

**A SOURCE CRITICAL REASSESSMENT OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE:
WAS CANONICAL MARK REALLY LUKE'S SOURCE?**

**A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Wycliffe College
and the Biblical Department of the Toronto School of Theology
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology
awarded by the University of St. Michael's College**

**By
Kari Pekka Tolppanen**

Toronto 2009

© Kari P. Tolppanen



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-53123-5
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-53123-5

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

A Source Critical Reassessment of the Gospel of Luke:
Was Canonical Mark Really Luke's Source?

Ph.D., 2009
Kari Pekka Tolppanen

Biblical Department
University of St. Michael's College

ABSTRACT

The author argues that Luke did not derive his triple tradition material from *canonical* Mark. He bases his thesis on three major observations:

First, Luke clearly emphasizes certain theological themes in his double work, but interestingly these themes are sometimes missing in Luke while present in Markan parallel pericopes. The author discusses the following themes in detail: prayer, the Holy Spirit, power/mighty works, repentance, *ethnos*, salvation, angels, Jesus as the King, and the kingdom of God.

Second, the Lukan and Markan non-Passion sections resemble each other much more closely at both macro and micro levels than the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection sections do. There is no comprehensive theological or grammatical explanation for this change of tone. The author attempts to demonstrate the unlikelihood, by comparing the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section with his non-Passion section, that Luke drew these sections from an originally unified source, and, by detailed analysis of the Passion-Resurrection section, that Luke drew it from canonical Mark.

Third, great variation in verbatim agreement levels between the Lukan and Markan parallel passages run against the human tendency towards consistency in behavior and editorial practice. This fact may suggest that Luke did not derive his triple tradition material from canonical Mark, copy-editing it inconsistently. The author's study of some Greco-Roman and Jewish authors

shows that, in general, they were very consistent copyist-editors, either paraphrasing their source texts almost entirely or copying them almost word for word. In a few ancient works, in which variation in verbatim agreement most resemble Luke, another theory rather than the direct literary dependency one may better explain the relationship between two works.

In the conclusion, the author suggest that Luke derived his triple tradition material not from canonical Mark but from either a single Non-Canonical Markan Source/Tradition (NCMS/T) or two NCMS/Ts, which Luke used consistently. Canonical Mark and a NCMS/T(s) had the same origin but different development histories, developing in partly different directions probably due to the interaction of orality and literacy. Luke's reliance on a NCMS/T(s) rather than on canonical Mark may be the reason for the differences mentioned above.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“Do not try to do it all at once. Take it one bite at a time.” This advice was given by Larry J. Perkins, my professor at the ACTS Seminaries of Trinity Western University, when I told him of my intentions and fears about doing a Ph.D. in Theology. These words of wisdom have carried me along to this day.

In addition to God, who has called me into his kingdom, and Dr. Perkins for his wise advice, I also owe a great debt to the following persons:

First, it has been my great privilege to have Professor John S. Kloppenborg (University of Toronto) as my dissertation supervisor. The better I have come to know him, the more I have admired the breadth of his knowledge and wisdom. He has carefully read every page of my dissertation and helped me to improve my thesis by his constructive criticism.

Second, I am also grateful to the member of my examination committee, Professors Terence L. Donaldson (Wycliffe College), L. Ann Jarvis (Wycliffe College), John S. Kloppenborg (University of Toronto), Scott Lewis (Regis College), and Mark Goodacre (external; Duke University).

Third, I owe a very special word of thanks to Ainsley Sommer, proofreader of my dissertation, who has patiently corrected my English sentences free of charge.

Finally, I express my deepest gratitude to my wife Arja for her sacrificial love and support. Without her constant encouragement I would have never been able to finish this project. Thanks also to our daughter, Susanna, and son, Sakari, my parents Hilkka and Seppo, and my friends Ben, Hannu, Jason, Jouni, and Leo who have always stood my side and encouraged me to continue when I have been tempted to give up. It is to them that this work is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abstract</i>	ii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	iv
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
1 Introduction:	1
The Synoptic Problem.....	1
Suggested Solutions to the Synoptic Problem and Critique of Them.....	3
Proposal.....	10
2 Lukan Thematic Omissions:.....	15
Introduction.....	15
<i>Luke's Path to Becoming a Theologian</i>	15
<i>Luke's Thematic Emphases</i>	17
The Overall Theme of Luke-Acts: The Plan of God.....	17
Various Emphatic Aspects of the Overall Theme.....	19
Inconsistencies in Luke's Use of Thematic Material Present in Mark.....	22
<i>Prayer</i>	23
Introduction.....	23
Analyses of the Pericopes.....	29
Aland §39 (Luke 4:42-43; Mark 1:35-38).....	29
Aland §147 (Mark 6:45-52) and 'the Great Omission'.....	34
Aland §§347-348 (Luke 23:44-48, 49; Mark 15:33-39, 40-41).....	44
Aland §163 (Luke 9:37-43a; Mark 9:14-29).....	49
Aland §275 (Mark 11:20-26).....	52
Aland §290 (Luke 21:20-24; Mark 13:14-20).....	55
<i>The Holy Spirit</i>	61
Introduction.....	61
Analyses of the Pericopes.....	62
Aland §283 (Luke 20:41-44; Mark 12:35-37a).....	62
Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19; Mark 13:9-13).....	63
<i>Power / Mighty Works</i>	66
Introduction.....	66
Analyses of the Pericopes.....	68
Aland §143 (Luke 9:7-9; Mark 6:14-16).....	68
Aland §167 (Luke 9:49-50; Mark 9:38-41).....	70
Aland §281 (Luke 20:27-40; Mark 12:18-27).....	71
<i>Repentance</i>	73
Introduction.....	73
Analyses of the Pericopes.....	74
Aland §§30, 32 (Luke 4:14-15; Mark 1:14-15).....	74
Aland §142 (Luke 9:1-6; Mark 6:6b-13).....	76
<i>Ethnos</i>	81
Introduction.....	81

Analyses of the Pericopes	82
Aland §273 (Luke 19:45-46; Mark 11:15-17)	82
Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19; Mark 13:9-13)	85
<i>Salvation</i>	88
Introduction.....	88
Analyses of the Pericopes	89
Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19; Mark 13:9-13)	89
<i>Angels</i>	90
Introduction.....	90
Analyses of the Pericopes	91
Aland §20 (Luke 4:1-13; Mark 1:12-13)	91
Aland §292 (Luke 21:25-28; Mark 13:24-27)	94
Aland §293 (Luke 21:29-33; Mark 13:28-32)	96
<i>Jesus as the King</i>	98
Introduction.....	98
Analyses of the Pericopes	99
Aland §339 (Luke 23:17-23; Mark 15:6-14)	99
Aland §342 (Mark 15:16-20a)	103
Aland §345 (Luke 23:35-38; Mark 15:27-32a).....	105
<i>The Kingdom of God</i>	107
Introduction.....	107
Analyses of the Pericopes	109
Aland §32 (Luke 4:14b-15; Mark 1:14b-15)	109
Aland §126 (Mark 4:26-29)	112
Aland §168 (Mark 9:42-50) / §229 (Luke 17:1-3a).....	113
Aland §182 (Luke 10:25-28) / Aland §282 (Mark 12:28-34).....	117
Conclusion	121
3 Dissimilarities between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives:.....	123
Introduction	123
Previous Approaches to the Problem.....	130
<i>Luke Used a Single Written Source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative</i>	131
The Source Was Mark.....	131
The Source Was Non-Markan.....	132
<i>Luke Combined Sources in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative</i>	134
The Combination of Mark and Proto-Luke	134
The Combination of Mark and a Non-Markan Source(s) or Tradition(s)	142
Exegetical Analyses.....	144
Aland §305 (Luke 22:1-2; Mark 14:1-2)	144
Aland §306 (Luke 7:36-50; Mark 14:3-9).....	147
Aland §307 (Luke 22:3-6; Mark 14:10-11).....	152
Aland §308 (Luke 22:7-14; Mark 14:12-17).....	156
Aland §311 (Luke 22:15-20; Mark 14:22-25).....	159
Aland §312 (Luke 22:21-23; Mark 14:18-21).....	163
Aland §313 (Luke 22:24-30; Mark 10:41-45).....	167

<i>Aland §315 (Luke 22:31-34; Mark 14:26-31)</i>	171
<i>Aland §316 (Luke 22:35-38)</i>	174
<i>Aland §330 (Luke 22:39-46; Mark 14:32-42)</i>	174
<i>Aland §331 (Luke 22:47-53; Mark 14:43-52)</i>	178
<i>Aland §§332-334 (Luke 22:54-23:1; Mark 14:53-15:1)</i>	182
<i>Aland §§334, 336 (Luke 23:1-5; Mark 15:1-5)</i>	191
<i>Aland §§337-339 (Luke 23:6-23; Mark 15:6-14)</i>	193
<i>Aland §341 (Luke 23:24-25; Mark 15:15)</i>	194
<i>Aland §342 (Mark 15:16-20a)</i>	195
<i>Aland §343 (Luke 23:26-32; Mark 15:20b-21)</i>	195
<i>Aland §344 (Luke 23:33-34; Mark 15:22-26)</i>	197
<i>Aland §345 (Luke 23:35-38; Mark 15:27-32a)</i>	200
<i>Aland §346 (Luke 23:39-43; Mark 15:32b)</i>	201
<i>Aland §§347-348 (Luke 23:44-49; Mark 15:33-41)</i>	202
<i>Aland §350 (Luke 23:50-56; Mark 15:42-47)</i>	202
<i>Aland §352 (Luke 24:1-12; Mark 16:1-8)</i>	205
A Comparison of ‘Overlapping’ Pericopes in the Lukan Travel Narrative	209
Conclusion	214
4 Variation in Verbatim Agreement within the Lukan Triple Tradition Passages:	217
Introduction	217
Analyses of Luke’s Gospel	224
Introduction	224
Variation within the Double Tradition	225
Variation within the Triple Tradition	227
Analyses of Jewish and Greco-Roman Literature	230
Introduction	230
Highly Paraphrastic Editing Method	231
Introduction: From Imitation to Creativity	231
Josephus	232
Philo	236
Valerius Maximus	238
Tacitus	243
Livy	246
Highly Literal Editing Method	250
Introduction	250
Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22	251
2 Kings 18:13-20:19 and Isaiah 36:1-39:8	251
2 Kings 24:18-25:30 and Jeremiah 39:1-10; 40:5-41:3; 52:1-34	254
Combination of Paraphrastic and Literal Editing Methods	259
Introduction	259
Diodorus Siculus	259
1QapGen	266
Pseudo-Philo	276

The Books of Chronicles	282
Conclusion	293
5 Conclusion:	295
<i>Appendix A: Word Agreement Percentages in the Synoptic Parallels</i>	<i>301</i>
<i>Appendix B: Weighted Word Agreement Percentages between Parallel Synoptic Pericopes ...</i>	<i>307</i>
<i>Appendix C: Arguments against and for Auld's Theory</i>	<i>310</i>
Works Cited	314

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations for both primary and secondary sources have been primarily taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*, ed. by Patrick H. Alexander et al., (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). Additional abbreviations have been taken from the *Theologische Realenzyklopädie: Abkürzungsverzeichnis*, ed. by Siegfried M. Schwertner (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1994). The following abbreviations have been coined:

2GH	Two Gospel Hypothesis
2SH	Two Source Hypothesis
3SH	Three Source Hypothesis
AH	Augustinian Hypothesis
CM	Christianity in the Making
COQG	Christian Origins and the Question of God
FCNTECW	Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings
FES	Finnish Exegetical Society
GPe	Gospel Perspectives
JCPS	Jewish and Christian Perspective Series
<i>JPSP</i>	Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
LPTB	Linzer philosophisch-theologische Beiträge
MwQH	Markan Priority without Q Hypothesis
NCMS/T	Non-Canonical Markan Source/Tradition
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (the version used in this study if not indicated otherwise)
OCM	Oxford Classical Monographs
SFF	Studia Fennica Folkloristica
ThI	Theological Inquiries
TLSM	Trends in Linguistic Studies and Monographs
TTCSG	T&T Clark Study Guides
TTS	Theologische Texte und Studien

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Synoptic Problem

The first three Gospels in the NT are called the Synoptics. Similarities and dissimilarities between them have given rise to the question of their interrelationship, which has bothered biblical scholars especially since the second half of the eighteenth century.¹

The most noticeable similarities are their similar content, shared vocabulary in parallel pericopes, and the order of pericopes in the triple tradition. In addition to these three major similarities, the Synoptic Gospels also share some parenthetical, editorial comments,² and unusual literary agreements in OT references (Mark 1:3 par. and 12:30 par.).³

The Synoptic Gospels have two kinds of shared material: 1) The triple tradition material shared by Mark with Matthew and/or Luke. About 80% of the Markan material, which consists of 661 verses, is found in Matthew and about 65% in Luke; 2) The double tradition material shared by Matthew and Luke. It consists of about 220 non-Markan verses. Each Gospel also has unique

1. Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 162; David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*, ABRL (Toronto: Doubleday, 1999); William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, slightly revised ed. of 1964 (New York: Macmillan, 1976); Bo Reicke, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 1–23; Stephen C. Carlson, “Overview of Proposed Solutions” (Cited 2006), <http://www.hypotypoiseis.org/synoptic-problem/2004/09/overview-of-proposed-solutions.html>.

In addition to the comments by Papias and Clement of Alexandria, only a few, including Augustine, H. Grotius (1641; see Carlson 2004), R. Simon (1689; see Dungan 1999: 323) and J. LeClerc (1712; see Farmer 1976: 9), attempted in some measure to explain the relationship.

2. Robert H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 37–42. Matt 24:15//Mark 13:14; Matt 9:6//Mark 2:10//Luke 5:24; Mark 5:8//Luke 8:29; Matt 27:18//Mark 15:10.

3. Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 45–46.

material not found in the two other Gospels.⁴

Parallel pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels also share a similar vocabulary, often verbatim. The level of word agreement, however, is a controversial issue owing to different definitions of the term by scholars.⁵

Another impressive area of similarities between the Synoptics is the order of episodes in the triple tradition. The agreement is most apparent between Mark and Luke, which share the same order throughout their works, with few exceptions.⁶ The common order of episodes between Mark and Matthew is very low in the first half of Matthew, but from Matt 12:22 through to the end of the Gospel, the order is, for the most part, the same. In the double tradition, the common order is less impressive and the subject of great controversy.⁷

Unquestionably, similarities among the Synoptics indicate that the three Synoptic Gospels are in some relationship with each other. The majority of scholars believe that literary dependency rather than common oral tradition theories can explain these similarities.

Dissimilarities between the Synoptics and some other problematic issues, however, have complicated the attempt to define the exact nature of the relationship.

4. Frans Neirynck, "Synoptic Problem," in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990), 588. The total number of verses is 1,068 in Matthew and 1,149 in Luke; see Stein, *The Synoptic Problem*, 48.

5. Anthony M. Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem," *NovT* 10 (1968): 95–147; Terence C. Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*, WUNT II 195 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005), 45–51, 192–204; Charles E. Carlston and Dennis Norlin, "Once More - Statistics and Q," *HTR* 64 (1971): 59–78; Charles E. Carlston and Dennis Norlin, "Statistics and Q - Some Further Observations," *NovT* 41 (1999): 108–23; Sharon L. Mattila, "A Problem Still Clouded: Yet Again - Statistics and 'Q'," *NovT* 36, no. 4 (1994): 313–29; John O'Rourke, "Some Observations on the Synoptic Problem and the Use of Statistical Procedures," *NovT* 16 (1974): 272–77; Eta Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?: Rethinking the Literary Dependence of the First Three Gospels*, trans. Robert W. Yarbrough (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); Theodore Rosché, "The Words of Jesus and the Future of the 'Q' Hypothesis," *JBL* 79 (1960): 210–20; Robert Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse* (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1971).

6. Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 11th ed. (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2000), 341–55.

7. Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 34–39; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, SAC (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 64–80; John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 88–91; Vincent Taylor, "The Original Order of Q," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 246–69; Stein, *The Synoptic Problem*, 104–07.

Three of the most obvious dissimilarities are partially different selections of material ('omissions,' unique material) by the Evangelists, strange differences in the content of some 'parallel' pericopes (see especially Mark 7:1-23 par.; 10:46-52 par.; 12:28-34 par.; 14:3-9 par.), and differences between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives. If the Evangelists knew at least one other synoptic work and used it as a source, why did they omit some pericopes of their source,⁸ add others, and change details within some?

The minor agreements (i.e., Matthew's and Luke's agreements in wording, order, and omissions against Mark),⁹ variation and inconsistencies in verbatim agreement levels between the Lukan non-Passion Narrative and his Passion-Resurrection Narrative on the one hand, and between individual pericopes within these two major sections on the other hand;¹⁰ duplicate expressions such as in Mark 1:32;¹¹ and overlappings - as it seems - of the triple and double traditions in some passages¹² have also been difficult to explain.

Suggested Solutions to the Synoptic Problem and Critique of Them

Scholars have suggested a number of different solutions to the Synoptic Problem. Some are built on a non-documentary (i.e., oral) hypothesis, while the majority are documentary hypotheses. Documentary hypotheses can be divided into two major categories: 1) The relationship between the Synoptics is indirect: the Evangelists derived their material from a noncanonical source(s) (e.g., *Urgospel*, *Ur-Markus*, *Deutero-Markus*, and Fragmentary Hypotheses); and 2) The relationship between the Synoptics is direct: the Evangelists, except for

8. The most problematic of these is Luke's so-called 'Great Omission' (Mark 6:45-8:26).

9. Andreas Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements": Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems*, WUNT 2/62 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994); Frans Neirynck, "The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory," in *Evangelica II: 1982-1991 Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck, BETL 99 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), 3-42; Frans Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: With a Cumulative List*, BETL 37 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974).

10. James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, CM 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*.

11. Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*, SNTSMS 44 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 16-21, 41-51.

12. Harry T. Fleddermann, *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*, BETL 122 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995).

the one who wrote first, derived at least part of their material from a canonical source(s); either only the triple tradition material (e.g., 2SH, Jerusalem School Hypothesis), or both the triple and double tradition material (e.g., Augustinian, Griesbach or 2GH, and MwQH). Some scholars have recently revitalized the view that the Evangelists combined documentary and nondocumentary material to a greater extent than dominant synoptic theories assume.¹³

The history of the Synoptic Problem in the modern era can roughly be divided into four distinguishable but overlapping periods:¹⁴ 1) *The initial quest (ca. the 1680s until 1838)*. Since ‘Augustine’,¹⁵ the dominant theory had been that Matthew wrote first, Mark used Matthew, and Luke used both Gospels. During the initial quest, several new theories were proposed. These suggestions can roughly be divided into five categories: i) The Evangelists used a single, non-canonical proto-gospel (*Urgospel*): R. Simon (1689) and G. E. Lessing (1778); ii) the Evangelists used multiple, noncanonical sources: a) sources undefined: J. LeClerck (1712) and J. B. Koppe (1782); b) a proto-gospel with different revisions: J. G. Eichhorn (1794); c) a proto-gospel and a saying source (and other shorter documents): H. Marsh (1798), F. Schleiermacher (1832), K. Lachmann (1835), and K. Credner (1836); iii) Lukan priority: Luke wrote first, Matthew used Luke, and Mark used both Gospels: A. F. Büchling (1766); iv) Markan priority without Q: G. C. Storr (1786) and C. Wilke (1838); and v) the Evangelists relied on oral tradition: J. G. von Herder (1797).

2) *The dominion of the 2GH (ca. 1835-63)*. In 1764, H. Owen suggested that Matthew wrote first, Luke used Matthew, and Mark conflated the two.¹⁶ The material which is not found in

13. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*; Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*.

14. My major sources in this section have been Stephen C. Carlson, “Chronology of the Synoptic Problem” (2000), <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/chron.htm> and Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 271–328.

15. The words *Augustine* and *Augustinian* have been put into quotation marks, because, as Kloppenborg notes in *Excavating Q*, p. 38 n.31 (following H. de Jonge), it is doubtful that Augustine’s comment in *De consensus evangelistarum* 1.2.4. about the order of the Gospels should be interpreted to mean that he supported a literary dependency view.

16. Matthew C. Williams, “The Owen Hypothesis: An Essay Showing That It Was Henry Owen Who First Formulated the So-Called ‘Griesbach Hypothesis’,” *JHC* 7 (2000): 109–25.

Matthew but is present in Luke was either derived from oral tradition or was composed by Luke. Mark, who wrote last, used the two Gospels written before him as his major sources, alternatively following either Matthew or Luke as his guide, sometimes comparing the texts of his two sources and conflating them,¹⁷ and regarding ‘Jesus as the teacher’ and what is meaningful for his Gentile readers as his leading principles for choosing his material. J. J. Griesbach (1776/83) popularized the theory and since then it has carried the name, ‘Griesbach Hypothesis’ or Two Gospel Hypothesis (2GH). This theory became very popular, especially by the influence of D. F. Strauss and F. C Baur of the Tübingen School, who strongly defended it.

3) *The dominion of the 2SH (since 1863)*. In his work of 1838, C. H. Weisse identified Papias’ Mark with canonical Mark and also argued that, in addition to Mark, Matthew and Luke also used a saying source. The Two Source Theory was born. Later (1856), Weisse rejected his original theory and argued that Papias’ Mark is identical with a proto-gospel called *Ur-Markus*, which all the Evangelists used as their major source. In addition, Matthew and Luke also used Q. This latter, 1856 theory was adopted and popularized by H. J. Holtzmann in 1863, but later (1880), he rejected certain aspects of the theory and argued that Matthew and Luke used canonical Mark and Q as their major sources. In addition, Luke also used Matthew. The scholars of the Oxford School (W. Sanday [1872/91], E. A. A. Abbot [1879/84], F. H. Woods [1886], V. Stanton [1893], J. C. Hawkins [1899], and E. F. Burkitt [1906]) adopted Weisse’s theories, popularized them and strongly defended them against the 2GH. Some of these scholars preferred more Weisse’s 1838 theory, while others his 1856 theory. B. H. Streeter, a member of the Oxford School, constructed his view on Weisse’s 1838 theory in his famous book *The Four Gospels* published in 1924. In it, Streeter rejected the *Ur-Markus* theory¹⁸ and argued again, as Weisse

17. See Figure 17 in Robert Allen Derrenbacker Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, BETL 186 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 166–69.

18. John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, 2nd ed., reprint, 1909 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 152; F. Crawford Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907), 40–60; William Sanday, “Introduction,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), x–xi, had argued against the *Ur-Markus* hypothesis before Streeter. Hawkins’ view was that, “On the whole it seems to me that such an examination of the Marcan

had done in 1838, that Matthew and Luke used canonical Mark and Q as their sources. Streeter, however, went beyond Weisse by arguing that Matthew also used the written source called 'M' from which he derived his unique material, and Luke used a Proto-Luke into which he implanted the Markan material. Streeter's 'M' as a written source and Proto-Luke theories have later been rejected by the majority of scholars but his basic two-source view that canonical Mark and Q were the common sources of Matthew and Luke has been dominating biblical scholarship since the publication of the book.

4) *The new quest (since 1951)*. Not all scholars have been satisfied with the 2SH. Although some scholars protested against the dominant 2SH even before 1951,¹⁹ it was B. C. Butler's book published that year that really opened a new phase in synoptic studies.²⁰ Butler revived the old 'Augustinian' Hypothesis (AH) and argued that some advocates of the 2SH had committed the 'Lachmann Fallacy.' Butler has not won many followers,²¹ but his example has encouraged many other scholars to challenge the 2SH.

A few years after the publication of Butler's book, A. M. Farrer revived Ropes' 1934 theory of the Markan priority without Q.²² According to this view, Mark wrote first, Matthew used Mark, and Luke conflated the two other Gospels. All of the material in Matthew that could not be traced back to Mark was regarded by Farrer as Matthew's own composition, or

peculiarities as has now been attempted supplies results which are largely in favour of the view that the Petrine source used by the two later Synoptics was not an 'Ur-Marcus', but St. Mark's Gospel almost as we have it now. Almost, but not quite" (p. 152).

19. H. G. Jameson (1922; AH), J. F. Springer (1924), J. H. Ropes (1934; F-GH), and J. Chapman (1937; AH).

20. Basil Christopher Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951).

21. The most prominent scholar, who has followed in Butler's footsteps, may be J. W. Wenham (*Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992]).

22. Austin M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. Dennis E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 57-88; Austin M. Farrer, *St. Matthew and St. Luke* (London: Black, 1954)

The theory was first launched by E. W. Lummis (*E. W. Lummis, How Luke Was Written* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915]), J. H. Ropes (*The Synoptic Gospels* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934]) and M. S. Enslin (*Christian Beginnings* [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938]) but in a less systematic form.

occasionally derived from oral tradition.²³ Farrer recognized in his 1955 essay, that Luke, who wrote last, must have reorganized quite a lot of the Matthean compositional material in his own work; however, Farrer explained this on the basis of Luke's theological and compositional interests.²⁴ The theory has been strongly defended and further developed by British scholars M. D. Goulder²⁵ and M. Goodacre²⁶ and is now often known as the Farrer(-Goulder) Hypothesis or the Markan Priority without Q Hypothesis (MwQH).²⁷

The Griesbach Hypothesis (2GH) was also put on the table once again in 1964 by W. R. Farmer²⁸ and has found many supporters since, including D. L. Dungan,²⁹ A. J. McNicol,³⁰ D. B. Peabody,³¹ B. Orchard,³² O. L. Cope,³³ T. R. W. Longstaff,³⁴ and H-H. Stoldt.³⁵ At present, the

23. Farrer, *St. Matthew and St. Luke*, e.g., 48, 192. See also Mahlon H. Smith, "Austin Marsden Farrer: 1904–1968" (2005), [Http://virtualreligion.net/primer/farrer.html](http://virtualreligion.net/primer/farrer.html).

24. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," 65 ff.

25. E.g., Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, vol. 1, JSNTSup 20 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); Michael D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974); Michael D. Goulder, "The Derrenbacker-Kloppenborg Defense," *JBL* 121, no. 2 (2002): 331–36.

26. E.g., Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002); Mark S. Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*, The Biblical Seminar 80 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTSup 133 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996); Mark S. Goodacre, "When is a Text not a Text? The Quasi Text-Critical Approach of the International Q Project," in *Questioning Q*, eds. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (London: SPCK, 2004), 115–26; Mark S. Goodacre, "A World Without Q," in *Questioning Q*, eds. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (London: SPCK, 2004), 174–79.

27. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 13–14.

28. William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Macmillan, 1964). See also William R. Farmer, "The Two-Gospel Hypothesis: The Statement of the Hypothesis," in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard — W. R. Farmer — F. Neirynck*, Jerusalem 1984, ed. D. Dungan, BETL 95 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 125–56.

29. E.g., Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*; David L. Dungan, "Two-Gospel Hypothesis," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, eds. David Noel Freedman, et al. (Toronto: Doubleday, 1992), 6:671–79.

30. E.g., Allan J. McNicol, David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody, eds., *Beyond the Q Impasse—Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996).

31. E.g., David B. Peabody, Lamar Cope, and Allan J. McNicol, eds., *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Renewal of Gospel Studies* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002).

32. E.g., Bernard Orchard and Harold Riley, *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987).

33. E.g., Lamar Cope, et al., "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis," in *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, SBLSP 34 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 636–87; Lamar Cope, David L. Dungan, and William R. Farmer, "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis," in *SBL 1994 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, SBLSP 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 516–73; Lamar Cope, David L. Dungan, and William R. Farmer, "Narrative

theory is considered one of the greatest challenges to the 2SH.

Most recently, J. D. G. Dunn's hypothesis of the interaction of literacy and orality in the formation of the Synoptic Gospels has received a lot of attention.³⁶ Dunn argues, following K. E. Bailey, that the early Jesus tradition was a relatively stable oral tradition ("informal, controlled oral tradition").³⁷ He maintains that Mark was the first Evangelist to write this tradition down,³⁸ and that Luke and Matthew derived at least some of their material from Mark, but often preferred the parallel oral versions.³⁹ A growing number of scholars take the interaction theory in its various forms seriously,⁴⁰ but it also has sharp critics.⁴¹

Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis," in *SBL 1993 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, SBLSP 32 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 303–33; Lamar Cope, et al., "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis," in *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, SBLSP 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 98–120.

34. E.g., Thomas Richmond Willis Longstaff, *Evidence of Conflation in Mark? A Study of the Synoptic Problem*, SBLDS 28 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

35. E.g., Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis*, trans. Donald L. Niewyk (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1980).

36. E.g., Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*; James D. G. Dunn, *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005); James D. G. Dunn, "Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition," in *SBLSP 136*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000), 287–326; James D. G. Dunn, "Altering the Default Setting: Re-Envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition," *NTS* 49 (2003): 139–75.

37. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 210.

38. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 143–46.

39. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 222–23.

40. See e.g., Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*; Barry W. Henaut, *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4*, JSNTSup 82 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 96, 116–17; Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus in Context: Power, People, Performance* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 111; Richard A. Horsley, "Introduction," in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), x; Holly E. Hearon, "The Implications of Orality for Studies of the Biblical Text," in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 9–10, 16; Jens Schröter, "Jesus and the Canon: The Early Jesus Traditions in the Context of the Origins of the New Testament Canon," in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 118; Vernon K. Robbins, "Interfaces of Orality and Literacy in the Gospel of Mark," in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 126; Whitley Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 4, 48, 103–21; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 43–45; Ian H. Henderson, *Jesus, Rhetoric and Law*, BibInt 20 (Leiden: Brill,

In the last few decades, the following hypotheses, among many others, have gained some acceptance: i) the Oral Tradition Hypothesis (B. Reicke,⁴² E. Linnemann,⁴³ S. Finnnern,⁴⁴ J. Rist,⁴⁵ A. B. Lord,⁴⁶ K. E. Bailey,⁴⁷ and A. D. Baum⁴⁸); ii) Holtzmann's 1880 3SH (R. H. Gundry,⁴⁹ and R. Morgenthaler⁵⁰); and iii) the Jerusalem School Hypothesis.⁵¹

As we have seen, three major synoptic theories at present are the 2SH, 2GH, and MwQH. Contrary to the 2SH, both the 2GH and MwQH attempt to solve the Synoptic Problem without

2006), 208, 210.

Horsley, *Jesus in Context* suggests that "various versions of each Gospel existed from an early as can be traced in their written transmission" (p. 5) as the result of the interaction of orality and literary (pp. 111, 118).

41. E.g., Theodore J. Weeden, "Theories of Tradition: A Critique of Kenneth Bailey," *Forum* 7, no. 1 (2004): 45–69, who argues that Dunn has set up his theory on a faulty foundation introduced by Kenneth E. Bailey. See also Daryl D. Schmidt, "Remembering Jesus: Assessing the Oral Evidence," *Forum* 7, no. 1 (2004): 71–82.

42. Reicke, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*; Bo Reicke, "Die Entstehungsverhältnisse der synoptischen Evangelien," in *Principat* 25/2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984), 1758–91.

43. Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?*; Eta Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial: How Scientific is "Scientific Theology"?* trans. Robert Yarbrough (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2001).

44. Sönke Finnnern, "Die Traditionshypothese als Alternative zur Zweiquellen-theorie: Ihre neueren Vertreter, ihre Argumente, ihre Beurteilung," *Jahrbuch für evangelische Theologie* 16 (2002): 33–67; Sönke Finnnern, "Die Traditionshypothese als Alternative zur Zweiquellen-theorie: Ihre neueren Vertreter, ihre Argumente, ihre Beurteilung," M.A. Thesis (FTA, 2001), <http://www.traditionshypothese.de/texte/finnnern.html>.

45. John M. Rist, *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*, SNTSMS 32 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

46. Albert Bates Lord, "The Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature," in *The Relationship Among the Gospels: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, ed. William O. Walker Jr., TUMRS 5 (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1978), 33–91.

47. Kenneth E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976); *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); "Psalm 23 and Luke 15: A Vision Expanded," *IBS* 12 (1990): 54–71; *The Cross & the Prodigal: Luke 15 Through the Eyes of Middle Eastern Peasants*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005); *Jacob & the Prodigal: How Jesus Retold Israel's Story* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003); "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *Themelios* 20, no. 2 (1995): 4–11; "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *ExpTim* 106 (1995): 363–67.

48. E.g., Armin D. Baum, "Matthew's Sources - Written or Oral? A Rabbinic Analogy and Empirical Insights," in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, eds. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–23; Armin D. Baum, *Der mündliche Faktor: Analogien zur synoptischen Frage aus der antiken Literatur, der Experimentalpsychologie, der Oral Poetry-Forschung und dem rabbinischen Traditions-wesen*, TANZ (Tübingen: Francke, 2008).

49. Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

50. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*.

51. For more information, see the following web-sites: Stephen C. Carlson, "Jerusalem School Bibliography" (1997), <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/jsbib.htm>; "Jerusalem Perspective Online" (2006), <http://www.jerusalemerspective.com/>; and David Bivin (1997), "An Overview of the Jerusalem School Hypothesis," <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/jssum.htm>.

Q.

I do not regard the 2GH as a very convincing theory for a number of reasons, fully discussed by other scholars.⁵² The MwQH is more plausible, but I doubt that the Synoptic Problem can really be solved without Q.⁵³ I am not convinced, however, that the dominant 2SH explains the Synoptic Problem adequately either. The theory has several problems: i) The minor agreements; ii) the Lukan Great Omission (Mark 6:45-8:26); iii) significant differences in content in some parallel non-Passion passages in Luke and Mark (especially in Mark 7:1-23/Luke 11:37-41; Mark 10:46-52/Luke 18:35-43; Mark 12:28-34/Luke 10:25-28; Mark 14:3-9/Luke 7:36-50); iv) Lukan thematic omissions; v) significant differences between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives; and vi) strange differences and inconsistencies in verbatim agreement levels within parallel passages in both the triple and double traditions. I will focus on the last three issues in my dissertation from the perspective of Luke's Gospel.

Proposal

In this work I will examine the relationship of Luke's Gospel to Mark's Gospel and argue that Luke did not draw his common material with Mark from *canonical* Mark. However, although I do not believe that Luke drew his common material with Mark from *canonical* Mark, I will approach the synoptic relationship with the framework of the two 'independent' sources/traditions theory because, in my opinion, it can better explain the synoptic problem than the MwQH or any other popular source theory.

52. E.g., A. Bellinzoni Jr., J. B. Tyson, and W. O. Walker Jr., eds., *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985); Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 29–152; Derrenbacker Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, 121–69; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*; Daniel B. Wallace, *The Synoptic Problem* (2006), http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=669; Stephen C. Carlson, "The Two Source Hypothesis" (2002), <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/2sh/index.htm>.

53. See e.g., Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*; Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 97–123; Derrenbacker Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, 171–209; Wallace, *The Synoptic Problem*; Carlson, "The Two Source Hypothesis".

I will build my view that Luke did not derive his triple tradition material from canonical Mark on three major arguments: i) Lukan thematic omissions, ii) dissimilarities between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives, and iii) variation in verbatim agreement within the Lukan triple tradition passages.

Lukan thematic omissions (chapter two): Since the rise of redaction criticism, biblical scholars have recognized that each of the Evangelists emphasizes certain theological issues in his Gospel. Luke, for example, emphasizes themes of prayer and the Holy Spirit. Yet, sometimes the theological elements which Luke emphasizes in his work remain interestingly unmentioned in some Lukan pericopes, although they are present in the parallel Markan pericopes. This seems to suggest that Luke did not have access to *canonical* Mark. To my knowledge, this phenomenon has not yet been studied in detail by any scholar. In this work, I will discuss the following Lukan theological themes: prayer, the Holy Spirit, power/mighty works, repentance, *ethnos*, salvation, angels, Jesus as the king, and the kingdom of God.

Dissimilarities between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives (chapter three): One of the most problematic questions of the Synoptic Problem is why the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative differs so significantly from the Markan one. There are differences in language, in order of material, additions of new material in Luke, the absence of some Markan material in Luke, Semitisms in Luke, and similarities between Lukan and Johannine Passion-Resurrection Narratives against the Markan one. One of the most interesting questions is why from Aland §269 (The Triumphal Entry; Mark 11:1-10 par.) onwards verbatim agreement between the Matthean and Markan pericopes is constantly higher than that between the Lukan and Markan parallel pericopes.⁵⁴ Before Aland §269, the agreement percentage is sometimes higher between Matthew and Mark, and at other times is higher between Luke and Mark; this often occurs in blocks. I hope to demonstrate that these general differences, along with

54. The only exceptions to the rule in the section Aland §§269-352 are Aland §278 (The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen), §284 (Woe to the Scribes and Pharisees), §308 (Preparation for the Passover), and §343 (The Road to Golgotha).

differences revealed by detailed analyses of the Passion-Resurrection pericopes, show that Luke did not have access to the Passion Narrative of canonical Mark. I agree with E. Trocmé's suggestion that the Markan Passion-Resurrection Narrative (chs. 14-16) and the rest of the Gospel were independent units with their own pre-history before 'Mark' attached them together.⁵⁵ Whether or not 'Mark' had already attached together these two sections before Luke wrote his Gospel is not clear, but what is clear, in Trocmé's view, is that Luke did not have access to this unified Markan story (i.e., canonical Mark). Luke derived his Passion-Resurrection Narrative from another branch of the 'Markan' Passion-Resurrection tradition than 'Mark.'

The presence of 'Markan-like' material within the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section is comparable to the presence of 'Markan-like' material in the Lukan larger Q/L-section (Aland §§188, 191, 192, 197, 198, 209, 211?, 218, 227, 229, 231, 234?, and 235). It is very unlikely that Luke derived this 'Markan-like' material in the larger Q/L-section from Mark.⁵⁶ If he had drawn it from Mark, he must have rejected his normal copy-editing practice here. This is to say, as advocates of the 2SH assume, that Luke used his sources in alternating blocks and rearranged the material drawn from his sources only seldomly; he did not go back and forth with respect to his sources.⁵⁷ However, if Luke had derived his 'Markan-like' material in the Lukan larger Q/L-section from Mark, he would have done exactly so.⁵⁸ It is more likely that this 'Markan-like' material was an integral part of Q/L material. I will compare these two 'Markan-like' sections, i.e., Luke's Passion-Resurrection Narrative and 'Markan-like' material in Luke's larger Q/L-section, and attempt to demonstrate that the presence of 'Markan-like' material in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative does not alone prove that Luke derived his Passion-Resurrection

55. Etienne Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy: A Study in the Origin of the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (London: SCM, 1983). Early form critics also argued that before Mark wrote his Gospel, only the Passion-Resurrection Narrative was a unified story among gospel material.

56. See Tim Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, SNTSMS 14 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

57. Derrenbacker Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, 212-15, 259.

58. The order of 'Markan-like' material in the Lukan greater Q/L-section is as follows:

Mark: 117, 118, 125, 128, 154, 163, 168, 168, 252, 255, 289, 291, 290/291 in Aland.

Luke: 188, 197, 192, 209, 191, 231, 218, 229, 227, 211?, 198, 234?, 235 in Aland.

Narrative from canonical Mark, just as the presence of ‘Markan-like’ material in the Lukan larger Q/L-section does not necessarily mean that Luke derived this material from canonical Mark.

Variation in verbatim agreement within the Lukan triple tradition passages (chapter four): Variation and inconsistencies in verbatim agreement levels within both the triple and double tradition pericopes have been recognized for some time. A strange fact is that verbatim agreement level in parallel passages between two or three synoptic Evangelists is sometimes very high and sometimes very low, normally without clearly observable grammatical or theological reasons behind them. I will discuss differences in verbatim agreement levels between the Lukan double tradition and the triple tradition, the Lukan non-Passion Narrative and the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, pericopes both within the Lukan non-Passion Narrative and the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, and within and between pericope blocks in the Lukan non-Passion Narrative. Variation in verbatim agreement levels casts doubt on the 2SH and other leading literary dependency theories. To me it does not seem sound to argue that, for example, Luke copied some pericopes from his sources word for word, but changed the wording almost completely in some other pericopes without obvious reasons. If the 2SH were correct, then Luke and Matthew must have been very inconsistent copyist-editors. This, however, runs counter to what we know about human nature; that is, a tendency toward consistency in behavior.

We cannot find an equivalent copy-editing method in use among those Greco-Roman or Jewish authors who are known to have employed the sources we find in Luke and Matthew. Greco-Roman and Jewish authors habitually either paraphrased the wordings of their sources almost entirely or used them almost verbatim. A close look at a few extant works, which seem to have a mixture of paraphrasis and verbatism, may not also support the view that their authors inconsistently copy-edited literary sources. The following Greco-Roman and Jewish authors and works are discussed: Josephus, Philo, Valerius Maximus, Tacitus, Livy, Psalm 18/2 Samuel 22, 2 Kings 18:13-20:19/Isaiah 36:1-39:8, 2 Kings 24:18-25:30/Jeremiah 39:1-40; 40:5-41:3; 52:1-34, Diodorus Siculus, 1QapGen, Pseudo-Philo, and the books of Chronicles.

If either Matthew or Luke alone had used an inconsistent copy-editing technique, this could be regarded as an interesting exception from the common practice in antiquity. However, if Matthew and Luke copy-edited their sources *independently*, as most proponents of the 2SH argue, then it becomes problematic to explain why both Evangelists used a very similar copy-editing technique when the equivalent copy-editing technique was not used by other writers in antiquity.

In the conclusion, I will suggest that Lukan thematic ‘omissions,’ dissimilarities between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives, and inconsistencies in verbatim agreement between synoptic parallels becomes more comprehensive if we assume that at least the Gospels of Luke and Mark represent two different but relatively faithfully preserved branches of an archetypical ‘Markan’ tradition. The ‘Markan’ tradition developed into different directions before and after the written gospel era due to the interaction of orality and literacy.⁵⁹ ‘Luke’ used one of these branches, but not our canonical Mark, as his source. This situation may be somewhat comparable to the development of the Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine *text* traditions which all developed from the same archetype in different directions little by little.⁶⁰ I am not arguing, however, that ‘Luke’ did not edit the tradition at all; it is clear to me that he did. I am only arguing that it seems unlikely that all the changes between the Gospels of Mark and Luke can be explained by the redactional activities of ‘Luke.’

59. Cf. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*.

60. See D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

CHAPTER 2

LUKAN THEMATIC OMISSIONS

Introduction

Luke's Path to Becoming a Theologian

Today, Luke is widely acknowledged as a *theologian* who emphasizes certain, distinctive themes in his Gospel. This consensus, however, is relatively new.¹

W. C. van Unnik claims that “in the period before 1950 Luke was almost exclusively viewed as a historian.”² In a sense this is true, but scholarly answers to the question as to what kind of a historian Luke was had been diverse since the rise of historical and source criticism at the end of the eighteenth century.³ Before that, Luke’s two works, Gospel and Acts, had been read as historically reliable documents of Christian origins. Historical and source critics began to seriously question this traditional belief.⁴

Form criticism,⁵ adopted by many NT scholars soon after the First World War, further weakened the pre-critical view of Luke as a historian.⁶ Form critics did not deny the possibility

1. See Mark Allan Powell, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 5–14.

2. W. C. van Unnik, “Luke-Acts: A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 19.

3. Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoe & Ruprecht, 1965), 13.

4. For a good survey of the development of critical Lukan studies from the end of the eighteenth century up to 1945, see Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 13–32, or Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. Basil Blackwell (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 14–34.

5. Four great names of form criticism are H. Gunkel and his three students, K. L. Schmidt (*Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*, reprint, 1919 [Darmstadt: Darmstadt Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969]), M. Dibelius (*From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B. L. Woolf from the 1933 ed. [Cambridge: Clarke, 1971]), and R. Bultmann (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, rev. ed., trans. John Marsh [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968]).

6. For good historical summaries and evaluations of the method, see Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 32–47; Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 14–32; Ernst Haenchen, “The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 34–50; Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1961*,

that Luke-Acts may include historically reliable material, but they did argue that theological needs of the early church coloured historical material to the extent that the recognition of original historical material from later developments has become extremely difficult. Luke and other Evangelists were viewed as collectors and compilers of tradition rather than historians in the full sense of the word. The hegemony of form criticism lasted until the Second World War.

After the Second World War, a new form of criticism - redaction criticism - began to occupy the ground and soon became a dominant method.⁷ G. Bornkamm, H. Conzelmann, and W. Marxsen are widely regarded as pioneers of this new method.⁸ Luke and other Evangelists were now viewed primarily as theologians who molded the tradition available to them to correspond with their own theological ideas.⁹ Each Evangelist had his own unique theology that could be distinguished by redactional analysis of a document. This method continues to dominate today.

In the last three decades or so, we have again been testifying the rise of a new emphasis. This new approach, narrative criticism, regards the Evangelists primarily as artists, while their

reprint, 1964 (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 236–62; Edgar V. McKnight, *What is Form Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969); Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 173–94, 223–33; Stephen H. Travis, “Form Criticism,” in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, ed. I. Howard Marshall (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 153–64; Craig L. Blomberg, “Form Criticism,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 243–50; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 4th rev. ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990), 229–37.

7. For good historical summaries and evaluations of the method, see Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969); Joachim Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM, 1968); Gail P. C. Streete, “Redaction Criticism,” in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, rev. and expanded, eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 105–21; Robert H. Stein, “What is Redaktionsgeschichte?” *JBL* 88 (1969): 45–56; Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 237–79; I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 3rd ed. (Exeter: Paternoster, 1988); Grant R. Osborne, “Redaction Criticism,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 662–69; John R. Donahue, “Redaction Criticism: Has the *Hauptstrasse* Become a *Sackgasse*?” in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, eds. Elisabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight, JSNTSup 109 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 27–57.

8. Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, trans. P. Scott (London: SCM Press, 1963), 13–57; Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber & Faber, 1960); Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*, trans. J. Boyce, et al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969).

9. According to Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 2, “The concept of ‘Luke the theologian’ is an implicit heritage of the Tübingen school.”

roles as theologians and even historians are not necessarily denied.¹⁰ At the same time, some leading scholars have raised their voices in defending the historical reliability of the Gospels once again.¹¹

Today, all biblical scholars regard Luke as a theologian irrespective of what other titles they might use to define him.

Luke's Thematic Emphases

The Overall Theme of Luke-Acts: The Plan of God

It is generally agreed that Luke, a theologian, wrote his double work with a certain purpose in mind. Scholars, however, disagree over what this purpose was. Most proposals fall into one or more of the following five broad categories:¹² i) Kerygmatic purpose: Luke wrote his double work to evangelize the unbelievers and/or strengthen the faith of the believers; ii) Apologetic purpose: Luke wrote his double work to defend Christianity before Roman authorities and/or against accusations of the Gnostics, Jews, Judaizers, or Marcionites; iii) Legitimation purpose: Luke wrote his double work to legitimate Christianity before Roman authorities; iv)

10. See Powell, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* 10–14. For good introductions to the method and the history and evaluations of it, see James L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005); Jack Dean Kingsbury, ed., *Narrative-Critical Gospel & Social-Scientific Interpretation Approach* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997); Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 3–13. See also Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, eds., *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, rev. and expanded (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999); Joel B. Green, ed., *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

11. In recent years, for example, Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*; Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 35–39; Colin J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, WUNT 49 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1989), have strongly defended the historical value and general reliability of Luke-Acts. See also Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); Paul Rhodes Eddy and Gregory A. Boyd, *The Jesus Legend: A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007).

12. Cf. Richard N. Longenecker, “The Acts of the Apostles,” in *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*, vol. 2, eds. Kenneth L. Barker and John Kohlenberger III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 378; Powell, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* 42–59; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Luke*, reprint, 1996, T&T Clark Study Guides (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 65–70; Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, NAC 24 (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 35–44; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, AB 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 8–14.

Pastoral purpose: Luke wrote his double work to explain the delay of the Parousia, or to attempt to conciliate Jews to Christians, or to resolve the identity crisis of Christians; v) Catechetical purpose: Luke wrote his double work “to Theophilus with the expectations that it could... be used within various churches for instructional purposes.”¹³ Some scholars have attempted to limit Luke’s purpose for writing to a single reason, but it is more likely, as the diversity of subject matters in Luke-Acts hint, that Luke had multiple purposes in mind. Whatever the specific reasons for writing were, most scholars now believe that all these purposes come together under one theological theme, which Luke clearly emphasizes; this is, the plan of God (ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ θεοῦ). Several issues in Luke-Acts demonstrate that the plan of God is Luke’s central theological theme:¹⁴ i) Direct references to God’s plan;¹⁵ ii) Paul was appointed to know God’s will (Acts 22:14); iii) Jesus and believers submit themselves to God’s will;¹⁶ iv) Jesus and believers feel that they must (δεῖ) do certain things, or these things must happen;¹⁷ v) some things “are about to” (μέλλω) happen;¹⁸ vi) προ-compound¹⁹ and related verbs²⁰ which refer to God’s plan; vii) God directs events through epiphanies;²¹ viii) the “today” texts which show the immediate availability of God’s promise;²² and ix) numerous references and allusions to the fulfillment of the Scriptures.²³ Luke desires to demonstrate how present events are related to, and are part of,

13. Longenecker, “The Acts of the Apostles,” 378.

14. John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, SNTSMS 76 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1–2. See also Darrell L. Bock, “Luke, Gospel Of,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. J. B. Green, S. McKnight, and I. H. Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 502–03; Darrell L. Bock, “A Theology of Luke-Acts,” in *A Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, eds. Roy B. Zuck and Darrell L. Bock (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 88–102.

15. Luke 7:30; Acts 2:23; 4:28; 5:38–39; 13:36; 20:27.

16. Luke 22:42; Acts 13:22; 21:14.

17. Luke 2:49; 4:43; 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 21:9; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44; Acts 1:16, 21; 3:21; 4:12; 5:29; 9:6, 16; 14:22; 16:30; 17:3; 19:21; 20:35; 23:11; 25:10; 27:24.

18. Luke 9:31, 44; 22:23; 24:21; Acts 17:31; 26:22, 23.

19. Acts 2:23; 3:18, 20; 4:28; 7:52; 10:41; 22:14; 26:16.

20. Luke 22:22; Acts 1:7; 2:23; 10:42; 13:47, 48; 17:26, 31; 19:21; 20:28; 22:10, 22.

21. Luke 1:11–22, 26–38; 2:9–15; 3:22; 9:30–32; 22:43; 24:4–7, 15–31, 36–49; Acts 1:3, 9–11; 2:3; 5:19–20; 9:3–7, 10–16, 30–32; 11:5–10, 13–14; 12:7–11; 23; 16:9–10; 18:9; 22:6–8, 17–21; 23:11; 26:13–18; 27:23–24.

22. Luke 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 13:32–33; 19:5, 9; 19:42; 23:42–43.

23. E.g., Luke 4:21; 9:31; 12:50; 18:31; 21:24; 22:16, 37; 24:44; Acts 1:16; 2:28; 3:18; 12:25; 13:25, 27, 52; 14:26; 19:21.

God's plan of salvation history.²⁴ God, author of history, is now fulfilling promises that he had earlier given through OT prophets.

Various Emphatic Aspects of the Overall Theme

Alongside the overall theme that is distinguishably Lukan, Luke also emphasizes several other theological themes more than any other Evangelist. It is impossible to discuss them in detail here and, therefore, I will only briefly refer to these themes, dividing them into seven categories.²⁵ Some of these themes will be discussed in greater detail later, under the title 'Inconsistencies in Luke's Use of Thematic Material Present in Mark.'

*Christology.*²⁶ The center and the turning point (Luke 16:16) of God's plan is Jesus Christ, about whom all the prophets spoke (Luke 24:25-27; Acts 3:24; 10:43; 26:22-23) and through whom God carries out his plan.

Luke's Christology may be "the most variegated in the NT"²⁷ and this may partly explain why scholars have come to somewhat different conclusions about what aspects of Christology Luke emphasizes. Most Christological studies have focused on titles used for Jesus. In Luke-Acts Jesus is called: Teacher (used by Jesus' opponents), Prophet, Lord, Son of Man, Son of God, Christ/Messiah, Master (used by Jesus' disciples), Servant, Son of David, Savior, King, Prince/Leader, Holy One, Righteous One, Judge, Author of Life, and God (?).²⁸ Although Luke

24. François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1–85; Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 1–2; Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, NTT (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 22–49; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Gospel According to Luke*, vol. 1 of *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 1–12.

25. For a good book about central themes of Luke, see John Navone, *Themes of St. Luke* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1970).

26. See Bovon, *Luke the Theologian (1950–2005)*, 123–223; Bock, "A Theology of Luke-Acts," 102–17; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, TPINTC (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 64–84; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 192–219; Robert F. O'Toole, *Luke's Presentation of Jesus: A Christology*, SubBi 25 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004); Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden, BETL 142 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 133–64; Tuckett, *Luke*, 76–89; Powell, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* 60–63; Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 88–94.

27. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 65.

28. See Stein, *Luke*, 48–49; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 197–219.

uses a great variety of titles for Jesus, scholars, in general, agree that the titles ‘Prophet,’ ‘Christ/Messiah,’ ‘Savior,’ and ‘Servant’ are the most significant to Luke.²⁹ Statistically, the most common ones are ‘Lord’ and ‘Christ/Messiah.’

*Soteriology.*³⁰ The ultimate goal of God’s plan is to save and restore the fallen world through the agency of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38-40; 3:19-25; 4:11-12). Luke uses “the vocabulary of ‘salvation’, or being ‘saved’, and speaking of Jesus as ‘Saviour’, more frequently than other New Testament writers.”³¹ In Luke-Acts, the offer of salvation is universal, especially including the disadvantaged and marginalized (Gentiles, the poor, the sinners, women).³² One of the consequences of salvation, emphasized by Luke, is joy.³³

*Pneumatology.*³⁴ It is a well known fact that Luke speaks about the Holy Spirit more than any other Synoptic. The Holy Spirit is actively present from the beginning of the Gospel (Luke 1:38) until the end of Acts (Acts 21:11; 28:25).

Angelology. Although it is not commonly recognized, angels play an important role in Luke-Acts, as I will show later.

*Discipleship.*³⁵ In Luke-Acts, one becomes a follower of Jesus through faith, repentance/conversion, and baptism. Luke emphasizes all of these themes, paying particular

29. Tuckett, *Luke*, 76–89; Bock, “Luke, Gospel Of,” 503–4; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 197–219.

30. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian (1950–2005)*, 273–328; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 219–27; Bock, “A Theology of Luke-Acts,” 117–40; Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 141–50.

31. Tuckett, *Luke*, 47.

32. Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 76–94; Joel B. Green, “Good News to Whom? Jesus and the ‘Poor’ in the Gospel of Luke,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, eds. J. B. Green and M. Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 59–74; S. John Roth, *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 144 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997); Esther A. De Boer, “The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus,” in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, eds. Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW 3 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 140–60.

33. Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 71–87.

34. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian (1950–2005)*, 225–72; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 84–88; Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 151–69; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 227–31.

35. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian (1950–2005)*, 329–462; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 235–57; Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 102–21; Bock, “A Theology of Luke-Acts,” 140–62; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 88–104; Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 38–50, 103–31, 188–210.

attention to the last two.

Luke uses the way (ὁδός) motif to describe discipleship.³⁶ The way of Jesus is also the way for the followers of Jesus, which in practice means, e.g., to keep God's commandments (cf. Jesus' ethical teaching), to seek God's guidance in prayer, to care for the poor and other marginalized, and to be ready to suffer for the gospel as Jesus did.

*Eschatology.*³⁷ J. A. Fitzmyer claims that eschatology "is the most difficult and most controversial aspect of Lucan theology today."³⁸ Many have followed Conzelmann who argues that Luke, due to the delay of the Parousia and the crises it had caused in the early church, decided to reinterpret the tradition, minimizing references to the imminence of the Parousia and postponing it to the indefinite future.³⁹ Fitzmyer, among many others,⁴⁰ justifiably rejects this view and shows that Luke has not "completely abandoned belief in an early expectation of the end-time," but he has shifted "the emphasis in many of Jesus' sayings from the *eschaton* to the *sēmeron* ['today']."⁴¹ The kingdom of God, one of the Lukan emphases, is not only in the future but a present reality. "This subtle shift directs Christian attention from the following of Christ in view of an imminent reckoning to an understanding of Jesus' conduct as an inspiration and guide for Christian life in the Period of *ecclesia pressa*, the church under stress."⁴²

One of the most interesting aspects of Luke's eschatology is the banquet theme. In the context of Jewish tradition the banquet metaphor is used to express messianic salvation.⁴³

Other Emphases. Luke also emphasizes some other themes such as the fatherhood of

36. See the "way" motif in Luke-Acts: e.g., Luke 1:76; 3:4; 7:27; 9:51-19:27; 9:57-62; 20:21; 24:13-35; Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22.

37. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian (1950-2005)*, 1-85; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 231-35; Bock, "A Theology of Luke-Acts," 162-66; Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 11-31; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 59-64.

38. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 231.

39. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*.

40. E.g., Tuckett, *Luke*, 34-44; Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 77-102.

41. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 234.

42. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 234.

43. Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 11-31.

God⁴⁴ and the word of God.⁴⁵

Inconsistencies in Luke's Use of Thematic Material Present in Mark

Luke is a theologian, who clearly had his own theological agenda for this double work. As we have seen, he emphasizes certain theological issues more than other Evangelists. Yet, sometimes the theological elements which Luke emphasizes in his works remain interestingly unmentioned in some Lukan pericopes, although they are present in the parallel Markan pericopes. This seems to suggest that Luke did not have access to *canonical* Mark. While several scholars have recognized that Luke occasionally fails to include theological elements which occur in the parallel Markan pericopes, and which Luke emphasizes in his Gospel, this phenomenon has not yet been studied in detail by any scholar to my knowledge.

D. Burkett has come to a similar conclusion in his recent book, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark*, that Luke did not derive his material from canonical Mark. He has come to this conclusion by studying the use of such words like πολὺς, πάλιν, ἴδε, φημί, ἐναγκαλισάμενος, εἰμί, περιβλέπομαι, διδάσκειν, etc. by the Evangelists.⁴⁶ Burkett, however, does not discuss Luke's thematic omissions. Although I agree with Burkett that Luke did not draw his material from canonical Mark, his multi-source theory is more problematic.⁴⁷

I have included the following theological themes in my discussion: prayer, the Holy Spirit, power/mighty works, repentance, salvation, *ethnos*, angels, Jesus as the king, and the kingdom of

44. Diane G. Chen, *God as Father in Luke-Acts*, SBL 92 (New York: Peter Lang, 2006); Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 51–55.

45. Walter L. Liefeld, "Luke," in *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*, vol. 2, pp. 797–1059, eds. Kenneth L. Barker and John Kohlenberger III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 210.

46. Delbert Burkett, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 7–59.

47. Burkett argues that Proto-Mark underwent two revisions, which he calls Proto-Mark A (i.e., PMA), used by Matthew and Mark, and Proto-Mark B (i.e., PMB), used by Luke and Mark. In addition to these two Proto-Mark revisions, all three Evangelists also used several other sources.

Burkett's theory has numerous problems. The way he divides Lukan and Matthean pericopes into different layers and sources is one of them. For example, he suggests on p. 107 that the Lukan parable discourse(s) (Luke 8:4–18b, 13:18–21) and miracle stories (8:22–56) must come from different sources – the former from A, while latter from PMB – because Luke 13:18–21 breaks the sequence of the section Luke 8:4–56.

God.

Prayer

Introduction

Prayer is one of the key religious concepts in the NT; the concept is present in all its books and their authors use rich vocabulary for it.⁴⁸ Over twenty different words have been used for describing Jesus' prayers alone.⁴⁹

It has long been recognized that Luke emphasizes prayer more than any other Evangelist⁵⁰ and it is commonly regarded today as one of the main themes in Luke-Acts.⁵¹ Five observations support this view.

First, prayer terminology appears in Luke more frequently than in the other Gospels. Luke's favorite terms are the verb προσεύχομαι and its cognate noun προσευχή. The former occurs 85 times in the NT: 19 times in Luke,⁵² 16 times in Acts,⁵³ 15 times in Matthew, 10 times in Mark, and 25 times in the rest of the NT.⁵⁴ The latter appears 36 times in the NT: 3 times in Luke,⁵⁵ 9 times in Acts,⁵⁶ 2 times in Matthew, 2 times in Mark, and 20 times in the rest of the NT.

48. Titus, 2 Pet, and 2 John do not use the prayer vocabulary, however, the salutations at the beginning of these Epistles can be regarded as prayers (Titus 1:4b; 2 Pet 2; 2 John 3).

49. William David Spencer and Aída Besançon Spencer, *The Prayer Life of Jesus: Shout of Agony, Revelation of Love: A Commentary* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 111–47, list the following words but their list is not complete: δέομαι, ἐρωτάω, ἀναβλέπω, αἶρω, ἐπαίρω, στενάζω, ἀγαλλιάω, ἐξομολογέω, ὑμνέω, εὐχαριστέω, εὐλογέω, κατευλογέω, προσεύχομαι, λέγω, φωνέω, βοάω, ἀναβοάω, ἱκετηρία, δακρύω, and κραυγή. See also G. T. D. Angel, C. Brown, and H. Schönweiss, "Prayer, Ask, Kneel, Beg, Worship, Knock," in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 855–86; Oscar Gerald Harris, "Prayer in Luke-Act: A Study in the Theology of Luke," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation (Vanderbilt University, 1967), 12–14.

50. Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1896), xlv-xlvi.

51. See David Michael Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*, WUNT 2/49 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 3; Steven F. Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, American University Studies VII/118 (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 1–8.

52. Luke 1:10; 3:21; 5:16; 6:12, 28; 9:18, 28, 29; 11:1, 2; 18:1, 10, 11; 20:47; 22:40, 41, 44, 46.

53. Acts 1:24; 6:6; 8:15; 9:11, 40; 10:9, 30; 11:5; 12:12; 13:3; 14:23; 16:25; 20:36; 21:5; 22:17; 28:8.

54. All statistic information has been drawn from the Nestle-Aland 27th edition by the BibleWorks 7 program. Compare the results with Robert Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, 3rd ed. (Zürich: Gotthelf, 1982).

55. Luke 6:12; 19:46; 22:45.

56. Acts 1:14; 2:42; 3:1; 6:4; 10:4, 31; 12:5; 16:13, 16.

Luke's second most favored terms are the verb δέομαι and its cognate noun δέησις. The verb occurs 22 times in the NT, but it does not always mean 'to pray.' It carries this meaning only 3 times⁵⁷ out of 8 occurrences in Luke, 4 times in Acts,⁵⁸ and once (9:38) in Matthew. Unlike the verb, the noun, that appears 18 times in the NT, always refers to prayer addressed to God. All the occurrences within Matthew-Acts are found in Luke.⁵⁹ In addition to these two favorite verbs and their cognates, Luke also uses other words to refer to prayer, such as αἰνέω,⁶⁰ αἰτέω,⁶¹ ἀνθομολογέομαι,⁶² βοάω,⁶³ δοξάζω,⁶⁴ ἐξομολογέω,⁶⁵ ἐρωτάω,⁶⁶ εὐλογέω,⁶⁷ εὐχαριστέω,⁶⁸ κρούω,⁶⁹ μεγαλύνω,⁷⁰ and προσκυνέω.⁷¹

57. Luke 10:2; 21:36; 22:32.

58. Acts 4:31; 8:22, 24; 10:2.

59. Luke 1:13; 2:37; 5:33.

60. In the sense of praise to God: Luke 2:13, 29; 19:37; Acts 3:8, 9. The word does not occur in Mark and Matthew.

61. The verb is used as a reference to prayer in the following passages in the Synoptics: Luke 11:9, 10, 13; Mark 11:24; Matt 6:8; 7:7, 8, 11; 18:19; 21:22.

62. Luke 2:28.

63. Luke 18:7.

64. Luke 2:20; 5:25, 26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43; 23:47; Acts 4:21; 11:18; 13:48; 21:20; Mark 2:12; Matt 5:16; 9:8; 15:31. See also Luke 7:29 and 9:43. For Luke's use of the noun δόξα in prayer/thanksgiving context, see Luke 2:14; 17:18; 19:38; Acts 12:23.

65. Luke 10:21 (Jesus praises the Father); Mark 1:5 (people confess their sins); Matt 3:6; 11:25.

66. Luke 14:18, 19. "The owner of the house" of the story (Luke 14:16-24) symbolizes God.

67. Luke 1:42, 64; 2:28, 34; 6:28; 9:16; 13:35; 19:38; 24:30, 50, 51, 53; Mark 6:41; 8:7; 11:9, 10; 14:22; Matt 14:19; 21:9; 23:39; 25:34; 26:26. In addition, Mark once uses the form κατευλογέω in 10:16.

68. Luke 18:11; 22:17, 19; Mark 8:6; 14:23; Matt 15:36; 26:27.

69. Luke 11:9, 10 (cf. 11:5-8); (12:36; 13:25); Matt 7:7, 8.

70. Luke 1:46; Acts 10:46; 19:17.

71. The verb means 'to bow down,' 'worship,' 'do reverence to.' Although the verb does not necessarily carry the meaning 'to pray,' it is very closely associated with this meaning in many passages in the New Testament. It occurs 3 times in Luke (4:7; 4:8; 24:52), twice in Mark (5:6; 15:19), and 13 times in Matthew (2:2, 8, 11; 4:9, 10; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 18:26; 20:20; 28:9, 17). "The NT uses *proskynein* only in relation to a divine object. Even Mt. 18:26 is no true exception, for in view of the importance of *proskynēsis* in Matthew (cf. 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:2) the divine king plainly stands behind the king of the parable. Thus when those who seek help from Jesus fall at his feet, this is more than a gesture of respect. The wise men bow in worship (Mt. 2:2, 11). The tempter seeks the worship that belongs to God (4:9-10). The disciples worship Jesus when they begin to grasp his divine sonship (14:33) and when they meet the risen Lord (28:9). The thought of God's transcendence forbids any weakening of the term in the NT. Peter rejects *proskynēsis* in Acts 10:25-26. Even the angel forbid it in Rev. 19:10. The gesture is expressly mentioned in Acts 10:25)" (H. Greeve, "Proskynéō, Proskynētēs," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Abridged in One Volume*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985], 949). See also H. Schönweiss and C. Brown, "προσκυνέω," in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 875-79.

Second, praising, thanksgiving to, and blessing the Lord, which are some aspects of prayer, are emphasized much more by Luke than by other Evangelists as the frequency of the words αἰνέω, δοξάζω, εὐλογέω and μεγαλύνω clearly shows. In addition, Luke alone has preserved such hymns of praise like the *Magnificat* (Luke 1:46-55), the *Benedictus* (1:68-79), the *Gloria in Excelsis* (2:14), and the *Nunc Dimittis* (2:29-32).⁷²

Third, Jesus is portrayed by Luke at prayer in nine cases not recorded in the parallel pericopes: at his baptism (Luke 3:21); before his first conflict with the authorities (5:16);⁷³ before choosing the twelve (6:12); before Peter's confession of Christ (9:18); at the transfiguration (9:29, 29); before teaching the Lord's Prayer (11:1); before the testing of Simon and other disciples by Satan (22:31);⁷⁴ and in two occasions at the cross (23:34, 46).⁷⁵ Mark and Matthew report the same incidents but fail to mention that Jesus prayed in these cases.⁷⁶

Fourth, Luke records three nonparallel parables on prayer: the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:5-8), the Unjust Judge (18:1-8), and the Pharisee and the Tax Collector at the Temple (18:9-14).

Fifth, prayer is also a prominent topic in Luke's second work, Acts.⁷⁷ One of the most

72. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, xlv.

73. See the conflicts recorded in Luke 5:17-32; (5:33-39); 6:1-11. Luke 5:33-39 does not depict a conflict between Jesus and authorities ('they' refer to the disciples of the Pharisees in the third plural) and not necessarily even between Jesus and people. The question of v. 33 may have arisen among people from curiosity, not from hostility. However, the phrase '[t]he old is good' (v. 39) at the end of the pericope may be interpreted to mean that some people do not want to change. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 143-44, questions the view that Jesus is praying in Luke 5:16 "in order to deal with future conflict, or even to avoid the temptations of popularity."

74. Notice that ὑμεῖς is plural.

75. See Kyu Sam Han, "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," *JETS* 43/4 (2000): 679-87; Stephen S. Smalley, "Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 15 (1973): 64-67; Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 119-24.

76. Matthew has some prayer texts that are not found in Luke or Mark: Matt 6:5-6, 7-8 and 18:19-20 (P. T. O'Brien, "Prayer in Luke-Acts," *TynBul* 24 [1973]: 116). The fact that Matt 6:5-8, which is the preface to the Lord's Prayer in Matthew, do not have a parallel in Luke, may arise some concerns whether Matthew and Luke had access to the same version of the Lord's Prayer. If Matthew drew his unique prayer texts from M, Luke almost definitely did not have access to it, because otherwise he might have used them since he emphasizes the prayer motif so strongly.

77. See Allison A. Trites, "The Prayer Motif in Luke-Acts," in *Perspectives in Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (Danville: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978), 179-86; Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 176-203; Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, 75-101; Steven F. Plymale, "Luke's Theology of Prayer," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*, ed. David J. Lull (Atlanta: Scholars Press,

significant features – noticed by several scholars – is “deliberate parallels” between the Gospel of Luke and Acts:

Immediately after His baptism Jesus prays and receives the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:21); the apostles and their companions (Acts 1:14) pray before the descent of the Spirit upon them... Jesus prayed before the choice of the Twelve (Luke 6:12); the early church prays before selecting Matthias (Acts 1:24). Jesus, at the point of His death, prays that His enemies may be forgiven (Luke 21:34), while Stephen, before falling asleep, cries in a loud voice, ‘Lord, do not hold this sin against them’ (Acts 7:60). And as Jesus offered the ‘evening prayer’, committing His spirit, in the words of the Psalmist, to the Father’s care (Luke 23:46), so the first martyr calls upon the Lord Jesus and cries, ‘receive my spirit’ (Acts 7:59).⁷⁸

To argue on the basis of statistics alone that Luke emphasizes the prayer motif more than other Evangelists could be misleading because Luke is longer than two other Synoptics,⁷⁹ but the four other observations mentioned above makes it absolutely clear that prayer is a key topic in Luke’s works.

Luke presents himself as a historian (Luke 1:1-4), who wants to offer to his readers a biographical look to Jesus’ prayer life. Scholars, however, have also recognized two other, more underlying motives for Luke’s presentation of the prayer theme in his two-volume work. One is the relationship of prayer to the didactic purpose of Luke-Acts, and the other is the relationship of prayer to salvation history in Luke-Acts.

W. Ott was the first scholar to write a monograph (1965) on prayer in Luke-Acts.⁸⁰ Some scholars, however, had already recognized the didactic aspect of prayer in Luke-Acts before Ott. For example, A. Plummer in his 1896 commentary on Luke divides the prayer texts into two categories: i) Jesus as the example of the man of prayer (Luke 3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18, 28-29; 11:1; 22:32, 39-46; 23:46), and ii) Jesus’ instructions on prayer to his disciples (Luke 6:28; 10:2; 11:1-

1990), 545–51.

78. O’Brien, “Prayer in Luke-Acts,” 122.

79. Matthew has 1,086 verses, Mark 661 verses, and Luke 1,149 verses. See Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 29.

80. Wilhelm Ott, *Gebet und Heil: Die Bedeutung der Gebetsparänese in der lukanischen Theologie*, SANT 12 (Munich: Kösel, 1965).

4, 5-13; 18:1-8; 21:36; 22:40, 46).⁸¹ Only in Luke, the disciples ask Jesus to teach them to pray (Luke 11:1).

Ott, following Conzelmann, divides salvation history into three distinct phases: the period of Judaism, of Jesus, and of the church. Luke writes to the church that has been facing heavy temptations since the Passion of Christ⁸² and wants to show them that prayer is *the* means to remain steadfast in those temptations until the coming of the Son of Man.⁸³ The key passages for understanding this aspect of Luke's theology are the Parable of the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:5-8) and especially the Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Widow (Luke 18:1-8) that states "πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι (18:1). A similar statement can be found at the end of "the synoptic Apocalypse" in Luke 21:36.⁸⁴ Luke, according to Ott, uses Jesus as the didactic example to the church of a person who stood steadfast in temptations through prayer.⁸⁵ That Jesus functions as the didactic example on prayer to the church is widely accepted among scholars, but this can logically be true only if Conzelmann's view of the temptation-free period of time during Jesus' ministry is wrong.⁸⁶ "It is difficult to see," as D. Crump correctly notes, "how Jesus can be an example to the church of how to survive demonic temptations through prayer if the largest part of his ministry was itself a temptation-free era."⁸⁷

O. G. Harris drew attention to the relationship of prayer to salvation history in Luke-Acts in his 1967 unpublished Ph.D. dissertation entitled *Prayer in Luke-Acts: A Study in the Theology of Luke*.⁸⁸ Harris argues that prayer texts in Luke-Acts fall into two categories: i) those composed

81. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, xlv-xlvi. See also Lindell O. Harris, "Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," *SwJT* 10/1 (1967): 59-69. He is not aware of Ott's monograph.

82. The time since the end of the temptation of Jesus (Luke 4:13) until Luke 22:31, according to Ott, *Gebet und Heil*, 85, was "eine satansfreie Zeit." See also p. 138.

83. Ott, *Gebet und Heil*, 73-75. See also Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 4.

84. Ott, *Gebet und Heil*, 14.

85. Ott, *Gebet und Heil*, 93, 97, 124-36: "Nach Lukas gibt Jesus hier *ein Beispiel*, wie man die Anfechtung des Satans - die Passion Jesu ist nach Lukas ja vom Satan gewirkt - besteht: betend..." (p. 97).

86. For example, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 158-64 rejects this aspect of Conzelmann's theory.

87. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 5.

88. Oscar Gerald Harris, "Prayer in Luke-Acts". See also Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, 3-5;

or modified by Luke,⁸⁹ ii) those accepted from tradition without modification.⁹⁰ Two main conclusions of Harris' study are: "First, Luke presents Jesus as an exemplar of praying man... Second, prayer is mentioned by Luke at important points in his account of Jesus and the early church."⁹¹ The first point is secondary.⁹² Because Luke interprets history through the lenses of *Heilsgeschichte*, he molded tradition by depicting Jesus at prayer at crucial moments of his ministry. Luke believes that God "guides the course of redemptive history" through prayer.⁹³ Harris' view has been widely accepted, but, in my view, on questionable bases: i) The argument that some references to prayer in Luke-Acts are free compositions of Luke is based on indirect evidence, rather than on hard facts (see my comments below); ii) It is not true that every reference to prayer in Luke-Acts is related to critical turning-points in salvation history.⁹⁴ See especially Luke 23:34,⁹⁵ Acts 6:1-6; 9:40; 16:26; 20:36; 21:5; 27:35; 28:8, 15;⁹⁶ iii) It is misleading to say that all references to Jesus at prayer in Luke are closely related to "*the means* by which God guides salvation-history."⁹⁷ In fact, Luke seems to relate Jesus' prayer to seeking divine *guidance* before an important decision only very occasionally (probably in Luke 4:42 and 6:12-16).

The prayer theme is strongly emphasized by Luke. It occurs in both Lukan L/Q passages (Luke 1:5-25, 39-56, 57-80 2:21-38; 6:27-36; 11:1-4, 5-8, 9-13; 18:1-8, 9-14; 21:34-36) and triple tradition passages. Within the triple tradition, the motif is sometimes present in both Markan and Lukan parallels (Luke 19:45-46; 20:45-47; 22:39-46) but more often only in the Lukan

Han, "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," 677-78; Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 5-7.

89. Luke 3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 9:28-29; 11:1-13; 18:1-8; 22:39-46; 23:34, 36 (pp. 195-96). According to Harris, these passages support his thesis "because Luke has composed the material of modified the traditional material" (p. 195). Harris also discusses prayer texts in Acts which support his view, but I have not listed them here because they deal with the prayer-life of the early church, not of Jesus.

90. Luke 20:46-47; 22:31-34. According to Harris, these passages do not support his thesis "because they are traditional material or merely incidental Lukan references" (p. 196).

91. Oscar Gerald Harris, "Prayer in Luke-Acts," 196-97.

92. Oscar Gerald Harris, "Prayer in Luke-Acts," 245.

93. Oscar Gerald Harris, "Prayer in Luke-Acts," 2-3.

94. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 6.

95. The passage is included in the Nestle-Aland 27th edition, but its textual history is uncertain.

96. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 7, drew my attention to the passages in Acts.

97. The quotation from Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 6. Han, "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," 679, makes the similar point.

parallel (Luke 3:21-22; 5:12-16, 33-39; 6:12-16; 9:18-21, 28-36; 22:31-34; 23:33-34, 44-48).

The fact that the prayer theme often occurs only in the Lukan parallel in the triple tradition, and that Luke emphasizes prayer not only in his Gospel but also in Acts, may support the view that most references to prayer in Luke's Gospel could be Luke's own additions to tradition. Against this background, it is very surprising that sometimes the prayer motif is missing in Lukan passages while present in the parallel pericopes in Mark (Luke 4:42-43; 9:37-43a; 21:20-24; 23:44-49),⁹⁸ or that the whole Markan pericope, which speaks about prayer, is missing in Luke (Mark 6:45-52; 11:20-26⁹⁹). It is also interesting that this and other concepts mentioned later are often missing in Luke when verbatim agreement between Markan and Lukan pericopes is low.

Next we are turning our attention to those pericopes which occur in both Mark and Luke but the prayer motif is missing in Luke while present in Mark. We will also look at Markan pericopes which refer to prayer but the whole pericope is missing in Luke. Some of these passages are more didactic, while others are more salvation-historical in character.

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §39 (Luke 4:42-43; Mark 1:35-38)

Luke 4:42-43 is a closing part of the narrative of the first preaching tour in Galilee. The section begins with Luke 4:14-15 (cf. Mark 1:14-15). Immediately after the temptation, Jesus returns to Galilee and begins preaching in their synagogues (Luke 4:15). Luke focuses on events in two cities during this tour: Nazareth (4:16-30) where Jesus was rejected, and Capernaum (4:31-43) where he was welcomed. The section ends with Jesus' words that he must proclaim the

98. Luke 18:15-17 could also be added to this list. According to wide consensus, Luke's sole source here was Mark 10:13-16. However, I wonder why Luke, who emphasizes praying, does not use the Markan *κατευλογέω* (10:16) but the 'obscure' verb *ἄπτω*, although *εὐλογέω*, as we saw earlier, is one of Luke's favoured words. The word *ἄπτω* does not seem to carry the meaning of 'blessing' in Luke-Acts (if not here; see BAGD) or other Greek literature (see LSJ).

99. Mark 11:20-26 is especially interesting: it is missing in Luke although it is not part of the Great Omission and it is also one of the most emphatic Markan pericopes on praying.

message of the kingdom of God to the other cities also, along with a note that Jesus continued his preaching ministry in the synagogues of Judea (Luke 4:43-44).¹⁰⁰

The sequence of the pericopes of Luke 4:14-15, 31-44 agrees with that of Mark. Verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan pericopes based on completely identical words¹⁰¹ is as follows: Luke 4:14a/Mark 1:14a 42%, 4:14b-15/1:14b-15 0%, (4:16-30/6:1-6a 6%, 5:1-11/1:16-20 9%), 4:31-32/1:21-22 39%, 4:33-37/1:23-28 48%, 4:38-39/1:29-31 41%, 4:40-41/1:32-34 22%, 4:42-43/1:35-38 17%, and 4:44/1:39 33%.¹⁰² Two major observations may be drawn from these numbers, to which we will return later: i) the verbatim agreement percentage between the Markan and Lukan pericopes is very low when they do not agree in order (Luke 4:16-30 par., 5:1-11 par.); ii) if Luke 4:14a, 14b-15, 44 par. are excluded because of their brevity, the agreement percentage drops quite significantly towards the end of the section.

The fact that Luke does not mention Jesus praying in Luke 4:42, although Mark mentions it in his parallel passage (Mark 1:35),¹⁰³ has surprised many scholars¹⁰⁴ and created a range of different explanations which we will discuss next.

Following W. Sanders, V. Taylor believes that before Luke started the reworking of the content of Mark 1:21-39, or any other unit of text, he memorized it. The fact that the verbatim agreement percentage between the accounts of Mark and Luke drops down towards the end of

100. For the controversy over *Ἰουδαίας*, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX*, 557-58; Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 70-72.

101. By "completely identical words" I mean the words which have the same inflected form. A percentage of the same inflected form of words in a given pericope is, in general, a surer indicator of a possible *literary* dependency than a percentage of the same lexeme form of words. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse* and Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, use this counting method in their studies of identical words between pericopes.

102. Based on my own calculation. Percentages here, as elsewhere in this study, are based on Markan words (i.e., identical words : Markan words in a pericope x 100 = %). Compare with Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 33-35; Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 62-63; Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem". Because Luke 4:14a, 14b-15; 4:44 par are very short, their percentages may be misleading.

103. The presence of *προσηύχετο* in Mark 1:35 and the absence of it in Luke 4:42 is text-critically secure.

104. See Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium: Kommentar zu Kapitel 1, 9-9, 50*, HTKNT (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 256; John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, WBC 35A (Dallas: Word, 1989), 215-16; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 197; C. S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 1986), 217; Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, WBC 34A (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 69.

this section is due to the fact that Luke remembered the end of the section less accurately than the beginning because of the time lapsed during the writing process. Luke failed to consult his source afresh because of “the difficulties occasioned by the use of ancient rolls for purpose of reference.”¹⁰⁵ This explains, according to Taylor, why Luke failed to refer to Jesus praying in Luke 4:42.

The argument is unconvincing. The section of Mark 1:21-39 has 277 Greek words. The whole text would have taken only four columns in a scroll or papyri roll¹⁰⁶ even if each column had as few as 70 words; but average columns have much more words.¹⁰⁷ Very likely, the whole text would have been available on the same opening of the scroll. Even if the whole text had not been on the same opening of the scroll, the section where the verbatim agreement level is lowest (Mark 1:32-38, [39] par.) would have definitely been before Luke; the text would have taken less than two columns (109 words) and it was at the end of the section Luke was reworking. It would have been easy for Luke to check the wording from his source.

C. F. Evans, who doubts Taylor’s explanation, argues that if Luke had mentioned Jesus praying in Luke 4:42, it would have given the impression that “Jesus was still uncertain of the nature and range of his mission,” although, in fact, he had been certain of it since his baptism.¹⁰⁸ The argument is very strange. If Luke had avoided mentioning Jesus praying in Luke 4:42 in order

105. Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926), 78–81.

106. Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 43–83, demonstrates that the earliest Christian preferred the codex to the roll at least from the second century on. If Luke used Mark in the codex form rather than the roll form, then Taylor’s argument is even less convincing because the codex would have been easier to use for reference than the roll.

107. According to my study, for example, Luke 16:9-21 takes one wide column in \mathfrak{P}^{75} , having about 230 words; Rom 6:23-8:5 takes four columns in Codex Sinaiticus, each column having an average 144 words; Eph 1:1-16 takes two columns in Codex Vaticanus, each column having an average 108 words (each page has three columns); and Rom 2:26-3:21 takes two columns in Codex Alexandrinus, each column having an average 179 words. According to Derrenbacher Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, 253, “[o]n average, early (papyrus) codices contained about 200 words per page.” He does not mention his source. For further reading regarding codex size, columns, margins, lines per page/columns, see Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 155–77. See also Hans-Josef Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 43–54.

108. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 284.

not to give the impression that Jesus was still uncertain of the nature and range of his mission, then Luke should not have emphasized the prayer motif at all in his Gospel.

Goulder suggests that Luke omitted a reference to Jesus praying because, in the Lukan account, “there were no disciples present yet to say, as there were in Mark.”¹⁰⁹ What Goulder means by this is not absolutely clear, however, if his intent is to state that Luke omitted a reference to prayer because the Lukan Jesus did not yet have disciples, who would have been the objects of the demonstrative prayer, Goulder’s logic fails. In this case, Luke would also have not recorded Jesus’ prayer at his baptism (Luke 3:12).¹¹⁰

F. Bovon’s proposition that Luke omitted Mark’s reference to Jesus praying because he intended “to create a summary passage around it later (5:16; in contrast to Mark 1:45)” is not satisfying either, for two reasons:¹¹¹ i) Luke 5:16 is not commonly regarded as a summary passage of a certain section in Luke, and ii) it is very unlikely that Luke, who has a clear tendency to add references to Jesus praying rather than remove them, would have eliminated the reference here without a clear reason.

Crump argues that Luke did not want to juxtapose prayer and the election of the disciples before the Jewish leaders had shown hostile opposition to and rejection of Jesus (Luke 6:11).¹¹² The juxtaposition would have happened before it if Luke had included the Markan reference to Jesus praying in Luke 4:42-44, which precedes the call of the first disciples (Luke 5:1-11). Only after the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish leaders was it appropriate for the Lukan Jesus to select “new leaders for the restored people of God.”¹¹³ “[T]he choice of the Twelve Apostles [Luke 6:12-16] was *God’s* selection” and God used “prayer to reveal those whom Jesus should select for apostleship.”¹¹⁴ This, according to Crump, explains why Luke omitted the Markan reference

109. Goulder, *Luke I*, 315.

110. My adviser, John Kloppenborg, drew my attention to this problem in Goulder’s explanation.

111. François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Christine M. Thomas, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 160.

112. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 144–46.

113. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 144.

114. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 145.

to Jesus praying in Aland §39. This is also an unsatisfying answer, because if Luke had referred to Jesus praying in Luke 4:42, this would have preceded Jesus' mission tour "to other cities of Judea" (4:43-44) and would not be immediately before the selection of the first disciples. The reference, therefore, could be interpreted to demonstrate that Jesus felt the need to spend some time at prayer before his demanding mission tour.

J. M. Creed,¹¹⁵ I. H. Marshall,¹¹⁶ E. Schweizer,¹¹⁷ and J. Nolland¹¹⁸ suggest that Luke omitted Mark's *κακεῖ προσήύχeto* in order to emphasize Jesus' mission and mark more clearly that Jesus' departure from Capernaum was "not just temporary withdrawal for an early morning vigil."¹¹⁹ This explanation is also unconvincing for two reasons: i) Jesus' mission began in Luke 4:14-15, not in 4:42-44. What is emphasized in Luke 4:43-44 is that Jesus' mission must (*δεῖ*) continue; he was not sent to preach in Capernaum (and Nazareth) only, but in other cities of Judea as well. This issue is emphasized so strongly in the passage that a short reference to Jesus praying would not have shifted the emphasis in any way. Rather, it could have strengthened it because it could be interpreted that, at prayer, Jesus became convinced that he must continue his mission and not stay in Capernaum where he was welcomed by crowds; ii) If Luke omitted the reference to Jesus praying in Luke 4:42 in order not to weaken his emphasis on Jesus' mission, then logically he should have also omitted the reference to Jesus praying, for example, in Luke 9:28 in order not to weaken two main points of the passage: Jesus' departure (*ἐξοδόν*) at Jerusalem (9:31) and "This is my Son, my Chosen; listen to him!" (9:35).

One could argue that Luke omitted Mark's reference to Jesus praying because the event recorded in Luke 4:42-44 is not one of the major turning points in the Lukan salvation history. This argument is problematic for two reasons: i) One may question if all Lukan references to

115. John Martin Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 72.

116. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 198.

117. Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, trans. D. E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox, 1984), 99.

118. Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 216.

119. Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 216.

Jesus praying, such as Luke (5:16);¹²⁰ 9:28-29; 11:1; and 23:34, are really highly important turning points in the Lukan salvation history; ii) One could also clearly point out many highly important turning points, such as Luke 4:14-15; 9:51; 19:28¹²¹ in the Lukan story when Luke does not mention Jesus praying. One may also regard Luke 4:42 as an important turning point, because Jesus was just heading to a demanding mission tour in Judea.

As we have seen, there is very little agreement among scholars as to why Luke failed to refer to Jesus praying in Luke 4:42. The most natural explanation is that the tradition from which Luke derived this section did not have reference to it.¹²²

Aland §147 (Mark 6:45-52) and ‘the Great Omission’

The Markan section 6:45-8:26 does not have a parallel in Luke and, therefore, it is commonly called ‘Great Omission.’ Mark 6:45-52, which states that after Jesus’ disciples had left for Bethsaida by the boat and Jesus himself had dismissed the crowd he went up on the mountain to pray, is the first pericope of this ‘omission’ in Luke. Because Aland §147 is part of the Great Omission, it is necessary to discuss it as a whole first. Scholars have offered various explanations for why Luke’s Gospel does not have a parallel to the Markan section.

Streeter discusses three main theories in his famous book *The Four Gospels*.¹²³

1) Luke knew Mark 6:45-8:26 but omitted it intentionally. This is definitely the most popular view among scholars.¹²⁴ Various reasons have been offered for this omission. Some of these theories attempt to give a general reason for the omission of the whole section, while others

120. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, 6, questions the importance of Luke 5:16.

121. We must also keep in mind, as noted before, that not all references to praying in Acts occur at important turning points of the story.

122. Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, BECNT 3A [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994], 440, suggests that “[i]t seems better to see an additional source here distinct from Mark.” Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* 1/3, 256), makes a similar suggestion.

123. Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 172–79.

124. See e.g. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 770–71; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 364; Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* 1/3, 525–27.

focus on exploring reasons for the omission pericope by pericope. The most common general arguments for why Luke omitted this whole section are:

First, Luke wanted to present the spreading of the gospel in phases: first to the Jews only in his Gospel, then to the Gentiles in Acts.¹²⁵ Because Jesus goes into a foreign territory in Mark 6:45-8:26, Luke omitted it. This argument, however, is problematic for many reasons: i) Only one event of this Markan section clearly occurs outside of the Jewish territory (Mark 7:24-30). In addition, Jesus did not go there to evangelize, but to rest. Mark 7:24 plainly states, “From there he [i.e., Jesus] set out and went away to the region of Tyre. He entered a house and did not want anyone to know he was there.” That he met a Gentile woman whose daughter he finally healed was accidental; Mark 7:24b notes that “[y]et He could not escape notice” (cf. Luke 10:13). After that incident, Jesus returned to the Sea of Galilee through Sidon and Decapolis (Mark 7:31). The healing incidents of Mark 7:32-37 most likely occurred near the sea, not on the way and in a totally foreign territory;¹²⁶ ii) Luke has specifically mentioned earlier that a great multitude of people, including from “the coast of Tyre and Sidon,” came to listen to Jesus (Luke 6:17). Whether they were Jews or Gentiles is not clear, but the possibility that they could have been Gentiles¹²⁷ cast another shadow over the theory that Luke limits the preaching of the good news to the Jews in his Gospel; iii) It is improbable that Luke felt compelled to omit Jesus’ journey to foreign countries for theological reasons, since Jesus had already been to Gerasenes in Decapolis

125. So Stein, *Luke*, 29; Goulder, *Luke I*, 437; John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1977), 97–98; see also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 770–71; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 364.

126. See Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 382. Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26*, 393, however, is open to the option that these healings happened “in the middle of the Decapolis,” not by the sea. Even if it had happened on the way, Luke could have moulded the tradition as Matthew does in the parallel pericope (Matt 15:29–31). Note also that Matthew includes Mark 6:45–8:29 in his Gospel, although he states that the disciples were forbidden to evangelize Gentiles (Matt 10:5–6) and Jesus “was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt 15:24). Against this background, it is clear that Matthew did not regard Mark 6:45–8:26, if it was before him, as a missionary journey to a foreign land.

127. E.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 624, and Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 242, believe that they were Gentiles.

(Luke 8:26-39).¹²⁸ Some have argued that Luke regarded Gerasenes as part of Galilee¹²⁹ or Jewish territory;¹³⁰ this is unlikely because Luke emphasizes that this place is *opposite* Galilee (Luke 8:26) and that people of this area raise pigs, which were regarded as unclean by the Jews.¹³¹ That Jesus asked the healed man to evangelize this mainly Gentile area (Luke 8:39) cast further doubt over the theory that Luke wanted to present two clearly distinguishable phases of the spreading of the good news in his Gospel and Acts; iv) Luke will later tell the story of the ten lepers (Luke 17:11-19). One of the healed men was a Samaritan, whom Luke calls ‘foreigner’ (ἄλλογενής). Jesus did not only heal him but also said to him, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.¹³²

Second, Luke omitted the Markan section because he desired to connect the feeding of five thousand (Luke 9:10b-17) with Peter’s christological confession (Luke 9:18-21).¹³³ This theory is not convincing either. If Luke had felt it was so crucial to connect these two events together and that it was necessary to exclude all the Markan material between them, then we could also justifiably expect Luke to have molded the wording of Luke 9:18-21 to make the connection between these two events clearer. Neither John the Baptist nor Elijah, mentioned in Luke 9:19, are connected to feeding miracles in the Bible. Why not include the names of Moses (Exod 16; Num 11) and Elisha (1 Kgs 4:42-44), who did feeding miracles as Jesus did, instead?

Third, Luke omitted the Markan section because the content of Mark 7:1-23 (Tradition of the Elders) especially, along with Mark 6:52; 7:27-28; 8:1-21, contradict Luke’s fundamental conviction that the Mosaic law, including the dietary law, “remains permanently valid for Israel,

128. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 361–62.

129. So Goulder, *Luke 1*, 437. If so, “‘Galilee’ for this purpose,” however, “has to be interpreted rather liberally: it includes ‘the county of the Gergesenes opposite Galilee’ (8:26-39), and Bethsaida, also east of the Jordan, but none of the Decapoltan hinterland.”

130. So William R. G Loader, *Jesus’ Attitude Towards the Law*, WUNT 97 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997), 321.

131. Note that after Jesus had cast the demons out of the man, the herdsmen went to the city and country to tell about the incident. This suggests that people in general in these places accepted raising pigs. After the report, people of these areas went out to see Jesus and “all the people” of the area asked Jesus to depart from them. – Many commentators regard this area pagan or semi-pagan (see Bovon, *Luke 1*, 329; Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, 775).

132. See Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, BECNT 3B (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 1405–06. See also Luke 9:51-56 and 10:29-37.

133. Stein, *Luke*, 29; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 364.

while never having been intended for gentiles.”¹³⁴ However, Luke did not completely abandon this material, but after re-editing it, “transposed” its major thematic elements to Acts 10:1-11:18.¹³⁵ Thus, M. Pettem’s theory is unconvincing for three reasons. i) None of the three pericopes (Mark 7:31-37; 8:11-13, 22-26) in this section has a reference to food; ii) All the references to food, except in Mark 7:1-23, are not clearly related to the dietary law at all; iii) Even if the latter part of Mark 7:1-23 (i.e., vv. 14-23) had contradicted Luke’s theological view, there would have been no need to omit the whole pericope because the first part of the pericope (Mark 7:1, 5-13)¹³⁶ is in total agreement with other Lukan pericopes in which Jesus criticizes wrong interpretation of the law (e.g., Luke 6:1-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6).

Fourth, Luke omitted the Markan section in order to make space for his non-Markan material and to keep the length of the Gospel reasonable.¹³⁷ Fitzmyer does not regard this argument as very convincing.¹³⁸ Even if Luke had included Mark 6:45-8:26, the length of his roll (if he used a roll) would still have remained within acceptable limits.¹³⁹ Luke 16:9-21, having 229 words and about 1200 letters,¹⁴⁰ fits on one sheet the size of 26.4 x 13 cm (10.375 x 5.125 in) in \wp^{75} .¹⁴¹ With the same density of the text, the whole Gospel of Luke would have taken 84

134. Michael Pettem, “Luke’s Great Omission and His View of the Law,” *NTS* 42/1 (1996): 36–37.

135. Pettem, “Luke’s Great Omission and His View of the Law,” 47–53.

136. Pettem, “Luke’s Great Omission and His View of the Law,” 44, admits that Mark 7:1-13 “may not have troubled Luke.”

137. So Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* 1/3, 526 and Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 364.

138. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX*, 770. See also Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel*, 98.

139. Scholars debate over the upper limits of the ‘comfortable’ roll length. Pliny (*Nat.* 13.77) claims that a papyrus roll never had more than 20 sheets (see Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995], 45, 44 n.10, 47, 47 n.18), but some existing fragments indicate that rolls were sometimes much longer. Gamble argues that “[a] roll of more than ten or eleven meters was too cumbersome for the reader to handle” (p. 47), but Williams A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 149, argues, based on his detail study of bookrolls, that an upper limit extended “at least to 15 meters, with great likelihood of odd examples extending to a length considerably beyond that.”

140. Based on my own calculations with the help of the BibleWorks 7 program. – Luke 16:9-21 in \wp^{75} has 42 lines. The number of lines per sheet varies between 38 and 48, and each line has 25 to 36 letters (Timothy W. Seid, ed., “Papyrus 75,” n.p. [cited 2006]. Online: http://www.earlham.edu/~seidti/iam/tc_pap75.html).

141. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd, enl. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), plate III.

sheets¹⁴² and the length of the roll would have been about 10.9 m. \wp^{75} , however, is not an excerpt from a roll, but a codex, and therefore has relatively wide margins. If one margin were eliminated, it would probably save 20% in space. In that case, the length of the roll would have been about 8.7 m. If the omitted Markan section had been included,¹⁴³ the total length of Luke's Gospel would have been approximately 9.2 m; still within acceptable limits.

As we can see, none of the aforementioned general arguments for why Luke omitted the Markan section, if he knew it, have shown to be very convincing.

Scholars have also offered specific reasons for Luke's omission of individual pericopes in this section:

First, Luke omitted Mark 6:45-52 (The Walking on the Water) due to its similarity to Luke 8:22-25 (Stilling the Storm), and Mark 8:1-10 (Four Thousand Are Fed) due to its similarity to Luke 9:10b-17 (Five Thousand Are Fed).¹⁴⁴ This argument has some weaknesses: i) It is highly questionable whether the first pair could be regarded as a true doublet.¹⁴⁵ In both stories, Jesus does calm the storm at the end, but the details of these stories is quite different. In addition, one could argue that the theological function of these two stories are different: the Jesus of the first story (Mark 4:35-41 par.) functions as the one whom God has authorized to perform miracles as some early prophets did (cf. Exod 14:15-31; 2 Kgs 2:8, 13-14), but the Jesus of the second story (Mark 6:45-52 par.) functions as a theophany of God (cf. ἤθελεν περιπατῶν in Mark 6:48 with Exod 33:19-23; 34:6; 1 Kgs 19:11; and ἐγὼ εἰμι in Mark 6:50 par with Exod 3:14; see also Job 9:8 LXX; Ps 77:19; Isa 43:16);¹⁴⁶ ii) Luke does not systematically eliminate doublets elsewhere in

142. According to the BibleWorks 7 program, the Gospel of Luke has 19,482 words, whereas according to Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, 164, it has 19,404 words. According to the Logos program, it has about 101,000 letters.

143. Mark 6:45-8:26 has 1,149 words and about 6,260 letters.

144. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 364; Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*, 99; Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels: An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 269, 284-85; Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1990), 285.

145. Bovon, *Luke I*, 361.

146. See Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 259-71, 345-54; Gundry, *Mark*, 237-41, 335-38; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 755-65.

his Gospel; why would he have done so here?¹⁴⁷

Second, Luke omitted Mark 6:45-52 because the disciples assumed they were seeing a ghost and this could have strengthened the view of docetism which argued that Jesus' body was not real. The view is problematic: i) There is little evidence that docetism was a real problem at the time of the writing of Luke's Gospel; ii) If Luke was afraid of giving a weapon for docetists, then he should also have eliminated Luke 24:36-43 (Jesus Appears to Two on the Way to Emmaus).

Third, Luke omitted Mark 6:53-56 (Healings at Gennesaret) because it adds "little to the tale" and is "told in a general way."¹⁴⁸ True, but Luke has similar kinds of summary statements elsewhere (e.g., Luke 4:14-15, 40-41, 42-44; 6:17-19).

Fourth, Luke omitted Mark 7:31-37 (Jesus Heals a Deaf Mute and Many Others) and 8:22-26 (A Blind Man Is Healed at Bethsaida) because Jesus healed a deaf mute and a blind person, argues H. Koester, "through elaborate manipulations; all other healings are accomplished through Jesus' words, simple gesture, or touching with or taking by the hand."¹⁴⁹ The "elaborated manipulations" as means of healing can hardly be a reason for these assumed omissions because Luke does not show any reluctance to record other healing stories in which people were healed by a means of "manipulations:" Luke 8:44 (the woman with a hemorrhage was healed by touching the fringe of Jesus' clothes), Acts 5:15-16 (the sick were healed when Peter's shadow fell on them), 19:12 (the sick were healed when the handkerchiefs or aprons that had touched Paul were brought to them).

147. For Lukan doublets, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX*, 81-82; Heinz Schürmann, "Die Dubletten im Lukasevangelium," *ZKT* 75 (1953): 338-45; Heinz Schürmann, "Die Dublettenvermeidungen im Lukasevangelium," *ZKT* 76 (1954): 83-93. Schürmann, "Die Dubletten im Lukasevangelium," 343, writes, "Luk schafft also von sich aus bewußt keine Dubletten, sondern läßt es höchstens zu, wenn bei seinem schematischen Kompositionsverfahren solch in wenigen Fällen entstehen." – Luke has four Sabbath controversies (Luke 6:1-5, 6-8; 13:10-17; 14:1-6), all of the last three having similar elements.

148. Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*, 99.

149. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 285.

Fifth, Luke omitted Mark 8:22-26 “due to the possible implication that Jesus was unable to heal the blind man instantaneously.”¹⁵⁰ It is unlikely that anyone would have come to this conclusion in light of the numerous other healing stories in Luke’s Gospel, in which Jesus healed the sick instantaneously. Rather, being used to the figurative meaning of Jesus’ parables, Luke and his audience might have tried to interpret this unusual healing story in a figurative sense, as Mark seemed to do.¹⁵¹

As we have seen, none of the above-mentioned reasons seem to offer a convincing explanation as to why Luke would have omitted Mark 6:45-8:26, if he knew it. The only somewhat weighty evidence that Luke knew Mark 6:45-8:26, but intentionally omitted it, is his knowledge of Bethsaida (Luke 9:10b) which is mentioned in the ‘omitted’ Markan section (Mark 6:45; 8:22). This argument too, however, can be seriously questioned: First, the word ‘Bethsaida’ does not occur in all MSS of Luke 9:10b. It is missing in some early manuscripts (N^{*and 2}, sy^c, bo^{mss}) and in some later ones (69, 157, 579, 788, [1241]) as well.¹⁵² Most scholars think that the word occurred in the ‘original’ text of Luke, but is missing in some MSS due to a mistake of the early copyist or an attempt to harmonize the Lukan text with the Markan and Matthean parallels. This is possible, but not certain. If the word ‘Bethsaida’ did not occur in the ‘original’ Luke, then the argument that Luke knew Mark 6:45-8:26 has no force. However, even if the word occurred in the ‘original’ Luke, this does not necessarily mean that Luke drew the term from Mark 6:45; 8:22. If the word occurred in the ‘original’ Luke, one may wonder why Luke, who was not

150. Stein, *Luke*, 29 n.18.

151. In Mark 8:22-26 the healing happens in two phases, probably symbolizing “the stages in the disciples’ gaining insight into the identity of Jesus” (the quotation from Gundry, *Mark*, 420, although he does not agree with the interpretation), especially because it occurs between Mark’s reference to blindness and the disciples’ lack of understanding (Mark 8:18-21) and Peter’s confession (Mark 8:27-30) (so Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26*, 430–31 and many others).

Also notice that John, who definitely wants to depict Jesus as God, does not feel uncomfortable to tell the story of the man born blind whom Jesus healed by using mud with saliva (John 9:1-41).

152. See Luke 9:10 in NA²⁷ and Reuben J. Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 160; Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: UBS, 1994), 123.

particularly interested in naming the places of events, would have added it to his text; the word ‘Bethsaida’¹⁵³ does not occur in the parallel text in Mark 6:32-44. This illogicality may hint that Luke did not draw Luke 9:10b-17 from *canonical* Mark at all. Second, Luke’s pericope of 9:10b-17 seems to have an inner contradiction. Luke says that Jesus and his disciples withdrew “to a city called Bethsaida” (Luke 9:10b) but the following feeding miracle clearly happens in a lonely place (ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ; Luke 9:12).¹⁵⁴ This may be regarded as further evidence that the word ‘Bethsaida’ is a latter addition to the Lukan text. Third, the sequence of geographical locations in Mark 6:32-6:53 par. is confusing. The Matthean and Johannine accounts agree that the feeding miracle occurred on the east side of the Sea of Galilee,¹⁵⁵ but the Markan account paints a baffling picture. The feeding miracle in the Markan account could have occurred either on the west or east side of the Sea of Galilee, depending on how we understand the reference to Bethsaida in Mark 6:45. If Mark means that the miracle happened on the east side of the sea, then the Bethsaida of Mark 6:45 must have been situated on the west side, but this contradicts the testimony of Josephus (*Ant.* 18.28; *J.W.* 2.168; 3.515; *Life* 72) and Ptolemy (*Geographia* 5.16.4) who seem to indicate that the city or village was situated in the east side of Jordan. If Mark means that the miracle occurred on the west side of the sea, then this location contradicts the accounts of Matthew and John.¹⁵⁶ According to the Lukan account, the feeding miracle occurred ‘in’ Bethsaida. However, we cannot accurately determine from the context where Luke assumed this city to have been situated. Fourth, Mark 6:32-44 par. has an extraordinarily high number of minor agreements: ἐχώρησεν (Luke 9:10b), οἱ ὄχλοι (9:11), ἠκολούθησαν (9:11), healing of people

153. Some have suggested that Luke added the word ‘Bethsaida,’ because it is thought to mean ‘place of satisfaction,’ but this translation is unlikely. Rather, it means ‘house of hunting or fishing.’ See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 765; Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, 828.

154. W. F. Arndt, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956), 255, attempts to solve the problem by suggesting that εἰς in Luke 9:10b could mean “toward”, but this view has found very few supporters.

155. Cf. Matt 14:13 with John 6:1; Matt 14:14 with John 6:3; Matt 14:22 with John 6:17; and Matt 14:34 with John 6:21-24.

156. Some have suggested that there were two Bethsaidas; one on the east side of the sea, another on the west side of it, but this is very questionable. See R. H. Mounce, “Bethsaida,” in *ISBE*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 1:475.

(9:11b), δέ (9:12), τάς (9:12), οἱ δέ (9:13), οὐκ (9:13), ἄρτοι (9:13), ὥσεῖ (9:14), εἶπεν δέ (9:14), τῷ ὄχλῳ (9:16), τὸ περισσεῦσαν (9:17), and κλασμάτων (9:17).¹⁵⁷ All of these observations together hint that the textual history of Mark 6:32-44 par. is complex and that Luke might not have used *canonical* Mark as his source here. Even many advocates of the 2SH admit that Luke might have been influenced by an overlapping tradition.¹⁵⁸

In summary, the view that Luke must have known Mark 6:45-8:26 because of his reference to Bethsaida in Luke 9:10b has no compelling evidence to offer. It is unlikely that Mark 6:45-8:26 as the whole was available to Luke.

Streeter, as I have mentioned above, also discusses two other theories which try to explain the Great Omission.

2) The Markan copy, which Luke used as his source, had originally had Mark 6:45-8:26 but was now missing due to the mutilation of the text. This is the theory which Streeter himself supports.¹⁵⁹ In the Lukan narrative, the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Luke 9:10b-17) is followed by Peter's confession (Luke 9:18-21). An interesting point, as Streeter mentions, is that some MSS (B*, 157, [1424], P⁷⁵?)¹⁶⁰ have συνήντησαν ("they met") instead of συνήσαν ("they were with") in Luke 9:18. Streeter assumes that the original reading of an ancestor of B was ἦντησαν ("they met").¹⁶¹ Streeter suggests that the wording of B reflects the problem Luke faced if his mutilated copy of Mark missed everything between αὐτὸς μόνος (Mark 6:47) καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα (Mark 8:27).¹⁶² Luke attempted to connect the accounts of the feeding and Peter's confession logically together and therefore introduced the word ἦντησαν to the text. Early copyists emended the Lukan text and changed ἦντησαν to συνήσαν (NA²⁷) and συνήντησαν (B).

157. Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 517–19; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 763.

158. So Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 763. Walter Radl, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: 1, 1–9, 50* (Freiburg: Herder, 2003), 595–96, argues that Matthew's and Luke's version of Mark differ here.

159. The theory is also supported by Ernst Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), 303–04.

160. See Luke 9:18 in NA²⁷ and Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Luke*, 163.

161. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 177 n.1.

162. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 176.

In addition, because Luke's copy of Mark lacked the reference to Caesarea Philippi where Peter's confession happened (Mark 8:27), Luke concluded from the available text (Mark 6:45) that Peter's confession occurred in Bethsaida. In order to make his narrative clearer to the reader, Luke inserted the name Bethsaida before the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Luke 9:10b), not between this pericope and Peter's confession as it was in the Markan text (Mark 6:45) available to Luke.¹⁶³ Although the reading of B, 157 and 1424 may reflect a significant early textual problem, the rest of Streeter's theory builds on too many speculations to convince more than a few.

3) The original Mark used by Luke lacked the section Mark 6:53-8:21. In Mark 6:45 Jesus sends his disciples by boat to Bethsaida after *the Feeding of the Five Thousand*, but their arrival there is not mentioned till Mark 8:22, after *the Feeding of the Four Thousand* (Mark 8:1-10, [11-21]). Therefore, it is suggested by some that the material between these two 'Bethsaida pericopes' is a later insertion into the original text of Mark.¹⁶⁴ Streeter rejects this theory.¹⁶⁵ This theory, however, is very plausible. As I have demonstrated above, there is no convincing hypothesis to explain why Luke would have omitted the whole of Mark 6:45-8:26 if he knew it. Koester is one of the present supporters of this theory. He argues that the earliest version used by Luke did not have "the Bethsaida section" (Mark 6:45-8:26), whereas a later version of Mark used by Matthew did.¹⁶⁶

Mark 6:45-52, where there is reference to Jesus praying, is the first pericope of the Great Omission as noted earlier. Scholars who support the view that Luke knew Mark 6:45-8:26 but intentionally omitted it argue that Luke transposed the reference to prayer in Mark 6:46 to Luke

163. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 177.

164. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 173-74.

165. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 174, states two reasons why he rejects this theory: i) There are no differences in style and vocabulary between Mark 6:45-8:26 and the rest of Mark, and ii) Matthew must have known Mark 6:45-8:26 because his account has the parallel to it. Neither of these arguments is compelling. It is very possible that there were different versions of Markan-like material in circulation in the early church.

166. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 285-86. Koester supports the *Ur-Markus* theory, claiming that Luke and Matthew "have preserved the original Markan text" (Helmut Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels: Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 40-44; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 284-86. The quotation from the former book, p. 41).

9:18. This is theoretically possible, but the cumulative evidence discussed above seems to suggest that Luke was not aware of the whole section of Mark 6:45-8:26 at all. There are no convincing general or specific reasons, as I have shown above, for why Luke would have omitted Mark 6:45-52, if he had known it. If Luke did not have access to Mark 6:45-52, then the reference to Jesus praying in Luke 9:18 could not have been drawn by Luke from Mark.

Aland §§347-348 (Luke 23:44-48, 49; Mark 15:33-39, 40-41)

The Lukan account of the death of Jesus differs in many ways from the parallel account in Mark. The major differences are as follows:¹⁶⁷

First, Jesus' last prayer is different. While the Markan Jesus exclaims, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?" (Mark 15:34),¹⁶⁸ the Lukan Jesus cries out, "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46).¹⁶⁹ The difference is usually explained that Luke replaced the Markan prayer to depict Jesus as the one who faces his death peacefully and trusting God.¹⁷⁰ The argument is appealing but not necessarily compelling, because it is also possible that Luke drew his Passion-Resurrection Narrative from a source that had already partly developed into a different direction before Luke utilized it.¹⁷¹ The question of Luke's source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative

167. For all differences, see Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1838; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, AB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1512.

168. Cf. Ps 22:1 and its context. Scholars argue about how literally these words of Jesus should be taken (see Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*, vol. 2, ABRL [New York: Doubleday, 1994], 1043–78). One should notice that the centurion at the cross does not come to the conclusion that Jesus was rejected by God. After seeing *ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν* (Mark 15:39), he just comes to the opposite conclusion: "Truly this man was God's Son." That Jesus' exclamation (cf. Ps 22:1) is followed by two other scriptural allusions, i.e., the offering of vinegar (cf. Ps 69:21) and people looking on from a distance (cf. Pss 38:11; 88:8), may suggest that Jesus' exclamation on the cross was not intended by Mark to focus on Jesus' agony in the first place, but rather, to demonstrate how Scripture was fulfilled in Jesus' death.

169. Cf. Ps 31:5. Some scholars have suggested that the later Jewish custom to recite this verse of the Psalm at evening prayer (*b. Ber. 5a*) was already practiced at Jesus' time (see Eberhard Bons, "Das Sterbewort Jesu nach Lk 23,46 und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund," *BZ* 38 [1994]: 95 n.6; Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, 67), but this view has been questioned by others (see Bons, "Das Sterbewort Jesu nach Lk 23,46 und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund," 95; Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* [Vol. 2], 1069).

170. See Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, 67. Cf. Acts 7:59.

171. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1513, a devoted advocate of the 2SH, suggests that "the omission of the cry of dereliction" "might seem to stem from 'L'", "since John 19:28-30 knows nothing of it either (only Mark and Matthew record it)."

can be established only with cumulative evidence. The Passion-Resurrection Narrative will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Second, Jesus is called δίκαιος in Luke (23:47), while in Mark (15:39) he is called “Son of God” by the centurion. If Luke knew Mark, why did he decide to use δίκαιος instead of “Son of God,” although he often uses the latter title or concept elsewhere in his Gospel?¹⁷² A widely accepted explanation, since the influential article of G. D. Kilpatrick¹⁷³ in 1942, has been that δίκαιος means “innocent” here and Luke chose this term because he wanted to emphasize Jesus’ (political) innocence in the Passion context (Luke 23:4, 14, 15 [twice], 22, 41); Luke continues to develop this theme in Acts (3:14; 7:52; 13:28; 22:14).¹⁷⁴ This observation is again very interesting, but the data can be interpreted in opposite ways: F. J. Matera believes that Kilpatrick’s interpretation of δίκαιος “has the advantage of integrating the centurion’s cry into

John S. Kloppenborg, “*Exitus Clari Viri*: The Death of Jesus in Luke,” *TJT* 8/1 (1992): 106–20, argues that Luke intentionally molded the Markan Passion Narrative in order to make the story more appealing to his Graeco-Roman audience. He finds three elements in Luke’s depiction of Jesus’ death which correspond to the story of Socrates’ death as told in the *Phaedo*: Jesus’ farewell address, his heroic death, and the presence of Jesus’ friends at his death. There are some similarities between these stories, but these do not naturally prove that Luke edited the Markan text or even that Luke himself is behind these changes.

172. Luke 1:35 (Mark has no parallel); 4:3, 9 (absent in Mark; Q); 4:41 (absent in Mark); 22:70 (absent in Mark); Acts 9:20. See also Luke 1:32; 2:49; 3:22, 23; 9:39; and 20:41, 44.

Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1515, suggests that Luke probably avoided the Markan phrase ‘Son of God on the lips of a pagan in order to avoid being misunderstood by his readers. Kalervo Salo, *Luukkaan Teologian Ydin: Luukkaan Evankeliumin Ja Apostolien Tekojen Pelastuskäsitys*, SESJ 84 (Helsinki: Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, 2003), 191, agrees. Fitzmyer’s suggestion, however, is not convincing because Luke had already used the phrase ‘Son of God’ to describe Jesus several times before the crucifixion episode. So the readers already know that this phrase is not equal to the Greek concept of ‘sons of gods.’

Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 1164–65, suggests that Luke did not want to use the title “Son of God” on the lips of a Gentile before Acts that is “devoted to the spread of faith among the Gentiles.” This, however, is a questionable explanation, because the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles is not totally excluded in Luke’s Gospel either as we have already seen (Luke 6:17; 8:39).

173. George Dunbar Kilpatrick, “A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke Xxiii.47,” *JTS* 43 [1942]: 34–36. Recently many scholars, including Robert J. Karris, “Luke 23:47 and the Lucan View of Jesus’ Death,” in *Reimagining the Death of the Lucan Jesus*, ed. Dennis Sylva, BBB 73 [Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1990], 68–78, John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, WBC 35C [Dallas: Word, 1993], 1158–59, Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* [Vol. 2], 1163, and Frank J. Matera, “The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources,” *CBQ* 47/3 (1985): 471–72, have challenged Kilpatrick’s translation and some of them have returned back to the old translation ‘righteous.’ The translation ‘righteous/just’ may be more accurate here, but, as Brown correctly notes, this translation also includes the meaning of ‘innocent’ (see above).

174. The Scripture references from Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1864. Bock claims that Luke 23:47 is the seventh confession of innocence in the Passion Narrative.

Luke's total portrait of Jesus, thereby suggesting that Luke is editing Mark rather than drawing upon another continuous PN,"¹⁷⁵ whereas Fitzmyer argues that because Luke uses δίκαιος rather than υἱὸς θεοῦ, Luke may have drawn the term from L that has preserved the more "authentic historical tradition" than Mark; Mark's υἱὸς θεοῦ reflects a later theological development in the church.¹⁷⁶

Third, the order of events between the Lukan and Markan accounts is significantly different as the following diagram shows (I have also included Luke 23:33-43 par., because Mark 15:36 has a parallel in Luke 23:36):¹⁷⁷

<i>Mark 15:22-41</i>		<i>Luke 23:33-49</i>
1) Arrive at Golgotha	(1)	1) Arrive at place called The Skull
2) Offer of wine/myrrh	(8)	2) Crucifixion
3) Crucifixion	(2)	3) Malefactors right and left
4) Casting lots	(5)	4) 'Father forgive'
5) Third hour	(*)	5) Casting lots
6) Title 'Kings of Jews'	(9)	6) <i>People watching</i>
7) Thieves right and left	(3)	7) 'Saved others' jest ('Come down' omitted)
8) Temple jest	(*)	8) Vinegar and 'Save thyself' jest
9) 'Saved others - come down'	(7&8)	9) Title
10) Thieves mock	(10)	10) Two malefactors <i>contrasted</i>
11) Darkness at sixth hour	(11)	11) Darkness at sixth hour
12) Cry of forsakenness - Elijah	(*)	12) Temple veil
13) Vinegar	(8)	13) Load cry
14) Loud cry	(13)	14) 'Father into thy hands'
15) Temple veil	(12)	15) Death
16) Death	(15)	16) Centurion
17) Centurion	(16)	17) People watch
18) Women	(19)	18) <i>Watching crowd departs</i>
		19) Women

It is no wonder that J. Jeremias, in his own similar study, concludes that if Luke knew the Markan account of the crucifixion, he totally muddled ("vollständig durcheinandergewirbelt") the order of events.¹⁷⁸

175. Matera, "The Death of Jesus According to Luke," 471-72. Matera does not recognize, however, that his view does not prove that Luke knew Mark's Passion Narrative. The innocent theme could also have been present in Luke's non-Markan Passion source.

176. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1513, 1520. Fitzmyer believes the L-tradition overlapped Mark in the Passion Narrative.

177. The diagram is from Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*, 114.

178. Joachim Jeremias, "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" *NTS* 4 (1957-58): 118. Jeremias believes that only a special tradition ("Sonderüberlieferung") can explain these differences.

In the pericopes under discussion, the different order of the rending of the temple veil has especially bothered scholars: while in the Markan account the rending occurs after Jesus' death (Mark 15:38), in the Lukan account it happens before his death (Luke 23:45b). Scholars have tried to figure out the reason for this difference, but no consensus has been reached.¹⁷⁹ Probably two of the most interesting suggestions are those of D. E. Sylva and R. E. Brown. In Sylva's interpretation, the rending of the veil functions positively: as Stephen saw the heavens opened up before his death (Acts 7:56), so the temple veil was rent before Jesus' death. The 'opening' in these stories represents Stephen's and Jesus' communion/communication with God.¹⁸⁰ Sylva's comparison limps: i) Luke uses different Greek words for 'opening' in Luke 23:45b and Acts 7:56; ii) Stephen *saw* the heavens open, Jesus *did not see* the rending of the veil; iii) Why use a confusing veil image in Jesus' case when Luke could have easily been able to use a clearer heaven image (cf. Luke 3:21-22)? Brown is not convinced by Sylva's arguments.¹⁸¹ In Brown's own interpretation, the rending of the veil functions negatively: it symbolizes "God's wrath." By his rearrangement of the rending episode, Luke is able to focus first on two negative signs (i.e., the darkness and the rending of the temple veil) and then on three positive ones (i.e., the centurion's confession; the beating of breasts that represent repentance for Brown; and Jesus' acquaintances at the cross); the dividing event is Jesus' death.¹⁸² Brown's theory is even less convincing than Sylva's: i) The rending of the veil is not seen as a negative symbol by early sources. As Heb 9:3, 8; 10:19-22 shows, at least some early Christians interpreted the event positively. There is also no indication that Luke opposed the worship in the temple: still Paul goes there to worship at the end of Acts (21:17-29; 24:10-13, 17-19); ii) The beating (τύπτω) of breasts in Luke 23:48b does not

179. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1157, lists seven major suggestions regarding the significance of the rending of the veil. See also Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1860–61.

180. Dennis D. Sylva, "The Temple Curtain and Jesus' Death in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 105/2 (1986): 250, 245. For Sylva, the rending of the veil does not mean "the opening of a new way to God."

181. See Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 1102–06.

182. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 1038, 1141–88.

likely mean repentance but sorrow;¹⁸³ iii) Because Jesus' acquaintances were standing "at a distance" (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν), Luke may allude to Pss 38:11 and 88:8, which, by the way, do not depict the onlookers very favorably.

The lack of scholarly consensus regarding the reason why the order of the rending of the veil differs in Mark and Luke may be one further indication against the view that Luke relied on canonical Mark here.

Fourth, verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts is low (17.9% and 9.3%¹⁸⁴/21.0% and 9.3%¹⁸⁵). Those who believe that Luke used Mark here argue that the low agreement percentage is due to Luke's rewriting of the account in order to better reflect his theological view. However, because the verbatim agreement percentage is much lower *throughout* the Passion-Resurrection Narrative than in the non-Passion section, this may indicate that Luke did not draw his Passion-Resurrection Narrative from canonical Mark.

"[T]he case," as Marshall puts it, "for a separate passion narrative used by [Luke] is at its weakest here [in Aland §§347-348],"¹⁸⁶ and yet, it has been strong enough to convince numerous scholars that Luke either drew these pericopes from a non-Markan source¹⁸⁷ or was influenced by an additional source.¹⁸⁸ According to D. L. Bock, "[o]nly a few scholars argue for a total Lucan

183. So e.g. Joel B. Green, "The Demise of the Temple as 'Culture Center' in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23.44-49)," *RB* 101/4 (1994): 500-01; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 877. See also H. Haarbeck, "κόπτω," in *NIDNTT*, vol. 2, ed. C. Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 417-19; G. Stählin III, "Kopetós," in *TDNT: Abridged in One Volume*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 453-58. The verb *τύπτω* is not used in the sense of "beat (the breast)" in the LXX or NT beside in Luke 18:13 and 23:48. In Luke 18:13, the beating the breast is an expression of lamentation, including the sense of contrition. Josephus (*Ant.* 7.252) uses the same Greek verb for David's lamentation over his dead son Absalom. In Luke 23:48, the expression means very likely the same as in Josephus: lamentation over the dead. This is the normal meaning of this expression with the more common verb *κόπτω*, as the articles of Haarbeck and Stählin show. Cf. Luke 8:52; 23:27.

184. So Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?* 71.

185. So Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 64-65.

186. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 874.

187. So Jeremias, "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" 117-19. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 27-37.

188. So Vincent Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*, ed. O. E. Evans, SNTSMS 19 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 98; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 873-77; Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, RNT 3 (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1977); E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, rev. ed., NCB (London: Oliphants, 1974), 266; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 7th ed., THKNT 3 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974), 431; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-*

redaction of Mark.¹⁸⁹

Aland §163 (Luke 9:37-43a; Mark 9:14-29)

The Markan pericope of the healing of a boy possessed by an evil spirit ends with Jesus' instruction to his disciples, "This kind can come out only through prayer" (Mark 9:29). This verse is missing in both Matthew and Luke. Fitzmyer, an advocate of the 2SH, regards it "strange, given all the Lucan emphasis on prayer in the Gospel" that Luke has omitted it.¹⁹⁰ Bock concludes that "[t]his may be yet another indication of a complex situation with regard to sources."¹⁹¹

Koester argues that this "is the most complex miracle narrative in Mark and presents the most difficult problem for the explanation of its relationship to the parallels in Matthew (17:14-21) and Luke (9:38-43a)."¹⁹² The pericope is part of chapter 9 in Luke, which some scholars regard as a preview of the central section of Luke (9:51-19:44).¹⁹³

XXIV, 1520; Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 284-85; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1155, 1159; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1858-66; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*; Friedrich Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*, WUNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1959). For a good summary of different opinions, see Franz Georg Untergaßmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Redaktionsgeschichte und zur Frage nach der lukanischen 'Kreuzestheologie'*, PaThSt 10 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1980), 109.

189. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1838-39.

190. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 807.

191. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 884.

192. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 281.

193. David P. Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy," *JBL* 102/4 [1983]: 575-605. Moessner argues that i) Luke intentionally depicts Jesus as the prophet like Moses in chapter 9. Moessner finds allusions to the story of Moses throughout the chapter. For example, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Transfiguration, and the Healing of the Possessed Boy are intended to recall the Manna Feeding in the Wilderness, Moses on Sinai, and the Golden Calf incident. It is true that the chapter has several allusions to Moses, but it also has allusions to the stories of Elijah, Elisha and John the Baptist; and it was not only Moses who appeared to Jesus at the transfiguration but Elijah too. Moessner forces the text to say more than it in fact says. For a summary of different interpretations of Moses and Elijah in Luke 9:30, see Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 868-69. For a modified view of the prophet like Moses, see D. A. S. Ravens, "Luke 9.7-62 and the Prophetic Role of Jesus," *NTS* 36 [1990]: 119-29; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9," in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978], 146-47; Robert F. O'Toole, "Luke's Message in Luke 9:1-50," *CBQ* 49 [1987]: 74-89; ii) The turning point of the chapter is the Transfiguration account, not Peter's Confession. "Each incident on the side has its mirror image on the other side of the mountain": Luke 9:1-6, 7-9/9:37-43a; 9:10-17/9:43b-45; 9:18-22/9:46-48; 9:23-27/9:46-50 (Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50," 599-600). This view has not won many enthusiastic supporters.

The Markan version of the story is much longer than the parallel versions in Matthew and Luke. The Matthean and Lukan accounts are very similar: they “are both shorter at the same points (‘the negative agreements’)” and “they share some material in common against Mark (‘the positive agreements’)”.¹⁹⁴ Many scholars argue that these similarities are accidental, resulting in Matthew’s and Luke’s decision “to eliminate needless Marcan details.”¹⁹⁵ This explanation, however, faces two problems. First, although it is characteristic for Matthew to shorten the Markan *miracle stories*, even radically, this is not typical for Luke.¹⁹⁶ Second, there are too many minor agreements to be accidental: αὐτῷ (Luke 9:37), λέγων (9:38), ὅτι (9:38), ἡδυνήθησαν (9:40), Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν (9:41), καὶ διεστραμμένη (9:41), ὧδε (9:41), τὸ δαιμόνιον (9:42/Matt 17:18), and ἰάσατο/ἐθεραπεύθη (9:42/Matt 17:18/ cf. Mark 9:27).¹⁹⁷ Two of the most interesting minor agreements are ἡδυνήθησαν and καὶ διεστραμμένη. G. E. Sterling notes,

The replacement of ἰσχύσαν with ἡδυνήθησαν is not expected. The verb occurs four times in Mark. Matthew preserves it in the other three instances but not here. Luke never maintains a Marcan use but employs the word eight times elsewhere. This is the only time that the First and Third Evangelists agree in their way of handling ἰσχύω in either Mark or Q. It is possible that each independently borrowed the term from the question of the disciples in Mark 9:28: ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἡδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; yet I find Matthew’s willingness to reproduce ἰσχύω everywhere except here surprising. The addition of καὶ διεστραμμένη is also worth noting. It is common to point to the phrase in Deut 32:5, γενεὰ σκολιά καὶ διεστραμμένη, and conclude that both evangelists added the participle independently. This is buttressed with the observation that the phrase appears in Phil 2:15. There are, however, some problems with this: first, the phrase is not identical; second, it seems unlikely that the two would *independently* add this when the phrase is not identical.¹⁹⁸

Sterling concludes that “[w]hile it is possible to attribute everything to the coincidences of

194. Gregory E. Sterling, “Jesus as Exorcist: An Analysis of Matthew 17:14–20; Mark 9:14–29; Luke 9:37–43a,” *CBQ* 55 (1993): 472.

195. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 806.

196. So Paul J. Achtemeier, “Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14–29,” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 473–74, following H. J. Held.

E.g. Aland §37/89 (Matt: 30 words; Mark: 44 words; Luke: 38 words); Aland §42/84 (Matt: 62; Mark: 99; Luke: 98); Aland §43/92 (Matt: 126; Mark: 196; Luke: 213); Aland §47/112 (Matt: 90; Mark: 95; Luke: 115); Aland §90/136 (Matt: 73; Mark: 118; Luke: 94); Aland §91/137 (Matt: 135; Mark: 325; Luke: 293); Aland §95/138 (Matt: 138; Mark: 373; Luke: 287); Aland §264 (Matt: 79; Mark: 123; Luke: 108).

197. Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, 532–3. For F. Neirynck’s contra-arguments, see F. Van Segbroeck, ed., *Evangelica II: 1982–1991 Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck*, BETL 49 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), 19, 20–23, 72.

198. Sterling, “Jesus as Exorcist,” 475–76.

redaction, the *quantity* of the agreements leads me to believe that Matthew and Luke had access to another version.”¹⁹⁹

Many scholars have also recognized that “the details which Luke has omitted are largely those which many critics hold to be secondary in Mk.”²⁰⁰ In other words, the versions of Matthew and Luke seem to be more primitive than that of Mark.²⁰¹ P. J. Achtemeier acknowledges that, theoretically, Matthew and Luke could have known “an earlier form of the story,” but rejects this view, because Matthew and Luke do not make the same point at the end of the story (cf. Matt 17:19-20/Luke 9:43).²⁰² The argument is very strange. Mark does not end the story in the same way as Matthew either (Mark emphasizes prayer, 9:29; Matthew emphasizes faith, 17:20-21) and yet Achtemeier believes that Matthew and Luke used Mark as their source here.

Fitzmyer argues that Luke omitted Mark 9:28-29 to “soften the criticism of the disciples.”²⁰³ It is difficult to understand how Fitzmyer has come into this conclusion, because Luke’s omission of Mark 9:28-29 in fact hardens Luke’s criticism of the disciples. In the Markan account, the disciples have some hope: they can heal even this kind of sick people if they pray, but this is not suggested in the Lukan account. Therefore, Luke’s desire to soften the criticism of the disciples cannot be a reason for why Luke’s account does not have a reference to prayer.

The verbatim agreement percentage between the Markan and Lukan accounts is low (15.2%²⁰⁴/13.7%²⁰⁵) as in many other cases when Luke’s emphasized theme is present in a Markan account but missing in the parallel Lukan account.

199. Sterling, “Jesus as Exorcist,” 476.

200. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 390. For a summary of the discussion of the prehistory of the Markan account, see John Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, WBC 35B (Dallas: Word, 1993), 506–08; Sterling, “Jesus as Exorcist,” 488.

201. See Achtemeier, “Miracles and the Historical Jesus,” 473; Sterling, “Jesus as Exorcist,” 488; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 383–84; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 282. E. P. Sanders, *Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), rejects the view of form critics that pericopes of the gospel tradition developed consistently from simpler to longer and more complex.

202. Achtemeier, “Miracles and the Historical Jesus,” 474.

203. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 810.

204. So Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 66.

205. So Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 48.

The evidence presented above favors the view that Luke did not draw this section (Aland §163) from canonical Mark.

Aland §275 (Mark 11:20-26)

The Withered Fig Tree account is found in Mark and Matthew but not in Luke. In Mark, the Cleansing of the Temple episode is ‘sandwiched’ between two parts of the cursing and withering of the fig tree accounts (Mark 11:12-14, 20-25, [26]), whereas in Matthew, the cleansing and withering incidents are separate units following each other (Matt 21:10-17, 18-19). In Matthew, the cursing and withering of the fig tree carries only a single *explicit* meaning: it is used as a demonstration of the power of faith and prayer in faith.²⁰⁶ But in Mark the issue is more complex because of the sandwich structure. There are three major interpretations of the Markan account and its pre-history:²⁰⁷

First, the text has only one intended purpose: to pronounce a judgment on the temple. W. R. Telford argues in his influential book that the sayings in Mark 11:24-25 (26) are post-Markan additions to the original text of Mark and can therefore be ignored, and that the “this mountain” (τῷ ὄρει τοῦτῳ) saying in Mark 11:23 is a Markan addition that makes the same point as the tradition: the temple will be destroyed.²⁰⁸ However, there is no textual evidence whatsoever that Mark 11:24-25 would be post-Markan additions, as S. E. Dowd correctly notes,²⁰⁹ and, as a result, most exegetes reject Telford’s argument. As for Telford’s interpretation of Mark 11:23, it has gained some supporters,²¹⁰ but many question or reject it because it contradicts the

206. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, trans. James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 22, shows that although the Withered Fig Tree has only a single explicit meaning in Matthew, the episode has been used “as a symbolic act that speaks of judgment on Israel” at least since Origen and Jerome.

207. For different interpretations of the passage, see Christfried Böttrich, “Jesus und der Feigenbaum: Mk 11:12–14, 20–25 in der Diskussion,” *NovT* 39/4 (1997): 328–59.

208. William R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark’s Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*, JSNTSup 1 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 49–59.

209. Sharyn Echols Dowd, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mk 11:22–25 in the Context of Markan Theology*, SBLDS 105 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 4.

210. E.g. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, WBC 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 188.

expectations of the OT regarding the status of Mount Zion in the last days.²¹¹

Second, the text has two intended purposes: to pronounce a judgment on the temple and to illustrate the power of faith and prayer in faith. The former is expressed implicitly, while the latter is asserted explicitly. The majority of scholars seem to hold this view. Some argue that Mark created the sandwich structure,²¹² while others believe that the structure was already present in Mark's source.²¹³ Some also argue that Mark added the originally independent sayings of Mark 11:22-25²¹⁴ to the tradition,²¹⁵ while others hold the view that they were already present in the pre-Markan tradition.²¹⁶ All these scholars, however, agree that Mark intended the episode to carry a double meaning.

Third, the text has only one intended purpose: to illustrate the power of faith and prayer in faith. P. F. Esler has recently argued that Mark found the 'sandwiched' structure in the early source that he calls the 'Last Days of Jesus' document.²¹⁷ The text is in the 'sandwiched' form, not because Mark wanted "to convey the message of judgment about to fall on Israel,"²¹⁸ but because Mark 11:12-25 is a faithful record of events: Jesus, on his way to Jerusalem from Bethany (v. 12), cursed the fig tree then went to the temple and returned to Bethany (v. 19); the following morning, on their way to Jerusalem (vv. 20, 27), the disciples noticed that the tree had

211. See e.g., Isa 2:2; 4:2-6; Zech 14:10; Mic 4:1. Many exegetes think that 'this mountain' is not specific or that it refers to the Mount of Olives; see e.g., France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 450.

212. So e.g., J. R. Edwards, "Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narrative," *NovT* 31 (1989): 193-216. Edwards argue that Mark created the structure "intentionally and for theological purpose" (p. 196). According to Edwards, there are about nine sandwich structures in Mark: 3:20-35; 4:1-20; 5:21-43; 6:7-30; 11:12-21; 14:1-11; 14:16-31; 14:53-72; 15:40-16:8. Some of his suggestions could be challenged.

213. So John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 894-95. He argues that the Withered Fig Tree account, created by a pre-Markan author, is not historical (p. 895).

214. For their possible relationship to Q, see Fleddermann, *Mark and Q*, 178-86 and Frans Neirynck, "Assessment," in *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*, Harry T. Fleddermann (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995), 289-91.

215. So e.g., Meier, *A Marginal Jew* (Vol. 2), 890. For the redactional and traditional elements in the text, see also Gerd Lüdemann, *Jesus After 2000 Years* (London: SCM, 2000), 78-79.

216. So e.g., Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 190, 194.

217. Philip Francis Esler, "The Incident of the Withered Fig Tree in Mark 11: A New Source and Redactional Explanation," *JSNT* 28/1 (2005): 41, 67.

218. Esler, "The Incident of the Withered Fig Tree in Mark 11," 50.

withered. “If Mark wished to convey a message of judgment about to fall on Israel,” why did not Mark indicate it more clearly, Esler argues, but instead of hiding “the meaning he wished to convey under another message [cf. Mk 11:22b-25] entirely.”²¹⁹ Esler makes a good point.

But, why does the Gospel of Luke not have the Withered Fig Tree episode?²²⁰ According to Telford, as we have seen above (the first option), the Markan verses 24-25 are post-Markan additions. Telford seems to suggest that the Markan version, which Luke used, only included the judgment of Israel material (vv. 12-14, 20-23). Luke omitted the pericope because in Luke’s theology, Israel still has a chance to repent.²²¹ If Luke had included the Withered Fig Tree episode, according to which “[m]ay no one ever [εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] eat fruit from you again” (Mark 11:14), Luke would have practically denied this chance. Telford’s suggestion does, however, have several weaknesses. First, there is no textual evidence whatsoever, as already noted above, that canonical Mark would not have had the saying of Mark 11:22b-25 from the beginning. Second, there would not have been a necessity to omit the whole pericope because of the words εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Mark 11:14); Luke could have easily changed them to fit to his theology on Israel. Third, Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem in Luke 19:41-42, which also does not envision a chance of repentance but only judgment, is no less harsh on Israel than the Withered Fig Tree episode.

If advocates of the second and third option, mentioned above, are correct that the sayings of Mark 11:23-25 are an inherent part of the Markan episode, then we face the problematic issue of why Luke would have ignored the best and largest block of material on prayer found in

219. Esler, “The Incident of the Withered Fig Tree in Mark 11,” 50.

220. See Brent Kinman, “Lucan Eschatology and the Missing Fig Tree,” *JBL* 113/4 [1994]: 669–78. Kinman summarizes six suggestions for why Luke omitted the Withered Fig Tree episode: i) Luke used a non-Markan source; ii) Luke replaced the episode by the Parable of the Barren Fig Tree (Luke 13:6-9), because this parable visions a possibility of repentance for Israel, whereas the Withered Fig Tree episode does not. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1004, correctly rejects this explanation; iii) “[T]he story would have cast aspersions on Jesus’ character”; iv) Luke omitted it due to his “political apologetic” concerns: “[s]orceres, astrologers, and the like were on occasion subject to imperial bans”; v) Luke omitted the episode since the “rapid rise in the number of Jewish converts appears not to confirm to the Marcan picture of a nation devastated”; and vi) The episode is “incompatible with... Luke’s teaching about a future for national Israel.” Kinman rejects all the views except the last one.

221. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 220.

Mark.²²² Even if Luke had wanted to exclude the Withered Fig Tree episode itself, there would not have been any necessity to exclude these sayings on prayer as well. In my opinion, the best explanation is that Luke did not use *canonical* Mark as his source and this explains why the Withered Fig Tree episode is missing in Luke.

Aland §290 (Luke 21:20-24; Mark 13:14-20)

The pre-history and interpretation of Mark 13 and its parallels is one of the most intensely debated issues in the Synoptics.²²³ Numerous different theories have been developed to explain, first, the pre-history of the Markan account, and, second, the pre-history of the Lukan and Matthean accounts. Mark has been seen as either a collector,²²⁴ a redactor,²²⁵ or an author.²²⁶

222. Cf. Dowd, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering*, 1.

223. See Keith D. Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount: Mark 13 and the Gathering of the New Community*, ITS 2 (Bern: Peter Lang, 1998); George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993).

224. Timothy Colani (1864): Mark used a single apocalyptic Jewish Christian document, which he interpolated into his Gospel without essential change. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 13–20.

F. Flückiger (1970): Mark used a pre-Markan discourse, compiled from three independent sources (the apocalyptic source, the temple prophecy source, and a collection of missionary sayings) by a redactor, which Mark integrated into his Gospel with little change. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 195–98; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 985.

225. Carl Weizsäcker (1864): Mark used and redacted an apocalyptic Jewish document. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 32–35.

R. Pesch (1868): Mark used and redacted an apocalyptic Jewish Christian document. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 273–83, 362; George R. Beasley-Murray, “Second Thought on the Composition of Mark 13,” *NTS* 29 (1983): 418.

Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 360–76: Mark combined isolated sayings from the catechetical tradition and other sources and redacted them. See also France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 498; Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, Vol. 2, eds. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1125–40.

David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse*, GPe 4 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 365, 367, 369: Mark used and redacted a pre-synoptic, pre-Pauline source (oral or written), which was also used by Luke and Matthew independently. Matthew and Luke might have also used canonical Mark as an additional source. See also Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1653–54; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 984.

226. E.g., L. Hartman (1966): Mark, inspired by some section of the book of Daniel, composed Mark 13:5b–8, 12–16, 19–22, 24–27 and combined them with some *logia* sayings. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 262–66.

J. Lambrecht (1966 and 1967): Mark redacted traditions on Jesus with a heavy hand, drawing most material from of Q (vv. 2, 5b–6, 21–23, 9–11, 12, 15–16, 30–31, 32–37) that he used loosely, and being inspired by some OT texts. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 266–73, 362–63. See also Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 985.

If scholarly opinions are divided regarding the pre-history and interpretation of Mark 13, the same is also true regarding the Lukan parallel passage. The relationship between Mark 13 and Luke 21 has been explained in three different ways:

1) Luke is using Mark exclusively. Although verbatim agreement between these parallel texts in general is low,²²⁷ a majority of scholars believe that all the changes in Luke can be explained on redactional bases. Some of the scholars who support this view are:²²⁸ J. Wellhausen, F. C. Burkitt, R. Bultmann, E. Klostermann, J. M. Creed, J. Schmid, H. Conzelmann,²²⁹ E. Grässer, E. Haenchen, J. Zmijewski, F. Neirynck, G. Schneider, W. Wiefel, and R. Geiger, (M. D. Goulder²³⁰), C. F. Evans,²³¹ and J. Verheyden.²³² Klostermann proposes three reasons for Luke's redaction:²³³ i) To update Mark in light of present/past events, such as the destruction of Jerusalem, persecution of Christians, and delay of the Parousia;²³⁴ ii) to avoid repetition of eschatological material,²³⁵ and iii) to remove offensive statements of Mark (13:32).

2) Luke is combining the Markan account and non-Markan source(s).²³⁶ This view also

227. 17.5% [Li] / 23.1% [Mo] in Aland §287 (Luke 21:5-6 par.); 49.5% [Li] / 51.5% [Mo] in Aland §288 (Luke 21:7-11 par.); 22.7% [Li] / 22.7% [Mo] in Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19 par.); 21.6% [Li] / 21.7% [Mo] in Aland §290 (Luke 21:20-24 par.); 28.2% [Li] / 25.4% [Mo] in Aland §292 (Luke 21:25-28 par.); 50.6% [Li] / 50.0% [Mo] in Aland §293 (Luke 21:29-33 par.). Li = Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 68; Mo = Morgenthauer, *Statistische Synopse*, 56-58. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 101-02, notes that if Luke really used Mark as his source here, he must have adopted "a very different manner from anything we can find in the Third Gospel previous to the Discourse; in fact, we have to turn to the Passion narrative itself to find a parallel to St. Luke's procedure."

228. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1326; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1654; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 755.

229. Conzelmann's (*The Theology of St. Luke*, 125-36) exegesis is typical.

230. Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, vol. 2, JSNTSup 20 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 704, an advocate of the MwQH, argues that Luke did not draw the unique material in chapter 21 from a non-Markan source, but "he simply composed the new matter himself."

231. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 732.

232. Josef Verheyden, "The Source(s) of Luke 21," in *L'Évangile de Luc. The Gospel of Luke*, rev. and enlarged ed., ed. F. Neirynck, BETL 32 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 491-516.

233. Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 3rd ed., reprint, 1929, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1975), 197. See also Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1654.

234. See also Goulder, *Luke II*, 702 and Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 131.

235. Luke 21:14-15 = Luke 12:11-12; Luke 21:21b = Luke 17:31; Mark 13:20-23 = Luke 17:23; Mark 13:34-36 = Luke 12:39-48.

236. Thomas Walter Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke* [London: SCM, 1949], 323, divides the material of Luke 21:5-36 into three categories: i) Probably derived from Mark: vv. 5-11a, 16-17, 21a, 23a, 26b, 27, 29-33; ii) Certainly not derived from Mark: 11b,

has many supporters, including:²³⁷ G. B. Caird, L. Gaston, T. Schramm, I. H. Marshall, E. Schweizer, D. L. Tiede, T. W. Manson, B. S. Easton, A. Schlatter, G. R. Beasley-Murray, P. Winter, V. Taylor, L. Hartman,²³⁸ W. L. Knox,²³⁹ K. D. Dyer,²⁴⁰ J. A. Fitzmyer, D. L. Bock, B. H. Streeter,²⁴¹ D. Wenham,²⁴² C. H. Dodd,²⁴³ J. Nolland,²⁴⁴ and J. Ernst.²⁴⁵ Opinions regarding whether or not a non-Markan Eschatological Discourse source(s) was continuous are divided. There are two views:

First, a non-Markan source was continuous. This view is held by T. W. Manson, D. Wenham, I. H. Marshall,²⁴⁶ and some advocates of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Manson²⁴⁷ is inclined to believe that Luke 21:5-36 is, at least mostly, “a solid block of L material whose arrangement – and, to a considerable extent, its wording also – has been determined by the pre-Markan ‘little apocalypse.’”²⁴⁸ In Manson’s opinion, Mark and Luke used this ‘little apocalypse’ independently,²⁴⁹ but Luke also incorporated into his version some pieces from Mark.²⁵⁰ Wenham

18, 25b, 26a, 28, 34-36; iii) Doubtful cases: vv. 12-15, 19, 29, 21b, 22, 23b, 24, 25a.

237. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1326 and Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1654.

238. Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.*, ConBNT 1 (Lund: Gleerup, 1966), 233. Hartman mentions six reasons why he believes that “in ch. 21 Luke based his text to some extent on a separate tradition” (p. 234): i) “*Luke’s usual fidelity to Mark’s text*,” ii) “*The uneven parallelism*,” iii) “*The homogeneity of the separate material*,” iv) “*Some details*,” v) “*The connection with the OT*,” and vi) “*[t]he proem*” (pp. 227-34).

239. Wilfred L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953). On page 106 he claims, “It appears that Luke is following all through his section xxi. 12-19 a different form of the Marcan apocalypse.”

240. Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount*, 89, 273.

241. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 214-17.

242. David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse*, 365, 369.

243. Charles H. Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the ‘Abomination of Desolation,’” in *More New Testament Studies*, ed. C. H. Dodd, reprint, 1947 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968), 71-80.

244. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 983-84.

245. Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 421.

246. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 575, does not have a strong opinion regarding whether an additional source was continuous or not, but “[o]n balance it is probable that Luke was using a connected source, related to 19:41-44...”. Luke combined this material with Markan material.

247. Manson is also an advocate of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, but because his view regarding the prehistory of the Eschatological Discourse seems to differ from that of Streeter and Taylor, I discuss his view separately from them.

248. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 325.

249. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 327, 330, 337.

250. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, e.g. 329-30.

has arrived at a similar conclusion independently (?). He believes that “there was an elaborate pre-synoptic form of the Eschatological Discourse (or at least of major parts of the discourse), and that this was known and used independently by Matthew, Mark and Luke.”²⁵¹ He does not, however, deny the possibility that Luke could not have known the Markan Eschatological Discourse as well, but if so, Luke’s dependence “on Mark is much less than is usually supposed.”²⁵² Advocates of the Proto-Luke theory instead believe that Luke inserted the Markan material to the frameworks of Proto-Luke, which he got to know before Mark, but their opinions are divided regarding how much Mark and Proto-Luke overlapped outside the Passion Narrative. While Streeter believes that Luke 21:34-36 and “possibly some others (*e.g.* 18)” may be from Proto-Luke,²⁵³ Taylor suggests that within Luke 21:5-36, Luke’s primary source was Proto-Luke in vv. 12-36, which contain “Markan insertions” in Luke 21:16-19, 21a, 23a, 26b-7, and 29-33.²⁵⁴

Second, a non-Markan source(s) was fragmentary, oral or written. This view is dominant among the scholars who hold that Luke had access to both Mark and a non-Markan source(s).

Marshall, who is open for the option that a non-Markan source was continuous, lists five reasons in favor of the *combination* theory:

1. It is odd that Luke should have omitted references to the gentile mission and to the gift of the Spirit (Mk. 13:10, 11) if he was following Mk.²⁵⁵
2. There are a number of sutures in the text which suggest that Luke was combining two sources. V. 21a appears to be an interruption, since αὐτῆς and εἰς αὐτήν in v. 21b refer to Jerusalem (v. 20) and not to Judaea. Vs. 26b-27 disturb the connection between vs. 25f. and 28.
3. The poetic parallelism in vs. 20-24 is hardly the result of Lucan editing.²⁵⁶
4. The subtle use of the OT (MT not LXX) in vs. 20-28 does not seem to be typical of Luke himself (Hartmann, 229-234).²⁵⁷
5. When the Marcan material is set aside, we are left with a reasonable continuous

251. David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*, 365.

252. David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*, 369.

253. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 215.

254. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 117. Matthew Mahoney, “Luke 21:14–15: Editorial Rewriting or Authenticity?” *ITQ* 47 (1980): 220–38, discusses only Luke 21:11-15 in detail, but his general view seems to be closer to Taylor’s than to Streeter’s.

255. Marshall does not recognize that his first argument does not support the combination theory but the third theory, i.e., Luke is using a non-Markan source exclusively.

256. For more about this, see Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the ‘Abomination of Desolation’”; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 328–31. The insertion of the Markan verses 21a and 23a disrupts the poetic parallelism in Luke 21:20-24.

257. I.e., Luke’s version “is markedly Semitic at several points” (Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the

discourse instead of a set of *disiecta membra*.²⁵⁸

Dodd also uses the difference in function between the Lukan and Markan accounts in Aland §290 as evidence that Luke had access to two different versions of the Eschatological Discourse, which he partly combined. He argues, “[w]hereas... in the Lucan oracles the prototype of coming disaster is the Babylonian capture of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., in Mark its prototype is the sacrilege of Antiochus in 168-7 B.C.”²⁵⁹ This argument, however, can also be used for the third view discussed below.

F. Keck,²⁶⁰ conveniently summarized by Verheyden,²⁶¹ and W. G. Kümmel²⁶² present several contra-arguments against the combination theory, especially the form which argues for the existence of a continuous non-Markan Eschatological Discourse. These arguments, however, have not convinced all scholars.

3) Luke is using a non-Markan source exclusively. This is not a widely held view, but in my opinion best explains the relationship between Luke and Mark, not only here in the Eschatological Discourse section but elsewhere too. The first option, i.e., Luke is using Mark exclusively, faces too many problems to convince me and a great number of leading scholars. The second option sounds more promising but the theory can only be true if Luke had a second source(s) available that *extensively* overlapped the Markan text.

‘Abomination of Desolation’,” 79).

258. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 755–56.

259. Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the ‘Abomination of Desolation’,” 82.

260. Fridolin Keck, *Die öffentliche Abschiedsrede Jesu in Lk 20,45–21,36: eine redaktions- und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Stuttgart: Katolisches Biblewerk, 1976).

261. Verheyden, “The Source(s) of Luke 21,” 494–96.

262. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A. J. Mattill Jr. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 94. Kümmel rejects the view that Luke had access to a continuous non-Markan Eschatological Discourse, but he believes that, in addition to Mark 13, Luke also used “additional pieces of tradition” (p. 94). This argument is often offered by those who reject the existence of a continuous non-Markan source, especially in the Passion Narrative, as we will see in chapter three. One, however, may justifiably wonder that, if this this pool of “additional pieces of tradition” is needed in almost every pericope to explain off source critical problems of the text, would it not be more logical to believe that Luke really had access to continuous ‘non-Markan’ episodes and sections parallel to those in canonical Mark?

Aland §290 is part of the Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13/Luke 21. One interesting detail of this pericope is that the Lukan account lacks the Markan note, “Pray that it may not be in winter” (Mark 13:18). A typical explanation for this omission is that Luke excluded it because, as Fitzmyer puts it, Luke knew that Jerusalem was destroyed, not in the winter, but in late August/early September.”²⁶³ Fitzmyer’s explanation is not convincing. The fact that the city was not destroyed in winter as the Markan Jesus had asked his disciples to pray would almost definitely have been seen by the post-70 C.E. readers of Luke’s Gospel as a wonderful testimony and demonstration of the power of prayer: the prayer had been answered.²⁶⁴

One may also argue that Luke omitted the Markan statement because he did not want to give the impression to his readers that Jesus was ignorant and/or wrong concerning the season of the destruction of Jerusalem. This is also a questionable approach because Luke, like Mark (13:12), does not depict Jesus omniscient: Jesus grew in wisdom (Luke 2:40, 46, 52), he had to pray to God for guidance, and he had to ask questions (Luke 8:30; 17:17). In this light, for Luke, as well as for Mark, Jesus’ ignorance about the exact time of the destruction of Jerusalem would not have been embarrassing. Still, another explanation supported, for example, by Marshall is that Luke omitted the reference to prayer in order not to offer “any suggestion of relaxation in the rigours of the siege. He concentrates (as in Mk. 13:19) on the horrors of the time.”²⁶⁵ Luke may in fact focus on the horrors of the time, but Marshall forgets that the target audience of the Eschatological Discourse was not unbelieving Jews, but Jesus’ disciples (Luke 21:8, 12-19, 28, 31, 34-36). “You” of v. 20, who are instructed to escape to the mountains when Jerusalem would be surrounded by armies, are Jesus’ disciples. In that context, it would have been completely appropriate to pray that the flight of the Christians would not happen in winter when the hasty departure would have been much more troublesome. The fact that the Markan references to the

263. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1328. Many scholars believe that Luke wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem.

264. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1002, has also come to the same conclusion as me and therefore rejects this common explanation.

265. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 773.

Holy Spirit (Mark 13:11), angels (13:27, 32), salvation (13:13), and the preaching to the Gentiles (13:10) – the themes which Luke emphasizes in his Gospel – are also missing in the Lukan parallel texts strengthen the view that Luke did not draw the Eschatological Discourse from canonical Mark.

The Holy Spirit

Introduction

The Holy Spirit is an even more emphasized theme in Luke-Acts than prayer. The phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον, its cognates, and πνεῦμα, as a clear reference to the Holy Spirit, occur seventeen times in the Gospel²⁶⁶ and fifty-five times in Acts,²⁶⁷ while only six times in Mark²⁶⁸ and twelve times in Matthew.²⁶⁹ Thirteen out of the seventeen occurrences of these terms in the Gospel of Luke are found in the first four chapters; most of them occurring in the L-sections.²⁷⁰ It is possible Luke may not have drawn any of these seventeen cases from Mark. Luke 4:14a has a parallel in Mark (1:14a) but the Markan passage does not have a reference to the Holy Spirit; Luke 10:21 and 11:13 are clearly from Q; and Luke 3:16, [22]; 4:1; 12:10²⁷¹ and 12:12 are Mark/Q-overlap passages which are believed by members of The International Q Project to have

266. Luke 1:15, 35, 41, 67; 2:25, 26, 27; 3:16, 22; 4:1, 14, 18; 10:21; 11:13; 12:10, 12. “The power of the Most High” in 1:35, “the finger of God” in 11:20, and “the promise of My Father” in 24:49 (cf. Acts 1:4-5; 2:33, 38-39) are also clear references to the Holy Spirit. Somewhat unclear cases are 1:17, 80.

267. Acts 1:2, 5, 8, 16; 2:4, 17, 18, 33, 38; 4:8, 25, 31; 5:3, 9, 32; 6:3, 5, 10; 7:51, 55; 8:15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 39; 9:17, 31; 10:19, 38, 44, 45, 47; 11:12, 15, 16, 24, 28; 13:2, 4, 9, 52; 15:8, 28; 16:6, 7; 19:2, 6; 20:23, 28; 21:4, 11; 28:25. “The promise” in 1:4; 2:39 also clearly refers to the Holy Spirit. Somewhat unclear cases are 18:25; 19:21; 20:22; 23:8, 9.

268. Mark 1:8, 10, 12; 3:29; 12:36; 13:11.

269. Matt 1:18, 20; 3:11, 16; 4:1; 10:20; 12:18, 28, 31, 32; 22:43; 28:19. Matt 26:41 is a somewhat unclear case.

270. Luke 1:15, 35, 41, 67; 2:25, 26, 27; 4:18.

271. In the case of Luke 12:10 it might be more accurate to say that Luke has ‘omitted’ the parallel Markan passage (Mark 3:28-30) and ‘replaced’ it by a Q passage, if Luke used Mark. One, however, may question whether Luke knew the Markan version (3:22-30) at all. In the Markan context (and the Matthean context, Matt 12:22-37), it is Jewish scribes (Mark 3:20) who are accused of/warned about committing the sin against the Holy Spirit (3:28-30), whereas in the Lukan context, the objects of the warning are the followers of Jesus (cf. Luke 12:1-9, 11-12), who would be in danger of committing this sin amid persecution. It is interesting that although the Markan and Matthean contexts agree regarding the object of the warning, Matthew, as well as Luke (Luke 11:14-12:12), seems to have drawn the whole section from Q rather than from Mark.

been drawn by Luke from Q rather than from Mark.²⁷² In light of the fact that Luke strongly emphasizes the theme ‘Holy Spirit,’ it is very surprising that in two cases, when a Markan text has a reference to the Holy Spirit, Luke’s parallel texts do not (Luke 20:42; 21:15).

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §283 (Luke 20:41-44; Mark 12:35-37a)

This pericope is one of the most controversial passages in the Gospels. Bock notes that “[v]irtually every detail is debated.”²⁷³ The debate revolves around three major issues:²⁷⁴ i) How was Ps 110 understood in pre-Christian Judaism?, ii) Does the saying of Aland §283 go back to Jesus?, and iii) What is the point of Jesus’ comment?²⁷⁵

Even though almost every detail of this pericope is debated, advocates of the 2SH normally agree that Luke drew this pericope from Mark without any influence of a secondary source. In addition to the relatively high verbatim agreement percentage between the Lukan and Markan pericopes (55.4%²⁷⁶/57.1%²⁷⁷/51.8%²⁷⁸), Schramm mentions three other reasons to believe that Mark was Luke’s sole source here:²⁷⁹ i) no minor agreements,²⁸⁰ ii) no Lukan peculiarities (“Lk-Sonderelementen”), and iii) no Semitism in the Lukan version.

272. See James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000). Although Luke drew these passages from Q rather than from Mark, it is still possible that Luke was also influenced by the Markan parallel texts. See also Fleddermann, *Mark and Q*, 31–39, 66–73, 191–95. - Luke 11:20, where Luke uses the phrase “finger of God,” also belongs to a Mark/Q-overlap section. It is likely that Luke’s source used this phrase rather than “the Spirit of God” (Matt 12:28).

273. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1630. For a history of the debate, see Gerhard Schneider, “Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk 12,35–37),” in *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970–1990*, Gerhard Schneider, NovTSup 67 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 308–23.

274. Cf. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1310–13; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1630–31.

275. I.e., is Jesus denying Davidic sonship for Messiah?, or, is Jesus suggesting that the Messiah is more than the Son of David?

276. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 68.

277. Anthony M. Honoré, “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem,” in *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, ed. David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 116.

278. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 56.

279. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 171.

280. In fact, there are some minor agreements: δὲ (Luke 20:41), οὐν (20:44), καλεῖ (20:41), πῶς (20:41). See Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, 555.

The absence of reference to the Holy Spirit in the Lukan version as the source of David's inspiration, while present in the Markan (12:36: ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ) and Matthean versions, raises a serious question about the validity of the consensus view. What makes the absence even more odd is that in three other cases, when Luke has a scriptural reference, he claims that David (Acts 1:16; 4:25) and Isaiah (28:25) functioned as mouthpieces of the Holy Spirit. The absence is passed over in silence by many scholars. Only some have expressed surprise about the absence²⁸¹ and even fewer have tried to explain it. Schweizer's attempt, in writing, "[i]nstead of the Holy Spirit (Mark 12:36), Luke refers to the Book of Psalms, probably to prevent any misunderstanding to the effect that the Spirit speaks only in Scripture and not also in the present,"²⁸² is not convincing in view of the three passages mentioned above. In my opinion, the most plausible solution to the problem is that Luke did not have access to *canonical* Mark.

Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19; Mark 13:9-13)

This pericope is part of the Lukan Eschatological Discourse in Luke 21. As I have shown earlier (see Aland §290 above), scholarly opinions regarding whether Luke used Mark here exclusively or combined the Markan account with a non-Markan account are strongly divided. J. Zmijewski, for example, explains all the differences in the Lukan account on the basis of Lukan redaction, grouping the changes into six categories: i) stylistic corrections, ii) explanations, iii) shortenings or expansions, iv) rearrangements, v) corrections, and vi) changes of meaning on theological bases.²⁸³ Schramm, on the other hand, along with many others, strongly rejects the view that all the differences in this section could be explained by Luke's edition of Mark.²⁸⁴ The following issues support the latter view: First, the very low verbatim agreement

281. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1309; Stein, *Luke*, 505.

282. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, 309.

283. Josef Zmijewski, *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums: Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 21,5–36 und Lk 17,20–37*, BBB 40 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1972), 141.

284. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 175–78. See also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1324, 1341; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 995; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1671, 1673; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 323, 327–28.

(22.7%²⁸⁵/19.6%²⁸⁶/22.7%²⁸⁷) between the Lukan and Markan accounts. Second, Luke ‘omits’ the reference to the beating (δαρῆσασθε) of Jesus’ followers found in Mark 13:9, although he records such events in Acts (5:40; 16:23, 37; [18:17]; 22:24-25).²⁸⁸ Nolland suggests that this change may have been stylistically motivated,²⁸⁹ but this can be questioned. Third, Luke fails to reproduce Mark 13:10, according to which “the good news must first be proclaimed to all nations,” although Luke frames his Gospel by this idea (Luke 2:31-32 and 24:47). I will discuss this further under “*Ethnos* / Aland §289.” Fourth, Luke ‘drops’ the reference to the Holy Spirit found in Mark 13:11. Some scholars have tried to explain this anomaly by arguing that Luke changed the wording in order to emphasize Christ’s role as the source of “a mouth and wisdom” (Luke 21:15) and to point “forward to the experience of the disciples in Acts.”²⁹⁰ The explanation, however, is not convincing because Luke clearly emphasizes the role of the Spirit in his double work, and it is the Holy Spirit or God in Acts who uses the mouth of his people (Acts 1:16; 3:18, 21; 4:25; 22:14) and gives wisdom (Acts 6:3, 10; 7:10, 22) to them, not Christ. C. K. Barrett’s suggestion that Luke 21:14-15 preserves the older form of the saying than Mark may be correct.²⁹¹ He writes, “many scholars argue, in the case of Mt. 12.28=Lk. 11.20, that Luke’s ‘finger of God’ is original rather than Matthew’s ‘Spirit of God’ because Luke, who in general shows so great an interest in the work of the Holy Spirit, would not have omitted a reference to the Spirit which he had found in a source. Precisely the same argument may be applied here.”²⁹² Fifth, Barrett’s argument is strengthened by the fact that Luke 21:14-15 “contains idioms which

285. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 68.

286. Honoré, “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem,” 116.

287. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 57.

288. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 327; Mahoney, “Luke 21:14–15,” 224.

289. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 995–96.

290. So Zmijewski, *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums*, 136–37. The quotation is from Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 768.

291. C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), 132. R. P. Menzies (*Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994], 161–63) rejects this view. He argues that Luke altered “Spirit of God” to “finger of God” in order to avoid the association of the Spirit with exorcism. For a history of the discussion of Luke 21:14-15 and 12:11-12, see A. Fuchs, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik*, AnBib 49 (Rome, 1971), 37–44.

292. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 131.

have a distinctly Semitic colouring.”²⁹³ Sixth, the complex relationship between Matt 10:17-22a; 24:9-14; Mark 13:9-13; Luke 21:12-19; and 12:11-12. Reicke argues that the 2SH cannot explain the relationship between “the three contextual parallels in Mt 24:9-14, Mk 13:9-13 and Lk 21:12-19” on the one hand, and “the two content-analogous but context-different passages in Mt 10:17-23 and Lk 12:11-12” on the other.²⁹⁴ It is unlikely that Matthew would have i) removed Mark 13:9-12 and transferred it to the commission speech in Matt 10, while retaining the rest of the Markan passage in the Markan context with considerable additions (Matt 24:10-12); ii) combined the transferred Markan passage with a Q-saying (Matt 10:19); and iii) transferred the content of Mark 13:10 to Matt 24:14. Similarly, it is unlikely that Luke would have i) moved Mark 13:11 to the commission speech in Luke 12 while keeping the rest of the “verses in chapter 21 as contextual parallels to the relevant elements of Mk 13;” ii) combined the transferred passage with Q (Luke 12:11-12); and iii) filled the gap in Luke 21 with a new, rephrased material (Luke 21:14-15).²⁹⁵

Table 1

Matt 10:17-22a	Matt 24:9-14	Mark 13:9-13	Luke 21:12-19	Luke 12:11-12
17-18		9	12-13	
19		<u>10</u>		
20		11a	14-15	11
21		11b		12
		12	16	

293. For more details, see Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 131–32. See also Lars Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae: Participial Constructions in the Synoptic Gospels: A Linguistic Examination of Luke 21, 13*, ConNT 19 (Lund: Gleerup, 1963), 73–75. Hartman argues that the Lukan text “exhibits a somewhat more ‘Semitizing’ style than Mark and Matthew.” Clear examples are: ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν (Luke 21:12; cf., e.g., 3 Kgs 21:6 (LXX)); ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου (Luke 21:12; cf. e.g., Ps 22:3; 24:11 LXX); εἰς μαρτύριον (Luke 12:13); and θέτε οὖν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν (Luke 21:14; cf. e.g., 1 Kgs 21:13 LXX). Hartman concludes, “Such an accumulation of passages in which Luke has ‘Septuagintized’ Mark is unprecedented. It seems to us more likely that in this section Luke reverts to a separate tradition, somewhat different from that in Mark” (p. 74). Hartman believes that the homogeneity and the divergency in the distribution of the various types of participle constructions between the Synoptic Gospels also support the view that Luke and Mark represent somewhat different traditions (pp. 5-56). In his later work (Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 233), however, he states that Luke “used a different version of the eschatological discourse [in Luke 21], in addition to Mk 13.”

294. Bo Reicke, “A Test of Synoptic Relationships: Matthew 10, 17–23 and 24, 9–14 with Parallels,” in *New Synoptic Studies*, ed. W. R. Farmer (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983), 214.

295. Cf. Reicke, “A Test of Synoptic Relationships,” 213–14.

22a	9b 10-12	13a	17	
	13 <u>14</u>	13b	18 19	

It is doubtful that two authors would have *independently* edited the *same* Markan passage in such an uncharacteristically complex way, especially in light of the fact that it must have been difficult to edit *scriptio continua* of ancient scrolls and codices.²⁹⁶ Reicke believes that all five of these passages have “a common root.” This common root story, “a warning spoken by Jesus concerning a coming persecution of his disciples,” “was developed into a few similar, originally independent pericopes which circulated in the congregation.”²⁹⁷

If these arguments are correct, then it is likely that Luke did not draw this pericope from canonical Mark.

Power / Mighty Works

Introduction

The concept of δύνάμις is emphasized more by Luke²⁹⁸ than Mark²⁹⁹ or Matthew.³⁰⁰ That Luke emphasizes this concept more than Mark becomes obvious when comparing the parallel passages: in seven cases, Luke uses this term while it is missing in the Markan parallel passages,³⁰¹ the term also occurs ten times in Acts.³⁰²

Barrett classifies the occurrences of δύνάμις in the Synoptic Gospels into seven different categories: i) δύνάμις as miracle (Luke 10:13; Matt 7:22; 11:20-23; Mark 6:2, 5; 9:39; ii) δύνάμις

296. Reicke, “A Test of Synoptic Relationships,” 213, claims that “[n]o author would have treated a document in such a perverse way.”

297. Reicke, “A Test of Synoptic Relationships,” 214.

298. The Greek term occurs in the following passages in Luke: 1:17 (L), 35 (L); 4:14, 36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; 10:13 (Q); 10:19 (L); 19:37; 21:26, 27; 22:69; and 24:49.

299. The Greek terms occurs in the following passages in Mark: 5:30; 6:2, 5, 14; 9:1, 39; 12:24; 13:25, 26; and 14:62.

300. The Greek term occurs in the following passages in Matthew: 7:22; 11:20, 21, 23; 13:54, 58; 14:2; 22:29; 24:29, 30; 25:15; and 26:64.

301. Luke 4:14, 36; 5:17; 6:19; 9:1; 19:37; and 24:49.

302. Acts 1:8; 2:22; 3:12; 4:7, 33; 6:8; 8:10, 13; 10:38; and 19:11.

as a periphrasis for God (Luke 22:69; Matt 26:64; Mark 14:62); iii) δύναμις in a doxology (Matt 6:13 in many MSS); iv) δυνάμεις as heavenly beings (Luke 21:26; Matt 24:29; Mark 13:25); v) δύναμις as eschatological power (Luke 21:27; Matt 24:30; Mark 9:1; 13:26); vi) δύναμις as miraculous power (Luke 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; Mark 5:30), and vii) δύναμις as the power of the Spirit (Luke 1:17, 35; 4:14; 5:17 ?; 24:49).³⁰³

Scholarly opinions regarding the relationship of the Holy Spirit and δύναμις in Luke-Acts are sharply divided. According to the traditional view, the activity of the Spirit includes both inspired speech and miracles (δύναμις) in Luke-Acts. Especially Luke 4:18-21 and Acts 10:38 are understood to support the inclusion of the miracles.³⁰⁴ This view, however, has been challenged by several scholars, including E. Schweizer,³⁰⁵ C. Tuckett,³⁰⁶ and particularly R. P. Menzies³⁰⁷ in recent years. It is also strongly defended with some modifications by M. Turner.³⁰⁸ Menzies argues that Luke associated the Spirit with inspired speech and δύναμις with miracles.³⁰⁹ The two terms are not synonymous, but “[e]ach produces a specific nexus of activities.”³¹⁰ When terms πνεῦμα and δύναμις occur together they always refer “to a combination of prophetic and miraculous activities.”³¹¹ Menzies also argues that Luke abandoned the traditional Christian view, expressed by Mark (3:22-30) and Matthew (12:15-18, 28, 31-32), which clearly regarded both inspired speeches and miracles as activities of the Spirit, and returned to a traditional Jewish view

303. C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, new ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1966), 71–77. Only the clearest examples from the Gospels are included in the brackets.

304. See Max Turner, “The Spirit and the Power of Jesus’ Miracles in the Lucan Conception,” *NovT* 33 (1991): 124.

305. Eduard Schweizer, “πνεῦμα,” in, vol. 6 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 407–09.

306. Christopher M. Tuckett, “Luke 4,16–30, Isaiah and Q,” in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, ed. J. Delobel (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), 346–51.

307. Robert P. Menzies, “Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts: A Response to Max Turner,” *JSNT* 49 (1993): 11–20; Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*.

308. Turner, “The Spirit and the Power of Jesus’ Miracles in the Lucan Conception”; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, JPTSUP 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). Edward J. Woods, *The ‘Finger of God’ and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 205 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 215f, also rejects the view of Schweizer and Menzies.

309. Menzies, “Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts,” 19.

310. Menzies, “Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts,” 18.

311. Menzies, “Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts,” 18.

which directly connects only inspired speech with the activity of the Spirit.³¹² Turner rightly opposes Menzies' view both on historical and exegetical bases. Turner admits that Jewish literature most often connects inspired speech/revelation to the Spirit, but he also insists that miracles are occasionally attributed to the same Spirit.³¹³ One of the clearest examples is the story of Samson (Judg 14:6, 19; 15:14-15). In Luke-Acts miracles are also occasionally attributed to the anointing of the Spirit (see especially Luke 4:14-15, cf. 7:21-22, and Acts 10:38).³¹⁴

Although Luke clearly emphasizes the concept of δύνάμις in his double work, the word is missing in six cases, while present in the parallel Markan passage.³¹⁵ Out of these, Mark 6:14; 9:39 and 12:24 are especially interesting and are discussed below.

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §143 (Luke 9:7-9; Mark 6:14-16)

The view that Luke 9 is a unity and prelude to the Travel Narrative (Luke 9:51-18:14/19:44) is widely accepted.³¹⁶ Many also hold that each episode in the chapter answers either implicitly or explicitly to Herod's question, raised in 9:9, regarding Jesus' identity.³¹⁷ It is also almost universally accepted that Luke drew this pericope from Mark exclusively and that all the differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts are due to Lukan redaction.³¹⁸ E. E. Ellis, however, has challenged the latter consensus view.³¹⁹ He first points out that chapter nine has exceptionally many minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark.³²⁰

312. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 165.

313. Turner, *Power from on High*, 82-138.

314. Turner, "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception," 138-42, 146-52.

315. Mark 6:2=Luke 4:22; Mark 6:5=Luke 4:24; Mark 6:14=Luke 9:7; Mark 9:1=Luke 9:27; Mark 9:39=Luke 9:50; Mark 12:24=Luke 20:34.

316. Fitzmyer, "The Composition of Luke".

317. See E. Earle Ellis, "The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology," in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 121-22; Fitzmyer, "The Composition of Luke," 143f. On the other hand, one may argue that the episodes following Luke 9:7-9 are not answers to Herod's question in particular, because this same question ("Who is he?") is raised throughout Luke's Gospel (5:21; 7:20, 49; 8:25; 22:67, 70; 23:3).

318. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 128-29; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 348.

319. Ellis, "The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology". Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 357, also seems to be uncertain whether or not Luke used here "some other tradition" in addition to Mark.

320. Ellis, "The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology," 123-24.

1. 9:1-9: 7 words (2, 5, 7), 2 phrases of 3 words each (1, 5) and one of 2 words (4), partial agreement of one verse (2). All but one agreement are in 9:1-6.
2. 9:10-17: ten words (12, 13, 14, 16, 17), one phrase of four words (11), approximate agreement of one word (10) and of a reference to healing (11).
3. 9:18-27: three words (19, 20), one phrase of two words (20) and one of four words (22). All agreements are in 9:18-22.
4. 9:28-36: two words (31, 35), one phrase of three words (29), approximate agreement of one phrase of three words (34), word order (30).
5. 9:37-45: five words (38, 40, 41, 44), approximate agreement of one phrase of two words (41) and one of four words (42).
6. 9:46-50: none³²¹

This, according to Ellis, suggests that “with the exception of 9:23-27, 46-50 and perhaps of 9:7-9, Luke has used Q traditions in addition to Mark in composing this chapter.”³²² He also points out that Schramm has come to a similar conclusion: “Luke 9:7-9, 46-50 is composed of Markan material slightly reworked; the rest of Luke 9:1-50 (with the possible exception of 9:23-27) is Markan material that has been altered under the influence of non-Markan sources.”³²³ I doubt the suggestions of Ellis and Schramm that imply Luke is combining two traditions here, but I do agree that the exceptionally high number of minor agreements in chapter nine is one indicator “that a rigid two-document hypothesis is an oversimplification of the Synoptic problem.”³²⁴

Ellis further discusses Luke 9:7-9 in particular. Minor agreements³²⁵ and expressly the difference in the general structures of the Lukan and Markan accounts, (i.e., in the Markan account Herod concludes that “John the Baptist has been raised from the dead” and this explains why miraculous powers are at work in Jesus, whereas in the Lukan account Herod denies this possibility³²⁶) suggest, according to Ellis, that like in the subsequent episodes, Luke is probably

321. For a more detailed discussion of the minor agreements in Luke 9, see Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*.

322. Ellis, “The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology,” 124.

323. Ellis, “The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology,” 124. Ellis summarizes Schramm’s conclusions on pp. 29n, 185f. (cf. 70-85) of *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*.

324. Ellis, “The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology,” 124.

325. Ellis recognizes only one minor agreement (ὁ τετραάρχης in Luke 9:7a), but there is also another agreement (ἡγήθη) in Luke (9:7b). The typical explanation for the first agreement is that Luke and Matthew independently corrected Mark, who calls Herod ὁ βασιλεὺς (see e.g. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 348).

326. In the immediate Lukan context, the phrase “heard of all that was happening” (Luke 9:7a; ἤκουσεν... τὰ γινόμενα πάντα) gives an impression that Luke is referring to the activity of the disciples (Luke 9:1-6), but the phrase “he sought to see him” in 9:9b and its close connection with Luke 23:6-8 makes clear that Herod recognizes that Jesus is the one behind all of the miraculous activities happening in the country.

combining and reworking “pre-Lukan traditions.”³²⁷ In my judgment, these differences may rise some further doubts towards the 2SH.

Specifically the fact that the Lukan account (9:7) misses the Markan reference to δύναμις, even though Luke, as we have seen, clearly emphasizes this theme in his double work, causes me to doubt that Luke drew this pericope from canonical Mark; the issue is seldom even mentioned in literature. If mentioned, it is often passed over without clear explanation.³²⁸ May this ‘omission’ occur because the tradition from which Luke drew this pericope did not have reference to δύναμις? A reason for the Lukan ‘omission’ cannot be in any way that in the Markan context the word δύναμις would have been related to the word πνεῦμα (cf. Menzies’ view above), because it is not. The same is true in the following two pericopes where the term is missing in the Lukan account while present in the Markan account.

Aland §167 (Luke 9:49-50; Mark 9:38-41)

In Luke, this is the closing pericope of Jesus’ Galilean ministry section. It is universally held that because Luke here closely follows the Markan order and wording, he has derived this pericope from Mark without any influence of another tradition.³²⁹ The parallel pericopes, however, have some significant differences. Three of them are easy to explain: i) John calls Jesus ἐπιστάτα (Luke 9:49a) instead of διδάσκαλε (Mark 9:38a). Throughout Luke, with the exception of 17:13, the word ἐπιστάτα is used for Jesus only by the disciples,³³⁰ whereas the term διδάσκαλε is normally used for him only by the outsiders.³³¹ Therefore, it is natural that Luke

327. Ellis, “The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology,” 125.

328. For example, Fitzmyer, “The Composition of Luke,” 142, contends, “For some reason Luke omits all references to Jesus’ miracles...”

329. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 140–41; Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 522; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 819.

330. Luke 5:5 (L); 8:24, 45; 9:33; 17:13 (L).

331. Luke 7:40 (no parallel in Mark); 8:49; 9:38; 10:25 (no the term in Mark); 11:45 (L/Q); 12:13 (L); 18:18; 19:39 (no parallel in Mark); 20:21; 20:28; 20:39 (no parallel in Mark). In Luke 22:11 the title is used for Jesus by the disciples when they talk about Jesus to an outsider. Luke 21:7 is an obscure case: those who ask the question from Jesus may be the “some” of Luke 21:5, who could be outsiders, but Luke 21:8ff. seems to indicate that the “some” are Jesus’ followers.

used here the title ἐπιστάτα because the speaker is Jesus' disciple; ii) Luke uses ὑμῶν (Luke 9:50b) instead of ἡμῶν (Mark 9:40). This can only be a stylistic change, as well as iii) the addition of "to him" (Luke 9:50a).

The remaining differences between the Lukan and Markan pericopes are more problematic: i) Luke 'omits' the useful saying of Mark 9:41 and fails to use it anywhere in his Gospel; ii) It is very strange that Luke 'omits' Jesus' words, "for no one who does a deed of power (δύναμιν) in my name will be able soon afterward to speak evil of me" (Mark 9:39), although Luke clearly emphasizes the δύναμις concept in his double work. Very few commentators even mention this 'omission,' and if they do, they rarely try to explain it. For example, Bovon's explanation, "[t]he reason for deleting Mark 9:39, 41-50 is unclear. Luke is probably in a hurry to arrive finally at the travel narrative (Luke 9:51ff.)," convinces very few, if any.³³² The fact that this pericope is part of Luke 9, which is source-critically somewhat problematic, should further rise doubts that Luke drew this pericope from canonical Mark.

Aland §281 (Luke 20:27-40; Mark 12:18-27)

In the Markan account, Jesus responds to the Sadducees' question about the resurrection by asking a rhetorical question, "Is not this the reason you are wrong, that you know neither the scriptures nor the power [δύναμις³³³] of God?" (Mark 12:24). In the Lukan account, however, this saying is missing, although Luke clearly emphasizes the theme of δύναμις, and the role (fulfillment,³³⁴ understanding³³⁵) of the Scriptures in his double work.

The wording of the Lukan account coincides relatively closely with the wording of the

332. Bovon, *Luke I*, 392.

333. Gundry, *Mark*, 702, believes that "the power of God" here refers to God's power to raise the dead.

334. E.g., Luke 3:4; 4:17, 21; 7:27; 18:31; 20:17; 21:22; 22:22, 37; 24:27, 44, 46; Acts 1:16, 20; 8:32; 13:29, 33; 15:15; 17:2, 11; 18:28; 28:23, 25. See also general references to the Scriptures in Luke-Acts: Luke 2:23; 4:4, 8, 10, 12; 10:26; 19:46; 20:28; Acts 7:42; 18:24; 23:5; 24:14. In Mark the fulfillment theme occurs in the following passages: Mark 1:2; 7:6 (no parallel in Luke); 9:12, 13 (no parallel in Luke); 10:4; 11:17; 12:10; 14:21, 27 (no parallel in Luke), 49 (no parallel in Luke). See also general references to the Scriptures in Mark 10:4, 5; 12:19.

335. E.g., Luke 24:32, 45; Acts 8:35; 28:25.

Markan account before (Luke 20:27-34a) this saying, and also sometime after (Luke 20:37-38) it, but radically differs in vv. 34b-36. Because of this, several scholars, including Fitzmyer³³⁶ and Marshall,³³⁷ regard it possible, although unlikely, that Luke was influenced here by a non-Markan tradition. Some other scholars, including Schramm³³⁸ and D. E. Aune, are instead convinced that Luke relied here at least partly on another tradition. Aune argues in his essay “Luke 20:34-36: A ‘Gnosticized’ Logion of Jesus?”³³⁹ that Luke used the parallel Markan account as his source but replaced Mark 12:24b-25 (Luke 20:34b-36) with an independent saying, being developed within a baptismal context in early Syrian Christianity that required celibacy from the baptized believers. “The motivation for this insertion can be understood in light of the Lukan interest in asceticism generally and celibacy in particular.”³⁴⁰ Aune mentions five reasons why he believes that Luke did not draw Luke 20:34b-36 from Mark:

(1) In its present form, Luke 20:34b-36 contains three Septuagintisms or Semitic idioms, “sons of this age” (v. 34b), “sons of God,” and “sons of the resurrection” (v. 36b). There is greater probability that Luke derived these Septuagintisms or Semitic idioms from a source than that he inserted them himself. (2) The substantival passive participle of καταξιωθέντες may be considered a Semitism because it is an example of the so-called *passivum divinum*, i.e., the passive as a circumlocution for a more direct mention of God as the actor. (3) Since Luke tends to avoid repetition and parallelism in his utilization of source, the presence of antithetic parallelism in vv. 34f., absent from both Mark and Matthew, suggests that Luke has retained this parallelism from a source other than Mark rather than create it himself through the extensive redaction of his Markan exemplar. (4) The absence of any of the distinctive features of Lukan style in vv. 34-36 similarly points in the direction of an extra-Markan source. (5) The absence of any contextual links between vv. 34-36 and the rest of the pericope in Luke together with the fact that these verses constitute a saying of Jesus which could conceivably have circulated independently suggests that this logion was derived from a source in which the brief narrative framework of the chreia was absent.³⁴¹

Although I am not convinced by Aune’s argument that Luke inserted Luke 20:34b-36 into his

336. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1299.

337. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 738.

338. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 170–71. He writes, “Das stark semitisierende ‘Sprachgepräge’ der Verse schliesst spezifisch luk Mk-Redation aus” (p. 170) and “Einfluss einer Traditionsvariante sicher nachweisbar” (p. 171).

339. David E. Aune, “Luke 20:34–36: A ‘Gnosticized’ Logion of Jesus?” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflection: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. Band III: Frühes Christentum*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 187–202.

340. Aune, “Luke 20:34–36,” 189.

341. Aune, “Luke 20:34–36,” 188–89.

Gospel from a non-Markan source for theological reasons,³⁴² the reasons he offers for why it is highly unlikely that Luke rewrote his Markan source at this point are compelling. But Aune's insertion theory simply cannot explain why Luke decided to exclude the saying of Mark 12:24 and replace Mark 12:25 with a non-Markan version (i.e., Luke 20:34b-36). The immediate context of this Lukan pericope may also hint that canonical Mark was not Luke's source here: Mark 12:28-34 is radically relocated in Luke (10:25-38), although thematically the Markan order would have been more logical, since throughout Mark 11-12³⁴³ "the relationship between Jesus and Scripture is a recurrent feature."³⁴⁴

Repentance

Introduction

Luke strongly emphasizes the concept of repentance in his double work. The verb μετανοέω occurs nine times in the Gospel³⁴⁵ and five times in Acts.³⁴⁶ The noun μετάνοια occurs five times in the Gospel³⁴⁷ and six times in Acts.³⁴⁸ The verb occurs only five times,³⁴⁹ and the

342. In light of the following passages, it is unlikely that Luke regarded calibacy "as a prerequisite for resurrection" (Aune, "Luke 20:34-36," 192): Luke 1:5-6; 2:4-5; 4:38-39; 8:3; 16:18; Acts 5:1; 10:1-2, 47; 15:1-31; 18:2, 7-8.

343. Most pericopes of these chapters are in the same order in Luke.

344. James Luther Mays, "Is This not Why You Are Wrong?: Exegetical Reflections on Mark 12:18-27," *Int* 60/1 [2006]: 33: i) Ps 118:26 is cited in Mark 11:9-10; ii) Isa 56:7 is cited in Mark 11:15-19; iii) The parable of Isa 5:1-7 and a citation from Ps 118:22-23 appear in Mark 11:27-12:12; iv) Gen 1:27 ("likeness") is alluded in Mark 12:13-17; v) Aland §281; and vi) the hermeneutical question of the scribes regarding "interpretative priority among the commandments" in Mark 12:28-34. In the last three pericopes Jesus is tested by authorities. This sequence ends with the Evangelist's comment, "After that, no one would venture to ask Him any more questions" (Mark 12:34), cf. Luke 20:40 (pp. 33-43).

345. Luke 10:13 (Q); 11:32 (Q); 13:3, 5 (L); 15:7 (Q); 15:10 (L); 16:30 (L); 17:3, 4 (Q). The verb occurs only in the Q- and L-passages. This raises a question as to whether all of these passages come from the same tradition. It seems unlikely to me that two totally independent traditions, i.e., Q and L, would emphasize the same theme. It is possible that at least some of the L-passages come from the Q-tradition. In Mark the theme is not emphasized as strongly as in Luke: the verb (Mark 1:15; 6:12) and noun (Mark 1:4) occur only three times altogether, and in two of these cases Luke omits Markan references to repentance (Mark 1:15; 6:12).

One may also wonder if Matthew and Luke drew their Q-material from the same document because in two cases Luke lacks a reference to repentance in Q-sections (Matt 3:11; 11:20) and in three cases Luke has a reference to repentance in Q-sections (Luke 15:7; 17:3, 4) while it is lacking in the parallel passage in Matthew.

346. Acts 2:38; 3:19; 8:22; 17:30; 26:20.

347. Luke 3:3, 8; 5:32; 15:7; 24:47.

348. Acts 5:31; 11:18; 13:24; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20.

349. Matt 3:2; 4:17; 11:20, 21; 12:41.

noun twice,³⁵⁰ in Matthew, while only twice³⁵¹ and once³⁵² in Mark respectively. It is not only the frequency of occurrences of the verb and the noun in Luke that demonstrates that Luke emphasizes the theme of repentance more than other Synoptics, but it is also a rare expression *μετανοίας* / *ν* εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν that frames the Gospel. The same expression is found in Luke 3:3 and 24:47. Besides these two passages, the phrase occurs only in Mark 1:4 (a parallel to Luke 3:3) and Acts 11:18 in the NT. Although Luke emphasizes the theme of repentance, a reference to it is strangely missing in two cases (Aland §§ 32 and 142) in Luke, while present in the Markan parallel passages.

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §§30, 32 (Luke 4:14-15; Mark 1:14-15)

The relationship between Mark 1:14-39 (plus 6:1-6) and Luke 4:14-44/Matt 4:12-23 is debated.³⁵³ At one end of the spectrum of opinions is the view that Mark was Luke's sole source and Luke's theological agenda sufficiently explains all the differences between the accounts.³⁵⁴ At the other end of the spectrum lies the view that Luke knew Mark's account, but chose to use another source in Luke 4:14-15,³⁵⁵ or in Luke 4:16-30, and probably in Luke 4:14-15 as well.³⁵⁶ Most scholars hold a 'middle' position, arguing that Luke conflated the Markan account with another source or supplemented it "with fragments of tradition and with material of his own composition."³⁵⁷ It is, however, disagreed as to the extent of conflation and supplementation.³⁵⁸ I

350. Matt 3:8, 11.

351. Mark 1:15; 6:12.

352. Mark 1:4.

353. Bovon, *Luke I*, 149. For a very thorough review of the discussion of Luke 4:14-30, see C. J. Schreck, "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4,16-30 in Recent Study," in *L'Evangile de Luc. The Gospel of Luke*, rev. and enlarged ed., ed. F. Neirynck, BETL 32 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 399-471.

354. So Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 31-38.

355. So Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium I/3*, 223-24, 241-44. Schürmann holds that Luke used a variant source in Luke 4:16-30 too. See also Heinz Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), 69-80.

356. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 179, 176-77; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 397, 390-91.

357. Robert C. Tannehill, "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke Iv 16-30," in *Jesus in Nazareth*, eds. E. Grässer and et al., BZNW 40 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972), 52.

358. For different views, see e.g., Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 390-91, 396-97; Marshall, *The Gospel of*

reject the first view that Mark was Luke's sole source here on two grounds.

First, Luke uses at least three atypical words and expressions for himself in Luke 4:14-30:

i) In 4:16, Luke uses the form Ναζαρά for Nazareth, although elsewhere³⁵⁹ he uses the form Ναζαρέθ; ii) In 4:17, 20, Luke uses the form βιβλίον for a book/scroll, although elsewhere³⁶⁰ he uses the form βιβλος; iii) In 4:15, Luke uses the expression "their synagogues," although he does not use this or other similar expressions ("their city/ies," "their synagogue/s") anywhere else.³⁶¹ Because there is no clear antecedent to αὐτῶν in the context, it may be possible, as Marshall suggests, that "the phrase has come from an earlier, fuller [non-Markan] narrative."³⁶² These observations indicate that Luke neither drew this section from canonical Mark nor created it from his own head.

Second, some striking similarities between the Lukan and Matthean accounts suggest a more complex textual history of the section than most advocates of the 2SH assume. There are at least three such similarities: i) The only place, in addition to Luke 4:16, where the form Ναζαρά for Nazareth occurs is Matt 4:13,³⁶³ which is a parallel text to Luke 4:14ff; ii) Matthew is aware, like Luke, but contra to Mark,³⁶⁴ that *immediately* after his baptism and temptation, Jesus first went to Nazareth (Matt 4:13a) and then to Capernaum (Matt 4:13b; cf. Luke 4:16, 31).³⁶⁵ On this

Luke, 179; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 149–50; Tannehill, "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke Iv 16–30".

359. Luke 1:26; 2:4, 39, 51; Acts 10:38.

360. Luke 3:4; 20:42; Acts 1:20; 7:42; 19:19.

361. These expressions are common in Matthew (4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 11:1; 12:9; 13:54; 22:7). In Mark they occur twice (1:23, 39). Some scholars believe that the expression "their synagogues" (e.g., Matt 9:35) reflects some kind of hostility between the Jewish and early Christian communities. There definitely was some hostility between them, but in light of how Josephus uses the second plural possessive pronoun, it is very questionable that the expressions like "their synagogues" could be used for this argument. See e.g., "their festivals" in *Ant.* 1.81; "their temple" in *Ant.* 15.389; 20.123, 233; "their country" in *Ant.* 20.123; "their synagogue" in *J.W.* 2.289.

362. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 177. This observation is supported by the fact that Jesus refers to miracles performed by him in Capernaum (Luke 4:23), although Luke has not recorded them in his narrative.

363. The form also occurs in Matt 2:23 in ⲡ⁷⁰. See Michael D. Goulder, "Two Significant Minor Agreements (Matt. 4:13 par.; Matt. 26:67–68 Par.)," *NovT* 45 (2003): 365–73.

364. In the Markan narrative, Jesus goes first to Capernaum soon after his baptism (1:21), but his first visit to Nazareth is recorded much later (6:1–6a).

365.	<u>Matt</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
	into Galilee (4:12)	into Galilee (1:14a)	into Galilee (4:14a)
		Jesus begins preaching (1:14b–15)	Jesus begins preaching (4:14b–15)
	from Nazareth (4:13b)		to Nazareth (4:16–30)
		Jesus calls his disciples (1:16–20)	
	to Capernaum (4:13b)	to Capernaum (1:21)	to Capernaum (4:31)
	Jesus begins preaching (3:17)		

and other bases, W. O. Walker argues that Matthew must have been aware of a tradition similar to one recorded in Luke at this point;³⁶⁶ iii) The Lukan and Matthean Jesus calls his first disciples after his preaching trip to Capernaum (Matt 4:18-22; cf. 4:13 / Luke 5:1-11; cf. 4:31), whereas the Markan Jesus calls them before it (Mark 1:16-20; cf. 1:21).

These observations suggest that Luke may not have drawn his material from *canonical* Mark at all, but rather from a tradition that had the same origin as the tradition found in canonical Mark but which had developed into a different direction, sometimes even radically as the comparison of Luke 4:16-30 and Mark 6:1-6a shows.³⁶⁷ This may also explain why the Lukan narrative is missing Mark 1:15 (“The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent (μετανοεῖτε), and believe in the gospel”), although Luke emphasizes the themes of repentance and faith and uses the expression “the kingdom of God is at hand” elsewhere.³⁶⁸ There is no internal, contextual, or theological reason why Luke could not have included at least some elements of this saying at this point of his Gospel if he had been aware of this saying of Jesus.

Aland §142 (Luke 9:1-6; Mark 6:6b-13)

The Gospel of Luke has two accounts of the sending out of disciples on mission. In Luke 9:1-6, which has the parallels in Mark 6:6b-13 and Matt 10:1-16, Jesus commissions the twelve, and in Luke 10:1-12 Jesus commissions the seventy. According to the consensus view, Luke drew the first mission account (i.e., Luke 9:1-6) from Mark and the second one (i.e., Luke 10:1-12) from Q, but he combined the accounts to some extent, transferring some of Mark’s terms to the second account and some of Q’s terms to the first. Matthew, instead, conflated and expanded these two accounts which he found in Mark and Q.³⁶⁹

Jesus calls his disciples (4:18-22)

Jesus calls his disciples (5:1-11)

366. William O. Walker, “‘Nazareth’: A Clue to Synoptic Relationships?” in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*, ed. E. P. Sanders (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), 105–18. James M. Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays*, eds. Christoph Heil and Joseph Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 331–40, basically argues that Aland §§30-35 had a ‘parallel’ in Q, having references to Nazareth and Capernaum with minimal or no narrative content. Despite this, Luke and Matthew decided independently to reject the Markan sequence and follow the sequence found in Q, although drawing their material from Mark.

367. Tuckett, “Luke 4,16–30, Isaiah and Q”, argues that Luke drew 4:16-21, 23, 25-27 from Q. The view has not won over many supporters.

368. Luke 10:9, 11; 21:31; cf. Acts 1:6.

369. Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, BTTS (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 403.

To confirm, the Lukan and Markan accounts essentially share the same sequence of events within Mark 4:35-6:44 and Mark 8:27-9:50. Still, there are some indications in Luke 9:1-6, as well as in other pericopes in this section as we have already seen, that Luke did not derive his first mission account from canonical Mark.

First, the order of details in the Lukan (ch. 9) and Matthean accounts agree against the Markan account as Table 2 shows.

Table 2

Luke 10				Matt 10	Mark 6	Luke 9
10:1 10:2					6:6b 6:7	<u>9:1</u>
	10:4 (10:4, a)	10:7, b 10:8	10:9 (10:9)	10:11	<u>10:1</u> <u>10:2</u> <u>10:3</u> <u>10:4</u> <u>10:5</u> <u>10:6</u> <u>10:7</u> <u>10:8</u> 10:9 <u>10:10,ab</u>	<u>9:2</u> (9:2) <u>9:3</u> (9:3)
	10:5 10:6		10:10, 11		<u>10:11</u> <u>10:12</u> <u>10:13</u> <u>10:14</u>	<u>9:4</u>
				10:12	6:11 6:12 6:13	<u>9:5</u> <u>9:6</u> (9:6)
10:3					10:15 10:16	

Both Luke (9:1b) and Matthew (10:1b) mention at the same place that Jesus sent his disciples to heal people. After this comment, the Matthean account is interrupted by the list of the names of the apostles (Matt 10:2-4) and further mission instructions (Matt 10:5-6). Again, after this interruption, the Lukan account (9:2) and the Matthean account (10:7-8) agree against Mark. Both accounts mention at the same place that Jesus sent his disciples to preach the kingdom of God and to heal. Mark mentions these things at the end of his account (Mark 6:12-13; cf. Luke 9:6).

Second, there are plenty of minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark.³⁷⁰ i) ἔδωκεν (Luke 9:1/Matt 10:1); ii) καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν (Luke 9:1), καὶ θεραπεύειν... νόσον (Matt 10:1); iii) κηρύσσειν (Luke 9:2), κηρύσσετε (Matt 10:7); iv) τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ (Luke 9:2), ἡ βασιλεία τῶν; v) μήτε ῥάβδον (Luke 9:3), μηδὲ ῥάβδον (Matt 10:10); vi) other μήτε/μηδὲ structures in Luke 9:3 and Matt 10:9-10; vii) ἀργύριον (Luke 9:3), ἄργυρον (Matt 10:9); viii) καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν (Luke 9:4), εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν (Matt 10:11); ix) ἐξερχόμενοι (Luke 9:5/Matt 10:14); x) τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης (Luke 9:5/Matt 10:14); xi) τὸν κονιορτόν (Luke 9:5/Matt 10:14); xii) κώμας (Luke 9:6), κώμην (Matt 10:11); xiii) πόλεως (Luke 9:5), πόλιν (Matt 10:11, 14);³⁷¹ and xiv) in the parallels to Mark 6:8-9, Luke and Matthew use the direct speech form while Mark uses the indirect one. Scholarly discussion has focused on the fifth minor agreement. Both the Lukan and Matthean Jesus prohibits the disciples to take a staff (ῥάβδος) with themselves, but the Markan Jesus allows it, along with sandals (Mark 6:8).³⁷² Exegetes have offered at least seven different explanations for *this* minor agreement.³⁷³ Some think the prohibitions in Luke and Matthew represent an older tradition and may go back to Jesus, while others argue that the Markan version is older.³⁷⁴ Some, following G. Theissen,³⁷⁵ argue that Luke and Matthew independently changed the Markan tradition in order to distance themselves from the Cynics who were allowed to carry a staff as Jesus' disciples in Mark, and therefore Luke and Matthew agree with each other in this detail. Nonetheless, if this is the reason for differences between the Markan account and the Lukan/Matthean account, then Luke and Matthew did a poor and inconsistent job as a close comparison of the accounts show.³⁷⁶ F. G. Downing, who has written on the

370. The issues mentioned just earlier are also minor agreements, but I wanted to discuss them separately.

371. Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 514.

372. The Matthean Jesus does not allow sandals either (Matt 10:10). Luke does not mention sandals in this pericope, but the wearing of them is prohibited in Luke 10:4, and Luke 22:35 presumes that when the twelve was sent out on mission, they were not allowed to wear sandals.

373. See Barnabas Ahern, "Staff or no Staff?" *CBQ* 5 (1943): 332-37; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 815-16; Walter L. Liefeld, "Luke," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 8, ed. F. E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 919-20.

374. Jonathan A. Draper, "Wandering Radicalism or Purposeful Activity? Jesus and the Sending of Messengers in Mark 6:6-56," *Neot* 29/2 (1995): 191. Draper holds the latter view.

375. G. Theissen, "Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum," *ZTK* 70 (1973): 258-59.

376. Compare the lists of items which the Cynics and Jesus' disciples were allowed to have. Cf. Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 389.

relationship of the Cynic and the Jesus movement more extensively than any other biblical scholar, emphatically rejects Theissen's view and argues that early Christianity "looked like a variant of a popular and pervasive – and varied – Cynicism, and that this Cynic strand went on being obvious and entirely acceptable to informed Christian writers in the early centuries."³⁷⁷ Downing does not see it as problematic that the Markan and Lukan/Matthean accounts differ in what the disciples were allowed to take with them for their mission journey. He rightly argues that not all Cynics strictly followed in the footsteps of Diogenes:³⁷⁸ some, for example, forwent a staff.³⁷⁹ In this case, the problem is this: Why then did Luke and Matthew change the Markan list of what the disciples were allowed to take with them for the mission journey, if these outwardly signs were not the issue for them, and if they knew the Markan account?

Others argue that the prohibitions and permissions in the mission accounts have nothing to

	Cynics	Mark 6	Matthew 10	Luke 9	Luke 10
staff	yes	yes	no	no	--
bread	yes	no	no (10:9b)	no	--
bag	yes	no	no	no	no
money	no	no	no	no	no
sandals	no	yes	no	--	no
tunic	double	single	single	single	--

In addition, one may wonder if Luke really wanted to play down similarities between the Cynic and Jesus movements, why he then, for example, speaks strongly for voluntary poverty (e.g., Luke 12:33) as the Cynics did.

377. F. Gerald Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 302. In his book, *Christ and the Cynics: Jesus and Other Radical Preachers in First-Century Tradition*, JSOTM 4 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), Downing lists hundreds of parallel texts in the Synoptic Gospels and Cynic texts. Downing's method is strongly criticized by C. M. Tuckett ("A Cynic Q?" *Bib* 70 [1989]: 349–76; *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 368–91), David E. Aune, "Jesus and Cynics in the First-Century Palestine: Some Critical Considerations," in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders*, eds. Janes H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 176–92, N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, COQG 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 66–74, and Craig A. Evans, *Fabricating Jesus: How Modern Scholars Distort the Gospels* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006). I agree with those critics in many points. Downing focuses on similarities, although there are many fundamental differences between these two movements (cf. e.g., monk movements in Hinduism and Christianity).

378. For five central ideas of Diogenes' Cynicism, see R. Bracht Branham, "Introduction," in *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 8–9. For a concise history of the movement, see pp. 6–18. For a comprehensive catalogue of known Cynic philosophers, see M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, "Appendix A: A Comprehensive Catalogue of Known Cynic Philosophers," in *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 389–413.

379. See F. Gerald Downing, "The Jewish Cynic Jesus," in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records*, Mark and Q Jesus (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 199–200; Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins*, 32–33.

do with the Cynics.³⁸⁰ Some of these scholars also hold that Mark intentionally wanted to correspond his mission episode with the Passover/Exodus story.³⁸¹ According to the Passover instructions, the Israelites had to eat the Passover lamb, "...your loins girded, your sandals on your feet, and your staff in your hand..." (Exod 12:11). When Moses summarizes experiences of the Israelites in the wilderness, he says, "[t]he clothes on your back have not worn out, and the sandals on your feet have not worn out; you have not eaten bread..." (Deut 29:5-6). However, in this case, Luke and Matthew totally missed Mark's intention to relate the mission of the disciples to the story of Moses and the Passover/Exodus, although both Luke and Matthew clearly want to relate Jesus to Moses elsewhere, and decided *independently* to replace at least partly the Markan material with non-Markan material.

As we have seen, none of these three theories (Theissen, Downing, the Passion/Exodus analogy) can satisfactorily explain the differences between the prohibitions and permissions between the Markan and the Lukan/Matthean Missionary Discourse. Therefore, the most feasible option is that neither Luke nor Matthew knew this discourse in the form we find it in canonical Mark.

Third, it is hard to imagine that Luke would have omitted the word "sandals" (Mark 6:9/Luke 9:3)³⁸² or the phrase "two by two" (Mark 6:7/Luke 9:1) in his discourse parallel to Mark only to make use of them in his Q discourse (Luke 10:4, 1).

Fourth, the verbatim agreement percentage between the Markan and Lukan accounts is low (28.3%³⁸³/26.4%³⁸⁴), and significantly below average.

The pre-history of the Missionary Discourses (Aland §§142, 177) is very complex, but in light of the evidence presented above, I consider it very unlikely that Luke knew and used the Missionary Discourse of *canonical* Mark. It is more probable that the Missionary Discourse(s) developed in different directions during the pre-Synoptics period as a result of the interaction between orality and literacy, and Luke used one branch of this tradition while Mark used another.

380. E.g., Tuckett, "A Cynic Q?" 367; Craig A. Evans, *Fabricating Jesus*, 107.

381. So e.g., Draper, "Wandering Radicalism or Purposeful Activity"; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 358, 389.

382. Luke 22:35 assumes that when the twelve was sent out on mission by Jesus, they were not allowed to wear sandals.

383. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 65.

384. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 42.

This may also explain why the Lukan account (Luke 9:6) lacks the Markan reference to repentance (μετανοῶσιν; Mark 6:12), although Luke does emphasize the theme of repentance in his double work.³⁸⁵

Ethnos

Introduction

The Lukan birth narrative of Jesus begins with the announcement of a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world (οἰκουμένην) should be registered (ἀπογράφεσθαι), probably for taxation (Luke 2:1). God also has an announcement to all the people (παντὶ τῷ λαῷ; Luke 2:10),³⁸⁶ but contra to the announcement of Augustus, God's announcement is good news: "to you is born this day... a Savior (σωτήρ)" (Luke 2:11). The same theme continues a few verses later in Luke 2:30-32 and 3:6. In the former passage, Simeon declares with the baby Jesus in his arms, "my eyes have seen your salvation (σωτήριόν), which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples (πάντων τῶν λαῶν), a light for revelation to the Gentiles (ἔθνῳ) and for glory to your people (λαοῦ) Israel." In the latter passage, Luke quotes the saying of Isa 40:3-5, "all flesh shall see the salvation of God." Luke's Gospel ends with the words, "Thus it is written... that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), beginning from Jerusalem" (Luke 24:46-47). Luke clearly frames his Gospel with the idea that the gospel would be preached to all people, including the Gentiles (ἔθνος).³⁸⁷ Between these frames, Luke uses the word ἔθνος several times in reference to 'Gentiles';³⁸⁸ yet, the term is

385. Someone may argue that Luke has substituted the Markan concept of 'repentance' for 'the gospel' (Luke 9:6), but this is not at all certain. It is interesting and strange that whenever Mark uses the word εὐαγγέλιον (Mark 1:1, 14, 15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9; [16:15]), this noun never occurs in the Lukan parallels, and whenever Luke uses the word εὐαγγελίζω (Luke 1:19; 2:10; 3:18; 4:18; 4:43; 7:22; 8:1; 9:6; 16:16; 20:1), this verb never occurs in the Markan parallels. Luke uses only the verb in his Gospel, although he also knows the noun form (Acts 15:7; 20:24); Mark uses only the noun.

386. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 109, correctly notes, "The 'people' means Israel rather than the gentiles..., but it is just possible that a wider reference is beginning to creep in, since the message echoes Hellenistic announcements affecting the whole world."

387. In Luke's usage, the word ἔθνος sometimes refers to the people of Israel (Luke 7:5; 23:2; 24:47; Acts 10:22, 35(?); 17:26; 24:10, 17; 26:4; 28:28), but in most cases, both in Luke and Acts, it refers to the Gentiles.

388. Luke (2:32); 12:30; 18:32; 21:10, 24, 25; 22:25. In Luke 24:47, the term includes both the Jews and the Gentiles.

missing in two Lukan pericopes (Aland §§273 and 289) which are present in the Markan parallels³⁸⁹ Aland §289 is especially interesting. It is surprising that the Markan phrase, “the good news must first be proclaimed to all nations” (Mark 13:10) is missing in Luke even though this theme frames his Gospel. According to Conzelmann, Luke wrote his Gospel to prepare the church for a long interval period before the Parousia, i.e., the period when the gospel would be preached to the nations.³⁹⁰

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §273 (Luke 19:45-46; Mark 11:15-17)

The temple incident is one of the most debated passages in the Gospels. Scholars disagree over both the historicity of the incident and its meaning. My interest here falls on the differences between the Markan and Lukan accounts.³⁹¹

Luke ‘eliminates’ all the material found in Mark 11:15b-16, changes the Markan κληθήσεται το καὶ ἔσται (Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46) and ‘omits’ the phrase “for all the nations” (Mark 11:17). There is no scholarly consensus concerning the reason why Luke made these changes. The first difference is explained by Nolland stating that Luke severely abbreviated the Markan account in order to draw the emphasis onto the biblical citations in Luke 19:46,³⁹² but this a very speculative argument.³⁹³ The second change is explained by Nolland stating that Luke changed the verb in order to enable him “to treat quotation from Isa 56:7 as a legal stipulation, rather than as the prophetic word that it is in the text of Isaiah,” “Luke is concerned to minimize any sense in which Jesus might be seen as critical of the Jerusalem temple.”³⁹⁴ It is difficult to buy into this argument in light of Jesus’ hard words against Jerusalem in Luke 19:41-44 and the

389. The word occurs only five times in Mark (10:33, 42; 11:17; 13:8, 10).

390. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 95–97, 131–32.

391. See also my discussion of Aland §275 above.

392. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 935.

393. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1261, admits that he cannot explain why Luke omitted Mark 11:16.

394. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 937.

temple in Luke 21:5-6. In addition, as a result of this change, Luke's sentence has become grammatically inferior to Mark's, because Luke has added καί which is useless in this context; it also does not occur in Jer 7:11 LXX. It is no wonder that Marshall cannot find "very obvious motive for the change" of the verb.³⁹⁵

The explanations for the third change are most diverse; scholars have offered at least three different theories.

First, Bock admits that the omission is hard to explain, but suggests that "Luke omitted the phrase to keep the stress on the indictment."³⁹⁶ It is difficult to see, however, in what sense the omission helps to keep the stress on the indictment of Mark 11:17b par.

Second, the phrase was omitted by Luke and Matthew because the temple was already destroyed at the time they wrote their Gospels.³⁹⁷ Marshall argues that the inclusion of the phrase would have made Jesus out to be the author of a false prophecy.³⁹⁸ The argument is strange for at least six reasons: i) The temple served as "a house of prayer for all the nations" until it was destroyed. Proselytes and other Gentiles (Acts 8:26-30) came there to worship God; ii) Mark 11:17a is a quotation from Isaiah, not *Jesus'* prophecy; iii) The temple was no longer "a house of prayer" even for *Jewish* Christians at the time Luke and Matthew wrote their Gospels, because it was destroyed. If the failure of the prophecy was the reason for the omission, then the first part of the quotation should also have been excluded, because it had also failed; iv) It is possible, although not likely, that Mark too was writing shortly after the destruction of the temple.³⁹⁹ If so, why was Mark not embarrassed to include the phrase?; v) The church could have interpreted the omitted phrase metaphorically, fulfilled in the church, even if Luke and Matthew had included it in

395. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 721.

396. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1579.

397. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1261; Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 242; C. K. Barrett, "The House of Prayer and the Den of Thieves," in *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 15.

398. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 721.

399. Barrett, "The House of Prayer and the Den of Thieves," 15.

their Gospels.⁴⁰⁰ And finally, vi) the phrase “for all the nations” is also missing in Matthew, suggesting that there was another version of the pericope available to Luke and Matthew aside from the one found in Mark.

Third, “the idea of the temple as a place for God at time of Luke’s writing was difficult.”⁴⁰¹ This is also a highly questionable claim. It has already been shown that Luke, in general, has a positive attitude towards the law and the temple.⁴⁰² In addition, Luke depicts the temple as a place of prayer throughout his double work (e.g., Luke 1:5-10; 2:21-38; 24:53; Acts 2:46-47; 3:1; 22:17; 24:17).⁴⁰³

As we have seen, no one has effectively been able to explain the differences between the Markan and Lukan accounts.

I. Buse has offered a radically different explanation. He argues that Luke and Matthew were influenced by a pre-Markan source, “something like an Ur-Markus” or “a smaller source than an Ur-Markus,” that led them “to make some corrections in the Marcan story.”⁴⁰⁴ It is also believed that Mark and John used this same source. In this earlier document, the episode of the Question about Authority (Mark 11:27-33 par.) immediately followed the episode of the Cleansing of the Temple (Mark 11:1-17 par.). Buse offers three pieces of evidence for the support of this theory. First, in the Gospel of John these two episodes are together (John 2:13-17, 18-22).⁴⁰⁵ Second, there are “striking agreements” between the Markan and Johannine accounts.⁴⁰⁶

400. Adela Yarbro Collins, “Jesus’ Action in Herod’s Temple,” in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, eds. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2001), 46.

401. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1579.

402. See Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*.

403. Cf. Geir Otto Holmås, “‘My House Shall be a House of Prayer’: Regarding the Temple as a Place of Prayer in Acts Within the Context of Luke’s Apologetical Objective,” *JSNT* 27/4 (2005): 393–416. Holmås attempts to minimize the importance of the temple as a place of prayer in Luke’s double work, but at the end of this article he, however, admits that “[i]n Luke’s depiction of the temple as a place of prayer we see his attempt to legitimate the young Christian ‘sect’” (p. 416).

404. Ivor Buse, “The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John,” *ExpTim* 70 (1958–59): 24.

405. This first argument is more assumed than clearly stated by Buse.

406. For more details, see Buse, “The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John,” 22.

These agreements suggest that Mark and John were dependent on an earlier common source.

Third, there are “a large number of agreements of Luke and Matthew against Mark.”⁴⁰⁷

[1] Both the later Synoptic writers make the Cleansing take place immediately on the arrival of our Lord at Jerusalem. [2] Neither records the refusal of Jesus to allow the carrying of vessels through the Temple. [3] The two agree in the surprising omission of ‘for all the nations’ from the words of Jesus. [4] They both introduce the Old Testament quotation in the form of a statement, while Mark makes Jesus ask a question. [5] In Matthew and Luke the words are an utterance on the occasion of the Cleansing: in Mark they may well be a summary of the content of more continuous teaching. When we turn to the story of the inquiry about the authority of Jesus, we find that, [6] whereas Mark introduces the incident by remarking that Jesus was ‘walking’ in the Temple, Matthew and Luke say that He was teaching. [7] Neither has ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς οἱ ἀποκριθῇτέ. [8] Both have ἀποκριθεῖς...κἀγὼ and οἱ δέ.⁴⁰⁸

I am not convinced that Mark and John used the *same* common source, but I agree with Buse in that the agreements between Mark and John, on one hand, and between Luke and Matthew, on the other, strongly suggest that the relationship between Luke and Mark is more complex than the 2SH suggests.

Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19; Mark 13:9-13)

This pericope is part of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse. Because I have already extensively discussed various views of the relationship between the Synoptics in this section (see Aland §§289 and 290 above), there is no need to revisit this issue. There, I indicated that it is very unlikely that Luke drew this section from canonical Mark. Here, I will present one more strong piece of evidence to support my theory.

As we have already seen, Luke frames his Gospel by the idea that the gospel would be preached to all people, including the Gentiles. This thought, however, is not prominent in the Lukan Eschatological Discourse where we would expect it to be, especially if Conzelmann’s argument, that Luke wrote his Gospel to prepare the church for a long interval period before the Parousia when the gospel would be preached to the nations, is correct. Luke ‘omits’ the Markan sentence, “the good news must first be proclaimed to all nations” (Mark 13:10). Whether the

407. Buse, “The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John,” 23.

408. Buse, “The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John,” 23.

Lukan expression, “It will lead to an opportunity for your testimony [μαρτύριον]” (Luke 21:13; NASB), means the same as the Markan expression is debated.⁴⁰⁹ The majority view is that Luke is not using μαρτύριον in a negative sense here, i.e., as an evidence against the persecutors on judgment day, but rather in a positive sense, i.e., as an opportunity to bear witness before the persecutors.⁴¹⁰

Still, why would Luke have rejected the wording of Mark 13:10 if he had used Mark as his source? Three of the most widely held explanations by proponents of the 2SH are as follows: First, Luke excluded the Markan sentence because Luke 21:12-19 seems to deal with the time before the fall of Jerusalem,⁴¹¹ Luke knew that the gospel was not preached to all the nations before the fall of Jerusalem and therefore he could not include the Markan sentence.⁴¹² Second, Luke regarded Luke 21:24b and/or Luke 24:47 as substitutes for Mark 13:10.⁴¹³ Third, Luke excluded the sentence because he avoids the use of the noun ‘gospel.’⁴¹⁴ The first argument presents a good point, but it is not definite that the account of Luke 21:12-19 is limited to the time before the fall of Jerusalem. In the beginning of the Lukan episode, the disciples ask Jesus merely about the destruction of the temple and the sign preceding it (Luke 21:7), but Jesus’ answer to the question also deals with the events beyond the destruction of the temple until the Parousia of the son of Man (Luke 21:25-28; cf. 21:24). Many scholars argue that Luke 21:8-24 concerns only the events prior to 70 C.E. and Luke 21:25-28 is about the events after the destruction of Jerusalem. At first sight, the explanations seems persuasive, but a closer look at vv. 8-24 reveals some weaknesses of the view.

409. Many scholars have adopted L. Hartman’s view (*Testimonium Linguae*, 75) that the Lukan sentence ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον (Luke 21:13) should be translated as “[i]t will turn out for you into a testimony.” According to this view, μαρτύριον does not mean here “the *activity* of bearing witness but the *evidence* that will be available on the day of judgment for the disciples and against their enemies” (Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 768).

410. See Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1669–70; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 996; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 767–68.

411. Cf. Luke 21:12 and 21:20.

412. So e.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 768.

413. So e.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 768.

414. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1340; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 996.

One can argue that ὁ καιρός in v. 8 and τὸ τέλος in v. 9 refer to the Parousia (v. 27) and the coming of the kingdom of God (v. 31), not to the destruction of Jerusalem.⁴¹⁵ Great signs from heaven in v. 11 resemble the signs mentioned in vv. 25 and 26. Moreover, there is not historical evidence about widespread and extensive persecution of Christians, mentioned in vv. 12, 16-17, prior to 70 C.E. All this evidence suggests that Luke 21:8-24 and 21:25-28 may not have been intended to describe the events in strict chronological order. Rather, vv. 8-24, which seem to primarily describe the destruction of Jerusalem, also describe the events prior to the Parousia (cf. Revelation, 1 Thess 2:1-11).⁴¹⁶ The destruction of Jerusalem and the events preceding it are a picture of the end.⁴¹⁷

If vv. 8-24 also typify the time before the Parousia, then it should not have been problematic for Luke to include the saying of Mark 13:10, which refers to the evangelization of the world, in his account.

In addition, even if Luke 21:8-24 were limited to the time before the fall of Jerusalem, one may wonder why Mark, who likely wrote just at the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem,⁴¹⁸ and the first *post-70* C.E. copyist of Mark's Gospel did not feel embarrassed by the statement "the good news must first be proclaimed to all nations." If they were not embarrassed, why should Luke, who likely wrote at the time when the 'whole' Roman Empire was basically evangelized (cf. Rom 15:19, 23-24), have been embarrassed?

The second and the third arguments are weak. Neither Luke 21:24b nor Luke 24:47 can be regarded as substitutes for Mark 13:10. The first passage says nothing about the evangelization of the nations and the second is too far removed from the Eschatological Discourse. As for the third argument, it is true that Luke does not use the noun εὐαγγέλιον in his first work,⁴¹⁹ but he

415. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1663-92.

416. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, 241, suggests that verses 8-11, 12-19, 20-24 and 25-33 may be four appended sign sayings, answering "the introductory question" of verses 5-8, each saying having "one point of termination, the end of the age."

417. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1667: "Jerusalem's fall is intended as the example of what end-time chaos looks like..."

418. See the influential work of Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*.

419. Luke, however, uses the word twice in Acts (15:7; 20:24).

could easily have used the verb εὐαγγελίζω, instead, which occurs 25 times in Luke-Acts,⁴²⁰ or another expression as a substitute, as he does in Luke 24:47. The most natural explanation for the ‘omission’ of Mark 13:10 is that Luke did not have access to canonical Mark.

Salvation

Introduction

No other Synoptic Evangelist emphasizes the theme of salvation more than Luke. Only Luke uses the words σωτήρ,⁴²¹ σωτηρία,⁴²² and σωτήριον.⁴²³ All the occurrences of these words in Luke’s Gospel, except σωτήριον in Luke 3:6, are found in L-sections.⁴²⁴ In Luke’s thinking, Jesus is the savior of the world.⁴²⁵

The verb σῶζω occurs 17 times in Luke’s Gospel,⁴²⁶ 13 times in Acts,⁴²⁷ 14 [15] times in Mark,⁴²⁸ and 15 times in Matthew.⁴²⁹ Statistically, the frequency of the verb in Luke is not much higher than in other Synoptics, but in several cases the Lukan version of a pericope has the verb, while it is missing in a Markan parallel pericope.⁴³⁰ What is both interesting and strange is that in 50% of cases when Mark uses the verb,⁴³¹ it is missing in Luke, although Luke clearly emphasizes the concept of ‘salvation’/‘getting well’ in his Gospel. The most noteworthy case is Mark 13:13 (Aland §289).

420. Luke 1:19; 2:10; 3:18; 4:18, 43; 7:22; 8:1; 9:6; 16:16; 20:1; Acts 5:42; 8:4, 12, 25, 35, 40; 10:36; 11:20; 13:32; 14:7, 15, 21; 15:15; 16:10; and 17:18.

421. Luke 1:47 (for God); 2:11 (for Jesus); Acts 5:31 (for Jesus); 13:23 (for Jesus).

422. Luke 1:69, 71, 77; 19:9; Acts 4:12; 7:25; 13:26, 47; 16:17; 27:34.

423. Luke 2:30; 3:6; Acts 28:28.

424. Luke 3:6 does not have a parallel either in Mark or Matthew, but Luke 3:1-6 overlaps with Mark and probably with Q as well.

425. E.g., Luke 2:11; Acts 4:12; 5:31; 13:23.

426. Luke 6:9; 7:50; 8:12, 36, 48, 50; 9:24; 13:23 (L or Q); 17:19 (L); 18:26, 42; 19:10 (L or Q); 23:35, 37, 39.

427. Acts 2:21, 40, 47; 4:9, 12; 11:14; 14:9; 15:1, 11; 16:30, 31; 27:20, 31.

428. Mark 3:4; 5:23, 28, 34; 6:56; 8:35; 10:26, 52; 13:13, 20; 15:30, 31; [16:16].

429. Matt 1:21; 8:25; 9:21, 22; 10:22; 14:30; 16:25; 19:25; 24:13, 22; 27:40, 42, 49.

430. Luke 7:50; 8:12, 36, 50; 23:37, 39.

431. Mark 5:23, 28; 6:56; 13:13, 20; 15:30. Mark 16:16 is not included in the calculation.

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §289 (Luke 21:12-19; Mark 13:9-13)

This pericope is part of the Lukan Eschatological Discourse in Luke 21. As I have already shown earlier (see Aland §§289, 290 above), opinions regarding whether Luke used Mark exclusively here or combined the Markan account with a non-Markan account are strongly divided.

In Luke 21:18-19, the Lukan Jesus promises his persecuted followers that “not a hair of your head will perish. By your endurance you will gain your souls (ψυχάς),” but just a few verses earlier (Luke 21:16b), Jesus said that “they will put some of you to death.” These sayings seem to contradict each other. Interpretations of these sayings fall into three categories.⁴³² First, Luke is copying his sources carelessly and this explains the contradiction.⁴³³ The close proximity of Luke 21:16 and 21:18-19, however, makes this explanation very unlikely.⁴³⁴ Second, Luke 21:18-19 must be taken literally; the Lukan Jesus is promising physical safety to his persecuted followers.⁴³⁵ This interpretation, however, clearly contradicts Jesus’ claim in Luke 21:16, although it may find some support in Acts 27:34; 1 Sam 14:45; and Dan 3:27. Third, Luke 21:18-19 must be understood spiritually; the Lukan Jesus is reminding his persecuted followers that God is in control of everything (cf. Luke 12:7) and is promising eternal safety to them. This view is held by many scholars.⁴³⁶ If the last view is correct, then we may rightly wonder why Luke felt compelled to change the Markan saying, “the one who endures to the end will be saved (σωθήσεται)” (Mark 13:13b) to “[b]y your endurance you will gain your souls (ψυχάς)” (Luke 21:19). In the Markan context, σῶζω seems to refer to the salvation in the second coming of Christ (cf. Mark 13:7, 8b,

432. Cf. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1673; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 769.

433. So Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1341.

434. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1673; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 737.

435. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 745; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 997–98; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 328. One form of this view suggests, following J. Weiss, that “v. 16 refers to only a few martyrs, while this verse refers to the safety of the church as a whole;” see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 769.

436. E.g. Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 480–81; Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 256; Lüdemann, *Jesus After 2000 Years*, 391; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 769; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1673.

19-20, 24-27). The Lukan expression, however, as C. F. Evans correctly notes, is ambiguous.⁴³⁷ It could refer either to the time of the Parousia or the end of the life of an individual. Even if Luke had not wanted to give the impression that only those who endure to the very end of the time will be saved, he could have easily changed the noun τέλος to another word without dropping his favored term of σῶζω as well. The fact that his favored term is missing suggests that Luke did not use canonical Markan account as his source. The absence of the expressions τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον and ἔθνος in this same Lukan pericope strengthen my argument.

Angels

Introduction

The word ἄγγελος occurs 25 (26) times in Luke,⁴³⁸ while only six times in Mark.⁴³⁹ Only three times in Luke and once in Mark does the word refer to a human being(s) rather than to a heavenly being(s).⁴⁴⁰ Most of the occurrences in Luke are found in the L-material.⁴⁴¹ The word is also found five times in the Lukan Q-material; interestingly, in three of these cases the word is missing in the Matthean parallel.⁴⁴² The word also occurs 21 times in Acts.⁴⁴³ All of this strongly suggests that Luke intentionally emphasizes the role of angels in salvation history, and yet, the word is missing in three cases in the Lukan text while present in the Markan parallel: Aland §§ 20, 292, and 293.⁴⁴⁴

437. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 745. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 770, on the contrary, claims that, "Mark's use of σῶζω is ambiguous, and this may have motivated the alteration in wording."

438. Luke 1:11, 13, 18, 19, 26, 30, 34, 35, 38; 2:9, 10, 13, 15, 21; 4:10; 7:24, 27; 9:26, 52; 12:8, 9; 15:10; 16:22; [22:43]; 24:23. In Luke 20:36 the word occurs in the form ἰσάγγελος ("equal to angels"). One may wonder why Luke changed the Markan ὡς ἄγγελοι (Mark 12:25) to ἰσάγγελοι if he used Mark as his source. In addition, in Luke 24:1-12, Luke interestingly calls angels ἄνδρες (v. 4), like Mark, but uses the plural form, unlike Mark (Mark 16:5).

439. Mark 1:2, 13; 8:38; 12:25; 13:27, 32.

440. Luke 7:24, 27; 9:52; Mark 1:2. Some scholars, including Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27: The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?" *BBR* 6 (1996): 65, argue that Mark 13:27 refers to preachers of the gospel rather than to angels, but the argument is not convincing.

441. All of the 14 occurrences are found in chapters 1 and 2; Luke 9:52; 15:10; 16:22; 24:23.

442. Luke 4:10 (angel); 7:24 (human beings; missing in Matthew); 7:27 (human being); 12:8, 9 (angels; missing in Matthew).

443. Acts 5:19; 6:15; 7:30, 35, 38, 53; 8:26; 10:3, 7, 22; 11:13; 12:7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 23; 23:8, 9; 27:23.

444. Aland §13 (Mark 1:2-6 par.) may be regarded as a fourth case. Mark 1:2, where the word ἄγγελος occurs, does not have a parallel in Luke and Matthew, but the same quotation from Mal 3:1 occurs in the Q-section

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §20 (Luke 4:1-13; Mark 1:12-13)

The Markan account of Jesus' temptation is much shorter than the Lukan and Matthean accounts. While the Markan account has only 30 Greek words, the Lukan and the Matthean accounts have 203 and 184 words respectively. All the Synoptics parallel only at the beginning of the story (Mark 1:12-13a par.). In addition, the Markan and Matthean accounts end with similar words (Mark 13b/Matt 4:11b).

The common section in all three Synoptics shares four similarities: "(1) Jesus' possession by the Holy Spirit, (2) the influence of a demonic figure, (3) the naming of the scene of the events as ἡ ἔρημος, and (4) the giving of the duration of the experience as forty days."⁴⁴⁵ However, this short common section also has six minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark. First, in Luke and Matthew, the subject of the action is Jesus: he is led by the Spirit into (Matthew) or in (Luke) the wilderness, but in Mark, the subject of the action is the Spirit: he drives Jesus out into the wilderness. Second, whereas Luke and Matthew use the verb 'lead' (ἄγω in Luke; ἀνάγω in Matthew) for the action of the Spirit, Mark uses the verb 'drive out' (ἐκβάλλω). Third, Luke and Matthew mention particularly that Jesus fasted for forty days, yet this remark is missing in Mark. Fourth, the Markan mention of the 'wild beasts' is missing in Luke and Matthew.⁴⁴⁶ Fifth, whereas Luke and Matthew call the Tempter ὁ διάβολος, Mark calls him ὁ Σατανᾶς. Sixth, only Luke and Matthew mention that Jesus became hungry after the forty-day fast.⁴⁴⁷

(Luke 7:27/Mark 11:10).

445. Jeffrey B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*, JSNTSup 112 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 37.

446. Richard Dormandy, "Jesus' Temptations in Mark's Gospel: Mark 1:12-13," *ExpTim* 114 (2003): 183. Dormandy also mentions a fifth contrast - Luke and Matthew emphasize the concept of wilderness less than Mark - I do not regard this as a very convincing point.

447. Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 476.

The relationship between the Markan and the Lukan/Matthean accounts has been explained in three different ways.⁴⁴⁸ First, Mark 1:12-13 is an abbreviation of a Q version of the temptation. However, it is difficult to understand why Mark would have abbreviated the story so radically. Second, a Q version is an expansion of the Markan version, written either by Luke or Matthew, and used by another of these two Evangelists. This is theoretically possible, but if Luke used Matthew as his source, as proponents of the 2GH and MwQH suggest, then we face a question as to why Luke decided to omit the reference to ministering angels at the end of the Matthean account (Matt 4:11b), even though he clearly emphasizes the role of angels in salvation history. Third, most scholars believe that both temptation accounts are independent. D. C. Allison suggests that both accounts “grew out of something not quite like either one.”⁴⁴⁹ He calls this source “Ur-text.”⁴⁵⁰

Most scholars agree that in the Q version of the temptation, Jesus is typified with the experience of Israel in the wilderness after the exodus from Egypt, but opinions are strongly divided regarding the typological reference of the Markan account. Some argue that the Markan account typifies Jesus with Adam in paradise, while others contend that the story typifies Jesus with Israel in the wilderness, as the Q version. Allison argues for the former theory;⁴⁵¹ J. P. Heil for the latter one.⁴⁵² Allison maintains that the original Ur-text “presented Jesus not as the new Israel or the last Adam but as an eschatological prophet like Elijah,” whom the angels served in the wilderness (1 Kgs 19:4-8).⁴⁵³ In descendent texts of the Ur-text, Elijah turned into a Moses typology (Q) and an Adam typology (Mark). Allison argues that the Markan account is an upside-down story of the Adam story in Genesis 1-3.⁴⁵⁴ At the beginning of the story, Adam is in

448. See Dale C. Allison, “Behind the Temptations of Jesus: Q 4:1-13 and Mark 1:12-13,” in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, eds. Bruce D. Chilton and Craig Evans, NTTS 28/2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 195. See also Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*, 37-41.

449. Allison, “Behind the Temptations of Jesus,” 195.

450. Allison, “Behind the Temptations of Jesus,” 203.

451. Allison, “Behind the Temptations of Jesus”.

452. John Paul Heil, “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13,” *CBQ* 68/1 (2006): 63-78.

453. Heil, “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13,” 202.

454. Allison, “Behind the Temptations of Jesus,” 197.

paradise, where he lives “in peace with the animals” (Gen 2:18-20; *Jub.* 3:1-3, 28; *L.A.E.* 8:1-3; 37:1-3; *Apoc. Mos.* 15:3; 16:2; 24:4; 29:14, 16; 2 *En.* 58:2-6), is guarded and/or honored by angels (*L.A.E.* 13:3-15:3; 21:1-3; 22:1-2; 33:1-3; *Apoc. Mos.* 29:1-6, 14; *Apoc. Sedr.* 5:2), and is fed by them (*L.A.E.* 4:2). Even so, after his failure in the temptation, Adam is cast out from paradise. Jesus, instead, “is first cast out. Then he is tempted. Then he gains companionship with the animals and the service of angels.”⁴⁵⁵ In this interpretation, being with the wild animals and angels represents the pre-fall environment. One of the major weaknesses of Allison’s view is that it heavily relies on references in the OT Pseudepigrapha, yet we do not know whether Mark knew any of these writings. Heil’s argument is more convincing. He first demonstrates that an Adam/Jesus typology in Mark 1:12-13 faces several serious problems.⁴⁵⁶ Then, he argues that Mark 1:12-13 has a chiasmic, rather than an upside-down structure, in the following manner:⁴⁵⁷

- A And (καί) immediately the *Spirit* drove him out into the wilderness (v. 12)
- B and he was (καί ἦν) in the wilderness forty days tested by Satan (v. 13a)
- B’ and he was (καί ἦν) with the wild animals (v. 13b)
- A’ but (καί) the *angels* were ministering to him (v. 13c)

If Heil’s suggestion is correct, as I believe it is, then “Jesus’ being with the wild animals... is parallel to his being tested by Satan in the wilderness for forty days.”⁴⁵⁸ In this interpretation, the wild animals represent a hostile environment, not the pre-fall environment. Heil is able to demonstrate that both the OT and *Jubilees* relate the leading of the Spirit (Isa 63:14), the wild animals (Num 21:5-6; Deut 8:15) and the angels (Ps 77:19, 24-25 [LXX]; Ps 91:11-13; Wis 16:20) to the experience of the people of Israel in the wilderness.⁴⁵⁹

455. Allison, “Behind the Temptations of Jesus,” 196–97.

456. Heil, “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13,” 64–65. See also Jan Willem van Henten, “The First Testing of Jesus: A Rereading of Mark 1.12–13,” *NTS* 45/3 (1999): 349–66.

457. Heil, “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13,” 65–66. See also Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*, 79–80.

458. Heil, “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13,” 66.

459. Heil, “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13,” 73–75. Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*, SBT 39 (London: SCM, 1963), 101 n.2, points out to Exod 23:20-23; 14:19; 32:34; and 33:2, which clearly show that the angels accompanied Israel in the wilderness.

I have attempted to show that there is no need to conclude, as Allison does, that the accounts of the temptation in Mark and Luke/Matthew represent different typologies. If the Markan account also represents the Moses/Israel in the wilderness typology, then it becomes even more difficult to explain why the Lukan account fails to include the Markan reference to the angels (Mark 1:13b) because the angels, according to Jewish traditions, were related to the experience of the people of Israel in the wilderness. If Luke knew the Markan version of the temptation, there would not have been an obvious theological reason to exclude it in his own account. I agree with Bock's comment⁴⁶⁰ that this Lukan omission, along with numerous minor agreements, might suggest that Luke did not use Mark as his second source here, as most scholars believe.⁴⁶¹ In fact, there is very little if any evidence that Luke knew the Markan temptation account.

Aland §292 (Luke 21:25-28; Mark 13:24-27)

The opinions as to whether or not Luke drew the Eschatological Discourse exclusively from Mark are deeply divided, as I have shown above (see Aland §§289 and 290). Many scholars maintain that Luke is wholly dependent on Mark in Aland §292, but some present commentators on Luke, including Nolland,⁴⁶² Bock,⁴⁶³ Marshall,⁴⁶⁴ Fitzmyer,⁴⁶⁵ and Schramm⁴⁶⁶ have questioned this common view. First, only Luke 21:26b-27 has a genuine counterpart in Mark. Therefore, verbatim agreement between Mark and Luke is low (28.8%⁴⁶⁷/31.0%⁴⁶⁸/25.4%⁴⁶⁹). Second, the Lukan account seems to be internally inconsistent, suggesting that it is a combination

460. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 382.

461. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* 1/3, 218–19; Fleddermann, *Q*, 236, 238; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 166; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX*, 507.

462. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1003.

463. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1653–54.

464. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 774.

465. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1328–29. He thinks that in this pericope v. 28 probably comes from 'L.'

466. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 180–81.

467. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 68.

468. Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem," 116.

469. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 58.

of two traditions. Vs. 25-26 and v. 28 are logically related, but v. 28 does not coincide with v. 27, “because v. 28 still speaks about the beginning of the End, while v. 27 has already given a description of this final stage.”⁴⁷⁰ Thus, Schramm argues that the Markan material is imperfectly melted with the non-Markan material.⁴⁷¹ Third, there are some minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark. The most interesting may be that Mark refers only to celestial disturbances preceding the coming of the Son of Man, while Luke and Matthew both mention distress among people (Luke 21:25b/Matt 24:30). Ennulat mentions a few other minor agreements, including: i) σημεῖα (Luke 21:25a), σημεῖον (Matt 24:30); ii) τῶν οὐρανῶν (Luke 21:26b/Matt 24:29b); and iii) καὶ δόξης πολλῆς (Luke 21:27b/Matt 24:30b).⁴⁷² Fourth, Luke, like Mark, mentions the coming of the Son of Man on a cloud(s),⁴⁷³ but the account of the sending of the angels and the gathering of the elect (Mark 13:27a) is missing in Luke. Scholars have offered some explanations for this ‘omission.’ Probably the most popular hypothesis is that Luke substituted Luke 21:28 for Mark 13:27.⁴⁷⁴ This view, however, is not convincing for four reasons. First, the focus and content of these verses are different. Mark 13:27 describes what will happen when the Son of Man comes, whereas Luke 21:28 contrasts the disciples’ joyful expectations of the future with the nonbelievers’ fear of the future (Luke 21:25b-26c). Second, as we have already seen, Luke clearly emphasizes the role of the angels in the history of salvation. Therefore, it would be very unlikely that he would excluded Mark 13:27, which refers to the angels, if he had

470. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, 312. The quotation from Verheyden, “The Source(s) of Luke 21,” 511. See also Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 331.

471. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 180.

472. Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, 564.

473. Opinions regarding the interpretation of the meaning of the coming of the Son of Man are divided in both Markan and Lukan scholarship. Most scholars hold that Mark 13:14-20 (and 21-23) has to do with historical events and Mark 13:24-27 is concerned with eschatological events. Brant Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*, WUNT 2/204 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005), 378, 298–301, however, argues that Mark 13:14-27 is a single unit and it concerns “a final stage of unparalleled distress: the Great Tribulation,” while Hatina, “The Focus of Mark 13:24–27”, interprets the coming of the Son of Man metaphorically and argues that Mark 13:14-27 as a whole concerns historical events in 70 C.E. Similar lines of interpretation can be found regarding the Lukan eschatological discourse (see Ray Summers, *Commentary on Luke: Jesus, the Universal Savior* [Waco: Word, 1976], 259–61).

474. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1328.

known the Markan eschatological account. Third, Luke uses the word ἐκλεκτός, which occurs in Mark 13:27, elsewhere in his Gospel for the faithful (Luke 18:7; cf. 23:35). Therefore, there is not apparent theological reason for the Lukan omission of the word here and in two other cases in the Eschatological discourse (Mark 13:20, 22).⁴⁷⁵ Fourth, Luke believes that the gospel will be preached to all the nations before the end. Therefore, it would have been natural to include Mark 13:27, which speaks about the gathering of the elect from the ends of the earth, if Luke had known this Markan passage.

Nicol argues that “Luke disregards Mk 13:27 because it is his conception that the angels are subject only to God and not to the Son,”⁴⁷⁶ and offers Luke 9:26/Mark 8:38; Luke 12:8-9 and 15:10 as evidence.⁴⁷⁷ None of these verses prove Nicol’s view. Although Luke does not specifically mention that the angels are subject to Jesus, this can be assumed because Jesus is depicted in Luke-Acts as the one who has been seated at the right hand of God, i.e., the place of the highest honor (Luke 20:41-44; Acts 2:25-36; 5:31; 7:56), and is called *the* (ὁ) Son of God (Luke 3:22; 4:41; 9:35), Lord (Luke 2:11; Acts 2:36; 7:59-60; 10:36) and Prince (Acts 5:31). In addition, if the Markan subjection of the angels to Jesus had been problematic to Luke, he would have easily been able to change the Markan active sentence (“he [the Son of Man] will send out the angels;” Mark 13:27) to the ‘divine passive’ (“the angels will be sent out”).

Theoretically, it could be possible that Luke combined Mark with a non-Markan source(s), as many scholars believe, but in light of the evidence presented above, it is more likely that Luke’s Gospel is missing the sending out of the angels (Mark 13:27), because Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source.

Aland §293 (Luke 21:29-33; Mark 13:28-32)

Leading Lukan scholars, except Schramm, assert that Luke drew this eschatological saying exclusively from Mark.⁴⁷⁸ Schramm believes that Luke combined the Markan tradition with

475. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, 474. The word ἐκλεκτός occurs only three times in Mark.

476. W. Nicol, “Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21,” *Neot* 7 (1973): 67.

477. Nicol, “Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21,” 71 n.24.

478. See e.g., Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1654; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 778; Manson, *The Sayings of*

a non-Markan one.⁴⁷⁹ The majority view is strongly defensible because there is but one minor agreement (ἐως αὖ in Luke 21:32/Matt 24:34) between Luke and Matthew against Mark.⁴⁸⁰ Also, apart from Luke 21:29-30a, Luke agrees with Mark almost word for word.⁴⁸¹

Despite this, I argue that Luke did not draw this pericope from canonical Mark. I base my argument on two observations. First, it is difficult to explain why Luke would have changed the grammatically competent expression in Mark 13:28b (“when its branch has already become tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near;” NASB) to the awkward one in Luke 21:30 (“as soon as they put forth *leaves*, you see it and know for yourselves that summer is now near”), if he used canonical Mark as his source.⁴⁸² The Lukan plural form for the trees does not require such radical changes in the sentence structure. Second, the Lukan ‘omission’ of Mark 13:32 is hard to justify. Scholars have offered two explanations. Some suggest that Luke “did not want to admit that the Son was ignorant of” the time of the Parousia.⁴⁸³ Others hint that Luke omitted it in order not to create a ‘doublet’ with Acts 1:7.⁴⁸⁴ Neither of these suggestions are convincing. Even though Jesus’ ignorance of the time of the Parousia has been a problematic issue for the church since the Arian controversy,⁴⁸⁵ there is no reason to assume that it was embarrassing to Luke (cf. Luke 18:19); he indicates at the beginning of his Gospel that Jesus grew in knowledge and wisdom as every human being does (Luke 2:40, 46, 52); Luke does not claim anywhere that Jesus was omniscient. The argument that Luke omitted Mark 13:32 in order to

Jesus, 333; Verheyden, “The Source(s) of Luke 21,” 511; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1008.

479. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 181.

480. Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, 565.

481. Verbatim agreement between *Luke 21:31–33* and *Mark 13:29–31* is 87.8%. The verbatim agreement percentage between the Matthean and Markan accounts is probably the highest (90.8%; Mark has a total of 87 words; Matthew has 79 completely identical words with Mark) within the triple tradition.

482. Matthew accepts the Markan wording, making only some minor changes in the order of words. See also Randy Leedy’s sentence diagrams on these Lukan and Markan passages in BibleWorks7.

483. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV*, 1328.

484. See Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 778; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1693.

485. For good reviews of historical responses to Jesus’ eschatological ignorance in Mark 13:32, see Harold F. Carl, “Only the Father Knows: Historical and Evangelical Responses to Jesus’ Eschatological Ignorance in Mark 13:32,” *JBS* 1/3 (2001); Kevin Madigan, “*Christus Nesciens?* Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment?: Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13:32 in the Ancient Latin West,” *HTR* 96 (2003): 255–78.

avoid creating a ‘doublet’ is extremely artificial. The Markan saying in Mark 13:32 and the Lukan saying in Acts 1:7 are very different and they would not have even occurred in the same volume of Luke’s work if Luke had included the Markan saying.

In light of the evidence presented so far, regarding the relationship of the Lukan and Markan Eschatological Discourses, it is highly probable that Luke did not draw Aland §293 from canonical Mark. This also explains why the Markan reference to the angels (Mark 13:32) is missing in the Lukan episode.

Jesus as the King

Introduction

Luke introduces Jesus as a regal figure at the beginning of his Gospel (Luke 1:27, 31-33, 69; 2:4, 11), but does not develop this theme further before Luke 18:38-39, where a blind man, sitting by the road near to Jericho, calls Jesus ‘Son of David,’⁴⁸⁶ and Luke 19:11-27, where Jesus tells the Parable of the Pounds and people who did not want ‘a nobleman’ (ἄνθρωπός τις εὐγενής; Luke 11:12) to reign over them (Luke 19:27).⁴⁸⁷ The theme is, again, emphatically underlined by Luke in the extended Passion Narrative (Luke 19:38; [20:41-44]; 22:29-30; 23:2-3, 37-38, 42).⁴⁸⁸ A. Hastings justifiably calls Luke’s Gospel “a kingly gospel.”⁴⁸⁹ Acts 13:22-23, 35; 15:16; 17:6-7 further indicate that Luke and the early church regarded Jesus as king. Nonetheless, although the theme is emphasized by Luke in the Passion Narrative, in four cases the Markan reference to Jesus as the king in the Passion Narrative is missing in Luke: Aland §§339 (twice), 342 (the whole pericope is missing in Luke), and 345.

486. Mark uses the same expression for Jesus in his parallel pericope, but it is unlikely that Luke drew this pericope from canonical Mark, as I will attempt to show later.

487. The Matthean parallel does not have a saying similar to Luke 19:27.

488. The Lukan Jesus is openly depicted as the king in Luke 19:38, whereas in the Markan parallel Jesus is not openly called the king. In this respect, Mark follows more closely the wording of MT and LXX than Luke. Mark does not have the similar sayings to Luke 23:2 and 23:37. The Lukan reference to the inscription on the cross (Luke 23:38) occurs in Mark but in a different context (Mark 15:26).

489. Adrian Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teachings of Saint Luke* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1958), 152. See also Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 88–99.

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §339 (Luke 23:17-23; Mark 15:6-14)

After Jesus was arrested, he was first led before the Sanhedrin (Mark 14:53-65 par.) and then before Pilate. Jesus' trial before Pilate is recorded in all the Synoptics. In Luke, however, it is divided into two parts, being interrupted by the trial before Herod. Luke resumes the trial before Pilate in Luke 23:13-16, which finds no parallel in Matthew and Mark.

	<u>Matt</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
Before Pilate	27:1-2, 11-14	15:1-5	23:1-5
Before Herod			23:6-12
Before Pilate			23:13-16
	27:15-23	15:6-14	23:[17]18-23
	27:24-26	15:15	23:24-25

Source critical assessments of the Lukan Passion Narrative, including the trial pericopes before Pilate and Herod, are vastly divided.⁴⁹⁰ Two major approaches are: i) Luke used Mark exclusively as his source,⁴⁹¹ and ii) Luke combined the Markan account with a continuous non-Markan source or fragmentary non-Markan sources.⁴⁹²

Those who argue that Luke used Mark exclusively or primarily as his source in the trial episodes, but heavily edited it, usually base their view on some of the following six arguments. First, Luke follows the Markan order here. Second, some short Lukan sentences agree with the Markan language word for word (Luke 23:3/Mark 15:2; Luke 23:21b, 22a/Mark 15:13b, 14a). Third, Lukan style and phraseology are evident.⁴⁹³ This argument, however, is controversial

490. For a comprehensive discussion of the issue, see Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22,54–23,25. A Historical Survey: 1891–1997*, NTTs 30 (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

491. So Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 685–88, 802–03. It is hard to find other scholars who argues as rigidly as Harrington that Mark was Luke's only source in the Passion Narrative.

492. The following scholars, among others, support the view that Luke combined a continuous non-Markan Passion source with the Markan account: Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1023; François Bovon, "The Lukan Story of the Passion of Jesus (Luke 22–23)," in *Studies in Early Christianity*, François Bovon, WUNT 161 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2003), 88–102; Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*.

493. See e.g. the analyses of Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaction und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 301–04; Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*; Gerhard Schneider, "The Political Charge Against Jesus (Lk 23:2)," in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, eds. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 409–12.

because it is based on certain source critical presumptions. Fourth, Luke rewrote the existing Markan account and composed the Herod episode and the following Pilate episode (Luke 23:13-16)⁴⁹⁴ in order to emphasize Jesus' innocence for apologetical purposes.⁴⁹⁵ While Pilate declares Jesus innocent once in Mark (15:14), in Luke he is declared innocent three (four) times by Pilate (23:4, 14b-15, 22) and once by Herod (23:15).⁴⁹⁶ This often presented argument, however, does not prove that *Luke* is responsible for creating the innocent theme; it is also possible that it was already present in his source(s). Fifth, some hold, following M. Dibelius (*Herodes*, 1915), that Luke created the Herod episode based on Acts 4:24-28 and to correspond to the plural form of 'kings' (מלכים; βασιλεῖς) in Ps 2:2.⁴⁹⁷ This is an unconvincing argument since "Acts 4 shows the rulers as conspirators, Luke 23 does not"⁴⁹⁸ and "[t]he declaration of innocence in the passage [Luke 23] runs against a creative detail formed from Ps. 2:1-2, which looks at hostile conspiracy."⁴⁹⁹ Sixth, Luke inserted the Herod episode in order to parallel the hostility of the Herodian dynasty towards Jesus in the Gospel (Luke 13:31-32; 23:11) and towards the early church and the apostles in Acts (4:27; 12:1-19), on the one hand, and the 'friendliness' of the Herodian dynasty towards Jesus (Luke 23:7-9) and Paul (Acts 25:13-26:32), on the other.⁵⁰⁰ Luke's Gospel and Acts have distinct parallelism, but to find parallelism in twofold attitude of the Herodian dynasty towards Jesus and the early church is artificial at the best: Herod was both

494. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 802, argues that Luke composed Luke 23:6-16 "using Markan materials he omitted in parallel places namely Mk 3,6; 6,14-29; 15,16-20."

495. See Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 797. Conzelmann's suggestion (*The Theology of St. Luke*) that Luke wrote the Gospel and Acts to present a political apology for Christianity is questioned by many scholars. Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 19-23, 182-83, and Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 14-15; "Luke, Gospel Of," 497, list over ten suggestions for what purpose Luke wrote his Gospel. See also Powell, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* 82-102.

496. In Matthew, Pilate declares Jesus innocent twice (27:23, 24) and his wife once (27:19).

497. So e.g., Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 280.

498. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1816.

499. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1817. For a more detailed discussion against Dibelius' view, see Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 797-801; Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels.*, vol. 1, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 778-86; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*, WUNT 2/33 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1988), 81-82.

500. So Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 797.

‘friendly’ (Luke 23:7-9, 15, but cf. Acts 4:27) and hostile (Luke 23:11) towards Jesus, but Herod Agrippa II does not show any hostility towards Paul in Acts 25:13-26:32. – If there is no obvious reason why Luke would have composed the episode of Luke 23:6-16 out of nothing, and that he had no apologetical, theological, or literary purpose in mind, then it is possible that this episode could be historical and that Luke drew it from his source(s).⁵⁰¹

There are at least four reasons to believe that Luke did not draw the trial episodes, including Aland §339, from canonical Mark. First, verbatim agreement between the parallel Lukan and Markan accounts is extremely low, as noted above. Only Luke 23:3,21a-22b finds verbatim correspondence in Mark. The fact that verbatim agreement is *consistently* lower between Luke and Mark than between Matthew and Mark in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, while altering in the non-Passion Narrative, strongly suggests that Luke did not draw the Passion-Resurrection Narrative from canonical Mark. I will revisit this issue in chapter three. Second, Luke’s grammar in Luke 23:21 appears awkward. Luke uses the form σταύρου, σταύρου αὐτόν, whereas Mark uses the form σταυρώσον αὐτόν. Bovon argues that, “[b]ecause Mark’s use of the aorist imperative is correct and Luke’s use of the present imperative is not, one must conclude that Luke reproduces here a source other than Mark. He lets pass the awkwardness of his source; otherwise one must imagine the improbability that Luke himself fashioned an improper formulation of a correct Marcan expression.”⁵⁰² Third, Luke 23:24-25 is uneconomical, repetitious and

501. The historicity of the Barabbas episode (Aland §339) is denied by many on two grounds: i) There is no recorded evidence that there would have been an insurrection in Jerusalem at around the time of Jesus’ crucifixion (cf. Mark 15:7/Luke 23:19) in which Barabbas could have been arrested (Roger David Aus, *“Caught in the Act,” Walking on the Sea, and the Release of Barabbas Revisited*, SFSHJ 157 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998], 157), and ii) there is not evidence that there would have been a custom of releasing prisoners at great religious festivals in the Roman Empire (Brown, *The Death of the Messiah [Vol. 1]*, 814–20; H. Z. Maccoby, “Jesus and Barabbas,” *NTS* 16 [1969–70]: 55–60). These two arguments, however, are in reality based on an incorrect assumption that existing Greco-Roman sources record all important events and customs of the Empire. In addition, Robert L. Merritt, “Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon,” *JBL* 104 (1985): 57–68, demonstrates that the Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks, and probably Romans too practiced the custom of releasing prisoners at great festivals. If Mark had totally invented the practice of the custom, his opponents would have easily been able to use this fabrication against the early Christians. See also Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1130.

502. François Bovon, *Studies in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2003), 96 n.62. See also Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 860.

grammatically awkward. While Mark writes, “[w]ishing to satisfy the crowd, Pilate released Barabbas for them, and after having Jesus scourged, he handed Him over to be crucified” (Mark 15:15; NASB), Luke writes, “[a]nd Pilate.... released the man they were asking for who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, but he delivered Jesus to their will.” Luke needlessly repeats here what he has already said about Barabbas a few verses earlier (Luke 23:19); it would have been economically and grammatically better to agree with the wording in Mark. Fourth, Luke is missing two Markan references to Jesus as “the King of the Jews” (Mark 15:9, 12b) in Aland §339. The first ‘omission’ (Mark 15:9) is understandable, *if* Luke rewrote the Markan account and added the threefold declaration of Jesus’ innocence, since by changing the Markan wording of Mark 15:6-12a, he was able to make a smoother transition from Aland §338 to §339. But the second ‘omission’ (Mark 15:12b) is much harder to explain. Luke hardly omitted it because of its ironical sense, since his Gospel has other similar ironic utterances about Jesus and his status (Luke 23:2b-3, 35 [cf. 23:2b], 37-38). It is also unlikely that Luke omitted the title in order to minimize or avoid the nationalistic flavor of Jesus’ kingship (‘the king of the *Jews*’), because, as I have already shown, for Luke, Jesus is the king, even just the king of the Jews/Israel in a metaphorical sense (cf. Luke 1:32b-33, 69-75; 22:29-30; Acts 1:6-7).⁵⁰³ In Luke, Jesus also accepts this term for himself, at least indirectly (Luke 22:29-30; 23:3; cf. 19:37-40).⁵⁰⁴ Irony in Luke and other Gospels is that opponents of Jesus use the correct title for Jesus without recognizing their king. The only logical explanation for why Luke does not use the title for Jesus

503. See Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 162–67. Conzelmann argues that “[t]he concepts which indicate Israel’s position within redemptive history are now applied to the Church” (p. 163). See e.g., Luke 22:29-30; 24:21; Acts 2:22; 3:12; 5:35; 13:16-41; 28:20.

504. When Pilate asks from Jesus, “Are you the King of the Jews?”, Jesus answers, “σὺ λέγεις (Luke 23:3 par.). Some scholars argue that Jesus’ answer is clearly affirmative (NIV: “Yes, it is as you say,” NASB: “*It is as you say*,” cf. Luke 23:67-71 par.; John 18:37), others hold that it is more obscure (NRSV: “You say so”). Both views face problems. If the former view is correct, then it is difficult to understand why Pilate regards Jesus as a harmless person. If the latter view is correct, then Pilate’s question and answer contradict, because Pilate does not say that Jesus is the king. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1114, 1118, takes Jesus’ words as a contra-question: “Do you say [so]?” But, because the conversation does not continue between Jesus and Pilate, it is unlikely that Jesus’ words should be taken as a question. Regardless as to whether Jesus gives an affirmative or obscure answer or makes a contra-question, one thing is clear: Jesus accepts the title for himself at least indirectly because he does not clearly deny that he is the king of the Jews.

in Aland §339 would be that Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source.

I agree with Bovon that it is unlikely Luke would have fused Mark and an overlapping non-Markan source(s).⁵⁰⁵ First, it is improbable, as I have just argued, that Luke knew the Markan account of Jesus' trial. Second, Luke, in general, seems to prefer 'copying' techniques which are as simple as possible: he follows his sources ('Mark,' Q, L) alternately⁵⁰⁶ and seems to avoid fusing extensively the contents of 'Mark' and Q when they overlap.⁵⁰⁷ Therefore, it is unlikely that Luke would have fused his overlapping (written) sources in the Passion Narrative to the extent of that which many proponents of fusion theories suggest.⁵⁰⁸

In my opinion, the best way to explain similarities and differences between the Lukan and Markan trial episodes is to assume that Luke did not have access to the Passion Narrative of canonical Mark but was dependent on a tradition that goes back to the same origin as Mark. Many similarities between the trial episodes in John and the Synoptics further strengthen the view that there existed different branches of the Passion Narrative of the same origin in the early church.⁵⁰⁹

Aland §342 (Mark 15:16-20a)

After the trial before Pilate, Jesus, according to Mark and Matthew (Aland §342), was handed over to the soldiers to be mocked and tortured before the crucifixion; the episode is

505. Bovon, *Studies in Early Christianity*, 92–102.

506. Derrenbacker Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*.

507. There is no consensus regarding the number of overlap texts. According to Rudolf Laufen, *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*, BBB 54 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980), 91–92, Mark and Q overlap in twenty-five cases, whereas, according to Fleddermann (*Q*, 75–76), these texts overlap in twenty-nine cases. Fleddermann believes that Luke fused the texts of his two sources only in the following cases (I question Fleddermann's (*Q*, 192–93, 75–76) judgment in some cases): Mark 1:7-8/Luke 3:16-17; Mark 3:28-30/Luke 12:10; Mark 4:21/Luke 11:33 (?); Mark 6:7-13/Luke 10:2-16; Mark 8:11-13/Luke 11:16, 29-32 (?); Mark 9:42/Luke 17:1b-2; Mark 13:11/Luke 12:11-12 (?); Mark 13:21/Luke 17:23 (?). I would like to add the following passages to the list: Mark 4:30-32/Luke 13:18-19; Mark 9:50a/Luke 14:34-35a; Mark 10:11-12/Luke 16:18 (?).

508. Bovon, *Studies in Early Christianity*, 92–102, suggests that Luke used Mark and a continuous non-Markan source alternatively in the Passion Narrative.

509. Cf. John 18:33 with Mark 15:2 par.; John 18:37 with Mark 15:2b par.; John 18:39a with Mark 15:6 par.; John 18:39b with Mark 15:9; John 18:40 with Luke 23:18 and Matt 27:21 (a minor agreement); John 19:1, 16 with Mark 15:15 par.; and John 19:2-3 with Mark 15:17-20 and Matt 27:28-31.

interestingly absent in Luke. There are three major reasons to doubt that Luke had access to this Markan episode.

First, the Lukan Jesus predicts that the Son of Man “will be handed over to the Gentiles; and will be mocked (ἐμπαιχθήσεται) and insulted (ὕβρισθήσεται) and spat upon (ἐμπτυσθήσεται). And after they have flogged (μαστιγώσαντες) him, they will kill him” (Luke 18:32-33), but in the Lukan Passion Narrative Jesus is never spat upon or flogged.⁵¹⁰ Because Mark 15:15-20a uses the same or very similar words, i.e., ‘to flog’ (φραγελλώω; Mark 15:15),⁵¹¹ ‘to spit upon’ (ἐμπτύω; Mark 15:19), and ‘to mock’ (ἐμπαίζω; Mark 15:20),⁵¹² which occur in Jesus’ prediction in Luke 18:32-33, one might assume that Luke would have wanted to use Mark 15:15-20a in order to show the accuracy of Jesus’ prediction, but Luke is strangely missing this Markan pericope. One could argue that Luke omitted Aland §342 to avoid depicting the Roman authorities and military in a bad light, but this argument can be seriously questioned. Although Luke emphasizes that Pilate and Herod, representatives of Roman authority, declared Jesus innocent in the trial episodes, elsewhere he depicts both men as arbitrary and sinful rulers.⁵¹³ The Gospel of Luke also has one negative comment about the *Roman* soldiers (Luke 23:36-37), not found in Mark.

510. Once, Jesus is beaten (δέροντες) by the *Jewish* crowd (ὄχλος) and the temple police (στρατηγούς τοῦ ἱεροῦ) who arrested Jesus (Luke 22:47, 52, 63), but not by the Gentiles (cf. Luke 18:32-33).

A comparison of the terminology of Jesus’ mistreatment in the Passion Narratives:

	<u>Matt</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
Aland §332 (the Sanhedrin)			22:63-65 (to mock, beat, blaspheme)
Aland §332 (the Sanhedrin)	26:67-68	14:65 (to spit, strike, beat)	
Aland §337 (Herod, the soldiers)			23:11 (to treat with contempt, mock)
Aland §341 (Pilate)	27:26	15:15 (to flog)	
Aland §342 (Pilate’s soldiers)	27:27-31a	15:16-20a (to strike, spit, mock)	
[Aland §345 (the rulers, soldiers)			23:35-36 (to scoff, mock)
Aland §346 (the thief)			23:39 (to blaspheme)]

511. For the definitions of μαστιγώω (Luke 18:33) and φραγελλώω (Mark 15:15), see BAGD.

512. In Luke, Jesus is mocked by the temple police (Luke 22:63; cf. 22:47, 52), Herod’s troops (23:11), and the soldiers at the cross (23:36).

513. Regarding Herod Antipas, see Luke 9:9; 13:31-32; 23:11; 24:7; Acts 4:27. Regarding Pilate, see Luke 13:1; 23:16, 22b, 23-25; 24:7; Acts 4:27; 13:28-29. The Roman authorities are not also depicted in favorable terms in the following passages: Acts 15:5; 16:22-24, 35-39; 17:6-9; 18:12-17; 24:24-27; 25:14. If Luke had really wanted to please the Roman authorities, he should not have include such negative comments.

Second, while in the Markan and Matthean accounts Jesus is clothed by Pilate's soldiers (στρατιώτης; Mark 15:16 par.) in a royal purple or scarlet robe (Mark 15:17 par.), in the Lukan account, he is clothed by Herod's troops (στράτευμα) in an elegant robe (ἐσθήτα λαμπράν; Luke 23:11).

Third, one would expect Luke, who depicts Jesus as the king, to have used this episode if he knew the Markan Passion Narrative, because the Markan account of Aland §342 is a powerful image of Jesus as the king, even though in an ironic sense.

These observations arise doubts as to whether Luke really knew Mark 15:15-20a.⁵¹⁴

Aland §345 (Luke 23:35-38; Mark 15:27-32a)

The crucifixion episode (Luke 23:33-49 par.) is divided by scholars into subsections in various ways. All of them are, more or less, artificial. Brown, for example, divides the text in the following way: i) the setting: Luke 23:33-34 par.; ii) activities at the cross: 23:35-43 par.; iii) last events and death: 23:44-46 par.; and iv) happenings after Jesus' death: 23:47-49 par.⁵¹⁵ This division, however, fails, because the points mentioned in Luke 23:34, 46 are also "activities at the cross" while Jesus is still alive. The main reason for why Brown deals with Luke 23:35-43 as a unit is that he believes Luke intentionally framed "the three hostile mockeries [Luke 23:35b, 36, 39] with a neutral preface (the observing people [Luke 23:35a]) and a benevolent conclusion (the sympathetic wrongdoer [Luke 23:40-43])."⁵¹⁶ Brown assumes that Luke's artistic motif explains

514. Cf. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1124.

515. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 902-03.

516. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* [Vol. 2], 1030. In my opinion, it is also possible to find other frames within the crucifixion episode: i) Jesus' two prayers on the cross (Luke 23:34, 46), and ii) two groups of people watching at Jesus (Luke 23:35a, 49). All these three frames overlap each other.

It is not absolutely sure that Luke depicts the 'people' in Luke 23:35a as neutral (Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 532). The interpretation of this verse depends on how the second καί is understood (NASB: "And (καί) the people stood by, looking on. And (δέ) even (καί) the rulers were sneering at Him..."; NRSV: "And (καί) the people stood by, watching; but (δέ) the leaders scoffed at him..."). Luke does not elsewhere in his double work depict the crowds only in a positive or neutral terms (Luke 23:13-14, 18, 21, 23, 25; Acts 2:22-23, 37-38; cf. Luke 2:34). For a further discussion of the issues, see Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 989-91; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1147.

this, as well as many other differences between the Lukan and Markan Passion Narratives.⁵¹⁷ This is very possible. However, one may wonder why Luke suddenly becomes much more artistic *within* individual pericopes in the Passion Narrative than he has been before it; he makes a relatively few ‘artistic’ changes *within* pericopes in the non-Passion Narrative, although the general structure of the Gospel of Luke is artistic.

Some issues in the crucifixion episode suggest that Luke did not draw this section from canonical Mark. First, the order of events in Luke 23:33-49 differs significantly from the order of events in the parallel Markan account as I have shown above (see Prayer/Aland §§347-348). Second, verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts is very low. According to Taylor, “[o]f the 265 words in the narrative [Luke 23:33-49] only seventy-four (or 28.3 per cent) are common to Luke and Mark, and of these nearly a quarter occur in two successive verses [Luke 23:44-48].”⁵¹⁸ Third, Luke does not use the same Greek words for verbal abuse of Jesus as Mark and Matthew use in the parallel cases. In Luke 23:35, which alludes to Ps. 21:7 (LXX), Luke uses the rare verb ἐκμυκτηρίζω,⁵¹⁹ while Mark and Matthew use the verb ἐμπαίζω. Luke uses the same word as the psalmist. One, however, might assume that if Luke used Mark as his source, he would have relied on the Markan account without checking what verb is used in the reference passage in Ps 21:7 (LXX). In Luke 23:39, Luke uses the verb βλασφημέω, while Mark and Matthew use the verb ὀνειδίζω. Again, it is difficult to see why Luke would have changed the verb here if he used Mark as his source, while preserving it in his assumed Q text in Luke 6:22.⁵²⁰ Fourth, Luke, who regards Jesus as the king, ‘omits’ the Markan mockery title ‘King of Israel’ in his first mockery episode (Luke 23:35).⁵²¹ The change could be intentional, theologically or

517. For an extreme example of this approach, see J. Smit Sibinga, “The Making of Luke 23:26–56: An Analysis of the Composition Technique in Luke’s Crucifixion Narrative,” *RB* 104/3 (1997): 378–404.

518. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 92.

519. Ps 2:4; 21:7 (LXX), 34:16 (LXX); 1 Esd 1:49; Luke 16:14; 23:35.

520. The verb ὀνειδίζω occurs once in Luke (6:22) and twice in Mark (15:32; 16:14). The verb βλασφημέω three times in Luke’s Gospel (12:10; 22:65; 23:39) and four times in Mark (2:7; 3:28, 29; 15:29).

521. The mockery titles used for Jesus in the crucifixion episode (Luke 23:35-43 par.):

	<u>Matt</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
people			
Son of God			

stylistically motivated, but scholars have not been able to find a clear explanation for this difference.⁵²² In light of the other evidence, presented above, that speaks against the view that Luke knew the Passion Narrative of canonical Mark, it is very possible that Luke uses here a different mockery title for Jesus, because his source did not have the title 'King of Israel' at this point.

According to Bock, only a few scholars, including G. Schneider (1977) and L. Schenke (1974), argue for a total Lukan redaction of Mark in the crucifixion episode.⁵²³ Most scholars, including J. C. Hawkins (1911), B. H. Streeter (1924), J. M. Creed (1930), W. Grundmann (1963), V. Taylor (1972), J. Ernst (1977), I. H. Marshall (1978), E. E. Ellis (1974), J. A. Fitzmyer (1985), J. Nolland (1993), and D. L. Bock (1994) maintain that Luke used either a second source/tradition here or combined it with the Markan text.⁵²⁴ The third and most likely and natural deduction is that Luke used a second source/tradition here. Luke was not fond of combining his sources as analyses of parallel Q and 'Markan' texts, mentioned earlier in this work, show this.

The Kingdom of God

Introduction

In Luke-Acts, the content of the preaching of Jesus and the apostles is summed up in one phrase: the kingdom of God.⁵²⁵ The theme frames both Luke's Gospel and Acts. Acts begins with

rulers	King of Israel	Christ, King of Israel	Christ, Chosen One
	Son of God		
soldiers			King of the Jews
thief/thieves			Christ

522. One may argue that Luke omitted the title 'King of Israel' in order to avoid repetition within the Lukan first mockery episode, and between the first and second mockery episodes. In the first case, Luke uses the title 'Christ' as does Mark, but 'replaces' the Markan 'King of Israel' by 'Chosen One.' For Luke, one may argue, 'Christ' means the same as 'King of Israel' (see Luke 23:2; Acts 17:7) and therefore he replaced the term 'King of Israel' with 'Chosen One.' But in the Lukan context, the title 'Chosen One' also means 'Christ' (see Luke 9:20, 35) and therefore there is 'repetition' within the first mockery episode anywhere. And the title 'Christ' occurs twice in the Lukan mockery episodes. One may also argue that Luke omitted the title 'King of Israel' in the first episode, because the title 'King of the Jews' is used in the second episode, but as we have already seen, Luke does not avoid repetition in this section and therefore this explanation is hardly valid.

523. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1838–39. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 985–1001, argues that

the Lukan note that Jesus spoke “of the things concerning the kingdom of God” (λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts 1:3; NASB) over a period of forty days before he was taken up into heaven. Acts ends with the note that Paul preached the kingdom of God (κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts 28:31; see also 29:23) unhindered while he was in custody in Rome. Within these frames, Luke uses the phrase ‘kingdom (of God/Israel)’ five times,⁵²⁶ employing the word ‘kingdom’ as the direct object of the verbs κηρύσσω and διαμαρτύρομαι in three cases (Acts 20:25; 28:23, 31).⁵²⁷

The kingdom of God theme also frames Luke’s Gospel, although not as clearly as Acts does. At the beginning of the Gospel, the angel Gabriel announces to Maria that her son would “reign over the house of Jacob forever” and *his* kingdom (τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ) would have no end (Luke 1:33).⁵²⁸ On the cross, Jesus promises to one of the thieves, in response to the thief’s request to remember him when Jesus would come into *his* kingdom, that today he would be with Jesus in paradise (Luke 23:42-43). A few verses later, Luke notes that Joseph, who buried Jesus, was waiting for the kingdom of God (Luke 23:51).

The theme not only frames Luke’s Gospel, but it also occurs regularly between the frames, altogether 39 times in Luke.⁵²⁹ In comparison, it appears 52 times in Matthew⁵³⁰ and 15 (16) times in Mark.⁵³¹ Although the phrase appears more frequently in Matthew than in Luke, this does

besides Luke 23:40-43, Luke drew everything else from Mark.

524. See Untergaßmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu*, 109; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1838.

525. Robert F. O’Toole, “The Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts,” in *The Kingdom of God in Twentieth-Century Interpretation*, ed. Wendell Willis (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987), 153.

526. Acts 1:6; 8:12; 14:22; 19:8; 20:25.

527. Acts 20:25: κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν; Acts 28:23: διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts 28:31: κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

528. In Luke, the kingdom of God is also Jesus’ kingdom (cf. 1:32-33; 12:32; 22:29-30; 23:42).

529. Luke 1:33; 4:43; 6:20; 7:28; 8:1, 10; 9:2, 11, 27, 60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:2, 20; 12:31, 32; 13:18, 20, 28, 29; 14:15; 16:16; 17:20, 21; 18:16, 17, 24, 25, 29; 19:11; 21:31; 22:16, 18, 29, 30; 23:42, 51.

530. Matt 3:2; 4:8, 17, 23; 5:3, 10, 19, 20; 6:10, 33; 7:21; 8:11, 12; 9:35; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 12:28; 13:11, 19, 24, 31, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 16:19, 28; 18:1, 3, 4, 23; 19:12, 14, 23, 24; 20:1, 21, 31, 43; 22:2; 23:13; 24:14; 25:1, 34; 26:29. In most cases, Matthew uses the form ‘kingdom (of heaven),’ but in four cases (Matt 12:28 [Q]; 19:24; 21:31 [M], 43 [M?]) he interestingly uses the form ‘kingdom of God.’ Matt 9:35 is also an interesting case. Its minor agreements with Luke 8:1 against Mark 6:6b are such that the Matthean and Lukan versions cannot have been drawn from Mark. Does it come from Q?

531. Mark 1:15; 4:11, 26, 30; 9:1, 47; 10:14, 15, 23, 24, 25; (11:10); 12:34; 14:25; 15:43. Mark 11:10

not mean that the concept would be less significant to Luke than to Matthew. In addition to the fact that the theme frames Luke's Gospel, there are two other reasons to believe that Luke regarded the concept of the kingdom of God as one of his key themes. First, the phrase also appears in Lukan pericopes which are missing in Mark and Q (i.e., L-tradition), or of which parallel pericopes in Mark and Q miss the phrase.⁵³² Second, Luke sums up the content of the preaching in the same way as in Acts, using the 'kingdom of God' as the direct object of the verb 'preach'.⁵³³ The phrase is never used in this way by Mark⁵³⁴ and only rarely by Matthew in a slightly different form.⁵³⁵

Although the 'kingdom of God' is one of the key themes in Luke, the concept is missing in the following pericopes, while present in the parallel Markan passages: Aland §§32, 126, 168/229, and 182.⁵³⁶

Analyses of the Pericopes

Aland §32 (Luke 4:14b-15; Mark 1:14b-15)

According to the Gospel of Mark, Jesus went to Galilee after his baptism and began to preach, saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel" (Mark 1:15; NASB). Whether this statement functions merely as a transitional

refers almost definitely to a messianic kingdom, which can be understood in various ways.

532. Luke 1:33 (L); 4:43; 8:1 (Q?); 9:11, 60 (Q), 62 (L or Q); 12:32 (L?); 17:20 (L?), 21; 18:29; 19:11 (L or Q); 21:31; 22:16 (L?), 29 (Q?), 30 (Q); 23:42 (L).

533. Luke 4:43: εὐαγγελίσασθαι... τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Luke 8:1: κηρύσσω καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Luke 9:2: κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Luke 9:60: διάγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Luke 16:16: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται (the passive form carrying the same mean as the active form).

534. Cf. Mark 1:14: κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ; Mark 13:10: κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; Mark 14:9: κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (the passive form); [Mark 16:15: κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον].

535. Matt 4:23; 9:35: κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας; Matt 24:14: κηρυχθήσεται... τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας (the passive form but has the same meaning as the active form).

536. The phrase is also missing once in Luke in Aland §255 (Luke 18:24-30 par.), and a similar phrase ("the kingdom of our father David") is missing in Aland §269 (Luke 19:28-40 par.), but these pericopes are not included in this study. In the latter case, I agree with those scholars, who believe that Luke did not draw the pericope from canonical Mark (so e.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 709; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1548. See also Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 921-22).

sentence,⁵³⁷ a summary statement of Mark 1:16-3:6,⁵³⁸ or as the manifesto for the whole Gospel, is debated. Many scholars reject the latter view, for example, because the statement does not refer to exorcism and miracles, which play an important role in Mark,⁵³⁹ and because the issues mentioned in Mark 1:15 are not particularly emphasized in Mark.⁵⁴⁰ Still many may agree with R. A. Guelich's judgment that, in some sense, the statement of Mark 1:14-15 seems to "represent a summary of Mark's Gospel."⁵⁴¹

Luke agrees with the Markan account that after his baptism, Jesus went to Galilee and began his ministry there (Luke 4:14-15). However, if Luke used Mark as his source, as many believe, it is difficult to understand why he has excluded the 'summary' statement of Mark 1:15 from his Gospel, since all of the theological themes mentioned in this verse are clearly important to Luke. First, the 'kingdom (of God),' as we have already seen, is one of the key terms in Luke-Acts. According to Luke's theology, the kingdom of God has come near (Luke 10:9, 11; 21:31). In the first two references, Luke even uses the same expression as Mark 1:15. Second, in Luke's thinking, there is a season of time (cf. *καιρός* in Mark 1:15) for everything.⁵⁴² Along with the coming of Jesus began the time of the fulfillment (cf. *πληρώω* in Mark 1:15) of everything that is written about him in the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms (Luke 24:44-46).⁵⁴³ Third, the verb *μετανοέω* (cf. Mark 1:15) and the noun *μετάνοια* occur a total 14 times in Luke,⁵⁴⁴ much

537. So Gundry, *Mark*, 64.

538. So Francis J. Moloney, *Mark: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 63.

539. Gundry, *Mark*, 42.

540. Cf. Robert A. Guelich, "Mark, Gospel Of," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 517. Mark uses *ἡ βασιλεία (τοῦ θεοῦ)* 15 (16) times, but he does not say elsewhere that the kingdom of God has come near. The verb *πιστεύω* occurs 10 times, and the verb *μετανοέω* and the noun *μετάνοια* altogether three times in Mark 1:1-16:8. There is no further references to the fullness of time.

541. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 42.

542. See especially Luke 1:20; 4:13; 12:42, 56; 18:30; 19:44; 21:8; 22:16.

543. See also Luke 4:21; 9:22; 18:31; 22:37; 24:25-27, 32.

544. Luke 3:3, 8 (Q); 5:32 (missing in Mark); 10:13 (Q); 11:32 (Q); 13:3 (L), 5 (L); 15:7 (Q-section; missing in Matthew); 15:10 (L); 16:30 (L); 17:3 (Q-section; missing in Matthew), 4 (Q/L?; missing in Matthew); 24:47 (L?).

more frequently than in Mark.⁵⁴⁵ Jesus has come to call sinners to repentance (Luke 5:32), repentance is to be proclaimed to all nations (Luke 24:47), and those who do not repent will perish (Luke 13:3, 5). Fourth, the verb πιστεύω (cf. Mark 1:15) and the noun πίστις are also key terms in Luke, occurring altogether 20 times;⁵⁴⁶ the words are often missing in parallel passages in Mark. Against this background, it is very surprising that Luke would not have included at least some elements from Mark 1:15 in his introduction pericope to Jesus' ministry in Galilee (Luke 4:14-15), if he had known it. The content of Mark 1:15 would have functioned as a good summary of Jesus' message in the Lukan context.

Some argue that Luke excluded Mark 1:15 because the pericope of Jesus' Preaching at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30) functions as the manifesto of Jesus' ministry in Luke. The Nazareth episode may function as the manifesto of Jesus' ministry in Luke, as most believe,⁵⁴⁷ but this does not sufficiently explain why Luke would have excluded a short summary statement of Mark 1:15, which mentions theological themes that Luke emphasizes in his Gospel. Luke uses similar summary statements elsewhere in his Gospel (e.g., Luke 4:40-41; 5:15). The inclusion of Mark 1:15, if Luke knew it, would also have beautifully framed the Nazareth-Capernaum episode because, at the end of the Capernaum episode, Jesus says, "I must preach the *the kingdom of God* to the other cities *also*, for I was sent for this purpose" (Luke 4:43; NASB). Here, the sentence is a bit awkward because there is no previous reference in Luke to the kingdom of God in the context of Jesus' preaching; there would be, if Luke would have included Mark 1:15.

These arguments, along with those mentioned earlier under 'Repentance/Aland §§ 30, 32,' suggest that Luke did not in fact have access to canonical Mark.

545. It is noteworthy that the Lukan account of the commissioning of the twelve misses the Markan reference to repentance (Mark 6:12). This is a further indication that Luke did not draw this account from canonical Mark.

546. Luke 1:20 (L), 45 (L); 5:20; 7:9 (Q), 50 (missing in Mark); 8:25; 8:12 (missing in Mark), 13 (missing in Mark), 48, 50; [16:11]; 17:5 (L/Q?; missing in Matthew), 6 (Q), 19 (L); 18:8 (L); 18:42; 20:5; 22:32 (missing in Mark), 67 (missing in Mark); 24:25 (L).

547. See Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 195.

Aland §126 (Mark 4:26-29)

The Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mark 4:26-29) is the second of three seed parables of the kingdom in Mark 4. The other two parables are the Parable of the Sower (Mark 4:3-9) and the Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mark 4:30-32). Between the Parables of the Sower and the Seed Growing Secretly, there are three pericopes: the Reason for Speaking in Parables (Mark 4:10-12), Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mark 4:13-20), and He who Has Ears to Hear, Let Him Hear (Mark 4:21-25).

According to B. B. Scott, the omission of the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly “from the other Synoptic Gospels is a puzzle.”⁵⁴⁸ Scholars have offered numerous suggestions without finding a consensus on the issue. i) J. D. Crossan argues that Luke omitted the parable because it “stands out with a clearly different focus” than the Parables of the Sower and the Mustard Seed: the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly focuses on the farmer, while the latter parables focus on “the fate of the sown seed.”⁵⁴⁹ The view has not won many supporters;⁵⁵⁰ ii) A. M. Ambrozic suggests that “Luke most likely omitted this parable because of its insistence on the all-sufficiency of God’s power and the uselessness of human efforts.”⁵⁵¹ If this were true, then Luke should have also omitted the Parables of the Mustard Seed (Luke 13:18-19) and the Leaven (Luke 13:20-21), which make the same point as the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly; iii) B. W. Henaut proposes two reasons for the Lukan omission:⁵⁵² a) Luke omitted it that his work would not go

548. Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 363.

549. John D. Crossan, “The Seed Parables of Jesus,” *JBL* 92 (1973): 251, 252.

550. See Aloysius M. Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark’s Gospel*, CBQMS 2 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1972), 109, 117; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 364–66; Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 388; Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. S. H. Hooke (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 151–53; George Eldon Ladd, *The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 189–90. Earlier, the majority of scholars maintained that the center of attention of the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly is on the seed and its growth. Now, a growing number of interpreters contend that the center of attention rests on the seed and the certainty of the harvest.

551. Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom*, 121.

552. Henaut, *Oral Tradition and the Gospels*, 243.

beyond “the outer limits for a comfortable book length.” Henaut assumes that Luke used a roll instead of a codex.⁵⁵³ This is an easy but questionable solution to the problem. I have shown earlier that even if Luke had included the Great Omission to his work, the length of the work would not have gone beyond reasonable limits. The Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly is so short that it would not have lengthened Luke’s work more than by a few lines; b) Luke omitted the parable in order to avoid creating a contextual problem: if he had included the parable, he should have also offered an allegorical interpretation for it, following the pattern of the Interpretation of the Sower (Luke 8:11-15). This is also a very unsatisfying suggestion. If this were an issue, Luke would have had at least three options to solve the problem: first, to omit the Interpretation of the Sower and save more space; second, to create an interpretation of the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly; or third, to move the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly to the same context where two other similar parables without interpretations occur in Luke (13:18-21); iv) Marshall contends that Luke omitted Mark 4:26-34 “no doubt because the section was not relevant to his present purpose of presenting Jesus’ teaching on the importance of hearing the word of God aright.”⁵⁵⁴ This is only partly true. The Markan conclusion (Mark 4:33-34) of this parable section has the catch word “to hear” and therefore, Luke could have included it in his work. He could have also transferred the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mark 4:26-29) to another context as he did, according to Marshall, with the Parable of the Mustard Seed.

It is quite puzzling, as Scott remarks, that the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly is missing in Luke, who emphasizes the kingdom theme so clearly. In my opinion, the most logical explanation for why it is missing in Luke is that he did not know this parable.

Aland §168 (Mark 9:42-50) / §229 (Luke 17:1-3a)

In Mark, Aland §168 is part of the larger section, consisting mainly of Jesus’ sayings and

553. If Luke used a codex instead of a roll, Henaut’s argument loses all its power because codices can have much more material than rolls. For the use of codices in the early church, see Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*.

554. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 330.

building at least partly upon catchword-association.⁵⁵⁵ Many scholars, following Bultmann,⁵⁵⁶ maintain that this section begins with Mark 9:33 and ends with Mark 9:50.⁵⁵⁷ Aland §168 is believed to consist of a Markan or pre-Markan collection of originally independent sayings. J. Lambrecht believes that the sayings of Mark 9:42, 50 were derived by Mark from a different source than the saying of Mark 9:43, 45, 47.⁵⁵⁸ Despite Mark's redactional activity, argues Lambrecht, "there remains a serious tension between verses 43-49 and verse 42, both grammatically and regarding content."⁵⁵⁹ The verb of the subordinate clauses (σκανδαλίζω) is the same in v. 42 and vv. 43, 45, 47, but the tense, subject, and direct object of the verbs are different.⁵⁶⁰ In addition, whereas the subordinate clause of Mark 9:42 is introduced by καὶ ἄν, the other three subordinate clauses are introduced by καὶ ἕάν.⁵⁶¹ Some scholars question the view that Mark 9:42 and 9:43-48 would not have originally been together in the pre-Markan tradition,⁵⁶² but the differences in grammar and content between these two sayings favor Lambrecht's suggestion. Most scholars agree that the sayings of Mark 9:(49), 50 were not part of the original unit of tradition, but were later combined together with the preceding verses on the basis of the catchwords 'fire' and 'salt.'

This is the first pericope discussed in this study which does not occur in the same order in Mark and Luke. While in the Markan context the event is situated in Capernaum (Mark 9:33), just before Jesus begins his final journey to Jerusalem (Mark 10:1), the Lukan Jesus is already on his way to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51) when he pronounces the saying of Aland §168/§229.

555. Gundry, *Mark*, 507-08. Gundry lists the catchwords occurring in this section.

556. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 149-50. Bultmann argues that Mark's source for this section was a "a short of catechism." Only a few scholars have accepted this suggestion.

557. For a short summary of various views, see Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom*, 172-74.

558. Lambrecht believes that Mark knew Q, the view that I question, and drew the sayings of Mark 9:42, 50 from it, whereas the sayings of Mark 9:43, 45, 47 he derived from another tradition.

559. Jan Lambrecht, "Scandal and Salt: Is Mark Dependent on Q in 9:42-50?" in *Forschungen zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Albert Fuchs*, ed. Christoph Niemand, LPTB 7 (Frankfurt: Lang, 2002), 229.

560. In Mark 9:42 the tense of the verb is the aorist, the subject is ὁς, and the direct object is ἔνα, whereas in Mark 9:43, 45, 47 the tense is the present, the subject is a body part (hand, foot, eye), and the direct object is σε.

561. Lambrecht, "Scandal and Salt," 227, 231.

562. So e.g., Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 69.

In general, scholars agree that Luke 17:1-3a (Aland §229) is the first subsection of the unit Luke 17:1-10.⁵⁶³ Three other subsections are Luke 17:3b-4, 5-6, and 7-10.⁵⁶⁴ Most scholars also agree that either Luke or a pre-Lukan traditionist bound these originally independent proverbial sayings together on the basis of their common theme of discipleship.⁵⁶⁵

Proponents of the 2SH explain the relationship between the Lukan and Markan accounts as follows. First, Luke decided to use some of the Markan material of Mark 9:42-50, but instead of using it in the Markan context (Aland §168), he opted to move it to his travel narrative section (Aland §229). Second, Luke resolved to exclude the sayings of Mark 9:43-48 from his work. Third, Luke chose independently from Matthew to replace the saying of Mark 9:42 with a parallel Q-version, retaining probably only one to three phrases from Mark (“around his neck,” “into the sea,” “one of these little ones”).⁵⁶⁶ Fourth, Luke decided independently from Matthew to reject the saying of Mark 9:49-50 in its Markan context and replace it by a Q-version in another Lukan context (Aland §218/Luke 14:34-35).

The logic behind all of these arguments can be challenged. First, it is difficult to understand why Luke would have felt compelled to relocate the sayings of Mark 9:42-50 to another context in his Gospel, while he retains two other sayings of Mark 9:33-37 and 9:38-41 in the ‘Markan’ order between the pericopes Aland §164 (Jesus Foretells His Passion Again; Luke

563. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 834, exceptionally includes also Luke 17:11-19 to this unit.

564. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1136; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 639–40; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1380; John J. Kilgallen, “The Unity of Luke 17,1–10,” *ETL* 79/1 (2003): 157.

565. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 835, suggests that in addition to the common theme of discipleship, the sayings of Luke 17:1-3a and 17:5-6 also have a catchword connection (“into/in the sea”). A few scholars, including Kilgallen, “The Unity of Luke 17,1–10”, argue that the four subsections are not loosely related proverbs but are a theologically closely combined unit.

566. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1136; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 640. Fleddermann, *Mark and Q*, 161, argues that “[o]nly the final part of Luke 17,2 (‘...than that he scandalize one of these little ones’) comes from Mark 9,42.” The committee of The International Q Project holds that Q also included the saying of Luke 17:2 (Q: “It is better for him [if] a millstone is put around his neck and he is thrown into the sea, than that he should entice one of these little ones”; James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English: With Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002], 141). Frans Neirynck, *Evangelica II: 1982–1991 Collected Essays* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), 432, is one of a few scholars, who argue that Luke 17:2 did not overlap with Q but is the Lukan redaction of Mark 9:42. Fleddermann, *Mark and Q*, 160–61, presents several arguments against Neirynck’s view.

9:43b-45) and Aland §174 (Decision to Go to Jerusalem; Luke 9:51). Retaining the sayings of Mark 9:42-50 between Aland §164 and Aland §174 would not have interrupted the move from the prediction of suffering to the decision to go to Jerusalem any more than the other two sayings which Luke retains (i.e., Mark 9:33-37/Luke 9:46-48; Mark 9:31-41/Luke 9:49-50). In addition, these two sayings deal with the same aspects of discipleship as does Aland §168 (i.e., Mark 9:42-50/Luke 17:1-3a), which is argued by proponents of the 2SH to have been transferred to a new context by Luke (Aland §229; cf. Luke 17:3b-10). Second, it is difficult to understand why Luke would have wanted to exclude the sayings of Mark 9:43-48 from his Gospel if he knew them. A standard but not very satisfying answer is that Luke wanted to save space. These sayings, however, would have been powerful illustrations of the seriousness of sin. Third, it is very unlikely that both Luke and Matthew would have independently introduced the same two changes in the sayings of Mark 9:42-50: i) both would have replaced or combined the saying of Mark 9:42 with a Q-version, which, however, says nothing more than the Markan version does;⁵⁶⁷ and ii) both would have removed the saying of Mark 9:49,⁵⁶⁸ which has a catchword connection to Mark 9:43-48 (“fire”), and the saying of Mark 9:50, which has a catchword connection to Mark 9:49 (“salted,” “salt”), and replaced them by a Q-version. Fourth, it is unlikely that Luke would have been so keen on preserving a few phrases from Mark 9:42 and combining them with his Q parallel that he would have bothered to move from his present place in Mark to Mark 9:42 in the roll (if he used it) which was naturally difficult to use.⁵⁶⁹

567. Neirynck, *Evangelica II*, 432, argues that only the saying of Luke 17:1 comes from Q (cf. Matt 18:7), which Luke combined with Mark, but this view is rejected both by Fleddermann, *Mark and Q*, 159–61, and The International Q Project (Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *The Sayings Gospel of Q in Greek and English*, 141).

568. Some maintain that Matthew did not exclude Mark 9:49 but redacted it. This view, however, is very questionable since Matt 5:13a is significantly different than Mark 9:49.

569. The strength of this argument depends on whether or not Luke drew the Markan-like passages (Aland §§182 [Luke 10:25-28 par.], 188 [Luke 11:14-23 par.], 191 [Luke 11:29-32 par.], 192 [Luke 11:33 par.], 194 [Luke 11:37-54 par.], etc.), occurring in his Travel Narrative, from Mark or another source. If Luke drew these passages from Mark, he must have gone back and forth in Mark all the time in this section. But this would have been against his normal copying method. In the following chapter, I will argue that Luke did not draw this material from Mark.

Even if Luke had used a Markan codex, moving from his present place in Mark to Mark 9:42 would not

The traditional explanation regarding the relationship between the Lukan and Markan versions of Aland §168/§229 seem artificial and illogical. Therefore, I am open to the view that Luke did not actually draw Luke 17:1-3a from canonical Mark, nor was he influenced in wording by the Markan text, but that he derived these verses entirely from a Proto-Luke (Q+L) version. For more details of my argument, see chapter three.

The ‘omission’ of phrase ‘kingdom of God,’ which occurs in the middle of Mark 9:43-48, is not itself a very strong evidence for my view that Luke did not derive this pericope from canonical Mark, but together with other pieces of evidence, mentioned just above, my theory becomes very probable.

Aland §182 (Luke 10:25-28) / Aland §282 (Mark 12:28-34)

Luke 10:25-28 is the second pericope discussed in this study which differs from the Markan order of episodes. It is located at the beginning of the Lukan Travel Narrative, starting at Luke 9:51, whereas its parallel account in Mark and Matthew is located in the section of Jesus’ Final Ministry in Jerusalem. Luke 10:25-28 is the first part of a larger unit, including definitely Luke 10:29-37⁵⁷⁰ and probably 10:38-42⁵⁷¹ and even 11:1-13.⁵⁷²

There is no scholarly consensus regarding Luke’s source behind Aland §182. Some scholars maintain that this pericope is the Lukan redaction of the Markan episode⁵⁷³ because there

have been very easy because his source text was continuous, having no brakes between words.

570. This view is universally accepted. Luke 10:25-28 and 10:29-37 are linked together by shared vocabulary: ποιέω in 10:25, 28, 37 (twice) and ἀλησίον in 10:27, 29, 36 (Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1018). See also detailed analyses of the section by Gerhard Sellin, “Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10:25–37),” *ZNW* 65–66 (1974–75): 65:166–89, 66:19–60. Scholars only debate whether or not these two pericopes were already connected in pre-Lukan tradition (Stein, *Luke*, 314; Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 580; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 440; Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom*, 177; Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, 184–85).

571. So e.g. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 579: “The second and third units (vv 29-37, 38-42) take up in reverse order the love of God and love of neighbor, which have become the subjects of concern in the opening unit, vv 25-27. As often, Luke balances a story about men with a story about women.”

572. So e.g. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 439: “Very roughly one may say that the three incidents handle the relationship of the disciples to their neighbours, to Jesus, and to God respectively.”

573. So Frans Neirynck, “The Minor Agreements and Q,” in *Gospel Behind the Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 61–62; Jarmo Kiilunen, *Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in synoptischer Sicht: Ein redaktionskritischer Versuch über Mk 12,28–34 und die Parallelen*, AASF B 250 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1989). E.

are some similarities between the structures of the Lukan and Markan episodes: i) both are introduced by a question from a scribe/lawyer; ii) both quote Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18; and iii) both end up with a positive comment either from Jesus (Mark 12:34) or a lawyer (Luke 10:28); this is missing in the Matthean account.⁵⁷⁴

Probably the majority of scholars, however, hold that either Luke combined a parallel non-Markan episode with the Markan one, using the former as his major source, or Luke replaced the Markan episode by a parallel non-Markan episode (L, Q, or an unnamed source).⁵⁷⁵ There are two major reasons to believe so. First, there are some significant differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts. Stein summarizes them as follows:⁵⁷⁶

(1) In Mark and Matthew it is the expert/teacher who quotes the OT, whereas in Luke it was Jesus. (2) In Mark and Matthew the question was about the most important/greatest commandment, whereas in Luke it was how to have eternal life. (3) In Mark the question addressed to Jesus was neutral, but in Matthew and Luke it was hostile.⁵⁷⁷

Those who support the view that Luke redacted the Markan account argue that these differences

Klostermann (1929), H. L. Egelkraut (1976), G. Schneider (1977), W. Wiefel (1988), J. Schmid (1960), and E. E. Ellis (1974) are also mentioned among those who support this view (Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1019 n.4; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 877; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 441).

574. Cf. Stein, *Luke*, 314 n.39.

575. E.g., Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 22–23; Reginald H. Fuller, “The Double Commandment of Love: Test Case for the Criteria of Authenticity,” in *Essays on the Love Commandment*, eds. Luise Schottroff, Reginald H. Fuller, Christoph Burchard, and M. Jack Suggs, trans. R. H. Fuller and I. Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 42; Jan Lambrecht, “The Great Commandment Pericope and Q,” in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald Piper, NovTSup 75 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 95; Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, 184–85; Craig A. Evans, “‘Do This and You Will Live’: Targumic Coherence in Luke 10:25–28,” in *Jesus in Context: Temple, Purity, and Restoration*, Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans, A., AGJU 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1990/1997), 390–91; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 877–78; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 441; Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 583; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1019–20. Some of these scholars maintain that the Markan and Lukan episodes of the Great Commandment are two different incidents.

576. Stein, *Luke*, 314–15 n.39. I quote only his first three arguments.

577. The last observation is important. The section of Luke 19:45–20:47, as well as its Markan parallel, consists of controversy stories with the Jewish leaders. The only exception in Mark is this Great Commandment episode. In Mark, the episode is neutral, whereas in Luke and Matthew, it is hostile toward Jesus. To argue that Luke derived this episode from Mark but decided to change its character from neutral to hostile and then transfer it from Luke’s controversy section to another section, which does not include hostile episodes exclusively, does not make very much sense in my opinion. Rather, it is more likely, as I will further argue in chapter three, that Luke might have known a collection of traditional (Markan) material (however, not canonical Mark) but regarded his non-Markan source more authoritative and therefore substituted the ‘non-Markan’ version of the Great Commandment for its ‘Markan’ version.

are due to Luke's decision to combine together the episodes of Luke 10:25-28 and 10:29-37;⁵⁷⁸ this is believed to explain why there is basically no agreement in wording between the Lukan and Markan episodes in Aland §§182/282, beside the wording in the OT quotations. Second, there are up to ten minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark in this episode. Lambrecht summarizes them well:⁵⁷⁹

- (1) Unlike Mk 12:29, their quotation of the first commandment does not begin with "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one".
- (2) Both Matthew and Luke offer a much shorter version. They have no parallel to Mk 12:32-33. This means that they do not offer a monotheistic comment (cf. Mk 12:32: "there is no other than he") nor a critique on sacrifices (cf. Mk 12:33: "much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices").
- (3) Jesus is initially addressed as διδάσκαλε ("teacher"), a title not found at the beginning of the Markan pericope (12:28) but only subsequently in 12:32.
- (4) The question in Mt 22:35 and Lk 10:25 is asked by a νομικός ("lawyer"), whereas in Mk 12:28 it is posed by εἷς τῶν γραμματέων ("one of the scribes").⁵⁸⁰
- (5) By his question the lawyer intends to put Jesus to the test (see Mt 22:35: πειράζων and Lk 10:25: ἐκπειράζων), while Mark's scribe questions Jesus "seeing that he answered them (= the Sadducees) well" (12:28c; cf. Lk 10:28b). The scribe in Mark appears to be well-disposed toward Jesus.
- (6) Both Matthew and Luke have the expression ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, be it in a different context. Compare Mt 22:36, "Teacher, which is the great commandment 'in the law'?" with Lk 10:26, "(Jesus) said to him, What is written 'in the law'?" The expression ἐν τῷ νόμῳ is not present in Mark.
- (7) In the enumeration of Mt 22:37 and Lk 10:27, both evangelists use the preposition ἐν, while Mark in 12:30, as well as in 33, always writes ἐξ.
- (8) Both Matthew and Luke end the series of human faculties on διανοία ("mind"), Mark has ἰσχύς ("strength") as the fourth and the last term.
- (9) Matthew and Luke agree in that they have, respectively in 22:37a and 10:26a, ὁ δὲ (without "Jesus"), a verb of saying and the indication of the addressee: compare ὁ δὲ ἔφη

578. Some scholars, however, argue that the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:29-37) must have been combined with the Great Commandment episode (Luke 10:25-28) in the pre-Lukan tradition, because it is difficult to imagine who the parable would have survived independently "without its present setting to provide a context for it" (Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 440). See also Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 580.

579. Lambrecht, "The Great Commandment Pericope and Q," 79-81. See also Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 47 n.4; Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 554; Fuller, "The Double Commandment of Love," 41-42.

580. For the text critical problem of the existence of νομικός in Matt 22:35, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 59. See also the debate between Frans Neirynck, "Luke 10:25-28: A Foreign Body in Luke?" in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, eds. Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 149-65; "The Minor Agreements and Lk 10,25-28," *ETL* 71/1 (1995): 151-60 and Robert H. Gundry, "The Refusal of Matthean Foreign Bodies to be Exorcised from Luke 9,22; 10,25-28," *ETL* 75/1 (1999): 104-22; "Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew Against Mark: Evidence That Luke Used Matthew," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck and et al., BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1467-95; "A Rejoinder on Matthean Foreign Bodies in Luke 10,25-28," *ETL* 71 (1995): 139-50, regarding this minor agreement.

αὐτῷ (Matthew) with ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν (Luke). In Mk 12:29a we read: ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς. This last agreement, thus, is threefold.
 (10) Both Matthew and Luke have Jesus' answer in direct speech without a ὅτι which we find in Mk 12:29a.⁵⁸¹

For these reasons, the majority of scholars maintain “that both Matthew and Luke have used a common tradition, a tradition which was independent of Mark.”⁵⁸² Whether Luke combined this tradition with the Markan account or not, and whether this second tradition should be called L, Q or something else are debated as I have noted above. J. Kiilunen fights against this majority view, trying to demonstrate that all of these minor agreements can be explained on the basis of Luke's redaction of the Markan text.⁵⁸³ However, I agree with Lambrecht's judgment that, “even though each of these agreements, taken separately, could be regarded as independent Matthean and Lukan redactions of the Markan text alone, this type of solution hardly works for all of them taken together. Could two independent redactors agree so often? This is hardly believable.”⁵⁸⁴

The Lukan episode of Aland §182 ends with Jesus' words, “You have given the right answer; do this and you will live” (Luke 10:28), while the Markan Jesus says, “You are not far from the kingdom of God” (Mark 12:34). Especially those scholars who contend that Mark was Luke's only source here argue that Luke changed the ending of the pericope to correspond with the lawyer's question at the beginning of the episode, “Teacher... what must I do to inherit eternal life?” (Luke 10:25).⁵⁸⁵ This is possible, but, in the same fashion, Luke could have also changed the lawyer's question to the form, “Teacher... what must I do to enter/inherit the kingdom of God” and Jesus' comment to the form, “You have given the right answer; do this and you will

581. Lambrecht notes on p. 81 n.27 that, “In Mk 12:29 it could also be direct speech, but with ὅτι this remains uncertain.”

582. Fuller, “The Double Commandment of Love,” 42.

583. Kiilunen, *Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in synoptischer Sicht*, 51–84.

584. Lambrecht, “The Great Commandment Pericope and Q,” 82.

585. Craig A. Evans, ““Do This and You Will Live””, indirectly questions this view. He demonstrates that Lev 18:5 (“by which a man may live if he does them”), to which Luke refers in Luke 10:25, was interpreted in a sense of ‘eternal life’ in Targums and some other Jewish writings. Evans concludes his analysis by arguing that “[t]hematic and dictional coherence between Luke 10:25–28 and the Targum and the presence of features common to rabbinic pedagogy and debate strongly suggest that what we have here is not something that the Lukan evangelist composed on the basis of what he found in Greek Mark (or in Q, for that matter)” (p. 391).

enter/inherit the kingdom of God.”⁵⁸⁶ This would have been a more natural and logical change since the phrase ‘kingdom of God’ was already present in Luke’s assumed source.

In light of all the evidence presented above, it seems more likely to me that Luke did not use the phrase ‘kingdom of God’ here because the traditional unit he was using did not have reference to it.

Conclusion

Today, all biblical scholars acknowledge that Luke was a theologian, who emphasizes certain theological themes in his double work. What is interesting, and at the same time strange, is that although Luke emphasizes certain theological themes in his Gospel, these emphasized themes are missing in some Lukan pericopes while present in the parallel Markan pericopes. In this study, I have focused on seven such themes. This phenomenon seems to indicate that Luke did not use *canonical* Mark as his source, although some striking similarities between these two Gospels seem to imply otherwise.

These Lukan ‘omissions’ occur too frequently to convince me that they are accidental. The lack of scholarly consensus for explaining these ‘omissions’ also hints that the source history of Luke’s Gospel is more complex than the 2SH suggests.

Especially the Lukan Eschatological Discourse (Luke 21:5-36) has a great concentration of thematic omissions. There, Luke ‘omits’ the Markan references to prayer (Mark 13:18), the Holy Spirit (13:11), *ethnos* (13:10), salvation (13:13), and angels (13:27, 32), although he clearly emphasizes these themes elsewhere. Most scholars, even some of the most devoted proponents of the 2SH, admit that Luke might have drawn the material of this section either primarily from a non-Markan source or inserted some material from a non-Markan source to the Markan discourse. The Lukan Eschatological Discourse, however, is not an isolated incident. We can find similar thematic omissions throughout the Gospel of Luke. Scholars have struggled to explain

586. Cf. Luke 16:16; 18:17, 24, 25; Acts 14:22. In addition to this verse, the phrase ‘to inherit eternal life’ occurs only once in Luke 18:18; so, it is not Luke’s favourite expression like the phrase ‘kingdom of God.’

these ‘omissions.’ A few believe that all of these differences can be explained on the basis of Luke’s redactional activity of the Markan text. Many believe that Luke’s use of a non-Markan (fragmentary) source(s) better explains these differences between the Gospels of Luke and Mark. I am suggesting that it is more likely, in light of cumulative evidence, that Luke did not have access to *canonical* Mark at all, but drew his so-called triple tradition material from another source. This explanation remains the most natural to me.

In the following chapters, I will attempt to give further evidence supporting my theory.

CHAPTER 3

DISSIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE LUKAN AND MARKAN PASSION-RESURRECTION NARRATIVES

Introduction

One of the most problematic questions of the Synoptic Problem is why the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative differs so significantly from the Markan one. Advocates of a special source(s) for the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative have pointed out several differences.¹ Of most importance are differences in language,² differences in order of material, additions of new material in Luke, the absence of some Markan material in Luke, Semitisms in Luke, and some similarities between the Lukan and Johannine Passion-Resurrection Narratives against the Markan one.

Differences in language between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives have been long recognized. These differences became obvious by comparing not only individual pericopes with each other in the Passion-Resurrection section but also verbatim agreement percentages between the Lukan and Markan Gospels in general. In general, as Appendix B shows, there is not a remarkable difference in verbal agreement percentages between the Matthean and Markan non-Passion sections (the weighted word agreement is 41.5%)³ and the Passion-

1. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, lists a number of the suggested problems. John C. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 84, discusses the first three differences (i.e., differences in language, order of pericopes, and additions of new material) and argues that "in each case the freedom appeared to be of such a kind as was likely to result oral use of the source."

2. See e.g., Alfred Morris Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920); Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 33–75; Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 91–99; Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 27–37; Marion L. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*, JSNTSup 14 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

3. The simple agreement percentage is 41.4%. If all pericopes of the non-Passion section (Mark 1:1–13:37) are included, the simple agreement percentage is 36.1%. The latter percentage has been calculated from Morgenthauer, *Statistische Synopse*, 66–68.

Resurrection sections (47.4%).⁴ There is, however, a significant difference in these numbers between the Lukan and Markan accounts. While verbatim agreement in the non-Passion section is 37.5%, it is only 22.8% in the Passion-Resurrection section.⁵ In addition, as Appendix A shows, from Aland §269 (The Triumphal Entry) onward, word agreement between the Matthean and Markan pericopes is consistently higher than that between the Lukan and Markan parallel pericopes. Before Aland §269 the agreement percentage is sometimes higher between Matthew and Mark, and sometimes higher between Luke and Mark; this often occurs in blocks. The only exceptions to the rule in the section Aland §§269-352 are Aland §278 (The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen) in which the agreement percentages are equal according to Morgenthaler, §284 (Woe to the Scribes and Pharisees) in which the agreement percentage is exceptionally high between Luke and Mark (66.7%)⁶ and exceptionally low between Matthew and Mark (9.9%), §308 (Preparation for the Passover), and a short Markan passage of §343 (The Road to Golgotha).

The order of material differs, according to Hawkins,⁷ twelve times in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative from the Markan one; four times more often than in the Lukan non-Passion section.⁸ Taylor has tabulated Hawkins' list of differences in order in a convenient way

4. The simple agreement percentage is 46.4%. If all the pericopes of the Passion-Resurrection section (Mark 14:1-16:8) are included, the simple agreement percentage is 47.7%. The latter percentage has been calculated from Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 68.

5. The simple agreement percentages are 37.8% and 24.6% respectively. If all the pericopes are included, the simple agreement percentages are 25.2% and 19.3% respectively. The latter numbers have been calculated from Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 66-68.

6. It is the second highest after Aland §253 (68.8%; Jesus Blesses the Children) if Aland §16, which overlaps with Q, is excluded.

7. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 80-84. Many scholars refer to Hawkins's twelve differences in order; see e.g., Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 202. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, 24-25, 107, lists many more differences in order: "four traspositions of sections" (Luke 22:21-23, 24-27, 63-65, 56-62) and "fourteen transpositions of verses or portions of verses" ("important" ones: Luke 22:39, 66, 70b; 23:2, 33b, 36, 45b; and less important ones: Luke 22:40, 70; 23:19, 32, 38, 54; 24:10a).

8. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 89, lists seven variations from the Markan order in the Lukan non-Passion section: Luke 6:12-19 (Mark 3:7-19a), Luke 8:23 (Mark 4:37, 38), Luke 8:28, 29 (Mark 5:42), Luke 8:55b, 56 (Mark 5:42b, 43), Luke 9:14a (Mark 6:44), and Luke 20:15 (Mark 12:8). He does not include Luke 8:19-21 (Mark 3:31-35), "because a change of that incident from its Marcan position was necessitated by Luke's omission here of the discourse to which it is appended in Mark." Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, 24, lists the following differences in order within Luke 3:3-18:14: "three changes in order of sections (Luke 3:19-20; 6:17-21; 8:4-15)" and "eight transpositions of verses of portions of

which I reproduce below with some changes.⁹

	Event	In relation to	Found in Mark	Found in Luke
1.	The prediction of the betrayal	The last supper	Before (14:18-21)	After (22:21-23)
2.	The saying, "I shall not drink..."	The words of institution	After (14:25)	Before (22:18)
3.	The woe pronounced on the traitor	The questionings of the apostles	After (14:21)	Before (22:22)
4.	The prediction of Peter's denial	The departure from the upper room	After (14:29)	Before (22:31-34)
5.	The denial	The trial before the priests and mocking	After (14:66-72)	Before (22:56-62)
6.	The mocking	The trial before the priests	After (14:65)	Before (22:63-65)
7.	The superscription	The mockery of various onlookers	Before (all; 15:29-32)	After (some; 23:35-37)
8.	Mockery by the soldiers	Crucifixion	Before (15:16-20a)	During (before in the case of Herod's soldiers; 23:36-37)
9.	The rending of the temple veil	The death of Jesus	After (15:38)	Before (23:45)
10.	Temporal statement	The burial	Before (15:43-46)	After (23:50-53)
11.	The preparation of spices and ointments	The reference to the Sabbath	After (16:1)	Before (23:56)
12.	The names of the women	The visit to the tomb	Before (16:1)	After (24:10)

Hawkins notes that "[w]ith the exception of Nos. 1 and 2 in the list, perhaps none of them have any practical importance in the way of giving us different impressions as to the course of event. The others are unimportant themselves, being chiefly such transpositions of statements as do not necessarily imply any transposition of the facts referred to."¹⁰

Variations in order of material in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative have been interpreted by scholars in a number of different ways. For some, these differences strongly suggest that Luke

verses" (Luke 3:2-3; 8:29b, 42a, 46b; 9:14a; 9:48c; 8:51b, 55c). But see also Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. H. C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 58; Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 227-30; Neiryneck, "Synoptic Problem," 589-90; Frans Neiryneck, "The Argument from Order and St. Luke's Transpositions," *ETL* 49 (1973): 784-815.

9. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 73.

10. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 81.

drew the Passion-Resurrection Narrative completely from a non-Markan source,¹¹ used a non-Markan source as a framework into which he inserted some material from Mark,¹² or allowed a non-Markan source(s) to influence the edition of the Markan text. Others argue that all these differences are due to Lukan redaction of the Markan text.¹³ In Hawkins' opinion, it is unlikely that any author, using the Markan text as his source, would have taken such trouble to alter the order of material in such a way that Luke did in his Passion-Resurrection Narrative,¹⁴ especially when it cannot clearly be demonstrated that these changes were linguistically or theologically motivated. Therefore, the most likely explanation in Hawkins' view is that these variations of order resulted "from oral use of the source."¹⁵

The Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative also has the addition of some new material not found in Mark. Scholars partly disagree about the extent of it. The following table lists additions of new material according to A. M. Perry,¹⁶ Hawkins,¹⁷ and Fitzmyer.¹⁸ The last column shows my position regarding new material.¹⁹

11. E.g. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 14–19, 27–37.

12. So advocates of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

13. E.g., Frank J. Matera, "Luke 22,66–71: Jesus Before the ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΙΟΝ," *ETL* 65 (1989): 58; Frank J. Matera, "The Trial of Jesus: Problems and Proposals," *Int* 45 (1991): 9; Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 115–25.

14. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 81.

15. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 84. Hawkins argues that Luke had basically memorized the Passion Narrative before he wrote it down. When Luke came to the Passion section, "he would write down the memories of his past teaching which were impressed upon his mind, without having constant occasion to make direct reference to the Marcan source, as he himself had done in describing those earlier parts of the life of Jesus which were less familiar to him..." (p. 92). This explains differences in order in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

16. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, 23, 107.

17. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 15, 194–97. Compare with John C. Hawkins, "St. Luke's Passion-Narrative Considered to the Reference to the Synoptic Problem," *ExpTim* 15 (1903–4): 123–24. In Hawkins' view, ("Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 78–80, 84), new material in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative is one of the three indicators that Luke produced the Markan Passion-Resurrection Narrative from his memory, combining with it other oral material

18. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX*, 84.

19. Scripture references in parentheses mean uncertainty.

<u>Perry</u>	<u>Hawkins</u>	<u>Fitzmyer</u>	<u>Tolppanen</u>
	22:3a	22:3a	22:3a
			22:6b
22:15-16	22:15	22:15-18	22:15-17, (18?)
	22:19b, 20	22:19c-20	22:19c
22:27ab	22:27	22:27	22:27
22:28-32	22:28-32	22:31-33	22:31-33
22:35-38	22:35-38	22:35-38	22:35-38
	22:40		22:40 (?)
(22:43-44)	22:43-45b		Some details
22:48-49	22:48-49		22:48-49
22:51	22:51		22:51
22:53c	22:53b		22:53c
22:61a	22:61a		22:61a
22:67b-68	22:65-66a, 67-68	22:63-71 (?)	22:65, 67b-68
	23:2		23:2
23:4-16	23:4-6, 7-12, 14-16	23:6-12, 13-16	23:(4?), 5, 6-12, 13-16
23:22bc	23:22b-23		23:22bc, (23?)
23:27-31	23:27-31	23:27-32	23:27-32
(23:34a)	23:34a		23:34
23:35a		23:35a	23:35a (?)
		23:36-37	23:36-37
23:39-43	23:39-43	23:39b-43	23:39-43
23:46b	23:45a, 46	23:46	23:46b
23:48-49a	23:48	23:47b-49	23:47b-48, (49?)
23:51a	23:51a		23:51a
23:53c	23:53b		23:53c
23:56b	23:56	23:56	23:56
24:3	24:4a, 5b		24:(3?), 4a, 5b
24:7-8	24:7-8a		24:7-8
(24:10b-11)	24:11		24:10b-11
(24:12)	24:12		(24:12)
24:13-53	24:13-53	24:13-49	24:13-53

Scholars debate whether Luke drew this new material from a non-Markan source(s) / tradition or whether he composed it himself.²⁰ In my opinion, it is highly unlikely that Luke composed the material *ex nihilo* because much of this material fails to add anything theologically or literarily significant to the Lukan story. The number of additions is much higher in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section than in its non-Passion section in relation to the length of these sections.²¹

20. My definition of 'composition' is the same as Fitzmyer's (*The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 83): "...free creative activity on the part of the evangelist, who was not depending on a previous source, oral or written, and not merely redacting or modifying something that he had inherited."

21. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, 23; Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 88.

The Markan Passion-Resurrection Narrative also has some material not found in Luke. Perry²² and Hawkins²³ list the following Markan verses. The last column shows my position regarding the absence of Markan material in Luke.

<u>Perry</u>	<u>Hawkins</u>	<u>Tolppanen</u>
(14:3-9)	(14:3, 4, 5-7)	(14:3-9?)
14:20	14:20	14:18-19, (20?), 21b
(14:23-24)		(14:23-24?)
14:26-29, 31c		14:26-28, (29?), 31c
14:33-34, 38b-42	14:40-41	14:32b-34, (35b?), 37b, 38b-42
14:44, 46, 50-52	14:44-45, 49b, 51-52	14:43b-44, 46, 49b-52
14:55-61, 64	14:56b, 57, 58, 61	14:55-61a, 63a, 64b
15:1a		
15:4-5		15:4-5
15:6, 8, 10	15:8	15:6, 8, (9?), 10, 11a
15:16-20		15:16-20a
	15:21b	
15:23, 25	15:25	15:23, 25
15:29		15:29-30
	15:32	15:32b
15:34-36	15:34	15:34-35, (36a?), 36b
		15:40b, (41?)
15:44-45	15:44-45a	15:44-45
16:3, 7-8	18:8b	16:(1?), 3, 7-8

According to Perry, “the amount of omitted material is proportionately about the same” in the Lukan non-Passion and Passion-Resurrection sections, but “the blocks of material are smaller in the Passion-narrative.”²⁴ Some scholars have used the Markan material which is absent in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative as further evidence that Luke relied on a non-Markan source(s) here, while advocates of the 2SH argue that all or most of omissions can be explained by Lukan redaction.²⁵

Luke’s Greek is more elegant than most of the other NT authors, but, interestingly, his

22. Perry, *The Sources of Luke’s Passion-Narrative*, 23–24, 107.

23. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 11, 114–42. Notice that Hawkins does not present a complete list of the Lukan omissions of the Markan material.

24. Perry, *The Sources of Luke’s Passion-Narrative*, 24.

25. For a good discussion of the Lukan omissions of the Markan material, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 91–97; Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 114–25, 131–42.

Gospel is also coloured by Semitic words and grammar structures more than other Gospels.²⁶ Some sections in Luke are coloured by Semitism more than others. This is especially true with the Infancy Narrative (Luke 1:5-2:40), but some sections in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative also have considerable Semitic flavour.²⁷ Opinions are divided regarding how to explain this phenomenon. Some believe that variations in the amount of Semitism between Lukan sections favour the view that Luke replaced at least some Markan sections by non-Markan material, or combined these sources; others reject this view. For example, when considering the Lukan Infancy Narrative, Ellis argues that “[v]ery probably the traditions used in the infancy narratives (1:5-2:40), at least, rest directly upon written Hebrew sources,”²⁸ whereas Kümmel believes that Luke wrote the Infancy Narrative based on “various traditions which had in part already received a linguistically fixed form,” “later than the rest of the Gospel.”²⁹ Semitisms in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative will be revisited in the exegetical part of this chapter.

The last problematic and, at the same time, interesting issue discussed here is the existence of some similarities between the Lukan and Johannine Passion-Resurrection accounts. Major signs of contacts are as follows: Luke 22:3/John 13:2, 27a; Luke 22:14-38/John 13-17; Luke 22:39-53a/John 18:1-12; Luke 22:53b-71/John 18:13-27; Luke 23:1-25/John 18:29-19:16; Luke 23:25-26/John 19:17-42; Luke 23:34a, 43, 46/John 19:26-27, 28, 30; Luke 23:36/John 19:29; Luke 24/John 20-21.³⁰ According to Brown, the relationship

26. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 113. Fitzmyer (pp. 114-25) distinguishes Septuagintism and Aramaism/Hebraism in Lukan Greek, believing that most Semitism in Luke can be explained by the influence of the LXX upon him. He offers a good number of Semitic expressions found in Luke. See also Frans Neirynck, “La matière marcienne dans l’évangile de Luc,” in *L’Évangile de Luc: Problèmes Littéraires et Théologiques: Mémorial Lucien Cerfaux*, ed. F. Neirynck, BETL 32 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), 179-93.

27. Perry, *The Sources of Luke’s Passion-Narrative*, 67-69, 80-83. Cf. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 205-6. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*, 65, however, claims that the Lukan Passion Narrative is not “written in noticeably Semitized Greek”

28. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, 27.

29. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 137.

30. The list is combined from Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 88; John Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, NovTSup 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1963); Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*, 87-91. See also F. Lamar Cribbs, “St. Luke and Johannine Tradition,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 422-50;

between the Lukan and Johannine Passion-Resurrection Narratives has most often been explained in one of three ways: i) John used Luke's Gospel or a pre-Lukan Passion Narrative; ii) Luke used a pre-Johannine Passion Narrative source or traditions;³¹ or iii) Luke and John relied on "an independent (oral) source or tradition(s)."³² I will discuss the relationship between Luke and John further in the exegetical section of this chapter. Suffice to say, at this point, I do not believe John was dependent on Luke's Gospel. The most likely explanation is that the Lukan and Johannine Passion Narratives developed in the same circle of people and were partly influenced by each other in their oral stage.

Previous Approaches to the Problem

Though in the non-Passion section, the Lukan and Markan accounts in general agree closely, the question as to why the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative differs so significantly from the Markan one has bothered scholars for a long time. A great number of explanations have been offered. Here, I am able to discuss only some of these. I have divided suggestions into two broad categories: i) Luke used a single written source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, and ii) Luke combined sources in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative. The latter category is further divided into two major subcategories: a) The combination of Mark and Proto-Luke, and b) The combination of Mark and a non-Markan source(s)/tradition(s). From each category only some

Matti Myllykoski, "The Material Common to Luke and John: A Sketch," in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. Petri Luomanen, FES 54 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991), 115–56; Mark A. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke*, SBLDS 178 (Atlanta: SBL, 2001); Paul N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 112–14.

31. In recent years this view has found several supporters; see Peter Leander Hofrichter, ed., *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums: Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000*, TTS 9 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002). Some scholars hold that Luke used canonical John as his source; so, e.g., Barbara Shellard, "The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem," *JTS* 46 (1995): 71–98; Barbara Shellard, *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*, JSNTSup 215 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 148–260; Robert Morgan, "The Priority of John - Over Luke," in *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums: Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000*, ed. Peter Leander Hofrichter, TTS 9 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002), 195–211.

32. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 86–87.

representatives have been picked up. An exhaustive history of the discussion of the issue is offered by J. M. Harrington.³³

Luke Used a Single Written Source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative

In recent years, some scholars have come to the conclusion that Luke used only a single written source in his Passion-Resurrection section. Some argue that this was Mark, while at least one scholar holds that it was not.

The Source Was Mark

Relatively few scholars insist that Luke's sole source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative was Mark. The possibility that some details could have been drawn from fragmentary oral tradition is not necessarily denied, but its importance is usually minimized. Almost all differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts are explained by Lukan redaction and composition. Some of the most typical representatives of this view are J. Finegan,³⁴ W. G.

33. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*.

34. Jack Finegan, *Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934), 35, argues that Lukan redaction basically explains all differences between the Lukan and Markan Passion Narratives: "Mt und Lc haben also keine historische Quelle für die Leidensgeschichte Jesu außerhalb Mc. Ihre Unterschiede von Mc entstehen allein aus ihrer Umgestaltung des vorliegenden Mc-Berichts und durch die Einführung von ein paar legendarischen Stücken, von denen einige wahrscheinlich schon vorhanden waren"

Kümmel,³⁵ F. Neirynck,³⁶ R. Pesch,³⁷ F. G. Untergaßmair,³⁸ D. Senior,³⁹ F. J. Matera,⁴⁰ and J. M. Harrington.⁴¹

The Source Was Non-Markan

E. Trocmé has a unique approach to the Synoptic Problem. His main arguments, related directly to the Synoptic Problem, are:

First, the Markan Passion-Resurrection Narrative (chs. 14-16) and the rest of the Gospel were independent units with their own pre-history before anyone attached them together.⁴² He rejects the views of Linnemann, D. Dormeyer, P. J. Achtemeier, J. R. Donahue and W. Kelber who feel “that the stylistic and theological similarities between Mark 1-13 and Mark 14-16 are so far-reaching and the literary structure of both sections so identical that the redactional work done

35. Kümmel’s approach (*Introduction to the New Testament*, 135) to the issues is cautious: “If... Luke did not derive from a consecutive special source the extensive material that goes beyond Mk and Q, the possibility cannot be excluded that he – as has already been conjectured for Mk – found assembled in oral or even written form some of the special traditions that he employed. But that can hardly be demonstrated with certainty.”

36. Frans Neirynck, “La matière marcienne dans l’évangile de Luc,” in *Evangelica: Gospel Studies: Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. van Segbroeck, BETL 60 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), 79, 81.

37. Rudolf Pesch, *The Trial of Jesus Continues*, trans. D. G. Wagner (Allison Park: Pickwick, 1996), 17, believes that “Luke’s presentation, which is dependent on Mark’s material, is throughout a redactional treatment of Markan material, presupposing no additional, original, special source and probably not even a single special tradition. In judging the Lukan Passion narrative, one must rather taken into account that traditional material of Luke’s second book, the Acts of the Apostles, influenced the redaction of the material of the first book.” Pesch also believes that “[t]he Markan Passion narrative with its account of Jesus’ trial, which appears in the Gospel of Mark, is largely identical with the pre-Markan passion narrative, upon which the evangelist drew...”

38. Untergaßmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu*, 153–55.

39. Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1989), 10.

40. Matera is one of the most plain-spoken advocates of the view that Luke did not use other sources or traditions beyond Mark in the parallel Passion-Resurrection Narrative passages. He concludes his study on Luke 22:66–71 (“Luke 22,66–71,” 58) by claiming that the passage “does not preserve an independent tradition about Jesus’ trial before the Jewish leaders. Luke has composed account employing Mark as his primary, and probably his sole, source...,” and his study on Luke 23:1–25 (“Luke 23,1–25: Jesus Before Pilate, Herod, and Israel,” in *L’Évangile de Luc - The Gospel of Luke*, 2nd ed., ed. F. Neirynck, BETL 32 [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989], 550) by insisting that “in the composition of 23,1–25, Luke is not dependent upon other sources or traditions in addition to Mark’s Gospel.” See also Frank J. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories*, ThI (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 155; Matera, “The Trial of Jesus,” 9.

41. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 802, argues that even in the composition of Luke 23:6–16 Luke did not use any other sources but Mark (3:6; 6:14–29; 15:16–20).

42. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 10, 12–13. On p. 19 Trocmé claims that Mark 1–13 and 14–16 were not edited by the same person and that Mark 14–16 was appended to Mark 1–13 at a later date.

by the evangelist must have been the same throughout the whole gospel.”⁴³ Trocmé argues (contra E. J. Pryke⁴⁴) that so-called characteristics of Markan vocabulary and style could be those of tradition, not of the Evangelist who combined together two units of tradition.⁴⁵ Similarities in vocabulary and style between these two units of tradition merely suggest that these units “came from roughly the same circle;” it does not prove that Mark is responsible for them.⁴⁶ It is practically impossible to distinguish Markan redaction from tradition.

Trocmé refutes the view “that many of the features of Mark 1-13 pointed towards the Passion narrative, so that these chapters must be seen as a long introduction to the story of the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus, which is the real core of the gospel.”⁴⁷ He argues that none of the allusions in Mark 1-13 point “to a *narrative* of these events which would be part of the same book. No story is needed for the readers to know what the allusions and prophecies in question are about, since the Passion of our Lord was at the heart of Christian preaching.”⁴⁸

Trocmé also points out that there are contradictions between the two units of tradition, which seem to speak against Markan composition of these units from smaller units *and* with a heavy edition of them. Some of these contradictions are: a) the use of christological titles in these two units; b) Jesus’ attitude towards the temple; and c) the length of time between Jesus’ death and resurrection (cf. Mark 15:42; 16:2 with 8:31; 9:31; 10:33f.).⁴⁹

Second, while Matthew had at his disposal a copy of Mark’s Gospel which already included the last three chapters, Luke’s copy of Mark did not have them yet, so he used another Passion Narrative which was a derivation of the common archetype.⁵⁰ Trocmé rejects the view that differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts could be purely editorial or could have

43. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 15.

44. E. J. Pryke, *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel: A Study of Syntax and Vocabulary as Guides to Redaction in Mark*, SNTSMS 33 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

45. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 10, 15–17.

46. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 17.

47. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 10.

48. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 10.

49. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 11–12, 18–19.

50. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 24, 34, 37.

risen from the combination of the Markan Passion Narrative with non-Markan tradition. Despite many similarities between these two accounts

it became clearer at every step that far-reaching differences existed between the Lukan and the Markan Passion narratives, in addition to the striking dissimilarity of their vocabulary. It is therefore not enough to assume that Luke made use of some isolated tradition units beside the Markan story, as this would account in no way for the fact that the differences are found in every single pericope to an extent which makes it highly unlikely that they might be purely editorial.⁵¹

I share Trocmé's view regarding the relationship between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives and defend it in this chapter, however our opinions seem to differ regarding the relationship between the Lukan and Markan non-Passion sections. I believe, as I attempted to demonstrate in the previous chapter, that Luke did not derive even the non-Passion section from *canonical* Mark.

Third, Trocmé believes that John's Passion Narrative is a derivation of "an archetype that was also at the root of the Lukan and the Markan stories of the suffering and death of Christ."⁵²

Luke Combined Sources in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative

Most scholars believe that Luke combined sources and/or traditions in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative. There are two basic versions of this view: i) Luke combined the accounts of Mark and another Gospel, called Proto-Luke. This was a widely held view between the 1930s' and 1960s' and a few still support it; ii) Luke combined Mark and other, often unnamed, sources or traditions which were either continuous or non-continuous, written or oral.

The Combination of Mark and Proto-Luke

The Synoptic Problem quest took a new and major turn in the 1920s when Streeter proposed a brilliant theory.⁵³ He suggested that the Gospel of Luke is a combination of two previous Gospels: Mark and Proto-Luke. Streeter argued that Luke formed his Gospel in two

51. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 36.

52. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*, 45–46.

53. Burnett Hillman Streeter, "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem," *HibJ* 20 (1921–22): 103–12; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 199–226.

stages. In the first stage, he combined Q- and L- materials,⁵⁴ which consisted of the following five major sections of Luke: 3:1-4:30; 6:20-8:3; 9:51-18:14; 19:1-27; 22:14-24:53, and probably following minor sections: Luke 5:1-11; 6:14-16; 19:37-44; and 21:18, 34-36.⁵⁵ This Gospel, Proto-Luke, opened with the solemn words, “[i]n the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar... the word of God came to John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness,” (Luke 3:1-2) and ended with the Passion-Resurrection account (Luke 22:14-24:53). This theory, according to Streeter, explains, for example: i) The position of the genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:23-38). One would expect to find it in connection with the birth and infancy accounts of Jesus rather than its present location. “If, however, it was originally inserted in a book which only began with Lk. iii. 1, its position is explained;”⁵⁶ ii) Preferences for the non-Markan version to the Markan one when sources overlap. Luke omitted the Markan versions of the Beelzebub Controversy (Mark 3:22 ff.; cf. Luke 11:14-23), the Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mark 4:30-32; cf. Luke 13:18-19), Jesus’ Rejection at Nazareth (Mark 6:1-6a; cf. Luke 4:16-30), Jesus’ Anointing (Mark 14:3-9; cf. Luke 7:36-50), and the Great Commandment (Mark 12:28-34; cf. Luke 10:25-28), because these were already present in his earlier Gospel, i.e., Proto-Luke.⁵⁷

If we look up these passages in Mark in a Synopsis of the Gospels and notice the incidents which immediately precede and follow them, we shall see that Luke reproduced everything else in the neighbourhood from account of these incidents. The alternative versions which he gives are *always* given in a *completely different context* – presumably, then, their context in the source from which he took them.⁵⁸

iii) Twelve rearrangements of the Markan order of material and three substitutions of the non-Markan material for the Markan one in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative;⁵⁹ iv) The use of the

54. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 218–19, believed that L-material consisted of Luke’s own notes, whereas Q-material was composed by somebody else.

55. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 199, 222.

56. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 209.

57. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 219–20.

58. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 210.

59. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 211. For the twelve rearrangements of the material, see the Introduction to this chapter. Three substitutions are as follows: i) “a mocking by Herod, not by the soldiers of Pilate” (Luke 23:11; Mark 15:16-20a); ii) “the trial takes place in the morning instead of at night,” (Luke 22:66; Mark 14:53-15:1); and iii) the resurrection appearances happen in Jerusalem rather than in Galilee.

title ὁ κύριος (in narrative) and the vocative κύριε for Jesus in the Lukan sections assigned to Proto-Luke. According to Streeter, while the first term “never appears in passages clearly derived by Luke from Mark,” it occurs 15 times outside them.⁶⁰ The vocative occurs 16 times in Luke; “14 of these are in the sections assigned to Proto-Luke, only 2 in those derived from Mark;”⁶¹ v) Some Lukan omissions. “To Luke Mark was a supplementary source, from which, if pressed for space, he would refrain from extracting material which seemed to him of subordinate interest.”⁶²

In the second stage, some years after combining Q- and L-material, a copy of Mark’s Gospel came Luke’s way and he inserted a great bulk of it into the framework of Proto-Luke and prefixed the Gospel by the stories of the infancy from some other source(s).⁶³ In the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, the following passages “are probably from Mark:” Luke 22:18, 22, 42, 46-47, 52-62, 71; 23:3, 22, 25 f., 33-34b, 38, 44-46, 52-53; 24:6; and the following passages “may be derived from Mark, or represent Proto-Luke partially assimilated to the Marcan parallel:” Luke 22:69; 23:35, 49, 51; 24:1-3, 9-10.⁶⁴

Streeter’s Proto-Luke theory rests on⁶⁵ similar theories of P. Feine⁶⁶ and Perry.⁶⁷ He may have also been influenced by J. Weiss, B. Weiss and others.⁶⁸

Taylor adopted Streeter’s theory and developed it further.⁶⁹ He agreed with Streeter on the extent of Proto-Luke with a few exceptions, as the table below shows.

60. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 212–13. But see Mark (1:3); 11:3; (12:36); (13:35).

61. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 213.

62. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 214.

63. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 208, 218–19.

64. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 222.

65. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 203 n.1.

66. Paul Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte: Eine Untersuchung* (Gotha, 1891). See Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 3–13.

67. Perry, *The Sources of Luke’s Passion-Narrative*. Perry argues that in the Passion Narrative Luke used two written sources: “a document closely resembling our present Gospel of Mark” and J (“Jerusalem source”) (pp. 6, 105-06). The Jerusalem source consisted of the following passages: Luke 19:28, 37-44, 47-48; 20:34-36 (?); 21:10, 11b-12a, 13-15, 18-20, 21b-22, 23b-26a, 28, 34-38; 22:8, 14-19a, 21, 23, 24-33, 35-39, 40-41, 42b-52a, 53, 54a, 55-60a, 61ab, 62-65, 66a, 67-68, 70; 23:1-2, 4-22a, 22c-25, 27-33, 35-37, 39-43, 46-49a, 50-51a, 53c-56; 24:2-10a, 13-53 (p. 89). For the vocabulary of the Jerusalem document, see pp. 110-15.

68. See Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 13–45. See also Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 26–27.

69. See especially Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*.

<u>Streeter</u>	<u>Taylor</u> ⁷⁰
3:1-4:30	3:1-4:30
5:1-11	5:1-11
6:14-16	6:12.....
6:20-8:3 8:3
9:51-18:14	9:51-18:14
19:1-27	19:1-28
19:37-44	19:37-44
—	19:47-48
21:18, 34-36	— ⁷¹
22:14-24:53	22:14-24:53 ⁷²

Taylor also agreed with Streeter, in general, on the extent of Markan insertions in the Proto-Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

<u>Streeter</u>	<u>Taylor 1926</u> ⁷³	<u>Taylor 1972</u> ⁷⁴
22:18	22:19a	
22:22	22:22	22:22
	22:34	22:34
22:42		
22:46-47	(22:46b)	22:46b, (47)
	22:50b	22:50b
22:52-62	22:52-53a, 54b-61	22:52b-53a, 54b-61
(22:69)		(22:69)
22:71		(22:71)
23:3	23:3	23:3
23:22		
23:25-26	23:26	23:26
23:33-34b	(23:34b)	23:34b
(23:35)		
23:38	23:38	23:38
23:44-46	23:44-45	23:44-45
23:(49), (51), 52-53	23:50-54	23:49, 50-54
(24:1-3)		(24:1-3)
24:6		
(24:9-10)	(24:10)	24:10a

Taylor offers seven arguments for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.⁷⁵ Two of them, which were

70. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 180.

71. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 117–18, 127, suggested that the author of the Third Gospel combined Mark with a non-Markan source in the Eschatological Discourse, but the non-Markan source was not Proto-Luke.

72. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 179–80, believed that the Passion Narrative of Proto-Luke had a parallel to Luke 22:1-13, but Luke replaced it by the Markan version (Mark 14:1-2, 10-17).

73. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 128.

74. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 119.

75. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 183–210.

already suggested by Streeter, are particularly strong.

First, the Proto-Luke version has been preferred by Luke in cases where Proto-Luke and Mark overlap. Such cases are, for example, the following sayings: the Beelzebub Controversy (Mark 3:22-27/Luke 11:14-23), the Sin against the Holy Spirit (Mark 3:28-30/Luke 12:10), Warning concerning Temptations (Mark 9:42-48/Luke 17:1-2), the Parable of Salt (Mark 9:49-50/Luke 14:34-35), On Divorce and Celibacy (Mark 10:1-12/Luke 16:18), the Great Commandment (Mark 12:28-34/Luke 10:25-28), etc.⁷⁶ Taylor argues that, on the contextual basis, it is more likely that Luke omitted the Markan version because it was already in Proto-Luke than that he omitted it in order to present it or a similar version later in his non-Markan section.⁷⁷ According to Taylor, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis can also better explain the omissions of the following Markan narratives: the Call of the Disciples (Mark 1:16-20/Luke 5:1-11), Jesus' Visit to Nazareth (Mark 6:1-6/Luke 4:16-30), the Request of James and John (Mark 10:35-45/Luke 22:24-27), the Woman with the Ointment (Mark 14:3-9/Luke 7:36-50), and True Greatness (Mark 10:42-45/Luke 22:25-27).⁷⁸ "On the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," Taylor points out, "St. Luke does not need these Markan passages, since in Proto-Luke he has narratives either parallel to them or corresponding to them."⁷⁹

Second, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis can offer a convincing explanation for some positions of the text in canonical Luke: i) the position of Luke 3:1-2, which sounds like the opening of a document; ii) the position of the Lukan genealogy in 3:23-38 rather than in the Lukan Infancy Narrative; and iii) the position of Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth (4:14-30) and the neglect of the parallel account of Mark 6:1-6.⁸⁰

76. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 190-91.

77. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 190.

78. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 141, 191-92.

79. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 192.

80. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 193-98. For contra-arguments, see Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 132; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 90-91.

F. Rehkopf examined the vocabulary of Luke in the last section of his *Die lukanische Sonderquelle* (1959) and argued that the presumed Proto-Luke sections⁸¹ together with the Lukan Infancy Narratives (Luke 1-2) have distinctively different vocabulary than Luke's Markan sections. He lists 78 such words and phrases not found, or rarely found, in Luke's Markan sections in addition to vocatives, substantives used as vocatives, verbs in the historical present tense, and the divine names in the third person plural.⁸² He has included in the list such words and phrases, which occur at least three times in Luke.⁸³ In his review of Rehkopf's book, H. Schürmann questioned Rehkopf's defense of Proto-Luke Hypothesis on the basis of language.⁸⁴ Schürmann argued that only such words from Rehkopf's list can be used for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, which i) occur in both the Q and L material, and ii) show noticeable agreement in usage in both the Q and L material.⁸⁵ Because 49 words do not meet these requirements, they must be excluded from the list. In the remaining 29 cases, evidence for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is either "weniger wahrscheinlich" (in 20 cases) or "nicht beweisbar" (in 9 cases).⁸⁶ Schürmann concludes:

Wer aber trotz dieses wenig ermutigenden Ergebnisses an der protoluk Redaktion festhalten will, muß (entgegen dem Urteil der klassischen Protolukas-Hypothese!) seine Zuflucht zu der Annahme nehmen, dieser «Protolukas» sei weniger ein das luk S [= L material] und die Q-Tradition einheitlich redigierender und fest verknüpfender Redaktor gewesen als ein Kompilator, der die ihm zugekommenen beiden Traditionsschichten nur lose zusammengefügt habe, ohne dieser seiner neuen Sammlung sprachlich-stilistisch ein stärkeres Gespäge zu geben. In diesem – immerhin denkbaren – Fall dürften wir uns freilich nicht wundern, wenn dieser postulierte vorluk Kompilator nicht durch sprachlich-stilistische Kriterien zu stellen wäre.⁸⁷

81. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*. According to Rehkopf, the special Lukan source (= Proto-Luke) included Luke 3:1-4:30; 5:1-11; 6:12-8:3 (except 6:17-19); 9:51-18:14; 19:1-44 (except 19:19-36); 21:34-38; 22:14-24:53 (p. 90).

82. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 91-99, 105-6. See also Vincent Taylor, "Rehkopf's List of Words and Phrases Illustrative of Pre-Lukan Speech Usage," *JTS* NS 15 (1964): 59-62.

83. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 87.

84. Heinz Schürmann, "Protolukanische Spracheigentümlichkeiten?" *BZ* 5 (1961): 266-86.

85. Schürmann, "Protolukanische Spracheigentümlichkeiten?" 270.

86. Schürmann, "Protolukanische Spracheigentümlichkeiten?" 285.

87. Schürmann, "Protolukanische Spracheigentümlichkeiten?" 285. See also Owen E. Evans, "Editorial Note," in *The Passion Narrative of St Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*, Vincent Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 29.

Although Schürmann questioned the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, he did, however, believe that Luke's major source in the Passion Narrative was likely a continuous non-Markan source, into which he inserted some passages from Mark.

Many have taken Schürmann's study as a fatal blow to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, but it is not necessarily so. It still seems to remain a fact that there are some similarities in vocabulary between the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative and Lukan non-Markan non-Passion section (i.e., Q+L material).

For G. B. Caird, the crucial issue for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is whether or not Mark was Luke's primary source in Luke 3:1-4:30 and 22:14-24:53, which function as the frames of the first-stage-Gospel in the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.⁸⁸ Caird believed that Mark was not Luke's primary source in those two passages. He offered seven reasons for the defense of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Because I have already mentioned most of them directly or indirectly above, I will only mention some of his observations in detail. First, Caird extended Streeter's and Taylor's lists of those passages where Luke seems to have "omitted a passage from Mark because he has included elsewhere a parallel passage from Q [i.e., Proto-Luke]."⁸⁹ The passages not yet mentioned above are: Mark 8:15/Luke 12:1; Mark 10:31/Luke 13:30; Mark 11:23/Luke 17:6; Mark 11:25/Luke 11:4; Mark 13:15-16/Luke 17:31; and Mark 13:21-23/Luke 17:23. Second, because Luke drew two-thirds of his Gospel from non-Markan sources, "omitted nearly half the contents of Mark... and, where his sources overlapped,... he frequently preferred Q and L to Mark," it is hard to believe that Luke valued Mark above his other sources so much that he wanted to use it as the framework for his non-Markan material (cf. 2SH).⁹⁰ Third, Luke's Gospel has two mission charges, one addressed to the twelve and drawn from Mark (Luke 9:3-9), and the other addressed to the seventy and drawn from a non-Markan section (Luke 10:2-12). "But when Jesus later reminds the twelve that they had gone out *with no purse or bag or sandals* [Luke

88. G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke*, PNTC (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), 23-27.

89. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke*, 25.

90. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke*, 26.

22:35], he is echoing the charge given to the seventy [Luke 10:4]. This editorial lapse is readily understandable if, when Luke first wrote the account of the Last Supper, he had only one mission charge to refer to.”⁹¹

Kümmel presents six reasons⁹² and Fitzmyer seven reasons,⁹³ which mostly overlap, as to why they reject the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. I do not find the bulk of them very convincing, and none of them compelling. I remain open to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, but I reject a view of its advocates stating that Luke had access to canonical Mark. I will suggest at the end of this work that Luke appears to have drawn his triple tradition material from a Markan-like source but not from canonical Mark. Whether or not the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is correct is not crucial for me. In this work I am only arguing that Luke did not draw his triple tradition material from canonical Mark. If *some* central elements of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis will prove to be correct, this only strengthens my theory. I and advocates of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis agree that Luke did not draw *at least* the following passages from canonical Mark: Aland §§20 (Luke 4:1-13; Mark 1:12-13), 30 (Luke 4:14a; Mark 1:14a), 32 (Luke 4:14b-15; Mark 1:14b-15), 114 (Luke 7:36-50;

91. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke*, 26.

92. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 132–38: i) Luke has also arranged the Markan sequence in his non-Passion section, not just in his Passion-Resurrection Narrative; ii) It is unlikely that Luke would have inserted the following four blocks of Markan material, secondarily, into his proto-gospel: Mark 1:21-3:6; 4:1-9:40; 10:13-52; 11:1-14:16; iii) “The so-called ‘travel narrative’ (9:51-19:27) is a creation of Luke”; iv) “Rehkopf’s effort at isolating non-Lukan vocabulary in Lk has not succeeded”; v) The exclusion of the Markan verses, assumed to have been inserted into the Lukan apocalyptic discourse (ch. 21) and Passion-Resurrection Narrative, “does not make the original continuity more comprehensive”; vi) “That Lk has used Mk as a basic source is shown conclusively in the breaking up of the Markan structure in the process of Lk’s expansion.”

93. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 90–91: i) Because Luke flanks the genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:23-38) “with two incidents that are otherwise closely linked in the Marcan account, the baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:9-11) and his temptation (1:12-13),” it is also possible that Luke “inserted the genealogy into the Marcan order” rather than the reverse; ii) “The omission of such Marcan material as 3:20-30 right after the section (mostly ‘Q’ and ‘L’) of Luke 6:20-8:3 and of other material (=Mark 9:42-50) right before the peculiarly Lucan travel account is strange, if the Marcan material is to be understood as inserted into Proto-Luke”; iii) “Among the doublets that do occur, normally the episode that is derived from ‘Mk’ precedes the doublet from ‘Q’... This argues in general for the precedence of the Marcan text and for the insertion of ‘Q’ and ‘L’ into it”; 4) Luke 4:16-30 cannot seriously be taken to have been part of Proto-Luke as a sort of initiation story, since the mention of Capernaum (4:23) is then inexplicable”; v) “The attempts of F. Rehkopf and others (Tyson, Taylor) to distinguish pre-Lukan vocabulary in ‘L’ (or ‘Q’) has scarcely been convincing”; vi) The arrangement of three passion announcements in Mark and Luke speaks against the Proto-Luke Hypothesis; vii) If the Proto-Luke was written in Caesarea Maritima, as some argue, “[h]ow would the text of Proto-Luke have survived the shipwreck off the island of Malta?”

Mark 14:3-9), 168 (Luke 17:1-2; Mark 9:42-48), 182 (Luke 10:25-28; Mark 12:28-34), 188 (Luke 11:14-23; Mark 3:22-27), 191 (Luke 11:29-32; Mark 8:11-12), 192 (Luke 11:33; Mark 4:21), 194 (Luke 11:37-39; Mark 7:1-9), 195 (Luke 12:1; Mark 8:14-15), 197 (Luke 12:10; Mark 3:28-30), 198 (Luke 12:11-12; Mark 13:11), 209 (Luke 13:18-19; Mark 4:30-32), 218 (Luke 34-35; Mark 9:49-50), 227 (Luke 16:18; Mark 10:11-12), 229 (Luke 17:1-3a; Mark 9:42), 231 (Luke 17:5-6; Mark 9:28-29), 235 (Luke 17:22-23; Mark 13:19-21), 266 (Luke 19:12-13; Mark 13:34), 269 (Luke 19:28-40; Mark 11:1-10), 274 (Luke 19:47-48; Mark 11:18-19), and the most of the Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

The Combination of Mark and a Non-Markan Source(s) or Tradition(s)

Most scholars believe that in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative Luke combined Mark with another source(s) or tradition(s). The majority of these scholars hold that Luke's major source was Mark, which he radically edited and into which he inserted some material from fragmentary oral traditions and/or written sources. Some typical representatives of this view are Creed,⁹⁴ Marshall,⁹⁵ Brown,⁹⁶ Fitzmyer,⁹⁷ and M. L. Soards.⁹⁸

94. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. Creed rejected the Proto-Luke Hypothesis (p. lviii n.1) and strongly defended the Markan priority (p. lvi), but remained open to the possibility that Luke drew some overlapping sections in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative from non-Markan sources: 22:1-28; 23:26-32, 39-43 (pp. lxvi-lxvii).

95. Marshall may not be considered a typical representative of this view because he is open to the option that a non-Markan source was continuous. In his *The Gospel of Luke*, 31, he states that "[t]he existence of a connected 'L' source," containing "possibly some parts of the passion and resurrection narrative," "has not been confirmed by my investigation," but elsewhere (*Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 62) Marshall argues that "[i]n its full form this theory [i.e., Proto-Luke] must be pronounced 'not proven.'... Nevertheless, the less ambitious form of the theory stands proven, namely that 'Q' and 'L' were combined before they found their way into Luke, and that Luke on the whole prefers this source to Mark where they reported the same of similar incident."

96. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*. Brown admits that it is very difficult to decide whether or not Luke used a special written source in the Passion Narrative. If those who argue that Luke combined Mark with a special source are right, a question arises: "why has Luke combined this source with Mark differently from the way he has combined material from the L source earlier?" (p. 66). On the other hand, if those who argue "Luke had no special source for the PN but simply edited Mark, rephrasing, transposing, delating, and expanding (with some elements from special traditions)," the question arises as to "why has Luke edited and expanded here to a degree far beyond his editing Mark elsewhere?" (p. 67). Brown acknowledges that in his earlier writings he posited a special Lukan Passion Narrative source, but recently he has given it up (p. 67). His position in his 1994 book is that in addition to editing Markan material, Luke also drew some material from oral tradition (pp. 75, 92).

97. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX*, 82-85; *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, e.g. 1458. Fitzmyer believes the L-source was probably a fragmentary collection of oral and written material and Luke

A relatively small but influential number of scholars, however, maintain that Luke had access to two *continuous* sources in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative: Mark and a non-Markan source (but not a Proto-Luke), which Luke combined, regarding one of them as his major source, or both of them as equal. Some representatives of this view are Bovon,⁹⁹ W. Grundmann,¹⁰⁰ Schneider,¹⁰¹ Ellis,¹⁰² Schweizer,¹⁰³ and Nolland.¹⁰⁴

used this material in the Passion Narrative too. He acknowledges that it is basically impossible to know with certainty whether Luke drew this material from his source(s) or composed it himself, but he seems to believe that at least part of this material was drawn from sources by Luke.

98. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*. Soards argues that: i) "Mark is the basic source for Luke's work in ch. 22 of his Gospel;" ii) "Luke had recourse to oral tradition that went beyond Mark and he included some of that information in ch. 22..." iii) "In the course of writing ch. 22, Luke freely composed additional material of his own..." (pp. 118-19).

99. Bovon, "The Lukan Story of the Passion of Jesus [Luke 22-23]". Bovon argues that: i) A non-Markan source, which Luke used in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, was continuous (p. 101); ii) Luke alternated between Mark and a non-Markan source. Luke probably drew the following passages from Mark: Luke 21:29-33; 22:1-14; 22:47-23:5; and 23:44-24:11, and the following passages from a Lukan special source: Luke 21:34-36; 22:15-46; 23:6-43; and 24:12-53 (p. 97). Luke did not mix the information from these two sources. "For the passage he is writing" Luke relied "on one document and on one alone" (p. 93). "Like everywhere else, Luke was not looking for difficulties or complications" (p. 93); iii) The Lukan special source, used in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, might have been part of a larger gospel, including L-material but not Q-material (pp. 101-02).

100. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Grundmann believed that "Lukas neben Markus und Q eine Sondertradition benutzt hat, die vielleicht bereits mit Q verbunden war" and the Lukan special material was "ziemlich homogene" (p. 17). In the Passion-Resurrection Narrative Luke began to use it beside Mark from Luke 22:14 on (p. 421). For a summary of the verses which Grundmann included to Mark and a non-Markan source, see Neirynck, "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc," 196-97.

101. E.g. Gerhard Schneider, "Das Problem einer vorkanonischen Passion-Erzählung," in *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970-1990*, reprint, 1972 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 213-35. Schneider argued that Luke combined Mark and a non-Markan source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative. The special source ("vorlukanisch und nichtmarkinisch") included at least the following passages in Luke 22: vv. 19-20a, 24-26, 28-30, 31-32, 35-38, 63-64, 66-68 (p. 227). Schneider's view changed significantly during his career and finally he rejected the view of a continuous non-Markan source in the Passion Narrative: cf. Gerhard Schneider, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22,54-71: Studien zur lukanischen Darstellung der Passion*, SANT 22 (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1969); Gerhard Schneider, "Das Verfahren gegen Jesus in der Sicht des dritten Evangeliums (Lk 22,54-23,25). Redaktionskritik und historische Rückfrage," in *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970-1990*, NovTSup 67 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 276-95. For an excellent discussion of Schneider, see Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 430-76, 487.

102. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*. Ellis' position is a bit confusing. On the one hand, he seems to regard Mark as "the skeleton for the progression of parts of the Gospel" (p. 26), but on the other hand, he also claims that "no one document is really the foundation for the third Gospel. All the sources are quarries from which the Evangelist selects and adapts material to serve his own end" (p. 27). According to Ellis, it could be possible although not certain that "some passages of the Q and L material... came from one pre-Lukan translator or source..." (p. 28).

103. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*. Schweizer argues that is very probable that in addition to Mark, Luke also used another "Gospel" as his source, which included L and Q material, but "it highly

Bock, whose commentary I often refer to in this study, does not clearly fall into either category. He cautiously maintains Markan priority,¹⁰⁵ but also states that:

In my judgment, what may often have happened is not that the writer knew the other Gospel as such or the exact verbal form of the tradition the other Gospel had, but that he knew the same tradition stream (whether oral or written) reflected in that other Gospel. The uncertainty about precise sources is indicated when numerous differences in a pericope have no clear motive or stylistic preference behind them. If one cannot explain why the text is different, maybe those texts were never the same from the start.¹⁰⁶

Exegetical Analyses

Now we are turning to exegetical analyses of the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative. I will attempt to prove further that Luke did not draw this narrative from canonical Mark.

Aland §305 (Luke 22:1-2; Mark 14:1-2)

Scholars in general, even those who hold that Luke used a continuous Passion Narrative in addition to Mark's,¹⁰⁷ believe that Luke had the Markan *text* before him when he wrote this pericope. All differences are believed to be intentional changes made by Luke: i) Luke left out the Markan μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας because of his tendency to omit numbers, and replaced it by one of his favored words ἐγγίζω;¹⁰⁸ ii) Luke added ἡ ἑορτή in order to conform to solemn LXX style (Exod 23:15; 34:18; Deut 16:16; etc.);¹⁰⁹ iii) Luke changed the Markan πῶς to τὸ πῶς which is

unlikely that Luke himself was responsible for most of the special material and the alterations in Q" (p. 5). He offers some linguistic evidence for this view (pp. 1-6). Schweizer does not call a non-Markan Gospel as Proto-Luke. He believes that Luke "imposed Mark's structure upon" his non-Markan Gospel (p. 5).

104. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1023. Nolland is convinced that in addition to Mark, Luke used a continuous non-Markan source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative: "A second Lukan source first becomes visible in 22:15-20, is uncertain for vv 21-23, is clear for vv 24-30, 31-34, 35-38, likely for vv 39-46, 47-54a, 54b-62, clear for vv 63-64, likely for vv 66-71, 23:1-5, quite possible for vv 6-12, uncertain for vv 13-16, likely for vv 18-25, very likely for vv 26-32, likely for vv 33-34, unlikely for vv 35-38, very likely for vv 39-43, quite possible for vv 46-47 in the unit vv 44-49, and possible for vv 50-56. While there is no guarantee that all of this came to Luke from a single source, the sheer quantity makes a second continuous passion narrative almost certain."

105. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 915.

106. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 916-17.

107. E.g. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 42.

108. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 42.

109. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 786.

“typically Lukan;”¹¹⁰ iv) Luke replaced ἀποκτείνω by ἀναιρέω which is also Lukan;¹¹¹ and v) Luke eliminated the Markan μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ probably in order to avoid confusion (present in the Markan account) because he realized the arrest of Jesus happened “precisely on that day.”¹¹² All the above arguments are either misleading or inaccurate: i) Luke does not avoid using numbers, as the following example shows: the number εἰς occurs 44 times in Mark, 43 times in Luke, and 21 times in Acts; the number δύο occurs 18 times in Mark, 29 times in Luke, and 13 times in Acts; and the number τρεῖς occurs 7 times in Mark, 10 times in Luke, and 14 times in Acts. Thus, the presence of δύο in the Markan text cannot explain why Luke uses ἐγγίζω in its place; ii) Luke’s use of ἑορτῇ with ἄζυμος was hardly motivated by his desire to improve the Markan expression by conforming to solemn LXX style. If he had intentionally wanted to use a more solemn and normal¹¹³ way to refer to the Feast of Unleavened Bread, we would expect him to have used it also in three other places where he refers to this feast (Luke 22:7; Acts 12:3 and 20:6), but he does not; in all these cases Luke uses the expression ἡμέρα/ἡμέραι/ἡμέρας τῶν ἄζυμων. I also wonder why Luke, if he really had Mark’s text before him, would have changed Mark’s more accurate way of referring to two distinct but combined feasts, using a less accurate way. Mark precisely distinguishes the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread by using “and” between them. Luke, on the other hand, inaccurately writes, “Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which is called the Passover, was approaching;”¹¹⁴ iii) The expression τὸ πῶς is Lukan in a sense that it occurs three times in Luke’s writings (Luke 22:2, 4; Acts 4:21) whereas in the rest of the NT, LXX, Josephus, Philo, and Apostolic Fathers occurs only twice (1 Thess 4:1; Philo, *Spec.* 3:35).

110. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 787.

111. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 787.

112. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1368.

113. When the LXX refers to the feast of Unleavened Bread, it always uses the word ἑορτῇ in this expression. Josephus uses a simplified form only three times: τῶν ἄζυμων (*Ant.* 2.317; 3:250) and τῆς τῶν ἄζυμων (*J.W.* 2.99).

114. Cf. Luke 2:41; 22:7; Acts 12:3-4. Josephus clearly knows that “[o]n the fifteenth the Passover is followed up by the Feast of Unleavened bread, lasting seven days” (*Ant.* 3.249; cf. 3.250; 9.271; 10.70), but sometimes he equates, like Luke, these two festivals (e.g., *Ant.* 2.317; 14.21; 17.213; 18.29; 20.106; *J.W.* 2.10; 5.98). Mark (14:12) also calls the day when the Passover lamb was sacrificed the first day of Unleavened Bread, but he does not equate the Feast of Unleavened Bread with the Passover in the same way as Luke does.

Luke, however, uses a simple anarthrous πῶς with a verb¹¹⁵ much more often than an arthrous πῶς. Therefore, there is no compelling reason why Luke could not have used the simple form used by Mark if Luke had Mark's text before him; iv) It is misleading to claim that ἀναιρέω (Luke 22:2) is more Lukan than ἀποκτείνω. In fact, ἀναιρέω occurs only twice in Luke's Gospel (22:2; 23:32), whereas ἀποκτείνω occurs twelve times in the Gospel, and twice in Jesus' prediction of his own death (Luke 9:22; 18:33).¹¹⁶ Against this background, it is strange that Luke does not use the same verb as Mark, if Mark's text was really before him; v) The argument that Luke eliminated the Markan μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ because he wanted to avoid the confusion between this statement and what actually happened (that Jesus was arrested during the festival), is strange. Matthew (26:5) and Mark must have also realized the tension and yet they included the saying. In Matthew and Mark, the tension between this saying and what actually happened highlights how desperately Jewish leaders wanted to destroy Jesus: they knew that the arrest during the feast could lead to turmoil amongst the people, but they acted against their better judgment because they hated Jesus so much. In Luke, this saying would have highlighted Luke's general theme: no one can hinder and change God's plan; Jesus had to die during the feast (cf. Luke 9:22,30; 22:14, 34, 42, 52). In addition, if Luke really intentionally wanted to exclude the reference to the feast, he could have easily changed the saying into, "...how they might *arrest him in the absence of the multitude* (cf. Luke 22:6) and put him to death; for they were afraid of the people" (cf. Mark 14:1b-2). However, Luke does not do this here. In this light, it seems to me very unlikely that Luke had Mark's *text* before him when he composed this pericope.

There is only one clause (καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς) beside some individual words (δέ, πᾶσχα, πῶς) which agrees verbatim with the Markan words. There is

115. Luke 1:34; 6:42; 8:18, 36; 10:26; 11:18; 12:11, 27, 50, 56; 14:7; 18:24; 20:41, 44; Acts 2:8; 8:31; 9:27; 11:13; 12:17; 15:36; 20:18; 27:12.

116. Luke 9:22; 11:47, 48, 49; 12:4, 5; 13:4, 31, 34; 18:33; 20:14, 15. ἀποκτείνω occurs six times in Acts, while ἀναιρέω occurs 19 times.

absolutely nothing in this pericope which requires that Luke would have had Mark's *text* before him.

Aland §306 (Luke 7:36-50; Mark 14:3-9)

The Anointing of Jesus episode occurs in all four Gospels. In Mark and Matthew (26:6-13) it is interpolated in the Passion Narrative, while in Luke and John (12:1-8) it is before it. In Mark, Matthew, and John the incident happens in Bethany, whereas Luke places it in Galilee. The Lukan and Markan episodes share at least seven similarities, but there are also numerous differences between them in addition to the two just mentioned.¹¹⁷ Interestingly, there are also several striking similarities between both the Johannine episode and the Markan/Matthean one, and between the Johannine episode and the Lukan one.¹¹⁸ The most obvious similarity between John and Luke is that the woman anoints Jesus' feet rather than his head, as she does in Mark and Matthew, and wiped them with her hair. Scholars have offered at least five different explanations for the existence of these versions.¹¹⁹ First, Luke rewrote the Markan episode and relocated it.¹²⁰ Second, Luke derived the story from his special source/tradition and combined it with details from the Markan parallel episode.¹²¹ Third, Luke's episode is distinct from the one found in Mark,

117. For details, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 684-85.

118. For a detailed discussion of the issue, see Charles H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 162-73; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, vol. I-XII (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 449-52; Maurits Sabbe, "The Anointing of Jesus in John 12,1-8 and Its Synoptic Parallels," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, vol. 3, eds. F. Van Segbroeck and et al., BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2051-82; Cribbs, "St. Luke and Johannine Tradition," 437-41. In his interesting article, Cribbs pays attention to the fact that "Luke agrees quite closely with Matthew and Mark in those pericopes that he shares only with these two co-evangelists..., but makes numerous divergences from the Matthean/Markan traditions in the direction of the Johannine tradition in almost every pericope that he shares with all three of his co-evangelists..." (p. 426). Interestingly, most of those passages where the Lukan version has some similarities with the Johannine version are the same which advocates of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis believe to have been part of Proto-Luke (see Cribbs' list of verses on p. 428). Cribbs suggests that "Lukan agreements with John against both Matthew and Mark may have been due to Luke's familiarity with some form of the developing Johannine tradition or even to his acquaintance with an early draft of the original Gospel of John" (pp. 426-27).

119. See Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 689-91; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 685.

120. So e.g. Harry Kenneth Luce, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, CGTSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 74-75.

121. So e.g., Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 43-45. John J. Kilgallen, "What Does It Mean to Say That There Are Additions in Luke 7,36-50?" *Bib* 86 (2005): 529, 535, among many others, argues against the

Matthew and John.¹²² Fourth, the episode recorded by Luke is distinct from the episode described by Mark, Matthew and John, but these two traditions partly conflated before they were written down by the Evangelists.¹²³ Fifth, all the variations go back to one incident, which was told in various forms in oral tradition, cross-combining different features of these variations.¹²⁴ A common problem with the first three suggestions is that they cannot explain striking similarities between the Johannine and the Synoptic episodes if one does not maintain, at the same time, that either John used the Synoptics as his source or the Synoptics used John as their source; this view is rejected by the majority of scholars. Only the last two suggestions can offer a satisfying explanation for cross-combinations. In my judgment, the last one is the most likely because it can explain more convincingly why in many other gospel stories as well, “certain details of a story seem to have wandered from one *pericopé* to another.”¹²⁵

Another question is why Luke omitted the Markan anointing version, if he knew it, and used a similar version in a totally different context. Fitzmyer acknowledges that the Lukan episode in its present context “is unrelated to the three preceding passages” (Luke 7:11-35) and, therefore, “it is not easy to discern the reason why it has been added just at this point.”¹²⁶ Some explanations have been offered by scholars, but all of them are more or less superficial.¹²⁷ The Markan episode in the Lukan Passion Narrative would have served Luke’s general purpose at

view that either Luke 7:41-43 and/or Luke 7:47b-50 would be later additions to the story.

122. So e.g., Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, 689–91.

123. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 306.

124. So e.g., Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 171–72; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 686. Fitzmyer believes that the Lukan version of “Jesus’ pardon of the sinful woman is derived from ‘L’” (p. 684).

125. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 169. Dodd adduces two examples: Luke 10:25-28 par. and Matt 9:27-31 par. (pp. 169-71).

126. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 684.

127. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, 684, notes that there are two catch word connections between the Lukan anointing episodes and the previous episode: “sinners” (Luke 7:34/7:37) and “the Pharisees” (Luke 7:30/7:36), but it is unconvincing to maintain that Luke would have felt ‘compelled’ to omit the Markan version and use a similar version in its present context because of these catch word connections. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, 690, also rejects the view that Luke’s motive for the transposition was “to illustrate the Pharisees’ attitude toward Jesus” (the quotation from Andreas J. Köstenberger, “A Comparison of the Pericopae of Jesus’ Anointing,” in *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*, Andreas J. Köstenberger, SBL 38 [New York: Lang, 2001], 60).

least as well as its derivation in its present context. The Markan episode refers to two themes of Luke's special interest: the outcasts (Simon, the leper, Mark 14:3),¹²⁸ and the preaching of the gospel in the whole world (14:9), both of which are interestingly absent in the Lukan version. In addition, the Markan explanation of the anointing – “for burying” (14:8) – would have also fit well in the context of the Lukan Passion Narrative.¹²⁹

Why would Luke have omitted the Markan version, which includes themes he emphasizes, and replaced it by another version in the other context, where its contextual function is not superior? Either Luke did not know the Markan anointing version at all, or he regarded his non-Markan version and source to be more authoritative than Mark.

My understanding of what occurs here, and elsewhere in Luke's Gospel, can be summarized as follows:

First, regarding the Lukan non-Passion section:

i) Luke considers his non-Markan tradition (Q+L) more ‘authoritative’ than his ‘Markan’ tradition - whether canonical Mark or not - because whenever these two traditions overlap, he seems to use a Q+L version.¹³⁰

Why did Luke regard his non-Markan material more authoritative than Markan material? It is difficult to give a definitive answer to this question, but perhaps because of its age, authorship and/or usage in the early church.

128. It is unlikely that Simon was still a leper, but he still had the nickname ‘leper.’

129. This is especially true, if J. K. Elliott, “The Anointing of Jesus,” *ExpTim* 85 (1973–74): 105, is right that the anointing of Jesus' head in the Markan version is a “symbolic act of acknowledging a king's consecration” Luke depicts Jesus as the king in his Passion Narrative (Luke 23:2-3, 35-38, 39, 42). I, however, doubt that Mark had such a symbolic meaning in mind, because he states by Jesus' mouth that the anointing was “for burying.” See also Sabbe, “The Anointing of Jesus in John 12,1–8 and Its Synoptic Parallels,” 2081.

130. Cf. Mark 1:16-20/Luke 5:1-11; Mark 3:7-12/Luke 6:17-19; Mark 3:22-27/Luke 11:14-23; Mark 3:28-30/Luke 12:10; Mark 4:30-32/Luke 13:18-19; Mark 6:1-6a/Luke 4:16-30; Mark 6:6b-13/Luke 9:1-6; Mark 7:1-23/Luke 11:37-41, (42-54); Mark 8:11-13/Luke 11:16, 29; Mark 8:14-21/Luke 12:1; Mark 9:42-50/Luke 17:34-35; 14:34-35; Mark 10:1/Luke 9:51; Mark 10:2-12/Luke 16:18; Mark 10:31/Luke 13:30; Mark 10:35-45/Luke 22:24-30; Mark 11:12-14, 20-26/Luke 13:6-9; Mark 12:28-34/Luke 10:25-28; Mark 13:15-16/Luke 17:31; Mark 13:21-23/Luke 17:23-24, 37b; Mark 13:33-37/Luke 19:12-13; 12:40; and Mark 10:35-45/Luke 22:24-30. See also Appendix A.

Was the non-Markan source continuous? It is hard to imagine that Luke would have put so much weight and value on his non-Markan material if the material had only been fragmentary.

Was the non-Markan source a composite, consisting of Q and L material? Luke seems to have had two leading principles when he composed his Gospel: First, he stuck to the ‘Markan’ order very faithfully in the non-Passion section, even though he does not seem to have regarded this material to be as authoritative as his non-Markan material. Second, Luke normally reproduced his sources in *large* blocks (see Appendix A). However, a close examination of the Lukan non-Markan sections (3:1-4:30; 6:17-8:3; 9:51-18:14) reveals that, in particular, L material does not occur in distinct, large blocks. This may indicate that Luke did not draw his non-Markan material from two distinct source (i.e., Q and L) but from a combined source (i.e., Q+L) and highly regarded this combined source. Two other facts strengthen this observation. First, Luke seems to have substituted L material for ‘Markan’ material in some cases (e.g., Luke 4:16-30; 5:1-11) – the same way he does with Q material.¹³¹ This suggests that Luke valued overlapping L material above ‘Markan’ material, as he does overlapping Q material. Second, Lukan Q and L sections share the same *unique* vocabulary to a great extent.¹³² I will use two Q blocks to demonstrate my point: Luke 12:22-59 and 14:15-15:10. Luke 12:22-59 has 243 lemma words. Of these, 44 words do not occur either in Acts or Mark’s Gospel (i.e., 18.1%).¹³³ Out of these 44 words, 26 occur only in this section of Luke (i.e., 10.7%). The remaining 18 words are distributed in the following way: μεριμνάω (L:10:41; Q: 12:11, 22, 25, 26); δοκιμάζω (Q: 12:56; 14:19); περιζώννυμι (Q: 12:35?; 12:37?; L: 17:8); αντίδικος (Q: 12:58; L: 18:3); αποθήκη (Q: 3:17; 12:24; L: 12:18); βαλλάντιον (Q: 10:4; 12:33; L: 22:35, 36); γάμος (Q: 12:36?; L: 14:8); δυσμή

131. If Luke found Q and L material in a combined form, he hardly even knew that they had originally been distinct material.

132. By the word ‘unique’ I mean such words which do not occur in either Acts or in Mark’s Gospel. In other words, they are not words which could have been Luke’s own vocabulary in light of the evidence drawn from Luke-Acts could not have ‘learned’ them from Mark’s Gospel. These unique words in Luke’s Gospel are therefore either Luke’s own vocabulary used only in his Gospel or vocabulary drawn from his non-Markan source(s).

133. Percentages of unique lemma words (as defined in the previous footnote) are, in general, much higher in the Q+L sections than in those sections in Luke which have a parallel in Mark.

(Q: 12:54; 13:29); ἐλαχὺς (Q: 12:26; 19:17; L: 16:10); ἡλικία (Q: 12:25; L: 2:52; 19:3);
 θεραπεία (9:11;¹³⁴ Q: 12:42); θερίζω (Q: 12:24; 19:21, 22); καίω (Q: 12:35?; L: 24:32);
 οἰκονόμος (Q: 12:42; L: 16:1, 3, 8); ταμεῖον (Q: 12:3; 12:24); φρόνιμος (Q: 12:42; L: 16:8);
 κρήζω (Q: 12:30; L: 11:8); and χρονίζω (Q: 12:45; L: 1:21).¹³⁵ Luke 14:15-15:10 has 198 lemma
 words. Of these, 24 words do not appear either in Acts or Mark's Gospel (i.e., 12.1%). Out of
 these 24 words, 10 occur only in this section of Luke (5.1%), while the remaining 14 words are
 distributed in the following way: γείτων (Q: 15:6; 15:9; L: 14:12); ἐννέα (Q: 15:4, 7; L: 17:7);
 συνχαίρω (Q: 15:6; L: 1:58); ἀνάγκη (21:23; Q: 14:18); ἀνάπειρος (Q: 14:21; L: 14:13); βοῦς
 (Q: 14:19; L: 13:15; 14:5); διαγογγύζω (Q: 15:2; L: 19:7); δοκιμάζω (Q: 12:56; 14:9); εὐθετος
 (Q: 9:62; 14:35); λευγός (Q: 14:19; L: 2:24); θεμέλιος (Q: 6:48; 6:49; 14:29?); ὀργίζω (Q:
 14:21; L: 15:28); πρεσβεία (Q: 14:32?; 19:14); and σαρόω (Q: 11:25; 15:8?). These two
 examples are enough to show that many *unique* words in Luke are exclusive to Q and L sections,
 and that these same unique words occur in both of these materials, thereby making it impossible
 to distinguish them based on vocabulary.

ii) The 'Markan' tradition which was available to Luke was not identical to the tradition
 found in canonical Mark because, in numerous cases, as discussed in chapter two, theological
 elements which Luke emphasizes in his works often remain unmentioned in Lukan pericopes while
 being present in the parallel Markan pericopes. This suggests that Luke relied on a different
 branch of 'Markan' tradition than that of the author of the Second Gospel.

iii) Whether the Q+L tradition was combined together by Luke or by someone else before
 him is not absolutely clear, but, in my opinion, as I suggested above, it is more likely that Luke

134. I have some doubts that Luke drew Luke 9:7-17 and especially 9:10b-17 from Mark.

135. Those words which are regarded by the committee of The International Q Project to belong to Q are in *italic*. If the wording of a Q passage disagree, the committee normally follows the wording found in Matthew, because in the triple tradition sections Matthew often follows Mark's wording closer than Luke. However, as Appendix A demonstrates, in some blocks of triple tradition material, Luke follows closer to Mark's wording than Matthew. In addition, the principle is based on a presumption – which I challenge in this work – that the Markan text used by Matthew and Luke was basically identical. It is very likely that Matthew and Luke did not use only different versions of the Markan text but that they also used different Q versions.

found this tradition in a combined form.

iv) Whether the material available to Luke was in oral form, written form, or both is not absolutely clear either. In my opinion, it is very likely that many of the gospel traditions were in a relatively fixed oral form before Luke used them. Oral theory may explain, for example, minor agreements better than literary dependency theories because oral tradition has a greater tendency to combine ‘minor’ elements, such as formulaic sayings, than does copy-editing of literary sources.¹³⁶

Second, regarding the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section:

i) A person’s editorial practice is *usually* consistent, especially within the same work.¹³⁷ In this light, radical differences between the Lukan and Markan non-Passion sections versus their Passion-Resurrection sections, as shown above, suggest that Luke did not draw these two sections from the same, unified source – whether canonical Mark or not. Here, I agree with Trocmé.

ii) The Markan-like tradition used by Luke in his Passion-Resurrection Narrative has the same origin as the Markan-like tradition used in Luke’s non-Passion section, but they have different development histories.

iii) Vocabulary analyses of the non-Passion Q+L sections and the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section do not *clearly* indicate (contra to the advocates of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis) that these two sections were unified before Luke, but I still remain open to this option.

Aland §307 (Luke 22:3-6; Mark 14:10-11)

Scholars who hold to the Markan priority agree generally that Luke derived this episode

136. See Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, HSCL 24 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960); Albert Bates Lord, “Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries,” in *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley (Columbia: Slavica Publishers, 1981), 451–61, and chapter four.

137. I will revisit this issue in detail in the next chapter.

from Mark, except for the phrase εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν (Luke 22:3a).¹³⁸ However, many of these same scholars, including Fitzmyer, believe that Luke has “restored the original connection of vv. 1-2 to vv. 3-6 of the more primitive passion narrative (of the pre-Markan form),” which is broken by the Anointing in Bethany episode in Mark (14:3-9).¹³⁹ Fitzmyer’s statement seems to involve a contradiction since he elsewhere rejects Luke’s knowledge of (continuous) pre-Markan Passion Narrative. The view that Luke restored the pre-Markan form can only be held if one also argues that this restoration was accidental; Fitzmyer and others do not suggest so. If Luke 22:1-2, 3-6 represents a pre-Markan form, the episode in the pre-Markan source/tradition could not have been limited to just these verses. As Nolland correctly notes, this episode “would need to have been completed with some account of the actual handing over” (i.e., Mark 14:43-52/Luke 22:47-53).¹⁴⁰

There are also several other reasons to believe that Luke did not derive this pericope from canonical Mark. First, verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan episodes is relatively high (40.0%¹⁴¹ / 37.7%¹⁴²) but qualitatively poor. The common words are: τῶν δώδεκα, αὐτοῖς, αὐτόν in Luke 22:3-4, ἐχάρησαν, καὶ, αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι in 22:5, and καὶ ἐζήτει, αὐτόν in 22:6. Most of these words are common and non-sequential, without which the story could not be told. These agreements point to oral dependency rather than literary. Second, there are a few minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark. These are:¹⁴³ i) The use of “called” in relation to Judas Iscariot. While Mark uses the simple form (“Judas Iscariot”), Luke refers to him as “Judas called (καλούμενον) Iscariot” and Matthew writes “called (λεγόμενος) Judas

138. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1373; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 787; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 27; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 44; Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 184.

139. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1373. Also so e.g., Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1029. See also Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 787; Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin, reprint, 1960 (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1990), 93 n.5.

140. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1029.

141. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 69.

142. Morgenthauer, *Statistische Synopse*, 59; Honoré, “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem,” 117.

143. See Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, 570.

Iscaiot.” In an earlier reference, Luke calls him “Judas Iscaiot” (Luke 6:16) while in later references, he calls him “Judas” without the addition of “Iscaiot” (Luke 22:47, 48; Acts 1:16, 25). If Luke used canonical Mark as his source here, why did he add the word “called,” considering he did not do this in his *introduction* reference to Judas in Luke 6:16?¹⁴⁴ ii) The phrase ἐξήτει εὐκαρίαν (Luke 22:6/Matt 26:16); iii) The “Grecized form”¹⁴⁵ of Iscaiot in the Lukan and Matthean accounts. The word “Iscaiot” occurs twice in all the Synoptics (Matt 14:4; 26:14; Mark 3:19; 14:10; Luke 6:16; 22:3) and five times in John (6:71; 12:4; 13:2, 26; 14:22). Matthew and John consistently use the Greek form (Ἰσκαριώτης) of the word while Mark consistently uses the Semitic form (Ἰσκαριώθ). Luke is the only Evangelist who uses “Iscaiot” inconsistently: in the first reference he uses the Semitic form, but in the second reference he uses the Greek form.¹⁴⁶ This suggests that Luke did not derive the pericope under discussion from canonical Mark.¹⁴⁷ Third, the use of ἀριθμός. While Mark simply says Ἰσκαριώθ ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα (Mark 14:10), Luke adds the word “number,” making a clause more complex: Ἰσκαριώτην, ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα (Luke 22:3). The word “number” is Lukan, occurring five times in Acts, but it is difficult to find a reasonable explanation as to why Luke uses it here if he had canonical Mark before him. Marshall suggests that Luke might have used the word “number” here to imply “that Judas merely belonged to the group outwardly without really being one of them in true loyalty to Jesus,”¹⁴⁸ but this explanation can be challenged, because he

144. When Luke first refers to Mary Magdalene, he uses the complex form (Luke 8:2: “Mary, called Magdalene”), but later he uses a simple form (Luke 24:10: “Mary Magdalene”). The same is true regarding “Simon Zealot” (Luke 6:16: “Simon, who is called the Zealot;” Acts 1:13: “Simon the Zealot”). As for Simon Peter, Luke consistently calls him “Simon” before Luke 6:14 (“Simon, whom he named Peter”) and “Peter” after that. The only exception are: i) Luke 5:8, where Luke uses the form “Simon Peter,” which is also found its Johannine ‘parallel’ in John 21:11, but nowhere else in the Synoptic; John uses it regularly; ii) two passages in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative (22:31; 24:34) where he is called “Simon;” and iii) the Cornelius episode, where he is referred to as “Simon who is/was called Peter” (Acts 10:18, 32; 11:13).

145. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1704 n.7.

146. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 32–33, does not regard the different usage as significant, but he does not recognize that Luke is the only Evangelist who inconsistently uses the word. He does not recognize the problem because he assumes that the word “Iscaiot” also occurs in Mark 14:43 in its Greek form; the word is excluded in the NA²⁷.

147. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1030, has arrived to a similar conclusion.

148. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 788.

does not use the same expression later in Luke 22:47, but rather the traditional one (εἰς τῶν δώδεκα).¹⁴⁹

Although most scholars are convinced that Luke derived the pericope under discussion from Mark, they also believe that Luke had access to additional material from which he drew the phrase, εἰσῆλθεν δέ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν (Luke 22:3a).¹⁵⁰ The phrase is missing in other Synoptics but occurs in John (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ σατανᾶς; 13:27) in a slightly different context. While according to Luke's account, Satan entered into Judas before the Last Supper, according to John's account Satan had already been put into Judas' heart before the Supper to betray Jesus, but he had not actually entered into him yet (John 13:2, 27). The occurrence of this phrase in both Luke and John has troubled scholars, especially because John, elsewhere in his Gospel, always uses διάβολος (John 6:70; 8:44; 13:2) or πόνηρος (17:15) instead of σατανᾶς.¹⁵¹ Some believe that John derived this phrase from Luke,¹⁵² or that Luke drew it from either an early edition of John or canonical John.¹⁵³ Many scholars, however, hold that the phrase occurred in an early common tradition, either oral or written, which was used directly or indirectly by Luke and John.¹⁵⁴ I agree with the latter view. The phrase must have been part of a larger Passion story; it

149. The comparison with Acts 1:17, 26 does not also support Marshall's view.

150. So e.g., Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 184; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1373; Myllykoski, "The Material Common to Luke and John," 129; Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 49; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1029; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1704–5; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 787–88; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 27.

151. The word σατανᾶς occurs seven times in Revelation but not in the Johannine letters. Luke uses both words, σατανᾶς (Luke 11:18 [Q]; 10:18 [L]; 13:16 [L]; 22:3, 31; Acts 5:3; 26:18) and διάβολος (Luke 4:2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13 [Q]; 8:12) in Luke-Acts. Mark uses the form σατανᾶς exclusively. If Luke really derived Aland §124 from Mark, it is difficult to explain why he changed the Markan σατανᾶς (Mark 4:15) to διάβολος (Luke 8:12).

152. So e.g., Maurits Sabbe, "The Johannine Account of the Death of Jesus and Its Synoptic Parallels (Jn 19,16b-42)," *ETL* 70 (1994): 34, 63. This was a widely held view before the publication of Percival Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).

153. So e.g., Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 266–70; Shellard, "The Relationship of Luke and John," 79, 96; Robert Morgan, "The Priority of John - Over Luke," 195, 201, 209; John Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, 30–31; James H. Charlesworth, "The Priority of John? Reflections on the Essenes and the First Edition of John," in *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums*, Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000, ed. Peter Leander Hofrichter, TTS 9 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002), 73–114.

154. For a good discussion concerning the early contacts between the Markan and Johannine traditions, see Paul N. Anderson, "Interfluent, Formative, and Dialectical - A Theory of John's Relation to the Synoptics," in *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums*, Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000, ed. Peter Leander Hofrichter, TTS 9 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002), 19–58.

could not have survived without it.

The agreements between Luke and Matthew, on the one hand, and between Luke and John, on the other, suggest that the source history of Luke is more complex than the 2SH suggests.

Aland §308 (Luke 22:7-14; Mark 14:12-17)

In this pericope the verbatim agreement percentage between Luke and Mark is the highest (46.2%) in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative (see Appendix A). It is also one of two episodes in the Passion-Resurrection section where verbatim agreement between Luke and Mark is higher than between Matthew and Mark. Many words also occur in Luke in the same sequence as in Mark, as shown below (the Luke-Mark agreements underlined):

⁸ Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, [ἐν] ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα. ⁸ καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην εἰπὼν· πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν. ⁹ οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν; ¹⁰ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσῃ ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπορεύεται, ¹¹ καὶ ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας· λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος· ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; ¹² κακεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε. ¹³ ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. ¹⁴ ¶ Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. ¹⁵⁵

In addition, the length of the Lukan and Markan episodes is essentially equal: Luke has 107 words, while Mark has 106 words.¹⁵⁶ The narrative sequence within the pericopes is also the same, except in Luke 22:8-9/Mark 14:12b-13a: in Mark, the disciples are initiators, whereas in Luke, Jesus is the initiator for preparations for the Passover meal. Grundmann and Matera believe the Lukan different narrative sequence can be explained theologically: Luke wants to present Jesus as Lord over his disciples and the coming events.¹⁵⁷

It is no wonder that scholars almost universally agree with Schürmann, who after a careful

155. Cf. Morgenthauer, *Statistische Synopse*, 59.

156. Interestingly, the Matthean episode is much shorter, having only 68 words. It does not have the instructions to the disciples on how to find the house where they prepare the meal.

157. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 390; Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies*, 160.

study of verses 7-13, states, “Dabei ist in den meisten Fällen, in denen luk R[edaction] festzustellen war, deutlich, daß die redigierte luk V[orlage] nicht wesentlich anders gelautet haben kann als unser Mk-Text.”¹⁵⁸ According to Schürmann, only a literary dependency theory, not the oral dependency one, can rightly explain such high verbatim agreement between Luke and Mark.¹⁵⁹

Even if scholars generally agree that Luke’s sole source in Luke 22:7-13 was Mark, they sharply disagree regarding Luke’s source for v. 14, which most scholars consider the opening verse of the following Last Supper episode (Luke 22:[14], 15-20). While Schürmann argues that “Lk 22,14 im ganzen luk R[edaction] von Mk 14,17-18a ist,”¹⁶⁰ Jeremias¹⁶¹ and Taylor¹⁶² reject Schürmann’s detailed arguments and maintain that Luke derived v. 14 from a non-Markan source. Green¹⁶³ and Fitzmyer¹⁶⁴ are somewhat uncertain. There are two main reasons why v. 14 is considered non-Markan by many scholars. First, only one word (καί) agrees verbatim in the Lukan and Markan parallels.¹⁶⁵ Second, there are two interesting minor agreements between Luke (22:14) and Matthew against Mark: i) The concept of ‘hour’ in Luke and Matthew. Luke uses the phrase ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα (Luke 22:14). In the present context, ὥρα could simply be a temporal reference to the time in the Passover evening (cf. Mark 14:17) when the meal was eaten,¹⁶⁶ or it could carry a theological (salvation-historical) connotation,¹⁶⁷ as it does in many passages in

158. Heinz Schürmann, *Der Paschalmahlbericht: Lk 22, (7–14.) 15–18*, vol. I of *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlberichtes Lk 22, 7–38*, NTAbh 19/5 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1953), 104. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 28 states, “[t]here is general unanimity that this pericope [Luke 22:7-13] was based solely on its counterpart in the Second Gospel.”

159. Schürmann, *Der Paschalmahlbericht*, 104.

160. Schürmann, *Der Paschalmahlbericht*, 110.

161. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 99 n. 1.

162. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 48–49.

163. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 29–30.

164. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1377.

165. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 27, however, argues that although there is lack of verbatim agreements between the Lukan and Markan verses, “there is a striking similarity between the thought patterns of the verses.”

166. So e.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 794; Jerome Neyrey, S.J., *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 12.

167. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1384: “The term *hōra* does not mean merely ‘evening’ (see Mark 14:17), but carries a salvation-historical connotation;” Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 52–53; and probably Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 33.

John¹⁶⁸ and Luke 22:53. The latter view is more likely. As Nolland correctly notes, v. 14 is “the climax of the development.”¹⁶⁹ As the lamb had to (ἔδει) be sacrificed on the Passover (Luke 22:7; cf. 22:1), so Jesus had to die on the Passover (cf. Luke 20:19; 22:2, 6, 15, 19-20, 21-22). The ὥρα had come. Matthew uses another word, καιρός, in a theological sense in the parallel text: “My time has come” (Matt 26:18). This is seldom noticed by scholars. This connotation is missing in the Markan passage; ii) Both Luke and Matthew end the pericope by saying that Jesus “sat at table” (Luke: ἀναίπτω; Matthew: ἀνάκειμαι). The same thought is found in Mark 14:18 but Luke did not necessarily transpose it from there (cf. Matthew 26:20 and 26:21).

Evidence that Luke would have used Mark as his source at least in vv. 7-13 is stronger than elsewhere in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, however there are also some reasons to question this view. First, there is very little evidence from antiquity that anyone copied his literary sources in the way Luke would have done if he used the Markan text as his source. Normally, texts used as sources were either copied almost word for word or they were completely paraphrased. I will discuss this phenomenon further in the next chapter. Second, the narrative sequence is different in Luke 22:8-10a and Mark 14:12b-13a. The Lukan sequence may be theologically motivated, as noted above, but this does not prove that the author of the Gospel of Luke changed the sequence; it is also possible that the present sequence was already in his source. Third, Luke names two disciples whom Jesus sent to prepare the Passion meal (Luke 22:8), whereas they remain anonymous in Mark. Schürmann argues that “[i]n der Einfügung der Namen ist aber entscheidend darum die Hand des Luk erkennbar, weil sich die Nebenordnung des Petrus und Johannes und ihre bevorzugte Nennung als ein luk Charakteristikum erweisen läßt.”¹⁷⁰ Taylor, however, remains open to the idea that Luke derived the names from oral tradition.¹⁷¹ Fourth, the pericope under discussion is surrounded by other episodes which show very little

168. John 2:4; 4:21, 23; 5:25, 28; 7:30; 8:20; 12:23, 27; 13:1; 16:2, 4, 25, 32; 17:1.

169. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1041.

170. Schürmann, *Der Paschalmahlbericht*, 85. Peter and John often occur side by side in Luke-Acts: Luke 5:10; 6:14; 8:51; 9:28; Acts 1:13; 3:1, 3, 4, 11; 4:1, 13, 19; 8:14, 17, 25.

171. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 45.

evidence that Luke would have drawn them from canonical Mark. Therefore, it is also unlikely that he would have derived this passage from it.

Aland §311 (Luke 22:15-20; Mark 14:22-25)

The institution of the Lord's Supper is recorded in all the Synoptics and 1 Cor 11:23-25. Very few passages in the Gospels have inspired as much scholarly discussion as this one and virtually all issues are debated. In this work, I can only touch on those issues which are important for my general argument.

Even a quick comparison of the Markan, Lukan, and Pauline accounts reveals very intriguing similarities and differences between these accounts. The Lukan account is much longer (111 words) than the Markan one (69 words); Luke 22:15 does not have a counterpart in the Markan episode; Luke 22:(16), 18 has a counterpart in the Markan account but in a different narrative sequence; also, the Lukan episode refers to two cups whereas the Markan and Pauline accounts refer to only one cup. In addition, although the Lukan wording agrees in some points with the Markan wording against the Pauline one, Luke 22:19-20 is much closer to the Pauline wording than to the Markan one, as the following comparison shows (the Luke-Mark agreements are underlined and the Luke-First Corinthians agreements are bolded):

Mark 14

Luke 22

1 Cor 11

Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ἐπιθυμία
ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν
μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· ¹⁶
λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω
αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ
βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. ¹⁷ καὶ
δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας
εἶπεν· λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ
διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· ¹⁸ λέγω
γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ
νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς
ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ
θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.
¹⁹ καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον
εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν

Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν
ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· λάβετε,

Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ
κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν,
ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ
παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον ²⁴ καὶ
εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν·
τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ

τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

²³ καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον
εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ
ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. ²⁴ καὶ
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά
μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ
ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. ²⁵
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι σὺ μὴ
πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου
ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ
πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ
θεοῦ.

τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν
ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ²⁰ καὶ τὸ
ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ
δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ
ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ
αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
ἐκχυννόμενον.

ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν
ἀνάμνησιν.

²⁵ ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον
μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων· τοῦτο
τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη
ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο
ποιεῖτε, ὡς ἂν πίνετε, εἰς τὴν
ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Verbatim agreement between Luke 22:19-20 and Mark 14:22-24 is only 44.2%,¹⁷² whereas between Luke 22:19-20 and 1 Cor 11:23b-25a, it is 76.0%.

The explanations for the existence of the present Lukan text fall into three main categories:

First, Luke's sole source was Mark. Especially, Kilpatrick has forcefully defended this view.¹⁷³ He argues that the author of Luke i) took over Mark 14:22 in Luke 22:19, ii) omitted Mark 14:23-24 because he found the Markan interpretation of the cup as the cup of blood offensive, iii) transposed Mark 14:25 to Luke 22:16, 18, and iv) made the observance of Luke 22:15-19a "more like a Passover."¹⁷⁴ Kilpatrick argues that Luke 22:19b-20 is an insertion from 1 Cor 11:23b-25 by a later copyist, not by the author of the Gospel. The latter view finds some support from the fact that Luke 22:19-20 is missing in some manuscripts.¹⁷⁵ Kilpatrick's arguments that Luke omitted the Markan reference to the cup because he found it offensive, and that Luke edited the Markan text heavy-handedly in order "to make the observance more like a Passover," are totally unconvincing. If Luke had been offended by the Markan equation of the cup with blood, then he should have also changed the Markan equation of the bread with Jesus' body (Luke 22:19b) since eating of human flesh was categorically offensive in the first century Greco-Roman and Jewish cultures (cf. John 6:51-56, 60). In addition, Luke's statement, "This cup that is

172. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 60.

173. George Dunbar Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 28–42. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 273, also supports this view.

174. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 42, 34.

175. See NA²⁷. For a good summary of the manuscript evidence, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1387–88.

poured out (ἐκχυννόμενον) for you is the new covenant in my blood,” basically carries the same meaning as the Markan statement because ἐκχυννόμενον must refer to Jesus’ blood; his blood, not the wine, was poured out (on the ground).¹⁷⁶ There would also not have been the need to edit in a heavy-handed manner the Markan text in Luke 22:15-19a, as Kilpatrick argues, in order to make the meal more closely resemble a Passover meal; both the Markan and Lukan accounts have already made it absolutely clear that this meal is a Passover meal (Mark 14:1, 12-13, 16-17, 18, 22 / Luke 22:1, 7-8, 13-14).¹⁷⁷

Overwhelming manuscript evidence also speaks against Kilpatrick’s view that Luke 22:19a-20 would be a later transposition from 1 Cor 11.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, a great majority of scholars attempt to explain the relationship of the Markan, Lukan, and Pauline accounts of the Lord’s Supper differently than Kilpatrick.

Second, Luke interweaved two traditions: a common pre-Pauline/Lukan tradition with a Markan tradition. This is probably the most widely held view in various forms.¹⁷⁹ Scholars who maintain this view typically, and correctly, argue that i) Luke 22:15-20 consists of two parts: vv. 15-18 refers to the ‘old Passover meal,’ whereas vv. 19-20 refers to the ‘new Passover meal’ (i.e., the Lord’s Supper).¹⁸⁰ Two elements of the ‘old Passover meal’ – the lamb (πάσχα; Luke

176. Cf. Luke 5:37; 12:50; Acts 1:18; 2:17, 18, 33; 10:45; 22:20.

177. For more detailed arguments against Kilpatrick’s theory, see Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 30–35.

178. See NA²⁷, Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1387–88; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 148–50.

179. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1386–87, argues that apart from Luke 22:19ab, Luke “has substituted for the Markan account of the Last Supper proper a form derived from ‘L’ (certainly for vv. 15-17 and 19cd, 20, and probably also for v. 18 [one may hesitate about the latter because of its similarity to Mark 14:25]. It is impossible that vv. 15-18 are a mere reworking of Mark 14:25..., or that vv. 19-20 are dependent on 1 Cor 11:24-25.” Heinz Schürmann, *Der Einsetzungsbericht: Lk 22,19–20*, vol. II of *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22,7–38*, NTAbh 20/4 [Münster: Aschendorff, 1955], 131–32, argues that “Der luk EB [Einsetzungsbericht] Lk 22,19-20a ist eine eigenständige, von Pls [Paulusschriften] und Mk im ganzen literarisch unabhängige vorluke T[radition]; auch kleinere Mk-Einflüsse konnten nicht nachgewiesen werden, dürfen aber für Lk 19a nicht gänzlich für unmöglich gehalten werden; Lk 22,20b hat Luk vielleicht von Mk übernommen.” See also Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 30; Salo, *Luukkaan Teologian Ydin*, 176–84.

180. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1389–91; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 799–801; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1719–21; Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 56–57; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1050–51, 1056. Nolland argues that “in Luke’s account, because of the cup is given

22:15)¹⁸¹ and wine – correspond in the Lukan episode with two elements of the ‘new Passover meal’ – the bread and wine – and give a new meaning to them; ii) Both Luke and Paul had access to the second part of the tradition. Whether or not Paul also knew the first part of tradition, like Luke, will never be known. Frequent liturgical use of this form of the institution of the Lord’s Supper in some sections of the early church explains high verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Pauline accounts without direct literary dependency on each other.¹⁸² It is good to remember here that, if form critics are right, it was not only the words of the institution of the Lord’s Supper which were constantly repeated in the early church, but the whole Passion Narrative, which is believed to have been a unit from the earliest period of the church, was also retold over and over again. This, rather than literary dependency, may explain similarities and differences between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection accounts; iii) Markan influence on Luke is minimal in this Lukan pericope. It is possible that Luke could have interweaved two traditions, but there is no compelling reason to believe so. If the Lukan and Pauline accounts can have high verbatim agreement without direct literary dependency on each other, as most scholars believe, then there is also no reason to argue that the Lukan and Markan accounts should be literally dependent on each other based on their verbatim agreements.¹⁸³

eucharistic features and lamb and cup in vv 15-18 are set in parallel with bread and cup in vv 19-20, the cup no longer be meant to identify a particular cup in the Passover sequence. Rather, Passover lamb and cup are meant in vv 15-18 to characterize the Passover meal, just as bread and cup are meant in vv 19-20 to characterize the church’s eucharistic celebration” (p. 1056). For the Passover sequence, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1930; Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 85–86.

181. Πάσχα here could refer to either the Passover meal or the Passover lamb. Most scholars take it as the Passover lamb.

182. See Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 30.

183. One of the main reasons why I doubt that Luke knew the Markan and Pauline institutions of the Lord’s Supper in their present forms is that, although Luke or the pre-Lukan author seem to have tried to create a symmetrical structure (cf. Luke 22:15-16 with 22:17-18, and 22:15-18 with 22:19-20), the Lukan account is not as symmetrical as it could easily have been if Luke had had the Markan and Pauline versions of the institution before him. Luke hardly derived part of his account from 1 Cor because the symmetrical element 3’ is missing in his account as shown below.

	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>1 Cor</u>
1. This is my body...	x	x	x
2. for you/many...	-		x x
3. Do this in remembrance of me	-	x	x
1’. This is...	x	x	x

Third, Luke derived his account from a pre-Lukan, non-Markan/Pauline source exclusively. This view is forcefully defended by Jeremias¹⁸⁴ and Green.¹⁸⁵ Both of these scholars base their conclusions on word analyses of the parallel texts and the transpositions of the order of events within this pericope (Mark 11:25 in Luke 22:16, 18) and its contexts (the episode Jesus Foretells His Betrayal follows the institution of the Lord's Supper in Luke [22:21-23], while in Mark [14:18-21] it precedes it). Jeremias argues it is unlikely that Luke, who was "an enemy of rearrangement," would be behind these and other changes of the order of events in the Passion Narrative.¹⁸⁶ Green points out that "in liturgical texts describing the Supper we naturally expect some correspondence in wording and phrasing. Points of contact in such cases suggest familiarity among the writers with common tradition, whether oral or written, but not necessarily direct literary dependence."¹⁸⁷ I regard this third view as the most likely option.

Aland §312 (Luke 22:21-23; Mark 14:18-21)

There are three theories of the relationship between Luke 22:21-23 and Mark 14:18-21.¹⁸⁸ First, Schürmann argues that Luke derived the whole passage from Mark, editing vv. 21 and 23 heavy-handedly.¹⁸⁹ Second, Rehkopf maintains that Luke derived the passage entirely from a non-Markan source.¹⁹⁰ It is very interesting that linguistic and stylistic analyses of the same Lukan text

2'. for you/many

x

x

-

3'. Do this in remembrance of me

-

-

x

It is also unlikely that Luke derived part of his account from canonical Mark because he has not utilized the second part of the Markan symmetrical structure of i) καὶ... λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας (Mark 14:22; cf. Luke 22:19), ii) καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας (Mark 14:23; cf. Luke 22:20).

In my judgment, the most likely explanation for these inconsistencies is that Luke derived the institution from oral tradition or pre-Lukan, non-Markan/Pauline source. See also Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 41.

184. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 96–105.

185. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 28–42.

186. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 98.

187. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 40.

188. Cf. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 807.

189. Heinz Schürmann, *Jesu Abschiedsrede: Lk 22,21–38*, vol. III of *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, Lk 22,7–38*, NTAbh 20/5 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1957), 20–21. Surprisingly Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1058, also seems to hold this view.

190. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 7–30.

have led Schürmann and Rehkopf to the exact opposite conclusions.¹⁹¹ Third, most scholars take a middle position, holding that i) Luke followed a non-Markan source but inserted v. 22 from Mark,¹⁹² or ii) Luke's main source was Mark with which he conflated material from other source(s),¹⁹³ or iii) Luke's main source was non-Markan but he was also likely influenced by the Markan account,¹⁹⁴ or iv) Luke combined Mark with a non-Markan source(s).¹⁹⁵

Although most scholars have adopted either the view that Luke's sole source here was Mark or that he combined two or more sources, there are several contextual and innertextual reasons to question these views.

First, the Lukan farewell speech (22:21-38) has several contact points with the Johannine farewell speech (13:12-17:26). As many scholars have noticed, the Lukan and Markan episodes of the Lord's Supper end differently: in Mark, Jesus and his disciples sing a hymn after the meal and go out to the Mount of Olives, whereas in Luke, *like in John*, Jesus delivers a farewell speech after the meal.¹⁹⁶ These two speeches have several contact points. Bock argues that "[t]he connection of Luke 22:21-23 to John 13:21-22, Luke 22:24-30 to John 13:1-20, and Luke 22:31-34 to John 13:37-38 suggests a traditional background to several Lucan differences."¹⁹⁷

Second, most of the material of the Lukan farewell speech is not found in Mark (Luke 22:24a-b, [25-26], 27a-d, 28-30c, 31a-32d, 35a-38d¹⁹⁸), which may suggest, together with the previous observation, that the Lukan farewell speech is part of pre-Lukan tradition of the Lord's

191. For linguistic and stylistic analyses of the Lukan passage, see also Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 43-48; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 59-61; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 807-10; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1409-10; Stephen Hultgren, *Narrative Elements in the Double Tradition: A Study of Their Place Within the Framework of the Gospel Narrative*, BZNW 113 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002), 284.

192. So e.g., Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 61.

193. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1407-09; Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 274-79.

194. So e.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 807-10; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1730-35.

195. So e.g., Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 44.

196. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1407.

197. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1731 n.1.

198. So according to Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 30-32.

Supper which “had already been gathered together... before it reached Luke.”¹⁹⁹

Third, three Lukan passages in the farewell speech are in different order than in Mark: Luke 22:21-23 (Mark 14:18-21), 22:24-30 (Mark 10:41-45), and 22:31-34 (Mark 14:29-31). The first difference in order is explained by Fitzmyer that “[b]y making the foretelling of the betrayal of Jesus part of the last discourse, Luke has intensified the nature of the offense,”²⁰⁰ and by Bock that the rearrangement gives “the meal a prominent position” and presents “the final remarks as a unit, as a final testament.”²⁰¹ Fitzmyer’s argument is very subjective; in the same way, one could argue that it is in fact the Markan order which intensified the nature of the offense: although Judas was now aware that Jesus knew he was going to betray him, Judas still took part in the meal that symbolizes Jesus’ death. Bock’s argument is more objective, but as Marshall points out, “it is equally possible that this was the order in his [i.e., Luke’s] special source, and it is given some support by the order in Jn. 13:1-20, 21-30.”²⁰² Other changes of order will be discussed later when I exegete those passages. As we have already seen, Luke appears to avoid transpositions. Jeremias calls Luke “an enemy of rearrangement.”²⁰³ Against this background, it is very unlikely that Luke would have performed three changes of order in such a short section of the Passion Narrative.

Fourth, beside Luke 22:22, verbatim agreement between Luke 22:21-23 and Mark 14:18-21 is minimal. Only two words (μετ’ ἐμοῦ) in v. 21 and one (ἤρξαντο) in v. 23 agree with the Markan counterpart. Verbatim agreement between v. 22 and its Markan counterpart is 38.7%, while the general agreement between these two accounts is only 19.5 %.²⁰⁴

Fifth, there are at least two contact points between Luke 22:21-23 and John 13:1-30:²⁰⁵ i)

199. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 807.

200. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1409.

201. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1734.

202. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 808.

203. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 98.

204. Morgenthauer, *Statistische Synopse*, 59.

205. There are also at least two contact points between Mark and John: i) Mark 14:19 and John 13:24-25, and ii) Mark 14:20 and John 13:26.

Jesus reveals after or during the meal proper in both Luke and John (13:2, 21-30) that he would be betrayed by one of his closest followers, while the Markan Jesus reveals this before the meal;²⁰⁶

ii) When Jesus reveals the betrayal, the disciples in Luke (22:23) and John (13:22) respond to it “not with a self-examination,” like in Mark, “but rather with a reciprocal questioning in the disciples’ looking and thinking... about one another.”²⁰⁷ I do not believe that Luke used canonical John, or that John used canonical Luke as his source, but these contact points may suggest that a tradition which Luke used stemmed from the interaction of Markan and non-Markan traditions.²⁰⁸

Sixth, there are at least three significant differences in content between the Lukan and Markan accounts: i) While the Markan Jesus first reveals that his betrayer is one of the twelve who is eating with him (14:18b) and then pinpoints him by revealing that he is dipping bread into the dish with him (14:20), the Lukan Jesus is less specific and simply states that the hand of his betrayer is with him on the table (22:21);²⁰⁹ the fact that the disciples ask one another, after Jesus’ revelation, which of them it was that would do this (22:23) makes it clear that the Lukan Jesus did not specifically pinpoint anyone in the group;²¹⁰ ii) While according to the Markan account, “the Son of Man goes as it is written (γέγραπται) of him” (14:21), in the Lukan account, he “is going as it has been determined (ὁρισμένον)” (22:22). Ὀπίζω is definitely Lukan, occurring only twice outside the Lukan writings in the NT,²¹¹ but Luke uses γράφω in the same sense as Mark (14:21) much more frequently.²¹² Why was Luke not satisfied with the Markan expression if Mark’s text was before him? iii) While each disciple in the Markan account asks *Jesus* whether he would be the betrayer (14:19), in the Lukan episode, the disciples ask it of *one another* (22:23). It is

206. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 278.

207. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 277.

208. I picture two story tellers whose stories were partly mingled by the story tellers themselves or their followers.

209. Notice that word “hand” occurs only in the Matthean (26:23) and Lukan accounts.

210. The Matthean (26:25) and Johannine (13:26-27; but see also 13:28-30) Jesus is the most specific, revealing the identity of the betrayer accurately.

211. Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23; 10:42; 11:29; 17:26, 31; Rom 1:4; Heb 4:7.

212. Luke uses γράφω as a reference to Scriptures fulfilled in the following passages: Luke 3:4; 4:17; 7:27; 18:31; 19:46(?); 20:17(?); 21:22; 22:37; 24:44, 46; Acts 1:20; 7:42(?); 13:29, 33; 15:15.

difficult to see why Luke should have redacted the Markan account so extensively if he used it as his source, especially since “the explanation in terms of stylistic improvement seems inadequate”²¹³ and no one can show clear theological motivations for these changes.²¹⁴

I agree with Marshall that “the cumulative impression of the pericope” suggests that Luke is following a non-Markan source here, oral or written.²¹⁵

Aland §313 (Luke 22:24-30; Mark 10:41-45)

Manson divides this Lukan passage into three parts: i) “the dispute among the disciples and the comment of Jesus” (vv. 24-26); ii) “a further saying in parabolic form” (v. 27); and iii) “a promise to the Twelve” (vv. 28-30).²¹⁶ Luke 22:24-26, 27b has a loose parallel in Mark 10:41-45 and Matt 20:24-28, while Luke 22:28, 30 has a loose parallel only in Matt 19:28.²¹⁷ Opinions regarding Luke’s sources in this pericope are strongly divided.

As for Luke 22:24-27, those who argue that Luke used Mark as his source present two main arguments for it:²¹⁸ i) Verbal (not verbatim) agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts is relatively high. According to Soards, 57% of Luke’s words in 22:25-26 are matched by words in Mark,²¹⁹ ii) The structure of the Lukan and Markan passages are “remarkably similar,” even though “the same cannot be said for the contents.”²²⁰

<u>Mark</u>		<u>Luke</u>
10:41	Introduction	22:24
10:42-44	Example and Teaching	22:25-26
10:45	Christological Conclusion	22:27

213. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 808.

214. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 278.

215. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 810.

216. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 337.

217. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 30–31, 39, 48, argues that only “25a-26c may be comparable to Mark 10.42-44” (p. 39).

218. Peter K. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24–30*, SBLDS 138 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 125–26.

219. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 42.

220. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 31.

P. K. Nelson lists the following scholars among those who hold that Luke used Mark in at least part of vv. 24-27:²²¹ A. Feuillet, J. Schlosser, J. Bailey, F. W. Beare, A. Büchle, J. B. Chance, F. D. Danker, C. L'Eplattenier, P. F. Esler, J. A. Fitzmyer, A. George, J. Gillman, J. F. Gormley, M. D. Goulder, M. Kiddle, W. L. Knox, J. Kodell, M.-J. Lagrange, G. W. H. Lampe, A. Loisy, R. Pesch, A. M. Perry, M. Rese, F. Rienecker, J. Schlosser, J. Schmid, W. Schmithals, E. Schweizer, P. H. Sellew, D. E. Smith, M. L. Soards,²²² A. Vööbus, P. W. Walasky, and S. G. Wilson. J. Neyrey²²³ and C. A. Evans²²⁴ can be added to this list. However, there are a few compelling reasons for rejecting this view:²²⁵ i) The *quality* of verbal agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts is low, although they share many of the same words.²²⁶ According to Morgenthaler, verbatim (not verbal) agreement between these two passages (Luke 22:24-27/Mark 10:41-45) is only 16.5%.²²⁷ Such low verbatim agreement definitely does not require literary dependency between Luke and Mark. Even Creed, a devoted advocate of the 2SH, admits that “[d]ifferences both in wording and thought make it probable that Lk. is dependent on a non-Markan source” here;²²⁸ ii) Some differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts are difficult to explain on redactional bases. There are especially two such problems: a) As many scholars, including Marshall, have noted, “Luke normally prefers compound verbs, inserting them where they are lacking in his source,” but here he ‘drops off’ the prefix *κατα-* (Mark 10:42) from

221. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 126 n.8. See also Schürmann, *Jesus Abschiedsrede*, 63, n.213.

222. Soards' view (*The Passion According to Luke*) is a bit obscure and confusing; cf. pp. 39, 49, 116-17.

223. Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 21-28.

224. Craig A. Evans, “The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24-30,” in *Jesus in Context: Temple, Purity, and Restoration*, Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans, AGJU 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1993/1997), 468-70.

225. See Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 126-31, who himself argues against the view that Luke redacted Mark's text here.

226. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 129, 126-31.

227. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 52.

228. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 267. Also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1412, admits that the dependency theory is “not without problems.” He argues for the following view: Luke 22:24 is Lukan composition; v. 25 is a traditional introduction combined with a Lukan redaction of Mark 10:42bc; v. 26 is a Lukan redaction of Mark 10:43-44; v. 27 is probably from L; vv. 28, 30 are probably from Q; and vv. 29, 30a may be Lukan composition or a derivation from L (p. 1412-13).

the verb κυριεύουσιν (Luke 22:25);²²⁹ b) Luke ‘omits’ the Markan soteriological statements, “to give his life a ransom (λύτρον) for many” (Mark 10:45b), although, as Fitzmyer notes, “there is nothing in the Marcan verse which ill suits Luke’s view of soteriology. He does not avoid ‘ransom’ language, for he uses the vb. *lytrousthai*, ‘redeem’ in 24:21....; he has already used the n. *lytrōsis*, ‘redemption,’ twice in the infancy narrative (1:68; 2:38). In Acts 7:35 he presents Moses as a type of Christ and calls him *lytrōtēs*, ‘redeemer.’”²³⁰ In addition, the Lukan “interpretation of the death of Christ as the offering for sin” finds a very clear expression at the giving of the wine at the Last Supper: “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood” (Luke 22:20).²³¹ Thus, the omission cannot be explained on a theological basis. Fitzmyer regards this omission a “mystery,”²³² and yet he suggests that Luke may have omitted it “because of what has been said by Jesus at the end of v. 20.”²³³ However, if Luke wanted to avoid ‘repetition’ here in order to be consistent, he should have also omitted another ‘repetition,’ the references to the table in 22:14, 21, 27, which clearly functions as a catchword between these episodes; iii) Literary context of the Lukan and Markan episodes differs. The Markan episode occurs on the way to Jerusalem, while the Lukan episode takes place at the Lord’s Supper. In this aspect, the Lukan account agrees with the Johannine one (John 13:4-5, 12-17), which also depicts Jesus as a servant in the Last Supper. It is difficult to find any rational reason for this transposition if Luke used Mark as his source. The passage would have served its purpose before entering Jerusalem in the Markan context as well as it does in the present Lukan context, as Bock correctly points out.²³⁴

The list of the names of those scholars who argue that throughout vv. 24-27 Luke derived from a non-Markan source/tradition is impressive:²³⁵ E. Arens, E. Bammel, E. Best, F. H. Borsch,

229. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 812.

230. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1212.

231. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 267.

232. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1212.

233. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1414.

234. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1736-37.

235. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 127-28 n.15. See also Schürmann, *Jesus Abschiedsrede*, 63 n.213.

J. M. Creed, J. D. Crossan, C. H. Dodd, B. S. Easton, J. Ernst, A. Feuillet, J. B. Green, W. Grundmann, A. J. B. Higgins, V. P. Howard, J. J. Jeremias, P. E. Leonard, W. L. Liefeld, E. Lohse, H. K. Luce, C. S. Mann, T. W. Manson, I. H. Marshall, S. H. T. Page, J. Roloff, A. Schulz, H. Schürmann, B. H. Streeter, D. M. Sweetland, V. Taylor, H. E. Tödt, J. Wellhausen, J. Wenham, and P. Winter. D. L. Bock²³⁶ and J. Nolland²³⁷ can also be added to the list.

I agree with Nelson's summary statement, "there appears to be insufficient evidence to conclude that Luke follows Mark in all or part of 22:24-27. Rather, the evidence of similar structure and sense along with dissimilar language and context suggests that Luke here follows a non-Markan source, but one that is related to or perhaps even identical to Mark's own source."²³⁸

Opinion is divided regarding whether Luke 22:28-30 was an organic part of the pericope (Luke 22:24-30) in Luke's possible non-Markan source which overlapped with Q here,²³⁹ or a secondary incorporation from Q to Luke.²⁴⁰ Three observations may support the former view: i) Luke 22:28-30 is the *only* Q passage in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative, raising some doubts that Luke derived it from Q;²⁴¹ ii) verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Matthean (29:28) versions is relatively low; and iii) Luke 22:29, a possibly non-Q saying, is located between vv. 28 and 30.

236. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1735–39.

237. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1062–65.

238. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 131.

239. For example, Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1063, rejects the view that Luke 22:29-30a constitutes "a separate unit of tradition, secondarily incorporated at this point." Peter K. Nelson, "The Unitary Character of Luke 22:24–30," *NTS* 40 [1994]: 609, also argues that Luke 22:24-27 and 22:28-30 "together form a coherent and organic literary whole within the Lukan narrative." The following five aspects favor this view: i) language and concepts, ii) structure, iii) literary form, iv) progression of thought, and v) symbolism. He, however, believes that Luke drew vv. 28, 30 from Q (Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 176, 179).

240. See Paul Hoffmann and et al., eds., *Documenta Q: Q 22:28, 30: You Will Judge the Twelve Tribes of Israel*, Documenta Q (Leuven: Peeters, 1998); Christopher M. Tuckett, "Q 22:28–30," in *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honor of David R. Catchpole*, eds. David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett, NovTSup 99 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 99–116; Fleddermann, *Q*, 864–71; Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 173–79; Josef Verheyden, "The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28–30," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, ed. A. Lindemann, BETL 158 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 695–718; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 46–48; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 817; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1063; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1740.

241. My supervisor, John S. Kloppenborg, drew my attention to this fact.

Aland §315 (Luke 22:31-34; Mark 14:26-31)

Luke 22:31-34 has a parallel in Mark 14:26-31, but these two accounts are remarkably different in setting, wording and structure. In Luke, the prediction of Peter's denial happens during the Lord's Supper as part of the farewell speech, whereas in Mark, the prediction occurs on the way to the Mount of Olives, after Jesus and his disciples had left the guest room. The wording of these two accounts also does not match closely. According to Morgenthaler, only 12.7% (or, 18.4% if also Luke 22:39 is included) of the words of the Lukan account find verbatim correspondence in the Markan account: (six words in v. 39), three words in v. 33, and seven words in v. 34.²⁴² As for the structure, the Markan account (vv. 27-31) falls into five parts: i) a Scripture reference (v. 27), ii) Jesus' promise to the Eleven (v. 28), iii) Peter's first promise of loyalty (v. 29), iv) Peter's denial predicted (v. 30), and v) Peter's second promise of loyalty (v. 31).

The Lukan account does not have a Scripture reference. This is somewhat surprising because Luke clearly desires to show in his Gospel that the Scriptures were fulfilled in Jesus (see especially Luke 24:27, 44-47). The 'omission' is commonly explained by Luke's tendency to depict the disciples in a favourable light: the Markan Jesus' prediction of "you will all become deserters" scandalized Luke; in Luke's Gospel, the Eleven do not abandon Jesus; at least some of them may have been watching the crucifixion from a distance with some women (Luke 23:49).²⁴³ If Luke, however, wanted to avoid giving the impression that all Jesus' disciples did not "become deserters," Luke did not succeed: in Luke 23:49, he uses an obscure word *γυνῶστοι* (acquaintances, friends, intimates) instead of a clear reference to the Eleven, and in Luke 23:50-56, only women go with Joseph Arimathea to bury Jesus; the Eleven are too concerned about their own safety to follow their master on his 'last journey.' The Lukan disciples were indeed shattered and needed to be strengthened after the resurrection (Luke 22:32b). Also, later, Luke

242. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 60.

243. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1421-22.

sometimes depicts the apostles in an unfavourable light: Luke 24:11, 25, 33, 37, 41, 44-45; Acts 10:14-16; 15:36-40. In my judgement, it is very possible that Luke does not refer to Scriptures (Zech. 13:7), as Mark does, because he did not have access to the Markan account.

The Lukan account is also missing Jesus' promise to the Eleven to meet them again in Galilee after his resurrection (Mark 14:28). This omission could be redactional: in Luke, Jesus meets his disciples in Jerusalem, not in Galilee as in Mark, and is taken up into heaven in Bethany/the Mount of Olives (Luke 24:50; Acts 1:12). However, it is also possible that Luke did not know the promise of the Markan tradition about Jesus' appearance in Galilee and this would explain the differences between these two accounts.

Most scholars, with few exceptions,²⁴⁴ agree mainly on a linguistic basis that Luke 22:31-32 constitutes a pre-Lukan, non-Markan tradition with relatively little Lukan redaction, especially in verse 31.²⁴⁵ Opinions are more divided regarding Luke 22:33-34. Some argue that both verses are derived from Mark,²⁴⁶ while others hold that probably only v. 34 is from Mark.²⁴⁷ Still others maintain that neither verse is from Mark.²⁴⁸ There is very little reason to believe that Luke derived v. 33 from Mark, as it is generally agreed: only three common words (ὁ δέ, αὐτῶ) agree in verbatim. "The vocabulary of the saying is largely Lucan, but there is no clear evidence that it rests on redaction of Mk.," as Marshall correctly notes.²⁴⁹ Verse 34 is more problematic: 31.8% of the Lukan words agree verbatim with Mark 14:30, but two observations cast doubts on the

244. E.g., Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, argues that the structure and thought of "31a-32d is a Lukan composition designed to replace Mark 14:27-28" (p. 53) in order to avoid depicting the disciples in a negative light (p. 52). Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 281, agrees with him.

245. E.g., Schürmann, *Jesus Abschiedsrede*, 99-116, argues that "Lk 22,31-32 ist seinem Grundbestand nach ein vorluk Traditionsstück, welches wahrscheinlich als Gestandteil einer Nicht/Mk-Fassung der Passionsgeschichte den Anlaß abgab für die luk Einfügung der Mk-R Lk 22,33-34, zu deren Einleitung es von Luk umgeformt wurde" (pp. 115-16). See also Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1070; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 819; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 48-50.

246. Schürmann, *Jesus Abschiedsrede*, 21-35; Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 53.

247. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 339; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 49-50; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1073; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 66; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1421. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 819, suggests that "Luke has remodelled a non-Markan source on Marcan lines" in v. 34, and that "[t]he dependence of v. 33 on Mk. 14.29 and 31 is much less certain."

248. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 503.

249. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 823.

view that Luke derived this verse from Mark. First, the Lukan account agrees with the Johannine and Matthean accounts against the Markan account concerning the crowing of the cock.

According to Mark 14:30, Peter would deny Jesus three times before the cock crowed *twice*.

Mark 14:72 indicates that the cock crowed a *second* time immediately after Peter's third denial.

This naturally means that the cock had already crowed once before the third denial. According to the Lukan, Johannine, and Matthean accounts, however, the cock would not crow *at all* before Peter had denied Jesus three times (Luke 22:34; John 13:38; Matt 26:34; cf. Luke 22:60-61; John 18:27; Matt 26:74-75). This difference is difficult to explain on the basis of Luke's redaction of the canonical Markan text. Second, Luke and John agree in using the οὐ ἔως-structure which is missing in the Markan version. Nolland correctly notes, "There are... just enough coincidences with John 13:37-38 to raise the question of a second source."²⁵⁰

Verbatim agreements between Luke 22:34 and Mark 14:30 cannot be used for defending Luke's literary dependence on Mark, if, at the same time, one is not willing to argue for the same between the Lukan and Johannine accounts, since verbatim agreement between Luke 22:34 and John 13:38 is almost as high as between Luke and Mark. Verbatim agreements of this kind are very understandable without literary dependence if "this tradition had achieved a relatively firm shape and was well known from early times."²⁵¹

The change from 'Simon' in Luke 22:31 to 'Peter' in 22:34 does not necessarily prove, as many scholars believe,²⁵² that Luke returned from a non-Markan source, which used 'Simon,' to the Markan source, which used 'Peter,' since Luke uses both these names for Simon Peter in the same context in Acts 10:5, 18, 32; and 11:13.

If Luke does not really try to whitewash the disciples' reputation, as I have argued above, then it is also difficult to comprehend why Luke would have felt forced to reject the Markan wording and structure of 14:29-31 and rewrite it. The reason cannot be grammatical because

250. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1071.

251. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 49.

252. E.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 818.

Matthew follows the Markan wording closely. I believe the most logical explanation for all these differences and similarities between the Lukan and Markan accounts is that Luke did not draw this account from canonical Mark.

Aland §316 (Luke 22:35-38)

Luke 22:35-38 is the last section of Jesus' Farewell Discourse delivered at the Last Supper. It has no parallels in other Gospels. Scholarly opinions on whether Luke derived this pericope from tradition or composed it are divided.²⁵³

This pericope, as well as the Lukan Commissioning the Twelve (Luke 9:1-6) or Commissioning the Seventy (Luke 10:1-12), does not show any clear signs that Luke knew the Markan version of Commissioning the Twelve (Mark 6:6b-13). Here the Lukan Jesus asks of the Twelve, "When I sent you out without a purse, bag, or sandals, did you lack anything?" (Luke 22:35). These three prohibited items are mentioned only in the non-Markan commissioning of the Seventy (i.e., Luke 10:1-12), suggesting that either Luke was careless or he was dependent "on a source in which this language had been associated with the Sending out of the Twelve."²⁵⁴ Luke does not make any efforts to resolve the 'inconsistency.'²⁵⁵

Aland §330 (Luke 22:39-46; Mark 14:32-42)

According to all the Synoptics, Jesus went to pray in Gethsemane/the Mount of Olives just before he was arrested. Whether Luke relied here on Mark and/or on another source is hotly debated. Opinions can be roughly divided into three categories: i) Mark was Luke's only source,²⁵⁶ ii) Luke derived his material from Mark and a non-Markan source,²⁵⁷ iii) Luke was

253. For a further discussion of the issue, see Schürmann, *Jesus Abschiedsrede*, 116–39; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1745–46; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1429–30; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 824; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 50–52; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 66–68.

254. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1075.

255. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1430.

256. Very few scholars hold this view without hesitation. Among those who do hold this view are: J. Neyrey (*The Passion According to Luke*, 49–68), J. Finegan, J. M. Creed, J. Schmid, E. Linnemann, E. Klostermann, G. Schneider, and J. A. Fitzmyer (see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1438 and Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1757). Later, as is well known, Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?*, radically

dependent on a non-Markan source.²⁵⁸

There are several reasons to believe that Luke did not derive this pericope from canonical Mark:²⁵⁹ i) Verbatim agreement between the Markan and Lukan accounts is exceptionally low (9.9%);²⁶⁰ ii) There are several minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark: λέγων (Luke 22:42), the conditional εἰ-structure (22:42), πλὴν (22:42), τὸ θέλημα (22:42/Matt 26:42), γινέσθω (22:42/Matt 26:42), and πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς (22:45).²⁶¹ These agreements could be accidental, but in light of the number of minor agreements in the Synoptics,²⁶² it is more likely that these minor agreements reflect a more complex compositional history of Luke and Matthew than the 2SH suggests;²⁶³ iii) There is inconsistent evidence for Lukan redaction. It is often argued that Luke changed the Markan account in two ways. First, Luke dropped off some Markan material in order to create a chiastic structure that emphasizes the importance of prayer to avoid entering into temptation (cf. Luke 22:40b with 22:46b).²⁶⁴ Second, Luke edited the Markan

rejected her previous view and began to support the oral tradition theory.

257. Among scholars who hold this view are: Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1081–82, who argues that Luke's major source here was "a chiastically formed" non-Markan source, Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1753–64, and Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 117.

258. According to Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1438, and Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1757, the following scholars hold this view: A. Schatter, A. Loisy, M.-J. Lagrange, W. Grundmann, K. G. Kuhn, V. Taylor, F. Rehkopf, L. Lescow, and E. Haenchen. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 827–29, is somewhat uncertain.

259. For all differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1437; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1754; Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 289.

260. The Lukan account has 15 completely identical words out of the total 181 words of the Markan account (see Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 69; Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem," 117; Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 61).

261. See Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 575–76.

262. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 208–12, counts about 218 minor agreements; 20 of them are really significant; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 180, regards about 33 minor agreements as somewhat significant; Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis*, 11–21, lists 272; Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: With a Cumulative List*, 55–195, lists over 770; and Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 417, discusses about one thousand cases.

263. There are a great number of minor agreements which Streeter's explanation (*The Four Gospels*, 179–81, 295–331) does not satisfy.

264. So Bart D. Ehrman and Mark A. Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43–44," *CBQ* 45 (1983): 401–16. The pericope has the following chiastic structure according to them:

Introduction (Luke 22:39)

A (22:40)

B (22:41a)

C (22:41b)

text heavy-handedly in order to depict Jesus as the one who faces his destiny calmly, bravely and in control of himself and the situation.²⁶⁵ The first argument is somewhat convincing, but a problem exists: Lukan triple tradition episodes do not seem to be structured chiastically more often than their parallels in Mark.²⁶⁶ If Luke was not fond of creating them, then there is also no compelling reason to think he would have intentionally excluded Mark 14:39-42 and its two references to Jesus praying (vv. 39, 41a), a theme Luke emphasizes in his Gospel, in order to create a chiasmus. Therefore, the chiastic structure of Luke 22:40b-46 does not prove that Luke redacted the Markan account. Rather, it may indicate, as Nolland argues, that he relied here on “a chiastically formed” non-Markan source.²⁶⁷

The second argument is also problematic. First, the argument of the Lukan depiction of Jesus’ calmness in the face of arrest and death, contrary to the depiction of Jesus in the Markan

D (22:41c-42)

C’ (22:45a)

B’ (22:45b)

A’ (22:45c-46)

The authenticity of Luke 22:43-44 is hotly debated. Ehrmann and Plunkett argue that these two verses are not authentic, because they break the chiastic structure of Luke 22:41b-46, but Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 182-83, and Christopher M. Tuckett, “Luke 22:43-44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel.*, ed. Adelbert Denaux, BETL 161 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 131-44, demonstrate that the Lukan section contains a chiasmus regardless of one’s view of the authenticity of Luke 22:43-44. Tuckett, Brown, and Claire Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of Blood’ (Lk 22:43-44): P69 and F13,” *HTR* 98 (2005): 419-40, also show that many other arguments of Ehrman and Plunkett are questionable, and they believe that Luke 22:43-44 is authentic. For a list of the scholars who support or reject the authenticity of Luke 22:43-44, see Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 180 n.2. See also T. van Lopik, “Once Again: Floating Words, Their Significance for Textual Criticism,” *NTS* 41 (1995): 289, who convincingly demonstrates that “the archetype of fam 13, just like the majority of the manuscripts, read Luke 22:43-4 at its normal place in Luke,” not after Matt 26:39, and therefore the ‘f¹³-argument’ should not be used as an evidence against the authenticity of Luke 22:43-44.

265. So Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 49-68 and Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 410f.

266. K. E. Bailey argues that the Lukan Travel Narrative (9:51-19:48) as the whole (*Poet and Peasant*, 79-85) and many of its individual pericopes (see *Poet and Peasant, Through Peasant Eyes*) are structured chiastically, but he holds that it was “a pre-Lukan Jewish-Christian” (*Poet and Peasant*, 83), not Luke, who arranged the material in that way. For chiastic structures in Mark, see John Dart, *Decoding Mark* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003).

267. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1082. Nolland believes that this “chiastically formed” non-Markan source was Luke’s primary source in this pericope.

account, is exclusively based on both the pericope under discussion²⁶⁸ and Aland §347.²⁶⁹

Moreover, whether the Lukan Jesus is as calm as often argued depends on the interpretation of Jesus' prayer of the removal of the cup in Luke 22:42,²⁷⁰ Jesus' agony in 22:43-44,²⁷¹ and the meaning of συνέχομαι in 12:50.²⁷² Second, if Luke really used Mark as his source here and wanted to depict Jesus as a serene martyr, as often argued, Luke failed to use one of the best pieces of evidence in the Markan text - "the hour has come; behold, the Son of Man is being betrayed into the hands of sinners. *Get up, let us be going*; behold, the one who betrays Me is at hand" (Mark 14:41b-42; NASB) - to highlight Jesus' calmness and bravery in the face of his arrest and death. The view, suggested occasionally, that Jesus wanted to run away in the Markan account is widely rejected by Markan scholars.²⁷³ It is also unlikely that Luke would have interpreted Mark's comment in this way if he had access to this Gospel. I agree with A. Y.

Collins' comment:

The verb ἄγειν ("to go") is used [in Mark 14:42] in the sense of motion away from a position [see BAGD], but the goal is not expressed. It is highly unlikely that the flight is meant. Jesus' final statement in this scene, which links the Gethsemane story to the account of the arrest that follows, is "See, the one who is to hand me over has drawn near." The implication is that Jesus plans to meet Judas and those with him...²⁷⁴

It is also noteworthy that the Markan references in these two verses to "the hour" and Jesus'

268. Tuckett, "Luke 22:43-44," 136-40, correctly notes that the depiction of Jesus by Luke may not actually differ so radically from the depiction in Mark as Ehrman and Plunkett suggest in their article. "[T]he Lukan Jesus does still ask that the cup be taken away. The prayer is not omitted completely by Luke" (p. 137).

269. Discussed in chapter two.

270. See Tuckett, "Luke 22:43-44," 137-38. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 777-78, notes, "Jesus's... request concerning the removal of 'the cup' suggest a portrait of Jesus that falls short of the superhuman bravado characteristic of Jewish martyrological scenes."

271. Whether Luke 22:43-44 is part of the original text of Luke is not absolutely certain. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151; Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*, 189-90, 217-18; Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 58-62; Tuckett, "Luke 22:43-44," 138-40; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 831-32. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, 343, is right when he points out that "Jesus is not depicted as a Stoic" in Luke 22:43-44.

272. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 997; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 547-48; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1193-94.

273. See e.g., Morna Dorothy Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, BNTC (London: Black, 1991), 350; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 590; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1976), 321; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 418.

274. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 682-83.

betrayal to “the hands of sinners” would have fit the Lukan context very well because Luke later uses these terms in the same context as Mark (see Luke 22:53; 24:7).

It is no wonder that several scholars have ended up arguing that Luke did not derive this pericope, at least exclusively, from canonical Mark.

Aland §331 (Luke 22:47-53; Mark 14:43-52)

Scholarly opinions regarding whether Luke composed this episode using the Markan text as his sole source or whether he was also influenced by a (fragmentary) non-Markan parallel source/tradition are again very divided. Some, including G. Schneider, Creed, C. F. Evans, Fitzmyer,²⁷⁵ argue for the former view, whereas the rest, including J. Ernst, Grundmann, Rehkopf, Taylor, Green, Marshall, Soards, Bock, and Nolland,²⁷⁶ view the latter view as more probable.

The Markan and Lukan accounts have many similarities and differences.²⁷⁷ A close comparison of these accounts shows that the Markan account is, as C. F. Evans puts it, “somewhat disjointed.”²⁷⁸ i) Judas and the crowd (Mark 14:43-44), ii) Judas and Jesus (v. 45), iii) the crowd and Jesus (v. 46), iv) the disciples (v. 47), v) Jesus and the crowd (vv. 48-49), and vi) the disciples and Jesus (vv. 50-52). In the Lukan account, on the contrary, the material is organized very logically: i) Judas and Jesus (vv. 47-48), ii) the disciples and Jesus (vv. 49-51), iii) Jesus and the crowd (vv. 52-53), with Jesus being the center of the story and each section having the phrase “Jesus said” (Luke 22:48a, 51a, 52a).²⁷⁹ The somewhat disjointed nature of the

275. Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium Nach Lukas*, 2 vols., ÖTKNT 3 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1977), 2:460–61; Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 272; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 815; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1448. Evans believes that Luke used Mark as his sole written source “with the aid of tradition.” Fitzmyer believes that all details in the Lukan account, except “the ‘right’ ear and its cure,” can be explained on the basis of the Markan text.

276. Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 608–09; Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 413; Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 31–85; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 76; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 61; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 834; Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 117–18; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1766; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1086.

277. For the lists of those, see Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1765–66; Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 293–94.

278. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 815.

279. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 814.

Markan material could have been a reason for Lukan rearrangement and improvement of the Markan material. However, there are several reasons to believe that Luke was not aware of the canonical Markan version of this episode.

First, verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts is low beside Luke 22:47a, 50, 52b-53a par. The general agreement is 25.7%²⁸⁰/27.0%²⁸¹/22.7%.²⁸²

Second, there are some minor agreements between the Lukan and Matthean accounts against the Markan one: i) ἰδοὺ (Luke 22:47; Matt 26:47); ii) Jesus speaks to Judas (Luke 22:48; Matt 26:50); iii) πατάσσω (Luke 22:49, 50; Matt 26:51), while Mark uses παίω (Mark 14:49; cf. John 18:10). Both Matthew and Luke know and use the latter word elsewhere (Matt 26:68; Luke 22:64); and iv) Jesus rebukes the disciple who cut off an ear of the slave of the high priest (Luke 22:51; Matt 26:52-54).²⁸³

Third, there are some (minor) agreements between the Lukan and Johannine accounts against the Markan one: i) The strike with the sword is recorded by both Luke (22:50, 54a) and John (18:10, 12) prior to the arrest of Jesus; ii) It is the *right* ear of the slave, which is cut off (Luke 22:50; John 18:10); iii) Jesus rebukes the disciple who cut off an ear of the slave (Luke 22:51; John 18:11). Here all three Gospels agree against Mark; and iv) the disciples do not flee (cf. John 18:8) as they do in Mark.²⁸⁴ While these and previous (minor) agreements do not prove that Luke did not know Mark, they strongly suggest that the source history of the Lukan account seems to be much more complex than many 2SH critics assume.

Fourth, while Mark introduces Judas simply, “Judas, one of the twelve” (Mark 14:43), Luke strangely adds, “*the one called* (ὁ λεγόμενος) Judas, one of the twelve” (Luke 22:47;

280. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 69.

281. Honoré, “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem,” 117.

282. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 61–62.

283. See Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1086–87; Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, 577–78; Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 72–75. Note that the wording of Matt 26:52a is very similar to John 18:11a. In addition, in both cases, Jesus asks a rhetorical question from the disciple who struck the slave (Matt 26:53-54 / John 18:11b).

284. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 294, lists seven agreements, but some of them are not very convincing in my opinion. See also Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 72–75.

NASB), although readers already know Judas (Luke 6:16; 22:3).²⁸⁵ The existence of this phrase here has aroused scholarly discussion.²⁸⁶ Rehkopf's suggestion that the phrase exists because Luke derived this section from a source in which Judas was mentioned the first time seems to be the most logical explanation.²⁸⁷ It is very unlikely that Luke would have added this otherwise 'useless' phrase if he had used canonical Mark as his source.

Fifth, instead of using the Markan compound form (καταφιλέω; Mark 14:45) for "kiss," Luke uses a simple form (φιλέω; Luke 22:47), although he generally favours compound verbs and uses only the compound form for "kiss" everywhere else in his double work (Luke 7:38, 45; 15:20; Acts 20:37). Nolland's explanation that Luke reduced the verb form "perhaps for the sake of the noun form to come in v 48" is hardly compelling.²⁸⁸

Sixth, the Lukan reversed word order τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον (Luke 22:50; cf. Mark 14:47) may be difficult to attribute to Luke (cf. John 18:10).²⁸⁹

Seventh, according to the Markan account, the arresters of Jesus are "from the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders" (Mark 14:43b), whereas according to the Lukan account, the arresters *are* "the chief priests, the officers of the temple police and the elders" (Luke 22:52a). It is difficult to find any compelling reason for this change if Luke used Mark as his source.

Eighth, both Luke and Mark mention three distinctive groups behind Jesus' arrest, but the middle group differs in these Gospels. In Mark, the arresters consist of the crowd from the chief priests, *the scribes* and the elders, whereas in Luke they consist of the chief priests, *the officers of the temple police* and the elders. If Luke really used canonical Mark as his source, why did he

285. Luke uses λέγω in the similar sense only three times elsewhere (Luke 22:1; Acts 3:2; 6:9). He normally uses the word καλέω when he introduces a person or place by name: Luke 1:32, 35, 60, 76; 2:4, 21; 6:15; 7:11; 8:2; 9:10; 15:19, 21; 19:29; 21:37; 22:3 (a reference to Judas), 25, 33; Acts 1:12, 19, 23; 3:11; 8:10; 9:11; 10:1; 13:1; 14:2; 15:22, 37; 27:8, 14, 16; and 28:1.

286. See Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 835.

287. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 37–38. See also Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 246.

288. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1088.

289. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 837; Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, 68–69. Based on my own quick study, Luke uses the reversed order only in the following passages in his Gospel: Luke 1:4; 2:44; 16:17; 20:41; 22:41, 71; 24:42.

change the Markan “scribes” to “the officers of the temple police,” although, according to Luke, it was particularly the chief priests and *the scribes* who “were looking for a way to put Jesus to death” (Luke 22:2) and Luke regularly mentions the scribes along with the high priests in the Passion Narrative as who opposed Jesus?²⁹⁰ It is also noteworthy that the Matthean account of Jesus’ arrest also fails to mention the scribes (Matt 26:47).

Ninth, although Luke emphasizes Jesus’ teaching activity in the temple during his last week, Luke fails to refer to it here (Luke 22:53), while Mark mentions it (Mark 14:49).²⁹¹ This is not an isolated incident. It is interesting that whenever Mark uses the words διδάσκω or διδασχί for Jesus’ teaching activity during Jesus’ last week, Luke fails to use these words, except in Luke 20:21/Mark 12:14.²⁹² Also, whenever Luke uses these same words, they are always missing in the Markan accounts.²⁹³ Nolland’s explanation that Luke dropped the reference to Jesus’ teaching in the temple in Luke 22:53 in order to avoid useless repetition (cf. Luke 19:47; 20:1; 21:37) is not convincing²⁹⁴ because Luke again later refers to Jesus’ teaching activity in Luke 23:5.²⁹⁵

Tenth, Luke ‘omits’ the Markan allusion to the fulfillment of Scripture (Mark 14:49b), although the fulfillment theme frames Luke’s Gospel (Luke 1:1; 24:25-27, 32, 44-48) and Luke emphasizes it throughout his double work.²⁹⁶ Fitzmyer’s suggestion that Luke omitted the Scripture allusion “probably because of its vagueness” is hardly accurate because, as Fitzmyer

290. Luke 19:47 (“the chief priests and the scribes and the leading men among the people”; NASB); 20:1 (“the chief priests and the scribes with the elders”), 19 (“the scribes and the chief priests”); 22:2 (“the chief priests and the scribes”), 4 (“the chief priests and officers”), 52, 66 (the Council of elders of the people..., both chief priests and scribes); 23:10 (“the chief priests and the scribes”), 13 (“the chief priests and the rulers and the people”); and 24:20 (“the chief priests and our rulers”).

291. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1451, regards this omission strange.

292. Mark 11:17/Luke 19:46; Mark 11:18/Luke 19:48; Mark 12:14/Luke 20:21; Mark 12:35/Luke 20:41; Mark 12:38/Luke 20:45; and Mark 14:49/Luke 22:53.

293. Luke 19:47/Mark 11:18; Luke 20:1/Mark 11:27; Luke 20:21/Mark 12:14; Luke 21:37/-; Luke 23:5/Mark 15:2-5.

294. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1089.

295. We also have to remember that Luke does not always avoid repetition. For example, Paul’s conversion story is told three times in *detail* in Acts (9:1-19; 22:3-16; 26:9-18).

296. See e.g. Luke 3:4; 4:21; 7:27; 9:31; 22:37; Acts 1:16; 2:16, 30-32; 3:18, 24; 8:28-35; 13:27, 33-41; and 28:25-27.

himself admits, Luke quotes Scriptures “similarly” elsewhere.²⁹⁷

In light of the evidence provided above, it is highly improbable that Luke’s sole source here was Mark. The widely supported combination theory (i.e., Luke reworked the Markan account with a help of a non-Markan source/tradition) cannot also offer a satisfactory explanation for the differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts. Rather than calling on a non-Markan source/tradition for help every time (and its help is very often needed, especially in the Passion Narrative) when the 2SH cannot satisfactorily explain differences between Luke and Mark, it is more logical to conclude that Luke did not derive any of his material from a canonical Mark.

Aland §§332-334 (Luke 22:54-23:1; Mark 14:53-15:1)

Few other sections in the Passion Narrative have prompted more source critical discussion than this one.²⁹⁸ Opinions are strongly divided. Some, including Finegan,²⁹⁹ Brown,³⁰⁰ Senior,³⁰¹ Soards,³⁰² and Matera,³⁰³ argue that Mark’s Gospel was Luke’s sole source in the entire section, in addition to some oral influence, while most, including Schneider,³⁰⁴ Fitzmyer (except Luke

297. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1452.

298. For good bibliographies, see Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*, 315–27, 563–67; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1090–92, 1097–98, 1100–03.

299. Finegan, *Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu*, 21–25.

300. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*, 485, 583.

301. Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 93–105.

302. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 118–19.

303. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies*, 170: “It does seem probably that Luke was drawing from some other traditions, although not necessarily another passion narrative, in his composition of the denial, mockery, and trial scenes.”

304. Schneider, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22,54–71*, 73–139; Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: Kapitel 11–24*, ÖTKNT 3 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1977), 463–70. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 442–43, summarizes Schneider’s view as follows: “Following an in-depth investigation of 22,54-71 Schneider concludes that Luke used a non-Markan source for the mockery and the beginning of the Sanhedrin trial as his primary source, but inserted the Markan account of Peter’s denial and added some vital information from the Markan version of the trial to round out the narrative. Most specifically, he ascribed the following verses to Mk: 22,54-61.64 (probably).69-71 and possibly a part of 66-67c. However, in 54.55.69-71 non-Markan influence was ‘nicht unmöglich’. A special non-Markan source was responsible for vv. 63-64.66-68, but some Markan influence was not excluded in 63.64.66-67. Lukan redaction was credited with 59a.b.61a(probably).64c.65a.b.70a.71d. Luke redacted all the material in the course of joining the Markan version of the denials with the non-Markan mockery and trial scene. It was probable, in Schneider’s estimation, that only vv. 67d-68b remained untouched by Lukan redaction.” For the development of Schneider’s source critical views on Luke 22:54-71, see Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 420–24, 430–43, 447–76.

22:54-62),³⁰⁵ D. R. Catchpole,³⁰⁶ Grundmann,³⁰⁷ Taylor (except Luke 22:54b-61),³⁰⁸ Marshall,³⁰⁹ Nolland,³¹⁰ Bock,³¹¹ Green,³¹² and G. S. Sloyan,³¹³ believe that Luke had access to an additional non-Markan source in the whole section, or at least in part of it; the non-Markan source played either a dominant or assisting role in the formation of the Lukan section. There are numerous reasons why many believe that Mark's Gospel was not Luke's sole source here. The first three are more general reasons; the rest are specific ones, related to particular sections in this episode:

First, the Lukan order of episodes differs notably from the Markan order, as shown in a footnote below.³¹⁴ In the Lukan account, the trial before the Sanhedrin occurs in the morning, whereas in the Markan account it occurs at night. Peter's denial and Jesus' mockery are also in reversed order in Mark and Luke. Two explanations have often been offered for the Lukan reordering of the trial episode: i) by reordering the material, "the hearings before the Sanhedrin, before Pilate, and before Herod come in a simple sequence,"³¹⁵ and ii) "[h]istorical probability favours the view that a decision was taken in the morning rather than by night."³¹⁶ Brown

305. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1456-58.

306. David R. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day*, SPB 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 153-220.

307. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 416, 418-19.

308. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 78, 80, 84.

309. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 838-51.

310. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1092-113.

311. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1775-77.

312. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 66-76.

313. Gerard S. Sloyan, *Jesus on Trial: The Study of the Gospels*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2006), 68.

<p>314. <u>Mark</u> [14:46 (the arrest)] (i) 14:53 (the council's gathering) (ii) 14:54 (Peter's denial, part 1)</p> <p> (iii) 14:55-61a (the trial, part 1) (iv) 14:61b-64 (the trial, part 2) (v) 14:65 (the mockery) (vi) 14:66-72 (Peter's denial, part 2) (vii) 15:1 (the council's consultation)</p>	<p> <u>Luke</u> 22:54a (the arrest)</p> <p> (ii) 22:54b-55 (Peter's denial, part 1) (vi) 22:56-62 (Peter's denial, part 2) (v) 22:63-65 (the mockery) (i) 22:66 (the council's gathering)</p> <p> (iv) 22:67-71 (the trial)</p>
--	--

315. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1104.

316. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 847. So also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1456.

questions the latter argument, stating that “there is little or no solid evidence” that the mishnaic rule (*m. Sanh.* 4.1) “that capital cases must be tried in the daytime” governed Sanhedrin proceedings in the first century. He also argues that the Markan night-time proceeding may well be historical.³¹⁷ Some scholars have tried to harmonize the Markan and Lukan trial episodes, suggesting that Mark and Luke narrate two different trials: the trial narrated in Luke followed the trial narrated in Mark.³¹⁸ Brown emphatically rejects this view:

By way of harmonizing many have argued that Luke [22:66, 67-71] does not narrate the trial session that Mark [14:55-64] puts during the night, but an enlarged form of the morning session in Mark [15:1]. That thesis should be rejected on three grounds: First, Luke in narrating the morning trial gives no indication of a previous night session and has left no room for one; second, the contents of the Lucan morning session are quite similar to a major part of the Marcan night session, but not to what Mark reports in the morning; and third, Mark [15:1] does not describe a morning session but simply the termination of the one and only session which took place at night.³¹⁹

If Mark and Luke record different trials, as some argue, then Luke must have drawn this episode from a non-Markan source. If Mark and Luke are recording the same trial, but one of the Evangelists has re-arranged the material, then it still remains highly probable that there is no direct relationship between the Markan and Lukan accounts: it is difficult to find any logical explanation for why Mark would have changed the time reference from morning to night, or why Luke would have changed the time reference from night to morning, if they were drawing their material from each other or a common source. Also, the first explanation above for the Lukan reordering of the trial episode cannot explain why Luke would have felt ‘forced’ to reject the Markan view that the trial occurred at night; if Luke reordered the Markan material in order to create a simple sequence with the trial before Peter and Herod, he could still have preserved the Markan time reference. Interestingly, he did not do so. Why?

317. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 421. For a further discussion of conflicts between trial procedures in the Gospels and Mishna, see Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 358–59; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1792.

318. See e.g., Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1779–80, 1791–92.

319. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 421.

Second, verbatim agreement percentages between the Lukan and Markan accounts are either low or very low throughout the section: i) in Aland §332 (Mark 14:53-65 par.) 9.0%³²⁰/19.5%,³²¹ ii) in Aland §333 (Mark 14:66-72 par.) 26.6%³²²/26.4%,³²³ and iii) in Aland §334 (Mark 15:1 par.) 0%³²⁴/17.4%.³²⁵ Such low agreement percentages do not require a literary dependency theory to explain the relationship between the Lukan and Markan accounts.

Third, there are a number of minor agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark.³²⁶ i) The Lukan (22:67) and Matthean (26:63b) indirect question regarding Jesus' status as Christ contradict the Markan (14:61b) direct question; ii) The vague confession of the Lukan Jesus (22:67b-68, 70b) and the Matthean Jesus (26:64a), that he is the Christ and the Son of God, contradict the clear answer of the Markan Jesus (14:62a); iii) ἡκολούθει (Luke 22:54b/Matt 26:58a); iv) In the Lukan (22:60, 61b) and Matthean (26:74b-75) episodes of Peter's denial, the cock crows only once,³²⁷ whereas in the Markan episode it crows twice, having an interval between the first and the second crow (17:72); v) τοῦ ῥήματος (Luke 22:61/Matt 26:75); vi) ἐξεληθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς (Luke 22:62/Matt 26:75b).³²⁸ This is one of the most significant minor agreements in the Gospels; vii) λέγοντες (Luke 22:64/Matt 26:68); and viii) τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε (Luke 22:64/Matt 26:68). The last is another significant minor agreement in the Gospels. There is no textual historical uncertainty regarding this saying.³²⁹ Minor agreements are

320. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 70. Linnemann has also included the words of Mark 14:55-61, which is absent from Luke.

321. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 62. The words of Mark 14:55-61a, which is absent from Luke, is not included.

322. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 70.

323. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 63.

324. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 70.

325. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 63. Morgenthaler has included Luke 22:66, whereas Linnemann has excluded it.

326. See Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, 579-84.

327. The same in the Johannine episode (18:27; cf. 13:38).

328. According to the UBS⁴ Committee, the Lukan text is certain, belonging to the category A. See NA²⁷ and Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151.

329. See NA²⁷. Frans Neirynck, "ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ: Mt 26:68/Lk 22L64 (Diff. Mk 14:65)," *ETL* 63, no. 1 (1987): 5-47, is open to the possibility that this saying is an early assimilation or interpolation.

so notable in the Peter's denial episode (Luke 22:54b-61 par.) that it is almost certain Luke and Matthew had access to a non-Markan source here.

The following four arguments question the view that Luke derived the Peter's denial episode (Luke 22:54b-62) from Mark:

Fourth, the locations of Peter's denial partly differ in Luke and Mark. While in Mark Peter moves to the gateway after his first denial at the fire, all three acts of denial take place at the fire in the courtyard in Luke.³³⁰ It is hard to find any convincing explanation for the Lukan rejection of the Markan locations in the last two cases if he was relying on the Markan account.

Fifth, Peter's challengers partly differ in Luke and Mark. While in Mark Peter is first challenged by the same maid servant (ἡ παιδίσκη, Mark 14:69) twice and then by the bystanders, in Luke he is challenged first by a maid servant and then twice by two different men.³³¹ Schneider suggests that Luke changed the second woman challenger to a man in order not to humiliate Peter too much.³³² This suggestion could explain this particular change, but in light of other inexplicable changes in this episode, including the Lukan change of the third challenger(s) from the bystanders to a single man, Schneider's explanation must be judged as artificial.

Sixth, the addresses of Peter's challengers differ in Luke and Mark.³³³ While in Mark the challenges are addressed to Peter himself, to the bystanders, and to Peter again, in Luke the challenges are addressed to the bystanders, to Peter himself, and to the bystanders, respectively. These changes make little sense if Luke used canonical Mark as his source.

Seventh, the forms of Peter's denial differ in Luke and Mark.³³⁴ The wording of Peter's denial differs in all three cases between Luke and Mark. One may wonder, for example, why Luke

330. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 65; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 839. In John's Gospel the denials occur in the following locations (John 18:16-27): i) at the door to the courtyard, ii) at the fire in the courtyard, and iii) at the fire in the courtyard. Thus, John's Gospel partly agrees with the Markan account and partly with the Lukan account.

331. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 65; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 839.

332. Schneider, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22,54-71*, 83-84.

333. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 65-66; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 839.

334. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 66-67.

did away with the word “Nazarene” (Ναζαρηνοῦ, Mark 14:67) in the Markan first denial, although Luke uses this Greek form once elsewhere (Luke 4:34).³³⁵ It is also interesting that the content of the Markan *first* denial (Mark 14:68) and the Lukan *third* denial (Luke 22:60) agree: in both cases, Peter pretends to be stupid, claiming not to have understood what the challenger stated.³³⁶ Again, these changes make little sense if Luke used canonical Mark as his source.

The following two arguments, in addition to the difference in order and the significant minor agreement of Luke 22:64b (see above), question the view that Luke derived the mockery episode (Luke 22:63-65) from Mark:

Eight, “[t]hough Peter has been mentioned more recently, αὐτόν, ‘him,’ in v 63 must be Jesus. This infelicity reflects not Lukan formulation on the basis of Mark 14:66 but rather the use of a source reproduced here without the antecedent of its source setting.”³³⁷

Ninth, Luke’s unique vocabulary describing Jesus’ mistreatment (ἐμπαίζω, δέρω, βλασφημέω contra to the Markan ἐμπτύω, κολαφίζω, ῥάπισμα) strongly suggests that Luke did not draw this material from canonical Mark.³³⁸

The following argument questions the view that Luke derived the trial episode (Luke 22:66) from Mark:

Tenth, Luke knows that the Sanhedrin consists of three groups of people: the high priests, elders, and scribes (Luke 9:22; 20:1; Acts 4:5-6 15), but in Luke 22:66 he seems to call the Sanhedrin itself as τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, suggesting that it consists of two groups of people: the high priests and scribes (apposition: ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς).³³⁹ Because Mark suggests in the

335. This form of Greek word (Ναζαρηνός,) occurs four times in Mark (1:24; 10:47; 14:67; 16:6). The form Ναζωραῖος is not found in Mark, but Luke uses it exclusively in Acts (2:22; 3:6; 4:10; 6:14; 22:8; 24:5; 26:9). It is interesting that, in one case, when Mark (10:47) uses the former form, Luke (18:37) uses the latter form. This may again be a hint that Luke did not derive Aland §264 (Luke 18:35-43 par.) from canonical Mark. See also Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 842.

336. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke*, 84.

337. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1098. So also Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1789.

338. Cf. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1789; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 66–67; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1099.

339. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 848; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1466. Whether the Sanhedrin and the whole body of the elders of Israel in Acts 5:21 are regarded by Luke as two

parallel passage that the Sanhedrin consisted of three groups of people (Mark 14:53; 15:1), it is unlikely that Luke would have used canonical Mark as his source here.

The following two arguments question the view that Luke derived the trial episode (Luke 22:66b-71) from Mark 14:55-65:

Eleventh, the Lukan account lacks the Markan reference to false testimonies and the charge against the temple (Mark 14:55-61a). The 'omission' is explained in various ways. Brown suggests that Luke omitted the section in order to use it in the Stephen trial in Acts 6:11-14.³⁴⁰ The explanation runs against the fact that, elsewhere Luke often, seems to intentionally create parallelism between the lives of Jesus and the apostle (the Gospel and Acts) and between the lives of Peter and Paul (Acts). Matera proposes that Luke omitted the charge against the temple in the Gospel in order to avoid "any impression that Jesus spoke against the temple."³⁴¹ If so, why has Luke included this accusation in Acts 6:14, where Jesus is clearly claimed to have spoken against temple? Matera also suggests that "[t]he absence of the temple charge allows him [Luke] to focus more sharply upon the messianic question" in Luke 22:67-71.³⁴² If this was Luke's only concern in this episode, then he should have also excluded a great deal of other material in Luke 22:54-71 which could potentially move the reader's focus from Christology to something else.³⁴³ – This account in Mark emphasizes Jesus' innocence: the Jewish leaders cannot bring forward true evidence against Jesus; only false witnesses whose testimonies do not agree (Mark 14:55-59). If the consensus view that Luke attempted to show Jesus as an innocent victim is correct, it is really surprising that Luke has not included Mark 14:55-61a in his account, if he had access to it.

distinctive groups (so NRSV) or the same group (so NASB; καὶ = even) is not clear.

340. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 484. Paul was also accused of speaking against the temple (Acts 21:28).

341. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies*, 173.

342. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies*, 173.

343. Frank Connolly-Weinert, "Assessing Omissions as Redaction: Luke's Handling of the Charge Against Jesus as Detractor of the Temple," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honour of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, eds. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 361–63, offers a few other explanations for the Lukan omission. However, none of them is convincing.

Twelfth, the structure of the Lukan christological confession significantly differs from the Markan one. While in Mark “the Christ” and “the Son of the Blessed” (i.e., the Son of God) are clearly synonymous, being parts of one question (Mark 14:61b), in Luke these two titles are introduced in two separate questions (Luke 22:67a, 70a). Some have suggested that Luke, while editing Mark, separated these two titles from christological reasons: the former title being a reference to Jesus’ humanity, while the latter title being a reference to Jesus’ divinity.³⁴⁴ Although many people hold this view, it can be questioned. As already noted, these two titles were basically synonymous to Mark.³⁴⁵ “The Christ” is clearly a messianic title, but “the Son of the Blessed” is problematic. Although the latter title (in the form ‘sons of God’) is used for angels (Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; Dan 3:25), Israel (Exod 4:22-23; Hos 11:1; Mal 2:10) and the king (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 89:26-27) in the OT, before the recovery of the Qumran texts, there was no evidence that this title or concept was used in a messianic sense in early Judaism. The Qumran texts 4QFlor 1:10-14; 1QSa 2:11-12; 4QpsDan A^a (4Q246)³⁴⁶ now, however, demonstrate that the title or concept was used in a messianic sense in Jesus’ lifetime. If both terms were understood messianically by the members of the Sanhedrin, why then was Jesus accused of blasphemy by the Sanhedrin when Jesus admitted to being the Messiah (Mark 14:61b-62a)?³⁴⁷ There is no evidence that the self-confession of messiahship was regarded blasphemous in ancient Judaism (cf. Luke 7:18-19, 27; John 10:24; Bar Kochba).³⁴⁸ In my opinion, the most likely reason for the offence was that the Sanhedrin could not regard *Jesus*, who was seen as an apostate by the leaders (Mark 14:55-60;

344. So e.g. John J. Kilgallen, “Jesus’ First Trial: Messiah and Son of God (Luke 22,66–71),” *Bib* 80, no. 3 (1999): 403; Joel Marcus, “Mark 14:61: ‘Are You the Messiah-Son-of-God?’,” *NovT* 31 (1989): 140; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1467–68.

345. Joel Marcus, “Mark 14:61”, rejects the view that these two titles were synonymous in Mark, but his argument is not convincing.

346. As for 4QpsDan A^a, see R. H. Eisenman and M. O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Rockport: Element, 1992), 68–71.

347. This does not mean that Mark would not have understood the title “Son of the Blessed” in a deeper sense. He does. For him, Jesus is equal to God who only can forgive sins (Mark 2:7, 10) and who sits at God’s right hand as the ‘crown prince’ (Mark 12:35-37).

348. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus*, 132.

15:4, 29; cf. 2:7), as the Messiah.³⁴⁹ The idea that an *apostate* would claim to be the Messiah was viewed as blasphemy.³⁵⁰ A similar conclusion may be drawn from the Lukan version.³⁵¹ When Jesus is asked by the members of the Sanhedrin whether he is Christ, he does not give a clear answer but instead tells them that from now on he would be seated at the right hand of God. Jesus refers to Dan 7:13, which was understood messianically in some Jewish circles (*1 En.* 37-71, 4 *Ezra* 13). From this, the Sanhedrin draws the conclusion that Jesus *then* (οὐν) is the Son of God. The word “then” in the context suggests that the Sanhedrin understood the term messianically, not as a reference to Jesus’ divinity.³⁵² There is no evidence that the Messiah was regarded as divine among early non-Christian Jews.³⁵³ If both Mark and Luke use the two titles (i.e., the

349. Before the discovery of the Qumran texts, it was often argued that the Christian understanding of the title “Son of God” was read by Mark to the meaning: the members of the Sanhedrin were offended because Jesus claimed to be not only a human being (i.e., Christ) but also a divine being (i.e., Son of God). The view is still held by many: Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 471, 480–83; Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 103–04.

The Matthean version (26:63b-68) is very similar to the Markan version. Note that after the Sanhedrin had drawn the conclusion that Jesus had blasphemed, those who mistreated Jesus did not say to him, “Prophecy to us, you *Son of God*,” but “Prophecy to us, you *Christ*” (Matt 26:68; NASB). This suggests that the offense was not that Jesus claimed to be a divine person but that he claimed to be the Messiah.

Marc Turnage, “Jesus and Caiaphas: An Intertextual-Literary Evaluation,” in *Jesus’ Last Week*, eds. R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker, Jewish and Christian Perspective Series 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 140–41, argues that “[t]he double question in Luke... seems to derive from a more primitive account of this inquisition than do the simple questions found in Matthew and Mark. The simple question posed to Jesus in Matthew... and Mark... seemingly betrays a later Christian redaction of the material, for assumed within the singular form of this question lies the assumption that the titles Messiah and Son of God are necessarily equivalent – a notion more reflective of later Christian theology.”

350. Cf. the controversy between the Qumran community and the Jerusalemite leadership. Both groups regarded each other as apostate and rejected each other’s claim of being God’s representatives. The Qumran community called a certain Jerusalemite high priest (?) “the wicked priest” whose authority was rejected (see e.g., 1QpHab 8.8-13; 8.16-9.2; 9.9-12; 12.2-10) and the Jerusalemite leadership persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness and his community (see e.g., 1QpHab 9.9-12; 4Q171 4.7-9; CD 1.14-2.1).

351. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus*, 86, summarizes well three different views regarding the titles “Christ” and “Son of God” in the Lukan trial episode: “Some make the two titles express two separate charges; others absorb messiahship into the transcendence presumed to be inherent in Son of God, so that messiahship itself becomes superhuman in character; a third group, more loyal to the Mk 14.61 formulation, understand Son of God as only a title of the entirely human messiah.”

352. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1111, correctly argues that “[f]or Luke, to be ‘Son of God’ is an exalted status and relationship to God experienced by the messiah (cf. at 3:22; 1:26-38), but in the present question the words should be taken as no more than a synonym for ‘messiah’...”

353. Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 155–216, demonstrates that early Jewish Christians, however, began to see Jesus as divine soon after Jesus’ resurrection.

Christ and the Son of the Blessed/God) in a messianic sense in this context, then there is no reason to argue that Luke separated those two terms from the christological reason. To adopt the Markan version as is would have been much more economical for Luke. This and minor agreements in this section suggest that Luke drew the section from a non-Markan source.

In sum, considering the evidence presented above, it is unlikely that Luke used canonical Mark or combined Mark with a non-Markan source in Luke 22:54-71, as most scholars argue.

Aland §§334, 336 (Luke 23:1-5; Mark 15:1-5)

Scholarly opinions on whether this section was derived by Luke from Mark's Gospel, a non-Markan source, or from both of these sources, are again strongly divided. Those who argue that Luke drew this material from Mark include Bultmann, Creed, Dibelius, Fitzmyer, Klostermann, Schneider, and Brown, whereas those who believe that Luke derived the section from a non-Markan source, or combined it with Mark, include Taylor, Ernst, Rengstorf, Grundmann, Marshall, Green, Nolland, and Block.³⁵⁴ Several reasons support the latter view (see also "Jesus as the King/Aland §339" in chapter two).

First, there are significant differences in content between the Lukan and Markan accounts. There is no true Markan parallel to Luke 23:2, 4-5, and no Lukan parallel to Mark 15:3-5. While in the Markan account Jewish leaders do not present to Pilate any specific charges against Jesus (see Mark 15:3-4, 14),³⁵⁵ in Luke 23:2 they bring forward three (or two) charges: "We found this man perverting (διαστρέφοντα)...., and (καί) forbidding (κωλύοντα)...., and (καί) saying (λέγοντα)..."³⁵⁶ Also, while the Markan Pilate does not declare Jesus innocent at this point, the

354. See Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 1), 737; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1806-7.

355. Pilate's question, "Are you the King of the Jews?" (Mark 15:2), however, suggests that Jewish leaders had brought forward the accusation that Jesus had claimed to be Christ (i.e., the King of the Jews; cf. Mark 15:32), before Pilate asked this question from Jesus.

356. Schneider, "The Political Charge Against Jesus (Lk 23:2)," 408, argues that twofold rather than threefold accusation is brought against Jesus: "The twofold καί does not bind together three participles paratactically, but καί κωλύοντα and also καί λέγοντα are subordinate to the διαστρέφοντα," but this is grammatically unlikely, although this view has found some support (so e.g. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* [Vol. 1], 738; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1117-18; NET, NIV, NJB). Most commentators, as Schneider (p. 407) admits, hold that Luke 23:2 must be understood as a threefold accusation (so e.g., Marshall, *The Gospel of*

Lukan Pilate (Luke 23:4), and the Johannine Pilate (18:38b), do. Jesus is declared innocent three times in both the Lukan (23:4, 14, 22) and Johannine (18:38; 19:4, 6) accounts.³⁵⁷

Second, except for Luke 23:3, there is no verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts;³⁵⁸ these accounts share only six common words: ὁ, δέ, Πιλάτος, κατηγορέω, ἀρχιερέως, and αὐτός.³⁵⁹ Luke 23:3 agrees almost word for word with Mark 15:2, but as impressive as this may look at first, it loses its force when it is realized that in the narrative of John's Gospel the question and answer are also identical.³⁶⁰ Marshall rightly concludes that "[i]f Luke were drawing purely on Mk., it would be inexplicable why he had left this one verse unedited."³⁶¹

Third, the word παραδίδωμι is missing in Luke 23:1 (present in Mark 15:1b), although Luke emphasizes the theme of Jesus' deliverance into the hands of people/Gentiles elsewhere.³⁶² The omission is especially difficult to explain in this case if Luke would have had access to the account of canonical Mark.

Fourth, the high concentration of Lukan vocabulary in this episode³⁶³ does not prove, as

Luke, 852; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1810–11; ASV, NAV, NKJV, NRS). Many hold, without proper justification, that the first accusation (διαστρέφοντα) must be understood as a political rather than a moral (or religious; cf. Acts 6:14) accusation. Roman rulers, in general, were interested in the welfare of the nation.

357. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1115.

358. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 63.

359. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 77.

360. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 79.

361. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 852. However, Marshall believes that Luke 23:3 is based on Mark, although the surrounding narrative is not. In my opinion, it is more likely that nothing in this section is based on canonical Mark.

362. See Luke 9:44 (Mark 9:31); Luke 18:32 (Mark 10:33); Luke 22:4, 6 (Mark 14:10, 11); Luke 22:21, 22 (Mark 14:21; the first Lukan reference missing in Mark); Luke 22:48 (missing in Mark); Luke 23:25 (Mark 15:15); Luke 24:7 (missing in Mark); Luke 24:20 (missing in Mark); and Acts 3:13.

The Greek word occurs 31 times in Matthew, 20 times in Mark, 17 times in Luke, 15 times in John, and 13 times in Acts.

363. See Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 300–01; Schneider, "The Political Charge Against Jesus [Lk 23:2]," 409–12.

Words and phrases in Luke 23:1–5 which notably occur more often in Luke's double work than in other Gospels:

Luke 23:1: i) ἀνίστημι: Luke 27, Mark 17, Matt 4, Acts 45; ii) ἅπας: Luke 11, Mark 4, Matt 3, Acts 12; iii) πᾶς: Luke 8, Mark 2, Matt 0, Acts 16; iv) ἅπαν τὸ πᾶν: only in Luke 8:37; 19:37; 23:1; Acts 25:24; v) ἄγω: Luke 13, Mark 3, Matt 4, Acts 26; John 13.

Luke 23:2: i) κατηγορέω: Luke 4 [the significance questionable], Mark 3, Matt 2, Acts 9; ii) οὗτος: Luke

often assumed, that Luke edited the *Markan* account³⁶⁴ or that he created part of it without relying on sources.³⁶⁵ The high concentration of Lukan vocabulary could also be present even if Luke edited a non-Markan source. A comparison of the use of ‘Lukan’ words found in this pericope and elsewhere in Luke and Mark question the theory that Luke used canonical Mark as his source in general: sometimes, Luke does not adopt a ‘Lukan’ word found in the parallel Markan pericope but, instead, uses a ‘non-Lukan’ word in its place or totally omits the word.³⁶⁶

In light of powerful evidence, it is unlikely that Luke derived this pericope, or parts of it, from canonical Mark.

Aland §§337-339 (Luke 23:6-23; Mark 15:6-14)

Luke 23:6-23 consists of three pericopes: i) Jesus before Herod (23:6-12), ii) Pilate Declares Jesus Innocent (23:13-16), and iii) Jesus or Barabbas? (23:17-23). Only the last pericope has a parallel in Mark. Because it is already discussed in chapter two along with two other pericopes (see “Jesus as the King” / Aland §339), there is no need to revisit them in any detail. It will suffice to remember that there is no scholarly consensus regarding Luke’s source here,

229, Mark 79, Matt 147, Acts 236, John 336; iii) εὐρίσκω: Luke 45, Mark 11, Matt 27, Acts 35 [not unusually common], John 33; iv) διαστρέφω: Luke 2, Mark 0, Matt 1, Acts 3, Phil 1; v) ἔθνος: Luke 13; Mark 6; Matt 15; Acts 43; vi) κωλύω: Luke 6, Mark 3, Matt 1, Acts 6; vii) φόρος: Luke 2 [the significance questionable], Mark 0, Matt 0, Rom 2.

Luke 23:4: i) αἴτιος: Luke 3, Mark 0, Matt 0, Acts 1; Heb 1; ii) εἶπεν πρὸς: Luke 35; Mark 0; Matt 1; Acts 10.

364. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1807.

365. In fact, it is difficult to be certain about what constitute Lukan vocabulary because at least part of the vocabulary, thought to be Lukan, could have been drawn by Luke from non-Markan source(s).

366. I will take five words found in Luke 23:1-5 as an example: i) ἀνίστημι: Luke uses the word much more often than other Evangelists. However, sometimes the word is missing in a Lukan pericope, although present in the parallel Markan account (particularly interesting verses italicized): Mark 1:35/Luke 4:42 (missing); 2:14/5:28; 3:26/11:18 (missing); 5:42/8:55; 7:24/no parallel; 8:31/9:22 (*missing*); 9:9, 10/9:36f (missing); 9:27/9:42 (missing); 9:31/9:44 (*missing*); 10:1/9:51 (missing); 10:34/18:33; 12:25/20:35 (a noun, not a verb); 14:57, 60/no parallel; 16:9/no parallel; ii) ἅπας: Mark 1:27/Luke 4:36 (missing; Luke uses another word); 8:25/no parallel; 11:32/20:6; 16:15/no parallel; iii) ἄγω: Mark 1:38/Luke 4:43 (missing); [13:11/12:11 (missing; Q); 14:42/22:46f (missing); iv) οὗτος: The word occurs much more often in Luke than in Mark, but is often missing in Luke when found in the Markan parallel pericope: e.g., Mark 1:27/Luke 4:36 (missing); 2:8/5:22 (missing); 4:13/8:11 (missing); 14:71/22:60 (missing); v) φημί: Mark 9:12/no parallel; 9:38/9:49 (missing); 10:20/18:21 (missing); 10:29/18:29 (missing); 12:24/20:34 (missing); 14:29/22:33 (missing). It is interesting that Luke uses this word in Luke 23:3, although he does not use it in the previous verses.

especially regarding the trial episode before Herod.³⁶⁷ Some scholars, including Harrington, argue “that Lk 23,6-12.(13-16) is Lukan redaction rather than tradition,”³⁶⁸ “using Markan materials he omitted in parallel places namely Mk 3,6; 6,14-29; 15,16-20.”³⁶⁹ Harrington offers ten arguments in support of his view,³⁷⁰ most of which, however, are regarded as weak by many commentators. Some, including Brown, maintain that Luke interwove early tradition of Herod Antipas with some Markan material.³⁷¹ Still others, including Nolland, suggest that the episode was “part of Luke’s second connected passion source.”³⁷²

Aland §341 (Luke 23:24-25; Mark 15:15)

This pericope is the end of the trial episode in all four Gospels. Although the Lukan and Markan pericopes agree that Pilate released Barabbas and condemned Jesus, I doubt that Luke derived this pericope from canonical Mark. There are two reasons for my belief. First, verbatim

367. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 691–709, has divided source critical views of the Herod episode to nine different categories: i) Continuous source or tradition (Harrington lists 37 names of scholars), ii) Separate source of traditions (74 names), iii) Unspecified sources independent of Mark (7 names), iv) Unspecified source(s) in conjunction with Mark (4 names), v) Historical account with no reference to nature and extent of source (38 names), vi) Lukan composition (86 names). Harrington includes very different approaches under this category [“A) Based on traditional materials, B) Lukan redaction of Mk, C) Arising from Ps 2, D) influenced by Paul’s experience recounted in Acts, E) Using other materials (Derrell)” (p. 698)], vii) The Herod pericope was inspired by Matthew’s Gospel (2 names), viii) Non-historical without further information (4 names), ix) Undetermined: provided no information on source of Herod pericope (60 names).

368. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 711. So also Karlheinz Müller, “Jesus vor Herodes: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23,6–12,” in *Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*, eds. Josef Blank et al., QD 87 (Freiburg: Herder, 1979), 111–41.

369. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 802. So also Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 77–80.

370. Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*, 711–12: “1) the story is found only in Lk; 2) similarly, ‘it is remotely unlikely that the account is historical, since it is not in Mark, and the substance of the story is found in Mk 15,4f., 16f.’ [Goulder, *Luke*, Vol. 2, p. 757]; 3) it fits well in its context; 4) the passage contains Markan material omitted in parallel places in Lk, especially details about the death of John the Baptist (Mk 6,17-29), and other information found in Mk: the silence of Jesus (Mk 15,3f.), the mockery (Mk 15,16-20a), and the charges raised by the religious authorities (Mk 15,3); 5) both the style and vocabulary are Lukan; 6) the episode emphasizes the Lukan theme of innocence, theology, and apologetics (e.g. to excuse Pilate and assign greater responsibility to the Jews); 7) there are similarities with Paul’s trials in Acts; 8) there is no clear reason why Pilate sent Jesus to Herod; 9) there was insufficient time for Herod’s trial to take place, and 10) the episode seems to lack purpose or significance.”

371. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah (Vol. 1)*, 785–86. So also Marion L. Soards, “Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Luke’s Account of Jesus Before Herod Antipas,” *Bib* 66 (1985): 344–63.

372. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1122.

agreement between the Lukan and Markan pericopes is minimal, consisting of only five words: Πιλάτος, ἀπέλυσεν, τόν (2x), and Ἰησοῦν. Second, the grammatical structure of the Markan text is much simpler, better and economical than that of the Lukan one. It is difficult to imagine that Luke would have wanted to complicate his sentence structure, if he did have access to the Markan version. In addition, the transition from the previous Lukan pericope (23:17-23) to the present one would have remained smooth with Markan wording.³⁷³

Aland §342 (Mark 15:16-20a)

This section has already been discussed in chapter two.

Aland §343 (Luke 23:26-32; Mark 15:20b-21)

This pericope consists of three pieces of material: i) Luke 23:26, ii) 23:27-31; and iii) 23:32. Commentators generally agree that 23:26 is a Lukan redaction of Mark 15:20b-21, that Luke 23:27-31 is non-Markan,³⁷⁴ and that Luke 23:32 may have been inspired by Mark 15:27. There are, however, a few reasons to argue that Luke might not have used canonical Mark as his source for 23:26, 32.

First, the level of verbatim agreement (36.0%³⁷⁵) between Luke 23:26 and Mark 15:20b-21 does not require literary dependency. The shared words are common, without which the story could hardly be told: καὶ, αὐτόν, Σίμωνα, Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀργοῦ, τὸν σταυρὸν. The two accounts, however, must have the same root.

373. If Luke had still wanted to emphasize Barabbas' identity as a criminal (see Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* [Vol. 1], 850), he could have done it easily within the Markan sentence structure: "So, wishing to satisfy the crowd, Pilate released for them Barabbas [who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder], and after having Jesus scourged, he handed Him over to be crucified."

374. For further discussion of Luke 23:27-31, see Untergaßmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu*, 13-33, 125-45; Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 304-05; Marion L. Soards, "Tradition, Composition and Theology in Jesus' Speech to the 'Daughters of Jerusalem' (Luke 23:26-32)," *Bib* 68 (1987): 228-39; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1135-38; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 87-89; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1836-39, 1843-48.

375. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 64.

Second, the different antecedents of “they” in Luke 23:26 and its Markan parallel (15:20b) may suggest separate sources. While the antecedents in the Markan episode are the Roman soldiers (Mark 15:16-20a), in the Lukan episode the antecedents are the Jews (cf. Luke 23:13, 25). It is often argued that the different reference in Luke is accidental, caused by Luke’s omission of the Markan episode of the Jesus Mockery by the Soldiers (Mark 15:16-20a).³⁷⁶ This is possible, although Luke in general is a careful editor. It is interesting, however, that John’s Gospel makes the same point: Jesus was handed over to the Jews to be crucified (John 19:17a; cf. 19:14b-16a, 18), even though in John (19:16b, 23), contra to Luke, the Roman soldiers actually crucified him. This subtle Lukan agreement with John, along with many other agreements between these two Gospels in the Passion Narrative – as we have seen earlier – may suggest that Luke was relying on a tradition which had some likeness with the Johannine tradition.

Third, both Luke (23:26a) and Matthew (27:31b) use the verb ἀπάγω (“lead away”) rather than the Markan (15:20b) verb ἐξάγω (“lead out”).³⁷⁷ This minor agreement could be “fortuitous,”³⁷⁸ but it could also be a subtle sign of a source critical problem here.

Fourth, mentioning the two other criminals who were crucified with Jesus in Luke 23:32 is repetitious and uneconomical because Luke mentions them again in 23:33b and 23:39-43. The most efficient way would have been to first mention them in 23:33b (cf. John 19:18) or in Luke 23:34b, as Mark does (15:27), or even as late as in Luke 23:30, which introduces the episode of the discussion between Jesus and the two criminals. If Luke did in fact have a copy of canonical Mark in his usage, it is difficult to find any solid reason for why he mentions the criminals already

376. E.g. Soards, “Tradition, Composition and Theology in Jesus’ Speech to the ‘Daughters of Jerusalem’ (Luke 23:26-32),” 227; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1136.

377. Luke uses both verbs elsewhere in his double work: ἀπάγω occurs four times in Luke’s Gospel and twice times in Acts, and ἐξάγω occurs once in Luke’s Gospel and eight times in Acts. In the present Lukan context, ἀπάγω may be a more accurate verb because in the Lukan story, unlike in the Markan story, Jesus was not taken *inside* the palace, that is the praetorium (cf. Mark 15:16, which is missing in Luke; cf. John 18:28). But, why does Matthew also use the same verb as Luke, although, according to his account, like in Mark, Jesus was taken *inside* the palace?

378. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1135.

in 23:32. A non-Markan source, as Marshall suggests, may be “responsible for their inclusion at this point.”³⁷⁹

Aland §344 (Luke 23:33-34; Mark 15:22-26)

The most widely held view among commentators seems to be that Luke had access to two sources here: Mark, and a fragmentary or continuous non-Markan source.³⁸⁰ Opinions are divided regarding whether Luke inserted some Markan material into a non-Markan framework or some non-Markan material into a Markan framework. For example, Taylor and Nolland give their votes to the former view, suggesting only minimal influence of the Markan account on Luke.³⁸¹ Fitzmyer, on the other hand, is inclined to think the latter option is more probable.³⁸² Arguments presented in support of the view that Luke must have had access to another source beside Mark are as follows:

First, verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan accounts is not impressive (26.1%³⁸³), consisting of common words, some of them also being found in the parallel Johannine account: 4 of 12 words in Mark 15:22/Luke 23:33a (καί, ἐπὶ τόν, τόπον); 0 of 9 words in 15:23; 1 of 3 words in 15:24a/23:33b (αὐτόν); 3 of 12 words in 15:24b/23:34c (τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ; Luke 23:34c and John 19:24 share the following words: τὰ ἱμάτια, ἔβαλον); 0 of 7 words in 15:25; 6 of 12 words in 15:26/23:38 (καί, ἐπιγραφή, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; the last four words are also found in John 19:19); and 4 of 14 words in 15:27/23:33c (καί, ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἔξ). These agreements do not require literary dependency of Luke on Mark, nor do they rely on canonical Mark as his source.

379. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 866.

380. So e.g., Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1500; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1142; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 866–68; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1838–39; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 94; see also Untergaßmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu*, 109.

381. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 92–96; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1142–46.

382. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1500.

383. Morgenthaller, *Statistische Synopse*, 64. The percentage is based on the comparison between Mark 15:22-27 and Luke 23:33-34, 38. Morgenthaller’s table has one mistake: only one, not two, of three words in Mark 15:24a/Luke 23:33b agree in verbatim.

Second, the Lukan and Johannine Passion Narratives continue to share some common points in this episode.³⁸⁴ The least controversial point is the statement of the crucifixion of two other men immediately after the mention of Jesus' crucifixion (Luke 23:33b/John 19:18). Some scholars also regard the common omissions in Luke and John as weighty: omissions of the reference to wine (Mark 15:23) and the time of the crucifixion (Mark 15:25).³⁸⁵ These similarities are interesting, but they do not prove that Luke or John used the other as his source because the Johannine and Markan accounts also have commonalities not found in Luke. Here the use of the word 'Golgotha' (Mark 15:22/John 19:17) and the mention of the *titulus* above Jesus (Mark 15:26/John 19:19) at the same sequence are such examples. These agreements are explained in various ways.³⁸⁶ In my opinion, the most likely explanation is that, prior to the Gospels, the Markan tradition – which might have been partly written, partly oral – developed in different directions and these different branches of the Markan tradition interacted with some elements of another major gospel tradition, i.e., the Johannine one. This may also explain why certain elements in John agree with Luke and some with Mark. This theory may also explain, as I argue in this work, why Luke sometimes seems to be unaware of some of the elements found in Mark's Gospel.

Third, Luke uses a different Greek word for 'left' (23:33; ἀριστερός) than Mark (15:27; ἐξώνυμος), although, as Marshall correctly notes, these words are "synonymous and there is no obvious reason for a change by Luke."³⁸⁷ In addition, Luke uses ἐξώνυμος once elsewhere (Acts 21:3), but not ἀριστερός.³⁸⁸

384. For more details, see my comments above and below, and John Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*; Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?*.

385. So e.g., Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1142.

386. I.e., similarities are accidental, or due to John's use of all the Synoptic Gospels or John's use of Luke's Gospel as a supplement (John Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*) or Luke's use of the Johannine tradition as a supplement (Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?*).

387. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 867.

388. The word ἀριστερός occurs 4 times in the NT and 65 times in the LXX, while ἐξώνυμος is found 9 times in the NT and 19 times in the LXX.

Fourth, the reference to the time of the crucifixion is missing in Luke's episode (cf. Mark 15:25). The presence of two other time references in the Passion Narrative – i.e., the sixth (Luke 23:44) and ninth (Luke 23:44) hour, which are also found in the parallel Markan texts – only highlights “[t]he enigmatic nature of this deletion.”³⁸⁹ Fitzmyer suggests that Luke eliminated the initial reference “probably because the early morning session of the Sanhedrin and the appearance of Jesus before Herod would make the ‘third hour’ [Mark 15:25] implausible.”³⁹⁰ This explanation is unbelievable for two reasons: i) It is unlikely that Luke, who as a nonresident of Jerusalem was hardly aware of how much time it would have taken to move from the Sanhedrin to Pilate's and Herod's places and to the Calvary, deleted the Markan time reference in order to correct Mark's ‘unrealistic’ timeline.³⁹¹ More importantly, ii) the time reference is also missing in the parallel Matthean episode (27:33-37), although the procedure of Jesus' trial in Matthew is very similar to that in Mark.

Fifth, the absence of the reference to “wine mixed with myrrh” (Mark 15:23) in the Lukan episode may also support the view that Luke did not know the Markan episode in its present form, especially if the ‘traditional’ explanation of the verse is accepted. According to the traditional view, based mainly on *b. Sanh.* 43a, the wine mixed with myrrh was offered to people condemned to death in order to ease their pain.³⁹² If this explanation is accepted, it is astonishing

389. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 92.

390. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1501.

391. For Luke time references are not irrelevant as the following passages show: Luke 22:59; 24:33; Acts 2:15; 3:1; 5:7; 10:3, 9, 30; 16:30; 19:34; and 23:23.

392. The traditional explanation is rejected, for example, by Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 500–01 and Erkki Koskeniemi, Kirsi Nisula, and Jorma Toppari, “Wine Mixed with Myrrh (Mark 15.23) and Crurifragium (John 9.31–32): Two Details of the Passion Narratives,” *JSNT* 27/4 (2005): 379–86, 389. Evans argues that “A Jewish custom would scarcely serve as a guide. Wine mixed with myrrh or other perfumes was thought of a delicacy (cf. Pliny, *Nat.* 14.15 §92: ‘The finest wine in early days was that spiced with the scent of myrrh’; 14.19 §107). It is probable, then, that the offer of fine wine to Jesus was in fact part of the ongoing mockery (cf. vv 29-32). In effect, the soldiers were offering the finest wine to the ‘king of the Jews’ (p. 501). Koskeniemi et al. argue in their very informative article that the wine mixed with myrrh was a method of torture. Based on their own experiment they write, “The pieces of resin do not taste very bitter. When some myrrh was added to red wine, however, the result was a surprise. Within ten minutes the pieces started to dissolve in the wine. In two hours the wine was corrupted, and the next morning the saturated solution was as impossible to drink as gasoline or vinegar. This simple experiment seems to solve the question of why wine was mixed with myrrh. Although a small amount of myrrh was often used in wine to preserve it, myrrh in excess served a very different

that Luke has not retained the Markan verse “which would have underlined the martyr spirit of Jesus,” since Jesus refused to taste the analgesic drink.³⁹³ For this reason, Marshall concludes that the Markan reference to the wine mixed with myrrh “was missing from his [Luke’s] non-Markan source.”³⁹⁴ A more logical explanation, however, is that Luke did not have access to canonical Mark at all, because if he had, as Marshall believes, Luke could have easily inserted the verse from Mark into his own work, even though that verse would not have occurred in his non-Markan source.

Only a handful of scholars maintain that Luke’s sole source here was Mark. The view that Luke had access to both Mark and a non-Markan source is widely held. Nolland, who argues for the existence of a connected non-Markan Passion Narrative beside Mark, summarizes his view as follows:

The case for a second Lukan source here is fairly weak, but given the extensive evidence for the presence of a second Lukan source for the passion material up to this point, it is hard not to believe that at least a large part of this second source material has come from a connected passion narrative. In turn, it is impossible that such a narrative lacked an account of the crucifixion. For this reason, even rather modest evidence should be allowed to tip the scales in favor of a second Lukan source here [vv. 33-38].³⁹⁵

In light of the evidence provided above, an even more logical explanation is that Luke did not have access to canonical Mark in addition to a non-Markan source. If he did have access to Mark, he could have easily drawn, for example, the time reference from Mark 15:25, even if that failed to appear in his non-Markan source.

Aland §345 (Luke 23:35-38; Mark 15:27-32a)

This section has already been discussed in chapter two.

purpose” (p. 385). Our text, however, does not reveal how much myrrh had been added to the wine. Therefore we are not able to draw any firm conclusion about the purpose of the myrrh here.

393. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 867. It is often argued by scholars that Luke wants to depict Jesus as the one who faces his death calmly and in full consciousness.

394. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 867.

395. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1142.

Aland §346 (Luke 23:39-43; Mark 15:32b)

Apart from the first verse of the Lukan episode, which bears some resemblance to Mark 15:32b, the Lukan pericope is unique. The section has several Lukan theological emphases,³⁹⁶ but only some of its language is characteristically Lukan.³⁹⁷ This inconsistent evidence has led scholars to two very different conclusions. Some, including Bultmann³⁹⁸ and Matera,³⁹⁹ focus on the artistic structure of Luke 23:35-43 (three episodes of mockery) and theological emphases of the section, arguing that the section is a Lukan creation. Others, including Fitzmyer⁴⁰⁰ and Green,⁴⁰¹ draw attention to the scarcity of typically Lukan vocabulary and maintain that Luke drew the episode from his non-Markan source but edited it (slightly).

Opinions regarding the relationship between Luke 23:39 and Mark 15:32b are again divided. According to the Markan account, both criminals reviled Jesus, whereas according to the Lukan account, only one of them railed at him. The discrepancy is explained in two different ways: i) Harmonistic explanation: Both criminals mocked Jesus at first but one of them changed his mind later. This explanation relates back to the church fathers;⁴⁰² ii) Two different sources: Luke knew the Markan reference but corrected it in light of his second source.⁴⁰³ All these explanations are theoretically possible, however, one may wonder why Luke would have wanted to create so much unnecessary tension between his and the Markan account if he really knew the

396. For a good discussion of the issue, see Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 134–40.

397. For more details, see Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 306–07; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 94–95; Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 95–96. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1507, holds that “Lukan redaction in this episode is at a minimum.”

398. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 157, 283, 302, 309.

399. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies*, 184.

400. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1507.

401. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 95.

402. See Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1856.

403. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1507. Plummer’s (Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 533–34) view is very similar to Fitzmyer’s. He argues that “Mt. and Mk. regard the two λητᾱί as a class, to which the conduct of either of them may be attributed. Christ’s conversation with the penitent robber would not be heard by many... Mt. and Mk. would hardly have omitted the incident of the penitent robber, if they had known it; but here Lk. once more has other source of information” (p. 534).

Markan reference. It would have been very easy for Luke to release the tension by including a short explanatory comment stating that one of the criminals changed his mind. Because Luke does not make any efforts to relieve this tension, I assume he did not know the Markan reference.

Aland §§347-348 (Luke 23:44-49; Mark 15:33-41)

These sections have already been discussed in chapter two.

Aland §350 (Luke 23:50-56; Mark 15:42-47)

Green's comment regarding the source(s) of this Lukan episode represents a general consensus among scholars: "we may regard vv 50-54 as having been based on the Markan text. Verses 55-56a may also have originated with Mark, but this is less sure."⁴⁰⁴ There are, however, several reasons to believe that Luke did not derive even vv. 50-54, 56b from canonical Mark.

First, verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan episodes is again low (20.8%⁴⁰⁵/24.8%⁴⁰⁶/22.8%⁴⁰⁷). The episodes share the following words or phrases: Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτής, ἀπὸ Αριμαθαίας, ὅς, τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡγήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in Luke 23:50-52/Mark 15:43 (51.9%, but notice that Luke 23:52 agrees 100% with Matt 27:58a contra to Mark); καί, καθελὼν, σινδόνι, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν in Luke 23:53/Mark 15:46 (26.9%); and καί, ἦν, σάββατον in Luke 23:54/Mark 15:42 (30%).

Second, the beginning of the Markan episode (15:42-43) is smoother, grammatically, than the Lukan one (23:50-52).⁴⁰⁸ Advocates of the 2SH often use grammatical superiority of the Gospels of Luke and Matthew over the Gospel of Mark as evidence that Luke and Matthew edited Mark. There are, however, many cases where Markan grammar and sentence structures are smoother than those found in Luke and Matthew. Here is one such case; it is difficult to see why

404. Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus*, 102. See e.g., Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 99–103; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 878–79; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1523–24.

405. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 71.

406. Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem," 117.

407. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 65.

408. For more details, see Randy Leedy's grammatical diagrams on these passages in BibleWorks 7.

Luke would have felt compelled to change the Markan sentence structure if he knew it. Luke could have easily included his additional information (in italics below) in the Markan sentence structure. In this case, the Lukan sentence would have been as follows: “When evening had come, since it was the day of Preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, Joseph of Arimathea, a respected member of the council, *a good and righteous man, who had not consented to their purpose and deed*, [and] who was looking for the kingdom of God, took courage and went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus” (cf. RSV).

Third, the content of Mark 15:44-45a is missing in both Luke and Matthew. Again, it is difficult to understand why Luke and Matthew would have omitted this material if they knew it; it would have served apologetical purpose well, in both Gospels, “to show that Jesus was truly dead” (cf. Matt 27:62-66; 28:11-15, 17b).⁴⁰⁹

Fourth, the Markan reference to rolling a stone against the door of the tomb (Mark 15:46b) is missing in the Lukan episode. Luke later refers to the stone (Luke 24:2), but one is justified in assuming that Luke would have also wanted to include a reference to the stone here for apologetic purpose. As Matthew’s Gospel indicates (see the references just above), the death and resurrection of Jesus was questioned by contemporaries of the Evangelists. Therefore, it is likely that the Evangelists wanted to use every piece of evidence available to them to prove to their contemporaries that Jesus was truly dead and that his body could not have been easily stolen from the tomb because of ‘a great stone’ at the door (Matt 27:60b; Mark 16:4).

Fifth, Mark’s reference to time at the beginning of the narrative (Mark 15:42) occurs in Luke’s narrative “rather awkwardly” after the actual burial (Luke 23:54) – the same place as in John’s narrative (19:42). Marshall may be correct in suggesting that “[t]he change may reflect use of a different source” in Luke 23:54-56, “since it is difficult to see any other good reason for the change.”⁴¹⁰

409. The quotation from Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (Vol. 2), 1222.

410. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 879.

Sixth, according to Mark, the women bought spices for anointing Jesus after the sabbath (16:1), whereas according to Luke, they prepared them before the sabbath (23:56). At least four different explanations have been offered to explain this contradiction: i) Luke misunderstood Mark;⁴¹¹ ii) “Luke may have compressed the account;”⁴¹² iii) Women bought spices twice; Mark records one of these purchases while Luke does another;⁴¹³ iv) Luke is following a different tradition than Mark.⁴¹⁴ None of the first three options has won much support. The last explanation, however, offers the most natural reason for the differences. Here, as often is the case elsewhere, Fitzmyer draws L-tradition/source to save his thesis: despite striking differences between the accounts, Luke’s main source was canonical Mark. He believes that Luke may have derived Luke 23:56c, in addition to 23:53c, from L, while the rest came from Mark.⁴¹⁵ These sayings, however, could not have survived without a wider narrative context.⁴¹⁶ Rather than trying desperately to save the 2SH by offering L-tradition/source to explain differences, it would have been more logical to admit that there existed a parallel Passion Narrative(s) which Luke used as his source.

Seventh, several agreements between i) Luke and Matthew, ii) Luke, Matthew, and John, and iii) Matthew and John against Mark speak against the traditional explanation of the 2SH. In Luke 23:52-53, as Goulder notes, fifteen out of sixteen words, all but καθελὼν, are identical to Matt 27:58-59.⁴¹⁷ In addition, “Luke, like Matthew, drops the Marcan πολήσας, and the whole sentence on Pilate’s confirmation of the death, and the purchase of the linen... He says that no one had ever yet lain in the tomb, echoing Matthew’s καὶνῶ.”⁴¹⁸ Interestingly, the Johannine account

411. See Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 881.

412. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1877.

413. So Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1877.

414. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 102.

415. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, 1523.

416. And, as Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1163, correctly notes, this whole pericope “cannot have been transmitted apart from a passion narrative.”

417. Goulder, *Luke II*, 771. The word ἐντολίσω occurs only here in the whole Greek Bible: Luke 23:53; Matt 27:59; John 20:7.

418. Goulder, *Luke II*, 771.

(John 19:41) agrees with Matthew, clearly stating that the tomb was new (Matt 27:60), and with Luke, claiming that it was where no one had ever been laid (Luke 23:53).⁴¹⁹

In light of this evidence, it really surprises me how some scholars can still argue for a ‘simple’ source critical solution (like 2SH) here. All similarities and differences between the accounts can hardly be explained satisfactorily on the basis of any dominant literary dependency theory.

Aland §352 (Luke 24:1-12; Mark 16:1-8)

Source critical opinions of Luke 24:1-12 are divided, as are most of the other sections in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative. Especially before Luke 24:12 was judged authentic with high probability by text critics,⁴²⁰ most scholars were inclined to agree with either Bultmann, that Luke’s sole source here was Mark,⁴²¹ or with Rengstorf, that Luke’s major source was Mark but that he also adopted some small additions from a non-Markan source;⁴²² only Taylor, with a small number of supporting scholars, argued that “the whole of Lk. xxiv.1-11 is non-Markan with a Markan insertion giving the names of the women in v. 10a.”⁴²³ Since then, more scholars have become more open to the option that Luke may have followed “an alternative source, closely similar to Mk”⁴²⁴ or that Luke was significantly influenced by another source.⁴²⁵ The following reasons speak against the view that Mark was Luke’s sole source here.

419. There are also two interesting agreements between the Matthean and Johannine accounts against the Markan and Lukan accounts: i) Both Evangelists ‘omit’ the status of Joseph of Arimathea as a member of the Sanhedrin (Matt 27:57a/John 19:38a). If Matthew knew the Markan account in its present form, the omission is quite surprising because of the apologetical significance of this detail; ii) Both Evangelists call Joseph a disciple of Jesus (Matt 27:57b/John 19:38b), not the one who was only looking for the kingdom of God.

420. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 157–58. Metzger writes, “Although ver. 12 is sometimes thought to be an interpolation... derived from Jn 20.3, 5, 6, 10, a majority of the committee regarded the passage as a natural antecedent to ver. 24, and was inclined to explain the similarity with the verse in John as due to the likelihood that both evangelists had drawn upon a common tradition.”

421. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 287.

422. Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, NDT 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 278.

423. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, 108.

424. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 882.

425. E.g., Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1882–83; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1184–85.

First, there is very low verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan episodes (12.5%⁴²⁶/16.8%⁴²⁷). The accounts share the following words: τῇ, μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, ἐπὶ τό in Luke 24:1/Mark 16:2 (cf. John 20:1), εἰσελθοῦσαι in Luke 24:3/Mark 16:5; ζητεῖτε τὸν in Luke 24:5/Mark 16:6a, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἠγέρθη in Luke 24:6/Mark 16:6b (cf. Matt 28:6a), καί, ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου in Luke 24:9/Mark 16:8, and ἡ Μαгдаληνῇ, Μαρία, καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ in Luke 24:10a/Mark 16:1. This sort of verbatim agreement does not absolutely require literary dependency between these pericopes.

Second, details of the angel vision in the Lukan and Markan accounts differ in at least six different ways: i) The women in the Lukan account did not immediately see the men (= angels, Luke 24:23) when they entered the tomb, as in the Markan story;⁴²⁸ ii) The women saw two angels rather than one, as in the Markan episode. A typical explanation for this difference is that Luke changed the number of angels to reflect a two-witness motif (cf. Luke 9:30; Acts 1:10), but the presence of two angels in John 20:12 suggests that the number two was present in tradition;⁴²⁹ iii) The angels were standing, not sitting, as in the Markan story. Although angels always appear in the standing position in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:11, 19; 2:9; Acts 1:10; 10:30; 11:13; 27:23; cf. Acts 7:56; 23:11), in light of a comparative study of the words ἐφίστημι,⁴³⁰ ἵστημι, παρίστημι, κάθημαι, καθέζομαι, κατακλίνω, and καθίζω in Luke-Acts, it is difficult to see any clear (theological) motive behind this choice of body position and compelling reason why Luke would have changed the Markan ‘sitting’ to ‘standing.’ Luke loves to use the body position language;⁴³¹ iv) The description of the appearance of the angels differs. While in Mark the angel is “wearing a white robe” (περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν), in Luke the angels appear “in dazzling clothing” (ἐν ἑσθήτι ἀστραπτύσῃ). It is difficult to see why Luke would have wanted to change the

426. Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, 71.

427. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 65.

428. Notice that in the Matthean episode the women seem to see the angel outside the tomb.

429. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1890; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 885.

430. The word occurs in our present pericope (Luke 24:4). It is clearly Lukan, occurring 18 times in Luke-Acts and only three times in the rest of the NT.

431. The Greek words mentioned just above occur 141 times in Luke-Acts.

Markan description, if he knew it, since he uses both λευκός (Luke 9:29; Acts 1:10) and στολή (Luke 15:22; 20:46) elsewhere in his text and describes the appearance of the angels in Acts 1:10 (ἐν ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς) in a very similar way as Mark does here;⁴³² v) The women's reaction to the vision differs.⁴³³ While the Markan women "were amazed" (ἐξεθαμβήθησαν; Mark 16:5, 6), the Lukan and Matthean women "were terrified" (ἐμφοβῶν in Luke 24:5; cf. Matt 28:5);⁴³⁴ vi) The message of the angel(s) to the women differs radically. Besides the words οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε... ἡγέρθη (Luke 26:6a/Mark 16:6b; cf. Matt 28:6), there is nothing common in the messages.

Third, the names of the women who came to the tomb partly differs. According to Mark, they were Mary Magdalene, Mary the [mother] of James, and Salome (Mark 16:1), whereas according to Luke, they were Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the [mother] of James, and some unnamed women. If Luke derived these names from canonical Mark, why did he change Salome to Joanna? Where did Luke draw Joanna's name if not from Mark?⁴³⁵ This suggests that Luke had access to a source other than Mark.

Fourth, agreements between i) Luke and Matthew, ii) Luke and John, and iii) Matthew and John against Mark further suggest that Luke did not draw this pericope from canonical Mark. Matson mentions five agreements between Luke and Matthew. I will list four of them.⁴³⁶ i) The similarity in the description of the angel(s). Matthew uses the noun ἀστραπή (28:3) while Luke

432. For other description of angels or the glorified Jesus in Luke-Acts, see Luke 2:9; 9:29; 21:27; Acts 10:30.

433. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 384.

434. This argument, however, is weakened by the fact that ἐκθαμβέω occurs only in Mark (9:15; 14:33; 16:5, 6). Luke uses once an adjectival form ἐκθαμβός (Acts 3:11). In other occasions when the feelings of people who saw angel(s) are described by Luke, he uses ταρασσώ and φόβος (Luke 1:12), and φόβέω (2:9); cf. Luke 24:37, 38.

435. In his previous name list of women, Luke mentions Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Susanna by name (8:2-3). Contrary to Luke, Mark is consistent in his name lists of women: Mary Magdalene (Mark 15:40, 47; 16:1, 9), Mary the mother of James the Less (15:40; 16:1) and Joses (15:40, 47), and Salome (15:40; 16:1). It is interesting that two brothers of Jesus carry names of James and Joses (Mark 6:3). Is it possible that 'Mary the [mother] of James and Joses/Joseph (Matt 13:55) is in fact Jesus' mother (she probably was in Jerusalem at that time; cf. Acts 1:14; John 19:25-27)? Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 511, suggests that Mary of James and Joses was Mary the wife of Clopas, mentioned in John 19:25.

436. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 383-84. One of his arguments (the third in his list) is so weak that I do not reproduce it here. See also Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1184.

uses the verb ἀστράπτω (24:4) to describe the appearance of the angel(s); ii) As already mentioned above, in Luke and Matthew, “the women’s reaction to the men at the tomb is fear, not amazement as in Mark;” iii) “In both Luke and Matthew, the women return... from the tomb to tell [ἀπαγγέλλω] the disciples” what had happened; and iv) “The whole disputed passage of verse [Luke 24:]6a exhibits almost verbatim agreement with Matthew.” The relationship between the four Gospel accounts at the tomb becomes even more complex when agreements between John and the other Gospels are noted. Nolland and Matson list a number of such agreements: i) “[T]he name of Mary Magdalene is introduced at the same point by Matthew and John” (Matt 28:1/John 20:1); ii) “Matthew, Luke, and John seem to agree against Mark (but without coincidence of language) that the arrival at the tomb was earlier than sunrise;” iii) Matthew, Luke, and John “agree against Mark in reporting nothing of the women’s concern over how to remove the stone;” iv) “Luke and John both have two men/angels;”⁴³⁷ v) In both Luke and John, Peter responds to the women’s report by rushing to the tomb.⁴³⁸ Luke 24:12 and John 28:3-9 “agree exactly on ὁ Πέτρος, τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια, ἀπήλθην[ον] πρὸς ἑαυτὸν [αὐτοῦς].”⁴³⁹

R. J. Dillon suggests that Luke used two principle sources in his empty-tomb story: Mark, in Luke 24:1-11, and “a second, younger and supplementary tradition,” in Luke 24:12, 24, which he shared with John.⁴⁴⁰ It is, however, unlikely that Luke’s “supplementary tradition” of Peter’s visit to the tomb would have survived as an isolated tradition. It must have been part of a larger Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

437. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1184–85.

438. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 385.

439. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1191–92.

440. Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*, AnBib (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 68. Notice that although according to Luke 24:12, only Peter went to the tomb after the women’s report, Luke uses the plural in 24:24 as John 20:3 does (Peter and the other disciple).

Dillon admits that “[t]he problem of non-Markan source-material in our passage becomes acute at v. 4, with its semitic syntax [(καὶ) ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ; καὶ ἰδοὺ] and its doubling of the angelic embassy” (pp. 20, 23), but argues that “the presence of hebraism cannot immediately and solely cancel other arguments favoring direct use of Mk” (p. 21). He believes that Luke imitated a Hebraistic style here (p. 21).

Many scholars, as already noted, believe that Luke also had access to an additional source(s) in Luke 24:1-11. In light of numerous differences between the Lukan and Markan accounts and agreements between the Gospel accounts against Mark, it is most likely that Luke derived the whole pericope from a non-extant source rather than combining the Markan text with a tradition shared with John and other traditions/sources. This theory explains, better than other Synoptic theories, why Luke's Gospel is missing some theological terms and themes found in Mark's Gospel, although Luke emphasizes them in his (as discussed in the previous chapter), and why Luke's Passion Narrative has, for example, several agreements with the other Gospels against Mark.

A Comparison of 'Overlapping' Pericopes in the Lukan Travel Narrative

Most scholars, as we have seen, believe that either Luke used Mark as his sole source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative or that he combined Markan material with another source(s)/tradition(s). Both of these views, however, can be challenged: not only by analyzing parallel texts themselves, as we have done above, but also by comparing so-called overlapping Markan and Q texts in the Lukan Travel Narrative.

According to advocates of the 2SH, Mark and Q represent two *independent* traditions. Overlapping texts, however, reveal that these two traditions partly shared the same, or very similar, material. To some extent, they even possess the same wording. In the Lukan Travel Narrative we can find at least 11 (13) such pericopes: Aland §§ 188 (Luke 11:14-23; Mark 3:22-27; Matt 12:22-30), 191 (Luke 11:29-32; Mark 8:11-12; Matt 12:38-42), 192 (Luke 11:33; [8:16]; Mark 4:21; Matt 5:15), 197 (Luke 12:10; Mark 3:28-30; Matt 12:31-32), 198 (Luke 12:11-12; [21:14-15]; Mark 13:11; Matt 10:19-20), 209 (Luke 13:18-19; Mark 4:30-32; Matt 13:31-32), 211? (Luke 13:22-30; Mark 10:31; Matt 7:13-14, 22-23; 8:11-12; 25:41; 19:30), 218 (Luke 14:34-35; Mark 9:49-50; Matt 5:13), 227 (Luke 16:18; Mark 10:11-12; Matt 19:9; 5:32), 229 (Luke 17:1-3a; Mark 9:42; Matt 18:6-7), 231 (Luke 17:5-6; Mark 9:28-29; Matt 17:19-21),

234? (Luke 17:20-21; Mark 13:21; Matt 24:23), and 235 (Luke 17:22-37; Mark 13:14-16, 19-23; Matt 10:39; 24:17-18, 23, 26-27, 28, 37-39, 40-41). The Markan and Q traditions agree verbatim in these passages as follows:⁴⁴¹

Aland §	Shared Words	%	Notes
188	Luke 11:15 Q: 10 words Mark/Luke: 9 words	42.9	Q 14-15,17-20,[21-22],23
	Luke 11:17 Q: 9 words Mark/Luke 5 words	13.9	
	Luke 11:18 Q: 10 words Mark/Luke 5 words	33.3	
191	Luke 11:29 Q: 13 words Mark/Luke: 5 words	23.8	Q 11:29-30,31-32
192	Luke 11:33 Q: 8 words Mark/Luke: 6 words (Luke 8:16 Matt/Luke: 4 words Mark/Luke: 1 word)	27.3	Q 11:33; The Lukan Q version agrees with Mark 4:21 more closely than Luke 8:16, which is, according to many, derived by Luke from Mark!
197	Luke 12:10 Q: 9 words Mark/Luke: 4 words	20.0	Q 12:10
198	Luke 12:11-12 Q: 11 words Mark/Luke: 7 words Luke 21:14-15 Mark/Luke: 2 words		Q 12:11-12; The Lukan Q version agrees with Mark 13:11 more closely than Luke 21:14-15, which is, according to many, derived by Luke from Mark!
209	Luke 13:18-19 Q: 19 Mark/Luke: 13	21.1	Q 13:18-19
211	Luke 13:30 [Q: 5] Mark/Luke: 5 (6)	55.6	Q 13:24-27,29,28,[30]
218	Luke 14:34-35 Q: 10 Mark/Luke 9	36.0	Q 14:34-35
227	Luke 16:18 Matt 19:9/Luke: 4 Mark/Luke: 5 Q: 8	20.0	Q 16:18 (Matt 5:32)
229	Luke 17:1-2 Q: 19		Q 17:1-2

441. Based on Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse* and my own calculations.

231	Mark/Luke: 15 Luke 17:6 Q: 6	51.7	Q 17:6
234	Mark/Luke: 2 Luke 17:20-21 [Q: 2]	14.3	[Q 17:20-21]
235	Mark/Luke: 1 Luke 17:23 Q: 5 Mark/Luke 3	21.4	Q 17:23-24,37,26-27,[28-29],30,34-35,33

I will specifically compare four pericopes in more detail below. The passages are Aland §§188, 209, 218, and 229. The bold words are shared by Luke and Matthew, and the underlined words are shared by Luke/Mark, or Matthew/Mark, or all three accounts.

Aland §188 (Matt 12:22-30; Mark 3:22-27; Luke 11:14-23):

Matthew
²² ¶ Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. ²³ καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον· μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ; ²⁴ οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες εἶπον· οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοῦλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων. ²⁵ εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἡ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθίσεται.

²⁶ καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη· πῶς οὖν σταθίσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ²⁷ καὶ εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοῦλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ἔσονται ὑμῶν. ²⁸ εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. ²⁹ ἡ πῶς δύναται τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τὰ σκεῖη αὐτοῦ ἀρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον δῇσῃ τὸν ἰσχυρόν;

Mark
²² Καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβοῦλ ἔχει καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.
²³ Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· πῶς δύναται σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; ²⁴ καὶ ἐὰν βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι ἡ βασιλεία ἐκείνη. ²⁵ καὶ ἐὰν οἰκία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δυνήσεται ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη σταθῆναι. ²⁶ καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὐ δύναται στήναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει.

²⁷ ἀλλ' οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν

Luke
¹⁴ ¶ Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον [καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν] κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι.

¹⁵ τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον· ἐν Βεελζεβοῦλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.
¹⁶ ἕτεροι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐζήτουν παρ' αὐτοῦ. ¹⁷ αὐτὸς δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει.

¹⁸ εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη, πῶς σταθίσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβοῦλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια. ¹⁹ εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοῦλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται. ²⁰ εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

οίκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ
σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ
πρῶτον τὸν ἰσχυρὸν δῆσῃ,

καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ
διαρπάσει.

³⁰ ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ
ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ
σκορπίζει.

καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ
διαρπάσει.

²¹ ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος
φυλάσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν
εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ·

²² ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ
ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτόν, τὴν
πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἶρει ἐφ' ἧ
ἐπεποίθει καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ
διαδίδωσιν.

²³ Ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ
ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ'
ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

The underlined words in Aland §188 must have occurred in both the Markan and Q material.⁴⁴² It is unlikely these words would have been missing in Q, and that Luke and Matthew would have drawn them independently from the Markan tradition. The Lukan version offers very little solid evidence that Luke conflated the Q material with the Markan one.⁴⁴³

Without the Matthean parallel, which reveals the existence of Q tradition, those scholars who argue that Luke's sole source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative was Mark, would have made the same conclusion here. How wrong they would be! Also, those scholars who support the conflation theory in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative may have drawn the wrong conclusion here. It is more likely that Luke drew this whole pericope from Q tradition solely rather than conflating it with Markan tradition.

Aland §209 (Matt 13:31-32; Mark 4:30-32; Luke 13:18-19):

Matthew
³¹ ¶ Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν
αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ
σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος
ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῇ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ· ³² ὁ
μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν
σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ ἀυξηθῇ μείζον
τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται

Mark
³⁰ ¶ Καὶ ἔλεγεν· πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν
τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν τίνι
αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν; ³¹ ὥς
κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερον ὢν πάντων
τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
³² καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ
γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν

Luke
¹⁸ ¶ Ἐλεγεν οὖν· τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν
ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίνι
ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν; ¹⁹ ὁμοία ἐστὶν
κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν
ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον
ἑαυτοῦ,
καὶ ἤυξησεν

442. Cf. Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *The Sayings Gospel of Q in Greek and English*, 104–07.

443. One could argue that the word order in Luke 11:15b, which agrees more closely with Mark and Matthew, and ἐφ' ἑαυτήν in Luke 11:17 shows Markan influence. It is, however, questionable that if Luke had compared the Markan and Q texts, he would have limited Markan influence only to vv. 15b and 17; these changes have minimal value.

δένδρον,

ὥστε ἔλθειν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.

λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.

καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.

The contents of the Q and Markan versions of this parable are very similar. The underlined words must have agreed verbatim in these two versions. Again, there is very little strong evidence of Markan influence on Luke.⁴⁴⁴ It is therefore likely that Luke derived the whole pericope from the Q tradition/source rather than combining two sources. Again, both of those groups who support either the sole Lukan redaction of Mark or the combination theory in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative would have near definitely drawn the wrong conclusion here without the Matthean parallel.

Aland §218 (Matt 5:13; Mark 9:49-50; Luke 14:34-35):

Matthew

¹³ ¶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀλισθήσεται; εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι εἰ μὴ βληθὲν ἔξω καταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Mark

⁴⁹ Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται. ⁵⁰ καλὸν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας ἄναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε; ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

Luke

³⁴ ¶ Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται; ³⁵ οὔτε εἰς γῆν οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν εὐθετόν ἐστιν, ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

Aland §229 (Matt 18:6-7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:1-3a):

Matthew

⁶ Ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνίκος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης. ⁷ ¶ Οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἔλθειν τὰ σκάνδαλα, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δί' οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται.

Mark

⁴² ¶ Καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων [εἰς ἐμέ], καλὸν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περὶκειται μύλος ὀνίκος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.

Luke

¶ Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ· ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἔλθειν, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. ² λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μυλῆος περὶκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἓνα. ³ προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς.

444. One may argue that ἔλεγεν, τοῦ θεοῦ, (the 2nd) τίνι, and αὐτήν in Luke 13:18, and καὶ in Luke 13:19 come from Mark, but this can be questioned. The IQP Committee suggests that all these words, except ἔλεγεν, come from Q (Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *The Sayings Gospel of Q in Greek and English*, 128–29).

The underlined words in two examples above must have occurred in both the Q and Markan versions of these sayings. In the first example, the word καλόν (Luke 14:34), and in the second example, the words εἰ and εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (Luke 17:2) could have been drawn from Mark by Luke, but the IQP Committee suggests that these words also could have occurred in Q.⁴⁴⁵ There is no compelling reason to assume Luke conflated two sources here.

The fact that two ‘independent’ traditions share the same wording to the extent shown above, in the overlapping pericopes of the Lukan Travel Narrative speaks against those who argue Luke’s sole source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative must have been Mark due to similar wording between the Lukan and Markan accounts. If we did not have access to the Matthean parallels, which reveal the existence of Q tradition, these same scholars would have concluded that Luke’s sole source in the passages mentioned above was Mark, when, in fact, it seems to have been Q.

Verbatim agreements at the level we find between Luke and Mark in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative do not prove that Luke derived this material from Mark.

Conclusion

In the previous chapter, I argued that Lukan thematic omissions, both in his non-Passion and Passion-Resurrection sections, hint that Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source but rather a different branch of Markan tradition. In this chapter, I have suggested that Luke did not derive his Passion-Resurrection Narrative from the same, unified source/tradition as his non-Passion section (cf. E. Trocmé’s theory). While these sections have the same origin, they do not have the same development history. The following four issues especially seem to be evidence of the different development history: i) Differences in language – especially a remarkable change in verbatim agreement percentages between the Lukan and Markan accounts when moved from their non-Passion sections to their Passion-Resurrection sections; ii) The increased number of

445. Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *The Sayings Gospel of Q in Greek and English*, 138–43.

differences in order of material in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative in comparison to his non-Passion section; iii) A higher concentration of Semitism in *some* sections of the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative than in his non-Passion section, except the Infancy Narrative which notoriously has a high concentration of Semitism; and iv) A high concentration of similarities between the Lukan and Johannine Passion-Resurrection Narratives. Two other issues may also suggest that Luke did not use Mark as his source in the Passion-Resurrection Narrative: i) Additions of new material in Luke, and ii) The absence of some Markan material in Luke.

Close analyses of the pericopes of the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative have provided further evidence that Luke did not derive this material from canonical Mark.

A comparison of some of the Lukan Travel Narrative pericopes with the parallel Markan and Matthean pericopes revealed that the sayings of these pericopes existed in at least two different and independent forms, sharing, however, the same wording to a great extent. Without the parallel Matthean pericopes, which reveal the existence of Q tradition, most scholars – if following the same interpretation principles they use in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative – would have drawn an incorrect conclusion, arguing that either Luke used Mark as his sole source or that he combined two sources. However, the evidence drawn from those overlapping texts seems to indicate that Luke drew this material exclusively from Q, although the wording of these texts greatly resembles the wording of Mark. This observation should be a warning sign for all those who support the Mark only or the combination theory in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

Rather than inviting an additional source as often as Fitzmyer and other supporters of the combination theory do to save the 2SH, I will suggest that Luke did not conflate various sources/traditions, at least in the extent suggested by some, but that he relied on a tradition which had originated from the same source as the tradition found in Mark but was partly developed in a different direction prior to Luke using it. This, rather than the combination theory, may better explain Lukan thematic omissions and the differences and similarities in his Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

In the following chapter, I will offer further evidence that Luke might not have drawn his Markan-like material from canonical Mark.

CHAPTER 4

VARIATION IN VERBATIM AGREEMENT WITHIN THE LUKAN TRIPLE TRADITION PASSAGES

Introduction

One of the critical debates in psychology has been “whether stable behavioral dispositions, or traits, exist.”¹ “On the basis of everyday observations,” as S. Epstein noted about three decades ago, “it seems evident to most people that they do. Yet the vast bulk of psychological research fails to provide confirmatory evidence.”² Epstein demonstrated against the then dominant view that “most single items of behavior have a high component of error of measurement and a narrow range of generality,” but “when measures of behavior are averaged over an increasing number of events, stability coefficients increase to high levels for all kinds of data” and therefore “it is possible to predict behavior averaged over a sample of situations and/or occasions.”³ The majority of scholars have followed in Epstein’s footsteps and today the controversy is viewed as almost over.⁴ Because we have stable behavioral dispositions, we do certain things in certain ways always, or most of time. Therefore, our behavior is usually highly predictable.⁵

1. S. Epstein, “The Stability of Behavior: I. On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time,” *JPSP* 37 (1979): 1097–126; reprinted in S. Epstein, “The Stability of Behavior: I. On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time,” in *Personality: Critical Concepts in Psychology: II. Theoretical Approaches*, eds. Cary L. Cooper and Lawrence A. Pervin (New York: Routledge, 1998), 371.

2. Epstein, “The Stability of Behavior,” 371.

3. Epstein, “The Stability of Behavior,” 371.

4. Lawrence A. Pervin, *The Science of Personality*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 61.

5. Epstein, “The Stability of Behavior,” 406, remarks that “it should be noted that not everyone is equally predictable.” Some individuals show “no stability” within subject correlations, some others show “extremely high stability,” while most individuals demonstrate “a moderately high degree of stability.” See also Pervin, *The Science of Personality*, 58–61; R. Michael Furr and David C. Funder, “Situational Similarity and Behavioral Consistency: Subjective, Objective, Variable-Centered, and Person-Centered Approaches,” *Journal of Research in Personality* 38, no. 5 (2004): 421–47.

One such area of consistency in behavior is how modern authors use sources. As most readers may notice, some scholars use direct quotations more often in their works than others. This practice may be relatively consistent throughout the career of a scholar, but it is usually very consistent within the same scholarly work. Both those who use many direct quotations and those who avoid them have a certain, often recognizable, ‘philosophy’ behind their practice. Is this observation applicable to ancient authors? I think it is. Editorial practices have partly changed within literary history, but we can assume that human nature has remained the same. It pursues certain consistency in behavior, including editing practices.

In the following pages I will attempt to show that in the ancient Greco-Roman and Jewish cultures there were two opposite practices in using source texts; both of them were (relatively) consistent. On the one hand, a great number of ancient writers paraphrased their source texts entirely, probably due to the influence of Greco-Roman education. On the other hand, some authors adapted the wording of their sources almost verbatim, likely because those source texts were regarded as sacred.⁶ However, there are also some texts which are a mixture in nature: some sections in them agree verbatim with the assumed source text, while other sections have been entirely paraphrased or even changed regarding their content. Whenever we face such inconsistencies within the same work, we should not be quick to conclude that regardless of these inconsistencies, all sections have been derived from the same literary source. This level of caution must be practiced, especially when no clear explanation for differences in the editing technique can be offered. Such inconsistency seems to run against what we know about human nature, as discussed above.

I am not saying that an author cannot derive his material inconsistently from his literary sources, but one should not come to this conclusion without strong evidence for it. When we face

6. Josephus, a Palestinian Jew who was deeply influenced by Greco-Roman educational principles, shows a definitely different attitude towards biblical writings than some other Jews to whom I will refer later in this work. While Josephus felt free to paraphrase entirely his biblical source texts, those other authors did not feel the same freedom. The reason for this lesser freedom may have been religious.

this kind of inconsistency in ancient works, we should seriously consider other explanations, such as: 1) The author may have derived his material from a parallel lost literary source; 2) The author may have derived his material from various parallel literary sources, not from a single one; 3) The author may have derived his material from oral sources. Oral tradition can be very flexible, (very) fixed, or both. Recent global studies on oral tradition agree with the findings of Milman Parry and Albert Bates Lord among Yugoslavian epic singers⁷ that “variation is the life-blood of oral tradition.”⁸ Parry and Lord observed that, among Yugoslavian epics, the basic story-line was “carefully preserved”⁹ but the wording of the same song varied significantly from singer to singer and from performance to performance.¹⁰ The wording only agreed verbatim, or almost verbatim, occasionally like in the first five lines of the *Song of Bagdad* which was performed in three different occasions by the same singer,¹¹ or in very popular songs.¹² Parry and Lord observed that traditional illiterate singers did not even try to memorize epics word for word, but rather after

7. M. Parry collected 12,544 songs, conversations, and stories in 1933-35. See Matthew W. Kay, ed., *The Index of the Milman Parry Collection 1933-35: Heroic Songs, Conversations and Stories* (New York: Garland, 1995). For English translations of some of these stories, see Milman Parry, *Serbo-croatian Heroic Songs: I. Nova Pazar: English Translations*, ed. Albert Bates Lord (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954). A. B. Lord, an assistant of Parry, revisited Yugoslavia twice in the 1950s and 60s and collected more songs.

For the best introduction to the Yugoslavian oral tradition, see Lord, *The Singer of Tales*.

8. The quotation is from Lauri Honko, “Thick Corpus and Organic Variation: An Introduction,” in *Thick Corpus, Organic Variation and Textuality in Oral Tradition*, ed. Lauri Honko, SFF 7 (Helsinki: Finnish Literary Society, 2000), 3.

9. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 123. The possible changes in the basic story fall into the following categories: “(1) saying the same thing in fewer or more lines, because of singers’ method of line composition and of linking lines together, (2) expansion of ornamentation, adding of details of description..., (3) changes of order in a sequence..., (4) addition of material not in a given text of the teacher, but found in texts of other singers in the district, (5) omissions of material, and (6) substitution of one theme for another, in a story configuration held together by inner tensions.”

Dwight Fletcher Reynolds, *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes: The Ethnography of Performance in an Arabic Oral Epic Tradition* (London: Cornell University Press, 1995), also noticed, while field-studying *Ṣīrat Banī Hilāl*, the best-known narrative tradition of Arabic oral literature (p. 2), that the order of some thirty episodes of this huge epic was generally agreed upon among the al-Bakātūsh poets “with a certain amount of variation found within some subsections” (p. 16). Each episode “constitutes of at least a full evening’s performance” (p. 16).

In light of this and similar evidence from other folklore studies, there is no ground for the argument that the similarities in the order of episodes in the Synoptic Gospels can only be explained on literary basis.

10. For examples, see Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 69-77 and Appendixes I-V.

Reynolds, *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes*, 128-33, came to a similar conclusion while comparing individual performance styles among singers of *Ṣīrat Banī Hilāl*.

11. Lord, “Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries,” 452-53.

12. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 69-70.

learning a basic story-line by heart,¹³ they sang the song using traditional formulas learned ‘unconsciously.’ Only those singers who had learned traditional epics from printed texts followed the wording of a printed version closely.¹⁴ If such a singer was experienced, he/she was able to continue singing even if his/her memory failed because he/she was able to create new lines while singing.¹⁵ “Such a combination of processes resulted in ‘mixed’ texts, i.e., partly memorized and partly not.”¹⁶

Even though the wording of most traditional epics around the world seems to be very flexible, there are examples of oral traditions with very fixed wordings. I will briefly refer to a few scientific studies and unscientific reports: i) Oral poems of Somalia: B. M. Andrzejewski, I. M. Lewis, and S. S. Samatar, who have studied Somali poetry, make the following observations: a) “Somali oral poets compose their poetry before performing it;”¹⁷ b) Some of these poems are very long;¹⁸ c) The composed oral poem “becomes the property of its composer;”¹⁹ d) The goal of those poets who learn other composers’ poems by heart, “unaided by writings,”²⁰ “is verbatim transmission,” but naturally poems “suffer corruption on occasion” in the transmission.²¹ “Even so, oral transmission is surprisingly reliable and a comparison of several versions shows them to be nearly identical. If there is any difference between several versions of a given text, it is hardly ever a difference of meaning. Words might be transposed and new phrases substituted for original ones but the alternative order and the meaning often remain unaffected;”²² and e) The audience

13. Some experienced singers, like Abdo Međedović, were able to learn by heart a basic story line of several thousand lines by one listening (Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 78–79 and Appendix I). See also B. M. Andrzejewski and I. M. Lewis, *Somali Poetry: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 45.

14. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 109.

15. Lord, “Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries,” 460.

16. Lord, “Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries,” 460.

17. Said S. Samatar, *Oral Poetry and Somali Nationalism: The Case of Sayyid Mahammad ‘Abdille Hasan*, AfS 32 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 67. See also Andrzejewski and Lewis, *Somali Poetry*, 45.

18. Andrzejewski and Lewis, *Somali Poetry*, 45.

19. Samatar, *Oral Poetry and Somali Nationalism*, 64.

20. Andrzejewski and Lewis, *Somali Poetry*, 45.

21. Samatar, *Oral Poetry and Somali Nationalism*, 73.

22. Samatar, *Oral Poetry and Somali Nationalism*, 73. See also Andrzejewski and Lewis, *Somali Poetry*, 45.

may correct the reciter when he makes mistakes.²³ ii) The *qasīda* type of oral poetry of Yemen: The poetry of Yemen falls into three types: *bālah*, *zāmil*, and *qasīdah*.²⁴ “[T]he *qasīdah* is a lengthy [often dozens of verses long], intricately crafted poem by a single poet, which is composed over a period of time, but eventually circulated as a finished product and at times achieved national or even international fame.”²⁵ iii) The Arabic *Sīrat Banī Hilāl*: According to D. F. Reynolds, this epic “is the single most widespread and best-documented narrative tradition of Arabic oral literature.”²⁶ It consists of roughly thirty episodes, each taking “at least a full evening’s performance.”²⁷ When Reynolds compared individual performances of *Sīrat Banī Hilāl*, he came to the same conclusion as Parry and Lord before him: the basic storyline was carefully preserved but the wording of the same song varied significantly from singer to singer and from performance to performance.²⁸ However, Reynolds also made two other interesting observations: a) Some singers’ performances have less variation than others’. Reynolds notes that one of the singers, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ḥamid Tawfiq (b. 1936), had “virtually memorized” three episodes of the epic he knew. Reynolds’ “recordings from 1983 and 1987 show less variation than similar recordings from the other poets completed only a few minutes or days apart;”²⁹ b) When Reynolds asked another singer, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, to teach him to sing the epic, he noticed that...

... Shaykh ‘Abd al-Wahhāb’s version did not change except for the smallest substitutions of prepositions and the like; he was perfectly capable of retaining a passage of many verses nearly verbatim for several hours, and even over several days, while teaching it to me. But when compared with public performances of his I had recorded, the verses he was giving me in my lessons were almost always substantially different in wording from versions he had sung weeks or months earlier. Whether consciously or not, he was quite capable of both engaging in and refraining from textual variation.³⁰

23. Andrzejewski and Lewis, *Somali Poetry*, 46.

24. Steven Charles Caton, *Peaks of Yemen I Summon’: Poetry as Cultural Practice in a North Yemeni Tribe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

25. Dwight Fletcher Reynolds, *Arab Folklore: A Handbook* (London: Greenwood Press, 2007), 37.

26. Reynolds, *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes*, 2.

27. Reynolds, *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes*, 16.

28. Reynolds, *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes*, 128–33.

29. Reynolds, *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes*, 133.

30. Dwight Fletcher Reynolds, “Creating an Epic: From Apprenticeship to Publication,” in *Textualization of Oral Epics*, ed. Lauri Honko, TLSM 128 (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 268.

iv) Oral poetry of the South Pacific islands: According to R. Finnegan, the process of oral composition, transmission, and performance is very similar in various islands of the South Pacific.³¹ A certain kind of oral poetry is composed, memorized, rehearsed, and taught to the choir and dancers by the oral composer prior to its public presentation. v) The oral epics of Rajasthan in India: These epics are guarded and recited by often illiterate, wandering *bhopas*. William Dalrympe describes them in a lively manner in his article entitled "Homer in India: The Oral Epics of Rajasthan" in *The New Yorker* (Nov. 20, 2006, pp. 48-55). Dalrympe tells us that these reciters have memorized huge portions of traditional epics such as 'Dev Narayan.' Mr. Mohan Bhopa, whom Dalrympe was listening to, was one of them. He was able to accurately recite very long sections of Dev Narayan. During the performance, which lasted for several hours, Dalrympe

asked another guest, who understood Mewari, one of the five major dialects of Rajasthan, if he could check Mohan Bhopa's rendition against a transcription by John D. Smith, of Cambridge University, of a version performed in a different part of Rajasthan in the nineteen-seventies. Give or take a couple of turns of phrase, the two versions were identical, he said. And there was nothing homespun about Mohan Bhopa's language, he added. It was delivered in a fine and courtly diction.³²

Dalrympe suggests, following the Indian folklorist Komal Kothari, that "illiteracy seems as essential condition for preserving the performance of an oral epic... Just as the blind can develop a heightened sense of hearing, smell, and touch to compensate for their loss of vision, so it seems that the illiterate have a capacity to remember in a way that the literate simply do not."³³

These studies and reports challenge the universal applicability of the four main pillars of the oral-formulaic theory introduced by Parry and Lord. These pillars are:

1 *The text of oral literature is variable and dependent on the occasion of performance, unlike the fixed text of a written book....*

31. Ruth Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 91-109. John Miles Foley, *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Garland Pub., 1985), 64, criticizes Finnegan for relying too much on secondary sources in her survey.

32. William Dalrympe, "Homer in India: The Oral Epics of Rajasthan," *The New Yorker*, 20 November 2006, 52.

33. Dalrympe, "Homer in India," 54. See also Rustom Bharucha, *Rajasthan, an Oral History: Conversations with Komal Kothari* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 23-24.

- 2 *The form of composition characteristic of oral literature is composition-in-performance, i.e., not prior composition divorced from the act of performance...*
 3 *Composition and transmission of oral literature is through the process... and not... through word for word memorization...*
 4 *In oral literature, there is not concept of a 'correct' or 'authentic' version.*³⁴

The great majority of biblical scholars reject the oral tradition theory as a way to explain the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels. One of the major reasons for this is the lack of clear rhythmic features in the gospel texts. This feature is considered essential for faithful preserving of a tradition in oral form.³⁵ This claim, however, runs against the fact that some people have memorized biblical books by heart even though those books may not have clear rhythm.³⁶ Rhythm definitely helps in memorizing but it is not necessary.

And finally, 4) The author may have derived his material from both literary and oral sources.

In my previous two chapters, I showed that Luke did not use canonical Mark, as Luke's Gospel lacks certain theological and linguistic features that one expects it to have if Luke had been using canonical Mark, however loosely.

High variation rate in verbatim agreement between the Lukan and Markan parallel accounts, which I discuss next, may be further evidence that Luke did not use *canonical* Mark as his source. If Luke had used canonical Mark as his source, we should expect to find more consistency in his copy-editing method in light of the findings of modern behavioral psychology.

34. Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality*, 88–89. Both in this book and *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), Finnegan strongly criticizes the Parry-Lord theory regarding it too simplistic and one-sided.

35. John S. Kloppenborg, "Variation in the Reproduction of the Double Tradition and an Oral Q?" *ETL* 83, no. 1 (2007): 53.

36. For example, one of my closest friends has memorized several biblical books, including the Gospel of John and Romans, by heart, although he is not an exceptionally intelligent person.

It is true that the memorization of biblical material now happens from the fixed *text*, to which the memorizer can return again and again during the memorization process. However, I argue that *orally* composed stories can also be recited surprisingly accurately. You may test this by composing a story in your mind using vivid images (such as Jesus used in his teaching) and telling the story to yourself several times until it seems to get a fixed form. Then write it down. In the following days retell the story several times without the help of the written text. After a while write the story again down and compare it with your previous text. You may surprise how closely they agree in verbatim.

See also Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel*, 103–25; Baum, "Matthew's Sources".

Analyses of Luke's Gospel

Introduction

The parallel accounts in Luke and his assumed sources (i.e., Mark and Q) are not exclusively highly literal or highly paraphrastic. High variation rate in verbatim agreement within the pericopes of both the Lukan double and triple tradition has bothered scholars for a long time.³⁷

Before the rise of redaction criticism, some leading synoptic scholars, including Hawkins, argued that the combination of oral and written accounts in Luke and Matthew best explains variation in verbatim agreement within the pericopes of these Gospels.³⁸ Streeter's explanation was that Luke and Matthew basically derived all their material from written sources, but that such parallel accounts, which are significantly different in wording, were not derived by Luke and Matthew from a common written source. Such parallels indicate that some accounts existed in at least two distinctive forms in the oral tradition phase.³⁹ W. Sanday, instead, explained variation in verbatim agreement in terms of memory failure.⁴⁰ Before the Evangelist copied a certain section from his source, he memorized it but often his memory faded as he worked through the writing. This is a highly unlikely explanation, as we already concluded in Chapter Two.

After the rise of redaction criticism, a number of scholars began believing that theologically-driven redaction by Luke and Matthew can often explain variations in wording. However, these scholars, as we have seen in the previous two chapters of this work, often have not been able to reach a consensus on how best to explain these differences theologically.

37. Here I am partly debt to Alan Kirk, "Synoptic Scholarship on Agreement and Variation in the Double Tradition," SBL Conference, November 18–21 (Washington, DC, 2006), 1–13.

38. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 67–67, 216–17.

39. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 183–4, 237, 239, 249–50, 281–5.

40. William Sanday, "The Conditions Under Which the Gospels Were Written, in Their Bearing Upon Some Difficulties of the Synoptic Problem," in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 18–19.

Both before and after the rise of redaction criticism, there have also been scholars, including the above-mentioned famous folklorist Albert B. Lord,⁴¹ who hold that the Evangelists derived all (or most of) their material from oral sources, and this explains variations.

Variation within the Double Tradition

Most scholarly discussion about verbatim agreements in the Synoptics has concentrated on comparing the degree of variation between the double and triple traditions.⁴² The only issue on which scholars who have researched the issue agree is that Luke and Matthew have copied non-Markan material (i.e., Q) more conservatively than Markan material, both in narrative and sayings sections. However, scholars disagree about the degree of conservatism. For example, C. E. Carlston and D. Norlin argue that the average agreement in the triple tradition is 56.0% (48.5% in narrative material; 65.8% in words of Jesus; 58.5% in miscellaneous sayings-material), while in the double tradition it is 71.0% (53.7% in narrative material; 71.5% in words of Jesus; 84.1% in miscellaneous sayings-material).⁴³ A. M. Honoré's corresponding figures are 30.7% for the triple tradition and 39.1% for the double tradition.⁴⁴ The dissimilarity in figures is due to the different

41. Lord, "The Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature". Lord argues that both parallel sequences of pericopes and verbal correspondence between them strongly favor the view that the Synoptic Gospels are "three oral traditional variants of the same narrative and non-narrative materials" (p. 90). His four concluding marks are as follow: "*First*,... their texts vary from one another to such an extent as to rule out the possibility that, as a whole, one could have been copied from another. In this respect they have the appearance of three oral traditional variants of the same narrative and non-narrative materials. It is true that on occasion the texts are so close that one should not rule out manuscript transmission; hence, it may be that oral tradition has sometimes had written sources affecting the text, not merely in respect to content but also as *text*. *Second*, the sequence of episodes show chiastic variations in arrangement between gospels (AB in one and BA in another), which are also typical of oral traditional literature. This structural principle allies no only to the order of episodes within a sequence but also to the order of larger sequences. *Third*, one finds a marked tendency to elaboration and expansion both of individual episodes and or sequences, which is, again, characteristic of oral traditional composition.... *Fourth*, I have noted several instances of duplication of multiforms. This is peculiarly an oral traditional phenomenon.... There is enough such evidence to indicate that these gospels are closely related to oral traditional literature, both narrative and non-narrative" (pp. 90-91).

42. Rosché, "The Words of Jesus and the Future of the 'Q' Hypothesis"; Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem"; Carlston and Norlin, "Once More - Statistics and Q"; O'Rourke, "Some Observations on the Synoptic Problem and the Use of Statistical Procedures"; Mattila, "A Problem Still Clouded"; Carlston and Norlin, "Statistics and Q"; Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*, 45-53, 194-204.

43. Carlston and Norlin, "Once More - Statistics and Q," 71.

44. Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem". See also Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*, 47-48.

definition of agreement⁴⁵ and the material included in those studies. Carlston and Norlin have been criticized for using too loose a definition of agreement; they admit this but insist that, despite the different definitions of agreement, both studies show the double tradition has about 27% higher agreement than the triple tradition.⁴⁶ From this, they conclude that Q must have been written since Mark was also written.⁴⁷ They further argue that “the forms of ‘Q’ used by Matthew and Luke must have been essentially the same, since the more they differ, the more inexplicable the close agreement in the Q-material (closer than when they are following Mark!) becomes.”⁴⁸ Both these conclusions are rejected by T. R. Rosché,⁴⁹ Honoré,⁵⁰ S. L. Mattila,⁵¹ and Mournet,⁵² who all believe that a relatively low verbatim agreement in the double tradition does not support the view that Luke and Matthew derived this material from a (unified) document. In addition, the level of verbatim agreement between individual pericopes in the double tradition varies significantly. According to Morgenthaler, the percentage of Q in five ranges of verbatim agreement levels is as follows: 13.2% of Q falls in the range of 98-80% of agreement; 27.8% in 60-79%; 24.8% in 40-59%; 25.9% in 20-39%; and 8.2% in 0-19%.⁵³ If Luke and Matthew derived all their double tradition material from a common, unified source, why were they so inconsistent when editing? Sometimes, as was the case with material related to John the Baptist (Q 3:7-9, 16-17), they copied their source *independently*, almost word for word, while they occasionally changed the wording of their source almost completely and often without any obvious reason. This kind of editorial behavior seems to run against human inclination for consistency, as we discussed earlier.

45. Carlston and Norlin have also included the words “approximately same in both Matthew and Luke” (“Once More - Statistics and Q,” 62), whereas Honoré has only included the words with “the same grammatical form of the same word” (“A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem,” 97).

46. Carlston and Norlin, “Statistics and Q,” 109, 112.

47. Carlston and Norlin, “Statistics and Q,” 122.

48. Carlston and Norlin, “Statistics and Q,” 122.

49. Rosché, “The Words of Jesus and the Future of the ‘Q’ Hypothesis”.

50. Honoré, “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem”.

51. Mattila, “A Problem Still Clouded.”

52. Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*, 48–49, 202–03.

53. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse*, 261, cited by Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 203.

Variation within the Triple Tradition

We can find similar variation in verbatim agreement in the triple tradition as we did in the double tradition.

First, as we noticed in the previous chapter, there is a remarkable difference in verbatim agreement percentages between the Lukan and Markan Non-Passion Sections and the Passion-Resurrection Sections. While the weighted verbatim agreement between Luke and Mark in the Non-Passion Section is 37.5%, it is only 22.8% in the Passion-Resurrection Section (see Appendix B). Some scholars explain the difference as due to Luke's wish to stress Jesus' innocence and calm in his martyrdom. This seems a poor explanation because the innocence motif is present only in a few Lukan pericopes. This significant difference in verbatim agreement between these two sections in Luke may favor E. Trocmé's theory, as we noticed in the previous chapter.⁵⁴ Trocmé argues that the Non-Passion material and the Passion-Resurrection material existed as independent, but source critically related, units with their own pre-history before somebody (Mark?) united them together.⁵⁵ When Luke wrote his Gospel, he did not yet have access to this unified Gospel. A version of the Non-Passion Section, to which Luke had access, was very close to the version now found in Mark, but his version of the Passion-Resurrection Section differed significantly from the corresponding Markan version; the original source of all these versions, however, is the same (the same story-teller?). This explains similarities and differences between the Lukan Non-Passion Section and Passion-Resurrection Section.

Second, not only does the comparison of the Lukan Non-Passion Section with its Passion-Resurrection Section show inconsistency in verbatim agreement, but the comparison between pericopes within these two major sections also does. In the Lukan Non-Passion Section verbatim agreement with the corresponding material in Mark varies between 0% (Aland §32: Luke 4:14b-

54. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*.

55. Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy*. Early form critics arrived basically at the same conclusion.

15/Mark 1:14b-15) and 68.8% (Aland §253: Luke 18:15-17/Mark 10:13-16),⁵⁶ while in its Passion-Resurrection Section verbatim agreement varies between 9.3% (Aland §348: Luke 23:49/Mark 15:40-41) and 46.2% (Aland §308: Luke 22:7-14/Mark 14:12-17) (See Appendix A).

Third, there is also intriguing variation in verbatim agreement within and between pericope blocks in the Lukan Non-Passion Narrative. I will highlight a few examples. i) The healing miracles/controversy stories block in Luke 4:31-6:19⁵⁷ versus the parable discourse block in Luke 8:4-16 (see Appendix A). Scholars agree that verbatim agreement, in general, is higher in sayings material than in narrative material, both in the double tradition and the triple tradition. However, in this case it is the opposite: verbatim agreement in the parable discourse block is significantly lower, as shown in Appendix A, than in the healing miracles/controversy stories block.⁵⁸ The reason for lower verbatim agreement in the parable discourse block cannot be Mark's 'inferior' grammar because Matthew, who is also believed to have improved Markan grammar frequently, follows more closely the Markan text in the Parable of the Sower and its interpretation than Luke does. How do we explain this inconsistency in verbatim agreement?⁵⁹ ii) Variation in verbatim agreement in the Lukan healing stories of the demoniac. Luke's Gospel has three lengthy healing stories of the demoniac: 'The Healing of the Demoniac in the Synagogue' (Luke 4:33-37), 'The Gerasene Demoniac' (8:26-39), and 'Jesus Heals a Boy Possessed by a Spirit' (9:37-43a). Verbatim agreements with the parallel Markan episodes are as follows: 50.0%, 37.5%, and 13.7%. Variation in verbatim agreements is surprisingly high, especially in light of the fact that all

56. Verbatim agreement between Luke and Mark in Aland §16 (Luke 3:15-18/Mark 1:7-8), which overlaps with Q, is 70.0%.

57. The following passages in this section contain healing miracle or/and controversy stories: Luke 4:31-41... 5:12-6:11... 6:17-19.

58. Some pericopes in the healing miracles/controversy stories block have high amount of sayings (especially Luke 4:33-37; 5:12-16; 5:17-26; 5:33-39; 6:1-5), but notice that these pericopes also have higher verbatim agreement with the corresponding Markan material (50.0%; 37.8%; 36.2%; 55.0%; 48.1%) than the four pericopes in the parable discourse block (30.5%; 34.6%; 26.7%; 35.5%).

59. It is also interesting to ask why Matthew has dispersed the material of the healing miracles/controversy stories block if he used canonical Mark as his source as the advocates of the 2SH argue.

these pericopes are about healing of the demoniac. The fact that a) the last two narratives have exceptionally low verbatim agreement between Matthew and Mark (16.6% and 14.4%), b) in the second narrative, there are two demoniacs in Matthew versus one in Mark,⁶⁰ and c) in the third story, there is a high concentration of positive and negative minor agreements as shown in chapter two, increase the possibility that the source critical relationship of the Synoptic Gospels is more complex than the 2SH suggests. If Luke really used canonical Mark as his source, why did he edit his material so inconsistently? iii) Miracle pericopes in Luke 5:12-6:11 versus those in Luke 8:22-56. The healing miracles/controversy stories block in Luke 4:31-6:19 has five lengthy miracle stories: 'The Healing of the Demoniac in the Synagogue' (Luke 4:33-37); 'The Healing of Peter's Mother-in-law' (4:38-39); 'The Cleansing of the Leper' (5:12-16); 'The Healing of the Paralytic' (5:17-26); and 'The Man with the Withered Hand' (6:6-11).⁶¹ These stories have significantly higher verbatim agreement with the parallel Markan accounts than three miracle stories in Luke 8:22-56: 'Stilling the Storm' (Luke 8:22-25); 'The Geresene Demoniac' (8:26-39); and 'Jairus' Daughter and the Women with a Hemorrhage' (8:40-56). In the former stories, verbatim agreements are 50.0%, 38.6%, 37.8%, 36.2%, and 36.2%, while in the latter stories they are 28.3%, 37.5%, and 26.5%. It is also worth noting that, while in the former block of material, verbatim agreement between the Matthean and Markan versions is about the same level as it is between the Lukan and Markan versions, in the latter block of material, verbatim agreement between the Matthean and Markan versions is exceptionally low (22.5%; 16.6%; 13.1%).⁶² How

60. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, WBC 33A [Dallas: Word, 1993], 225-26, offers two reasons for the difference in numbers: i) "A possible reason for Matthew's doubling here may be to compensate for his omission of Mark's first exorcism story (Mark 1:23-28) from his narrative.... as well as an earlier story of the healing of the blind man (Mark 8:22-26)." The argument is very unconvincing. ii) "It may also be the case, given Matthew's Jewish-Christian readers and their debate with the synagogue, that Matthew is thinking of the importance of more than one witness in Jewish tradition..." This is a more convincing argument, but one may wonder why Matthew does not then double 'witnesses' consistently in all his healing stories. For example, the narrative of 'The Healing of the Paralytic' (Matt 9:1-8), where Jesus heals only a single person, occurs between the narratives of 'The Gadarene Demoniacs' (Matt 8:28-34) and 'Two Blind Men' (Matt 9:27-31), where Jesus heals two persons. See also Matt 8:1-4; 9:18-26; 15:21-28; 17:14-23.

61. Luke 4:40-41 and 6:17-19 also refer to Jesus' healing ministry, but they are more summary statements, rather than specific healing stories.

62. All but one of these miracle pericopes occur in chapters 8 and 9 in Matthew.

do we explain these phenomena? These inconsistencies lead me to doubt that Luke (and Matthew) derived all (if any) of this material from *canonical Mark*. iv) Variation in verbatim agreement in the Eschatological Discourse (Luke 21:5-36), which consists almost exclusively of sayings material. As we saw in chapter two, several such theological elements, which Luke emphasizes in his work, are missing in the Lukan version of the Eschatological Discourse, even though these themes are present in the parallel Markan version. This suggests that Luke did not derive this section from canonical Mark. A great variation in verbatim agreement between individual pericopes in the Lukan Eschatological Discourse further strengthens this conclusion. Verbatim agreement varies between 21.7% and 51.6%, being 50% or higher in two pericopes and under 50% in four pericopes (see Appendix A). Grammatical⁶³ or theological reasons can hardly explain this inconsistency.

In summary, inconsistencies in verbatim agreement suggest that Luke did not derive his triple tradition from a single unified source known as canonical Mark.

Next, we will turn to examining the editing methods used in ancient Greco-Roman and Jewish literature beyond the Synoptic Gospels and we will compare those methods with methods used by the Evangelists.

Analyses of Jewish and Greco-Roman Literature

Introduction

It is interesting that we cannot find an equivalent editing method among those Greco-Roman or Jewish writings whose authors are known to have used sources which we find in Luke and Matthew. Habitually, Greco-Roman and Jewish authors either paraphrased the wordings of their sources almost entirely or they used them nearly verbatim. A close look at a few extant works, which seem to have a mixture of paraphrasism and verbatism, reveal that the editing methods used by their authors were quite different from what we find in the Synoptic Gospels

63. Note that Matthew and Mark's wordings agree with each other very closely except in Aland §289 (Matt 24:9-14/ Mark 13:9-13).

or/and that these works were end-products of the interaction between different oral and/or written traditions.

Highly Paraphrastic Editing Method

Introduction: From Imitation to Creativity

Those Greco-Roman authors who relied on sources used a highly paraphrastic editing method almost exclusively. The Greco-Roman education system may explain why this editing technique was preferred.⁶⁴ The ability to paraphrase one's sources "was a vital marker of social status and power" in the Greco-Roman world because it indicated that an imitator had become a creative, autonomous, and authoritative figure in society.⁶⁵

64. For the Greco-Roman education, see especially Henri Irénée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb, reprint, 1956 (New York: Mentor, 1964); Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (London: Methuen, 1977); Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996); Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Laurentino García Y. García, *Pupils, Teachers and Schools in Pompeii: Childhood, Youth and Culture in the Roman Era* (Rome: Bardi Editore, 2005); M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971); William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); Herbert C. Youtie, "ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΕΥΣ: The Social Impact of Illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt," *ZPE* 17 (1975): 201–21; Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church*; Mary Beard, ed., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archeology, 1991); Tim Cornell, "The Tyranny of the Evidence: A Discussion of the Possible Uses of Literacy in Etruria and Latium in the Archaic Age," in *Literacy in the Roman World*, ed. Mary Beard (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archeology, 1991), 7–33; A. R. Millard, *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*, BiSe 69 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Aelius Theon, "The Exercises of Aelius Theon," in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. George A. Kennedy (Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 1–72; Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. and trans. Donald Russell, LCL 124–127, 494 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Quintilian (ca. 30/35 – 100 C.E.) favored paraphrasing his sources but he did not paraphrase everything. Quintilian's *Constitutio Oratoria* includes about 1,300 short quotations or allusions whose sources have been identified (Merle M. Odgers, "Quintilian's Use of Earlier Literature," *CP* 28 [1933]: 183–84; see also "Authors and Passages Quoted" in Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, Books 11–12, vol. 5, ed. and trans. Donald Russell, LCL 494 [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001], 414–32). Of them, 1,100 are concerned with Latin literature and 200 with Greek literature. Of these references to Latin literature, 66% are actual quotations, while only 9% of the references to Greek literature are 'verbatim' reproductions (Quintilian wrote *Const.* in Latin; Odgers, "Quintilian's Use of Earlier Literature," 183, 185, 188). Charles N. Cole, "Quintilian's Quotations from the Latin Poets," *CIR* 20 (1906): 47–51, convincingly shows that Quintilian frequently quoted his sources from memory (see also William C. Helmbold and Edward N. O'Neil, comp., *Plutarch's Quotations*, Philological Monographs 19 [Oxford: Blackwell, 1959], ix).

65. Quotation from Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 198. See also pp. 92, 224, 262–70, and Ruth Webb, "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Boston: Brill, 2001), 289.

Josephus

Flavius Josephus (37 - ca. 100 C.E.) may be regarded as a typical, highly educated historian in the Greco-Roman world of the first century C.E.⁶⁶

Josephus composed at least four works, which all exist. These are *The Jewish War*, *Jewish Antiquities*, the *Life*, and *Against Apion*. He used sources in the composition of all of them.

In the first ten (eleven) books of *Antiquities*, Josephus' primary source was the OT, whereas in the rest of the books he relied on extra-biblical sources. Almost all those sources which Josephus used in the second half of *Antiquities* have been lost, but how he used his biblical sources in the first half of his work, and some existing extra-biblical sources, such as 3 Esd 2:1-9:55 in *Ant.* 11.1-158, 1 Macc 1:1-16:24 in *Ant.* 11.346-13.229, 2 Macc 4:7-15:37 in *Ant.* 12.223-412, and *Let. Aris.* in *Ant.* 12.11-118, in the latter part of his work, may also reliably reveal how he used his lost sources. A comparison of these existing sources with parallel texts in *Antiquities* reveals that although Josephus asserts at the beginning of both *Ant.* 1.5 and *Ag. Ap.* 1.54 that he has translated the accounts from the sacred writings of the Jews, he has actually completely paraphrased the text of his sources to a point where it is very difficult to find any words in the same sequence in his texts and his sources. He paraphrases his biblical texts so extensively that in most cases scholars are not even sure whether he derived his material from a Hebrew Bible, a Greek Bible, or Targums.⁶⁷ Interestingly, "Josephus is much freer in vocabulary, style, order, and content in his rendering of biblical material in the first five books of the *Antiquities*, where he is paraphrasing the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges" than in books 6-11.⁶⁸

Josephus not only paraphrases the biblical texts but he also omits and adds sections, alters

66. For his education, see Josephus, *Life* 7-12, *Ant.* 20.263, and Helen K. Bond, "New Currents in Josephus Research," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 8 (2000): 166.

67. Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 23-24, 30-36, 63-64; Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*, JSJSup 58 (Boston: Brill, 1998), 539; Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*, HDR 7 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 30-33.

68. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 27.

the sequence of them, and combines sources.⁶⁹ According to P. L. Maier, there is only one literal quotation from the OT in all Josephus' known writings. This is found in *Ant.* 9.239-241, where Josephus quotes Nahum 2:8-13.⁷⁰ Maier calls it an "almost verbatim, but a little abridged" quotation,⁷¹ but this is clearly an overstatement as a close comparison of Josephus' text with the Hebrew and Greek (LXX) parallels shows below:

<u>Nahum 2:9-13</u>	<u>Nahum 2:9-14 (LXX)</u>	<u><i>Ant.</i> 9.239-241</u>
וְנִינְוָה כְּבִרְכַּת-מִיָּם מִיָּם הָיָה וְהָמָּה נָסִים עָמְדוּ עָמְדוּ וְאִין מִפְּנֵה בָּזוּ קָסָף בָּזוּ וְזָבַח וְאִין קָצָה לְתַכְוֵנָה כְּבִד מְלִל כְּלִי תְּמִידָה בּוֹנֵה וּמְבֹנֵה וּמְבַלְקָה וְלֵב נָמַס וּפֶקַח בְּרָפִים וְחִלְקָהּ בְּכָל-מִתְנַגִּים וּפְנֵי כָלֵם קָבְצוּ פֶּאֶרֶד אֵינָה מְעוֹן אֲרִיֹת וּמִרְעָה הוּא לְקַפְרִים אֲשֶׁר הֵלֵךְ אֲרִיָּה לְבִיא שָׁם גֹּר אֲרִיָּה וְאִין מְחִרִיד	⁹ καὶ Νινευη ὡς κολυμβήθρα ὑδατος τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῆς καὶ αὐτοὶ φεύγοντες οὐκ ἔστησαν καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐπιβλέπων ¹⁰ δῆρπαζον τὸ ἀργύριον δῆρπαζον τὸ χρυσίον καὶ οὐκ ἦν πέρας τοῦ κόσμου αὐτῆς βεβάρυνται ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἐπιθυμητὰ αὐτῆς ¹¹ ἐκτιναγμός καὶ ἀνατιναγμός καὶ ἐκβρασμός καὶ καρδίας θραυσμός καὶ ὑπόλυσις γονάτων καὶ ὠδίνες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὁσφύν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον πάντων ὡς πρόσκαυμα χύτρας ¹²	...ἔλεγεν ὡς ἔσται Νινύας κολυμβήθρα ὑδατος κινουμένη οὕτως καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἅπας ταρασσόμενος καὶ κλυδωνιζόμενος οἰχήσεται φεύγων λεγόντων πρὸς ἀλλήλους στήτε καὶ μείνατε καὶ χρυσὸν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄργυρον ἀρπάσατε ἔσται δ' οὐδεὶς βουλευσόμενος ²⁴⁰ σώξειν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐθελήσουσι τὰς ψυχὰς μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ κτήματα δεινὴ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἔρις ἔξει καὶ θρήνος πάρεσις τε τῶν μελῶν αἶ τε

69. For more details, see Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Selfdefinition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, NovTSup 64 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 291–95; Pere Villalba i Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*, ALGHJ 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 268–72; Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 37–39. See also Christopher T. Begg, *Josephus' Story of the Later Monarchy* (AJ 9, 1–10, 185), BETL 145 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), 623–24. In *Ant.* 9.1–10.185 Josephus "comprises the parallel segments 2 King 1–25 and 2 Chronicles 19–36." He "clearly drew on both these segments... In those instance where one of his two biblical historical sources provides a notably more elaborate account of a given king, Josephus generally follows this in preference to the other source's short presentation... Where the two sources generally run parallel to each other, but differ in detail, Josephus typically oscillates between the, utilizing items from one, now from the other... In all these cases Josephus evidences his intention of making maximal use of the data of both his historical sources." Many scholars believe that Josephus also combined oral tradition with written ones (see Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 65–73).

Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 39–46, discusses nine scholarly suggestions to resolve Josephus' apparent failure to live up his promise not to alter the biblical text. On page 44, Feldman notes that "there were apparently two distinct theories as to what a translation should be. A century before Josephus, Cicero contrasts a translation that proceeds word for word (*verbum pro verbo*) with his own method of translation as an orator, whereby he preserved only the general style and form of the original" (*Opt. gen.* 5.14; 7.23). Cf. M. Parry and A. B. Lord's observation among the Yugoslavian epic singers for whom the stability of an epic meant something different than for us: these singers were "deeply devoted" to preserving traditional epics, but the idea of stability did not include the wording, which to them "has never been fixed, nor the essential part of the story." They built their performance "on the stable skeleton of narrative." If the story line was preserved faithfully, the whole epic was regarded as having transited without a change even if the wording of two performances of the epic differed radically (Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 26–29, 99).

70. Flavius Josephus, *The New Complete Works of Josephus*, rev. and expanded ed., trans. by William Whiston, commentary by Paul L. Maier (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999), 329 n.2.

71. Josephus, *The New Complete Works of Josephus*, 329 n.2.

אֲרִיָּה טָרַף בְּדִי גְרוֹתָיו וּמִקְנֵה לֶלֶבָרִי
 וְיִמְלֵא־טָרֶף
 וְיִזְרֹחַ וּמִעֲלֵיו וְיִקְרַח

ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατοικητήριον τῶν
 λεόντων καὶ ἡ νομὴ ἢ οὐσα τοῖς
 σκύμοις οὐ ἐπορεύθη λέωντος
 εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖ σκύμνος λέοντος
 καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐκφοβῶν ¹³ λέων
 ἤρπασεν τὰ ἱκανὰ τοῖς σκύμοις
 αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέπνιξεν τοῖς λέουσιν
 αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπλησεν θήρας νοσσιὰν
 αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κατοικητήριον αὐτοῦ
 ἀρπαγῆς ¹⁴ ¶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σέ
 λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ καὶ
 ἐκκαύσω ἐν καπνῷ πλήθος σου
 καὶ τοὺς λέοντάς σου καταφάγεται
 ῥομφαία καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω ἐκ τῆς
 γῆς τὴν θήραν σου καὶ οὐ μὴ
 ἀκουσθῇ οὐκέτι τὰ ἔργα σου

ὄψεις ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου μέλαιnai
 τελέως αὐτοῖς γενήσονται ²⁴¹ ποῦ
 δὲ ἔσται τὸ κατοικητήριον τῶν
 λεόντων καὶ ἡ μήτηρ σκύμων λέγει
 δέ σοι ὁ θεὸς Νινύα ὅτι ἀφανῶ σε
 καὶ οὐκέτι λέοντες ἐκ σοῦ
 πορευόμενοι ἐπιτάξουσι τῷ κόσμῳ

P. Villalba i Varneda lists 29 “literal” quotations from non-biblical sources in *Antiquities* besides quotations from the *Let. Aris.* in *Ant.* 12.11-118,⁷² but this list is far from complete.⁷³ In light of the ‘literal’ quotation from Nahum, it is unlikely these quotations are verbatim either.

In the second half of *Antiquities*, Josephus is believed to have relied on a number of different sources, though he seldom names them. One of his major sources seems to have been the vast work of Nicolas of Damascus whom he mentions a few times in his account.⁷⁴ Scholars have also suggested – although, without reaching a consensus – the following works as direct or indirect sources of Josephus: Alexander Polyhistor (*Ant.* 1.240), Philo (18.259-260), Livy (14.68), Strabo (8.286-287, 319, 347; 14.35, etc.),⁷⁵ commentaries of Vespasian (*Life* 342, 352,

72. Villalba i Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*, 271: *Ant.* 1.240-241; 7.101-103; 8.144-146, 262 (?), 324; 11.3-22-25, 99-103, 118-119, 123-130; 12.36-39, 45-50, 51-56, 135-136, 137-144, 147-153; 14.112, 138-139, 145-148, 149-155, 190-195, 306-313; 16.162-166; 17.134-135, 137; 18.304; 19.280-285, 287-291, 303-311.

Maier (Josephus, *The New Complete Works of Josephus*, 13) states that Josephus “cites twenty-four classical authors in his *Antiquities*, as well as other unnamed authorities.”

73. Villalba i Varneda does not mention, for example, the following ‘literal’ quotations: *Ant.* 8.146-149; 11.26-28; 11.104.

74. *Ant.* 1.94, 108, 159; 7.101; 12.126-127; 13.250, 347; 14.9, 68, 104; 16.29-58, 183-186, 299, 333, 335-355, 370-372; 17.54, 99, 106-121, 127, 219, 225, 240-248, 315-316. Feldman, *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible*, 4; Ben Zion Wachholder, “Josephus and Nicolaus of Damascus,” in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, eds. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 147-72.

75. See especially Alessandro Galimberti, “Josephus and Strabo: The Reasons for a Choice,” in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*, Zuleika Ropdgers (Boston: Brill, 2007), 147-67.

etc.) and other Roman generals,⁷⁶ Agrippa II (364-367, etc.), Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Hekataios, Berossos, Manethon, oral tradition, etc.⁷⁷

Josephus uses 1 Maccabees as his source in *Ant.* 11.346-13.229 as noted above. Although Josephus follows his source relatively closely here, it is essentially impossible to find the same sequence of words in Josephus and his source.⁷⁸

In *Ant.* 12.11-118, Josephus paraphrases nearly two-fifths of the content of the *Letter of Aristaeas*.⁷⁹ He paraphrases it so entirely that “aside from a single broken sequence of twelve words and another of ten words,” points out Feldman, “Josephus deliberately varies the language of his source, even going so far as to substitute synonyms for individual words, altering the prefixes in his verbs, and varying the syntax, although he sticks to the sequence of events in the original.”⁸⁰ Even when Josephus tells the same story in two of his works,⁸¹ he phrases them differently as a comparison of *Ant.* 18.55-62 with *J.W.* 2.169-177,⁸² and *Ant.* 108-160 with *J.W.*

76. For Vespasian and other Roman generals as Josephus' source, see M. Broshi, “The Credibility of Josephus,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 381-83.

77. See Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History*, 33-37; Sterling, *Historiography and Selfdefinition*, 256-90; Villalba i Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*, 267; Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 10, 51-56; Honora Howell Chapman, “By the Waters of Babylon’: Josephus and Greek Poetry,” in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, eds. Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi (Boston: Brill, 2005), 121-46; Bond, “New Currents in Josephus Research,” 167.

78. See Joseph Sievers, *Synopsis of the Greek Sources for the Hasmonean Period: 1-2 Maccabees and Josephus, War 1 and Antiquities 12-14*, SubBi 20 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001). Agneta Enermalm-Ogawa, “Josephus' Paraphrase of 1 Maccabees in *Antiquities* 12-13: Prayer in a Narrative Context,” in *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*, eds. James H. Charlesworth, Mark Harding, and Mark Kiley (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994), 73, observes: “While the events are reported by Josephus normally corresponding to those in 1 Maccabees, the speeches are elaborated and embellished by him. The prayers, on the other hand, are reduced to short passages almost negligible in the flow of narrative.” Tessel M. Jonquière, “Two Prayers by King Solomon in Josephus' *Antiquities* 8 and the Bible,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Paris 2001: Studies on the Antiquities of Josephus*, eds. Folker Siegert and Jürgen U. Kalms (Münster: Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium, 2002), 73-75, however, notes that sometimes Josephus greatly expands prayers found in his sources.

79. H. St. J. Thackeray, “The Letter of Aristaeas,” in *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Henry Barclay Swete (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 549. For a critical Greek text of the latter, see pp. 551-606. For an English translation of the latter, see OTS, vol. 2.

80. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 164. Feldman refers to André Pelletier, *Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée: Une Réaction atticisme contre la koiné* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1962).

81. For parallel episodes in Josephus' *Life* and *Jewish War*, see Steve Mason, trans. and commentary, *Flavius Josephus: Life of Josephus* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 213-22.

82. For more details, see Daniel R. Schwartz, “Composition and Sources in *Antiquities* 18: The Case of Pontius Pilate,” in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*, ed. Zuleika Rodgers (Boston: Brill, 2007), 125-46.

1.364-385 shows.⁸³

As the discussion above reveals, Josephus walked in the footsteps of Quintilian in how he used literary sources, though Josephus hardly received formal Greco-Roman rhetorical education. Josephus paraphrased everything, even his previous accounts of the same event. There does seem to be a minor difference between Quintilian and Josephus in their use of citations: Quintilian's quotations are verbatim, or close to it, in 60% of cases when he quotes Latin sources and in 9% of cases when he quotes Greek sources, whereas Josephus hardly ever seems to quote verbatim. Josephus is very consistent in his editing method, unlike what we find in the Synoptic Gospels.

Philo

Philo (ca. 20 B.C.E. - 50 C.E.) was an extremely wealthy, highly educated,⁸⁴ influential Jewish exegete, philosopher, and leader in Alexandria, who wrote more than seventy treatises, of which forty-eight have survived; thirty-nine of them are exegetical.⁸⁵

K. Schenck divides Philo's works into three distinct categories: 1) Philo's three commentary series: *Questions and Answers on Genesis/Exodus*, *The Allegorical Commentary*, and *The Exposition of the Law*; 2) Philo's historical and apologetical treatises; and 3) Philo's philosophical treatises.⁸⁶ Here, I will discuss a few treatises of the first category because Philo's main source for them, the Septuagint, exists and therefore the texts can be compared.

The Questions and Answers on Genesis/Exodus is a running commentary on Genesis 2:4-28:9 and Exodus 6:2-30:10. Most of it has only been preserved in Armenian. The questions take two basic forms: either a direct quotation of the biblical text with an interrogative (e.g., "What is the meaning of the words, 'And God made every green thing of the field before it came into being

83. For more details, see Villalba i Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*, 139-43.

84. For his education, see Philo, *Prelim. Studies* 11, 17-18, 74-76, 142, 144, 146, 148; *Embassy* 182; *Spec. Laws* 2.230; *Dreams* 1.205; *Posterity* 102-103.

85. Kenneth Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 3; Gregory E. Sterling, "Philo," in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, eds. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 790.

86. Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo*, 14-23.

on the earth, and every grass before it grew'?" *QG* 1.2) or a paraphrase of the biblical text with an interrogative (e.g., "Why is He said to have planted Paradise in Eden toward the East?," *QG* 1.7).⁸⁷ The answers are normally short and frequently contain both literal and allegorical interpretations.⁸⁸ The way Philo uses his source in both the questions and answers does not resemble how Luke and Matthew used their sources. Philo makes the clear distinction between his source text, which he regards as authoritative, and his own interpretation.⁸⁹

Philo's *Allegorical Commentary* is also a running commentary on Genesis 2:1-41:24, originally consisting of at least twenty-six books, of which twenty-three exist today in part or whole.⁹⁰ Like in the *Questions and Answers on Genesis/Exodus*, each section in the *Allegorical Commentary* begins with a quotation from the biblical text and is followed by Philo's interpretation. The *Allegorical Commentary*, however, differs from the *Questions and Answers* in a number of ways: 1) the quotations are not normally with an interrogative; 2) the interpretations

87. Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria as Exegete," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation. Volume 1: The Ancient Period*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 128, points out that the form of question and answer is also found "both in the Jewish Alexandrian writer Demetrius (*On the Kings of Judea*, fragment 2), and Greek commentaries on Plato's *Theaetetus* (*Anonymous Commentary on Theaetetus* 34.9-14; 34.33-35.44) and on the writings of Homer (*Scholia Venetus A* on *Iliad* 1.52, etc.). It was also frequently used in Christian exegesis" and rabbinic exegesis (Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, NovTSup 86 [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 86).

The question and answer form also occurs in some other sections of Philo's works: the *Exposition of the Law of Moses*, *On the Life of Moses*, and the *Allegorical Commentary* (Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria as Exegete," 126).

88. Ralph Marcus, "Introduction," in *Philo: Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*, LCL 380 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), ix, divides Philo's allegorical interpretation into three subcategories: the physical (corresponds to the 'allegorical' interpretation of the Church Fathers), the ethical or psychological (cf. 'moral' interpretation), and the mystical (cf. 'anagogical' interpretation). Sometimes Philo offers only one kind of allegorical interpretation, and occasionally all three.

89. See David M. Hay, "Philo's View of Himself as an Exegete: Inspired, but not Authoritative," in *Heirs of the Septuagint: Philo, Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity: Festschrift for Earle Hilgert*, in *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, Vol III, 1991, eds. David T. Runia, David M. Hay, and David Winston, BJS 230 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 106.

90. Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo*, 16-7. The existing treatises are: *Alleg. Interp.* 1, 2, 3 (Gen 2:1-3:19); *Cherubim* (Gen 3:24-4:1), *Sacrifices* (Gen 4:2-4), *Worse* (Gen 4:8-15), *Posterity* (Gen 4:16-25), *Giants* (Gen 6:1-4a), *Unchangeable* (Gen 6:4b-12), *Agriculture* (Gen 9:20-21), *Planting* (Gen 9:20-21), *Drunkenness* (Gen 9:20-21), *Sobriety* (Gen 9:24-27), *Confusion* (Gen 11:1-9), *Migration* (Gen 12:1-6), *Heir* (Gen 15:2-18), *Prelim. Studies* (Gen 16:1-5), *Flight* (Gen 16:6b-14), *Names* (Gen 17:1-5, 16-22), *God* (Armenian fragment), *Dreams* 1 (Gen 28:1-23; 31:10-13), and *Dreams* 2 (Gen 37:8-11; 40:9-11, 16-17; 41:17-24).

are highly allegorical; 3) the interpretations are much longer; and 4) the interpretations include references to secondary biblical texts. As is the case with *Questions and Answers*, Philo's editorial method differs radically from Luke and Matthew's; Philo clearly distinguishes the authoritative text from his own interpretation.

The Exposition of the Law consists of treatises of three categories: 1) an account of creation (*Creation*); 2) biographical material (*Abraham, Joseph*), and 3) legislative material (*Decalogue, Spec. Laws 1, 2, 3, 4, Virtues, Rewards*).⁹¹ These treatises are sometimes regarded as belonging to the genre of rewritten Bible because they retell and explain the biblical text chronologically.⁹² Others reject this view by pointing out that, unlike the authors of, e.g., *Ant.*, *Jub.*, 1QapGen. Ps.-Philo, Philo distinguishes the biblical text and his interpretations.⁹³ Philo's editing method is again completely different from Luke and Matthew's. In addition, there is basically no verbatim agreement between the biblical texts and Philo's paraphrases. Philo, like Josephus, was consistent in his editing method.

Valerius Maximus

Valerius Maximus collected about 960 stories from the Roman and foreign worlds and arranged them topically in nine books. The work, *Memorable Doings and Sayings* (hereafter *MDS*), was probably finished in 31 C.E. and was dedicated to the Emperor Tiberius (14-37 C.E.; *MDS* 1.pref.). Valerius likely came from a non-aristocratic and poor Roman family, but his friendship with Sextus Pompeius, proconsul and Valerius' patron, made it possible for Valerius to write this ambitious work (4.7.ext.2). The work soon became popular and "was a bestseller throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance period. His book and the Bible were the two most influential ancient books during these eras, and more manuscripts of them survive than of

91. For more details, see Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo*, 18–19, 101–07. Some scholars also regard *On the Life of Moses* (*Moses* 1, 2) as part of the Exposition of the Law collection (p. 19).

92. So e.g., Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 283.

93. Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, eds. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 116–18. See e.g., *Creation* 26, 32.

any other prose work.” In the past two centuries, however, Valerius’ work has drawn relatively little scholarly attention.⁹⁴

Valerius collected worthy deeds and sayings of the most famous authors to save others from “the trouble of spending a lot of time on research” (1. pref.). He arranged them, as already mentioned above, in nine books and divided each book into anywhere from eight to fifteen chapters, each chapter dealing with a specific topic. Such topics were Religion (ch. 1), False Religiosity (ch. 2), Superstitious Cults (ch. 3), the Auspices (ch. 4), Omens (ch. 5), Prodigies (ch. 6), Dreams (ch. 7), and Miracles (ch. 8) in Book One. Other books of *MDS* discuss such issues as ancient customs (Book Two), and one’s character and relationship to others (Book Five).⁹⁵ Each chapter has several illustrative examples from Roman authors and some from foreign, mainly Greek, authors. “The stories of Valerius Maximus,” as H. J. Walker points out, “give us a unique insight into how the Romans behaved every day, how they felt about almost every issue you could imagine, and what characteristics they most admired in people.”⁹⁶

Valerius does not normally mention the source(s) from which he has drawn a particular story. However, at present scholars generally agree that Valerius drew most of his material from Cicero (102 – 43 B.C.E.) and Livy (ca. 59 B.C.E. – 12/17 C.E.),⁹⁷ though he also refers to several other Latin and Greek authors.⁹⁸ Sometimes Valerius seems to combine elements from

94. For a more detailed discussion, see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, “Introduction,” in *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, Valerius Maximus, LCL 492 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 1–6; Henry John Walker, “Introduction,” in *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: One Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*, Valerius Maximus (Cambridge: Hackett, 2004), xiii–xxiv. The quotation from Walker, pp. xxi–xxii.

95. See Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: One Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*, trans. Henry J. Walker (Cambridge: Hackett, 2004).

96. Henry John Walker, “Introduction,” xiv.

97. For a more detail discussion of Valerius’ probably use of Cicero and Levy, see W. Martin Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 59–77. Some earlier scholars suggested that Valerius drew his material, similar to Cicero and Levy’s, not directly from them but rather from a lost intermediate source. Bloomer, as well as many other recent scholars, rejects this view.

98. Latin authors: Coelius Antipater (1.7.6), Cato the Elder (8.1.2), Cicero (8.10.3; 8.13.ext.1), C. Gracchus (9.5.ext.4), Livy (1.8.ext.19), Asinius Pollio (8.13.ext.4), Munatius Rufus (4.3.2), Pomponius Rufus (4.4.pref.), M. Scaurus (4.4.11), and Varro (3.2.24). Greek authors: Alexander Polyhistor (8.13.ext.7), Aristoxenus Musicus (8.13.ext.3), Ctesius of Cnidos (8.13.ext.5), Damastes (8.13.ext.6), Hellenicus (8.13.ext.6), Herodotus (8.13.ext.5), Plato (1.8.ext.1), Theodectes of Phaselis (8.14.ext.3), Theophanes of Mytiline (8.14.3), Theopompus

different sources.⁹⁹

It is generally agreed that Valerius' two main or sole sources in *MDS* 1.6.1-1.6.ext.3 are Livy and Cicero. In *MDS* 1.6 Valerius tells sixteen (eighteen¹⁰⁰) short stories of unnatural events that were believed to foreshadow the future. The comparison of these stories with the parallel stories in Livy and Cicero reveals how thoroughly Valerius paraphrased them.¹⁰¹ In three cases I have included the whole text of the parallel stories.¹⁰²

<u>Valerius</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Parallel</u>
1.6.1 (Servius Tellus): “ <u>Servio Tullio</u> etiam tum puerulo <u>dormienti</u> circa <u>caput</u> flamam emicuisse domesticorum oculi adnotaverunt. quod prodigium Anci regis Marcii uxor <u>Tanaquil</u> admirata <u>serva natum</u> in modum filii educavit et ad regium fastigium evexit.”	Livy 1.39.1-3,5: “Eo tempore in regia prodigium visu eventuale mirabile fuit. Puer <u>dormienti</u> , cui <u>Servio Tullio</u> fuit nomen, <u>caput arsisse</u> ferunt multorum in conspectu. Plurimo igitur clamore inde ad tantae rei miraculum orto excitos reges, et cum quidam familiarium aquam ad restinguendum ferret, ab regina retentum, sedatoque eam tumultu moveri vetuisse puerum donec sua sponte experrectum esset. Mox cum somnia et flammam abisset. Tum abducto in secretum viro <u>Tanaquil</u> , ‘Viden tu	Cicero, <i>Div.</i> 1.121: “ <u>Caput arsisse Servio</u> <u>Tullio dormienti</u> quae historia non prodidit?

(8.13.ext.5; 8.14.ext.5), and Xenophon of Lampsacus (8.13.ext.7). See Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, 63.

99. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, e.g., 62.

100. *MDS* 1.6.5 has not only one, as other subdivisions, but three short stories.

101. Valerius 1.6.1: **S** Livy 1.39.1-3,5, **P** Cicero *Div.* 1.121 / Valerius 1.6.2: **S** Livy 25.39.12-16 / Valerius 1.6.3: **S** Livy 5.15-17, **P** Cicero *Div.* 1.100 / Valerius 1.6.4: **S** Cicero *Div.* 1.72 / Valerius 1.6.5a: **S** Livy 3.10.5-6 / Valerius 1.6.5b: **S** Livy 21.62.2-5; 22.1.8-13; 35.21.4 / Valerius 1.6.6: **S** Livy 22.3.11-14; 22.7.1-5, **P** Cicero *Div.* 1.77 / Valerius 1.6.7: **S** Livy 55 / Valerius 1.6.8: **S** Livy 25.16 / Valerius 1.6.9: **S** Livy 27.26-27 / Valerius 1.6.10 / Valerius 1.6.11: **S** Livy 106 / Valerius 1.6.12 / Valerius 1.6.13 / Valerius 1.6.ext.1 / Valerius 1.6.ext.2: **S** Cicero *Div.* 1.78 / Valerius 1.6.ext.3: **S** Cicero *Div.* 1.78. (**S** = source; **P** = parallel).

The table is taken from Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, 38, with some minor changes. For a further discussion the relationship of some of Valerius' sections to Livy and Cicero, see pp. 29-40.

102. The texts have been drawn from Valerius Maximus, *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, LCL 492 (London: Harvard University Press, 2000); Cicero, *De senectute*, *De amicitia*, *De divinatione*, trans. William Armistead Falconer, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923); Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, trans. B. O. Foster, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919).

puerum hunc,' inquit, 'quem
 tam humili cultu educamus?
 Scire licet hunc lumen
 quondam rebus nostris dubiis
 futurum praesidiumque
 regiae adflictae; proinde
 materiam ingentis publice
 privativumque decoris omni
 indulgentia nostra
 nutriamus.'... Hic quacumque
 de causa tantus illi honos
 habitus credere prohibet
serva natum eum parvumque
 ipsum servisse."

"Household eyes
 noticed that a flame flashed
 around the head of Servius
 Tullius, still a little boy, as he
 slept. King Ancus Marcius'
 wife Tanaquil wondered at the
 prodigy and brought him up
 like a son, thought his mother
 was a slave, and raised him to
 royal eminence."

"At this time there
 happened in the house of the
 king a portent which was
 remarkable alike in its
 manifestation and in its
 outcome. The story is that
 while a child named Servius
 Tullius lay sleeping, his head
 burst into flames in the sight
 of many. The general outcry
 which so great a miracle
 called forth brought the king
 and queen to the place. One
 of the servants fetched water
 to quench the fire, but was
 checked by the queen, who
 stilled the uproar and
 commanded that the boy
 should not be disturbed until
 he awoke of himself. Soon
 afterwards sleep left him, and
 with it disappeared the
 flames. Then, taking her
 husband aside, Tanaquil said,
 'Do you see this child whom
 we are bringing up in so
 humble a fashion? Be assured
 he will one day be a lamp to
 our dubious fortunes, and a
 protector to the royal house
 in the day of its distress. Let
 us therefore rear with all
 solicitude one who will lend
 high renown to the state and
 to our family.'... This great
 honor, for whatever cause
 conferred on him, forbids us
 to suppose that his mother
 was a slave and that he

"... What history has
 failed to record the fact that
 while Servius Tullius slept his
 head burst into flames?..."

himself had been in a state of servitude as a child.”

1.6.4

(L. Sulla):

“Nec parum prosperi successus quod sequitur. L. Sulla consul sociali bello, cum in agro Nolano ante praetorium immolaret, subito ab ima parte area prolapsam anguem prospexit, qua visa Postumii haruspici hortatu continuo exercitum in expeditionem eduxit ac fortissima Samnitium castra cepit. quae victoria futurae eius amplissimae potentiae gradus et fundamentum exstitit.”

“Nor did the following fail of a prosperous outcome. Consul L. Sulla was performing a sacrifice in front of his headquarters in the territory of Nola during the Social War when he saw a snake suddenly glide forward from the lowest part of the altar. After sight of it and at the urging of the diviner Postumius, he immediately led out his army for a foray and captured the strongly held Samnite camp. That victory was a step and basis for his future enormous power.”

1.6.5

(Volumnius and Servius Sulpicius):

“Praecipuae admirationis etiam illa prodigia, quae C. Volumnio Ser. Sulpicio consulibus in urbe nostra inter initia motusque bellorum acciderunt: bos namque mugitu suo in sermonem humanum converso novitate monstri audientium animos exterruit. carnis quoque in modum nimbi dissipatae partes ceciderunt,

Cicero, *Div.* 1.72:

“...et ut in Sullae scriptum historia videmus, quod te inspectante factum est, cum ille in agro Nolano immolaret ante praetorium, ab infima ara subito anguis emergeret, cum quidem C. Postumius haruspex oraret illum ut in expeditionem exercitum educeret. Id cum Sulla fecisset, tum ante oppidum Nola fortissima Samnitium castra cepit.”

“We find another illustration of conjectural divination in the history of Sulla in an occurrence which you witnessed. While he was offering sacrifices in front of his head-quarters in the Nolan district, a snake suddenly came out from beneath the altar. The soothsayer, Gaius Postumius, begged Sulla to proceed with his march at once. Sulla did so and captured the strongly fortified camp of the Samnites which lay in front of the town of Nola.”

Livy 3.10.5-6

“Anno deinde insequenti lex Terentilia ab toto relata collegio novos adgressa consules est; erant consules P. Volumnius Ser. Sulpicius. Eo anno caelum ardere visum, terra ingenti concussa motu est. Bovem lacutam, cui rei priore anno fides non fuerat, creditum. Inter alia prodigia et carne pluit, quem imbrem ingens

quarum maiorem numerum
praepetes diripuerunt aves,
reliquum humi per aliquot dies
neque odore taetro neque
deformi aspectu mutatum
iacuit.”

“Especially remarkable
too were prodigies that
occurred in our city in the
Consulship of C. Volumnius
and Ser. Sulpicius in the first
stirrings of wars. An ox
changed his lowing into human
speech, terrifying hearers with
the novelty of the monstrous
thing. Portions of flesh fell
scattered like a rain shower.
Most of them were torn to
shreds by birds flying straight
ahead (?); the rest lay on the
ground for several days
unchanged, neither evil-
smelling nor hideous to look
upon.”

numerus avium
intervolitando rapuisse
fertum; quod intercidit,
sparsum ita iacuisse per
aliquot dies, ut nihil odor
mutaret.”

“In the following year
the Terentilian law was
brought up again by the
entire college and menaced
the new consuls, to wit,
Publius Volumnius and
Servius Sulpicius. This year
the heavens were seen to
blaze, and the earth was
shaken with a prodigious
quake. That a cow had
spoken - a thin which had
found no credence the year
before - was now believed.
Among other portents there
was even a rain of flesh,
which is said to have been
intercepted by vast numbers
of birds flying round in the
midst of it; what fell to the
ground lay scattered about
for several days, but without
making any stench.”

A comparison between Valerius and Livy/Cicero’s versions of the parallel stories shows that Valerius paraphrased his source material very thoroughly, only occasionally keeping the wording of his sources¹⁰³ and even then often changing the word order. Valerius’ editing method is consistent. Luke neither paraphrased his sources thoroughly nor does his editing method show similar consistency to Valerius’.

Tacitus

Tacitus (ca. 56 - ca. 117 C.E.) is often regarded as the greatest historian of ancient Rome. He began his career as a writer after the assassination of Domitian in 96 C.E. In the following two decades, he wrote five monographs: *Agricola*, *Germania*, *Dialogue on Orators*, *Histories*, and

103. Notice above that several underlined words are names.

Annals. The first three are minor works, with the first two being written in 98 C.E. The last two are histories, covering the period from the accession of Tiberius in 14 C.E. to the death of Domitian in 96 C.E. The *Histories*, which covers the latter part of this period, was published before the *Annals*.

The *Annals* narrates the reign of four Julio-Claudians emperors: Tiberius (14-37 C.E.) in Books 1-6 (most of Book 5 has been lost), both Caligula (37-41 C.E.) and Claudius (41-54 C.E.) in Books 7-12 (Books 7-10 have been lost), and Nero (54-68 C.E.) in Books 13-18 (Books 17-18 have been lost).¹⁰⁴ Because all these emperors, except Nero, reigned before the birth of Tacitus, Tacitus must have drawn all his information from written and oral (e.g., *Ann.* 11.27) sources. Unfortunately, Tacitus, as well as other Latin historians, seldomly names his sources.¹⁰⁵ He refers to his sources by name only in eleven cases in the *Annals* and anonymously a few more times.¹⁰⁶ Some scholars believe that in many cases Tacitus relied on two official records: *acta senatus*, which was only available to the members of the senate, and *acta diurna*, which was available to the general public.¹⁰⁷ Because most of his probable sources have been lost, we cannot draw a definite conclusion as to how Tacitus used his sources. In two cases, however, we may get a glimpse into Tacitus' editorial method. In *Ann.* 6.6.1, Tacitus quotes a letter of Tiberius.¹⁰⁸ The

104. Timothy E. Duff, *The Greek and Roman Historians* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2003), 96. The exact number of books is uncertain, but it is generally assumed that the *Annals* originally consisted of 18 books.

105. Ronald H. Martin, "Introduction," in *Tacitus: Annals V & VI*, trans. Ronald Martin (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2001), 22.

106. For the list of references, see A. J. Woodman, "Introduction," in *Tacitus: The Annals*, trans. A. J. Woodman (Cambridge: Hackett, 2004), xiv-xv. Tacitus refers to the following sources by name: The Elder Pliny (*Ann.* 1.69.2; 13.20.2; 15.53.3), Cluvius Rufus and Fabius Rusticus (13.20.2; 14.2.1-2; 15.61.3), the Younger Agrippa (4.53.2), Corbulo (15.16.1), the speeches of Tiberius (1.81.1; 2.63.3); a letter of Tiberius (6.6.1).

See also Ronald H. Martin, *Tacitus* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 199-213; Ronald Mellor, *Tacitus* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 31-35; Herbert W. Benario, *An Introduction to Tacitus* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975), 80-87; Oliver Devillers, *Tacite et les sources des Annales: enquêtes sur la méthode historique* (Louvain: Editions Peeters, 2003).

107. Benario, *An Introduction to Tacitus*, 84; Woodman, "Introduction," xv; Martin, "Introduction," 23-25.

108. *Insigne visum est earum Caesaris litterarum initium; nam his verbis exorsus est: "Quid scribam vobis, patres conscripti, aut quo modo scribam aut quid omnino non scribam hoc tempore, di me deaque peius perdant, quam perire me cotidie sentio, si scio."*

"The start of the letter of Caesar's was regarded as distinctive, for he opened with these words: 'If I know what to write to you, conscript fathers, or how to write or what not to write all at this time, may the gods and

same quotation is found almost verbatim in Suetonius, *Tiberius* 67.1.¹⁰⁹ This indicates that, at least occasionally, Tacitus preserved the wording of his sources. Most often, however, he seems to have paraphrased his sources completely as a comparison of the official record of Claudius' speech in the senate in 48 C.E.¹¹⁰ and Tacitus' version of it, recorded in *Ann.* 11.24, shows. In the speech, Claudius argues for the right of Gallic nobles to become senators. A. J. Woodman, an expert on Tacitus, is certain that Tacitus "had in front of him a copy of Claudius' original" because "half a dozen main points are common both to the original and to Tacitus' version," even though "Tacitus' version is otherwise nothing like Claudius' original."¹¹¹ To give a glimpse at how different these versions are, I have included a latter part of these speeches, where the Gauls are mentioned, side by side.¹¹²

Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.24

It is regretted that the Balbi crossed over from Spain and families equally distinguished from Narbonese Gaul? Their descendants remain; nor do they yield to ourselves in love for this native land of theirs. What else proved fatal to Lacedaemon and Athens, in spite of their power in arms, but their policy of holding the conquered aloof as alien-born? But the sagacity of our own founder Romulus was such that several times he fought and naturalized a people in the course of the same day! Strangers have been kings over us: the conferment of magistracies

The official version

It is time now, Tiberius Caesar Germanicus, for you to reveal to the members of the senate the direction of your speech; for you have already reached the outer limits of Narbonensian Gaul. Here, under my eyes, are all these distinguished men in the prime of life. It would not be a cause of regret if they were senators any more than it is to Persicus, a man of the highest consular lineage and a friend of mine, to read the name of 'Allobrogicus' when he looks at the busts of his ancestors. Now if you agree that this is the case, what more do you need than for me to use my finger to point

goddesses destroy me worse than they daily death I feel."

The Latin quotation from the LCL; the English quotation from Tacitus, *The Annals*, trans. A. J. Woodman (Cambridge: Hackett, 2004), 168.

109. Postremo semet ipse pertaesus, tali epistulae principio tantum non summam malorum sourum professus est: "Quid scribam vobis, p.c., aut quo modo scribam, aut quid omnino non scribam hoc tempore, dii me deaeque peius perdant quam cotidie perire sentio, si scio.

"At last in utter self-disgust he all but admitted the extremity of his wretchedness in a letter beginning as follows: 'If I know what to write to you, Fathers of the Senate, or how to write it, or what to leave unwritten at present, may all gods and goddesses visit me with more utter destruction than I feel that I am daily suffering.'"

Both texts have been drawn from the LCL.

110. The official version of the speech was found at Lyons in 1524, written on bronze tablets.

111. Woodman, "Introduction," xvi.

112. The Latin text of the official version of the Claudius' speech is available in Hermannus Dessau, ed., *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* (Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1892), No. 212. An English translation of it is available in Barbara Levick, *The Government of the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Routledge, 2000), 178–80.

on the sons of freedmen is not the novelty which it is commonly and mistakenly thought, but a frequent practice of the old commonwealth. – ‘But we fought with the Senones.’ – Then, presumably, the Volscians and Aequians never drew up a line of battle against us. – ‘We were taken by the Gauls.’ – But we also gave hostages to the Tuscans and underwent the yoke of the Samnites. – And yet, if you survey the whole of our wars, not one was finished within a shorter period than that against the Gauls: thence-forward there has been a continuous and loyal peace. Now that customs, culture, and the ties of marriage have blended them with ourselves, let them bring among us their gold and their riches instead of retaining them beyond the pale!

out to you that actually the soil outside the boundaries of the province of Narbonensis already sends you senators, since it is not a cause of regret that we have members of our order from Lugdunum? Differently indeed, members of the senate, have I passed outside the provincial boundaries that are known and familiar to you; but the case for Gallia Comata has now to be fought with no holds barred. In the course of it, if anyone has an eye to the fact that they kept the deified Julius busy fighting for ten years, let him also consider the other side: one hundred years of unshakable loyalty and a readiness to obey that has been more than tried during a number of crises in our affairs. While my father Drusus Germanicus was conquering Germany they remained quiet and so afforded him secure and untroubled peace behind him, and that when he had been called away to the war from the work of carrying out the census, a novel and unfamiliar operation to the Gauls at that time.

Creativity, uniqueness, and rhetorical beauty were even more important to Tacitus, who is considered to be the greatest historian of ancient Rome, than scientific accuracy (cf. Cicero, *De or.* 2.51-64; *De gen.* 5.15; 7.23). Tacitus had learned his lessons well: a good orator paraphrases his sources rather than reproduces them. We have good reason to believe that he did so with almost all of his source material.

Livy

Titus Livius (= Livy; 59 B.C.E.? - 17 C.E.?), the author of the massive *Ab Urbe Condita* (*From the Foundation of the City*), “remains the most nebulous figure of all the greater historians of the ancient world.”¹¹³ His work originally consisted of 142 books, covering a period of 744 years, from the foundation of Rome to the death of Drusus in 9 B.C.E. Only Books 1-10 and 21-45, which cover the years 753-293 and 219-167 B.C.E., have survived.¹¹⁴ Scholars agree that

113. P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 1 For the personal history of Livy, see pp. 1-19, and B. O. Foster, “Introduction,” in *Livy*, trans. B. O. Foster, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), ix-xxxvi.

114. Walsh, *Livy*, 5.

Livy blocked out his material in bundles of five books (i.e., pentad), a pair of pentads sometimes forming the dominant unit (Books 6-16, 21-30).¹¹⁵ T. J. Luce suggests the following structure for the first 45 books: 1-15: Early Rome (1-5: From the Founding to the Sack; 6-15: The Conquest of Italy); 16-30: The Punic Wars (16-20: The First Punic War; 21-30: The Second Punic War); 31-45: The Conquest of the East (31-35: The War with Philip V; 36-40: The War with Antiochus; 41-45: The War with Perseus).¹¹⁶

Luce argues, partly following H. Nissen,¹¹⁷ that Livy composed his work in three stages:¹¹⁸ First, he read extensively in long periods of Roman history in order to determine the amount of material and to choose his sources for his work. Luce contends that Livy chose his sources based on the following criteria: "general credibility, the fame and reputation of the writer, the closeness of the author to the period of question, potential for effective literary adaption, and fullness."¹¹⁹ Although Livy tried to use reliable sources, there is no evidence, however, that Livy ever consulted primary sources, which is naturally his major fault as an historian.¹²⁰ The size of his work may have been a major reason for heavily relying on secondary sources; Livy must have written at least three books per year, if he worked on the project from 27 B.C.E. until 17 C.E.¹²¹ Second, Livy read again through the selected material for each major block and designed how to arrange the material and join together material from various sources. Third, Livy wrote up the material section by section. Luce argues that Livy wrote those sections from memory, consulting his sources only occasionally during the writing process.

Scholars agree that Polybius (ca. 200 - 118 B.C.E), whose 40-volume Greek-text *Historiae* is still partly extant, was definitely Livy's major source in Books 31-45, although it is

115. T. James Luce, *Livy: The Composition of His History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 3, 6.

116. T. James Luce, *Livy*, 7.

117. H. Nissen, "Das Geschichtswerk des Titus Livius," *RhM* 27 (1872): 539-61.

118. T. James Luce, *Livy*, 188-229. Cf. the working method of Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 3.5.

119. T. James Luce, *Livy*, 145.

120. P. G. Walsh, "Livy," in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), 121.

121. Foster, "Introduction," xi.

possible he may have already drawn some of his material from Polybius from Book 24 onwards.¹²² Now it is generally agreed that, although Books 21-22 have similar material to Polybius', Livy did not draw it from Polybius.¹²³ Livy is believed to have derived information for events in Italy and Spain in Books 31-45 from Valerius Antias and Claudius Quadrigarius, whose works, unfortunately, have almost completely been lost.¹²⁴

Luce argues that Livy commonly employed Polybius' material in the following three ways: "(1) close adaption: i.e. retaining all major items of information and the order in which the Greek historian gave them; (2) recasting rather thoroughly, yet retaining the essential points of the original: e.g. shifting the order about, omitting minor items, making additions, elaborating certain facts or ideas; (3) extensive abridgment: i.e. not only being as succinct as possible, but omitting facts, episodes, and ideas of importance. Rarely does he undertake what might be termed a true epitome."¹²⁵ Luce offers the following passages as examples of the first category: 37.18.10-19.7 = Pol. 21.10; 37.45.4-21 = Pol. 21.16-17; 38.38.1-39.2 = Pol. 21.41-43; 42.65.9-10 = Pol. 27.11; 33.35 = Pol. 18.48; 43.19.13-20.4 = Pol. 28.8; 45.3.3-8 = Pol. 29.19; 38.5.1-5 = Pol. 21.27.1-6; 33.39 = Pol. 18.49-50; 37.52.7-10 = Pol. 21.18.5-10; 37.54.4-15 = Pol. 21.22.5-23.4.¹²⁶ However, even a quick comparison of these parallel passages shows that Livy has completely and consistently paraphrased the material he has drawn from Polybius. I have included two typical examples below.¹²⁷ In the other two other categories mentioned by Luce, differences between the versions of Polybius and Livy are even greater.

122. Walsh, *Livy*, 125; T. James Luce, *Livy*, 189. Luce questions the view that Livy relied on Polybius in Books 24-30.

For the lists of parallel passages in Livy 31-45 and Polybius, see Hermann Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios* (Basel: Schwabe, 1977), 29-32; John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy: Books XXXI-XXXIII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 1; John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy: Books XXXIV-XXXVII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 1; John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy: Books 38-40* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 1-2.

123. T. James Luce, *Livy*, 178.

124. Walsh, "Livy," 122-23.

125. T. James Luce, *Livy*, 205.

126. T. James Luce, *Livy*, 205 n.27.

127. The translations from Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. Paton, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922); Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, trans. E. T. Sage, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922).

Polybius 18.49b-50

Antiochus's project was going on as well as he could wish, and while he was in Thrace, Lucius Cornelius arrived by sea at Selymbria. He was the ambassador sent by the Senate to establish peace between Antiochus and Ptolemy. At the same time arrived three of the ten commissioners, Publius Lentulus from Bargylia and Lucius Terentius and Publius Villius from Thasos. Their arrival was at once reported to the king and a few days afterwards all assembled at Lysimachia. Hegesianax and Lysias, the envoys who had been sent to Flaminus, arrived there at the same time. In the unofficial interviews of the king and the Romans the conversation was simple and friendly, but afterwards when an official conference about the situation in general was held, things assumed another aspect. For Lucius Cornelius, asked Antiochus to retire from the cities previously subject to Ptolemy which he had taken possession of in Asia, while as to those previously subject to Philip he demanded with urgency that he should evacuate them. For it was a ridiculous thing, he said, that Antiochus should come in when all was over and take the prizes they had gained in their war with Philip. He also advised him to keep his hands off the autonomous cities. And generally speaking he said he wondered on what pretext the king had crossed to Europe with such large military and naval forces. For anyone who judged correctly could not suppose that the reason was any other than that he was trying to put himself in the way of the Romans. The Roman envoy having concluded his speech thus...

Polybius 21.27.1-6

The Aetolians, besieged in Ambracia by the Roman consul Marcus Fulvius, gallantly resisted the assaults of rams and other machines. For the consul, after securing his camp, had begun siege operations on an extensive scale. He brought up three machines through the level country near the Pyrrheum at some distance from each other but advancing on parallel lines, a fourth at the Aesculapium and a fifth at the acropolis. As the assault was

Livy 33.39

At this time, too, Lucius Cornelius, sent by the senate to arbitrate the difference between the kings, Antiochus and Ptolemy, stopped at Selymbria, and some of the ten commissioners, Publius Lentulus from Bargylia and Publius Villius and Lucius Terentius from Thasos, came to Lysimachia. Also, Lucius Cornelius from Selymbria and Antiochus from Thrace arrived there a few days later. There was a preliminary meeting with the ambassadors and then a kindly and hospitable reception, but when the debate over their instructions and the present situation in Asia began, there were displays of temper. The Romans did not conceal the fact that his conduct, from the time he set sail from Syria, was displeasing to the senate, and they also deemed it right that all the cities which had belonged to Ptolemy should be restored to him; for, as regarded the cities formerly held by Philip, which Antiochus had taken the opportunity to seize while Philip was engaged in the Roman war, they regarded it as surely unendurable that the Romans should have suffered so many toils and dangers for so many years on land and sea and that Antiochus should carry off the prizes of war. But, granting that the Romans pretended to ignore his advice into Asia as an act which did not concern them, what then? What of the fact that he was even then crossing into Europe with all his fleets and armies, and how far did that differ from an open declaration of war on the Romans? He, of course, would deny it, even if he crossed into Italy, but the Romans would not wait for him to have the power to do this...

Livy 38.5.1-5

The consul had by now completed the fortifications by which the town had to be surrounded as well as the siege-engines which he was making ready to move up to the walls, and attacked the ramparts in five places at once. Three of the assaults, equidistant from one another, the approach from the plain being easier, he directed against what they call the "Pyrrheum," one on the side of the temple of Aesculapius, one against the citadel. He was

vigorously conducted at one and the same time in all these places, the besieged were terrified by the prospect of what awaited them. While the rams continued to batter the walls and the long sickle-shaped grapples to drag down the battlements, the defenders of the city made efforts to counter-engineer them, dropping by means of cranes leaden weights, stones, and stumps of trees on to the rams and after catching the sickles with iron anchors dragging them inside the wall, so that the pole of the apparatus was smashed against the battlement and the sickle itself remained in their hands. They also made frequent sallies, sometimes attaching by night those who slept on the machines, and sometimes openly attempting in daylight to dislodge the day shift, thus impeding the progress of the siege.

shaking the walls with battering-rams; he was pulling down the parapets with hooks fixed on poles. The citizens were at first stricken with terror and confusion both at the sight and at the blows which struck the walls with fearful din; then, when they saw the walls still standing, contrary to expectations, they recovered their courage and with the aid of cranes they dropped on the rams masses of lead or stone or stout logs; seizing the wall-hooks with grappling-irons they pulled them inside the walls and broke off the poles; besides, by sallies conducted both by night against the guards of the engines and by day against the outposts they did their part in spreading terror.

In the following decades and centuries, Livy's work became the standard source-book for other Greco-Roman authors, including Lucan, Silius Italicus, Asconius, Frontinus, Florus, Cassius Dio, Plutarch, and Valerius Maximus as already noted above.¹²⁸

Not all ancient writers, however, used highly paraphrastic editing methods. Some biblical writers used the exact opposite method, and now we are turning to those authors.

Highly Literal Editing Method

Introduction

The admiration of rhetorical creativity, promoted by Greco-Roman higher education, may explain why Greco-Roman authors, including those Jewish authors who were deeply influenced by Greco-Roman thinking and education, used a highly paraphrastic editing method. As we have seen, those authors were pretty consistent in rewriting their sources.

At the other end of the spectrum are some biblical writers who used a highly literal editing method: they faithfully preserved the wording of their sources. The most probable explanation for

128. Foster, "Introduction," xxiii-xxiv.

this conservatism in editing may be that those source texts, which were faithfully preserved, were regarded as sacred. These authors also seem to have been very consistent in copy-editing.

Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22

Psalm 18, the third longest psalm, is commonly classified as a royal song of thanksgiving. It has a parallel in 2 Samuel 22. These two versions are almost identical, having only few expansions and variants.¹²⁹ Despite their likeness, the majority of scholars agree with P. C. Craigie and J. Goldingay who argue respectively that “it is clear that they represent two variant traditions (perhaps northern and southern?) in the history of the psalm’s transmission.”¹³⁰ and that “[i]t is inappropriate to assimilate the two to each other; they are simply two versions.”¹³¹ Neither a psalmist nor the author of 2 Samuel copied the psalm from each other but “[t]hey are recensions of a common original,” either written or oral.¹³² “There can be no certainty as to which may be the oldest and most authentic of the two texts.”¹³³ A comparison of these two independent texts reveals how faithfully at least some Jews transmitted sacred texts.

2 Kings 18:13-20:19 and Isaiah 36:1-39:8

The parallel texts in 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39 are another example of high verbatim agreement between two OT texts.¹³⁴ Apart from 2 Kgs 18:14-22,¹³⁵ which is missing in the Isaiah

129. See Primus Vannutelli, *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum Loci Paralleli* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1931), 118–29; James D. Newsome, Jr., *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles: With Related Passages from Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezra* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986), 64–69.

For a detailed analysis of the texts, see Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: 2 Samuel 22 = Psalm 18,” *JBL* 72 (1953): 15–34.

130. Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, WBC 19 (Waco: Word Books, 1983), 171.

131. John Goldingay, *Psalms 1–41*, vol. 1, BCOT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 253.

132. Goldingay, *Psalms 1–41*, 253. See also Marian Smelik and Willem Smelik, “Twin Targums: Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22,” in *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*, eds. Ada Rapaport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg, JSOTSup 333 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 244.

133. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, 171. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 256, holds that “Psalm 18 is closer than 2 Samuel 22 to the prototype,” whereas Cross and Freedman, “A Royal Song of Thanksgiving,” 16, argue that “[t]he presence of... orthographic archaism in II Sam 22 is remarkable.”

134. See Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39: A Continental Commentary*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 428–93; Vannutelli, *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum Loci Paralleli*, 560–607; Newsome, *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*, 223–40;

version, some minor variations in words, and a few brief expansions – mainly in the 2 Kgs version – these two texts are almost identical. Some of these pericopes also have parallels in 2 Chr 32:1-31, but the wording of the Chronicles version differs significantly.¹³⁶

The parallel accounts in 2 Kings and Isaiah consist of three stories:¹³⁷ Hezekiah's confrontation with Sennacherib (2 Kgs 18:13-19:37/Isa 36:1-37:38), his illness (2 Kgs 20:1-11/Isa 38:1-8, 21-22¹³⁸), and meeting with the delegation from Babylon (2 Kgs 20:12-19/Isa 39:1-8).

Since P. Ackroyd's 1974 and 1982 articles,¹³⁹ a general consensus, especially among 'liberal scholars,' has been that Isa 36-39 is not only an appendage to First Isaiah (chs. 1-35), as M. Gesenius suggested in his commentary (1821), but that it is "a redactional bridge joining First and Second [chs. 40-66 or 40-55] Isaiah"¹⁴⁰ "because they refer both backwards to what precedes

John C. Endres, William R. Millar, and John Barclay Burns, eds., *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 307-21.

135. Scholars debate whether or not 2 Kgs 18:14-22 is an integral part of 2 Kings (H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1994], 200-01) or a later addition to it (Christopher R. Seitz, *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 51-61).

136. The relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles will be discussed later, but 2 Chr 32:2-8 ('Hezekiah's water tunnel') indicates that the Chronicler had access to historical sources beyond Samuel-Kings.

137. The majority of critical scholars have accepted B. Stade (1886) and B. Duhm's (1875) view that originally this section consisted of four independent stories: two independent accounts of the events of 701 B.C.E. have been woven together in chs. 36 and 37 (Wildberger, *Isaiah 28-39*, 364).

138. The order of events differs in 2 Kgs and Isaiah (2 Kgs 20:1-6 = Isa 38:1-6; 2 Kgs 20:7-8 = Isa 38:21-22; 2 Kgs 20:9-11 = Isa 38:7-8). In addition, Hezekiah's thanksgiving hymn (Isa 38:9-20) is missing in 2 Kgs. If the author of the book of Isaiah drew the account from 2 Kings, as the majority of scholars believe, why did he distort the logical order of events found in 2 Kings? Because of the change of order, Hezekiah's thanksgiving hymn, which he composed "after his illness and recovery" (Isa 38:9), precedes the account of the recovery (Isa 38:21) and Hezekiah's request of sign remains unanswered in the Isaianic version (38:22). It would have been much more logical to keep the order found in 2 Kgs 20:1-11 and add the thanksgiving hymn at the end of this account.

Many scholars believe that the story of Hezekiah's illness occurred chronologically before Sennacherib's invasion (cf. Isa 38:6 with ch. 37).

139. Peter R. Ackroyd, "An Interpretation of the Babylonian Exile: A Study of II Kings 20 and Isaiah 38-39," *SJT* 27 (1974): 329-52; reprinted in *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1987), 152-71; "Isaiah 36-39: Structure and Function," in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. Dr. J. P. M. van der Ploeg*, eds. W. C. Delsman et al, AOAT 211 (Kavelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1982), 3-21; reprinted in Ackroyd, *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament*, 105-20.

140. The quotation from Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 260.

and forwards to chapter 40-55.”¹⁴¹ Chapters 36-39 are believed to have been added to the end of First Isaiah either by the author or by a redactor of Second Isaiah.¹⁴²

Since Gesenius’ commentary, a wide consensus has been that either the author or a redactor of Second Isaiah derived Isa 36-39 from 2 Kings. Gesenius argued that 2 Kgs 18-20 was an integral part of the book and therefore more original.¹⁴³ In recent decades, however, this view has been challenged by several scholars. Some, including A. Jepsen,¹⁴⁴ K. A. D. Smelik,¹⁴⁵ J. N. Oswald,¹⁴⁶ and R. Seitz,¹⁴⁷ argue that the Isaiah version is more original and that the author or a redactor of Second Isaiah did not derive it from 2 Kings.¹⁴⁸ Others, including H. Wildberger,¹⁴⁹ A. H. Konkel,¹⁵⁰ and H. G. M. Williamson,¹⁵¹ maintain Gesenius’ view that the author or a redactor of Isaiah drew the material of chs. 36-39 from 2 Kings, but reject Gesenius’ view that this material was composed by the author or a redactor of 2 Kings. Instead, they interestingly believe this block of material forms a single independent unit, which was “incorporated first into Kings and then from that passage into Isaiah.”¹⁵² Whether the material under discussion was derived by the author or a redactor of Isaiah from 2 Kings, the reverse, or independently from a common source,

141. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 188.

For a history of criticism on Isaiah, see G. L. Robinson and R. K. Harrison, “Isaiah,” in *ISBE: Vol. 2*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 893–904; Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, 513–31.

142. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, challenges this view. He argues that “there are strong links of a literary nature between Isaiah 36-9 and the earlier chapters in the book” (p. 193), but he does not find similar links between Isa 36-39 and the second half of the book (pp. 196-97, 209). If so, why would the author or a redactor of Second Isaiah have added chapter 36-39 to the work as a bridge?

143. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, 361–62.

144. Alfred Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1956), 77.

145. Klaus A. D. Smelik, “Distortion of Old Testament Prophecy: The Purpose of Isaiah XXXVI and XXXVII,” *OtSt* 24 (1986): 70–93.

146. John N. Oswald, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 700–01.

147. Seitz, *Zion’s Final Destiny*, 66–71, 136–41.

148. For Smelik’s main arguments for his theory, see Smelik, “Distortion of Old Testament Prophecy”. For summaries of Smelik’s theory and contra-arguments, see Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 190–209; Childs, *Isaiah*, 261–62.

149. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, 361, 364.

150. A. H. Konkel, “The Sources of the Hezekiah in the Book of Isaiah,” *VT* 43 (1993): 482.

151. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 209.

152. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, 364.

one thing is clear: the text was copied faithfully and consistently; verbatim agreement between all the parallel pericopes in 2 Kgs 18-20 and Isa 36-39 is high.

2 Kings 24:18-25:30 and Jeremiah 39:1-10; 40:5-41:3; 52:1-34

The book of Jeremiah is a very interesting text source critically. The text of its Greek translation (LXX) is about 2700 words shorter than the MT and some of its material is in a different order than in the MT.¹⁵³ Three extensive sections of the MT, which deal with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E., are absent in the LXX (Jer 39:4-13; 52:2-3, 27b-30). Discoveries from Qumran have made the text critical issue even more exciting: four fragments of the book of Jeremiah agree closely with the MT, while two represent a shorter form similar to the LXX.¹⁵⁴ “[T]wo explanations have been offered: either the LXX translator(s) has deliberately abbreviated the Hebrew text, or the MT is expansionistic due to later scribal redaction that enlarged the shorter Hebrew manuscript tradition residing behind the LXX translation.”¹⁵⁵ Many scholars support the latter view.¹⁵⁶

The fall of Jerusalem is described twice in the book of Jeremiah; first in 39:1-10 and then again in 52:4-16. Between them, there are the following accounts: Jeremiah’s first release (39:11-14), a message to Eved-melech (39:15-18), Jeremiah’s second release (40:1-6), Gedaliah’s governorship and assassination (40:7-41:18), Jeremiah’s warning against going to Egypt (42:1-22), the flight to Egypt and Jeremiah’s warning of judgment (43:1-44:30), a message to Baruch (45:1-5), and prophecies against the nations (46:1-51:64: Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom,

153. Ralph W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint After Qumran*, GBSOT (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 20; Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction, Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and Also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament*, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1965), 348–49.

154. Martin Abegg Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, trans., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time Into English* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999), 382–83. See also Leo G. Perdue, “Jeremiah in Modern Research: Approaches and Issues,” in *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies*, eds. Leo G. Perdue and Brian W. Kovacs (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1984), 11; Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 173–77.

155. Perdue, “Jeremiah in Modern Research,” 11.

156. Perdue, “Jeremiah in Modern Research,” 11–12.

Damascus, Kedar and Hazar, Elam, and Babylon). The last section ends with the words, “Thus far are the words of Jeremiah” (51:64). Many scholars argue that ch. 52 is a later addition to the book of Jeremiah.¹⁵⁷

All the material of Jer 52, except 52:28-30, has parallel in 2 Kgs 24:18-25:30 as shown below.

<u>2 Kings</u>	<u>Jeremiah</u>	<u>Jeremiah</u>
24:18-20	52:1-3	
25:1-12	52:4-16	39:1-10
25:13-17	52:17-23	
25:18-21	52:24-27	
	52:28-30	
25:22-26		40:5-41:3
25:27-30	52:31-34	

The account in 2 Kgs 25 agrees almost word for word with its parallel in Jer 52, having only a minimal number of variations in wording. However, the Jeremiah version has a number of brief expansions which, interestingly, often agree with Jer 39:1-10 against the parallel section in 2 Kgs 25:1-12 as shown below (only part of the section is included; the expansions of Jer 52 in relation to 2 Kgs 25, and agreements between Jer 52 and Jer 39 against 2 Kgs 25 are underlined). The 2 Kgs 25 version has no expansions in comparison with its parallel accounts.

<u>2 Kgs 25:1-8</u>	<u>Jer 52:4-12</u>	<u>Jer 39:1-7</u>
¹ וַיְהִי בַשָּׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית לְמָלְכוֹ בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂירִי בְּעָשׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ בָּא נְבוֹכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ-בָּבֶל הוּא וְכָל-חֵילוֹ עַל-יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיִּחַן עָלֶיהָ וַיִּבְנוּ עָלֶיהָ דִּיקָה סָבִיב: ² וַתָּבֹא הָעִיר בַּמָּצוֹר עַד עֲשֵׁתִי עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לְמָלְךְ צִדְקִיָּהוּ:	⁴ וַיְהִי בַשָּׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית לְמָלְכוֹ בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂירִי בְּעָשׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ בָּא נְבוֹכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ-בָּבֶל הוּא וְכָל-חֵילוֹ אֶל-יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיִּחַן עָלֶיהָ וַיִּבְנוּ עָלֶיהָ דִּיקָה סָבִיב: ⁵ וַתָּבֹא הָעִיר בַּמָּצוֹר עַד עֲשֵׁתִי עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לְמָלְךְ צִדְקִיָּהוּ:	¹ בַּשָּׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית לְצִדְקִיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ-יְהוּדָה בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂירִי בָא נְבוֹכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ-בָּבֶל וְכָל-חֵילוֹ אֶל-יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיִּצְרוּ עָלֶיהָ: ס ² בְּעֶשְׂתֵי-עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לְצִדְקִיָּהוּ

157. For the history of discussion about the literary evolution of the books of Jeremiah, and W. L. Holladay's suggestion, see William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah: Chapters 26–52*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 10–24.

בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי בַּחֲשֻׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ

הַקֹּזֶעַ הָעִיר:

³ וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל שָׂרֵי מֶלֶךְ-בָּבֶל וַיֵּשְׁבוּ

בְּשַׁעַר הַתֹּנֶן גִּרְגַּל שַׁרְאָצָר

סַמְגָר-נָבִי שַׁר־סָכִים רַב־סָרִיס

גִּרְגַּל שַׁרְאָצָר רַב־מָג וְכָל־שְׂאֵרֵי

שָׂרֵי מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל:

⁴ וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָם צִדְקִיָּהוּ

מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה וְכָל־אֲנָשֵׁי הַמְּלָחָמָה

וַיִּבְרָחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ לָלֶזֶת מִן־הָעִיר

וַיָּדָךְ גֵּן הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּשַׁעַר בֵּינוֹ

הַחֲמֹתִים וַיֵּצֵא דָרֶךְ הָעֶרְבָה:

⁵ וַיִּרְדְּפוּ חֵיל־כַּשְׂדִּים אַחֲרֵיהֶם

וַיִּשְׁגּוּ אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּעֶרְבוֹת יְרֵחוֹ .

וַיִּקְחוּ אֹתוֹ וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ

אֶל־נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל

רַב־לְתָהּ בְּאַרְצַ חֲמַת וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ

מִשְׁפָּטִים:

⁶ וַיִּשְׁחַט מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל אֶת־בְּנֵי

צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּרַב־לָהּ לְעִינָיו וְאֶת־

כָּל־חֲרֵי יְהוּדָה שְׁחַט מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל: ⁷

וְאֶת־עֵינֵי צִדְקִיָּהוּ עֹגֵר וַיֹּאסְרֵהוּ .

בְּנֻחְשָׁתִּים לִבִּיא אִתּוֹ בָּבֶלָה:

⁶ בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי בַּחֲשֻׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ

וַיִּחְזַק הָרָעַב בָּעִיר וְלֹא־הָיָה לָהֶם

לֶעָם הָאָרֶץ: ⁷ וַתִּבְקַע הָעִיר

³ בַּחֲשֻׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ וַיִּחְזַק הָרָעַב

בָּעִיר וְלֹא־הָיָה לָהֶם לֶעָם הָאָרֶץ:

⁴ וַתִּבְקַע הָעִיר

וְכָל־אֲנָשֵׁי

הַמְּלָחָמָה וַיִּבְרָחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ מִן־הָעִיר

לָלֶזֶת וַיָּדָךְ שַׁעַר בֵּינוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ

אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ

וְכָשְׂדִים עַל־הָעִיר סָבִיב וַיָּלֶךְ

דָּרֶךְ הָעֶרְבָה:

וְכָל־אֲנָשֵׁי

הַמְּלָחָמָה וַיִּבְרָחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ מִן־הָעִיר

לָלֶזֶת וַיָּדָךְ שַׁעַר בֵּינוֹ הַחֲמֹתִים .

אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ וְכָשְׂדִים

עַל־הָעִיר סָבִיב וַיָּלֶכּוּ דָּרֶךְ

הָעֶרְבָה:

⁸ וַיִּרְדְּפוּ חֵיל־כַּשְׂדִּים אַחֲרָיו

הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּשְׁגּוּ אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּעֶרְבוֹת

יְרֵחוֹ וְכָל־חֲרֵי־לָהּ נִפְצוּ מֵעֵלָיו: ⁹

וַיִּתְּפֹשׂוּ אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ אֹתוֹ

אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל רַב־לְתָהּ בְּאַרְצַ

חֲמַת וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּטִים:

¹⁰ וַיִּשְׁחַט מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל אֶת־בְּנֵי

צִדְקִיָּהוּ לְעִינָיו וְגַם אֶת־כָּל־שָׂרֵי

יְהוּדָה שְׁחַט בְּרַב־לְתָהּ: ¹¹ וְאֶת־עֵינֵי

צִדְקִיָּהוּ עֹגֵר וַיֹּאסְרֵהוּ בְּנֻחְשָׁתִּים

וַיִּבְאֵהוּ מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בָּבֶלָה וַיִּתְּנֵהוּ

(בְּבֵית־) [בֵּית־] הַפְּקֻדָּת עַד־יוֹם

מוֹתוֹ:

¹² וּבַחֹדֶשׁ הַחֲמִישִׁי בְּעָשׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ

הָיָא שְׁנַת תִּשְׁע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לְמֶלֶךְ

נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בָּא

נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי

מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בִּירוּשָׁלַם:

⁸ וּבַחֹדֶשׁ הַחֲמִישִׁי בְּשָׁבָעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ

הָיָא שְׁנַת תִּשְׁע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לְמֶלֶךְ

נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בָּא

נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים עֹמֵד

מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בִּירוּשָׁלַם:

How do we explain the relationship of these three accounts? There is no easy and certain answer to this question. Although the source critical question of Jer 52 has raised a lot of discussion, the same cannot be said about Jer 39. W. L. Holladay suggests that ch. 52 was added to the book of Jeremiah in the exilic period, whereas most of the material of chs. 38-40 was added to it later in the fifth century.¹⁵⁸ A redactor derived Jer 52, except vv. 28-30, from 2 Kgs 25 and expanded it slightly.¹⁵⁹ Later, another redactor expanded the existent Jer 39 by vv. 4-10, which he derived from Jer 52:6-16 (Jer 39:4-10, as noted above, is missing in the LXX version suggesting that it is a secondary addition to the MT).¹⁶⁰ Holladay is very obscure regarding the source of the rest of Jer 39. Because Jer 39:11-18 do not have a parallel in 2 Kings or Jeremiah 52, Holladay cannot naturally argue that they were derived canonical writings. As for vv. 1-2, he only obscurely states, “[v]v. 1-2,... are a duplicate or adaption of 52:4-[7a] = 2 Kgs 25:1-[4a],” while, he clearly states, regarding Jer 39:4-10 that they were derived from Jer 52.¹⁶¹ If Holladay believes that Jer 39:1-2, which states the capture of Jerusalem by the army of Nebuchadnezzar, was derived from Jer 52, then the account of Jer 38:28 ... 39:11ff. was unintelligible before the addition of Jer 39:1-10 because the story line moved directly from the imprisonment of Jeremiah (38:28) to Nebuchadnezzar’s instructions concerning Jeremiah (39:11ff.) without ever mentioning that Jerusalem was captured by the army of Nebuchadnezzar. Another theory is that a redactor(s) of Jer 39 derived vv. 1-2 from 2 Kgs 25:1-3a and vv. 4-10 from Jer 52.¹⁶² This explanation is highly unlikely for at least three reasons: i) Not all scholars agree with Holladay that Jer 39 is a later addition than Jer 52; ii) Verbatim agreement between Jer 39:1-2 and its parallel passages in Jer 52:4-7a / 2 Kgs 25:1-4a is more similar than between Jer 39:4-10 and Jer 52:7b-16 / 2 Kgs 25:4b-

158. Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 24.

159. Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 439. Holladay believes that Jer 52:28-30 were derived “from a contemporary record” (p. 24).

160. Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 439.

161. Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 291. William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah: Volume II: Commentary on Jeremiah XXVI-LII*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 972, is less dubious when he states, “Verses 1-2 are extracted from 52.4-6 (2 Kgs 25.1-3).”

162. As noted above, Holladay clearly states that Jer 39:4-10 was drawn from Jer 52.

12 suggesting that both Jer 39:1-2 and 39:4-10 were derived from the same source by the same individual; iii) Why would the redactor(s) of Jer 39:1-2,(3) have dropped off the time reference in v. 1 (“on the tenth day of the month”) though it is present in 2 Kgs 25:1, and added another time reference in v. 2 (“in the fourth month”) though it is absent in 2 Kgs 25:2 while being present in Jer 52:6? This theory does not make any sense. A more natural explanation is that a redactor(s) of Jer 52 used 2 Kgs 25 as his major source but added some extra information from Jer 39. It is likely that a redactor(s) of Jer 39:1-10 did not derive the material directly from 2 Kgs 25 but that Jer 39:1-10 represents an independent or pre-MT tradition.¹⁶³ This may explain, for example, an inconsistency between 2 Kgs 25:1 / Jer 39:1 and 2 Kgs 25:2 / Jer 39:2 as discussed above. As a comparison of the MT Jeremiah version with the LXX Jeremiah version and their akims in Qumran show, there were at least two different kinds of Hebrew versions of the book in circulation at one time.

The account of Gedaliah’s governorship and assassination in Jer 40:5-41:3 has a parallel in 2 Kgs 25:22-26, but the former account is much longer and more detailed than the latter one. W. McKane explains the relationship between them as follows:¹⁶⁴

The availability of 2 Kgs 25.23-24 enables us to inspect three stages of the history of the Hebrew text and not just the two which are usually presented in the book of Jeremiah by MT and the shorter of Sept. respectively. In this enlarged setting 2 Kgs 25.23-24, with a shorter text than 40.7-9 (Sept), displays the earlier of these three stages. Sept. shows some of the expansions which appear in MT 40.7-9 and derives from a *Vorlage* which occupies an intermediate position, while MT, which is the longest text, bears the marks of still later expansion.

In this light, it is very unlikely that a redactor(s) of Jer 40 derived the account from MT 25.22-26.

In summary, it is not at all certain that the source of Jer 39:1-10 and 40:5-41:3 was 2 Kgs 25 or that the source of Jer 39:1-10 was Jer 52:4-16. It is likely, though not certain, that the

163. See Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 37–52. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 21C (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 81, questions the view that “the narrator” of Jer 39 would “have borrowed from the Deuteronomistic Historian.”

164. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (Vol. 2), 995–96.

source of Jer 52 was 2 Kgs 25. Whatever may be the source of Jer 52, it is clear that a redactor(s) of it copied his source very faithfully, almost verbatim.

Combination of Paraphrastic and Literal Editing Methods

Introduction

Some ancient works give an impression that their authors used both paraphrastic and literal editing methods in a single work. Most of these extant works are Jewish extracanonical writings, often belonging to the so-called rewritten Bible genre, such as *Jubilees*, *Reworked Pentateuch*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and *Pseudo-Philo*. Here, I will discuss the latter two works. The first work discussed is written by a Roman historian, Diodorus, and the last work is a canonical writing, *Chronicles*.

Diodorus Siculus

Diodorus Siculus' (1st cent. B.C.E.¹⁶⁵) work, *Bibliothèque Historique*, originally consisted of 40 books, but only Books 1-5 and 11-20 survive completely, while the rest in fragments.¹⁶⁶ Diodorus' aim was to offer a user-friendly presentation of world history, narrating the most important events from the most ancient times until about 60 B.C.E. (*Bibliothèque* 1.3-4) and introducing the content of each book at the beginning of a book. Books 1-6 "embrace the events and legends previous to the Trojan War, the first three setting forth the antiquities of the barbarians, and the next three almost exclusively those of the Greeks"; Books 7-17 narrate "events from the Trojan War [1184 B.C.E.; its historicity is questionable] to the death of Alexander [323 B.C.E.]"; and Books 18-40 describe events down to the beginning of the war between the Romans and the Celts [60/59 B.C.E.]" (*Bibliothèque* 1.4.6-7). The events from the

165. For more about his life, background, and the terminal date of his work, see Kenneth S. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); Siculus Diodorus and Peter Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1: Greek History 480–431 B. C. - The Alternative Version; Translated with Introduction and Commentary by Peter Green* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006), 2–7, 238–41.

166. For the index of the existing fragments, see Diodorus of Sicily, vol. XII, pp. 670-75 in the LCL.

Trojan War on are presented in a 'strict' chronicle order following Apollodorus's *Chronology* (*Bibliothèque* 1.5.1).¹⁶⁷

Diodorus' work was likely popular among his contemporaries and definitely among early Christian writers due to his clarity and emphasis on morality,¹⁶⁸ but modern scholars have often questioned Diodorus' talent, independency, and reliability as a historian. This view began to gain ground because of the influence of the works of J. H. Boecler (1670) and P. Wesseling (1746), who argued that Diodorus merely imitated Polybius' *History*.¹⁶⁹ In the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century several scholars described Diodorus as a miserable, incompetent and unoriginal historian who copied long sections, sometimes verbatim, from a single source at one time.¹⁷⁰ In recent decades, this view has been questioned by several first rank scholars¹⁷¹ while being defended by others.¹⁷² Unfortunately, all of Diodorus' probable sources have been lost either in part or completely and therefore we cannot get a full and reliable picture about his editing practice. Whether or not Diodorus relied on a single source at a time is hotly debated, but there is a 'general' consensus regarding which authors Diodorus may have used at least as his *main* source in each book: Hecataeus of Abdera and Agatharchides of Cnidus (Book 1); Ctesias of Cnidus (Book 2); Dionysius Scytobrachion (Books 3, 4, 6, 7); Timaeus of Tauromenium (Book 5); Herodotus (Book 9, 10); Ephorus (Books 11-15, [16]); Cleitarchus (Book 17);

167. In fact, Apollodorus' *Chronology* covers only the years 1184-119 B.C.E. It is not clear whose chronology Diodorus used from 119 B.C.E. on.

168. Jane Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 18; Diodorus and Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1*, 32-33.

169. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, 19.

170. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, 19-20; Diodorus and Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1*, 25-26.

171. Anne Burton, *Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 1-34; Catherine I. Reid, "Ephoros Fragment 76 and Diodoros on the Cypriote War," *Phoenix* 28 (1974): 123-43; Diodorus and Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1*, 1-47; Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, 9-22; Kenneth S. Sacks, "Diodorus and His Sources: Conformity and Creativity," in *Greek Historiography*, ed. Simon Hornblower (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 213-32; Frances Pownall, *Lessons from the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 117-18.

172. Especially by P. J. Stylianou, *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus: Book 15*, OCM (New York: Clarendon Press, 1998). Stylianou described Diodorus as "a second-rate epitomator who generally used first-rate sources" (p. 1).

Hieronymous of Cardia (Books 18-20); Polybius (Books 22-28¹⁷³) and Posidonius (Book 29-40).

Polybius is Diodorus' only source of which parallel texts exist somewhat extensively, but in fragments. The account of 'Career of Charops in Epirus,' found in Polybius 32.5.4-32.6.2 and Diodorus 31.31, may be one of the best and most typical examples of how Diodorus edited his sources.¹⁷⁴

Polybius 32.5.4-36.6.2

καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸν Ἡπειρώτην Χάροπα
 συνεκύρησε κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τοῦτον ἐν
 Βρεντεσίῳ μεταλλάξαι τὸν βίον. τὰ δὲ κατὰ
 τὴν Ἡπειρον ἔτ' ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις ἦν καὶ
 ταραχαῖς, ὥς κατὰ τοὺς ἐπάνω χρόνους, διὰ
 τὴν Χάραπος ὠμότητα καὶ παρανομίαν, ἐξ οὗ
 συνέβη τελεσθῆναι τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον.
 μετὰ γὰρ τὸ κατακρῖναι Λεύκιον Ἀνίκιον καὶ
 Ἀλεύκιον Αἰμίλιον ἀνελεῖν τοὺς μὲν τῶν
 ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν, τοὺς δ' ἀπαγαμεῖν εἰς τὴν
 Ῥώμην, ὅσοι καὶ βραχεῖαν ὑποψίαν εἶχον,
 τότε λαβὼν ὁ Χάροψ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ὁ βούλοιο
 πράττειν, οὐκ ἔστι τῶν δεινῶν ὅποιον οὐκ
 ἐποίησε, τὰ μὲν δι' αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῶν φίλων,
 ἅτε νέος μὲν ὢν αὐτὸς κομιδῇ,
 συνδεδραμηκότων δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν
 χειρίστων καὶ τῶν εἰκαισιότατων ἀνθρώπων διὰ
 τὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων νοσηφισμὸν. εἶχε δ' οἶον,
 ἐφεδρείαν καὶ ῥοπὴν πρὸς τὸ πιστεῦσθαι
 διότι πράττει κατὰ τινα λόγον ἃ ποιεῖ καὶ μετὰ
 τῆς Ῥωμαίων γνώμης τὴν τε προϋπάρχουσαν
 αὐτῷ σύστασιν πρὸς τοὺς προειρημένους καὶ
 πρὸς ταύτη Μύρωνα πρεσβύτην ἄνθρωπον
 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Νικάνορα, τᾶλλα τε
 μετρίους ἀνθρώπους καὶ δοκοῦντας εἶναι
 Ῥωμαίων φίλους, οἳ πολὺ τι κεχωρισμένοι τὸν
 πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον ἀπάσης ἀδικίας οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως
 τότε συνεπέδωκαν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ συνεπισχῶναι
 καὶ κοινωνεῖν ταῖς τοῦ Χάραπος ἀνομίαις.
 ἐπειδὴ δ' ὁ προειρημένος τοὺς μὲν κατὰ τὴν
 ἀγορὰν ἀναφανδὸν ἐφόνευσε, τοὺς δ' ἐν ταῖς
 ἰδίαις οἰκίαις, ἐνίοις δ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν καὶ
 κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐπαποστέλλων ἐδολοφόνησε

Diodorus 31.31

Ὅτι οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καταπολεμήσαντες Περσέα
 τῶν μετασχόντων τοῦ πολέμου τοῖς Μακεδόσι
 τοὺς μὲν ἐκόλασαν, τοὺς δὲ ἀπήγαγον εἰς τὴν
 Ῥώμην. τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἡπειρον λαβὼν
 ἐξουσίαν Χάροψ διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι
 φιλορώμαιος τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὀλίγα καὶ

173. So Francis R. Walton in the introduction to Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliothèque*, vol. xi, LCL, p. xxi. According to Stylianou, *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus*, 8-9, Polybius was Diodorus' main source only in Books 28-32, but he drew some sections from him in some previous books too.

174. Diodorus 31.31-32 exists are a fragment, *Const. Exc.* 2(1); see the LCL.

καὶ πάντων τῶν τεθνεώτων ἐξηνδραποδίσαιτο τοὺς βίους, ἄλλην ἐπεισήγε μηχανήν.

προέγραφε γὰρ τοὺς εὐκαιροῦντας τοῖς βίοις φυγάδας, οὐ μόνον ἄνδρας ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκας· ἀναταθείς δὲ τὸν φόβον τοῦτον ἐχρηματίζει· αἰεὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας δι' ἑαυτοῦ, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας διὰ τῆς μητρὸς Φιλώτιδος· τάνυ γὰρ εὐφυῆς ἐγένετο καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πρόσωπον, πρὸς δὲ βίαν καὶ πλείον τι δυνάμενον συνεργεῖν ἢ κατὰ γυναῖκα.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πάντας καὶ πάσας ἐξηργυρίσαντο κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν, εἰσήγον εἰς τὸν δῆμον οὐδὲν ἦττον ἅπαντας τοὺς προγεγραμμένους. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Φοινίκῃ τὰ μὲν διὰ τὸν φόβον, τὰ καὶ δελεαζόμενοι διὰ τῶν περὶ τὸν Χάροπα κατέκριναν οὐ φυγῆς ἀλλὰ θανάτου πάντας τοὺς προσαγγελθέντας ὡς ἁλλότρια φρονούντας Ῥωμαίων....

For it happened that Charops of Epirus also ended his days at Brundisium during this year. Epirus, however, remained still as in the preceding years in a very unsettled and disturbed state, all due to the cruelty and lawless violence exercised by Charops ever since the end of the war with Perseus. For after the decision of Lucius Anicius and Lucius Aemilius to put some of the notables to death and transport to Rome all those who had incurred the least suspicion, Charops, being now at liberty to do what he wished, committed every kind of crime either personally or through his friends, being himself very young, and all the worst and most unprincipled characters having gathered about him in the hope of stealing other people's property. A sort of support and colour for the belief that he did all he did for valid reason, and with the approval of Rome, lay in his previous close relations with the Romans and in his association with Myrton, and elderly man and his son Nicanor, both of them men of good character and supposed to be friends of the Romans. They had been previously very far from being guilty of any wrong, but for some reason or other they now devoted themselves to the support of Charops and participation in his crimes. After Charops had murdered some citizens openly in the market-place and others in their own houses, after he had sent emissaries to assassinate others at their country-seats and on the roads, and had confiscated the property of all who perished, he

πεφεισμένως εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐξημάρτανεν· αἰεὶ δὲ προβαίνων τῇ παρανομίᾳ εἰς τέλος ἐλυμήνατο τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἠπειρον. οὐ γὰρ διέλειπεν αἰτίας ψευδεῖς ἐπιφέρων τοῖς εὐπορωτάτοις, καὶ τοὺς μὲν φονεῦων, τοὺς δὲ φυγαδεύων καὶ τὰς οὐσίας δημεύων οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἄνδρας ἡργυρολόγησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας διὰ τῆς μητρὸς Φιλώτας (πάνυ γὰρ εὐφυῆς ἐγένετο καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς ὁμότητα καὶ παρανομίαν πλείονα ἢ κατὰ γυναῖκα), καὶ πολλοὺς εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, κατατιπασάμενος φρονεῖν ἁλλότρια Ῥωμαίων. καὶ πάντων κατέγνωσαν θάνατον.

After vanquishing Perseus the Romans curbed some of those who had taken part in the war on the Macedonian side, and removed others to Rome. In Epirus Charops, who had gained control of the state on the strength of his reputation as a friend of the Romans, at the outset was guilty of but few crimes against his people and showed some caution; but proceeding further and further in lawless

introduced a new device, which was to proscribe and sentence to exile all those who were well off, not only the men, but their wives. Under the terror of this menace he went on extorting money himself from the men and from the women through his mother Philotis: for she too was a great expert at this, and as regards the application of force more capable of helping him than one could expect from a woman.

After they had stripped them all, both men and women, to the utmost of their power, they nevertheless brought all the proscribed before the popular assembly. The people of Phoenice by a majority, either terrorized or seduced by Charops, condemned all the accused not to exile, but to death as enemies of Rome....

behaviour, he wrought havoc in Epirus. He incessantly brought false charges against the wealthy, and by murdering some, and driving others into exile and confiscating their property, he exacted money not only from the men but also, through his mother Philota (for she was a person with a gift for cruelty and lawlessness that belied her sex), from the women as well; and he haled many before the popular assembly on charges of disaffection to Rome. And the sentence in all case was death.

If Diodorus derived his material here exclusively from Polybius, as many believe, a comparison of these two texts reveals that Diodorus abbreviated Polybius' version and paraphrased it completely except in Polybius 32.5.13-32.6.2.

Another example comes from Diodorus 11.59.2-11.69.1, which is commonly believed to have been drawn by Diodorus from Ephorus' (c. 400-330 B.C.E.) *Historia*. Ephorus' work is not extant, with the possible exception of papyrus fragments and citations in later writers (Stephanus of Byzantium, Strabo, and Plutarch).¹⁷⁵

Since the analyses of *P.Oxy.* 1610 by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt,¹⁷⁶ scholars have viewed it as Ephorus' work because some sections of its sixty fragments correspond to Diodorus 11.59.2-11.69.1.¹⁷⁷ The lines 1-139 of *P.Oxy.* 1610, which clearly correspond to Diodorus' account, have been reconstructed relatively well, while the rest of the lines (140-302) remain very

175. Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Vols. IIA, reprint, 1926-29 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 37-109; Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 115-19.

176. Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 13* (London: London Egypt Exploration Society, 1919), 98-127.

177. The argument, however, is circular: because scholars suppose Diodorus used Ephorus as his source in his Books 11-15, (16), they conclude that if *P.Oxy.* 1610 corresponds to Diodorus's account in Book 11, it must be a fragment from Ephorus' work (Diodorus and Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1*, 26-27).

E.g., Thomas D. Africa, "Ephorus and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1610," *The American Journal of Philology* 83 (1962): 86-89, questions the attribution of *P.Oxy.* 1610 to Ephorus.

fragmentary.¹⁷⁸ I have reproduced the section from Diodorus below. I have marked in bold the words or letters of *P. Oxy.* 1610, which could be restored *and* which correspond to Diodorus' account; I have underlined the words, which occur in the same sequence in both works; and I have used the marker “|” to indicate – when there is a possibility for confusion – that words or phrases are not continuous with the preceding or following words or phrases.

(11.59.2) τίς δὲ πρὸς ἅπασαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας δύναμιν ἀναστάτω τῇ πόλει παραταχθεὶς ἐνίκησε; τίς δὲ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὴν πατρίδα δυνατὴν κατεσκεύασε **τοιούτοις**; τίς δὲ πολέμου μεγίστου κατασχόντος αὐτὴν διέσωσε, μὲν δ' ἐπινοία τῇ περὶ τοῦ ζεύγματος γενεμένη τὴν πεζὴν τῶν πολεμίων δύναμιν ἐξ ἡμίσεος μέρους ἐταπείνωσεν, ὥστ' εὐχείρωτον γενέσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι; (3) διόπερ ὅταν τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ θεωρήσωμεν, καὶ σκοποῦντες τὰ κατὰ μέρος εὕρωμεν ἐκεῖνον μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡττωσμένον, τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τὰς ἐκεῖνου πράξεις ἐπαιρομένην, εἰκότως τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι τῶν ἁπασῶν πόλεων | σοφωτάτην | **καὶ** | ἐπιεικεστάτην | χαλεπωτάτην | **πρὸς ἐκεῖνον** | εὐρίσκομεν γεγεννημένην.

(4) Περί μὴν οὖν τῆς Θεμιστοκλέους ἀρετῆς εἰ καὶ πεπλεονάκαμεν παρεκβάντες, ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ ἄξιον ἐκρίναμεν τὴν αὐτοῦ παραλιπεῖν ἀνεπισήμαντον. Ἄμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν Μίκυθος ὁ τὴν δυναστείαν ἔχων Ῥηγίου καὶ Ζάγκλης πόλιν ἔκτισε Πυξοῦντα.

(XI.60.1) Ἐπ' ἄρχοντος δ' Ἀθηνησι Δημοτίωνος Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν ὑπάτους κατέστησαν Πούπλιον Οὐαλέριον Ποπλικόλαν καὶ Γάιον Ναύτιον Ῥούφον. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων Ἀθηναῖοι | **στρατηγὸν** ἐλόμενοι **Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου** καὶ δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον παραδόντες, ἐξέμψαν ἐπὶ τὴν παράλιον τῆς Ἀσίας βοηθήσοντα μὲν ταῖς συμμαχοῦσαι πόλεις, ἐλευθερώσοντα δὲ τὰς Περσικαῖς ἔτι φρουραῖς καεχομένας. (2) οὗτος δὲ παραλαβὼν τὸν στόλον ἐν Βυζαντίῳ, καὶ καταπλεύσας ἐπὶ τὸλιν τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Ἡϊόνα, ταύτην μὲν Περσῶν κατεχόντων ἐχειρώσατο, Σκύρον δὲ Πελασγῶν ἐνοικούντων καὶ Δολόπων ἐξετολιόρησε, καὶ κρίστην Ἀθηναῖον καταστήσας κατεκληρούχησε τὴν χώραν. (3) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα μειζόνων πράξεων ἄρξασθαι διανοούμενος, κατέπλευσεν εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ, καὶ προσλαβόμενος πλείους τριήρεις καὶ τὴν ἄλλην χορηγίαν ἀξιόλογον παρασκευασάμενος, τότε μὲν ἐξέπλευσεν ἔχων τριήρεις διακοσίας, ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεμψάμενος παρὰ τῶν Ἰώνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων τὰς ἀπάσας εἶχε τριακοσίας. (4) πλεύσας οὖν μετὰ παντὸς τοῦ στόλου πρὸς τὴν Καρίαν, τῶν παραθαλαττίων | πόλεων ὅσαι μὲν | ἦσαν | ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπωκισμέναι, | ταύτας | **παραγρήμα** **συνέπεισεν** ἀποστῆναι τῶν Περσῶν, ὅσαι δ' ὑπῆρχον δίγλωττοι καὶ φρουρὰς ἔχουσαι Περσικάς, βίαν προσάγων ἐπολιόρηκε. προσαναγόμενος δὲ τὰς κατὰ τὴν Καρίαν πόλεις, ὁμοίως καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ Λυκίᾳ πείσας προσελάβετο. (5) παρὰ δὲ τῶν αἰεὶ προσπιθεμένων συμμάχων προσλαβόμενος ναῦς ἐπὶ πλεον ἠύξησε τὸν στόλον.

Οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι τὸ μὲν πεζὸν στράτευμα δι' ἑαυτῶν κατεσκεύασαν, τὸ δὲ ναυτικὸν ἠθροίσαν ἐκ τε φοινίκης καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Κιλικίας· ἐστρατήγει δὲ τῶν Περσικῶν δυνάμεων Τιθραύστης, υἱὸς ὧν Ξέρξου νόθος. (6) Κίμων δὲ πυνθανόμενος τὸν | στόλον | τῶν Περσῶν | διατρίβειν | **περὶ τὴν Κύπρον**, καὶ πλεύσας ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους, ἐνανμάχησε διακοσίαις | καὶ | πεντήκοντα | ναυσὶ | **πρὸς τριακοσίας καὶ τετταράκοντα** γενομένου δ' ἀγῶνος ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τῶν στόλων ἀμφοτέρων λαμπρῶς ἀγωνιζομένων, τὸ τελευταῖον ἐνίκων οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ **πολλὰς μὲν τῶν** ἐναντίων ναῦς **διέφθειραν**, πλείους δὲ τῶν **ἐκατὸν** | σὺν | **αὐτοῖς** | τοῖς | **ἀνδράσιν εἶλον**. (7) τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν νεῶν

178. Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 13*, 98–127, is the best source for the comparison.

καταφυλουσών εἰς τὴν Κύπρον, οἱ μὲν ἐν αὐταῖς ἄνδρες εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀπεχώρησαν, αἱ δὲ νῆες κεναὶ τῶν βοηθούντων οὔσαι τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐγενήθησαν ὕροχείριοι. (11.61.1)

.....

..... (98 Greek words)

(3) παραχρῆς δὲ μεγάλης γενομένης παρὰ τοῖς Πέρσαις, οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Κίμωνα πάντα τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ἔκτειναν, καὶ τὸν μὲν στρατηγὸν τῶν βαρβάρων τὸν ἕτερον Φερενδάτην, ἀδελφιδοῦν | τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ καταλαβόντες ἐφόνευσαν, τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὓς μὲν ἔκτεινον, οὓς δὲ κατετραυμάτιζον, πάντας δὲ διὰ τὸ παράδοξον τῆς ἐπιθέσεως φεύγειν ἠνάγκασαν, καθόλου δ' ἔκπληξις ἅμα καὶ ἄγνοια τοιαύτη κατεῖχε τοὺς Πέρσας, ὥσθ' οἱ πλείους τοὺς ἐπιθεμένους αὐτοῖς οἴτινες ἦσαν οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον. (4) τοὺς μὲν γὰρ Ἑλληνας οὐχ ὑπελάμβανον ἡκεῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ δυνάμεως, τὸ σύνολον μὴδ' ἔχειν αὐτοὺς περὶ τὴν στρατιὰν πεπεισμένοι· τοὺς δὲ Πισίδας, ὄντας ὁμόρους καὶ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀλλοτριῶς ἔχοντας, ὑπελάμβανον ἡκεῖν μετὰ δυνάμεως. διὸ καὶ νομίσαντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἡπείρου τὴν | ἐπιφορὰν εἶναι | τῶν πολέμιων, πρὸς τὰς ναῦς | ὡς πρὸς | φιλίας | ἔφευγον. (5) τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς οὔσης ἀσελήνου καὶ σκοτεινῆς συνέβαινε τὴν ἄγνοιαν τολὸν μᾶλλον αὐξέσθαι καὶ μηδὲνα τάληθές δύνασθαι ἰδεῖν. (6) διὸ καὶ πολλοῦ φόβου γενομένου διὰ τὴν ἀταξίαν τῶν βαρβάρων, ὁ μὲν Κίμων προειρηκῶς τοῖς στρατιώταις πρὸς τὸν ἀρθησόμενον πυρσὸν συντρέχειν, ἦρε πρὸς ταῖς ναυσὶ σύσσημον, εὐλαβούμενος μὴ διεσπαρμένων τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀρπαγὴν ὀρμησάντων γένηται τι παράλογον. (7) πάντων δὲ πρὸς τὸν πυρσὸν ἀθροισθέντων καὶ πανσαμένων τῆς ἀρταγῆς, τότε μὲν εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἀπεχώρησαν, τῇ δ' ὑστεραία πρόπαιον στήσαντες ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν Κύπρον, νενικηκότες δύο καλλίστας νίκας, τὴν μὲν κατὰ γῆν, τὴν δὲ κατὰ θάλατταν· οὐδέπω γὰρ μνημονεύονται τοιαῦται καὶ τηλικαῦται πράξεις γενέσθαι κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ναυτικῶ καὶ περὶ στρατοπέδῳ. (11.62.1)

.....

..... (about 1750 Greek words)

(11.69.1) Τοῦ δ' ἐνιαυσίου χρόνου διεληλυθότος Ἀθήνησι μὲν ἦρχε Λυσίθεος, ἐν Ῥώμῃ δ' ὑπατοὶ καθεστήκεσαν Λεύκιος Οὐαλέριος Ποπλικόλας καὶ Τίτος Αἰμίλιος Μάμερκος. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἀρτάβανος, τὸ μὲν γένος Ὑρκάνιος, δυνάμενος δὲ πλείστον παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ Ξέρξῃ καὶ τῶν δορυφόρων ἀφηγούμενος, ἔκρινεν ἀνελεῖν τὸν Ξέρξην καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς ἑαυτὸν μεταστήσαι. ἀνακοινωσάμενος δὲ τὴν ἐπιβουλήν πρὸς | Μιθριδάτην | τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ὃς ἦν | κατακομιστὴς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὴν κυριωτάτην ἔχων πίστιν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ συγγενῆς ὢν Ἀρταβάνου καὶ φίλος ὑπήκουσε πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβουλήν. (2)

J. S. Kloppenborg argues that the way Diodorus used Ephorus' work as his source – sometimes paraphrasing it and sometimes copying it word for word – resembles the way Luke and Matthew used Mark and Q.¹⁷⁹ However, to see this similarity in editing styles, one must restrict largely to sections with extensive verbatim agreement between Diodorus and *P.Oxy.* 1610. By contrast, if Diodorus' text and its agreements with *P.Oxy.* 1610 are presented as a continuous text

179. Kloppenborg, "Variation in the Reproduction of the Double Tradition and an Oral Q?" 63–67, 73–74.

as I have done above, the similarities between Diodorus and *P.Oxy.* 1610 as compared to similarities between Luke/Matthew and Mark become less impressive.

Both this and the previous example show that paraphrasing seems to have been Diodorus' normal editing method, copying his source texts near to verbatim only occasionally.¹⁸⁰ Diodorus' copy-editing method resembles modern scholarly editing and quotation method rather than Luke's or Matthew's method. Where Diodorus does quote verbatim, the texts are often those that we, today, consider most memorable expressed (as in the former example) or important numbers or names (as in some cases in *P.Oxy.* 1610). Contrary to Luke and Matthew's style, "an analysis of Diodorus' style shows," as Hornblower notes, "that it is consistent throughout the *Bibliothēke*... Diodorus followed the same method of composition in all parts of the *Bibliothēke*."¹⁸¹

1QapGen

1QGenesisApocryphon is one of the seven major scrolls found in Cave 1 at Qumran in 1947. Its twenty-two (three) columns, of which only some are relatively well preserved, contain stories of Genesis, paraphrasing them in Aramaic.¹⁸² Columns 2-17 narrate the stories of Lamech and Noah in the first person, and columns 19-22 narrate the story of Abram first in the first

180. Cf. Stylianou, *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus*, 15; Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 118; Sacks, "Diodorus and His Sources". P. Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1*, 35–36, even claims: "The *Bibliothēke* does not consist of near-verbatim extracts from one source for each historical period (however convenient this would be for historians). Result: The old assumption that throughout Books 11–12 he is virtually transcribing Ephoros must be abandoned, and a great many passages hitherto listed as Ephoran fragments removed from the canon."

In most cases Diodorus seem to have paraphrased completely the material believed to have been drawn from Polybius. For cases where Diodorus copied Polybius close to verbatim at least in part of a pericope, see Polybius 1.65-88/Diodorus 25.1.2-25.8 (Polybius 1.84.5-6/Diodorus 25.4.2 agree closely); Polybius 13.6-8/Diodorus 27.1-2; Polybius 23.12-14/Diodorus 29.18-21; Polybius 29.21/Diodorus 31.10 (the words of the prophecy have been quoted almost verbatim); and Polybius 30.25-26/Diodorus 31.16; Polybius 31.22-30/Diodorus 31.26-27. See also Polybius 3.33.1-4/Diodorus 25.16; Polybius 28.21/Diodorus 30.17; Polybius 28.18/Diodorus 30.18a; Polybius 29.20/Diodorus 30.23; Polybius 30.18/Diodorus 31.15.2-3; and Polybius 32.1-2/Diodorus 31.28-30.

181. Hornblower, *Hieronymys of Cardia*, 32.

182. For the most complete translations of 1QapGen, see Géza Vermès, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1995), 448–59; Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997), 89–105. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary*, BibOr 18A (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 48–75.

person, until 21.22, and then in the third person; it is unclear why the narrative changes in the middle of the Abram story. Originally, the scroll may have also included the beginning of the Genesis story since the sheet starting with columns 5, 10, and 17 begin with the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth letters of the Hebrew alphabet.¹⁸³ The document “is dated paleographically to 25 BCE through 50 CE (plus or minus twenty-five years).”¹⁸⁴

There has been considerable disagreement over the literary genre of 1QapGen.¹⁸⁵ Some have suggested that it is a targum, while others have argued that it is closest to a midrash. In recent years, Fitzmyer’s view that 1QapGen belongs to the genre of ‘rewritten Bible’ has been widely accepted.¹⁸⁶ As stated above, 1QapGen retells at least part of Genesis. An interesting fact is that aside from the Abram story, the surviving Aramaic text of 1QapGen hardly ever agrees ‘verbatim’ with the Hebrew MT. The only places where the texts ‘agree’ are: 1QapGen 7.12/Gen 8:4; 1QapGen 11.17/Gen 9:4; 1QapGen 12.9-12/Gen 10:1-22.¹⁸⁷ In general, the stories of Lamech and Noah (i.e., columns 2-17) in 1QapGen contain “considerable quantities of expansive aggadah which appear to have little or no basis in the text of Scripture, but belong to the sort of legendary material as is found in the quotation from the Book of Noah in Jub. 10:1-14.”¹⁸⁸ The Abram stories in Genesis and 1QapGen also seldom agree ‘verbatim’ until Abram leaves Egypt in 1QapGen 20.33.¹⁸⁹ The agreements after the departure are presented below as drawn from

183. Daniel J. Harrington, “The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” *CBQ* 33 (1971): 448; M. Morgenstern, “A New Clue to the Original Length of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *JJS* 47, no. 2 (1996): 345–47.

184. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 302.

185. See Craig A. Evans, “The Genesis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 153–65; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 6–14.

186. Fitzmyer, “Genesis Apocryphon,” 302; Sidnie White Crawford, “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume One: The Hebrew Bible and Qumran*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (N. Richland Hills: BIBAL Press, 2000), 173–95. For the definition of ‘rewritten Bible,’ see Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 56, 64.

187. See Wise, Abegg Jr., and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 89–105.

188. Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 104.

189. For ‘verbatim agreements’ between the stories of Abram in Genesis and 1QapGen 19.(6), 7–20.32, see Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 59–67. The most significant agreement in this section is 1QapGen 20.26–27 with Gen 12:18–19.

Fitzmyer's commentary on 1QapGen.¹⁹⁰

Genesis 13:1-15:4

¶ So Abram went up from Egypt to the Negev, he and his wife and all that belonged to him, and Lot with him. ² ¶ Now Abram was very rich in livestock, in silver and in gold. ³ He went on his journeys from the Negev as far as Bethel, to the place where his tent had been at the beginning, between Bethel and Ai, ⁴ to the place of the altar which he had made there formerly; and there Abram called on the name of the LORD. ⁵ Now Lot, who went with Abram, also had flocks and herds and tents.

⁶ And the land could not sustain them while dwelling together, for their possessions were so great that they were not able to remain together. ⁷ And there was strife between the herdsmen of Abram's livestock and the herdsmen of Lot's livestock. Now the Canaanite and the Perizzite were dwelling then in the land. ⁸ ¶ So Abram said to Lot, "Please let there be no strife between you and me, nor between my herdsmen and your herdsmen, for we are brothers. ⁹ "Is not the whole land before you? Please separate from me; if *to the left*, then I will go to the right; or if *to the right*, then I will go to the left." ¹⁰ Lot lifted up his eyes and saw all the valley of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere-- *this was* before the LORD destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah-- like the garden of the LORD, like the land of Egypt as you go to Zoar. ¹¹ So Lot chose for himself all the valley of the Jordan, and Lot journeyed eastward. Thus they

1QapGen 20.33-22.34

Notes

20.33-21.4: So I, Abram, went (forth) with very many flocks and with silver and gold too, and I went up from [Egy]pt. [Lot], my brother's son, (was) with me, and Lot too (had) acquired many flocks; he had taken for himself a wife from the daughters [of Egypt]. And I [cam]ped [with him] at every place of my (former) encampments, until I reached Bethel, the place where I (had) built the altar, and I built it again. I offered upon it holocausts and an offering to the God Most High, and there I called upon the name of the Lord of the ages, and I praised the name of God, and I blessed God. I gave thanks there before God for all the flocks and the good things which he had given me; because he had done good to me; because he had brought me back to this land in safety.

1

21.5-7: After this day Lot parted from me because of the conduct of our shepherds, and he went and settled in the valley of Jordan; (he took) all his flocks with him, I too added greatly to what he had. He pastured his flocks and came (eventually) to Sodom. He bought himself a house in Sodom and dwelt in it. But I was dwelling (then) on the mountain of Bethel, and it grieved me that Lot, the son of my brother, had parted from me.

2

190. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 67-75.

separated from each other. ¹² Abram settled in the land of Canaan, while Lot settled in the cities of the valley, and moved his tents as far as Sodom. ¹³ Now the men of Sodom were wicked exceedingly and sinners against the LORD.

¹⁴ ¶ The LORD said to Abram, after Lot had separated from him, "Now lift up your eyes and look from the place where you are, northward and southward and eastward and westward; ¹⁵ for all the land which you see, I will give it to you and to your descendants forever. ¹⁶ "I will make your descendants as the dust of the earth, so that if anyone can number the dust of the earth, then your descendants can also be numbered. ¹⁷ "Arise, walk about the land through its length and breadth; for I will give it to you."

21.8-19a: God appeared to me in a vision of the night and said to me, "Go up to Ramath-Hazor, which is to the north of Bethel, the place where you are dwelling; lift up your eyes and look to the east, west, south, and north, and see all this land which I am giving to you and to your descendants forever." The next day I climbed up to Ramath-Hazor and I looked at the land from this height, from the River of Egypt to Lebanon and Senir, and from the Great Sea to Hauran, and all the land of Gebal as far as Kadesh, and at all the Great Desert which is (to the) east of Hauran and Senir as far as the Euphrates. And he said to me, "To your descendants I shall give all this land; they will inherit it forever. I shall make your descendants as numerous as the dust of the earth which no man can number; so too your descendants will be without number. Rise, walk about, and go (around) to see how great is its length and how great is its width. For I shall give it to you and to your descendants after you for all ages." So I, Abram, set out to go around and look at the land. I started going about from the Gihon River, moving along the Sea, until I reached the Mount of the Ox. I journeyed from [the coast] of this Great Salt Sea and moved along the Mount of the Ox toward the east through the breadth of the land, until I reached the Euphrates River. I travelled along the Euphrates, until I came to the Red Sea in the east. (Then) I moved along the Red Sea, until I reached the tongue of the Reed Sea, which goes forth from the Red Sea. (From there) I journeyed to the south, until I reached the Gihon River. Then I returned, came home safely and found all my household safe and sound.

¹⁸ Then Abram moved his tent and came and dwelt by the oaks of Mamre, which are in Hebron, and there he built an altar to the LORD.

14:1 ¶ And it came about in the days of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of Goiim, ² that they made war with Bera king of Sodom, and with Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, and Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar). ³ All these came as allies to the valley of Siddim (that is, the Salt Sea). ⁴ Twelve years they had served Chedorlaomer, but the thirteenth year they rebelled. ⁵ In the fourteenth year Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him, came and defeated the Rephaim in Ashteroth-karnaim and the Zuzim in Ham and the Emim in Shaveh-kiriathaim, ⁶ and the Horites in their Mount Seir, as far as El-paran, which is by the wilderness. ⁷ Then they turned back and came to En-mishpat (that is, Kadesh), and conquered all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites, who lived in Hazazon-tamar. ⁸ And the king of Sodom and the king of Gomorrah and the king of Admah and the king of Zeboiim and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar) came out; and they arrayed for battle against them in the valley of Siddim, ⁹ against Chedorlaomer king of Elam and Tidal king of Goiim and Amraphel king of Shinar and Arioch king of Ellasar-- four kings against five. ¹⁰ Now the valley of Siddim was full of tar pits; and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, and they fell into them. But those who survived fled to the hill country. ¹¹ Then they took all the goods of Sodom and Gomorrah and all their

21.19b-22: I went and dwelt at the Oaks of Mamre, which are in Hebron, to the northeast of Hebron. There I built an altar and offered on it a holocaust and a offering to God Most High. I ate and drank there, I and all the men of my household. And I sent an invitation to Mamre, Arnem and Eshcol, the three Amorite brothers, (who were) my friends; and they ate together with me and drank with me. (cf. Gen 14:13)

21.23-34a: Before those days there came Chedorlaomer, the king of Elam, Amraphel, the king of Babylon, Arioch, the king of Cappadocia, (and) Tidal, the king of Goiim which is between the two rivers; and they made war on Bera, the king of Sodom, on Birsha, the king of Gomorrah, on Shinab, the king of Admah, on Shemiabad, the king of Zeboiim, and on the king of Bela. All of these joined together to fight a battle in the valley of Siddim. But the king of Elam and the kings who were with him prevailed over the king of Sodom and all his allies. They imposed tribute on them. For twelve years they kept paying their tribute to the king of Elam, but in the thirteenth year they rebelled against him. And in the fourteenth year the king of Elam led (forth) all his allies, came up (by way of) the desert route, and they set about destroying and plundering from the Euphrates River (onward). They destroyed the Rephaim who (were) in Ashteroth-Karnaim, the Zumzammin who (were) in Ammon, the Emim [who were in] Shaveh-Hakerioth, and the Hurrians who (were) in the mountains of Gebal, until they reached El-Paran which is in the desert. They they returned and struck the [Amorites who dwelt (?)] in Hazezon-Tamar. The king of Sodom went out to face them, and (likewise) the king of [Gomorrah], the king of Admah, the king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela; [and they fought] the battle in the valley of [Siddim] against Chedorla[omer, the king of Elam, and

food supply, and departed.

¹² They also took Lot, Abram's nephew, and his possessions and departed, for he was living in Sodom. ¹³ ¶ Then a fugitive came and told Abram the Hebrew. Now he was living by the oaks of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and brother of Aner, and these were allies with Abram. ¹⁴ When Abram heard that his relative had been taken captive, he led out his trained men, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen, and went in pursuit as far as Dan. ¹⁵ He divided his forces against them by night, he and his servants, and defeated them, and pursued them as far as Hobah, which is north of Damascus. ¹⁶ He brought back all the goods, and also brought back his relative Lot with his possessions, and also the women, and the people.

¹⁷ ¶ Then after his return from the defeat of Chedorlaomer and the kings who were with him, the king of Sodom went out to meet him at the valley of Shaveh (that is, the King's Valley). ¹⁸ And Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine; now he was a priest of God Most High. ¹⁹ He blessed him and said, "Blessed be Abram of God Most High, Possessor of heaven and

the kings] who (were) with him. But the king of Sodom was routed, and he fled; the king of Gomorrah fell into pits [of bitumen.....]; and the king of Elam plundered all the wealth of Sodom and of [Gomorrah.....] and

4

21.34b-22.12a: they carried off Lot, the son of Abram's brother, who was dwelling in Sodom, together with them - and all his flocks. But one of the herdsmen of the flock which Abram given to Lot escaped from the captives and came to Abram. At that time Abram was dwelling in Hebron; and he informed him that Lot, his nephew, had been carried off with all his flocks, but (that) he was not killed, and that the kings had set out (by way of) the route of the Great Valley toward their province, taking captives, plundering, destroying, killing and making their way toward the province of Damascus. Abram wept for Lot, his nephew; then he summoned up his courage, rose up, and chose from his servant the best men for war, three hundred and eighteen (of them); and Arnem, Eshcol, and Mamre set out with him. He went in pursuit of them until he reached Dan and found them encamped in the valley of Dan. He fell upon them by night from all four sides. He slaughtered some of them (that) night, routed them, and pursued them, as all of them went fleeing before him, as far as Helbon which is situated to the north of Damascus. So he rescued from them all that they had captured and all that they had plundered, - and all their own goods. Lot too, his nephew, he saved with all his flocks; and all the captives which they had taken he brought back.

22.12b-26: The king of Sodom heard that Abram had brought back all the captives and all the booty, and he went up to meet him. He came to Salem, that is Jerusalem, while Abram was camped in the Valley of Sheveh - that is the Vale of the King, the Valley of Beth-haccherem. Melchizedek, the king of Salem, brought out food and drink for

earth; ²⁰ And blessed be God Most High, Who has delivered your enemies into your hand." He gave him a tenth of all.

²¹ The king of Sodom said to Abram, "Give the people to me and take the goods for yourself." ²² Abram said to the king of Sodom, "I have sworn to the LORD God Most High, possessor of heaven and earth, ²³ that I will not take a thread or a sandal thong or anything that is yours, for fear you would say, 'I have made Abram rich.' ²⁴ "I will take nothing except what the young men have eaten, and the share of the men who went with me, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre; let them take their share."

15:1 ¶ After these things the word of the LORD came to Abram in a vision, saying, "Do not fear, Abram, I am a shield to you; Your reward shall be very great." ² Abram said, "O Lord GOD, what will You give me, since I am childless, and the heir of my house is Eliezer of Damascus?" ³ And Abram said, "Since You have given no offspring to me, one born in my house is my heir." ⁴ Then behold, the word of the LORD came to him, saying, "This man will not be your heir; but one who will come forth from your own body, he shall be your heir."

Abram and for all the men who were with him; he was a priest of the Most High God and he blessed Abram and said, "Blessed be Abram by the Most High God, the Lord of heaven and earth. Blessed be the Most High God who has delivered your enemies into your hand." And he gave him a tithe of all the flocks of the king of Elam and his confederates. Then the king of Sodom approached Abram and said, "My Lord Abram, give me the men that are mine who are captives with you and whom you have rescued from the king of Elam; all the goods (are) left for you." Abram then answered the king of Sodom, "I raise my hand (in oath) this day to the Most High God, the Lord of heaven and earth, that I shall not take so much as a thread or a sandalstap from anything that is yours lest you say, 'From my possessions (comes) all of Abram's wealth' - except for what my young men who are with me have already eaten and except for the portion of the three men who went with me; they are masters over their portion, to give it to you (or not)." Then Abram returned all the goods and all the captives and gave (them) to the king of Sodom. All the captives who were with him from this land he set free and sent them all away.

22.27-34: After these things God appeared to Abram in a vision and said to him, "Look, ten years have elapsed since the time you departed from Haran; you passed two (years) here, seven in Egypt, and one since you returned from Egypt. Now examine and count all that you have; see how they have doubled and multiplied beyond all that went forth with you on the day when you set out from Haran. Now do not fear; I am with you; and I shall be to you both support and strength. I (shall be) a shield over you and a buckler for you against one stronger than you. Your wealth and your flocks will increase very much." And Abram said, "My Lord God, my wealth and (my) flocks are vast (indeed); but why

do I have all these things, seeing that when I die I shall depart (from this life) barren (and) without sons? Even one of my household servants is to inherit me, Eliezer, the son of [.....].” But he said to him, “This one shall not inherit you, but the one who shall go forth....

The way the author of 1QapGen seems to have used his source in *this* section resembles how Luke and Matthew used theirs. As far as it can be concluded by comparing the Hebrew text of Genesis and the Aramaic text of 1QapGen, verbatim agreement in *this* section varies in ways similar to consecutive synoptic pericopes. However, the picture is totally different in the non-Abramic section where the texts of 1QapGen and the MT have very little common. The question then arises: why are these two sections so different? Did the author derive both sections from a single written source but decide to edit them differently, following the biblical text more closely and adding less extrabiblical material in the Abramic section than in the non-Abramic one? This is theoretically possible but seems to run against human tendency to be relatively consistent in behavior and in editing literary sources. Did the author derive his material from a text different from the MT, if he used any ‘authoritative’ text as his source at all? Almost definitely he did. J. C. VanderKam argues that the biblical text tradition found in 1QapGen stems from the non-masoretic text tradition.¹⁹¹ VanderKam accepts the widely held view of F. M. Cross that the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, and the source text of the LXX represent three distinct Hebrew text-types.¹⁹² He summarizes Cross’ central thesis neatly:¹⁹³

[D]uring the last five centuries or so B.C., several distinct *families* of Hebrew text developed in geographically separated areas of Jewish settlement. The *Urtext* of the pentateuch and former prophets, which was probably edited into final form in Babylon during the sixth century B.C., was transmitted in the sizable Jewish community there during the following centuries. Texts representing this tradition or family were brought to Palestine in the early post-exilic period; there they set in motion a new history of copying and editing. In the course of their separate histories, these two families, the Babylonian

191. James C. Vanderkam, “The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 45–55.

192. For Cross’ collected essays on this topic, see Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).

193. Vanderkam, “The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon,” 45–46.

and the Palestinian, developed their own readings and characteristics and in this manner came gradually to differ from one another. At a somewhat later date exemplars of the Palestinian family appeared in Egypt where they served the needs of the large Jewish community. After another unique of copying and study in that locale, one or more texts of the Egyptian Hebrew family served as the model(s) from which the LXX was translated.

A comparison of the parallel texts in 1QapGen with these three text traditions shows that 1QapGen belongs to the Palestinian family, along with the Samaritan Pentateuch, 1 Chronicles 1-9, many Qumran writings, *Jubilees*, and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.¹⁹⁴ 1QapGen and the Samaritan Pentateuch agree in nine instances against the MT. The Palestinian text family, which 1QapGen and the Samaritan Pentateuch represent, "is known to be expansionistic and the product of considerable editorial work."¹⁹⁵ Differences between the source text of 1QapGen and the biblical text (i.e., MT), however, could hardly have been so significant that this could explain major differences between these two texts. Did the author draw his material from different literary sources? Theoretically, this is possible.

I suggest, however, that rather than looking for an explanation for the similarities and differences between 1QapGen and the biblical text from literary dependency theories, one should consider that the author of 1QapGen may have drawn his material in whole from oral tradition. There is at least one reason to believe so: 1QapGen and the parallel account in *Jubilees* share a number of similarities. VanderKam lists 18 agreements.¹⁹⁶ One of the most interesting similarities is the time framework (see Note 6 in the Table above).¹⁹⁷ Both documents agree that God appeared to Abram and promised a son ten years after his departure from *Haran* (1QapGen

194. Vanderkam, "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon," 47, 55.

There is some disagreement as to whether or not 1QapGen was a sectarian composition. Fitzmyer, "Genesis Apocryphon," 303, claims that it was not, but the reference to "the law of the eternal statute" in 1QapGen 6.8 may suggest that it was (Wise, Abegg Jr., and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 93-94).

195. Vanderkam, "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon," 53.

196. James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, HSM 14 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 278, 142-98. See also Vanderkam, "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon," 47.

197. For other similarities, see Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. Description and Contents of the Scroll Facsimiles, Transcription and Translation of Columns II, XLX-XXII* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1956), 16-37; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 76-184.

22.27-28, cf. 19.9-10, 23; 20.18; *Jub.* 14.1, cf. 13.8, 16, 26-27).¹⁹⁸ The parallel text in Genesis 15 does not give a time reference (but cf. Gen 16:3). 1QapGen 20.33-22.34 (see above) also shares some other similarities with *Jubilees*: i) Both elaborate in the description of Abram's offering and prayer, and refer to Abram's safe return to the Promised Land (Note 1 in the Table; cf. *Jub.* 13.15b-16); ii) Both mention that Abram' grieved the departure of Lot (Note 2; cf. *Jub.* 13.18); iii) Both report the names of the kings who attacked the valley of Siddim in the same order (Note 3; cf. *Jub.* 13.22); iv) Both indicate that the king of Gomorrah died in the battle, while the king of Sodom survived (Note 4; cf. *Jub.* 13.22); and v) Both make it clear that it was Abram who gave the tithe to Melchizedek, while the meaning of Gen 14:20 remains obscure (Note 5; cf. *Jub.* 13.25). It is unlikely the similarities between these two works are due to literary dependency. If the author of 1QapGen had used *Jubilees* as his source in addition to the biblical version, as some scholars suggest, we would expect to find more extensive verbal¹⁹⁹ and contextual agreements between 1QapGen and *Jubilees*. My impression is that the common elements were already part of tradition; not drawn by the author of 1QapGen from *Jubilees* and then combined with the biblical version.

Verbatim agreements between Abram's story in 1QapGen and the biblical text are not so impressive that they would require literary dependency, especially since this story was one of the foundational stories in Judaism, retold again and again. The fact that the Abramic story was likely retold on regular basis may also explain why verbatim agreement between 1QapGen and the biblical version is much higher in the Abramic section than in the non-Abramic section.²⁰⁰

In sum, a comparison between 1QapGen and Luke's Gospel reveal that in the *Abramic* section verbatim agreement varies in a similar way to within consecutive synoptic pericopes. It is not certain, however, whether or not the author of 1QapGen derived this material from a literary

198. See Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 180.

199. Reflecting the level of verbal agreements found between 1QapGen and the biblical text.

200. Cf. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 69-70; Lord, "Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries," 452-3, who notes that very popular parts of the Yugoslavian epics occasionally agreed verbatim or almost verbatim.

source. Rather, it is likely that he drew it from a relatively fixed oral tradition, while the existent non-Abramic section was derived from less fixed oral tradition. Dependency on oral tradition, therefore, may explain 'editorial' inconsistencies in verbatim agreement between the non-Abramic and the Abramic section, on the one hand, and within the Abramic section, on the other hand.

Pseudo-Philo

The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*Biblical Antiquities*; *LAB*), once thought to be written by Philo of Alexandria, is another work falling into the category of 'rewritten Bible'.²⁰¹ It retells the biblical story from Adam to the death of Saul. Most scholars believe that it was written either just before or after 70 C.E. in Hebrew, and was later translated from Hebrew to Greek and from Greek to Latin.²⁰² *LAB* only exists in eighteen complete and three fragmentary Latin manuscripts, all from the eleventh to the fifteenth century.²⁰³

The consensus view is that *LAB* is not a sectarian work and its home is Palestine,²⁰⁴ but its purpose has remained enigmatic for scholars. It is clear that it was not intended to replace the biblical text since "[i]t refers to scriptural books by name several times,"²⁰⁵ but beyond this fact, opinions are widely divided.²⁰⁶

The way *LAB* retells the biblical story is clearly selective. It greatly embellishes the genealogies of Genesis (Gen 4-5, 10-11; *LAB* 1-2, 4), gives some space for the flood (*LAB* 4) and

201. Most scholars now agree with Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*," in, in *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, Louis H. Feldman, AGJU 30 (New York: Brill, 1989), 60, that *LAB* "is neither a targum nor a *peshet* commentary nor a Midrash nor an apocalypse nor a chronicle, although it has elements of all of these."

202. For a thorough discussion of the date, see Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, vol. 1, AGJU 31 (New York: Brill, 1996), 199–210; Bruce Norman Fisk, *Do You not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*, JSPSup 37 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 34–40. Jacobson supports the post-70 C.E. date, whereas Fisk remains uncertain. Probably most scholars argue for the pre-70 C.E. date.

203. Daniel J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 298.

204. Frederick James Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 7.

205. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 5.

206. See Louis H. Feldman, "Prolegomenon," in *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo: Now First Translated from the Old Latin Version*, trans. M. R. James (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971), xxxiii–xlvi.

the tower of Babel (*LAB* 6-7) stories, and briefly summarizes the history of Abram's family from Abram's arrival to the land of Canaan until Jacob moves to Egypt (*LAB* 8), but it otherwise totally omits the remainder of Genesis. Similarly, *LAB* develops the account of the birth of Moses (*LAB* 9), retells the accounts of the departure from Egypt (*LAB* 10), the giving of the law (*LAB* 11), and the gold calf (*LAB* 12), but otherwise omits the rest of Exodus. Leviticus is ignored almost completely; only some material concerning the tent of meeting and the festivals (*LAB* 13) is included. Aside from the census of Israel (*LAB* 14), the stories of the twelve spies (*LAB* 15), the rebellion of Korah (*LAB* 16), the rod of Aaron (*LAB* 17), Balaam (*LAB* 18), and Moses' farewell, prayer, and death (*LAB* 19), Numbers and Deuteronomy have been passed by. "The central focus on the work," as L. H. Feldman correctly notes, "is on the period of the Judges, consisting approximately 40 percent of the work."²⁰⁷ Interestingly, the biblical account of Othniel, "has been replaced by an extensive, unparalleled narrative of Kenaz," the father of Othniel (Judg 3:9,11), "who is, in terms of the space devoted to him, second in importance only to Moses himself" (*LAB* 25-28).²⁰⁸ The rest of *LAB* retells selectively the stories of Samuel, David, and Saul (*LAB* 50-65).

The way the author of *LAB* tells the story is unique. He not only seamlessly weaves together a biblical story with extrabiblical material but he also combines it with allusions to and quotations from contextually different biblical texts, as the following two examples will show.²⁰⁹ The first example is *LAB* 15.1-7, which retells the story of the twelve spies (Num 13-14; 'agreements' with the biblical text are underlined, but notice that some of these underlined texts occur *outside* the biblical story of the twelve spies).²¹⁰

207. Feldman, "Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*," 58.

208. Feldman, "Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*," 58.

209. For different categories of quotations and allusions in *LAB*, see Howard Jacobson, "Biblical Quotation and Editorial Function in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *JSP* 5 (1989): 63-64. For a list of the identified biblical citations and allusions in *LAB*, see Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, vol. 2, AGJU 31 (New York: Brill, 1996), 1223-60; Daniel J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo".

210. The text and highlights have been taken from Daniel J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo". The references to the biblical passages have been combined from Harrington's work and Jacobson's commentary on *LAB* (Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, 2 vols, AGJU 31 [New York: Brill, 1996]).

(1) And Moses sent twelve men as spies to spy out the land, for so it was commanded him. When they went up and spied out the land, they returned to him and brought back fruits from the fruits of the land. And they troubled the heart of the people, saying, "You cannot inherit the land, because it has been locked up with iron bars by its mighty men." (2) Yet two men of the twelve did not speak in this way, but said, "Just as hard iron can overcome the stars, or as weapons conquer lightning, or thunder is shut off the arrows of men, so can these men fight against the LORD." For they saw as they went up that the lightnings from the stars shone forth and claps of thunder resounding with them followed. (3) And these are their names: Caleb the son of Jephunneh, son of Beri, son of Batuel, son of Galifa, son of Cenen, son of Selumin, son of Selon, son of Judah. The second was Joshua son of Nun, son of Eliphath, son of Gal, son of Nefelien, son of Emon, son of Saul, son of Dabra, son of Ephraim, son of Joseph. (4) But the people did not listen to the voice of these two. Rather, they were very disturbed and said, "Are these the words that God spoke to us, saying, 'I will bring you into a land flowing with milk and honey'? And how does he now bring us up so that we should fall upon the sword and our wives be taken into captivity?" (5) And when they said these words, suddenly the glory of God appeared, and he said to Moses, "So, do the people continue not to listen to me at all? Behold now the plan of action that has issued from me will not be in vain. I will send the angel of my wrath upon them to afflict their bodies with fire in the wilderness. But I will command my angels who watch over them not to intercede for them; for their souls I will shut up in the chambers of darkness, and I will tell my servants, their fathers, 'Behold this is the seed to which I have spoken, saying, "Your seed will stay a while in a land not its own, and I will judge the nation whom it will serve."' And I fulfilled my words and made their enemies melt away and set the angels beneath their feet and placed the cloud as the covering for their head. And I commanded the sea, and when the abyss was divided before them, walls of water stood forth. (6) And there was never anything like this event since the day I said, 'Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together into one place,' until this day. And I brought them forth, but I killed their enemies. And I brought them before me to Mount Sinai, and I bent the heavens and came down to kindle a lamp for my people and to establish laws for creation. And I taught them to make sanctuaries for me that I might dwell in them, but they abandoned me and did not believe my words, and their mind grew weak. And now behold the days will come, and I will do to them as they wished, and I will cast their bodies in the wilderness." (7) And Moses said, "Behold you took the seed from which you would make man upon the earth, was it I who did establish their ways? Therefore let your mercy sustain us until the end, and your fidelity for length of days; for unless you had mercy, who would ever be born?"

Num 13:1-3,17,
20-29,32f.; 32:9
Deut 1:23,25
Josh 14:8; Deut
1:28
Num 13:30; 14:6

Num 13:4; 32:12
1Chr 7:21-27

Exod 3:8; Num
14:3; 16:14
Num 14:10,22

Num 16:35

Gen 15:13f.

Exod 14:22; 15:8
Deut 4:32
Gen 1:9

Isa 64:1; Ps 18:9

Num 14:32; Ps
106:26
Num 14:13-19

The general outlines of *LAB* 15.1-7 and Num 13-14 are similar, but the two versions rarely agree 'verbatim.' The *LAB* version includes a few 'verbatim' quotations from, and several allusions to, other biblical passages.

The second example is Hannah's prayer, when she dedicated her son, Samuel, to serve the Lord at the temple (*LAB* 51:3-6; cf. 1 Sam 2:1-11).

(3) "Come to my voice, all you nations, and pay attention to my speech, all you kingdoms, because my mouth has been opened that I should speak and my lips have been commanded to sing a hymn to the LORD. Drip, my breasts, and tell your testimonies, because you have been commanded to give milk. For he who is milked from you be raised up, and the people will be enlightened by his words, and he will show to the nations the statues, and his horn will be exalted very high. (4) And so I will speak my words openly, because from me will arise the ordinance of the LORD, and all men will find the truth. Do not hurry to say great things or to bring forth from your mouth lofty words, but delight in glorifying (God). For when the light from which wisdom is to be born will go forth, not those who possess many things will be said to be rich, nor those who have born in abundance will be called mothers. For the sterile one has been satisfied in childbearing, but she who has many children has been emptied. (5) Because the Lord kills in judgment, and brings to life in mercy. For them who are wicked in this world he kills, and he brings the just to life when he wishes. Now the wicked he will shut up in darkness, but he will save his light for the just. And when the wicked have died, then they will perish. And when the just go to sleep, then they will be freed. Now so will every judgment endure, until he who restrains will be revealed. (6) Speak, speak, Hannah, and do not be silent. Sing a hymn, daughter of Batuel, about the miracles that God has performed with you. Who is Hannah that a prophet is born from her? Or who is the daughter of Batuel that she should bear the light to he peoples? Rise up, you also, Elkanah, and gird your loins. Sing a hymn about the wonders of the LORD. Because Asaph prophesied in the wilderness about your son, saying, 'Moses and Aaron were among his priests, and Samuel was there among them.' Behold the word has been fulfilled, and the prophecy has come to pass. And the words will endure until they give the horn to his anointed one and power be present at the throne of his king. And let my son stay here and serve until he be made a light for this nation."

1 Sam 2:10
Isa 51:4
1 Sam 2:3
Isa 51:4
1 Sam 2:5
1 Sam 2:6
1 Sam 2:9
Ps 97:11
Isa 51:4
Jer 1:17; Job 38:3
Ps 99:6
1 Sam 2:10f.

Aside from a few phrases, as commentators have observed, Hannah's prayer in *LAB* has very little in common with the parallel prayer in 1 Sam 2.²¹¹ As in the previous example, a few phrases from other biblical texts have been incorporated in the prayer. The reason why these two prayers are so different is unclear.

211. See Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Vol. 2), 1098–99.

The author of *LAB* must have had a profound knowledge of the Bible, as H. Jacobson shows in his commentary on *LAB*,²¹² calling the author's knowledge "extraordinary."²¹³ According to Jacobson, *LAB* contains quotations and echoes from all the books of the Hebrew Bible, except from Haggai.²¹⁴ In light of how difficult it was to use the ancient scrolls and to find the desired text from them, because the text was *scriptio continua* without the chapter and verse divisions, the author of *LAB* must have drawn his secondary biblical references from memory, though many of these references are 'verbatim.' Therefore, it is also highly likely that the author relied on his memory of primary references. Jacobson warns that "we should not think of the author of *LAB* as sitting at a desk with texts of the Bible at hand for constant consultation while he wrote," and continues, "[c]omposition may well have been largely of an oral nature and, at all events, relied to a great extent on memory."²¹⁵ It is also unlikely that the author created the extrabiblical sections *ex nihilo* because many of these sections have contact points in other extrabiblical sources.²¹⁶

F. J. Murphy classifies passages in *LAB* into four categories regarding the extent to which they depend upon biblical passages:²¹⁷ 1) "Passages that depend heavily upon quotations of biblical passages and in which Pseudo-Philo's interpretation depends upon small-scale changes in the text." Murphy notes that only few passages fall into this category. The most obvious is the story of the Flood in chapter 3, which has been significantly abridged but 'verbatim' agreement with the parallel story in Genesis is very high. 2) "Passages that quote the Bible to set up the

212. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Vol. 1), 224–41.

213. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Vol. 1), 236.

214. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Vol. 2), 1223–60.

215. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Vol. 1), 256.

216. See Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Vol. 1), 195, thinks that in the case of *LAB* it is even "problematic to speak of an author at all. To be sure, there can be no question that the work as we have it is the product of one formative mind, one shaping spirit. Yet, the contents of the book are so largely derivative that one tends to think of the author as the person who gave this work form rather than substance. Not only is the biblical narrative the foundation of the whole book, but even the deviations and embellishments, it is reasonable to assume, are in some measure the product of a tradition that anteceded our author."

217. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 20.

situation of a passage or to constitute the structure of an incident but in which there is extensive rewriting, often with the addition of lengthy passages that do not appear in the Bible.” One example of this common category is the story of Abram and the tower of Babel (*LAB* 6). 3) “Passages built around a biblical figure, but consisting of material not found in the Bible” (*LAB* 29, 38, 41). 4) “Passages with no counterparts in Scripture” (*LAB* 34). In comparison to Luke’s editing technique, the two truly correspond only in the first and last categories: a few passages in Luke have high verbatim agreement with their possible source (Mark or Q), and a few passages in Luke do not have parallels either in Mark or Matthew (Q).

In sum, a comparison of the level of ‘verbatim’ agreements between pericopes in *LAB* reveals similar kinds of inconsistencies to what we find in Luke’s Gospel: ‘verbatim’ agreement is very high in *LAB* 3 as it is in a few passages in Luke, but minimal in some other pericopes in Luke. How do we explain these ‘editorial’ inconsistencies?

We saw above that there is strong reason to believe that the author of *LAB* had memorized a lot of biblical material by heart – although not necessarily everything word for word. Therefore, he did not necessarily need a biblical text in front of him while he was writing his work. The author was able to retell biblical stories from memory and combine them with extrabiblical and biblical material drawn from other contexts. In some cases, he remembered the wording of the biblical text more accurately than in others. Occasionally (especially in *LAB* 3), however, the author might have had a biblical text before him. I believe that the author’s (primary) reliance on memory explains the ‘editorial’ inconsistencies in ‘verbatim’ agreement in *LAB*.

Besides similar inconsistencies in ‘verbatim’ agreement levels in some passage in *LAB* and Luke’s Gospel, the editing techniques of Pseudo-Philo and Luke are almost entirely different: Pseudo-Philo blends together biblical passages from different documents, whereas Luke seldom does.²¹⁸ Pseudo-Philo combines the biblical texts with lengthy extrabiblical passages within the

218. Sometimes Luke seems to combine Markan material with Q material within the same pericope. See Appendix A.

pericope, whereas Luke does not;²¹⁹ and Pseudo-Philo follows his biblical source, in general, much more loosely than Luke does.

The Books of Chronicles

The books in the Hebrew Bible have been arranged in three divisions: the Law, the Prophets (which has two subdivisions: the Former Prophets and the Latter Prophets²²⁰), and the Writings. Chronicles, or ‘the Events of the Past Time,’ belongs to the last division, being the last book of it. Originally, Chronicles was a single volume, following the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The translators of the LXX divided it into two volumes, moved it to the History Books section – the second one in the fourfold division of the LXX (others are: Law, Poetry, and Prophets) – preceded by the Kingdoms (i.e., 1-2 Samuel, and 1-2 Kings) and followed by 1 Esdras and Ezra/Nehemiah, and renamed it Παραλειπομένων, ‘the Things Omitted.’ In the Hebrew Bible, Chronicles was divided into two volumes in 1448 C.E.²²¹

The two books of Chronicles consist of four segments: 1) Genealogies from Adam to Saul’s descendants, and Saul’s death (1 Chr 1-10); 2) The reign of David (1 Chr 11-29); 3) The reign of Solomon (2 Chr 1-9); and 4) The Davidic kingdom from the division until the end of the Jewish state (2 Chr 10-36). Pericopes in all of these four segments have parallels in other parts of the OT. According to the authors of *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*, the first segment has parallel texts in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai.²²² The second segment has

219. In Luke’s case I mean by ‘extrabiblical passages’ Lukan material which does not have parallel material either in Mark or Q.

220. Former Prophets = Deuteronomistic History: (Deuteronomy), Joshua, Judges, 1-2 Samuel, and 1-2 Kings; Latter Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, The Twelve (minor prophets).

221. G. F. Hasel, “Chronicles, Books Of,” in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 667.

222. Endres, Millar, and Burns, *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*, 3–46. See also Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 12 (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 245–514.

Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 37, 43, a proponent of the theory that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as source, argues that “[w]hile many commentators have said the Chronicler used both biblical and extrabiblical genealogical information in constructing his genealogies for the tribes, information parallel to the biblical data may already have been recorded in his

parallel texts in 2 Samuel, 1 Kings and Psalms; the third one has parallel texts in 1 Kings, Psalms and Jeremiah; and the fourth segment has parallel texts in Deuteronomy, 1-2 Kings, Ezra, Isaiah and Jeremiah.²²³ All these segments also have unique sections, not found in the OT.

Scholars have reached a consensus on very few issues in Chronicles research. Its date,²²⁴ unity,²²⁵ relationship to Ezra-Nehemiah²²⁶ and historical value²²⁷ are among the issues which divide opinions. Also, in recent years, Chronicles' relationship to Samuel-Kings has again become a topic of debate.

Similarities and dissimilarities between the accounts of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, and how to explain them, have bothered scholars at least since the beginning of critical scholarship. Even a quick comparison of the outlines and contents of these two books reveals that 1) both have unique material, 2) occasionally the order of parallel pericopes disagrees, and 3) verbatim agreement between parallel accounts varies greatly.²²⁸ Perhaps the most bothersome thing is that in many cases parallel accounts agree word for word, having only minor differences, whereas in some other cases parallel accounts have very little in common, even contradicting each other. I have chosen two parallel accounts for demonstration.

nonbiblical source" (p. 43).

223. Endres, Millar, and Burns, *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*. Cf. Newsome, *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*; Vannutelli, *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum Loci Paralleli*.

224. Chronicles is dated between about 530 and 164 B.C.E. For a good discussion of the issue, see Isaac Kalimi, *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place, and Writing*, SSN 46 (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2005), 41–65; Hasel, "Chronicles, Books Of," 670–71; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 13–16.

225. See Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 11–13; John W. Kleinig, "Recent Research in Chronicles," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 2 (1994): 44–46.

226. Some scholars argue that the same person composed both Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, while others reject this theory. A growing number of scholars favor the latter view. See Kalimi, *An Ancient Israelite Historian*, 54–56; Kleinig, "Recent Research in Chronicles," 44; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 72–89; Steven L. McKenzie, "The Chronicler as Redactor," in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 71–80; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 6–10.

227. See Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 23–26.

228. See Endres, Millar, and Burns, *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*; Newsome, *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*; Vannutelli, *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum Loci Paralleli*.

The parallel accounts of 2 Samuel 5:1-5 and 1 Chronicles 11:1-3 are an example of high verbatim agreement (notice: the *non*-verbatim words have been underlined).²²⁹

2 Sam 5:1-5

¹ וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־דָּוִד חֶבְרוֹנָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ
לְאֹמֶר הִנֵּנוּ עֲצָמֶךָ וּבְשָׁרְךָ אֲנַחְנוּ: ² גַּם־אֶתְמָוֶל
גַּם־שְׁלֹשׁוֹם בְּהָיוֹת שָׂאוֹל מֶלֶךְ עָלֵינוּ אַתָּה (הֵייתָה)
[הֵייתָ] [מוֹצִיאַ] [הַמוֹצִיאַ] [וְהַמְבִּיאַ] אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לְךָ אַתָּה תִרְעָה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאַתָּה
תִּהְיֶה לְנֶגִיד עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל: ³ וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חֶבְרוֹנָה וַיִּכְרֹת לָהֶם הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד בְּרִית
בְּחֶבְרוֹן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיִּמָּשְׁחוּ אֶת־דָּוִד לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל:
⁴ פ' בְּזִשְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה דָּוִד בָּמָלְכוֹ אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה מֶלֶךְ:
בְּחֶבְרוֹן מֶלֶךְ עַל־יְהוּדָה שִׁבְעֵי שָׁנִים וּשְׁשֵׁה חֳדָשִׁים
וּבִירוּשָׁלַם מֶלֶךְ שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁלֹשׁ שָׁנָה עַל כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיְהִי־כֵן:

¹ Then all the tribes of Israel came to David at Hebron, and said, "Behold, we are your bone and flesh." ² In times past, when Saul was king over us, it was you that led out and brought in Israel; and the LORD said to you, 'You shall be shepherd of my people Israel, and you shall be prince over Israel.'

³ So all the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron; and King David made a covenant with them at Hebron before the LORD, and they anointed David king over Israel.

⁴ David was thirty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years. ⁵ At Hebron he reigned over Judah seven years and six months; and at Jerusalem he reigned over all Israel and Judah thirty-three years.

1 Chr 11:1-3

¹ וַיִּקְבְּצוּ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־דָּוִיד חֶבְרוֹנָה לֵאמֹר הִנֵּה
עֲצָמֶךָ וּבְשָׁרְךָ אֲנַחְנוּ: ² גַּם־תְּמָוֶל גַּם־שְׁלֹשׁוֹם בְּהָיוֹת
שָׂאוֹל מֶלֶךְ אַתָּה הַמוֹצִיאַ וְהַמְבִּיאַ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמְרוּ
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְךָ אַתָּה תִרְעָה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאַתָּה תִּהְיֶה נֶגִיד עַל עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל: ³ וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־זִקְנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חֶבְרוֹנָה וַיִּכְרֹת לָהֶם דָּוִד בְּרִית
בְּחֶבְרוֹן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיִּמָּשְׁחוּ אֶת־דָּוִיד לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
כַּדְּבַר יְהוָה בְּיַד־שְׁמוּאֵל: ס

¹ Then all Israel gathered together to David at Hebron, and said, "Behold, we are your bone and flesh." ² In times past, even when Saul was king, it was you that led out and brought in Israel; and your God said to you, 'You shall be shepherd of my people Israel, and you shall be prince over my people Israel.'

³ So all the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron; and David made a covenant with them at Hebron before the LORD, and they anointed David King over Israel, according to the word of the LORD by Samuel.

This short text reveals two major problems which source critics are faced with. First, the last clause in 1 Chr 11:3 refers to Samuel's prophecy and assumes that the readers of Chronicles

229. The English translations are from Newsome, *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*.

know it, although the prophecy is not mentioned in Chronicles but rather only in 1 Sam 15:28; 16:1-13.²³⁰ Source critics, who maintain that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source, regard this and similar texts in Chronicles as some of the strongest evidence in support of their theory. This argument, however, is weak because it is not required that the first readers of Chronicles knew the prophecy from Samuel-Kings. It is also possible that they knew it either from other official or unofficial records, to which the Chronicler often refers,²³¹ or from oral tradition. Second, 2 Sam 5:4-5 does not have the contextual parallel in 1 Chr 11.²³² This is noteworthy because these two verses are also absent in the Old Latin of Samuel, 4QSam^a and Josephus.²³³ It should be noted that this is not an isolated incident but a very common pattern. In a great number of cases 4QSam^a / 4QSam^b and the MT of Chronicles agree against the MT of Samuel.²³⁴ Many of these cases are also supported by the LXX.²³⁵ Therefore, most scholars, convinced by S. L.

230. 1 Chr 11:3b could refer to the prophecy mentioned just before in v. 2b. The prophecy also occurs in the parallel text in 2 Sam 5:2b. Although the prophecy is not directly attributed to Samuel by the author of 2 Samuel, it is very likely that he alludes to Samuel's prophecies recorded in 1 Sam 15:28; 16:1-13. Notice, however, that the prophecy of 1 Chr 11:3b/2 Sam 5:2b does not occur anywhere in the OT in this form.

231. For a comprehensive list of the sources to which the Chronicler refers, see Reinhard Gregor Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, trans. John Bowden (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 39; Hasel, "Chronicles, Books Of," 668; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 39-44. It is widely assumed that these various titles refer to Samuel-Kings, but this view can be questioned. If the Chronicler used only one document as his source, why does he call this same document by so many different names while the author of Kings consistently uses the same titles for his sources ("the book of the acts of Solomon" in 1 Kgs 11:41; "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" in 1 Kgs 14:29; etc.; "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" in 1 Kgs 14:19; etc.)? Many scholars have followed Martin Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, JSOTSup 50 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 53, who argues that the Chronicler is not "actually citing sources that have been used" but has adopted "a literary convention, following the example of Dtr." But this is only a presumption, not a certainty. In my opinion, Hasel's (Hasel, "Chronicles, Books Of," 668) view is more probable: "the variety of titles... seems to suggest a variety of sources."

For a good discussion on sources mentioned in Chronicles, see also Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster, 1993), 14-23.

232. The same statement occurs in different contexts in Chronicles: 1 Chr 3:4; 26:31.

233. Eugene Charles Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 60-2; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1-9*, 535; Abegg Jr., Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 241.

234. See Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 30, and footnotes in his commentary.

235. See Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*; Hasel, "Chronicles, Books Of," 668; Frank Moore Cross, *An Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 132, 139-40; George J. Brooke, "The Book of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H Lim, and W. Brian Aucker (Boston: Brill, 2007), 35-48.

An interesting fact is that the Greek translations (LXX) of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles often agree very closely in wording even though it is unlikely that they were translated by the same person. This fact weakens the

McKenzie's analyses,²³⁶ now agree that the Chronicler did not use the MT of Samuel as his source.²³⁷ Whether or not he used the MT of Kings is still debated.²³⁸ "As a result of these findings, scholars have become rightly hesitant to use divergence from the MT as direct evidence for the editorial activity and theological bias of the Chronicler."²³⁹ Some scholars also use this as evidence for the common source theory as discussed below.

In general, verbatim agreement between the parallel accounts in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles is much higher than within the Synoptic Gospels.

The parallel account of 1 Kings 2:46b-3:15 and 2 Chronicles 1:1-13 is an example of low verbatim agreement. Below, I have reproduced the section where God speaks to Solomon in a dream (1 Kgs 3:5-15/ 2 Chr 1:7-13; notice: the *non*-verbatim words have been underlined).

1 Kgs 3:5-15

בַּבֹּקֶר נִרְאָה יְהוָה אֶל-שְׁלֹמֹה בַּחֲלוֹם הַלַּיְלָה וַיֹּאמֶר
אֱלֹהִים שְׂאֵל מִה אֶתֶּן-לְךָ: וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁלֹמֹה אֶתָּה עֲשִׂית
עִם-עַבְדְּךָ דָּוִד אֲבִי תֶסֶד גָּדוֹל בְּאֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ לִפְנֵיךָ
בְּאֵמֶת וּבְצִדְקָה וּבִישֻׁרֵת לִבָּב עַמְּךָ וּתְשַׁמְרֵ-לִי
אֶת-הַתֶּסֶד הַגָּדוֹל הַזֶּה וּתְתֵן-לִי כִּן יֵשֵׁב עַל-כִּסְאוֹ כִּיּוֹם
הַזֶּה:

2 Chr 1:7-13

בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא נִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים לְשְׁלֹמֹה וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ שְׂאֵל
מִה אֶתֶּן-לְךָ: וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁלֹמֹה לְאֱלֹהִים אֶתָּה עֲשִׂית
עִם-דָּוִד אֲבִי תֶסֶד גָּדוֹל

argument that the Evangelists could not have used the Hebrew or Aramaic U-gospel as their source and translated it independently because of their close agreements in wording.

236. Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomic History*, HSM 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

237. Kleinig, "Recent Research in Chronicles," 47.

Also notice that even though the phrase 'your God' (1 Chr 11:2) often occurs in both 1-2 Samuel (12 times) and 1-2 Chronicles (18+2 times), the phrase is missing in three cases in Chronicles while it is present in Samuel (2 Sam 24:3, 23; 35:1a). Only once does the phrase occur side by side in the parallel texts (1 Kgs 10:9/2 Sam 9:8). If the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source, why did he omit the phrase in those cases? – For use of the words "God" and "YHWH" in Chronicles and Samuel-Kings, see A. Graeme Auld, "What If the Chronicler Did Use the Deuteronomic History?" in *Virtual History and the Bible*, ed. Jo Cheryl Exum (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 136–50. Auld believes that a comparison of the usage of these two terms in Chronicles and Samuel-Kings supports his view that the Chronicler did not use the MT of Samuel-Kings as his source.

238. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomic History*, 119–58. McKenzie argues that "[t]here can be little doubt that K^M [the MT of Kings] and C^M [the MT of Chronicles] reflect a single text type of K [Kings], i.e., Chr's Vorlage of K was proto-Rabbinic" (p. 155).

239. Kleinig, "Recent Research in Chronicles," 47.

והמלך תגִּי תַחֲתָיו:

⁷ ועתה יִהְיֶה אֱלֹהִי אֹתָהּ הַמְּלִכֶת אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ תַּחַת דָּוִד

אֲבִי וְאֲנֹכִי בְּעַד קִטּוֹן לֹא אֲדַע צֹאת וּבֹא:

⁸ וְעַבְדְּךָ בְּתוֹךְ עַמּוֹךְ אֲשֶׁר בְּחֶרֶת עַם־רֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְנָה וְלֹא יִסְפֹּר מֶרֶב:

⁹ עֲתָה יִהְיֶה אֱלֹהִים יָאֲמֹן לְבָרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אֲבִי כִּי אֹתָהּ הַמְּלִכֶתִי עַל־עַם רֹב כַּעֲפָר הָאָרֶץ:

¹⁰ עֲתָה חֲכֹמָה וּמִדַּע תִּזְוֶלִי וְאַצְאָה לִפְנֵי הָעַם־הַזֶּה וְאֲבֹאָה כִּי־מִי יִשְׁפֹּט אֶת־עַמּוֹךְ הַזֶּה הַגָּדוֹל: ס

⁹ וְנִתַּתְּ לְעַבְדְּךָ לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ לִשְׁפֹּט אֶת־עַמּוֹךְ לְהִבִּין בֵּין־טוֹב לְרָע כִּי מִי יֻכַּל לִשְׁפֹּט אֶת־עַמּוֹךְ הַכָּבֵד הַזֶּה:

¹⁰ וַיִּיטֹב הַדָּבָר בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנָי כִּי שָׁאֵל שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה:

¹¹ וַיֹּאמֶר־אֱלֹהִים לְשְׁלֹמֹה יַעֲזֹן אֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה זֹאת עִם־לִבְּךָ וְלֹא־שָׁאֲלָתָּ עֹשֶׁר וְנִכְסִים וְכָבוֹד וְאֵת נַפְשׁ שִׁנְאִיד וְגַם־יָמִים רַבִּים לֹא שָׁאֲלָתָּ וְתִשְׁאֲלֶהָ לָּךְ חֲכֹמָה וּמִדַּע אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁפֹּט אֶת־עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר הַמְּלִכֶתִי עָלָיו:

¹¹ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֵלָיו יַעֲזֹן אֲשֶׁר שָׁאֲלָתָּ אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וְלֹא־שָׁאֲלָתָּ לְךָ יָמִים רַבִּים וְלֹא־שָׁאֲלָתָּ לָּךְ עֹשֶׁר וְלֹא שָׁאֲלָתָּ נַפְשׁ אִיבִיד וְשָׁאֲלָתָּ לָּךְ הִבִּין לִשְׁמֹעַ מִשְׁפָּט:

¹² הַחֲכֹמָה וְהַמִּדַּע נִתְּנוּ לָּךְ וְעֹשֶׁר וְנִכְסִים וְכָבוֹד אֲתוֹ־לָּךְ אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיָה לָּךְ לְמַלְכִּים אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֶיךָ וְאַחֲרֶיךָ לֹא־יִהְיֶה־כֵּן:

¹² הַזֶּה עָשִׂיתִי כַּדְּבָרֶיךָ הַזֶּה וְנִתְּנִי לָּךְ לֵב חָכָם וְנִבְּזוֹן אֲשֶׁר כְּמוֹךָ־גִּיא־הָיָה לִפְנֶיךָ וְאַחֲרֶיךָ לֹא־יָקוּם כְּמוֹךָ: ¹³ וְגַם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁאֲלָתָּ נִתְּנִי לָּךְ גַּם־עֹשֶׁר גַּם־כָּבוֹד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיָה כְּמוֹךָ אִישׁ בְּמַלְכִּים כְּלִי־יָמֶיךָ:

¹⁴ וְאַם תֵּלֵךְ בְּדַרְכֵי לִשְׁמֹר חֻמֵּי וּמִצְוֹתַי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִלַּךְ דָּוִיד אֲבִיךָ וְהֵאֲרַכְתִּי אֶת־יָמֶיךָ: ס

¹³ וַיָּבֹא שְׁלֹמֹה לְבִמָּה אֲשֶׁר־בְּגִבְעוֹן וַיְרוּשָׁלַם מִלִּפְנֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וַיִּמְלֹךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל: פ

¹⁵ וַיִּקְרַץ שְׁלֹמֹה וְהָיָה חֲלוֹם וַיָּבֹא יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיַּעֲמֵדוּ לִפְנֵי אָרֹן בְּרִית־אֲדֹנָי וַיַּעַל עֲלוֹת וַיַּעַשׂ שְׁלָמִים וַיַּעַשׂ מִשְׁתָּה לְכָל־עַבְדָּיו: פ

⁵ At Gibeon the LORD appeared to Solomon in a dream by night; and God said, "Ask what I shall give you."

⁶ And Solomon said, "Thou hast shown great and steadfast love to thy servant David my father, because he walked before thee in faithfulness, in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart toward thee; and thou hast kept for him this great and steadfast love, and hast given him a son to sit on his throne this day."

⁷ And now, O LORD my God, thou hast made

⁷ ¶ In that night God appeared to Solomon, and said to him, "Ask what I shall give you."

⁸ And Solomon said to God, "Thou has shown great and steadfast love to David my father, and

thy servant king in place of David my father, although I am but a little child; I do not know how to go out or come in.

⁸ And thy servant is in the midst of thy people whom thou hast chosen, a great people, that cannot be numbered or counted for multitude.

⁹ Give thy servant therefore an understanding mind to govern thy people, that I may discern between good and evil; for who is able to govern this thy great people?"

¹⁰ ¶ It pleased the Lord that Solomon had asked this.

¹¹ And God said to him, "Because you have asked this, and you have not asked for yourself long life or riches, or for the life of your enemies, but have asked for yourself understanding to discern what is right,

¹² behold, I now do according to your word. Behold, I give you a wise and discerning mind; so that none like you has been before you and none like you shall arise after you. ¹³ I give you also what you have not asked, both riches and honor, so that no other king shall compare with you, all your days.

¹⁴ And if you will walk in my ways, keeping my statutes and my commandments, as your father David walked, then I will lengthen your days."

¹⁵ ¶ Then Solomon awoke, and behold, it was a dream. Then he came to Jerusalem, and stood before the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and offered up burnt offerings and peace offerings, and made a feast for all his servants.

hast made me king in his stead.

⁹ O LORD God, let thy promise to David my father be now fulfilled, for thou hast made me king over a people as many as the dust of the earth.

¹⁰ Give me now wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in before this people, for who can rule this thy people, that is so great?"

¹¹ God answered Solomon, "Because this was in your heart, and you have not asked possessions, wealth, honor, or the life of those who hate you, and have not even asked for long life, but have asked wisdom and knowledge for yourself that you may rule my people over whom I have made you king,

¹² wisdom and knowledge are granted to you. I will also give you riches, possessions, and honor, such as none of the kings had who were before you, and none after you shall have the like."

¹³ So Solomon came from the high place at Gibeon, from before the tent of meeting, to Jerusalem. And he reigned over Israel.

The wording in these parallel texts, as well as in the preceding (1 Kgs 2:10-12/1 Chr 29:22b-30) and following (1 Kgs 4:20-21/2 Chr 9:26; 1 Kgs 5:1-18; 7:13-14/ 2 Chr 2:1-18; 1 Kgs 6:1-38/2 Chr 3:1-14) parallel texts, differs significantly;²⁴⁰ they have very few common words. If the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source, as most scholars believe, why did he change his

240. For a detailed analysis of 1 Kgs 3:4-4:1 and 2 Chr 1:3-13, see A. Graeme Auld, "Solomon at Gibeon: History Glimpsed," in *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*, Graeme Auld (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 98-103.

editing technique so radically here, even though there is no compelling grammatical or theological reason for it?²⁴¹

The source critical views of Chronicles' relation to Samuel-Kings fall into two basic alternatives.²⁴²

1) The Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source. In 1806, W. M. L. de Wette proposed in his *Kritische Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik*, against the dominant view then, that "[t]he accounts which run parallel with the books of Samuel and Kings were derived [by the Chronicler] from that source."²⁴³ The theory was developed further by scholars like C. P. W. Gramberg, K. H. Graf, and J. Wellhausen.²⁴⁴ Since M. Noth's work, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (1943),²⁴⁵ the theory has won almost universal acceptance among OT scholars, even though most of Noth's central statements have been widely challenged and rejected since the publication of his book.²⁴⁶ In the second part of the book, Noth argues:²⁴⁷ i) The books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are a literary unity composed by one author, the Chronicler. Most scholars now reject this view; ii) The Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source "in the form that we know them." Noth adds that "that must be obvious and uncontroversial."²⁴⁸ Most

241. Cf. Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 304–06.

242. Kai Peltonen, "Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena: Aspects of Source Criticism as Theory and Method in the History of Chronicles Research," in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 20–41, suggests that the opinions fall into three alternatives: i) There were unknown sources only, ii) there were both known and unknown sources, iii) known sources are the only ones that matter. The distinction between the second and third alternatives, however, is artificial and even misleading. Even most devoted proponents of the view that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as a source do not deny that the Chronicler would not have also used unknown sources.

243. The quotation from Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, trans. and enlarged by Theodore Parker (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 2005), 306. See Peltonen, "Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena," 36–41.

244. Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*, 4–5.

245. ETs of it: Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981) and Noth, *The Chronicler's History*.

246. Kleinig, "Recent Research in Chronicles," 44–46.

247. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*. See especially pp. 29–95.

248. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 52.

scholars still maintain that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source, but are forced by the evidence from Qumran to reject the claim that it was MT Samuel-Kings; iii) Almost all changes in the parallel texts can be attributed to the Chronicler.²⁴⁹ In light of the Qumran evidence, most scholars have become hesitant to use divergencies between MT Samuel-Kings and MT Chronicles “as direct evidence for the editorial activity and theological bias of the Chronicler” as already noted above;²⁵⁰ iv) The Chronicler omitted material from Samuel-Kings for theological reasons.²⁵¹ One of the major goals of the Chronicler was to depict David and Solomon as ideal kings. This explains why the Chronicler omitted, for example, “the struggle between the House of Saul and David, sin with Bathsheba, and the rebellions against David.”²⁵² T. Sugimoto, while supporting the dominant source theory, questions the logic behind this argument.²⁵³ He demonstrates that the Chronicler does not attempt to completely hide the struggle between two houses (see 1 Chr 10:14; 12:1; 29:26-27); it is unlikely that the Bathsheba episode (2 Sam 11-12) is excluded in order to hide David’s dark side because “[t]he Chronicler does not hesitate to include David’s sin in taking the census (1 Chron. 21) and his failure in bringing up the ark of the covenant (1 Chron. 13);”²⁵⁴ and “Absalom’s rebellion (2 Sam. 13-19) and Sheba’s revolt (2 Sam. 20) are also not omitted simply because they are unfortunate for David, but because the Chronicler wishes to relate David’s reign and Solomon’s reign more closely.”²⁵⁵ One may also wonder why the

249. For a further study on this issue, see especially Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Kalimi argues that “differences between the parallel texts of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles mostly stem from the creative literary involvement of the Chronicler with the earlier texts rather than from his ‘carelessness’ or the ‘carelessness’ of later transmitters and copyists, or even intentional modifications by later scribes or theologians” (p. 405). Kalimi is criticized by McKenzie, “The Chronicler as Redactor,” 89, that “Kalimi tends to undervalue textual criticism and fails to appreciate the independence of the witnesses, especially 4QSam^a.”

250. The quotation from Kleinig, “Recent Research in Chronicles,” 47. See also Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 52–65; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 26–30. Klein states, “The primary source used by the Chronicler for 1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 36 is the books of Samuel and Kings, but the copy of these books, the Chronicler’s *Vorlage*, was not identical with the MT of these books” (p. 30).

251. See also Wette, *Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, 253–316; Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, 22–44; Tomotoshi Sugimoto, “Chronicles as Independent Literature,” *JSOT* 55 (1992): 61–74.

252. The quotation from Sugimoto, “Chronicles as Independent Literature,” 64.

253. Sugimoto, “Chronicles as Independent Literature.”

254. Sugimoto, “Chronicles as Independent Literature,” 67.

255. Sugimoto, “Chronicles as Independent Literature,” 67.

Chronicler also omitted such sections, which are favorable to David and Solomon, if he used Samuel-Kings as his source: David's kindness towards Mephibosheth (2 Sam 9:1-13), David's psalm of deliverance (2 Sam 22:1-51), David's last words (2 Sam 23:1-7), Solomon's judgment of the harlots (1 Kgs 3:16-28), Solomon's officials (1 Kgs 4:1-19; cf. 1 Chr 11:10-47; 12:1-40), Solomon's wealth and power (1 Kgs 4:22-28), Solomon's wisdom (1 Kgs 4:29-34), and the construction of Solomon's royal palace (1 Kgs 7:1-12); v) The Chronicler had access to non-canonical documents and sources. Noth argues that some pieces of information in Chronicles' unique material "are so accurate historically that we are compelled to adopt the assumption that Chr. derived them from a pre-exilic source."²⁵⁶ He discusses two such texts in some detail: 2 Chr 32:30 (Hezekiah's tunnel) and 2 Chr 35:20-24 (the battle between Josiah and Necho).²⁵⁷ Some early scholars suggested that the Chronicler composed the unique sections *ex nihilo*, but this is highly unlikely in light of these two passages, and other evidence;²⁵⁸ and vi) Later redactors of Chronicles extended the work. Noth argues that 12:1-23, 24-41; 15:4-10, 16-24; 16:5-38, 41-42; 22:17-19; 23:3-27:34 and most of the genealogies in 1 Chr 1-9 are secondary additions to 1 Chronicles.²⁵⁹ However, a present trend, especially among English speaking scholars is to "ascribe very few passages to a second hand."²⁶⁰

2) The author of the Deuteronomistic history/Samuel-Kings and the author of Chronicles used a shared unknown source. This was a leading theory at the beginning of the critical study of Chronicles in the early nineteenth century. For example, it was held by J. G. Eichhorn (1752-1827) and C. F. Keil (1807-88), who both argued that the authors of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles used different versions of their common source – the short biography of David and

256. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 57.

257. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 57–58. For other references, which Noth believes to have been drawn from ancient nonbiblical documents, see pp. 58-60. See also Peltonen, "Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena," 49. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 10.74.

258. See Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 118–20; Kleinig, "Recent Research in Chronicles," 48; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 23–6.

259. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 29–50. See also Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 12.

260. Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 11.

Solomon – supplementing it from other sources. This explains similarities and differences between these two accounts. Recently, a first rank Hebrew Bible scholar, A. G. Auld, has revitalized this view and has defended it in a number of his writings.²⁶¹ He has been followed by some other scholars, including C. Y. S. Ho,²⁶² J. Treballe,²⁶³ and R. F. Person,²⁶⁴ with some modifications.

Auld argues that the author(s) of Samuel-Kings and the author(s) of Chronicles drew their common material independently from an older document, which he calls the ‘Book of Two Houses.’ It consisted of “a story of David’s house from the death of Saul to the fall of Jerusalem and of Yahweh’s house in Jerusalem from David’s entry into that city until his last successor’s departure – a story in which the period of David and Solomon took up one half of the space and all of their successors together the other.”²⁶⁵ This document was “roughly half as long as either of the successor works we now know.”²⁶⁶ Both authors extended and supplemented their base-narrative by materials from other sources. Therefore, “Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are something like two originally identical cuttings from the same plant: cultivated in different soils and in different climates, trained differently, grown to twice their original size, and very different now in aspect.”²⁶⁷ For arguments against and for Auld’s theory, see Appendix C.

261. E.g., A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible’s Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994); A. Graeme Auld, *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of A. Graeme Auld* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004). For writings for and against Auld’s theory, see Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, eds., *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (Boston: Brill, 2007).

262. Craig Y. S. Ho, “Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1–13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1–12?” *VT* 45, no. 1 (1995): 82–106.

263. Julio Treballe, “Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Tradition,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker (Boston: Brill, 2007), 483–501.

264. Raymond F. Person, “The Deuteronomistic History and the Books of Chronicles: Contemporary Competing Historiographies,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker (Boston: Brill, 2007), 315–36.

265. A. Graeme Auld, “Prophets Shared - But Recycled,” in *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of A. Graeme Auld*, A. Graeme Auld (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 127.

266. A. Graeme Auld, “Re-Reading Samuel (Historically): ‘Etwas Mehr Nichtwissen,’” in *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States*, eds. Volkmar Fritz and Philip R. Davies (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 163.

267. A. Graeme Auld, “History - Interpretation - Theology: Issues in Biblical Religion,” in *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of A. Graeme Auld*, A. Graeme Auld (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 166.

Some details of the common source theory may not be correct, but I am convinced along with the proponents of this theory that the Chronicler did not draw his material from Samuel-Kings. One of the major reasons why I think so is a great variation in verbatim agreement between pericopes. It is hard to believe that if the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as his source, he would have been so inconsistent an editor: copying his source word for word in some instances and radically changing the wording in other cases without clear reasons. This kind of editorial practice would have run against human tendency for consistency. In addition to some major changes, there are “the myriad of small differences Chronicles vis-à-vis Samuel-Kings that scholars have struggled to explain,” as McKenzie correctly notes.²⁶⁸ We face the same problem in the Synoptic Gospels.

Conclusion

Recent psychological studies suggest that human behavior is usually relatively consistent and even highly predictable. The police, for example, rely on this fact when solving serious crimes committed by a single person. How individual modern scholars use their sources is also highly consistent, at least throughout a single work but even throughout a scholar’s career. We also have good reason to believe that ancient authors pursued consistency in their usage of sources. Our study of Greco-Roman and biblical authors seems to confirm this assumption. Greco-Roman authors, in general, and those Jewish authors, like Josephus and Philo, who were deeply influenced by Greco-Roman education and thinking, normally paraphrased their source texts entirely, or almost entirely. Biblical authors, on the other hand, typically reproduced their source texts almost word for word.

Interestingly, however, what we find in Luke’s Gospel seems to run against our assumption: verbatim agreement within the pericopes of both the Lukan double and triple tradition varies significantly. There are also other writings, both Greco-Roman (especially

268. McKenzie, “The Chronicler as Redactor,” 87. For the most comprehensive attempt to explain those differences, see Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*.

Diodorus' work) and Jewish, where verbatim agreement between the text and an assumed source text seem to vary greatly. A closer look at those texts, however, suggests that i) an author's editorial practice was not as inconsistent as the first impression may suggest (Diodorus), ii) an author may have drawn his material largely, if not exclusively, from oral tradition or memory (1QapGen, Pseudo-Philo), and/or iii) when/if an author drew his material from a literary source, a source text might have differed from an extant parallel text (Chronicles). These observations may explain apparent inconsistencies in verbatim agreements in those texts.

In the case of Luke's Gospel, one of the following options may explain the inconsistencies in verbatim agreement in Lukan pericopes: i) Luke relied on oral tradition exclusively; ii) Luke paraphrased canonical Mark inconsistently; iii) Luke derived his 'triple tradition' material from a non-extant Markan-like source(s). The first option is theoretically possible. The second option is less likely than the third option (a) because there is no clear evidence that ancient authors would have been more inconsistent editors than modern ones, and (b) because Luke fails to pick up from Mark significant lexemes and motifs that one should expect him either to take over verbatim or at least to include through some sort of revision (see chapters 2 and 3). The fact that he does not suggests that Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

I have argued in this work that Luke did not derive his triple tradition material from canonical Mark. I have based my assertion on three major observations.

First, certain theological themes, which Luke emphasizes in his double work, are sometimes surprisingly missing in Lukan passages while present in Markan parallel passages (chapter 2). This strongly suggests that Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source.

Scholars have recognized since the rise of redaction criticism after the Second World War that Luke and other Evangelists were not merely compilers of the tradition available to them; they also molded it and had a certain theological goal in mind when composing their work. The strongest evidence for this in Luke's case is the overall theme covering not only the first but also the second part of his double work: the plan of God (ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ θεοῦ). If this theme were found only in the first or second volume of his work, the theme would not necessarily be Lukan. Since it covers both volumes, the issue is settled.

Alongside the overall theme that is distinguishably Lukan, Luke also emphasizes several other theological themes more than any other Evangelist. The following themes were discussed in detail in chapter 2: prayer, the Holy Spirit, power/ mighty works, repentance, *ethnos*, salvation, angels, Jesus as the King, and the Kingdom of God.

Prayer is one of Luke's favorite motifs: prayer terminology appears in Luke more frequently than in the other Gospels, Jesus is portrayed at prayer in nine nonparallel cases, and the theme is also prominent in Acts. Therefore, it is very surprising that the theme is absent in four

Lukan passages while present in the parallel passages in Mark (Aland §§39, 163, 290, 347-248). Also, in two cases, the whole Markan episode containing the prayer motif is absent in Luke (Aland §§147, 275).

The Holy Spirit theme is more heavily emphasized in Luke-Acts than prayer and yet, in two cases, reference to the Holy Spirit is missing in Luke while present in Markan parallel passages (Aland §§283, 289).

The concept of power/mighty works (δύναμις) is also one of Luke's favorite theological themes and yet the concept is missing in six cases in Luke while present in the parallel Markan passages. Three of the most interesting passages were discussed in detail (Aland §§143, 167, 281).

The repentance motif frames the Gospel of Luke and yet the theme is strangely missing in two cases while present in the Markan parallel passage (Aland §§30/32, 142).

Preaching the gospel to all peoples, including the Gentiles, is another theological theme which frames the Gospel of Luke and yet the theme is surprisingly absent in two cases in Luke while present in the Markan parallel passages (Aland §§273, 289).

No other Synoptic Evangelist emphasizes the theme of salvation more than Luke and yet it is absent in several Lukan pericopes while present in the parallel Markan passages. The most noteworthy case is Aland §289.

The word ἄγγελος occurs approximately four times more in Luke than in Mark. The word is also very common in Acts. In a great majority of cases, this Greek word refers to a heavenly being(s) rather than to a human being(s). Even though angels play an important role in Luke's Gospel, they are absent in three Lukan episodes while present in the parallel Markan episodes (Aland §§20, 292, 293).

Luke introduced Jesus as a regal figure at the beginning of his Gospel and later returns to this theme at the end of his Gospel. Although Luke emphasizes the theme in his Passion Narrative, in two Lukan Passion pericopes the concept of Jesus as king is absent while present in the parallel

Markan passages (Aland §§339, 345); in one case there is no parallel in Luke to the Markan pericope (Aland §342).

In Luke-Acts the content of the preaching of Jesus and the apostles is summed up in one phrase: the kingdom of God. This theme frames both Luke's Gospel and Acts. Yet, the concept is absent in three pericopes in Luke while present in the parallel pericopes in Mark (Aland §§32, 168/229, 182) and one of the Markan kingdom of God parables is totally missing in Luke (Aland §126).

Lukan favorite themes, which are either present in the Markan parallel pericopes or 'available' in Mark, are absent too many times in Luke's Gospel to persuade me that Luke used canonical Mark as his source.

Second, Luke's Passion-Resurrection Narrative differs significantly from Mark's (chapter 3). I have demonstrated this in two ways: i) by contrasting the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection sections with their non-Passion sections, and ii) by comparing individual Lukan Passion-Resurrection pericopes with their parallels in Mark.

The difference between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection sections is highlighted when those sections are compared with their non-Passion sections. There are three major differences: i) One of the most disturbing questions is why the general verbatim agreement level between Luke and Mark notably diminishes in their Passion-Resurrection sections compared to their non-Passion sections. While verbatim agreement in the non-Passion section is 37.5%, it is only 22.8% in the Passion-Resurrection section. It is also strange that from Aland §269 (The Triumphal Entry) onward, verbatim agreement between the Matthean and Markan pericopes is consistently higher (with only few exceptions) than that between the Lukan and Markan parallel pericopes, although, before Aland §269, the agreement percentage is sometimes higher between Matthew and Mark and sometimes higher between Luke and Mark. ii) The Lukan order of material differs from the Markan order four times more often in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection

Narrative than in the Lukan non-Passion Narrative;¹ and iii) The number of non-Markan passages in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section is much higher than in its non-Passion section in relation to the length of these sections.² If Luke used canonical Mark as his source, why did he change his copy-editing technique so remarkably when he moved from his non-Passion section to his Passion-Resurrection section? The observation that the Lukan Passion Narrative emphasizes Jesus' innocence cannot explain the overall change of tone since this theme is present only in few Lukan Passion pericopes.

The detailed comparison of the Lukan Passion-Resurrection pericopes with the Markan parallel ones, in addition to the fact that there are several agreements between the Lukan and Johannine Passion-Resurrection accounts against the Markan account, raises further doubts that Luke used canonical Mark as his source in his Passion-Resurrection Narrative.

The comparison of the overlapping Markan and Q passages in the Lukan Travel Narrative shows that two 'independent' synoptic traditions, which are not even literarily related to each other, can share the same wording to a relatively high extent. Therefore, the verbatim agreement level between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection accounts does not exclude the possibility of the existence of an 'independent' Markan-like source(s), which shared the same wording with the canonical Markan account to a relatively high extent.

Third, the verbatim agreement level between the Lukan and Markan triple tradition material varies significantly from section to section and from pericope to pericope (chapter 4). We find remarkable variation between the Lukan and Markan non-Passion sections and the Passion-Resurrection sections, between individual pericopes within these two major sections, and within and between pericope blocks in the Lukan non-Passion section. For example, in the Lukan non-Passion section verbatim agreement with the corresponding material in Mark ranges from 0% to 68.8%.

1. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 80–84.

2. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, 23; Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," 88.

This kind of inconsistency in verbatim agreement between individual episodes within a single work seems to go against the human tendency for consistency in behavior. A look at how modern authors use and cite their sources reveals high consistency. There is no compelling reason, based on a shared human nature, to believe that ancient authors would have been very different from us in this respect.

My study of ancient writers shows that Greco-Roman authors, in general, and those Jewish authors who were deeply influenced by Greco-Roman education and thinking, normally paraphrased their source texts entirely or almost entirely, probably because paraphrasing was regarded as a sign of high education and creativity. *Biblical* authors, on the other hand, normally reproduced their ‘biblical’ source texts almost word for word, probably because according to their philosophy those writings were too sacred to be paraphrased. All these authors were very consistent in their copy-editing. If ancient authors were not more inconsistent in copy-editing and citation practices than we are, then the view that Luke derived his triple tradition material from a single document, which he edited inconsistently, must also be called into question.

Upon closer examination of a few ancient texts in which the variation in verbatim agreement with their assumed sources comes close to the variation in verbatim agreement between parallel Lukan and Markan passages, and which are sometimes used as proof of an inconsistent copy-editing method in antiquity, we find that these manuscripts may not support the view that some ancient authors copy-edited their literary sources inconsistently.

Diodorus’ work is sometimes used as proof of an inconsistent copy-editing technique. I have questioned, however, this view and argued that his editing method is similar to that of modern authors. Other works discussed in this study indicate that their authors may have drawn their material largely, if not entirely, from oral tradition or *memorized* ‘biblical’ texts (1QapGen, Pseudo-Philo) or a source text unknown to us (Chronicles). This may explain the seeming inconsistencies in verbatim agreement in those texts.

In summary, I believe there is enough evidence to conclude that Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source.

If Luke did not derive his triple tradition material from canonical Mark, where did he get it then?

I suggest that when Luke wrote his Gospel, there were different versions of the Markan tradition in circulation (cf. Luke 1:1). These versions had the same origin (the same story-teller?), but they had developed partly in different directions, probably due to the interaction of orality and literacy. 'Luke' used one of these versions as his source and 'Mark' used another version. I call the Markan-like source or tradition used by Luke Non-Canonical Markan Source/Tradition (NCMS/T). I want to distinguish my theory from the *Ur-Markus* and *Deutero-Markus* theories because these views, contrary to mine, normally assume that Matthew and Luke used the 'same' Markan document as their source. In my opinion, this is very unlikely.

I recognize that prior to the printing era there were no identical copies of the Gospel of Mark. However, I am suggesting that differences between canonical Mark and a NCMS/T were more substantial than what we find in the existing manuscripts of canonical Mark (cf. different versions of the book of Jeremiah in the LXX and the MT, the book of Isaiah in 1QIsa^a and the MT, and the book of Acts in the Western text and the Vaticanus/Siniaticus texts). I believe this explains Lukan thematic 'omissions,' dissimilarities between the Lukan and Markan Passion-Resurrection Narratives, and variation in verbatim agreement within the Lukan and Markan parallel pericopes. Differences between the Lukan and Markan non-Passion sections and their Passion-Resurrection sections may further suggest that Luke either derived these sections from two separate NCMS/Ts (cf. the claim of form criticism) or a single NCMS/T where these two sections, having different development histories, were already combined.

Word Agreement Percentages in the Synoptic Parallels

Explanations:

- A.M.O. = Agree with the Markan order
D.M.O. = Disagree with the Markan order
N.M.M. = Non-Markan material (either Q or L)
[green] = 'Markan' material
[yellow] = Q material
[rose] = 'Markan' material omitted by Luke (a min. num.)
[pink] = Markan origin unlikely (a min. num.)
% = Word agreement percentage between Mt/Mk or Lk/Mk. Only comparable information is included from three sources mentioned below.
L = Word agreement according to Eta Linnemann, *Biblical Criticism on Trial*, pp. 62-71, and Eta Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?*, 119-27. The numbers in italic are from the latter source. Linnemann has included only "totally identical" words (*Synoptic*, p. 112) in Kurt Aland's *The Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*.
H = Word agreement according to A. M. Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem," pp. 111-17. Honoré has included, with some exceptions, only words which have "the same grammatical form" (p. 72) in Albert Huck and Heinrich Greeven's *Synopse*.
M = Word agreement according to Robert Morgenthaler's *Statistische Synopse*, pp. 33-65. Morgenthaler has included only totally identical words. The + marks in the plus-columns (+) are based on figures drawn from Morgenthaler's work.
The Aland numbers and the pericope division have been drawn from Kurt Aland's *The Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*.

Aland No:	Matthew (parallels with Luke)					Markan order	Lukan order					+	
	+	% L H M					A.M.O	D.M.O.	N.M.M. (L & Q)	% L H M			
		L	H	M	L					H	M		
1.					[1:1]	1:1				1:1-4			
2.										1:5-25			
3.										1:26-38			
4.										1:39-56			
5.										1:57-80			
7.					[1:18-25]					2:1-7			
8.					[2:1-12]					2:8-20			
9.										2:21-38			
11.					[2:22-23]					2:39-40			
12.										2:41-52			
13.	+	28.3	¹	52.7	3:1-6	1:2-6	3:1-6			3:2b-3a (Q)	9.8	²	28.6
14.					3:7-10					3:7-9 (Q)			
15.										3:10-14			

¹ Mark 1:1-6/Matt 3:1-6: 54.1 %.

² Mark 1:1-6/Luke 3:1-6: 28.6 %.

16.		48.4	46.7	46.7	3:11-12	1:7-8	3:15-18	3:16b-17 (Q)	67.7	66.7	70.0	+
17.	+	60.0	57.5	57.5	(14:3-4)	(6:17-18)	3:19-20		25.0	15.0		
18.	+	49.1	51.9	50.9	3:13-17	1:9-11	3:21-22	3:(21b-22) (Q)	39.6	30.8	41.5	
19.					[1:7-17]			3:23-38				
20.			46.7	30.0	4:1-11	1:12-13	4:1-2	4:1-13 (Q)		40.0	26.7	
30.		33.3	25.0	4:12	1:14a	1:14a	4:14a		41.7	4	50.0	+
32.	+	21.7	17.4	4:13-17	1:14b-15	1:14b-15	4:14b-15		0		0	
33.			49.2	46.8	[13:53-58]	[6:1-6a]	4:16-30	4:16 (Q)		16.7		
34.			60.7	65.9	4:18-22	1:16-20		[5:1-11]				
35.						1:21-22	4:31-32			5	41.9	
36.						1:23-28	4:33-37				50.0	
37.		31.8	34.1	31.8	(8:14-15)	1:29-31	4:38-39		40.9	38.6	38.6	+
38.		17.4	23.9	15.2	(8:16-17)	1:32-34	4:40-41		19.6	23.9	26.1	+
39.						1:35-38	4:42-43			16.7	14.6	
40.			25.8	13.3	4:23	1:39	4:44			33.9	33.3	+
41.					[(13:1-3a; 4:18-22)]	[(4:1-2; 1:16-20)]	5:1-11					
42.	=	36.4	40.8	37.8	(8:1-4)	1:40-45	5:12-16		38.4	48.0	37.8	=
43.	=	37.1	39.3	36.2	(9:1-8)	2:1-12	5:17-26		37.6	43.9	36.2	=
44.	+	55.0	57.8	56.0	(9:9-13)	2:13-17	5:27-32		42.2	46.8	41.3	
45.	+	61.3	54.3	55.8	(9:14-17)	2:18-22	5:33-39		59.7	55.0	55.0	
46.		47.2	52.8	47.2	(12:1-8)	2:23-28	6:1-5		51.9	55.6	48.1	+
47.	+	38.9	43.6	39.4	(12:9-14)	3:1-6	6:6-11		38.9	45.7	36.2	
48.					(4:24-25; 12:15-16)	3:7-12		(6:17-19)				
49.		16.8		12.8	(10:1-4)	3:13-19a	6:12-16		34.7		25.9	+
77.				12.0	(4:24-5:2)	(3:7-13a)	6:17-20a	6:20a (Q)			13.0	+
78.					(5:3-12)			6:20b-23 (Q)				
79.								6:24-26				
80.					(5:38-48; 7:12)			6:27-36 (Q+)				
81.					(7:1-5; 12:36-37; 15:14; 10:24-25a)	(4:24-25)		6:37-42 (Q)				
82.					(7:15-20; 12:33-35)			6:43-45 (Q)				
83.					(7:21-27)			6:46-49 (Q)				
85.					8:5-13	(7:30)		7:1-10 (Q+)				
86.								7:11-17				
106.					11:2-6			7:18-23 (Q+)				
107.					11:7-19			7:24-35 (Q+)				
114.			60.6	50.0	(26:6-13)	(14:3-9)	7:36-50					
115.								8:1-3				
116.						3:19b-21						
117.					12:22-30; (9:32-34)	3:22-27		(11:14-15, 17-20, 12:1-22, 23) (Q)				
118.					12:31-37	3:28-30		(12:10) (Q)				
121.					12:46-50	3:31-35		(8:19-21)				
122.	+	53.6	57.6	52.3	13:1-9	4:1-9	8:4-8 (D)		30.5	30.5	30.5	
123.		21.2		19.2	13:10-17	4:10-12	8:9-10		34.6		34.6	+
124.	+	35.9	39.7	37.0	13:18-23	4:13-20	8:11-15		25.5	29.5	26.7	

³ Mark 1:14-15/Matt 4:12-17: 34.3 %.

⁴ Mark 1:14-15/Luke 4:14-15: 25.7 %.

⁵ Mark 1:21-28/Luke 4:31-37: 53.7 %

308.			37.7	35.8	26:17-20		14:12-17	22:7-14			45.3	46.2	+
310.					26:21-25		14:18-21		(22:21-23)				
311.	+		71.0	75.4	78.3	26:26-29	14:22-25	22:15-20			27.5	52.2	42.0
312.	+		71.1	70.1	(26:21-25)		(14:18-21)		22:21-23		23.7		19.5
313.	+			74.7	(20:24-28;19:28)		(10:41-45)		22:24-30	22:28,30 (Q)			16.5
315.	+		77.0	71.3	26:30-35		14:26-31	22:31-34				18.4	18.4
316.									22:35-38				
330.	+		61.9	63.5	59.1	26:36-46	14:32-42	22:39-46			8.3	9.9	12.2
331.	+		61.4	61.0	59.6	26:47-56	14:43-52	22:47-53			25.7	27.0	22.7
332.	+		45.5		42.8	26:57-68	14:53-65	22:54-71			9.0 ¹⁵		19.5
333.	+		39.1	40.8	26:69-75		14:66-72		(22:56-62)		26.6		26.4
334.	+		30.4	34.8	30.4	27:1-2	15:1	23:1			0	4.3	17.4
336.	+		47.9	51.1	50.0	27:11-14	15:2-5	23:2-5			31.3	38.3	29.2
337.									23:6-12				
338.									23:13-16				
339.	+		38.1	34.6	27:15-23		15:6-14	23:17-23			12.4	17	15.4
341.	+		35.0	45.0	27:24-26		15:15	23:24-25			0		25.0
342.				52.4	27:27-31a		15:16-20a						
343.			36.0	32.0	27:31b-32		15:20b-21	23:26-32			36.0		36.0 +
344.	+		40.0		27:33-37		15:22-26	23:33-34			14.5	20	21
345.			76.4		27:38-43		15:27-32a	23:35-38			4.2		
346.			85.7		27:44		15:32b	23:39-43			14.3		
347.	+		54.7	50.5	27:45-54		15:33-39	23:44-48			17.9	23	21.0
348.	+		44.2		27:55-56		15:40-41	23:49			9.3		9.3
350.	+		28.7	30.7	27:57-61		15:42-47	23:50-56			20.8	24.8	22.8
352.	+		21.3	20.4	28:1-8		16:1-8	24:1-12			12.5		16.8
355.							(16:12-13))				24:13-35		
356.											24:36-43		
363.							16:9-20						
365.							(16:15,19))				24:44-53		

¹⁵ Linnemann has also included the words of Mark 14:55-61a, which are absent from Luke.

¹⁶ Mark 15:6-15/Matt 27:15-26: 42.7 %.

¹⁷ Mark 15:6-15/Luke 23:17-25: 23.4 %.

¹⁸ Mark 15:22-32/Matt 27:33-44: 61.2 %.

¹⁹ Mark 15:22-32/Matt 27:33-44: 59.7 %.

²⁰ Mark 15:22-32/Luke 23:33-43: 25.4 %.

²¹ Mark 15:22-32/Luke 23:33-43: 23.1 %.

²² Mark 15:33-41/Matt 27:45-56: 54.7 %.

²³ Mark 15:33-41/Luke 23:44-49: 20.3 %.

Weighted Word Agreement Percentages between Parallel Synoptic Pericopes

Criterion of selection of pericopes: Only such pericopes have been included which occur in the same order in Matthew/Mark and Luke/Mark (exceptions: Luke 22:21-23, 31-34, 56-62), in clear blocks, and do not overlap with Q.

Simple agreement percentage = Words agreeing in verbatim in parallel pericopes in Matthew/Mark or Luke/Mark : total number of words in a Markan pericope x 100. The percentages have been calculated from Morgenthaler's *Statistische Synopse*.

Weighted value = Total number of words in a Markan pericope x simple agreement percentage. The weighted value proportions the simple agreement percentage to the length of the pericope in Mark.

Subtotal/Weighted word agreement percentage = All weighted value numbers in a section : total number of words in the Markan pericopes in a section.

Jesus' Ministry in Galilee:

Aland No:	Weighted Value	Simple Agreement %	Matthew	Mark (words)	Luke	Simple Agreement %	Weighted Value
30.	300.0	25.0	4:12	1:14a (12)	4:14a	50.0	600.0
32.	400.2	17.4	4:13-17	1:14b-15 (23)	4:14b-15	0	0
Subtotal	700.2:35= 20.0 %	42.4:2= 21.2 %		(35)		50.0:2= 25.0 %	600.0:35= 17.1 %
37.	1399.2	31.8	(8:14-15)	1:29-31 (44)	4:38-39	38.6	1698.4
38.	699.2	15.2	(8:16-17)	1:32-34 (46)	4:40-41	26.1	1200.6
Subtotal	2098.4:90= 23.3 %	47.0:2= 23.5 %		(90)		64.7:2= 32.4 %	2899.0:90= 32.2 %
Controversy Stories							
43.	7095.2	36.2	(9:1-8)	2:1-12 (196)	5:17-26	36.2	7095.2
44.	6104.0	56.0	(9:9-13)	2:13-17 (109)	5:27-32	41.3	4501.7
45.	7198.2	55.8	(9:14-17)	2:18-22 (129)	5:33-39	55.0	7095.0
46.	5097.6	47.2	(12:1-8)	2:23-28 (108)	6:1-5	48.1	5194.8
47.	3703.6	39.4	(12:9-14)	3:1-6 (94)	6:6-11	36.2	3402.8
Subtotal	29198.6:636= 45.9 %	234.6:5= 46.9 %		(636)		216.8:5= 43.4 %	27289.5:636= 42.9 %
Parable Discourse							
122.	7897.3	52.3	13:1-9	4:1-9 (151)	8:4-8	30.5	4605.5
123.	998.4	19.2	13:10-17	4:10-12 (52)	8:9-10	34.6	1799.2
124.	5402.0	37.0	13:18-23	4:13-20 (146)	8:11-15	26.7	3898.2
Subtotal	14297.7:349= 41.0 %	108.5:3= 36.2 %		(349)		91.8:3= 30.6 %	10302.9:349= 29.5 %
Miracle Stories							
136.	2700.0	22.5	(8:23-27)	4:35-41 (120)	8:22-25	28.3	3396.0
137.	5395.0	16.6	(8:28-34)	5:1-20 (325)	8:26-39	37.5	12187.5
Subtotal	8095.0:445= 18.2 %	39.1:2= 19.6 %		(445)		65.8:2= 32.9 %	15583.2:445= 35.0 %
143.	1198.8	22.2	14:1-2	6:14-16 (54)	9:7-9	33.3	1798.2
146.	8109.2	41.8	14:13-21	6:32-44 (194)	9:10b-17	24.2	4694.8
Subtotal	9308.0:248= 37.5 %	64.0:2= 32.0 %		(248)		57.5:2= 28.8 %	6493.0:248= 26.2 %
158.	3900.0	52.0	16:13-20	8:27-30 (75)	9:18-21	34.7	2602.5
159.	3801.9	55.1	16:21-23	8:31-33 (69)	9:22	27.5	1897.5
160.	8194.5	60.7	16:24-28	8:34-9:1 (135)	9:23-27	57.8	7803.0
161.	8996.1	57.3	17:1-9	9:2-10 (157)	9:28-36	29.9	4694.3
Subtotal	24892.5:436= 57.1 %	225.1:4= 56.3 %		(436)		149.9:4= 37.5 %	16997.3:436= 34.5 %

	57.1 %	56.3 %				37.5 %	39.0 %
163.	3888.0	14.4	17:14-21	9:14-29 (270)	9:37-43a	13.7	3699.0
164.	1301.9	27.7	17:22-23	9:30-32 (47)	9:43b-45	38.3	1800.1
166.	2303.5	27.1	18:1-5	9:33-37 (85)	9:46-48	28.2	2397.0
Subtotal	7493.4:402=	69.2:3=		(402)		80.2:3=	7896.1:402=
	18.6 %	23.1 %				26.7 %	19.4 %
Subtotal average	96083.8:2641=	829.9:23=		(2641)		776.7:23=	88061.0:2641=
	36.4 %	36.1 %				33.8 %	33.3 %

Journey Storied:

Aland No:	Weighted Value	Simple Agreement %	Matthew	Mark (words)	Luke	Simple Agreement %	Weighted Value
253.	2598.4	40.6	19:13-15	10:13-16 (64)	18:15-17	68.8	4403.2
254.	5005.0	45.5	19:16-22	10:17-22 (110)	18:18-23	59.1	6501.0
255.	7199.1	42.1	19:23-30	10:23-31 (171)	18:24-30	42.1	7199.1
262.	3000.3	41.1	20:17-19	10:32-34 (73)	18:31-34	23.3	1700.9
264.	2706.0	22.0	20:29-34	10:46-52 (123)	18:35-43	43.1	5301.3
Subtotal average	20508.8:541=	191.3:5=		(541)		236.4:5=	25105.5:541=
	37.9 %	38.3 %				47.3 %	46.4 %

The Final Ministry in Jerusalem:

Aland No:	Weighted Value	Simple Agreement %	Matthew	Mark (words)	Luke	Simple Agreement %	Weighted Value
269.	6297.6	38.4	21:1-9	11:1-10 (164)	19:28-40	36.6	6002.4
273.	3698.5	56.9	(21:12-13)	11:15-17 (65)	19:45-46	32.3	2099.5
276.	7600.0	60.8	21:23-27	11:27-33 (125)	20:1-8	54.4	6800.0
278.	8307.9	45.9	21:33-46	12:1-12 (181)	20:9-19	45.9	8307.9
280.	5798.2	54.7	22:15-22	12:13-17 (106)	20:20-26	43.4	4600.4
281.	9007.7	53.3	22:23-33	12:18-27 (169)	20:27-40	50.3	8500.7
283.	3102.4	55.4	22:41-46	12:35-37a (56)	20:41-44	51.8	2900.8
284.	504.9	9.9	23:1-36	12:37b-40 (51)	20:45-47	66.7	3401.7
Subtotal average	44317.2:917=	375.3:8=		(917)		381.4:8=	42613.4:917=
	48.3 %	46.9 %				47.7 %	46.5 %

The Eschatological Discourse:

Aland No:	Weighted Value	Simple Agreement %	Matthew	Mark (words)	Luke	Simple Agreement %	Weighted Value
287.	1400.1	35.9	24:1-2	13:1-2 (39)	21:5-6	23.1	900.9
288.	5505.6	59.2	24:3-8	13:3-8 (93)	21:7-11	51.6	4798.8
289.	2298.7	23.7	24:9-14	13:9-13 (97)	21:12-19	22.7	2201.9
290.	8096.0	70.4	24:15-22	13:14-20 (115)	21:20-24	21.7	2495.5
292.	4899.0	69.0	24:29-31	13:24-27 (71)	21:25-28	25.4	1803.4
293.	7301.4	84.9	24:32-36	13:28-32 (86)	21:29-33	50.0	4300.0
Subtotal average	29500.8:492=	343.1:6=		(492)		194.5:6=	16500.5:492=
	60.0 %	57.2 %				32.4 %	33.5 %

The Non-Passion Section:

Total average	190410.6:4591=	1739.6:42=		(4591)		1589:42=	172280.4:4591=
	41.5 %	41.4 %				37.8 %	37.5 %

The Passion and Resurrection Narrative:

Aland No:	Weighted Value	Simple Agreement %	Matthew	Mark (words)	Luke	Simple Agreement %	Weighted Value
305.	1499.4	44.1	26:1-5	14:1-2 (34)	22:1-2	32.4	1101.6
307.	1200.0	40.0	26:14-16	14:10-11 (30)	22:3-6	36.7	1101.0
308.	3794.8	35.8	26:17-20	14:12-17 (106)	22:7-14	46.2	4897.2
311.	5402.7	78.3	26:26-29	14:22-25 (69)	22:15-20	42.0	2898.0
312.	5397.7	70.1	(26:21-25)	(14:18-21) (77)	22:21-23	19.5	1501.5
315.	6203.1	71.3	(26:30-35)	14:26-31 (87)	22:31-34	18.4	1600.8
Subtotal	23497.7:403=	339.6:6=		(403)		195.2:6=	13100.1:403=
	58.3 %	56.6 %				32.5 %	32.5 %
330.	10697.1	59.1	14:32-42	22:39-46 (181)	22:39-46	12.2	2208.2

331.	8403.6	59.6	26:47-56	14:43-52 (141)	22:47-53	22.7	3200.7
332.	9501.6	42.8	26:57-68	14:53-65 (222)	22:54-71	19.5	4329.0
333.	5100.0	40.8	26:69-75	14:66-72 (125)	(22:56-62)	26.4	3300.0
334.	699.2	30.4	27:1-2	15:1 (23)	23:1	17.4	400.2
336.	2400.0	50.0	27:11-14	15:2-5 (48)	23:2-5	29.2	1401.6
339.	3598.4	34.6	27:15-23	15:6-14 (104)	23:17-23	15.4	1601.6
341.	900.0	45.0	27:24-26	15:15 (20)	23:24-25	25.0	500.0
343.	800.0	32.0	27:31b-32	15:20b-21 (25)	23:26-32	36.0	900.0
344.-346.	7999.8	59.7	27:33-44	15:22-32b (134)	23:33-43	23.1	3095.4
347.	5302.5	50.5	27:45-54	15:33-39 (105)	23:44-48	21.0	2205.0
348.	1698.5	39.5	27:55-56	15:40-41 (43)	23:49	9.3	399.9
350.	2504.8	24.8	27:57-61	15:42-47 (101)	23:50-56	22.8	2302.8
Subtotal	59605.5:1272= 46.9 %	568.8:13= 43.8 %		(1272)		280.0:13= 21.5 %	25844.4:1272= 20.3 %
352.	2794.8	20.4	28:1-8	16:1-8 (137)	24:1-12	16.8	2301.6
Subtotal	2794.8:137= 20.4 %	20.4 %		(137)		16.8 %	2301.6:137= 16.8 %
Subtotal average	85898.0:1812= 47.4 %	928.8:20= 46.4 %		(1812)		492.0:20= 24.6 %	41246.1:1812= 22.8 %

The Passion and Resurrection Section:

Total average	47.4 %	46.4 %		(1812)		24.6 %	22.8 %
----------------------	---------------	---------------	--	---------------	--	---------------	---------------

APPENDIX C

Arguments against and for Auld's Theory

“[R]eferences in Chronicles to material in the Former Prophets that is not shared by Chronicles” is the major reason why many scholars reject Auld's theory.¹ S. L. McKenzie lists nine such references in Chronicles: 1 Chr 10:13-14; 29:27; 15:29; 17:6, 10; 20:5; 2 Chr 10:15; 18/22:3-5; 22:7-8; 32.² Two other reasons why McKenzie rejects Auld's theory are i) Auld's failure to offer precise limits of the extent of the 'Book of Two Houses' document and ii) some inconsistencies in Auld's theory regarding the roots and development of deuteronomistic terminology in 2 Sam 7 and 1 Kgs 8.³ In his response to McKenzie, Auld does not regard any of these arguments as a blow to his theory; nor do I.⁴ If it cannot be proven that the author(s) of Samuel-Kings created his history from *ex nihilo*, there are no grounds to insist that the referential information mentioned by McKenzie could not have been available to the Chronicler from various other sources apart from Samuel-Kings.⁵ Even the most critical scholars have to admit, in light of the results of archaeological research, as already noted earlier, that not only some parallel material in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles is historical but also that some unique information in Chronicles

1. The quotation from McKenzie, “The Chronicler as Redactor,” 82. See also Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 67; John Van Seters, “The ‘Shared Text’ of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles Re-Examined,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H Lim, and W. Brian Aucker (Boston: Brill, 2007), 504–05.

2. McKenzie, “The Chronicler as Redactor,” 81–5. See also Gary N. Knoppers, “Review of A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege*,” *ATJ* 27 (1995): 118–21; Klein, *1 Chronicles*.

3. McKenzie, “The Chronicler as Redactor,” 81, 85–87.

4. A. Graeme Auld, “What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles?” in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 91–99.

5. See H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 19–21.

is “historically authentic and derived from some unknown literary source” at the Chronicler’s disposal.⁶

Ho argues that even though verbatim agreement between 1 Sam 31:1-31 and 1 Chr 10:1-12 is exceptionally high, literary analyses of the relationship of these texts suggest that the Chronicler did not draw the account from 1 Samuel. 1 Sam 31:1-13 is an extended version of the original,⁷ while 1 Chr 10:1-12 remains more faithful to the original behind the synoptic texts and “is coherent and consistent with some of the episodes” in 1 Sam 1-18 and 28.⁸

Trebolle argues that the text of 3 Kingdoms 3-10 LXX “represents an older textual form than that which was transmitted by MT Kings and Chronicles.”⁹ Proof of this is that the LXX text is often shorter than 1 Kgs 3-10 MT – the assumed source text of the LXX version. The missing elements of a main LXX text are usually found dispersed elsewhere in 3 Kgdms LXX as the reproduction of 3 Kgdms 9:10-28 LXX below shows.¹⁰ This does not prove that the Chronicler did not use 1 Kgs 3-10 MT as his source, but it suggests that 1 Kgs 3-10 MT was not the oldest version of the account.

MT 1 Kgs 9	MT 2 Chr 8	LXX 3 Kgdms 9	LXX 2 Chr 8
10	1	10	1
11		11	
12		12	
13		13	
14		14	
15		[2:35i,k + 10:22a]	
16			
	2		2

6. Peltonen, “Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena,” 49.

7. According to Ho, “Conjectures and Refutations,” 101, 1 Sam 31:6-13 is 13 % longer than the parallel in Chronicles.

8. Ho, “Conjectures and Refutations,” 103. For an evaluation of his theory, see Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 282–91.

9. Treballe, “Kings (MT/LXX? and Chronicles,” 493.

10. Cf. Treballe’s (“Kings [MT/LXX? and Chronicles”) arguments and the Table on p. 495.

3			3
	4		4
17	5	[10:22a]	5
18-19	6	[10:22a]	6
20	7	[10:22b]	7
21	8	[10:22b]	8
22	9	[10:22b]	9
23	10	[2:35h]	10
24	11	[2:35f]	11
25	12	[2:35g]	12
	13		13
	14		14
	15		15
	16		16
26	17	26	17
27	18a	27	18a
28	18b	18	18b

A comparison of these texts also reveals many other problems, including the following three: First, according to 1 Kgs 9:2 MT, it was Solomon who gave cities to Hiram as a gift, but 2 Chr 8:2 MT reverses the roles. If the Chronicler used 1 Kings 9 MT as his source, why did he change the roles? In the following episode, Solomon is presented by the Chronicler as a more generous and rich ruler than the Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:10, 13/2 Chr 9:9, 12). Why not here (cf. 1 Kgs 9:11, 14)? Second, according to 1 Kgs 9:26 MT, Solomon “built a fleet of ships in Ezion-geber,” but the Chronicler fails to mention this (2 Chr 8:17 MT). If the Chronicler used 1 Kgs 9 MT as his source, why did he downgrade the greatness of Solomon? Third, according to 1 Kgs 9:23 MT, there were 550 chief officers who supervised Solomon’s building projects, but the number is downgraded to 250 in 2 Chr 8:10 MT. Why?

Person hypothesizes that the common source behind Samuel-Kings and Chronicles “is an

early redaction of the Deuteronomistic History that was undertaken in the Babylonian exile.”¹¹

When some Jews returned to the Promised Land under Zerubbabel, the scribal community experienced a division. Both scribal schools, one now in Palestine and another in Babylonia,

used this common source, but they continued to revise this source independently of one another, responding to their increasingly diverse social and theological perspectives and including additional source material. Over time this produces two different historiographical works, the Deuteronomic History and Chronicles, each with its own unique theological perspectives. These two different works came into contact with each other when Ezra and his accompanying scribes returned to Jerusalem to ‘introduce’ the Mosaic law with Persian support.¹²

11. Person, “The Deuteronomic History and the Books of Chronicles,” 333.

12. Person, “The Deuteronomic History and the Books of Chronicles,” 333–34.

WORKS CITED

- Abegg Jr., Martin, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, trans. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time Into English*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. "Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14–29." *CBQ* 37 (1975): 471–91.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. "An Interpretation of the Babylonian Exile: A Study of II Kings 20 and Isaiah 38–39." *SJT* 27 (1974): 329–52.
- . "Isaiah 36–39: Structure and Function." In *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. Dr. J. P. M. van der Ploeg*, eds. W. C. Delsman et al. AOAT 211, 3–21. Kavelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1982.
- . *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1987.
- Africa, Thomas D. "Ephorus and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1610." *The American Journal of Philology* 83 (1962): 86–89.
- Ahern, Barnabas. "Staff or no Staff?" *CBQ* 5 (1943): 332–37.
- Aland, Kurt, ed. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 11th ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2000.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Retelling the Old Testament." In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, eds. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 99–121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Allison, Dale C. "Behind the Temptations of Jesus: Q 4:1–13 and Mark 1:12–13." In *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, eds. Bruce D. Chilton and Craig Evans. NTTS 28/2, 195–213. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ambrozic, Aloysius M. *The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel*. CBQMS 2. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1972.
- Anderson, Hugh. *The Gospel of Mark*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1976.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered*. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- . "Interfluentia, Formative, and Dialectical - A Theory of John's Relation to the Synoptics." In *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums*, Symposium in

Salzburg am 10. März 2000, ed. Peter Leander Hofrichter. TTS 9, 19–58. Hildesheim: George Olms, 2002.

Andrzejewski, B. M., and I. M. Lewis. *Somali Poetry: An Introduction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Angel, G. T. D., C. Brown, and H. Schönweiss. "Prayer, Ask, Kneel, Beg, Worship, Knock." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, ed. Colin Brown, 855–86. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.

Arndt, W. F. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1956.

Attridge, Harold W. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. HDR 7. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.

Auld, A. Graeme. "History - Interpretation - Theology: Issues in Biblical Religion." In *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*, A. Graeme Auld, 161–71. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

———. *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

———. "Prophets Shared - But Recycled." In *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*, Graeme Auld, 127–34. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

———. "Re-Reading Samuel (Historically): 'Etwas Mehr Nichtwissen'." In *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States*, eds. Volkmar Fritz and Philip R. Davies, 160–69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

———. *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of A. Graeme Auld*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

———. "Solomon at Gibeon: History Glimpsed." In *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*, Graeme Auld, 97–107. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

———. "What If the Chronicler Did Use the Deuteronomistic History?" In *Virtual History and the Bible*, ed. Jo Cheryl Exum, 136–50. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles?" In *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 263, 91–99. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Aune, David E. "Jesus and Cynics in the First-Century Palestine: Some Critical Considerations." In *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders*, eds. Janes H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns, 176–92. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.

———. "Luke 20:34–36: A 'Gnosticized' Logion of Jesus?" In *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflection: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. Band III: Frühes Christentum*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger, 187–202. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996.

Aus, Roger David. "Caught in the Act," *Walking on the Sea, and the Release of Barabbas Revisited*. SFSHJ 157. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

- Avigad, Nahman, and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. Description and Contents of the Scroll Facsimiles, Transcription and Translation of Columns II, XIX-XXII*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1956.
- Bailey, D. R. Shackleton. "Introduction." In *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, Valerius Maximus. LCL 492, 1–6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Bailey, John Amedee. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*. NovTSup 7. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. *The Cross & the Prodigal: Luke 15 Through the Eyes of Middle Eastern Peasants*. 2nd ed. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005.
- . "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *Themelios* 20, no. 2 (1995): 4–11.
- . *Jacob & the Prodigal: How Jesus Retold Israel's Story*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003.
- . "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *ExpTim* 106 (1995): 363–67.
- . *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- . "Psalm 23 and Luke 15: A Vision Expanded." *IBS* 12 (1990): 54–71.
- . *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
- . *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. New ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
- . "The House of Prayer and the Den of Thieves." In *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer, 13–20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Baum, Armin D. "Matthew's Sources - Written or Oral? A Rabbinic Analogy and Empirical Insights." In *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, eds. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland, 1–23. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . *Der mündliche Faktor: Analogien zur synoptischen Frage aus der antiken Literatur, der Experimentalpsychologie, der Oral Poetry-Forschung und dem rabbinischen Traditionswesen*. TANZ. Tübingen: Francke, 2008.
- Beard, Mary, ed. *Literacy in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archeology, 1991.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.

- . “Second Thought on the Composition of Mark 13.” *NTS* 29 (1983): 414–20.
- Begg, Christopher T. *Josephus’ Story of the Later Monarchy* (AJ 9, 1–10, 185). BETL 145. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- Bellinzoni Jr., A., J. B. Tyson, and W. O. Walker Jr., eds. *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Benario, Herbert W. *An Introduction to Tacitus*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975.
- Bharucha, Rustom. *Rajasthan, an Oral History: Conversations with Komal Kothari*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Blomberg, Craig L. “Form Criticism.” In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall, 243–50. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Bloomer, W. Martin. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 1:1–9:50*. BECNT 3A. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- . *Luke 9:51–24:53*. BECNT 3B. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- . “Luke, Gospel Of.” In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. J. B. Green, S. McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 495–510. Downers Grove: InverVarsity, 1992.
- . “A Theology of Luke-Acts.” In *A Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, eds. Roy B. Zuck and Darrell L. Bock, 87–166. Chicago: Moody, 1994.
- Bond, Helen K. “New Currents in Josephus Research.” *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 8 (2000): 162–90.
- Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Bons, Eberhard. “Das Sterbewort Jesu nach Lk 23,46 und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund.” *BZ* 38 (1994): 93–101.
- Borgen, Peder. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. NovTSup 86. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “Philo of Alexandria as Exegete.” In *A History of Biblical Interpretation. Volume 1: The Ancient Period*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, 114–43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Bornkamm, Günther, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Trans. P. Scott. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Bovon, François. “The Lukan Story of the Passion of Jesus (Luke 22–23).” In *Studies in Early Christianity*, François Bovon. WUNT 161, 74–105. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2003.
- . *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*. Ed. Helmut Koester. Trans. Christine M. Thomas. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

- . *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- . *Studies in Early Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2003.
- Böttrich, Christfried. “Jesus und der Feigenbaum: Mk 11:12–14, 20–25 in der Diskussion.” *NovT* 39/4 (1997): 328–59.
- Branham, R. Bracht. “Introduction.” In *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, 1–27. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Briscoe, John. *A Commentary on Livy: Books 38–40*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . *A Commentary on Livy: Books XXXIV–XXXVII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- . *A Commentary on Livy: Books XXXI–XXXIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Brooke, George J. “The Book of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran.” In *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, 35–48. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Broshi, M. “The Credibility of Josephus.” *JJS* 33 (1982): 379–84.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 2. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- . *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 1. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- . *The Gospel According to John*. Vol. I–XII. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Rev. ed. Trans. John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Bundy, Walter E. *Jesus and the First Three Gospels: An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Burkett, Delbert. *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907.
- Burton, Anne. *Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Buse, Ivor. “The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John.” *ExpTim* 70 (1958–59): 22–24.
- Butler, Basil Christopher. *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

- Caird, G. B. *The Gospel of St Luke*. PNTC. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.
- Carl, Harold F. "Only the Father Knows: Historical and Evangelical Responses to Jesus' Eschatological Ignorance in Mark 13:32." *JBS* 1/3 (2001).
- Carlson, Stephen C. "Chronology of the Synoptic Problem," 2000. <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/chron.htm>
- . "Jerusalem School Bibliography," 1997. <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/jsbib.htm>
- . "Overview of Proposed Solutions," cited 2006. <http://www.hypotyposeis.org/synoptic-problem/2004/09/overview-of-proposed-solutions.html>.
- . "The Two Source Hypothesis," 2002. <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/2sh/index.htm>
- Carlston, Charles E., and Dennis Norlin. "Once More - Statistics and Q." *HTR* 64 (1971): 59–78.
- . "Statistics and Q - Some Further Observations." *NovT* 41 (1999): 108–23.
- Catchpole, David R. *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day*. SPB 18. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Caton, Steven Charles. *'Peaks of Yemen I Summon': Poetry as Cultural Practice in a North Yemeni Tribe*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Chapman, Honora Howell. "'By the Waters of Babylon': Josephus and Greek Poetry." In *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, eds. Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi, 121–46. Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Charlesworth, James H. "The Priority of John? Reflections on the Essenes and the First Edition of John." In *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums*, Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000, ed. Peter Leander Hofrichter. TTS 9, 73–114. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002.
- Chen, Diane G. *God as Father in Luke-Acts*. SBL 92. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Cicero. *De senectute, De amicitia, De divinatione*. Trans. William Armistead Falconer. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923.
- Clarke, M. L. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Clivaz, Claire. "The Angel and the Sweat Like 'Drops of Blood' (Lk 22:43–44): P69 and F13." *HTR* 98 (2005): 419–40.
- Cole, Charles N. "Quintilian's Quotations from the Latin Poets." *CIR* 20 (1906): 47–51.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13." In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, Vol. 2, eds. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100, 1125–40. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

- . “Jesus’ Action in Herod’s Temple.” In *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, eds. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell, 45–61. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2001.
- . *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Connolly-Weinert, Frank. “Assessing Omissions as Redaction: Luke’s Handling of the Charge Against Jesus as Detractor of the Temple.” In *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honour of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, eds. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski, 358–68. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Trans. Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber & Faber, 1960.
- Cope, Lamar, David L. Dungan, and William R. Farmer. “Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis.” In *SBL 1993 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering. SBLSP 32, 303–33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- . “Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis.” In *SBL 1994 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering. SBLSP 33, 516–73. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Cope, Lamar, et al. “Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis.” In *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering. SBLSP 31, 98–120. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Cope, Lamar, et al. “Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis.” In *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering. SBLSP 34, 636–87. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Cornell, Tim. “The Tyranny of the Evidence: A Discussion of the Possible Uses of Literacy in Etruria and Latium in the Archaic Age.” In *Literacy in the Roman World*, ed. Mary Beard, 7–33. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archeology, 1991.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1–50*. WBC 19. Waco: Word Books, 1983.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran.” In *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume One: The Hebrew Bible and Qumran*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 173–95. N. Richland Hills: BIBAL Press, 2000.
- Creed, John Martin. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- Cribbs, F. Lamar. “St. Luke and Johannine Tradition.” *JBL* 90 (1971): 422–50.
- Criboire, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- . *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *An Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

- Cross, Frank Moore, and David Noel Freedman. "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: 2 Samuel 22 = Psalm 18." *JBL* 72 (1953): 15–34.
- Cross, Frank Moore, and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *Qumran and the History of Biblical Text*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Crossan, John D. "The Seed Parables of Jesus." *JBL* 92 (1973): 244–66.
- Crump, David Michael. *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*. WUNT 2/49. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992.
- Dalrymple, William. "Homer in India: The Oral Epics of Rajasthan." *The New Yorker*, 20 November 2006, 48–55.
- Dart, John. *Decoding Mark*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- De Boer, Esther A. "The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus." In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, eds. Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff. FCNTECW 3, 140–60. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Derrenbacker Jr., Robert Allen. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. BETL 186. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Dessau, Hermannus, ed. *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1892.
- Devillers, Oliver. *Tacite et les sources des Annales: enquêtes sur la methode historique*. Louvain: Editions Peeters, 2003.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Trans. B. L. Woolf from the 1933 ed. Cambridge: Clarke, 1971.
- Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. AnBib. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Diodorus, Siculus, and Peter Green. *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1: Greek History 480–431 B. C. - The Alternative Version; Translated with Introduction and Commentary by Peter Green*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Dodd, Charles H. "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'." In *More New Testament Studies*, ed. C. H. Dodd. 1947, 69–83. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.
- . *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Donahue, John R. "Redaction Criticism: Has the *Hauptstrasse* Become a *Sackgasse*?" In *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, eds. Elisabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. JSNTSup 109, 27–57. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Dormandy, Richard. "Jesus' Temptations in Mark's Gospel: Mark 1:12–13." *ExpTim* 114 (2003): 183–87.

- Dowd, Sharyn Echols. *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mk 11:22–25 in the Context of Markan Theology*. SBLDS 105. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Downing, F. Gerald. *Christ and the Cynics: Jesus and Other Radical Preachers in First-Century Tradition*. JSOTM 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- . *Cynics and Christian Origins*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- . “The Jewish Cynic Jesus.” In *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records*, Mark and Q Jesus, 184–214. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Draper, Jonathan A. “Wandering Radicalism or Purposeful Activity? Jesus and the Sending of Messengers in Mark 6:6–56.” *Neot* 29/2 (1995): 183–202.
- Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1977.
- Duff, Timothy E. *The Greek and Roman Historians*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2003.
- Dungan, David L. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. ABRL. Toronto: Doubleday, 1999.
- . “Two-Gospel Hypothesis.” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, eds. David Noel Freedman, et al., 6:671–79. Toronto: Doubleday, 1992.
- Dunn, James D. G. “Altering the Default Setting: Re-Envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition.” *NTS* 49 (2003): 139–75.
- . “Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition.” In *SBLSP 136*, ed. James D. G. Dunn, 287–326. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000.
- . *Jesus Remembered*. CM 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Dyer, Keith D. *The Prophecy on the Mount: Mark 13 and the Gathering of the New Community*. ITS 2. Bern: Peter Lang, 1998.
- Eddy, Paul Rhodes, and Gregory A. Boyd. *The Jesus Legend: A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Edwards, J. R. “Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narrative.” *NovT* 31 (1989): 193–216.
- Ehrman, Bart D., and Mark A. Plunkett. “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43–44.” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 401–16.
- Eisenman, R. H., and M. O. Wise. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years*. Rockport: Element, 1992.

- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction, Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and Also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament*. Trans. Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1965.
- Elliott, J. K. "The Anointing of Jesus." *ExpTim* 85 (1973–74): 105–07.
- Ellis, E. Earle. "The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne, 121–27. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- . *The Gospel of Luke*. Rev. ed. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1974.
- Endres, John C., William R. Millar, and John Barclay Burns, eds. *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Enermalm-Ogawa, Agneta. "Josephus' Paraphrase of 1 Maccabees in *Antiquities* 12–13: Prayer in a Narrative Context." In *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*, eds. James H. Charlesworth, Mark Harding, and Mark Kiley, 73–84. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Ennulat, Andreas. *Die "Minor Agreements": Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems*. WUNT 2/62. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. *Christian Beginnings*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.
- Epstein, S. "The Stability of Behavior: I. On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time." *JPSP* 37 (1979): 1097–126.
- . "The Stability of Behavior: I. On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time." In *Personality: Critical Concepts in Psychology: II. Theoretical Approaches*, eds. Cary L. Cooper and Lawrence A. Pervin, 371–412. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Ernst, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. RNT 3. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1977.
- Esler, Philip Francis. "The Incident of the Withered Fig Tree in Mark 11: A New Source and Redactional Explanation." *JSNT* 28/1 (2005): 41–67.
- Evans, C. F. *Saint Luke*. TPINTC. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- Evans, Craig A. "'Do This and You Will Live': Targumic Coherence in Luke 10:25–28." In *Jesus in Context: Temple, Purity, and Restoration*, Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans, A. AGJU 39, 377–93. Leiden: Brill, 1990/1997.
- . *Fabricating Jesus: How Modern Scholars Distort the Gospels*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006.
- . "The Genesis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 153–65.
- . *Mark 8:27–16:20*. WBC 34B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.

- . “The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24–30.” In *Jesus in Context: Temple, Purity, and Restoration*, Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. AGJU 39, 455–79. Leiden: Brill, 1993/1997.
- Evans, Owen E. “Editorial Note.” In *The Passion Narrative of St Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*, Vincent Taylor, 27–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Farmer, William R. *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- . *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. Slightly revised ed. of 1964. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- . “The Two-Gospel Hypothesis: The Statement of the Hypothesis.” In *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard — W. R. Farmer — F. Neirynck*, Jerusalem 1984, ed. D. Dungan. BETL 95, 125–56. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
- Farrer, Austin M. “On Dispensing with Q.” In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. Dennis E. Nineham, 57–88. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- . *St. Matthew and St. Luke*. London: Black, 1954.
- Feine, Paul. *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte: Eine Untersuchung*. Gotha, 1891.
- Feldman, Louis H. “Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* and Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*.” In *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, Louis H. Feldman. AGJU 30, 57–82. New York: Brill, 1989.
- . *Josephus’ Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- . “Prolegomenon.” In *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo: Now First Translated from the Old Latin Version*, trans. M. R. James, ix-clxix. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971.
- . *Studies in Josephus’ Rewritten Bible*. JSJSup 58. Boston: Brill, 1998.
- Finegan, Jack. *Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934.
- Finnegan, Ruth. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- . *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Finnern, Sönke. “Die Traditionshypothese als Alternative zur Zweiquellentheorie: Ihre neueren Vertreter, ihre Argumente, ihre Beurteilung.” M.A. Thesis. FTA, 2001.
<http://www.traditionshypothese.de/texte/finnern.html>.
- . “Die Traditionshypothese als Alternative zur Zweiquellentheorie: Ihre neueren Vertreter, ihre Argumente, ihre Beurteilung.” *Jahrbuch für evangelische Theologie* 16 (2002): 33–67.

- Fisk, Bruce Norman. *Do You not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. JSPSup 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9." In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert, 139–52. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978.
- . *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary*. BibOr 18A. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- . "Genesis Apocryphon." In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam, 302–04. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*. AB 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV*. AB 28A. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- . *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*. BETL 122. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995.
- . *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. BTTS. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Foley, John Miles. *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Pub., 1985.
- Foster, B. O. "Introduction." In *Livy*, trans. B. O. Foster. LCL, ix–xxxvi. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Fuchs, A. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik*. AnBib 49. Rome, 1971.
- Fuller, Reginald H. "The Double Commandment of Love: Test Case for the Criteria of Authenticity." In *Essays on the Love Commandment*, eds. Luise Schottroff, Reginald H. Fuller, Christoph Burchard, and M. Jack Suggs, trans. R. H. Fuller and I. Fuller, 41–56. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Furr, R. Michael, and David C. Funder. "Situational Similarity and Behavioral Consistency: Subjective, Objective, Variable-Centered, and Person-Centered Approaches." *Journal of Research in Personality* 38, no. 5 (2004): 421–47.
- Galimberti, Alessandro. "Josephus and Strabo: The Reasons for a Choice." In *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*, Zuleika Ropdgers, 147–67. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- García, Laurentino García Y. *Pupils, Teachers and Schools in Pompeii: Childhood, Youth and Culture in the Roman Era*. Rome: Bardi Editore, 2005.

- Gardner-Smith, Percival. *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Gibson, Jeffrey B. *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*. JSNTSup 112. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Goldingay, John. *Psalms 1–41*. Vol. 1. BCOT. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2006.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- . *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. JSNTSup 133. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996.
- . *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. The Biblical Seminar 80. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . “When is a Text not a Text? The Quasi Text-Critical Approach of the International Q Project.” In *Questioning Q*, eds. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin, 115–26. London: SPCK, 2004.
- . “A World Without Q.” In *Questioning Q*, eds. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin, 174–79. London: SPCK, 2004.
- Goulder, Michael D. “The Derrenbacker-Kloppenborg Defense.” *JBL* 121, no. 2 (2002): 331–36.
- . *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Vol. 2. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Vol. 1. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- . “Two Significant Minor Agreements (Matt. 4:13 par.; Matt. 26:67–68 Par.).” *NovT* 45 (2003): 365–73.
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. “Appendix A: A Comprehensive Catalogue of Known Cynic Philosophers.” In *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, 389–413. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Green, Joel B., ed. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*. WUNT 2/33. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1988.
- . “The Demise of the Temple as ‘Culture Center’ in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23.44–49).” *RB* 101/4 (1994): 495–515.
- . “Good News to Whom? Jesus and the ‘Poor’ in the Gospel of Luke.” In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, eds. J. B. Green and M. Turner, 59–74. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- . *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

- . *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. NTT. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Greeve, H. “Proskynéō, Proskynētēs.” In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Abridged in One Volume*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 948–50. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 13*. London: London Egypt Exploration Society, 1919.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 7th ed. THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1–8: 26*. WBC 34A. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- . “Mark, Gospel Of.” In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall, 512–25. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- . “Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew Against Mark: Evidence That Luke Used Matthew.” In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festchrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck and et al. BETL 100, 1467–95. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- . *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . “The Refusal of Matthean Foreign Bodies to be Exorcised from Luke 9,22; 10,25–28.” *ETL* 75/1 (1999): 104–22.
- . “A Rejoinder on Matthean Foreign Bodies in Luke 10,25–28.” *ETL* 71 (1995): 139–50.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 4th rev. ed. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990.
- Haarbeck, H. “κόπτω.” In *NIDNTT*, vol. 2, ed. C. Brown, 417–19. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Trans. Basil Blackwell. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- . *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoe & Ruprecht, 1965.
- . “The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity.” In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 258–78. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.
- . *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1–13*. WBC 33A. Dallas: Word, 1993.

- Han, Kyu Sam. "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke." *JETS* 43/4 (2000): 674–93.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *CBQ* 33 (1971): 1–17.
- . "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 297–377. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Harrington, Jay M. *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22,54–23,25. A Historical Survey: 1891–1997*. NTTS 30. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Harris, Lindell O. "Prayer in the Gospel of Luke." *SwJT* 10/1 (1967): 59–69.
- Harris, Oscar Gerald. "Prayer in Luke-Act: A Study in the Theology of Luke." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Vanderbilt University, 1967.
- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Hartman, Lars. *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.* ConBNT 1. Lund: Gleerup, 1966.
- . *Testimonium Linguae: Participial Constructions in the Synoptic Gospels: A Linguistic Examination of Luke 21,13*. ConNT 19. Lund: Gleerup, 1963.
- Hasel, G. F. "Chronicles, Books Of." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 666–73. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Hastings, Adrian. *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teachings of Saint Luke*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1958.
- Hatina, Thomas R. "The Focus of Mark 13:24–27: The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?" *BBR* 6 (1996): 43–66.
- Hawkins, John C. *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. 2nd ed. 1909. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- . "St. Luke's Passion-Narrative Considered to the Reference to the Synoptic Problem." *ExpTim* 15 (1903–4): 122–26, 273–76.
- . "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday, 76–94. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Hay, David M. "Philo's View of Himself as an Exegete: Inspired, but not Authorative." In *Heirs of the Septuagint: Philo, Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity: Festschrift for Earle Hilgert*. In *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, Vol III, 1991, eds. David T. Runia, David M. Hay, and David Winston. BJS 230. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Hearon, Holly E. "The Implications of Orality for Studies of the Biblical Text." In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*. In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds.

Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley, 3–20. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Heil, John Paul. “Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13.” *CBQ* 68/1 (2006): 63–78.

Helmhold, William C., and Edward N. O’Neil, comp. *Plutarch’s Quotations*. Philological Monographs 19. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959.

Hemer, Colin J. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. WUNT 49. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1989.

Henaut, Barry W. *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4*. JSNTSup 82. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Henderson, Ian H. *Jesus, Rhetoric and Law*. BibInt 20. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Hengel, Martin. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Henten, Jan Willem van. “The First Testing of Jesus: A Rereading of Mark 1.12–13.” *NTS* 45/3 (1999): 349–66.

Ho, Craig Y. S. “Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1–13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1–12?” *VT* 45, no. 1 (1995): 82–106.

Hoffmann, Paul, and et al., eds. *Documenta Q: Q 22: 28, 30: You Will Judge the Twelve Tribes of Israel*. Documenta Q. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Hofrichter, Peter Leander, ed. *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums: Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000*. TTS 9. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002.

Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah: Chapters 26–52*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Holmås, Geir Otto. “‘My House Shall be a House of Prayer’: Regarding the Temple as a Place of Prayer in Acts Within the Context of Luke’s Apologetical Objective.” *JSNT* 27/4 (2005): 393–416.

Honko, Lauri. “Thick Corpus and Organic Variation: An Introduction.” In *Thick Corpus, Organic Variation and Textuality in Oral Tradition*, ed. Lauri Honko. SFF 7, 3–28. Helsinki: Finnish Literary Society, 2000.

Honoré, Anthony M. “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem.” *NovT* 10 (1968): 95–147.

———. “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem.” In *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, ed. David E. Orton, 70–122. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Hooker, Morna Dorothy. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. BNTC. London: Black, 1991.

Hornblower, Jane. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

- Horsley, Richard A. "Introduction." In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*. In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- . *Jesus in Context: Power, People, Performance*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Hultgren, Stephen. *Narrative Elements in the Double Tradition: A Study of Their Place Within the Framework of the Gospel Narrative*. BZNW 113. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Jacobson, Howard. "Biblical Quotation and Editorial Function in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *JSP* 5 (1989): 47–64.
- . *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. Vol. 1. AGJU 31. New York: Brill, 1996.
- . *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. Vol. 2. AGJU 31. New York: Brill, 1996.
- . *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. AGJU 31. New York: Brill, 1996.
- Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Vols. IIA. 1926–29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster, 1993.
- Jepsen, Alfred. *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1956.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Trans. Norman Perrin. 1960. Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1990.
- . *The Parables of Jesus*. 2nd rev. ed. Trans. S. H. Hooke. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.
- . "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" *NTS* 4 (1957–58): 115–19.
- . *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaction und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Jobs, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Johnson, Williams A. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

- Jonquière, Tessel M. "Two Prayers by King Solomon in Josephus' *Antiquities* 8 and the Bible." In *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Paris 2001: Studies on the Antiquities of Josephus*, eds. Folker Siegert and Jürgen U. Kalms, 72–89. Münster: Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium, 2002.
- Josephus, Flavius. *The New Complete Works of Josephus*. Rev. and expanded ed. Trans. by William Whiston. Commentary by Paul L. Maier. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999.
- Kalimi, Isaac. *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place, and Writing*. SSN 46. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2005.
- . *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Karris, Robert J. "Luke 23:47 and the Lucan View of Jesus' Death." In *Reimagining the Death of the Lucan Jesus*, ed. Dennis Sylva. BBB 73, 68–78. Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1990.
- Kay, Matthew W., ed. *The Index of the Milman Parry Collection 1933–35: Heroic Songs, Conversations and Stories*. New York: Garland, 1995.
- Keck, Fridolin. *Die öffentliche Abschiedsrede Jesu in Lk 20,45–21,36: eine redaktions- und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Stuttgart: Katolisches Biblewerk, 1976.
- Kiilunen, Jarmo. *Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in synoptischer Sicht: Ein redaktionskritischer Versuch über Mk 12,28–34 und die Parallelen*. AASF B 250. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1989.
- Kilgallen, John J. "Jesus' First Trial: Messiah and Son of God (Luke 22,66–71)." *Bib* 80, no. 3 (1999): 401–14.
- . "The Unity of Luke 17,1–10." *ETL* 79/1 (2003): 157–65.
- . "What Does It Mean to Say That There Are Additions in Luke 7,36–50?" *Bib* 86 (2005): 529–35.
- Kilpatrick, George Dunbar. *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke Xxiii.47." *JTS* 43 (1942): 34–36.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean, ed. *Narrative-Critical Gospel & Social-Scientific Interpretation Approach*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Kinman, Brent. "Lucan Eschatology and the Missing Fig Tree." *JBL* 113/4 (1994): 669–78.
- Kirk, Alan. "Synoptic Scholarship on Agreement and Variation in the Double Tradition." SBL Conference, November 18–21, 1–13. Washington, DC, 2006.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Klein, Ralph W. *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

- . *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint After Qumran*. GBSOT. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Kleinig, John W. "Recent Research in Chronicles." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 2 (1994): 43–76.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Exitus Clari Viri: The Death of Jesus in Luke." *TJT* 8/1 (1992): 106–20.
- . *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. SAC. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- . "Variation in the Reproduction of the Double Tradition and an Oral Q?" *ETL* 83, no. 1 (2007): 53–80.
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 3rd ed. 1929. HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1975.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 12. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- . "Review of A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege*." *ATJ* 27 (1995): 118–21.
- Knox, Wilfred L. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- . *From Jesus to the Gospels: Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Konkel, A. H. "The Sources of the Hezekiah in the Book of Isaiah." *VT* 43 (1993): 462–82.
- Koskeniemi, Erkki, Kirsi Nisula, and Jorma Toppari. "Wine Mixed with Myrrh (Mark 15.23) and Crurifragium (John 9.31–32): Two Details of the Passion Narratives." *JSNT* 27/4 (2005): 379–91.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. "A Comparison of the Pericopae of Jesus' Anointing." In *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*, Andreas J. Köstenberger. SBL 38, 49–63. New York: Lang, 2001.
- Kratz, Reinhard Gregor. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Trans. John Bowden. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1–59*. Trans. Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. A. J. Mattill Jr. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.
- . *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. H. C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.

- Ladd, George Eldon. *The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "The Great Commandment Pericope and Q." In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald Piper. NovTSup 75, 73–96. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Scandal and Salt: Is Mark Dependent on Q in 9,42–50?" In *Forschungen zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Albert Fuchs*, ed. Christoph Niemand. LPTB 7, 223–34. Frankfurt: Lang, 2002.
- Laufen, Rudolf. *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*. BBB 54. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980.
- Levick, Barbara. *The Government of the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook*. 2nd. ed. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Liefeld, Walter L. "Luke." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 8, ed. F. E. Gaebelin, 797–1059. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- . "Luke." In *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*, vol. 2. Pp. 797–1059, eds. Kenneth L. Barker and John Kohlenberger III, 206–89. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Linnemann, Eta. *Biblical Criticism on Trial: How Scientific is "Scientific Theology"?* Trans. Robert Yarbrough. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2001.
- . *Is There a Synoptic Problem?: Rethinking the Literary Dependence of the First Three Gospels*. Trans. Robert W. Yarbrough. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- Livy. *Ab urbe condita*. Trans. B. O. Foster. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- . *Ab urbe condita*. Trans. E. T. Sage. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922.
- Loader, William R. G. *Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law*. WUNT 97. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997.
- Longenecker, Richard N. "The Acts of the Apostles." In *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*, vol. 2, eds. Kenneth L. Barker and John Kohlenberger III, 376–518. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Longstaff, Thomas Richmond Willis. *Evidence of Conflation in Mark? A Study of the Synoptic Problem*. SBLDS 28. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Lopik, T. van. "Once Again: Floating Words, Their Significance for Textual Criticism." *NTS* 41 (1995): 286–91.
- Lord, Albert Bates. "The Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature." In *The Relationship Among the Gospels: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, ed. William O. Walker Jr. TUMRS 5, 33–91. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1978.
- . "Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley, 451–61. Columbia: Slavica Publishers, 1981.

- . *The Singer of Tales*. HSCL 24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Luce, Harry Kenneth. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. CGTSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Luce, T. James. *Livy: The Composition of His History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Lummis, E. W. *How Luke Was Written*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 37–52. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 21C. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 21–28*. Trans. James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Jesus After 2000 Years*. London: SCM, 2000.
- Maccoby, H. Z. "Jesus and Barabbas." *NTS* 16 (1969–70): 55–60.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Madigan, Kevin. "Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment?: Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13:32 in the Ancient Latin West." *HTR* 96 (2003): 255–78.
- Mahoney, Matthew. "Luke 21:14–15: Editorial Rewriting or Authenticity?" *ITQ* 47 (1980): 220–38.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 27. New York: Doubleday, 1986.
- Manson, Thomas Walter. *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke*. London: SCM, 1949.
- Marcus, Joel. "Mark 14:61: 'Are You the Messiah-Son-of-God?'" *NovT* 31 (1989): 125–41.
- . *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 27. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Marcus, Ralph. "Introduction." In *Philo: Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*. LCL 380, ix–xv. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Marrou, Henri Irénée. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Trans. George Lamb. 1956. New York: Mentor, 1964.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- . *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. 3rd ed. Exeter: Paternoster, 1988.
- Martin, Ronald H. "Introduction." In *Tacitus: Annals V & VI*, trans. Ronald Martin, 1–29. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2001.

- . *Tacitus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*. Trans. J. Boyce, et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969.
- Mason, Steve, trans. and commentary. *Flavius Josephus: Life of Josephus*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Matera, Frank J. "The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources." *CBQ* 47/3 (1985): 469–85.
- . "Luke 22,66–71: Jesus Before the ΠΙΠΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΙΟΝ." *ETL* 65 (1989): 43–59.
- . "Luke 23,1–25: Jesus Before Pilate, Herod, and Israel." In *L'Évangile de Luc - The Gospel of Luke*. 2nd ed., ed. F. Neirynck. BETL 32, 553–65. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- . *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories*. ThI. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.
- . "The Trial of Jesus: Problems and Proposals." *Int* 45 (1991): 5–16.
- Matson, Mark A. *In Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke*. SBLDS 178. Atlanta: SBL, 2001.
- Mattila, Sharon L. "A Problem Still Clouded: Yet Again - Statistics and 'Q'." *NovT* 36, no. 4 (1994): 313–29.
- Mauser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*. SBT 39. London: SCM, 1963.
- Mays, James Luther. "'Is This not Why You Are Wrong?': Exegetical Reflections on Mark 12:18–27." *Int* 60/1 (2006): 32–46.
- McKane, William. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah: Volume II: Commentary on Jeremiah XXVI-LII*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- McKenzie, Steven L. "The Chronicler as Redactor." In *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 263, 70–90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- . *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomic History*. HSM 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- McKenzie, Steven L., and Stephen R. Haynes, eds. *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Rev. and expanded. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- McKnight, Edgar V. *What is Form Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- McNicol, Allan J., David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody, eds. *Beyond the Q Impasse—Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.

- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Vol. 2. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Mellor, Ronald. *Tacitus*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Menzies, Robert P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . "Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts: A Response to Max Turner." *JSNT* 49 (1993): 11–20.
- Merritt, Robert L. "Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon." *JBL* 104 (1985): 57–68.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3rd, enl. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: UBS, 1994.
- Millard, A. R. *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*. BiSe 69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Moessner, David P. "Luke 9:1–50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy." *JBL* 102/4 (1983): 575–605.
- Moloney, Francis J. *Mark: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Morgan, Robert. "The Priority of John - Over Luke." In *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums: Symposium in Salzburg am 10. März 2000*, ed. Peter Leander Hofrichter. TTS 9, 195–211. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Morgenstern, M. "A New Clue to the Original Length of the Genesis Apocryphon." *JJS* 47, no. 2 (1996): 345–47.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*. 3rd ed. Zürich: Gotthelf, 1982.
- . *Statistische Synopse*. Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1971.
- Mounce, R. H. "Bethsaida." In *ISBE*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 1:475. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Mournet, Terence C. *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*. WUNT II 195. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005.
- Murphy, Frederick James. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

- Müller, Karlheinz. "Jesus vor Herodes: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23,6–12." In *Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*, eds. Josef Blank et al. QD 87, 111–41. Freiburg: Herder, 1979.
- Myllykoski, Matti. "The Material Common to Luke and John: A Sketch." In *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. Petri Luomanen. FES 54, 115–56. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Navone, John. *Themes of St. Luke*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1970.
- Neill, Stephen. *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1961*. 1964. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Neirynck, Frans. "The Argument from Order and St. Luke's Transpositions." *ETL* 49 (1973): 784–815.
- . "Assessment." In *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*, Harry T. Fleddermann, 261–307. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995.
- . *Evangelica II: 1982–1991 Collected Essays*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.
- . "Luke 10:25–28: A Foreign Body in Luke?" In *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, eds. Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton, 149–65. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc." In *L'Évangile de Luc: Problèmes Littéraires et Théologiques: Mémorial Lucien Cerfaux*, ed. F. Neirynck. BETL 32, 157–201. Gembloux: Duculot, 1973.
- . "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc." In *Evangelica: Gospel Studies: Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. van Segbroeck. BETL 60, 37–82. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.
- . "The Minor Agreements and Lk 10,25–28." *ETL* 71/1 (1995): 151–60.
- . "The Minor Agreements and Q." In *Gospel Behind the Gospels*, 49–72. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory." In *Evangelica II: 1982–1991 Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck. BETL 99, 3–42. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.
- . *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: With a Cumulative List*. BETL 37. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974.
- . "Synoptic Problem." In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy, 587–95. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- . "ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ: Mt 26:68/Lk 22L64 (Diff. Mk 14:65)." *ETL* 63, no. 1 (1987): 5–47.

- Nelson, Peter K. *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24–30*. SBLDS 138. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- . “The Unitary Character of Luke 22.24–30.” *NTS* 40 (1994): 609–19.
- Newsome, James D., Jr. *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles: With Related Passages from Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezra*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.
- Neyrey, Jerome, S.J. *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.
- Nicol, W. “Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21.” *Neot* 7 (1973): 61–71.
- Nissen, H. “Das Geschichtswerk des Titus Livius.” *RhM* 27 (1872): 539–61.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 18:35–24:53*. WBC 35C. Dallas: Word, 1993.
- . *Luke 1–9:20*. WBC 35A. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- . *Luke 9:21–18:34*. WBC 35B. Dallas: Word, 1993.
- Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler’s History*. JSOTSup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- . *The Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- O’Brien, P. T. “Prayer in Luke-Acts.” *TynBul* 24 (1973).
- O’Rourke, John. “Some Observations on the Synoptic Problem and the Use of Statistical Procedures.” *NovT* 16 (1974): 272–77.
- O’Toole, Robert F. “The Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts.” In *The Kingdom of God in Twentieth-Century Interpretation*, ed. Wendell Willis, 147–62. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.
- . “Luke’s Message in Luke 9:1–50.” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 74–89.
- . *Luke’s Presentation of Jesus: A Christology*. SubBi 25. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004.
- Odgers, Merle M. “Quintilian’s Use of Earlier Literature.” *CP* 28 (1933): 182–88.
- Orchard, Bernard, and Harold Riley. *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Osborne, Grant R. “Redaction Criticism.” In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall, 662–69. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Oswald, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Ott, Wilhelm. *Gebet und Heil: Die Bedeutung der Gebetsparänese in der lukanischen Theologie*. SANT 12. Munich: Kösel, 1965.
- Parker, D. C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Parry, Milman. *Serbocroatian Heroic Songs: I. Nova Pazar: English Translations*. Ed. Albert Bates Lord. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Peabody, David B., Lamar Cope, and Allan J. McNicol, eds. *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Renewal of Gospel Studies*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Pelletier, André. *Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée: Une Réaction atticisante contre la koiné*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1962.
- Peltonen, Kai. "Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena: Aspects of Source Criticism as Theory and Method in the History of Chronicles Research." In *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 263, 18–69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Jeremiah in Modern Research: Approaches and Issues." In *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies*, eds. Leo G. Perdue and Brian W. Kovacs, 1–32. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1984.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Perry, Alfred Morris. *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920.
- Person, Raymond F. "The Deuteronomistic History and the Books of Chronicles: Contemporary Competing Historiographies." In *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, 315–36. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Pervin, Lawrence A. *The Science of Personality*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Pesch, Rudolf. *The Trial of Jesus Continues*. Trans. D. G. Wagner. Allison Park: Pickwick, 1996.
- Pettem, Michael. "Luke's Great Omission and His View of the Law." *NTS* 42/1 (1996): 35–54.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*. WUNT 2/204. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1896.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. 5th ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Plymale, Steven F. "Luke's Theology of Prayer." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*, ed. David J. Lull, 529–51. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*. American University Studies VII/118. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

- Polybius. *The Histories*. Trans. W. R. Paton. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What Are They Saying About Luke?* New York: Paulist Press, 1990.
- Pownall, Frances. *Lessons from the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Pryke, E. J. *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel: A Study of Syntax and Vocabulary as Guides to Redaction in Mark*. SNTSMS 33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Books 11–12. Vol. 5. Ed. and trans. Donald Russell. LCL 494. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- . *The Orator's Education*. Ed. and trans. Donald Russell. LCL 124–127, 494. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Radl, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: 1, 1–9, 50*. Freiburg: Herder, 2003.
- Ravens, D. A. S. “Luke 9.7–62 and the Prophetic Role of Jesus.” *NTS* 36 (1990): 119–29.
- Rehkopf, Friedrich. *Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*. WUNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1959.
- Reicke, Bo. “Die Entstehungsverhältnisse der synoptischen Evangelien.” In *Principat* 25/2, 1758–91. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984.
- . *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- . “A Test of Synoptic Relationships: Matthew 10, 17–23 and 24, 9–14 with Parallels.” In *New Synoptic Studies*, ed. W. R. Farmer, 209–29. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Reid, Catherine I. “Ephoros Fragment 76 and Diodoros on the Cypriote War.” *Phoenix* 28 (1974): 123–43.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. NDT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Resseguie, James L. *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Reynolds, Dwight Fletcher. *Arab Folklore: A Handbook*. London: Greenwood Press, 2007.
- . “Creating an Epic: From Apprenticeship to Publication.” In *Textualization of Oral Epics*, ed. Lauri Honko. TLSM 128, 263–77. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.
- . *Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes: The Ethnography of Performace in an Arabic Oral Epic Tradition*. London: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Rezetko, Robert, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, eds. *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Boston: Brill, 2007.

- Rist, John M. *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*. SNTSMS 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "Interfaces of Orality and Literacy in the Gospel of Mark." In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*. In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley, 125–46. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Robinson, G. L., and R. K. Harrison. "Isaiah." In *ISBE: Vol. 2*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 885–904. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Robinson, James M. *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays*. Eds. Christoph Heil and Joseph Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- , eds. *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English: With Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Rohde, Joachim. *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. Trans. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1968.
- Ropes, James Hardy. *The Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Rosché, Theodore. "The Words of Jesus and the Future of the 'Q' Hypothesis." *JBL* 79 (1960): 210–20.
- Roth, S. John. *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*. JSNTSup 144. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997.
- Sabbe, Maurits. "The Anointing of Jesus in John 12,1–8 and Its Synoptic Parallels." In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, Vol. 3, eds. F. Van Segbroeck and et al. BETL 100, 2051–82. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- . "The Johannine Account of the Death of Jesus and Its Synoptic Parallels (Jn 19,16b–42)." *ETL* 70 (1994): 34–64.
- Sacks, Kenneth S. "Diodorus and His Sources: Conformity and Creativity." In *Greek Historiography*, ed. Simon Hornblower, 213–32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- . *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Salo, Kalervo. *Luukkaan Teologian Ydin: Luukkaan Evankeliumin Ja Apostolien Tekojen Pelastuskäsitys*. SESJ 84. Helsinki: Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, 2003.
- Samatar, Said S. *Oral Poetry and Somali Nationalism: The Case of Sayyid Mahammad 'Abdille Hasan*. AFS 32. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

- Sanday, William. "The Conditions Under Which the Gospels Were Written, in Their Bearing Upon Some Difficulties of the Synoptic Problem." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday, 3–26. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- . "Introduction." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday, vii–xxvii. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Sanders, E. P. *Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Schenck, Kenneth. *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Schmidt, Daryl D. "Remembering Jesus: Assessing the Oral Evidence." *Forum* 7, no. 1 (2004): 71–82.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. 1919. Darmstadt: Darmstadt Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Schneider, Gerhard. "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk 12,35–37)." In *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970–1990*, Gerhard Schneider. NovTSup 67, 307–32. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *Das Evangelium Nach Lukas*. 2 vols. ÖTKNT 3. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1977.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: Kapitel 11–24*. ÖTKNT 3. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1977.
- . "The Political Charge Against Jesus (Lk 23:2)." In *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, eds. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule, 403–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- . "Das Problem einer vorkanonischen Passion-Erzählung." In *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970–1990*. 1972, 213–35. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Das Verfahren gegen Jesus in der Sicht des dritten Evangeliums (Lk 22,54–23,25). Redaktionskritik und historische Rückfrage." In *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970–1990*. NovTSup 67, 276–95. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22,54–71: Studien zur lukanischen Darstellung der Passion*. SANT 22. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1969.
- Schnelle, Udo. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*. Trans. M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Schönweiss, H., and C. Brown. "προσκυνέω." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, ed. Colin Brown, 875–79. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Schramm, Tim. *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. SNTSMS 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Schreck, C. J. "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4,16–30 in Recent Study." In *L'Évangile de Luc. The Gospel of Luke*. Rev. and enlarged ed., ed. F. Neirynck. BETL 32, 399–471. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

- Schröter, Jens. "Jesus and the Canon: The Early Jesus Traditions in the Context of the Origins of the New Testament Canon." In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*. In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark. Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*, eds. Richard A. Horsley, Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley, 104–22. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Schürmann, Heinz. "Die Dubletten im Lukasevangelium." *ZKT* 75 (1953): 338–45.
- . "Die Dublettenvermeidungen im Lukasevangelium." *ZKT* 76 (1954): 83–93.
- . *Der Einsetzungsbericht: Lk 22,19–20*. Vol. II of *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22,7–38*. NTAbh 20/4. Münster: Aschendorff, 1955.
- . *Jesu Abschiedsrede: Lk 22,21–38*. Vol. III of *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, Lk 22,7–38*. NTAbh 20/5. Münster: Aschendorff, 1957.
- . *Das Lukasevangelium: Kommentar zu Kapitel 1,9–9,50*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.
- . *Der Paschalmahlbericht: Lk 22, (7–14.) 15–18*. Vol. I of *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlberichtes Lk 22,7–38*. NTAbh 19/5. Münster: Aschendorff, 1953.
- . "Protolukanische Spracheigentümlichkeiten?" *BZ* 5 (1961): 266–86.
- . *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Composition and Sources in *Antiquities* 18: The Case of Pontius Pilate." In *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*, ed. Zuleika Rodgers, 125–46. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News According to Luke*. Trans. D. E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1984.
- . "πνεῦμα." In Vol. 6 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 389–455. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Seitz, Christopher R. *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36–39*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Sellin, Gerhard. "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10:25–37)." *ZNW* 65–66 (1974–75): 65:166–89, 66:19–60.
- Senior, Donald. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*. Wilmington: Glazier, 1989.
- Shellard, Barbara. *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*. JSNTSup 215. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

- . "The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem." *JTS* 46 (1995): 71–98.
- Shiner, Whitley. *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Sievers, Joseph. *Synopsis of the Greek Sources for the Hasmonean Period: 1–2 Maccabees and Josephus, War 1 and Antiquities 12–14*. SubBi 20. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. *Jesus on Trial: The Study of the Gospels*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2006.
- Smalley, Stephen S. "Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts." *NovT* 15 (1973): 59–71.
- Smelik, Klaus A. D. "Distortion of Old Testament Prophecy: The Purpose of Isaiah XXXVI and XXXVII." *OtSt* 24 (1986): 70–93.
- Smelik, Marian, and Willem Smelik. "Twin Targums: Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22." In *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*, eds. Ada Rapaport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg. JSOTSup 333, 244–81. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Smit Sibinga, J. "The Making of Luke 23:26–56: An Analysis of the Composition Technique in Luke's Crucifixion Narrative." *RB* 104/3 (1997): 378–404.
- Smith, Mahlon H. "Austin Marsden Farrer: 1904–1968," 2005.
<http://virtualreligion.net/primer/farrer.html>.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. JSNTSup 14. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- . "Tradition, Composition and Theology in Jesus' Speech to the 'Daughters of Jerusalem' (Luke 23:26–32)." *Bib* 68 (1987): 221–44.
- . "Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Luke's Account of Jesus Before Herod Antipas." *Bib* 66 (1985): 344–63.
- Spencer, William David, and Aída Besançon Spencer. *The Prayer Life of Jesus: Shout of Agony, Revelation of Love: A Commentary*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990.
- Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. SNTSMS 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Stählin III, G. "Kopetós." In *TDNT: Abridged in One Volume*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 453–58. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. NAC 24. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- . *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- . *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

- . "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?" *JBL* 88 (1969): 45–56.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Selfdefinition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. NovTSup 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Jesus as Exorcist: An Analysis of Matthew 17:14–20; Mark 9:14–29; Luke 9:37–43a." *CBQ* 55 (1993): 467–93.
- . "Philo." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, eds. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, 789–93. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Stoldt, Hans-Herbert. *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis*. Trans. Donald L. Niewyk. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1980.
- Streeter, Gail P. C. "Redaction Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Rev. and expanded, eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, 105–21. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.
- . "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem." *HibJ* 20 (1921–22): 103–12.
- Stylianou, P. J. *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus: Book 15*. OCM. New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Sugimoto, Tomotoshi. "Chronicles as Independent Literature." *JSOT* 55 (1992): 61–74.
- Summers, Ray. *Commentary on Luke: Jesus, the Universal Savior*. Waco: Word, 1976.
- Swanson, Reuben J., ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Sylva, Dennis D. "The Temple Curtain and Jesus' Death in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 105/2 (1986): 239–50.
- Tacitus. *The Annals*. Trans. A. J. Woodman. Cambridge: Hackett, 2004.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Vol. 1 of *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- . "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke Iv 16–30." In *Jesus in Nazareth*, eds. E. Grässer and et al. BZNW 40, 51–75. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.
- . "The Original Order of Q." In *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, 246–69. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- . *The Passion Narrative of St Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*. Ed. O. E. Evans. SNTSMS 19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

- . “Rehkopf’s List of Words and Phrases Illustrative of Pre-Lukan Speech Usage.” *JTS NS* 15 (1964): 59–62.
- Telford, William R. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark’s Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*. JSNTSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. “The Letter of Aristeeas.” In *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Henry Barclay Swete, 531–606. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Theissen, G. “Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum.” *ZTK* 70 (1973): 245–71.
- Theon, Aelius. “The Exercises of Aelius Theon.” In *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. George A. Kennedy, 1–72. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Travis, Stephen H. “Form Criticism.” In *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, 153–64. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Tränkle, Hermann. *Livius und Polybios*. Basel: Schwabe, 1977.
- Trebolle, Julio. “Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Tradition.” In *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, 483–501. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Trites, Allison A. “The Prayer Motif in Luke-Acts.” In *Perspectives in Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert, 168–86. Danville: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978.
- Trocmé, Etienne. *The Passion as Liturgy: A Study in the Origin of the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. “The Christology of Luke-Acts.” In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden. BETL 142, 133–64. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- . “A Cynic Q?” *Bib* 70 (1989): 349–76.
- . “Luke 22,43–44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel.” In *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel.*, ed. Adelbert Denaux. BETL 161, 131–44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- . “Luke 4,16–30, Isaiah and Q.” In *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, ed. J. Delobel, 343–54. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.
- . *Luke*. 1996. T&T Clark Study Guides. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- . “Q 22:28–30.” In *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honor of David R. Catchpole*, eds. David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett. NovTSup 99, 99–116. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

- . *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*. SNTSMS 44. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Turnage, Marc. "Jesus and Caiaphas: An Intertextual-Literary Evaluation." In *Jesus' Last Week*, eds. R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker. Jewish and Christian Perspective Series 11, 139–68. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. JPTSup 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- . "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception." *NovT* 33 (1991): 124–52.
- Ulrich, Eugène Charles. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. HSM 19. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Unnik, W. C. van. "Luke-Acts: A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 15–32. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.
- Untergaßmair, Franz Georg. *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Redaktionsgeschichte und zur Frage nach der lukanischen 'Kreuzestheologie'*. PaThSt 10. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1980.
- Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: One Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*. Trans. Henry J. Walker. Cambridge: Hackett, 2004.
- . *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*. Trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. LCL 492. London: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Van Segbroeck, F., ed. *Evangelica II: 1982–1991 Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck*. BETL 49. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.
- Van Seters, John. "The 'Shared Text' of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles Re-Examined." In *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, 503–15. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Vanderkam, James C. "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon." *JBL* 97 (1978): 45–55.
- . *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Vannutelli, Primus. *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum Loci Paralleli*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1931.
- Verheyden, Josef. "The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28–30." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, ed. A. Lindemann. BETL 158, 695–718. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- . "The Source(s) of Luke 21." In *L'Évangile de Luc. The Gospel of Luke*. Rev. and enlarged ed., ed. F. Neirynck. BETL 32, 491–516. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

- Vermès, Géza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin, 1995.
- Villalba i Varneda, Pere. *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*. ALGHJ 19. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Wachholder, Ben Zion. "Josephus and Nicolaus of Damascus." In *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, eds. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, 147–72. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- Walker, Henry John. "Introduction." In *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: One Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*, Valerius Maximus, xiii–xxiv. Cambridge: Hackett, 2004.
- Walker, William O. "'Nazareth': A Clue to Synoptic Relationships?" In *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*, ed. E. P. Sanders, 105–18. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *The Synoptic Problem*, 2006. http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=669.
- Walsh, P. G. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- . "Livy." In *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey, 115–42. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Webb, Ruth. "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too, 289–316. Boston: Brill, 2001.
- Weeden, Theodore J. "Theories of Tradition: A Critique of Kenneth Bailey." *Forum* 7, no. 1 (2004): 45–69.
- Wenham, David. *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*. GPe 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Wenham, John William. *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de. *Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*. Trans. and enlarged by Theodore Parker. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 2005.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 28–39: A Continental Commentary*. Trans. Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Williams, Matthew C. "The Owen Hypothesis: An Essay Showing That It Was Henry Owen Who First Formulated the So-Called 'Griesbach Hypothesis'." *JHC* 7 (2000): 109–25.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997.

- Woodman, A. J. "Introduction." In *Tacitus: The Annals*, trans. A. J. Woodman, ix-xxviii. Cambridge: Hackett, 2004.
- Woods, Edward J. *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. JSNTSup 205. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. COQG 2. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Youtie, Herbert C. "ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΕΥΣ: The Social Impact of Illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt." *ZPE* 17 (1975): 201–21.
- Zmijewski, Josef. *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums: Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 21,5–36 und Lk 17,20–37*. BBB 40. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1972.