in Galilee. On the other hand, Marxsen considers Jerusalem the location of the first Church, and Galilee is the location of the Parousia.[4] Lohmeyer's position is based on an argument from silence; it seems to this writer that a Galilean Urgemeinde probably would have been mentioned in Acts or the Pauline epistles. The omission of "Galilee" in Acts 1:8 may imply

---

[3]Ernst Lohmeyer, Galilaea und Jerusalem (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1936), p. 24: "Fuer Lk ist Jerusalem nur der geschichtlich gegebene, weniger der theologisch geforderte Ort der Erscheinungen Jesu--er erscheint auch bei und in Emmaus--, fuer Lk ist der Ort ueberhaupt nebensaechlich. Aber Jerusalem wird wiederum der notwendige Mittelpunkt fuer die Aufgabe der Verkuendung wie fuer die Gabe des Geistes (Acts 1:4)."

[4]Willi Marxsen, Der Evangelist Markus (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 59, 67.

that this province was already Christian, as Michaelis also suggests,[5] but this is very unlikely. Luke uses "Judea" for the southern province (Luke 1:65; 2:4), the Roman province of Judea and Samaria (Luke 3:1; 5:17), or all of Palestine (Luke 1:5; 4:44; 6:17; 7:17). Luke's concept of "Judea" in Acts 1:8 may include Galilee as part of the Jewish nation in contrast to the Gentile Samaria.[6] Elliott-Binns correctly points out that Luke does not consider either Jerusalem or Galilee as an exclusive place for revelation or rejection.[7] The frequent references to Jerusalem in the "central section" may also have symbolical or cultic significance, as will be indicated in the following paragraphs.

Not too different from this is the symbolical interpretation which contrasts the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem. Manek writes: "Luke uses the topographical vocabulary for his theological confession. Therefore Luke's Jesus ascends to Heaven in the close proximity of Jerusalem."[8] In a similar vein Nicklin compares earthly Jerusalem to the second Egypt.[9]

---

[5]Wilhelm Michaelis, Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen (Basel: Werlag von Heinrich Majer, 1944), p. 42.

[6]Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954), p. 49.

[7]L. Elliott-Binns, Galilean Christianity (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956), p. 36.

[8]Jindrich Manek, "The New Exodus of the Books of Luke," Novum Testamentum, (1957), II, 14: For Luke Jerusalem "is in the first place a theological concept designating a realm of lack of faith. For Luke Jerusalem is representative of the non-faith of Israel."

[9]Thomas Nicklin, Gospel Gleanings (London: Longmans, Green, 1950), p. 134.

Bousset believes that this Jewish hope for a heavenly
Jerusalem was not dominant until after 70 A.D.[10] However,
St. Paul refers to the "Jerusalem above" in Gal. 4:25,26,
which may have been written shortly before the Apostolic Council
in 49 A.D. (cf. also Hebr. 12:22).[11] This interpretation has
serious limitations; perhaps the greatest is the fact that
Luke never explicitly describes Jerusalem in this symbolical
sense.

Lohmeyer lists several possible motivations for Jesus'
journey to Jerusalem, but he thinks it is especially signifi-
cant that Jesus cleanses the Temple soon after arriving in
the city.[12] This conflict with the priests is brought out in
the "central section" (the priest and the Levite in Luke
10:30ff). The crowds accompanying Jesus suggest a group of
pilgrims on their way to the Passover. The Samaritan mission
in this setting of the journey to Jerusalem may be parallel to

[10]Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judenthums im
Spaethellenistischen Zeitalter, in HZNT (Leipzig: A. Deichert,
1934), XXIII, 239.

[11]A. H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New
Testament (2nd edition revised by C. S. C. Williams; Oxford:
Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 147.

[12]Ernst Lohmeyer, Kultus und Evangelium (Goettingen:
Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1936), p. 107: "Entscheidend aber
ist auch hier Jesu Kampf und Ueberwindung des jerusalemischen
Kultus, vielleicht durch den ebenso prophetischen wie apo-
kalyptischen Gedanken bedingt, dasz an dem heiligen Tempel
sich das eschatologische Geschichte der Voelker und Israels
vollziehe."

the Old Testament view of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the Mountain of God.[13]

There seems to be little doubt that Luke considered Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection as an "exodus" (Luke 9:31). It is certain that the early Christians considered themselves the new "Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16). The Christians would certainly consider this great Old Testament redemptive act as a type of the greater exodus of Jesus, especially since Jeremiah spoke of the return from captivity (out of Babylon) as the "new exodus" (Jer. 31-33). However, the many references to the exodus in the prophets make it very difficult to discover whether the Gospel writers were intentionally following the exodus pattern as a framework for their narrative. They may have used the "exodus" terminology because it was so much a part of the life of the people. Otto Piper has traced this exodus motif throughout the Gospels. He feels that the apparent inconsistencies of the journey to Jerusalem have their parallels to Israel's forty years of wilderness wanderings. Piper summarizes the theological significance of this exodus motif in the New Testament:

> By relating the wilderness to the kerygma the movement started by Jesus characterized itself as a new Exodus. This view in turn would explain why the Primitive Church

___

[13]Cf. J. Jeremias, _Jesus' Promise to the Nations_ (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1958), pp. 57-60, for a listing of the biblical references under the headings the "Epiphany of God"; "The Call of God"; "The Journey of the Gentiles"; "Worship at the World-sanctuary"; "The Messianic Banquet on the World-mountain."

interpreted its own existence as that of God's people
in the desert. It is this plan underlying the primi-
tive Gospel tradition which is responsible for the
fact that of all Jesus' visits to Jerusalem only the
last one is mentioned in Mark, and that it is described
as the entry of a conqueror. The goal of migration had
eventually been reached.[14]

Although the exodus motif plays a significant role in the New

Testament, it is not likely that Luke was using Israel's

wilderness wanderings as a type for his "central section." A

closer parallel to the forty years of wilderness wandering

might be found in the forty days of resurrection appearances

just before the ascension (Luke 9:51?), which Jindrich Manek

also notes.[15]

A. M. Farrer and C. F. Evans believe that Luke's "central

section" is a Christian Deuteronomy. Evans even presents a

detailed comparison between Luke 10:1-18:14 and Deut. 1-26.[16]

It is generally assumed that Matthew patterned his five major

discourses after the Pentateuch. Farrer quite ingeniously

proposes the thesis that Luke has a similar Christian Penta-

teuch and therefore must have used the First Gospel as his

---

[14]Otto Piper, "Unchanging Promises," Interpretation, II
(1957), p. 18. Cf. also Gustaf Wingren, "'Weg,' 'Wanderung'
und verwandte Begriffe," Studia Theologica, III (1950),
p. 114.

[15]Jindrich Manek, "The New Exodus of the Books of Luke,"
Novum Testamentum, II (1957), 19: "The declaration about the
presence of the Resurrected Lord for forty days has as proto-
type the forty years' journey of Israel to the Promised Land."

[16]C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel,"
Studies in the Gospels, D. Ninehan, editor (Oxford: B. Blackwell,
1955), pp. 42-50.

model.[17] Luke's "Deuteronomy" (10:25-18:18) begins and ends
with a Shema, the question which both the lawyer and the ruler
put to Jesus, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?"
Morgenthaler would call this another case of "double witness."
Farrer emphasizes the observation that Matthew ends his
"Deuteronomy" with the same question (Matt. 19:16).

Again it should be pointed out that the division of such
a Christian Pentateuch is arbitrary. Not even Farrer and
Evans agree. Farrer makes sure that he begins and ends the
books of the Lucan "Pentateuch" at the right place but has
little concern for their content. If Luke were attempting to
draw a parallel between Deuteronomy and his "central section,"
why would he use the geographical framework?

Most interpreters are agreed that Jesus had to go to
Jerusalem to fulfill His Messianic claim. So Dodd writes:

> Whether he went there, primarily, to make a last appeal,
> or, primarily, to offer Himself to death, He was clearly
> resolved that in Jerusalem alone, the Holy City, could
> His Messianic career find its fitting climax. In set-
> ting His face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem, He was
> securing the stage for the predestined Messianic con-
> flict in which the Kingdom of God should be revealed.[18]

Dodd places a great deal of emphasis on the fact that Jesus
wanted to make a final appeal to the people corporately. This
responsibility toward the entire Jewish nation is indicated in
Jesus' lament over Jerusalem (Luke 19:41-44).

---

[17]A. M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," Studies in the
Gospels, D. Nineham, editor (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1955), p. 78.

[18]C. H. Dodd, History and Gospel (New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1938), p. 131.

However, the "central section" does not seem to be a period of Messianic disclosure. At least since the time of Peter's confession and the Transfiguration the disciples were convinced that Jesus <u>was</u> the Messiah. But the disciples misunderstood the claims that the Kingdom of God had on their lives (Luke 9:57-62; 14:26-35; 17:6-10,20,21); even after the resurrection of our Lord they still did not relate their discipleship to the Kingdom (Acts 1:6). They had not learned that the way of discipleship was one of suffering and self-denial, even though the Lord had repeatedly spoken to them about His own suffering (Luke 9:22,44-45; 17:25; 18:32-34).

According to Conzelmann Luke indicates that Jesus had His Messianic self-consciousness from Baptism, but kept it secret until Peter's confession. In the original setting the Transfiguration was God's stamp of approval on Jesus' Messianic claim, but Luke adds the significant revelation that this Messiah would have to suffer and die (Luke 9:31).[19] After the Transfiguration Jesus reveals His forthcoming suffering, which was misunderstood by the disciples.

Conzelmann believes that Luke expresses Jesus' own consciousness of suffering and his attempt to teach it to His disciples by the seemingly endless journey yet with the goal

---

[19]Conzelmann, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 47: "Die ganze Szene [the Transfiguration] erhaelt doppelten Sinn und entsprechend einen zweigliedrigen Aufbau: a) himmlische <u>Leidenskundgabe</u> an Jesus; b) <u>Wesenskundgabe</u> an die Juenger; im <u>Rueckblick</u> wird hier die Bestaetigung des Petrus bekenntnisses gegeben, im Vorblick ist das eine Bestaerkung auf dem nun zu beschreitenden Wege."

of Jerusalem--and death--always before Him.[20] The key to the
unfolding of Luke's "central section" as a revelation of Jesus'
imminent suffering and death is Luke 13:31-33.

Conzelmann's interpretation is perhaps the most penetrat-
ing study of the crux interpretum in Luke's "central section."
Of the various interpretations that the writer has surveyed
Conzelmann's is the most plausible and entirely in keeping
with the analogy of faith.

The writer now assumes that this theory accounts best for
the arrangement of sources in Luke's "central section." The
fact that all the Synoptics have the "Passion predictions"
near the end of Jesus' ministry indicates that this must have
been the original setting. After the resurrection the dis-
ciples who accompanied Jesus on that last journey to Jerusalem
remembered the significance of that occasion. The primitive
Church also considered them the "eyewitnesses" of the kerygma.

The testimony of these "eyewitnesses" was the kerygma.
This is clearly indicated in St. Paul's sermon at Antioch in
Pisidia:

---

[20]Ibid., p. 52: "Jesu Leidensbewusztsein wird als Reise
ausgedrueckt. Er wandert zunaechst gar nicht anderswo als
bisher--aber er wandert anders; er hat vor sich das Ziel, das
nach 13,33 ja nicht auf dem naechsten Weg angegangen wird.
In diesem Worte steckt das sachliche Darstellungsprinzip des
Abschnitts ebenso wie die dreiliedrige Disposition des ganzen
Evangeliums; von ihm aus zeigt sich auch, dasz die drei Teile
zeitlich etwa gleichwertig sein sollen."

> And for many days He appeared with those who went
> up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who now are
> His witnesses to the people (Acts 13:31).[21]

By using the first person plural in the following verse,
St. Paul identifies himself with those who had accompanied
Jesus on the last journey to Jerusalem and had seen Him after
His resurrection.

This tradition that the "witnesses" had accompanied Jesus
to Jerusalem must have been closely connected to the _kerygma_.
Paul's sermon is one of the earliest examples of _kerygma_ in
the primitive Church.[22] It at first seems quite strange that
the "Apostle to the Gentiles" would limit the field of "eye-
witnesses" to the relatively few who had accompanied Jesus to
Jerusalem and had seen him after the resurrection. Undoubtedly
a large number of Jews may have seen Jesus during His ministry
but did not answer the call to be His disciples until after
the resurrection. Their eyewitness to the words and deeds of
Jesus had not been seen, heard and felt as part of their dis-
cipleship; they had missed their opportunity to be "eye-
witnesses from the beginning."

---

[21]The Codex Bezae (V-VI) offers an interesting variant
to Acts 13:31: "He appeared to those who were going up together
with him from Galilee to Jerusalem for many days." The present
tense of the participle with the main verb indicates a lengthy
post-resurrection journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. However,
aside from being a rejected reading because of the isolated
witness of Bezae and its noted Marcionite interpolations, such
a post-resurrection appearance of such prolonged nature would
be unique.

[22]C. H. Dodd, _According to the Scriptures_ (New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 80.

Conzelmann believes that this is due to their rejection
of Jesus' call; Nazareth (Luke 4:21-30) attempted to kill Him:

> Now it becomes clear what the people of Nazareth,
> including his relatives, let slip through their
> fingers: the beginning. Also when they later come
> to him, they can no longer recover what has slipped
> by. They can no longer be "witnesses." This should
> be noted: the original setting of the witnessing
> concept does not have this exclusive limitation
> [Zuspitzung], but reflects the witnesses to the
> resurrection (which Luke himself indicates in his
> sections). And the resurrected one could naturally
> appear also to his relatives. The narrowing of the
> concept to the eyewitnesses of his entire works is
> quite polemical and results from another setting
> in the primitive Church, which course can be indi-
> cated in Acts 13:31 (in a sermon of Paul!).[23]

Assuming that this interpretation is correct, then Luke's
reference to the "eyewitnesses from the beginning" (Luke 1:2)
would most likely include the group of disciples who accompanied
Jesus to Jerusalem.

Luke would also contact such individuals to receive first-
hand information. The oral testimonies of these eyewitnesses
may have been written down at an early date so that the
missionaries would have authentic material on the life of our
Lord.

Luke recognized the testimony of these eyewitnesses as
authentic. By 60 A.D. the primitive Church could still dis-
tinguish the authentic logia of our Lord by following the
standard suggested by Paul (Acts 13:31). However, Luke mentions
that by this time many writers had already undertaken the
compilation of these logia, both the oral and written sayings.

---

[23]Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 20; the quotation is translated
by this writer.

It would become increasingly difficult for the church to distinguish the _logia_ from later embellishments. When the Christian congregations in the Gentile world received their first copy of the Third Gospel, they had further substantiation for many of the _logia_ that they were using in the mission field.

It is quite possible that Luke intentionally arranged much of the _logia_ and placed them into the framework of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem to afford his readers a "double witness" to the authenticity of the _logia_. Luke's first "witness" to verify the _logia_ in the "central section" is the fact that his source material was handed down by those "who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (Luke 1:2). The _second_ "witness" to the authenticity of the _logia_ is our Lord's transmission of His own teachings (especially the revelation of His suffering and death and the Gentile mission) to His disciples _as_ they accompanied Him on His last journey to Jerusalem. Any _logion_ handed down by one of these disciples as part of the _kerygma_ was considered authentic (Acts 13:31).

Thus it is the writer's conclusion that this authentication of the missionary _logia_ may be one of the reasons why Luke has apparently disregarded the original setting of some of the sayings of Jesus and inserted them in the "central section."

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The Lucan prologue (1:1-4) tells us a good deal about
the author's source materials and his method of editing these
materials.

The original "eyewitnesses and servants of the word"
probably represent the wider circle of disciples (Acts 1:22),
possibly including all the disciples who had accompanied
Jesus to Jerusalem (Acts 13:31). Their testimony may have
been handed down to the early Church orally or in written
form but probably both. The Second Gospel might possibly be
one of the "eyewitnesses from the beginning."

Luke used the testimony of the "eyewitnesses" for his
source material and probably referred to some of the writings
of the "many," especially the primary sources. Luke edited
his oral and written sources most likely in this manner: he
shows a tendency to follow one source at a time; in most cases
he arranges the materials in their original order; he gener-
ally avoids conflation. Luke compiled his sources in an
orderly arrangement but with the purpose that they would convey
to the reader the great truth that Jesus is the "universal
Savior of humanity."

For Luke, following a strict chronology was secondary to
arranging his material to meet this purpose. He may not have
used a main source (such as Mark or "Q") in determining his

chronological order. Many interpreters believe that Luke created the geographical framework in the "central section" chiefly as a literary device. Such attempts to explain Luke's "central section" may help to explain _how_ Luke arranged his source material, but they fail to interpret the _why_, the theological reasons for Luke's selection and arrangement.

In recent years several theological interpretations have been presented to explain why Luke included so many of the _logia_ of our Lord within the framework of His last journey to Jerusalem. Morgenthaler has made a substantial contribution with his study of the "double witness" in Luke. The writer has indicated the possibility that Luke intentionally arranged much of the _logia_ and placed them into the "central section" to give his readers a "double witness" to their authenticity.

Conzelmann believes that the key to the unfolding of Luke's "central section" is the revelation of Jesus' imminent suffering and death recorded in the enigmatic saying in Luke 13:31-33 (perhaps the original setting of the Passion predictions). Conzelmann believes that Luke expresses Jesus' own consciousness of suffering and his attempt to teach it to His disciples by the seemingly endless journey. This theory is very plausible and entirely in keeping with the analogy of faith.

William C. Robinson, Jr., has probably made the most recent contribution to the study of the theological context of Luke's travel narrative. He believes that the author of the Third Gospel was primarily interested in _Heilsgeschichte_,

which he apparently conceived as a δδός ("way"):

> the chief function of the account of the trip--as a stage along that way--is in connection with his concept of authenticated witness, on which he saw the life and ministry of the Christian church based.[1]

Other studies have emphasized the "central section" as a period of instruction for discipleship.

It is this writer's conclusion that St. Luke utilized both the form and content of the "central section" to emphasize the purpose of the Third Gospel and authenticate the missionary logia. This may be one of several reasons why Luke has apparently disregarded the original setting of some of the sayings of Jesus and included them in the "central section." Acts 13:31 seems to indicate that the "witnesses from the beginning" (Luke 1:2) may refer to those who had accompanied Jesus to Jerusalem and had seen Him after His resurrection. Their testimony was the early kerygma in the Church. Some of these "eyewitnesses" would logically write down some of the logia for missionary training within the Church. Soon these logia would have to be differentiated from secondary testimony. Under the Spirit's guidance Luke undertook that task and possibly gave much of the missionary material a "double witness" by including it in his "central section."

Following the principles for editing which Luke may have used and noting some of the more characteristic features of Luke's style, the writer also concludes that it may be possible

---

[1]Donald T. Rowlingson, "The Jerusalem Conference and Jesus' Nazareth Visit," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXI (1952), p. 20.

to differentiate some of Luke's sources. This procedure is
hypothetical, of course, and the writer offers the following
material from Luke 9:51 - 10:24 merely as an illustration.
The procedure is not substantiated here.

Luke 9:51 Luke's editorial introduction

Luke 9:52-55 Oral tradition from John the son of Zebedee?

9:56 Luke's editorial connecting link

9:57-62 "Q" source ?

10:1 Luke's editorial link

10:2-12 Mission source

10:13-15 Oral tradition ? John or Peter?

10:16 Oral tradition ?

10:17-20 Mission source

The principles set forth in the thesis would aid one in
analyzing the Lucan sources, but any conclusions must remain
theoretical as long as there are no written sources available.

This thesis has presented the "human side" of Gospel
composition. But no matter how the writers may have composed
their material the Spirit of God directed and inspired them
so that their words are in every sense God's Word.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Reference Works

Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English
Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Christian Litera-
ture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New
Testament. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden, editors. A Concordance to
the Greek Testament. 3rd edition. Edinburgh: T. and T.
Clark, 1950.

Nestle, D. Eberhard, editor. Novum Testamentum Graece. 24th
edition. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1960.

B. Commentaries

Arndt, William. The Gospel According to St. Luke. St. Louis:
Concordia Publishing House, 1956.

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. 2nd edition. Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952.

Geldenhuys, Norval. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951.

Gilmour, S. MacLean. Introduction and Exegesis to the Gospel
according to St. Luke. Vol. VIII of The Interpreter's
Bible. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1952.
Pp. 3-23; 168-342.

Hauck, Friedrich. Das Evangelium des Lukas. Vol. III of
Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Leipzig:
Deichert, 1934. Pp. 2-12; 124-238.

Klostermann, Erich. Die Evangelien in Handbuch zum Neuen
Testament. Vol. II. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919.
Pp. 468-556.

Leaney, A. R. C. Luke. New York: Harper, c.1958.

Luce, H. K., editor. The Gospel according to St. Luke.
    Vol. III of Cambridge Greek Testament. Cambridge:
    University Press, 1949. Pp. 186-307.

Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke. London: Hodder and
    Stoughton, 1930.

Marxsen, Willi. Der Evangelist Markus. Goettingen: Vanden-
    hoeck and Ruprecht, 1956.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
    Gospel according to St. Luke. Edinburgh: T. and T.
    Clark, 1922. Introduction, xi-lxxxv; pp. 246-455.

Strachan, R. H., and Others. General Articles on the New
    Testament. Vol. VII of The Interpreter's Bible. New
    York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c.1951. Pp. 3-74; 114-144.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of The Apostles.
    New York: Harper, c.1957.

C. Theologies and Exegetical Studies

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts.
    Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Die Religion des Judenthums im Spaethel-
    lenistischen Zeitalter. Vol. XXIII of HzmNT. Leipzig:
    A. Deichert Publishing Co., 1934. Pp. 213-242.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition.
    Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957.

Bundy, Walter E. Jesus and the First Three Gospels: an Intro-
    duction to the Synoptic Tradition. Cambridge, Mass.:
    Harvard University Press, 1955. Pp. 1-5; 328-412.

Cadman, William Healey. The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusa-
    lem. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Conzelmann, Hans. Die Mitte der Zeit. Tuebingen: J. C. B.
    Mohr, 1954. Pp. 10-79; 113-116.

Dalman, Gustaf Hermann. Sacred Sites and Ways. Translated
    from the German by Paul P. Levertoff. New York: The
    Macmillan Co., 1935. Pp. 195-283.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London:
    Anthion Press, 1956.

Dibelius, Martin. A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and
    Early Christian Literature. London: Ivor Nicholson and
    Watson, 1937.

-----. Gospel Criticism and Christology. London: Ivor
     Nicholson & Watson, 1935.

-----. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated from the revised
     2nd edition of Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums.
     London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934.

Dodd, Charles Harold. About the Gospels. Cambridge: University
     Press, 1950.

-----. According to the Scriptures. New York: Charles
     Scribner's Sons, 1953.

-----. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. 2nd
     edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1944.

-----. History and Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's
     Sons, 1938. Pp. 77-110.

Elliott-Binns, L. E. Galilean Christianity. Chicago: Alec R.
     Allenson, Inc., 1956. Pp. 33-42.

Filson, Floyd V. Opening the New Testament. 2nd edition.
     Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957.

Goguel, Maurice. The Life of Jesus. New York: Macmillan,
     1933.

Grant, Frederick C. The Earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-
     Cokesbury Press, 1943.

Hirsch, Emanuel. Fruehgeschichte des Evangeliums. Tuebingen:
     J. C. B. Mohr, 1941.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Naperville,
     Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1958. Pp. 76-79.

-----. The Parables of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's
     Sons, 1955.

Lightfoot, R. H. Locality and Doctrine. New York: Harper,
     1938.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Galilaea und Jerusalem. Goettingen: Vanden-
     hoeck and Ruprecht, 1936.

Love, Julian. The Gospel and The Gospels. New York: Abingdon-
     Cokesbury Press, c.1953.

Major, H. D. A. The Mission and Message of Jesus. New York:
     E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1946.

Marxsen, Willi. Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktion-
geschichte des Evangeliums. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and
Ruprecht, 1956.

-----. Exegese und Verkuendigung: Zwei Vortraege. Vol. LIX
in Theologische Existenz heute. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser
Verlag, 1957.

McNeile, A. H. An Introduction to the Study of the New
Testament. 2nd edition revised by C. S. C. Williams.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen.
Basel: Verlag von Heinrich Majer, 1944.

Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. London:
Macmillan and Co., 1927.

Morgenthaler, Robert. Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung
als Zeugnis. 2 vols. Zuerich: Zwingli, 1948-49.

-----. Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes. Zurich:
Gotthalf Verlag, 1958.

Nicklin, Thomas. Gospel Gleanings. London: Longmans, Green,
1950.

Nineham, D., editor. Studies in the Gospels. Oxford:
B. Blackwell, 1955.

Parker, Pierson. The Gospel Before Mark. Chicago: University
of Chicago Press, 1953.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Berlin:
Trowitzsch and Sohn, 1919.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels. 2nd edition.
London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930.

Taylor, Vincent. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.
London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1953.

Thompson, J. A. Archaeology and the New Testament. Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. Pp. 85-112.

Torrey, C. C. The Four Gospels. New York: Harper and Brothers,
1933, 1947.

D. Periodicals

Barton, George. "The Question of 'Ur-Marcus' Once More,"
Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), 239-247.

Dodd, C. H. "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative," Exposi-
tory Times, XLIII (1931-32), 396-400.

Grant, E. E. "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism
Overlap," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940),
11-21.

Grobel, Kendrick. "Idiosyncracies of the Synoptists in Their
Pericope Introductions," Journal of Biblical Literature,
LIX (1940), 405-410.

Lohse, E. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," Evange-
lische Theologie, (1954), 256.

-----. "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des
Lukas," Theologische Zeitschrift, X (1954), 1-13.

McCasland, S. Vernon. "The Way," Journal of Biblical Litera-
ture, LXXVII (1958), 222-230.

McCown, C. C. "The Geography of Jesus' Last Journey to
Jerusalem," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932),
107-129.

-----. "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," Journal of
Biblical Literature, LVII (1938), 51-66.

-----. "Gospel Geography: Fiction, Fact and Truth," Journal
of Biblical Literature, LX (1941), 1-25.

Montgomery, James. "Torrey's Aramaic Gospels," Journal of
Biblical Literature, LIII (1934),

Perry, A. M. "Jesus in Jerusalem," Journal of Biblical
Literature, XLIII (1924), 15ff.

-----. "An Evangelist's Tabellae: Some Sections of Oral Tradi-
tion in Luke," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII
(1929), 206-232.

Piper, Otto A. "Unchanging Promises," Interpretation, II
(1957), 3-22.

Robinson, Wm. C.,Jr. "The Theological Context for Interpreting
Luke's Travel Narrative," Journal of Biblical Literature,
LXXIX (1960), 20-31.

Rowlingson, Donald T. "The Jerusalem Conference and Jesus'
Nazareth Visit," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXI
(1952), 69-74.

Russell, H. G. "Which was first, Luke or Acts?" Harvard
Theological Review, XLVIII (1956), 167.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?," Theologische Zeitschrift, VI (1950), 161.

Stanley, David M. "Didache as a Constitutive Element of the Gospel-Form," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVII (1955), 336-348.

Taylor, Vincent. "The Order of Q," Journal of Theological Studies, I (1954), 159-167.

Vincent, John J. "Didactic Kerygma in the Synoptic Gospels," Scottish Journal of Theology, X (1957), 262-273.

Wingren, Gustaf. "'Weg', 'Wanderung' und verwandte Begriffe," Studia Theologica, III (1950), 111-123.

Winter, Paul. "The Proto-Source of Luke," Novum Testamentum, I (1956), 184-199.

Wright, G. Ernest. "The Unity of the Bible," Scottish Journal of Theology, VIII (1955), 337-352.