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CHAPTER 1

Critical Method as Discipleship

“...everything spiritual, and to some extent all science likewise, including theology, is and remains an adventure demanding courage even more than discipline or perseverance.”

~ Ernst Käsemann, New Testament Questions of Today, p. 5

~ Rembrant Harmenszoon van Rijn, Christ and Two Disciples on Their Way to Emmaus (1655-56)

I don’t want to talk about You like You’re not in the room
I want to look right at You; I want to sing right to You

~ Misty Edwards
SECTION 1

DISCIPLESHIP AS A HERMENEUTIC FOR PROTO-LUKE

“Woe to you experts! For you have taken away the key of knowledge. You yourselves did not enter in, yet those who were entering, you stopped.”

Jesus, Proto-Luke 11:52

Proto-Luke’s presentation of Christian spirituality can be summed up in one word: ‘discipleship’, or perhaps more powerfully in two: “ἀκολούθει μοι/follow me!” Christian faith in its very earliest form was a radical lifestyle of utter abandonment to heed the call of Jesus (Proto-Luke 5:11, 14:33). Such discipleship could not be taken in an abstract or spiritual sense, but literally as following Jesus on the journey to Jerusalem which is described in Proto-Luke 9:51, when Jesus ‘set his face’ to (or perhaps ‘against’, cf. Ezekiel 21:2) Jerusalem. Characteristic of this journey are active inquiry and such deep uncertainty on the path as having “nowhere to lay [one’s] head”, letting “the dead bury the dead” and not even being able to “look back” (Proto-Luke 9:57-62; 17:32). On this journey, the disciples sought to learn from Jesus as pupils from a teacher. Luke presents this process as being one which entailed little rote learning, and much fiery debate and discussion. The core aphoristic teachings of Jesus are presented here not as a tradition to be received but as occasion for debate. The parables found here are not paradoxical enigmas but stories of moral depth. Proto-Luke therefore exemplifies what B. F. Skinner would later articulate, “education is what remains when what has been learned has been forgotten.”
In Proto-Luke’s lexicon, μαθητής (disciple) is the noun form of μαθέω, (to inquire). In Luke, the radical quality of discipleship justifies the intense English translation: interrogate! So it is fitting that Proto-Lukian discipleship does not allow the teacher to remain in the comfortable position of an agent whose disciples are his patients. Jesus himself is the subject of a rigorous interrogation by his disciples. Whether this is conceived of as the disciples questioning Jesus with words as a prosecuting attorney might interrogate a witness, or observing his ways as an anthropologist might interrogate the culture of a newly discovered society, Jesus is the object of the student’s discipleship.

If the spirituality of this journey lies at the core of what it meant to be an authentic follower of Jesus, and (as the continuation of the journey in Acts testifies), the final redactor of Luke did not think this journey ended at the death of Jesus, but endured in the life of the 1st century church, then to the best way to read Luke is to make these values our own, and to interrogate Jesus ourselves. For the 21st century church, the once literal journey must be transformed into a metaphor for our journey. This has revolutionary implications for the academic Christian disciplines. The values of the journey become the guiding principles in our inquiry about Jesus: be it the areas of systematic and practical theology, or in the biblical disciplines such as the quest for the historical Jesus, the study of the New Testament’s theology and the christology of the Early Christian community, or especially the critical study of the synoptic gospels where discipleship itself is so core a theme.

Discipleship, because of its sheer authenticity, is a powerful key in its potential to unlock the meaning of the whole Jesus tradition, in a way that is true both for the reader/disciple, and also for the text/teacher. But however tempting it may be to write about the concept of
discipleship, and so define myself as a practitioner of contemporary Christian thought, I do not think that is the best strategy. Although discipleship may seem subjective as a heuristic tool, the focus of the disciple is never on the self, but on Christ. Therefore, this act of discipleship must focus not on the 21st century, but on the 1st. Furthermore, discipleship is something that can’t be told by words – it can only be lived out in actions. So what follows cannot be a theological exercise, theorising about discipleship. It must itself be an instance of discipleship: an interrogatory thought experiment in carrying out critical method with the intentionality of a disciples, following a specific teacher, walking a specific path, and reading a specific text.


This thesis proposes, as a ‘thought experiment’, to read a certain group of texts using discipleship itself as a critical method. There is a group of passages in Luke in which discipleship is emphasised more clearly than in any other portion of the gospels: where discipleship is the central theme, the opening and closing sentiment, the raison d’être of the characters, the driving force behind the plot. The text is Proto-Luke, i.e. Luke’s non-markan (L + Q) material, which stands out from Canonical Luke as a version of Luke that is more naïve than its final form, and which also frames the rest of the canonical gospel in its style and narrative structure.

As I will flesh out in more detail in the body of this thesis, in the past half-century, interest in this ‘ur-gospel’ has waned because of a lack of certainty about its empirical existence as an

1 See for instance, Terrence W. Tilley, The Disciples’ Jesus: Christology as Reconciling Practice (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2008).
historical document. The issue of certainty will be a recurring theme in this thesis, but it is worthwhile in opening to observe two central responses to this concern, which are two sides of one coin. The first is an ethical principle, that the methodology of discipleship as described above calls us to be open-minded learners, not fussy dogmatic rationalists. The second concern is methodological. Discipleship is a method which is both critical and scientific; and by definition, critical scientific method eschews certainty. Science is observation, and the making of hypotheses which are judged by their ability to make the best sense of the greatest amount of observed data in the simplest way. This principle can be demonstrated from commonly accepted facts about the natural sciences: evolutionary theory can’t be ‘proved’ in the way that a law-court may demand ‘proof beyond a reasonable doubt.’ Rather, it is widely accepted because it makes sense of both the fossil record and the diversity of species on Earth in a way that rival theories fail to do. The Proto-Luke hypothesis is like evolutionary theory – it is a theory of origins with powerful explanatory potential. Other examples of uncertain scientific progress include general relativity, string-theory, quantum physics etc. The Newtonian laws of physics, which were once preached with apodictic certainty, have now been seriously undermined by these “uncertain” developments.

This thesis will require a detailed argument for the historical existence of Proto-Luke, but at this opening moment the literary subsistence of Proto-Luke (as seen for instance in the discipleship theme I pointed out above) speaks for itself enough to call for our inquiry: although the document may subsist only in its heuristic potential, not being extant in any manuscript.
A Discipleship Hermeneutic applied to Proto-Luke

Understanding the unity of Proto-Luke enables us to read the work on its own terms, and to recognise the medium as the message of the work. For instance, the teachings of Jesus in Proto-Luke, including the Q sayings and the famous Lukan parables of the Good Samaritan (ch. 10) and Lost Son (ch. 15), are presented through the medium of discipleship. They are not isolated sayings, but are addressed to disciples as spoken by their rabbi, who has spelled out clearly the cost of true understanding of the message.

This discipleship is never presented by Luke as an uncritical thing, as the disciple brazenly interrogates the master. As early as 3:10, the crowds are calling out “what shall we do?” In 5:8, Peter is bold enough to tell Jesus to “go away from me!” The parable of the Good Samaritan is only told because a would-be disciple says “teacher what must I do to inherit eternal life?” Martha challenges Jesus in 10:41 “don’t you care?” In 11:1 the disciples interrogate further, “teach us to pray.” In 12:13, a man demands Jesus fairly divide the family’s inheritance. In 12:41, Peter asks Jesus to explain who the parables are for. In 13:23, a heckler asks Jesus if his teaching means only a few will be saved. The series of parables about the lost in ch. 15 are occasioned by a complaint from the Pharisees about Jesus’ poor choices of friends. The parable of Lazarus and the rich man is a response to ridicule from the Pharisees (16:19-31). Jesus heals the ten lepers because they call out (17:13). Even Zacchaeus’ timid approach does not fail to elicit a response (19:5). To be a disciple in Proto-Luke means not just to leave everything behind, but fiercely to fixate all one’s energies on the goal. The research of this dissertation is intended as an example of such critical discipleship.
SECTION 2

NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES AS A DISCIPLINE OF DISCIPLESHIP

...science is most valuable as one of the greatest spiritual adventures
    that man has yet known... ²

    - Karl Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*

Discipleship prefers scientific openness to the comfort and stability of rigid readings ('orthodox' or otherwise). The imagery of leaving possessions behind, and travelling to Jerusalem are, in Proto-Luke, the most challenging metaphors of discipleship. Therefore, the content of this discipleship could never be found in the tireless reaffirmation of certain, stable, eternal truths which Jesus taught the disciples so that they could be passed on in propositional form. Instead, the content of the discipleship is a message that Jesus imparted *in transit*. Ultimately, this is a discipleship of the mind, and so a *scientific* journey. Just as in the scientific method, new data are given power of veto over prevailing beliefs. Reading Proto-Luke through the lens of discipleship requires the reader to leave behind familiar mental landscapes. It is like a radical empiricism in which even ‘hinge-propositions’ may be called into question, only it grants to the revelatory words of the teacher the same import as sense-data. Reading the work with a particular theological or historical conviction is inauthentic since it disregards the central imperative of the text: to leave one’s security behind, let the dead bury the dead and instead, proclaim the kingdom (Proto-Luke 9:60).

In 2008, Dorothy McRae-McMahon preached at my church, and said that “the reason Christianity is failing to reach people in the West is that we have not passed a critical understanding of the New Testament on to our lay people.” She is right. To whatever degree clergy understand the Bible from a critical perspective, if they preach it uncritically to their congregations, they are schooling people in a world view centuries out of date, and it only follows that given such teaching, people would have to choose between their intellectual consistency and their authentic faith. Many people in this situation choose either to abandon their faith or to ignore their intellect, and yet there is a third alternative: to live with the tension.

Disciples of Jesus who live in the 21st century read their Bible with a conflicted sense of inhabiting two world views: a rational, scientific world, and the world of Christian orthodoxy.

Table 0.1
The logic of rationalism would view any contradiction between these world views as a problem to be solved. But world views are not data that are susceptible to being weighed against evidence. They are all-pervasive lenses, inherent in our perspectives, which frame data. We do not consciously choose our world views. This is what Rudolf Bultmann had in mind when he wrote that

...no one can appropriate a world picture by sheer resolve, since it is already given with one’s particular historical situation. Naturally it is not unalterable, and even an individual can work to change it. But one can do so only insofar as, on the basis of certain facts that impress one as real, one perceives the impossibility of the prevailing world picture and either modifies it or develops a new one.3

Instead, Twenty-first century disciples find themselves thrown into the nexus of two necessities, necessities of faith and of reason which in a scientific age sit ill-at-ease, but neither of which can be authentically denied.

The tension between faith and reason is also prevalent in Biblical Studies, to the point where ‘historical’ and ‘theological’ studies of the Bible often have little to say to each other as disciplines. Hans Frei has chronicled the development of this distinction by comparing the biblical scholarship of two such unlikely companions as the founder of Federal theology, Johannes Cocceius, and the founder of the historical critical method, Benedict de Spinoza. Frei theorises that these men had something in common, in spite of their “two very dissimilar views of the Bible”.4 According to Frei, it is in the work of these men that one can observe the phenomenon of literary or theological sense and historical reference beginning

to separate out, in a way in which they were not separable in the sixteenth century. Frei’s observation is significant because, if you can observe certain similarities in even the most divergent of viewpoints from a similar culture, at the same point of time, and the similarities mark a momentous turning point in the way hermeneutics is carried out, and world views are formulated, then you must have placed your finger on something pervasive in the \textit{Zeitgeist} of the time. By ‘\textit{Zeitgeist}’, I mean something like what C. S. Lewis is referring to in this (perhaps over-quoted) text:

\begin{quote}
Every age has its own outlook. It is specially good at seeing certain truths and specially liable to make certain mistakes... All contemporary writers share to some extent the contemporary outlook—even those, like myself, who seem most opposed to it.\footnote{Clive Staples Lewis, “Introduction” in St. Athanasius, \textit{On the Incarnation: The Treatise De Incarnatione Verbi Dei}, trans. and ed. A Religious of CSMV (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1953), 9.}
\end{quote}

Frei chronicles this division between theological and historical realities through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but the fissure was deep enough that it has continued well into the twentieth and twenty-first. Biblical scholars are now dealing with a collision, rather than a parting of worlds. Just as it was in the eighteenth century, both ends of the spectrum are participants – while the progressive end is doing so deliberately, the conservative end is unable to resist doing so. Even though “Cocceius obviously did not realize that he was on his way to a separation of fact and story,” it was nevertheless his work spiritualizing the Old Testament to fit Scholastic Reformed dogmatics that provided the grounds for the concept of \textit{Heilsgeschichte}, with its clear delineation from \textit{Historie} in the work of Bultmann, and the Biblical Theology movement.

In the twentieth century, the Christian story having been so severed by the advent of scientific knowledge, biblical scholars began to operate within those two different world
views. There is a correlation and continuity between the Federal theology of Cocceius (which observed the distinction, but remained wedded to the theological world view) and the discipline of presuppositional apologetics. Because the pervasiveness of this *Zeitgeist* is a cultural phenomenon, I am tending to think more of the popular practice of apologetics (represented by Francis Schaeffer⁶ and the L’Abri fellowship for instance) rather than the academic version which was being taught in seminaries by Reformed scholars such as Cornelius Van Til or Gordon Clark. Just as Schaeffer plays the Cocceius in this typology, Rudolf Bultmann plays the Spinozan counterpart. However, while the defense of the purely biblical world view had retreated to the area of philosophy and apologetics, and stopped contributing in a meaningful way to the field of biblical studies, the progressive side of twentieth century biblical studies was able to address the issue through the practice of demythologization – which is at once philosophy and biblical studies. Like Spinoza, Bultmann is able to carry out this program conscious of what is happening.

Schaeffer does not seem so aware that the two world views are now inseparable for a Christian disciple. His way of describing the situation is to claim that the modern Christian is ‘torn between two consistencies.’ According to Schaeffer, the Christian worldview is true to what is there in a way that no other world view can be. Because of this, Schaeffer argued for people to abandon their unchristian presuppositions. His approach is an ‘either/or’ solution, whereas I am proposing a both/and possibility. Still, his description is quite searching. Schaeffer claims that before being saved, all people exist on a spectrum between the real world (which includes the external world, and humanity’s personhood), and the

⁶ While Schaeffer is not seen as being a ‘scholarly source’, a fact which may be ascribed to his outspoken six-day creationism, as well as the simple popular language of his writing, I have not encountered any scholarly source which describes the lived situation of the conflict in context so accurately. Schaeffer never intended to reach out to the academic community, his aims were more pastoral. I would contend, though, that a great deal of cutting-edge theology happens on the grass-roots level, and that the scholarly community would be impoverished if it failed to draw on popular sources as well as academic ones.
logical conclusion of their ‘unchristian’ presuppositions. Because people cannot escape the real (Christian) world, they are torn between the consistencies of their faith and their secular world view. In Schaeffer’s view, pre-evangelism involves pushing people further towards the unacceptable conclusions of their unchristian presuppositions, and to force them to face the point of tension – the despair of living under a modern world view. It is at that point, not sooner, that a person becomes ready to receive Jesus. The tension or conflict is viewed not as a problem, but as a strategic and even necessary precondition for revelation.

If critical discipleship is ‘presuppositional’ because the call to follow Jesus is its absolute epistemological terminus, then it is also demythologisation because that faithfulness demands honesty about the modern world view, and total abandonment of securities about the past. Both projects are sensitive to the existence of this fracture in the consciousness of the contemporary theological mind, and both utterly eschew attempts to build faith on objective grounds (Evidentialism, or Liberalism). They both suggest that it is into the fractured mind of a post-Enlightenment disciple that the Word of God/Christian proclamation is able to speak, and they both appeal to the Reformation principle of sola fide in order to justify this stance. Compare, for instance, the following two statements by Bultmann and Schaeffer respectively:

There is no difference between security based on good works and security built on objectifying knowledge. The [one] who desires to believe in God must know that he has nothing at his own disposal on which to build this faith, that he is, so to speak, in a vacuum.

---

8 Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1958), 84.
...man, beginning with himself, can define the philosophical problem of existence, but he cannot from himself generate the answer to the problem.  

The tension between these two projects comes from the way that Schaeffer thinks this answer will belong to the old worldview, and Bultmann seeks his authenticity in adherence to the new, scientific one. The alternative possibility I am suggesting is to recognise that modern Christian people are helplessly beholden to both worldviews, so that there is a disorderly, complex and dynamic interplay between them. However, a simplistic understanding of the demythologisation project as being science-positive and myth-negative is not what Bultmann intended. My interpretation of Bultmann is that he embraced this interplay, and saw a positive role for mythology in the Christian worldview. In fact, there is no reason to take Bultmann’s words about the involuntary nature of the scientific worldview as implying any kind of superiority. It is simply the worldview we now have, and is just as prone to replacement as was the mythic one. Gary Dorrien, for instance, points out that the elimination of mythology is exactly what Bultmann criticised the Liberal theology of the generation before him for doing, since this elimination of mythology essentially eliminated the kerygma about Christ. Bultmann was rather suggesting that the essential message of myth was an anthropological meaning, accessible only by faith, not by history.  

In New Testament and Mythology, Bultmann set forward the project of demythologization. He suggests that there is nothing specifically Christian about the three-tiered universe assumed by the New Testament authors, and the good and evil spirits which were assumed to inhabit these realms and intervene in natural occurrences.

---

9 Francis Schaeffer, He Is There and He Is Not Silent (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1972), 34.
The real point of myth is not to give an objective world picture; what is expressed in it, rather, is how we human beings understand ourselves in the world. Thus, myth does not want to be interpreted in cosmological terms but in anthropological terms – or better, in existential terms.\textsuperscript{11}

It is because these transcendental ideas are expressed in the language of objectified reality that myth demands to be remythologised in order to be expressed to a different worldview. Bultmann’s concern is therefore not to eliminate myth, but to interpret it correctly.

A distinctively elegant modern reflection on this ‘two world view’ epistemology, which I am describing as the \textit{Zeitgeist} of contemporary biblical studies, is found in James Alison’s article ‘Theology Amid the Stones and Dust’, in which he says:

A blush comes on us at a moment when we feel we do not know how to speak well... where the two principal temptations are either to bluster our way out of the moment, by speaking with too much security and arrogance... or on the other hand to plunge into the shamed silence of one who knows himself uncovered... deprived of legitimate speech. This space of the blush, poorly as it seems to promise... seems to me the most appropriate space from which to begin a sketch of ways forward towards the stutter of a theology for the third millennium.\textsuperscript{12}

Alison gives three biblical examples of theological achievements that happened in this state. It was after Elijah had triumphed over the prophets of Baal with great wonders that he was chased by Jezebel’s army to Mount Horeb, where he learned not to associate Yahweh with wonders, but with the still small voice. At the fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE, Marduk seemed to have triumphed over Yahweh; all the sacred symbols of the imaginative world of Yahwism, and the societal structures of belonging, were in the dust. This moment was key to the formation of Judaism as monotheism and as a religion of a text. The final example Alison gives is the conversion of Saul as narrated in Acts 9:1-19, Galatians 1:11-17, etc.,

\textsuperscript{12} James Alison, “Theology amid the Stones and Dust” \textit{Theology and Sexuality} 11 (1999), 91.
where Saul’s ferocious militant zeal is deflated by the still small voice of the one whom he has been persecuting.13

The achievement of Alison’s view is to show that it is possible to view the situation from a higher level. Methodological discipleship enables us to see that these world views in conflict are not a problem to be solved at all, but that our nexus of uncertainty is the place where Jesus calls us to follow. In this view, the conflict has become a strategically advantageous perspective for reading the Bible.

Science and Theology in Dynamic Interplay

[Can] doctrine… be taught at all, if critical study remains in a state of flux and its findings have continually to be revised by the next generation. But… ‘How else can doctrine actually be taught, if Christ is to be the real Teacher?’ The protestant view is that it is only the man who is still learning who is fit to teach.14

I am proposing that discipleship as a hermeneutic transcends the divide between faith and reason; that to a disciple, science and spiritual conviction are mutually essential attributes of the journey. Käsemann describes the dynamic interplay of science and faith in terms of discipleship. Christ is the Teacher when I am aware of my perspective as his follower, and still open to reading the text critically, open to any outcome whatsoever. The knife’s edge between objectivity and orthodoxy is discipleship.

The relationship between scientific and the theological truth that I am proposing, however, does not seek a ‘balanced’ approach which moderates the insights of science on one hand with some theological considerations on the other. The point of friction between science

13 Ibid., 91-95.
and theology here occurs not within the object of study, but within the subject. Scientific

data, being given its full weight must be understood as an act of discipleship. There is a

helpful analogy of this in the work of Kant. Kant states that when reason seeks to be taught

by nature (or we may say, when theology seeks to be taught by critical enquiry), it must

approach “not like a pupil, who has recited to him whatever the teacher wants to say, but

like an appointed judge who compels witnesses to answer the questions put to him.”

Accordingly, as I have noted above, the picture of discipleship in Proto-Luke is not one of

passive ‘pupils’ who recite the rabbi’s teaching but of people who actively pursue, who

interrogate Jesus in this way. The study of the New Testament must allow the Christ of our

faith to interrogate the historical Jesus, for according to Kant this kind of interrogation or

negotiation between data and paradigm is how our understanding of the physical world

“was first brought to the secure course of a science after groping about for so many

centuries.” If we do so, we shall find that in contrast to Kant, Christ will interrogate Jesus

in ways beyond human rationality.

The originality of this approach will not be found in the critical apparatus, or in the tools that

I use, but in the intentionality of their use, so that critical study is performed as discipleship.

In the words of Philip Pullman’s King Iorek Byrnson,

The intentions of a tool are what it does. A hammer intends to strike, a vice intends
to hold fast, a lever intends to lift. They are what it is made for. But sometimes a

tool may have other uses that you don’t know. Sometimes in doing what you intend,
you also do what the knife intends without knowing...
By admitting that critical study is only one of the dynamics at play in biblical interpretation, I am not changing the way that the tools themselves are to be used. What I am doing is acknowledging the intention of the tools, what critical method has been doing through our use of it since the outset of the critical method. The methodology itself will not look any different to the time-honoured paradigms of historical-critical study: source, form, redaction and narrative criticism. What will happen is that awareness will be added to intentionality.

The problems with which I will be dealing are the same unsolved problems of New Testament studies that are being debated with such originality in the field today: especially the Synoptic problem and the problem of the historical Jesus. For these issues, the academic community must work together with consistent application of a certain set of methodological tools in order to function as a scientific community. My interest in Proto-Luke can be seen as part of the ‘mopping-up’ process of a normal science trying to make the data fit the paradigm (the two-source hypothesis), confident that the history of science has shown that it is through this ‘working the evidence’ that data become meaningful. As Kuhn says,

> It is hard to make nature fit a paradigm. That is why the puzzles of normal science are so challenging and also why measurements taken without a paradigm so seldom lead to any conclusions at all.¹⁸

It is in this context, no other, that I expect the interrogation of Jesus to occur. The development of a Proto-Lukan theology will surely raise the issue of Proto-Luke’s portrayal of Christ as, say, Elijah or the suffering servant of deuter-o-Isaiah, as a concept or a theological truth about the Christ. This may potentially stand as an antinomy to what we know about the phenomenal Jesus. There is still “but one Lord Jesus Christ”. In

Chalcedonian form (with a Kantian structure), we would see the Christ-Elijah, Christ-Suffering Servant interrogating Jesus of Nazareth, and so our picture of the one “same Lord” is instructed (modified) by whatever recalcitrant data arise in the process.

**Method in New Testament Criticism**

The hypothesis that this thesis will be addressing is that discipleship as a hermeneutic discipline is able to retain the values of both faithful Christian praxis and rigorous scientific method harmoniously.

*Walter Wink*

Walter Wink’s books *The Bible in Human Transformation* and *Transforming Bible Study* are books on method, both of which are on the same page as me in terms of their basic values. According to Wink, the historical critical method has become ‘bankrupt’, not in the sense of being useless or valueless, but in the sense of being unable to fulfil its purpose for existing: to interpret the scriptures in a way that brings about personal and social transformation.

Wink describes the biblical criticisms as having taken place at an objective moment in the history of the church – a moment when the academy broke free of the dogmatic control of the church. This moment was a kind of Faustian pact in which the academy sold its innocence in order to gain control over the Biblical text by transforming it into an object. The objectivity it claimed in doing so was not really so objective, for

Biblical criticism was a certain type of evangelism seeking a certain kind of conversion... [it] shook, shattered, and reconstituted generation after generation of students and became their point of entrée into the “modern world.”

---


20 Ibid., 14-15.
However, now that the historical critical method finished its original role of over-throwing Christianity’s orthodox super-ego, it has become the new super-ego – a Satanic and fundamentally idolatrous one. Wink proposes a new engagement with the text, one that exorcises the idolatry of the historical-critical method with a second naïveté. This approach engages all the tools of critical study, but then also analyses the response of the believing subject. Wink schematises this process as follows:

1. Fusion  
   N1: Negation of fusion through suspicion of the object.
2. Distance  
   N2: Negation of the negation through suspicion of the subject.
3. Communion

In order to reach this final stage of communion, Wink suggests that the tools of bankrupt biblical criticism can be taken under new management, they can be used by biblical scholars for purposes of human transformation, then this will affect a new communion with the text.

*James E. Loder and the ‘Conflict in Context’*

The work of James E. Loder represents a profound insight into the relationship between Wink’s categories of fusion, distance and communion. Speaking from the perspective of a developmental psychologist, Loder is able to offer a more specifically epistemological approach to the issue, which may also be applied also to the discipline of biblical studies. His insight has been employed in the fields of Christian education and systematic theology, but never related to biblical studies directly. It is, however, his model which will provide the
basic epistemological framework for this thesis. Methodological discipleship has potential to employ these insights in a way that transforms the practice of reading of the Bible.

Wink’s concept of critical ‘distance’ and non- (pre- or post-) critical closeness is a metaphor for the interaction of critical study (objective) with believing engagement as discipleship (subjective). In The Transforming Moment, James E. Loder described the same process from the perspective of an educationist and epistemologist, with a dual emphasis on both the objective and scientific aspect of the process (which Loder has called ‘verification and interpretation’) and the subjective aspect of the process (‘insight felt with intuitive force’).

Loder describes this experience by analysing the epistemology described in the Emmaus and Damascus Road experiences of Luke-Acts. In Chalcedonian form, he describes the human and divine aspects of the process in such a way as to give primacy to the divine (subjective) aspect, but without implying any subordination.

Loder argues that advances in human knowledge are based on conviction rather than rationality. He bases this on a number of examples, including the structure of scientific revolutions (Copernican, Newtonian and Einsteinian), clinical examples from his own practice, instances of development in his own life, and the two paradigmatic biblical examples of Emmaus and Damascus. He describes the entire process as the work of Spiritus Creator, who transforms the human spirit, using convictional knowledge, as depicted in the following chart21:

---

It is the ‘Conflict-in-Context’ that initiates the knowing response. In *Phenomenology of Perception*, Maurice Merleau-Ponty showed that humans instinctively project a ‘lived-world’ to give their experiences unified and cohesive context.\(^{22}\) According to Loder, as this happens, conflict arises from the recalcitrance of reality data. As we ‘sit with the problem’ (interlude for scanning), a new insight is presented to the human mind, followed by a sense of well-being (release and openness). Finally, in verification and interpretation, the lived-world is rebuilt according to the new insight.

What Loder is suggesting encapsulates, and sheds more light on the conflict between the two world views that I described above. While we remain in a conflicted state about this tension, we are collectively waiting for an intuitive insight that will unify our world view.

Loder has also given a powerfully biblical and theological framing of Wink’s ‘Faustian Pact’

metaphor. The moment after an intuitive insight, when one begins to interpret and verify what has been realised, one distances oneself from the insight, and the initial innocence of it is lost. Where Loder may say the conflict in context triggers the knowing response, Wink describes the loss in innocence as a Faustian pact that leads to a suspicion of the subject. Loder’s model is able to explain all the problems I have so far observed about the epistemology of contemporary biblical studies.

Moreover, Loder’s model is particularly apt for dealing with Proto-Luke. The wheel of convictional knowledge spins quickly and turbulently throughout Proto-Luke’s narrative. The great insights of revelation, baptism and epiphany (ch 3) are quickly put to the test in Jesus’ life through temptation by Satan and rejection in the πατρίς (ch 4). Peter has a similar experience in his call as the revelatory insight prompts a catch of fish, which leads to momentary release and openness, but cannot withstand the scrutiny of Peter’s conscience leading to the pitiable cry “depart from me; I am a sinner.” The banding together of the rejected Jesus with the disciples is a pivotal moment of intuitive insight. At this point, the imagery of turbulent waters gives way to the balanced, rational image of a teacher “lifting his eyes” in 6:20 to teach and expound the meaning of the revelation. This corresponds to the moment of verification and interpretation in the knowing process. 9:51 is the crisis point of the narrative, and it intrudes into the calmness of the sermon on the plain as a conflict in context which becomes the driving force behind the narrative of Proto-Luke. The entire body of the narrative from here on may be understood as an ‘interlude for scanning’, a journey which allows space for Spiritus Creator to bring about the convictional knowledge of the last supper (Proto-Luke 22).
Applied to biblical studies as a discipline, convictional knowledge contextualises the conflict between faith and reason as a helpful state of affairs by uniting these two obstinate forces in a single dynamic process. Great theological insight (e.g. Martin Luther’s new understanding of ‘the righteousness of God’ in Romans) is the third step: ‘insight’. The scientific process of New Testament criticism (e.g. the critique of Luther by the ‘New Perspective’) is the fifth step: ‘verification.’ So, scientific and theological understandings, even when they make contradictory claims, are both aspects of the dynamic of convictional knowledge. Together they create the conflict-in-context through which the Spirit speaks.

Joseph Campbell

If Loder has supplied an epistemology with which to read the journey of Proto-Luke, then Joseph Campbell has embodied this epistemology in the journey itself. This is only appropriate since the Proto-Lukan journey is one of discipleship, and one in which the act of reading is itself an act of journeying. Campbell employed the term monomyth to describe the image of the hero’s journey, in which he found the basic structure of mythology across human cultures. The function of this journey he claims, has always been “to supply the symbols that carry the human spirit forward, in counteraction to those constant human fantasies that tend to tie it back.”

---

The formula of the hero’s journey is for a hero to undergo (X) separation from the common world, (Y) initiation into the world of the adventure and finally (Z) return, with the power to bestow boons. This structure, I will show, is not only the structure of human knowledge as described by Loder, in which recalcitrant data separates the reader from the lived world (X), and through intuition, the Spiritus Creator initiates the subject into the world of insight (Y), and finally through verification and interpretation, the subject grants the ‘boon’ of his insight to his peers (Z). It is also the structure of Proto-Luke, in which Jesus calls his disciples into the realm of adventure (Proto-Luke 3-5), imparts his teaching to them on the road to Jerusalem (Proto-Luke 9-19), and finally at the last supper, appoints them to grant this boon to the church from their place on the twelve thrones of Israel (Proto-Luke 22:28-30).

24 Ibid., 26.
The transforming moments which Loder and Campbell describe in this way function as negations, or as thresholds between the epistemological stances applied to Biblical Studies by Wink as follows.

Table 0.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wink</th>
<th>Loder</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Proto-Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Fusion</td>
<td>negation of innocence</td>
<td>Conflict in Context</td>
<td>Threshold of Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Distance</td>
<td>negation of negation</td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) communion</td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>Return with boon</td>
<td>Farewell Discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will claim in this thesis that Proto-Luke's most creative contribution to the Christian tradition was to align the traditions of the early church with the epistemological process of discipleship in the form of the journey. He did this by taking the varied traditions of the Q and the L material, from which Proto-Luke is built, and yet neither of which are given in the context of a journey, and placing them in the context of Jesus' heroic journey to Jerusalem, which is found in all four gospels, but never used as the central occasion upon which Jesus imparts his teaching, except by Luke.

But by fusing the two traditions together, the tradition and the journey, Proto-Luke created the Christian pilgrimage of discipleship with Jesus as a transforming moment in the life of a disciple. The project was later expanded in the creation of Luke-Acts, which extended the metaphor to the missionary journeys of the church, with Paul as the hero figure, but the account given in Proto-Luke is unique in its quality of discipleship rather than mission.

Applying these images of the transformation of human knowledge to the image of discipleship given in Proto-Luke as a critical method, one can see the process unfolding in
the life of Jesus and the disciples along the road to Jerusalem. All the insights of the way are tested in Jerusalem, and Peter’s failure as a disciple is the result; but recalcitrance is a feature of the process of convictional knowing, and the scattered disciples receive insight on the Emmaus road. The hypothesis which this research will test is whether this can be carried out in a way that is convincing.
Section 3

HOW TO PROCEED

If they had come a few miles to see me, I would have received them honourably; now they have twice gone a voyage of millions of miles for nothing and will appear before me none the less.

- C. S. Lewis, Out of the Silent Planet, p. 122

Having addressed the philosophy behind this thought experiment, and stated the hypotheses to be tested, it remains to define how the experiment itself will now be carried out. While I have referred above to the philosophy of human interpretation that grounds my work as ‘hermeneutics’, and the way that those concepts are applied to biblical texts such as Proto-Luke as ‘method’ – the specific research approaches that will be used in the body of the thesis, I will refer to as ‘tactics’. The (hermeneutic) purpose is to observe the practice of historical reconstruction and interpretation, and to reflect upon (a) the values and (b) the cohesion of this practice. This is original in its application of certain theological values and critical-theoretical concepts to the task of biblical studies. However, the critical tactics being used are not intended to be original: they are the canonical critical praxes of traditional biblical studies, and this is what needs to be defined now. Perhaps the closest approximation of the specific interpretational tactics that I will employ is the work of some members of the Jesus Seminar, and of the International Q Project, where many of the key values of critical discipleship are exemplified. While there is no explicit mention in their
work of discipleship as a heuristic model, their work is an instance of discipleship to the extent that their reconstruction of Jesus for the 21st century is motivated by a desire to follow the Jesus that is reconstructed, or in the words of Marcus J. Borg, to “meet Jesus again for the first time.”

Of course, the Jesus Seminar is a diverse body, so one must assume that diverse motivations operate in the overall project. The description of the project, described here by Borg can be taken as a rough approximation of a method typical of the Seminar:

The process is very much like a particular stage of detective work: after the evidence has been gathered, analysed and weighed, it has to be integrated into an overall hypothesis. Doing this with the traditions about Jesus produces a sketch, or construal or gestalt or image, of Jesus. I prefer these terms to picture or portrait, both of which suggest too much fullness of detail. A sketch, on the other hand, suggests broad strokes—a clear outline without too much precision of detail.

This process is reminiscent of what Loder describes as the ‘interlude for scanning’ in the process of convicational knowledge. When the evidence has been carefully scrutinised, it is possible to scan it, asking the questions ‘who is this Jesus?’ ‘How can I follow him?’ It is at that point that convicational knowledge will speak, allowing the contemporary face of Jesus to be revealed.

This motivating factor seems to be true in the particular cases of Walter Wink, Marcus Borg and John Dominic Crossan. I think this can be extended to the redaction critics who worked on Q, many, such as Robinson and Kloppenborg being members of the Jesus Seminar, and also seeming to exemplify my approach. Something particularly useful to this project from

---
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both the Seminar and the Project is their ‘can-do’ attitude towards historical reconstruction, as described here by Marcus Borg.

Since the Proto-Luke hypothesis is a sub-species of the two-document hypothesis, redaction and source critical tactics seems particularly well suited to reviving the hypothesis. Having fallen out of favour after Vincent Taylor’s defence of Proto-Luke, this document was never able to be demonstrated by source-critical techniques. This was likely because the same hand redacted Proto-Luke as redacted the Canonical form of Luke, so that any techniques relating to style such as vocabulary, or syntax did not apply. But also, Proto-Luke was not used by any other New Testament author so that in any instance of the text being mechanically extracted from Luke (by the removal of Markan and infancy narrative material), there was no control to be used in the way that Matthew and Luke may be used reciprocally as controls in the extraction of Q. These methodological dead ends made any kind of verifiable conclusion about Proto-Luke impossible. Proto-Luke was never disproved, or even shown to be improbable by any New Testament scholar, but interest in it faded at the time when the early redaction critics began to assume the two-document hypothesis in order to carry out their work. A document so uncertain was not useful to theories about the redaction of Luke-Acts.

If Proto-Luke is at a disadvantage in the field of source criticism, then when the techniques of redaction criticism are used on Proto-Luke itself, it has the advantage over Q, and this makes the current state of New Testament scholarship a perfect opportunity for Proto-Luke to make a comeback. While Q has a genre and a theology, as I will demonstrate, Proto-Luke has a vivid central image (the journey), theme (discipleship) and a narrative development
with a clear beginning, climax and end. While the statistical evidence of Proto-Luke has not been judged clear, the literary evidence for it will prove abundant.

So the thought experiment I proposed above, to read a hypothetical text (Proto-Luke) from the perspective of a disciple in order to observe the act of interpretation, and to see what that tells us about the ontology of biblical texts, and the epistemology of reading biblical texts is particularly well suited to this task.

The structure of this thesis should follow the contours of the convictional knowing event described by Loder. First, it will reconstruct the text of Proto-Luke using redaction critical and other standard methods of biblical criticism. This is a knowing response to the conflicts-in-context which arise out of the synoptic problem, the history and purpose of Luke’s composition and (from another angle), the desire to see Luke’s christology, to understand the presentation of Jesus given in that text in order to understand more about how to follow that Jesus authentically.


In order to demonstrate this, I need to describe the way that Proto-Luke fits into the whole scope of Luke’s composition. This will require a sketch of the history of Q and of L, and finally the redactional moment at which Proto-Luke came into existence, in order to trace the changing intention behind the Jesus tradition as it is passed from one document to the next.
After insight felt with intuitive force comes the process of verification and interpretation. Chapters 4 and 5 will take up these two objectifying tasks separately. Chapter 4 is a verification/falsification of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Its tactic is to demonstrate that Proto-Luke has a beginning and an end, and therefore a literary unity, and can be treated as a secure object of interpretation. This will be done in two sections:

1. The first section reads Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30, the Galilean Ministry Narrative, and shows that this section is not of Markan origin.

2. The second section reads Proto-Luke 22, and demonstrates that the Last Supper narrative of canonical Luke is built into a farewell discourse in Proto-Luke that is free from Markan influence, and into which Mark’s material was later adapted.

Chapter 5 is an interpretation of Proto-Luke. Rather than attempting a close reading of each passage, this section taking the insight that the central theme of Proto-Luke is discipleship and the journey, and selects key passages which relate specifically to that theme.

1. Proto-Luke 9:51-57. This is the moment of crisis in Proto-Luke’s narrative, and also an exposition of the key theme: discipleship. I will argue that the Proto-Lukan redactor is setting these three Cynic style sayings against a metaphorical journey (the journey of life) in order to mitigate the literalising interpretation of the itinerant ‘Q’ community.

2. Proto-Luke 14:15, 25-33 repeats these key themes in greater depth. Here, the Redactor (R) (who composed v. 15) sets the Great Banquet of Q 14:16-24 against another triptych on the cost of discipleship, drawn from L (tower, war, salt). In doing so, his intention is the same is it was in 9:51-57. He takes Q material (the Great
Banquet), which was intended by the Q community as a Deuteronomistic condemnation of this sinful generation for rejecting Christ, a prophet of Sophia, and by adding from L traditional sayings about being salt and light, he deliteralises Q’s interpretation and opens the parable to a spiritual interpretation.

3. Proto-Luke 10:1-12; 22:35-38, 47b, 49, 51a, 53b. Proto-Luke’s Jesus gives to the disciples the strictest method of evangelism of any of the gospels, demanding itinerancy and open commensality as well as denying the disciples any sandals for the road. However, in the Proto-Lukán farewell discourse, (L material) the method is completely reversed. In this section, I will explore the idea of method and change of method as a narrative device that R uses to prevent rigid interpretations of Jesus’ ethical demands.

In all three key passages analysed, Proto-Luke uses narrative rhetorical devices to deliteralise the specific call of disciples into a universal concept of discipleship. The call to itinerant ministry in ch. 10 is revoked in ch. 22 – sell your begging equipment and buy a sword. The new call is not to be taken literally either, since the literal swords the disciples produce are treated contemptuously by Jesus: Ἰκανὸν ἦστιν, “Enough!” The implication for Proto-Luke’s readers is clear: if the call to itinerancy and the call to militarism are neither to be taken literally, then discipleship itself must be sought on the level of personal abandonment to the call.

According to Loder’s epistemology, this thorough process of verification and interpretation should lead to fresh problems – conflict-in-context. This will allow the conclusion of this study to be a moment of seeking convicational knowledge. At this point, I will also come to
the point of application, and ask what the data about Jesus and the path of discipleship is saying to the church of the 21st century.
CHAPTER 2
Reconstructing the Sources

Interrogating the Jesus behind the Text

...on one side and the other of a hidden crevice we find two green plants of a different species. Each has chosen the soil which suits it: and we realise that within the rock are two ammonites, one of which has involutions less complex than the other’s. We glimpse that is to say a difference of many thousands of years; time and space suddenly commingle; the living diversity of that moment juxtaposes one age and the other and perpetuates them.

~ Claude Lévi-Strauss, A World on the Wane, p. 60

~ Domenico Fetti, Archimedes Thoughtful (c. 1620)
I could compare my music to white light which contains all the colours. Only a prism can divide the colours and make them visible. This prism could be the spirit of the listener.¹

~ Arvo Pärt

The reconstructive task in New Testament studies is a site of discipleship. A 21st century disciple of Jesus comes to the New Testament seeking a teacher to follow, but finds only a text. In order to meet the teacher, the person must first be reconstructed. As John Dominic Crossan points out in the closing sentiment of his magisterial The Historical Jesus,

...there is only reconstruction. For a believing Christian both the life of the Word of God and the text of the Word of God are alike a graded process of historical reconstruction, be it red, pink, grey, black or A, B, C, D. If you cannot believe in something produced by reconstruction, you may have nothing left to believe in.²

When a person first picks up a New Testament (if we conceive of the event in perfect isolation), they have not yet encountered Jesus, or the gospel, because no such entities have been reconstructed yet. But with the first sentence of the New Testament they read, Jesus breaks into their world, and from that point on ‘there is only reconstruction’. We come to the New Testament as Lévi-Strauss once described a man stumbling across the plants growing on either side of a crevice. We see the top layer of soil and some foliage, but data about many layers of soil, and many periods of time is encoded in that one layer.

The metaphor of topsoil is particularly apt of the gospel of Luke, with its many sources. Proto-Luke functions as a key which is able to decode a whole trajectory of Jesus’ own

teaching, and of the various responses of different groups of disciples to that message, as it was apprehended in one specific stream of tradition.

This experience of New Testament reconstruction can be thought of as an event of convtional knowledge, described in the introductory chapter of this thesis according to James Loder’s model. Figure 1 in the previous chapter presented such knowing events as a rotating wheel, which is propelled to turn by the energy of a conflict-in-context situation, and moves through phases of scanning, insight, release, and verification/interpretation. The reconstructive task of New Testament studies moves in the same way as this wheel. Various strands of scriptural tradition and historical evidence present themselves to us, each painting a different picture of Jesus and the various early Christian communities, and a follower of Jesus needs to construct something in order to have a teacher to follow. In the process of scanning the text, and examining the data, the teacher is recognised! This leads to the process of historical reconstruction. In the process, ‘recognition’ is equivalent to ‘insight felt with intuitive force’, and reconstruction is equivalent to verification and interpretation, so that the table may be reworded for the New Testament disciplines as follows:
The objects which require reconstruction in the following chapters are the sources of Luke, which include the double-tradition material (Q) and the main source of the material unique to Luke (L), and Proto-Luke. On one level, these chapters can be considered an interlude for scanning through the data relating to Luke’s known sources. However, within the single act of scanning the sources are a number of overlapping epistemological arcs – reconstructions of Proto-Luke’s individual sources. Each of these arcs can be grafted onto the wheel of convctional knowledge – but they are discrete arcs. The chapter after this one will be devoted to the recognition of the literary unity of the document L, and the next to Proto-Luke, on the basis of the ‘scanning’ which took place in these chapters, however, each of those chapters will also require its own interlude for scanning of the data relevant to that particular source.
For an epistemological arc to be grafted onto the wheel of convictional knowledge, it is necessary to identify the current state of research on the specific entity under consideration. If there is a hypothesis under consideration by the scholarly community, then I shall seek to verify or falsify that hypothesis, and see what conflict emerges. If, however, there is conflict or contradiction in place in the scholarly community about the entity, then the knowing process should be regarded as already initiated. In either case, from this point, I shall scan the data until recognition occurs, and then reconstruct an historical image by seeking to verify or falsify, and to interpret that image.

In this thesis, the purpose of reconstructing historical sources is that they are necessary presuppositions for the claims I intend to make about the tendencies of Luke’s early traditional sources, which in turn shed light on the tendency of Proto-Luke. Jesus, as the reconstructed object of this study, but also the master of the whole subjective process of knowing, serves as the model for a reconstruction of two ways in which discipleship was acted out in the first century, by the communities and the literary work of Q, L and Proto-Luke. In the case of Jesus, there is already a healthy conflict-in-context ‘on the table’, represented by the variety of competing views about Jesus. Therefore it is possible to make a full cycle of the epistemological process, create a new hypothesis, and test it. By contrast, in the case of the double tradition, a much shorter arc is required. This is because there is a hypothesis (the Q hypothesis) that has survived over a century of critical scrutiny, and still (as I shall argue below) has no credible alternative. It seems enough then to reiterate the reasons that this hypothesis is widely accepted, and then to consider the main objections that are raised to the theory. Having concluded that the hypothesis is sound, I go on to scan the material of Q – in particular, the Son of Man sayings, which are so crucial to
our understanding of Q’s Christology. From this, I suggest a reconstruction of Q’s community, literary form, theology and purpose, which is also, largely in agreement with the current scholarly consensus in Q studies.
A Proto-Lukan Source: the Double Tradition (Q)

The mystic was back from the desert. “Tell us,” they said, “what God is like.”

But how could he ever tell them what he had experienced in his heart? Can God be put into words?

He finally gave them a formula – inaccurate, inadequate – in the hope that some might be tempted to experience it for themselves.

They seized upon the formula. They made it a sacred text. They imposed it upon other as a holy belief. They went to great pains to spread it in foreign lands. Some even gave their lives for it.

The mystic was sad. It might have been better if he had said nothing.

- Anthony De Mello, *The Song of the Bird*, 35

In some ways, the history of Q studies is the history of the various historical-critical methods in New Testament studies. This chapter is divided into two parts, a quantitative (source critical) validation of Q, and then a qualitative (redaction critical) recognition of Q. In order to show that Q studies divides naturally into these two categories, I will now summarise the stages in the development of the Q theory very briefly (the content of the various arguments I discuss will be fleshed out in much greater detail later on).

Q was initially an explanatory hypothesis within the two-document hypothesis, which was used to account for the tradition shared by Matthew and Luke only. Ever since the work of Streeter (discussed in detail below), the two-document hypothesis has been the dominant source solution for the Synoptic problem. However, at this stage, Q was not considered as a literary document in its own right, but as an explanatory device, which was useful in solving the synoptic problem.

Q was virtually ignored by form-criticism, since the Q hypothesis itself sheds no immediately obvious light on the origin of the individual sayings it contains, and because the Q material,
consisting of aphorisms rather than complex narratives, had very few internal clues about the history of their own transmission. It was therefore not until the emergence of redaction critical study that it became possible to study Q in greater depth.

By exploring the *Sitz im Leben* and theologies of communities and redactors, redaction criticism was able to engage with Q material as a literary unit with a historical context, and with theological content. As Edwards has pointed out, since Q is not an emendation of any extant document, and because the order of the sayings is unknown, the standard methods of emendation and composition criticism are not applicable to Q. Instead, Heinz Eduard Tödt pioneered the redaction critical study of Q by investigating the theology of the Christological titles used in Q, the Son of Man.³

The literary study of Q began with James M. Robinson’s proposal that Q’s genre was identifiable, as belonging to a specific genre, ‘the sayings of the wise’.⁴ This project of redaction-critical interpretation of Q as a reconstructed document was continued in greater detail by the International Q Project, which culminated in the publication of a ‘critical edition’ of Q, and in recent times, has opened the door for social-scientific critical work to be done on the reconstructed ‘Q community,’⁵ and for the witness of the Q community and document to be part of the critical approach taken to the reconstruction of the historical Jesus.⁶

⁶ See for instance John Dominic Crossan’s frequent reference to Q in *Historical Jesus*, 266-74.
In this section, I do not want to say anything original about the various current theories around the exact nature of Q. For instance, I do not think it matters to the Proto-Luke hypothesis whether the origins of the material are an Aramaic written source,\(^7\) a Greek written source,\(^8\) or, as Richard Horsley and Jonathan Draper have recently argued, a body of oral performances.\(^9\) In any case, it would not be possible to give these issues the space they deserve in this context. I highly regard the work of Horsley who has contextualised the speeches of Q within the tradition of prophetic oracles passed on by oral tradition. Delbert Burkett, however, has recently given an in depth study which concludes in agreement the majority view that Q is a unitary, written and Greek document,\(^10\) and it is towards that conclusion that this study will lean, although without assuming the question is solved.

The original suggestion I want to make about Q as a context for Proto-Luke is that whatever form it took, Q is valuable in making sense of Proto-Luke’s tendency and redaction. As traditions about Jesus’ ambiguous language began to interact with specific communities, they began to adopt more specific meanings in order to become useful in those contexts. My hypothesis is that the characteristics of Q, including its romanticisation of poverty and its itinerant ministry of begging and preaching Q’s deuteronomistic theology of judgment on Israel who rejected the prophets John and Jesus are best explained by seeing the Q community as a Jewish community who are seeking in Jesus’ life and teaching a set of alternative halakhic regulations to act as social boundary markers for their community.


Before arguing this hypothesis, I will argue for the accuracy of the Q hypothesis. In doing so, I want to refer to and summarise the work which has been done in verifying Q quantitatively. In particular, I will focus on the work of Streeter, and also the arguments of Delbert Burkett whose 2009 defence of the Q hypothesis is the most up to date, and represents a considerable sharpening of the essential argument used by Streeter, and which also specifically addresses the arguments against Q by Goodacre. From the point of this quantitative verification, following the lead of scholars like Kloppenborg, I begin to introduce my own qualitative arguments about the reasons for accepting the Q hypothesis.

**Arguments for a Q Source**

*Validating Q*

At the same time as the current flourishing of Q studies, there are voices protesting the certainty with which some scholars speak about Q, and it is the concerns of these ‘Q sceptics’ must also be addressed. For instance, I do not feel any need to apologise for the way that I am standing on the work of other scholars, particularly that of B. H. Streeter, in adopting the Q hypothesis, because I think their arguments are sound, and yet Mark Goodacre has taken practitioners of historical reconstruction to task over this issue. He cites the way that James Dunn and John Dominic Crossan assume Q in their work fairly uncritically, and calls for a return to viewing Q as a source-critical hypothesis, not a tangible document that can be used for historical reconstructions. If Goodacre is right about this methodological criticism, then it would not matter whether the Proto-Luke hypothesis is true, because the way that I am using it in this dissertation is invalid. In my discussion of Q, therefore, I need to make an argument against Goodacre for the validity of using Q as a tangible historical artefact.
At the heart of Goodacre’s critique is an accusation of dogmatism. He states

There are genuine grounds for anxiety here. It is not simply that our teachers taught us to be suspicious of claims so dogmatically asserted or assumed, but those of us who are teachers ourselves might be worried about the impression that the new student received, for it is rare in the recent literature to find a careful account of the origin of the Q hypothesis, at the very least locating the postulation of Q as an element in the discussion of the synoptic problem.\(^\text{11}\)

As I have argued, the situation that Goodacre is referring to has arisen because of a shift in heuristic models. At the advent of Redaction Criticism, New Testament studies was able to move on from source critical arguments, which would never attain certainty, to a method which was able to recognise sources because they are documents with human characteristics. In this methodological shift, Q ceased being the most likely of a variety of hypotheses, and became a feature of the way we read the synoptic gospels. Q ceased subsisting as a quantitatively probable hypothetical document, and attained qualitative certainty within such readings. It is this ‘circularity’ which Goodacre takes to task, suggesting narrative criticism as a possible alternative.

Redaction-critical arguments can only be taken so far when we are attempting to test our source-critical conclusions. Usually, the two-source theory is assumed before the work of redaction criticism begins. It is an in-house method, devised by biblical scholars, assuming certain source-critical matters. But narrative criticism is different. It is a tool that emerged outside the small world of New Testament scholarship.\(^\text{12}\)

And elsewhere:

Redaction criticism without consideration of broader narrative context in the gospels is, in the end, a blunted instrument that can only detract from our appreciation of the Gospels and their writers.\(^\text{13}\)

---


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 117.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., 145.
Goodacre is recommending Q-scepticism as a kind of visionary methodological purism – scientifically eschewing certainty and pushing forward to new, more rigorous scientific tools. To this extent, Q-scepticism is in keeping with the values of critical discipleship at first glance. And it is not only Q sceptics who hold to this kind of principled methodological approach. Richard Edwards’ A Theology of Q begins with an in-depth argument for Q’s existence before it proceeds to construct a theology, because “…the piling of hypothesis upon hypothesis is foolish.” This kind of scepticism not only represents a more radical kind of empiricism than critical study (which we are conceiving of as discipleship) demands, because it doesn’t just ask the scholar to abandon any presuppositions, but to also give up the possibility of reaching conclusions. The circularity that Goodacre is railing against is an essential feature of human knowledge, the classical problem of the hermeneutic circle. In a study like this, which is using convictional knowledge as an epistemological frame and discipleship as a model of learning, the idea that potential uncertainty should stop us from finding out more about the object of our inquiry (Jesus) can’t be taken seriously.

There is in fact no such thing as pure empiric knowledge in the sense of knowledge based only on immediately available observations. All human knowledge piles hypothesis on hypothesis, and relies of the conclusions drawn from other observations. Goodacre is like a genius Newtonian who is still trying to deny Einsteinian relativity on the basis of certain facts which do not fit because they have not yet been adequately interpreted within the new framework. Every instance of scientific progress involves this leap from an uncertain set of quantitative data with relative security to the confident positing of entities which cannot be directly observed: atomic particles, molecules, oxygen, gravity, electricity, germs...

and medicines etc. New research will assume these entities as ‘certain’ whenever it formulates new questions and new hypotheses. The development of penicillin assumes germ theory, which assumes the accuracy of microscopes, which assumes the Newtonian physics of light in motion – the cycle is endless, and at each step of the process, a leap was taken from a quantitative probability to the postulation of a non-empirical and yet profoundly useful entity. The cycle is hardly vicious, at least, not to a person with a streptococcal infection.

Science always proceeds with assumptions based on the most probable interpretations of data. If it did not, then the scientific enterprise itself would cease to be feasible. Taken to its logical conclusion, the result of Goodacre’s procedural scruples would be a spanner in the cogs of New Testament studies, and one that is insensitive to the way that reading works, and the way that science works. Demanding certainty at every step of the scientific process, and doing so on the basis of scientific uncertainty, when the scientific method itself excludes certainty as a foundational principle of the method, is a sure-fire way to halt progress. Where Goodacre’s principled scepticism departs from the task of Biblical Studies as discipleship is in its pessimism about finding conclusions, or its reticence to follow a conclusion if that theory accounts for the evidence in the best way. The disciples had no certainty of reaching their destination, but they still followed.

I should add that I do not think it is desirable, as Goodacre demands, for scholars like Crossan who are working within this process to have to present an account of Q before they can do any reconstruction work on the basis of it. In practice, this would weigh down the research enterprise, and it would be useless, since they would be competing with specialists in the area of Q studies. The best approach of a scientific community is to co-operate and
draw on the best research available, so that historical Jesus scholars depend on the rigorous work being done on Q by Q scholars.

Of course, epistemological optimism is no guarantee of a particular conclusion about the Q hypothesis. The hypothesis must still be shown to be the best way to account for the relevant data. As Kloppenborg has argued, the consensus around Q is based on a widespread recognition of the document Q as having literary qualities which could not have been extracted using a mechanical method unless the Q hypothesis held. The rebuttal which Goodacre makes when he anticipates this argument is that “The distinctiveness of Q as it is reconstructed from Matthew and Luke is a function of the way in which it is reconstructed.” In other words, the double tradition material’s literary distinctiveness can be accounted for by the way that it represents only those portions of Matthew’s addition to Mark that were pleasing to Luke, so that Q = (Matthew minus Mark) divided by “Luke pleasingness.” For instance, one of the most widely accepted conclusions of the two document hypothesis is that Luke's version of the first beatitude, “blessed are the poor” is more original than Matthew’s “blessed are the poor in spirit” because Matthew ‘spiritualised’ Q’s original. Goodacre is correct in pointing out that this change is just as well explained by Luke’s own preference for the ‘poor’, which would have made Matthew’s phrase ‘in spirit’ displeasing to him. However, as I shall argue below, this criterion of Luke-pleasingness is not an adequate explanation of all the double-tradition material’s literary characteristics. I do not intend to offer an original argument for the existence of Q, but I will

---

16 Goodacre, 74-5.
17 Ibid., 69.
summarise the most up to date reasons for accepting the Q hypothesis before going on to reconstruct a picture of Q, and its tendency and role within the history of Luke’s gospel.

Verifying Q

The source-critical theory of Farrer-Goulder, which explains the origin of the double tradition by Luke’s use of Matthew, has recently been reinvigorated by Goodacre. If true, this hypothesis would make the Proto-Luke hypothesis logically untenable. If the double-tradition material was copied by Luke out of Matthew as Goodacre suggests, then Luke found it there already combined with Markan material. This is directly counterposed to PLH which claims that Luke edited the material before he encountered Mark.

Goodacre’s work arguing for the Farrer-Goulder theory is sizable, but on his website, he has summarised the ‘top ten’ reasons for rejecting the Q hypothesis. These ten reasons are an apt summary of the content of his argument against Q in his scholarly work, so I will address his arguments under these ten headings:

1. No-one has ever seen Q
2. No-one had ever heard of Q

These first two reasons relate to Goodacre’s principled scepticism, which has been discussed above, and the response is simply that the Q theory is based on extrapolation from data in Matthew and Luke, rather than direct observation. What we have seen and heard of are the texts of Luke and Matthew from which we are able to ascertain information about their common source.

3. Narrative Sequence in Q

The third reason is that Q’s narrative content makes it generically different to the Gospel of Thomas, which Goodacre argues removes the only example of another gospel written in the same genre as Q. This argument has been discussed by Delbert Burkett who points out that genres are not watertight categories, but rather are a continuum of texts with similarities and differences.19

4. Occam’s Razor

While scientific method prefers the simplest explanation which accounts for all the data, it does not employ simplistic explanations. Goodacre’s appeal to the Razor is similar to the method by which William Farmer has argued for the Griesbach hypothesis (that Mark wrote a short compilation of Matthew and Luke). The preference for a simpler account of gospel origins functions to exclude a priori any hypothesis which refers to documentary sources, which is to beg the question. The flaw in reasoning becomes more explicit when Farmer states the argument in detail. He states:

The reason for this procedure is not that the simplest explanation is necessarily the correct one, but that it is methodologically wrong to multiply hypothetical possibilities unnecessarily. There is nothing wrong in hypothecating the existence of an otherwise unknown source or sources, if there exists evidence that is best explained thereby; but, for the sake of economy this is not to be done without good reason. This is not an infallible rule, but it is accepted procedure in literary criticism as well as in other disciplines, and one that commends itself by the results achieved when it is followed, compared to those achieved when it is ignored.20

There are a few problems with Farmer’s appeal to the razor here. The purpose of the Razor is not just to explain phenomena simply, but to explain all phenomena in the simplest way.

19 Burkett, 8-9.
And yet, if a more complex theory can account for more data, it remains preferable. And yet, Luke himself speaks of his use of many sources, which he has set out in an orderly account (Luke 1:1-3), and the way the synoptics are built out of small self-contained stories and sayings implies that those stories have a pre-history. Further, these sayings and stories appear in many non-canonical gospels, such as Peter and Thomas. In other words, the use of multiple sources by the gospels is a phenomenon itself which must be explained, and so cannot be ruled out by the Razor. In fact, the central principle of the Razor (i.e. all phenomena accounted for simply) seems to weigh against Farmer’s and Goodacre’s models because they only account for canonical sources, and ignore the existence of other data.

5. Major Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark
6. Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark
7. Minor Agreements in the Passion Narrative

I will deal with these fairly similar arguments together. There are a number of different explanations for these overlaps. The major agreements are few in number, and easily explainable by Mark-Q overlaps, which should not seem unlikely. Goodacre focuses particularly on the parable of the mustard seed and the preaching of John in Mark 1:7-8, where Matthew and Luke edit Mark in similar ways. However, Burkett responds to Goodacre by pointing out that in most substantial Mark-Q overlaps, such as the unforgivable sin (Mark 2:28-29 and parallels), and the Beelzebub controversy (Mk 3:22-30 and parallels), Luke only includes the sentences which Matthew has added to Mark, while also omitting the Markan material to which Matthew added it. This could easily be explained by the Q hypothesis if Luke if following Q, and Matthew is conflating Q and Mark. It is difficult to
understand why, according the Goodacre’s account, Luke would remove the Markan material from the material he adopts from Matthew.\textsuperscript{21}

If Burkett is right, then it is fairly easy to account for the case of Mark 1:7-8 as a verse which either overlapped with Q, or which Matthew and Luke both conflated with Q, because the Mark and Q sections were describing the same event. If we accept the Proto-Luke hypothesis, the first option should be preferred because the Lukan parallel was redacted before the redactor encountered Mark, but whichever option is taken, nothing about Mark 1:7-8 precludes the Q hypothesis.

More minor agreements can be explained by oral tradition, by obvious corrections to Mark’s idiosyncratic and perhaps clumsy Greek usage, or failing that, by reference to a Proto-Mark which Matthew and Luke were drawing on. None of these explanations are inherently unlikely, so they don’t seem to pose a major problem to the Q hypothesis.

8. The Phenomenon of Fatigue

Goodacre has used Michael Goulder’s term ‘fatigue’ to open up a new argument against the Q hypothesis. Fatigue is defined by Goodacre as the process in which

\begin{quote}
[i]n telling the same story as his predecessor, a writer makes changes in the early stages which he is unable to sustain throughout. Like continuity errors in film and television, examples of fatigue will be unconscious mistakes, small errors of detail which naturally arise in the course of constructing a narrative. They are interesting because they can betray an author’s hand, most particularly in revealing to us the identity of his sources.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

Goodacre argues that in six instances, Luke shows fatigue in editing the double tradition whereas Matthew never does. However, even if we were to admit that this shows Matthew

\textsuperscript{21} Burkett, 7-8.
is original (rather than just more careful), Burkett has shown that in four or five of those instances, the inconsistency can be explained simply by conflation of sources. For instance, in the mission instruction Luke 9:4-5, Luke changes from entering a house, to entering a city. The use of the word ‘city’ is double tradition (=Matt 10:11-14), but ‘house’ is not unique to Luke’s stylistic preferences. It is also found in Mark’s mission instruction in Mark 6:10-11.23

Recently, Paul Foster has pointed out an instance of editorial fatigue in Matthew’s handling of the double tradition, when in Matthew 12:28 = Luke 11:20 (the Beelzebub controversy), Matthew slips from his normal habit of changing “Kingdom of Heaven” for “Kingdom of God”.24 According to Goodacre’s presuppositions, this should establish that Matthew is using a source for the double tradition, and since that source is the same as Luke’s, it may be called Q. However, the number of actual instances being so small, (one in Matthew, one or two in Luke), it seems impossible to draw any conclusions from this phenomenon alone.

9. The Legacy of Scissors-and-Paste Scholarship

These criticisms reflect Goodacre’s preference for Narrative over Redaction criticism, and while he places them last, they are key to his argument because it is these issues which engage imaginatively with the text, and rely on a certain reconstruction of the final form of Luke to prove Goodacre’s point. He suggests that, unlike with ‘scissors-and-paste’ (clumsy and insensitive) redaction critical arguments for the two-source hypothesis, the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis allows people to recognise that Luke is an artistic literary creation, as he explains,

---

23 Burkett, 217-20.
24 Paul Foster, “Is it Possible to Dispense with Q?” *Novum Testamentum* 45 (2003), 313-37.
...adherents of the Farrer theory, in denying themselves the expedient of the Q hypothesis for accounting for every peculiarity in Luke’s order, are inevitably more inclined to look to Luke’s literary skill as a means of explaining the narrative development of his gospel. It is simply that the admittedly large scale reworking of Matthew that is demanded by the Farrer theory places Luke’s literary creativity and narrative agenda into sharper relief.  

However, the use of ‘scissors and paste’ as a negative image of scholarship to be avoided seems like an unfair criticism when this image is based on the huge amount of verbatim agreements that are found in the synoptic gospels, in the double and triple tradition material, which implies that exact copying did take place! The best interpretation of Luke will be given not by an over-estimation of his creative freedom any more than an underestimation, but the one that most accurately represents his editing process, in which case, Redaction criticism is a perfectly appropriate tool, whenever Luke can be shown to be editing a pre-existing text.

One proponent of the Farrer/Goulder hypothesis who emphasises this final argument is Eric Franklin. Franklin’s work is significant because he writes with an attention to redaction-critical data, and demonstrates in considerable detail how well the thesis of Luke’s wide editorial freedom is reflected by the evidence, and I will argue now in some detail that in spite of Franklin’s best efforts his thesis fails because the hypothetical editorial freedom is consistently better explained by Luke negotiating between his various sources as a conservative editor.

Franklin’s main argument is that Luke uses wide editorial freedom in reworking his sources, reworking Mark’s text to write a gospel with Pauline influence, which was deliberately critical of Matthew. He attempts to verify the Farrer/Goulder hypothesis by explaining the

---

redaction history of individual pericopes with reference to this motivation. This is a departure from the traditional understanding of Luke a conservative and respectful user of his sources, who doesn’t conflate or change the order of his sources as readily as say, Matthew.

Franklin has devoted a great deal of space to the Galilean ministry section, which he believes is Luke reworking Mark. He argues that this demonstrates that Luke is a creative editor who uses wide editorial freedom. His primary argument for this ‘wide editorial freedom’ is his reading of the Rejection at Nazareth pericope, for instance, in Luke’s redaction of Mark 1:14-15 (=Luke 4:14-15). Franklin claims that by changing the phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ into a report, ‘φήμη’, Luke is turning “its future thrust into a justification of the nature and significance of Jesus’ ministry so as to make that ministry witness to reality of the future act of God to which it points.”26 Admittedly, Franklin can give an imaginative account of how Luke edited Mark – but the editing can easily be conceived of in the reverse order. It is very easy to imagine Mark taking a matter-of-fact phrase like καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ’ ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ, and transforming it into the succinct, theologically loaded κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, and that he capitalises on the value of the statement by introducing the theme of his gospel: πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἡ γυνικὲς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. I do not mean to suggest that this is what actually happened, because it seems more likely to me that the verses were conceived of independently. I am simply pointing out that Franklin’s method of imagining theological motivations for phenomena has little evidentiary value if it can be easily replicated in the other direction.

Franklin then argues that Luke places a justificatory speech in Jesus’ mouth (presumably Luke 4:23-27) as an editorial decision which reflects his “overriding concern with the Jewish rejection.” He is right that Luke is being creative and original at this point, but the creativity is in his historiography and narrative craftsmanship, and that does nothing to demonstrate that Luke is creative specifically in the way that he adapts his sources. David Aune has outlined the significance of speeches in ancient historiography, and their significance to Luke, as well as the structural importance of the rejection in Luke’s whole narrative. The speech of Jesus in the synagogue stands alongside Mary’s Magnificat (1:46-56), Peter’s speech at Pentecost (Acts 2:14-36) and Paul’s speech in the Areopagus (Acts 17:22-31). Luke 4:23-27 is Jesus’ first speech, and as such, a decisive introduction of several thematic aspects of Jesus’ kerygma in Luke, including concern for the outsider, the Jewish rejection, and the miracles of Elijah. Luke uses speeches as structural devices at crucial junctures in his narrative, but this process is never undertaken at the expense of his careful preservation of his source material (Luke 1:1-3).

While Franklin has emphasised the Galilean ministry as a section in which Luke’s editorial freedom is particularly visible, he also observes it in the narrative flow of the whole gospel, and this specific claim I shall deal with now. For instance, Franklin claims that Luke repositions and rewrites the call of the disciples by taking Mk 1:16-20 = Matt 4:18-22, and placing it at Luke 5:1-11; the parable of the mustard seed, which is removed from the section Mark 4:30-32 from its equivalent place in Luke 8:4-25 and placed later in Luke’s gospel at Luke 13:18-19; and also the woman with the ointment (Luke 7:36-50), supposedly taken from Matt 26:6-13 = Mk 14:3-9. In each of these cases, there is almost no verbal

27 Ibid.
parallel, only similarity in content. These are totally atypical of the triple tradition since, when Luke’s order matches Mark’s, he also has a high percentage of verbal parallel with Mark. While Franklin sees each case as Luke editing Markan material, in all three cases, the section is possibly proto-Lukan and can be explained just as easily as a Markan reworking of Proto-Luke, or both authors having the story from a different tradition.

In Franklin’s account, the call of Peter in Luke 5:1-11 emphasises the person of Peter because of the distinctive role he will play in Acts. The insight Peter has into his own sinfulness, Franklin claims, is introduced here so it may be transferred to Paul at his Damascus Road experience. As evidence that Peter’s call is a reworking of Mark 1:16-20, Franklin points out that in Luke 5:10, the names of James and John sons of Zebedee are introduced for no real purpose. It could easily be granted that verse 10a (and possibly b) were added to the story after Luke encountered Mark, since verse 9 flows on to verse 10b or 11 smoothly, and verse 10a summarises Mark 1:16-20 concisely. However, when one compares the only parallel verse in Luke and Mark, i.e. the dominical saying in Mark 1:17 = Luke 5:10b, it is difficult to imagine Luke simply weakening the concrete metaphor of ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπων to the more abstract, periphrastic participle form ἀνθρώπους εἴη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς γραφῆς for no reason. The verb ἡμέρα τῆς γραφῆς, which in Classical Greek is a hunting term for catching and trapping animals, and is hardly a poetic way to describe Jesus’ mission. To suggest that Luke deliberately replaced the Markan noun for a fisherman (ἀλιεύς) with it does not flatter Luke’s artistic abilities in the way that Goodacre and Franklin intend. Perhaps both Mark and Luke have access to the saying. The similar placement of the saying by both evangelists can be explained by its specific function as a call of fishermen, which could only be placed at the beginning of a gospel when the first
disciples were called from their nets. It follows that Mark characteristically intensified the language into his own vibrant style. Luke, conservative in his use of sources and tradition, has preferred an earlier version, and in his final edition he has added v. 10a out of deference to his source Mark. This is hardly the action of a highly creative editor.

Franklin claims that Luke removes the parable of the mustard seed from Mark 4:30-32 (=Luke 8:4-25), because it is thematically inappropriate there for Luke, who does not intend to use the parable to illustrate that the kingdom is hidden, but to illustrate the hearing of the word of God in the present reality of Jesus’ time. Therefore, Luke changes Mark’s positioning of this pericope from among other parables, to immediately after a healing story (Luke 13:10-17), and changes the present tense of Mark 4:32’s ἀναβάει καὶ γίνεται μεῖζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων to the aorist καὶ ἔγενε τοῖς δένδροι to emphasise the present reality of the kingdom.

The Q hypothesis instead maintains that this is simply an overlap of material in Mark and Q. Franklin’s account of Luke’s editorial work is the weaker option here because it overlooks a vast amount of data, which cannot be explained if Luke is using Mark as his source for the pericope. Out of the 40 Greek words in Luke 13:18-19, only 10 words are identical to Mark’s, and another 4 are declined slightly differently, making verbal parallel of 10-14/40 (between 25 and 35%). But 24 of Luke’s words are identical to Matthew, and 1 more is quoted in a different declension, which is a verbal parallel of 24-25/40, or over 60%. Furthermore, of the parallels which occur within the quotation from Daniel 4:21 in Luke 13:19 (=Mk 4:32, Matt 13:32), Luke only agrees with Mark where he also agrees with LXX, i.e. in the short phrase τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, (which incidentally, accounts for 4 out of the 10 parallel words, leaving only 6/40 or 15%). By contrast, Luke and Matthew are almost
identical in this quotation, with the word καὶ being found later in the sentence in Matthew, and another word being parsed differently (Matt: κατεσκηνοῦν = Luke: κατεσκήνωσεν), Luke again using the aorist to agree with the aorist earlier in v 19. Unlike Mark, their agreement extends beyond incidental agreements with the LXX.

Finally, both Matthew and Luke follow the parable of the mustard seed with the parable of the Leaven, which Mark omits. Proponents of the two-source hypothesis have struggled to explain this pericope, usually resorting to the conclusion that Mark and Q overlap here (i.e., they have a common source). Either Luke and Matthew are both following Q their translation, or Luke has Matthew, or Matthew has Luke (perhaps in an earlier form). Whether that is the case, or if Luke has Matthew, or Matthew Proto-Luke, there is no reason to think that Luke had Mark before him at all when he was writing this section. In it, there is no material from Mark which is not better explained by his use of Q. Once this is acknowledged, it is simple to explain why Luke lacks the parable in its Markan context: he already had it in a more developed form elsewhere in his gospel when he found it in Mark, so he omitted it.
11. The term ἁζαρα in Luke 4:16

While this is not listed as one of Goodacre’s top ten arguments, it is still sometimes asserted that Luke 4:16 uses an unusual spelling of Nazareth (ἁζαρα) which he must have taken from Matthew’s spelling of the town’s name just as Jesus is leaving Nazareth (Mt 4:13). Q sceptics have argued that the presence of this, and similar instances of Matthean vocabulary in Luke indicate that Luke must have had access to Matthew.29 This argument is strained because it so clearly begs the question of the existence of Q, which could be the original source of this spelling. *The Critical Edition of Q* postulates a Q 4:16 that simply reads: ‘<…> ἁζαρα <…>’,30 indicating that nothing can be reconstructed of this verse except for the fact that it contained ‘ἁζαρα’, and that one or both of Matthew and Luke emended the passage before and after the word. The Q explanation commends itself over Franklin’s because of the possibility that Luke has alongside the single word, some of the Q material that Matthew has omitted. If this is the case, then we do not have to imagine the unlikely situation in which Luke would just copy a single word from his source (Matthew or Q), and decline to use the rest of the material in the pericope, and then never use the unique spelling again.

Assessment of the Q Hypothesis

This portrayal of Luke by Goodacre and Franklin as exercising wide editorial freedom does not hold. On the basis of this consideration, as well as the firm refutation of Goodacre’s quantitative arguments by Burkett, it is still possible to reassert Streeter’s basic case for Q as

a convincing argument, namely, that Luke and Matthew, after the temptation narrative, never insert the double tradition material into Mark at the same place, and that Matthew and Luke alternate in providing the most original form of any given saying. These two phenomena remain the most convincing arguments for the high probability of the Q hypothesis over any other.

**Recognising Q**

*Ask a child why, among many women, he calls this particular one his mother, and all he will be able to say will be only a repetition and affirmation of the very thesis for which he has been asked the reason: “But this is my mother.” That she is his mother is for this child the situation beyond all uncertainty.*

~ Karl Barth

As this quote from Karl Barth implies, the recognition of one human being by another is a different kind of knowledge than that attained through rational means, but is nevertheless a valid form of reasoning, and the recognition of human elements in the double tradition, such as social context and literary form are therefore strong arguments for Q, when they are given in the context of the above reaffirmation of Streeter’s more quantitative argument for the Q hypothesis.

As outlined above, the move from source and form criticism to redaction criticism represents more than a mere scholarly interest in or focus on compositional techniques, it also represents a quantum leap from the quantitative probability provided by arguments such as those of Streeter and Goodacre provided above to the certainty with which one

---


32 A more detailed discussion and many other arguments can be found in chapter 2 of Burkett’s book.

assumes one is dealing with an intelligible author, because one has recognised the face of the author in the text. Once the data have been analysed, Luke’s and Q’s existence can be ‘recognised’ in the human aspect of the work’s literary integrity. When mechanically reconstructed from Matthew and Luke, Q shows evidence of a genre, or of a central literary theme. I will therefore proceed assuming that the Q hypothesis is sound, but without making assumptions about its exact form. In doing this, I will rely mainly on the work of recent redactional, literary and social scientific studies of Q.

Ivan Havener has argued convincingly for the Q community’s North Galilean or Western Syrian location from a number of factors: their remembrance of Jesus’ initial ministry in the Galilee, and preservation of primarily sayings material from that time; the majority of North Galilean and Syrian cities mentioned in Q such as Tyre, Sidon, Capernaum and Nazareth; its similarity to other Syrian documents such as the Didache, Testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs; the prevalence of pro-Peter rhetoric in Syrian Christian literature; and the strong likelihood that both Matthew and Luke had connections with Syria.\textsuperscript{34} The genre of Q has been identified by James M. Robinson as a ‘sayings of the wise’ collection, comparable to the Pirke Aboth and the Testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs.\textsuperscript{35} Arland D. Jacobson has shown that the organising principle of all the different forms of material found in Q is the “Deuteronomistic sketch of history” in which Q argues that Wisdom/Sophia sent two final prophets to this sinful generation, John and Jesus, and that final judgment was pronounced on Israel because it rejecting them. All the forms of tradition that are unique to Q

\textsuperscript{34} Ivan Havener, \textit{Q: The Sayings of Jesus} (Good News Studies 19; Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1987), 42-45.

(macarisms, woes, eschatological correlatives and prophetic threats) function to pronounce this judgment.\textsuperscript{36} Jacobson states,

> In its oldest form, the Deuteronomistic tradition was at home in Levitical circles. Later, the tradition was borne by the Hasidic movement which, in the first half of the second century B.C.E., united several groups to form a common front against Hellenization and the deteriorating religious conditions, especially in the priesthood and the urban population... Indeed, one may perhaps say that in Q we see the soil of the Hasidic movement still clinging to the roots of earliest Christianity.\textsuperscript{37}

Carlos J. Gil Arbiol has observed that Q material shows that a pattern of social deviation called ‘self-stigmatisation’ is able to explain the origin of certain sayings of Jesus, as well as the way the Q community received those traditions. In this model, a charismatic individual associates himself with a certain stigmatised position in order to re-evaluate it positively, and to create a valid social alternative. There are three stages involved in the process, including unmasking the strategies behind the stigma by a charismatic leader who identifies with and over-values the stigma, the creation and legitimisation of an alternative, and creating a plausible social structure which enables the stigmatisation to be turned around.\textsuperscript{38}

Gil Abriol proposes that Jesus’ sayings about hating one’s family in Q 14:26-27 are understood as the overvaluing of the stigma of homelessness, with which Jesus identifies in Q 9:58. By this action, Jesus exposed the control-function of the family unit over the individual. In the Q community, this social stigma was constructed into a mark of legitimacy within a social structure with a specific set of rules, endowed with legitimacy which extended from the original charismatic leader (Jesus), and placed Q 14:26 (rejection of family) together with Q 14:27 (taking up the cross), together with a third statement which


\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 385, 388.

spoke about life itself being turned upside-down (Q 17:33), as an expression of the completely inverted social universe within the Q community.

I have argued in an article on the historical Jesus’ sense of humour that Jesus had a creative and fluid way of speaking about the kingdom of God, and the Son of Man, but Q’s use of Deuteronomistic language shows that their theology and practice had begun to calcify through a process of self-stigmatisation into a literalism which used the practices of itinerant living and open commensality as a kind of exclusory halkhot. The Deuteronomistic material is a part of Israel’s history, but it is not being used here in a way that implies the empowering of peasants, but rather a religious system, which would empower the retaining class: the leaders within the Q community.

The process of calcification is observable not only in Q’s moral proscriptions, but also in its Christology. This tendency is best illustrated by Q’s use of Son of Man statements. Heinz Schürmann gives a list of ten such statements used in Q. I present them as follows, translated from the Greek text of the Critical Edition of Q, with barnash used to translate ὁ ὑιός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in order to allow it to be read as generic, circumlocutional or titular, and also to draw attention to what the Q community was doing redactionally with Jesus’ original phrase:

1. Q 6:22:
   You are blessed when they insult you and [[persecute]] you and [[say all]] evil [[against]] you because of barnash.

2. Q 7:33-34

---

For John came, neither eating nor drinking, and you say ‘He has a demon’. *Barnash* came eating and drinking and you say, ‘Look! A person who is a glutton and drunk, a friend of custom-officers and sinners.

3. Q 9:57-58

And a certain person said to him, ‘I shall follow you wherever you may go.’” And Jesus said to him, “Foxes have lairs and the birds of the sky have homes, but *barnash* does not have anywhere to lay one’s head.”

4. Q 11:30

For as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so [[also]] will *barnash* be to this generation.

5. Q 12:8

Each person who [[may]] acknowledge me before people, [[*barnash*]] will acknowledge before the angels of ..

6. Q 12:10

And whoever may speak a word against *barnash* will be forgiven, but whoever may speak a word against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven.

7. Matt 10:23 (?)

And when they persecute you in this city, run to another; for truly I tell you, you will not finish the cities of Israel until *barnash* comes.

8. Q 12:40

And you be ready, for *barnash* will come at an hour you do not imagine.

9. Q 17:24

For just as the lightening goes out from the east and flashes as far as the west, so shall *barnash* be [[on his day]].

10. Q 17:26-27, 28-30

Just as it happened in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the day <> of *barnash* [[for just as they were in those days]] eating and drinking, marrying and being married, until the day Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and took everyone.
Harry Fleddermann has proposed that these passages show a two-stage Son of Man christology, in which the earthly Son of Man came to inaugurate the kingdom, and the eschatological Son of Man will come to manifest the kingdom definitively. Fledderman suggests that sayings 1-4 relate to the earthly Son of Man, and that sayings 6-10 relate to the future Son of Man. It seems more likely, however, that saying 4 is functioning as a hinge in this context. It compares what Jonah was to what the Son of Man will be (future tense) when he comes, and that future coming is imminent, since it will be a sign to this generation. Sayings 1-4 are this-worldly, and 4-10 are titular in their use of barnash. Only 4 is both.

Fleddermann’s proposal makes better sense of the data here. In sayings 1-3, barnash can be translated as a first personal pronoun. It makes sense to say “they say evil against you because of me”, or “I (in contrast to John) came eating and drinking” or “I have nowhere to lay my head.” But starting with the fourth saying, Q’s circumlocutional sayings also begin to function in the titular sense (or at very least, they are all able to function as titular). Q creates this titular function in order to evoke its two-stage Son of Man Christology.

Sayings 4-10 are titular and make best sense as apocalyptic. However, they can be read just as easily as circumlocutional, or as references to somebody else. If they were taken in isolation, it would seem obvious that they were not circumlocutional at all, but a reference to Daniel 7:13, and the establishment of the fifth kingdom. However, in the context of sayings 1-3, in which Q’s two-stage Christology has already established, these apocalyptic sayings take on a circumlocution gloss which presents Jesus as the apocalyptic Son of Man.

---

42 Although unlike Schürmann, he excludes Matt 10:23 and counts Q 17:27 and 30 as separate Q sayings, rather than a Lukan doublet.
Both groups of sayings seem to have a degree of ambiguity about them, when read in their original context of an itinerant Jewish rabbi. Sayings 1-3 ask the reader to make a decision whether they are titular as well as circumlocutional, and 4-10 each ask the reader to make a decision whether they are circumlocutional at all. It is the tendency of Q to resolve this ambiguity by its redactional choices.

Q’s tendency comes unravelled in the third saying. This belongs to the set of sayings that evoke the first-stage of Q’s Christology, by transforming circumlocutional sayings into titular sayings. This works in the case of sayings 1 and 2, because they are not generic. To “say evil against you because of people” or that “people came eating and drinking” in contrast to John are nonsensical uses of the phrase. Saying 3 is able to function generically on its own, but in its Q context it is circumlocutional and titular: Jesus is saying that he, the Son of Man, practices itinerant ministry. Q’s editorial efforts are undone by the Aramaic substratum, which Casey reconstructs using ūľ bar nasha for ‘but the Son of man’, and ūľ çipprê for ‘and the birds.’

When this saying is read in its original language, and outside of its Q context, the most obvious contrast here is between different kinds of animals and humans. Read with a little more suspicion, it is possible to see the social stratification of ancient Galilee encoded into this proverb, with the jackals representing the ruling class and ‘Herod the fox’, and the birds (çpr) being a play on the name Sepphoris, and so representing the city dwellers. This saying in its original context is best interpreted as a criticism of social

---


injustice cleverly disguised as a quaint contrast between *bar nasha* (meaning people) and the animals. Q has transformed it from subversive social commentary to halakhic social boundary marker.

Using this saying, and a number of other ‘anti-social’ sayings such as Q 14:26 (hating father and mother) and Q 6:22-23 (rejoice when people hate you), Havener has used a process of ‘mirror reading’ to postulate an image of the Q community as a community in which anti-social sayings survived because people identified with or were touched by anti-social ideas. Havener describes the community as “an audience that stood on the fringe of its society,” with the following characteristics:

> From a survey of the Q sayings we can define this early audience as early Christian itinerant prophets, charismatics, who were homeless, unpropertied, and who considered themselves to be loyal followers of Jesus, adopting his mobile manner of life and accepting his words that leant support to it.\(^45\)

When this character of the Q community is compared to the original message of Jesus, it becomes clear that the Q community had a tendency to take the playfulness out of Jesus’ subversive language, and create *halkhot* which defined the Q community, and literalise Jesus’ counter-cultural way of living which is interpreted as a requirement of the kingdom, rather than a creative possibility for subversion and social empowerment. Arbiol explained this tendency of Q using a ‘self-stigmatisation’ model. By transforming Jesus’ ambiguous language into self-referential *titles*, and thus authority, the community is able to give a legitimacy to the rules that their original charismatic leader created. It is precisely in the task of creating this structure that the Q community was engaged. The community sought to resolve ambiguities in Jesus’ teaching, even though those ambiguities were essential to

---

\(^45\) Havener, Q, 94.
the way that Jesus’ message functioned. They crafted that ambiguity into a Christology with two specific stages, and separated the “earthly” from the “heavenly” sayings in order to create a rational and structured Christology for their community. History testifies that this Christology failed to be embraced by future generations, and the values of that community have were lost. They have only been preserved by Matthew and Luke, both of which have a more universal vision of the scope of Jesus’ message. It is because of the tendency of Proto-Luke and then Luke, at the various stages of Luke’s redaction, were willing to adapt Jesus’ playful language to a different cultural milieu that Q’s witness was able to survive in this form, and in this conclusion we find the key to the redactional intent of Luke, at the various stages of its development.

**Conclusion**

When reconstructions of the historical Jesus and Q are contrasted with each other, a reconstruction of the origins of Luke’s gospel begins to emerge. It becomes clear that between the time of Jesus’ death and the composition of the gospel Q, Jesus’ message had begun to become rigid and inflexible within the context of the Q community. This is best understood as a social process of self-stigmatization, which was enacted by the creation of both community halkoth, and Christological titles. But this is only one part of the story of what was happening in first century Palestinian communities who remembered Jesus’ message. Luke combined this Q material with another body of tradition, and for this ‘other side of the story’, we must turn to Luke’s less recognised source, L.

L, however, is a special case because it there is no body of literature on L, or even a commonly accepted definition of the term ‘L’. The epistemological arc through which Q was reconstructed was short, moving directly from a summary of known data to a
reconstruction. L will require a longer arc, looking through various literature on Lukan parables and the so-called ‘travel narrative’, seeking out a body of data, and seeing if there is a way to unify these diverse studies into a single hypothesis.
CHAPTER 3
Reconstructing the Sources Part 2
The Jesus of the L Document

The contrast is stark and total: this passionate man set in the midst of numbed Jerusalem. And only the passion can finally penetrate the numbness.

~ Walter Brueggemann, The Prophetic Imagination p. 91

For every one pupil who needs to be guarded from a weak excess of sensibility there are three who need to be awakened from the slumber of cold vulgarity. The task of the modern educator is not to cut down jungles but to irrigate deserts.

~ C. S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man p. 13-14
So far, I have argued for the accuracy of the Q hypothesis, and this will be a necessary presupposition of my reconstruction of the L source. After the Q material is extracted from the non-Markan portions of Luke, there remains a small body of tradition that is unique to Luke, sometimes designated L, special Luke ($S^l$) or by one of the German terms Sondergut or (with special reference to it being a documentary source) Sonderquelle. In the absence of any clear consensus on these definitions, I will use the letter L to designate the single source of the majority of the tradition, and $S^l$ to refer to all the material that is unique to Luke regardless of its origin in tradition or redaction.

$S^l$ includes some of Luke’s most distinctive material: the Nativity, the Magnificat, the Good Samaritan, the Pharisee and the Tax Collector, and the Lost Son and the Road to Emmaus are among it. When Gerd Petzke took a small survey of religious education students in years 10-12, asking them to name up to ten biblical stories from memory, he found that 29% of the 638 responses were stories from $S^l$ material, even though it represents only some 6% of the New Testament, let alone the whole Bible.

This unique and compelling ability of $S^l$ to resonate with its readers is not a recent or culturally specific phenomenon. Petzke has shown that, with the singular exception of the crucifixion under Pontius Pilate (which is from the synoptic passion), the Christological portion of the Apostle’s creed does not include any material that is not $S^l$ tradition, and that most of the Christology of the Creed is either unique to $S^l$ (the ascension), unique to $S^l$ and M (the conception by the Holy Spirit and Virgin Birth), or specially emphasised in $S^l$ (the resurrection on the third day). In fact, $S^l$
may be said to have been the decisive source material organising the material that came to be binding in the historicisation of the Christian Faith.¹ It would be reasonable to think that such a distinctive body of tradition has a history, explaining these properties, but in fact, it has not been given a significant place in the source history of the synoptic gospels, and there is no widely accepted theory accounting for its origin. A well stocked theological library would be expected to have up to a shelf of books on Q, but may not have a single book about Slk or L.

One valid reason for this omission is that, unlike Q, which was used by two different gospels, Luke’s L source is not referred to in any other extant document. Therefore, it is not immediately clear what to use as a control in the process of identifying the source. I want to propose such a control mechanism, namely, I think that L can be identified in the same way that Archimedes of Syracuse quantified the value of π, by identifying maximal and minimal limits and then, if the values are close enough, simply ‘splitting the difference’. In his On the Measurement of a Circle, Archimedes of Syracuse rigorously estimated the quantity of π by proposing maximal and minimal estimates. The estimates were created by circumscribing and inscribing 96-sided polygons inside and outside the circle. Because the circle must be between the sizes of the two polygons, Archimedes showed that $3 \frac{10}{71} < \pi < 3 \frac{1}{7}$.

L, like π, is an unknown quantity. As I will show in this chapter, Gerd Petzke and Kim Paffenroth have circumscribed an outer or maximal limit by eliminating the infancy narrative, passion and resurrection accounts, Markan, Q and R material. Other

¹ Gerd Petzke, Das Sondergut des Evangelium nach Lukas. (Zurcher Werkkomentare zur Bibel; Zurich: Theologische Verlag, 1990), 229.
scholars such as Kenneth Bailey and Craig Blomberg have isolated a vestigial literary structure which (as I will show) is nested within $S^{lk}$ material. This vestigial structure inscribes a minimal limit. It is widely acknowledged that the central section of Luke contains a chiasm. As I shall demonstrate, this chiasm can be extended to the whole of documentary $L$, and can therefore function very usefully as such a control to determine the extent of document $L$, so that we can infer the following equation: chiasm $< L < S^{lk}$. To use a different metaphor, the literary chiasm is a skeletal structure which holds $L$ together and demonstrates the documentary nature of this source. The boundary markers of other sources such as Mark and the Infancy Narrative are the outer layer of clothing, which is quite easy to remove. Somewhere in what remains, between the skeleton and the inner garments is the skin: a boundary marker that separates tradition from redaction. It is in the process of comparing tradition and redaction that the editorial process (the skin) of $L$ and the further redaction of this material in the Gospel of Luke can be revealed.

**History of $L$ Research**

In the tiny literature that is available on this source, no scholarly consensus has emerged as to $L$’s oral or written, documentary or fragmentary, unitary or plural character. The existence of $L$ was first proposed by Bernard Weiss, who conceived of it as a written document, inclusive of all material unique to Luke.\(^2\) His arguments for this hypothesis are summarised by Kim Paffenroth as:

1. The stylistic difference between Luke 1:1-3 and the rest of Luke 1-2,

2. The Jewish-Christian Character of L

3. The sheer quantity of material contained in L\textsuperscript{3}

As Paffenroth points out, Weiss’s first two arguments are weakened by the fact that they relate specifically to Luke 1-2, which has its own narrative unity, and a distinctively Jewish-Christian characteristic. The third argument, which would seem to relate to L material outside Luke 1-2, is weakened by the amount of different kinds of materials included in L. It seems reasonable to apply the rule which has generally been accepted in scholarly practice that the fewer genres present in a body of tradition, the more likely it is that they are a unified source.

Raymond Brown has shown that Luke’s infancy narrative has its own structural integrity, independently of the rest of Q, as a pair of diptyches which serve to contrast both John and Jesus, and the Old and New Testaments:

\textsuperscript{3} Kim Paffenroth, \textit{The story of Jesus according to L} (JSNTSup, 147: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 13-15.
Table 2.1

Diptych 1:

1:5-25: John’s birth foretold

1:26-38: Jesus’ birth foretold

OT meets NT, 1:39-56: (Mothers): MAGNIFICAT

Diptych 2:

1:57-80: John’s birth, BENEDICTUS

2:1-21: Jesus’ birth, GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

OT meets NT, :2:22-40 (prophets): NUNC DIMMITIS

Considering this structural and purposive unity alongside the disparity between the forms in the infancy narrative (songs and biographical material) and those in the rest of L (parables and sayings), and considering Luke 3:1-2, which as I shall argue below, seems to be a separate prologue, it seems safe to conclude that Weiss was wrong to include ch. 1-2 in the document L.

Two decades after Weiss’ original proposal, B. H. Streeter used L in his four-documentary hypothesis of synoptic origin. The account he gives is closely tied into his account of Proto-Luke, which I shall deal with in the following chapter. However, his contribution in the specific area of L may be considered separately. He improved on Weiss’ hypothesis by leaving the infancy narrative out of his L source. Since Streeter, most scholars have been able to simply assume that this was the right move, and in the absence of any strong argument against Streeter’s conclusion, it

——

seems best to follow him too, while leaving open the possibility that the infancy may have an interesting documentary history of its own.

However, Streeter did follow Weiss in concluding that the bulk of $S^{LK}$ material comes from a unified documentary source (L). He suggested that “Luke during the two years he was at Caesarea in the company of Paul made good use of his opportunities of collecting information and made copious notes.”\textsuperscript{5} The only evidence Streeter can offer for this hypothesis is that it coincides with the time-line of Acts. Writing at a time when Harnack had briefly revived belief in the (now largely rejected) authorship of the third gospel by ‘St. Luke the physician’, and at a time when it was common practice to use Acts as the primary source for the history of early Christianity, which is also now considered a methodological mistake, Streeter was able to make a very specific historical reconstruction sound plausible, even though it now seems highly dubious.

Even if such a context were granted, Hugh Montefiore has pointed out in 1961 that the story cannot ‘hold water’, since the document could not have survived the shipwreck at Malta.\textsuperscript{6} It could still be objected that, given Streeter’s theory, a copy of the ‘L’ Gospel may have been maintained at the church in Caesarea. However, in either case, Montefiore is not so much dismissing the existence of L itself as the oddly specific details which Streeter and Taylor postulated for its composition. It is best to leave the exact correlation between L’s composition and the history of Acts alone, and deal with the source as a hypothesis about the source history of Luke.

\textsuperscript{5} Streeter, \textit{Four Gospels}, 218.

Even after the defense of L in Streeter, the document has been treated as an unknown quantity in biblical commentaries, in that there is no significant historical critical commentary which treats L with any confidence and consistency. For instance, Joseph Fitzmyer’s magisterial commentary of 1981 speaks of it enigmatically as a source, but “not in any real sense”, and suggests it cannot be known whether it was oral or written. This caution has been justified, because without any control document, the hypothesis could not be upheld merely by the evidence of source-critical methods.

**Arguments for a Documentary L Source**

*The Enduring Problem of the Central Section’s Origin*

One of the most vexing problems Lukan scholars face is how to account for the central section (Luke 9:51-18:14), which contains the highest concentration of L material, and suffers from a strange inconsistency between form and content – or between the author’s intention and the material used. In his book *Lord of the Banquet*, David Moessner has outlined three specific areas of disparity:

1. Discrepancy between the ‘journey indicators’ and the topography of Israel

The central section is littered with references to a journey. Moessner specifically lists 9:51, 52-53, 56, 57; 10:1, 17, 38; 13:22, 31-33; 14:25; 17:11; 18:31, 35; 19:1, 11, 28, 41. The majority of these references are redaction (but the references from ch. 18 are taken from Mark) and in the traditional material, Jesus never goes anywhere.

---

At the beginning of the journey (9:51) the narrator claims that Jesus sets out for Jerusalem through Samaria, and yet for most of the travel narrative, Jesus is clearly in Galilee. The impression is given, Moessner suggests, that journey indicators “congeal an apparent ‘characterless mass’ into a continuous, coherent journey”.

2. Discrepancy between the journey motif and the traditions

The individual pericopes within the section, such as teachings and parables, do not seem to bear any direct relevance to the journey.

3. Discrepancy the provenance and setting of the journey

The characters and the scenery never change, as one would expect them to on a journey. Jesus’ friends and disciples, the Pharisees, the crowd are always present, and Jesus is always in the same places: frequently at banquets, in the homes of his friends, and the homes of Pharisees.

According to Moessner, there have been four ways that scholars have attempted to account for this internal dissonance. Theological attempts to explain the journey include christological and ecclesiological explanations, such as the idea that the journey was the “Way of the Lord”, or an apologetic to give special status to the twelve and the seventy-two who accompanied him. These explanations account for the existence of a journey in Luke-Acts, but do not explain why the individual traditions seem so disconnected from the theological motif.

At the other end of the spectrum lay attempts to explain the origin of the traditions in a source (such as L), or in finding a literary structure for the journey, such as a chiasmus or (as Moessner himself suggests) in finding structural and theological similarities between the central section and the Deuteronomist picture of Moses as a prophet.

Moessner’s Deuteronomistic account of the travel narrative makes better sense of the travel narrative in its final redacted form within the narrative of Luke-Acts. However, it offers no explanation of why the Markan material is so absent from the vast majority of this section, or why there is a block of Mark inserted at 18:15-43. It also does not account for the fact that none of the L material contains *explicit* Deuteronomistic theology, but that it can appear so when juxtaposed with the clearly Deuteronomistic Q. In other words, to call the central section Deuteronomistic is to read L though the lens of Q, but this does not allow the source to speak in its own voice.

Since theological and literary accounts of the purpose of the central section are so unconvincing, it is necessary to look to Luke’s sources to account for this disparity. It was only in 1990, well after the advent of redaction criticism, that Petzke was able to put forward a solid methodological approach to speaking about L which would allow concrete conclusions to be drawn.
Gerd Petzke

Petzke has written a commentary on \( S^{lk} \), which employs an epistemological pessimism about documentary L. He therefore treats all \( S^{lk} \) including infancy, passion and resurrection accounts together with redactional material. From this overview, he draws cautious conclusions about the character of the material as a whole. Petzke argues for his method from the claims which the Endredaktor makes about his own redactional activity in the prologue of Luke 1:1-2, and suggests that if we deal with self-contained pericopes that are unique to Luke (excluding from the outset brief redactional notes in pericopes from other sources), and in those units separating tradition (defined as “vorgegebene Überlieferung”), from redaction (“Bearbeitung durch den Verfasser”) then in the process we will be able to identify the scope and clarify the concept of the Sondergut.\(^9\) One reviewer has cleverly characterised Petzke’s work as a “glimpse into the evangelist's workshop”, which turned out to be more of a glimpse into Petzke’s workshop.\(^{10}\)

In spite of Petzke’s epistemological pessimism, he is able to draw a number of firm conclusions from his study. The most significant of these is his ability to categorise virtually all the material with only to two specific genres: (1) narrative ethics (narrative Ethik), which includes parables (Gleichnisse) and example narratives (Beispiel Erzählungen) and (2) mythic biographical narrative (mythisch-biographischen Erzählungen). Petzke claims that 40% of the Sondergut material is mythic-biographical, and that this is contained in the sections relating to the birth,

\(^9\) Petzke, Sondergut, 11, 15-19.
adolescence and death of Jesus, but there is also biographical material (mainly editorial statements), which are not always mythical, found throughout Luke. It is this mythic biographic material which eventually became the dominant tradition defining Orthodox Christology.

The remaining literature is classified by Petzke as ‘Narrative Ethics’, a generic category which he draws from Jewish scholar Schalom Ben-Chorin’s work on narrative ethics in rabbinic literature. This genre is able to account for a large amount of $S_{lk}$ literature, which would previously have been analysed as a variety of form-critical categories including sayings, parables and example stories. Narrative Ethic pericopes can be identified simply by the technique of inviting the reader to identify, positively or negatively, with one of Luke’s (characteristically vivid) characters, and then to respond according to the following pattern:

So handele ich (nicht), bzw. so soll ich (nicht) handeln.

So bin ich (nicht), bzw. so soll ich (nicht) sein.\textsuperscript{11}

Many of the most distinctive parables in $S_{lk}$ are unique in the synoptic tradition because they are able to function in this way, and do not function as similitudes of the Kingdom of God. Petzke offers numerous examples of $S_{lk}$ parables which can only be taken as narrative ethics. They include most of the key parables of Luke’s gospel: 10:30-37 (the Good Samaritan), 12:16-21 (the Rich Fool), 16:19-31 (the Rich Man and Lazarus) and 18:9-14 (The Pharisee and the Tax Collector).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Petzke, 217. Rough translation: I (do not) act like that, and I should (not) act like that. I am (not) like that, and I should (not) be like that.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 219.
While Petzke’s purpose of investigating the redactional process of \( S^k \), and his very blurry distinction between L, other sources (the infancy narrative etc.), and Lukan redaction stops short of doing any specific historical reconstruction on a source critical level, many of his observations prove highly useful in the task of reconstructing L, which in turn will be useful in reconstructing Proto-Luke. Several years after the work of Petzke, a full-scale reconstruction of L as a documentary and historically specific source was offered by Kim Paffenroth, which fills some of the holes in Petzke’s method.

*Kim Paffenroth*

Paffenroth argues, contrary to Petzke, that L (a *Sonderquelle*) is specifically distinguishable from Luke on the basis of both stylometric and thematic features in many sections of the *Sondergut*, but do not appear in Acts, or in Luke’s use of Markan and Q material. The six stylistic criteria Paffenroth lists include (1) a high occurrence of \( \kappa\alpha\iota \), which Luke tends to edit out of Mark and Q pericopes, (2) a proportionally high use of \( \iota\nu\alpha \), which Luke omits from Markan material and uses disproportionately rarely in Acts, (3) using \( \pi\alpha\rho\alpha \) + accusative as a Semitism with comparative meaning, (4) using the dative, instead of Luke’s \( \pi\rho\omega\varsigma \) + accusative after a verb of speaking. Luke tends to replace the dative with \( \pi\rho\omega\varsigma \) + accusative in Mark and Q, (5) The use of cardinal numbers before the noun, which is unlukan syntax. Luke tends to remove numerals from his redaction of Mark and Q, and to place the numeral after the noun when he does use it, and (6) The historical present, which Luke avoids almost without fail in Markan pericopes, and appears five times in the
Sondergut. While Mark has 151 historical presents, Luke has only eleven. Of these eleven, only one of them is derived from Mark (Luke 8:49), of the rest, seven are from $S^k$ (7:40; 13:8; 16:7, 23, 29; 24:12, 36), and three are found among the $Q$ material, although these are unparalleled in Matthew (11:37, 45; 19:22).

In the third appendix of this thesis, the text of L is presented as one of the sources of Proto-Luke, and they are marked in the text, in both the source material and the work of the redactor, so that these criteria can be checked easily.

Paffenroth has also improved on a number of previous attempts to identify a prelukan vocabulary as a stylometric identification of L source material in Luke. The most ambitious being the work of Rehkopf who provides a list of 78 words which are used in Q, L and the Passion Narrative of Luke, but are not used or are avoided in Luke’s redaction of Markan material. Rehkopf’s method is not transferable to an argument for the existence of L, since Rehkopf is dealing specifically with Proto-Luke (as I define it) plus the passion narrative (which is now widely regarded to be of Markan origin). In either case, his and similar attempts have failed because, as Paffenroth suggests, it includes words from Q and the infancy narrative, as well as words which are common to the redaction of multiple sources, and therefore more likely to be instances of Lukan vocabulary.

---

13 Paffenroth, 85-95.
15 Rehkopf, 86, n.1; 91-98.
17 Paffenroth, 66-67.
By contrast, Paffenroth offers a more plausible methodological approach to identifying such a vocabulary, and consequentially produced a shorter list of words. He operates from the 197 verses which he concludes belong to L, and demonstrates that this material has the highest percentile of *hapax legomena* or rare words of any source material in Luke-Acts (4.9% of total words), seconded closely by the Q material. This percentile is higher than the average percentile of *hapax* in Luke-Acts (4%), and much higher that the percentile of *hapax* in the Markan material of Luke (3.1%). Since it is highly unlikely that a redactor would be in the habit of adding peculiar words to one of his sources, while limiting them in another source, Paffenroth argues that these words are evidence that the L material in Luke is from a source.

On the basis of these data, Paffenroth is able to claim as evidence for the source L, a list of *hapax* that are specific to L. Of the thirteen *hapax* and rare words in L, three (βρέχω, ὄνος and περιζωνυμω) cannot be considered as evidence that a passage is prelukan, because there is no specific evidence of canonical Luke avoiding their usage. βρέχω, for instance is absent from Luke’s redaction of Q 6:35, but could also be explained as a Matthean insertion into Q. Because of this, while it is retained as an instance of prelukan vocabulary, it is removed from consideration as quantitative evidence for a pericope’s inclusion in document L, because it could potentially be vocabulary shared by canonical Luke and L. By contrast, a noun like γάμος can be granted evidentiary value, because while Luke never removes it from another source, he regularly modifies Mark and Q with similar terms such as δείπνον (i.e. Luke 20:46 = Mark 12:39; Q 14:16, 17, 24; and even in the final redaction of L 14:12),
Paffenroth is able to give the following list of 10 words which are not only unique to L, and multiply attested in L, but also demonstrably avoided by the redactor of canonical Luke. They are: wedding feast (γάμος), neighbour (γείτων), eighteen (δεκαόκτω), olive oil (ἐλαιόν), ninety-nine (ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα) or just nine (ἐννέα), labour (κόπος), tower (πύργος), have compassion (σπλαγχνίζομαι), extort (συκοφαντέω), and debtor (χρέοφιλέτης). Among these, the numerals are specifically weighty, not only because L has a distinctive prelukan syntax for numbers (i.e., numeral before the noun), but also because as an avowed non-eyewitness, the final redactor of Luke-Acts has no basis to claim knowledge of something so specific as a number, except if he is using a source.

In addition to this list of ten, there are fourteen words or phrases from the extensive ‘prelukan’ lists of Rekhopf, Jeremias and Easton which are not hapax legomena, but are multiply attested in L and either omitted or passed over in favour of a ‘synonym’ in other instances of Lukan redaction. These include shame (αἰσχύνη/αἰσχύνομαι/καταίσχύνω), the phrase ‘a certain man’ (ἀνθρωπός τις), price or its verbal form ‘to spend’ (διαπάνη/διαπανάω), scatter (διασκορπίζω) have mercy (ἔλεεώ), rejoice (εὐφραίνω), the singular form of ‘Sabbath day’ (ἡμέρα τοῦ σαββάτου), kiss (καταφιλέω), leper (λέπρος), the phrase ‘famine came’ (λίμος ἐγένετο), far off (μακρόθεν), debt/debtor (ὀφειλέτης/ὀφείλω), at a distance (πόρρω/πόρρωθεν), and ‘gobble’ (χορτάζω).18

18 Paffenroth, 79-83, esp. 79 n. 58.
These words are fascinating enough because of what they reveal about the ‘inner texture’ and the special interests of L. This will be discussed in more detail in the section below on the L community. But because all of these distinctive qualities of L are specific, detailed and linguistic, Paffenroth is able to conclude that L was a written source, rather than an oral one:

If Luke were the first person to put this material in writing (whether working from oral traditions or freely composing), then his stylistic stamp should be strongly, indeed pervasively, upon it; but since the first criterion used to isolate the L material was its dissimilarity from Lukan style and vocabulary, this does not seem to be the case. Indeed, by its non-Lukan style and its retention of details, it would seem that Luke was perhaps somewhat more conservative with the L material that he was with the Markan material...

These vocabulary words are indicated in my reconstruction of Proto-Luke in appendix 3 by the symbol of a superscript ‘v’.

At this point, it is possible to compare Petzke’s and Paffenroth’s similar analyses of S^L^k/L, and see if any interesting patterns or contrasts emerge. The table in appendix 1 demarkates the passages included by Paffenroth’s L with Petzke’s Sondergut with an ‘x’, and using Q and R to designate Q material and redacted material respectively. The chart also assigns genres to the pericopes. Even though the generic categories are Petzke’s, he has not always spelled out exhaustively which specific pericopes belong to each genre, so I have used my own judgment while being guided by Petzke’s commentary in the process.

---

19 Ibid., 148.
As Appendix 1 shows, Paffenroth’s documentary L is clearly more limited in its genres than Petzke’s non-documentary $S^k$. However, even though Petzke, being skeptical about source-critical hypotheses, does not exploit the data in this way, some of his observations about genre in particular are especially useful in determining the parameters of the documentary source L within the Sondergut material. Paffenroth’s epistemological optimism enabled him to offer a more complete reconstruction, and thus focus on a more apt range of data than Petzke’s arbitrarily determined Sondergut, however, Paffenroth has not taken advantage of a number of Petzke’s key observations about genre. However, when Petzke’s and Paffenroth’s studies are placed next to each other, some constructive patterns begin to emerge.

The table reveals certain layers within the $S^k$ material that can be laid out in a form reminiscent of a chiasm:

**Table 2.2**

1-2 (Infancy narrative) Mythic Biographical

3-5 (Galilean Ministry) Biographical

7:11-19:27 (Central Section, Zacchaeus, etc.): Narrative ethic

22-23 (Farewell Discourse) Biographical

24 (Emmaus Road) Mythic Biographical

This table can be triangulated from observations made independently by both Petzke and Paffenroth. Apart from 4:25-27, only the narrative ethical material at the
central section in 7:11-19:27 has material which meets Paffenroth’s stylometric and thematic criteria for belonging to documentary L. It can therefore be concluded that all the biographical material which falls outside of this section belongs to a later stage of redaction. I would further hypothesise that the clear distinction between mythical biography which presents Jesus as a divine man (Θεος ἁγνής) and non-mythic (journey oriented) biographical material in separate layers of the chiasm allows us to postulate two different occasions of redaction, with separate historical contexts. This hypothesis is essentially the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

It is quite easy to discount the most obvious counter-thesis for explaining this pattern, namely, that the chiasm is a literary device. As it will be seen, the L document is chiastic in form. The structure outlined above, however, which only becomes clear upon the mechanical extraction and analysis of S\textsuperscript{LK} material, is not a literary chiasm because it falls into layers of different genres rather than parallel passages. What we can see here is rather a vestige of Luke’s editorial process. In Luke, editorial comments are found most often at the beginning and end of pericopes, so that it can be said that his standard editorial process involves adding a preface and a conclusion.\textsuperscript{20} The material that can be spoken of as L tradition is found in 7:11-19:27, and at the point of time where it was edited into Proto-Luke by combining it with Q material, biographical material was also added at the beginning and end as a forward and conclusion. Chapters 1-2 and 24 represent a later stage in the composition when this document (Proto-Luke) was combined with Mark and edited into Canonical Luke.

The Literary Unity of L

... The meaning of each small unit and large scene is illuminated by the insights gained from seeing them within the context of the whole and grasping their similarities and differences within the chiastic structure.21

Setting aside the Sk material from 7:11-19:27 because of its distinct limited range of genres and stylometrics already creates a maximal limit for a documentary L. It has excluded a great deal of material, but has not yet shown that every pericope within this scope belongs to the document. Many scholars have observed the chiastic structure of the section Luke 9:51-19:48, which is a very near overlap to Sk 7:11-19:27 and while some aspects of that structure have been quite dubious, other parts have been hard to deny. Since the majority of the material under consideration belongs to this section, the chiasm is the logical place to begin. However, because the chiasm is a literary device which, at this level of complexity, must be a conscious decision of a redactor, the essential structure of this chiasm can be taken to function as a minimal limit. If that minimal limit can be shown to be comprehensive of Sk 7:11-19:27, and original to that stage of redaction, then it will have effectively demonstrated the documentary character of L.

Even granting that the chiasm can be verified, it is still necessary to determine its origin, which can be accounted for in a number of ways:

1. The chiasm was created by the end-redactor of Luke.
2. The chiasm was created by the redactor of Proto-Luke.
3. The chiasm is original to the L source.

It seems highly unlikely that the chiasm could belong to the final level of redaction, since the material from Mark is not included in it, and since the material outside 7:11-19:27, and in Acts does not have any clear relationship to the chiasm.

Further evidence that the chiasm does not belong to the canonical text is, as Nils W. Lund has argued, that the Hellenistic redactor of Luke tends to dismantle chiastic structures in the Q material, and notes as well as his “freedom in redistributing the sayings.... by slight changes in the structures”22 whereas Matthew retains them,23 because “they were Hebrew and not Greek. However such structures might have appealed to a Jew, to a Greek, they must have looked like unnecessary repetition.”24

While Lund did not distinguish between Proto-Lukan and Lukan redaction, the examples which he gives all fall within the scope of Proto-Luke.


23 Ibid., 232.
24 Ibid., 269.
Table 2.3

Matthew 23:1-15; 23-32

Introduction, vss. 1-3

A Description of the Jewish leaders: aloofness, vs. 4.
B General Statement of their motives: “to be seen of men,” vs. 5a
C Ostentation in regard to dress, vs 5b
D Ostentation in regard to places of honour, vs. 6
E Ostentation in regard to salutations, vs. 7.
E’ One only is Teacher, vs. 8.
D’ One only is Father, vs. 9.
C’ One only in Leader, vs. 10.
B’ General statement of the Christian ideal: service, vs. 11.
A’ Description of the Christian leaders: humility, vs. 12.

A Their violence: preventing by force entrance to the kingdom of heaven, vs. 13.
B Their evil influence: making converts “twofold more a son of Gehenna,” vs. 15
C Their greed: “devouring widow’s houses,” vs. 14
D Externalism versus spirituality: two central triplets, vss. 23, 24
C’ Ostentation: the outside and greed: “extortion” vss. 25, 26
B’ Ostentation: the outside; and evil: “dead men’s bones” vss. 27, 28
A’ Ostentation: garnished tombs; and violence: “filling up the measure” vss. 29-32

Luke 11:42-52

A Externalism versus spirituality, vs 42
B Ostentation in regard to places of honour, vs 43
C Hidden tombs, vs. 44
A’ Their aloofness, vs. 46.
B’ Building the tombs of the prophets, vss. 47, 48 (and vss. 49-51).
C’ Preventing men by force from entering the kingdom of heaven, vs. 52

Lund argues, as the numbers in the right hand column demonstrate, that in constructing Luke 11:42-52, the redactor has moved from the centre of the second chiasm to the centre of the first, and then moved back and forth with a “pendulum method”, moving centrifugally from the centre of each chiasm to the extremity. Luke also removes Jewish sounding terms like “phylactery”, and skips the most distinctively Jewish verses in Matthew (vs. 14, 15, 25, 26).
This pattern, which accounts for almost all the comparative data, is too clear and deliberate for this to be coincidental, and no such pattern emerges if we take the Lukan order to be original.

Not only Luke’s selection, but his rejection of material as well, indicates a definite and ascertifiable method. Could we obtain such results as these unless the theory of Luke’s dependency on a document in structure similar to Matthew is correct? This document in none other than the Common Source from which most of the Q material is derived.  

Lund goes on to demonstrate that this pattern of dismantling chiasms in Q material is the standard practice of this redactor. In Matt 23:33-36 = Luke 11:49-51, Luke removes the opening item of the chiasm v. 33, and by changing the list of persecuted persons (prophets, scribes and wise men) to include only prophets and apostles, he breaks the central part of the chiasms in which there is a numerical correspondence between the persons and the way they are persecuted (killed and crucified, scourged in synagogues and persecuted in cities). In Matt 23:37-39 = Luke 13:34-35, there is a simple ABB’A’ chiasm which the redactor breaks by removing the second repetition of the words “gather” (ἐπισυνάγει). Other destroyed chiasms include Matt 5:10-12; 6:32-33; 7:15-20 and 11:25-30. In the light of this “aversion to chiastic forms”, it would be impossible to maintain that the redactor had created the broad chiastic form of the journey narrative. It must belong to L.

Just as the chiastic form clearly could not extend to the structure of Luke, it also falls short of Proto-Luke. The central section is preceded by both the Galilean Ministry section and the Sermon on the Plain section, for which there is no corresponding

25 Ibid., 295-96.
26 Ibid., 282.
material after the travel narrative. It seems inelegant at best to have a large chiasm, with a smaller body of non-chiastic material at the beginning. Finally, if the redactor of Proto-Luke created the chiasm, we would expect it to be created out of both L and Q material. However, the structurally significant portions of the chiasm are invariably from L material, and this will be verified below if the chiasm can be shown to have greater structural integrity without Q. The third option, that the chiasm is a feature of documentary L, is therefore the only possible conclusion.

*Literary Structure of the Chiasm*

So far, attempts to delineate the structure of the chiasm have been promising enough that it is reasonable to think we are ‘on to something’, but the final result has never been quite satisfactory. Craig Blomberg has summarised the various attempts and provided a critique of the main problems with each reconstruction.²⁷ Building on a number of earlier suggestions, it was Charles Talbert who in 1974 first put forward a complete chiastic arrangement for the central section. His structure consisted of eleven parallel parts, centering on the prophets perishing in Jerusalem.

---

Table 2.4

A Kingdom revealed to babes 10:21-24
B "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" 10:25-37
C De-emphasising good works 10:38-42
D God’s willingness to answer prayer 11:1-13
E healing, discussion about signs of the kingdom, warning about judgment 11:14-36
F Jesus rebukes Pharisees and lawyers and a meal 11:37-54
G Hell, riches, faithful stewardship 12:1-48
H transcending family loyalties, prudence, repentance, fruitless tree 12:49-13:9
I Sabbath healing, Jews treat animals better than people 13:10-17
J Parables: exclusion of privileged, inclusion of disadvantaged 13:18-30
K A prophet cannot perish away from Jerusalem 13:31-33
K’ O Jerusalem, Jerusalem… 13:34-35
J’ Parables: exclusion of the privileged and inclusion of the disadvantaged 14:7-24
I’ Sabbath healing, Jews treat animals better than people 14:1-6
H’ transcending family loyalties, prudence, tasteless salt, repentance 14:25-15:32
G’ unfaithful stewardship, riches, hell 16:1-31
F’ An exhortation to rebuke one’s brother, and a parable about a meal 17:1-10
E’ healing, discussion about signs of the kingdom, warning about judgment 17:11-37
D’ God’s willingness to answer prayer 18:1-8
C’ De-emphasising good works 18:9-14
B’ “What shall I do to inherit eternal life?” 18:18-20
A’ Kingdom received as a child 18:15-17

Blomberg has shown that a number of Talbert’s parallels are far too weak to be convincing. For instance, the parallelism relating to children at the extremities (A) is not thematically strong. The only connection is the reference to children, but the two verses use different words for children, νήπιος in 10:21 and βρέφος in 18:15.

The good works of Martha in 10:38-42 (C) are hardly comparable to those of the self-justified Pharisee in 18:9-14. Much of the material in II’ and JJ’ could easily be seen as parallel to each other or to EE’, because the parallel themes are recurrent in L.

The FF’ parallel is extremely weak because half of the parables in this section are
about meals, and because Pharisees are not considered ‘brothers’ by Jesus in Luke. In fact, all the themes and keywords at J (parables and inclusion of outcasts) are found everywhere in the travel narrative. Blomberg concludes that half of this structure cannot be validly analysed as a chiasm.

Kenneth Bailey has put forward an alternative chiastic structure which postulates that the chiasm is a vestige of a pre-Lucan source which he names “the Jerusalem Document”. Since the Jerusalem Document is only one source of the travel narrative, it need not include all of the material. He therefore constructs the following chiasm which includes 90% of the material, in a slightly altered order, and a more convincing chiastic structure:

Table 2.5

A Jerusalem: eschatological events 9:51-56
B Follow me 9:57-10:12
C What shall I do to inherit eternal life? 10:25-42
D Prayer 11:1-13
E Signs and the present kingdom 11:14-32
F Conflict with the Pharisees: Money 11:37-12:34
G The kingdom is not yet and is now 12:35-59
H The call of the kingdom to Israel 13:1-9
I The nature of the kingdom 13:10-20
J Jerusalem: eschatological events 13:22-35
I’ The nature of the kingdom 14:1-11
H’ The call of the kingdom to outcasts 14:12-15:32
G’ The kingdom is not yet and is now 16:1-8, 16
F’ Conflict with the Pharisees: Money 16:9-31
E’ Signs and the coming kingdom 17:11-37
D’ Prayer 18:1-14
C’ What shall I do to inherit eternal life? 18:18-30
B’ Follow me 18:35-19:9
A’ Jerusalem: eschatological events 19:10, 28-48

Blomberg suggests a number of reasons why some of Bailey’s parallels should be dismissed. Jerusalem at AA’ is mentioned frequently throughout the travel
narrative, as also is the idea of following Jesus at BB'. However, the *prima facie* problem which arises on an epistemological level when these distinct chiastic structures are proposed for (roughly) the same document is that in order to proceed, there must be a way to verify or falsify a proposed chiasm, and therefore to discern between them on the basis of objective features of the text rather than the exegete's imagination. Blomberg suggests a helpfully common-sensical method: following Bailey's suggestion about a preexisting source, Blomberg allows pericopes into the chiastic structure if and only if it can be demonstrated that there is a thematic, verbal or structural parallel which is strong enough to exclude another equally reasonable parallel being drawn, for instance, to another passage in Luke, or specifically in the travel narrative. Armed with this objectivity criterion, Blomberg proposes the following modest chiasm structure:

Table 2.6

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Parable about works and faith 10:25-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Parable about prayer 11:5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>τίς ἔξ ὑμῶν parable 11:11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Parable about riches 12:13-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Parable about servanthood 12:35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Parables about repentance 13:1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>τίς ἔξ ὑμῶν parable 14:1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>The Great Feast 14:7-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'</td>
<td>τίς ἔξ ὑμῶν parable 14:28-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F'</td>
<td>Parables about repentance 15:1-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E'</td>
<td>Parable about servanthood 16:1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'</td>
<td>Parable about riches 16:19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>τίς ἔξ ὑμῶν parable 17:7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td>Parable about prayer 18:1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>Parable about works and faith 18:9-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Blomberg, 239.
Blomberg’s suggestion has been well received by major contemporary commentaries such as Bock\textsuperscript{29} and Nolland\textsuperscript{30}, and that has been warranted by his rigorous application of his method. One of the key successes of Blomberg’s chiasm is its ability to function using only one genre (parables) and only one type of source material (S\textsuperscript{ch}). I am proposing, with a few changes which I must now justify, that Blomberg’s chiastic structure is able to provide the skeletal structure of L as a documentary and literary source of Luke, and therefore the minimal limit of documentary L.

\textit{Additions and Subtractions}

However, Blomberg’s structure has some problems. The most obvious problem is with the parallels which Blomberg draws at CC’ and GG’ (the τίς ἢ ἡ ὑμῶν parables). Blomberg is clear that they are only included because of the verbal parallel, but he admits that they are dubious, because the verbal parallel is weak, and there is no obvious thematic parallel. Given that the only link is the verbal parallel, they can be immediately discarded on the basis that this short phrase, and similar phrases are common in Luke, in both Q and L material, as shown in Table 2.7, It is difficult to understand why Blomberg has drawn a parallel between 11:11 and 17:7, and then 14:5 and 14:28 in particular. By his own rigorous criteria, these parables are not to be included in the structure!

---

Blomberg’s use of these parallels becomes even more problematic because 11:11-13 is usually analysed as Q material. To justify this, he quotes David Flusser, who has argued that this passage originally stood with the parable of the persistent friend in 11:5-8.\(^\text{31}\) Before Blomberg’s argument was published, both of the major critical commentaries had firmly ascribed the material to the Q source.\(^\text{32}\) Since the publication of Blomberg’s article, a few commentaries have found this convincing or worth consideration, such as Nolland, who analyses the section as a Q/L overlap,\(^\text{33}\) and Bock who quotes both sides of the argument and leaves the question undecided.\(^\text{34}\) In these commentaries, however, no reason has been given to assign the material to L, except the judgment of Blomberg. The theology of the passage (i.e. the heavenly Father as a giver of good gifts) is classically Q theology. I will therefore proceed as though CC’ and GG’ were not a part of the chiastic structure of Luke in the form that Blomberg presents it.


Conversely, Blomberg does not claim to have exhaustively identified all of the material in the chiastic source. While the strict minimalism he employed was necessary in order to identify the barest skeletal structure of the document, it remains necessary to make Blomberg's method work a little harder in order to discern whether this source is the same document as that which Paffenroth identified as L. Thanks to Paffenroth's rigorous stylometric research, we are justified in presupposing a literary source which Blomberg did not explicitly presuppose, and therefore, we will be looking for justified parallels in the material which Paffenroth includes, but is not yet included in the chiastic structure.

As well as removing \( \tau \xi \; \epsilon \ \iota \mu \omega \nu \) parallels from the chiasm, I put forward that there are two parallels which Blomberg has not used, but should be included. These are 9:51-56 = 19:41-44 and 11:27b-28 = 17:7-19.

1. 9:51-56 and 19:41-44

This parallel was proposed by Bailey, and dismissed by Blomberg because of its generality, and because the name Jerusalem is so common in the travel narrative. However, there are a number of specific reasons to see this parallel as one of the strongest in the whole travel narrative.

i. The term \( \iota \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \), referring to Jesus eschatological arrival in Jerusalem.

This particular usage of \( \iota \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \) is a Hebraism for \( \gamma \omicron \omicron \mu \omicron \), which in a usage such as this has an eschatological connotation, referring to a time of divine intervention. The noun \( \iota \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \) is used in this particular sense in 9:51 and 19:42,43, but nowhere else in
the Slk material in the travel narrative implying a verbal parallelism between the two passages.

One possible counter argument here is that Luke often uses ἡμέρα in a septuagintal style. However, that particular usage is only found in Luke’s redaction of Mark. On sixteen occasions, the Endredaktor of Luke has introduced the term ἡμέρα into Mark’s narrative, not to change the meaning of the text, but simply as a stylistic preference for septuagintal language, and each time he is simply referring to the passing of time within the narrative, not an eschatological ‘day’. While there are eight places where it could be argued that Luke has inserted ἡμέρα into a Q passage (4:2; 6:23; 17:4, 22, 22, 24, 30 and 31), all of these occurrences are used in a way that is consistent with Q (i.e., as a prophetic correlative). Most of them occur in ch. 17, in very close context to the prophetic correlative section, in which, between 17:26 and 17:29, there are five repetitions of ἡμέρα, each with a distinctively eschatological meaning. The other six repetitions are therefore best understood as Q material which did not survive Matthew’s editing process.

By contrast, there are only three occurrences of ἡμέρα in Slk which are hebraic and eschatological, 4:25 (Redactor), and 9:51 and 19:42,43. This is noteworthy since between Luke 9:51 and 19:44, ἡμέρα occurs 25 times. One is quoted directly from Mark (18:33), and fourteen are from Q. Of the remaining ten Slk usages, four refer to the Sabbath day (twice in 13:14, once in 13:16 and 14:5) and three are simply essential to the narrative (15:13, 16:19 and 18:7). The remaining instances are therefore unique, and justify a chiastic parallel between those two sections.
ii. The Deuteronomistic image of cities or villages facing eschatological
judgment

In 9:51, Jesus coming death in Jerusalem is referred to with the term ἀναληψις, a
term thick with eschatological meaning – Caird was right to say that “Luke packs a
whole theology into the word.” It is difficult to draw a firm conclusion as to what is
being referred to here. While most commentators have held that it refers to Jesus’
death, since later Jewish literature always uses ἀναλαμβάνω in that way, others
have pointed out that Acts 1:2 uses this term to describe Christ’s ascension.
However, in Luke 9:51’s immediate context, and in the specific context of the
journey to Jerusalem, the term means Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem, an event which,
from the perspective for Jesus’ Galilean followers, is virtually synonymous with his
death, and it is evocative of such events as the assumption of Moses (Ass Mos

In Luke 19:44, The use of ἐπισκοπή (visit) is similarly eschatological and
septuagintal language for Jesus’ arrival. The Septuagint translates the Hebrew
pāqad, ‘to visit’, with the verb form ἐπισκεπτομαι. In Numbers 16:29, this
translation is used for a divine visitation to punish, and in Gen 21:1, the same
translation is used with the sense of a visit for blessing. The parallelism of
ἐπισκοπή and ἀναληψις is evocative of a specific Deuteronomistic trope: the
decisive moment of a prophet’s arrival in a city, and his declaration of impending

37 Bayer, ἐπισκεπτομαι TDNT, 602.
judgment which, if ignored, will result in the city’s destruction. As Bock summarises, the chiastic section

begins as it will end – with a note of failure ... The journey section of Luke’s gospel starts (9:51-56) as it will end (19:41-44): with rejection ...

The perspective and influence of Deuteronomy controls the section as Jesus the prophet calls the people to repent lest they face destruction by God’s judgment (2 Kings 17:13-14, 23a). Luke 19:41-44 indicates their failure to heed the call.

iii. 9:51-56 and 19:41-44 are effective in this position as structural devices.

After the center of a chiasm, the extremities are commonly understood to be controlling factors in the rhetorical texture of the literary device. However, Blomberg’s proposed extremities: the contrast between works and faith in the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Pharisee and Tax Collector, are simply one of many themes in this corpus. Jerusalem and Samaria, as geographical locations, are able to operate as structural devices which govern a number of diverse themes.

iv. 19:41 completes the narrative expectation of 9:51

The completion of the journey begun in 9:51 in which Jesus set his face (τῷ πρόσωπον ἐστιρίσεν) to Jerusalem, and then arriving (ἐγείρεν) in Jerusalem and weeping (κλαίω) for the city. The completion includes a geographical contrast between the city of Jerusalem and the villages of Samaria.

The word Ἰερουσαλήμ in 9:51 should be understood as the antecedent for the arthrous noun τῆν πόλιν in Luke 19:41. 19:41 clearly refers to Jerusalem in its final

canonical setting, where, as Joel Green notes, the stage has been set for Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem by the use of ἐγγιζω “like a litany” to slow the pace of the narrative. However, in its original L setting, Jerusalem has not recently been mentioned. It is understood that the city Jesus arrives in is Jerusalem simply because that is the same city he set his face towards in 9:51. Jesus’ weeping over Jerusalem, and the judgment it has incurred stands in direct contrast with the villages of Samaria, which are also guilty of rejecting Jesus as the prophet of God, but which are spared God’s judgment.

2. Blessing is in obedience, not merely kinship (11:27b-28 = 17:7-19)

Between the BB’ parables about prayer and DD’ parables about riches in Blomberg’s chiasm, he placed two τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν sayings. A better match for this position in the structure is the short dialogue in 11:27b-28 with the two narratives in 17:7-19 which serve to illustrate the dominical saying in the dialogue – that true blessing is found, not in kinship to Jesus, but in obedience to what he says. The thematic parallel between these sections is obvious, but it can also be demonstrated that the parallel is verbally and structurally strong.

i. The word φωνή

The word φωνή as used in 11:27, ἐπάρασσα τίς φωνήν and 17:17, καὶ σὺν ήραν φωνήν is completely unique in the travel narrative. Apart from these two instances, and 1:44 in the infancy narrative, φωνή does not appear in S\textsubscript{Lk} or at any point in the Q sections of the travel narrative, even though the Endredaktor of Luke is fond of enhancing dialogue within Mark’s narrative with the phrase φωνῇ μεγάλη (4:33; 19:37; 23:23).
The word is used to signify the main dialogical figures being contrasted. The respective voices in question belong firstly to an unnamed woman and secondly to a leprous Samaritan person. Jesus responds positively to the second Samaritan voice and negatively to the unnamed woman, even though the contrasted figures both intended to use their voice to the same effect. In each case, the voice utters a pious macarism or doxology (μακαρία 11:27, δούναι δόξαν 17:18). However, it is not the intention, but the effectiveness of their voices, which is key to the contrast. The doxology of the Samaritan man is accepted because it is grounded in obedience whereas the woman’s macarism is rejected because it is based merely on kinship.

ii. 17:7-19 illustrates 11:27b-28 in an exemplary parallel

The use of doublets as narrative ethic to illustrate a moral principle by a contrast is a device that is uniquely common within the L material. Other examples include the Centurion and the Widow as examples of God’s acceptance of outsiders (7:1-17), Mary and Martha as illustrative of the principle of prayerful devotion (10:38-42), the lost sheep and the lost coin as examples of God’s attitude towards sinners (15:1-10), the judge and the widow as examples of persistent prayer (18:1-6), and the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14). Luke also employs many doublets outside of the L document, such as the contrast between John and Jesus, Peter and Paul, but these never illustrate moral axioms as the doublets in L do.

Jerome Kodell has described this structural feature of Luke with the term ‘exemplary parallelism’. A number of Kodell’s examples are unconvincing, but he gives one significant example in which a moral contrast is drawn out over a larger literary unity. The Good Samaritan and Mary and Martha serve of illustrate the two halves
of Jesus’ answer regarding eternal life in 10:25-27, as Kodell illustrates with the following structure.39

Table 2.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love of God</th>
<th>(10:25-27)</th>
<th>Love of neighbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary and Martha (10:38-42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good Samaritan (10:29-37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this same structure, the two themes which are announced in 11:27b-28, true blessedness and obedience not kinship, are shown in practice 17:7-19 by the slaves who do God’s will and the ‘foreigner’ who is truly blessed because he obeys and gives thanks. In this pattern, kinship cannot be confounded with true blessedness or obedience, and obedient slaves and foreigners are given as a foil to those who would be assumed obedient because of family ties.

Table 2.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blessing not by kinship</th>
<th>(11:27b-28)</th>
<th>Blessing by obedience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thankful, leprous Samaritan person (17:11-19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(17:7-10) obedient Servants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This structure reveals a specific contrast between the blessedness of people at various levels of kinship to Jesus. ἀλλογενής, which in its original etymology means...

‘other born’, stresses the familial distance between Jesus and the Samaritan man with leprosy, which stands out against the images of maternity which the woman in 11:27 uses to bless Jesus: κοιλία (womb) and μαστός (breast). Such verbal, structural and thematic parallels imply that 11:27b-28 = 17:7-19 are among the stronger contenders for a place within the chiasmic structure of the travel narrative.

3. 10:25-42 = 18:9-14; 19:1-10

Blomberg removed the parallel between Mary and Martha and the Pharisee and Tax Collector from Bailey’s chiasm because he argued that the thematic parallel was too weak. However, a larger-scale parallelism exists which includes these two passages, and also includes the Good Samaritan and Zacchaeus pericopes. Kodell has shown this structure, diagrammatised in Table 2.7 above, in which an ethical axiom (love of God and neighbour) is illustrated first by an exemplar (the Good Samaritan) and then by a contrasting pair (Mary and Martha). Further, the device is used across chiastic parallels, as when Jesus’ axiom about true blessedness in 11:27b-28 is illustrated by the parallel passages in 17:7-19, in which the exemplar is an obedient slave, and the contrasting pair are the thankful, leprous Samaritan person, and the nine others. This structural device of L only becomes clear in 18:9-14; 19:1-10 when the intermittent Markan material of Luke 18:15-43 is removed, and Jesus’ ethical teaching about trust, righteousness and treating others with contempt is exemplified first by the contrasting Pharisee and Tax Collector, and then by the exemplar Zacchaeus.
Table 2.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Theme</th>
<th>Exemplar</th>
<th>Exemplary Pair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love of God and neighbour:</td>
<td>Good Samaritan</td>
<td>Mary and Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10:25-27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and righteousness:</td>
<td>Pharisee and Tax Collector</td>
<td>Zacchaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18:9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So Blomberg is right in saying that the thematic parallel here is weak. However, the structural parallel is powerful, and is now emerging as one of the key structures within the L corpus. As Table 2.10 shows, the reversal in order between exemplars and exemplary pairs is, in fact, an aspect of the chiastic structure itself:

Just as the Good Samaritan demonstrates the meaning of 10:25-27 by practicing love, and the Mary and Martha pericope draws a contrast between the correct and incorrect attitude towards love, the exemplar Zacchaeus and the contrasting Pharisee and Tax Collector are examples of the right way to understand trust and righteousness. While some scholars have argued, on the basis of the present tense verbs in 19:8, that Zacchaeus does not exhibit repentance but an ongoing
commitment to generosity towards the poor,

\[40\] this interpretation does not make good sense out of verses 9 and 10 which say respectively that today, salvation has come to this house, and that Jesus came to seek out and save people who (like Zacchaeus) are lost. The contrast which L draws between those who trust themselves that they are righteous and treat others with contempt (like the Pharisee) and those who trust God (like the Tax Collector) and treat the poor with compassion (like Zacchaeus).

4. 13:1-17 is a unity, and parallel to 15:1-32

Blomberg has shown that the there are a number of structural similarities between the three parables of repentance in 13:1-9, and the three parables of ‘lost and found’ in 15:1-32. The healing on the Sabbath of a daughter of Abraham in 13:10-17, I would argue, ought to be included in this parallelism. That the woman was present during the parables (v. 11) shows that the two incidents belong to the same pericope in their canonical placement, but this could be understood as a feature of a redactor later than L. I will tentatively place these verses within the chiasm for two reasons. Firstly, it illustrates powerfully the ‘lost and found’ aspect of the repentance theme. 13:1-9 by itself seems to be a warning about repentance, but the salvation of a ‘daughter of Abraham’ makes it clear that such repentance is a joyous occasion, and like 15:1-32, it illustrates the hard heartedness of the Pharisees who do not celebrate when the lost are found. Secondly, 13:1-9 seems like a short parallel for such a long passage as 15:1-32, and lacking in the human examples which are so

\[40\] Johnston, 283-88.
distinctive of L material. While these reasons are not enough to conclusively prove that 13:10-17 belongs to the chiasm of L, that seems to be the best fit.

5. 13:31-33 and 14:1-24 belong together at the centre of the chiasm

Bailey made the a series of eschatological proclamations concerning Jerusalem the climactic centre of his chiasm (13:22-35), and Blomberg placed the parable of the Great Feast (14:7-24) in this position. These options both seem attractive because of the structural importance of judgment on Jerusalem within the chiasm, and because of the thematic importance of The structure I have been outlining above, based on a search for chiastic structures within the material that appears to belong to documentary L, leaves both of these pericopes together at the centre, between the two tracts of three parables at 13:1-17 and 15:1-32. Once the Q material in 13:18-30 and 13:34-35 are removed, this section remains. Its presence is most easily explained as a unity (H) rather than parallel passages (HH').

The climactic H section is a turning point in the narrative of the journey. In it, a decisive break is made, as Bock notes, “[m]uch of the journey up to this point has been consumed with warning the nation. From this point on, much of the section is concerned with teaching the disciples.”

The break happens when Jesus’ relationship with the Pharisees breaks down. They approach him in 13:34 to discuss the danger of aggravating Herod, and the discussion quickly turns to whether it is right to heal on the Sabbath (14:1-6). Jesus accuses the Pharisees of not understanding that humans are more valuable than animals, and then notices that they prefer to sit in seats of honour at the table, and tells the parables of the chief

41 Bock, 1243.
seats at the banquet, and of the great feast, concluding in verse 24 with the claim that those who were invited will not taste the banquet, implying the exclusion of the Pharisees from the great feast. After this point in L, the Pharisees are no longer warned, but instead become the object of Jesus’ prophetic condemnation.

In this table, I have set out the minimal chiastic structure of L, based in the main part on Blomberg’s set of parallel parables, with the changes outlined above. Sections which are judged to be the possible work of a redactor are set aside in parentheses at this point, and the paired stories of Jesus restoring marginalized women are placed in the structure as an introductory exemplary pair to the whole chiasm.

Table 2.12

Introduction (Triptych of women)

Widow at Nain 7:11-17
Sinful woman 7:36-50
Ministering Women 8:1-3

Journey to Jerusalem

A Visit to Samaria 9:51-56
B Exemplary parallel: Good Samaritan, Mary/Martha 10:25-42
C Friend at Midnight 11:5-8
D Blessing of Jesus’ true kindred 11:27-28
E Parable of the rich fool 12:13-21
F Parable of the doorkeeper 12:35-38
G Dispute with the Pharisees triptych 13:1-17, 31-33
H The Great Feast, 14:1-24
G’ Dispute with the Pharisees and ‘lost and found’ triptych 15:1-32
F’ Dishonest Manager 16:1-15
E’ Rich Man and Lazarus 16:19-31
D’ Dutiful Servants and a thankful Samaritan Leper 17:7-19
C’ Unjust Judge 18:1-8
B’ Exemplary parallel: Pharisee/Tax Collector, Zacchais 18:9-14; 19:1-10
A’ Jerusalem’s Visitation 19:41-44
When compared to the maximal limits of $L$ set in table 2.2 and appendix 1, the minimal limits set by this chiasm are close enough to demonstrate a documentary, literary source. Only two pericopes in the $L$ material between 7:11 and 19:27 are not included: the sayings about true discipleship in 9:57-62, and the discussion of the cost discipleship in 14:28-33. ‘Splitting the difference’ between these two limits is a matter of deciding whether these parallel passages have been moved from their original location in the chiasm, where they would naturally fit between $AA'$ and $BB'$ or between $GG'$ and $H$, or if they should be regarded as $S^L$ material placed within the central section by a later redactor (i.e., Proto-$L$uke). This matter cannot be demonstrated by any of the methods I have employed so far, and ultimately comes down to our judgment about the comparative purposes of $L$ and Proto-$L$uke. In what follows, I split the difference between $L$’s structure and its content in order to reconstruct an approximation of what the original may have looked like.

A Reconstruction of $L$ within the Source-History of Luke

*Das Lukasevangelium gleicht einem Mosaik, das aus verschiedenen Bruchstücken anderer Mosaiken zusammengesetzt wurde. Außerdem benutzte der Künstler selbst neue Steine, um die Mosaiken zu einem neuen Ganzen zu verbinden oder um die vorhandenen Bruchstücke zu verbessern. Uns liegt das Gesamtbild vor, aber es ist schwer bei einzelnen Mosaiksteinchen nun zu entscheiden, zu welchem Bruchstück es einst gehöerte oder ob es der Künstler selbst hinzugefügt hat.*

---

42 Gerd Petzke, *Sondergut*, 210. Rough translation: “Luke’s Gospel is like a mosaic, which was composed of several fragments of other mosaics. The artist also used new stones himself, to join the mosaic into a new whole, or to improve the existing fragments. We have before us the whole picture, but for several pieces now, it’s difficult to decide to which fragment it once belonged, or whether the artist himself has added it.”
Once the text of L has been established to a reasonable degree of certainty, it is possible to ask questions about its provenance. However, this becomes problematic because the text itself is a reconstruction, so how can its historical setting be described without indulging in excessive speculation on the basis of a reconstructed text. The work and method of Gerd Theißen is particularly helpful to the project of reconstructing the “L community”. His procedure of “localization” allows for the identification of text-transcending elements with as Lokalcolorit (local colour) and Zeitgeschichte (political history), without the need for any conclusions as to the location or date of the text itself, or to create “ideal forms” of units of tradition. Analysing the local colour of the traditional material which belongs to the L source entails no claims about the place and time of writing (about which, this thesis does not need to make any definite claims). As Theißen explains,

Even when we can determine that there is a great degree of familiarity with a particular place, that does not mean that the text must have originated there... In most cases we cannot locate our texts in a concrete “there and then.” We must be content to indicate typical place-connections, for example, impressions left by certain regions or types of landscape: sea and land, desert and rivers, mountains and plains, city and country.43

While the geo-political location and historical date of L’s community are not apparent in the text, elements of social structure and physical milieu are richly

attested throughout the material, allowing us to use the term “L community” as a simple cipher for a “localizable complex” discernible in the traditional material.

Following the lead of Theißen, I locate this complex (hereafter: L community) within the ‘trajectories’ of Early Christianity as described by Helmut Koester, which Krister Stendahl has suggested, is a “blueprint” for studies in Early Christianity. In Koester’s view, first century Christianity first flourished in Syro-Palestine and Antioch, then in Edessa in Osroene, and finally in the churches planted by Paul in the Aegean region. Each of these communities had their own specific theological emphasis.

The L community’s focus on the transmission of the original teachings of Jesus in the form of sayings and parables, its overwhelming economic concern with issues relating to peasant communities, and its conflict with the Pharisees (each of which I shall discuss below) seems to have its strongest affinity with Syro-Palestine.

This conclusion coincides with Paffenroth’s suggestion that, because this written document is Jewish Christian in character, with a detailed knowledge of Palestine and the Law, but lacks any reference to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, and also because it has no Christological titles or interest in the twelve disciples, and has many characteristics of oral tradition (i.e. numbers and catchwords), L was a documentary source prepared by a community before 50 or 60 CE. He further

44 Ibid., 18:22.
47 Ibid., 155.
suggests nine thematic groupings for the stories of L: tax collectors, widows and lepers; love; hospitality; watchfulness; honour and shame; children of Abraham; and the finding of the lost. These themes, as well as the content of L, reveal a community that remembered Jesus as a healer and ethical teacher who welcomed outcasts. This community therefore distinguished itself sharply from Jesus’ exclusive opponents. A number of stories reveal that this community itself was not poor, and themes such as banquets, land-ownership, and slave-ownership are indicative of some rich people in the community.\footnote{Ibid., 138, 156-57.}

Petzke’s similar proposal is that with respect to the narrative ethic portions of the Sondergut (we would call them L), the redactor of the Sondergut is a “balancing realist”, whose rhetorical approach is to juxtapose three sets of contrasting opposites, (1) Pharisees and tax collectors as a symbol of prestige, (2) rich and poor symbolising social and economic status, and (3) men and women representing gender. Petzke’s Sondergut redactor created a workable balance for the primitive community, which invited Pharisees into the community, allowed the rich an option of voluntary charitable giving by mitigating Jesus’ commandment of absolute poverty, and demonstrated an inclusive attitude to women while still firmly subordinating the women in the Gospel to the twelve apostles.

It has often been observed of Luke that he presents Jesus as the friend of sinners, bringer of good news to the poor, and one who cares for women. The tendency of commentators, especially during the redaction critical period when the evangelists’ theologies were being described, was to draw a connection between these

48 Ibid., 138, 156-57.
particularly sociological concerns and Luke’s ‘universalist’ belief that salvation is for all people.\textsuperscript{49} This interpretation cleanly reduces sociological content into theological content, but the source-history of Luke shows that the reality is more complex than that. Where is Luke’s interest in women found in Acts, where, as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has noted, women are only “auxiliary supporters or influential opponents of Paul’s mission” in the great “Lukan silence”?\textsuperscript{50} Paul’s stated goal in those missionary journeys is the conversion of the Gentiles, a theme which is not found in L. Unlike L, the Paul of Acts does not focus on healing the sick and eating with the poor and outcaste like the Jesus of L does (and to some degree, the Peter of early Acts); he preaches the Gospel. And what role do sinners play in the infancy narrative, other than being struck dumb? Even those sinners, even though they are poor, are exclusively pious, priestly, Jewish sinners; neither Samaritans nor outcasts. The distinctive social concern of Luke’s gospel is almost exclusively evidenced in passages from L, and it is therefore quite misleading to imply that it was ever the focal concern of the \textit{Endredaktor} of Luke. It is rather the ‘intellectual property’, and the defining value of the L community.

\textit{The Theology of L}

This hypothesis of a documentary L may be further verified by the identification of a distinct theology in L, which is not only unlike that of Luke-Acts, and Mark, but also strikingly dissimilar to the mythic-biographical sections of the \textit{Sondergut} (ch. 1-2, 24). In Petzke’s theology of the \textit{Sondergut}, these theological dissonances already

begin to emerge from the material, even though the two genres are considered together instead of separately. In the mythic-biographical sections, for instance, God is often spoken of directly as Father (2:49), Saviour (1.47), and Holy Spirit (1:15) and is portrayed as fulfilling the promises made to the ancestors of Israel (1:13-17, 46-55, 68-71; 24:27, 32), and bringing about salvation through a complete reversal of the social order (1:46-55). Christ is a divine man, born of a virgin, possessing divine knowledge, risen and ascending into heaven. He is the Lord (2:11), has the regal lineage of David (2:4), and speaks of God as his unique Father (2:49; 24:49).

None of these observations about God, Christ or salvation hold true of L. At every point of contrast, the ethical material seems to reflect a less developed Christology. God is only referred to indirectly in sayings and parables about prayer (CC’, the Friend at Midnight and Unjust Judge), the angels (15:10). Instead of having divine Christological titles, Jesus is simply a prophet (L 7:39, 13:33) and the Son of Man (18:8). In L, Luke’s mythical picture of salvation as divinely instigated social reversal has become a conciliation between believers of different social layers, which assures a place in the community to both wealthy and poor, as seen in the different social locations present in the pericopes of the Sinful Woman (L 7:36-50); the wealthy ministering women (L 8:1-3); the home of Mary and Martha (L 10:38-42); the Great Feast (L 14:1-24, 28-33), and the ‘lost and found’ trystich (L 15:8) if they perform voluntary acts of charity (i.e. Zacchaeus, L 19:1-10). The image of impending social
revolution in the infancy narrative is replaced by the reformist image of disciples learning ethical economic and social values from their rabbi.  

Petzke’s reconstruction of L’s theology according to doctrinal concepts rings true here, but it is also possible to give a deeper account of L’s unique theology by using literary and social-scientific analysis to reveal the theological categories that are significant to the discourses of the L community itself. Once L is reconstructed, and placed in a social context, it becomes quite clear that this community frames its theological categories differently. In particular, the L community normally describes its experiences of the sacred in language and categories drawn from the socio-economic realities relevant to its own context. The fundamental tenet of L’s theology is expressed succinctly in a saying of Jesus which is pivotal in two key L pericopes, both the climactic center (H The Great Feast 14:1-24, 28-33), and also the chiasm’s penultimate pericope (B’ Exemplary parallel: Pharisee/Tax Collector, Zacchaeus), L 14:11 = 18:14b: “For everyone who is self-exalting will be humbled, but the one who is self-humbling will be exalted.” In the context of an agrarian society such as ancient Palestine which is honour based, and operates with limited (or ‘zero-sum’) resources, this attitude towards honour represents a reception of the teaching of Jesus which is moderate and self-depricating, and values the good of the community above personal gain.

51 Ibid., 241-53. The biblical references are Petzke’s, although I may be misrepresenting his view by describing myth and ethic as separate ‘layers’, while Petzke, due to his source-critical skepticism, conflates them.
52 cf. Matt 23:12, which should be understood as a L/M overlap, rather than Q material, since the woes of Matthew 23 are drawn from Matthew’s special tradition,.
This concept of an eschatological reversal based on a person’s attitude to social status was expected by the L community to take place at the final Messianic banquet, and therefore the chiasm is structured around the image of the great feast in Luke 14. In contrast to the great reversal of the Lukan infancy narrative, this reversal is not happening now, it is instead a future criterion against which present actions must be weighed. In order to understand L’s theology on its own terms, it will be necessary to interpret the theology of Luke in terms of this eschatological feast.

*L’s Socio-Theological Context*

The central motif of the Eschatological feast for the poor in the L document makes very clear sense in the context of Galilee under Roman occupation. Gerard Lenski’s macro-social model of class divisions within a rural-agrarian society will be helpful to ascertain the social location of the L community. It will be demonstrated from this data that the community which produced L can be situated within the perspective of an economically diverse peasant community.

Lenski’s model, applied to peasant societies such as 1st century Galilee, demonstrates how the small economic surplus of these societies is mediated so that a single ruler and a ruling class extract surplus value from the overwhelming majority of people who belong to the peasant class. According to Lenski, power and privilege are mediated in peasant societies through a retaining class, including scribes, priests, public servants and merchants who are drawn from the peasant class, and given
extra power and privilege in order to administer and maintain the power of the ruler.\textsuperscript{54}

That the peasants of the L community were largely from below the retaining class is observable from the way that members of the retaining classes are always viewed from below. Key pericopes indicating this include the parallel BB’ (L 10:25-42; 18: 9-14; 19:1-10), in which priests and levites are viewed as unsympathetic towards the desperate traveler in the Good Samaritan parable, and both an unnamed tax-collector, and the tax-collector Zacchaeus are viewed as in need of repentance; F’ the dishonest manager (L 16:1-15) in which an economic functionary is viewed with distance and suspicion; and C’ the unjust judge (L 18:1-8), in which a widow has to plead with an arrogant and unsympathetic local magistrate for justice.

The L document therefore can be placed firmly within the peasant class of ancient Galilee. However, comparison of Lenski’s macro-social model with evidence from the both Roman imperial and Jewish history make it possible to be more specific: as Galilean peasants, it is likely that most of the L community are experiencing land-displacement.

Richard Horsley, highly critical of Western scholarship’s over-estimation of the Roman Empire, has said that in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century, Rome was consolidating its power in Galilee by transforming it into a ‘military-agribusiness complex’, comparable to the “military-industrial complex” of American imperial expansion as described in the speeches of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Under Rome, retired soldiers from ranking and

equestrian families would buy huge tracts of land and acquire slaves. They would then use the surplus of their booty to foreclose on indebted peasants. The result of this process was that local peasants experienced land-displacement and either wage-labour or slavery. Horsley quotes Plutarch’s claim that the provinces of Rome experienced “a rapid deline in the class of small-holders”55.

All of these social problems were further exacerbated by the need to pay tribute to Rome. When in normal circumstances, peasant families struggle to maintain a subsistence level existence, increased taxation would drive peasants first into debt, then off their lands, and finally into slave or wage labour. So Horsley describes, “in the reign of Antipas in Galilee, villagers would have been heavily in debt, chronically hungry and distressed about the future.”56

Kenneth Bailey’s interpretation of the parable of the Dishonest Manager (L 16:1-15) draws on mishnaic categories of tenancy to contextualise the economic situation of Jewish tenants on Roman occupied land. He describes three social layers of tenant farmers: The aris/kablan is a share-holding tenant who pays a rent as a fixed percentage of crop, the hoker pays a designated portion of the crop regardless of the yield, and the soker simply pays rent in money. The social context of the L community is best understood in the context of this style of tenancy.57

Almost every story within the L document is reflective of these economic realities: debt, land-displacement resulting in either share-cropping, wage-labour or slavery.

55 Life of Tiberius Gracchus 8.
Pericope E, Parable of the Rich Fool (12:13-21), for instance, describes a greedy land owner as standing under God’s judgment, and also does E’ Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31). The experience of wage-labour is described in F Parable of the Doorkeeper (L 12:35-38), in the Lost Son parable from G’ the ‘Lost and Found’ Triptych (L ch. 15), and the reality of slave-labour is described from the perspective of the slave in D’, the saying about dutiful slaves (L 17:7-10).

If the upper limit of the L community is set to include land-owners, but probably not many from the retaining class, then the lower limit is set by the attitude of the L document towards the outcast and the shamed. In Lenski’s macro-social model, all peasant societies have the potential of downward mobility resulting in becoming an expendable person because of the limited economic resources, limited land, and growing populations. The L document which always looks upward at land-owners and retainers with suspicion, and yet the prospect of losing social privilege is treated with aversion. Words using the root αἰσχύν- (shame) are often used to describe this experience of loss of social standing. In L 14:9, Jesus warns that those who are not humble may be shamed at a banquet by being asked to take the lowest place, and in L 16:3 the unjust manager faces the prospect of being shamed by losing his job and being forced to beg. At L 13:17, Jesus’ opponents are shamed (κοτῆσθαι) by losing a debate with him.

In each of these instances, the concern is a person who still has some social standing facing the prospect of losing it, such persons are described from above with compassion and an awareness of their humanity and suffering. By contrast, when dealing with people who are already in a position of being expendable. In H, The
Great Feast (L 14:1-24, 28-33), the community is instructed to invite the poor to their banquets. In E’ (L 16:19-31), the rich man had an obligation to care for Lazarus. In B’, at the Zacchaeus pericope (L 19:1-10), giving to the poor is the behaviour which identifies Zacchaeus as a true child of Abraham.

The L community, then, are not rich, but they are also not destitute. The emotive language used to describe wage-labour and slavery in the pericopes outlined above suggests that the community have the class-consciousness of tenants, but that they frequently find themselves, like the Lost Son, forced to hire themselves out to gentile (Roman occupiers) with their unclean farming habits (ie., feeding the pigs).

It is in this social context that L’s central trope, the banquet, makes sense. L’s kerygma is that Jesus’ practice of holding food in common with all people is the determining factor in the eschatological judgment. In L’s perspective, spiritual reality is ‘in the thick’ of the unjust social and economic realities of a 1st century peasant community occupied by a foreign empire. It is because of this central concern that a unifying theological vision began to emerge in the L community: an eschatological banquet in which these injustices are reversed. In Luke 14, at the climax of the L document, this eschatological vision is spelled out, and the discourses of the chapter culminate repeatedly with the declaration that the eschatological condition will redress the injustices of this world: that if you invite the poor to your banquet, then you shall be rewarded at the eternal banquet (14:14), and that the poor themselves will be invited in to the exclusion of the wealthy (14:21, 24).

The Inner Texture of L’s Theology
In reconstructing the text of L, authors such as Paffenroth have made use of a ‘pre-
Lucan vocabulary’. Certain key-words are repeated within the L document with a nuance distinct to L within the New-Testament. This vocabulary was useful in the identification of passages which belong to the L document, but it is impossible to ignore the way that L’s unique vocabulary and distinctive usage of words within this vocabulary are informative about the inner texture of the L community’s discourse about the sacred. Most of L’s unique words refer to daily economic and social realities of the material life of peasants in an advanced agrarian society. Each of these words has a spiritual connotation, often symbolic of an aspect of the coming judgment.

Bruce Malina and Richard Rohrbaugh describe this same phenomenon of a community creating its own unique vocabulary to nuance its message in the keywords of John’s gospel.\(^5^8\) They explain this trait using Michael Halliday’s ‘anti-
language’ model\(^5^9\) to describe the way that an alternative or recalcitrant in-group (anti-society) can create its own slang as a “mode of resistance” through relexicalisation and overlexicalisation. That is, in the context of a certain community texts redefine words to refer to the central concern of their alternative community, and sometimes this process redefines a broad range of words in similar ways.

1. Romantic Language for Just Realities


L’s rural vocabulary for dealing with instances of the self-humbling people being exalted includes ‘to drench’ (βρέχω), a word that primarily means rain, which in ancient Palestine was indispensable for harvest and survival. βρέχω always means rain in the New Testament, except in L 7:38 and 44 where it refers to the weeping of a sinful woman being accepted by Jesus. There is a tension within Luke between the meaning of the word as used by the L source here, and its usage by the Q source in Luke 17:29, where it refers to the raining down of fire and sulphur on Sodom.

‘Wedding banquet’ (γάμος), it has already been noted is the central image of the L document, but functions in the same way as βρέχω, a feature of daily life with spiritual significance. L introduces the term in explicitly eschatological terms in L 12:35-38, the Parable of the doorkeeper, in which the Lord returns to a wedding banquet, and judges the servants. The extended discourse of the Great Feast in chapter 14 fleshes out this picture of an eschatological banquet.

L often refers to neighbours, and uses both the term πλησίον which is common in the New Testament and γείτων, which is unique to L and John 9:8 in the New Testament. However, It is possible that the L document originally used only γείτων since the later redactor of Luke prefers πλησίον. In agrarian societies such as L’s Palestine, a ‘neighbour’ is a member of one’s own in-group. L’s relexicalised meaning of is spelled out in the “who is my neighbour?” discourse in L 10:25-29, which L uses as the opportunity for the parable of the Good Samaritan, and so redefines neighbours as those who treat one another mercifully.

Olive oil (ἐλαιόν) seems to have special symbolic significance in the L community. It is used by the Good Samaritan to treat the wounds of a stranger, it is a debt of olive
oil that that dishonest manager remits from the first debtor (L 16:1-15), and Jesus rebukes the Pharisee for neglecting to anoint him with olive oil in the pericope of the sinful woman (L 7:36-50) as a contrast to the love shown by the woman at his feet.

L’s special word for rejoicing (εὐφραίνω) is a double-sided word. Throughout the ‘lost and found’ trystich (Chapter 15), it refers to the rejoicing of a person who has recovered lost material goods or family members, but always interpreted allegorically as referring to the joy that God has over those who repent. Alternatively, it is used in parallel EE’ of rich people (such as the rich fool and the rich man) enjoying material goods which will be taken away from them and given to the poor in the eschatological reversal. The word is thus a two-sided coin, for one either rejoices unjustly with material possessions in this world, or practices humility and compassion in this life and rejoices at the eschatological banquet.

There is a strikingly similar relexicalisation of the word kiss (καταφιλέω), which in L’s anti-language is the compassionate greeting of between a shamed person and a self-humbling, honourable person, such as prodigal son and his father (L 15:11-32), or the sinful woman and the prophet (L 7:36-50).

The verb σπλαγχνίζομαι (to be moved with compassion) refers to the L community’s determination to remain conscious of the suffering of the outcast, and gains its visceral and emotive imagery from the word’s origin from σπλαγχνα (guts). All of the relexicalisations listed above are concrete examples of people are all signifiers for acts of compassion shown to expendable people. What has been given by concrete example is spelled out by L in the abstract and explicit. This term is used frequently in the Markan tradition with christological significance, as Jesus has
compassion on the crowds (Mt 9:36/14:14=Mk 6:34; Mt 15:32=Mk 8:1). Material unique to Matthew (Mt 20:34 is the final redactor, and 18:27 may also be) uses the term also in a christological sense, of Jesus having compassion on sick individuals and healing them, but the image remains of a charismatic or divine leader acting generously. The L community is unique among the gospel sources in using the word primarily of people who have sufficient resources showing an emotional awareness of the suffering of the expendable people in their society, which motivates them to act so as to meet their material needs. Jesus himself is moved in this way to restore a widow’s son (L 7:13), but the compassion is not presented as something unique to Jesus, since it also moves a Samaritan to heal a victim of bandits (L 10:33); and a father to receive back a son who has squandered his family’s resources (L 15:20).

Because this lexeme points to a specific abstract noun, ‘compassion’, it is this word which reveals the central concern of the L community, pointed to metonymically by the rest of the anti-language lexicon outlined above: compassion for expendable persons. In the context of first century Galilee, this makes all too much sense. The L community is distinctive because it defines itself antisocially by its dogged determination to maintain full consciousness of the humanity of those who became expendable under the Roman occupation. So, perhaps even more effective in achieving this aim, the L community also created a grotesque vocabulary to describe behaviour which created economic injustices.

2. Grotesque Language for Unjust Realities

The ugly lexicon with which L speaks about economic injustices underscores the social situation on their community. It is not easy for people living in a world of
surplus to understand the horror with which a rural society could view the wasting of resources. The L community describes such waste with the animalistic language of ‘scattering’ wealth (διασκορπίζω) as the lost son (L 15:13) and the dishonest manager (L 16:1) do, extorting (συκοφαντέω) money as Zachhaeus (L 19:8) repents of doing, and ‘gobbling-up’ (χορτάζω) resources as the lost son (L 15:16) and poor Lazarus (L 16:21) long to do. These special usages are striking in comparison to usages found in similar literature outside of S\textsuperscript{lk}. For instance, Q 6:21 makes ‘being fed’ (χορτάζω) an indication of blessedness, not a distasteful injustice. For Mark (in the synoptic passion, Mt 26:31=Mk 14:27), διασκορπίζω can mean the scattering of the disciples like sheep. In M material, it refers to the opposite of waste: the sowing of seeds for harvest (Matthew 25:24, 26)! These words have been relexicalised in L to condemn socially unjust situations as unbecoming of a member of the L community.

There is also a symbolic value given the numbers nine (ἐννέα) or ninety-nine (ἐννενήκοντα ἑννέα), both of which numbers immediately evoke the image of a an unspoken ‘one’, who is missing. This numerical symbolism is unique to the primitive Galilean communities of L and Q in the Bible, and is used by L to describe people who are too comfortable, who are unaware of the suffering of people like those symbolized by the lost sheep (L 15:4, 7) or the thankful Samaritan leper (L 17:7) who are the missing ‘one’, outcaste or expendable.

As in the case with the positive, rural anti-language terms which point towards idea of compassion, so too the negative, grotesque language includes terms which make explicit the central concern of the anti-language. For these negative terms, the
central concerns relate to the verbal stem ὀφείλ- (debt-) referring to the foundational economic hardship that Galilee was experiencing under Roman rule, the indebtedness which became instrumental to the other injustices of displacement, wage-labour and slavery. L vocabulary includes both words for debt (ὀφείλω), and for debtors (ὀφειλέτης/χρεοφιλέτης). In L 7:41, the forgiveness of debts is used to explain the love of a shamed woman for Jesus. In L 13:4, it is again used as a metaphor for sin. In L 16:5, 7, it is used of the debts which the unjust manager remits, and in L 17:10 of the obligation people have to serve God. The conflation of the related concepts of material and spiritual debt by early Jesus movements in Galilee is also evidenced in the Q material. Ironically, in Q 11:4, the final redactor of Luke has edited the term out of the Q material.

The L community also has a term for the increase in expendable persons which agrarian societies experience under economic hardship, as the L community frequently used terms with the root αἰσχύν- to refer to such shamed persons (αἰσχύνη/αἰσχύνομαι/καταἰσχύνω). It is shameful to lose a debate (L 13:17), to be demoted from your place at a banquet (L 14:9), or to be demoted to begging (L 16:3).

L’s special language clarifies our understanding of the central concern of the L community. L’s terminology is quite distinct from the anti-language lexicon found in John, and L’s unique theology is encoded into this vocabulary. When these realities are just, the words are rustic, romantic terms for homely and pastoral items and events. They are expressed in propositional form with second half of L’s climactic aphorism in L 14:11 = 18:14b, “the one who is self-humbling will be exalted.” The
second half of the aphorism, “for everyone who is self-exalting will be humbled”, refers to the unjust realities of L’s community life, and the corresponding words are grotesque – the L community is particularly fond of using bestial or objectifying words to describe humans who are being demeaned or excluded. This would have had the effect of shocking the hearer into a conscious acknowledgement of the injustice of the situation.

Walter Brueggeman has described this ability to maintain pathos in the face of the death and suffering that result from the injustices of imperial occupation as a distinctive task of Israelite prophetic vocation. According to Brueggeman, situations of excessive affluence and oppression bring numbness to such injustices, and the prophetic imagination, exemplified first in the public grieving of Jeremiah, allows people to embrace their experiences of suffering and death. L’s anti-language functions in exactly this way – it is by vivid language that it makes the economic conditions realities tangible. As Schlovsky has said of art, so also in the L community prophecy existed “that one may recover the sensation of life; it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone stony.”

At this point it is worth noticing an overlap between the anti-language of L and its narrative. Two of L’s anti-language terms for wasting community resources, ‘gobbling-up’ (χορτάζω), scattering (διασκορπίζω), both show human beings behaving brutishly and irrationally. The L community has included people from every layer of the peasant class, and values each individual as being fully human. It

is (in modern terminology) a ‘united front’ of Galilean peasants against the dehumanizing effects of the Roman occupation.

This comparison is made explicit in the climactic dialogue between Jesus and the Pharisees, who do not understand that people are more valuable than animals and objects, and articulated in L 14:11 = 18:14b. In L, the Pharisees functioning as a foil to the values of the L community, and are portrayed as characters who are so numb to injustice that they consistently treat animals better than the poor – thus breaking the class solidarity that held the L community together: The Pharisees are portrayed as divided from other peasants because of race (particularly against Samaritans), gender (women) and status (the unclean, the best seats at the table, etc.) rather than along class lines. Jesus’ climactic parable of the Great Feast exposes them as class traitors, and it is at this moment in the narrative of L that they begin to hate him (see for instance, L 15:1, where the change in attitude begins to become evident).

The Eschatological Vision of the L Community.

“We was farm people till the debt. And then – them people. They done somepin to us. Ever time they come seemed like they was a-whippin’ me – all of us. An’ in Needles, that police. He done somepin to me, made me feel mean. Made me feel ashamed. An’ now I ain’t ashamed. These folks is our folks. An’ that manager, he come an’ set an’ drank coffee, an’ he says, ‘Mrs. Joad’ this, and’ ‘Mrs. Joad’ that – an’ ‘How you getting’ on, Mrs. Joad?’” She stopped and sighed. “Why, I feel like people again.”

~ Steinbeck, The Grapes of Wrath, p. 321

Taken together, L’s reconstructed documentary form with its social location and the inner, linguistic tex ture of the L anti-language reveal the central ideological concern
than binds together both document and community. The L community are rich and poor peasants united by their shared class consciousness, who refuse to become numbed to the injustices and dehumanization which is happening all around them. They vested spiritual significance in the daily social and economic realities of life in Galilee, especially in the humanity of expendable people, and the coming eschatological banquet of those who share their resources.

I have placed a sketch of theology of the L community at the end in order to avoid a ‘method of doctrinal concepts’, which reduces the community’s complexity into modern theological categories. However, when the centrality of the Great Banquet to the chiasm is taken together with the concern for social justice in the anti-language and the key verse’s claim of a great eschatological reversal, it is not reductionist to claim that the key to L’s theology is their expectation of an eschatological banquet in which the injustices of their colonized and oppressed world were reversed.

This theology which is hinted at everywhere is spelled out in detail in the eschatological reversals of parallel EE’, of the rich fool and of Lazarus and the rich man. This parallel is a form of exemplary parallelism in which the rich fool is the exemplar of the same principle that is clarified by the exemplary pair, Lazarus and the rich man. The rich fool and the rich man are both hoarders of wealth in a community with limited resources. The question they are posed in 12:20, “And the things you have prepared, to whom shall they be?” is answered by the story of the reversal in which the good things belong to Lazarus in the world to come.
As Bock points out, there is no simplistic attack on wealthy people anywhere in Luke. Compared with other passages on the subject (which Bock consistently finds in passages I am considering as the L source), the judgment is always against those who hoard wealth to themselves.

[S]ome understand the verse to teach that there is a fixed quota of wealth and poverty to experience in life and the wealthy who run up their quota in this life end up with nothing later. Such a reading disregards not only the teaching of a passage like 16:9, it also ignored the poignant picture that Luke will deliver later in 19:8-9, where Zacchaeus becomes a model for how handle wealth. Luke 14:12-13 also illustrates the call to generosity, with a promise that such generosity will be paid back at the resurrection (Schneider 1977a: 342). More radically stated forms of the same emphasis are found in 12:33-34 and 18:22.  

The L community held that a person’s eschatological condition was completely determined by the class relations of the present condition, as seen in a close reading of the parable of Lazarus and the rich man (16:19-31). Emblematic of this determining is the great chasm referred to in L 16:26, which separates the rich man in Hades from the bosom of Abraham. The KJV, and almost all English translations and commentators misleadingly suggests that the great reversal is one reason that the rich man’s damnation is irreversible, and that the great chasm is a second reason: “besides all this”.

However, as Johnston points out, the Greek construction ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις could simply be taken to mean ‘in all these matters’ (i.e. the hoarding of wealth).  The traditional reading requires the construction to be interpreted as a ‘dative of
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addition’, a dative which is not attested anywhere in the New Testament. Arguing for such a usage in Septuagint Greek, Fitzmyer points to the phrase in the LXX of Sirach 48:15 and Job 12:9. Job 12:9 refers to a person knowing God “in” the things God has done, which is clearly an instrumental dative. The phrase in Sirach, slightly different in form (ἐν πᾶσιν τούτοις), is also instrumental: it refers to the miracles of Elijah, and then claims that not even because of all these miracles would the people repent.

There is no reason then to think that L 16:26 is anything other than an instrumental dative. I propose that, in keeping with the theology of the L community, the great chasm is no mere inconvenient attendant circumstance preventing the rich man from leaving the place of torment – it is rather a chasm that he himself dug through (ἐν) his actions in his life on earth.

The passage does not only suggest a causal link between hoarding wealth and eternal torment with the rich man as the agent of his own damning, it also spells out a parity between the earthly cause and the hellish effect. For instance, at the opening of the narrative, the narrator makes it clear that the rich man gives absolutely nothing to Lazarus, and it is because of (or ἐν) this that Lazarus cannot even give the rich man a drop of cool water (v. 24-26).

John Nolland has drawn on the interpretation of J. D. M. Derrett, and argued that the dogs (κυών) of v. 21, are the dogs of the rich man, which he sent to feed on the Lazarus’ sores. Other commentators have been cautious of this reading. Fitzmyer,

---

for instance, says nothing in the text indicated this, but the fact that the dogs’ licking Lazarus is introduced by the conjunction ἀλλά which retains its full contrasting function when joined to καί tends to favour the view that instead of food, the dogs not only fed on the scraps which he had asked for, but they also fed on him!

A second argument against Nolland’s reading is anticipated in Bock’s commentary which says that κυῖν are always wild dogs, but Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon identifies numerous references in the broader ancient Greek literature, particularly in Homer, in which κυῖν refers primarily to domestic dogs such as a shepherd-dog, a watchdog, and a hound.

The best argument for Nolland’s reading is the one which he presents, from the narrative function of the dogs in the wider narrative connection with the meal scene:

Though the common view is that the dogs here are wild street dogs, the linkage with the meal scene is best satisfied by these dogs being the dogs of the rich man’s house... Instead of a servant coming with the fallen scraps, the dogs come from having consumed the scraps and continue their meal with the juices that ooze from the afflicted man’s sores.

Just like L’s anti-language, I interpret the shocking imagery of this parable to be an indication of a theological resistance to the tendency to become emotionally numb to the human cost of the Roman Imperial exploitation of Palestinian peasant society:
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an expendable person like Lazarus, whom L honours by remembering his name while they forget the nameless rich.

If I could cautiously ‘demythologise’ the parable, ignoring the outcaste is an action which cuts you off from God, or from the ‘bosom of Abraham’: from intimacy with the people of God. Just as the rich man’s treatment of Lazarus set a ‘chasm’ which could not be destroyed, Zacchaeus’ charity resulted in Jesus acknowledging he is a son of Abraham (in intimate fellowship with his people), and the Good Samaritan deserved ‘eternal life’ for loving his neighbour. This is the meaning of the discourse on unjust mammon at the end of the parable of the rich fool. The eternal tents into which those who use their wealth well are received are the same thing as this communion with Abraham into which poor Lazarus and rich Zacchaeus are received.
Conclusion

...But this is illusion. Things have their shape in time, not space alone. Some marble blocks have statues within them, embedded in their future.

Alan Moore, The Watchmen, Ch. IV, p. 24

The method of these last two chapters have been a dynamic, convictional process of discovering the history of the New Testament by recognising patterns in the data, and reconstructing hypothetical sources on the basis of these patterns. The L community’s social moderateness stands in contrast to the radical Q material, which, as argued in the previous chapter, was deeply committed to obeying Jesus’ self-stigmatising commands, demanded complete renunciation of wealth and had an exclusory attitude towards outsiders.

The L material, however, is quite radical in defending the humanity and social needs of the members of their own community. In some ways the two tradition bodies are mirror images of each other, that given their mutual Palestinian or Syrian origin, it is tempting to speculate that the two communities were aware of each other, and modelled themselves, and their traditions in deliberate contradistinction to each other. This contradiction seems to be a valid problem in the interpretation of Jesus’ message – how can radicalism and inclusivity stand side by side?

Given this tension, it is remarkable that in Luke, as it stands in the Christian canon, the Q and L material are combined, and set apart from the Markan material. This can hardly be an accident, because the materials, which are so freely mixed here, are not sympathetic to each other. The process of redaction must have combined what was seen as being the best of both worlds. This does not mean that the redactor
changed the tradition of his sources. Rather, he placed the various traditions into a new context: the context of a journey to Jerusalem. By doing this, the redactor disallowed rigid interpretations of traditions, and restored their original symbolic and ambiguous context, before they had become proof-texts for the various practises of diverse early Christian communities. In particular, the demand for authentic discipleship, which leaves everything behind to follow Jesus and which is so clear in Q, is maintained above the compromise by the propertied class of the L community. But Proto-Luke has not sided with Q. The inclusivity of the L community is emphasised over against the exclusive nature of the Q community by the realities of life on the road, and by the quality of people who did in fact follow Jesus. For Proto-Luke, imagery of the journey is able to create a synthesis of authenticity and inclusion.

So, with the reconstruction of the various sources of Proto-Luke, a picture of sorts has been sketched of the final document, but only to the extent that any literary work is a sum of its parts. What remains in the process of reconstructing and interpreting Proto-Luke is the task of looking at the document as a whole.
CHAPTER 4
The Proto-Luke Hypothesis

If we cut crosswise through the stem of a plant, we can observe a rather complex pattern on the surface revealed by the cut. What we are looking at is a section of the plant’s longitudinal fibres. These fibres will be revealed if we now make a second cut perpendicular to the first. Again in this example, one perspective depends on the other. The longitudinal section shows us the fibres themselves which make up the plant, while the transversal section shows us their arrangement at one particular level. But the transversal section is distinct from the longitudinal section, for it shows us certain relations between the fibres which are not apparent at all from any longitudinal section.

~ Ferdinand de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics. Part 1, Ch. 1 III § 4

Jacopo Tintoretto The Last Supper (1592-94)
Introduction: Methodological Considerations

To characterize industrial progress by quantitative indices alone, without considering quality, is almost like describing a man’s physique by his height and disregarding his chest measurements. - Leon Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, p. 13-14.

In the Oxford Conference on the Synoptic Problem held on the 7-10 April 2008, J. Verheyden presented a paper on Proto-Luke, and suggested that there are two directions of argumentation used to validate the Proto-Luke hypothesis (PLH). The first argues that there is specific continuum of material which can be shown to belong to Proto-Luke, and the second outlines specific characteristics of Proto-Luke, such as its theology or Semitic style.¹

Quantitative Methods

The first method Verheyden mentions is to show that certain passages belong to Proto-Luke. This approach is reminiscent of the work of B. H. Streeter and Vincent Taylor who worked from statistical features such as the percentages and distribution of common words, the order of pericopes, etc.² The scholars of this era wanted to build scientific conclusion upon these quantifiable data. The data that they generated will prove both interesting and helpful for understanding Proto-Luke, but it must be a mistake to prove PLH quantitatively from data within canonical Luke, simply because a text, such as Proto-Luke, does not function like the physical world with mechanical consistency. Word-statistics have also played a helpful role in the reconstruction of Q and L, as Proto-Luke’s sources, as seen in my previous chapter. But the task of reconstructing Proto-Luke will ultimately fail if it only uses quantitative data to verify the presence of a biblical source, because it is people who write texts, and people are inconsistent – their vocabularies and grammatical tendencies fluctuate

with their age, environment, social situation and even mood. A short monologue from C. S. Lewis’ *That Hideous Strength* serves to illustrate the issue here, that the small regularities in texts are the remote consequence of greater unity of the style of the authors and communities behind the texts, which we do not have access to:

‘Shakespeare never breaks the real laws of poetry,’ put in Dimble. ‘But by following them he breaks every now and then the little regularities which critics mistake for the real laws. Then the little critics call it a “license.” But there’s nothing licentious about it to Shakespeare.’

Furthermore, Proto-Luke may be at an unfair disadvantage in the statistics game. If it were compiled, as its proponents have tended to think, by the same author as canonical Luke-Acts, one would expect a degree of stylistic regularity to render the Proto-Lukan redactor stylistically indistinguishable from the redactor of Canonical Luke. This possibility means that many of the methods used in the reconstruction of Q and of Document L will not be applicable to the reconstruction of Proto-Luke.

**Qualitative Methods**

Verheyden’s second method – reconstruction from qualitative attributes of the source – corresponds more closely to the approach of this thesis. I have argued that the source history of a biblical text must be reconstructed by recognition of human features in the text, an epistemological moment which corresponds to what Loder calls ‘insight felt with intuitive force’, and that this can only be done subjectively, by a human reader. This is the task of redaction criticism, and what it is seeking is the *intention* of the text. It is not a form of unrestrained subjectivism because of the dynamic process of convictional knowledge which I outlined in chapter 1 insists that insightful knowledge undergoes a process of objective

---

verification in which the source historical reconstruction builds on this recognition by a process of verification/falsification and interpretation. This quantitative process has already begun in the reconstruction of Proto-Luke’s source history in chapters 2 and 3.

However, according to Verheyden’s second qualitative method, we have not yet begun. Looking at this text from a qualitative vantage point means finding a heuristic method to ascertain the intention not the historicity of this posited, hypothetical entity Proto-Luke. This process starts with the simple observation that when one reads Luke, a group of texts ‘jump out’ at you, the most obvious being the so-called ‘greater interpolation’ of 9:51-18:14, but also include the lesser interpolation and the incident with Zacchaeus. This text can be recognised as a literary work in its own right.

The passages in question are conspicuously absent of Markan influence, and seem to present Acts-Lukian theology and christology with a naïve simplicity that the larger work lacks. But since source critical methods did not demonstrate PLH to a sufficiently broad consensus of scholars, the initial hypothesis was unable to be verified, and so the process of convicitional knowledge was unable to complete a full cycle.

Since the qualitative method is about seeking to demonstrate the literary unity of Proto-Luke, and is not yet trying to show a documentary Proto-Luke, Saussure’s advice to linguists come to mind. To understand a stative linguistic phenomenon, one must studiously ignore the temptation to study the things that produced the state. “[T]he synchronic viewpoint predominates, for it is the true and only reality of the community of speakers.”4 If we forget this viewpoint, as everyone who has studied Proto-Luke to date has forgotten it, Proto-Luke

---

will cease to be a literary phenomenon, and become merely a historical hypothesis which it is impossible to prove or disprove (conclusively) without an actual manuscript discovery.

As an alternative to such methods, I will have to take the reconstructed sources Q and L as a given, and ask the question how they came to be combined in the way that they have been. The combination of the Q and the L material is Luke’s central section is stark, and this juxtaposition is often bewildering to modern commentators. Once the sources have been individually reconstructed by quantitative data, the redaction of those two sources into their present arrangement can be used as an objective basis to test hypotheses about the intention of the redactor. In this way, redaction criticism is able to draw conclusions about PLH that source criticism itself was unable to draw.

I have demonstrated in the previous chapter (see table 2.2) that the source history of Luke could be seen in the layers of 5th tradition which are evident once Mark is mechanically extracted from Luke. I have argued that these layers are independently present in the narrative-ethical genre, class-conscious intention, and eschatological tendency of L, contrasted with the anti-social, Deuteronomistic aphorisms of Q. This material is prefaced and postscripted by biographical material (the Galilean Ministry of Proto-Luke 3-5, and the Farewell Discourse in Proto-Luke 21-22), and then prefaced and postscripted again by mythical biography (the Infancy Narrative and the Road to Emmaus). These layers tell the story of the history of Luke’s redaction.

Since this chapter represents a newly framed question within the dissertation, namely the question of Proto-Luke itself rather than any of its sources, it is necessary to chart how this specific epistemological arc will be grafted into the process in terms of Loder’s convictional

---

5 Take for instance, Johnson’s attempt to read the various Q material in 17:1-19 on repentance as a narrative unity with the ten lepers pericope, Luke, 257-62.
knowledge paradigm, the observation that there is such a sub-set of passages within Luke, and that the genre of the material marks out a history of the way these passages came together, are instances of recognition, or intuitive insight. How then can we interact critically with Proto-Luke? The intuitive force of the insight leads the subject to seek out interpretation and verification. PLH is counter-posed to the Markan Hypothesis (MH), the alternative view that Q and L were introduced into Mark’s Narrative. PLH will be verified if it consistently makes better sense of the relevant material than alternative logical options such as MH, and will be falsified if the alternatives make better sense.

In order to achieve this, this chapter summarise the various theories concerning the PLH, and also the arguments for MH. These various theories will first be discussed in detail. Then the alleged opening and closing tracts of Proto-Luke, Luke 3:1-4:30 and 21-22, are both subjected to a close exegesis to determine which hypothesis makes better sense of these significant sections.
SECTION 1

A History of Proto-Luke Studies

The first proposal of something like Proto-Luke was given in Paul Feine’s 1891 work, in which he proposed a number of sources for the synoptic tradition, including a narrative source (like a Proto-Mark) which was used by all the synoptic evangelists which he called A, and a Redenquelle which he called B. Mark had access to A only, while Matthew had access to both. For Luke, however, he posited a special Aramaic source called C, or the Quellenschrift.\(^6\) an early form of Luke-Acts which was associated with the Jerusalem church, datable to 67 CE, and was distinguishable by its Semitic quality.\(^7\)

This version of PLH has recently been revitalised by Thomas Brodie, and will be considered in more detail in the course of this chapter as a “PLH-B”. Relying as it does on the semitic tone of the Infancy Narrative and of Acts 1-12 (which, like many scholars, I am inclined to ascribe to the archaicising style of the redactor of Canonical Luke), Feine’s Quellenschrift seems to be a different hypothesis from Classical PLH, as described by B. H. Streeter.

Between the work of Feine and Streeter, two significant critiques of Feine’s version of PLH began to shape the classical formulation of the hypothesis. Firstly, Johannes Weiß criticised the view of Feine because it seemed to reject the emerging scholarly consensus that Luke used Mark. He therefore distinguished between a special Lukan source and “LQ”, or the combination of this source with Matthew’s Q source, which Luke would combine with an


\(^7\) Ibid., 233-35.
Urmarcus to create his canonical gospel.\(^8\) Secondly, Burton Scott Easton, largely convinced by the work of Weiß, argued forcefully that L was linguistically distinct from Luke.\(^9\) All of this laid the groundwork for Streeter’s classical statement of PLH in 1924.

**The Classical Proto-Luke Hypothesis**

Streeter’s work is a century old, but is widely regarded as a classic.\(^10\) His statement of PLH is the clearest expression of its classical form. However, as I shall outline below, the hypothesis is being revived by new scholars, and so it is necessary to trace the later development of the hypothesis and assess its various forms.

Streeter observed that Luke contains several strips of material which did not use Mark, and that these strips were composite of Q and L.\(^11\) He also noted that when placed together, the non-Markan strips read like a complete gospel, longer than Mark. They have a clear framework – in fact 3:1 (“In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius...”) reads like the opening of a complete work – and the genealogy in 3:23-28 also makes more sense at the opening of a work. The theological concern and style are similar to canonical Luke-Acts, so Luke is the likely author. Streeter’s Proto-Luke was either written during Luke’s time with Paul in Caesarea, or just after, drawing on notes made in Caesarea. Streeter saw Proto-Luke as fitting fairly unobtrusively into the four-document hypothesis (see Table 3.1), and proposed the following history of its composition:

---

\(^8\) Bernhard Weiß and Johannes Weiß, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas* (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892), 279.


Luke during the two years that he was at Caesarea in the company of Paul made good use of his opportunities of collecting information and made copious notes. Later on, probably not until after the death of Paul, a copy of Q came his way and on the basis of this and his own notes he composed Proto-Luke as a Gospel for the use of the Church in the place where he was then living. Still later a copy of Mark came his way, and he then produced the second and enlarged edition of his Gospel that has come down to us.\textsuperscript{12}

Table 3.1

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
M & Mark & Q \\
& & L \\
& Matthew & Proto-Luke \\
& & Canonical Luke
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In 1959, Friedrich Rehkopf proposed a ‘prelukan’ vocabulary of words that were ‘unlukan’, but evident in Proto-Luke.\textsuperscript{13} The proposed vocabulary is not immediately useful to us because it includes the very distinct vocabularies of L and Q, but as seen in the previous chapter, Rehkopf’s work has provided the basis for Kim Paffenroth’s reconstruction of a vocabulary of L.

In spite of Streeter’s hypothesis as a whole becoming the dominant source-critical theory, Proto-Luke itself has not enjoyed the same level of acceptance. While it is difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons for this, Werner Georg Kümmel’s 1963 \textit{Einleitung in das Neue Testament} presented a solid critique of PLH, in which he argued that Luke’s gospel has the same chronological sequence as Mark’s, and that therefore, Luke must have ‘fitted’ the non-Markan material to Mark’s order of events. Kümmel’s argument seems to have

\textsuperscript{12} Streeter, \textit{Four Gospels}, 214.
\textsuperscript{13} Friedrich Rehkopf, \textit{Die Lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch} (Tubingen: Mohr, 1959).
authoritatively decided the argument within German speaking scholarship, since there is no German language discussion of PLH after 1963. Since it was not translated into English until 1973,\(^{14}\) English-language scholarship does not appear to have been aware of this, and it is not referred to in English scholarship until Joseph Fitzmyer’s 1981 commentary,\(^{15}\) in which the argument against PLH is practically a re-echoing of Kümmel’s argument.

In 1963, the year of Kümmel’s *Einleitung*, George Bradford Caird’s Luke commentary suggested a method of verification for PLH, and decided in its favour. He proposes that there are two possible states of affairs, that Luke fitted his own material into a Markan framework, or that Mark was incorporated into the outline of Proto-Luke. He goes on to state:

> It will be observed that the crux of the problem lies in two passages (3:1-4:30 and 22:1-24:53), since there is little difference of opinion about the rest of the gospel. If in these two passages we hold that Mark has been used as a primary source, we shall agree with the first school that the framework of the Gospel is Marcan. Otherwise we shall be inclined to give our vote to the Proto-Luke school.\(^{16}\)

Caird demonstrates that Luke uses his sources conservatively. Instead of conflating doublets from Mark and Q as Matthew does, he tends to incorporate both forms of the saying in different places, as Caird shows in the following table:

---


Caird argues that if Luke uses his sources so conservatively, and the ‘framing’ sections which Caird describes as the ‘crux’ of the debate lack close verbal parallels with Mark, it is doubtful that they would be Markan in origin. It seems to me that, with the defeat of PLH in German speaking scholarship in 1963 being suddenly adopted in 1973 in English speaking scholarship, but without a scholarly dialogue taking place between the time of 1963 and 73 because of the language barrier, Kümmel’s and Caird’s respective arguments for and against and for PLH were never placed in dialogue, and that then, interest died off after the second half of the twentieth century. It was rejected by the majority of commentators, including such weighty names as Conzelmann\(^\text{18}\) and Fitzmyer,\(^\text{19}\) although neither of these scholars engage with Caird’s argument. The waning interest can be seen gradually through comparing the key commentaries of the decades of the last fifty years. Hans Conzelmann claims his Lukan theology is mainly “not dependent on any particular literary theories about St, Luke’s gospel,”\(^\text{20}\) he uses MH as the basis for his reaction-critical analysis of Luke, and

---

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 24.


\(^{20}\) Conzelmann, 9.
deals only with the category of how Luke edited Mark, dedicating some 40% of his magisterial *Theology of St. Luke* to implications of how Luke changes geographical elements of Mark’s gospel – and it is in Luke 3 and 4 (possibly Proto-Lukan material) that these geographical implications are clearest. Conzelmann sees Luke’s strict demarcation of John’s ministry in the Jordon, and of Jesus’ ministry in Galilee (and Luke’s complete omission of any mention of the district of Perea) as a strategy to clearly demarcate the epoch of Israel from the epoch of Jesus’ ministry.\(^{21}\) All of this simply assumed that PLH is wrong.

Some twenty years later, Fitzmyer needed to devote only three pages to PLH before dismissing it, and his arguments will be considered seriously below. But more recently, recent commentaries have not needed to do so. Critical commentaries by I. Howard Marshall,\(^ {22}\) L. T. Johnson,\(^ {23}\) D. L. Bock\(^ {24}\) do not mention Proto-Luke. Granted, it is not significant in the case of say Robert C. Tannehill\(^ {25}\) or Charles H. Talbert,\(^ {26}\) who are giving a reading of Luke only in its present literary form, but it does seem to be a significant omission in any commentary (like Bock’s) which does come to some source-critical conclusions. Nor do recent introductions to the New Testament such as Achtemeier,\(^ {27}\) or to the gospels such

\(^{21}\) ibid., 18-19 and passim 18-94.


as Goosen and Thomlinson. The 2006 publication, *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, is able to summarise and dismiss the hypothesis in a single sentence.

There are, however, two scholars who have recently revived the hypothesis, and made use of its great explanatory power in different ways. M. -E. Boismard, whose theory I will describe as a sub-hypothesis of PLH, and the theory of Feine as rearticulated by Thomas Brodie, which will be described as PLH-B.

*Boismard’s Multiple Stage Hypothesis*

Boismard, aiming to solve the many unsolved problems of the Synoptic question has put forward another story of their development, which also includes a Proto-Luke.

Table 3.3

*Boismard’s Hypothesis*

This adds into the theory three early gospels: A, a Palestinian gospel; B, a Gentile-Christian revision of A; and C, a very old and completely independent, possibly Palestinian source. Further, the final gospels had access to intermediate forms of Matthew and Mark.

---

Boismard’s hypothesis renders convincing tradition-histories all the difficult material in the Synoptics. If we say that Mark ‘improves’ on Matthew, say by adding ‘sheep without a shepherd’ in Mark 6:34, it is because Mark has B while Matthew only has A. When Matthew and Luke improve Mark’s grammar identically, by removing ‘εὐθὺς’, or fixing an historical present, Luke is using Intermediate Matthew, but Mark is using A. This differs from the classical hypothesis only in the way Luke and Mark have interacted, and in its ability to solve problems. The hypothesis remains marginal, perhaps because the full argument is only available in French. However, the implications of this theory for Proto-Luke are not in any essential way different from the classical PLH. Proto-Luke is still a combination of Q material with some independent traditions that may be labelled L, and represents a stage in the development of Luke from before the material of (intermediate) Mark was encountered.

The later developments of this theory by Boismard became more detailed, and adopted some of the earlier ideas of Feine which had been rejected by Easton, Streeter etc. when the two-source theory became dominant. For instance, Boismard went on to argue that the Infancy Narrative and large portions of Mark were included in Proto-Luke. Apart from his diversion from the near consensus (even among Q sceptics) of the priority of Mark, Boismard’s use of late medieval gospel harmonies as the basis of his reconstruction of Proto-Luke are too unlikely to merit consideration, and Boismard himself admits as much not only in titling his work a quête (quest) but also by explicitly in saying “N’est ce pas de la

33 Marie-Émile Boismard, En Quête du Proto-Luc (Études bibliques 37; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1997), 39.
folie?" His theories are too imaginatively detailed and poorly evidenced to stand on their own. Boismard’s work, however, proved valuable because it gave rise to a reconsideration of Feine’s essential hypothesis which has been taken up by Thomas Brodie, and Brodie’s method does merit a substantial consideration as follows.

**Thomas Brodie’s Reconstruction of Proto-Luke**

Brodie’s hypothesis has made Proto-Luke freshly relevant to contemporary scholarship. It challenges the dominant paradigm of tradition-historical analysis by crafting a history of gospel origins which is literary and inter-textual. In doing so, it brings together historical and literary readings of the Bible, which in current practice sit in an uneasy dichotomy. Further, this reaffirms the *Semitic* nature of the New Testament. An ‘orientalising revolution’ is taking place in the understanding of Greek culture, and New Testament studies cannot afford to lag behind here. Even more significantly, Brodie brings narrative critical concerns to bear on the issue, and in doing so, he opens up a way for PLH to be verified.

Brodie achieves this fresh approach by analysing the New Testament through the process of *mimēsis*, the ancient method ‘reworking’ texts. The entire reconstruction hangs on Proto-Luke, which he builds from Acts-Lukan material parallel to the Elijah/Elisha narrative. So, for example, the ascension is a *mimēsis* of Elijah’s rapture, and Acts 15 is a reworking of the restoration of the temple (2 Kings 12-13). Brodie’s hypothesis (PLH-B) does represent a departure form the classical PLH on a number of critical passages, as seen in Table 2.4.

---


36 Ibid., 72-3.
Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>omissions</td>
<td>1-2 (infancy narratives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1-38 (Jesus and John)</td>
<td>3:1-38 (omits 3:7-9, brood of vipers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1-13 (temptation)</td>
<td>omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:14-30 (the Galilean Ministry)</td>
<td>4:14-22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-11 (Miracle of fish/call of Peter and John)</td>
<td>omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14-16 (The twelve)</td>
<td>omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20-8:3 (centurion, widow, &amp; ministering women)</td>
<td>7:1-8:3 (omits 6:20-49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:51-18:43 The ‘greater interpolation’</td>
<td>yes, but omits:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:1-10 (Zacchaeus)</td>
<td>19:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:11-27 (The parable of the pounds)</td>
<td>omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omissions</td>
<td>22:1-13 (The plot to kill Jesus and preparing for the Passover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:18, 34-36 (A few apocalyptic sayings)</td>
<td>omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:14-30 (The Supper)</td>
<td>22:14-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:31-65 (Final words to disciples)</td>
<td>omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omits</td>
<td>Acts 1-15(^{37})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Streeter, Brodie omits Q, which he thinks is Matthew’s *mimēsis* of *logoi* in Deuteronomy. Brodie’s also includes the infancy narratives. Using the principle of *mimēsis*, Brodie suggests the following story of the birthing of the New Testament:

In order to decide between the classical PLH (as proposed by Streeter and re-worked by Boismard), and Brodie’s hypothesis which I shall designate ‘PLH-B’, I will begin by examining the most unique aspects of Brodie’s hypothesis, his unique redaction history of the Galilean ministry narrative. Instead of assigning the entire narrative to Proto-Luke, Brodie gives a more intricate version in which some sections of the narrative are Proto-Lukan, and others (3:7-9, 4:1-13 and verses 22b-30 of the rejection at Nazareth) are Matthean in origin.

Brodie’s reconstruction is based on three methodological steps. First, the text is identified by its use of septuagintisms. Brodie argues that the septuagintisms indicate a stream of texts which is on some level set apart. The second step of Brodie’s argument is to notice that the resulting text has a structural unity – much like the structural unity of the Elijah/Elisha narrative in 1/2 Kings. The third step in the reconstruction is to notice the problem solving ability of Proto-Luke – it yields a convincing history of the New Testament, which does not need Q, but instead sees Mark as transforming Proto-Luke into a Hellenistic bios, and so creating the genre of gospel.

---

Brodie’s particular reconstruction of Proto-Luke is unique in its ability to explain the formation of the Gospel genre through an intertextual (rather than oral) process, and also in its ability to ground the Greek text of the New Testament in Jewish literature. The skeletal structure of the Elijah/Elisha narrative is clearly and convincingly present in the narrative: at the beginning, middle and end. Luke has many references to Elijah. Jesus compares himself to Elijah, specifically mentioning the widow of Zarephath in Luke 4:26 (although Brodie removes Luke 4:22b-30 from classical Proto-Luke). The Elijah narrative opens with the account of the widow, whose ὑίός Elijah from the dead (1 Ki 17). Luke 7 is a parallel story. It ties the healing of the centurion’s servant with the raising of a widow’s μονογενὴς ὑίος.

Luke-Acts also parallels the Elijah/Elisha narrative at its central point. 2 Kings 1-2 recounts Ahaziah’s death, Elijah’s assumption, and the pouring out of the spirit on Elisha. So Luke 22 –Acts 1, the centre of Luke Acts has the same narrative sequence. The death of Jesus is followed by his ascension, and subsequently the Spirit is poured out on his successors the apostles.

Brodie claims the septuagintisms in Acts end at chapter 15. As Brodie points out, this chapter has a clear similarity to the final image of the Elijah/Elisha narrative: the Temple being restored at the end of Elisha’s ministry. Finally, Brodie demonstrates the similar proportions of the two texts by demonstrating that both Proto-Luke and the Elijah/Elisha narrative can be divided into eight blocks of text, and that each block is a diptych of two balancing panels.39

Having argued from the existence of septuagintisms, and from the similarity of Proto-Luke to the Elijah/Elisha narrative both in structure and content, Brodie’s third argument is to

39 Ibid, 100-3.
claim that his reconstruction is verified by the problems it solves, for instance it eliminates the need for Q, and provides a single coherent history of the New Testament’s origins, which he represents with Table 3.5.

**Critique of Brodie’s Arguments: 1st argument**

The first distinctive aspect of Brodie’s approach is that he identifies Proto-Luke by isolating passages that contain septuagintisms, rather than identifying passages which are free from Marcan influence as in the classical PLH. Brodie has used this method to identify a workable text of Proto-Luke, but he does not provide any justification why this particular way of generating the text is preferable to classical PLH’s method. If it is the case that both Proto-Luke and canonical Luke were redacted by the same author, we would expect his stylistic preferences to be seen at every level of composition. So the presence of septuagintisms in Luke 1–2 for instance is no reason to think they were not added at the final phase of composition. If Luke is using a source closely (such as Q), there is no reason to think that the source material should have septuagintisms in it even if it were part of an early phase of composition, so Brodie’s methodology does not justify his exclusion of the double tradition material, such as 3:7-9, the ‘brood of vipers’ saying, or the temptation narrative, 4:1-11.

Since the abrupt absence of septuagintisms in 3:7-9 and 4:1-11, compared with the surrounding verses can easily be explained by their Q origin, compared to the L origin of the other verses, it only remains to be seen whether 4:22b-30 should be included in Proto-Luke. Brodie’s argument for the exclusion of this section is that Luke’s distinctive usage of the
Septuagint stops at 22a, and resumes at 7:1. He claims that the transition is smooth, from v. 22a:

Καὶ πάντες ἔμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἔθαυπαζοῦν ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,

And everyone was bearing witness to him and they were wondering about the words of grace which proceeded from his mouth

to 7:1

Ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ρήματα αὐτοῦ ἔις τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, ἔισηλθέν ἔις Καφαρναοὺμ.

After he finished these sayings in the hearing of the people, he went into Capernaum.

It is unlikely that Luke would call Jesus’ speech first λόγοις and then ῥήματα, in such close context. Luke usually uses ῥήματα to refer to ‘sayings’ (i.e. 1:65; 2:17; 18:34 and especially Acts 20:35), and while 4:18-19, 21 do fit the criteria, the section directly preceding 7:1, (the Sermon on the Plain) seems like a more probable candidate for the ῥήματα of 7:1.

According to Brodie, it is in the section of 7:1-8:3 that the words spoken in Capernaum are fulfilled by healing and remission of sin. According to the classical PLH, Brodie’s ‘smooth transition’ would be broken by the rejection at Nazareth (4:22b-30), the call of the disciples (5:1-11) and the Sermon on the Plain (6:20-49). However, classical PLH’s order can be also be interpreted as a narrative device. Jesus was rejected at Nazareth, so he regroups by calling disciples, and attracting a crowd of followers, and then in chapter 7, goes into Capernaum where he is more successful. As Brodie says, “in this section (7.1-8.3), the

---

40 Ibid., 98.
words said in the synagogue become reality”, but with the intervening sections which Brodie omits functioning as a believable explanation as to why the prophecy is being fulfilled in a different town.

And there are even some problems with the flow of the narrative according to Brodie’s version. In 2:51 (which Brodie includes in Proto-Luke), Jesus is still in Nazareth. In 3:21, he is baptised, but Luke does not specify where or by whom. It is in 4:1 (which Brodie excludes) that it is then made clear that Jesus is returning from Jordan to the wilderness. In 4:14 he returns to Galilee in the power of the spirit, where the great deeds in Capernaum mentioned in 4:23 must be supposed to have happened and finally to Nazareth in 4:16. But Brodie’s Proto-Luke does not specify where Jesus was baptised, and also has no period in the wilderness. Brodie is left with a lengthy description of Jesus returning that seems totally unjustified because Jesus has not gone anywhere. Since the criterion of narrative unity does not support PLH-B as clearly as Brodie claims, and narrative unity can be made to work very well for classical PLH, 4:16-30 should certainly be viewed as a unity as it is in Classical PLH.

Brodie’s second line of evidence for dividing this section, i.e. that the septuagintisms stop at 4:22a, also does not bear scrutiny. Of Fitzmyer’s classical list of 25 septuagintisms common to Luke, 4:16-22a only has one examples, i.e. προσ + acc. after a verb of speaking in 4:21, λέγειν προσ συντον, as well as the catena of LXX scriptures in v. 18-19. But the part of the pericope that Brodie removes has two septuagintisms in it. προς + acc. after a verb of speech occurs in v. 23, ἐπευ προς συντον; and the septuagintal participle ἀναστάντες in v.29, as well as a paraphrase of an LXX story, including a direct quotation in v. 25-27. The calling of the first disciples in 5:1-11 also has two clear septuagintisms. In v.1: Ἐγένετο δὲ

---

41 Ibid.
... If Brodie’s only reason for excluding these passages from Proto-Luke is that the septuagintisms end at 4:22a, then their inclusion should be more certain to him than the inclusion of 4:16-22a.

Critique of Brodie’s Arguments: 2nd argument

The skeletal framework of the Elijah/Elisha narrative is clear in Luke, and can be seen in reconstructions of Proto-Luke whether PLH or PLH-B is followed (although admittedly, PLH would have to be viewed together with by some material from Acts, perhaps ch. 1-15). As Brodie claims, “In the entire world of ancient literature, Luke-Acts and the Elijah-Elisha Narrative are the only texts that consist of two balancing parts bridged by an assumption into heaven.” However, Brodie has pushed the case too far, drawing massive amounts of parallels to fill out a full passage-by-passage correspondence between Proto-Luke and the Elijah/Elisha narrative which seems to have little basis. For instance, Acts 5:1-11 is parallel to 1 Kings 20:1-21; 21:1-7 because one involves greed and the other fraud. Acts 8:9-40 is placed parallel to 2 Kings 5 just because both passages refer to money. Luke 19:1-10 is parallel to 2 Kings 4:38-44 because they both mention trees, and because there is a restoration in both stories (even though one is Zacchaeus being restored by Jesus, and the other is an axe-head being restored to its owner by miraculous floating). Scholars the calibre of Dodd and Bultmann have been criticised for ‘parallelomania’ because they proposed literary relationships much less fanciful than these. To argue that two passages A and B are parallel, the minimum burden of proof is to demonstrate that the parallel is, on some thematic or verbal grounds, stronger than parallels which could be suggested between A or B and other passages in the relevant corpus.
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Since the correspondence between canonical Luke-Acts and the Elijah-Elisha narrative can be simply explained by the final redactor of Luke-Acts using the Elijah-Elisha narrative as a model, without the need for a correspondence in minute detail, there remains no reason to suppose this correspondence was a discernable feature of Proto-Luke.

**Critique of Brodie’s Arguments: 3rd argument**

Brodie claims that his hypothesis can be verified by its ability to explain the formation of the New Testament in a way that ‘works’, without reference to Q.\(^{45}\) This argument functions as an appeal to Occam’s Razor: ‘entities are not to be multiplied without necessity’, therefore if the entity ‘Q’ can be avoided, it verifies Brodie’s hypothesis. I have discussed the razor in chapter 2, with reference to Goodacre and Farmer’s attempt to discredit Q, and argued that this is an invalid appeal to the razor because the existence on ‘many and various’ sources is a fact secured by the data (see Luke 1:1-3). The existence of sources is not a feature of the interpretation of that data, to which the razor might apply. Furthermore, with specific relation to the Galilean ministry narrative in Luke’s gospel, which will be dealt with specifically in the next section, Brodie’s explanation of the individual source-critical data is consistently more complex. According to Brodie, the narrative must start out in one form, be reworked by Mark and then finally reworked by canonical Luke into a story with the opposite conclusion to the original version. The added simplicity of removing a source is well counterbalanced by the simplicity of giving a unified account of this section.

None of Brodie’s arguments withstand methodological scrutiny, and in fact by the criterion of septuagintisms, PLH-B is refuted by the fact that there are often septuagintisms in the passages Brodie omits, and none in passages he includes. The next step then is to apply the

\(^{45}\) Brodie, *Birthing*, xxviii.
same scrutiny to the classical version of the hypothesis. For the purposes of this argument, Streeter’s and Boismard’s earlier hypotheses presented in Tables 3.1 and 3.3 are totally compatible, so they can be dealt with as a single theory.
SECTION 2

Arguments for and against the Proto-Luke Hypothesis

Having given above an overview of the different possible understandings of the origin of Luke’s gospel, shown Brodie’s alternative PLH to be false, and isolated two counter-posed possibilities relevant to this thesis, PLH and MH, I will now examine arguments on both sides of the issue. I will first present the arguments for the classical PLH, and then specifically argue against MH.

In this section, I will make frequent reference to the interwoven layers of Markan and non-Markan material, which are the primary source of evidence about PLH. The two main non-Markan sections are often referred to as the lesser and greater ‘interpolations’ (6:20-8:3; 9:51-18:14). This language implies there are one two such sections whereas there are five (including 1:1-4:30; 5:1-11; 19:1-27). The term ‘interpolation’ also assumes that the sections were being grafted into Mark’s structure, which I am contesting. Alternative designations, such as ‘the travel narrative’, divide the sections according to narrative structure, rather than the source content. The ‘travel narrative’ stretches from 9:51-19:44, and includes Luke 18:15-43, which is a summary of Mark 19-20. ‘Travel narrative’ is therefore not appropriate as a source-critical designation for the so-called ‘greater interpolation’. Instead I will designate Luke 1-2 ‘the Nativity’ 3:1-4:30 ‘the Galilean Ministry Narrative’, 5:1-11 ‘the Call of Peter’, 6:20-8:4 ‘the Sermon and Healings Section’, 9:51-18:14 ‘the Central Section’, and 19:1-27 ‘Zacchaeus and the Parable of the Minas’. I will use ‘travel narrative’ only to refer to the whole of Luke 9:51-19:44, and not to any particular stream of tradition.
Arguments against the Proto-Luke Hypothesis

1. The ‘Markan’ Chronology of Canonical Luke

Kümmel has argued that it can be demonstrated that the chronological structure of Luke is almost identical to Mark’s, and that therefore we should understand Mark as the text to which other material was “fitted”. I have suggested above that his argument seems to have been the primary reason for the rejection of PLH in the late twentieth century, so it seems a logical place to begin. When Kümmel tabulates the Markan pericopes in Luke alongside the corresponding pericopes in Mark, he finds only four divergences from Mark’s order.

a) The rejection at Nazareth

According to Kümmel, this scene is moved from Mark 6:1-6 to the beginning of Jesus’ ministry in Luke 4:16-30. He interprets this as the creation of a programmatic scene for Jesus’ ministry.

b) The call of the disciples

Kümmel argues this scene is moved from Mark 1:16-20 to Luke 5:1-10 so that it appears more plausible after Jesus’ first miracle.

c) The call of the twelve

Kümmel argues that Luke places the selection of the twelve disciples in Mark 3:13-19 before the great crowding of people in Mark 3:7-12 so that the crowd will still be there to provide an audience for the Sermon on the Plain material.

---
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d) The rejection of Jesus’ family

Kümmel argues that Luke has moved this forward from Mark 3:31-35 to Luke 8:19-21 in order to provide a crowd setting for the scene. Surely he is mistaken about Luke’s redactional method here because Luke 8:19-21 is at the end of the parables discourse, and Jesus leaves for the other side of Lake Galilee immediately afterwards.

In one sense, with the exception of the final example (d), Kümmel’s argument here is even better than he admits, because the divergences he notices are not moved from their place, they are omitted entirely. In each case, the Lukan version to which Kümmel’s table suggest the Markan pericope is moved lacks the kind of verbal parallelism with the Markan counterpart which is characteristic of Luke’s redaction of Mark, and which would imply that they are taken from Mark. Instead, I propose that they should be understood as L and Q tradition, which has a Markan doublet. In (a), the rejection at Nazareth, there is very little correspondence of form or content between Luke and Mark. In (b), the story given in Luke 5:1-11 is not just a calling as in Mark, but a miraculous catch of fish and the story of Simon’s conversion. It is $S^k$ material, not Markan.

In the case of (c), the call of the twelve, it is disputable whether it has in fact been moved from its Markan order. This judgment assumes that the healing of the multitude in Mark 3:7-12 corresponds to the setting for the sermon on the plain in Luke 6:17-19. But the verbal and thematic correspondence between these passages are limited to Luke 6:17b, which includes the words $πληθος$ πολὺ (great multitude), and a list of place names from which the $πληθος$ came. While this list may have been taken from Mark, v. 17a, 17c and 18-19 are a redactional creation which joins the Markan material in Luke 5:12-6:16 to the Sermon and Healings Section in 6:20-8:4.
So in every case except the relatively minor adjustment of (d) the rejection of Jesus’ family from the beginning of the parable discourse to the end, Luke has never departed from Mark’s Chronology on the level of pericopes. But in each case, the omission occurs because Luke is aware of a better tradition source, one he prefers to Mark, namely the 3rd (or possibly Q) material. It is possible that this material was already in Proto-Luke when Luke encountered Mark and if so, this seems to indicate that Luke prefers Proto-Luke to Mark.

If, in addition to this, key structural elements of Luke (such as the chiastic form of L, and the opening and closing sections of Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30, 22) can be shown to be absent of Markan content, then what is likely the case is that Luke has respected the chronologies of all his sources in the editing process. Mark’s chronology is in tact, just as L’s chiasm is still in tact even though, as I have shown in ch. 2, Luke dislikes chasms.

The alternative views presented by Kümmel and Caird about which stream of tradition was fitted to which are therefore both premised on a false dichotomy about Luke’s editing process. In his 1974 commentary on Luke, E. E. Ellis has already problematised this by suggesting that Luke himself formed the basic structure of Luke – that it is not derivative of either Mark or Proto-Luke.

...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. The ‘Gospel according to Luke’ is a considerable achievement, an achievement that in plan, as well as in publication belongs to Luke.48

Ellis’ argument came down in favour of MH, but should really be understood as a problematising of any attempt to differentiate MH and PLH in mechanistic terms, and one source being “fitted” to the other.

It seems fair then, without conceding everything to Kümmel, that the way PLH is framed needs to be modified in order to account for Kümmel’s observations about Markan order. Instead of seeking instances of Mark being “fitted to” Q+L, we are looking for instance of Q and L being fitted together without reference to Mark, since Mark was unknown at the time of Proto-Luke’s composition. If Mark’s material can be shown to be a seamless part of the unified structure, we will incline to MH, but if it ‘stands out’ as something alien to Q+L’s unity, then PLH should be regarded as more likely.

2. The position of the genealogy

Joseph Fitzmyer suggests that it is impossible for PLH to account for the order of pericopes in Luke 3:21-4:13, because the whole section seems to follow a Markan narrative logic. Why, asks Fitzmyer, would Luke flank the genealogy of Jesus from L with the Markan pericopes of the baptism and temptation? But the association of the baptism and temptation are not only Markan narrative logic. These pericopes are Mark-Q doublets, and are adjacent in both Mark and Q. The association of the two events in the chronology of Jesus’ life may therefore be ascribed to the earliest layer of tradition before Mark and Q were written, or simply to the historical chronological sequence of Jesus’ life – they need not imply reliance on Mark.

More convincing is the argument of Vincent Taylor that the genealogy’s lateness in the Gospel compared to Matthew can only be explained adequately if it was placed in its current location at the time of Proto-Luke’s redaction, before Luke was even aware of Mark’s existence, and before the infancy narrative was placed at the beginning.

50 Taylor, Third Gospel, 194-95.
genealogy’s position makes sense because this is the beginning of Proto-Luke, and because it demonstrates that Jesus is the son of God (as claimed by the baptism), and the son of Adam (which is illustrated by the temptation).

3. The priority of Markan doublets in Luke

Fitzmyer argues that in Luke, when there are Markan doublets, the Markan version is generally found first, and that this implies the other doublet is being added to an already Markan framework. In order for this argument to hold, however, it would have to be Luke’s general practice to give Mark’s version of a saying priority. In fact, of the ten Markan doublets, eight place the Markan half first, and these are all contained within the narrow window of Luke 8:4-9:50 (see Table 3.2 above). This section is a compact summary of Mark 3:20-9:50, which Luke places between two largest tracts of non-Markan material: the Sermon and Healings Section (Luke 6:20-8:3) and the Central Section (Luke 9:51-18:14). Everywhere else in Luke, the pattern is reversed and the Q parallel comes first: Q 11:43=Mark 12:38-39/Luke 20:46, and Q 12:11-12=Mark 13:11/Luke 21:14-15. If the Markan priority of these doublets were caused by a redactional process of expanding Markan narrative with material from Q and L, we would expect this kind of evidence to be found everywhere, not limited to this very short section.

4. The rejection in the πατρίς assumes a ministry in Capernaum

In Luke 4:23, Jesus’ audience in the Nazareth synagogue refer to ὁ σοι ἥκοσαμεν γενόμενα ἐκ τῆν Καφαρναούμ, “the things we heard you did in Capernaum”. Since Luke has only briefly mentioned Jesus “returning in the power of the Spirit” and “being glorified by all”

---

(Luke 4:14-15), but there is a section in Mark in which Capernaum is named as the site of ‘great deeds’ (Mark 6:1-6a), some have argued that Luke must have had Mark before him when he composed this section. Eric Franklin, a proponent of the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis has provided perhaps the most thorough exegetical argument for the Markan (and Matthean) origin of the Galilean ministry section.\(^{52}\)

The sentiment about the miracles in Capernaum might have made more sense in a Markan context, but this cannot taken to be mean that the verse is taken from Mark, because Luke 4:23 is not Markan material, it is unique to Luke. The pericope as it appears in Matthew 13:54-58=Mark 6:1-6 omits the entire verse Luke 4:23, and does not even use the word ‘Capernaum’. Since the verse is a Lukan composition, we can only conclude that he must have made a mistake in referring back to Capernaum without first introducing it. Why should it be impossible that Luke made this sort of mistake in composing Proto-Luke, if it is clear that he did in fact make the mistake at some point. This holds true whether the verse was taken from the \(^{51k}\) material, composed as part of Proto-Luke, or created at the time Mark’s material was being redacted.

5. Evidence of Q and L being inserted into the Markan framework.

It was first pointed out by Schürmann in 1954 that for each block of non-Markan material in Luke, there is a corresponding block of missing Markan material.\(^{53}\) Kümmel argues that this can only be accounted for if these two sections are interpolations into Mark’s narrative.\(^{54}\) For instance, next to the Sermon and Healings Section (Luke 6:17-8:3), Mark 3:20-30 (the

\(^{52}\) Franklin, 289.


\(^{54}\) Kümmel, 59.
Beelzebul controversy) is removed, and next to the Central Section (Luke 9:51-18:14), Mk 9:42-10:12 (sayings about temptation and divorce) are removed.

Jerome Kodell has fleshed the argument out in great detail with his exegesis of the opening and closing sections of the Central Section (Luke 9:51-18:14), and identified transitional sections in which the theme of lowliness and the image of the little child are used to join the Markan and non-Markan material.\footnote{Jeremy Kodell, “Luke and the Children. The beginning and end of the Great Interpolation (Luke 9:46-56; 18:9-23),” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 49 (1987), 416.} In what follows, I want to avoid the fallacy of refuting Kodell’s highly specific argument and assuming that Schürmann and Kümmel’s more general argument is thereby refuted, so I will carefully consider the evidence as interpreted by both the general and specific cases. However, I will argue that in both cases, the data does not indicate that Q and L material is being ‘fitted’ to Mark’s narrative, and that the omissions from Mark by Luke are easily accounted for by PLH.

Let us begin with the more specific argument of Kodell, and if that fails, we will see whether the more general argument can be sustained. In his interpretation of Luke 9:46-56, Kodell juxtaposes the Markan idea of receiving the kingdom like a little child against the Samaritans’ lack of hospitality, and the disciples’ lack of understanding in both cases. Similarly, in the transitional section of Luke 18:9-23, in which the L parable of the Pharisee and tax-collector is contrasted with the Markan blessing of the little children, and the story of the rich ruler. Again, the contrast emphasises the requirement of lowliness for entry in the kingdom by evoking the image of the little child. What is interesting about his interpretation is that it accounts for a thematic unity in a section which cuts across both Markan and Central Section source-material.

From this observation about thematic unity, Kodell surmises that a specific technique has
been used in the composition of Luke, that is, pairs of characters exemplifying specific concepts, and these ‘exemplary pairs’ spanning both the Markan and non-Markan sections.

The main purpose will be to describe the compositional technique governing Luke’s decisions. The argument, in brief, is that Luke has sewn this special material (9:51-18:14) into the Markan schema (replacing Mark 9:40-10:12) by the use of the technique of "exemplary pairs"... at the beginning and the end of the material.\textsuperscript{56}

Kodell’s conclusion, that “Luke has sewn this special material” into Mark is a problem to PLH, because it implies that the Q and L material is being fitted into a preexisting Markan framework. The problem can be resolved by the consideration that the content of the material which Kodell thinks is ‘replaced’ by Luke 9:51-18:14 are Mark-Q doublets, and therefore already exist in Proto-Luke. The redactor has simply removed the material in order to avoid unnecessary repetition.

As I argued in the previous chapter, the exemplary pairs (Mary and Martha, and the Pharisee and tax-collector) are a structural feature of the chiasm of document L, not a feature of final Lukian redaction. Kodell argues that Luke ‘stitches in’ L material to Mark’s narrative structure by creating an exemplary pair across the two sources, and linking the Markan pairs of disciples/exorcist in Luke 9:49-50 and the pericope unique to Luke which pairs Jesus and the Samaritans in Luke 9:51-56, unifying the pericopes around the theme of children and lowliness in Mark 9, at the point where the section is interpolated according to the Markan Hypothesis. “[T]he exorcist of the Marcan story corresponds to the child, while the non-accepting Samaritans in Luke's special material correspond to the disciples.”\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
The thematic unity Kodell is referring to here is the unity of Mark 9, not an editorial device of Luke’s final redaction. The disciples encounter first the little child and then the exorcist as part of Jesus’ teaching them about servant leadership, connected to Mark’s greater thematic concern with the true nature of the Messiah. But it is not possible to reduce the function of the incident with the Samaritans to the concerns of Mark’s gospel. The stated reason for the Samaritans’ rejection of Jesus in v. 53 is not that they are proud or self-promoting leaders, it is because of his intention to visit Jerusalem. Furthermore, the Samaritans are defended by Jesus against the disciples who want to call down fire from heaven to destroy them. The function of the Samaritans in Luke’s narrative is to focus Jesus and the disciples on their mission as stated in v. 51. To suggest that this narrative has been ‘stitched into’ Mark is reductionist, and conflates the narrative purposes of Proto-Luke with those of Mark.

A similar analysis holds true of the intersection between the Pharisee and tax-collector pericope at the closing of the Central Section (Luke 18:9-14), and the following Markan pericopes of Jesus blessing the Little Children (Luke 18:15-17) and the Rich Young Ruler (Luke 18:18-30). While the Markan pericopes continue the theme of servant-leadership Mark 9, the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector has its own concern – justification of the humble sinner by faith rather than the self-righteous, and like the Samaritan villagers at the opening of the section, this pericope is not interested in the Markan theme of leadership. Nothing in the central section can be reduced to the concerns of the Markan narrative.

But even if Kodell’s more complex data does not demonstrate that Q and L material was inserted into Mark’s framework, what about Schürmann and Kümmel’s simpler observation
that Markan material is missing wherever there is a block of non-Markan material? In fact, almost all of the missing material can be accounted for because of Mark/Q overlaps. This material has been removed only because it was already contained in the Proto-Lukan narrative. The climactic saying of the controversy about divorce in Mark 10:1-12, for instance, has a doublet in Q (Luke 16:18=Matt 5:31-32), and this can be proved by the observation that Matthew departs from his normal practice of conflating doublets by preserving Mark 10:1-12 separately in Matt 19:9. The Q version is found at Luke 16:18, and the Markan version is omitted from Luke. Given Luke’s overwhelming preference for retaining both forms of a doublet, this can only be understood as a deliberate omission. The remaining verses which Luke has allegedly omitted are the discourse on temptation in Mark 9:42-50, which are also found in Q 17:1-2. The fact that the redactor of Canonical-Luke retained the Q version at the expense of the Markan version, even though the Q version is later in the narrative, seems to indicate not only that he favours his Proto-Lukan source, but also that Luke 17 had already been planned out before he came across the version in Mark 3 which he omitted at the point of Luke 6:16. The plan of the non-Markan (Proto-Luke) material is being given prior consideration in the placement of the Markan material.

The omission of the Beelzebul controversy (Mark 3:20-30) directly before the sermon on the plain should similarly be understood as an adjustment of Mark to fit Proto-Luke. The Beelzebul story already existed in Proto-Luke, but had been sourced from Q 11:17-23.

This pattern points to a redactional technique quite different to Kodell’s suggestion that Luke’s special material was “stitiched in” to Mark, or Schürmann’s idea that it was inserted. Rather, at each point of intersection between Markan and non-Markan (Proto-Lukan) material in Luke, the missing section of Mark’s narrative can be understood as the way that

Similarly, 9:51-18:14 was marked out as the Proto-Lukan journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and the chronology of Jesus’ life required it to be placed after the transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8), and before the arrival in Jerusalem (Mark 10:46-52). This leads to the same conclusion that I arrived at in responding to Kümmel’s Markan Chronology argument. While the main proponents of both the Proto-Lukan and Markan hypotheses have spoken as though one document were haphazardly inserted into the structure of the other, that is clearly not the case.

However, it is possible for PLH to account for the phenomena of the opening and closing sections, so long as we consider Luke as a redactor who worked creatively with all his sources. In order to create a document like canonical Luke, he must have had a full copy of Mark before him, and (assuming PLH) Proto-Luke. He would have acted in a way which respected the narrative integrity of both documents. He must have planned at which point each document should intersect with the other, and rather than ‘inserting’ either material into the narrative unity of the other, we should think of him as interweaving the two documents. The omission by the final redactor of Luke of any Markan material which is already contained within the non-Markan sections when it is found at points of intersection between strips of Mark and Q+L, far from being an argument against PLH, implies that the
non-Markan material has already been arranged at the time of redaction. Instead of refuting PLH, this actually requires it.


Fitzmyer points out that Luke’s central section splits up the first two passion announcements (Luke 9:22=Mark 8:31; Luke 9:43b-45=Mark 9:30-31) from the third (Luke 18:31-34=Mark 10:32-34). Since the three notices are in quick succession in Mark, and have been broken apart in Luke, Fitzmyer concludes that the non-Markan portion must have been inserted to Mark’s structure.

I have argued above in points 1 and 5 that interrupted Markan structures can be accounted for so long as we think of the redactor of canonical Luke as having respect for the narrative unity of both of his main documentary sources, Mark and Proto-Luke. The Markan account has three notices of Jesus’ intention to go to Jerusalem and be killed (Mark 8:31=Luke 9:22; Mark 9:31=Luke 9:44; Mark 10:33-34=Luke 18:31-32). The Central Section has twelve travel notices by my count, in addition to three in Zacchaeus and the Minas, and one on Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem (sixteen in total), but none of them mention his death. There is no attempt made by the redactor to conflate or harmonise the Markan and non-Markan notices, they are simply presented (as can be verified from the Markan ones) in the original order, context and format of their original source. The Markan notices are notices of the passion (Luke 18:33=Mark 10:34, “they will kill him, and on the third day he will rise,”) whereas the non-Markan ones are simple notices of the journey’s destination (Luke 9:51 “he set his face towards Jerusalem”, Luke 19:41 “he drew near and saw the city”, etc.)

---

58 Fitzmyer, 91.
implies that the non-Markan material is not merely being inserted mechanically into the Markan framework, but that its own differences and structural integrity (ie. the Proto-Lukian narrative texture) are retained by the redactor of canonical Luke.

7. That the Central Section is a theological expansion on Mk 10:1; 11:1.

Kümmel claims it can be demonstrated that Luke’s travel narrative is a theologically motivated creation based on the idea of Mark’s travel notices that Jesus is going to Jerusalem in Mark 10:1 and 11:1. He draws on Conzelmann’s Lukan theology to demonstrate this. Conzelmann interpreted Luke’s redaction of the travel narrative as an integration of the life of Jesus into salvation and world history in order to account for the delay of the parousia, and connect the work of the Spirit to the institution of the church as represented by the apostolic witnesses.

As I noted above, Conzelmann’s theology uncritically assumed the Markan Hypothesis, and proceeds by analysing the way in which Luke edits Mark. It is therefore to be expected that Conzelmann’s theology of Luke should fit with the Markan Hypothesis. It would be circular reasoning (not convictional knowledge) to argue for the Markan Hypothesis from a theory of Luke’s theology which assumes it – which Conzelmann does. Additionally, the theology which Kümmel has sketched out accounts for the travel narrative section as a journey, but apart from the seventeen individual travel notices of Luke’s Central Section, there is nothing in the Central Section which suggests Jesus is journeying. As a redaction critic, Conzelmann naturally lionizes the importance of redactional interjections, but these travel notices are disjointed from the other content of the section. It is difficult to imagine why the remaining

---
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majority of material, with its complex theology, would be used to expand on the idea of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem.

Alternative accounts can be given of the theology and structure of the travel narrative that correspond to PLH. As I have shown in chapter 3, Luke’s Central Section is structured around the original chiasm structure and theological purposes of the document L. In the following chapter, I will sketch out an account of how this structure and theology are developed further at the time of Proto-Luke’s compilation. I will therefore defer my conclusion on this 7th argument to that chapter. If its account of the theology of this section is convincing, then it is unnecessary to think of this section as a creative expansion of Mark’s journey to Jerusalem.

**Arguments for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis**

I think it can be seen by now that stated reasons for PLH’s rejection by the majority of scholars are not very good. There are, however, a number of strong arguments to accept it.


Streeter makes the following observation, although he does not supply any specific data to support it:

Luke iii.1 opens with an elaborate chronological statement: ‘In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was ... the word of the Lord came to John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness.’ This surely reads—I owe the observation to a conversation with Sir J. Hawkins— as if it was originally written as the opening section of a book. The impression is strengthened by the curious position of the genealogy of our Lord (iii.23).  

---

This observation of Streeter and Hawkins has an intuitive force to it. Vincent Taylor took up this point and introduced a some concrete arguments for regarding 3:1-2 as a vestigial opening: that the elaborateness of the date, and the way that the Baptist is introduced as a new character even though he has been adequately introduced in the Infancy Narrative can only be accounted for in this way. Caird further makes the point that, “the attachment of the genealogy of Jesus to the story of his baptism instead of the story of his birth, as in Matthew’s Gospel, is perfectly natural if originally, it followed the first mention of his name.”

While these arguments make the original function of 3:1-2 likely to be the opening of a written document, this needs to be verified more thoroughly by comparison to other document openings. The vestigial opening of Proto-Luke is generically a perfect fit as the opening of a book of Hebrew prophecy. As the comparative chart of prophetic preambles in appendix 2 demonstrates, there is no prophetic book in the Old Testament whose opening paragraph does not have some structural similarity with the vestigial opening of Proto-Luke.

A few of the more obvious ‘family resemblances’ between these opening paragraphs may be noted just from a cursory glance. 93.75% of the preambles to prophetic books, (i.e., every prophet except Daniel) share with Luke 3:1-2 a noun signifying a verbal revelation, be it: λῆμμα, ὁρασίς, λόγος or as with Luke, ῥῆμα. 68.75% of cases (11/16) share with Luke 3:1-2 an aorist form of γίνομαι, almost always taking the term for the revelatory word as its subject, either directly (the ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου of Zechariah 1:1b), or by means of a relative pronoun (the λόγος κυρίου, ὁς ἐγενήθη of Zephaniah 1:1a). 62.5% of cases share with Luke a precise date in relationship to the reign of a king or other ruler, usually through
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such means as an ordinal number representing the year of a king’s reign, a statement saying ‘the year X’ or (in the case of Amos) a number of years before (προ) an event took place.


The Rejection of Jesus in the Nazareth Synagogue is a key narrative transition in the synoptic gospel. As I will flesh out in much greater detail in point 3 below, it is impossible to maintain that Luke has a Markan outline if transition points like this are shown to be independent of Mark. While section 3 will deal with the interpretation of the Galilean Ministry section of Luke (Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30), Luke’s earlier form of the πατρίς saying deserves specific attention as an argument which verifies PLH.

As Table 3.6 shows, while Matthew follows Mark’s version of the saying closely, Luke’s quotation corresponds more closely to the words used in Thomas.

Table 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπεν αὐτοῖς,</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὦτι</td>
<td>ἐπεν δὲ,</td>
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This saying is the climax of the Rejection at Nazareth pericope. Since the time of Bultmann and the form-critics, it has been common to view stories climaxing in a pithy saying (apophthegms) as being narratives specifically composed for the saying. Bultmann follows this principle in his exegesis of the Rejection at the πατρίς, and claims that Mark developed the saying from its original form, which is preserved in Thomas. The Jesus Seminar follow Bultmann here in categorising Luke 4:23b=Thomas 31:1 as a pink (“sure sounds like Jesus”) saying, and the words around it as questionable black (“there’s been some mistake”) or grey (“well maybe”) statements. Many other commentators (Martin Dibelius, Hugh Anderson, Fitzmyer) have argued that Bultmann’s view is unlikely because there is too much detailed material in Mark for it to be a simple filling out of a saying, and because a double saying about a prophet and a physician would not inspire a story with only a prophet and no physician. Fitzmyer claims that Luke uses δεκτός instead of ἀτίμος in view of the Isaiah quotation in Luke 4:19 (κηρύξει ἐνιαυτόν κυρίου δεκτόν), and Anderson claims that that ἱατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν in 4:23 is the saying half-way to its more developed Thomasine form.
Both Bultmann and his critics assume Markan priority as given in their reasoning, and the account that this assumption yields is not very convincing. *δεκτός* clearly has a different meanings in v. 19 than it does in v. 23 (v. 19 = God’s year of favour, v. 23 = a prophet’s favour in his home-town). If, as Fitzmyer claims, Luke 4:24 is a redactional move based on 4:19, then it seems as though Luke were saying ‘this is the year of favour (for the poor, from God), except in Jesus’ home town (for Jesus, from mortals)’, which is an extremely clumsy and quite unlukan concept. Surely this connection is not strong enough to argue for redactional intention here. Fitzmyer’s account similarly makes nonsense of Thomas’ redaction of the saying. It seems that the relationship between Luke and Thomas is literary: the closest known proverb to ἰατρέ, θεραπευον σεαυτόν is a quotation from Euripides (5th century BCE) quoted first by Plutarch in *How to Tell a Flatterer* (1st century CE): ἀλλών ἰατρός σεαυτόν ἐλκείσιν βρώων: ‘a physician of others, he is teeming with sores’, meaning something akin to the modern English “practice what you preach!”74 Compared to this, which shares only the word ἰατρός and the general theme, Thomas shares with Luke 4:24 every word of the quotation, except for οὐδείς, and in verse 23, Thomas shares forms of all the key words in the proverb, (ἡ ἰατρεί, and θεραπέω). The contrast is striking.

Alternatively, by Fitzmyer’s account, Thomas must be thought to have found the saying in Luke (because he uses the δεκτός which Fitzmyer assigns to Lukan redaction), and then created the parallel half of the saying by taking ἰατρέ from the previous verse. He also seems to have had Mark open to the parallel passage Mark 6:4 since ἐν τοῖς συγγείωσιν αὐτοῦ is too close to Thomas’ εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτό to be coincidental. Of course

the story is possible, but good poets hardly generate their material with a collage of short phrases from several parallel texts.

The preferable option, then, for the source-history of this pericope is to agree with Bultmann against Fitzmyer that the Thomasine form is original. But the logical conclusion of that is to say that this section of Luke must be independent of Mark, because he quotes the saying in its more original form, not its Markan form. Luke then, having already written the proverb ἵστρι, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν, only quotes the first half of the saying he found in Thomas in order to avoid creating a doublet, and because the figure of the prophet is more relevant to the story he is telling. In other words, the composition of this key transitional moment in Luke’s narrative occurred at a stage of composition prior to the discovery of Mark.


In Luke 4:17 and 20, Luke departs from his standard usage of βιβλος, and uses the diminutive term βιβλίον. The most natural explanation of this phenomenon is that the redactor is using a source. This source could be from the same community which produced the L document and infancy narrative, or a different community. However, this explanation rules out the understanding that Luke is following Mark’s gospel here, and as I have outlined above, if Luke is not following Mark’s outline in this pericope, he is not following Mark’s narrative structure at all, as MH requires. Even if Luke is conflating Mark and his other source, at this point, that is very different to following Mark’s outline.

As a proponent of the Farrer Hypothesis of Gospel origins, and of Luke’s artistic originality, Eric Franklin has suggested that Luke himself used this term because he specifically wants to
refer to the actual scroll instead of the literary contents.\textsuperscript{75} This usage, he finds in John 20:30 and Rev 1:17 (which must mean 1:11) cf. 3:5; 20:15. This must surely be a case of special pleading. Even if the bizarre assumption that Luke’s vocabulary is best defined by reference to the Johannine corpus were granted, John 20:30 is clearly using βιβλίον to refer to the gospel of John as a literary work, not to the physical scroll upon which it is written. Furthermore, as is clear from a brief survey of Rev 22, the author of Revelation uses the two forms interchangeably.

4. The Markan Hypothesis and the central section

This is an argument from the structure of canonical Luke on the macro-level, whereas arguments 1-3 were argued from more specific observations of particular verses. There is a disparity between the amount of source material of the Central Section which is Q+L (from 9:51-18:14 and also in 19:1-27 'Zacchaeus and the Parable of the Minas') and the amount which is Markan. Luke 18:15-43 is the only Markan material, and it neatly summarises all 52 verses of Mark 10 in only 28 verses. Luke would have created a narrative anachronism if he had placed Mark’s journey to Jerusalem outside of the Travel Narrative, but instead of integrating Mark’s travel narrative, he quickly summarises it at the end of the Q+L material.

The Markan hypothesis can’t account for this phenomenon. If the Q and L material were being added to Mark, we would not expect to see this Markan material all in one spot at the very end of the travel narrative. If, conversely, this tract of Markan material is ‘fitted’ (I think the word is justified here) to an already existing travel sequence, then the redactor must have combined Q and L before he added Mark, and that amounts to PLH.

Conclusion

At this particular stage of the reconstruction process, the arguments presented in Section 2 of this chapter indicate that PLH is on solid ground quantitatively. However, in keeping with the convctional knowledge method of this thesis, we shall not ascribe any certainty to PLH until it is clear that this qualitative argument makes sense of recognisable human traits in the redaction of Proto-Luke: narrative unity, redactional purpose, historical setting etc.

It now remains to move on to the task of reconstructing Proto-Luke, and to begin looking towards a convincing qualitative reconstruction of the text and its intention. Following Caird’s method of verification which I have already discussed at length, I specifically interrogate the sections of the text which, according to PLH, are the work of the redactor, the Galilean ministry section in Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30 and the Farewell Discourse in Proto-Luke 22, both of which contain biographical material beyond the work of L and Q, and fall outside the literary structure and generic content of the central section. In this section I give a closer exegesis of these key passages, and specify the details of how each must have been put together. Part of this close exegesis will still entail a quantitative argument for PLH as it specifically applies to the details of these individual passages. From these details I am able to begin to move on to more qualitative observations about the intention of Proto-Luke itself, and begin to sketch a picture of the redactor of the text, including both the historical situation of his creation of Proto-Luke, and his intention in doing so.
SECTION 3


Since there are Galilean ministry sections in both Luke and Mark, there are only three logical alternatives before us. Either Mark was edited by Luke, the sources are independent, or the Lukan form is first, and was then used by Mark. The second and third options correspond to PLH. The first option, assumed in most commentaries today,\(^{76}\) implies that Luke worked with wide editorial freedom, which I have discussed earlier in this chapter.

Material in this section, which is often ascribed to Mark, includes certain verses from the baptism and temptation of Jesus, and the rejection at Nazareth pericope of Luke 4:16-30. I have argued at length that the rejection at Nazareth is not based on Mark 6:1-6 (argument 2 for PLH). This leaves six verses around the preaching of John the Baptist (Luke 3:4=Mark 1:2-3), the baptism of Jesus (Luke 3:16; 21-22=Mark 1:7-11) and the temptation of Jesus (Luke 4:1-2=Mark 1:12-13), which could be Markan, but are not treated as Luke treats Markan material at any other point in his gospel.

My reconstruction of Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30 can be seen in detail in appendix 3. As Caird showed in his chart, which is represented in Table 3.2 above, Luke normally does not conflate Mark and Q material. Streeter’s classical observation that Luke and Matthew never insert material into Mark at the same point, except for in the Galilean ministry highlights the way that if Luke is editing these five Markan verses, he is doing so in ways which are identical to Matthew. For instance in both Matthew and Luke, the Isaiah quote of Mark 1:2 is placed after the Q announcement of John’s ministry (Luke 3:3=Matt 3:2). In Luke 3:21-

\(^{76}\) The last major commentary to disagree with this view was Marshall (1978), 150.
Matt 3:16, there are three major agreements of Luke and Matthew against Mark 1:9-11 which cannot be understood as incidental agreements, as shown in Table 3.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 3:21b-22a</th>
<th>Matthew 3:16-17a</th>
<th>Mark 1:9-11a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ Ἰσχου βαπτισθέντως</td>
<td>βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰσχοῦς</td>
<td>καὶ ἔβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν ἱορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, καὶ εὗρες ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεώχθησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἰδοὺ ἰπειρεῖν</td>
<td>εἶδεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβήναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν</td>
<td>οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδεν</td>
<td>σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωματικῷ εἶδεν ὡς περιστερὰν</td>
<td>σωματικῷ ὡς ἐπιστεράν ερχόμενον εἰπ αὐτόν, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα:</td>
<td>ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον εἰς οὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπ αὐτόν, καὶ φωνῇ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι</td>
<td>ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὦ εὐδοκήσα.</td>
<td>σὺ ἐῖ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδοκήσα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υἱὸς μου ἐיך σὺ, ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδοκήσα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholars of the last 35 years have been in consensus about the Markan origin of this passage, and this is consistent with the broad acceptance of the Markan hypothesis, Fitzmyer, for instance, holds that after the transposition of unique Lukan material in 3:19-20, Luke continues to parallel the Marcan sequence by basing Luke 3:21-22 on Mark 1:9-11, and that the “minor agreements with Matthew over against Mark are not so clear that one
should postulate a source independent of Mark.” He then enumerates five redactional modifications that Luke has made to Mark:

1. The omission of the notice that Jesus came from Jordan
2. The omission of the baptism by John
3. The portrayal of Jesus in prayer
4. The opening of the heavens instead of their being rent
5. The addition of the “bodily form” of the Holy Spirit.

but, having only just claimed that the agreements with Matthew are too minor to claim an alternative source to Mark, Fitzmyer fails to explain or even consider how it came to be that all of these (hardly minor) ‘redactional’ modifications except the characteristically Lukan third one are shared with Matthew. It seems highly unlikely that, as Bock has proposed, Matthew and Luke are simply “independently agreeing with each other here.”

In table 3.7 (above), I have underlined the instances where two gospels agree with each other against the third in a significant way. The double agreements occur frequently between Luke and Matthew, and Matthew and Mark, but never significantly between Luke and Mark, indicating that Matthew is the ‘mediating party’ here.

The only possible exception to this pattern is the use of the second person ἐὰν σοῦ in Luke 3:22, in which he agrees more closely with Mark’s σῷ ἔν than with Matthew’s οὔτος ἐστιν. François Bovon argues that this makes Luke’s probable dependence on Q here uncertain.

It should be noted however, that Luke’ ἐὰν σοῦ is identical to the wording of LXX Ps 2:7. Furthermore, in the Western text as testified in the manuscript Bezae Cantabrigiensiis, and

77 Fitzmyer, 479-80.
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the old Latin version, Luke 3:22 actually gives the full Septuagintal quotation ἐγένεται σε. Bart Ehrman has argued that, since scribes have not amended the other gospels to agree with the LXX here, it is more likely that this is a theologically motivated removal of a phrase which could be taken to imply an adoptionist Christology, by amending Luke to fit the other Synoptic gospels.⁸⁰ This further weakens the position that Luke is following Mark here. Whichever version is accurate, and whether his source is Q or Mark, Luke has corrected it to LXX, and cannot be taken as following Mark.

By contrast, the small agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are clearly sufficient to warrant the claim that Luke is using Q here. They both differ from Mark in turning his simple aorist phrase ἐβαπτίσθη, “he was baptised”, into a participle, and both Luke and Matthew use that participle as an adverbial subclause of ἀνοίγω, which is not in Mark. This grammatical construction belongs to the Q source of this verse. It seems likely that Matthew has conflated Mark with the Q version that remains in Luke.

Similarly, at the temptation scene there is some material that is possibly Markan at the opening, but the majority of the story is not found in Mark (Luke 4:3-13=Matt 4:3-11), and even in v. 1-2, Luke agrees with Matthew against Mark by saying that the Spirit “led” (ἀν—/ἀγω) Jesus into the wilderness, not “drove” him there (Mark: ἐκβάλλω). If Luke is using Mark here, then we would expect him to have retained some of the Markan features which Matthew has changed, such as the phrase ἐν τὸν ἱερὸν δόμων, (in the Jordan) which would work well with Proto-Luke’s redactor’s clear tendency to give place names and historical dates in this section; but there are no vestiges of Mark in this verse. As the reconstruction given in appendix 3 demonstrates, Luke 3:1-4:30 can be accounted for with three sources: Q

representing the double tradition, and L representing the source material found only found in Luke. The final source is the redactor, possibly the same author of canonical Luke, who combined the two sources.

The delineation of Q from $S^\text{lk}$ is theoretically quite easy, since Q is marked by parallel passages in Matthew. However the recognition of the redactor (R) which will be informative about Luke’s purpose in this passage, and the separation of ‘R’ from ‘$S^\text{lk}$’ that will allow us to observe how Luke’s purpose is different from his special source. This is the step which requires methodological justification, since it could be potentially done with no restraint on the source-critics subjective preference. The best approach we have is to use R’s usage of Mark and Q as ‘controls.’ The(Redactor’s(Voice


82 Ibid., 61 n 10.
than in chapter 3:1-6, the opening prologue to Proto-Luke. v. 1 reads like the opening prologue of a minor prophet (cf. Haggai 1:1 etc), v. 2-3, which is mainly taken from Q, records a moment in sacred history: the word of God came (Ἐγένετο), and v 4-6 are a quotation from Isaiah, indicating fulfilment. The redactor’s method was to take the moment of sacred history, and frame it with an historical prologue and an appropriate scripture quotation on either side. In all of this, Proto-Luke does not differ markedly from the intention of the canonical redaction of Luke, which confirms the idea of a common redactor, but 3:1-3 testify clearly that at the Proto-Lukan stage of redaction, the apologetic and universalising concerns of the later canonical redactor are already present.

R uses the prologue (3:1-6) and genealogy (3:23-38), Jesus’ genealogy as historicising ‘book-stops’ to the Q material on John’s preaching of repentance. He places the teaching of John the Baptist as he found it in his two sources Q and L. This is a larger scale version of the same structural process that he used in framing his prologue, and continues to use for each pericope.

The material which Proto-Luke is interested in historicising, however, are not yet the entirety of the hopes and dreams of Israel as in Luke 1-2, nor does he attempt to universalise the fulfilment of Israel’s prophetic tradition, as the apostolic preaching of the gospel in Acts. The earlier Proto-Luke is carrying out his apologetic project with greater reticence by taking a broad cross-sample of the Christian message as it existed in Syro-Palestine, placing the radical perspective of Q alongside what we might call the more ‘liberal’ perspective of L, and simply locating these early Christian ideologies in Greco-Roman historical and geographical co-ordinates.
R’s distinctive method and purpose continues in 4:1-30, where he now begins to use geographical data to create an historical sequence. In v. 1, R brings Jesus back to Galilee, where he places the temptation from his Q source (4:1-13). In v. 13-16, Jesus travels through Galilee (where he must have gone to Capernaum), and finally comes to his hometown of Nazareth, where R places his S\textsubscript{lk} source account of the rejection in the πατρίς. In v. 30, R has Jesus leave Nazareth, to call his disciples, and instruct and train them before the journey to Jerusalem will begin in 9:51. The scene is being set for a journey, by the creation of a motivation in Jesus’ rejection by his hometown, and also the selection of travelling companions. We have become accustomed to calling the following section (9:51-18:14) the ‘travel narrative’ or the journey to Jerusalem – but once Proto-Luke is viewed in its originality, it becomes clear that all of Proto-Luke is a travel document – and 9:51-18:14 is simply more easily identified because it is the largest extant section of Proto-Luke. The travel journey is a literary motif in which the fundamentally differing interpretations of Q and L can work together polyphonically because they themselves have been de-literalised, historicised, and are now seen through the literary trope of the journey. At every stage of its narrative rhetoric, Proto-Luke will use the journey to unify and contextualise the early Christian ideological view-points of Q and L.

Looking specifically at Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30 once again, it should now be possible to see the way that the redactor gives a commentary on the new theological texture created by his unifying action. As he locates the theologies of Q and L in world history, R pauses twice to comment on the relationship between the kingdom of God and the world. In 3:18-20, R interrupts Q to make it clear that John’s ministry was brought to an end by Herod’s evil ways. In 4:6, he expands on Q by putting the boast into Satan’s mouth to the effect that all
political authority is bestowed by Satan. In 3:19, he makes John’s imprisonment and death the consequence of the moral wickedness of Herod. Clearly, R is walking a fine line here; while he takes the world-affirming stance of situating sacred histories in secular world-history, but he also wants it to be clear, although he does not say so openly, that this is no wholesale moral approval of the world, or of the Roman presence in Israel. While he may not be living in a ‘free society’ where it is politically feasible to critique power explicitly, he is able to do so through his redaction process.


The source history of PLH, in this instance, has had a profound impact on our view of Lukan theology, when contrasted with Conzelmann’s classical reading of Luke’s theology, which suggests that Luke puts events into historical setting in order to “remove them from the context of the end” so that the kingdom of God is “removed into the metaphysical realm”. But given PLH, it is precisely the *metaphysical* view of the Kingdom in Q which Luke is placing into historical setting. The ministries of John and Jesus are no longer seen as being separated in order to demarcate Jesus’ ministry from the period of Israel. Proto-Luke enables us to see that Luke is not to be understood as commenting on another gospel (Mark or Matthew), but innovatively historicizing early Christian theologies. Whereas in Q and in L there have only been isolated sayings and stories, salvation history is, in Luke, both connected to world-history, and the fulfilment of sacred history – in the life of Jesus, *Historie* and *Heilsgeschichte* over-lap.

It will further be seen from this that various elements of ‘Lukan theology’ according to its more traditional interpretation, such as his interest in salvation, in women and outcastes
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are in fact interests of his sources, not personal interests of himself as a redactor. He quotes them approvingly, but they are not his creative work. Rather, his aim is to take these interests, and allow them a voice within his narrative. The interests of the redactor operate at the higher level of framing this message, whatever it may be, in world history - in the context of Jesus' rejection in Nazareth, and journey to Jerusalem and death – thus to bridge the gap between the fledgling Christian movement represented by the L and Q communities, and the historically progressive reality of Hellenistic culture within the Roman Empire.
SECTION 4
The Redaction History of Luke 22-23

*His life has been marked out from the common life of men, not merely by what he taught and achieved, but by what he experienced. Looking back now on his ministry he sees it as a series of trials, tests of his spiritual stamina. His call has been to drink the cup of experience to the dregs, to walk a path of obedience never before explored by man; and from the first wrestling with Satan in the wilderness to the last grim agony that now awaits him on the Mount of Olives he has had to face this destiny alone.*


As I have pointed out above, in order to understand Proto-Luke as a literary document, it is necessary to show that it has some kind of narrative, or else the Q and L material would have to be conceived of as placed together arbitrarily, and that would do nothing to establish a *literary* document Proto-Luke. The Galilean Ministry narrative in Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30 is an effective beginning because it sets up the narrative for the journey. However, a literary text needs a beginning and an end, and it now remains to demonstrate that Proto-Luke has a conclusion. The solution of Streeter, Caird and other proponents of PLH has been to designate a Passion Source (PS) that allegedly underlies Luke’s passion narrative (PN).

Even though we have been conditioned by our four canonical gospels to think that a gospel ought to have a passion narrative at the end, it is not necessarily the case that if PLH is true then there must have been a PS. Q and Thomas do not have a PN. In this section I intend to argue that where we would expect a passion, there is instead evidence of a vestigial Farewell Discourse or Final Testament in the non-Markan sections of Luke 22 (the last
supper). The evidence for this hypothetical source does not extend into ch. 23 (the passion), and therefore I am arguing for PLH as it applies to ch. 22, while departing from the classical formulation of PLH with regards to ch. 23. But I have gotten ahead of myself. I am going to begin with a source- and redaction-critical reading arguing for this source-history, and reconstruct the material of the original conclusion, and then move from my reconstructed text to a argue for a genre and literary reading. I will begin with a summary of the literature on the hypothetical PS.

The Question of Luke 23

The most recent comprehensive argument in favour of a Proto-Lukan PS was Vincent Taylor’s 1972 The Passion Narrative of St. Luke. Taylor identified the PS based on a Proto-Lukan vocabulary, and argued for the inclusion or exclusion of specific verses on the basis of their usage of these terms. It is generally accepted now that arguing about individual verses on the basis of percentile-stylometrics is linguistically naïve because style fluctuates drastically between such tiny literary sections as individual sentences, and so other scholars have not taken up Taylor’s argument.\(^{84}\) However, PS has also been postulated by a number of scholars including Marshall\(^ {85}\) and Fitzmyer,\(^ {86}\) who otherwise hold Luke to be structured in a Markan framework, and do not use stylometrics in their argument. These scholars point out that the material in common with Mark is interspersed with a substantial amount of non-Markan material which is mainly sayings but also includes a number of historical details, including a unique Lukan trial sequence in Luke 23:6-12 (the trial before Herod), a lamentation for the daughters of Jerusalem in 23:27-32, and the conversion of a crucified

\(^{86}\) Fitzmyer, Luke X-XVII, 1361.
bandit in 23:40, where Matthew and Mark only mention Jesus being mocked by the other criminals.

The conclusions which are drawn about the PS have implications for Christian theology and apologetics. Any scholar with a theological commitment to understanding the bible as verifiable history will also want to argue that, given that Luke himself is not an eye-witness (1:1-3), that he was working from reliable sources, and that he must have had a source for his historical differences from Mark. Luke’s later and substantial re-editing of Mark would not be a reliable source, while a special source might be. This hypothesis of a PS naturally recommends itself to any argument which wants to portray Luke as a competent and objective historian. Marshall, for instance, opens his book on Lukan theology with an appeal to Pannenberg’s argument that Christianity is an historical faith. He therefore claims that Luke himself understood that “faith is connected to historically verifiable events”, and wrote his history on that basis. Critical discipleship as a method does not share a dogmatic preference for historically verifiable faith, nor does it have any aversion to verifiability, but rather sees the expression of faithful reading in radical openness to whatever conclusion the text might favour. It is important that any dogmatic or apologetic preferences be bracketed in order to allow an objective consideration of this question.

Even still, this dogmatic tendency is hardly a solid basis for arguing for a documentary source, and does not require one. The redactor of canonical Luke could have had access to any number of sources other than Mark on the crucifixion, including one or more oral sources and/or traditions. The salvation of the bandit (23:42-43) speaks very clearly to the
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socially inclusive theology of the L source, for instance, and could easily be conceived of as a product of that community’s theology passed on to the redactor through oral tradition.

There are other suggestions of a PS which have been suggested apart from any theological bias for verifiable history. It is equally possible to suppose with John Dominic Crossan that Mark, Luke and other non-canonical gospels could all be using a common source, the ‘cross gospel’, which contains a very detailed crucifixion scene, and that Luke actually includes more of this source material than Mark does. However, what does seem to be undisputable is that at those moments in the passion narrative which are structurally pivotal to the narrative, such as the arrest, sentencing, and death of Jesus, Luke follows the Markan sequence (whether that was found in Mark, or a common source). The non-Markan material lacks any narrative or literary cohesion of its own, and therefore, it is impossible to reconstruct a literary source other than the Markan one for Luke 23.

More recent scholarship has therefore taken up the task of presenting Luke’s version of the crucifixion as a theologically motivated redaction of Mark’s passion. Notable studies include Joel Green’s presentation of the Preparation for Passover as a stylistic and theological reworking of Mark’s version, in which Luke presents Jesus as more actively involved in planning the Passover, and Peter and John ‘going ahead’ to prepare the meal as an example of servant leadership – a theme that will be strongly emphasised by Luke in the discourse after the Passover.

Green concludes that Luke’s passion can be accounted for with reference only to Mark, Luke’s theology of Jesus as Suffering Servant, and various independent traditions (such as

Luke 22:43-44). Matera goes a step further in suggesting that if this method is applied to the entire closing section of Luke’s gospel, it will do away with the need for a non-Markan source entirely.

Frank Matera has written a similar article on the death of Jesus in 23:44-48, and accounted for every divergence from Mark’s account in terms of specific Lukan theology. Both these articles claim that if Luke’s motivations in altering Mark’s account can be shown from his specific concerns, theology and style, that this will do away with the need for another source.

If there is an alternate PS in Luke 23, then like Matera and Green, I can’t find evidence of it. However, both of their arguments relate specifically to the source material in Luke 23, and so we should show some caution about excluding the separate possibility of a source in Luke 22. While Matera’s and Green’s theological approach has shown that the passion and crucifixion can be best accounted for as Luke’s redaction of Mark, I intend to argue that the non-Markan material in ch. 22 (the last supper) contains a vestigial farewell discourse which has been inserted at the point of Mark’s last supper narrative.

Proto-Luke 22

An unusual feature of Luke 22 is the uniqueness of its sayings material. Almost all the material in Luke 22 which does not derive from Mark is sayings-material, which is often characteristic of Q, and yet only one of these sayings belongs to the double tradition (Luke 22:30: the disciples promised royal thrones). Marion Soards provides a list of minor
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agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in Luke 22, and with the exception of Luke 22:28-30, which contains this saying, the agreements are so minor that they are easily dismissed an anomalies.\textsuperscript{94} Since Ernst Bammel’s 1970 article “Über den Schluß von Q.\textsuperscript{95}” it has been commonplace to speak of this verse as the final saying of the Q.\textsuperscript{96} This suggests the possibility that the speech in Luke 22 was a commentary on this significant saying. As it will be shown below, the Markan material itself is drastically re-ordered at some points, which is completely out of character for Luke – but does make sense if Mark’s material is being adapted to a separate rhetorical sequence.

As Marion Soards points out, linguistic analysis on both sides of the debate has led to a stalemate – because merely linguistic arguments can be marshalled in either direction. It was with specific reference to this passage that Vincent Taylor and J. M. Creed framed their debate about PLH in \textit{The Expository Times}, which culminated in both authors giving equally convincing accounts of the redaction history of a particular section of Luke’s passion narrative.\textsuperscript{97} The exercise proved nothing except the human ability to see patterns where there are none. The lack of methodological cohesion leaves the distinct impression that even if we did stumble upon the ‘perfect solution’ to the problem, nobody would know how to recognise it! And what is worse, each recent writer has only dealt with a limited sample of material from the passion narrative, so that (for instance) Matera’s arguments, even though presented as a perfect test case, are completely inapplicable to the sections which have no Markan parallels, such as the ‘change of method’ pericope (Luke 22:35-38).

Soards therefore proposes a more qualitative approach, and suggests an alternative method: work “primarily with the content and thought... bringing in linguistic matters only to support points made on other grounds.” This is different from other the approach redaction critics because instead of counting words, parsing words and comparing vocabularies, he seems to be trying to ‘think his way into Luke’s brain’.

In his book The Passion According to Luke, Soards identifies Lukan material by analysing each phrase with regards to its similarity to other sources (including Matthew, Johannine/Pauline Literature, LXX, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of Peter), agreement with Markan order, and the presence of telltale Lukan language. Soards marks every word in the pericope as coming from Luke’s composition, Mark or Tradition. In the following account, and my own reconstruction which can be seen in appendix 3, I will disagree with a number of his judgments. However, on the whole it is his rigorous linguistic method I shall adopt in discerning the proto-Lukan material, and large sections of my result are similar.

Soards has concluded from this study that Luke’s passion is merely a redaction of Mark’s passion, with no other source. He comes to this conclusion because the non-Markan portions of Luke’s PN do not seem to him to ‘form a continuous narrative’ when placed in order without Mark, and because that material does make sense as a theologically motivated alteration of Mark, Luke 22 functioning (as Soards summarises) as “a mini-course in Christology, Eschatology and Ecclesiology”, which he develops into a “full program if
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study”\textsuperscript{103} specifically designed to impart to Luke’s readers “(a) elevated Christology, (b) heightened Eschatology and (c) articulated Ecclesiology.”\textsuperscript{104} The task of the remainder of this section will be to show in this case that a vestigial farewell narrative makes more sense of Luke’s PN than Soards’ account.

I start with some simple logical arguments for the existence of a non-Markan literary source for ch. 22 of Canonical Luke. I use Soards’ own redaction critical approach but come to different results. They work from the phenomena described above (non-Markan pericopes and sentences interspersed with Markan pericopes and sentences, changes in Mark’s order, and the absence of Q), which are phenomena drawn from the entire passion narrative, not merely from one pericope.

Firstly, Canonical Luke is consistently faithful in following Mark’s order of events in the triple tradition. As it will be seen below, in Luke 22, Luke shuffles Mark’s order around quite drastically. Even if there are theological motives for these changes, it does not make sense for him to begin that method this late in the Gospel. But they can be accounted for if there is some other literary order to which he is amending Mark’s narrative. This will be seen in detail below. Therefore, we are dealing here, not with a series of disconnected oral traditions or written fragments, but a \textit{documentary source}.

Secondly, and most convincingly, as we have been finding with the proto-Lukan material as a whole, and as we found with Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30 specifically, when one removes the Markan material from Luke 22, what remains makes good literary sense. Luke employs three redactional techniques in this section, which between them, account for the entire redactional process: changes in Mark’s order to accommodate the narrative flow of Proto-

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid, 112.
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Luke/the passion source, insertions of significant narrative moments from Proto-Luke/the passion source into Mark, and compression of large narrative sections from Mark into smaller units.

Redactional Technique 1: Changes in Markan Order


In this case, Luke’s changes in the order of Mark 14 look like the work of a madman, unless he is following some kind of sequence of events other than Mark. The following table should convey the dissonance between the two versions of the supper:

Table 3.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betrayal foretold</td>
<td>Cup Blessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread Blessing</td>
<td>Bread Blessing (&quot;the same with the cup&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Cup Blessing</td>
<td>Betrayal Foretold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentaries which focus on the final canonical version of Luke have interpreted Luke’s different order with reference to the fact that the earliest reference to the Passover meal (m. Pes 10:1-7) mentions a plurality of cups, Darrell L. Bock identifying the cups as the first and third cups of the Seder. But this does not explain why Luke shuffles Mark’s material around, after treating his order so faithfully in the rest of the gospel. Luke is not a witness to the supper, so he has nothing to ‘correct’ in Mark’s account, and nothing about Mark’s version needs amending in order to present the Last Supper as a model Passover meal – so
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Luke is not correcting it to his understanding of Jewish liturgy, and even if he were, it seems strange that he does not explicitly use any imagery of Passover.

The interpretive potential of postulating a literary source becomes obvious when it is integrated into the picture:

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betrayal foretold Mark 14:18-21</td>
<td>Cup Blessing</td>
<td>The Betrayer’s hand Mark 14:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread Blessing Mark 14:22-24</td>
<td>Bread Blessing</td>
<td>The Betrayer’s hand Mark 22:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Cup Blessing Mark 14:25</td>
<td>The Passover Cup</td>
<td>The Betrayer’s hand Mark 22:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke 22:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciples Discuss</td>
<td>Disciples Discuss Luke 22:23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I am assuming here the better attested long reading of Luke 22:19-20. While v. 19b-20 are missing in some manuscripts, this can easily be explained as an attempt to harmonise Luke with the other gospels in which there is only one cup.

Luke’s alteration of Mark’s sequence immediately makes sense when the table is drawn like this. In the source document, Jesus is sharing the Passover cup with the disciples, and laments his coming betrayal, at which point the disciples’ interrogation triggers the discourse. The way that Soards accounts for this change is by reference to a “eucharistic
tradition similar to... 1 Cor 11.23-25” here,\footnote{Soards, Passion, 54.} but that does not explain the change in order, since 1 Corinthians agrees with Mark, not Luke about the bread preceding the cup.

When Canonical Luke was integrating material from Mark 14:18-25 into his gospel, it had to be placed at this point to avoid a doublet resulting in two last suppers. As seen in table 3.9, Mark 14:25 had to be moved back because in his other source, Jesus opens with the cup, but a reference to Mark’s order was retained in Luke 22:21 in order to respect his Markan source. Mark opens with the foretelling of the betrayal, but in Luke’s other source, the betrayal makes more thematic sense at the beginning of the discourse.


After the discourse on greatness in Luke 22:24-30, which has no Markan parallel in the passion narrative (although Luke 22:25-6 should be regarded with some caution because of their similarity to Mark 10:42-45), Luke again reverses Mark’s order in a way that can only be explained by the existence of another document, as follows:

Table 3.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Departure for Mt. Olives</td>
<td>Jesus predicts Peter’s denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where?)</td>
<td>The change of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus predicts Peter’s denial</td>
<td>The Departure for Mount Olives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke 22:39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of similarities can be drawn between tables 3.9 and 3.10. Not only are they equally inexplicable theologically or stylistically, the shape of the intersecting stemma is in
the same pattern: A reversal of order of Mark’s beginning and ending verses around a central passage (the bread blessing/change of method), so that A – (B) – C becomes C – (B) – A. But also, once the documentary source is introduced as a factor, the pattern begins to make better sense:

Table 3.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Departure for Mt. Olives</td>
<td>22:24–30</td>
<td>The Greatness Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:29–31</td>
<td>22:33–34</td>
<td>The change of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus predicts Peter’s denial</td>
<td>22:39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garden of Gethsemane</td>
<td>22:40–46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:32–42</td>
<td>22:47etc.</td>
<td>The crowd arrives to arrest Jesus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The source material had its own rhetorical flow, in which the crowd arrives to arrest Jesus at the end of a lengthy farewell discourse. To integrate this material with the Markan order, the redactor must somehow cope with the new Markan datum that Jesus was arrested at Mt. Olives, not at the table, and significantly, that Jesus (in Mark) spoke to Peter after he left the table. The journey to Mt. Olives would be divide Jesus’ and Peter’s conversation in half if the Markan order were retained. The prediction of Peter’s denial in Mark 14:29-31, being a dialogical moment in Mark, is therefore appropriately brought before the departure and next to Jesus’ prayer that Simon remain faithful during the sifting process in Proto-Luke, and therefore integrated into the greater discourse. The narrative elements of departure and
prayer (Mark 14:26-28, 32-42) are then placed together after the speech (after Luke 22:39),
to match the temptation in the garden but before the crowd arrives to arrest him (Luke
22:47 etc.)

Redactional Technique 2: Compression of Markan Narrative

phenomena coincide: the absence of additions to Mark’s narrative content, the close
following of Mark’s chronological sequence, and the general (but not universal, see 22:54-
62) tendency to paraphrase Mark’s material instead of using Mark’s exact words.

These three phenomena can all be simply accounted for if Luke is using Mark and a PS. Luke
intends to compress this material so that it supplements his PS with a narrative flow it lacks
– but does not distract from the discursive characteristic of the PS.


Vincent Taylor identified this passage as a section of Proto-Luke, because its verbal
agreement with Mark was only 26%, (and removing the Western interpolation in vv. 43-44
would only raised the percentile to 34%). He therefore concluded that “the only doubtful
point is whether xxii. 46b is a Markan pendant.”107 It seems doubtful, though, if this were
the case, whether there would be such a high correspondence of words, and an exact
correspondence of order, as the following table shows:

1926), 45.
Table 3.12

Mark  Luke

14:32  a. They go to Gesthemane  a. He goes to a place 22:40

   b. He tells disciples to pray  b. He tells them to pray

14:33  a. He takes the three further  a. Withdraws a stone's throw 22:41

   b. He is troubled  b. He prays:

14:34  a. He tells the three he is troubled

   b. He instructs them to watch

14:35  He prays the cup be taken away

14:36  “Abba Father  “Father

   “All things possible for you  “if you are willing

   “Remove the cup  “Remove the cup

   “Not what I want…”  “Not my will…”

   Western Interpolation: Strengthened by an angel 22:43–4

14:37  a. finds disciples sleeping  finds disciples sleeping 22:45

   b. He rebukes disciples  a. He rebukes disciples 22:46

14:38  a. Watch and pray  b. Rise (ἀναστάντες) and pray

   b. So no temptation  c. So no temptation

   c. Spirit willing, flesh weak

14:39  Again, went away, prayed

14:40  Finds disciples sleeping

14:41  Rebukes disciples

14:42  rise (ὑπέρασπις), betrayer at hand
It can be seen from this chart that Luke does not remove anything from the Markan account but compresses it in the following ways:

1. omitting repeated material (such as Mark 14:34b, 39-42)
2. summarising (Mark 14:33b-34 > Luke 22:41b)
3. glossing over Mark’s detail where it serves no purpose (in Mark 14:32 = Luke 22:40: Gethsemane > a place; disciples > them; and from Mark 14:33 the largely irrelevant reference to ‘the three’ is replaced by the poetic ‘stone’s throw’)
4. removing data that is purely emotional in content, such as Jesus’ being troubled in 14:33-34
5. Hellenising Semitisms (Gethsemane > a place, Abba Father > Father)

He also changes Mark’s stylistic choices on a number of occasions (Mark 14:42, ἐγείρεσθε > Luke 22:46, ἀναστάντες; Mark 14:36 ‘what I want’/ τί ἐγὼ θέλω > Luke 22:42 ‘my will’/ τὸ θέλημά μου). The only detail not accounted by this theory is the ‘stones’ throw.’ As tempting as it may be to explain such details by reference to oral traditions – a better explanation may simply be that this is a poetic flourish of Luke’s creation.

Luke 22:43-4 is taken here to be a Western interpolation (rather than Alexandrian omission) possibly as an anti-docetic proof text. In this case, L. Brun’s rubric that, with the exception of the Western text’s interpolation in 22:43-44, “nowhere else in the passion narrative does Luke shorten Mark’s account without some replacement” holds true.

However, this text-critical observation is in no way essential to my argument here. If it is taken as an omission, then the dotted arrows from Mark 14:33b-34a could be adjusted to point to Luke 22:43-44. This is not preferable, however, because Luke has no reason to move the material to a point in the narrative after the prayer of Luke 22:41 – and nowhere else has he moved material forward, only back, retrospectively. Also, as Ehrman and Plunkett have pointed out, Luke 22:40-46 forms a chiasmus, with Jesus’ prayer in the center, which the interpolation would interrupt:

Table 3.13


Α γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου ἔπειν αὐτοῖς, Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσέλθειν εἰς πειρασμόν. (22:40).

Β καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὥσει λίθου βολήν (22:41a)

C καὶ θεὶς τὰ γόνατα (22:41b)


C’ καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς (22:45a)

Β’ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς (22:45b)

Α’ ἐὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, καὶ ἔπειν αὐτοῖς, Τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. (22:45c-46). 109

That Luke, who elsewhere clearly dislikes and disrupts chiasms (see Table 2.3), would create one here is remarkable in itself. He is not drawing the chiasm from Mark, because Mark’s chiasm lacks a C’ (which would have been in 14:37). Luke’s normal practice, however, of

109 Ehrman, and Plunkett, 413.
disrupting chiasms is due to his Hellenistic aesthetic, which dislikes the Semitic parallelism of ideas. This chiasm is based on the spatial co-ordinates of entry into the garden (BB') and the assumption of a prayerful posture (CC') is not a parallelism of ideas. However, as Table 3.12 outlines, in this instance Luke condenses a considerable amount of repetitive narrative material by using this technique.

All of this sheds further light on Luke’s redactional purpose in compressing Mark’s material: he emphasises Jesus’ submissive, prayerful obedience in a stylistically beautiful and concise form, and manages to do so without losing any significant Markan content – his technique is brilliant, and must have happened after the discovery of Mark, since it uses Markan material as its building blocks. This section may be confidently judged not to belong any source that Luke had before he discovered his Markan one.


Jesus’ arrest is also Markan in content; Taylor has pointed out that in the whole of Luke 22:14ff, 22:54b-61 in particular (which parallels Mark 14:53-54, 66-72) is “distinguished... by the fact that it has no less than half its words in common with Mark.”¹¹⁰ Luke 22:66-71, by contrast, has very few words in common with the Markan parallel, Mark 14:55-62.¹¹¹ It will be noted, however, that in the latter section, the narrative is the same as Mark’s in content. The order of events and the phrasing have been rearranged and compressed, but there is nothing in this section which is dependent on other traditions or Luke’s creation. Bock, and an impressive list of scholars whom he cites have disagreed with this conclusion. Bock’s argument seems to summarise the scholarly reasons for postulating a source, from six differences:

¹¹⁰ Taylor, 48.
¹¹¹ Ibid., 50.

2. Luke does not record the charge about the temple (Mark 14:57-59)

3. In Luke, the Sanhedrin does not explicitly condemn Jesus (Mark 14:64).

4. In Luke, Peter’s denials are all together, and precede the trial (Luke 22:54-62; Mark 14:66-72)


6. The Gospels differ about who elicits Peter’s denials; the slave girls are more prominent in Matthew (26:69, 71) and Mark (14:66, 69) than in Luke (22:56).\(^{112}\)

It is strange to suggest the existence of “additional material” on the basis of material which is missing (points 2, 3 and 6), conflated (points 1 and 4) and rearranged (point 5).\(^{113}\) As it will be seen below, all these features of Luke are better accounted for as strategies by Luke to compress rather than add to Mark’s material.

But Bock also refers to an impressive list of scholars arguing for a source here, including Fitzmyer,\(^ {114}\) Marshall,\(^ {115}\) Nolland,\(^ {116}\) Green\(^ {117}\) and Soards.\(^ {118}\) Fitzmyer attributes vv. 54-62 and 63-65 to a Lukan reworking of Mark, and only vv. 66-71 to another tradition, because of the absence of a charge of blasphemy, and the verdict,\(^ {119}\) again, as in the case of Bock, this is an argument only from silence.

The following chart makes Luke’s redactional technique clear without requiring a non-Markan source:

---


\(^{113}\) Ibid.


\(^{119}\) Fitzmyer, 1458.
Table 3.14

**Mark**  
Moment of arrest (κρατέω)  
(14:46)  
Have you come with swords?  
14:47–50 (Luke uses elsewhere)  
A young man flees  
X (omits)  
51–2  
To high priest + temple authorities  
14:53  
Peter follows  
14:54  
Charge of destroying temple  
X (omits)  
14:55–61a  
Charge of blasphemy  
14:61b–64  
“Prophesy!”  
14:65  
Peter’s denial  
14:66–72  
Jesus handed to Pilate  
15:1

**Luke**  
Moment of arrest (συλλομβάνω)  
22:54a  
Taken to high priest  
22:54b  
Peter follows  
22:55  
Peter’s denial  
22:56–62  
“Prophesy!”  
22:63–65  
Jesus handed to Pilate  
22:66–23:1  
Charge of blasphemy  
22:67–71

Just like Luke 22:40-46 (table 3.12), this section can be considered a condensation of Mark’s material. None of Luke’s concepts are new to Mark, but material that would not make good sense to a Luke’s Hellenistic audience (destroying the temple, and the cryptic story of the naked young man) are omitted. Just as in Table 3.12, Luke condensed the story by removing the repetitive contrasts between Jesus’ prayer and the disciples’ sleep, so now the recurrent contrasts of Jesus’ confession with Peter’s denial are reordered. Luke brings the references to Peter in Mark 14:54 and 14:66-72 together, moving the denial earlier in the narrative. He
also takes Mark’s separate blocks of trial narrative in 14:61b-64 and 15:1, and places them in a logical order.

As Johnson points out, Mark’s contrast of Jesus and Peter is “obviously to Peter’s disadvantage”\textsuperscript{120} and Luke’s account can therefore be seen as kinder to the apostles, whom Luke will use as witnesses in the book of Acts. Alternatively, Caird has suggested that Luke’s order simply makes more sense of what might have actually happened, since an immediate midnight trial seems historically improbable.\textsuperscript{121} Whatever Luke’s motives, or even if there are a number of motivating factors, in separating and consolidating the three sections of Jesus arrest (Luke 22:54), Peter’s denial (22:55-62) and Jesus’ trial (22:63-71), Luke has made the story clearer and more concise, and to do so, he did not need any material other than Mark.

\textit{Redactional Technique 3: Insertion into Markan Narrative}

There are other sections in Luke’s PN where Mark’s order and content is followed, but with additions rather than omissions. While redactional techniques 1 and 2 tend to support a PS, these passages \textit{prima facie} argue against it. But, in each of these cases, Luke steers Mark’s text to his own ends by making additions which (unlike the ‘stone’s throw’ of Luke 22:40) are crucial to the narrative.


The narrative function of Judas’ betrayal, and the arrest of Jesus in Luke cannot be overestimated. It is not as (perhaps) it is in Mark, simply the occasion of the crucifixion.

\textsuperscript{120} Johnson, \textit{Luke}, 362.
\textsuperscript{121} Caird, \textit{Luke}, 244.
Rather, it is the decisive strike of Satan (the antagonist), over whom Jesus the protagonist triumphs at the cross.

At these pivotal moments, Luke uses Markan narrative material to flesh out what was stated concisely in dialogue form in PS. He inserts pivotal sentences of apocalyptic importance from his PS into the vivid imagery of Mark’s narrative, in such a way as to transform Mark’s meaning. These verses (22: 47a, 49, 51a, 53b) are identifiable simply because they are not in Mark, either verbally, or conceptually.

In Luke’s PS, the arrest happens with words. Judas arrives with a crowd, and Jesus corrects the disciples’ use of violence and submits to the power of darkness, simply by saying so. In the canonical redaction, R adds a Markan backdrop: an intention to betray by a kiss (although Luke uniquely omits the actual kiss), a violent incident with a sword, a severed ear, a healing and a heated dialogue between Jesus and his captors. The source knows none of this, describing only the spiritual dimensions of Jesus’ non-violent submission to death.


The reconstruction of this section is perhaps the most difficult to account for. It includes only three verses (Luke 22:3, 7 and 14b) which are not in Mark. If it were not for the analogy of Luke 22:47-54 = Mark 14:43-52, it may be best to treat the whole section as a redaction of Mark made at the time of Canonical Luke’s composition. In support of this view, Joel Green has claimed that there is unanimity among scholars that this section is a redaction of Mark,122 and that Luke’s purpose is to stress the agency of Jesus and the servanthood of the apostles.123 Johnson sees this as a reinforcement of Luke’s portrayal of

123 Ibid., 312-3.
Jesus as a prophet. Joseph Fitzmyer describes the additions as “wholly of Lukan creation”. There are, however, a number of reasons for treating this section as insertions from PS rather than editorial invention.

The first reason for treating Luke 22:3, 7 and 14b as PS material is that it is simpler to understand Luke’s technique as consistent throughout ch 22. Luke has consistently been adapting the Markan source in such a way that it is subordinate to the source Proto-Luke. In every instance, it is Mark which is rearranged to fit the Proto-Luke discourse, and to provide narrative settings for it: the supper becomes the occasion of the discourse on greatness, and the arrest at Mount Olives becomes the occasion for Jesus’ final words in the discourse: “let it go” and “this is your hour…”.

In fitting with Luke’s consistent method, in Luke 22:1-14, it is the non-Markan verses which exercise discursive control over the Markan verses. Bock has noted, for instance, that it is in Luke 22:1-6 that “The hunt is on... The plan to hand over Jesus has begun; the hounds are out of the pen... [This] impetus comes from outside spiritual forces and from inside the twelve... the only reason given is that Satan is at work in Judas, [and] in the great chess match, this is Satan’s major move to remove Jesus from the game.” Satan’s entry into Judas then, should not be understood as stylistic addition to Mark’s narrative, but as a narrative function of PS – a feature to which the details of Mark’s narrative were later added as ‘padding.’ The Markan phrase “καὶ ἔζητει πῶς αὐτὸν ἐυκαιρίως παραδοῖ.” (Mark 14:11), which Luke transforms into “καὶ ἔζητει ἐυκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδούναι αὐτὸν ἀπερ ὄχλου αὐτῶν.” (Luke 22:6), is also transformed in meaning, because in Canonical

124 Johnson, 336.
Luke, with the PS addition, Satan (Σατανᾶς) in Judas becomes the subject of the verb ζητέω, just as the devil (ὁ διώκος) was the subject of Luke’s source for 4:13.

However, the most convincing argument for the inclusion of these verses in the PS is that when it is read in its original form, as a whole, it flows better with these verses attached. Without them, Jesus and the disciples would be suddenly, inexplicably seated at the Passover table. The opening lines of the discourse in Luke 22:15, “Ἐπιθυμία ἔπεθύμησα τότε τὸ πόσχα φαγεῖν μεθ’ ἕμων πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν” would be ungrammatical, since there is no substantive anywhere, antecedent or postcedent to which τούτο might refer (so which Passover is this Passover?) But if (and only if) the verses in question are separated from Mark, and placed before the farewell discourse, they set the scene for the Passover table discourse in such a way that the narrative makes sense. For these reasons, even though the verses are not essential to demontrate a PS, it seems better to include them in the reconstruction.


I designate Luke 22:24-32 as section of Luke non-Markan source. However, the first four verses of this section are similar to Mark 10:42-45. The pre-Lukan chapter 22 can work well with or without these verses, but I have chosen to designate them as an overlap between Proto-Luke and Mark for a number of reasons. Firstly, this passage is taken from an earlier place in Mark’s narrative, and Luke normally does not alter the order of Mark’s pericopes. Secondly, while Matthew has copied Mark’s version almost verbatim in Matt 20:25-28, there are actually very few words in common between the Markan and Lukan versions. Luke uses ten Markan words out of sixty-seven in total. Of these ten, only three are key words, and only one key word has an identical inflection (τῶν ἔθνων in v. 25). Luke also
has the substantive participle ὁ διακονῶν for Mark's noun form διάκονος, and κυριεύουσιν for Mark's κατακυριεύουσιν in v. 25, is particularly interesting because, as Marshall points out, Luke tends to prefer compound verbs, so it would be strange for him to change Mark's compound verb for a simple one unless he is following a source. Apart from these three words, Mark and Luke only have the occasional article, pronoun and conjunction in common. Finally, Mark 10:45 is missing from Luke, and this makes the Markan version seem later in origin because of its more developed theology.

Chapter 22 as a whole

The following table summarises the different redactional techniques used by Luke in chapter 22. It is notable that this table requires no crossing of arrows, so on this larger scale, Luke has not adjusted the order of pericopes in the way he does individual verses:

Table 3.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Passion Source (no redaction)</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:26–31</td>
<td>Technique 1: Changes in order</td>
<td></td>
<td>22:24–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:43–52</td>
<td>Technique 3: Insertion</td>
<td></td>
<td>22:40–46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By ‘undoing’ the three redactional techniques listed above, it is possible to reconstruct the

---

127 Marshall, 809.
128 see Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, 93.
Passion Source of ch. 22. This can be seen in appendix 3, where it is placed as the concluding pericope of Proto-Luke.

**Literary Analysis of Proto-Luke 22**

Having reconstructed the source material of this section, it now remains to be seen whether what remains makes enough literary sense to be counted as a documentary source, or if it should be thought of as fragmentary or oral traditions. I will argue below that Luke 22 without Markan influence, which I have been calling PS, makes sense as a documentary source, with a specific genre, and a narrative and rhetorical purpose that makes best sense as the closing section of Proto-Luke. The literary purpose of the farewell discourse discloses information about its tendency and origin, and so it is in this section that I will argue specifically for a *Proto-Luke 22* farewell discourse, which can be understood as connected to the larger documentary source, Proto-Luke.

**Genre**

As William Kurz has argued, in Luke 22:14-38 various traditional sayings of Jesus are drawn together into a farewell discourse, written in the tradition of biblical farewell addresses such as Gen 49, Deut 31, and second temple examples such as *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Testament of Moses*, in which the whole literary work is a testament. But Luke’s farewell address is also written for a Hellenistic audience which is familiar with the traditional Greco-Roman farewell speech, modelled on the death of Socrates in Plato’s
Phaedo, and the various Diogenes Laërtius’ Lives. Charles H. Talbert summarises the content of farewell discourses as follows,

...a hero figure knows he is going to die... he gathers his primary community together and gives a farewell speech with two standard components—there is first a prediction of what will happen after he is gone and then there is an exhortation about how to behave after his departure.

Kurz notes an impressive list of attributes which Luke 22 shares with a broad selection of both Jewish and Hellenistic farewell discourses. Luke 22 includes (1) Reference to the speaker’s example, (2), Reference to the speaker’s impending death (3), Exhortations (4), Warnings/final injunctions (5), Blessings (6), Tasks for successors (7), Revelation of the future (8), Promises (9), Successors (10), Future degeneration of reversal (11), A renewal of covenant (12), Care of those left (13), Consolidation of inner circle. Kurz also notes that the paraenetic and historiographic functions of Luke 22 match the general function of both Jewish and Hellenistic farewell discourses.

Paraenetic Functions:

• v. 19 “do this in remembrance”
• vv 24-27 encourages the true spirit of leadership
• v 32 Commissions Simon
• vv 36-37 Warns the disciples to have a sword

Historiographic Functions:

• To justify transitions of authority in the church from Jesus to the twelve

---

131 Kurz, 263-64.
132 Ibid., 265-67.
• To recall the foundations of teachings and practices important to Luke’s readers (specifically, to defend the missionary approach of Paul by undercutting the absolutism of Gospel instructions to the Seventy.)
• By predicting the Judas’ betrayal and Peter’s fall, to show that Jesus did not exercise poor judgment in choosing his disciples.

What is interesting for the purpose of this study is that none of the attributes of a farewell discourse are derived from Mark, (except the institution of the Lord’s Supper, v. 19, and no other ancient farewell discourse includes the establishment of a new ritual). However, beyond this circumstantial argument, it still remains to be seen whether the rhetorical cohesion of the discourse belongs to a pre-Lukan source, or (as Kurz himself concludes), that it belongs to a ‘weaving together’ of independent sayings that took place during Luke’s redaction of Mark.\(^{133}\)

**Narrative Function**

I have already argued above on redaction- and source- critical grounds that Mark’s order of events is being re-ordered to fit some other order, and that implies a documentary source. I will now argue that this source is the final pericope of the Proto-Luke document. This can be shown from a reading of the narrative function of PS within the gospel itself. As a farewell discourse, Luke 22 is the conclusion to a gospel, and it refers back to events within the narrative of Luke (vv. 35-38), and yet, when this section is viewed in its final canonical format, the Markan insertions into the Proto-Lukan farewell discourse sometimes function to break up the natural rhetorical flow of the discourse. This would not be the case if Luke were bringing various sayings in to complement the Markan text, and create a conclusion for the ministry of Jesus in Luke-Acts. For instance, the entrance of Satan into Judas happens (in Proto-Lukan sequence), directly after the parable of the minas in 19:11-27 in

\(^{133}\) Kurz, 257.
which two faithful servants are contrasted with one unfaithful, and a crowd of enemies. Now, in chapter 22, the parable is lived out, as two faithful disciples (Peter and John) are contrasted with one unfaithful disciple, Judas, and the crowd to whom he betrays Jesus. This literary analogy was lost when Markan material was placed between the parable and the discourse in ch. 20-21.

Another example is the trip to the mount of olives, which occurs in canonical Luke before the farewell discourse in completed, and disrupts the contrast between ἵκανόν ἐστιν v. 38 and Ἐάτε ἐγὼς τούτου in v. 51, both of which are corrections of the disciple’s literal and chillingly overenthusiastic interpretation of Jesus’ commandment to carry a sword. In the Proto-Lukan text, the play is more complex, since the disciples, having misinterpreted the permission to acquire a sword as a ‘call to arms’ further misinterpret ἵκανόν ἐστιν as an estimation that two swords “should be enough”, instead of “enough of this violent behaviour!”, and finally v. 51 “let it go!” serves as a correction of their misinterpretation of his correction of their first misinterpretation. The dark humour is lost by the insertion of Markan material.

After Luke has interwoven Mark, the eleven intervening verses of mainly Markan material about the prayer on the Mount of Olives introduce great emotional weight to the crucifixion scene only at the expense of ruining the punch line of the macabre Proto-Lukan comedy of errors. In the absence of the institution of the supper (vv. 18-22), Peter’s verbal interruptions into the speech (v. 34), and narrative interruption which comes through the relocation to the Mount of Olives (vv. 40-46), Proto-Luke’s speech runs smoothly. This phenomenon demands a better explanation than the Markan Hypothesis can provide: that in Luke 22, all the Q and S῾ material works together discursively in a way that is conducive
to the genre of a farewell speech, and that the Markan material is at best a setting for the farewell discourse – but probably simply indifferent to this narrative function of the section. The most intuitive explanation is that the discourse was composed separately as a conclusion for Proto-Luke, and integrated into canonical Luke with Mark later on.

Themes

The second quantitative argument for naming this source ‘Proto-Luke 22’ may seem more ‘circular’ in logic than the first, since it requires the assumption of PLH, as it applies to the rest of Proto-Luke. But, to be fair, PLH in general has been argued for above on quantitative grounds that do not specifically assume Proto-Luke 22. Based on those arguments, this argument is from the way that Luke 22 functions as a conclusion to a number of aspects of the plot that began in the opening section of Proto-Luke (3:1-4:30). Firstly, the expectation of the devil’s return for an ἀχρι καιροῦ, which was set up in Proto-Luke 4:13 is now fulfilled in the conclusion of Proto-Luke – Satan has entered Judas, and after Jesus’ speech the καιρὸς arrives. Secondly, the change in missionary method ban on possessions from Luke 10 for the journey to Jerusalem) is now reversed, indicating that the journey is completed. In Canonical Luke-Acts, these events can be understood as a new phase in the narrative preparation for the final battle between Satan and Christ which will be won on the cross. However, in Proto-Luke, the battle between Satan and Jesus, and the journey in which this battle is carried out, are the driving principle of the story, and therefore, in the context of a farewell address, they have the stronger narrative function of concluding the plot, and bringing the journey narrative to a decisive end. Once these loose ends are ‘tied up’ in Jesus’ parting speech, a clear end to the narrative can be recognised, which matches the clear beginning of 3:1.
Many of Proto-Luke’s themes and literary devices apparent in 3:1-4:30 are now brought to a conclusion in Proto-Luke 22. Firstly, the preaching of repentance by John, and of the ‘year of the Lord’s favour’ by Jesus as representative of a radical ethical vision are continued by the call to non-violence by Jesus, even more radical demands in this discourse, and finally his peaceful submission to Satan’s testing. The picture of Jesus as a faithful Israelite is seen in his eager desire to celebrate Passover, just as he was faithful in synagogue attendance in Nazareth, faithful Jewish worship. Finally, the anti-Imperial dig of Proto-Luke 4:6, which declares the glory of the nations of the world to be bestowed by the devil is continued in several features of Luke 22. Proto-Luke 22:24-30 compares the apostle’s future servant leadership with the arrogance of the rulers and benefactors of the gentiles, and calls the impending Roman crucifixion the ‘hour of darkness’.

The critique of earthly gentile power which began in John’s preaching against Herod (Proto-Luke 3:18-20) is continued in the contrast between the servant leadership that is expected of disciples, and the arrogance of the rulers of the nations in verse 25. The reference to benefactors itself can easily be construed as a dig at the whole social system of patron-client relations. This could be understood either as a ‘demonising’ of the Empire itself since benefactors were a Roman influence, or it could be understood as a kind of resistance to the exploitation involved in this aspect of imperial culture. Either way, Proto-Luke is still principled in defining the Christian community as not belonging to the Greco-Roman world even as it makes a home for itself within Hellenistic culture. The un-subtle disapproval of Imperial Rome is distinguished from any kind of cultural elitism by the adoption of a Hellenistic farewell discourse genre.
A Source History of Luke 22

The above analysis of the redaction history of Luke 22 brings us firmly back to PLH, and the development of the passage through three stages. First, this existed as the final saying of ‘Q’\(^{134}\) (or, possibly as Athanasius Polag has reconstructed it, the penultimate saying, which introduces the final parable of the talents/pounds)\(^{135}\) to the proto-Lukan farewell discourse, and finally to the canonical Lukan Last Supper and arrest sequence.

1. The Q Context

In its Q context as the final saying of Q, 22:30 is best understood as a bold final statement of the message of ‘Q’. This parallels the situation in the Gospel of Thomas, in which the final saying (Thomas 114) functions as a bold final statement of the theological tendency of Thomas:

> Simon Peter said to them, ‘Make Mary leave us, for females don’t deserve life.’ Jesus said, ‘Look, I will guide her to make her male, so that she too may become a living spirit resembling you males. For every female who makes herself male will enter the domain of heaven (Scholars’ Version)\(^{136}\)

Thomas’ transcendental theology, as well as its (hopefully metaphorical) misogyny are stated more bluntly here than it is in other sections of Thomas. So too, the casting of discipleship as the practise of homeless itinerant prophesy is stated boldly in this final statement that those who stand with Jesus through Earthly sufferings will share in his kingly, eternal authority.

---


2. The Proto-Lukan stage of development

Proto-Luke’s farewell discourse was created at the same stage of composition as Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30. In Proto-Luke 3:1-4:30, R took the primitive *kerygma* of the Q community and crafted into a historical narrative, so as to integrate sacred history into world-history (the ‘reign of Tiberius’), and into Greco-Roman culture. In doing so, he consistently emphasised concrete events over abstract theology, and he sought to maintain the integrity of the Christian message by stressing repentance and the call to discipleship. He made it clear that by situating the Christian message in a Hellenistic context, he was not approving of Hellenistic culture, as in Proto-Luke 4:6 it is R who recounts Satan’s claim to have given authority to the nations.

3. The Canonical stage of development

In canonical Luke, Mark’s rapid narrative material has been complemented with the Proto-Lukan material in such a way as to create theologically profound sayings about discipleship into a narrative about the time of testing as a confrontation with Satan – a compilation which is no longer Markan or Proto-Lukan but uniquely *Lukan*.

In summary, Proto-Luke 22 functions within the genre of farewell discourse better than canonical Luke 22 does, and therefore can be recognised as a documentary source. It is less complex, and more unified discourse than its canonical counterpart. The thematic unity, for instance, is intensified as scattered references to Satan in vv. 3, 31 and 53 are brought to the beginning, middle and end of the discourse. Second, all the essential components of the genre outlined by Talbert remain in place – but incidental interruptions to the discourse are removed. All the remaining Proto-Luke material is ethical, predictive, and transfers...
authority to successors, which is consistent with the usual content of farewell discourses. Finally there is the end of v. 51 – which functions as a kind of apocalyptic fiat, declaring that the speech is over, and the dark hour of Jesus’ death is to begin. This is the note upon which Proto-Luke as we know it comes to a conclusion.

Conclusion

The Proto-Lukan Farewell Discourse is a more cohesive, yet more naïve literary unit than Luke 22, just as the whole of Proto-Luke is when compared to its canonical counter-part. In the reconstruction process, the ‘journey’ image was reunited with its original clear beginning and end by the removal of Mark, so this discourse is restored to its original context at the Passover table, between Satan’s return through Judas and Jesus’ consequent “opportune” arrest.

The literary meaning of Proto-Luke’s ending is also fitting for its moment in the history of the early church’s development. It makes sense because, as shown in the above analysis of Luke 3:1-4:30), Luke’s apologetic purpose is to transform an essentially Palestinian group of traditions (belonging to the Q and L communities) into a universal narrative that is fitting for a Hellenistic audience (Proto-Luke). The genre of a farewell discourse is a strategic pivot-point for such cross-cultural communication.
CHAPTER 5
Recognising Proto-Luke
Interrogating the Jesus of the Text

But you can’t start. Only a baby can start. You and me - why, we’re all that’s been. The anger of a moment, the thousand pictures, that’s us. This land, this red land, is us; and the flood years and the dust years and the drought years are us. We can’t start again. The bitterness we sold to the junk man - he got it all right, but we have it still...

How can we live without our lives? How will we know it’s us without our past? No. Leave it. Burn it.

They sat and looked at it and burned it into their memories. How’ll it be not to know what land’s outside the door? How if you wake up in the night and know—and know the willow tree’s not there? Can you live without the willow tree? Well, no, you can’t. The willow tree is you. The pain on that mattress there—that dreadful pain—that’s you.

~ Steinbeck, The Grapes of Wrath. Ch. 9.

~ Simone Martini Maesta: St John the Baptist (1315)

"People may be unprepared, but they are never unprovisioned. Each person is born with the wherewithal fully intact."

Introduction

This observation is important. A journey from Galilee to Jerusalem need be nothing more than a literal, geographical journey; but a journey from Galilee to heaven cannot be simply a literal geographical one... Jerusalem is not geographically nearer heaven than anywhere else on Earth.¹

This final chapter completes the task of reconstructing Proto-Luke from canonical Luke-Acts simply by making sense of the narrative of Proto-Luke, the themes and the character development, the genre and the apologetic of the passages that have been identified by the removal of Mark and the infancy and passion narratives. Now that the traditional material has been designated within Proto-Luke by a process of determining the skeletal structure of Q and L's literary structures, and removing the external clothing of Mark, and the infancy and passion narratives, there remains a 'layer of skin' which is the work of the Redactor of Proto-Luke who provided Proto-Luke with the sinews, flesh and skin. In this chapter I am seeking to describe the literary form and theological content of Proto-Luke.

Two specific methodological tactics I use in this chapter are redaction criticism and demythologization. The previous chapters have been focused mainly on source and literary criticism, because they were specifically concerned with the question of how Proto-Luke was constructed from objective sources. This chapter is unique in its focus on why it was put together – or, what was the authorial intention of this material being put together in this specific way, and is it possible then to reconstruct a Proto-Lukan theology. As the source-critical section has observed the communities

of Q and L applying the broadly interpretable and playful message of Jesus to specific situations, Proto-Luke is more interested in universalising that message in a way that he will continue in Canonical Luke, not only by building connections between the diversity of early Christian communities by harmonising their traditions, but also in beginning to place the material in the format of Greco-Roman history, geography and mythology, to make it appropriate for Hellenistic audiences. This process and its theological motivations are the object of the redaction critical study.

But the specific redaction of Proto-Luke immediately opens the question of myth. As I will show, to achieve his theological ends, Proto-Luke places the raw material of Q and L into a universal *mythic* story-structure: the hero’s quest. Proto-Luke follows this archetype in detail, and does so in a way which neither its sources anticipated, nor which was sustained in the later Canonical edition. But once this is recognised, the key to understanding his purpose is to demythologise the myth; to discover how it spoke to the human condition in universal ways. As I will now show in more detail, this process of demythologisation has already begun in the work of scholars reading the Travel Narrative theologically, and can be clarified when applied specifically to Proto-Luke.

The passages in Proto-Luke which belong to the outer layer of redacted material tend to be concerned with the radical nature of discipleship, and critics have not been quick to recognise this, sometimes preferring to find ways to avoid the call to discipleship in the text. In this case, demythologisation requires a de-ideologicalisation of our own distortions of the text, and I analyse these passages with reference to Slavoj Žižek’s critique of ideology.
Proto-Luke’s Theology

I am convinced that there is a whole host of people simply waiting for the Christian message to challenge them, for once, to a heroism worthy of their lives.  

In reconstructing a theology of Proto-Luke, a fine line will have to be drawn between obscurantism and misappropriation of the literature on Lukan theology. This “storm-centre” of Biblical scholarship has produced a massive literature on the theological implications of Luke and particularly of the Travel Narrative which, since Bultmann, has been discussed as “Luke’s construct” which is informative about Luke’s editorial interests. The majority of these scholars, however, have written about the Travel Narrative in its canonical context, and did not intend to write about Proto-Luke, especially if they are skeptical about its existence.

When the Proto-Luke Hypothesis was still new, Vincent Taylor noticed that any attempt to read it as the work of an author would result in a tension between the Proto-Lukan intention and the Lukan intention, because the hypothesis calls for two moments of authoring, even though it also tends to favour the idea of a single author. Taylor writes, “if the theory is sound, the theology of the document is not merely St. Luke’s theology, but substantially represents his doctrinal ideas about A.D. 65”, to which he also adds

No doubt we must allow for the possibility of a certain amount of editorial modification at the time when St. Luke compiled the Third Gospel, but I do not think it will have been considerable.  

---

5 Ibid., 255 n. 1.
The only way that Taylor is able to justify this confidence is because Luke has not, in substance, changed the material derived from Q or Mark. The way that the vestigial chiasm which from the L document remains in tact seems to once again uphold the ‘conservatism’ with which Luke is traditionally understood to have edited his sources.

Our recognition of these two moments of authoring will mean that the theology of Proto-Luke cannot be used to differentiate between Proto-Lukan and Canonical Lukan strata in Luke. Proto-Luke’s ideological viewpoint is an earlier version of what will later become canonical Luke’s viewpoint. A line of development must therefore be traced between the two ‘editions’. Even the most distinctive of features in Proto-Luke (the Travel Narrative) are further developed in Luke-Acts (i.e. the Missionary Journeys of Paul).

But since the Travel Narrative is so clear when it is seen in its Proto-Lukan format, I intend to lean towards misappropriation of later theological trends in Luke, rather than obscurantism towards the theology we see in the travel narrative. So, I will make the best use of the available literature on its theology, but in order to counterbalance the possibility of reading later Lukan theological developments into Proto-Luke, I must constantly be critical in asking which stratum any of Luke’s specific theological beliefs and tendencies belongs to, and it is beholden on me to argue that each point I adopt from the literature comes specifically from Proto-Luke’s redaction, not its sources nor its later canonical form.

6 Ibid., 214.
As Taylor noticed, the most prominent theological theme in Proto-Luke is the “virile personality” of Jesus.\(^7\) Three characteristics of the Proto-Lukan Jesus are worth noting, and which are both essentially christological categories in Proto-Luke. Even though the exact content of Taylor’s Proto-Luke does not match with mine, these categories are firstly, a certain sternness or severity combined with his graciousness. In Proto-Luke, Jesus prefers to challenge his disciples rather than make their way easy. Secondly, the Proto-Lukan Jesus has absolute clarity about the scope and purpose of his Mission. Thirdly, the Proto-Lukan Jesus is a ‘realist’. He does not give figurative or abstracted descriptions of any of the spiritual realities of mission and discipleship.\(^8\) The following quotation is particularly fitting to the personality of Christ described in Taylor’s theology of Proto-Luke.

The return of the seventy [Luke 10:17-20], flushed with success, creates for Jesus the vision of a battle already won: ‘I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven. It is in this experience of spiritual exaltation that He describes the commission which the Seventy have received ‘Behold I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall in any wise hurt you.’ [10:19]. To describe this language as figurative is only to confess the greatness of its claims, for herein Jesus is revealed as both sword and armour to His disciples. In the grim fight against evil they are by Him both authorized and sealed. Great as the claim undoubtedly is, anything more unlike a fictitious account would be difficult to cite. The final words, ‘Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven’, are especially lifelike.

If the most distinctive feature of Proto-Lukan theology is its personality of Jesus, then the call and cost of discipleship must be the second – although perhaps it would be more accurate to say that this theme is the primary function of the kind of

\(^7\) Ibid., 263.
\(^8\) Ibid., 261-62.
personality Jesus has in Proto-Luke. This is born out in Proto-Luke’s content. The most distinctive single feature of the redactional layer is the travel notices. Even though these redactional notes stand in a fairly random relationship to their surrounding source material, they also hold the key to Luke’s purposes a Redactor. Hans Conzelmann said that they are “the clearest indication by which we can recognise Luke's own composition, and see what is his special interest.”

David Gill has suggested that, after they are used so powerfully in 9:51-62 to introduce the call to discipleship and mission, and that they are then used by Luke to bring the reader’s attention back to these key themes. For instance, in the travel notice of 9:53, the Samaritan villagers reject Jesus because his face is set to Jerusalem. In other words, their refusal is not so much a personal rejection of Jesus, but of the call to follow even to the point of death. Similarly, in the pericope of the ten lepers, πορεύομαι is used three times to draw attention to the call to discipleship which the lepers are accepting or rejecting. (17:11, 14, 19).

Kariamadam’s similar study has also highlighted the significance of the journey as the ὀνάλημψις of Jesus referred to in Luke 9:51, which he interprets as both entry into the kingdom, and a journey to union with the Father, underscored by the use of Father language (i.e. Proto-Luke 11:2).

---

12 Ibid., 180.
The Jesuit scholar Paul Bernadicou has suggested that the meaning of the section is best captured by understanding that, as Bultmann has said, for Luke "the image of Jesus as a traveller is a christological category" and by its existential significance for disciples. For Bernadicou, therefore, the key word of the travel notices is not so much πορεύομαι, as στρέφω. Jesus' path is to glory in heaven through suffering in Jerusalem, and he walks ahead of the disciples and turns around to instruct them, and this is an image of both the spirituality and the existential significance of the journey: Jesus who has walked ahead turns around to instruct Christians who follow and imitate his journey through death to glory. “The Christian must die to his earth-bound self – transcend himself if you will – in order to fulfil the greater commands of the gospel.” The essential components of Jesus' spiritual journey and therefore the Christian's include absolute surrender to the providence of the Father, and to his work of salvation in both the individual and the world.

If we apply this theory to Proto-Luke, the existential message becomes significantly more pronounced, because this journey to death and suffering does not yet contain any explicit reference to glory, but rather concludes with the abject self-surrender of Proto-Luke 22:53, “this is your hour and the power of darkness”! At this stage of redaction no theology of an eternal reward for discipleship has been explicitly developed, but the surrender to the providence of the Father is even more absolute, as it requires handing oneself over to the test of Satan's worst testing, just as Christ was handed to crucifixion. The Proto-Lukan Christ’s actions in this regard match his

13 Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, 33.
teaching about hatred of self, possessions and loved ones more closely than the Lukan Christ, because in Proto-Luke 12:33, Christ does not call his followers to love life less than some other love such as the promise of resurrection, but instead to hate them. It is consistent with Jesus’ call to self-hatred that he hands himself over to the power of darkness.

In chapter 1, I compared the epistemology of Wink and Loder to the structure of the hero’s quest as described by Joseph Campbell (see Figure 2). At this point, Campell’s Hero’s Journey structure will become useful again as a narrative structure for the reconstructed text of Proto-Luke. The structure is particularly appropriate because of Campbell’s highly respected expertise of not only the Greek canon of mythic journeys, but also the mythic canons of Babylon and Assyria, and his fascination with the specific trope of the journey, and his ability to see universals in particular stories. His structure of the journey can be understood as one deeply insightful into the Semitic and Hellenistic journey. The structure is equally applicable to Odyssey and Exodus.

Proto-Luke follows the outline of the journey as mapped out by Campbell closely. The redactor of Proto-Luke, as I have already suggested, was mediating between the cultural tension between Jewish Christianity and the burgeoning Hellenism which would eventually overtake the movement. It is the journey structure which he uses which allows him to speak “bilingually” to both cultures – because the structure of the journey is common to both.
The hero’s journey should therefore be seen as the key to how Proto-Luke can be read. As it will be seen, Proto-Luke has crafted his various traditions into a form which Campbell presents as a timeless and universal journey.

It has always been the prime function of mythology and rite to supply the symbols that carry the human spirit forward, in counteraction to those constant human fantasies that tend to tie it back.\textsuperscript{16}

Not everyone will be equally convinced by Campbell’s claim to have found a universal truth in the mythic journey, but the appeal to a common structure of many human cultures is difficult to ignore. If, as I have argued, the originally creative and adaptable teachings of Jesus were going through a process of becoming rigid in their application to specific cultural situations and norms in the Q and L communities, then the journey symbol moves in the opposite direction, and brings the teachings of Jesus back into a universal form, and into the broader context of the human spirit.

As Campbell says, and as could easily be applied to the hero/s of Proto-Luke,

\begin{quote}
The hero, therefore, is the man or woman who has been able to battle past his personal and local historical limitations to the generally valid, normally human forms. Such a one's visions, ideas, inspirations come pristine from the primary springs of human life and thought. Hence they are eloquent, not of the present, disintegrating society and psyche, but of the unquenched source through which society is reborn. The hero has died as a modern man; but as eternal man—perfected unspecific, universal man—he has been reborn. His second solemn task and deed therefore... is to return then to us, transfigured, and teach the lesson he has learned of life renewed.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} Campbell, 10-11.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 20.
In Proto-Luke, the hero is primarily Jesus, and then also the disciples who follow him and therefore experience with him the refining process of the journey. By implication, the hero is the primitive communities for whom Proto-Luke was written, who are also called to journey and therefore to view discipleship as something that is not bound to their own cultural perspective, in the sense that it belongs to world-history as well as Israelite sacred history, and to return from their own encounter with Christ to share this boon with their own contextual communities. Demythologisation occurs for us as readers when we enter the journey, and experience its soul-purifying trials as members of the ὁχλὸς πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, (Proto-Luke 6:17).

I should add one caution about engagement with Campbell’s work. Campbell’s engagement with ancient mythic tropes is strongly coloured by his belief that ancient mythology can be accounted for by depth-psychology, and his identification of the journey-world with the subconscious, with integration of the personality as its ultimate goal. He says, for instance, that “Freud, Jung, and their followers have demonstrated irrefutably that the logic, the heroes, and the deeds of myth survive into modern times.” 18

But the Jesus of Proto-Luke is more than an archetype of the Self, and consequentially, discipleship is more than ego-death and self-discovery, and the meaning of Proto-Luke can’t be reduced to a function of depth psychology, as I think Campbell himself sometimes does. And Campbell himself was critical of this possibility when he said about the final goal of the hero-journey that,

18 Ibid., 4.
The ineffable teaching of the beatitude beyond imagination comes to us clothed, necessarily, in figures reminiscent of the imagined beatitude of infancy; hence the deceptive childishness of the tales. Hence, too, the inadequacy of any merely psychological reading.\textsuperscript{19}

The psychological interpretation, then, must be understood as just one manifestation of the soul’s ultimate journey. Proto-Luke follows the same narrative structure with surprising consistency, and so the model is able to reveal the shape of Proto-Luke in such a way as to show how the traditional material was built into a proto-gospel.

The structure of myth as proposed by Campell is as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item X. Separation
  \item Y. Initiation
  \item Z. Return
\end{itemize}

The standard features of this myth as expressed in the tropes of a hero journey are as follows:\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 164.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 227.
Figure 4: Stages of the Hero’s Journey

The journey can now be shown in the structure of Proto-Luke (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>X: Call to Discipleship</th>
<th>Y: Instructions on Discipleship</th>
<th>Z: The goal of discipleship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The call of Jesus</td>
<td>b. A discourse on discipleship</td>
<td>a. Farewell Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:2b-4:30</td>
<td>6:17-8:3</td>
<td>22:14-65 (in part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The call of the Disciples</td>
<td>5:1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the key elements of the hero quest are present at the appropriate transition points of the narrative (Table 4.2).
Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to adventure: Baptism of John</td>
<td>3:2b-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian of the Threshold – the Devil</td>
<td>4:1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from within - Holy Spirit</td>
<td>3:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X) The Threshold of Adventure - Nazareth Synagogue</td>
<td>4:16b-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Belly of the Whale: the call of Peter at Lake Galilee</td>
<td>5:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road of Trials:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus announces the values of the journey</td>
<td>6:1-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus calls the disciples to leave home for Jerusalem</td>
<td>9:51-62 and ‘travel notices’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus explains the cost of discipleship</td>
<td>14:15-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Boon: the apocalyptic feast</td>
<td>13:1-14:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y) Atonement with the Father: The Lost Son</td>
<td>15:11-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Z) Return Threshold: Passover Meal</td>
<td>22 (various)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return of Satan</td>
<td>22:3, 31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reversal of methods</td>
<td>22:35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betrayal</td>
<td>22:47, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elixer (ability to grant boons): the thrones of Israel</td>
<td>22:28-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There now follows a more detailed reading of the way that these key elements and the structure of the hero-journey was used by Proto-Luke to give a new presentation of the tradition of Jesus’ teachings. In this I will be focussing specifically on the work of the redactor, and how he worked with the sources to create meaning. This will include an in depth analysis of those sections of the redactional material in which Proto-Luke, in the voice of the redactor, explicitly creates a ‘road of trials’, including:

1. Travel notices (9:51-62 etc.)
2. The cost of discipleship (14:15-38)
3. Method and reversal (10:1-12; 22:35-38, 47b, 49, 51a, 53b)

But these will be given in the context of the whole journey structure as it relates to Proto-Luke.

**Proto-Luke’s Narrative**

*Intro (3:1-2a)*

Proto-Luke begins the process of mediating Jewish and Hellenistic culture at the outset. Verses 1 and 2a situate the document in world history by giving the date and a list of Roman emperors, governors, kings and priests. The Q material of Luke 3:2b-4 (= Matt 3:1-3) “the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the desert” is not world history, but *sacred-history* drawing on the Deuteronomistic understanding of history as the story of the relationship between God and Israel, especially “this present generation” (Deut 1:35; 32:5, 20 etc.) By joining together this kind of material with the Roman dating system, the redactor is bridging the gap between the sacred and secular worlds – disallowing any ‘other-worldly’ interpretation of the
Q material, and at the same time preventing any interpretation of Greco-Roman history whose meaning is not interpreted through the Jewish Christian governing heuristic model of the Word of God.

X. a. The call of Jesus (3:2b-4:30)

This section has the narrative function of an exposition – it sets the stage for the journey to Jerusalem. The content of the section is three life-changing moments for Jesus, who is called first to baptism by John, then to temptation in the wilderness and finally rejection in the πατρίς. By the end of the section, Jesus has begun to carry a sense of tragic inevitability. Three pivotal moments together leave Jesus filled with the spirit, having temporarily overcome great opposition and distraction from the devil, and having a clear message to preach, but no one willing to hear it in his home town. There is no longer any other option than to go to Jerusalem.

The key theme of the section is repentance. This is at first expressed in the ‘Q’ material, in the language of John the Baptist’s preaching. Here, journey imagery is prefigured in Isaianic language as ‘the way of the Lord’, and the cost of discipleship explained as people come to John and ask ‘what must we do.’ In its Q context, this call to repentance signals a call to adopt the itinerant practices of the community. Placing the call before a journey narrative transforms it into the voice of destiny which calls the hero into journey. It “signifies that destiny has summoned the hero and transferred his spiritual center of gravity from within the pale of his society to a zone unknown.”

When Jesus himself submits to baptism, from this moment he is

21 Ibid., 53.

Campbell describes how the hero’s acceptance of the call to adventure summons the guardian of the threshold, the embodiment of the danger of the quest, and the protection of the norms that the hero is leaving behind, who tries to dissuade the hero from entering. “Such custodians bound the world in the four directions — also up and down—standing for the limits of the hero’s present sphere, or life horizon.”

Walter Wink describes the Devil’s temptations as the voice of yesterday’s truths: “‘If you are the Son of God... behave like the great heroes of Israel.’ Jesus refuses.”

When the Devil leaves Jesus, he goes to wait for ἀχρι καιροῦ, another opportunity (4:13). This opportunity becomes apparent when Jesus reaches Jerusalem, but until then, a note of suspense hangs in the air for the entire journey, and lets the reader know how menacing is the destination.

X. b. The Call of the Disciples (5:1-11)

The action of the narrative begins to unfold when Jesus, having crossed the threshold to adventure in the Nazareth synagogue, prepares for the journey by finding a group of followers. He calls Peter and the other disciples in ch. 5, where in verse 11, the disciples leave their boats and everything to follow him. For them to join Jesus in his journey, they must push their boats out to sea in the night.

Campbell shows from a number of world-mythological examples including the
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biblical examples of the belly of the whale in Jonah, and the tomb in the passion and resurrection narratives that such images of the ocean is a universal symbol of the beginning of the journey. It is both death and the womb of rebirth, effecting a break-away from the mundane world into the heart of the journey itself.

The idea that the passage of the magical threshold is a transit into a sphere of rebirth is symbolized in the worldwide womb image of the belly of the whale. The hero, instead of conquering or conciliating the power of the threshold, is swallowed into the unknown, and would appear to have died. ... This popular motif gives emphasis to the lesson that the passage of the threshold is a form of self-annihilation. 

Peter himself succumbs to a brief ‘refusal of the call’ before his own self-annihilation. In contrast to Jesus’ seemingly effortless acceptance, Peter is unable to overcome shame and cries out “Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, sir!” The hero in Peter’s predicament is described by Campell as refusing life itself.

Often in actual life, and not infrequently in the myths and popular tales, we encounter the dull case of the call unanswered; for it is always possible to turn the ear to other interests. Refusal of the summons converts the adventure into its negative. Walled in boredom, hard work, or “culture,” the subject loses the power of significant affirmative action and becomes a victim to be saved.

It is, however, the word of Christ, “Do not fear!” that pulls Peter also into the world of the journey. This word is the supernatural assistance to the disciples that Jesus himself has already received from the Spirit, and therefore the word of Christ will be the helper of the journey from this moment until their arrival in Jerusalem and the return of Satan.

---
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Y. a. A Discourse on Discipleship (6:20-8:3)

The section of Proto-Luke which has been retained intact in Luke 6:20-8:3 is the closest to a theoretical exposition on the concept of discipleship of anything in Luke. This function is intensified when it is viewed out of its canonical context and placed in its Proto-Lukan setting. Here, it stands immediately between the call of the disciples and the journey to Jerusalem, and is the first moment when the journeyers assemble together around the task ahead. Its genre can be seen as analogous of the modern phenomenon of the ‘spirit-boosting talk’ before a team activity. The relationship of Joshua 1:1-18 to the Canaanite conquest or of Deuteronomy to the Deuteronomistic history are biblical texts with similar functions within larger discourses, and may well have inspired the placement of this material here.

In Proto-Luke, material that is explicitly about discipleship is more replete at structurally significant junctures, where both redactors of Luke and Proto-Luke tend to make more editorial insertions. This discourse section states its theme at its opening by naming the hearers of the sermon as τοὺς μαθητὰς, the disciples. The climax of the section occurs in the dialogue between Jesus and the disciples of John the Baptist, which contrast the ascetic ways of John with Jesus’ liberal attitude to food and drink (v. 34). The two groups of disciples function in Proto-Luke’s context as metonymys for the ascetic disciples of the Q community and more Hellenised believers. The section closes with reference to the women disciples who supported him out of their means.

The content of this section is instruction in the message of salvation and the ways of the kingdom by Jesus, who heals outsiders (the centurion, the widow’s son, the
sinful woman), and is several times referred to as a prophet (7:16; 27; 39). We should not let details of content blind us to its function in the structure of the journey – the ethical instruction, and the healings by the prophet, and the dialogue with John’s disciples are all answers to questions about what sort of person is ready to undertake the journey.

The simple juxtaposition of Q and L material by Proto-Luke is the most obvious example of Proto-Luke’s way of bringing these contrasting value systems together without silencing or speaking over either community’s voice. The teaching of Jesus opens with material drawn from the inaugural Q speech which was the Q community’s rule of life. The beatitudes of Q 6:20b-23 insist on the gospel call to radical poverty, dependence on the heavenly Father for physical needs. The βασιλεία (reign of God) belongs to the πτωχοί (poor) who live this rule. The redactor’s voice in Proto-Luke 6:21 and 22, and the additional material of Proto-Luke 6:24-25\(^{26}\) qualifies that this poverty is not an absolute – it is, like Lazarus’ poverty in L 16:19-31, poverty ἐζευγία (now), and it awaits the eschatological reversal of the L community’s theology, when those who are rich and full and glad will receive their woe.

The Σ\(^{\text{IIk}}\) material that the redactor adds to the end of the inaugural Q speech serves to include also the gentile oppressor on foreign soil (a centurion), the member of the aristocratic household of Herod (Joanna wife of Chuza) in Σ\(^{\text{IIk}}\) 8:3, and the other

---

\(^{26}\) ...unless the woes are also Q’s material. I interpret them as being Proto-Lukan redaction because they are absent from Matthew for no apparent reason. In this, I am following Bovon who says the limited use of woes in Christian and patristic literature suggests a later date for their composition than allowed by Q (Bovon, 221).
materially wealthy women of 8:1-3. Proto-Luke does not solve the contradictions of discipleship, but he allows the tradition to speak in all its voices.

The one who is fit to journey is the ‘poor’ of Proto-Luke 6:20, but this term is not used to designate simply those who are poor in the way that the ascetic and itinerant Q community may have understood poverty. The definition of poor must be wide enough to include the Galilean fishermen, the laughing Son of Man, the weeping Baptist, the rich and aristocratic women and the Centurion, but also as narrow as the gauntlet ‘road-of-trials’ that is about to follow, and about which Jesus warns. As we shall see, this paradox can only be answered as its contradictions are mediated by the trials of the journey itself.

Y. b. An Image of Discipleship - the Journey (9:51-18:43)

The placing together of diverse voices in simple juxtaposition itself does nothing to unify them. Placing them together in the context of a journey universalises them by the use of a literary device that belongs to all cultures. The greater interpolation opens in 9:51 with Jesus setting his face to Jerusalem – a journey which functions as a metaphor for the life journey of discipleship in the early Christian communities. The literary trope of the journey is remarkably flexible in this context. It functions as a metalepsis for the Isaianic New Exodus, a metonym for Jesus’ own journey from this world to the next, and a synecdoche of the geographical journey of the disciples. But primarily, all these other tropes are drawn together into one overarching metaphor, discipleship: the discipleship of proto-Luke’s contemporaries, who want to live this call and this journey in the context of a world with remarkably different values to those that it had in the first days of the journey itself in parochial Galilee.
Campbell describes this universal journey as a road of trials, a “favorite phase of the myth”\textsuperscript{27} with a series of tests and ordeals, during which the ‘supernatural helper’ (in this case the Holy Spirit) assists the hero, either by means of the advice and equipment given at the beginning, or by means of a benign, supernatural presence. The radical renunciation of world by the Q community is transformed into a spiritual renunciation of ego, as the hero of the quest is stripped of possessions through the journey.

And so it happens that if anyone—in whatever society—undertakes for himself the perilous journey into the darkness by descending, either intentionally or unintentionally, into the crooked lanes of his own spiritual labyrinth... In the vocabulary of the mystics, this is the second stage of the Way, that of the “purification of the self,” when the senses are “cleansed and humbled,” and the energies and interests “concentrated upon transcendental things”\textsuperscript{28}

There is no road of trials in either Q or L, but the of redactor Proto-Luke introduces the journey motif by the introduction of the travel notices. He also creates a dialogue on the cost of discipleship at the climax of the journey narrative in Proto-Luke 14:15, 25-33, and manipulates some of Q’s methodical missionary instructions into a narrative of method, and reversal of method in Proto-Luke 10:1-12; 22:35-38, 47b, 49, 51a, 53b. It is these modifications that transform the teaching of Jesus from a static body of fixed traditions to a process of discipleship which the disciples and the Pharisees experience as they accompany Jesus on the road.

\textit{Travel Notices}

\textsuperscript{27} Campbell, 89.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 92-93.
9:51-62 is the first and clearest example of Jesus proclaiming discipleship as journey, and as early as 9:52b-56, a gross misunderstanding of the nature of this discipleship has been perpetrated by James and John, as they seek to call down the fire of heaven to punish those who reject the message. This could be understood as a critique or even a parody of the exclusory vision of discipleship which Q's theology may have been understood as demanding from members of that radical community by its proclamation of judgment on ‘this present generation’ (cf. Q 11:50). But Jesus’ correction of this misunderstanding is followed by a forceful reiteration by Jesus that everything must be left behind, even homes and dead parents (v. 57-62). Jesus appears at one moment as the voice of reason, and in the next verse as demanding a level of commitment that defies common sense. By placing the traditions of Q and of L both at the beginning of the journey in these opening two images, the redactor of Proto-Luke is inviting the diversity of early Palestinian Christianity to mutually undertake the journey as a unified Christian praxis in spite of different theoretical understandings of discipleship. By unapologetically blending images so stark in their juxtaposition, he is walking the tightrope between the need for a community to grow and change and be inclusive (v. 52-56), and the need for a community to retain its values and identity (v. 57-62).

Verse 51-52a, the setting of Jesus’ face towards Jerusalem, is the heading of both contrasting images, and is itself a polyvalent image. The NIV captures the contrast well by paraphrasing the Hebrew phrase in Ezekiel 21:2 as “set your face against Jerusalem” and the Greek phrase in Luke 9:51 as “resolutely set out to Jerusalem.”
Proto-Luke intends both meanings, because Jesus’ journey is both quest and judgment.

Renunciation

The practice of discipleship in Proto-Luke 14:15, 25-33 is one of absolute renunciation. In this text the same juxtaposition of values is expressed. The parable of the great banquet mandates inclusion, the parables of the tower and the king going to war, followed by the need to relinquish possessions reiterate the need to hold fast to identity and values. The saying about salt losing its flavour is appropriately enigmatic.

Jesus has clearly stated from the beginning that anyone who does not ἀποτάσσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν, that is, leave behind all of his existence (possessions), cannot be a disciple (14:33). While Luke always uses ὑπάρχουσιν (the dative plural participle) to refer to material possessions (see especially 8:3, Acts 4:32-4), the term refers to one’s being. The life-journey of a disciple is therefore one of death to self and death to ego. “The agony of breaking through personal limitations is the agony of spiritual growth.”

Luke's repeated demand for absolute poverty and hatred of family is a stricter demand than that found in the other gospels. This is an expression of what Taylor described as Christ’s gracious severity in Proto-Luke. A large proportion of these demands are contained within Proto-Luke, and specifically, within the layer of its redaction, which implies that the Proto-Lukan context may be a fruitful one for understanding this feature of Luke's soteriology. In Proto-Luke, the call to poverty in
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the structure of the journey has this violent and heroic heart. It is not a philosophical, but a hateful renunciation.

Cultural theorist Slavoj Žižek has noticed that the tendency of Christian biblical interpretation is always to refuse the “heroic” acceptance of what he describes as “the tremendous violence which dwells at the heart of the Christian notion of love for one’s neighbour.” Citing four sayings of Christ which call for this violence\(^\text{30}\) (two of which are from Proto-Luke), he notes five strategies for avoiding this aspect of Christ’s teaching, re-translation or correction of the original text, juxtaposing such sayings against others and thus modifying their message, suggesting that such hatred is not being promoted by Christ but merely predicted, and finally, spiritualizing the texts, or creating a metaphorical meaning of the demand and denying the literal one.\(^\text{31}\) If we take discipleship as the central theme of Proto-Luke, then the question of resolving this apparent contradiction will be of utmost importance to our reading.

Peter Liu categorises attempts to mitigate the call to poverty in Luke into five specific strategies,\(^\text{32}\) which in some ways mirror the strategies outlined by Žižek.

1. Apply the demands only to certain Christians

Scholars have noted that the call to poverty is not only particularly strict in Luke, but also inconsistent. Luke Timothy Johnson has put it aptly, “although Luke consistently


\(^{32}\) Liu, Peter, “Did the Lukan Jesus Desire Voluntary Poverty of His Followers?” *Evangelical Quarterly* 64.4 (1992), 292-98.
talks about possessions, he does not talk about possessions consistently." \(^{33}\) Lazarus, for instance, is only required to give half of his possessions (Proto-Luke 19:8-10), and the women of Proto-Luke 8:1-3 have clearly retained their wealth, since they are using it to support Jesus and the disciples.

A number of scholars, including I. Howard Marshall\(^{34}\) and, in a prominent study on the subject, Hans-Joachim Degenhardt,\(^{35}\) have therefore suggested that some disciples expressed a more radical model of poverty than others. The voluntary nature of Lukan poverty, particularly as expressed in the early Jerusalem church in the opening chapters of Acts is held in contrast to the mandatory poverty of the Qumran community.

Since the time of Liu’s writing, Christopher Hays has put forward a thorough argument in favour of this view. He starts from the observation that in Luke, the calls of poverty and celibacy (understood as a renunciation of family) tend to occur together in Luke, and therefore they should be expected to function in an analogous way. Just as the renunciation of celibacy is an option for discipleship alongside the possibility of marriage, so poverty and the generous use of wealth to care for the poor are both valid options for the expression of discipleship, because they both place family, possessions and self in a relationship to Jesus which calls their relative value into question.


Discipleship is the ultimate commitment, relative to which all other values are reassessed. Specifically, discipleship to Jesus confronts commitment to family and the security of stable employment, subordinating both to the greater good of following the messiah.  

At the heart of this strategy is therefore retranslation, because if renunciation of wealth is voluntary, then the hatred of wealth and family which Christ demands cannot really be hatred, but only less love compared to the love for Christ. One traditional response to the demand of hatred has been to claim that μισείω (hate) simply means ‘to love less’, as the redactor of Matthew suggests in Matt 10:37. Hays rejects this clearly unwarranted expansion of the semantic field, but suggests a different one. Drawing on the metaphorical usage of the equivalent Hebrew term sânē’, which, in the wisdom literature often means “to behave towards someone or something in a negative or deleterious fashion, which might otherwise imply hate”, and which is translated as μισείω in the Septuagint, Hays suggests that the meaning of μισείω can be taken as a Hebraism with the same semantic range. The radical demands of Christ can therefore involve acting in a way that could be perceived as hateful, but are merely neglectful, motivated out of an “overwhelming commitment to Christ”.  

A similar approach is taken in Otto Michel’s gloss of the word μισείω as it appears in the context of Jesus’ call to discipleship.

The reference is not to hate in the psychological sense, but to disowning, renunciation, rejection, (καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκατοῦ) as in the Wisdom literature of the OT. Those who become disciples of Jesus must be committed exclusively to Him; they cannot be bound to anyone or anything else. The term “hate” demands the separation of the disciple,
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and the warning not to love anyone or anything more is the test. This abnegation is to be taken, not psychologically or fanatically, but pneumatically and christocentrically.\footnote{Otto Michel, ‘μισή’, in Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds., \textit{Theological Dictionary of the New Testament}. Trans. G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76), 4:690.}

It is a contradiction that Mennonite theologian and pacifist John Howard Yoder, who emphasised absolute obedience to the words of Christ, defaults immediately to the strategy of retranslation to deal with the sayings of Christ about hatred in his discussion of Luke 14:25-36. Dismissing modern ‘psychologising’ interpretations of hatred as having completely missed the point, Yoder claims that Jesus is calling upon his disciples to be a voluntary society which would naturally take upon itself the hostility of the stable and religiously grounded family units that alternative communities such as the one Jesus called into being undermine. Yoder translates the saying into a modern context as a critique of seeking church growth when the call of the gospel is to move away from the crowd.\footnote{John Howard Yoder, \textit{The Politics of Jesus} (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), 37-38.} While certainly a radical reading, Yoder’s exegesis has in effect changed the active voice of ‘hate’ into a passive voice ‘be hated’, with no justification except perhaps the juxtaposition of Christ’s more pacifistic saying.

Žižek’s summary of this interpretive strategy is also a powerful refutation of it, so I quote it here at length.

\textit{One should therefore reject the standard reading of Christ’s “scandalous” words which interprets them as a simple call for moderation, in a movement which resembles a fake copy of the Hegelian “negation of negation”: once we have rejected all worldly attachments for the sake of our unconditional love for God, we are allowed to return...}
to the world – we can once again love our spouse, parents, and so on, but now in moderation, since only God should be loved unconditionally. But such a reading is blasphemy which totally misses the point of Christianity: when Christ says that wherever there is love between two of his disciples, he will be there, one should take this literally – Christ not (only) loved, he is love, our love for our neighbors. This is why the “hatred” he speaks of is not a hatred of “lesser” humans which is supposed to prove that we “really” love only God, but is rather a hatred of neighbors on behalf of our love for them.\textsuperscript{40}

Liu confirms these theological conclusion from exegetical grounds, firstly noting that the call for renunciation of possessions in Luke 12:33 comes in the context of a speech, not to the twelve only, but to the crowd of onlookers (12:1, 13), and secondly, when Peter specifically asks if he is only addressing the inner core of the crowd, Jesus declines to answer (12:41).\textsuperscript{41} The demands of discipleship are given in a context (a context they were placed in by the redactor of Proto-Luke) which refuses to allow the demands to be moderated or confined to certain ‘superior’ (?) disciples. Proto-Luke places the demand on all believers in Jesus.

2. Suggest the existence of an Ebionite source

The Ebionite heresy was a Jerusalem based movement which we only know of from its negative assessments in patristic writings, but it seems to have placed a high value on voluntary poverty. Liu notes an attempt by David L. Mealand to suggest that the interest in voluntary poverty belongs to Luke’s special source.\textsuperscript{42} I think that Mealand’s hypothesis here is historically correct (both Q and L had special interests and unique cultural norms on the subject of poverty, as I have outlined), but as Liu

\textsuperscript{40} \v{z}ižek, 115-16.
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points out, Mealand is mistaken to suggest that this somehow mitigates the original interest of Jesus in poverty, or the active choice of the final redactor to include the material. Mealand has accounted for the severity of Jesus in this passage on historical grounds, but he has not lessened it.

3. Give the demands a particular literary function.

Johnson’s approach to the radical demands of the gospel in Luke has been to assign them a symbolic role in the literary work of Luke-Acts. They function as a “primary symbol of human existence, an immediate exteriorization of and manifestation of the self.” Liu has rightly replied that the existence of rich disciples in Luke-Acts (and we may well add in Proto-Luke as well, cf. 8:1-3), seems to imply that Johnson’s theory requires further refinement.

4. Apply the demands only to the period of Jesus' ministry

Next, Liu deals with Schuyler Brown’s suggestion that the renunciation of property in the age of Jesus is replaced by a renunciation of the ‘proprietary spirit’ in the age of the church. Liu points out that this fails to account for several counter-examples of wealthy disciples in the age of Jesus (the women of Luke 8:1-3), or the poverty of the early church in the opening chapters of Acts. But perhaps a more thorough statement of this interpretive strategy is to be found in the Lukan theology of Hans Conzelmann. Conzelmann’s salvation historical reading of Luke-Acts divides the time

\[\text{Liu, 295-96.}\]
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\[\text{Liu, 297.}\]
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of Christ and the time of the Church into discrete ages. The pivotal moments in his schema are the departure of Satan in Luke 4:13, which marks the beginning of the ‘Satan-free’ time of Jesus, and Satan’s return in Luke 22:3, which marks the beginning of the age of the church, and the time of temptation. Conzelmann therefore presents the demand of poverty as a temporary measure:

Thus Luke can distinguish between those commands of the Lord which were meant only for the contemporary situation, such as the directions concerning equipment which were given when the apostles are sent out, which in Luke xxii 35-7 are explicitly annulled for the period to follow, and those which are permanent, such as the Sermon on the Plain.

5. Give the demands a specific eschatological significance

The argument towards which Liu has the most sympathy is that of Eric Franklin, and it is similar to the previous one, except that it claims Jesus’ calling to poverty was because of a specific situation, rather than a specific period of time. The situation which Franklin believes the demands to be addressing is that Jesus’ ministry was fostering a particularly urgent eschatological urgency, from which, possessions would be only a distraction. This was not intended, in Franklin’s view of Luke-Acts’ theology, as an ongoing moral guide for the church. It is difficult, however, to account for Luke’s inconsistency in urging the church to urgency in light of an imminent eschatological hope, but creating a double-standard by not requiring them to follow the standards as well.

---
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Liu’s final suggestion, which draws on explanations four and five, is that itinerancy is no longer demanded of Luke’s readers, because the practical situation of Christian discipleship has changed since the end of Jesus’ ministry, and that the demands of poverty can now be upheld by making one’s possessions available to the Christian community and selling them if need arises – because poverty is a test of discipleship to Christ which is meant to enhance the experience of Christian conversion, not an end in itself.\(^{52}\)

The problem with all these strategies, including Liu’s final strategy, is that they treat the command of Christ just in this way, as a means to an end. But, as Taylor observed in his theology of Proto-Luke, the severity of Christ in this context is not an incidental or pragmatic aspect of plot – it is a key aspect of his character, and as such is a Christological category in Proto-Lukan theology. Renunciation can be a means to an end when carried out with moderation, but the demand of Christ in Proto-Luke is beyond renunciation, it is μισέω: hatred. As an irrational dislike, hatred is always an end in itself.

In order to deal with the contradictory expressions of this self-hatred in Proto-Luke, without assuaging it, the contradictions must be allowed to speak in polyphony. This is what the ‘conservative’ Proto-Lukan redactor tends to do, instead of trying to reduce one aspect of the paradox to the other.

Anthony O’Leary’s approach, while in some regards seeking to resolve the paradox, notes the semantics of the Lukan word for possessions, which is the present active participle of ὑπόρχω (to exist), and yet in Luke, the participle for is always used of

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 317.
possessions. While O’Leary does not claim that there is sufficient evidence to argue for a double-entendre, Luke is still putting forward a tension between being and having – hatred of self (being), and hatred of family and possessions (having). With this definition, O’Leary can say that “[t]he role of possessions is that they effectively express the inner orientation and values of the person in relation with God and other human beings.”

The implication of O’Leary’s interpretation for the exegesis of Proto-Luke 12:33, and for the theology of Proto-Luke itself, is that what Jesus is calling for is, in essence, decisive action against the owning/being object of self-hatred which Jesus calls the disciples to express through both the voluntary poverty exemplified in the Q material, and the generosity required in the L material.

Atonement with the Father (Proto-Luke 15:11-32)

If Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem is a heroic one, as I have been arguing, then there must be some point at which Jesus succeeds or fails in his trials. Without a passion narrative, Proto-Luke’s narrative cannot be understood as building up to a crucifixion scene, but instead as a journey of discipleship, and the climax therefore must be seen in the decision of certain people to follow Jesus, or leave him.

Matera points out that throughout the travel narrative, changes of time and place often introduce new discourses, so he explores the importance of the discourses as a key to the narrative flow of the journey. He then analyses those discourses to reveal
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the narrative structure of the section. Since the section Matera analyses overlaps completely with a large tract of Proto-Luke, some of his observations appropriate nicely into observations about Proto-Luke’s narrative.

He notices that throughout the discourse material of the journey, a conflict gradually emerges with the Pharisees which comes to a head during this longest discourse section in the journey narrative (Luke 15.3-17.10) alternates between addressing the religious leaders (15:3-32, 16:14-31) and the disciples (16:1-13, 17:1-10). The whole discourse should be understood as happening in the hearing of both groups, and specifically draws attention to the contrasts between those groups.

The discourse begins as Jesus' response to the Pharisees and scribes who grumble (διεγόγγυζον) because he eats with tax collectors and sinners (15.2). The grumbling of the religious leaders recalls a similar reaction to Jesus' table fellowship with Levi (5.30) and foreshadows the reaction others will have when he stays at the house of Zacchaeus (19.7). Most importantly, Jesus' table fellowship with sinners signifies a break with the Pharisees and scribes who no longer invite him to dine with them. In response to the grumbling of the Pharisees and scribes, Jesus tells the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin and the Prodigal Son.  

The conflict which emerges in Matera’s reading of the travel narrative is between conflicting visions of purity within the kingdom of God. Jesus’ vision of purity is based on almsgiving, and the renunciation of possessions, while the Pharisees, who are lovers of money, base their idea of purity on excluding some people. In keeping with Matera’s narrative-critical approach, he sees the emergence of this conflict as a narrative feature leading up to the crucifixion in Jerusalem.
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Viewed in the context of Luke’s wider narrative, the conflict disclosed in the journey leads to Jesus’ death. When the members of the council bring Jesus to Pilate they accuse him of misleading their nation (το ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων) by opposing the payment of taxes and by claiming that he is the messiah (23.2).

But if we appropriate the narrative observations that Matera makes to Proto-Luke, then we are no longer able to see the conflict culminating in the cross. Instead, in Proto-Luke, victory comes in the dialogue itself. This is the Achilles’ tendon of Proto-Luke’s theology, as Campbell describes,

in every system of theology there is an umbilical point, an Achilles tendon which the finger of mother life has touched, and where the possibility of perfect knowledge has been impaired. The problem of the hero is to pierce himself (and therewith his world) precisely through that point; to shatter and annihilate that key knot of his limited existence.

The problem of the hero going to meet the father is to open his soul beyond terror to such a degree that he will be ripe to understand how the sickening and insane tragedies of this vast and ruthless cosmos are completely validated in the majesty of Being. The hero transcends life with its peculiar blind spot and for a moment rises to a glimpse of the source. He beholds the face of the father, understands – and the two are atoned.  

It is in the parable of the Lost Son that this point of atonement is reached in Proto-Luke. The stylised Pharisaic view of purity is represented metonymically by the “older brother” of the parable, who is rebuked by the Father, and thus the Pharisees are humiliated alongside him in the dialogue. Just as the boon of table-fellowship is
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granted to the younger son by the Father, so the table-fellowship of Jesus with sinners is vindicated in the discourse.

*Saving Zacchaeus (Proto-Luke 19:1-10)*

Finally, the journey’s end (and discipleship’s purpose) is seen as Jesus comes to Jericho. It brings salvation to a tax-collector, who responds by giving generously to the poor. The vindication of Jesus’ atoning practise of table fellowship is celebrated at this point, in the freedom with which Jesus is able to publicly join in table fellowship with one who, from the crowd’s negative reaction, is clearly a notorious sinner. The inclusion of this man not only intensifies the affective force of the journey narrative, but sharpens its meaning. But Zacchaeus gives half his possessions, and he is saved. What has become of the demands of discipleship? A question is posed about the rigidity of Jesus’ commands now that the physical journey is completed, and neither Proto-Luke nor canonical Luke offer a solution to this contradiction.

**Z. Farewell Discourse (22:14-65)**

Upon arrival in Jerusalem, The dénouement of the disciples’ journey is the final clarity that the disciples find in eating a final Passover with Jesus, before his arrest. Jesus instructs them about the coming betrayal and attack of Satan (22:14-46), and the plot comes to climax as Satan seizes the opportunity to enter Judas (22:3), and through him to hand Jesus over (22:54) to be crucified. This is the ‘ἄχρι καὶ ροῦ’ which was pre-empted at Satan’s previous departure at 4:13.
Jesus prays for Peter, who is spared from Satan’s sifting. The alternative paths of Judas and Peter are given as examples on the one hand of discipleship gone horribly wrong (22:47-53), and Peter’s journey of discipleship through failure and restoration (22:31-32).

Proto-Luke’s redactor has crafted a narrative ending to the traditional material from which he constructed his journey, and in order to do so, he has given an account of how the journey’s boon (communion at table) will be brought back into the world. Although much of the material he uses in this section is traditional material (and designated here as Slik) the only material that belongs to any discernable tradition stream is Q 22:28-30, in which Jesus confers to the disciples’ authority to sit on the twelve thrones of the tribes of Israel. This is likely to have been the Q document’s closing saying, in which Jesus appoints his successors, and therefore established them as authoritative within the Q community. In Proto-Luke, the disciples are rather commissioned as emissaries of the journey itself, and of the teaching of Jesus which they have received along the way. Just as Jesus drew Peter into the journey (Proto-Luke 5:1-11), he now releases him to draw others into journey. As Campbell has shown, this motif of return from journey is a standard trope in world mythology, and is intended everywhere in just the sense that Proto-Luke uses for in ch. 22.

How teach again, however, what has been taught correctly and incorrectly learned a thousand thousand times, throughout the millennia of mankind’s prudent folly? That is the hero’s ultimate difficult task. How render back into light-world language the speech-defying pronouncements of the dark? How represent on a two-dimensional surface a three-dimensional form, or in a three-dimensional image a multi-dimensional meaning? How translate into terms of “yes” and “no” revelations that shatter into meaninglessness every attempt to define the pairs of opposites? How communicate to people who insist on the exclusive evidence of their senses the message of the all-generating
The final words of Proto-Luke, “This is your hour and the power of darkness” powerfully evoke the anticlimactic end of the historical Jesus’ life without specifically naming it. They could appear disjointed enough to consider the possibility that the original ending may have been lost – but compare the equally severe original ending of Mark 16:8: “They were afraid.” I tend to accept the possibility that they are relatively in tact here, although I do not mean to insist upon it with any certainty. Jesus’ abject surrender to the darkness is an appropriate image for what may have been one of the earliest attempts to capture the meaning of Jesus’ passion in a narrative form. Jesus’ crucifixion is a deeper discipleship yet than Proto-Luke is able to articulate, until he encounters the passion narrative in Mark, and builds on it to create the canonical Lukan passion narrative, with its resurrection, and magnification of the importance of the ascension, (but these are beyond the scope of this study).

Critical discipleship’s call to heroic acceptance of the text is again at the fore in the radical demands of Proto-Luke 22:35-37:

35 And he said to them, ‘When I sent you out without a money-bag and a travel-bag and shoes, did you lack anything?’ They said, ‘Nothing.’ 36 And he said to them, ‘But now, let the one who has a money-bag take it! The same with a travel-bag! And let the one who has none sell his cloak and buy a dagger. 37 For I say to you that this which is written must be fulfilled by me, “And he was reckoned with the outlaws.” And so, that which is about me has a fulfillment.’

In this passage, Jesus apparently reverses the call to radical itinerant mission of

58 Ibid., 203.
Proto-Luke 10:1-12, instructing the disciples that now (νῦν), not only should they now take a money bag and a travel bag, but also a μαχαίρα (possibly a sword, knife or dagger).

The scholarship on this passage has again confirmed Žižek’s observation that any call to heroic acceptance of the call to discipleship in the gospels is met with unheroic obfuscation, but at least in this case, the scholarly confusion matches the confusion of the disciples. This is particularly clear in Proto-Luke, where the original narrative flow of Jesus’ interaction of the disciples is restored when verses 35-38; 47; 49; 51 and 53 are brought back into their unity (see Appendix 3), and a dialogue becomes visible in which the disciples comic attempt to obey Jesus’ new and violent commandment, and are met with indecipherable responses. The first such riddle is the phrase ἰκανόν ἐστιν in v. 38, which could either be taken, as implied in Young’s Literal Translation (“It is sufficient.”) and the Aramaic New Testament in Plain English (“They are enough.”), to praise the worthiness or the length of the proffered blade/s which is/are “sufficient”. Alternatively, as both critical scholarship and every widely selling bible translation have preferred, the words could be taken to completely rebuke the whole enterprise: “that’s enough, stop this!”

An even more enigmatic situation arises in v. 51 when they offer to use the swords to defend Jesus at the time of his arrest, and Jesus replies with ἔατε ἐγώς τούτου‘ which has been taken in most English translations as a rebuke of the disciples for obeying his earlier commandment to arm themselves, and yet is rendered most literally by the King James Bible’s “suffer ye thus far”, which could mean almost anything. I have translated it in my reconstruction of Proto-Luke as Jesus simply
ignoring the question of swords, and pointing again to the greater crisis of Satan’s imminent return: “‘let go of this [meaningless talk about swords]! ... this is your hour, and the power of darkness!’”

Again, retranslation, correction, juxtaposition, prediction and spiritualization of the text lay at the heart of the strategies through which the reader may refuse the call to violence, and this is how critical scholarship has indeed responded.

1. Take the swords as metaphorical or spiritual

I will deal with Conzelmann’s approach first because of its significant influence on scholarship since its publication. His approach draws on his Lukan theology of salvation history by framing Christ’s commandments in chapter 22 as a new set of instructions which relate specifically to the age of the church, and is therefore able to relate the more extreme call to poverty as belonging to the age of Jesus. Within the age of the church, which is relevant to Luke’s readers, Conzelmann argues that the swords are symbolic of the spiritual battle with Satan that will take place in this new age in the form of temptations and persecutions.59

A similar approach was taken by P. S. Minear who agrees that this new method is given by Jesus because it is a pivot point in salvation history, but suggests that the taking of literal swords is an act of treachery against Jesus by the disciples, and that they are the ‘lawless ones’ of v. 37.60

59 Conzelmann, 81-82.
H. A. J. Kruger connects the swords to the broader theological question of Jesus’ self-awareness, and suggests that the call to bear swords comes out of Jesus’ identification with the figure of Yahweh as divine warrior in the Old Testament, and was expecting a messianic conflict to occur in Jerusalem, but that in the Garden of Gethsemane, he changed in his understanding to identify with the Isaianic Servant of Yahweh, and abandoned his violent method.  

But Patrick T. Egan in his 2005 masters thesis has argued that the call to assume the sword is not found in contrast to an abstract concept such as peace. It rather comes in the context of a discussion of literal travelling items such as bags and garments. Those who prefer a literal reading, but remain uncomfortable with the violent implications of bearing a sword must therefore find a different interpretation of what Jesus said, or find a less violent purpose for the swords.

2. Propose that a specific, situational crisis called for a special exception to the pacifist rule.

Joan Gormley’s PhD dissertation has brought a structural analysis of the passage’s discourse to bear on the situation, and in doing so, limited the application of the call to buy a sword to a smaller group of followers. She noted (in opposition to Conzelmann’s salvation historical reading) that the Lukan phrase for but now (ἀλλὰ νῦν) is too weak to imply a change of the ages, and probably only refers to the new

---

situation, not a new age. She then notes a problem with the traditional translation ("let the one who has no sword buy one"), because the participle noun phrase ὁ μὴ ἔχων stands in an antithetical parallelism to the previous phrase ὁ ἔχων and should therefore have the same object, that is, not a sword, but a money-bag (βαλλάντιον). Gormley therefore constructs a discourse analysis of the text which follows the following contours:

The one who has a money-bag
   Let them take it!
The same with a travel-bag!
The one who has no [money-bag]
   Let them sell their cloak!
   And let them buy a sword!

In this way, Gormley presents Jesus as only instructing ὁ μὴ ἔχων [βαλλάντιον] (the ‘have-not’s’) to buy a sword, not ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον (the ‘have’s’). Gormley has effectively created two tiers of disciples, those who are ready to continue on the journey of discipleship, and those who are not ready – who must therefore arm themselves.

Similarly, as I have shown in more detail in the previous chapter, William Kurz has interpreted this whole passage in the context of biblical and Greco-Roman farewell address genre, which functioned as a transfer of leadership from the original

charismatic leader. The closest parallel that Kurz finds to Luke is a biblical speech, the transfer of the kingdom from David to Solomon in 1 Kings 2:8-9 predicted a period of political turmoil to follow the graced Davidic peace, and specifically refers to David’s reticence to use the sword, and commands Solomon to use it against David’s enemies.

The idea of a situational crisis calling for the use of swords is closely connected to the exegetical strategy of prediction.

3. Suggest that Jesus was predicting, not commanding violence.

In a discussion that took place in *The Expository Times* in 1938-39, T. M. Napier had proposed a fairly simple literal reading, that Jesus’ words were enigmatic and were spoken in a sad and dismissive way, disappointed that the disciples had so little faith as to arm themselves. In this reading it is as though Jesus had said, “go ahead and buy swords, I know you are going to.” This is clearly not the interpretation of the disciples who do go in search of swords (which Napier would have to understand as an narrative-ironic response), and it takes an unlikely meaning of the imperative mood that Jesus uses in the instructions, but also interprets this saying of Jesus in a completely different way to the parallel passage in 10:1-12, to which this passage alludes. While the interpretation is not an impossible one, if there is no compelling reason to take the passage in an unlikely sense other than a preference for a less violent Jesus, then Napier’s interpretation must be understood as another scholarly ‘refusal of the call’.

---

4. and 5. Suggest these are not exactly swords

In the following edition of *The Expository Times*, W. Western replied to Napier with the creative suggestion that what Jesus is telling them to do is to get *fishing knives* because their journey is over and they will now have to return to their former fishing trade.\(^6^5\) This model of argument could be used in a variety of different ways, and Žižek himself provocatively draws attention to the translation of Matthew 10:34-39 in which, I think, he effectively parodies the approach taken by Western and similar interpretations. He quotes the way that Book of Kells erroneously uses the word “gaudium” (“joy”) rather than “gladium” (“sword”), rendering the verse in translation: “I came not [only] to bring peace, but joy.” (One is tempted to read this mistranslation together with the correct translation and thus compose the full message as: “I come not to bring peace, but the joy of the sword, of struggle.”)\(^6^6\)

The result of correction and retranslation is always a more palatable message at the expense plausibility – another interpretive evasion of the heroic call to journey. A less dubious retranslation has been proposed by Egan, who interprets the passage in its context near the beginning of Acts as a commissioning to continue missional activity among the Gentiles.\(^6^7\) Egan’s proposal draws on Oscar Cullman’s study of the historical Jesus in the context of 1\(^\text{st}\) century Palestinian banditry, and the need


\(^6^6\) Žižek, 101-02.

\(^6^7\) Egan, 55.
for travellers to protect themselves in dangerous conditions.\textsuperscript{68} In this new context, and in foreign lands, hospitality cannot be assumed as it was in the commission to evangelism in Israel (10:1-12). The “lawless ones” of v. 37 therefore refers to the gentiles to whom Paul and others will bring the message, and the brandishing of swords in defence of Jesus is a complete misunderstanding of his final commissioning.\textsuperscript{69}

By understanding the swords as being defensive provisions for travel, Egan has combined a milder retranslation of the term ‘sword’ with a modified Conzelmannian understanding of a new situation changed conditionally, without such a pronounced eschatological ‘change of ages’, and in this way, mollifies the offense of the swords. His approach can now be dealt with alongside other situational approaches.

While I think that the exegesis of these above methods is flawed, and that Žižek’s parody of them as uncourageous is also valid, the main problem with these methods is that they misunderstand the function of the journey in mythic literature. The reader is not being presented with a distant history which allows them to then reflect on how this might impact on the present and changed situation in the Lukan community or the apostolic age. The reader is called to heroic identification with the hero in his quest, and thus as Campbell defines the purpose of myth, to “carry [the reader’s] human spirit forward”.\textsuperscript{70}

The reader (and critical scholarship itself) is therefore presented with a situation much like that of the boy Bastian in the 1984 movie \textit{The Never-Ending Story}, where

\textsuperscript{69} Egan, 59, 65.
\textsuperscript{70} Campbell, 10-11.
he is reading a story-book about a great hero, Atreyu. Atreyu is searching for a human child to save the land of Fantasia by giving the Childlike Empress a new name. As he reads, Bastian repeatedly resists the nagging implication that the human-child is actually Bastian himself – surely that would be impossible! Atreyu is shown a mirror that reveals his true self, and sees a boy matching Bastian’s description, but still, it is not until later in the movie that Bastian admits that he is in fact the hero, and saves the day by naming the Empress.

Retranslation, correction, juxtaposition, prediction and spiritualization of the heroic calls in Luke fail because they are ways to avoid identification with the disciples in their call to follow Christ. The disciples of Jesus who struggle to respond to the call to heroic journey are yet looking at us readers, perplexed themselves about the swords, and yet waiting for us to join them in their perplexity and their moment of decision. Jesus tells them they are going to be sifted by Satan – and that is true of us as well. Some of them, like Judas, will ultimately face spiritual ruin for refusing the quest (Proto-Luke 22:3, 47), and others like Peter will foolishly try and swing a sword inappropriately trying to defend justice in a wrong-headed and wrong-hearted way (Proto-Luke 9:54; 22:49). There is some comfort, however, that Jesus has prayed so that his faithfulness will lead to restoration (Proto-Luke 22:31-32).

The text of Proto-Luke=Q 22:28-30, the source material around which Proto-Luke’s final discourse is constructed, is perhaps the clearest call to demythologization of the journey as we could expect.

‘You are the ones who have remained with me during my trials, and I grant you, just as my Father has granted me, royal power, so that you
may eat and you may drink at my table in the time of my royal power, and will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

The disciples are therefore sent to teach and rule in the church as those who have traversed the road of trials with Christ, and been granted the boon of table fellowship with him, and are now able to share it with others. The contrasting calls to unarmed poverty and violent conflict in Jerusalem both perform the same function of preparing them to receive the final gift of royal power and admittance to the heavenly banquet. Once the journey is understood in this way, the reader is asked also to join Jesus in his trials, and to spiritually prepare for the violence at the climax of the journey.

Proto-Luke as a Whole

Taken as a whole, the simple elegance of Proto-Luke’s narrative speaks for itself, the end product being half-way between a ‘sayings gospel’ (such as Thomas or ‘Q’) and a fully formed gospel (such as Mark). It sheds light on the development of the gospel genre, not least because it lacks a crucifixion or resurrection.

Unity of Imagery: the Journey

The genius of Proto-Luke’s artistic creation was that the disparate material of the Q sayings was drawn together by means of a unifying literary trope: the image of a journey to Jerusalem.

The richness of the trope is itself an argument for the PLH. This journey functions as an historical account of a literal journey, a theological presentation of the journey of
Christ from this world into the next, a vehicle for the presentation of parables and teaching, a metalepsis of the Isaianic New Exodus, and a metaphor for the journey of discipleship. Surely it cannot be coincidence when, upon removing Markan material from Luke, such a journey stands framed by a narrative with a clear beginning and end.

*Purposive Unity: an Apologetic for Contextual Discipleship*

The purpose of Proto-Luke can be summarised as follows. The radical nature of Jesus’ message as preserved by the itinerant Q community around northern Palestine did not translate well into Hellenistic culture. As the message spread further afield, it became apparent that believers had to choose between becoming isolationist and exclusive, or assimilating into Hellenistic culture and losing their identity. Proto-Luke took the raw material of Q with its demand for radical repentance and kingdom-living, and recontextualised it for the Hellenistic world. It did so with an eye to the way that Jesus’ message about the kingdom and the Son of Man, having been open to interpretation in a wide variety of contexts, was beginning to be interpreted in a rigid way by the Q community, and by giving it a literary form, re-opens the message for a broader audience.

In defining Proto-Luke’s purpose in this way, I am following the lead of several scholars including Gregory Sterling, John Squires and Luke Timothy Johnson who see Luke primarily as an apologist for the early Christian movement. None of these scholars have claimed this specifically for Proto-Luke, but what they say is often directly applicable to Proto-Luke. For instance, Johnson’s words below capture the essence of Proto-Luke beautifully:
A minority group under attack for its distinctiveness can react in three ways. It can intensify the efforts to assimilate and become indistinguishable from its critics; it can intensify its separatist qualities and cultivate and insider-against-outsider mentality; or it can seek to defend and explain its way of life to others. This last is the way of apologetic. Of the three, it is surely the noblest: less craven than the panic to assimilate and less defensive that the utter refusal to communicate.\footnote{Luke Timothy Johnson, \textit{Writings of the New Testament} (London: SCM. 1999), 74.}

Proto-Luke took the authentic, primitive kerygma of Q, which through a process of self-stigmatisation, had hardened Jesus’ dynamic, open ended message into a culturally appropriate but wooden form, and crafted it into an apologetic history through use of his own special source, ‘L’ which had a warmer, more world affirming and inclusive message. The ‘L’ material used material such as the healing of gentiles and women, and the parable of the Good Samaritan to make it clear that however radical Jesus’ message may have been, discipleship could not be defined through an insider-outsider mentality. At the same time, Q’s call to renounce everything and follow Jesus is given pride of place in passages such as 9:57-62 and 14:25-35. Proto-Luke’s project can therefore be understood as a recontextualisation of Jesus’ call to discipleship in both mythological trope and world history, without releasing anyone from its demands.
CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

Frankly, rather than trying to squeeze everything into the ark, I prefer to try to rock it instead.

~ Stephen Moore, Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge, xii.

~ Christopher Richard Wynne Nevinson, The Road from Arras to Bapaume (1918)
When we read Proto-Luke, the Journey Gospel, the text shows us how to read it. It calls for disciples to follow Christ in abandonment, and so that is how the text must be read.

Having originated as a hermeneutics for Proto-Luke, critical discipleship as a method has much to offer the broader field of New Testament studies. The discipline itself is characterised by a conflict-in-context between radical and conservative scholars about the extent to which the historical-critical method should be applied, and how clearly it is possible to differentiate the Christ of the Christian faith, and the ‘real’ Jesus of history.

In chapter 1, I raised the problem of the relationship between critical (scientific) biblical studies and the Christian faith. These two commitments are on one hand mutually exclusive, and yet paradoxically they assume on another. To deal with this problem, I proposed a thought-experiment: to carry out an act of biblical criticism using rigorous scientific method at the same time as being motivated by a desire to follow Jesus in discipleship. This hermeneutic, I named ‘critical discipleship’, and the thought experiment would be carried out by testing the Proto-Luke Hypothesis (PLH) – a text which is fitting for the experiment because of its own focus on Jesus as a ‘trail-blazer’, calling others to radical self-denial in order to become a disciple.

In chapters 2 and 3 respectively, I reconstructed the sources from which Proto-Luke was built, the Q and L documents, and chapter 4 was a reconstruction of Proto-Luke itself. To reconstruct these documents, I use a variety of methods, which I refer to as ‘tactics’: source and redaction criticism, but also newer methods such as literary and social-scientific criticism. I conclude that both Q and L are recognisable, written sources because the texts of Q and L have a powerful recognisable literary unity and purpose when they are reconstructed mechanically through simple techniques – and the hypothesis withstands a
rigorous source-critical scrutiny. Q, for instance, is recognisable by a comparison between Luke and Matthew, L through its chiastic form, the use of stylometric measurements, the study of the genre of its pericopes, as well as from the fact that it is found interspersed with Q in tracts of Luke where Markan material is conspicuously absent. The reconstruction is confirmed through a social scientific study of the L pericopes, which display a marked uniformity of socio-economic perspective, and of theological vision, which are clearly different from the vision of Q or of canonical Luke. A new scriptural voice and a new vision of Jesus have thus been reconstructed.

In chapter 4, I argue for the validity of PLH using the traditional methods of source criticism, drawing heavily on arguments for PLH which do not seem to have been answered before being dismissed by a scholarly consensus against PLH. Then, in ch. 5, I explore the literary unity of Proto-Luke, its mythos and Christology, as well as its theological and ideological perspective. I use a number of tools to identify the unique theological voice of PL, including the mono-myth of Joseph Campbell, and the cultural, ideological criticism of Slavoj Žižek. Proto-Luke’s creative fusion of the voices of Q and L, its demythologisation of the myth of Christ’s journey to Jerusalem, and its placement of Israelite sacred-history into the story of Greco-Roman sacred history are profound additions to the world of ancient Christian thought which cannot be reduced to the grander theological vision of Luke-Acts. Again, it is the moment of recognition of a newly emerging picture of Jesus and of the Christian faith which ultimately convinces that the ‘scientific’ inquiry has produced something worthwhile.

The thought experiment being completed, it seems safe to now draw the conclusion that critical discipleship is a feasible option, at least as a biblical hermeneutic, if not also as a way of life. Christian faithfulness and rigorous scientific inquiry, when understood in this way,
may not be harmonious, but they create a tension which is rich with the possibility of prompting new questions and areas of growth and learning.

In conclusion, I would like to offer some reflections on the relationship between faith and rationality, particularly as they relate to the discipline of biblical studies. Some of the conclusion that this thesis has led me to about the ontology of the biblical text and the nature of hermeneutics can be found in my article “Does Yahweh Play Dice with the Torah”.

In this thesis, I have been more concerned with the ethical implications for the practice of Christian biblical interpretation, and that is the topic I turn to now.

Instead of securing ‘Christian’ answers, the authentic discipleship of the method I am proposing is built structurally into my hermeneutic. Critical discipleship cannot treat this as a contradiction but must view it dialectically. The stage in Loder’s dynamic model of convictional knowledge which is described as ‘Verification and Interpretation’ corresponds to the scientific processes of New Testament studies which are often described as ‘historical-critical’ or ‘diachronic.’ This stage in the process of knowing is not a ‘side of the debate’, but one part of the task of New Testament studies, and an essential one. When it is practiced, it must be practiced with all the methodological rigor of a natural science. It is this process which leads us to the conflict in context, just as it led Christianity to that place in the nineteenth century, culminating in the modernist/fundamentalist controversy.

Biblical scholarship has sought a variety of ways to resolve this dialectic. Many, following in the tradition of Spinoza and Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl have done their scholarly work from the historical-critical point of view. Others, following Karl Barth’s strategy of drawing a

line to separate revealed events (*Geschichte*) from scientific historical enquiry (*Historie*), such as Gerhard von Rad and the members of the Biblical Theology movement have focused on the Christ who transcends scientific historical criticism.

Critical discipleship is difficult to place within this sweeping taxonomy of biblical scholarship. To theologise from dogmatic theological presuppositions is totally opposed to the value of uncertainty on the journey. But equally so, the journey itself, as a response to divine call, presupposes more than methodological naturalism can answer. Trying to think antithetically and decide between reason and faith here is a lose-lose situation. If we were simply to treat science and theology as utterly discrete arenas of knowledge, we would be ‘putting [our] hand to the plough [following the christological commitments of sacred-history] and looking back [to the ‘real world’ commitments of secular-history]’ (Proto-Luke 9:62).

Situating methodological discipleship should instead be understood as bringing a new dimension in to play. That is, instead of deciding between or separating out revealed and scientific truth – this method places them in a dynamic relationship. But it is useless to create a methodology which sits aloof from other methodological frameworks. The best strategy for situating this method seems to be to treat different biblical scholars individually, and to critique each one with specific reference to the values of discipleship. In particular, I will critique one scholar who seems to privilege ‘scientific’ techniques: Wayne Meeks, and two scholars whose approaches are more theological: Brevard Childs and Walter Brueggemann. These scholars are selected somewhat arbitrarily from the wealth of options available, of which no individual scholar could be representative. Their approaches are old enough that they are not novel, and recent enough to remain ‘contemporary’, and are well
established enough over time to be representative of the broader division between scientific and theological approaches, and when their approaches are placed in tension in this way, they illustrate the relationship between these different points of view well.

**Situating the Method: Scientific Readings**

If science represents the moment of ‘verification and interpretation’ in the cycle of convctional knowledge, then any method which limits itself to science alone as a means of interpreting the scriptures, to the extent that it suppresses insights which are not scientific, stops short at the crucial stage of meaning-making like a spanner thrown into the gears and pistons of the machine. It will stifle the dynamic process of convictional knowledge. This is not to say that convictional knowledge has ceased to function at such times, but rather that the knowing subject is not co-operating with, and is possibly even quenching the work of *Creator Spiritus* in the text (cf. 1 Thess 5:19).

One of the most fruitful avenues of scientific enquiry in contemporary times has been social-scientific criticism, which uses the tools of sociology to study the social world of the New Testament, and which I have been able to draw on in reconstructing the historical Proto-Luke, Q and L. Such approaches are particularly invaluable in the reconstruction of sources about which little is known from history, but which are situated within specific communities such as Q and L. At its best, this discipline represents an attempt, as described by Robin Scroggs, to “put body and soul together again,” by considering the social *realia* of the New Testament alongside the literary and theological aspects of the text.² At the same time, just as social scientific biblical studies was becoming aware of itself as a criticism, ²Robin Scroggs, “The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research,” *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980), 165-66.
Bruce Malina described the role of the social sciences in terms which could never be described as positivist, and argued fervently against the idea that there are any reductionist or determinist implications of the method:

Reductionism refers to the idea of subsuming one model within another when both models are at the same level of abstraction... However to explain sets of data – and not models – from the perspective of [another] is not reductionistic. Rather such varied explanations, pushed to their limit, simply reveal how much can be known and explained using a given model. The data set, the range of information, remains in tact.  

To Malina, not only is social science criticism not reductionistic itself, it also prevents theological reductionism:

On the other hand, to equate biblical interpretation (a task requiring the explanation of past, textual meanings) with theology, as some systematic theologians do, is reductionistic; the same holds for those theologians who use a model called “the analogy of faith” to explain (away) the results of biblical interpretation.

Given the understanding of Scroggs and Malina, it would seem that social science criticism fits almost perfectly into the process of convictional knowledge. The method has a way of bringing theoretical models based on objective data concerning the human condition to bear on the data of the biblical text in such a way as to make the subjective intuitive force of theological insight answerable to a process of testing and interpretation. However, more recently, Wayne Meeks has broken this trend, and argued that scientific method requires that verifiable sociological realities be allowed to eclipse theological aspects of the text. This seems to be the very reductionism that Malina was arguing against.

---


4 Ibid.
Meek’s 2005 article “Why Study the New Testament?” is representative of the scientific position of the conflict. In it, Meeks proposes “that scientific history leads us to objective, secure knowledge of the past.” In the history of the discipline, the natural sciences became the model (ideal or envy) for the social Wissenschaften. New Testament scholars used comparison of texts as their “substitute for the laboratory experiment” – the chief means of amassing empirical data. Even though this scientific method has been under attack from the opponents of grand narratives, the way forward is to keep doing “Sisyphus’ task” of objective scientific history, and move away from the history of ideas to the history of communities.

While we will continue to speak primarily to the community of faith, the New Testament sciences must abandon the discipline of New Testament theology, which implicitly claims textual and historical warrants for propositions that in truth arise only out of continuing transactions between text and reader through many times and places, and it invites our complacency as historians in this masking of the source of authority.

Meeks claims that if we are to continue to have a discipline and an audience, New Testament studies must also give up its role in the theological hierarchy as an educator of pastors, because this role blinkers our understanding by privileging doctrine over life.

This scientific method exemplifies many of the values of discipleship – its openness, and willingness to privilege new data over old beliefs. What it lacks is the intentional, relational aspect of the “ἀκολούθει μοι” of Proto-Luke 9:59. Even though scientific insight itself is a

---

6 Ibid., 157.
7 Ibid., 164-5.
8 Ibid., 167-8.
no doubt the work of the Creator Spiritus, the method itself cannot acknowledge this, and so lacks the element of ‘following’. Proto-Luke 5:10 is the first call to discipleship recorded in Proto-Luke, and it consists in two commands, to stop fearing, (μὴ φοβοῦ) and to become a missionary, a ‘catcher of people’ (ἀνθρώπος ἔση ζωγρᾶν). In this sense, Meek’s call to give up our missional focus as New Testament scholars is a challenge to the discipleship-hermeneutic.

To apply Meek’s scientific method to a text like the parables of Jesus in Luke’s gospel would be to read against the grain of the text itself. The teachings of the greater interpolation section from 9:51-18:14 are teachings for disciples. In 14:33, anyone who does not ἀποτάσσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν, ie. hatefully renounce possessions as an act of self-renunciation, is not able to hear what the teacher says as a disciple. One’s possessions are one’s being in a metaphorical sense. In this sense, just the things Meeks wants to preserve (the audience, the discipline) are the very ὑπάρχουσια that need to be renounced. Otherwise, the best we could do would be to watch the act of communication take place, but we could never participate in it.

Aside from my above (admittedly moralizing) critique of Meeks’ position, we should also consider the factual component of his hermeneutic claims. Meeks’ claim is a pragmatic concern that our place in academia is called into question by our theological agenda. If he was saying this about theological commitments – then he would be right in asking us to abandon them. However, what he is questioning is no specific theological doctrine, but the underlying mission of New Testament studies as a discipline. So, allow me to assume that Meeks is right, but to turn his proposition on its head: In order to fulfil our calling as teachers in the church, and to maintain our integrity as biblical theologians, should we
renounce the goal of ‘objective’ scientific knowledge? Loder’s criticism of another rationalistic thinker applies well here, “Physicist Stephen Hawkings wanted to know ‘the mind of God,’ but he did not understand that if such knowledge occurs, it will be through a radical transformation of the human mind; the human is stripped of its eros and arrogance so as to behold in awe a magnificence in God that only God can bestow.”

Is our eros towards academic validity stopping us from hearing God? If so, and we renounce that goal, (“hate it!” in the words of Proto-Luke 14:26), the spiritual benefit will be a cleansing of the soul through the process of the road of trials which leads to Jerusalem, and the boon will be new clarity in reading Scripture.

A final critique of Meeks relates to his epistemology. Meeks’ bracketing of human subjectivity is pre-Einsteinian, treating phenomena as though they were not observer-conditioned. It is reductionist in its assumption that a human science (the reading of a text) can operate with the methods of a natural science.

Suppose we took Meeks’ suggestion and withdrew from the history of ideas and threw ourselves into the ‘laboratory experimentation’ of comparing texts. Would this mean we had successfully eliminated ourselves as observers from the equation? In fact, when we throw the text into the test tube, all we end up with is paper and ink. But if we remove it from the test tube, it is immediately ‘infected’ by the reality of the reader’s lived-world. And this well before any thesis has been formulated, or experiment is performed.

Situating the Method: Theological Readings

---


10 If this is a hard word for ambitious academics to hear, Jesus’ “μη ἐφοβοῦ” of Luke 5:10 is worth bearing in mind.
So do these considerations mean we should turn from a *scientific* reading of scripture to a *theological* reading of scripture? This would be at least as counter-productive a positivistic approach, because it would not merely prevent convicitional knowledge from proceeding dynamically, but also, by disabling science from performing its role of ‘verification and interpretation’ in the knowing process, this approach would in practice tend to require the practitioner overlook recalcitrant data within the text. I will show how this has happened with reference to Brevard Childs and Walter Brueggemann.

Perhaps the most effective attempt to make a shift towards theological method in modern times was Brevard Childs’ proposal that “the canon of the Christian Church is the most appropriate context from which to do Biblical Theology.”\(^{11}\) In 1970, he claimed that the Biblical Theology Movement (BTM) was in crisis, ultimately because it could not reconcile “the strain of using biblical language for the constructive part of theology, but at the same time approaching the Bible with all the assumptions of Liberalism.”\(^ {12}\) Here, Childs is describing the same conflict-in-context that I am talking about. He argues that the BTM failed because its central tenets could not be demonstrated scientifically, and because there was no consensus as to what ‘history’ meant, with reference to the *Historie-Geschichte* dialectic, (whether historical events ‘actually happened’, or were simply remembered in a certain way).

So Childs proposes that reading scripture as canon frees the text from the ‘prison’ of what the text meant in its past contexts, and frees us to see what the text means for us today, as


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 103.
a fresh revelation to the contemporary church.\textsuperscript{13} It is this method that enabled Calvin to renounce allegory, and still give a christological reading of the Old Testament – he did not associate the literal sense with the historical context, but the canonical. So also, Barth’s alienation from historical criticism, and from the \textit{Heilsgeschichte} movement, made him “invulnerable to the weaknesses that beset the Biblical Theology Movement.”\textsuperscript{14}

Childs has certainly taken seriously the observer-conditionality of the biblical text, to the extent that the way the reader observes it (its canonicity) has become the context in which the reader observes it. As a critical method, I find this approach circular and unsatisfactory, since it is influenced by and reliant on its own conclusions. It is as though, only because the church has decided to make the work canonical, the church’s canon in turn contextualises and interprets the work. But how is this critical, or methodical? If my assumptions are the only ground against which my assumptions are being tested, where is the process of testing? It is because of this that the philosopher of hermeneutics E. D. Hirsch has argued on Kantian moral grounds that anachronistic allegorical readings of the Bible are epistemologically immoral. They use the author of a text merely as “grist for the mill,” a means to an end (my/our ‘canonical’ reading).\textsuperscript{15} So Hirsch forms his moral axiom: “Unless there is a powerful overriding value in disregarding an author’s intention (i.e. original meaning), we who interpret as a vocation should not disregard it.”\textsuperscript{16} If we apply this to canonical criticism, it becomes clear that Childs’ universalising of his own assumptions traps

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Childs does not give the canon absolute power of veto over historical-critical considerations. He sides with Jerome when Augustine questioned his corrections of the canonical Septuagint from the Hebrew. The reason Childs can do this is because he claims the canon does not make the original setting irrelevant. But there is no discussion by Childs about why he can side with Jerome here, while making the canon determinative on other exegetical decisions. Where should the line be drawn?
\item Childs, 110.
\item Ibid.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
him in a Heideggerian hermeneutic circle: a prison as big as a reader’s lived-world. Scientific method being disarmed, there remains no mechanism for ego-driven Christian assumptions to be questioned.

While Meeks’ scientific objectivism on the left is to be avoided as outdated, Childs’ subjective reading of Scripture to the right has not avoided the trap of being pre-critical, or even a-critical. It is not discipleship simply because, as Käsemann observed, it makes the church Christ’s teacher rather than his pupil (μαθητής), and to borrow a phrase from Bertrand Russell, while it acknowledges the importance of critical methods, it has a soporific to numb their effect.17 the canon.

**Brueggemann and the Covenantal-Historical Model**

Brueggemann, as an Old Testament scholar, uses the concept of covenant as a heuristic model for reading the Bible. The approach is immediately sympathetic to the discipleship hermeneutic since, unlike ‘canon’, covenant is a biblical concept, and therefore authentic to the text. Both discipleship and covenant centred hermeneutics allow the text to tell us how to read it, instead of imposing a foreign heuristic model on the text. Yet while Brueggemann’s method bears many similarities to the discipleship hermeneutic, it also stands in tension with it on some essential values. In this way, the two methods relate to each other valuably as mutually corrective critiques.

The tension exists *prima facie* because the call to discipleship is essentially an individual one, whereas the covenant is a relationship between God and a community. A more profound tension between the two approaches is that discipleship is a scientific and open method.

---

Like critical discipleship, Brueggemann distances himself from both orthodox and rationalist methods of biblical interpretation, which he describes as the tyrannies of confessionalism (which places the church over the text), and of reductionism (which places the academy over the text).\(^\text{18}\) Because scripture refuses to accommodate power and greed, but makes all human concerns penultimate to its main character Yahweh, Brueggeman reads the Bible in order to redescribe reality in covenantal modes, and “naming things properly”, in their covenantal framework.

This covenantal framework Brueggemann describes is historical in nature, and the history which it offers is (at least to a certain degree) closed, as Bruggemann expressed earlier when he wrote:

> By *covenantal* I mean an enduring commitment between God and God’s people based on mutual vows of loyalty and mutual obligation through which both parties have their life radically affected and empowered. By *historical* I mean that these covenant partners, God and God’s people, have a vast deposit of precious memories of decisive interactions. These interactions, which run the gamut of love and hate, affirm to us that our whole existence depends on staying seriously and faithfully involved with the covenant partner, even at some risk.\(^\text{19}\)

A number of areas of tension with the discipleship-hermeneutic arise from this quotation. While a ‘commitment that empowers’ is very reminiscent of the disciples’ commitment to follow Jesus, the ‘vast deposit of memories’ is hopelessly at odds with the call to leave everything behind. Covenantal thinking is about preserving a stable relationship with God – while discipleship calls us to forge a new relationship from the instability of the call. Many of the ethical criticisms of canon-criticism given above may also apply here – to read a text


from the vantage of a ‘precious memory’ will naturally emphasise the things in the text which are favourable towards the preservation of the memory, leaving very little role for critical thinking. In fact, critical thinking and inquiry in this context would be dangerous (even heretical!), since “our whole existence (ὑπάρχοντα) depends on [this particular form of relationship] with the covenant partner.” A threat to the precious memories of the covenant community is a threat to that existence which Jesus said, “one cannot be my disciple without renouncing it.” (Proto-Luke 14:33)

This is the flaw which discipleship exposes in Brueggemann’s model, critical inquiry outside of the covenant is dangerous. It is no wonder then that he draws on the postmodern trend of deconstructing the nature of science itself to neutralise the threat. One of the alternatives to the covenantal-historical model which he explores he calls the ‘modern-industrial-scientific model.’ This model, he claims, holds that “life consists in acquiring enough knowledge to control and predict our world.” In this view, people have value based on what they achieve, and graciousness is despised since everything is earned, managed, knowable and predictable. If this description of the scientific world-view holds, then we have a tour-de-force victory for the precious memories of the covenant. However, anyone who has experienced the thrill of scientific discovery, or the wonder of seeing a newly discovered nebula, or the adrenalin rush of charting unknown territory knows that Brueggemann’s description of scientific heuristic models is a grotesque distortion of the very spirit of science – reducing it to a kind of pragmatic technological endeavour. Science, as the radical empiricist Karl Popper has articulated, and as all great scientists from Newton to Heisenberg, Einstein and Hawking have known, is “most valuable as one of the greatest
spiritual adventures that man has yet known.”  Its ability to force our gaze upon those recalcitrant data our covenantal-historical eyes might skip over, lest our existence be denied by the refutation of our precious memories is soul-cleansing and transformative.

None of these considerations mean that the covenantal-historical view is somehow ‘wrong’. I would suggest that the covenantal consciousness described in Brueggemann’s approach is well suited for ‘books of the covenant’, documents which themselves call for such a hermeneutic: Exodus, the Deuteronomistic history, Jeremiah, etc. And these are the very books of the Bible to which Brueggemann has applied his method so successfully. Even within such texts, Brueggemann’s method is specifically suited to the ‘release and openness’ moment of the wheel of convictional knowledge. What must be remembered is that those moments are hijacking the process of human knowing when they are allowed to create a glut which is exclusive of the other aspects of the knowing event, towards which critical, scientific enquiry is more favourable.

But Proto-Luke, and similar books which call the reader to renunciation and abandonment: leave the covenantal memories to be buried by their dead custodians (Proto-Luke 9:60), from whom while the heroic readers themselves are cut off (Proto-Luke 12:53), and whom themselves become the object of a holy hatred (Proto-Luke 14:26) which the reader renounces in order to seek out the kingdom of God, and to follow the Jesus of the text.

So against Meeks’ and Childs’ presentation of theological and scientific reading of the Bible as competing and incompatible projects, and in conversation with the covenantal demands

of Brueggemann, Proto-Luke itself asks to be read in such a way that assumes both theology and science stand together in a heroic relationship as follows:

Figure 5: Heroic Biblical Criticism

In this way, the content and form of Proto-Luke, and even its reception can be understood as discipleship from the beginning to end of the journey to Jerusalem, and Jesus’ “ἀκολούθε μοι” is addressed to its readers just as much as it is to the literary characters of Jesus’ disciples, not as an afterthought about how to apply the text to some distant 21st century context, but as the primary intention of the text itself.
### Appendix 1: L material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible L material</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Paffenroth</th>
<th>Petzke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infancy Narrative</td>
<td>1:5-2:52</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits (Infancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching of John the Baptist</td>
<td>3:10-14</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus returns to Galilee</td>
<td>4:14-15</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits (Mark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rejection at Nazareth</td>
<td>4:14-30</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>only v. 25-27, rest (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call of disciples</td>
<td>5:1-11</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The woes</td>
<td>6:24-26</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus raises son of widow in Nain</td>
<td>7:11-17</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>x (v. 16-17 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sinful woman forgiven</td>
<td>7:36-50</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 48-50 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ministering Women</td>
<td>8:1-3</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Samaritan Villagers</td>
<td>9:51-56</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature of Discipleship</td>
<td>9:57-62</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Good Samaritan</td>
<td>10:29-37</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 29, 37b =R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary and Martha</td>
<td>10:38-42</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 38 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the persistent friend</td>
<td>11:5-8</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 5a = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The blessedness of Jesus’ Mother</td>
<td>11:27-28</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the rich fool</td>
<td>12:13-21</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the doorkeeper</td>
<td>12:35-38</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 13-16a; 21 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants Wages</td>
<td>12:47-50</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parables of repentance</td>
<td>13:1-17</td>
<td>saying, example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 1a; 6a, 17c = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning about Herod Healing on the Sabbath</td>
<td>13:31-33</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>x (v. 31a; 33 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of choice of place at table</td>
<td>14:1-5</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>x (v. 1 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>14:7-14,</td>
<td>example-story,</td>
<td>x (v. 7; 11; 15 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting the cost</td>
<td>14:28-33</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>x (v. 33 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the lost sheep</td>
<td>15:1-7</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 1-3, 7 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the lost coin, son</td>
<td>15:8-32</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 10 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the dishonest manager</td>
<td>16:1-15</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 1a, 9-15 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of rich man and Lazarus</td>
<td>16:19-31</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say, “We have only done our duty”</td>
<td>17:7-10</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thankful Samaritan leper</td>
<td>17:11-19</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>x (v. 11, 19 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the unjust judge</td>
<td>18:1-8</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 1; 8b = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of Pharisee and publican</td>
<td>18:9-14</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 9; 14b = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacchaeus repents</td>
<td>19:1-10</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>x (v. 1 = R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Pounds</td>
<td>19:11-27</td>
<td>example-story</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Synoptic</td>
<td>19:39-44</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td>21:34-36</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Passover meal as a farewell</td>
<td>22:15-18</td>
<td>mythic-biographical?</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two swords</td>
<td>22:25-38</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus before Herod Daughters of Jerusalem</td>
<td>23:16-18</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two criminals</td>
<td>23:27-32</td>
<td>sayings</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The road to Emmaus</td>
<td>24:13-53</td>
<td>mythic-biographical</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The Preface to Proto-Luke

Prophet  Time  Revelation
Proto-Luke  3:1-2a  Εν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαὶ δεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ...

In the fifteenth year of the rule of...

Osee  1:1b  ἐν ημέραις Οζίου καὶ Ἰωάθαμ...
in the days of Ozias and Jotham ...

A word of God came to John ...

Amos  1:1b  ἐν ημέραις Οζίου βασιλέως Ιουδα καὶ ἐν ημέραις Ιεροβαµ|[...]
... in the days of Ozias king of Juda and in the days of Jeroboam of Joas king of Israel, two years before the earthquake.

A word of the LORD, which came to Osee of Beeri

Michaias  1:1b  ἐν ημέραις Ἰωάθαμ...
in the days of Joatham...

Words of Amos, which came in Nakkarim of Thekoue, which he saw in Jerusalem...

Joel  1:1  Καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Μιχαίαν τὸν τοῦ Μωρασθὶ... And a word of the Lord came to Michaias of Morasthi

Abdias  1:1a  Ὅρασις Ἀβδιοῦ. A vision of Abdias.

Jonas  1:1  Καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ἰωάναν τὸν τοῦ Ἀµαθὶ λέγων A word of the Lord which also came to Jonas of Amathi, saying

Naoum  1:1  Λήµµα Νινεύη A commission of Nineue.
1:1 Τὸ λήμμα, ὃ ἔδει Αμβακουμ ὁ προφήτης. The commission, which Ambakoum the prophet saw.

Sophonias 1:1b ...ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰωσια... ...in the days of Josias...

...A word of the Lord, which came to Sophonias...

Aggaias 1:1a Ἅγγαι τῷ βασιλείῳ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου ἐν χειρὶ Ἁγγαίου τοῦ προφήτου...

...a word of the Lord came by the hand of Aggaias the prophet ...

Zacharias 1:1b Ἅγγαι τῷ βασιλείῳ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς Ζαχαρίαν...

...a word of the Lord came to Zacharias ...

Malachias 1:1 Ἀγγελία λόγου Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσραήλ...

...A commission of the word of the Lord to Israel...

Esaias 1:1a Ὁρασίες ἐν ὑιῷ Ἁμώς...

An oracle which Isaias son of Amos saw,

6:1a Καὶ ἐγένετο τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, οὗ ἀπέβαλεν Οζίας ὁ βασιλεὺς,

And it happened the year which Ozias the king died,

6:1b ἔδω τῷ Κυρίῳ...

I saw the Lord ...
Jeremias 1:2b... in the days of Josias son of Amos king of Juda, in the thirteenth year of his kingdom.

1:1-2a The word of God which came to Jeremias of Chelkias of the priests, who lived in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin. A word of God which came to him... 1:4 And it happened in the thirtieth year...

8:1b... and the heavens were opened, and I saw oracles of God.

Jezekiel 1:1a Kair egeveto ev to triakostw etei...

1:2 On the fifth of the month (this was the fifth year of the captivity of king Joakim)

8:1a Kair egeveto ev to ev to pepton mhn pepton tov mhn... And it happened in the sixth year in the fifth month, fifth of the month...

1:1b... and the heavens were opened, and I saw oracles of God.

1:3... and a word of the Lord came to Jezekiel... and the hand of the Lord came upon me.

8:1b... and the hand of the Lord came upon me.

Daniel 1:1a (LXX) Ev etei triito tis basileias lousa kai tis triites tou

1:1a (Theodotion) Ev etei triito tis basileias lousa kai tis triites tou

In the third year of the kingdom of Joakim (king) of Juda
Appendix 3: A Reconstruction of Proto-Luke

This appendix is a reconstruction of Proto-Luke, with sources indicated, in the order in which they appear in Proto-Luke. It does not give a reconstruction of the original wording or order of the sources themselves, but gives an overall impression of Proto-Luke’s method of redaction. I have simply designated on a sentence by sentence basis which of Luke’s sources is being followed, occasionally, when specific words have been obviously supplied by a redactor (such as the redactor’s fondness for the word νῦν (now), I have marked the individual word as the redactor’s, but it is not possible to do this with any reliable consistency. Many individual words and small changers of the redactor’s will no doubt never be discovered unless a manuscript of Proto-Luke were discovered.

In dealing with Q, I have tended to follow the principle that “oral sounding” parallelism found in Luke, but not found in Matthew are probably simply variants of Q coming from an oral period of its transmission. This is not to indicate a preference for either an oral or written Q, but simply to follow Bovon (himself an advocate of a written Q) who says that with regards to the history of its transmission, “Luke’s doubling of the sayings about love for enemies is not worth considering.”¹ Similarly, I think the difference between Luke 10:16 and Matthew 10:40 is not a case of either being more original, but both being performance variations of the Q text.

Much of the variations between Luke and Matthew are therefore simple differences of oral performance and I have simple followed Luke’s order as Q in those instances. I do not, by this, imply that Matthew has reordered anything – simply that he may have received a different performance variation.

So that some of my stylometric claims can be scrutinised independently by the reader, I have marked out the “unlukan” stylolemetric criteria, which I follow Kim Paffenroth in using to identify source material, by using a signs as follows:

1. καί: & (superscript)
2. ἵνα: *
3. παρά + accusative as a Semitism with comparative meaning: % (superscript)
4. using the dative after a verb of speaking²: >
5. Cardinal numbers before the noun: #: (superscript)
6. Historical Present: underlined
7. L’s unique vocabulary³: ν (superscript)

² Verbs of speaking used with datives in Proto-Lukan material include: ἀποκρίνομαι, εὐαγγελίζομαι, νόμος, λέγω and φωνέω.
³ hapaxes: γάμος, γείτων, δεκαόκτω (or δέκα κοίτω), ἔλαιον, ἔνανθις κοίτα ἑνέα (or just ἑνέα), κόπος, πύργος, απλαγχίζομαι, αὐκοφαντέω, χρεοφειλέτης.
not hapaxes: αἰσχύνη/αἰσχύνομαι/κατασχύνω, ἄνθρωπος: τίς (or similar constructions with a synonym of ἄνθρωπος), δαπάνη/δαπανάω, διασκοριέω, ἔλεώ, εὐφαίνω, ἡμέρα τοῦ εὐββάτου (singular), καταφίλεω, λέπρος, λίμος ἐγείνετο, μακρόθεν, ὀφειλέτης/ὀφεῖλο, πόρρω/πόρρωθεν, χορτάζω.


In the fifteenth year of the rule of Tiberius Caesar, when Pontius Pilate ruled Judea, and Herod was the Tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip his brother was the Tetrarch of Ituraea and the country of Trachonitis, and Lysanias was the Tetrarch of Abilene, in the time of the high-priest Annas and Caiaphas,

Q 3:2b-4

A word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the desert. And he went into all the surrounding region of the Jordan, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins.

As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, ‘A voice is calling in the wilderness: “Prepare the way for the Lord, make straight his paths.”’

Proto-Luke 3:5-6

Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be flattened, and crooked things shall be made into straight things, and uneven ways made into level ways, and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.’

Q 3:7-9

Then he said to the crowds that came out to be baptised by him, ‘children of snakes! Who has shown you how to flee the impending wrath? You must bear fruits worthy of repentance, and do not begin to say among yourselves, “We still have a father: Abraham!” for I am telling you that God is able, from these stones, to raise up children for Abraham. And also, the axe is already laid at the root of the trees. Therefore every tree that is not bearing good fruit is being cut down and cast into the fire.’
S\textsuperscript{lk} 3:10-14

And\textsuperscript{a} crowds were asking him, saying ‘then what should we do?’ And answering, he said > to them, ‘Let the one who has two\textsuperscript{b} tunics give to the one who hasn’t, and\textsuperscript{a} let the one who has food do likewise.’ And\textsuperscript{a} tax-collectors also came to be baptized, and\textsuperscript{a} said to him, ‘Teacher, what should we do?’ And he said to them, ‘Do nothing more than\textsuperscript{a} what you are commanded.’ And\textsuperscript{a} soldiers also asked him, saying ‘Us also\textsuperscript{a}, what should we do?’ And\textsuperscript{a} he said > to them, ‘Neither extort anybody, nor make any false accusation’, and\textsuperscript{a} be satisfied with your pay.’

Proto-Luke 3:15

But since the people were waiting expectantly, and\textsuperscript{a} since everyone was saying in their hearts concerning him, ‘Perhaps he could be the Messiah’,

Q 3:16-17

John continually answered by saying > to everyone, ‘Though I am baptising you with water, there is one coming who is more powerful than I, the strap of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie. It is he who will baptise you with the Holy Spirit and\textsuperscript{a} with fire. His winnowing-shovel is in his hand, to clean out his threshing-floor, and\textsuperscript{a} to be gathering the wheat into his barn, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire.’


So, with many and\textsuperscript{a} diverse words of encouragement, he proclaimed the good news to the people. But Herod the tetrarch, being rebuked by him about Herodias, his brother’s wife, and\textsuperscript{a} about all the evil Herod had been doing, also\textsuperscript{a} added this to it all: he [also\textsuperscript{a}] put John in prison.

Q 3:21-22

It happened when all the people were baptised, Jesus was also\textsuperscript{a} having been baptised and\textsuperscript{a} praying, and the heavens were opened, that the Holy Spirit also\textsuperscript{a} came down in bodily form as a dove upon him, and\textsuperscript{a} a voice was coming from heaven, ‘You are my Son, the Beloved. I am pleased with you.’

L 3:23-38
And Jesus was, when he began, about thirty years. He was the son, it was believed, of

Joseph, Heli, Matthat, Levi, Melchi, Jannai, Joseph,
Mattathias, Amos, Nahum, Esi, Naggai, Maath, Mattathias,
Semein, Josech, Joda, Joanan, Rhesa, Zerubbabel, Shealtiel,
Neri, Melchi, Addi, Cosam, Elmadam, Er, Joshua, Eliezer, Jorim,
Matthat, Levi, Simeon, Judah, Joseph, Jonam, Eliakim, Melea,
Menna, Mattatha, Nathan, David, Jesse, Obed, Boaz, Sala,
Nahshon, Amminadab, Admin, Arni, Hezron, Perez, Judah,
Jacob, Isaac, Abraham, Terah, Nahor, Serug, Reu, Peleg, Eber,
Shelah, Cainan, Arphaxad, Shem, Noah, Lamech, Methuselah,
Enoch, Jared, Mahalaleel, Cainan, 38Enos, Seth, Adam,

God.

Q 4:1-13

And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan,

and was led by the Spirit to the desert, to be tested by the devil for forty days. And he ate nothing in those days, and when they were finished, he was hungry. And the devil said > to him, ‘If you are the Son of God, speak to this stone, so that it may become bread.’ And Jesus answered him, ‘It is written, “Humanity will not live only on bread.”’

And as the devil led him up, it showed him in an instant all the kingdoms of the empire in a moment of time. And the devil said > to him, ‘To you I will give all this authority and their glory, for it has been given to me, and I give it to whom I will.

So then, if you would kneel before me, it will all be yours.’ And answering, Jesus said > to him, ‘It is written, “The Lord your God will you worship, and serve only God.”’

And the Devil led him into Jerusalem, and stood him on the edge of the temple, and said > to him, ‘If you are the Son of God, cast yourself down from here, for it is written, “He will command his angels concerning you, to protect you”, and “They will lift you up with their hands, that you will not strike your foot against a stone.”’

And answering, Jesus said > to him, ‘It is spoken, “You shall not test the Lord your God.”’
Proto-Luke 4:13-16a

And bringing every test to an end, the Devil departed from him until another opportunity.

And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and news about him spread through the whole neighbourhood. And he was teaching in their synagogues, being glorified by everyone.

And he came to Nazareth, where he was brought up,


And according to his custom, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and he stood up to read, and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. And when he unrolled the scroll, he found the place where it is written: ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, who, having anointed me to proclaim good news > to poor people, sent me to proclaim release > to people in captivity, and recovery of sight > to blind people, to send the oppressed forth in liberty, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.’

And closing the scroll, and handing it back to the attendant, he sat down. And all the eyes in the synagogue were staring at him. And he began to say to them, ‘Today this scripture is fulfilled in your ears.’ And everyone was bearing witness to him and they were wondering about the words of grace which proceeded from his mouth, and they said, ‘Can this be Joseph’s son?’ And he said to them, ‘By all means, tell me this proverb, “Physician, heal yourself! Whatever things we heard happening in Capernaum, do also here in your hometown.” ’ And he said, ‘truly I tell > you that no prophet is accepted in their hometown. But I will tell > you about reality, there were many widows in the days of Elijah in Israel, when the heaven was closed for three years and six months, when it happened that there was a great famine’ in all the land, and Elijah was sent to none of them, but to Zarephath in Sidon, to a woman who was a widow. And there were many people with leprosy in Israel at the time of Elisha the prophet, and he cleansed none of them except Naaman the Syrian. ‘And everyone in the synagogue was filled with passion when they heard these things. And standing up, they cast him out of the city, and led him unto the peak of a mountain on which the city was built, so that they might throw him off a cliff. But going through the middle of them, he went on his way.
It happened when the crowd were urging him and listening to the word of God, that he was also standing by the lake of Gennesaret. And he saw two boats standing by the lake, but the fishermen having gone from them, were washing the nets. Having gone into one of the boats, which was Simon’s, he asked him to go out a little from the land. Having sat down, he was teaching the crowd from the boat. As he stopped speaking, he said to Simon, ‘Go out to the deep water, and lower your nets for a catch.’ And having answered, Simon said, ‘Master, having worked the whole night, we caught nothing, but at your word I will lower the nets.’ And having done it, they caught a great multitude of fish, but their nets were breaking, and he called out to his partners in the other boat, to come and catch them, and they came and filled both the boats so that they were sinking. But when he saw, Simon Peter fell at Jesus’ knees saying, ‘Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, sir!’ for fear seized him, and all who were with him about the fish which they had caught, and similarly were James and John the sons of Zebedee, who were companions of Simon, and Jesus said to Simon, ‘Do not fear, from now on you will be fishing for people.’ And having led the boats to the land, and leaving everything, they followed him.
**The Inaugural Q Speech**

*Proto-Luke 6:17-20a*

And having came down with them, he stood on a level place, and a great crowd of his disciples, and a great multitude of people from all Judea and Jerusalem and the coast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him and be healed of their diseases, and those who were tormented by unclean spirits were being healed. And the whole crowd was seeking to touch him, for power came out of him and healed everyone.

And having raised his eyes to his disciples, he said,

*Q 6:20b-23*

‘Blessed are the poor for yours is the kingdom of God.
Blessed are the ones who hunger now
for you will be filled’.
Blessed are the ones who weep now
for you will laugh.

‘Blessed are you when people will hate you, and when they will exclude you and insult you and cast out your name as an evil thing because of the Son of Humanity.

‘Rejoice in that day and leap for joy, for see, your reward is great in heaven, for according to these things their ancestors they acted towards the prophets.

*Proto-Luke 6:24-26*

‘But woe to you who are rich for you have received your comfort.
‘Woe to you who are full now, for you will hunger.
‘Woe to you who laugh now for you will mourn and weep.
‘Woe, when all people speak well of you, for according to these things their fathers acted towards the false-prophets.

*Q 6:27-38*

‘But I say > unto you who are listening, ‘Love your enemies.
Do good to those who hate you. Bless those who curse you.
Pray for those who persecute you.
‘To the one who slaps you on your cheek, offer also the other one, and from the one who asks from you your coat, do not withhold even your tunic. Give to all who ask of you, and from the one who takes from you, do not demand what is yours. And just as you want * people to do unto you, so do unto them.

‘And if you love those who love you, what grace is it to you? For even sinners love those who love them. And if you do good those who do good to you, what grace is it to you? Even sinners do that. And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what grace is it to you? Even sinners lend to sinners so that they may receive back the same amount.

‘But love your enemies, and do good, and lend expecting nothing in return and your reward will be great and you will be sons of the Most High, for he is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked.

‘Be merciful, just as your Father is [also] merciful.

‘And do not judge, and you will not be judged. And do not condemn, and you will not be condemned. Forgive and you will be forgiven. Give, and it will be given to you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be given into your lap. For by what measure you measure, it will be measured to you.’

Q 6:39-45

And he also told > them a parable, ‘Is a blind person able to lead a blind person? Won’t they both fall into a ditch?

‘A student is not above his teacher, but everyone who is qualified will be like his teacher.

‘Why do you see the splinter in your brother’s eye, but do not observe the log in your own eye? How can you say > to your brother, ‘Brother, let me remove the speck from your eye’, he who does not see the log in your eye? Hypocrite! First remove the log from your eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the splinter from your brother’s eye.

A good tree doesn’t produce bad fruit, nor again does a bad tree produce good fruit. Each tree is known by its own fruit.
Do they gather figs from thorns or bunches of grapes from thistles? The good person out of their good treasure of their heart brings good things, and the bad person from the bad treasure brings bad things. For out of the abundance of the heart, their mouth speaks.

Q 6:46-49

Why do you call me Lord, Lord, and you don’t do the things I say?

Everyone who comes to me and is hearing my words, and is also doing them,

I will show you what he is like.

He is like a person who dug and excavated and laid a foundation on the rock, and when the flash-floods came, the river beat against that house, and could not shake it for it was well built.

But the one who having heard, also does not do, is like a person who dug and excavated and laid a foundation on the land with no foundation,

which the river beat against that house, and immediately it fell, and it happened that the ruin of that house was great.

Q 7:1-10

After he finished these sayings in the hearing of the people, he went into Capernaum.

A certain Centurion, having a sick servant who was about to die,
and having heard about Jesus, sent to him elders of the Jewish people

saying to him ‘coming, heal

his servant’

and the ones who came to Jesus urged him, saying ‘He is worthy, the one to whom you will grant this thing, for he loves our people and he built our synagogue for us.’

And Jesus went with them, and him being yet a long way off from the house, the Centurion sent friends saying > to him,

“Lord,

do not trouble yourself

for I am not sufficient for you * to come under my roof.

Therefore, I did not deem myself worthy to come to you.

But say > a word and let my boy be healed.

For I am also a man appointed under authority, having soldiers under me. And I say > to this one ‘Go!’ and he goes, and to another one ‘Come!’ and he comes, and to my servant, ‘Do this!’ and he does it.”

But Jesus, hearing, was amazed and having turned, he said to the crowd who followed, “I say > to you, not even in Israel have I found such faith!”

And having returned to his house, the ones whom he sent found the servant healed.
Document L’s opening Tryptych

L 7:11-17

And it came to pass immediately afterwards that
he came to a city called Nain, and his disciples and a great
crowd were gathering around him. As he was approaching
the gate of the city, behold, also, an only son who had died
was being carried out by his mother, who was also a widow,
and a decent crowd from the city was with her. And When
he saw her, the Lord was moved with compassion for her
and said to > her, “don’t cry.”

And having come forward, he touched the coffin, and those
who were carrying it stood still, and he said ‘Young man, I say
> to you, get up!’

And the dead man sat up and started to speak, and he
gave him to his mother.

So fear took hold of everyone, and they glorified God saying,
“A great prophet has been raised up among us” and that
“God has visited his people”

And this word concerning him went out into all Judea and
all the neighbouring areas.

Q 7:18-35

And John’s disciples announced to > him about all these
things, and having called two certain ones of his disciples,
John sent them to the Lord, saying, ‘Are you the one to come
or should we expect another?’

Being sent to him, the men said, ‘John the Baptist sent us to
you saying, “Are you the one to come or should we expect
another?”’

In that hour he healed many from diseases and wounds
and evil spirits, and he granted many blind people sight.

And having answered, he said > to them, ‘having gone,
announce to > John the things you saw and heard. Blind
people are seeing, lame people are walking, people with
leprosy are being cleansed and deaf people are hearing,
deaf people are being raised, poor people are hearing the
good news.’
‘And blessed is the one who is not offended by me.’

The messengers from John having left, he began to talk to the crowds about John. ‘What did you go out in the wilderness to look at? A reed shaken by the wind?

‘Or what did you expect to see? A person arrayed in luxurious garments? See, those in glorious apparel and luxury are dwelling with kings.

‘Or what did you expect to see? A prophet? Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet.

‘This is the one concerning whom it is written, “See, I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way before you.”

‘I tell you, nobody from those born of women is greater than John. But the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he is.’

And the whole people having heard this, even the tax-collectors justified God, who had been baptized with the baptism of John.

But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected God’s plan for themselves, who had not been baptised by him.

‘To what then shall I compare the people of this generation? And what are they like?

‘It is like children who are seated in the market, and who are calling out to the others saying “we played the flute for you and you did not dance, we wailed and you did not cry.”

‘For John the Baptist came, neither eating bread nor drinking wine and you say, “he has a demon.”

‘The Son of Humanity came eating and drinking and you say, “See! A gluttonous person and a drunk, friend of tax-collectors and sinners.

‘And wisdom is justified by all her children.’
A certain one of the Pharisees asked him * to eat with him, and when having gone into the house of the Pharisee, he reclined.

And behold, a certain woman was in the city who was a sinner, and having perceived that he was reclining in the house of the Pharisee, and brought an alabaster box of ointment, and having placed herself behind him, around his feet, weeping, she began to drench his feet with tears, and she wiped it up with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed him with the ointment.

When the Pharisee who had invited him saw, he said to himself, ‘If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman is touching him, that she is a sinner.’

And having answered, Jesus said to him, ‘Simon, I have something to say to you.’

‘Teacher,’ he says, ‘speak!’

‘Two people were debtors to a certain creditor. One owed five hundred denarii, and the other, fifty. They not having anything to repay, he forgave them both freely. Which one of them will therefore love him more?’

Simon answered, saying, ‘I take it the one to whom more was forgiven.’

He said to him, ‘You have judged correctly.’

And having turned to the woman, he said to Simon, ‘Do you see this woman? I came into your house; you did not give me water for my feet, but she drenched my feet with tears, and wiped them with her hair. You did not give me a kiss, but since I came, she has not stopped kissing my feet. You did not anoint my head with olive oil, but she anointed my feet with ointment. Because of this I say to you, her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved greatly. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.’

He said to her, ‘Your sins are forgiven you.’

And those who reclined with him began to say in themselves, ‘Who is this who also forgives sins?’

But he said to the woman, ‘Your faith has saved you, go in peace.’
L 8:1-3

And it came to pass in succession that he also travelled through cities and villages preaching and proclaiming the Kingdom of God, and the twelve with him.

And certain women who were healed from evil spirits and diseases. Mary called Magdalene from whom seven demons were cast, and Joanna wife of Chuza Herod’s steward and Susanna and many others, who served him from their possessions.
The Proto-Lukan Journey to Jerusalem

L 9:51-56  A. Visit to Samaria

It came to pass in the fullness of the days of his assumption, that he also set his face on Jerusalem.

And he sent messengers before his face, and going forth, they went into a village of the Samaritans, so as to prepare for him. But they did not welcome him,

for his face was going to Jerusalem.

Watching, the disciples James and John said, “Lord! Do you want us to call fire down from the sky and destroy them [as Elijah also did]?”

Having turned, he rebuked them [and said, you to not know what kind of spirit you are of, for the Son of Humanity did not come to destroy human lives, but to save,]

and they went into another village

Q 9:57-62

and them going along their way,

Someone said to him, ‘I will follow you wherever you go.’

And Jesus said > to him, ‘Foxes have dens, and the birds of heaven have nests, but the Son of Humanity has nowhere to lay his head.’

He said to another, ‘Follow me’, but he said, ‘Permit me first to go and bury my father.’

He said > to him, ‘Let the dead bury their own dead

And you, having gone, proclaim the kingdom of God.

Yet another said, ‘I will follow you, Lord, but first let me say goodbye to those who are in my household.’

And Jesus said to him, ‘Nobody putting their hand the plow and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God.’

Q 10:1-16

After these things, the Lord appointed seventy[-two], and sent them by twos before his face to all the cities and places he was about to go.

He said to them, ‘The harvest is great, but the workers are few. Ask, therefore, the Lord of Harvest to send workers into his harvest.
'Go on your way! See, I am sending you out as sheep in the midst of wolves.

‘Do not be carrying a purse, nor a pack, nor shoes, nor staff, and do not greet anyone on the way.

‘Into whatever house you go, first say, “peace be on this house.”

And if a Son of Peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him, but if not it shall return to you.

Remain in that house, eating and drinking their things, the worker is worthy of their reward.

‘Do not go from house to house.

‘And into whichever town you go, and they receive you,

‘eat what they set before you,

‘and cure those who are sick there, and say > to them “The kingdom of God has come near to you.”

‘Into whichever town you go, and they do not receive you, go into their wide streets and say, “Even the dust which stuck to us from your city, we wipe it off our feet for you.”

‘ “But know this, that the kingdom of God has come near.” I tell > you, for Sodom it shall be more tolerable on that day, than for that town.’

‘Woe to you, Chorazin!

‘Woe to you, Bethsaida!

‘For if the miracles which were done in you were done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and sitting in ashes.

‘But for Tyre and Sidon it will be more tolerable in the judgment than for you.

‘And you, Capernaum! Will you be exalted in heaven? You will come down into Hades.

‘The one who hears you, hears me. And the one who rejects you rejects me, and the one who rejects me rejects the one who sent me.’


The Seventy[two] returned with joy saying, ‘Lord! Even the demons submit to us in your name.’
But he said to them, ‘I was watching Satan, like lightning from heaven, falling. See, the authority is given to you to trample over snakes and scorpions, and on all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall hurt you.

‘But do not rejoice in this, that the spirits submit to you. Rejoice that your names are written in heaven.’

Q 10:21-24

In that hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, ‘I praise you, Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that you have hidden these things from the wise and intelligent, and revealed them to children.

‘Yes, Father, for this was a pleasing thing before you.

‘Everything was given to me by my Father, and nobody knows who the Son is except the Father, and who the Father is except the Son, and the one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.’

And turning to his own disciples he said,

‘Blessed the eyes that see the things you are seeing. I tell you that many prophets and kings wanted to see the things that you are seeing and they did not see, and to hear the things you are hearing and they did not hear.’

L 10:25-42  B. Good Samaritan, Mary/Martha

And behold, a certain lawyer stood up to test him saying, ‘Teacher, what doing shall I inherit eternal life?’

He said to him, ‘What is written in the law? How do you read?’

Having answered, he said, ‘You shall love the Lord your God from your whole heart, and in your whole life, and in your whole strength, and in your whole understanding, and your neighbour as yourself.’

He said to him, ‘You have answered correctly. Do this and you will live.’

But wanting to justify himself he said to Jesus, ‘and who is my neighbour?’

Repliesing, he said, ‘A certain person went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and encountered bandits who also stripped him, and having inflicted wounds, departed, having left him half dead.'
‘By chance, a certain priest was going down by that road, who also, after having seen him, passed by on the opposite side. In the same way also, a levite, having come to the place and looked, passed by on the opposite side.

‘But a certain Samaritan came to him while he was travelling who, also, after seeing him, was moved with compassion’. And having approached, he bound his wounds, pouring on olive oil and wine. Having placed him on his own mount he led him to an inn and took care of him. And on the next day, having taken out two denarii, he gave them to the innkeeper and said, “Take care of him, and whatever more you might spend, I will repay you when I return.”

‘Which of these three appears to you to have become a neighbour to the one who encountered bandits?’

He said, ‘The one who showed him mercy.’

Jesus said to him ‘Go, and you do similarly!’

When he left, he went into a certain village. A certain woman named Martha received him into her house. She had a sister named Mary, who also having sat at the Lord’s feet, was listening to his word. But Martha was occupied with much service. Having come up, she said, ‘Lord, does it not concern you that my sister has left me to serve alone? So tell her to come help me!’

Having answered the Lord said to her, ‘Martha, Martha, you are anxious about and distracted with many things. [A few or] one thing is necessary. Mary has chosen the good part, which will not be taken from her.’

Q 11:1-4

And it happened when he was praying in a certain place, as he paused, a certain one of his disciples said to him,

‘Lord, teach us to pray, just like John also taught his disciples.’

Jesus said to them,

‘When you pray, say,

‘Father, may your name be sanctified, may your kingdom come. Give us sufficient bread each day, and cancel our sins,

for we ourselves also cancel debts for everyone who owes us. And do not lead us into temptation.’
L 11:5-8  C. Friend at Midnight

And He said to them, “which one of you will have a friend, and will go to him at midnight, and would say to > him, ‘Friend, lend me three loaves; since my friend came to me from a journey, I do not have what I will give him.’

“And that one, from within would say, ‘Do not be causing me toil!’ My door is already shut, and my children are with me in bed. I am not able, having risen, to give to you.’

“I say to > you, if, having risen, he will not give to him because he is his friend, because of his shamelessness, having woken up, he will give him as many as he needs.”

Q 11:9-13

And I say > to you, ask and it will be given to you, seek and you will find, knock and it will be opened.

For every asker receives, and the seeker finds, and it is opened to the knocker.

Which father among you, if his son asks for a fish, will instead give him a snake?

Or if he also asks for an egg, will give him a scorpion?

If you who are evil know to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your father from heaven give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him?

Q 11:14-26

And he was casting out a demon, [and it was] mute. The demon having gone out, the person who was mute spoke and the crowd was amazed. Certain ones among them said, “He is casting out demons by Beelzebul, the ruler of the demons.”

Others, testing him, were seeking a sign from heaven.

But him, knowing their thoughts, said > to them, ‘Every kingdom that is divided against itself will become desolate, and a house will fall upon a house.

‘But if Satan is also divided against himself, how will his kingdom be established?

For you are saying that I cast out the demons by Beelzebul.
‘But if I cast the demons out by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Because of this, they will be your judges. But if by the finger of God I am casting out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you.

‘When a strong man is fully armed, he will guard his own courtyard. His belongings are at peace. But when one stronger than him, having come, defeats him, he takes away the armour in which he trusted, and divides his spoil.

‘The one who is not with me is against me, and the one who does not gather, scatters.

‘When the unclean spirit goes out from a person, it goes through dry places seeking rest, and does not find it. [Then] it says, ‘I will return to my house from which I came, and coming he finds it swept and decorated. Then it goes and brings seven spirits worse than itself, and they go into that house and live there, and it happens that the end of that person is worse than his start.’

L 11:27-28  D. Blessing of Jesus’ true kindred

It came to pass

while he was saying these things

A certain woman, having raised her voice from the crowd said to > him, ‘Blessed is the womb that carried you, and the breasts which you sucked.’

But he said, ‘On the contrary, blessed are those who are hearing the word of God and doing it.’

Q 11:29 – 12:12

The crowd gathering around him, he began to say, ‘This generation is an evil generation. It is seeking a sign, and a sign will not be given to it except for the sign of Jonah, for just as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so also the Son of Humanity will be to this generation.

‘The Queen of the South will be raised up at the judgment with the men of this generation and see, one who is greater than Solomon is here. The Men of Ninevah will rise in the judgment against this generation and see, one who is greater than Jonah is here.
‘Nobody takes a light and puts it in a secret place [or under a basket], but on a lamp stand so that* those who enter may see the light.

‘The light of the body is your eye. When your eye is good, your whole body is also* illuminated. But if your eye is bad then your whole body is also* in darkness.

‘Take care that the light in you is not darkness.

‘If then your body is wholly illuminated, with no part being in darkness, it will be wholly illuminated, as when a lamp illuminates you with its rays.’

While he was speaking, a Pharisee asks if he would eat with him. Going in, he reclined. But the Pharisee marveled, seeing that he did not wash before the meal.

The Lord said to him, ‘Now, you Pharisees wash the outside of the cup and* the plate, but your inside is full of grasping and* evil. Fools! Does no the one who made the outside also* make the inside? Give generously what is inside, and* see, everything will be clean for you.

‘But woe to you, Pharisees, for you tithe mint and* rue and* every garden herb, and* you neglect judgment and* the love of God. You ought to have done these things without neglecting the others.

‘Woe to you Pharisees, for you love the best seats in the synagogue, and* greetings in the marketplace.

‘Woe to you, for you are like unmarked graves, and* the people who walk over you do not realise.

A certain lawyer, having answered, says > to him, ‘Teacher, saying these things, you insult us too*!’

But he said, ‘And* to you lawyers, woe!

‘For you load people with heavy burdens, and* don’t touch the burdens with one finger.

‘Woe to you, for you build tombs for the prophets your fathers killed. So you are witnesses and* approve of the works of your fathers, for they killed them, but you build them.

‘Because of this the Wisdom of God also* said, ‘I will send to them prophets and* apostles, and* of them, they will kill and* persecute,’ so that* the blood of all the prophets from
the foundation of the world may be charged to this
generation, from the blood of Abel, to the blood of Zechariah
who perished between the altar and the sanctuary, yes I say
> to you, it will all be charged to this generation.

‘Woe to you, lawyers, for you took the key of knowledge.
You did not go in, and you withheld from those who were
going in.”

From then on, him having left, the scribes and Pharisees
began to hold a terrible grudge against him, and to
question him closely about more things, laying in wait to
catch what came out of his mouth.

When the countless crowds had gathered together, so that
they were trampling each other, he began to say to his
disciples,

‘Guard yourselves against the yeast – which is hypocrisy – of
the Pharisees.

‘For there is nothing that is concealed that will not be
revealed, or hidden that will not be known, for as much as is
said in the darkness will be heard in the light, and what you
said into someone’s ear in a private room will be proclaimed
on the rooftops.’

But I say > to you my friends, ‘Do not fear the ones who can
kill the body and after that does not have anything more to
do.

‘But I will show you what to fear. Fear the one who, after the
killing, has authority to cast into Gehenna. Yes, I tell > you,
fear this one.

‘Don’t they sell five# sparrow for two assaria? And not one
of them is forgotten before God. But even the all the hairs
of your head have been counted. Do not fear, you are of
more value than many sparrows.

‘I say > to you, who ever confesses me before people, the Son
of Humanity will also confess them before the angels of
God.

‘but the one who denies me before people will be denied
before the angels of God.

‘And everyone who will say a word against the Son of
Humanity, it will be forgiven him, but it shall not be forgiven
to the one who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit.

‘And when they bring you to the synagogues and rulers and
authorities, do not worry about how you ought to defend
yourself or what you ought to say, for the Holy Spirit will
Teach you in that hour the things you must say.”
L 12:13-21  

**E. Parable of the rich fool**

A certain one from the crowd said to > him, ‘Teacher, tell > my brother to share the inheritance with me!’

He said to > him, ‘Sir, who made me a judge or mediator over you?’

He said > to them, ‘Keep watch, and guard yourselves against all greed, for life is not in the surplus of a certain one’s possessions.’

He told them a parable, saying, ‘A certain rich person’s field produced good crops, and he debated in himself saying, “What shall I do, for I do not have a place to store my harvest?”

‘And he said, “this is what I will do, I will pull down my barns and build greater ones, and I will store there all my grain, and my good things’

‘And I will say > to my soul, Soul, you have many good things stored up for many years. Rest, eat, drink, celebrate’!”

‘God said > to him, “Fool! This night they will demand your soul from you. And the things you have prepared, to whom shall they be?”

‘Like this is the one who stores treasures for themself, and is not rich towards God.’

Q 12:22-34

He said to his disciples,

‘Because of this I say > to you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat, or about your body, what you will wear, for life is more than food, and the body is more than clothing.

‘Consider the crows, that neither sow nor reap, they have neither store-room nor granary, and God feeds them. How much more are you worth than birds?

‘Which one among you is able to add one cubit to their stature by worrying?

‘If then you are not able to do the smallest thing, why do you worry about the rest?

‘Consider the lilies, how they grow, that neither labour nor spin. I say > to you that not even Solomon in all his glory was dressed like one of these. If God thus clothes the grass,
which is in the field one day and\(^a\) thrown into the furnace the
next, how much more you, people of little faith?

‘And\(^b\) you, do not seek after what you will eat and\(^c\) drink,
and\(^d\) do not worry. All the nations of the world are seeking
after these things. But of you, the Father knows that you
need them. But seek his kingdom, and\(^e\) these things will be
added to you.

‘Do not fear, little flock, for the Father is well-pleased to
give you the kingdom. Sell your belongings, and\(^e\) give
mercifully.

‘Make for yourselves purses that are not aging, an unfailing
treasure in the heavens, where thieves no not come, nor
moths spoil, for where your treasure is, there your heart will
also\(^e\) be.’

L 12:35-38  F. Parable of the doorkeeper

Let your loins be clothed\(^f\), and\(^g\) your lamps burning, and\(^h\) be
like people who expect the Lord himself when he may return to
the wedding banquet\(^i\) so that\(^*\) him coming and\(^k\) knocking,
they shall open for him. Blessed are those slaves who, coming,
the Lord shall find awake. I say to \(>\) you truly, he will clothe\(^v\)
himself and\(^k\) seat them at table, and\(^k\) having gone in he will
serve them. Even if he comes in the second or even in the third
watch, and\(^k\) if he finds them, those ones shall be blessed.

Q 12:39-59

But know this. If the ruler of house had known in what hour
the thief was coming, he would not have left his house to be
broken into. And\(^b\) you, become people who are ready, for
you do not know at what hour the son of humanity is coming.

And Peter said, ‘Lord, are you telling us this parable, or also\(^k\)
to everyone?’

And\(^b\) the Lord said,

‘Who then is the wise, faithful steward, whom the Lord will
appoint over his servants to give rations at the right time?
Blessed is that servant whom the Lord shall find doing so
when he comes. I tell \(>\) you truly, he will appoint him over all
his possessions.

‘If that servant should say in his heart, “My Lord is delaying to
return”, and\(^k\) he begins to beat his male and\(^k\) female
servants, and\(^k\) to eat, drink and\(^k\) get drunk, the servant’s
master will come in that hour when the servant does not
expect. And in that hour which he doesn’t know, he will also cut him into pieces and assign him an inheritance among the faithless.

‘That servant who knew the will of his Lord and does not prepare or do his will, he will punish greatly. But the one who does not know, but who does things worthy of beatings, will be punished a little.

‘From everyone to whom much is given, much will be sought, and from the one to whom much is entrusted, more will be asked.

‘I have come to cast fire on the earth, and how I wish it was already kindled.

‘I have a baptism with which to be baptized, and how I am suffering until it is finished.

‘Do you think that I have come to bring peace on the earth? No, I say to you, but division. From now on there shall be five in one household divided three against two and two against three. Father will be divided against son, and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother. Mother-in-law against bride and bride against mother-in-law.

‘And he said to the crowd, “When you see the cloud rise in the west, you immediately say ‘a storm is coming’, and so it happens. And when the south wind is blowing, you say ‘it will be hot’, and it happens. Hypocrites! The face of the earth and the sky, you know to interpret. How do you not know to interpret this opportunity?”

‘And why do you not judge what is right from yourselves?

‘For as you go before a magistrate with your opponent, on the way, make an effort to reconcile with them. Maybe they will drag you before the judge, and the judge will hand you over to the officer, and the officer will throw you in jail. I say to you, you won’t get out of there until you have even paid the last lepton.”

L 13:1-17, 31-33   G. Dispute with the Pharisees triptych
Q 13:18-30; 34-35

On that occasion, certain ones were present, announcing to him about the Galileans whose blood Pilate mixed with their sacrifices.
And having answered, he said to them, ‘Are you thinking that these Galileans were sinners compared to all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things? No, I say to you! But unless you repent, all of you will be destroyed similarly.

‘Or those eighteen’ on whom the tower in Siloam fell and killed them, do you think that they became debtors compared to all the people living in Jerusalem? No, I say to you! But unless you repent, all of you will be destroyed in the same way.’

He told this parable, ‘A certain one planted himself a fig tree in his vineyard, and he, having come seeking fruit in it, did not find. He said to the gardener, “See, for three years I am coming to seek fruit in this fig tree and I am not finding, [so] cut it down! Why is it even using up land?”

‘Having answered, he says to him, “Lord, leave it, even this year until when I will dig around it and thrown down manure. And if it produces fruit in the coming year – but if not, you will cut it down.”’

He was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbaths, and see, a woman having a spirit of sickness eighteen years and was bent double and was not able to straighten up at all. Seeing her, Jesus called out and said to her, ‘Woman, you are released from your sickness.’

And He placed his hands on her and immediately she straightened up and was giving glory to God.

The leader of the synagogue, indignant that Jesus healed on the sabbath, having answered, was saying to the crowd, ‘There are six days in which it is necessary to work. Coming, be healed on those, and not on the sabbath day.’

The Lord answered him and said, ‘Hypocrites, does not each of you on the sabbath release his ox or his donkey from his feeding trough, and having led it up, water it? This one being a daughter of Abraham, see, Satan bound her even eighteen years, was it not necessary for her to be loosed from her chain on the sabbath day?’

And him saying these things, all those who opposed him were ashamed and the whole crowd was rejoicing in all the glorious things being done by him.

Then he said, ‘What is the kingdom like, and what shall I compare it to? It is like a grain of mustard, which a person took and planted in their garden, and it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the sky nested in its branches.’
And again he said, ‘What shall I compare the kingdom of God to? It is like yeast which a woman, having taken it, hid in three satons of flour, until all of it was leavened.’

And he travelled through cities and villages, teaching and making his way to Jerusalem.

Someone said to > him, ‘Lord, if only a few are being saved…?’ He said to them, ‘Struggle to enter through the narrow gate, for many, I say to > you, will seek to enter and not be capable, for whom the house-master will rise and lock the door, and you will begin to stand outside and knock the door saying, “Lord, open to us!”, and having answered he will say to > you, “I do not know where you are from.” Then you will begin to say, “we were eating and drinking with you, and you taught in our wide streets.” And saying he will say to > you, “I do not know where you are from. Go away from me, all workers of unrighteousness! There, there shall be weeping and grinding of teeth, when you shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, but yourselves cast out of there. And they will come from east and west, and from north and south and sit down to eat in the kingdom of God, and behold there are the last ones who will be first, and there are the first ones who will be last.”

In this hour, Certain Pharisees came saying to > him, ‘Get out and go from here, for Herod is seeking to kill you.’

And he said to > them, “having gone, you tell > this fox, ‘See, I am casting out demons, and I shall accomplish healings today and tomorrow and the third, I am finished.’

‘Yet it is necessary for me to journey today and tomorrow and the next, for it is not possible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem.

‘Jerusalem! Jerusalem! The city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it. How often I have desired to gather your children together, as a hen does her own brood under her wings, and you were not willing. See, your house is desolate. I say to > you, you will not see me until you say “Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!”’

L 14:1-24; 28-33    H. The Great Feast

Q 14:25-27; 34-35
And it came to pass

When he went into the house of a certain one of the leaders of the Pharisees on the sabbath to eat bread and

and see, a certain person before him had the dropsy.

And Having answered, Jesus spoke to the lawyers and the Pharisees saying, ‘Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath or not?’

They were silent, and having taken hold, he healed him and let go, and he said to them, ‘Which one of you, if his child or an ox has fallen into a well, will not immediately lift him out on the sabbath day?’

And they were not able to reply to him about these things.

He told a parable to the ones who were invited, noticing that they were choosing places of honour, saying to them,

‘Whenever you are invited by a certain one to a wedding banquet, do not recline in a place of honour, in case one more distinguished than you may be invited by him. And the one who also invited you, having come, will say to you, “give place to this one”, and then with shame you may begin to take the last place.

‘But, whenever you are invited, having gone, sit down at the last place, so that when he comes, the one who invited you may say to you, “Friend, move up higher!” Then it shall be a glory to you in front of everyone sitting at table with you.

‘For everyone who is self-exalting will be humbled, but the one who is self-humbling will be exalted.’

And he said to the one who invited him,

‘When you have a feast or a banquet, do not summon your friends, or your brothers, or your relatives, or your rich neighbours, otherwise they also will invite you back and a repayment be made to you.

‘But when you have a feast, invite poor ones, disabled ones, lame ones, blind ones, and you shall be blessed, for they have nothing to repay you, for you shall be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous.’

Having heard, a certain one of the dinner guests said to him, ‘Blessed is whoever eats bread in the kingdom of God.’

He said to him, ‘A certain person had a great banquet, and invited many people, and he sent his servant to say to the people who were invited, “Come, it is now ready!” And all from one they began to make excuses.
‘The first said to > him, “I have bought a field and™ I have a
duty to go out and see it. I ask you, have me excused.”

‘And™ another said, “I have bought five pair of oxen, and™ I am
going to examine them. I ask you, have me excused.”

‘And™ another said, “I have married a woman and™ because of
this I am not able to come.”

‘And™ Having returned, the servant announced these things to
> his master. Then, having become angry, the householder
said to > his servant, “Go out quickly into the wide streets
and™ the alleys, and™ lead in here poor ones, and™ disabled
ones, and™ blind ones, and™ lame ones.”

‘And™ the servant said, “Master, what you commanded has
happened, and™ yet there is space.”

‘And™ The master said to the servant, “Be going into the roads
and™ lanes and™ compel them to come so that™ my house may
be filled. For I say to > you that no one of those men I invited
will taste my banquet.”’

And great crowds were journeying with him, and™ having
turned, her said to them,

‘If anyone comes to me, and™ does not hate his own father,
and™ his mother and™ his wife and™ his children and™ his
brothers and™ sisters,

and™ yet more, his own life,

is not able to be my student.

‘[NIV: And™] Whoever does not carry his own cross and™
come after me is not able to be my student.

‘Which one among you, wanting to build a tower™, does not
first, having sat down, calculate the cost™, if he has enough to
complete it, * unless having laid its foundation, and™ not being
able to finish, everyone who is watching may begin to ridicule
him, saying, “This man began to build and™ is not able to
finish.”

‘If a certain king, journeying against another king to engage in
a battle, does he not first, having sit down, deliberate if he is
able with ten thousand to go out to meet the one who comes
against him with twenty thousand?

‘Otherwise, him still being far off™, having sent a delegation,
he petitions for peace.

‘In this way they, each of you who does not renounce all of
his possessions, is not able to be my disciple.
Salt is good, but if salt also loses its flavour how will it be seasoned? It is not fit for soil or for manure, they cast it out! The one who has ears to hear, let them hear.’

G’ Dispute with the Pharisees and ‘lost and found’ triptych 15:1-32

All the tax collectors and the sinners were drawing near to hear him. And The Pharisees and the scribes were complaining, saying, “This one receives sinners and eats with them.”

He said to them this parable, saying, ‘Which certain person among you, having one hundred sheep, and having lost one of them does not leave the ninety-nine in the wilderness and journey for the lost until he finds it? And finding it, he lays it on his shoulders rejoicing. And going to his home, he calls together his friends and neighbours, saying to them, “rejoice with me, for I have found my lost sheep.”

‘I say to you that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner repenting than over ninety-nine righteous ones who do not have a need of repentance.

‘Or which certain woman having ten drachmas, if she loses one drachma, does not light a lamp and sweep the house and search carefully until she finds it? And having found it, she calls together her friends and neighbours, having said, “rejoice with me, for I have found my lost drachma.” I am saying to you, there is such joy before the angels of God over one sinner repenting.

He said, ‘A certain person had two sons. And the younger of them said to the Father, ‘Give me the part of your wealth that is due’, so he divided to them his possessions. And after not many days, gathering everything together, the younger son left into a far country. And There, he wasted his wealth on reckless living.

‘Him having spent everything, a severe famine occurred in that country, and he began to be in need. And having gone, he joined himself to one of the citizens of that country, and he was sending him into the field to tend pigs, and he was longing to be fed on the pods of which the pigs were eating, and nobody was giving to him.

‘Having come to himself, he was saying, “How many of my father’s labourers have plenty of bread? Here, I am dying of hunger! Having gotten up, I will go to my father and say to him, “Father, I have sinned to heaven and before you. I am no longer worthy to be called your son. Do to me as unto one of your labourers.”’
‘And having gotten up, he went to his own father. Him being yet far away from a distance, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and running he fell on his neck and kissed him.

‘The son said to him, “Father, I have sinned to heaven and before you. I am no longer worthy to be called your son...”

‘The father said to his servants, “Quick, bring out the best robe and put it on him, and Give a ring to his hand and shoes to his feet, and bring the fatted calf. Slaughter, and having eaten we may rejoice. For this, my son was dead and lived. He was lost, and was found.” And they began to rejoice.

‘Now his older son was in the field, and as he was going he approached the house. He heard music and dancing. And Having called over one of the boys, he was inquiring what these things might be. He said to him, “Your brother is here, and your father has slaughtered the fatted calf, for he has received him in good health.”

‘He was angry and did not want to go in, so his father, having gone out, appealed to him. Having answered, he said to his father, “See, all these years I am serving you, and never broke your commandments, and to me, you never gave a goat so that I may rejoice with my friends. But when your son came, having devoured your possessions with prostitutes, you slaughtered for him the fatted calf.”

‘He said to him, “Child, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours. It was necessary for us to rejoice and be glad, for this your brother was dead and lived, and He was lost, and was found.”

F’ Dishonest Manager 16:1-15

He was also saying to his disciples, ‘A certain person was rich, who had a manager, and accusations were brought to him that this one was wasting his possessions. And having addressed him, he said to him, “Why am I hearing this about you? Give an account of your management. You are therefore no longer able to be my manager.”

‘The manager said to himself, “What shall I do, for my master is taking my management position from me? I do not have the strength to dig; I am ashamed to beg.

“‘I know what I shall do, so that when I am removed from my management position, they may receive me into their houses.’ And having summoned one by one each of his master’s debtors, he said to the first, “How much do you
owe my master?” He said, “One hundred baths of olive oil.” He said to him, “Take your bills and having sat down, quickly write ‘fifty’.” Then to another he said, “How much do you owe?” He said, “One hundred measures of wheat.” He said to him, “Take your bill and write ‘eighty’.”

‘And the master praised the unjust manager, who acted wisely. For the sons of this age are wiser in their own generation than the sons of light.

‘And I say to you, make you yourself friends of unjust mammon, so that when it is gone, you may be received into eternal tents. The one who is faithful in the least is also faithful in much, and the one who is unjust in the least is unjust in much. If then, you have not become faithful with unjust mammon, who shall entrust the genuine thing to you? And if you have not been faithful with another person’s thing, who will give you your own? No house-slave is able to serve two masters. Either he will hate the one and love the other, or hold to one and despise the other. It is not possible to serve God and mammon.’

The Pharisees, being lovers of money, heard all these things, and were making fun of him. And he said to them, ‘You are the ones who justify yourselves before people, but God knows your hearts, that the thing which is exalted by people is an abomination before God.

Q 16:16-18

‘The law and the prophets are until John. From then, the kingdom of God is preached, and everyone is forcing their way into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one pen-stroke of the law to fall.

‘Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and the one who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery.

E’ Rich Man and Lazarus 16:19-31

‘A certain person was rich and he was clothed in purple cloth and fine linen, while he rejoiced splendidly every day. A certain poor person named Lazarus was cast at his gate and he was covered in sores. And he longed to be fed with the things that fell from the table of the rich man, but instead, his dogs came to lick his sores.
‘It happened when the poor person died, and** he was carried by the angels into the presence of Abraham, that the rich person also** died, and** was buried.

‘And** in Hades, having raised his eyes and being in pain, he sees in the distance*, Abraham, and** Lazarus in his presence.

‘And** having called out, he said, “Father Abraham, have mercy’ on me and** send Lazarus so that* he may dip the tip of his finger in water and** cool my tongue, for I am suffering in this flame.

‘Abraham said, “Child, remember that you received your good things during your life, and** Lazarus, similarly, the bad things. Now, in this place, he is being comforted while you suffer. And** in all these things, a great chasm was established between us and** you, that those who wish to cross over to you from here are not able to cross over, nor from there to us.

‘He said, “I petition you, Father, so that* you may send him to the house of my father, for I have five* brothers, so that he might warn > them so that* they might not also* come to this place of torment.

‘Abraham says, “They have Moses and** the prophets, let them listen to them.”

‘He said, “No, Father Abraham, but if a certain one of the dead came to them, they would repent.”

‘He said to > him, “If they do not listen to Moses and** the prophets, then not even if a certain one of the dead rises will they be convinced.”’

Q 17:1-6

He said to his disciples, ‘It is impossible that obstacles should not come, and yet woe to the one by whom they come. It is preferable for that one if a millstone is secured around their neck and** they are lowered into the ocean, than for them* to cause one of the least of these to stumble.

‘Watch yourselves!

‘If your brother sins against you, reprimand him; and** if he repents forgive him, and** if seven times a day he sins against you, and** seven times turn to you saying ‘I repent’, forgive him.’

And** the apostles said to the Lord, ‘increase our faith.’

And the Lord said, ‘If you have faith as a grain of mustard, you would have said to this mulberry tree, “be uprooted and** planted in the sea!” and** it would have obeyed you.'
D’ Dutiful Servants and a thankful Samaritan Leper 17:7-19

“Which one of you having a servant plowing or keeping sheep, who comes in from the field will say to > him, “quickly, coming, sit down.” Will you not say to > him, “Prepare what I shall eat and having dressed, serve me while I am eating and drinking, and after these things shall you also eat and drink.”

‘Do not have gratitude to a servant who did all the things commanded? Similarly also with you, when you have done all the things commanded to > you, say “we are merely servants, who are obligated to do what we have done.”’

And it happened as he was journeying to Jerusalem, and passed through the middle of Samaria and Galilee,

and Him going into a certain village, ten leprous men met him, who stood far off. And they raised a cry saying, ‘Jesus, Master, have mercy on us.’

And seeing, he said to > them, ‘Having gone, show yourself to the priest.’ And It happened while they were going up that they were cleansed. One of them, having seen that he was healed, he turned, praising God with a loud voice. And He fell on his face at his feet, giving thanks to > him; and he was a Samaritan. Having answered, Jesus said, “Were not ten cleansed? But where are the nine? Were they not found, having returned, to give glory to God, except this foreigner?” And he said to > him, “Having gotten up, go. Your faith has saved you.”

Q 17:20-37

Being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come,

having answered > them he also said,

‘The kingdom of God does not come with observation, nor will they say, “See it is here!” or “there!”, for the kingdom of God is inside you.’

And he said to the disciples,

‘Days are coming when you will long to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and you won’t see. And they will say to > you, ‘look, there!’ and ‘look here!’ Do not go and do not seek.
'For just as lightening shines when it flashes from under the sky to above the sky, so shall the Son of humanity be on his day. But first it is necessary for him to suffer many things and be rejected by this generation.

‘And just as it happened in the days of Noah, so shall it also be in the days of the Son of humanity. They were eating, drinking, marrying and being married until the day Noah went into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed everyone.

‘In the same way, just as it happened in the days of Lot, they were eating, drinking, buying, selling, planting, building, but in the day in which Lot left Sodom, fire and sulphur rained from heaven and destroyed everyone.

‘It shall be according to these things in the day in which the Son of humanity is revealed.

‘In that day, whoever is on the roof and his stuff in his house, should not go down and get it. And similarly, the one who is in the field should not turn back to what is behind. Remember Lot’s wife!

‘Whoever will seek to preserve his soul will destroy it, and whoever will destroy it will give life to it.

‘I say to you on this night there will be two in one bed; the one shall be taken and the other one left.

‘There will be two women grinding grain together; the one shall be taken and the other one left.’

And having answered they said to him, ‘where, Lord?’ He said to them, ‘where the body is, there also the vultures will congregate.’

C’ Unjust Judge 18:1-8

He told them a parable that they must always pray and not become discouraged, saying, ‘There was a certain judge in a certain city, not fearing God and not respecting people. There was a widow in that city and she came to him saying, “Get justice for me from my opponent,” and he was not willing for a while, but after these things he said to himself, “Even if I do not fear God or respect people, yet because this widow causes me toil, I will get her justice, so that she might not wear me out, continually coming.”’

The Lord said, ‘hear what the unrighteous judge is saying. Shall not God do justice for his chosen ones who cry out to him by day and by night, and delay them? I say to you, he
will do justice for them quickly. Yet, the Son of Humanity coming, will he find faith on the earth?’

B Pharisee/Tax Collector, Zacchaeus 18: 9-14; 19:1-10

And he said this parable

to some who were persuaded in themselves that they were righteous, and despised the rest.

‘Two people went into the temple to pray, one a Pharisee and the other a Tax Collector. The Pharisee, having stood by himself, prayed these things, “God, I am giving thanks to you that I am not like the rest of people, greedy, unrighteous, adulterers, or even like this tax collector. I fast two times a week, and I tithe everything that I acquire.

‘The tax collector, standing in the distance’, did not want to raise his eyes to the sky, but beat his chest saying, “God, have mercy on me, the sinful one.

‘I say to you, he went to his home justified, rather than that one.

‘for everyone who is self-exalting will be humbled, but the one who is self-humbling will be exalted.’

And having entered Jericho, he passed through it.

And behold, there was a man named Zacchaeus. And he was a head chief tax collector and he was rich. And he was trying to see who Jesus was, and he was not able to from the crowd because he was short of stature. And having run on ahead, he climbed up a sycamore tree so that he might see him, for he was about to go through there. And as he went to the place, having looked up, Jesus said to him, ‘Zacchaeus! Having hurried up, come down! For it is necessary for me to stay in your house today.’

And having hurried up he came down and rejoicing, he received him as a guest. And having watched, everyone was complaining, saying “with a sinful man he has gone in to find lodging.”

Having halted, Zacchaeus said to the Lord, ‘See, I am giving half my possessions, Lord, to the poor; and if I have falsely accused anyone of anything, I am repaying it four times.’

Jesus said to him, ‘Today, salvation has happened in this house, because he also is a son of Abraham.

‘For the Son of Humanity came to seek and save the lost.’

Q 19:11-27
Hearing these things from them, having proceeded, he said a parable, because he was near to Jerusalem, and it seemed to them that the kingdom of God was about to appear.

He said to them

‘a certain’ noble person travelled to a far country
to receive a kingdom, and return.

But having called ten slaves to himself, he gave them ten minas, and he said to them, “use what I have given you to engage in trade.”

‘But his citizens hated him and they sent an ambassador to him saying, “We are not willing for this person to reign over us.”

‘And it happened when he returned,

having received the kingdom,

that he also ordered the slaves whom he had given the money to be called to him, in order to know what they profited.

‘The first one came, saying, “Master, your mina earned ten minas.”

‘And he said to him, “Well done, good slave, for you have been faithful in the a small thing, have authority over ten cities.”

‘And the second came saying, “Your mina, master, made five minas.”

‘And he said to this one, “And you shall be over five cities.”

‘And the other one came saying, “Lord, see your mina, which I have kept in a handkerchief, for I feared you, that you are a severe man. You take what you did not deposit and you reap what you did not sow.”

‘He says to him, “From your own mouth I will judge you, wicked servant. You knew that I am a severe man, taking what I did not deposit and reaping what I did not sow. ‘And why did you not give my money to the bank, and I having come might have collected it with interest?”

‘And to those who were present he said, “Take the mina from him and give it to the one who has ten minas.”
And^ they said to > him, “Master, he has ten" minas”

‘I say to > you that to all those who have, it shall be given, and^ from those who do not have, what they have will also be taken away.

‘However, these enemies of mine who did not want me to rule, bring them here and^ slaughter them before me.’

A’ Jerusalem’s Visitation 19:41-44

And^ as he approached, beholding the city, he wept over it, saying,

‘And^ if you knew on this day the things that are towards peace... but now they are hidden from your eyes. For days are coming on you when your enemies shall also^ surround your palisades, and^ surround you, and^ hem you in on every side, and^ they shall dash you on the ground and even^ the children within you, and^ they shall not leave a stone on a stone within you, on account of you did not recognise the opportune moment of your visitation.’

Proto-Luke 22 (various verses)

3... But Satan entered into Judas called Iskariot, being of the number of the twelve ... 8And^ he sent Peter and^ John, saying, ‘When you go, prepare for us the Passover so that * we may eat.’ 14...And^ when the hour came, he reclined, and^ the apostles with him, 15and^ he said to them,

‘With longing have I longed to eat this Passover with you before my suffering. 16for I say to you that I will not eat it until this is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.’ 17And^ taking a cup, and giving thanks, he said, ‘Take this and^ divide it among yourselves... 21but see, the hand of my betrayer is with me on the table’ ... 23and^ they began to interrogate one another as to who it may be among them, who was about to do this. 24And^ an argument happened between them, as to which of them appeared to be greatest, 25but he said to them, ‘The kings of the nations rule over them, and^ those who have authority over them are called benefactors. 26But you, do not be like them. But let the greatest among you become like the youngest, and^ the leader like the servant. 27For who is greater, the dinner-guest or the servant? Isn’t it the dinner-guest? But among you, I am like a servant.
You are the ones who have remained with me during my trials, and I grant you, just as my Father has granted me, royal power, so that you may eat and you may drink at my table in the time of my royal power, and will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Simon! See, Satan has asked permission to sift the disciples like wheat, but I have prayed for you, so that your faithfulness will not give out. And you, when you've returned, re-establish your brothers.' ...

And he said to them, 'When I sent you out without a money-bag and a travel-bag and shoes, did you lack anything?' They said, 'Nothing.' And he said to them, 'But now, let the one who has a money-bag take it! The same with a travel-bag! And let the one who has none sell his cloak and buy a dagger. For I say to you that this which is written must be fulfilled by me, “And he was reckoned with the outlaws.” And so, that which is about me has a fulfillment.'

And they said, 'Lord, look, here are two swords.' And he replied, 'It is enough.' While he was speaking, see, a crowd and the one called Judas ... When those who were around him saw what was happening, they said, 'Lord, will we slay them with the sword?' ... But Jesus replied saying, 'let go of this! ... this is your hour, and the power of darkness!'
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