

**LUKE'S PREFACE AND THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM**

**James W. Scott**

**A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews**



**1986**

**Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:**

**<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>**

**Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:**

**<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/8792>**

**This item is protected by original copyright**

LUKE'S PREFACE AND THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

A Thesis Submitted to  
the Faculty of Divinity, St Mary's College  
University of St Andrews  
in Candidacy for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

J. W. Scott

August 1985



Tu A357

## ABSTRACT

The preface to Luke's gospel (Lk. 1:1-4), when properly exegeted, says this: "(1) Since many have undertaken to draw up a narrative account of the things that are well-established among us, (2) just as those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed them down to us, (3) I have decided, for my part, having been a follower of them all for a long time, to write an accurate narrative for you, most excellent Theophilus, (4) in order that you may know what is certain with regard to the matters in which you have been instructed." Luke's claim to have been a follower of the apostles (vs. 3), and thus conversant with their oral gospel tradition (vs. 2), is confirmed by an ecclesiastical tradition that can be traced back to one of those very apostles.

Luke implies that he did not use written sources in the composition of his gospel, for unlike ancient historians who did use written sources, he does not acknowledge any use of his predecessors' narratives. In writing "an accurate narrative" he would not have relied upon what he considered to be the inaccurate narratives of his predecessors. Luke indicates that his gospel records the oral tradition that he has learned directly from the apostles.

The leading theories of synoptic origins tend to collapse into an oral theory under the weight of Luke's literary independence. The arguments hitherto advanced against the oral theory are inadequate. The oral tradition consisted of a basic narrative tradition

(which is reconstructed) and a body of independent tradition. Luke and Matthew drew upon both traditions, but Mark confined himself to the former. Our two-tradition theory is corroborated, especially in comparison with the standard two-source theory, by various literary and stylistic phenomena.

Supervisor's Declaration

I certify that James W. Scott has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1 (as amended), and is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.....

Candidate's Declaration

I was admitted as a research student under Ordinance 350 (General No. 12) on 30th January, 1980, and as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D. under Resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1 (as amended) on 13th February, 1981.

The following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, is my own composition, and has not previously been presented for a higher degree. The research was carried out in the University of St Andrews under the supervision of Professor R. McL. Wilson.

Copyright Declaration

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

## PREFACE

It may seem strange that a writer addressing the synoptic problem would devote ten chapters to Luke's preface and only two to the literary phenomena that give rise to the problem. However, Luke's preface provides the only direct evidence bearing upon synoptic origins, and ten chapters proved to be necessary in order to establish what Luke actually says and implies in it. These ten chapters would have constituted a thesis by themselves, but my conclusions would have met with incredulity, since the literary phenomena of the synoptics seem to contradict them. Therefore, the final two chapters were added in order to show that the literary data can be reasonably explained in agreement with my interpretation of Luke's preface. These two chapters were originally intended merely to lend a measure of credibility to my exegesis, and not to make out a positive case in their own right. But a positive case did develop, providing unexpectedly strong confirmation for the understanding of gospel origins worked out from Luke's preface. In retrospect it might have been advisable to devote the entire thesis to the development of these arguments, but Luke's preface nevertheless deserves the full treatment accorded to it, especially in view of the surprising results obtained.

I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor, Professor (now Emeritus) R. McL. Wilson, for allowing me to pursue a seemingly dubious line of research, for pointing out weaknesses in my argument as it was developing, for alerting me to potential criti-

cisms, and for correcting various mistakes.

I am also grateful to those whose financial support has enabled me to pursue my research, especially my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert J. Scott, my wife, Althea, and her parents, Dr. and Mrs. Jonathan H. Cilley.

James W. Scott

August 15, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .viii

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED IN ABBREVIATED FORM . . . . .xiii

1. INTRODUCTION. . . . . 1

2. THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF LUKE'S PREFACE. . . . . 8

3. LUKE'S MANY PREDECESSORS AND THEIR NARRATIVES (VS. 1a). . . . 18

4. THE SUBJECT MATTER OF PREVIOUS NARRATIVES (VS. 1b). . . . .32

5. THE STANDARD FOR GOSPEL COMPOSITION (VS. 2) . . . . . .66

6. LUKE'S DECISION TO WRITE A GOSPEL (VS. 3) . . . . . .88

7. LUKE'S QUALIFICATION FOR WRITING (VS. 3, CONT.) . . . . . 112

8. LUKE'S PURPOSE IN WRITING (VS. 4) . . . . . . 155

9. THE ARGUMENT AND SCOPE OF LUKE'S PREFACE. . . . . . 171

10. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM IN THE LIGHT OF LUKE'S PREFACE. . . . 187

11. THE LITERARY PHENOMENA OF THE SYNOPTICS RECONSIDERED . . . 210

12. A NEW ANALYSIS OF THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION . . . . . . 266

APPENDIX. THE IDENTITY OF THE ELDER JOHN . . . . . . 315

NOTES . . . . . . 357

## ABBREVIATIONS

- AB            The Anchor Bible
- AnBib        Analecta Biblica
- ANCL        Ante-Nicene Christian Library, ed. by A. Roberts,  
              J. Donaldson, and A. Menzies
- ANRW        Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, ed. by  
              H. Temporini and W. Haase
- ASNU        Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis
- AV            The Authorized Version (King James Version) of The  
              Holy Bible (1611)
- BAG          W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English  
              Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early  
              Christian Literature, tr. and adapted from the 4th  
              ed. of W. Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch  
              (Chicago, 1957)
- BAGD        BAG, 2nd ed., rev. and augmented from W. Bauer's 5th  
              ed. by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (Chicago,  
              1979) (BAGD is cited only when it augments BAG or  
              is otherwise of special interest.)
- Bauer        W. Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den  
              Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen  
              urchristlichen Literatur (5th ed.; Berlin, 1958)
- BBB        Bonner Biblische Beiträge
- BC        The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of  
              the Apostles, ed. by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K.  
              Lake
- BDF        F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New  
              Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, tr.  
              and rev. by R. W. Funk (Chicago, 1961)
- BDR        F. Blass and A. Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestament-  
              lichen Griechisch, rev. by F. Rehkopf (14th ed.;  
              Göttingen, 1976)
- BeO        Bibbia e Oriente
- BNTC        Black's New Testament Commentaries (= Harper's)

<u>BSac</u>	<u>Bibliotheca Sacra</u>
BSGRT	Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
<u>BZ</u>	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift</u>
CBSC	The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CECNT	Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
CGTSC	Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges
Crum	W. E. Crum, <u>A Coptic Dictionary</u> (Oxford, 1939)
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
<u>DBSup</u>	<u>Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément</u>
<u>ÉHPR</u>	<u>Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</u>
<u>EQ</u>	<u>Evangelical Quarterly</u>
E.T.	English translation
ÉtB	Études bibliques
<u>EvT</u>	<u>Evangelische Theologie</u>
<u>ExpT</u>	<u>Expository Times</u>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
F.T.	French translation
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
G.T.	German translation
HCNT	Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTCNT	Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament
HTKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<u>HTR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>

ICC	The International Critical Commentary
<u>IntB</u>	<u>The Interpreter's Bible</u> , ed. by G. A. Buttrick et al.
JB	<u>The Jerusalem Bible</u> (1966)
<u>JBC</u>	<u>The Jerome Biblical Commentary</u> , ed. by R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>JETS</u>	<u>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</u>
<u>Jos. Conc.</u>	K. H. Rengstorf, ed., <u>A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus</u> (Leiden, 1973-83)
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
KEKNT	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
Lampe	G. W. H. Lampe, ed., <u>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</u> (Oxford, 1961)
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u> , New ed. rev. by H. S. Jones (Oxford, 1940)
L.T.	Latin translation
MM	J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, <u>The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</u> (London, 1914-29)
MNTC	The Moffatt New Testament Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible (also called The Century Bible, New Edition)
NC1B	The New Clarendon Bible (New Testament)
NEB	<u>The New English Bible</u> (1961, New Testament)
NICNT	The New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	The New International Version of <u>The Holy Bible</u> (1973, New Testament)
<u>NKZ</u>	<u>Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift</u>
<u>NovT</u>	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements

- NPNF A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church [First Series]  
A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church [Second/A New Series]
- NRT Nouvelle Revue Théologique
- NTAbh Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
- NTD Das Neue Testament Deutsch
- NTS New Testament Studies
- OECT Oxford Early Christian Texts
- ÖTKNT Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament
- OLD P. G. W. Glare, ed., Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford, 1968-82)
- PG J.-P. Migne, ed., Patrologiae cursus completus . . . series graeca . . . (Parisiis, 1857-66)
- PL J.-P. Migne, ed., Patrologiae cursus completus . . . series latina . . . (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1844-66)
- PW G. Wissowa et al., eds., Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (rev. ed.; Stuttgart and München, 1893-1980)
- RB Revue Biblique
- RHPR Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses
- RNT Regensburger Neues Testament
- RSV The Revised Standard Version of The Holy Bible (1946, New Testament)
- RTP Revue de théologie et de philosophie
- RV The Revised Version of The Holy Bible (1885)
- SB La Sainte Bible
- SC Sources Chrétiennes
- Smith (Mrs. Margo-  
liouth) J. P. Smith (Mrs. Margoliouth), A Compendious Syriac Dictionary (Oxford, 1903)
- SNTSMS Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
- StEv Studia Evangelica
- TCL Translations of Christian Literature

- TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, tr. and ed. by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1964-74)
- THKNT Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
- TNTC The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
- TU Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
- WGT J. H. Thayer, tr. and rev., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti (Edinburgh, 1896)
- WMANT Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
- WUNT Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
- ZB Züricher Bibelkommentare
- ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
- ZTK Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED IN ABBREVIATED FORM

Biblical Texts and Versions

- Old Testament Greek: Septuaginta. Ed. by A. Rahlfs. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1935.
- New Testament Greek: Novum Testamentum Graece. Ed. by K. Aland et al. 26th ed. of the Nestle-Aland text. Stuttgart, 1979.
- Old Latin: Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung. Ed. by A. Jülicher. Rev. by W. Matzkow and K. Aland. Vol. III: Lucas-Evangelium. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1975.
- Vulgate: Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem. Ed. by R. Weber with B. Fischer et al. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1969.
- Old Syriac: Evangelion da-Mepharreshe. Ed. by F. C. Burkitt. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1904.
- Peshitta: The New Testament in Syriac. London, 1905-20.
- Coptic  
(Bohairic): The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect Otherwise Called Memphitic and Bohairic. Vol. II: The Gospels of S. Luke and S. John. Oxford, 1898.
- Coptic  
(Sahidic): The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic. Vol. II: The Gospel according to Luke. Oxford, 1911. (Italics indicating words of Greek origin are removed in quotations.)  
Also: Quecke, H. Das Lukasevangelium saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv. - Nr. 181 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M569. Studia et Textus 6. Barcelona, 1977.

Ancient Literature: Critical Texts and Translations

If no E.T. is indicated here, translations are supplied by the

present writer.

Aelian. Varia historia. Greek text ed. by M. R. Dilts. BSGRT. Leipzig, 1974.

Ambrose. Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam. Latin text ed. with a F.T. by G. Tissot. SC, 45 and 52. Paris, 1956 and 1958.

The anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke. Greek text and Latin version ed. by W. F. Howard. "The Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels." ExpT 47 (1935-36):534-538, at p. 535.

Greek text ed. with an E.T. by R. G. Heard. "The Old Gospel Prologues." JTS, N.S. 6 (1955):1-16, at p. 7.

Aphraates (= Aphrahat). De persecutione. E.T. ("Demonstration XXI--Of Persecution") of the Syriac by J. Gwynn. NPNF, Second Series, 13, 392-402. New York and Oxford, 1898.

Appian. Historia Romana. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Roman History) by H. White. LCL. London and New York, 1912-1913.

Aristeas. Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula. Greek text ed. with an E.T. by M. Hadas. Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas). New York, 1951.

Arrian. Alexandri Anabasis. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Anabasis of Alexander) by E. I. Robson. LCL. London and New York, 1929-33.

Artemidorus. Oneirocritica. Greek text ed. by R. G. Pack. BSGRT. Lipsiae, 1963.

E.T. (The Interpretation of Dreams) by R. J. White. Ridge Park, N.J., 1975.

Athanasius. Epistula festivalis trecesima nona. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 26, 1435-1442.

E.T. ("Festal Letter 39") by A. Robertson. NPNF, Second Series, 4, 551-552. New York and Oxford, 1892.

Atheneaus. Deipnosophistae. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (The Deipnosophists) by C. B. Gulick. LCL. London and New York, 1927-41.

Augustine. De consensu evangelistarum. Latin text ed. by F. Wehrlich. CSEL, 43. Vindobonae and Lipsiae, 1904.

E.T. (The Harmony of the Evangelists) by S. D. F. Salmond. Ed. by M. B. Riddle. NPNF, [First Series,] 6, 65-236. New York, 1888.

Clement of Alexandria. Stromata. Greek text ed. by O. Stählin and reedited by L. Früchtel. GCS, Clemens Alexandrinus, 2-3. Berlin, 1960-70.

E.T. (The Miscellanies) by W. Wilson. ANCL, 4 and 12; The Writings of Clement of Alexandria, 1, 347-470 and vol. 2. Edinburgh, 1867 and 1869.

Clement of Rome. The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.

- Greek text ed. with an E.T. by J. B. Lightfoot. Fathers, Part I, II, 5-210 and 271-305.
- Clement of Rome, Pseudo-. The Clementine Homilies. Greek text ed. by B. Rehm. GCS, 42. Berlin, 1953.  
Also cited: Greek text ed. by A. R. M. Dressel. Gottingae, 1853.  
Also cited: Greek text ed. by P. de Lagarde. Leipzig, 1865.  
E.T. by T. Smith, P. Peterson, and J. Donaldson. ANGL, 17, pt. 1. Edinburgh, 1870.
- Demosthenes. De corona. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (On the Crown) by C. A. Vince and J. H. Vince. LCL, Demosthenes, 2, 1-229. London and New York, 1926.
- De falsa legatione. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (On the Embassy) by C. A. Vince and J. H. Vince. LCL, Demosthenes, 2, 231-473. London and New York, 1926.
- Oratio in Olympiodorum. Greek text ed. with an E.T. ("Against Olympiodorus") by A. T. Murray. LCL, Demosthenes, 5: Private Orations, 2, 331-369. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1939.
- Dio. Historia Romana. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Roman History) by E. Cary. LCL. London and New York, 1914-27.
- Diodorus of Sicily. Bibliotheca historica. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (The Library of History) by C. H. Oldfather et al. LCL. London and New York/Cambridge, Mass., 1933-67.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Antiquitatum Romanarum. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Roman Antiquities) by E. Clay. LCL. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1937-50.
- Dioscorides, Pedanius. De materia medica. Greek text ed. by M. Wellmann. Berlin, 1906-14.  
E.T. (The Greek Herbal of Dioscorides) by J. Goodyer. Ed. by R. T. Gunther. Oxford, 1934.
- Epictetus. Dissertationes. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Arrian's Discourses of Epictetus) by W. A. Oldfather. LCL. London and New York, 1926-28.
- Epiphanius. Adversus loxx haereses (= Panarion). Greek text ed. by K. Holl. GCS, Epiphanius, 1, 151 through 3, 496. Leipzig, 1915-33.
- Eusebius. Demonstratio evangelica. Greek text ed. by I. A. Heikel. GCS, Eusebius Werke, 6. Leipzig, 1913.  
E.T. (The Proof of the Gospel) by W. J. Ferrar. TCL, Series I, Greek Texts. London, 1920.
- Historia ecclesiastica. Greek text ed. by E. Schwartz. GCS, Eusebius Werke, 2. Leipzig, 1903-09.  
E.T. (The Ecclesiastical History) by J. E. L. Culton. Lawlor and Oulton. Eusebius, I. (Italics indicating a biblical or

- other quotation are removed in quotations.)  
 Also cited: E.T. (Church History) by A. C. McGiffert. NPNF, Second Series, 1, 1-404. New York and Oxford, 1890.  
 Also cited: E.T. (The Ecclesiastical History) of books I-V by K. Lake. LCL. London and New York, 1926.  
 Syriac version ed. by W. Wright and N. McLean. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac. Cambridge, 1898.
- Euthalius. Editio Actuum Apostolorum. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 85, 627-664.
- Euthymius Zigabenus. Commentarius in quatuor Evangelia. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 129.
- Galen. De anatomicis administrationibus. Greek text ed. by G. G. Kühn. Medicorum Graecorum Opera, Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia, 2, 215-731. Lipsiae, 1821.  
 E.T. (On Anatomical Procedures) by C. Singer. Oxford, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De naturalibus facultatibus. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (On the Natural Faculties) by A. J. Brock. LCL. London and New York, 1916.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De usu partium. Greek text ed. by G. Helmreich. BSGRT. Lipsiae, 1907.  
 E.T. (On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body) by M. T. May. Ithaca, N.Y., 1968.
- Georgius Hamartolus. Chronicon. Partial Greek text ed. with an E.T. by J. R. Harmer. Lightfoot. Fathers (ed. by Harmer), 519 and 531.
- Hermas. The Shepherd, Mandates. Greek text ed. with an E.T. by K. Lake. LCL, The Apostolic Fathers, 2, 70-137. London and New York, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Shepherd, Similitudes. Greek text ed. by M. Whitaker. GGS, 48. Berlin, 1956.  
 E.T. by F. Crombie. ANCL, 1, 375-435. Edinburgh, 1867.  
 Also cited: E.T. by J. R. Harmer. Lightfoot. Fathers (ed. by Harmer), 439-483.  
 Also cited: (Greek text ed. with an) E.T. by K. Lake. LCL, The Apostolic Fathers, 2, 138-305. London and New York, 1913.  
 Also cited: G.T. by M. Dibelius. Die Apostolischen Väter. Vol. IV: Der Hirt des Hermas. HNT, supp., 550-644. Tübingen, 1923.  
 Also cited: (Greek text ed. with a) F.T. by R. Joly. SC, 53, 210-365. Paris, 1958.  
 Also cited: E.T. by G. F. Snyder. Grant, R. M., ed. The Apostolic Fathers, 6, 94-160. Camden, N.J., 1968.
- Herodotus. Historiae. Greek text ed. with an E.T. by A. D. Godley. LCL. London and New York, 1921-24.  
 Also cited: E.T. by H. Cary. Herodotus. Bohn's Classical Library. London, 1848.  
 Also cited: E.T. by G. Rawlinson. History of Herodotus. 3rd ed. London, 1875.

- Also cited: E.T. by G. C. Macaulay. The History of Herodotus. London, 1890.
- Also cited: E.T. by J. E. Powell. Herodotus. Oxford, 1949.
- Hesychius (Abbot of Sinai). De temperantia et virtute, Centuria. Greek text with a L.T. PG, 93, 1479-1544.
- Hippocrates. De prisca medicina. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Ancient Medicine) by W. H. S. Jones. LCL, Hippocrates, 1, 1-64. London and New York, 1923.
- Ignatius. Epistle to the Ephesians. Greek text ed. with an E.T. by J. B. Lightfoot. Fathers, Part II, II, 21-89 and 543-550.
- Irenaeus. Adversus haereses. Greek text and Latin version ed. with a F.T. by A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau. SC, 100, 152, 153, 210, 211, 263, 264, 293, and 294. Paris, 1965-82.
- E.T. (Against Heresies) by A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaut. ANCL, 5 and 9, pt. 1. Edinburgh, 1868 and 1869.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Fragments of lost works. Greek texts ed. by W. W. Harvey. Sancti Irenaei, II, 470-511.
- E.T. by A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaut. ANCL, 9, pt. 1, 158-187. Edinburgh, 1869.
- Jerome. Commentariorum in Mattheum. Latin text ed. by D. Hurst and M. Adriaen. CCL, 77: S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera, pt. I: Opera Exegetica, 7. Turnholt, 1969.
- Partial E.T. ("Preface to the Commentary on Matthew") of the Migne text by H. J. Cadbury. "The Tradition." BC, II (London, 1922), 209-264, at pp. 238-239.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De viris illustribus. Latin text ed. PL, 23, 631-760.
- E.T. (Lives of Illustrious Men) by E. G. Richardson. NPNF, Second Series, 3, 359-384. New York and Oxford, 1892.
- John Chrysostom. Homiliae in Acta Apostolorum. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 60, 13-384.
- E.T. (Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles) by J. Walker, J. Sheppard, and H. Browne. Rev. by G. B. Stevens. NPNF, [First Series,] 11, 1-328. New York, 1889.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Homiliae in Matthaem. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 57, 13-472.
- E.T. (Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew) by G. Prevost. Rev. by M. B. Riddle. NPNF, [First Series,] 10. New York, 1888.
- Josephus. Antiquitates Judaicae. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Jewish Antiquities) by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. LCL, Josephus, 4-9. London and New York/Cambridge, Mass., 1930-65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Bellum Judaicum. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (The Jewish War) by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL, Josephus, 2-3. London and New York, 1927-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Contra Apionem. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Against Apion) by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL, Josephus, 1, 161-411. London and New York, 1926.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Vita. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Life) by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL, Josephus, 1, 1-159. London and New York, 1926.
- Justin. Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo. Greek text ed. by I. C. T. Otto. Opera, I, pt. II. Ienae, 1847.  
E.T. (Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew) by G. Reith. ANGL, 2, 85-278. Edinburgh, 1867.
- Lucian. Quomodo historia conscribenda sit. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (How to Write History) by K. Kilburn. LCL, Lucian, 6, 1-73. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Verae historiae. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (A True Story) by A. M. Harmon. LCL, Lucian, 1, 247-357. London and New York, 1913.
- Martyrdom of Polycarp (from the Church of Smyrna). Greek text ed. with an E.T. by J. B. Lightfoot. Fathers, Part II, III, 363-403 and 477-487.
- Origen. Commentariorum in Matthaeum. Greek text and Latin version ed. by E. Klostermann and E. Benz. GCS, Origenes Werke, 10-12. Leipzig, 1933-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Homiliae in Lucam. Jerome's Latin version and Greek fragments ed. by M. Rauer. GCS, Origenes Werke, 9, 1-222. Leipzig, 1930. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1959. (We follow the paragraph numbering adopted in the edition of H. Crouzel, F. Fournier, and P. Périchon. SC, 87. Paris, 1962.)  
Partial E.T. (with Migne's Latin text) by H. J. Cadbury. "The Tradition." BC, II (London, 1922), 209-264, at pp. 226-233.
- Philip of Side. Historia Christiana. Partial Greek text (of an epitome) ed. with an E.T. by J. R. Harmer. Lightfoot. Fathers (ed. by Harmer), 518-519 and 530-531.
- Philo. De vita Mosis. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (On the Life of Moses) by F. H. Colson. LGL, Philo, 6, 273-595. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Quod omnis probus liber sit. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Every Good Man Is Free) by F. H. Colson. LCL, Philo, 9, 1-101. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1941.
- Philostratus. Vitae sophistarum. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Lives of the Sophists) by W. G. Wright. LCL, Philostratus and Eunapius, 1-315. London and New York, 1922.
- Photius. Bibliotheca. Greek text ed. with a F.T. by R. Henry. Paris, 1959-77.  
Partial E.T. (The Library of Photius) by J. H. Freese. TCL, Series I, Greek Texts. London, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Fragmenta in Lucam. Greek text ed. with a L.T. FG, 101, 1213-1230.

- Plato. Parmenides. Greek text ed. with an E.T. by H. N. Fowler. LCL, Plato, 6, 193-331. London and New York, 1926.
- Plutarch. Moralia. Greek text ed. with an E.T. by F. C. Babbitt et al. LCL. London and New York/Cambridge, Mass., 1927-76.
- Pollux. Onomasticon. Greek text ed. by E. Bethe. Lexicographi Graeci, 9. Lipsiae, 1900-37.
- Polyaenus. Strategemata. Greek text ed. by J. Melber. BSGRT. Lipsiae, 1887.
- Polybius. Historiae. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (The Histories) by W. R. Paton. LCL. London and New York, 1922-27.
- Quintilian. Institutio oratoria. Latin text ed. with an E.T. by H. E. Butler. LCL. London and New York, 1921.
- Socrates Scholasticus. Historia ecclesiastica. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 67, 29-842.  
E.T. (Ecclesiastical History) by A. C. Zenos. NPNF, Second Series, 2, 1-178. New York and Oxford, 1891.
- Strabo. Geographica. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (Geography) by H. L. Jones. LCL. London and New York, 1917-32.
- Tacitus. Annales. Latin text ed. with an E.T. (Annals) by J. Jackson. LCL, Tacitus, 3, 255 through vol. 5. London and New York/Cambridge, Mass., 1931-37.
- Tertullian. Adversus Marcionem. Latin text ed. with an E.T. by E. Evans. OECT. Oxford, 1972.
- . De praescriptione haereticorum. Latin text ed. by R. F. Refoulé. CCSL, 1; Tertulliani Opera, pt. I, 185-224. Turnholti, 1954.  
E.T. ("On Prescription against Heretics") by P. Holmes. ANCL, 15; The Writings of Tertullian, 2, 1-54. Edinburgh, 1870.
- Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Greek text ed. by M. de Jonge. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, I, 2. Leiden, 1978.  
E.T. by H. C. Kee. In The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. I: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments, 775-828. Ed. by J. H. Charlesworth. Garden City, N.Y., 1983.
- Theophylact. Enarratio in Evangelium Lucae. Greek text ed. with a L.T. PG, 123, 691-1126.
- Thucydides. Historiae. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (History of the Peloponnesian War) by C. F. Smith. LCL. London and New York, 1919-23.
- Valens, Vettius. Anthologiae. Greek text ed. by W. Kroll. Vettii Valentis Anthologiarum Libri. Berolini, 1908.
- Xenophon. Anabasis. Greek text ed. with an E.T. (The Anabasis of Cyrus) by G. L. Brownson. LCL. London and New York, 1921-22.

Modern Literature

These works are cited in the notes by author and abbreviated title. But commentaries on Luke's gospel are, whenever feasible, cited only by the author's name. If no page number is given for a commentary, "ad loc." is assumed.

Published E.T.'s are generally used, although the original will be cited if the translation is inadequate. If both the original and the E.T. are listed in the bibliography, the abbreviated title of the original is given whenever that work is cited.

Reference is generally made to the last edition of a work, but in the notes works are listed according to the date of the first (or substantially revised) edition.

Works that are more peripheral to the subject matter of this thesis, which are cited only once (or again by "op. cit."), are cited in full in the notes.

- Abbott, E. A. "The 'Elders' of Papias." Expositor, 5th Ser. 1 (1895):333-346.
- Alexander, J. A. The Acts of the Apostles. 2 vols. London, 1857.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament. 4 vols. 5th ed. of vols. I-II; 4th ed. of vol. III; 3rd ed. of vol. IV. London, 1863-66. (1849-61.)
- Arndt, W. F. The Gospel according to St. Luke. Saint Louis, 1956.
- Bacon, B. W. "Date and Habitat of the Elders of Papias." ZNW 12 (1911):176-187.
- . "The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator." JBL 27 (1908):1-23.
- . "An Emendation of the Papias Fragment." JBL 17 (1898): 176-183.
- . An Introduction to the New Testament. New York, 1900.
- . "Le témoignage de Luc sur lui-même." F.T. RHPR 8 (1928):209-226.
- Balducelli, R. "Professor Riesenfeld on Synoptic Tradition." CBQ 22 (1960):416-421.
- Bardenhewer, O. Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur. 5 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1902-32.
- Bardy, G. "Jean le Presbytre." DBSup 4 (1949):843-847.
- Barnes, A. Notes on the New Testament, Explanatory and Practical: Luke and John. Ed. by R. Frew. Grand Rapids, 1949. (First publ., 1833.)
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel according to St John. 2nd ed. London, 1978. (1955.)

- \_\_\_\_\_. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. London, 1961.
- Barth, F. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 2nd ed. Gütersloh, 1911. (<sup>1</sup>1908.)
- Bartlet, V. "Papias's 'Exposition': Its Date and Contents." In Amicitiae Corolla (Festschrift for J. R. Harris), 15-44. Ed. by H. G. Wood. London, 1933.
- Bartsch, H.-W. Wachet aber zu jeder Zeit! Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1963.
- Bauer, J. "ΠΟΛΛΟΙ LUK 1,1." NovT 4 (1960):263-66.
- Bauernfeind, O. Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. Ed. by V. Metelmann. WUNT 22. Tübingen, 1980. (Commentary first publ. in 1939.)
- Baur, F. C. Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältniß zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung. Tübingen, 1847.
- Beck, A. Der Prolog des Lukas-Evangeliums. Amberg, 1900.
- Bengel, J. A. Gnomon of the New Testament. E.T. of 2nd Lat. ed. (1759). Rev. and ed. by A. R. Fausset. 5 vols. Edinburgh, 1857-58. (1st Lat. ed., 1742.)
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. Ed. by A. H. McNeile. ICC. 2 vols. paginated as 1. Edinburgh, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pastoral Epistles. CGTSC. Cambridge, 1899.
- Betz, H. D. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, 1979.
- Bigg, C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. ICC. 2nd ed. Edinburgh, 1902. (<sup>1</sup>1901.)
- Birks, T. R. Horae Evangelicae: or, The Internal Evidence of the Gospel History. 2nd ed. ed. by H. A. Birks. London, 1892. (<sup>1</sup>1851.)
- Bisping, A. Exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II: Erklärung der Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas. 2nd ed. Münster, 1868. (<sup>1</sup>ca. 1860.)
- Blass, F. "The Origin and Character of our Gospels." E.T. ExpT 18 (1906-07):345-347, 395-400, 458-459, 491-493, 558-559.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Philology of the Gospels. London, 1898.
- Bleek, F. Beiträge zur Einleitung und Auslegung der heiligen Schrift. Vol. I: Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik. Berlin, 1846.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Brief an die Hebräer. 3 vols. Berlin, 1828-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Introduction to the New Testament. Ed. by J. F. Bleek. E.T. of 2nd Ger. ed. (1866). 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1869-70. (1st Ger. ed., 1862.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien. Ed. by H. Holtzmann. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1862.
- Bloomfield, S. T. Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. The Greek Testament, with English Notes. . . . 2 vols., plus a Supplemental Volume. 8th ed. of vols. I-II; 2nd ed. of Supp. Vol. London, 1850-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Recensio Synoptica Annotationis Sacrae. 8 vols. London, 1826-28.
- Bowie, W. R. See Gilmour, S. MacL.
- Braun, F.-M. Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'église ancienne. EtB. 3 vols. Paris, 1959-66.
- Breen, A. E. A Harmonized Exposition of the Four Gospels. 4 vols. Rochester, N.Y., 1899-1904.
- Brown, D. "Matthew-John." In A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old and New Testaments, III, pt. I. By R. Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and D. Brown. Grand Rapids, n.d. (First publ., 1864-70.)
- Brown, R. E. The Epistles of John. AB. Garden City, N.Y., 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel according to John. AB. 2 vols. paginated as 1. New York, 1966.
- Brown, S. "The Role of the Prologues in Determining the Purpose of Luke-Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, 99-111. Ed. by C. H. Talbert. Edinburgh, 1978.
- Brownson, G. L., ed. and tr. Xenophon. Anabasis. LCL. 2 vols. London and New York, 1921-22.
- Brox, N. Die Pastoralbriefe. RNT. Regensburg, 1969.
- Bruce, A. B. "The Synoptic Gospels." In The Expositor's Greek Testament, I, 1-651. Ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll. 5 vols. London and New York, 1897-1910.
- Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, 1952. (1951.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. NICNT. Grand Rapids, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. NIGTC. Exeter, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Men and Movements in the Primitive Church. Studies in

- Early Non-Pauline Christianity. Exeter, 1979. (American title: Peter, Stephen, James & John. Grand Rapids, 1980.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit. Exeter, 1977.
- Bundy, W. E. Jesus and the First Three Gospels. An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition. Cambridge, Mass., 1955.
- Burchard, C. Der dreizehnte Zeuge. Göttingen, 1970.
- Burkitt, F. C. The Gospel History and Its Transmission. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1911. (1906.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Appendix B. Vestigia Christi according to Luke." In BC, II (London, 1922), 485-487.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. Evangelion da-Mepharreshe. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1904.
- Burkitt, W. Expository Notes, with Practical Observations on the New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. 11th ed. London, 1739. (1700.)
- Burton, E. De W. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. IGC. Edinburgh, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Purpose and Plan of the Gospel of Luke." Biblical World 16 (1900):248-258, 342-350.
- Cadbury, H. J. "Appendix G. Commentary on the Preface of Luke." In BC, II (London, 1922), 489-510.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface." Expositor, 8th Ser. 24 (1922):401-420.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Making of Luke-Acts. 2nd ed. London, 1958. (1927.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface." Expositor, 8th Ser. 21 (1921):431-441.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts." NTS 3 (1956-57): 128-132.
- Caird, G. B. The Gospel of St Luke. The Pelican Gospel Commentaries. London, 1963.
- Calvin, J. A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke. E.T. Calvin's Commentaries. Ed. by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh, 1972. (1st Lat. ed., 1555.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. In Novum Testamentum Commentarii. Ed. by A. Tholuck. 7 vols. Berolini, 1833-34.
- Campbell, G. The Four Gospels. 2 vols. London, 1789.
- Campanhausen, H. von. The Formation of the Christian Bible. E.T. London, 1972. (Ger. ed., 1968.)

- Chapman, J. John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel. Oxford, 1911.
- Charles, R. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. ICG. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1920.
- Chase, F. H. The Credibility of the Book of The Acts of the Apostles. London, 1902.
- Chavannes, H. "Les ressemblances des Évangiles synoptiques." RTP 37 (1904):138-160.
- Clarke, A. The Holy Bible, . . . with a Commentary and Critical Notes. 6 vols. New ed. London, 1836. (First publ., 1810-25.)
- Clogg, F. B. An Introduction to the New Testament. London, 1937.
- Collins, R. F. Introduction to the New Testament. Garden City, N.Y., and London, 1983.
- Colson, F. H. "Notes on St Luke's Preface." JTS 24 (1922-23):300-309.
- Conzelmann, H. Die Apostelgeschichte. HNT. 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1972. (1963.)
- . The Theology of St Luke. E.T. London, 1960. (1st Ger. ed., 1954.)
- Conzelmann, H., and Lindemann, A. Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament. 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1976. (1975.)
- Corssen, P. "Warum ist das vierte Evangelium für ein Werk des Apostels Johannes erklärt worden?" ZNW 2 (1901):202-227.
- . "Zu Eusebius h.e. III,39 und II,15." ZNW 3 (1902):242-246.
- Craddock, F. B. The Gospels. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville, 1981.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel according to Saint Mark. CGTC. Cambridge, 1959.
- Credner, K. A. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Halle, 1836.
- Creed, J. M. The Gospel according to St. Luke. London, 1930.
- Davidson, S. An Introduction to the New Testament. 3 vols. London, 1848.
- . An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London, 1882. (1868.)
- Davies, D. P. "The Position of Adverbs in Luke." In Studies in New Testament Language and Text (Festschrift for G. D.

- Kilpatrick), 106-121. Ed. by J. K. Elliott. *NovTSup* 44. Leiden, 1976.
- Deissmann, A. Licht vom Osten. 4th ed. Tübingen, 1923. (<sup>1</sup>1908.)  
 ————. Light from the Ancient East. E.T. of 4th Ger. ed. (1923). Rev. ed. London, 1927. (1st Ger. ed., 1908.)
- Dévoidère, M. "Le prologue du troisième évangile." *NRT* 56 (1929): 714-719.
- Dibelius, F. "Die Herkunft der Sonderstücke des Lukasevangeliums." *ZNW* 12 (1911):325-343.
- Dibelius, M. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. Tübingen, 1919. (Reference is also made to the 2nd ed. of 1933.)  
 ————. From Tradition to Gospel. E.T. of 2nd Ger. ed. (1933). London, 1934. (1st Ger. ed., 1919.)
- Dibelius, M., and Conzelmann, H. The Pastoral Epistles. E.T. of 4th Ger. ed. (1966). Ed. by H. Koester. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, 1972.
- Dillon, R. J. From Eye-witnesses to Ministers of the Word. Tradition and Composition in Luke 24. *AnBib* 82. Rome, 1978.  
 ————. "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1: 1-4)." *CBQ* 43 (1981):205-227.
- Doddridge, P. The Family Expositor. 6 vols. London, 1739-60.
- Drury, J. Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel. London, 1976.
- Dunwell, F. H. The Four Gospels, As Interpreted by the Early Church. London, 1878.
- Dupont, J. Les Actes des Apôtres. SB. 2nd ed. Paris, 1958. (1953.)  
 ————. Les sources du Livre des Actes: État de la question. [Bruges,] 1960.  
 ————. The Sources of Acts. The Present Position. E.T. London, 1964. (Fr. ed., 1960.)
- Earl, D. "Prologue-form in Ancient Historiography." In *ANRW*, I.2 (Berlin, 1972):842-856.
- Easton, B. S. The Gospel according to St. Luke. New York and Edinburgh, 1926.  
 ————. The Pastoral Epistles. London, 1948.
- Ebrard, J. H. A. Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte. 3rd ed. Frankfurt a. M., 1868. (1842.)

- Ellis, E. E. The Gospel of Luke. NCB. London, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gospels Criticism: A Perspective on the State of the Art." In Das Evangelium und die Evangelien, 27-54. Ed. by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28. Tübingen, 1983.
- Ernst, J. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. RNT. Regensburg, 1977.
- Ewald, P. Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage und der Weg zu seiner Lösung. Leipzig, 1890.
- Farmer, W. R. The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis. Macon, Ga., 1976. (First publ., 1964.)
- Farrar, F. W. The Gospel according to St Luke. CBSC. Cambridge, 1895.
- Feine, P. Jesus. Gütersloh, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas. Gotha, 1891.
- Feuillet, A. "'Témoins oculaires et serviteurs de la parole' (Lc 1 2<sup>b</sup>)."  
NovT 15 (1973):241-259.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. The Gospel According to Luke. Vol. I. AB. Garden City, N.Y., 1981.
- Flender, H. St Luke, Theologian of Redemptive History. E.T. London, 1967. (Ger. ed., 1965.)
- Foote, J. Lectures on the Gospel according to Luke. 2 vols. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1858. (1838.)
- Franzmann, M. H. The Word of the Lord Grows. A First Historical Introduction to the New Testament. Saint Louis, 1961.
- Fuller, R. H. "Classics and the Gospels: The Seminar." In The Relationships Among the Gospels: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue, 173-192. Ed. by W. O. Walker, Jr. San Antonio, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament. London, 1971. (First publ., 1966.)
- Gealy, F. D., and Noyes, M. P. "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and The Epistle to Titus." In IntB, XI (Nashville, 1955):341-551.
- Geldenhuis, N. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. NICNT. Grand Rapids, 1951.
- Gerhardsson, B. Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. E.T. ASNU 22. Lund, 1961.
- Gilmour, S. MacL., Bowie, W. R., et al. "The Gospel According to St. Luke." In IntB, VIII (Nashville, 1952):1-434.

- Gloag, P. J. Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels. Edinburgh, 1895.
- Glöckner, R. Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas. Walberberger Studien der Albertus-Magnus-Akademie, Theologische Reihe, 9. Mainz, [1975].
- Godet, F. Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. E.T. of 3rd Fr. ed. (1881-85). 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1892-95. (1st Fr. ed., 1864-65.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. E.T. of 2nd Fr. ed. (1872). 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1875. (1st Fr. ed., 1871.)
- Goguel, M. Introduction au Nouveau Testament. 4 vols. Paris, 1922-26.
- Goodspeed, E. J. "Some Greek Notes." JBL 73 (1954):84-92.
- Goulder, M. D. Midrash and Lection in Matthew. London, 1974.
- Grimm, W. "Das Proömium des Lucasevangelium." Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie 16 (1871):33-78.
- Grosheide, F. W. "The Synoptic Problem. A Neglected Factor in its Solution." EQ 3 (1931):57-67.
- Grundmann, W. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. THKNT. 9th ed. Berlin, 1981. (21961.)
- Guericke, H. E. F. Neutestamentliche Isagogik. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1868. (11843.)
- Güttgemanns, E. "In welchem Sinne ist Lukas 'Historiker'? Die Beziehungen von Luk 1,1-4 und Papias zur antiken Rhetorik." Linguistica Biblica 54 (1983):9-26.
- Gundry, R. H. Matthew. A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids, 1982.
- Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction. 3rd ed. London, 1970. (11961-65.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pastoral Epistles. TNTC. London, 1957.
- Hadas, M., ed. and tr. Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas). New York, 1951.
- Haenchen, E. The Acts of the Apostles. E.T. of 5th Ger. ed. (1965). Oxford, 1971. (1st Ger. ed., 1956.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Johannesevangelium. Ed. by U. Busse. Tübingen, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen. Sammlung Töpelmann, zweite Reihe, 6. Berlin, 1966.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Das 'Wir' in der Apostelgeschichte und das Itinerar." ZTK 58 (1961):329-366.
- Hahn, G. L. Das Evangelium des Lucas. 2 vols. Breslau, 1892-94.
- Hammond, H. A Paraphrase and Annotations upon All the Books of the New Testament. 4th ed. London, 1675. (1653.)
- Hanson, R. P. C. The Acts. NCLB. Oxford, 1967.
- Harnack, A. Geschichte der alchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius. Part II: Die Chronologie der alchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1897-1904.
- Harrington, W. J. The Gospel according to St. Luke. Westminster, Md., 1967.
- Harrison, E. F. Introduction to the New Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, 1971. (1964.)
- Hartl, V. "Zur synoptischen Frage. Schließt Lukas durch 1,1-3 die Benutzung des Matthäus aus?" BZ 13 (1915):334-337.
- Harvey, A. E. The New English Bible. Companion to the New Testament. Oxford and Cambridge, 1970.
- Harvey, W. W., ed. Sancti Irenaei, Libros quinque adversus Haereses. 2 vols. Cantabrigiae, 1857.
- Hauck, F. Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments. Gütersloh, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium des Lukas. THKNT. Leipzig, 1934.
- Hawkins, J. C. Horae Synopticae. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1909. (1899.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel." In Studies in the Synoptic Problem, 27-94. Ed. by W. Sanday. Oxford, 1911.
- Heard, R. An Introduction to the New Testament. London, 1950.
- Hendriksen, W. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke. Grand Rapids, 1978.
- Henry, M. An Exposition of the Old and New Testament. Ed. by E. Bickersteth. 6 vols. London, 1851. (First publ., 1706.)
- Héring, J. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. E.T. of 2nd Fr. ed. (1959). London, 1962. (1st Fr. ed., 1949.)
- Hiebert, D. E. An Introduction to the New Testament. 3 vols. 2nd ed. of vols. 2-3. Chicago, 1975-77. (Vol. 2 first publ. in 1954; vol. 3 in 1962.)
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts." In Apostolic History and the Gospel (Festschrift for F. F.

- Bruce), 78-91. Ed. by W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Exeter, 1970.
- Hofmann, J. C. K. v. Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments. Pt. 8, sect. 1: Das Evangelium des Lukas. Cap. I-XXII, 66. Nördlingen, 1878.
- Holtzmann, H. J. Die Apostelgeschichte. HGNT. 3rd ed. Tübingen, 1901. (<sup>1</sup>1889, 1890.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3rd ed. Freiburg i. B., 1892. (<sup>1</sup>1885.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Synoptiker." In Die Synoptiker-Die Apostelgeschichte, 1-304. HGNT. 2nd ed. Freiburg i. B., 1892. (<sup>1</sup>1890.) (Always cited by title.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Synoptiker. HGNT. 3rd ed. Tübingen, 1901. (<sup>1</sup>1890.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die synoptischen Evangelien. Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter. Leipzig, 1863.
- Hort, F. J. A. The Epistle of St James. London, 1909.
- Hoskyns, E., and Davey, N. The Riddle of the New Testament. 3rd ed. London, 1947. (<sup>1</sup>1931.)
- Hug, [J. L.] Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. of 3rd Ger. ed. (1826). Notes by M. Stuart. Andover, Mass., 1836. (1st Ger. ed., 1808-09.)
- Hughes, P. E. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians. NICNT. Grand Rapids, 1962.
- Jacquier, E. Les Actes des Apôtres. 2nd ed. Paris, 1926. (<sup>1</sup>1926.)
- Jeremias, J., and Strobel, A. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus; Der Brief an die Hebräer. NTD. 12th ed. Göttingen, 1981. (<sup>1</sup>1936.) (Jeremias wrote the portion on the Pastorals.)
- Jones, M. "The Work of St. Luke: A Historical Apology for Pauline Preaching before the Roman Court. A Reply." Expositor, 8th Ser. 9 (1915):217-234.
- Juel, D. Luke-Acts. The Promise of History. Atlanta, 1983.
- Jülicher, A., with Fascher, E. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaft III.1. 7th ed. Tübingen, 1931. (<sup>1</sup>1894, by Jülicher alone.)
- Keil, C. F. Commentar über die Evangelien der Markus und Lukas. Leipzig, 1879.
- Kelly, J. N. D. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. BNTC. London, 1963.

- Kelly, W. An Exposition of the Gospel of Luke. Minneapolis, 1981. (First publ., 1914.)
- Klein, G. "Lukas 1,1-4 als theologisches Programm." In Zeit und Geschichte (Festschrift for R. Bultmann), 193-216. Ed. by E. Dinkler. Tübingen, 1964.
- Klostermann, E. Das Lukasevangelium. HNT. 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1929. (1919.)
- Klostermann, E., with Gressmann, H. "Lukas." In Die Synoptiker, 359-613. HNT. Tübingen, 1919. (Always cited by title.)
- Knox, R. A. A New Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vol. I: The Gospels. London, 1953.
- Koester, H. Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. by the author. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1982. (Ger. ed., 1980.)
- Kümmel, W. G. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 17th ed. Heidelberg, 1973. (1913, by P. Feine.)
- . Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. of 17th Ger. ed. (1973). Nashville, 1975. (1st Ger. ed., 1913, by P. Feine.)
- Kürzinger, J. "Lk 1,3: . . . ἀκριβῶς καθεστῆς σοι γράψαι." BZ, N.S. 18 (1974):249-255.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Jean. ÉtB. 6th ed. Paris, 1936. (1924.)
- . Évangile selon Saint Luc. ÉtB. 6th ed. Paris, 1941. (1921.)
- . "Le sens de Luc, I, 1, d'après les papyrus." Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne 2 (1912): 96-100.
- Lake, K., ed. and tr. Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. Vol. II tr. by J. E. L. Oulton. LCL. 2 vols. London and New York, 1926-32.
- Lake, K., and Cadbury, H. J. Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary. In BC, IV (London, 1933).
- Lardner, N. A Supplement to the First Book of the Second Part of the Credibility of the Gospel History. 3 vols. 2nd ed. London, 1760. (1756-60.)
- Larfeld, W. "Das Zeugnis des Papias über die beiden Johannes von Ephesus." In Johannes und sein Evangelium, 381-401. Ed. by K. H. Rengstorf. Wege der Forschung 82. Darmstadt, 1973. Reprinted from NKZ 33 (1922):490-512.
- LaVerdiere, E. Luke. New Testament Message 5. Wilmington, Del., 1980.

- Lawlor, H. J. "Eusebius on Papias." Hermathena 19 (1920-22):167-222.
- Lawlor, H. J., and Oulton, J. E. L., tr. and ed. Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine. 2 vols. London, 1927-28.
- Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. BNTC. London, 1958.
- Lee, G. M. "The Presbyter John: a Reconsideration." StEv 6 (TU 112) (1973):311-320.
- Leimbach, C. L. Das Papiasfragment. Gotha, 1875.
- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel. Minneapolis, 1961. (First publ., 1946.)
- Léon-Dufour, X. Les Évangiles et l'histoire de Jésus. Paris, 1963.
- Lesêtre, H. "La méthode historique de S. Luc." RB 1 (1892):171-185.
- Lessing, G. E. "New Hypothesis concerning the Evangelists regarded as Merely Human Historians." E.T. In Lessing's Theological Writings, 65-81. Ed. by H. Chadwick. London, 1956. (Ger. ed., 1778.)
- Lieberich, H. Studien zu den Proömien in der griechischen und byzantinischen Geschichtschreibung. 2 pts. München, 1899-1900.
- Lietzmann, H. An die Römer. HNT. 4th ed. Tübingen, 1933. (1906.)
- Lightfoot, J. B. The Apostolic Fathers. 2 pts. in 5 vols. London, 1885-90.
- . The Apostolic Fathers. Ed. and completed by J. R. Harmer. 2nd ed. London, 1893. (1891.)
- . Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion. London, 1889.
- . Notes on Epistles of St Paul from Unpublished Commentaries. Ed. by J. R. H[armer]. 2nd ed. London, 1904. (1895.)
- . Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. 8th ed. London, 1888. (1868.)
- . St Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. 9th ed. London, 1890. (1875.)
- Lock, W. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (I & II Timothy and Titus). ICC. Edinburgh, 1924.

- Lockton, W. "The Martyrdom of St. John." Theology 5 (1922):80-83.
- Lohse, E. The Formation of the New Testament. E.T. of 3rd Ger. ed. (1979). Nashville, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte." EvT 14 (1954): 256-275.
- Loisy, A. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. L'Évangile selon Luc. Paris, 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Les Évangiles synoptiques. 2 vols. Geffonds, 1907-08. (Always cited by title.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Origins of the New Testament. E.T. London, 1950. (Fr. ed., 1936.)
- Loofs, F. Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus. TU 46 (1930), no. 2.
- Luce, H. K. The Gospel according to St Luke. CBSG. Cambridge, 1936.
- Luck, U. "Kerygma, Tradition und Geschichte Jesu bei Lukas." ZTK 57 (1960):51-66.
- Lünemann, G. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews. E.T. of 4th Ger. ed. (1874). CECNT. Edinburgh, 1882. (1st Ger. ed., 1855.)
- Luthardt, C. E. St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel. Rev. and tr. by C. R. Gregory. Edinburgh, 1875.
- McGiffert, A. C., tr. Eusebius. Church History. NPNF, Second Series, I, 1-404. New York and Oxford, 1890.
- Machen, J. G. The Literature and History of New Testament Times. Pt. I: The Historical Background of Christianity; The Early History of Christianity. Philadelphia, 1915.
- McNeille, A. H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2nd ed. rev. by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford, 1953. (1927.)
- Maddox, R. The Purpose of Luke-Acts. Edinburgh, 1982.
- Major, H. D. A. "Incidents in the Life of Jesus." In The Mission and Message of Jesus: An Exposition of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Research, 1-297. By H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright. London, 1937.
- Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke. MNTC. London, 1930.
- Marsh, H. A Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of our Three First Canonical Gospels. Cambridge, 1801.

- Marshall, I. H. The Acts of the Apostles. TNTC. Leicester, 1980.
- . The Gospel of Luke. NIGTC. Exeter, 1978.
- . "Luke and his 'Gospel'." In Das Evangelium und die Evangelien, 289-308. Ed. by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28, Tübingen, 1983.
- . Luke: Historian and Theologian. Exeter, 1970.
- Martin, R. P. New Testament Foundations. 2 vols. Grand Rapids and Exeter, 1975-78.
- Marx, W. G. "A New Theophilus." EQ 52 (1980):17-26.
- Marxsen, W. Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. of 3rd Ger. ed. (1964). Oxford, 1968. (1st Ger. ed., 1963.)
- Mayor, J. B. The Epistle of St. James. 3rd ed. London, 1913. (1892.)
- . The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. London, 1907.
- Menestrina, G. "L'incipit dell'epistola 'Ad Diognetum', Luca 1, 1-4 e Atti 1, 1-2." BeO 19 (1977):215-218.
- Merx, A. "Notes on the Armenian Version." In The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac, xlii-xvii. Ed. by W. Wright and N. McLean. Cambridge, 1898.
- Meyer, E. Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. 3 vols. Stuttgart, 1921-23.
- Meyer, H. A. W. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles. E.T. of 4th Ger. ed. (1870). Rev. and ed. by W. P. Dickson. CECNT. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1877. (2nd Ger. ed., 1854.)
- . Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke. E.T. of 5th Ger. ed. (1867). Rev. and ed. by W. P. Dickson and W. Stewart. CECNT. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1880. (3rd Ger. ed., 1855.)
- Michaelis, J. D. Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. of 4th Ger. ed. (1788). 4 vols. in 5. 2nd ed. London, 1801-02. (4th Ger. ed., 1788.)
- Michaelis, W. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3rd ed. Bern, 1961. (1946.)
- Milligan, [W.] "John the Presbyter." The Journal of Sacred Literature, 5th Ser. 2 (1867-68):106-122.
- Minear, P. S. "Dear Theo. The Kerygmatic Intention and Claim of the Book of Acts." Interpretation 27 (1973):131-150.

- Moffatt, J. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1918. (1911.)
- Mommsen, T. "Papianisches." ZNW 3 (1902):156-159.
- Moorman, J. R. H. The Path to Glory. Studies in the Gospel According to Saint Luke. London, 1960.
- Morgan, G. C. The Gospel According to Luke. Westwood, N.J., 1931.
- Morgenthaler, R. Statistische Synopse. Zürich, 1971.
- Morris, L. The Gospel according to St. Luke. TNFC. Leicester, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospels and the Jewish Lectionaries." In Gospel Perspectives, vol. III: Studies in Midrash and Historiography, 129-156. Ed. by R. T. France and D. Wenham. Sheffield, 1983.
- Moulton, J. H. "Notes from the Papyri." Expositor, 6th Ser. 7 (1903):104-121.
- Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, G. "Lexical Notes from the Papyri." Expositor, 7th Ser. 10 (1910):282-288.
- Müller, P.-G. Der Traditionsprozeß im Neuen Testament. Freiburg, 1982.
- Munck, J. The Acts of the Apostles. Rev. by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann. AB. Garden City, N.Y., 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Presbyters and Disciples of the Lord in Papias." HTR 52 (1959):223-243.
- Mussner, F. "Die Gemeinde des Lukasprologs." In The New Testament Age (Festschrift for B. Reicke), 373-392. Ed. by W. G. Weinrich. 2 vols. paginated as 1. Macon, Ga., 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Καθ' ἑξῆς im Lukasprolog." In Jesus und Paulus (Festschrift for W. G. Kümmel), 253-255. Ed. by E. E. Ellis and E. Gräßer. Göttingen, 1975.
- Neil, W. The Acts of the Apostles. NCB. London, 1973.
- Nellessen, E. Zeugnis für Jesus und das Wort: Exegetische Untersuchungen zum lukanischen Zeugnisbegriff. BBB 43. Köln, 1976.
- Nestle, E. Die Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius aus dem Syrischen übersetzt. TU 21 (1901), no. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Luke 1.3." ExpT 13 (1901-02):139-140.
- Nickle, K. F. The Synoptic Gospels. Conflict and Consensus. Atlanta, 1980.
- Nösgen, C. F. Die Evangelien nach Matthäus, Markus und Lukas. (Kurzgefaßter Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und

- Neuen Testamentes sowie zu den Apokryphen. 2nd ed. München, 1897. (<sup>1</sup>1886.)
- Nolloth, C. F. The Fourth Evangelist. London, 1925.
- Nunn, H. P. V. The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. [Windsor, Berks.,] 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel. London, 1927.
- Olshausen, H. Biblical Commentary on the Gospels, and on the Acts of the Apostles. (Title of vols. I-III; Biblical Commentary on the Gospels.) E.T. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1847-50. (1st Ger. ed. of commentary on Luke's preface, 1830.)
- Oosterzee, J. J. van. The Gospel according to Luke. E.T. of 2nd Ger. ed. (1861). A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, by J. P. Lange et al. Edinburgh, [1866]. (1st Ger. ed., 1859.)
- Orchard, J. B. "Some Guidelines for the Interpretation of Eusebius' Hist. Eccl. 3.34-39." In The New Testament Age (Festschrift for B. Reicke), 393-403. Ed. by W. C. Weimrich. 2 vols. paginated as 1. Macon, Ga., 1984.
- Parry, R. St J. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge, 1920.
- Peake, A. S. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament. London, 1909.
- Petrie, C. S. "The Authorship of 'The Gospel according to Matthew': A Reconsideration of the External Evidence." NTS 14 (1967-68): 15-32.
- Piper, O. A. "The Purpose of Luke." Union Seminary Review 57 (1945-46):15-25.
- Plessis, I. I. du. "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1 1-4)." NovT 16 (1974):259-271.
- Plooij, D. "Again: The Work of St. Luke." Expositor, 8th Ser. 13 (1917):108-124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Work of St. Luke: A Historical Apology for Pauline Preaching before the Roman Court." Expositor, 8th Ser. 8 (1914):511-523.
- Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke. ICC. 2nd ed. Edinburgh, 1898. (<sup>1</sup>1896.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistles of S. John. CGTSC. Cambridge, 1886.
- Plumptre, E. H. "The Gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke." In A New Testament Commentary for English Readers, I, 1-365. Ed. by C. J. Ellicott. 3 vols. London, [1877-79].
- Poole, M. Annotations upon the Holy Bible. 2 vols. London, 1688. (First publ., 1683-85.)

- Pope, A. M. "The Key Word of the Lucan Narratives." The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought 3 (1926):44-52.
- Potwin, L. S. "Does the Preface to Luke's Gospel Belong Also to the Acts?" BSac 38 (1881):328-332.
- Puech, A. Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du iv<sup>e</sup> siècles. 3 vols. Paris, 1928-30.
- Ragg, L. St Luke. Westminster Commentaries. London, 1922.
- Ramsay, W. M. Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? London, 1898.
- Regul, J. Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe. Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 6. Freiburg, 1969.
- Reicke, B. The Gospel of Luke. E.T. London, 1965. (Ger. ed., 1962.)
- Reiling, J., and Swellengrebel, J. L. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke. Helps for Translators 10. Leiden, 1971.
- Rendall, G. H. The Epistles of St Paul to the Corinthians. London, 1909.
- Rengstorf, K. H. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. NTD. 6th ed. Göttingen, 1952. (1936.)
- Reuss, E. (W. E.) History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. E.T. of 5th Ger. ed. (1874). Edinburgh, 1884. (2nd Ger. ed., 1853.)
- Rinaldi, G. "'Risalendo alle più lontane origini della tradizione' (Luca 1,3)." BeO 7 (1965-66):252-258.
- Robbins, V. K. "Prefaces in Greco-Roman Biography and Luke-Acts." Perspectives In Religious Studies 6 (1979):94-108.
- Robertson, A. T. "The Implications in Luke's Preface." ExpT 35 (1923-24):319-321.
- . Luke the Historian in the Light of Research. Edinburgh, 1920.
- . Word Pictures in the New Testament. 6 vols. Nashville, 1930-33. (Cited as a commentary.)
- Robinson, J. A. St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London, 1903.
- Roloff, J. Die Apostelgeschichte. NTD. Göttingen, 1981.
- Ropes, J. H. "An Observation on the Style of S. Luke." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 12 (1901):299-305.
- . "St Luke's Preface; ἀσφάλεια and παρακολουθεῖν." JTS 25 (1923-24):67-71.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge, Mass., 1934.
- Sahlin, H. Der Messias und das Gottesvolk. ASNU 12. Uppsala, 1945.
- Salmon, G. A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament. 5th ed. London, 1891. (1885.)
- Samain, É. "La notion de *ΑΡΧΗ* dans l'oeuvre lucanienne." In L'Évangile de Luc (Festschrift for L. Gerfaux), 299-328. Ed. by F. Neirynek. Gembloux, 1973.
- Sanday, W. The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford, 1905.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Survey of the Synoptic Question." Expositor, 4th Ser. 3 (1891):81-91, 179-194, 302-316, 345-361, 411-426.
- Sanders, E. P. "The Argument from Order and the Relationship between Matthew and Luke." NTS 15 (1968-69):249-261.
- Sanders, J. N. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St John. Ed. and completed by B. A. Mastin. BNTC. London, 1968.
- Schanz, P. Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Lucas. Tübingen, 1883.
- Schenke, H.-M., and Fischer, K. M. Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. 2 vols. Gütersloh, 1978-79.
- Schille, G. Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas. THKNT. Berlin, 1983.
- Schlatter, A. Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas. Schlatters Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart, 1947. (First publ., 1900.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinen Quellen erklärt. Stuttgart, 1931. (Always cited by title.)
- Schmid, J. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. RNT. 4th ed. Regensburg, 1960. (1940.)
- Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Berlin, 1919.
- Schmiedel, P. W. "Gospels." In Encyclopaedia Biblica, II:1761-1898. Ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. London, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John, Son of Zebedee." Ibid., II:2503-2562.
- Schmithals, W. Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas. ZB. Zürich, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. ZB. Zürich, 1980.
- Schnackenburg, R. The Gospel according to St John. Vol. I. E.T. HTCNT. London and New York, 1968. (Ger. ed., 1965.)
- Schneckenburger, M. Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte. Bern, 1841.

- Schneider, G. Die Apostelgeschichte. HTKNT. 2 vols. Freiburg, 1980-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. ÖTKNT. 2 vols. Gütersloh and Würzburg, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Bedeutung von καθεξῆς im lukanischen Doppelwerk." ZNW 68 (1977):128-131.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Zweck des lukanischen Doppelwerks." BZ, N.S. 21 (1977):45-66.
- Schoedel, W. R. Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias. In The Apostolic Fathers, V. Ed. by R. M. Grant. Camden, N.J., 1967.
- Schürmann, H. "Evangelien-schrift und kirchliche Unterweisung. Die repräsentative Funktion der Schrift nach Lk 1,1-4." In Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien, 251-271. Düsseldorf, 1968. Essay first publ. in 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Lukasevangelium. Vol. I. HTKNT. Freiburg, 1969.
- Schulz, S. Die Stunde der Botschaft. Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten. 2nd ed. Hamburg, 1970. (1967.)
- Schweizer, E. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. NTD. Göttingen, 1982. (Always cited by title.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Good News according to Luke. E.T. London and Atlanta, 1984. (Ger. ed., 1982.)
- Scott, E. F. The Literature of the New Testament. New York, 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pastoral Epistles. MNTC. London, 1936.
- Sneed, D. J. "An Exegesis of Luke 1:1-4 with Special Regard to Luke's Purpose as a Historian." ExpT 83 (1971-72):40-43.
- Solages, de. A Greek Synopsis of the Gospels. E.T. Leyden, 1959.
- Spicq, G. L'Épître aux Hébreux. ÉtB. 2 vols. Paris, 1952-53.
- Spitta, F. Die synoptische Grundschrift in ihrer Überlieferung durch das Lukasevangelium. Leipzig, 1912.
- Spivey, R. A., and Smith, D. M., Jr. Anatomy of the New Testament. A Guide to Its Structure and Meaning. 2nd ed. New York, 1974. (1969.)
- Stählin, G. Die Apostelgeschichte. NTD. Göttingen, 1962.
- Stanton, G. N. Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching. SNTSMS 27. Cambridge, 1974.
- Stanton, V. H. The Gospels as Historical Documents. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1903-20.

- Stein, R. H. "Luke 1:1-4 and Traditionsgeschichte." JETS 26 (1983):421-430.
- Steinmueller, J. E. "The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to St. Luke." In A Commentary on the New Testament, 227-291. By the Catholic Biblical Association. [Washington,] 1942.
- Stoldt, H.-H. History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis. Tr. and ed. by D. L. Niewyk. Macon, Ga., and Edinburgh, 1980. (Ger. ed., 1977.)
- Stonehouse, N. B. Origins of the Synoptic Gospels. Some Basic Questions. Grand Rapids, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Witness of Luke to Christ. London, 1951.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. London, 1936. (First publ., 1924.)
- Stuhlmüller, C. "The Gospel according to Luke." In JBC, II, 115-164. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968.
- Styler, G. M. "Excursus IV: The Priority of Mark." In The Birth of the New Testament, 285-316. By C. F. D. Moule. 3rd ed. London, 1981.
- Talbert, C. H. Reading Luke. New York, 1982.
- Taylor, V. The Gospel according to St. Mark. 2nd ed. London, 1966. (1952.)
- Tenney, M. C. New Testament Survey. Grand Rapids, 1961.
- Thiersch, H. W. J. Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Kritik der neutestamentlichen Schriften. Erlangen, 1845.
- Thiessen, H. C. Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids, 1943.
- Thompson, G. H. P. The Gospel according to Luke in the Revised Standard Version. NCLB. Oxford, 1972.
- Torrey, C. G. The Four Gospels. A New Translation. New York, 1933.
- Trapp, J. A Commentary or Exposition upon all the Books of the New Testament. 2nd ed. London, 1656. (First publ., 1647.)
- Trocé, É. Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire. ÉHPR 45. Paris, 1957.
- Uchida, K. "The Study of the Synoptic Problem in the Twentieth Century: A Critical Assessment." Ph.D. thesis, Aberdeen, 1981.
- Unnik, W. G. van. "Once More St. Luke's Prologue." Neotestamentica 7 (1973):7-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Remarks on the Purpose of Luke's Historical Writing

- (Luke 1 1-4)." In Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik, pt. I: Evangelia, Paulina, Acta, 6-15. NovTSup 29. Leiden, 1973. (First publ. in Dutch in 1955.)
- Vaganay, L. Le problème synoptique. Une hypothèse de travail. Bibliothèque de théologie, Series III, vol. I. Tournai, 1954.
- Vögtle, A. "Was hatte die Widmung des lukanischen Doppelwerks an Theophilus zu bedeuten?" In Das Evangelium und die Evangelien, 31-42. Düsseldorf, 1971. (First publ., 1969.)
- Völkel, M. "Exegetische Erwägungen zum Verständnis des Begriffs καθεξής; im lukanischen Prolog." NTS 20 (1973-74):289-299.
- Vogel, F. "Zu Luk. 1,4." NKZ 44 (1933):203-205.
- Webster, W., and Wilkinson, W. F. The Greek Testament. 2 vols. London, 1855-61.
- Weiffenbach, W. Das Papias-Fragment bei Eusebius H. E. III, 39, 3-4. Giessen, 1874.
- Weiss, B. Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas, KEKNT. 9th ed. (4th of B. Weiss's). Göttingen, 1901. (1878.) (Reference is also made to the 7th ed. of 1885.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Life of Christ. E.T. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1883-84. (1st Ger. ed., 1882.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. 2 vols. London, 1888. (1st Ger. ed., 1886.)
- Weiss, J. "Die drei älteren Evangelien." In Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, I, 31-525. Ed. by J. Weiss. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1907-08. (1906-07.)
- Weisse, C. H. Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium. Leipzig, 1856.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1838.
- Wenham, J. W. "Gospel Origins." Trinity Journal 7 (1978):112-134.
- Wernle, P. Die synoptische Frage. Freiburg i. B., 1899.
- Westcott, B. F. The Epistle to the Hebrews. 3rd ed. London, 1903. (1889.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. 6th ed. Cambridge, 1881. (1860.)
- Wette, W. M. L. de. An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. E.T. of 5th Ger. ed. (1848). Boston, 1858. (1st Ger. ed., 1826.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kurze Erklärung der Evangelien des Lukas und Markus.

- Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1846. (1836.)
- Whitaker, G. H. "Additional Note on 'The Philology of St. Luke's Preface.'" Expositor, 8th Ser. 21 (1921):239-240.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Philology of St. Luke's Preface." Expositor, 8th Ser. 20 (1920):262-272.
- Whitby, D. A Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament. 2 vols. 10th ed. Edinburgh, 1807. (1703.)
- White, E. "Questions on the Logos in St. Luke, chap. i. ver. 2." Expt 4 (1892-93):129-130.
- Wieseler, K. A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels. E.T. 2nd ed. London, 1877. (Ger. ed., 1843. E.T., 1864.)
- Wikenhauser, A. Die Apostelgeschichte. RNT. 4th ed. Regensburg, 1961. (1938.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Apostelgeschichte und Ihr Geschichtswert. NTAbh 8, nos. 3-5. Münster i. W., 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Testament Introduction. E.T. of 2nd Ger. ed. (1956). New York, 1958. (1st Ger. ed., 1953.)
- Wikenhauser, A., and Schmid, J. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 6th ed. Freiburg, 1973. (1953, by Wikenhauser alone.)
- Wilckens, U. "Kerygma und Evangelium bei Lukas (Beobachtungen zu Acta 10 34-43)." ZNW 49 (1958):223-237.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. WMANT 5. 2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1963. (1961.)
- Wilke, C. G. Der Urevangelist oder exegetisch kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältnis der drei ersten Evangelien. Dresden, 1838.
- Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. BNTC. London, 1957.
- Wotke, F. "Papias. 2)." In PW, 18.2 (1949):966-976.
- Wrede, W. Die Entstehung der Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Tübingen, 1907.
- Wright, W., and McLean, N., eds. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac. Cambridge, 1898.
- Yarbrough, R. W. "The Date of Papias: A Reassessment." JETS 26 (1983):181-191.
- Zahn, T. "Apostel und Apostelschüler in der Provinz Asien." In Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur, VI, 1-224. Leipzig, 1900.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas. KNT. 2 vols. paginated as 1. 3rd ed. of Part I; 1st-2nd eds. of Part II. Leipzig, 1921-22. (1,<sup>2</sup>1919-21.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium des Lucas. KNT. 2 vols. paginated as 1. 1st and 2nd eds. Leipzig, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. of 3rd Ger. ed. (1906-07). Ed. by M. W. Jacobus. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1909. (1st Ger. ed., 1906-07.)

## INTRODUCTION

The synoptic problem, despite two centuries of intensive study, remains a problem. A generation ago the two-source theory seemed to have conclusively solved it, leaving only a few details to be worked out. Opposition to this "assured result" of modern scholarship seemed limited to a few obscurantists. But since then the situation has changed. The arguments for the two-source theory have been subjected to a barrage of criticism by an ever increasing number of scholars. A variety of alternative theories have been advanced with considerable sophistication, and one in particular, the revived Griesbach hypothesis, has developed a sizeable following.<sup>1</sup> It may still be true, as K. F. Nickle has recently observed, that "most scholars today assume the priority of Mark," but it is also true that Matthean priority has been advocated in recent years "with observable impact."<sup>2</sup> Thus, the synoptic problem has become more of an open question again.<sup>3</sup>

The renewed discussion of the synoptic problem has, generally speaking, produced only negative results. That is, the criticisms leveled at the two-source theory have weakened the confidence with which many hold to it, but the consensus of opinion in its favor remains more or less intact. Its critics have demonstrated the inconclusiveness of the arguments once thought to prove it, and they have focused attention on the evidence which it cannot easily explain, but they have failed to advance convincing arguments for

their alternative theories. The two-source theory admittedly has its weaknesses, but other theories seem to have more serious ones. This should not provide much comfort for those who adhere to the two-source theory, however, for until all the relevant evidence can be satisfactorily (if not conclusively) explained within its framework, its adequacy, not to mention its validity, must remain open to question. It may be the least unsatisfactory theory of synoptic origins currently receiving attention, but another theory, perhaps one not presently being considered, may eventually prove more satisfactory.

It is almost universally assumed that the synoptic problem can only be solved, if at all, by the proper literary analysis of the synoptic material. As a result, other evidence is not given much consideration. This would not matter if literary analysis yielded conclusive results, but since it has not done so, it is important that all the relevant evidence be carefully and thoroughly considered.

The evidence relevant to the synoptic problem may be outlined as follows:

- I. Direct evidence: any statement made by an evangelist about gospel origins
- II. Circumstantial evidence
  - A. Literary: similarities and differences among the gospels, especially in parallel accounts
  - B. Historical: authorship, date, etc.

Modern scholars seeking to solve the synoptic problem have focused their attention on the literary evidence (II.A), but have largely ignored the other categories of evidence. Furthermore, the other evidence, especially the historical evidence bearing upon the

questions of authorship and date, has generally been evaluated on the assumption that the two-source theory is correct, rather than independently of literary theory.

The most important evidence pertaining to the origin of any work would of course be the direct evidence supplied by the author himself or by some other person with firsthand knowledge. Clearly, any statement made by an author concerning the source of his material, or even any inference reasonably drawn from his comments, must be accepted as definitive, unless there is good reason to doubt his veracity or objectivity.

The direct evidence bearing upon the synoptic problem consists solely of the preface to Luke's gospel. In it he describes the efforts of his predecessors to record the original traditions about Jesus (vss. 1-2), his own acquaintance with those traditions and his intention to record them (vs. 3), and his purpose in writing a gospel (vs. 4). Surely this information, coming from the author himself, ought to point us toward the correct solution to the synoptic problem, at least insofar as it pertains to the Third Gospel.<sup>4</sup> The study of the synoptic problem, then, should begin with a careful analysis of Luke's preface.<sup>5</sup>

The importance of Luke's preface was recognized by P. Wernle in his classic exposition of the two-source theory, Die synoptische Frage. In discussing the "Ausgangspunkt" for the investigation of the synoptic problem, he asks: "Gibt es einen festen Punkt, der sich für ein völlig unparteiisches Verfahren eignet?" He finds such a point in Luke's preface, because "das ist die einzige Stelle in unsern Syn., wo uns ein Evangelist über sein schriftstellerisches Vorhaben Auskunft gibt." From this he properly infers: "Sie gehört daher an die Spitze jeder Untersuchung des synoptischen

Problems."<sup>6</sup>

One might have expected Wernle to proceed with a thorough exegesis of Luke's preface. However, he simply declares that "drei feste Thatsachen" are "sichergestellt" by the preface. The first fact is, "Lc schreibt nicht das älteste Evangelium, sondern hat schon viele Vorgänger." The second is, "Diese Vorgänger sind selbst nicht Augen- und Ohrenzeugen gewesen, sondern haben aus deren Überlieferung geschöpft." And his third fact is, "Lc will seine Vorgänger übertreffen durch Vollständigkeit und durch chronologische Reihenfolge."<sup>7</sup> In our view, Wernle's first two points are valid, but the third is not. But whether his threefold starting point is entirely correct or not, he ought to have established it with exegesis, not simply by assertion.

Having stated his "drei feste Thatsachen," Wernle declares, again without any supporting argumentation: "Daraus folgt: Lc schreibt als ein Mann der zweiten oder gar dritten Generation. Er schöpft nicht direkt aus der Überlieferung, sondern aus Quellen."<sup>8</sup> Wernle decides, therefore, to begin his study of the literary evidence by analyzing Luke's gospel as "ein relativ spätes Werk" and "von da aus rückwärts gehend, nach seinen Vorgängern, die seine Quellen sind, zu forschen."<sup>9</sup> The next 100 pages or so of his book are consequently devoted to searching out Luke's sources. He begins this investigation with these words: "Aus dem Prolog Lc 1 ergab sich, daß Lc schriftliche Quellen gekannt und benützt hat. Welches sind diese Quelle?" Since Luke does not specify them, they can be determined, Wernle says, only by comparing Luke's material with that of Mark and Matthew. He asks, "Sind Mr oder Mt oder beide unter den 'Vielen', die Lc vor sich hatte, als er sein Evg

schrieb?"<sup>10</sup>

Wernle's reasoning may seem simple and straightforward, but none of it necessarily follows from the three "facts" that he has laid down, let alone from what Luke's preface actually says. According to Wernle's second fact, the gospel tradition originated as the oral tradition of the eyewitnesses and was drawn upon by Luke's predecessors. But that does not necessarily make Luke a man of the second or third generation. Wernle's facts would also allow that while the eyewitnesses were still proclaiming their oral gospel Luke's predecessors and now Luke, still in the first (i.e. apostolic) generation of the church, wrote their gospels. If so, Luke could also have drawn directly upon the oral tradition, rather than (or in addition to) written sources. Luke's gospel was of course written after those of his unnamed predecessors, but it could still have been written before other gospels, perhaps including those of Matthew and Mark. We may grant for the sake of argument that Luke intended to surpass his predecessors, both in completeness and in chronological order, but it by no means follows from this that he drew his information from their works. Luke knew of (and may well have read) other narratives, but it does not necessarily follow that these were his sources of information. Thus we see that Wernle's inferences may not contradict his three facts, but not one of those inferences necessarily follows from them.

The brevity and convenience of Wernle's treatment of Luke's preface suggest that it was probably prepared after (and in accordance with) the literary analysis which it introduces, though presented as the fruits of exegesis warranting that analysis. In saying this, we do not mean to question Wernle's integrity as a

scholar. But one is often tempted to see in a text what one would like to be there. W. Grimm complained over a century ago that modern studies of Luke's preface were marred by their authors' efforts to find their particular theories of synoptic origins set forth in it and other theories refuted by it.<sup>11</sup> A good example of this is provided by H. J. Holtzmann, who, after working out a theory of synoptic origins, turned his attention to Luke's preface and found his theory confirmed. He discerned that Matthew and Mark were included among Luke's predecessors in vs. 1, that each of the two was specifically criticized in vs. 3, and that "Urmarcus" and "Urmattäus" were the common sources of the synoptics mentioned in vs. 2.<sup>12</sup> Holtzmann's understanding of synoptic origins changed by the time he wrote his commentary on the synoptic gospels, and naturally his interpretation of Luke's preface was modified accordingly.<sup>13</sup> Grimm's complaint has remained valid, for interpretations of Luke's preface have continued to change in line with developments in synoptic criticism.

R. J. Dillon has recently actually recommended the eisegetical approach: "Accordingly, our method for the passage at hand will be the measurement of its phrases by prominent and well-tested trends of composition in the Gospel; and not only that, but a correlation of the prologue's terms with the specific editorial stratagems which relate the Gospel to . . . Acts." This enigmatic statement turns out to mean that the results of Dillon's dissertation on Luke 24 hold the key to understanding Luke's preface.<sup>14</sup> (In an apparent oversight, Luke failed to direct his readers to study the end of his book before reading its preface!) In other words, inferences drawn from circumstantial evidence will control Dillon's interpretation of Luke's prefatory statement. Thus he himself illustrates

how "the exegete easily oversteps his boundaries where indirect arguments and implications are the nature of the evidence,"<sup>15</sup> According to S. Brown, one's interpretation of Luke's preface "will inevitably be influenced by the understanding of Luke's purpose obtained from the rest of the work,"<sup>16</sup> but with determined self-discipline this need not be so.

Wernle's approach to the synoptic problem was sound in theory, but, as we have seen, it was inadequate in practice. Unfortunately, students of the synoptic problem since Wernle have often praised his work, but have failed to follow his methodological insight. Indeed, twentieth-century studies of the synoptic problem not only have not begun with a discussion of Luke's preface, but have hardly noticed its relevance at all.

We propose to rectify this situation by approaching the synoptic problem with a careful examination of Luke's preface. We will endeavor, first of all, to establish the exact meaning of Luke's words. This essential preliminary task will, because of the difficulties attending it, demand most of our attention. But if we can determine precisely what Luke is saying, we will be in a position to draw definite conclusions pertaining to the synoptic problem. This, hopefully, we will be able to do. Finally, we will consider whether the literary evidence can be reasonably explained in a manner consistent with the results of our study of Luke's preface.

## THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF LUKE'S PREFACE

Luke's preface has been generally recognized as one of the most elegantly crafted passages in the New Testament. Until about 1920 its literary excellence was not thought to impinge upon its seriousness of statement and thus upon its historical value. After all, one can tell the truth elegantly as well as inelegantly. However, a number of modern interpreters, led by H. J. Cadbury, have drawn the historical value of Luke's preface into question. Luke, they say, constructed his preface along conventional lines and adorned it with rhetorical flourishes, all without careful regard for accuracy of statement. Hence, as Cadbury warns, one must "constantly guard against taking the preface too seriously," for it is "a literary form."<sup>1</sup> If this were true, the potential value of Luke's preface for synoptic research would be considerably reduced, if only because one could never be sure which words in the preface to take seriously. Therefore, our first task is to investigate the literary character of Luke's preface, and determine how, if at all, it qualifies the accuracy of his statements.

By introducing his gospel with a preface, Luke followed the customary practice of Greek (and Roman) historians and other writers of his day.<sup>2</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in 7 B.C., acknowledged the force of this convention: "Although it is much against my will to indulge in the explanatory statements usually given in the prefaces to histories, yet I am obliged to prefix to

this work some remarks concerning myself."<sup>3</sup> Luke evidently followed this convention because he wanted to present his gospel as respectable historical literature.<sup>4</sup>

Literary convention not only prescribed that there be a preface, but also suggested a broad range of appropriate subject matter for it.<sup>5</sup> This may be inferred from the fact that in their prefaces ancient historians often referred to other writers who had written on the same or a related subject, commented on themselves, and offered introductory observations on their subject. In addition to these general matters, a concern for accuracy (in one's own or in another's work), a related interest in eyewitness testimony (especially one's own), a statement of purpose, and various other specific matters appeared from time to time.<sup>6</sup>

Out of this wide range of appropriate subject matter each writer chose which particular subjects he would treat in his preface. While trends in literary fashion no doubt influenced certain writers to deal with certain matters, none of them had to be treated. Furthermore, the breadth of acceptable subject matter was so wide that each writer had ample scope to say whatever he wished. Indeed, it is hard to imagine what any writer could have wanted to say in his preface that would not have pertained to himself, his subject matter, or other writers and their works. Thus, while it may be technically true that, as Cadbury puts it, "the subjects discussed in prefaces were limited both naturally and by tradition,"<sup>7</sup> those limitations amounted virtually to a license to say whatever one wanted. Only by supposing that the limitations of subject matter restricted every author to a set of narrowly defined "conventional motifs," which manifestly they did not, as anyone who would read a few prefaces would readily see, can Cadbury infer that

one must not "lay too great stress on the selection of ideas" in Luke's preface.<sup>8</sup> Rather, since there was no such restriction, Luke was free to say anything relevant to his book, and that implies that we can lay stress on his statements.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, what was said on any given subject was not predetermined by convention. There were no statements repeated in preface after preface, such as the modern effusive thanking of one's marvelously forbearing wife, which one could suppose had been made for convention's sake, without scrupulous regard for the truth. Naturally, if a writer commented on, say, the importance of his subject or the accuracy of his work, his point of view was predictable. But there was no convention that an author should express himself in a certain way irrespective of the truth. What might at first seem like a literary convention at work may simply be a natural description of a commonly occurring circumstance or the expression of a common feeling.<sup>10</sup> For example, it was fairly common for ancient writers to disparage the work of other writers in order to justify and commend their own literary ventures,<sup>11</sup> but they were merely expressing feelings which often arise among writers (although modern concepts of civility may limit their expression today), not dutifully following some literary convention.

When different writers had similar things to say, their statements showed no more verbal similarity than one would expect in naturally recurring manners of expression. But even this was exceptional, for the prefaces written before and during the first century A.D. were characterized by enormous variety and originality, reflecting the different circumstances and the independent thinking of their authors. H. Lieberich, after examining the prefaces of Greek historians from the sixth century B.C. to the fifth century

A.D., notes that from Thucydides (who originated the more developed type of preface) to Josephus prefaces showed only occasional traces of imitation, but that from Phlegon of Tralles (who wrote in the middle third of the second century) onward (not without exception, however) there was a trend toward conventionality.<sup>12</sup> Thus, it is anachronistic to suppose, as does Cadbury, that the first-century literary milieu in which Luke wrote was characterized by a "close similarity between prefaces."<sup>13</sup> There may have been some tendency toward imitation on the part of lesser or aspiring writers whose works have not survived, but there is no evidence that Luke was part of any such tendency.<sup>14</sup>

It has been suggested to the contrary by P. de Lagarde<sup>15</sup> and J. Moffatt<sup>16</sup> that Luke may have imitated the preface of De materia medica, by the botanist and pharmacologist Pedanius Dioscorides. But F. Blass<sup>17</sup> and T. Zahn<sup>18</sup> have shown that the resemblances between the two prefaces are too slight to warrant such an inference. We would agree with Lagarde against Blass, however, that the general thrust of both prefaces is the same; that is, both authors refer to the unsatisfactory literature in their field in order to account for their writing on the subject. (Blass denies that Luke does this.) But direct literary dependence can hardly be deduced from this similarity.<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore, it is by no means clear that Dioscorides' treatise had been written, copied, disseminated, and brought to Luke's attention before he wrote his gospel. Dioscorides came from Anazarbus, near Tarsus in Cilicia, and dedicated his work to a certain Areios, who was undoubtedly the physician Laecanius Areios of Tarsus. Areios took the name Laecanius from his patron, C. Laecanius Bassus, who was consul in 64 and died in the year that Pliny the

Elder began his Natural History, which would have been several years before the completion of that work in 77. Dioscorides says that from his youth he pursued botanical-pharmacological studies, and that while traveling with Roman armies (evidently as a physician) he collected drug specimens and took notes on their properties and native uses in much of southern Europe. After retiring from military service, he combined his accumulated data with information derived from older books (notably from the identically titled work by Sextius Niger, who lived in the days of Augustus), and produced a large, five-volume work. From these facts it has been inferred that he was a military doctor during the reigns of Claudius (41-54) and Nero (54-68) and wrote his treatise during the reign of Vespasian (70-79), although these inferences are obviously somewhat problematic.<sup>20</sup> Now Dioscorides was probably younger than Areios, and Areios than Bassus. This may be inferred from the fact that Dioscorides' dedication to Areios was probably an expression of respect and affection for an older physician of his own country, and from the fact that Areios took his name from Bassus. If these relative ages are correct, then Bassus's dates imply that Areios flourished in the sixties and seventies, and probably into the eighties. He would have been an esteemed elder physician, then, in the eighties, and perhaps into the nineties. Since Dioscorides probably wrote his treatise no earlier than in his late middle age, when Areios was somewhat elderly, we may date it in the eighties, or perhaps even in the nineties. A date in the seventies would perhaps be possible, but an earlier date would seem to be excluded. A date between 80 and 85 would seem most likely. A. H. Buck,<sup>21</sup> evidently followed by the Encyclopaedia Britannica,<sup>22</sup> dates the treatise around 77, for which the only basis seems to be the date

of Pliny's Natural History. Now if one dates Luke's gospel at 90 or later, or perhaps in the eighties, it is possible that he may have read Dioscorides and been impressed by his preface. But an earlier date, especially one before 70, would put Luke's date of publication before Dioscorides' date.<sup>23</sup> Thus, if there was any imitation, it may well have been Dioscorides who imitated Luke.<sup>24</sup>

It is certainly true that there are some verbal and conceptual similarities between Luke's preface and some other prefaces of antiquity. Scholars have, of course, given these parallels considerable attention.<sup>25</sup> In order to properly evaluate their significance, it must be borne in mind that when two writers treat the same subject and express themselves in the same literary idiom, correspondences in thought and expression occasionally appear. This simply reflects the fact that human thought and experience, for all their variety, often follow similar patterns. Now since Luke dealt with matters in his preface which many other writers dealt with in theirs, usually at much greater length, it should come as no surprise that an occasional word or clause in another preface, especially one written in the Hellenistic idiom of Luke's day (e.g., one written by Josephus) bears some resemblance to a word or clause in Luke's preface. But the resemblances in thought are so brief and so general, and the verbal correspondences are so slight and so often disconnected, that it is unwarranted to deduce from them that Luke is repeating conventional motifs.

If there were any particular remarks that writers included in their prefaces for the sake of convention, they would be found in many prefaces, yet no statement in Luke's preface is paralleled by one in even several other prefaces, let alone many others. Indeed, apart from one- and two-word parallels, if those can be called

parallels, one is hard-pressed to find more than one or two other prefaces which have the same combination of like words. And in no case does another preface as a whole, or even a paragraph in another preface, resemble Luke's preface at all closely.<sup>26</sup> So, in the absence of any pattern of similarity among the parallel passages in other prefaces, and in view of the unremarkable character of those parallels that do exist, we must conclude that the correspondences between Luke's preface and various other prefaces show only that Luke followed the broad conventions respecting the subject matter of prefaces, that his circumstances and ideas were not entirely different from all those of all other writers, and that he had a good command of literary diction, all of which leaves the seriousness and historical value of his statements untouched.

One parallel passage of which much has sometimes been made is found in the long preface to Josephus's Jewish War. Several pages into his preface, Josephus notes that he will not recount the ancient history of the Jewish people in his present work, "seeing that many Jews before me have accurately recorded the history of our ancestors" (ἐπειδήπερ καὶ Ἰουδαίων πολλοὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ τὰ τῶν προγόνων συνετάξαντο μετ' ἀκριβείας).<sup>27</sup> This statement bears some resemblance to Luke's opening words, "Since many have undertaken to draw up a narrative account of the things that are well-established (or, have been accomplished/completed/fulfilled) among us" (Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφόρημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων). These two clauses are similar (though their contexts are not) because both writers are referring to pertinent literature, in accordance with a common practice. Both employ the conjunction ἐπειδήπερ, reflecting the same literary idiom. Since both make only general mention of previous writers,

they not surprisingly refer to them with the general term πολλοί. Luke's use of the verb ἀνατάσσομαι and Josephus's use of the more common synonym συντάσσομαι to designate the writing done by their predecessors again reflect literary usage. Josephus judges that earlier writers of Jewish history had done so μετ' ἀκριβείας, and Luke says in another part of his preface (in vs. 3) that he himself will write (or that he has followed everything) ἀκριβῶς, which indicates that the two writers shared an interest in historical accuracy. Taken together, these correspondences show only that Luke and Josephus shared certain concerns and could use the same literary idiom to describe similar things.<sup>28</sup> Consequently, we cannot share I. I. du Plessis's opinion that these correspondences are "too striking to be ignored as coincidence" and "give reason to think that this type of formula was generally used in prefaces."<sup>29</sup> Of course, the verbal correspondences are not, strictly speaking, merely coincidental, for they may be attributed to the common factors outlined above. Nevertheless, the evidence hardly establishes the existence of a "type of formula." And since the other prefaces of antiquity provide no evidence for the existence of this "type of formula," it may hardly be supposed to have been "generally used in prefaces."

Probably the largest cluster of verbal correspondences to Luke's preface is found in another lengthy preface of Josephus. In two nearby passages of Against Apion, there are a total of eight words which are the same as, or similar to, words in Luke's preface: παράδοσιν, πράξεων (twice), ἀκριβῶς, παρεκλούθηκότα, ἔγραψα, πολλῶν, and αὐτόπτης.<sup>30</sup> However, these words are used in connections different from those in Luke, and do not always have the same meaning. We do see that Luke and Josephus were both

interested in accuracy and in the relationship of eyewitnesses to the account. But apart from these common concerns, the verbal correspondences are no more significant than another eight words (viz. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, γενόμενῃν, πάντες, προσηνώσκοντες, ἄνωθεν, μαρτυρεῖν, and ἀκριβεστάτην) in the unrelated, non-prefatory passage, Ac. 26:4-5.

The careful styling of Luke's preface and the presence in it of certain words and clauses which have formal parallels in certain other prefaces have led some scholars to speak of its "rhetorical" character and then assert that the rhetorical elements were included to make the preface look literary, regardless of historical accuracy. However, as F. H. Colson has pointed out, this does not necessarily follow. Greek (and Latin) rhetoric (the "rhetorical exhibitions of the Sophists" aside) was simply "a careful and elaborate formulation of the laws of effective speech based on a study of the earlier oratorical models."<sup>31</sup> It was not a principle of rhetoric that accuracy could be ignored in the narration of facts. Rhetorical style was not exclusive of, or even antagonistic in principle to, factuality of statement.<sup>32</sup> It is true that some writers apparently wrote histories largely to display their literary skill, and thus neglected the accuracy of their accounts.<sup>33</sup> But an interest in stylistic elegance or persuasiveness was itself quite compatible with accuracy of statement. Whether a given writer endeavored to write accurately or not depended upon his purposes for writing and his concern for factuality, not upon the effectiveness of his speech. Therefore, we must reject any insinuation that the historical accuracy of this or that word or statement in Luke's preface is questionable on account of its rhetorical effectiveness. Every critic would do well to abide

by Colson's sober judgment: "The utmost, then, that we can say is that a training in rhetoric and a study and observation of historical practice may have contributed to move Luke to put in the forefront of his narrative a statement as to his sources of knowledge, and his claim must be judged on its merits."<sup>34</sup>

Lieberich defines the rhetorical element in ancient Greek prefaces to historical works as those statements which emphasize the importance of the book's subject, extol its merits, or are in some other way intended to persuade the reader to read and appreciate it.<sup>35</sup> Whether or not such statements are properly designated as "rhetorical," it is obvious that while many writers would not be entirely truthful in their self-commendation, the effort to persuade is not in itself associated with a disinterest in objectivity. Each writer's claims, whether in his preface or elsewhere, must be evaluated on their merits, not prejudged on the basis of their "rhetorical" character.

Neither the conventional aspects nor the rhetorical effectiveness of Luke's preface, then, draws its accuracy into question. Literary convention and rhetorical practice may have suggested its subject matter, but they did not prescribe the substance of its statements. The literary idiom influenced Luke's style and diction, but did not compel him to compromise the truthfulness of his assertions. The historical accuracy of his preface would be open to question only if his intention to tell the truth about his book and its background could be challenged, and there would appear to be no grounds for such a challenge. Therefore, in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary at any point, Luke's preface must be accepted as a knowledgeable, forthright, and trustworthy source of information about the origin of his gospel.

## LUKE'S MANY PREDECESSORS AND THEIR NARRATIVES (VS. 1a)

In the first half of his preface, Luke describes the literary background against which his own work is to be understood. He states, first of all, that "many" (πᾶλλοί) had already written narratives about Jesus. But how many are "many"? As a general rule, the number signified by the word depends upon the nature of the subject. But no matter what the subject may be, it is hard to see how two or three could be described as "many" in number.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the number of gospel writers would not have to have been much higher for the word "many" to apply. A number in the range of five to ten could reasonably be in view,<sup>2</sup> and a larger number, although seemingly improbable, cannot be absolutely ruled out.<sup>3</sup> It may be surprising to some that there would have been many attempts to record the gospel traditions at an early date. However, since so little is really known about the early church, it would be rather presumptuous to insist that Luke is exaggerating at this point.<sup>4</sup>

Some will argue that the first Christians were so gripped by their expectation of the imminent return of Christ that they had no reason to record the gospel traditions, and therefore did not do so--despite what Luke says.<sup>5</sup> However, the extent and impact of that expectation must not be exaggerated. There may well have been those who did not accept that it rendered gospel literature superfluous. The end may not have been expected so immediately that a

written record of Jesus' life and teachings could not have served a useful purpose in the intervening period. That this would probably have been the case is shown by the Qumran community, which, as E. E. Ellis points out, "combined an intense apocalyptic expectation with prolific writing."<sup>6</sup>

The factuality of Luke's claim to have had "many" predecessors is indicated by his introduction of it with the conjunction ἐπειδήπερ, which means "since, inasmuch as, seeing that."<sup>7</sup> This word, according to Blass-Debrunner-Funk, calls attention to "a fact already well known."<sup>8</sup> Indeed, W. Schmithals translates it as "weil bekanntlich."<sup>9</sup> Thus, Luke is drawing his readers' attention to the fact that he has many predecessors, and he assumes that this fact is already well-known. We may infer, then, that his readers were aware, or at least could have ascertained, that a fairly substantial body of gospel literature had already been written. Luke's "since" clause forms the logical foundation for the entire argument of his preface; it is hard to believe that he would have begun his carefully constructed argument with such a statement if it was not true.

It has been argued to the contrary that Luke described his predecessors as πολλοί not because they were in fact many in number, but rather, without regard to their actual number, simply because it was conventional to use πολλός in prefaces, exordia, and other introductory statements. M. Dibelius, for example, comments that Luke's mentioning of "many" predecessors "corresponds to convention and so does not prove that there were many, but only that there were several of such texts."<sup>10</sup> Cadbury advises us that "Luke's reference to many who had tried to compile records must be taken with a grain of salt," since the word "many" may be merely

"a convention of frontispiece rhetoric."<sup>11</sup> This line of interpretation is pushed even further by J. Bauer, who simply dismisses Luke's use of the word as a rhetorical flourish. He argues that Luke referred to his predecessors in order to justify his writing of a gospel, and in calling them "many" he "gebraucht den üblichen locus communis . . . lediglich, weil er eben zu ähnlichen Vorreden dazugehört."<sup>12</sup> W. G. Kümmel similarly declares that "the stylized πολλοί tells nothing about the number of predecessors known to Lk."<sup>13</sup>

The view that Luke's use of πολλός in Lk. 1:1 is "conventional" or "rhetorical," and therefore must not be mistaken for a factual description, did not arise from a careful study of Luke's preface, of ancient prefaces or rhetorical practices, or of the use of πολλός generally. Rather, it arose in 1907 when E. Schwartz, in order to defend his compressed scheme of Pauline chronology, was obliged to dispose of the seemingly contrary evidence provided by the word πολλός in Ac. 24:10. In so doing, he cast doubt upon the seriousness of its use in Lk. 1:1 and elsewhere. That is, in order to date the arrest of Paul at Pentecost 55 and the dismissal of Felix shortly thereafter, Schwartz had to explain away the "many years" of procuratorial office attributed to Felix by Paul in Ac. 24:10, since he had been procurator of Judea only since 52 or 53. To do this he asserted that Paul's speech was only Luke's invention-- which, however, still left Luke's dating of Felix to be accounted for--"und außerdem ist πολλός ein Wort das ins rhetorische Prooemium nun einmal gehört, ohne daß man sich viel dabei denkt." In support of the latter claim, he cited Lk. 1:1, Ac. 24:3 (i.e. vs. 2 in the Greek and English Bibles), Heb. 1:1, and six passages from Greek and Latin (!) authors as demonstrative of the rhetorical use of

πολύς. However, he made no effort to justify that designation in those instances, to demonstrate a connection between this supposedly rhetorical usage and a lack of factuality, or to establish that Luke had so used πολύς in Ac. 24:10.<sup>14</sup>

Although Schwartz fell far short of proving his case, especially with regard to Lk. 1:1, his notion of a rhetorical πολύς was taken up in 1922 by Cadbury in his influential study of Luke's preface in The Beginnings of Christianity.<sup>15</sup> Cadbury went beyond Schwartz, however, by appealing to "the formal nature of the preface as a whole," and not simply to the conventionality of "this usage in particular," as grounds for interpreting πολλοί loosely in Lk. 1:1.<sup>16</sup> Schwartz had not discounted the historical value of Ac. 24:10 merely because it was an exordium composed in the rhetorical mode. Nor is there any reason for doing so. According to Quintilian, "The sole purpose of the exordium is to prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech." This would be most effectively accomplished "by making the audience well-disposed, attentive and ready to receive instruction." And while praising the judge was a common tactic employed to gain his good will (as in Ac. 24:2; cf. vs. 10), it had to be done "with tact" and was most effective when linked "to the furtherance of our own case."<sup>17</sup> Quintilian advised the advocate to say what would be effective, but he did not suggest that the facts be misrepresented, however carefully they might be selected and however extraneous they might be. It goes without saying that many advocates then, as now, took liberties with the truth in the promotion of their causes, but it was not their adherence to rhetorical models, but rather their own personal character and their considerations of expediency that determined

how scrupulous they would be in their presentations. Thus we find that the exordium of Tertullus in Ac. 24:2-3 misrepresents the facts of history in order to flatter the judge. But we cannot infer from that, or, indeed, from the exordia of a whole host of crafty advocates, that the apostle Paul misrepresents the facts in his exordium (vs. 10), or that Luke would have disregarded historical accuracy in his "rhetorical" preface.

In support of the new interpretation of πολλοί, Cadbury<sup>18</sup> and more recently Bauer<sup>19</sup> gathered together statements from a wide range of prefaces, exordia, and other opening (and even closing!) remarks in which the word πολύς or an etymologically related word occurs with reference to anything<sup>20</sup> --but rarely to previous writers.<sup>21</sup> One could easily infer from these passages that, as J. M. Creed says, "the use of a part of πολλός was felt to be stylistically effective."<sup>22</sup> However, it seems strange that ancient writers would have prized the common and colorless word πολύς for, of all things, its stylistic effect. Furthermore, it is hard to see why πολλός or any other word would have been considered stylistically effective in an introductory statement, but not in the rest of one's composition. We should expect to find πολλός occurring with a higher frequency in introductory statements than elsewhere simply because it is appropriate to begin a treatise or oration by presenting the general background or context for what follows. This is easily accomplished with a summary reference to one's predecessors, to past events, to the general situation, etc. It should come as no surprise that the word πολύς, which indicates a general number or quantity, would often be used in such references. The logic of composition, then, and not the supposed stylistic effect of πολλός, accounts best for its apparently somewhat more

frequent use in prefaces and other introductory statements.

But even if we grant, for the sake of argument, that for some inexplicable reason the use of πολλός was considered stylistically effective in prefaces, this would not necessarily imply, as Creed recognizes, "that the statement itself is not true to fact."<sup>23</sup> There is a modern convention to thank the appropriate people in one's preface, but that does not mean that every such expression of thanks is exaggerated or disingenuous. Some, indeed, may not be entirely sincere, but that depends upon the personal character of the author, not upon the constraints of convention. There is no reason to think that Luke was insincere in referring to the number of his predecessors, and so we should accept his statement at face value. And even if we suppose that Luke was under an obligation to use πολλός in his preface, he could, had he not had many predecessors, just as well have satisfied that obligation by referring to "many" eyewitnesses and servants of the word in vs. 2. Therefore, even if it was conventional to use πολλός in prefaces, that is no reason to discount its force in Lk. 1:1.

It is true that the word πολλός lends itself to exaggeration. For example, in his flattery of Felix, Tertullus declares, with no little exaggeration, that under his wise rule the people have enjoyed "much" peace (Ac. 24:2). On the other hand, when Paul defends himself, he refrains from flattery in his exordium and merely appeals to Felix as one who has judged the nation for "many" years (vs. 10), quite in accordance with historical fact.<sup>24</sup> In their commentary on Acts, K. Lake and Cadbury assert that the use of the word "many" in Ac. 24:10 is "purely conventional" --although Lake, when writing on his own, takes the word at face value<sup>25</sup>--and claim that this usage is illustrated by a letter in which the

emperor Claudius refers to his first year of rule as "many years."<sup>26</sup> However, Lake and Cadbury have misinterpreted Claudius, for he refers rather to his many years in the Augustan house.<sup>27</sup> Thus, there is no reason to say, as does one recent commentator, that "the many years is rhetorical and not to be taken too seriously."<sup>28</sup>

Since Paul, with Luke's certain approval, uses πολλός in his exordium without any exaggeration, the fact that Tertullus, with Luke's undoubted disapproval, uses the word with exaggeration does not provide any basis for supposing that Luke's own use of it in Lk. 1:1 is a manifestation of rhetorical exaggeration. Rather, we must think that Luke would have followed the usage with which he quotes Paul, not that with which he quotes Tertullus. Certainly the burden of proof rests upon anyone wishing to charge Luke with exaggeration in Lk. 1:1, and no proof of exaggeration has been forthcoming. One would expect a person prone to exaggeration to minimize the number of those who had already written something comparable to his own work, for the greater the number of one's recent predecessors, the less justifiable one's own book might seem, unless one disparages them all, as Luke does not do. Therefore, we are obliged to take Lk. 1:1 seriously, and to recognize that Luke did have, in fact, many predecessors.<sup>29</sup>

Despite the weakness of the arguments advanced in favor of a rhetorical πολλός in Lk. 1:1, scholarly opinion was easily won over by Cadbury. Dibelius, for example, had taken Luke's preface entirely at face value in the first edition (1919) of his Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums,<sup>30</sup> but in the second edition (1933) he expanded his treatment of Luke's preface in order to take Cadbury's work into account, and this time he conceded the

conventional use of πολὺς in vs. 1.<sup>31</sup> Almost with one voice interpreters since 1922 have been discounting the force of πολλοί in Lk. 1:1.<sup>32</sup> They have been eager to do so because Luke's "many" predecessors can thus be reduced to two or three in number, and their writings can then be identified as the two or three sources commonly held to have been used by Luke. This is made abundantly clear by Bauer, who concludes his argument with these words: "Wir haben . . . klar gemacht, dass aus der Erwähnung der 'Vielen' im Lukasprolog auf keinen Fall mehr herausgelesen werden darf als uns eine saubere Analyse des lukanischen Werks wirklich zeigt."<sup>33</sup> Or, as Dillon puts it, "it seems reasonable to understand it under the terms of the Two-Source criticism which has been so consistently validated in contemporary Lucan studies."<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, C. C. Torrey insists that "we have good reason to believe, and no reason to doubt, that his use of the adjective was fully justified," that "good reason" apparently being his theory that the four gospels are based on "voluminous, multiform, and scattered written material," which would accordingly be in view in Lk. 1:1.<sup>35</sup> But literary theory should not be allowed to prejudice the exegesis of Luke's preface, one way or the other. Rather, careful grammatico-historical exegesis should inform literary criticism. And, as we have seen, there are solid grounds for heeding C. K. Barrett's advice that the words of Luke's preface, including the word "many" in vs. 1, "be taken more seriously than it has of late been fashionable to take them."<sup>36</sup>

Luke states that his many predecessors "have undertaken" (ἐπιχειρήσαν) to write. The verb ἐπιχειρέω means "set one's hand to," that is, "undertake, attempt."<sup>37</sup> It signifies the making of a determined effort to accomplish a demanding task.<sup>38</sup> Thus, in Ac.

9:29 and 19:13, the other two places where the word occurs in the New Testament, it refers to an effort by conspirators to murder Paul and to an effort by exorcists to usurp apostolic power, respectively. That the word was sometimes used in Greek literature with reference to the writing of books, as in Lk. 1:1, will come as no surprise to anyone who has undertaken that task.<sup>39</sup> Because of its demanding character, the undertaking in view is often unsuccessful, as in Ac. 9:29 and 19:13. Nonetheless, the verb itself does not imply the failure of the effort, even when the context indicates that it did fail.<sup>40</sup> The success or failure of the undertaking is indicated, if at all, only by the context.<sup>41</sup>

Origin and other Church Fathers perceived a note of criticism in Luke's use of the verb ἐπιχρῆσεω. Origin understood Luke to be criticizing "those who leapt forward without the grace of the Holy Spirit to write Gospels."<sup>42</sup> Eusebius similarly interpreted Luke as saying that they "had somewhat rashly taken it upon them" to write.<sup>43</sup> And Augustine understood Luke to be referring to those who "were utterly incompetent rightly to carry out what they took in hand."<sup>44</sup> Theophylact similarly commented, "Because they set out without divine grace, they did not finish."<sup>45</sup> In more modern times W. Burkitt likewise inferred that "divers Persons in that Age had imprudently and inconsiderately set upon writing Gospels, without Direction from the Spirit of God, whose Errors and Mistakes were to be corrected by a true Narrative."<sup>46</sup> But this view has long been out of fashion,<sup>47</sup> for there is no clear evidence that ἐπιχρῆσεω was ever used with the connotation that the undertaking in view was presumptuous or rash. Even the Church Fathers do not really so argue. Rather, seeing that "have undertaken to draw up" falls short of the positive "have drawn up," they are able to read

between the lines and see a reference to inadequate writers, which they take to be a critical reference to the writers of heretical gospels.<sup>48</sup>

A few modern scholars have also discerned a note of criticism in Luke's use of ἐπιχέρω. G. Klein thinks that the word indicates the inadequacy of former efforts.<sup>49</sup> His view is adopted by S. Schulz.<sup>50</sup> Fitzmyer is inclined to see "a pejorative nuance," but he finds it "hard to be certain." He maintains that the verb connotes "a presumptuous undertaking" as it is used by Josephus (in Vit. 40, 338) "of others who tried to write Jewish history."<sup>51</sup> However, in both passages their presumption is indicated by the context. Klein, Schulz, and Fitzmyer all mention Herm. Sim. 9.2.6 as evidence that the verb itself can carry negative connotations, but here again the note of failure is present in the context: ". . . for the things which you cannot understand, do not attempt (μὴ ἐπιχέρετε) to comprehend, as if you were wise; but ask the Lord, that you may receive understanding and know them." In this case failure is implied by the impossibility of the thing attempted, not by the use of the verb ἐπιχέρω.

Each of Luke's predecessors undertook "to draw up" (ἀνατάξασθαι) something. There would not seem to be any closely analogous use of the rare word ἀνατάσσομαι in earlier or contemporary literature, but the context here leaves little doubt that it refers to the composing of an account. The nature of that composing, however, has been disputed.

Some scholars have inferred from the prefix ἀνα- in the verb that the composing involved repetition. The idea of repetition is indeed present in the word as it is used by Plutarch (with reference to an elephant's rehearsal of its circus routine)<sup>52</sup> and by

Irenaeus (with reference to the restoration of the Mosaic law by Ezra).<sup>53</sup> Thus, B. F. Westcott understands the verb to mean "to draw up and arrange afresh" in Lk. 1:1.<sup>54</sup> On this view, the object of ἀνατάξασθαι, namely διήγησιν ("narrative account"), denotes that which was repeated. Accordingly, G. E. Lessing argued (with support from H. Marsh) that διήγησιν refers to a written gospel narrative, and that many attempts had been made to rearrange its contents in a more suitable fashion.<sup>55</sup> Blass, on the other hand, thought that the verb meant "to restore from memory," and that Luke was referring to the written reproduction of oral traditions from memory.<sup>56</sup> Similarly, Klein understands that each of Luke's predecessors reproduced in written form an orally transmitted narrative.<sup>57</sup>

This line of interpretation, however, is inconsistent with the fact that διήγησιν is anarthrous. Luke's many predecessors concerned themselves with "a narrative," not "the narrative." One would not say that a number of authors have rearranged or reproduced "a narrative" if one particular narrative were in view.<sup>58</sup> Luke is saying that each of his predecessors has prepared a work which could be classified as a διήγησις, not that each one has reworked a previously existing one.<sup>59</sup> Consequently, we must reject the notion that the words ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν convey any idea of the reworking of a primitive oral or written narrative. The idea of repetition could only be present if the object of ἀνατάξασθαι were a general expression like παραδόσεις ("traditions"). Blass, indeed, interprets the passage as if that were the case, but the term διήγησιν is too specific for such an interpretation.

There is in fact evidence that ἀνατάσσομαι was already being used without any suggestion of a repetitive process being involved.

In the Letter of Aristeas the verb refers to the drawing up of laws by Moses.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, the meaning "set forth in order, compose, compile" is attested in early Christian literature.<sup>61</sup> This sense fits the context of Lk. 1:1 perfectly well, and would appear to be the correct one.<sup>62</sup> We would prefer to express it as "draw up," trying to avoid any suggestion of originality of content, since Luke adds in vs. 2 that his predecessors relied upon traditional material.<sup>63</sup>

Luke says that his predecessors "have undertaken to draw up" (ἐπιχειρήσαν ἀνατάξασθαι) their works, not that they "have drawn up" (ἀνετάξαντο) them.<sup>64</sup> But since they did no doubt succeed in drawing them up, it may be that the former words are a circumlocution for the latter one. However, the remarkable brevity and succinctness of the preface as a whole make it doubtful that Luke would have indulged in verbosity at this point. Even Cadbury is inclined to recognize this,<sup>65</sup> although his own explanation, that Luke's use of ἐπιχειρέω was "due to the modest periphrases with περιάσσομαι with which ancient writers were wont in their prefaces to refer to their own work,"<sup>66</sup> is no better. Since Luke was describing the works of others, there was no reason for him to adopt a modest periphrasis appropriate for referring to one's own work. Furthermore, he did not use the future tense (or any other tense) of περιάσσομαι (or of περιάξω). Therefore, we must conclude that Luke was describing his predecessors' undertakings to write, and not, strictly speaking, what they actually wrote.<sup>67</sup>

Each of Luke's predecessors undertook to draw up "a narrative account" (διήγησις).<sup>68</sup> F. Büchsel notes that the word διήγησις "is found from the time of Plato and simply denotes an oral or written record as such."<sup>69</sup> Since, as we shall see,<sup>70</sup> the accounts

drawn up by Luke's predecessors dealt with the gospel history, they were clearly narrative in character. Thus, the term διήγησις, as used by Luke, can only mean "not something special, but a narrative."<sup>71</sup> Fitzmyer notes that "the term diēgēsis, 'a narrative account,' was often used in classical and Hellenistic Greek literature of historical writing,"<sup>72</sup> and that is the specific meaning intended here.<sup>73</sup> W. C. van Unnik similarly observes that Luke employs "a technical term for the well-ordered, polished product of the historian's work."<sup>74</sup> We would agree with Fitzmyer that Luke had in mind "a comprehensive story which aims at being something more than a mere collection of notes or a compilation of anecdotes."<sup>75</sup>

Although the word διήγησις could perhaps have been used to denote an oral narrative,<sup>76</sup> most commentators have recognized that Luke uses it here to denote the literary genre of narrative. His predecessors "have undertaken to draw up" a narrative account, and both the undertaking and the drawing up sound like literary composition.<sup>77</sup> Furthermore, Luke indicates that he, in writing a gospel narrative, is doing what they, too (καί, vs. 3), have done. This strongly implies that their narratives were written, like his.<sup>78</sup> We may assume that Luke was following the common practice of commenting on one's literary antecedents in one's preface.

Recently, W. R. Farmer and Ellis have suggested that Luke's many predecessors together compiled one narrative, rather than that each of them individually drew up his own narrative.<sup>79</sup> As their discussions show, both Farmer and Ellis have been influenced by the interpretation of Lessing and Marsh. But according to Lessing and Marsh each of Luke's predecessors rearranged the primitive narrative into one of his own, whereas according to Farmer and Ellis

they produced that narrative together.<sup>80</sup> However, we have already seen that in Lk. 1:1 the word  $\delta\iota\acute{\gamma}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ , being anarthrous, denotes not one particular work, but rather the (one) kind of work that was in each case produced.<sup>81</sup> Both Farmer and Ellis (like Marsh) stress that  $\delta\iota\acute{\gamma}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\nu$  is a singular noun, but Luke is simply using what might be called a distributive singular.<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, the indefiniteness of the word "many" indicates that each of them produced a narrative, for if Luke had had a group of coauthors in mind, he would probably have identified them with a more definite expression.

Luke begins his preface, then, by noting that he has many predecessors, each of whom has undertaken to draw up a written narrative account.

## THE SUBJECT MATTER OF PREVIOUS NARRATIVES (VS. 1b)

Each of Luke's many predecessors undertook to draw up a narrative account  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$  τῶν πεπληροφωρημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, which we understand to mean "of the things that are well-established among us." Scholars are by no means agreed on the meaning of the participle  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omega\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ . Because its meaning is so difficult to determine, we will first examine the other words in the prepositional phrase, in the hope that a clear understanding of the context will shed light on it.

The preposition  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$  indicates that the phrase which it introduces denotes the subject matter of the accounts drawn up by Luke's predecessors.<sup>1</sup> But however one interprets that phrase, the identity of this subject matter remains a mystery. It consists of certain "things" ( $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$ ), which, among the members of a group identified only as "us" ( $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ ), are distinguished from all other things only by the fact that they have reached a certain state, are in a certain condition, or have a certain status (i.e. that denoted by the participle), which no doubt could be said of many other things in many situations.<sup>2</sup> These words are not clarified elsewhere in the preface. Rather, other vague expressions are used, notably "the matters in which you have been instructed" (vs. 4). Indeed, if Luke's preface were the only surviving portion of his writings, we would have very little idea of what he was referring to or what his work dealt with.<sup>3</sup>

As we shall argue in due course,<sup>4</sup> certain of Luke's expressions are vague because the person to whom the preface was addressed, namely a certain Theophilus (vs. 3), had previously communicated with him about these matters and thus would have known what he was talking about.<sup>5</sup> We are not privy to this earlier communication, but it is not difficult to determine what Luke is referring to.

There is ample evidence that "the things" about which Luke's predecessors wrote were, generally speaking, the same things as those about which Luke wrote, and thus that they, like he, wrote narrative accounts of the gospel history. Luke devotes the first half of his preface to the literary efforts of others, compares their accounts with his (by implication), and never specifically mentions his own subject matter. These facts are explicable only on the assumption that their subject matter was the same as his. Now in Ac. 1:1 Luke says that his gospel was written "about everything . . . that Jesus began to do and to teach." Therefore, Luke would presumably have explained "the things" of Lk. 1:1 as the deeds and teachings of Jesus.<sup>6</sup>

Although history, viewed abstractly, may be said to consist of events, it would be slightly incorrect to interpret τῶν . . . πραγμάτων as "the events" of the gospel history. We should rather let Ac. 1:1 interpret Lk. 1:1, and think of these "things" as the things that Jesus did and the things that he said. If Luke had had events as such in mind, rather than deeds and teachings, he probably would have written τῶν γεγονένων (as in Lk. 24:18) or perhaps τῶν γεγονότων.<sup>7</sup> This is how he ordinarily refers to events, as may be seen in Lk. 8:34, 35, 56; 9:7; 10:13; 23:47, 48; 24:12, 18; Ac. 4:21; 5:7; 12:9; 13:12.<sup>8</sup> (Luke also refers to events as τῶν

συμβεβηκότων in Lk. 24:14 and, in the singular, in Ac. 3:10.) The difference between deeds and teachings, on the one hand, and events, on the other, is perhaps only a matter of viewpoint, but without a precise understanding of the words in the immediate context of the participle πεπληροφόρημένων, we may not be able to determine its meaning.

Luke's predecessors did not undertake to narrate only certain things that were part of the gospel history, but rather "the" (τῶν) things that comprised that history. The force of the definite article here is that Luke's predecessors undertook to relate the gospel history as a whole.<sup>9</sup> Their narratives, then, presented more or less comprehensive accounts of the deeds and teachings of Jesus. Thus, they could not have been mere fragments of tradition, collections of sayings or miscellaneous anecdotes, or segments of the gospel history (e.g., a passion narrative).<sup>10</sup> Rather, they must have been comparable in scope, and perhaps also in size, to the synoptic model.<sup>11</sup>

Luke does not say that his predecessors' works, taken together, cover the whole range of gospel tradition. Rather, "the things," i.e. the gospel history as a whole, constitute the subject matter of "a narrative account," which each of his predecessors undertook to draw up. Thus, each of their accounts narrated "the things" in view. Each provided a more or less comprehensive account of the gospel history.

The words "have undertaken to draw up a narrative account" also indicate that Luke's predecessors wrote works on the order of a synoptic gospel. A considerable effort is implied by "have undertaken," and an effort "to draw up" a narrative account would be an effort to assemble and put together material. A considerable

effort to put material together in literary form would result in a work that was at least fairly substantial. F. Bleek thus correctly argues that in the words "draw up a narrative account" there is a reference to "zusammenhangende Erzählungen einer größeren Reihe von Begebenheiten," "zumal in Verbindung mit den folgenden Worten" specifying their subject matter as the whole gospel tradition.<sup>12</sup> And E. Güttgemanns adds that in the terminology of ancient rhetoric a  $\delta\acute{\eta}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ , in contrast to a  $\delta\acute{\eta}\gamma\gamma\mu\alpha$ , was "ein umfassend-komplexer Erzählungsablauf."<sup>13</sup>

Luke speaks of the deeds and teachings of Jesus as things that are in a certain state  $\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ , "among us." (This phrase, by itself, could also mean "(with)in us," but that would not seem to fit the context, however the participle be understood.) There is no antecedent for the pronoun "us," and the group of people to whom it refers is not identified. We may assume, however, that Theophilus, on the basis of his previous communication with Luke, would have known who was meant.<sup>14</sup> But we are not left in the dark, for the context indicates that by "us" Luke means "us Christians," that is, Luke and his fellow Christians.

This will be more readily seen once it is recognized that those called "us" in vs. 1 are the same people as the recipients of the gospel traditions likewise called "us" ( $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ ) in vs. 2.<sup>15</sup> The two identical pronouns are separated (in the Greek text) by only three other words, and neither one has an antecedent or any qualification whatever. In such a situation the reader could hardly be expected to discern a shift in meaning. Cadbury well observes that "the change in a single sentence is difficult unless the context makes it perfectly clear."<sup>16</sup> And this the context does not do. On the contrary, the gospel history said in vs. 1 to be in a certain

resultant state "among us," is said in vs. 2 to have been handed down by the original tradition bearers "to us." The implication would seem to be that in connection with the gospel traditions' having been handed down (aorist tense) to us, their subject matter, i.e. the deeds and teachings of Jesus, reached a certain state (perfect tense) among us. The meaning of the word "us" here certainly remains constant.

Nonetheless, there have been those who would distinguish between those first called "us" and those called "us" a few words later. For example, Kümmel says that "ἐν ἡμῖν in v. 1 indicates the generation of the End-time; ἡμῖν in v. 2 indicates the generation of the writer."<sup>17</sup> This explanation follows that of H. Schürmann, who understands the first "us" as eschatological and the second one as ecclesiological.<sup>18</sup> However, if Luke had really intended to make such fine distinctions, he undoubtedly would have expressed himself with words which actually convey them, not with the words "us . . . us." Distinctions between the two pronouns are drawn by those whose interpretation of the obscure participle πεπληροφόρημένων seems to require it. For them, confident of the correctness of their interpretation, "there is," as I. H. Marshall declares, "no difficulty about such a shift in meaning."<sup>19</sup> But if such an unnatural shift is necessary, the correctness of one's exegesis ought to be questioned. Obscure words should be interpreted in the light of clear ones, not vice versa.

There can be little doubt that those called "us" in vss. 1 and 2 were Christians. Whatever state πεπληροφόρημένων may signify, it must have been among Christians that the deeds and teachings of Jesus were in that state. This is confirmed in vs. 2, for the recipients of the gospel traditions (i.e. "us") were certainly

Christians (whoever else may also have heard them).<sup>20</sup>

There is also ample reason to think that by "us (Christians)" Luke meant the Christian church as a whole, not just one section of it. If he had had in mind a specific group of Christians, he would presumably have so indicated. One can hardly suppose that "many" would have written accounts of the gospel history within a particular Christian community. And even if there had been a concentration of gospel writers in one place, it is hard to believe that Luke would have given his attention solely to them. If writers throughout the church wrote accounts of the deeds and teachings of Jesus as they were known to "us" (vs. 1), then we must locate "us" throughout the church, too. It was to "us" that the original tradition bearers handed down the gospel traditions (vs. 2). They did so to the whole church, and thus it would be natural to identify "us" as the whole church.

For these reasons, therefore, we cannot accept Blass's suggestion that Luke is referring to "the Christian community existing in Judaea, most members of which were a part of that population among which our Lord had lived and died."<sup>21</sup> This view faces the additional objection that it would make Luke, who was surely one of "us," a member of the Judean church, which seems unlikely.<sup>22</sup>

Also unacceptable is Dillon's limitation of "us" to Luke's "circle," that is, to Luke and "his audience."<sup>23</sup> P. S. Minear similarly supposes that Luke has himself and Theophilus in view "as members of churches caught up in multiple perplexities" (which he thinks Luke is endeavoring to dispel).<sup>24</sup> However, there is no reason to think that Luke's intended audience, beyond Theophilus, was narrower than the church in general, or that Luke was part of a limited "circle" for whom alone he would have written.

Finally, we should note that while the word "us" naturally focuses on Luke and his contemporaries, it is probably meant to embrace the whole church up to that time. This is suggested in vs. 2, where it is said that the apostles handed down the gospel traditions "to us." They handed down the gospel traditions directly to those Christians with whom they had personal contact, as well as more generally to the church at large. Thus, the resultant state denoted by *πεπληροφορημένων* evidently characterized the deeds and teachings of Jesus throughout the apostolic period, certainly in Luke's own day, but also earlier.

We should also observe that this participle relates things of the past (i.e. the deeds done and teachings given by Jesus) to people of the present (i.e. "us" in the apostolic and perhaps post-apostolic age). And since it is a perfect passive participle, it gives to those things of the past a state, condition, or status in the present experience of Luke and his fellow Christians.<sup>25</sup> That state came into being among them and it remained with them. It follows from this that the participle does not describe the deeds and teachings of Jesus as historical phenomena, but rather as they were part of subsequent Christian experience. Therefore, it must have to do with the proclamation and/or reception (and subsequent knowledge) of the gospel traditions in the church. It is hard to see how else the gospel history could be present in Christian experience.

Luke, then, identifies the deeds and teachings of Jesus as those things which, among Christians of the apostolic age, and especially at the time when he wrote, were *πεπληροφορημένων*. This much is clear, but the generally recognized meanings of the verb *πληροφορέω* do not fit this context very well. In other words,

there would not seem to be any closely analogous use of the verb elsewhere in Greek literature.<sup>26</sup>

Πληροφωρέω is compounded from πλήρης and φέρω (or, φέρω), and thus has the etymological sense of "bear fully" or "bring to a fullness," that is, "make full" or "fill full."<sup>27</sup> Not surprisingly, then, it is often used synonymously with the much more common word πληρέω, which also has the etymological sense of "make full." Indeed, πληρέω is a variant reading for πληροφωρέω in Col. 4:12 (p<sup>46</sup> Byz) and 2 Tim. 4:5, 17 (F G), and the latter is a variant for the former in Rom. 15:13 (B F G). Thus, the usage of πληρέω may help to explain that of πληροφωρέω. However, one cannot automatically assume that every meaning of πληρέω is necessarily available to the interpreter of πεπληροφωρημένων in Lk. 1:1. The two words share a wide range of meaning, but both words would also seem to have their distinctive uses.

If we begin with the basic meaning of πληροφωρέω, namely "make full" (for "fill full" would not seem to be appropriate), and ask in what sense the gospel history was "made full" among the Christians of Luke's day, taking into consideration that the participle evidently makes reference to the proclamation and/or reception (and subsequent knowledge) of the gospel traditions,<sup>28</sup> the best answer would seem to be that the facts about Jesus were in the state of being "well-established" among Christians. The gospel history was firmly established as historically true and as central to Christian belief through persuasive apostolic preaching and teaching and through the acceptance of that history by Christians. It then continued to be well-established as the church perpetuated the gospel traditions and continued to believe them. Thus Luke could speak of the deeds and teachings of Jesus as "the things that

are well-established among us."

Luke could have referred to the gospel history in other ways. However, his primary purpose for writing a gospel was to relate what was certain about Jesus, as he says in vs. 4. Accordingly, he introduces the gospel history by emphasizing its "well-established" character. He then mentions the highly qualified persons who originally established the gospel traditions in the church (vs. 2) and indicates his own familiarity with them (vs. 3). Our interpretation of πεπληροφορημένων, then, fits into the preface as a whole, as well as into the immediate context.

Several ancient Greek-speaking commentators interpreted πεπληροφορημένων in Lk. 1:1 more or less as we do. Their testimony is important because they may well have had a better understanding of the varied usage of πληροφόρεω than we moderns can gain from the passages assembled by lexicographers. If an ancient commentator says that a certain word has a certain meaning in a given passage, we have good reason to believe that that word could have been used with that meaning, even though it may not have been so used in the passage in question, and even though it may not otherwise be known to modern scholars. Thus, if ancient Greek commentators say that πεπληροφορημένων means "well-established" or the like, then we have evidence that the word was so used in Greek, whether or not it has that meaning in Lk. 1:1.

Let us consider first the rather extensive remarks on this word made by one of the most learned scholars of the ancient church, namely Origen. He comments, as translated and adapted by Jerome, in his Homilies on Luke: "'Many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those things which have been confirmed (confirmatae sunt) among us.' They have essayed and taken in hand

to write about those things which have been clearly ascertained (manifestissime sunt compertae) among us. The result<sup>29</sup> in his own case Luke indicates by his language, in which he says, 'Among us have been clearly shown (manifestissime sunt ostensae),' that is πεπληροφορημένων, which the Latin language does not express in a single word. For he had learned with sure faith and reason, nor did he hesitate in any matter as to whether it was this way or the other. But this was the outcome in those who faithfully believed, and they obtained that for which the prophet prays, and they say, 'Confirm (Confirma) thou me in thy words.' Wherefore the apostle also says of those who were fixed and firm, 'That ye may be rooted and grounded in faith.'<sup>30</sup> The statement about the Latin equivalent of πεπληροφορημένων is clearly an interpolation by Jerome into Origen's text.

No Greek manuscript of Origen's work is extant, but on the basis of various catenae M. Rauer has reconstructed a portion of the passage just quoted, beginning with the third sentence. We would translate it as follows: "Now Luke, by saying περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῶν πραγμάτων, indicates his own state of mind, that doubting nothing and not imagining anything, he instead confirmed (ἐβεβαίωσεν) everything confidently, as knowing it well. For he had been convinced (Πεπληροφόρητο) and was uncertain about nothing, whether it was so or not. This happens to those who are steadfastly (βεβαίως) believing, who are praying and obtaining, and who have said, 'Strengthen (βεβαίωσόν) me with your words' [Psa. 119 (118):28]. For the Apostle also says concerning those who are steadfast (τῶν βεβαίων), 'that you may be firmly rooted and grounded in faith' [Eph. 3:17; Col. 1:23; 2:7]."

The first sentence of Jerome's translation represents what

must have been Origen's quotation of Lk. 1:1. Thus, confirmatae sunt translates πεπληροφορημένων. This may simply be Jerome's understanding of the participle, but he may have been influenced by Origen's subsequent discussion, especially by his use of the word ἐβεβαίωσε (in the first sentence of the reconstructed Greek text) to develop Luke's thought. The second sentence is Origen's restatement of the verse, and thus manifestissime sunt compertae translates Origen's handling of πεπληροφορημένων. It is not altogether clear what portion of Jerome's third sentence belongs to Origen, but since he was quoting Luke where Jerome reads manifestissime sunt ostensae, he undoubtedly read πεπληροφορημένων there. Judging by the Greek text, Jerome is paraphrasing at this point, with manifestissime sunt ostensae replacing Origen's completion of the sentence. For the rest of the passage, the correspondence between the Latin and the Greek is clear enough.

There is good reason to infer (as Jerome evidently did) that Origen understood Luke to have used the verb πληροφορέω in Lk. 1:1 roughly synonymously with βεβαίω (= confirmo), a verb that means "make firm, establish, confirm, strengthen."<sup>31</sup> This is evident from his use of the expressions ἐβεβαίωσε, βεβαίως, and τῶν βεβαίων in developing Luke's thought, his citation of Psa. 119 (118):28 (containing the word βεβαίωσον), and Jerome's use of confirmatae sunt in translating Origen's quotation of Lk. 1:1.<sup>32</sup> Origen sees that Luke, in describing the gospel history as πεπληροφορημένων, expresses his attitude toward it. His attitude was one of confidence in it and certain knowledge of it, because "he had been convinced" (πεπληροφόρητο) of its truth. This insight enables Origen to homilize on Christian conviction and steadfastness, using Luke as a paradigm. In so doing, he uses the verbs πληροφορέω and

βεβαίω in ways somewhat different from the way in which Luke uses the former word in Lk. 1:1. Luke speaks of the establishment of the gospel history among Christians (if we understand him correctly), whereas Origen develops the related thought of its effect upon them. Luke focuses on the propagation of the gospel traditions as much as (and probably more than) their reception by Christians. Both thoughts can be conveyed by πληροφορέω and βεβαίω, but for homiletical purposes Origen concentrates on the latter one.

Jerome, on the other hand, in putting forward manifestissime sunt ostensae, "have been clearly shown," as the meaning of πεπληροφορημένων, is more true to the Lucan context than Origen. Jerome's interpretation emphasizes the propagation of the gospel, its establishment by argument and demonstration.<sup>33</sup> He probably has the same thing in mind when he translates the Greek participle as confirmatae sunt.<sup>34</sup>

Both Origen and Jerome, then, provide evidence, though the former goes off on a tangent, that πεπληροφορημένων could have been used by Luke with the meaning of "firmly established" (or the like). (We prefer to express the intensive force of πληροφο- as "well-", instead of "fully" or "firmly.") Furthermore, they indicate how this meaning could well have been used by Luke in Lk. 1:1. Their testimony thus supports our conclusion, based upon etymology and the context, that Luke speaks of the deeds and teachings of Jesus as "the things that are well-established among us."

Rauer presents a fragment which he thinks is probably derived from Origen's Homilies on Luke, though not paralleled in Jerome's translation. We will translate it as follows: "He did not say simply 'believed' (πιστευμένων), but rather 'πεπληροφορημένων,' testifying to the inviolable character (τὸ ἀπαράβατον) of what was

said."<sup>35</sup> If Origen (or whoever) understands "well-established (as true)" by *πεπληροφόρημένων*, then it is clear that "the inviolable character" of the gospel is implicit in the participle. He probably once again has the acceptance of the gospel history primarily in view.

Origen was not the only ancient writer who, in interpreting *πεπληροφόρημένων* in Lk. 1:1, emphasized the conviction of Christians regarding the gospel history. Just as Origen (in Rauer's reconstructed text) inferred that Luke "had been convinced (*πεπληροφόρητο*) and was uncertain about nothing," so also Eusebius, in paraphrasing Luke's preface (in order to explain his purpose for writing a gospel), refers to "those things of which he had been fully persuaded (*ἔνν αὐτὸς πεπληροφόρητο λόγων*)."<sup>36</sup> Athanasius held the same interpretation, for in his clever adaptation of Luke's preface to his own situation he speaks of "the divinely inspired Scripture, concerning which we have been fully persuaded (*περὶ ἧς ἐπληροφόρηθήμεν*)."<sup>37</sup> To the same effect are the translations adopted in the Peshitta ("of which we have been persuaded") and in the Sahidic ("which were accepted among us").<sup>38</sup>

This line of interpretation cannot be simply dismissed, as Cadbury does, as "the learned tradition of patristic curiositas descending from Origen."<sup>39</sup> Some interpreters and translators may have been directly or indirectly influenced by Origen's exposition,<sup>40</sup> but there is no reason to think that they were all simply repeating him. Rather, this line of interpretation is to be explained by the fact that the verb *πληροφόρεῖν* in ecclesiastical usage (as in Rom. 4:21; 14:5; perhaps Col. 4:12) was primarily used of persons in the passive voice with the meaning "be (fully) convinced, be persuaded, be assured" (or with a similar meaning),<sup>41</sup>

a meaning related to that of πληροφορία, "assurance," whereas it was only rarely (if at all) used as Luke had used it. In other words, the unfamiliar was interpreted as the familiar--a procedure not uncommon even in our day. It is true, of course, that "the things," not "we," are said by Luke to be πεπληροφωμένων, and that things cannot be persuaded, but this line of interpretation is not thereby refuted,<sup>42</sup> for it could still paraphrastically capture Luke's meaning. As we have argued, it does capture one aspect of it. That is, that which is well-established among us is that which is accepted among us (Sahidic) and that of which we have been persuaded (the rest). Eusebius may well have understood the precise import of Lk. 1:1, but still drew the same inference as Origen in order to advance the purpose of his reworking of Luke's preface, namely, to emphasize Luke's qualifications for writing a gospel.<sup>43</sup>

Of considerable interest are the later Greek commentators Photius, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus, for they not only set forth the interpretation (more or less) for which we have been arguing, but also (in two cases) combine it with the implied notion of assurance. This shows both that our interpretation can be conveyed by the Greek and that the Origenic line readily develops from it. Photius explains that Luke's predecessors related "with undoubting assurance that which is true" (τῆ . . . ἀδοκτάκτῳ πληροφορία τὸ ἀληθές ) and introduced "what is readily accepted" (τὸ εὐπαράδεκτον).<sup>44</sup> Theophylact provides this exposition: "For the things of Christ are not simply bare tradition, but things which are [held] in truth and steadfast faith (ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ πίστει βεβαία) and with all assurance (μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας)." He then asks, "But how are these things established (εἰσι πεπληροφωμένα)?" and answers by quoting vs. 2, "just as those who from

the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed them down to us."<sup>45</sup> It is clear from Theophylact's question and answer that he considered the apostolic handing down of the gospel traditions to be that which resulted in "the things of Christ" being πεπληροφωρημένα. Since the apostolic teaching established them as true and as objects of faith, this participle would seem to mean "established (as certain)."<sup>46</sup> Finally, Euthymius interprets Luke's πεπληροφωρημένων as βεβαιωθέντων, "which have been established/confirmed," though he does not provide further elucidation.<sup>47</sup>

This line of interpretation held its own well into the nineteenth century. Generally speaking, however, emphasis was placed on the belief and conviction of Christians, rather than upon the establishment of the gospel history as such. J. Calvin, for example, comments that the participle "means things that are properly established, without any doubt."<sup>48</sup> This represents a properly balanced view, but the words which our modern English translator renders as "properly established," namely probe compertas,<sup>49</sup> would be more accurately rendered as "rightly ascertained," thus focusing upon Christian belief.<sup>50</sup> Similarly, the AV reads, "those things which are most surely believed among us."<sup>51</sup> H. A. W. Meyer explains that the verb πληροφωρέω means "to bring to full conviction," and thus translates Luke's words as "of the facts that have attained to full conviction among us (Christians),"<sup>52</sup> P. Doddridge comes closer to Luke's wider meaning when he paraphrases the participle as "which have been confirmed . . . with the fullest and most satisfactory Evidence."<sup>53</sup> The best interpretation of which we are aware is that put forward by S. T. Bloomfield, who sees a reference to things which are "fully

confirmed and established, and are therefore received as certain truths, with full assurance of faith."<sup>54</sup> Similarly, A. Schlatter sees Luke referring to things which are "zur Gewißheit gebrachte Dinge, die als sicher verbürgt und kräftig erwiesen das helle, klare Wissen der Christenheit ausmachen."<sup>55</sup> Westcott originally interpreted the participle as "fully believed," but in the sixth edition of his Introduction to the Study of the Gospels he improved that, unfortunately without comment, to "fully established,"<sup>56</sup> a reading which then appeared in the margin of the RV.<sup>57</sup>

In the twentieth century there has been less enthusiasm for this line of interpretation. W. Manson, however, following Moffatt's translation, provides a notable comment: "The subject handled in the earlier gospels was the established facts of the Christian religion as recorded in the tradition of the Church."<sup>58</sup> And A. Loisy understands Luke as speaking of "a narrative of the matters established among ourselves."<sup>59</sup> Others noting the aspect of Christian belief and assurance are V. Bartlet,<sup>60</sup> K. H. Rengstorff (in part),<sup>61</sup> W. F. Arndt,<sup>62</sup> and N. Turner.<sup>63</sup> Despite the decline of this line of interpretation, we are convinced that it has considerable merit.<sup>64</sup>

Most scholars have interpreted  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  in Lk. 1:1 as meaning "fulfilled" in the sense of "accomplished" or "completed." According to this view, Luke is referring to the gospel events as "the things which have been accomplished/completed among us." However, there is but scant evidence that  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\omega}$  was ever used with such a meaning.<sup>65</sup> Cadbury assures us that it is "well attested,"<sup>66</sup> but this claim is belied by the absence of any such attestation in the standard lexicons.<sup>67</sup>

Cadbury appeals to what he calls the "spontaneous testimony"

of "the early versions" in support of this meaning,<sup>68</sup> but only some of the early translators adopted "fulfill" or "complete" as the word's meaning, and it is by no means certain either that they had Cadbury's (or any other particular) interpretation of the passage in mind or that their understanding of it reflected a usage of πληροφω otherwise known to them. The (European) Old Latin reads quae in nobis completae sunt,<sup>69</sup> and Jerome retained this reading in the Vulgate.<sup>70</sup> The Old Syriac (i.e. the Sinaitic Syriac MS.), not supported by the Peshitta, similarly (and perhaps under "Western" influence) reads "which among us have been completed (ܩܠܠ ܕܝܘܨܘܢ)." <sup>71</sup> Finally, the Bohairic reading, not supported by the Sahidic, is "which were fulfilled (ܕܩܠܠܝܢ ܕܝܘܨܘܢ) among us."<sup>72</sup> It is possible that the translators of these versions knew that πληροφω could mean "complete," and so understood the word in Lk. 1:1. But since this was an unusual meaning, if it existed at all, it is more likely that they were puzzled by the participle in Lk. 1:1,<sup>73</sup> and, either assuming it to be equivalent here (as it often is) to πληρω (which often means "fulfill" or "complete") or simply taking it in its etymological sense of "make full," just translated it with a word of presumably equivalent meaning, without necessarily implying any particular interpretation of the passage.

And even if these translators did have a specific interpretation in mind, that interpretation could, at least for the Latin and Syriac translators, have been "fulfilled" in the sense of fulfilling the promises or will of God--an interpretation which is being increasingly advocated these days<sup>74</sup>--rather than in the sense of completing events.<sup>75</sup> It is even possible that one or more of these translators understood the gospel history to have been completed or made full in the sense of "fully expressed," "fully

established," or the like. This might seem far-fetched, but we have seen that Jerome interpreted  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$  as manifestissime sunt ostensae,<sup>76</sup> and yet accepted completae sunt into the Vulgate. More remarkable is Ambrose's treatment of the Latin text. He quotes it and then adds uel quae in nobis redundant, "or rather, 'which abound among us.'"<sup>77</sup> He evidently has in view the widespread dissemination and acceptance of the gospel accounts, which enables him to launch into a discussion of Christian conviction and its basis, following Origen.<sup>78</sup> Thus we see that it would be precarious to rely upon certain ancient versions for one's evidence that  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  was used to designate the accomplishment or completion of events. Their translators may not have meant that at all, and in any case they were probably just guessing the meaning of  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ .

Some evidence pointing toward the meaning "accomplish, complete" is perhaps provided by 2 Tim. 4:5, where Timothy is exhorted to "fulfill" ( $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\eta\sigma\omicron\nu$ ) his ministry, that is, to "fully carry out" or "fully perform" his ministerial responsibilities.  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$  is used with the same meaning in a very similar exhortation in Col. 4:17 (cf. Ac. 12:25; 14:26). The meaning of  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  and  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$  here comes close to "complete," though it should be distinguished from it.<sup>79</sup> Nonetheless, one could argue that the meaning is so close that "complete" should be considered as coming within the potential range of meaning for  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ . On the other hand, Luke is not speaking in Lk. 1:1 of responsibilities (or the like) that have been carried out.

Better evidence would be provided by Col. 4:12, on one interpretation of the passage, if we read  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$  there (as do the standard critical editions, on the authority of  $\times A B C D^*$ ,

supported by a few other MSS.), rather than πεπληρωμένοι (as do p<sup>46</sup> D<sup>1</sup> Byz syr). The latter reading can no longer be dismissed as a late ecclesiastical revision, for p<sup>46</sup>, the oldest manuscript of the passage, shows that it goes back at least to the year 200. It could be argued that a scribe would have been more likely to change the relatively obscure word πληροφώρα to πληρώ (as happened at 2 Tim. 4:5, 17 in MSS. F and G) than vice versa. However, one could just as easily argue that πληρώ was changed to the more elegant or perhaps (in a reviser's view) more appropriate πληροφώρα (as happened at Rom. 15:13 in MSS. B F G). In favor of πεπληρωμένοι is the fact that the same word is used in the same way in Col. 2:10, where the Colossians are said to be "complete" in Christ. However, one could also argue that this verse influenced the text of 4:12. These considerations are rather evenly balanced, but in the judgment of the present writer, the case for πεπληρωμένοι is somewhat stronger.

Let us suppose, however, that πεπληροφωρημένοι is the correct reading in Col. 4:12. In that case, it would make good sense to translate the participle (as πεπληρωμένοι would have to be translated) as "complete": Epaphras remembers the Colossians in his prayers "in order that you may stand perfect (τέλειοι) and complete (πεπληροφωρημένοι) in everything willed by God." That is, he prays that in all matters of Christian faith and life they may reach maturity, lacking nothing. In favor of this interpretation is the likelihood that the meaning of πεπληροφωρημένοι is closely related to that of τέλειοι. However, most commentators have interpreted the participle as "fully assured," in accordance with Paul's usage in Rom. 4:21; 14:5. This is a reasonable interpretation, for "perfect" and "fully assured" are complementary ideas. In our

view, however, the context favors "complete" over "fully assured," though also in our view πεπληρωμένοι was originally written here with that meaning. One could argue from this passage, however, that πληροφορέω (as a perfect passive participle!) could have been used by Luke with the meaning "complete." In Col. 4:12 it would denote a spiritual completeness not in view in Lk. 1:1, but some other kind of completeness could nonetheless be meant by Luke.

The one passage in the patristic literature (of which we are aware) in which πληροφορέω would seem to mean "complete" is De temperantia et virtute, Cent. 2.10, which is attributed to Hesychius, a fifth-century presbyter of Jerusalem, but which is today assigned to another Hesychius, a sixth- or seventh-century abbot of a Sinai monastery.<sup>80</sup> He writes that "the Old Testament did not perfect (ἐτελείου) or complete (ἐπληροφόρει) the inner man for (εἰς) godliness." This passage evidently reflects Col. 4:12. Therefore, it probably does not bear independent witness to the existence of the meaning "complete" for πληροφορέω. Furthermore, ἐπληροφόρει should perhaps be translated as "did . . . give full assurance (to)." On balance, then, Hesychius probably does not shed any light on the first-century usage of πληροφορέω.

Apart from 2 Tim. 4:5, where πληροφορέω only comes close to meaning "complete," and Col. 4:12 (together with the passage in Hesychius), where that is a controverted meaning of a questionable text, the evidence for the existence of the meaning "accomplish, complete" is highly dubious. J. B. Lightfoot gives "to fulfil, accomplish" as the first of three meanings for the verb, and cites as evidence for it, in addition to 2 Tim. 4:5 (and Lk. 1:1), only Clem. Hom. 19:24 and "perhaps" Herm. Sim. 2.8.<sup>81</sup> However, Lightfoot misconstrues the text of the corrupt Clementine passage, and

thus misunderstands the meaning of πληροφορέω in it, for the word belongs with the clause preceding it and means "be fully assured" or "fully know." He quotes the passage as πεπληροφορημένων νῦν ἤδη τριῶν ἡμερῶν, whereas the text actually reads (in the one manuscript preserving it) πεπληροφορημε . . . . . νῦν δὲ τριῶν ἡμερῶν (according to the editions of Lagarde and Rehm).

Lightfoot evidently adopted the text as edited by Dressel, who ignored most of the lacuna and emended δέ to ἤδη, except that he removed Dressel's brackets around the final three letters of the participle. Dressel's [νων] replaces a lacuna of some eleven spaces, and so another word or two must have originally followed the participle. As the placement of the post-positive δέ after νῦν indicates (and as the rest of the sentence permits), the omitted word or two, and thus also the participle before it, belong with the previous clause (pace Rehm, who supplies ὑπέρθεσιν, "a delay," as the missing word and transposes νῦν and δέ, although concluding the previous clause with the participle). But whatever one may make of the lacuna, the context clearly shows that the participle (ending with -νος, not -νων) belongs with the previous clause, not with the words with which it is connected by Dressel and Lightfoot: "And Simon . . . said: '. . . I appeared to yield to your ignorance, that you might go on to the next topic, in order that, becoming acquainted with the whole range of your ignorance, I might condemn you, not through mere conjecture, but from full knowledge (μη στοχαζόμενος καταγινώσκω σου, ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορημέ[νωσ]. . . . .). Allow me now to retire for three days (νῦν δὲ τριῶν ἡμερῶν μοι συγχώρησον), and I shall come back and show that you know nothing.'" (Incidentally, πληροφορέω is used with the same meaning in the elided portion of Simon's statement.)

In Herm. Sim. 2.8 the verb πληροφoρέω probably means "fulfill," but in the sense of "fill full" or "fill up," not "accomplish" or "complete." The passage reads (following Crombie's translation): "So also poor men interceding with the Lord on behalf of the rich, increase their riches (πληροφoροῦσι τὸ πλοῦτος ἀντῶν); and the rich, again, aiding the poor in their necessities, satisfy their souls (πληροφoροῦσι τὰς ψυχὰς ἀντῶν). Both, therefore, are partners in the righteous work." The parallelism of the two clauses in the first sentence suggests that the word πληροφoροῦσι has the same meaning in each clause. Harmer translates it as "establish" both times, but it is hard to see how the intercessions of the poor "establish" the wealth of their rich benefactors. Dibelius translates the word as "kommen zu Hilfe" in each case, but this goes beyond the word's established range of meaning. The parallelism would perhaps be clearer if, as Lake conjectures, εὐχάς is read for ψυχάς, for the poor man is rich in prayers just as the rich man is rich in wealth: "So also the poor, interceding with the Lord for the rich, complement their wealth, and again, the rich helping the poor with their necessities complement their prayers." Joly adopted Lake's conjecture in his Greek text, but by mistake, as his footnote to the word and his French translation show. Then Snyder, following that text (see p. 2), like Lake translated πληροφoροῦσι as "complement" each time. We are inclined to reject Lake's conjecture, however, because throughout this similitude reference is made exclusively to the "intercession" (ἐντευξις) of the poor, but never to their "prayers." Thus, if the writer had intended to refer to the prayers of the poor, he would probably have used the word ἐντευξις. The wealth of the rich and the soul (i.e. the human needs, as in 5.3.7) of the poor are sufficiently

parallel in that both require what those of opposite means can supply. As Lake observes (on p. 147n.), "The idea in πληροφόροῦσι is that of filling up that which is lacking,--a ὑστέρημα." Since the rich man's attendance to his wealth leaves him "poor in matters relating to the Lord" (§ 5), it needs to be "filled up" or "enriched" with divine blessing (§ 5) through the intercession of the poor man. Similarly, the soul of the poor man needs to be "filled up" or "satisfied" through the generosity of the rich man. So understood, this passage uses the verb πληροφωρέω in a manner quite unlike that which Lightfoot favors for Lk. 1:1. Joly translates πληροφόροῦσι in the first instance in a manner somewhat similar to the usual modern translation of πεπληροφωρημένων in Lk. 1:1, namely as "assurent un plein développement aux," but this translation is not appropriate in the context and is not similar to that which he correctly gives in the second instance, namely "donnent pleine satisfaction à."

In addition to the passages cited by Lightfoot, M.-J. Lagrange cites several more in order to establish the meaning which he sees in Lk. 1:1, namely "remplir complètement, achever tout à fait."<sup>82</sup> He cites 2 Tim. 4:17, where Paul says that the Lord stood with him and strengthened him in court "in order that through me the gospel message (τὸ κήρυγμα) might be made full (πληροφωρηθῆ) and all the gentiles might hear it." On that occasion the gospel message could have been "made full" through Paul only in the sense of being "fully proclaimed" (RSV) or "set forth in full." If τὸ κήρυγμα is "the gospel message" and πληροφωρηθῆ characterizes its declaration before a Roman tribunal, then the fullness implied by πληρο- must be a fullness of statement. The point is that Paul was able to make a full proclamation of the gospel before the tribunal (cf. Ac.

9:15). This straightforward line of interpretation has been followed by a number of modern commentators,<sup>83</sup> but others, beginning with the unwarranted assumption that πληροφωρέω must mean "complete," have tried to explain how Paul could "complete the gospel proclamation." Some have supposed that the Lord strengthened him so that "the preaching of the gospel might be completed,"<sup>84</sup> but the κήρυγμα, being that which "all the gentiles might hear," must be the message preached, not the activity of preaching, in line with the word's uniform usage elsewhere in the New Testament.<sup>85</sup> Others have supposed that what was completed was Paul's apostolic preaching office or commission,<sup>86</sup> but it is arbitrary to give κήρυγμα such a meaning. Furthermore, neither Paul's preaching activity nor his preaching office could have been completed at his "first defense" (vs. 16), for such an expression implies a second defense and thus further opportunity to proclaim the gospel. We conclude, then, that in 2 Tim. 4:17 πληροφωρέω means "set forth in full."<sup>87</sup> This meaning is related to that for which we have argued in Lk. 1:1, for the gospel history was set forth in full among Christians, and as a result became "well-established" among them.<sup>88</sup>

Lagrange also cites 1 Clem. 54.1, where, as Lightfoot observes, πληροφωρέω means "to fill."<sup>89</sup> And he cites Herm. Mand. 9.2, where the verb means "carry out" (i.e. "grant") or "satisfy."<sup>90</sup> He draws attention to Eccl. 8:11 LXX (where alone the verb occurs in the Septuagint), but Lightfoot cites this passage as evidence for the meaning "to persuade fully, to convince."<sup>91</sup>

Lagrange also notes the use of the verb by the second-century astrologer Vettius Valens, but he only uses it to designate the outcome in the life of men of a planetary configuration. The

passage to which Lagrange refers is Anth. I.22 (p. 43.18 in Kroll's edition). According to Valens, the conjunction of Saturn, Mars, and the moon bodes ill. Various troubles (which he lists) come one's way, ἵνα διὰ τῆς κατοχῆς ταύτης τὸ τῆς συνοχῆς σχῆμα πληροφορηθῆ, "in order that by this hindrance the aspect [i.e. the (aforementioned) configuration of heavenly bodies] of affliction may be fulfilled."<sup>92</sup> In a communication to A. Deissmann, W. Kroll translated this clause as "damit die (durch die ganze Konstellation prädiizierte) συνοχή sich auf diese Weise erfüllt (zur Erfüllung gelangt)."<sup>93</sup> Deissmann's English translator incorrectly translated "sich . . . erfüllt" as "may fulfill itself," instead of "may be fulfilled": "in order that the συνοχή (predicted by the whole constellation) may fulfil itself (come to fulfillment) in this way."<sup>94</sup> But it is σχῆμα, not συνοχή, which is the subject of the verb. That is, it is the configuration which is fulfilled in the predicted affliction, not the affliction which comes to fulfillment. Valens also uses the verb πληροφορέω in V.9 (p. 226.20), where he says that men τὴν προαίρεσιν πληροφοροῦσι, "carry out their purpose." In neither passage does the verb denote the taking place of an event or the completion of anything. Valens uses the verb much as New Testament writers use πληρόω to denote the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy.

Finally, Lagrange mentions an eighth-century Bithynian inscription "qui parle de l'achèvement d'une tour." However, neither the wording of the inscription nor its interpretation is clear,<sup>95</sup> and in any case the inscription is much too late to illuminate first-century usage. Thus, the evidence cited by Lagrange does establish the general meaning "remplir complètement" (in various senses), but the specific meaning which he allies with

it, "achever tout à fait," which is the meaning alleged for the verb in Lk. 1:1, is not at all established by that evidence.

In a list much like Lagrange's, H. Lietzmann adds two more passages as illustrative of the meaning "füllen, erfüllen."<sup>96</sup> One is 1 Clem. 42.3, but there the verb clearly means "fully assure." Clement speaks of the apostles as "having been fully assured (πληροφορηθέντες) through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance (μετὰ πληροφορείας) of the Holy Ghost."<sup>97</sup>

Lietzmann also cites Photius, Bibl. 72 (paraphrasing Ctesias), but there the verb means "give assurance to." This meaning is well attested in patristic literature.<sup>98</sup> The text of Photius (I, 121 in Henry's edition) reads: Πολλοῖς οὖν ὅρκοις καὶ λόγοις πληροφορήσαντες Μεγάβυζον μόλις ὁμῶς πείθουσι πρὸς βασιλέα παραγενέσθαι, which we would translate as "So having given assurances to Megabyzus with many oaths and arguments, they barely persuaded him to present himself to the king." Henry similarly translates the participle as "ils donnent des assurances à." So does Lagrange: "ayant comblé . . . d'assurances."<sup>99</sup> However, Bleek, followed by Wilke-Grimm-Thayer<sup>100</sup> and apparently by Lightfoot,<sup>101</sup> claims that the word here means "persuade."<sup>102</sup> But the text quoted by Bleek (and reproduced by Lightfoot) ends with the word Μεγάβυζον, thus leaving the verb πείθουσι, which carries the concept of persuasion, out of the picture. Similarly, Freese conjoins the participle and the finite verb in his translation: "After many entreaties and solemn promises, with great difficulty they succeeded in persuading Megabyzus to visit the king."<sup>103</sup> Thus, neither passage adduced by Lietzmann supports the view that πληροφορέω means "fulfill" in Lk. 1:1 in the sense of "accomplish, complete."

Taken together, all these passages show that *πληροφoρέω* was used in a variety of ways, but apparently not with the meaning "accomplish, complete." It was used of duties, purposes, and requests with the meaning "accomplish" in the sense of "carry out, perform," but the sense of "accomplish" thought to be used in Lk. 1:1 with reference to historical events is rather "complete" or "take place." There is some evidence which can arguably be construed as supporting the meaning "complete," but the argument is not strong.

But let us suppose that Luke could have used *πληροφoρέω* with the meaning "accomplish, complete." After all, this would seem to be within the potential range of a verb whose etymological sense is "make full." Luke may well have been the only author of antiquity who so used the word.

According to the simplest form of the "accomplished, completed" line of interpretation, the events of the gospel history (and perhaps of the early apostolic history, too<sup>104</sup>) "have been accomplished" (RSV) in the sense that they "have happened" (NEB) or "have taken place" (JB) and now may be looked back upon as, in a final sense, "completed."<sup>105</sup> They have been accomplished or completed "among us" (*ἐν ἡμῖν*) in the sense that "we" were present when they occurred, or at least were contemporary with them, and now accept their factuality.<sup>106</sup> (According to an older variation of this interpretation, the things in view, i.e. the deeds of Jesus, "have been done" or "have been performed" among us by Jesus.<sup>107</sup>)

But the words "among us" present this interpretation with a serious difficulty.<sup>108</sup> As we have seen,<sup>109</sup> the word "us" here refers in a general way to Christians. But Luke and his

contemporary fellow Christians most likely were not, with few exceptions, those among whom the gospel events had taken place. Therefore, it has been argued that by "us" Luke means Christians (and perhaps their non-Christian contemporaries) in a broad sense without temporal limitations, thus including the followers of Jesus who founded the church.<sup>110</sup> On this view, what was true of the immediate disciples of Jesus is also true of "us Christians" as a whole. Such an interpretation is not impossible,<sup>111</sup> but it is not a very natural one. It is hard to believe that Luke, in writing to a fellow Christian (and by implication to their contemporaries) would have spoken of events which had taken place "among us," if in fact neither he nor the great majority of his fellow Christians had had any firsthand knowledge of them--and, indeed, if they had taken place (as is probably the case) in a different part of the world.

Furthermore, it must be doubted whether Luke would have represented the events of Jesus' life as having taken place among Christians at all. However much the immediate disciples of Jesus may, as a group of persons following him, have anticipated the Christian church as a distinct religious body, the church itself was not established until the day of Pentecost (Ac. 2:1, 41-42; cf. vss. 43-47). Luke represents the events of Jesus' life as having taken place among the Jews, "in the midst" of the "men of Israel" (Ac. 2:22) and "in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem" (10:39), not "among us Christians." The twelve apostles were witnesses of these events (10:39), but even they were not, strictly speaking, Christians when they took place. Luke's conceptual framework, then, contradicts the notion that  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\sigma\phi\omicron\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\ \eta\acute{\mu}\iota\upsilon$  in Lk. 1:1 refers to the occurrence of the gospel events among Christians.

Some have tried to reduce the tension inherent in this line of interpretation by pointing to the connection of "us Christians" with the present reality implied by the perfect tense of the participle. In the words of du Plessis, "The perfect tense implies that it refers to the Christ event and its consequences."<sup>112</sup> Lagrange elaborates: "L'événement accompli a sans doute sa date historique, et il est accompli, mais les conséquences s'en font sentir parmi nous, disciples des témoins oculaires."<sup>113</sup> Or, as C. Stuhlmüller puts it, "The pf. form of the Gk participle indicates that what happened in the life of Jesus was perfectly completed and that its effects are now being felt 'among us' in the Church."<sup>114</sup> However, the grammar of the passage will not permit this sort of explanation. The phrase ἐν ἡμῖν modifies the participle as a whole, and thus brings "us" into connection with its past action (if there be any) just as much as with its present result or state.

Recognizing that the gospel events did not take place "among us (Christians)," some have suggested that Luke has in mind the events related in Acts, many of which (if Luke did not write at too late a date) took place among the Christians of Luke's day.<sup>115</sup> However, the gospel events would not thereby be excluded from view, and they did not take place in the Christian community. Furthermore, we will demonstrate in due course that neither here nor anywhere else in Luke's preface are the events related in Acts brought into view.<sup>116</sup>

This line of interpretation faces yet another contextual difficulty, namely, the fact that the words τῶν . . . πραγμάτων refer to the deeds and teachings of Jesus, and not, strictly speaking, to the gospel events as such.<sup>117</sup> Events may be said to have taken place, but probably not deeds and certainly not teachings.<sup>118</sup> Thus,

both the words which πεπληροφορημένων modifies (i.e. τῶν . . . πραγμάτων) and those which modify it (i.e. ἐν ἡμῖν) show that it does not mean "accomplished" or "completed."

In view of the difficulties posed by the context on the assumption that πεπληροφορημένων refers to the occurrence of the gospel events, some scholars have interpreted Luke to mean that the course of Christian history has been "completed among us" in the events of the apostolic period. In the original form of this interpretation, the deeds and teachings of Jesus were considered to have begun before the Ascension (as related in Luke's gospel) and been completed after it (as related in Acts). Proponents of this view have generally appealed to Ac. 1:1, where Luke says that his gospel relates what Jesus "began" to do and teach, presumably implying that Acts will relate what he continued to do and teach.<sup>119</sup> However, many scholars consider the word in Ac. 1:1 upon which so much emphasis is placed to be pleonastic,<sup>120</sup> and in any case continuation does not necessarily imply completion. Furthermore, on this interpretation τῶν . . . πραγμάτων would have to be a course of events, not the events (or, more precisely, the deeds and teachings) themselves.<sup>121</sup> But this reads too much into these words. Moreover, while Luke obviously looked upon the history related in Acts as a continuation of that related in his gospel, he certainly did not consider the overall course of Christian history to have been completed. Rather, he finishes Acts on a positive, forward-looking note (28:30-31), since the new epoch would not be completed until Jesus returned from heaven (Ac. 1:11).<sup>122</sup> It is not enough to reply that the universal spread of the gospel is brought to a fitting completion at Rome at the end of Acts,<sup>123</sup> for Rome was hardly "the end of the earth" (Ac. 1:8).<sup>124</sup>

Nor is it sufficient to argue that Luke intended in a third volume to bring the history of Christianity down to "the completion which it had reached in his own time,"<sup>125</sup> for Luke expected that history to continue until Christ's return.<sup>126</sup>

A new wrinkle in the "completion" theme has been introduced by Klein and Schulz. According to them, the events of the gospel history (alone) are completed in the church's proclamation of them. Klein, pointing to the "unübersehbare zeitliche Differenz zwischen den πράγματα und ihrem πληροφόρησιςθαι," says, "Werden jene, die sich in der ersten christlichen Phase begaben, zu πληροφόρημαίνα erst in der daran anschließenden Zeit, so muß das Partizip darauf gehen, daß sie sich nunmehr als vollständig darstellen."<sup>127</sup> However, even if πληροφόρέω could mean "complete," it can hardly mean "present as complete." Events do not "present themselves as complete," and even if they did, what would it mean for them to do so "among us" rather than "to us"?<sup>128</sup> Much like Klein, Schulz explains that in the church age (i.e. "among us") the gospel events "sind . . . zur Vollendung gekommen." In this he discerns the exclusive theme of Luke-Acts, namely the "historische Kontinuität zwischen dem irdischen Jesus und der kirchlichen Gegenwart." The gospel history comes to completion as its completeness ("Abgeschlossenheit") is "als solche erkannt und dargestellt."<sup>129</sup> However, events are completed when they have finished taking place, not when they are subsequently recognized and presented as complete. Events may have an effect on those who hear of them, but the events themselves do not thereby "come to completion." It must be remembered that Luke is merely identifying (in a general way) the subject matter on which his predecessors have written, and that is hardly the place to look for his historico-theological program.

Somewhat similar is the effort of Dillon to inject the results of his doctoral study of Lk. 24 into the picture: "Luke's subject matter is the saving events of the past which were 'brought to full measure' in him and his contemporaries by the tradition of Christ's own Easter instruction."<sup>130</sup> The gospel events are brought to full measure in the sense that they are brought "to the saving effect of forging a community of believers in later times."<sup>131</sup> This exegesis, like that of Klein and Schulz, imposes far more meaning upon Luke's words that they can possibly bear.

A number of writers who understand Luke to be referring to "the events accomplished/completed among us" have interpreted the participle *πεπληροφόρημένων* as a "divine passive," thus making the gospel events divine acts in history.<sup>132</sup> But this notion must be rejected. When events are thought of as having taken place, they are viewed as visible effects, apart from any hidden cause. And when one thinks of things that are "accomplished" or "completed" in human history, one ordinarily thinks of the human participants doing the accomplishing and completing, not of God as the Mover of history. Furthermore, there is no hint in the context that historical events are being viewed from the point of view of divine causation.

It would thus appear that every effort to explain *πεπληροφόρημένων* in Lk. 1:1 as "accomplished" or "completed" faces grave objections, especially from the immediate context. If the paucity (and probably the absence) of evidence supporting even the existence of these meanings makes this line of interpretation highly questionable, these additional objections based on the context make it simply untenable.

Modern scholars have advanced another line of interpretation

which we must also consider. According to this view, *πενήροφορη-  
μίνων* means "fulfilled" and refers to the fulfillment of the divine  
plan (especially as set forth in Old Testament prophecy) in the  
gospel history (and perhaps also in the history of the church).  
This interpretation was first set forth by Lessing,<sup>133</sup> and it  
attracted little support<sup>134</sup> until the middle of the twentieth  
century. Since then it has increasingly been advocated.<sup>135</sup> The  
attraction of this interpretation is that the preface would thus  
give expression to a major Lucan theme. As Fitzmyer puts it, "the  
emphasis in the Lucan writings on the fulfillment of what was  
spoken of in the OT seems to call for" it.<sup>136</sup>

However, this interpretation is untenable. First of all, the  
verb *πληροφόρέω*, unlike *πληρόω*, is not used elsewhere to refer to  
the fulfillment of prophecy,<sup>137</sup> although there is an analogous  
usage in the astrological terminology of Valens.<sup>138</sup> Furthermore,  
the phrase *ἐν ἡμῖν* is as incompatible with this interpretation as  
it is with the "accomplished, completed" line of interpretation,  
for the same reasons.<sup>139</sup> Moreover, and most telling of all, this  
interpretation would require that the *πράγματα* that are fulfilled  
be plans or prophecies, which they are not.<sup>140</sup> They are the deeds  
and teachings of Jesus, not plans for, or prophecies of, them. The  
deeds and teachings of Jesus could be said to "have fulfilled  
(something)" (active voice), but not to "have been fulfilled" (pass-  
ive voice).<sup>141</sup> One could speak of the gospel events (although the  
*πράγματα* are not, strictly speaking, "events"<sup>142</sup>) as the things  
which "have taken place (or, have been completed) in fulfillment of  
the divine will,"<sup>143</sup> but such an interpretation overloads *πληροφο-  
ρέω* with more meaning than it (or *πληρόω*) can reasonably bear.  
Neither the length and sonority nor the obscurity of the participle

in Lk. 1:1 provides any justification for overloading it with theological conceptualization. Therefore, we must concur with Cadbury's early opinion that "the suggestion that the fulfillment of Scripture is what Luke means need hardly be taken seriously."<sup>144</sup>

There are three basic lines of interpretation for *πεπληροφορημένων* in Lk. 1:1. Luke has been understood as referring to the things that are (1) "well-established/accepted/fully believed," (2) "accomplished/completed," or (3) "fulfilled" among us. All three interpretations give to *πληροφορέω* a meaning that is either unattested or weakly attested, although we have shown that the first interpretation gives to it a meaning evidently known to Origen, Jerome, and others in the early church. The first interpretation suits the context well, while the other two do not. In other words, the first interpretation has certain things to be said for it and nothing decisive to be said against it, while the latter two have virtually nothing to be said for them and decisive things to be said against them. Consequently, we conclude that Luke is referring to "the things that are well-established among us."

## THE STANDARD FOR GOSPEL COMPOSITION (VS. 2)

Luke 1:1 ends with a comma, not a full stop. This fact, though often overlooked, is exegetically significant. Luke does not simply say that many have already undertaken to draw up narrative accounts of the gospel history. Rather, he says that they have undertaken to do so in a particular way, which is spelled out in vs. 2: "just as (καθὼς) those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed down (that history) to us." Luke credits his predecessors with having undertaken the difficult task of recording the gospel traditions not in a haphazard fashion, but rather "just as" they were originally and authoritatively delivered to the church.

However, Luke does not say that they actually succeeded in achieving that high standard of accuracy. If he had written ἀνετάξασαν in vs. 1, he would have done so. But by writing ἐπέχρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι instead, he refrained from crediting them with having reached that goal.<sup>1</sup> They tried to record the gospel traditions "just as" they had originally been handed down, but did not necessarily succeed in doing so. Failing to see this, some have hastily inferred from καθὼς that, in Luke's estimation, his predecessors had succeeded in recording the original tradition.<sup>2</sup> But the word ἐπέχρησαν indicates that Luke was unwilling to credit them with having achieved the desired standard of authenticity.

This unwillingness, in turn, implies that Luke was not

satisfied that they had achieved the desired goal. A failure to praise often implies criticism, especially where, as here, a laudable task is being described. By failing to acknowledge the success of his predecessors' efforts, Luke implies that they left something to be desired. He could perhaps be accused of meanness or jealousy, but we shall see in due course<sup>3</sup> that he is rather being gentle with them.

The task facing the writers of gospel narratives was to record the gospel history just as the original eyewitnesses and servants of the word had "handed down" (παρέδωσαν<sup>4</sup>) that history. A direct object for παρέδωσαν is not given, but the great majority of commentators have understood its implied object to be the πράγματα mentioned two words previously in vs. 1.<sup>5</sup> This view is probably correct, since the deeds and teachings of Jesus constituted the substance of the traditions handed down.<sup>6</sup> Alternatively, one could translate the verb as "taught,"<sup>7</sup> for which a direct object would not be needed in English. However, the verb is never used this way elsewhere in the New Testament, and so it is better to supply a direct object here.

The context shows, and nearly all commentators agree, that Luke uses the verb παραδίδωμι to refer to the handing down of παραδόσεις, "tradition." The verb is so used with reference to Christian tradition in 1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3; 2 Pet. 2:21; Jd. 3, and the noun is so used in 1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Thes. 2:15; 3:6.<sup>8</sup> It is evident from Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11:23-25 that this portion of the synoptic tradition was included in the earliest Christian tradition. No doubt much more of it was as well, as the summary in 1 Cor. 15:3-5 suggests. Indeed, according to Lk. 1:2 the entire gospel history

(i.e. "the things" of vs. 1) was "handed down," and thus probably formed the bulk of the early tradition. Arguably, the Christian "tradition" of which the New Testament speaks consisted entirely of gospel tradition.

By using the verb παραδίδωμι, Luke indicates that the gospel traditions were authoritatively communicated to the recipients of them. The authoritative transmission of an authoritative deposit of religious truth is always in view elsewhere in the New Testament when the verb (or its cognate noun) is used in connection with tradition or doctrine.<sup>9</sup> Only religious authorities are said to hand down tradition, whether they be Moses or later Jewish teachers (Mk. 7:13; Ac. 6:14), the apostles of Jesus (1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3; 2 Pet. 2:21; Jd. 3; cf. Ac. 16:4), or even God (Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22). Their tradition was authoritative because of its ultimately divine origin. Jewish tradition was traced back through the elders (Mt. 15:2; Mk. 7:3, 5, 13; Gal. 1:14) to Moses (Ac. 6:14), who delivered God's law to Israel. Similarly, Christian tradition was traced back through the apostles (1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3; 2 Thes. 2:15; 3:6; 2 Pet. 2:21 in the light of 3:2; Jd. 3 in the light of vs. 17) to Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 11:23; 15:3 in the light of 11:23; cf. 2 Pet. 3:2; Jd. 17; Jn. 15:26-27), to whom all truth had been delivered by the Father (Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22). On the basis of this usage, we may infer from Lk. 1:2 that the entire gospel tradition was handed down by authoritative Christian teachers. And this is indeed what the context shows to be the case, for, as we shall see,<sup>10</sup> the whole tradition is here represented as having been handed down by the apostles to the church.

Tradition can be handed down in either oral or written form (see 2 Thes. 2:15; cf. Ac. 6:14), but, as most commentators

recognize, oral transmission is in view in Lk. 1:2.<sup>11</sup> It is certainly historically probable that the gospel accounts were delivered orally long before they were committed to writing,<sup>12</sup> and modern gospel research may be said to have confirmed that the gospel traditions had an oral history prior to their written formulation. Luke implies as much in his preface. The broad word "many" in vs. 1 would seem to include all those who had already undertaken to record the gospel traditions, and since their efforts came after the original transmission of those traditions as described in vs. 2, it would follow that that transmission was oral.<sup>13</sup>

Admittedly, the "many" would seem to be distinguished from the apostolic "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" in vs. 2, which leaves open the possibility that some of the latter may have transmitted tradition in written form. But it would have been pointlessly repetitive for other writers (and especially many of them) to draw up narrative accounts of the gospel history "just as" these authorities had already recorded it.<sup>14</sup> Apostolic gospel literature is excluded from vs. 1 not because it is included in vs. 2, but rather because there was none of it in existence. The verb "draw up" in vs. 1, furthermore, indicates that the gospel traditions had not yet been assembled in written form, at least at the stage in view in vs. 2.

To be sure, the narrative accounts mentioned in vs. 1 were more or less comprehensive, leaving open the possibility that some of the gospel traditions may have been previously handed down by the apostles in brief notes or small collections. However, Luke would probably have mentioned such apostolic writings (and his knowledge of their contents), if there had been any, for such

reliable sources would have assured Theophilus of the accuracy and trustworthiness of his narrative, qualities which he claimed for it (see vss. 3 and 4). Also, the words "have undertaken to draw up . . . just as" argue against the existence of apostolic gospel writings.<sup>15</sup> They describe a considerable effort on the part of Luke's predecessors to get back to the original traditions. This could hardly have been said if they were available in written form.<sup>16</sup> We must conclude, therefore, that Luke refers in vs. 2 to the oral transmission of the gospel history.

The gospel history was handed down "to us" (ἡμῶν). These people are not identified, but there is every reason to think that the church (i.e. Christians in general) is in view, just as it is in vs. 1.<sup>17</sup> It is clear that the church is meant by "us" in vs. 2, for it was the recipient of the gospel traditions. Just as Paul handed down at least one piece of gospel tradition to the Corinthian church (see 1 Cor. 11:23-25), so the entire group of eyewitnesses and servants of the word handed down the whole body of tradition to the church as a whole.<sup>18</sup>

Since ἡμῶν refers to the church as a whole, it cannot be inferred from this verse that Luke necessarily received the gospel traditions directly from the eyewitnesses and servants of the word, rather than indirectly from other teachers.<sup>19</sup> In Ac. 6:14 the accusers of Stephen refer to "the practices which Moses handed down to us (παρέδωκεν ἡμῶν)," which means that Moses delivered the law to the Israelite nation as a whole, including, through intermediaries (in the case of the oral law, especially), those of subsequent generations. A similar situation is permitted by the language of Lk. 1:2.<sup>20</sup> Only in vs. 3 does Luke deal specifically with his personal connection with the original bearers of the tradition.

The original bearers of the gospel tradition are described as οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, which we would translate as "those who from the beginning have been eye-witnesses and servants of the word." We construe οἱ as the article for γενόμενοι (governing the entire phrase), ἀπ' ἀρχῆς as an adverbial modifier of the participle, and both αὐτόπται and ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου<sup>21</sup> as predicate nominatives. Most scholars have understood the syntax of this phrase in this way.<sup>22</sup>

However, some have preferred to construe ἀπ' ἀρχῆς with αὐτόπται alone and γενόμενοι with ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου alone, in such a way as to yield the meaning "those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning and who became servants of the word."<sup>23</sup> Schürmann has adopted this construction "weil der Beginn des 'Wortdienstes' zeitlich nicht mit dem der Augenzeugenschaft zusammenfällt."<sup>24</sup> That is, only one beginning can be indicated by the phrase ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, yet if it goes with the participle, two beginnings must be in view: for the eyewitnesses, the beginning of Jesus' career, but for the servants of the word, the beginning of the apostolic ministry. A few exegetes have wrestled with this problem,<sup>25</sup> but there really is no problem, for, as we shall see,<sup>26</sup> there was in fact one beginning for both the eyewitnesses and the servants of the word.

It has been similarly argued by Klein and others that the eyewitness experience in view took place before Pentecost (as recorded in Ac. 2), and that the service of the word took place thereafter.<sup>27</sup> But Luke is concerned with the eyewitnesses as those who bear witness to what they have seen and heard, not as those seeing and hearing. Jesus tells them, as Pentecost approaches, "You shall be my witnesses" (Ac. 1:8), not "You have been my witnesses."<sup>28</sup>

Another argument put forward by Klein is that the word

γενόμενοι stands in the middle of the expression ὑπηρεταὶ τοῦ λόγου, and so must go with ὑπηρεταὶ alone, not with αὐτόπται as well.<sup>29</sup> However, Greek word order is too flexible to warrant Klein's deduction. In the first two editions of his commentary on the synoptic gospels, Holtzmann mentioned the consideration to which Klein calls attention, and accordingly favored the translation, "diejenigen, welche von Anfang an Augenzeugen gewesen und Diener des Wortes geworden sind."<sup>30</sup> But in the third edition he abandoned this argument and adopted the construction which we prefer (by omitting "gewesen"), recognizing that "der gemeinsame Artikel zeigt, dass dieses γενόμενοι auch zu αὐτόπται, wie ἀπ' ἀρχῆς auch zu ὑπηρεταὶ gehört."<sup>31</sup> The construction abandoned by Holtzmann must also be rejected because it arbitrarily imposes a participle (i.e. another γενόμενοι, Holtzmann's original "gewesen") upon the words ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται in order to balance ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, the usual analysis is to be preferred.

The expression οἱ . . . γενόμενοι could be translated as "those who were," implying that they no longer are, or as "those who have been," implying that they still are.<sup>33</sup> However, the phrase "from the beginning" (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) implies that the situation continues up to the present. This is the implication wherever else the phrase occurs in the New Testament, namely in Mt. 19:4, 8; 24:21; Mk. 10:6; 13:19; Jn. 8:44; 15:27; Ac. 26:4; 2 Thes. 2:13; 2 Pet. 3:4; 1 Jn. 1:1; 2:7, 13, 14, 24 (bis); 3:8, 11; 2 Jn. 5, 6. The preposition ἀπό sets up an open-ended situation, and unless other words are added to close it, that situation must be understood to continue. Therefore, Luke is referring to "those who have been"-- up to the moment when Luke writes--eyewitnesses and servants of the

word.<sup>34</sup>

Since οἱ . . . γινόμενοι governs the entire phrase, it is evident that Luke has in view one group of original tradition bearers. However, it does not follow from this that the two anarthrous predicate nominatives, "eyewitnesses" and "servants of the word," necessarily designate two functions exercised (either concurrently or successively) by the same persons.<sup>35</sup> The two expressions, "eyewitnesses" and "servants of the word," do not, strictly speaking, share a common article, but even if they did, it would not follow that the same persons were both eyewitnesses and servants of the word. As D. A. Carson observes (quoting A. T. Robertson), "When two or more groups are governed by one article, the separate groups 'are treated as one for the purpose in hand,' not assumed to be identical in every respect." To show that this is so he cites Lk. 14:21; 15:9; Ac. 17:18; 23:7, and other passages.<sup>36</sup> The eyewitnesses and servants of the word were one insofar as they handed down the gospel traditions to the church, but not necessarily in any other respect.<sup>37</sup> The precise meaning of the two expressions must be established before it can be determined whether they designate identical, overlapping, or mutually exclusive groups.

By "eyewitnesses" (αὐτόπται) Luke clearly means those who observed the activity of Jesus and heard his teachings. Those who were eyewitnesses "from the beginning" (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς)<sup>38</sup> handed down to the church authoritative accounts of what they had seen and heard. Their original, uncorrupted testimony about Jesus would obviously have been prized by those writing a gospel narrative. According to Luke, these eyewitnesses played a decisive role in the handing down of the gospel tradition.

Cadbury, however, insists that Luke's reference to "eyewitness-

ship" (as he puts it) can be properly evaluated only when we realize that "historians often claimed it for themselves." Luke, he says, "is following a convention of historians," which even became "a commonplace of rhetoric." He points out that "the claim of eyewitness-ship" by ancient historians is often at least partially suspect, and, in the case of romancers, entirely untrue.<sup>39</sup> The implication of this would be that we need not take Luke's reference to eyewitnesses too seriously. Their role may not have been so important after all. Cadbury draws this implication in connection with what he understands to be Luke's claim to firsthand knowledge in vs. 3, suggesting that it may be taken "with a grain of salt," and advising us not to let our critical judgment (e.g., concerning Lucan authorship and the meaning of the "we" passages in Acts) be swayed by "any boastful claims of his own."<sup>40</sup>

Now it is undoubtedly true that ancient historians sometimes exaggerated the extent of their firsthand knowledge. Some may even have fabricated narratives much as romancers wrote fictional accounts of travels in distant lands.<sup>41</sup> However, one must not exaggerate the extent to which reputable ancient historians indulged in invention.<sup>42</sup> The fact is, as H. Koester points out, that "most Hellenistic historians at least knew and subscribed to the principle of objective historiography," however well they followed that principle in practice.<sup>43</sup> Cadbury's own evidence that "the rivals of the historian are accused of ἀσφασία"<sup>44</sup> shows that truthfulness was expected of historians who claimed to be (or to be passing on the reports of) eyewitnesses. Creed correctly observes in this regard that "an ancient writer would no more claim the authority of eye-witnesses without expecting his statement to be believed than a modern."<sup>45</sup> It was quite natural for narrators of

recent events then, as now, to call attention to any firsthand knowledge that they may have had, but this hardly proves that it was an accepted literary convention to misrepresent the extent of one's knowledge of the facts.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, it is manifestly unfair to introduce the foibles of certain other writers as evidence for determining the seriousness of Luke's own representations. Moreover, Luke says in vs. 2 that other persons, and not he himself, were eyewitnesses. And he mentions them in connection with his predecessors' works, not his own. Thus, his reference to eyewitnesses is quite unlike the claims of other historians to be eyewitnesses. Luke's reference to eyewitnesses is explained by their importance in the formation and propagation of the gospel traditions, not by the importance of following a supposed literary convention.

Our conclusion, that Luke's statement about the role of eyewitnesses is a straightforward description of historical fact as he knew it, is not affected by the opinion of C. H. Talbert that "the witness motif" of Luke-Acts, as introduced in Lk. 1:2, is "an anti-Gnostic device" intended "to protect against a Docetic tendency that confronted him." In Talbert's view, "Luke writes so as to have a motif of authentic witness guaranteeing the church's proclamation, particularly at the point of the materiality of Jesus' death, burial, resurrection, and ascension."<sup>47</sup> Luke's accounts of the Resurrection and Ascension do place some emphasis upon their corporeal aspects, but it does not follow that when he describes an apostle as "a witness of his resurrection" (Ac. 1:22), he has "particularly" in mind a witness to "the materiality" of that event, although, of course, that aspect of it is included in the total witness (as may be seen in Ac. 10:41). Furthermore, however

much "the witness motif" may function as a literary "device" in Acts "guaranteeing the church's proclamation," there is no reason to infer that it is merely a literary device, not intended to be a representation of historical fact. Lk. 1:2 indicates that the eyewitnesses of Jesus played a key role in the formation of the gospel tradition, and that suggests that Luke's emphasis on them (and on the other witnesses of the risen Jesus, notably Paul) in Acts reflects his view of their importance in the development of the church.

In order to identify the "eyewitnesses" mentioned in Lk. 1:2, it is necessary to consider Luke's use of the word  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ , "witness." As nearly all scholars recognize, the word  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ , which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, is an elegant equivalent to  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ , which is used frequently by Luke.<sup>48</sup> Now at the close of his gospel we find the risen Jesus appointing the eleven apostles to be the authoritative eyewitnesses of his ministry, and especially of his death and resurrection, saying, "You are witnesses of these things" (24:48). This is not a statement of the obvious fact that the disciples whom he had specially chosen (see 6:13-16) had seen and heard him, but rather a commissioning of them (minus Judas Iscariot, of course)--and thus of no one else, at least as yet<sup>49</sup>--to be those who would bear witness to his deeds and teachings. Similarly, in Acts Jesus tells "the apostles whom he had chosen" (1:2), "You shall be my witnesses" (1:8; cf. 10:41). This is not a prediction, but a commissioning of certain men, and thus not of others, to be his witnesses. And they carried out their commission, for they proceeded to be the "witnesses of all the things he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem" (10:39; cf. 4:20), and especially of his resurrection

(1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 4:33; 5:32; 10:40-41; 13:31). There were others who had accompanied Jesus and who had even seen the risen Lord (1:21-22a; cf. Lk. 24:13-32; 1 Cor. 15:6), but only one of them was chosen to join the first eleven apostles as "a witness with us of his resurrection" (1:22b), and he was added to their number only to replace Judas (1:20, 24-25).<sup>50</sup> The others who had seen and heard Jesus, then, were not witnesses whose testimony was recognized as authoritative in the early church.<sup>51</sup> The words "those who have been eyewitnesses . . . from the beginning" in Lk. 1:2, taken by themselves, could with some justification be interpreted as a reference to a broad group of Jesus' disciples (perhaps including the Seventy mentioned in ch. 10),<sup>52</sup> but Luke's identification of the twelve apostles as the authoritative witnesses of Jesus shows that they, and only they, were the "eyewitnesses" whom he had in mind.<sup>53</sup>

Luke mentions other witnesses of Jesus in Acts, but they are witnesses of the ascended Jesus, seen in visions, not witnesses of the earthly or resurrected Jesus seen in the flesh prior to the Ascension. Stephen is called a "witness" (22:20) because he testified to his vision of Jesus standing at the right hand of God (7:55-56).<sup>54</sup> Similarly, Paul was chosen by the risen Lord to be a witness of what he had seen and heard on the road to Damascus (22:15; 26:16) and of what he would see and hear in future visions of him (26:16; cf. 23:11; 9:15). But in 13:31 Paul distinguishes himself from the Twelve, who had seen the resurrected Jesus over many days prior to the Ascension, and so were witnesses of the Resurrection in a way that he himself was not. Thus, Paul is not to be included among the "eyewitnesses" of Lk. 1:2.

In addition to the eyewitnesses, Luke mentions the "servants

of the word" (ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου), at least those who have been such "from the beginning," as having handed down the gospel traditions. Their authority is coordinate with that of the eyewitnesses, but their identity and function are not so easy to determine.

A servant "of the word" would be one who serves the gospel, for, as nearly all commentators today recognize, "the word" is Luke's usual expression for the Christian gospel.<sup>55</sup> It is so used in Lk. 8:12, 13, 15; Ac. 4:4; 6:4; 8:4; 10:36; 11:19; 14:25; 16:6; 17:11; 18:5; 19:20.<sup>56</sup> "The word" is more fully expressed as "the word of God" in Lk. 5:1; 8:11, 21; 11:28; Ac. 4:31; 6:2, 7; 8:14; 11:1; 12:24; 13:5, 7, 44 v.l., 48 v.l.; 16:32 v.l.; 17:13; 18:11, and as "the word of the Lord" in Ac. 8:25; 12:24 v.l.; 13:44, 48, 49; 15:35, 36; 16:32; 19:10; cf. 4:29. G. Kittel observes that these three expressions "are used alongside one another without any discernible difference."<sup>57</sup> "The word" is said to be "of God" or "of the Lord" because it is "his word" (Ac. 4:29). This can only mean that it has come from him, that it is "die göttliche Offenbarung."<sup>58</sup> As Kittel puts it, "The One who speaks the Word is God. Whether explicit or not, the τοῦ Θεοῦ always controls λόγος statements."<sup>59</sup>

The expression "servants of the word" could reasonably apply to all those who "serve" the gospel, presumably by making it known and thus advancing its cause.<sup>60</sup> Accordingly, many scholars have supposed that the expression simply designates preachers of the gospel.<sup>61</sup> However, there is good reason to believe that this expression designates those who received the gospel directly from God, and thus excludes those preachers who learned it from other men. This is suggested by the fact that "the word" that they proclaimed was a word from God. As E. Schweizer observes, "the

real agent of their witness," as servants of the word, "is the Spirit of God (Acts 1:2; 5:32). Only the Spirit gives knowledge of what is truly taking place (cf. 2:11-12, etc.)."<sup>62</sup> Admittedly, one could serve a gospel learned from those who have received it from God. But these servants of the word functioned as such "from the beginning" (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), and thus proclaimed an original message, not one derived from other men. Furthermore, their authority to hand down gospel traditions was coordinate with that of the original apostles (i.e. the "eyewitnesses"), not secondary to theirs. Therefore, Luke apparently means by "servants of the word" those who had received the gospel by revelation.<sup>63</sup>

This interpretation is confirmed by Luke's use of the term ὑπηρέτης in Ac. 26:16, the only other passage in the New Testament (with the possible exception of 1 Cor. 4:1) in which it designates a minister of the gospel.<sup>64</sup> There Paul recollects that the risen Lord on the road to Damascus appointed him ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές [με] ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, that is (rejecting με as spurious<sup>65</sup>), "a servant and a witness of the things which you have seen and of the things in which I will appear to you." If, as seems most natural, the relative clauses are understood as relating to ὑπηρέτην as well as to μάρτυρα, then Paul is described as a servant of what he has seen (and heard, 22:14-15) and will see, that is, of visions and revelations. In his visions, revelations of the gospel were imparted to him (see Ac. 26:17-20; 22:14-15; cf. 16:9-10; 22:17-21; 23:11; 27:23-24). Thus, he proclaimed "the gospel of the grace of God" as he had received it from the Lord Jesus (20:24). Luke's portrayal of Paul shows that by the expression "servants of the word" in Lk. 1:2 he means those who have received revelations of the gospel.

It is difficult to identify the "servants of the word" precisely, because it is not always clear in Acts who proclaims the gospel as something which has been revealed directly to him, and who proclaims it as something learned from others. However, at least the first preachers of a divine message must receive it directly from God. Therefore, the first preachers of the gospel in Acts must be servants of the word. Now Luke clearly portrays the twelve apostles as the first preachers of the gospel, beginning with Peter's speech at Pentecost, which was delivered as he stood "with the eleven (other apostles)" (2:14).<sup>66</sup> They attend constantly to "the ministry of the word" (6:4).<sup>67</sup> "The word" is mentioned in connection with them in 4:4, 31; 6:2, 4, 7; 8:25; cf. 2:14, 42. The apostle Paul, in addition to the twelve apostles, must also be included among the servants of the word, since Luke designates him as a ὑπηρέτης in 26:16.<sup>68</sup>

Other men, besides the twelve apostles and Paul, were probably also servants of the word. Stephen seems to have been one of them, since the Spirit was with him when he spoke (6:10, cf. vs. 3 and 5) and attested his words with signs and wonders (6:8). The same may be said of Philip the evangelist, who received extraordinary guidance from the Spirit (8:26, 29, 39-40; cf. 6:3, 5), and whose preaching of the word was attested by signs and wonders (8:4-7, 13). Other preachers of the gospel who were driven from Jerusalem (8:1, 4; 11:19) may also have been servants of the word. Probably Barnabas (see 13:2, 5, 7, 44, 46, 48, 49; 14:25; 15:35, 36) and possibly Silas (see 15:40; 16:6, 32; 17:11) should be included with Paul. Perhaps others, not named in Acts, would also have been designated by Luke as servants of the word.<sup>69</sup>

There is reason to think that just as the "eyewitnesses" were

the apostles in a narrow sense (i.e. the twelve apostles), so the "servants of the word" were the apostles in a broad sense. In this broad sense, an apostle is one sent forth by Christ to preach the gospel entrusted to him. The twelve apostles were commissioned by him both during his ministry (see Lk. 6:13; 9:1-2) and after his resurrection (see Lk. 24:44-49; Ac. 1:2-3, 8), while the other apostles were, evidently, commissioned only by the risen Christ (as is clearly seen in the case of Paul).<sup>70</sup> Two servants of the word, namely Paul and Barnabas, are in fact called apostles in Ac. 14:4, 14 (as implied in 1 Cor. 9:5).<sup>71</sup> Stephen, Philip the evangelist, and Silas may have been regarded as apostles, too. James, the brother of Jesus, to whom the risen Lord had appeared (see 1 Cor. 15:7), was also an apostle (see Gal. 1:19; 2:9; 1 Cor. 9:5; 15:7; compare his role in Ac. 15),<sup>72</sup> and thus was apparently a servant of the word.<sup>73</sup>

The "eyewitnesses and servants of the word," then, may be regarded as the apostles. We cannot be sure that the term "apostles" covers exactly the same persons as the expression "eyewitnesses and servants of the word," but there is at least a close approximation. With this caveat, we shall say that Luke is referring to the apostles in Lk. 1:2. The longer expression is evidently used to specify the two apostolic functions involving the gospel traditions. All the apostles were servants of the word, and the twelve apostles were also witnesses of Jesus' deeds and teachings. Many scholars, both ancient and modern, have identified the "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" as the apostles, though usually in the narrow sense of that term.<sup>74</sup>

It is easy to see that the eyewitness testimony of the twelve apostles would have embraced the gospel traditions, particularly in

the more detailed teaching given to Christians within the church. But it is also true that the word proclaimed by the apostles as they spoke in their capacity as servants of the word, included gospel traditions.<sup>75</sup> This is shown by Ac. 13:24-25, where, in an evangelistic proclamation of "the word of God" (see vss. 42 and 44) Paul includes certain elements of the tradition about John the Baptist in the same detail, and with many of the same words, as it is presented in the gospel accounts.<sup>76</sup> Also, the summary of the gospel history given in 10:36-41 is consistent with the view that "the word" (vs. 36) incorporated the gospel tradition. Luke could hardly have intended his presentations of apostolic preaching in Acts to be understood as exhaustive accounts, rather than brief summaries. It would be fatuous to imagine that an apostle, after uttering his "kerygma" in about one minute, would have had nothing more to say about the life and teachings of Jesus. Not much of the gospel tradition (in its synoptic detail) is found in the preaching of Acts, but it must be remembered that "the word" spoken within the church undoubtedly included much more of it than that spoken outside it. This is indeed what Luke confirms in Lk. 1:2. There we learn that the whole gospel tradition was declared within the church.

Luke speaks not simply of "those who have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word," but of those who have been such "from the beginning" (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). Because this phrase modifies γενόμενοι,<sup>77</sup> it specifies a certain "beginning" since when there have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word. Most scholars have inferred from Mk. 1:1, 4; Lk. 3:23; Jn. 15:27; 16:4; Ac. 1:21-22; 10:37-42 that this beginning is that of the gospel history, that is, the ministry of John the Baptist or the initial public activity

of Jesus.<sup>78</sup> (Some have seen a reference to the earliest events narrated by Luke, namely those preceding and attending the birth of John the Baptist and that of Jesus,<sup>79</sup> but the apostles were not eyewitnesses of those events.<sup>80</sup>) These passages do indicate that the events with which the gospel traditions were primarily concerned, and of which the twelve apostles were eyewitnesses, began with the baptism of John, but they do not indicate that there were eyewitnesses and servants of the word functioning as such from that time onward.

The original apostles were, of course, observing the events of the gospel history from the time of John onward, and could therefore be considered to have been "eyewitnesses" from that time onward. But they did not begin to be "servants of the word" at that time. G. L. Hahn thinks that the terms of Lk. 1:2 are satisfied by the fact that the disciples began to preach the gospel of the coming kingdom during Jesus' ministry,<sup>81</sup> but they did not do so from the beginning of it. Furthermore, as we have seen,<sup>82</sup> a "servant of the word" was more than a preacher of the gospel; he was someone who had received his "word" by revelation from God. The disciples were commissioned to "preach the kingdom of God" (Lk. 9:2) and "evangelize" (9:6), but only Jesus spoke "the word (of God)" (see 5:1; 8:11, 12, 13, 15, 21; 11:28; cf. 4:32; 10:39; 21:33; 22:61; 24:19) prior to Pentecost, when Peter (with the other apostles) first proclaimed "the word" in the power of the Spirit (see Ac. 1:8; 2:4, 14, 41, 42). According to Luke, then, there were no apostolic "servants of the word" before Pentecost.<sup>83</sup>

But the phrase "from the beginning" can hardly refer to the baptism of John in connection with the eyewitnesses and yet to Pentecost in connection with the servants of the word.<sup>84</sup> Loisy

supposes that the phrase could have such a complex meaning,<sup>85</sup> but words do not function in such a fashion. Perhaps recognizing this, he adds that "ces deux commencements n'en font qu'un dans la perspective."<sup>86</sup> But in Luke's first-century perspective, the baptism of John and the birth of the Christian church were quite distinct from each other.

Another solution to this dilemma has been put forward by B. Weiss. He argues that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς can refer to the beginning of the gospel history even though there were no servants of the word until the conclusion of that history "sofern ja ihre Augenzeugschaft ἀπ' [sic] ἀρχῆς der Grund war, weshalb sie auch die ersten Diener des Wortes wurden."<sup>87</sup> But this presupposes that all the servants of the word were also eyewitnesses, which we have seen not to be the case. Furthermore, Weiss reads much more into the passage than is there. Nothing is said, for example, about the "Augenzeugschaft" of the servants of the word, let alone that it provided the basis for their becoming servants of the word. Weiss also argues that the meaning of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is determined by the word standing next to it, namely ὑπηρέται,<sup>88</sup> but this ignores the fact (which he himself points out in another connection<sup>89</sup>) that the phrase modifies γενόμενοι. The expressions "eyewitnesses" and "servants of the word," being the two parts of a compound predicate nominative, have precisely the same syntactical relationship with "from the beginning."

All difficulty disappears once it is recognized that the "beginning" in view is not the beginning of the events observed by the eyewitnesses, but rather the beginning of the time during which there were eyewitnesses (and servants of the word) functioning as such. The words οἱ . . . γενόμενοι mean "those who have been," and the temporal adverbial phrase ἀπ' ἀρχῆς tells us when they have

been. As we have seen,<sup>90</sup> the twelve apostles were not commissioned to be Jesus' witnesses (i.e. the "eyewitnesses" of Lk. 1:2) until after his resurrection (Lk. 24:48; Ac. 1:8; cf. Jn. 15:27; 19:35; 21:24). Indeed, the Resurrection was the main event of which they were to be witnesses. The apostles began to function as witnesses of the gospel history on the day of Pentecost (see Ac. 1:8, 22; 2:1, 11, 22-36). The eyewitnesses and servants of the word whom Luke has in view, then, were those who were such from the beginning of the apostolic church onward.

If the phrase "from the beginning" refers back to Pentecost in a strict sense, then Paul (and anyone else who may have become an apostle at a later date) cannot be included among the eyewitnesses and servants of the word with whose gospel traditions Luke's predecessors (and presumably Luke, too) were concerned.<sup>91</sup> However, it is very difficult to believe that Luke intended to exclude this outstanding servant of the word, who had handed down the gospel traditions to the gentile churches (cf. 1 Cor. 11:23-26).<sup>92</sup> Perhaps, then, "the beginning" is not restricted to the day of Pentecost, but refers more broadly to the foundational period of the church. This is suggested by the phrase ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων in Ac. 15:7 (cf. the ἀρχαῖοι μαθηταί of 21:16), which refers back to the events related in ch. 10, which followed Paul's conversion and association with the apostles in ch. 9. Paul would thus have been a servant of the word "from the beginning."<sup>93</sup> On the other hand, there is no demonstrable connection between Lk. 1:2 and Ac. 15:7, and the expression "from the beginning" seems more definite than a "foundational period" of several years. Therefore, it is probably better to interpret "the beginning" as the day of Pentecost, perhaps extending a few weeks or months, but not a few years.

Is Paul then excluded? Not necessarily. We have already noted that the words οἱ . . . γινόμενοι designate a group of people.<sup>94</sup> The words ἀπ' ἀρχῆς may then be applied to the group as a whole, without necessarily excluding the possibility that someone may have been admitted to it after the day of Pentecost, as Paul was (Ac. 9:26-28; cf. 5:13). If so, Paul may be permitted to take his place as one of the original and authoritative servants of the word.<sup>95</sup> It may also be significant that Paul was the founder of much of the gentile church, and thus was a servant of the word "from the beginning" at least insofar as the gentiles were concerned.

Even if the phrase "from the beginning" does not exclude Paul, it still must exclude some people who could be considered "eyewitnesses" or "servants of the word." Otherwise, it would be superfluous. There would seem to be no reason for Luke to have wanted to exclude anyone who may have become an authentic eyewitness or servant of the word subsequent to the original apostles. Therefore, the phrase "from the beginning" is probably meant to exclude the self-styled "apostles" who had arisen (see 2 Cor. 11:12-13), and who, in connection with their "different gospel" (2 Cor. 11:4; Gal. 1:6), were apparently teaching distorted versions of the gospel history, perhaps including fanciful tales of their own invention.<sup>96</sup> "Those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word," then, would be the original (and true) apostles, especially the Twelve, but also those (like Paul) genuinely associated with them.<sup>97</sup>

As we observed at the beginning of this chapter, it is important to remember the connection between vs. 1 and vs. 2 of Luke's preface. Luke tells us that his many predecessors undertook to

draw up narrative accounts of the deeds and teachings of Jesus just as the traditions were handed down by the apostles. His predecessors, in other words, recorded as best they could the authentic gospel traditions. These writers apparently did not have any interest in the accounts of Jesus put forward by false apostles or other unreliable or unauthorized people. Luke's predecessors, then, were not the authors of heretical gospels, as Origen suggested.<sup>98</sup> Luke was not writing a gospel because heretical gospels needed to be answered, but because orthodox accounts of the gospel history were in some measure deficient. His predecessors had undertaken to record the authentic gospel traditions as accurately as they could, presumably relying on the form of tradition which had developed in their respective churches, but Luke felt that another written gospel was still needed.

## LUKE'S DECISION TO WRITE A GOSPEL (VS. 3)

Having mentioned the gospel narratives already written by others (vs. 1) and having stated the standard of gospel composition at which they aimed (vs. 2), Luke proceeds to announce his own decision to write a gospel (vs. 3). He tells a certain "most excellent Theophilus" that "I have decided, for my part, . . . to write to you" (ἐδόξε καὶ μοι . . . σοι γράψαι).

The words ἐδόξε . . . μοι have usually been translated as "it seemed good to me" (so, e.g., AV and RSV). However, a more direct rendering, such as "I have decided" (so NEB and JB), would better convey Luke's meaning, even though the Greek grammatical construction is indirect.<sup>1</sup> Such a translation better captures the fact that Luke is announcing his decision to write a gospel, and is not merely expressing a perception that it would be good to do so. The basic argument of his preface is that "since" (ἐπειδή) such and such has transpired (vss. 1-2), "I have decided" to do something in response (vss. 3-4).

Luke structures his argument with ἐπειδή and ἐδόξε . . . μοι in essentially the same way as the opening sentence (after the greeting) of the letter conveying the so-called Apostolic Decree is structured in Ac. 15:24-26.<sup>2</sup> There we read: "Since (ἐπειδή) we have heard that certain persons . . . have troubled you . . ., we have decided (ἐδόξε ἡμῶν), having become of one mind, to send chosen men to you . . ."<sup>3</sup> In addition to the correspondence of

ἐπειδὴ with ἐπειδὴπερ and of ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν with ἔδοξε . . . ἐμοί, the causal clause refers indefinitely to "certain persons" (τινές), much as Lk. 1:1 refers to "many" (πολλοί). And between the impersonal δοκεῖ + dat. and the complementary infinitive there is a participial clause describing the immediate circumstance warranting the decision, just as in Lk. 1:3.

The ἐπειδὴ . . . ἔδοξε μοι form of declaration may also be illustrated by an imperial decree and two imperial letters. Augustus, in a decree granting certain rights to the Jews of his realm, declared: "Since (ἐπειδὴ) the Jewish nation has been found well disposed to the Roman people . . ., it has been decided by me (ἔδοξε μοι) and my council under oath, with the consent of the Roman people, that the Jews may follow their own customs in accordance with the law of their fathers . . ."<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Constantine wrote to Miltiades, bishop of Rome, in an effort to resolve the Donatist controversy: "Inasmuch as (ἐπειδὴ) documents . . . have been sent to me . . . from which it appears that Caecilian . . . is called to account on many charges . . .: it seemed good to me (ἔδοξε μοι) that Caecilian himself . . . should set sail for Rome, that there a hearing may be granted him . . ."<sup>5</sup> And in an imperial letter releasing clergymen from civic duties, Constantine wrote to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa: "Since (ἐπειδὴ) from many facts it appears that the setting at naught of divine worship . . . has brought great dangers upon public affairs . . .: it has seemed good (ἔδοξεν, sc. μοι) that those men who . . . bestow their services on the performance of divine worship, should receive the rewards of their own labours . . ."<sup>6</sup>

This form of statement was evidently common in official pronouncements. It would be going too far to infer from Luke's use of

it that he considered his preface to be an official ecclesiastical pronouncement,<sup>7</sup> but it would not be unreasonable to suppose that he intended the form of his preface to convey to the reader that his gospel was particularly authoritative.

Be that as it may, the nature of the argument is clear enough. The clause introduced by ἐπεὶ δὴ (περὶ) sets forth a situation calling for remedial action; the clause introduced by ἐδοξέ μοι announces what that action will be. Thus, in Ac. 15 the situation is that certain unauthorized Jewish Christians have been going to Syria and demanding that the gentile converts be circumcized and keep the Jewish law. The remedy is that authorized representatives of the Jerusalem Council will be sent out to them with the Decree setting forth minimal requirements for them, but affirming their fundamental liberty. Similarly, the situation presupposed by the Augustan decree is that the Jews have been loyal subjects, yet their loyalty has not been properly rewarded. The remedy, accordingly, is to grant them legal protection for the observance of their laws and customs. (Augustus does not specifically say that Jewish loyalty was not being rewarded, but the measure that he announces clearly implies that the Jewish way of life had been insufficiently protected by Roman law, and that he considered that to be inconsistent with the loyalty that the Jews had shown to Rome.) For Constantine the situation is the Donatist challenge to Caecilian's bishopric, and the remedy is his call for an ecclesiastical hearing to settle the matter. Again, Constantine responds to a situation in which clergymen are encumbered with civic duties to the detriment of their ecclesiastical responsibilities by relieving them of those duties.

In accordance with this pattern, we should understand that

Luke faced a situation calling for remedial action. The gospel literature known to him, in other words, presented a problem. In order to remedy the situation, he decided to issue his own gospel. Luke does not specifically state what the problem facing him was (unless the verb ἐπεχείρησαν in vs. 1 indicates presumption or incompetence on the part of his predecessors, as various Church Fathers thought<sup>8</sup>). However, as in the case of the Augustan decree, the problem may be inferred from the nature of the remedy. As we shall see, his remedy was to write an accurate gospel narrative (vs. 3),<sup>9</sup> thus enabling Theophilus to know what was certain about the life and teaching of Jesus (vs. 4).<sup>10</sup> From this it follows that the gospel narratives previously written, although intended to reproduce the original traditions accurately (vs. 2), were not sufficiently accurate and trustworthy.<sup>11</sup> It is not enough to say that the earlier narratives did not suit Luke's particular purpose,<sup>12</sup> for that purpose was to write an accurate account of the deeds and teachings of Jesus. Faced with inadequate gospel literature, Luke decided to write an accurate gospel.<sup>13</sup>

Luke does not actually disparage or condemn his predecessors (or their narratives). He probably looked upon them somewhat sympathetically, for they had undertaken the laudable task (which he, too, was about to undertake) of recording for posterity the original gospel traditions.<sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, as we have seen in considering the words "have undertaken to draw up . . . just as" in vss. 1-2,<sup>15</sup> and as we see here in considering the basic argument of the preface, Luke considered their works to have fallen short of the desired goal, thus establishing the need for an accurate account of the gospel history. He obviously felt responsible to write that accurate account himself.<sup>16</sup>

It has often been asserted that Luke draws attention to the works of his predecessors in order to justify his own writing of a gospel. Luke's argument, according to this view, is that "since" others (or, others who are not apostles) have already written gospel narratives, "I, too," am permitted (or, encouraged) to do so. As F. Godet puts it, Luke "feels it necessary to excuse the boldness of his enterprise, by referring to the numerous analogous attempts that have preceded his own."<sup>17</sup> However, the advocates of this view are putting words into Luke's mouth, for he says in vs. 3 only that he has decided to write, not that he is justified in doing so.<sup>18</sup> Luke is asking, according to Godet, "If my numerous predecessors have not been blamed, why should I be blamed, who am only walking in their steps?"<sup>19</sup> But Luke says that his predecessors have written narratives, not that they have not been blamed for doing so.

In addition to putting words into Luke's mouth, this interpretation attributes to him an argument that does not make any sense. The mere fact that others have done something does not justify anyone else in doing it. If others were criticized for recording the oral traditions, appealing to their precedent would have accomplished nothing. And if they were not criticized, Luke could still have been.

Indeed, an appeal to similar literature by an author writing under similar circumstances would only invite the charge of needless repetition. As Calvin observes, "it was unnecessary labour to repeat a tale told by many, if in fact they had properly dealt with their task."<sup>20</sup> This charge was evidently frequently heard in antiquity, for some writers anticipated it in their prefaces. For instance, Strabo says this: "If I, too, undertake to write upon a

subject that has been treated by many others before me, I should not be blamed therefor, unless I prove to have discussed the subject in every respect as have my predecessors."<sup>21</sup> And Dioscorides writes, "Although many writers . . . have composed Treatises on the preparation, power and testing of medicines, I will try to show you that I was not moved to this undertaking by any vain or senseless impulse."<sup>22</sup> The existence of similar literature did not justify yet another writer in addressing a subject, but rather required him to justify his doing so. And as we have indicated, it was the unsatisfactory nature of the existing literature which justified Luke's effort to write a gospel.

By writing ἔδοξε καὶ μοί rather than simply ἔδοξε μοι, Luke relates himself to his many predecessors. Most translators and commentators have rendered καὶ μοί as "to me, also" (so, e.g., RSV), in accordance with the basic meaning of the word. However, the context shows that Luke is not using a strictly correlative καί. He cannot mean "to me and to my predecessors," as that would involve them in the decision to write a gospel for Theophilus: "It has seemed good to me and my predecessors . . . to write to you, most excellent Theophilus."<sup>23</sup> Nor is Luke saying, "to me, as it once did to my predecessors," for we may be sure that each one of them had not decided to write a gospel for Theophilus. Thus, the καί in καὶ μοί is not setting up a strict correlation between Luke (and his gospel) and his predecessors (and their accounts).

It is useless to argue against this, as Zahn does, that only certain words in the clause (including γράψαι) refer to both Luke and his predecessors, while the others (including σοι) do not,<sup>24</sup> for it is arbitrary and ungrammatical to so divide up the clause. Nor can we agree with Zahn that καὶ μοί "shows that all which he says

of his predecessors is equally applicable to himself,"<sup>25</sup> for the scope of  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\acute{\iota}$  is defined by its own clause, and cannot be extended elsewhere. Sweeping generalizations about the similarity between Luke's gospel and the narratives of his predecessors, and thus inferences of Luke's high regard for them, though sometimes made (usually with some qualification),<sup>26</sup> are simply not warranted by the word  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\acute{\iota}$ .

If the context prevents us from understanding  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\acute{\iota}$  as "to me, also," in a strictly correlative sense, then the force of "also" must be understood more loosely, indicating only a general correspondence between the activity of Luke and that of his predecessors. This general connection would seem to be best brought out by adopting the meaning "for my part" or "as regards my share in the matter."<sup>27</sup> Others have undertaken to record the authentic gospel traditions, and now Luke, for his part, has decided to record them, too, by writing a gospel for Theophilus. Luke connects himself with his predecessors, then, only insofar as their basic literary intention is concerned.<sup>28</sup> He represents himself as undertaking the task which they have undertaken. They fell short of success, but he, presumably, will not.

A similarity of literary intention, we must emphasize, implies nothing about the relative merits of the works produced in attempts to fulfill that intention. It is quite wrong to infer from  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\acute{\iota}$ , as some scholars have, that Luke puts his predecessors' narratives on a par with his own, thus tacitly expressing his approval of them (at least so far as they go).<sup>29</sup> The word  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\acute{\iota}$  puts Luke on a par with his predecessors insofar as they were writers of gospel narratives, but it implies nothing about the value of their narratives. Luke's opinion of their works is implied rather, as we have seen,<sup>30</sup>

by the general structure of his argument (and by his failure to commend them), and that suggests that he was not satisfied with them.

Luke tells Theophilus, if we understand the syntax of vs. 3 correctly, that he intends to write his narrative ἀκριβῶς, "accurately." It is not immediately evident, however, that ἀκριβῶς should be construed with γράψαι rather than with παρηκολούθηκέτι.<sup>31</sup> In the former case Luke would be saying that he will write "accurately," while in the latter case he would be saying that he has followed everything "carefully" before writing. Both constructions are syntactically possible and both yield sensible statements.

Slightly in favor of the former construction is the fact that Luke elsewhere uses the adverb ἀκριβῶς with the meaning "accurately" (viz. in Ac. 18:25, 26; 23:15; 24:22; cf. 23:20), but never with the meaning "carefully." It may also be significant that in the introductory remarks to his works Josephus often uses the words ἀκριβῶς, ἀκριβῆς, and ἀκρίβεια with reference to the accuracy of his or others' writings,<sup>32</sup> but only once uses any of these words with reference to the carefulness of a writer's prior investigation of, or acquaintance with, the facts.<sup>33</sup>

Much more significant is the fact that many ancient authorities seem to have construed ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι. Probably the elder John (quoted by Papias), the author of the anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, and Euthalius, and certainly Augustine, understood the passage in this fashion. Their testimony indicates that this construction is natural and reasonable.

According to a tradition handed down by "the elder" (i.e. John) and preserved by Papias, Mark ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μόντοι

τάξει,<sup>34</sup> As we shall argue in due course,<sup>35</sup> this description of how Mark wrote his gospel reflects the words ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς . . . γράψαι in Lk. 1:3 (in order to compare Mark with Luke). Evidently, then, the elder John (or Papias) construed ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι.

This construction was also adopted by the author of the anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke. He says that Luke, according to his preface, wrote out "the accurate narrative (τὴν ἀκριβῆ . . . διήγησιν) of the dispensation." The adjective ἀκριβῆ is derived from Luke's adverb ἀκριβῶς, and διήγησιν interprets καθεξῆς . . . γράψαι with a term taken from vs. 1. In saying that Luke's narrative was accurate, he assumes that ἀκριβῶς modifies γράψαι.

In Jerome's translation of Origen's Homilies on Luke, ἀκριβῶς is not quoted or discussed in connection with the participial phrase preceding it (and perhaps concluded by it), even though it would bolster his argument to do so.<sup>36</sup> In the Greek text reconstructed by Rauer, Origen comments, γράφω δὲ οὐ ψιλὴν ἀκοήν, φησίν, παραλαβών, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς παρεκολουθηκῶς ἄνωθεν. If we understand this sentence correctly, ἀκριβῶς modifies γράφω: "He says, 'I am writing not mere hearsay that I have come across, but rather (am writing) accurately, having followed (them) for a long time.'" Admittedly, ἀκριβῶς could also be construed with παρεκολουθηκῶς, but the sense would be rather awkward. However that may be, Jerome's translation (sed ab initio ipse fuerit consecutus) does not seem to reflect the presence of ἀκριβῶς, and thus it may not have been in the original text. But whether we follow Rauer's Greek or Jerome's Latin, it is probable that Origen construed ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι.

Eusebius, in his treatment of Luke's preface, paraphrases the participial phrase of vs. 3 as ἄνωθεν ἅπασι παρεκολουθηκέαι, not

including ἀκριβῶς with it.<sup>37</sup> And later he says that Luke "gave us in his own Gospel the certain record (τὸν ἀσφαλῆ λόγον) of those events whose truth he had firmly grasped."<sup>38</sup> This probably reflects Lk. 1:3-4, and McGiffert even translates Eusebius's expression as "an accurate account." It would appear, then, that Eusebius construed ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι.

Athanasius, in his adaptation of the language of Luke's preface to his own situation, says that "it seemed good to me also, . . . having learned from the beginning, to set before you the books included in the Canon."<sup>39</sup> The words "having learned from the beginning" reflect the participial phrase in Lk. 1:3, yet they fail to reflect ἀκριβῶς, even though it would have strengthened the statement to add "carefully." And Athanasius goes on to say, "But for greater exactness (ἀκριβείας) I add this also, writing (γράφων) of necessity; . . ." This statement also seems to reflect Lk. 1:3, and, if so, it indicates that he construed ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι.

Euthalius says that Luke accompanied the apostles, καὶ εἰδὼς ἀκριβῶς γράφει, "and knowing (them) writes accurately."<sup>40</sup> This statement is clearly based on Lk. 1:3, and shows that Euthalius construed ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι.

Augustine, in his Harmony of the Evangelists, writes with respect to Luke that "it seemed good to him also to 'write carefully in order (ex ordine diligenter scribere) . . ."<sup>41</sup> Here diligenter (= ἀκριβῶς) is explicitly construed with scribere (= γράψαι). Augustine is using the Vulgate text, not the Greek, but that text follows the Greek word order exactly in this passage.<sup>42</sup> (Ambrose, on the other hand, construes both diligenter and ex ordine with the preceding participle.<sup>43</sup>)

In contrast to these ancient authorities, most modern scholars

have preferred to construe ἀκριβῶς with παρεκλούθη καὶ. <sup>44</sup> But the reasons for this preference have rarely been spelled out. Du Plessis says that it "seems preferable," <sup>45</sup> F. Mussner thinks that it is "wahrscheinlicher," <sup>46</sup> and Dillon declares that "ἀκριβῶς applies more readily to the participle," <sup>47</sup> but not one of them attempts to justify his opinion. It has probably been generally thought that the juxtaposed adverbs ἀκριβῶς and καθεξῆς, without a connecting καί, could only awkwardly be both attached to either the preceding participle or to the following infinitive, so that, in Creed's words, "the rhythm and balance of the sentence" is upset unless ἀκριβῶς is taken with the participle and καθεξῆς with the infinitive. <sup>48</sup> Schürmann is probably making this point when he says, "ἀκριβῶς läßt sich (neben καθεξῆς) kaum zu γράψαι ziehen." <sup>49</sup>

However, this argument loses its force if the two adverbs are complementary in meaning. <sup>50</sup> We are about to argue that καθεξῆς here means "in a narrative manner," <sup>51</sup> and if this is correct, ἀκριβῶς and καθεξῆς are complementary. The words ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι would then yield the smooth meaning, "to write to you accurately in a narrative manner" (i.e. "to write an accurate narrative for you"), which in no way upsets the rhythm and balance of the sentence. <sup>52</sup>

Strongly in favor of construing ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι is the fact that such a construction would be consistent with the usual patterns of Lucan word order. It has been said that in the New Testament "an adverb usually follows the adj. or verb which it determines," <sup>53</sup> but in Luke's gospel an adverb of manner, like ἀκριβῶς, characteristically precedes the word that it modifies. After a thorough study of Lucan usage (in his gospel), D. P. Davies concludes: "All this evidence suggests that a firm rule may be

enunciated, which is that our author prefers to put adverbs of time and manner before the word modified and adverbs of place after it except where the position of the adverb is determined by a desire to emphasize it or some other stylistic consideration such as putting the verb first."<sup>54</sup> In the case of adverbs separated by one or more words (not including connecting particles) from the word modified, like ἀκριβῶς; in Lk. 1:3, Davies finds that "in all but four instances (out of 40) the adverb is found as [the] first word in its clause, i.e. in an emphatic position."<sup>55</sup> But one of these four exceptional cases is not really an instance of separation, "since the words which intervene are all part of the same adverbial sequence,"<sup>56</sup> and in the other three cases the adverb still precedes the verb modified. Also relevant to Lk. 1:3 is the finding that anarthrous participles "are sometimes followed by an adverb of manner, though with the infinitive the adverb is never in post-position."<sup>57</sup> Applying these findings to the interpretation of Lk. 1:3, Davies says: "The question is whether ἀκριβῶς; modifies the participle or the infinitive. Usage suggests that since adverbs of manner are usually in pre-position, and always with the infinitive, it should be taken with γράψαι, giving the translation 'to write an accurate and orderly account' (contra RSV and NEB)."<sup>58</sup> And since Luke elsewhere in his gospel consistently puts in pre-position an adverb that is separated from the verb that it modifies, as ἀκριβῶς; would be in either construction, there can be little question but that it modifies γράψαι.

Theoretically, Lk. 1:3 could be the one exceptional case. But the demands of the larger context confirm the construction indicated by the usual patterns of Lucan word order, for the logical flow of the preface is greatly facilitated when ἀκριβῶς; is construed

with  $\chi\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$ . First of all, such a construction makes vs. 2 relevant to Luke's own gospel by applying the standard for gospel composition to it. That is, by writing his gospel "accurately" Luke will do what others have tried to do, namely, compose a narrative of the gospel history "just as" the apostles have handed down authentic accounts of it. Secondly, this construction makes Luke's concluding purpose clause intelligible. He will write "accurately" to Theophilus (vs. 3) "in order that" ( $\iota\acute{\nu}\alpha$ ) he may know "what is certain" ( $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ ) (vs. 4).<sup>59</sup> If Luke's intention is merely "to write to you in a narrative manner (or, in order)," the reader is given no reason to think that he will learn "what is certain" about Jesus.<sup>60</sup> Since the significance of vs. 2 and especially the basis for vs. 4 are clearly brought out only when  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  is construed with  $\chi\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$ , the correctness of this construction is doubly established.

The accuracy with which Luke intends to write is factual accuracy. He indicates that the events which he is about to relate actually took place just as he narrates them. The eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed down authentic accounts of Jesus, and he will now record them faithfully, thus achieving historical accuracy. The "things" that constitute his subject matter (vs. 1) are those things which Jesus actually "did" and "taught" (Ac. 1:1). The reader of Luke's gospel will be able to "know what is certain" about Jesus (Lk. 1:4). Clearly, then, Luke accepts the historical accuracy of the original gospel traditions, and claims the same accuracy for his record of those traditions. There is not the slightest hint in his preface that any sort of "theological truth" independent of historical truth is in view, however much theological significance the gospel history had for him.

Luke decided to write to Theophilus  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\epsilon\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ , as well as accurately. What he meant by this word has been much disputed. Unfortunately, the word occurs only rarely in Greek literature (though five times in Luke and Acts) and in a variety of usages. However, it always conveys sequentiality, whether the sequence in view be temporal (as in Lk. 8:1; Ac. 3:24; Aelian, Var. hist. 8.7), spatial (as in Ac. 18:23; Plutarch, Mor. 615B), literary (as in Mart. Pol. 22.4), logical (as in Test. Jud. 25.1; 1 Clem. 37.3), or whatever.<sup>61</sup> Thus, we may presume that Luke intended to write in a sequential manner of some sort.

Most scholars have assumed that when Luke speaks of writing in a sequential manner, he has in mind the principle according to which he intends to arrange his material. This intended order of material has been variously explained as (1) chronological,<sup>62</sup> either strictly so,<sup>63</sup> generally so,<sup>64</sup> as established in the gospel tradition (especially in Mark),<sup>65</sup> or indicating that the gospel history (related in Luke) is followed by the apostolic history (related in Acts),<sup>66</sup> (2) geographical,<sup>67</sup> (3) liturgical,<sup>68</sup> or (4) orderly, logical, literary, thematic, or systematic,<sup>69</sup> forming a continuous and connected account,<sup>70</sup> setting forth the development of salvation history,<sup>71</sup> manifesting the scheme of promise and fulfillment,<sup>72</sup> being straightforward,<sup>73</sup> and/or being, in a narrative, chiefly chronological.<sup>74</sup> However, while  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\epsilon\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$  may mean "in orderly sequence," the precise nature of that sequence is never part of the meaning of the word itself, but rather is indicated by the immediate context.<sup>75</sup> Therefore, it must not be supposed that  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\epsilon\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$  has a precise meaning like "in chronological order" or "in logical order" in Lk. 1:3.<sup>76</sup>

The precise and sometimes elaborate interpretations of  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\epsilon\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$

outlined above are not ordinarily reached by the usual exegetical methods, but rather (and this is sometimes made explicit) by first determining Luke's principle of arrangement from an analysis of his actual order of material in comparison with the order of parallel material in Mark and Matthew, and then declaring that Luke had that principle in mind when he wrote *καθεξῆς* in his preface.<sup>77</sup> But surely Luke did not expect his readers to follow such a procedure in order to determine what he intended to convey by *καθεξῆς*.

But when we look at the immediate context--"I have decided, for my part, . . . to write to you accurately *καθεξῆς*"--we find that it provides no hint of the kind of order supposedly in Luke's mind.<sup>78</sup> One cannot even assume that Luke is describing the order of events in a forthcoming narrative, for there is no suggestion in the immediate context that Luke is about to write a narrative. Therefore, G. Schneider's decisive objection to another scholar's view applies equally well to all other interpretations of *καθεξῆς* (including his own) which presuppose that Luke is describing the order of his material: "Ein solches Verständnis des *καθεξῆς* . . . kann aber aus Lk 1,3 allein kaum gewonnen werden."<sup>79</sup>

There are further reasons to think that Luke is not referring to the order of his material. First of all, it makes little sense to speak of writing "in order" without specifying the nature of that order, if only because it would go without saying that one intends to write in some kind of order. Secondly, if Luke had intended to describe the order of his material, he undoubtedly would have mentioned that material, no doubt by supplying a direct object for *γράψαι*. If Luke had written, say, *καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι διήγησιν*, then it would make sense to see in *καθεξῆς* a reference to his order of material: "to write a narrative for you in an orderly sequence

(of events)." But in the text as it stands, we doubt that καθέξῆς means "in (some kind of) order."

We question even more strongly the view advanced by Cadbury that καθέξῆς may refer to literary sequence and mean "hereafter" or "as follows."<sup>80</sup> There is no evidence that the word was ever used in this sense.<sup>81</sup> Nonetheless, Cadbury deduces it by arguing that καθέξῆς was synonymous with both ἔξῆς and ἐφεξῆς, and that these two synonyms were often used "in reference to the contents of the following writing," especially "to the following volume" of a multi-volume work. He cites nine examples of this usage in extra-biblical literature and asserts that in them "the adverb means 'next,' 'hereafter.'"<sup>82</sup> Now it is true that καθέξῆς is sometimes used interchangeably with ἔξῆς and ἐφεξῆς,<sup>83</sup> but it does not follow that every meaning of the latter two words can be automatically attributed to καθέξῆς. Furthermore, while Cadbury's examples show that ἔξῆς and ἐφεξῆς sometimes mean "next," in not one of them does either word mean "hereafter" or "as follows."<sup>84</sup> Nor do the standard lexicons provide any support for this alleged meaning for either word.<sup>85</sup>

More recently, however, J. Kürzinger has come to Cadbury's defense, pointing to the use of καθέξῆς in Mart. Pol. 22.4.<sup>86</sup> This passage was added at the end of the work by its transcriber, one "Pionius," and in it he claims to have received a revelation of the manuscript's location from the martyred Polycarp καθῶς δηλώσω ἐν τῷ καθέξῆς. Lightfoot translates this clause as "as I will declare in the sequel." There is, however, no sequel. But Lightfoot has convincingly argued that this document was at one time incorporated in Pionius's Life of Polycarp, so that "the sequel" was the subsequent (and now lost) concluding part of the Life.<sup>87</sup> According to

Kürzinger, the fact that the phrase ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς clearly means "im folgenden" confirms Cadbury's insight and justifies one in rendering καθεξῆς in Lk. 1:3 as "im folgenden" or "wie folgt."<sup>88</sup> Du Plessis similarly claims that καθεξῆς should be translated as "as follows" in Lk. 1:3.<sup>89</sup> However, Kürzinger confuses the word καθεξῆς with the phrase ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς. The latter does indeed mean "in the following," either of time (as in Lk. 8:1) or of place (as in Mart. Pol. 22.4)--although "as follows" is a questionable extension of this meaning--but neither the meaning of the whole phrase nor the meaning of καθεξῆς with just the article (i.e. "the following") can be given to the simple adverb.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, we deny that καθεξῆς could mean "as follows" or "(in) the following." And even if it could, there would seem to be little point in Luke's calling attention to the fact that what he intends to write will be found after the preface. Therefore, we would agree with Marshall that the meaning "as follows" would be "inappropriate" here.<sup>91</sup>

In order to ascertain the actual meaning of καθεξῆς in Lk. 1:3, we must compare this passage with any other passage that seems to use the word in the same way in a similar context. It is useless to construct a "concept" of καθεξῆς largely on the basis of its adjectival use (as in Lk. 8:1; Ac. 3:24; 18:24), and then read that theoretical construction into Lk. 1:3, where the word is used adverbially. Fortunately, there is a closely analogous passage, written by the same author, in which καθεξῆς is used to modify a similar verb in similar circumstances. That passage is Ac. 11:4.<sup>92</sup> It modifies a verb of communication in both Lk. 1:3 (i.e. γράψω) and Ac. 11:4 (i.e. ἐκτίθημι), and in each case it introduces a lengthy message, namely Luke's gospel and Peter's speech (Ac. 11:5-17), respectively. Therefore, there is every

reason to think that it has the same meaning in both passages. It would seem to be an adverb of manner in both places, indicating how Luke intended to write and how Peter explained.

Now it should be obvious that it would never have occurred to Luke to point out that Peter spoke "in an orderly manner," rather than in a disorderly jumble, for, as Klein points out, "Daß Petrus nicht konfus berichtet, versteht sich für Lukas vonselbst."<sup>93</sup> And if  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\varsigma\eta\acute{\nu}\varsigma$  does not mean "in an orderly manner" in Ac. 11:4, it almost certainly does not have that meaning in Lk. 1:3. Furthermore, it is hard to imagine why Luke would have felt any need to say that he intended to write "in an orderly manner," for what serious writer would not? There is no hint that he is contrasting his own orderliness with the disorderliness of his predecessors; indeed, the verb "draw up" in vs. 1 suggests their concern for order. Luke must have had something other than orderliness in mind when he wrote  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\varsigma\eta\acute{\nu}\varsigma$  in these two passages.

The sequential manner of communication which Luke intends to convey by  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\varsigma\eta\acute{\nu}\varsigma$  in Lk. 1:3 and Ac. 11:4 appears when we consider that the communications so characterized, namely Luke's gospel and Peter's explanation, have one basic characteristic in common: they are both narrative accounts. We may reasonably infer, then, that  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\varsigma\eta\acute{\nu}\varsigma$  means "in a narrative manner" in both passages. This meaning is appropriate in both cases. In Lk. 1:3 Luke declares his intention "to write to you accurately in a narrative manner," that is (in more idiomatic English), "to write an accurate narrative for you." And in Ac. 11:4 he introduces Peter's statement by saying that he "explained to them in a narrative manner," that is, "with a narrative."

This meaning, indeed, is practically demanded by the context

in Luke's preface. Surely Luke would have indicated in his preface that he, like his predecessors, was going to write a gospel narrative, yet apart from the word καθέξῆς there is no indication in it of what Luke was setting out to write.<sup>94</sup> Luke declares, "Others have undertaken to draw up a narrative, and now I have decided to write καθέξῆς." The word καθέξῆς here must indicate what Luke is going to write, and our translation fulfills this expectation.<sup>95</sup> We see that the words καθέξῆς γράψαι in vs. 3, describing what Luke intended to do, are equivalent to the words ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν in vs. 1, describing what Luke's predecessors had undertaken to do.<sup>96</sup> Luke intended, as they had intended, to write a narrative account of the gospel history. They had undertaken to record the gospel traditions "just as" they had originally been handed down by those who knew what Jesus had done and taught (vs. 2); Luke must have had the same goal in mind when he decided to write his gospel narrative "accurately" (vs. 3). Thus, when Luke says that he has decided "to write an accurate narrative," he is saying the same thing as when he says that others have undertaken "to draw up a narrative account of the things that are well-established among us, just as those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed them down to us." He will write what his predecessors undertook to write.

Luke dedicated his narrative to "most excellent Theophilus" (κράτιστε Θεόφιλε). The same person would later be addressed in the introductory sentence of Acts, though without an epithet: ὁ Θεόφιλε. Since "Theophilus" means "friend of God" or "lover of God" (or perhaps "beloved of God"),<sup>97</sup> there have been those, at least from the time of Origen, who have interpreted the name in Lk. 1:3 as a symbolic designation of the Christian, not simply (if at

all) as the name of a real person.<sup>98</sup> But nearly all modern scholars have rejected this speculative exegesis, and for several good reasons. First of all, books were often dedicated to real persons, but not to symbolic figures. Secondly, "Theophilus" was a common name, and thus not one in whose etymology the reader could have been expected to discern a symbolic significance. Thirdly, the epithet "most excellent" would have been inappropriate with a symbolic name. And finally, in vs. 4 Luke mentions the specific circumstances of a particular individual, which would not have been those of every Christian. We may be sure, then, that "Theophilus" was a real person.<sup>99</sup>

The epithet "most excellent" (κράτιστε) indicates that Theophilus was a man of considerable prominence. Elsewhere in the Lucan writings (and in the New Testament) only the procurators Felix (Ac. 23:26; 24:3) and Festus (Ac. 26:25) are so addressed. In extra-biblical documents, inscriptions, papyri, and literary dedications, the word is characteristically used of high public officials.<sup>100</sup> On the other hand, it seems also to have been used in dedications addressed to men who were not public officials, but rather prominent private citizens.<sup>101</sup> We would gather, then, that Theophilus was a prominent man commanding respect from Luke, and probably an official of high rank.<sup>102</sup>

Despite Theophilus's prominence and probable public office, he has not been identified in any extra-biblical sources. This fact permitted B. H. Streeter, like E. Renan before him,<sup>103</sup> to suggest that "Theophilus" may be "a prudential pseudonym for some Roman of position," and he put forward Domitian's cousin, T. Flavius Clemens, who, like his wife, may well have been a Christian,<sup>104</sup> as a likely candidate for it.<sup>105</sup> More recently, W. G. Marx has argued

that "Theophilus" was King Herod Agrippa II (cf. Ac. 25-26).<sup>106</sup>

However, our inability to identify an appropriate Theophilus in extra-biblical sources does not give any credence to these speculations, for the names of many notable people of the first century, including public officials, have been lost to history. Furthermore, there is no reason to think that Luke would have felt any need to shield his addressee behind a pseudonym. If Luke had wanted to be "prudent," he would probably have avoided using any name,<sup>107</sup> for a pseudonym only invites a search for the person's true identity.

Whoever Theophilus may have been, there is good reason to think that an expression of interest in the gospel history on his part prompted Luke to write his gospel.<sup>108</sup> This is questioned by Grimm, who supposes, quite without warrant, that in that case Luke would have acknowledged his request in his preface and thanked him for his confidence in him.<sup>109</sup> It is also questioned by Cadbury, who observes that "the relation of author to addressee was usually formal and it rarely affected the contents of the work." He therefore infers that "we cannot be sure that Theophilus would be more interested in 'all that Jesus began both to do and to teach' than the second-century emperors were in the works dedicated to them on Greek word accent" and other subjects.<sup>110</sup> However, only some prefaces were of this sort.<sup>111</sup> The seriousness of Luke's dedication is indicated in vs. 4, where he tells Theophilus that he is writing his gospel specifically (though probably not exclusively<sup>112</sup>) to tell him "what is certain" about Jesus. From this we may infer that Theophilus had heard or read some accounts of Jesus' ministry, was to some extent uncertain of their veracity, and had turned to Luke for fully reliable information.<sup>113</sup> Luke, then, replied in his

preface (if not by separate means, also) that he would try to satisfy his thirst for knowledge by writing an accurate account of the gospel history for him.

Further evidence that Theophilus had expressed to Luke an interest in obtaining better information about Jesus is afforded by the fact that the subject matter of Luke's work is not specified in his preface.<sup>114</sup> We can determine what he is talking about only by examining his book (assisted by Ac. 1:1). Luke assumes that the addressee of the preface, Theophilus, knows what the vaguely described "things" (vs. 1) and "matters" (vs. 4) are. Theophilus would have known about these matters only if he had previously communicated with Luke about them.<sup>115</sup> That communication evidently brought to light the insufficiency of Theophilus's instruction (vs. 4), and probably included a request on his part for better information. Only someone who had asked Luke to write on the subject at hand would have been able to make any sense out of his preface, without first reading the rest of the work.

The dedication to Theophilus, then, must be understood as a serious addressing of Luke's work to a man whose prior relationship with him must be presupposed (and can be reconstructed) in order for the preface to be intelligible. We can hardly imagine that Luke intended his gospel to be read only by Theophilus, but his preface makes it clear that in the first instance it was intended for that one man.<sup>116</sup>

There is also reason to go further, and think that Theophilus not only had asked Luke for information about Jesus, but had offered to underwrite the cost of publishing anything that Luke would care to write on the subject. An ancient writer would often dedicate his work to his literary patron, and such appears to be

the case here.<sup>117</sup> The mere fact that Luke dedicated his gospel to Theophilus does not, of course, mean that Theophilus was obliged to provide for its dissemination.<sup>118</sup> However, we may infer from his prominence (and probable political position) that he was a reasonably wealthy man. Since this man of means wanted Luke to provide him with reliable information about Jesus, and Luke very likely did not have the financial resources to produce a book, it is probable that Theophilus offered financial assistance to him. Furthermore, if we assume that Luke and Acts are separate works,<sup>119</sup> the fact that both are dedicated to Theophilus is best explained on the assumption of his patronage of Luke. Moreover, if we assume that Luke intended his gospel to reach a broader audience, we may safely infer that he expected Theophilus to see to its copying and distribution.

This was, in fact, a fairly frequent arrangement, as T. Kleberg observes: "Ein reicher Herr, dem eine literarische Arbeit gewidmet worden war, hat oft . . . die wirtschaftliche Verantwortung für die Veröffentlichung auf sich genommen."<sup>120</sup> A. Vögtle reaches a similar conclusion after a careful study of ancient dedications: "Normalerweise durfte der Widmungsempfänger, zumal wenn sich der Autor nicht gegenteilig äußerte, gewiß dessen Einverständnis mit einer weiteren Verbreitung des Werkes, wenigstens an Gleichgesinnte, voraussetzen."<sup>121</sup>

We cannot infer that Theophilus was Luke's literary patron merely because patrons were often addressed in prefaces, for persons were often addressed in prefaces without any thought of garnering their financial support.<sup>122</sup> However, the circumstances in this instance point toward Theophilus's already having agreed to be Luke's patron.<sup>123</sup>

We may conclude, then, that Theophilus asked Luke for reliable information about Jesus, and that in reply Luke announced his decision to write an accurate gospel narrative for him, probably expecting him to underwrite its publication and distribution costs.

## LUKE'S QUALIFICATION FOR WRITING (VS. 3, CONT.)

Luke decided to write his gospel in the circumstance of his παρακολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν. On all interpretations of this crucial and much disputed phrase,<sup>1</sup> Luke is setting forth his qualification for writing a gospel. The inadequacies of the gospel narratives then available established the need for a better one, and in this phrase Luke explains why he felt qualified to fill that need. "He wrote," as Cadbury says, "because it occurred to him that he was in a good position to write."<sup>2</sup>

The approximate meaning of the individual words in this phrase is clear enough: παρακολουθηκότι means "having followed" in some sense, ἄνωθεν looks well back in time, perhaps to the beginning of something, and πᾶσιν refers to "all" the persons or things in view. But since the phrase is short and each of its words is susceptible to various interpretations, the precise meaning of the phrase as a whole is not immediately evident. Not surprisingly, then, exegetes have advanced four principal lines of interpretation, understanding παρακολουθηκότι in four different ways, πᾶσιν in three different ways, and ἄνωθεν in two different ways and in two different connections. Let us consider the possibilities for each word and then see how various interpretations have arisen from them.

W. Bauer (as translated and adapted by Arndt and F. W. Gingrich) puts the meanings of παρακολουθῶ into three categories: first, "follow, accompany, attend" (with the dative of the person);

second, "follow with the mind, understand, make one's own" (with the dative of the thing);<sup>3</sup> and third, "follow a thing, trace or investigate a thing" (with the dative of the thing).<sup>4</sup> Interpreters of Lk. 1:3 have correspondingly understood Luke to be saying that he has been a follower of persons, has understood things, has observed or kept abreast of things, or has investigated things.

The form  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  could be either masculine or neuter, and it has been understood in both ways in Lk. 1:3. In this passage it obviously cannot mean "everyone" or "everything" in an unlimited sense. Most interpreters have explained the word as meaning "everyone" or "everything" in a limited sense, that limited sense being defined by previously mentioned persons or things. But in this case  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  should be more accurately translated as "them all."<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, interpreters have looked through vss. 1-2 for the appropriate antecedent. Depending upon their understanding of  $\pi\alpha\rho\eta\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\eta\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\iota$ , they have identified that antecedent either as "those who . . . have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (vs. 2) or as "the things" comprising the gospel history (vs. 1) and handed down as gospel traditions (vs. 2). Another possibility would be Luke's "many" predecessors (vs. 1), although no one seems to have identified them as the antecedent of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ . We may exclude their narratives from consideration, not simply because  $\delta\iota\grave{\eta}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is a feminine noun, but also because  $\delta\iota\grave{\eta}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\nu$  in vs. 1 is singular, denoting a literary genre, not a plural noun denoting narratives that could be referred to as "them all."<sup>6</sup>

The adverb  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  is ordinarily an adverb of place, meaning "from above," but in Lk. 1:3 it is almost certainly an adverb of time,<sup>7</sup> and thus could mean either "from the beginning" or "for a long time."<sup>8</sup> Some interpreters have favored the former meaning,

and some the latter. They have also disagreed on the question whether the adverb refers to the duration of Luke's following or to the course of what he followed.

Out of all these possibilities, four main lines of interpretation have emerged. First of all, there is the interpretation that has the most ancient lineage (and thus will be called "the ancient interpretation" in our discussion). According to this view, Luke is claiming to have been a follower or disciple of all the apostles (i.e. the eyewitnesses and servants of the word) for a long time. This interpretation has the support of the Peshitta,<sup>9</sup> and was set forth by Eusebius,<sup>10</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>11</sup> Euthalius,<sup>12</sup> and possibly John Chrysostom<sup>13</sup> in the fourth century, and probably by Origen in the third.<sup>14</sup> It also lies behind the ancient description of Luke as "the follower of the apostles," which was well-known to Irenaeus<sup>15</sup> (who provides additional evidence that he held to the ancient interpretation<sup>16</sup>) and the author of the so-called anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke<sup>17</sup> in the last half of the second century,<sup>18</sup> and is evidenced even earlier by Justin Martyr.<sup>19</sup> Since the only biblical basis for supposing that Luke was a follower of the apostolic band as a whole (and not just of Paul) is provided by Lk. 1:3 (with vs. 2), and since the form of the second-century description of Luke resembles that verse, it is highly likely that that description is based upon that verse. Thus, the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3 was evidently well-established by the middle of the second century.<sup>20</sup> Despite the antiquity of this interpretation, however, it has enjoyed virtually no support in modern times,<sup>21</sup> although B. W. Bacon seriously considered it.<sup>22</sup>

According to a second interpretation of ancient origin, which is first witnessed by the Latin textual tradition (and thus will be

called "the Latin interpretation"), Luke is claiming to have followed with his mind the entire course of the gospel history, or to have gained an understanding of all the gospel events or traditions.<sup>23</sup> Cadbury expresses the meaning of παρακολούθει adopted in this interpretation as "to follow with attention and understanding what is told or written,"<sup>24</sup> and since the gospel tradition was originally handed down orally, an attentive listening to, and not a reading of, the apostolic testimony would have to be in view.<sup>25</sup> The Latin interpretation was followed in the West by Ambrose,<sup>26</sup> Jerome,<sup>27</sup> and presumably Augustine.<sup>28</sup> In the East it may have had the support of Origen<sup>29</sup> and Athanasius,<sup>30</sup> is found in the Sahidic version,<sup>31</sup> and perhaps lies behind the Bohairic<sup>32</sup> and Old Syriac.<sup>33</sup> Photius adopted it in the ninth century,<sup>34</sup> and so did Euthymius in the twelfth.<sup>35</sup> In early modern times it was adopted in the AV<sup>36</sup> and by Bengel.<sup>37</sup> Cadbury wrote in 1922 that the Latin interpretation "appears to have no advocates,"<sup>38</sup> but it had been advocated by W. M. L. de Wette (in part),<sup>39</sup> J. Foote,<sup>40</sup> Westcott,<sup>41</sup> C. E. Luthardt,<sup>42</sup> and recently (1911) by F. Dibelius,<sup>43</sup> and was subsequently adopted by Bacon.<sup>44</sup> However, it has been ignored by virtually all twentieth-century commentators.

The great majority of modern scholars--perhaps anticipated by the Old Syriac<sup>45</sup>--have held the view (which will thus be called "the modern interpretation") that Luke is claiming to have investigated the history of Jesus from its beginning. In Calvin's words, "It is the painstaking regard for enquiry that Luke wishes to express."<sup>46</sup> This view probably developed out of the Latin interpretation, with which it is easily confused.<sup>47</sup> Investigation is, to be sure, one process by which a knowledge of things can be attained,<sup>48</sup> but it is not the one implied by the Latin interpreta-

tion, for, as we have seen, the advocates of it have generally inferred from vs. 2 that Luke gained his understanding by receiving the teaching handed down by the apostles, not by critically investigating the facts. Therefore, it is best to distinguish the Latin interpretation from the modern one.

A few advocates of the modern interpretation have understood ἀνωθεν as meaning "for a long time," referring to the length of Luke's investigations,<sup>49</sup> or even as meaning "afresh," acknowledging the similar labors of his predecessors.<sup>50</sup> But the great majority have understood it as "from the beginning," referring to the course of the events to be related and especially bringing into view those narrated in chs. 1-2.<sup>51</sup> Alternatively, some have seen a reference to the beginning of the gospel tradition<sup>52</sup> or the beginning of gospel writing.<sup>53</sup> Luke's investigation of the gospel history has been thought to have involved the questioning of knowledgeable authorities and/or the study of written source materials, and has often been termed "research."

According to another view of modern vintage, which has been championed by Cadbury (and thus will be called "Cadbury's interpretation"), Luke is claiming to have for a long time kept abreast of, or even participated in, the events related by him. Cadbury initially argued that παρακολουθεῖν was being used "of keeping in touch with things done, with a course of events," and he urged scholars to "leave the possibility open that the author is claiming for himself actual presence and participation in the events described."<sup>54</sup> He subsequently declared more positively that it did refer to Luke's "first-hand contemporary knowledge" of the events.<sup>55</sup> The events in view, he explained, were not those of the gospel history, but rather those narrated in the latter chapters of Acts (especial-

ly the "we" sections), in which he was personally involved.<sup>56</sup>

Cadbury claimed that J. L. Hug had much earlier "defended the same thesis as the present article,"<sup>57</sup> but while Hug did agree that Luke had "followed everything" in the sense of following the course of events, according to him those events were the ones related in the gospel, which Luke followed "from the beginning," not "for a long time."<sup>58</sup> Cadbury's interpretation was immediately defended by J. H. Ropes,<sup>59</sup> and was subsequently adopted by Loisy (together with the modern interpretation),<sup>60</sup> G. Milligan,<sup>61</sup> H. K. Luce,<sup>62</sup> H. Sahlin,<sup>63</sup> the RSV,<sup>64</sup> M. G. Tenney,<sup>65</sup> É. Trocmé,<sup>66</sup> J. Dupont,<sup>67</sup> A. J. B. Higgins (in combination with the modern interpretation),<sup>68</sup> G. H. P. Thompson,<sup>69</sup> and R. Maddox.<sup>70</sup> Apparently under the influence of Maddox, Marshall has recently broadened his version of the modern interpretation to incorporate Cadbury's interpretation, allowing that "perhaps" Luke has in view "both those events in the past which Luke had investigated by examining the relevant evidence both written and oral and also those more recent events in which he himself had personally participated," so that "the scope of Luke's investigations in the prologue is the whole area covered by Lk-Acts."<sup>71</sup>

We are now ready to evaluate the relative merits of these four lines of interpretation. The lexical, contextual, and historical considerations are complex, but well worth a thorough examination. We will consider first the interpretations of modern origin, and then those of ancient origin.

The modern interpretation, that Luke has investigated everything from the beginning, has been attractive to many because it seems to portray Luke as engaging in historical research in preparation for the writing of his gospel. Our author claims, according

to J. G. Machen, "a genuine historical aim and method in the composition of his work,"<sup>72</sup> As N. Geldenhuys puts it, Luke "examined all available data with a fixed purpose in order to be able to give as detailed a rendering as might be necessary."<sup>73</sup> Similarly, Kümmel explains that in order "to arouse full confidence in the content of the Christian teaching," Luke "researched the history" of Jesus.<sup>74</sup> He did so, according to W. Grundmann, "wie ein Forscher."<sup>75</sup> A reference to historical research seems natural in the context, accords with the modern conviction that Luke made use of various written sources, and seems to enhance the historical value of his gospel.<sup>76</sup>

However, even if Luke is referring to an investigation of the gospel history, the syntax of the passage shows that it did not consist of research carried out in furtherance of his decision to write a gospel narrative. The ἐμοί in κάμοί functions both as the indirect object of ἔδοξε and as the "subject" of γράψαι. Therefore, since the perfect participle παρηκολούθηκόντι modifies κάμοί, the present state indicated by it could be coincident either with the deciding denoted by ἔδοξε or with the writing denoted by γράψαι. But the meaning of the participle (on the modern interpretation), when the nuance of the perfect tense is brought out, shows that it modifies κάμοί as it is the object of ἔδοξε. That is, it makes good sense to say, "Being in the position of having investigated everything, I have decided to write," but it is terribly awkward and artificial to say, "I have decided, being in the position of having investigated everything to write," i.e. "I have decided to be in the position of having investigated everything and (then) to write." Grimm can make sense out of the latter construction by transforming the perfect participle into an aorist participle, and

then paraphrasing it with an aorist infinitive (παρὰκολουθεῖν) and καί, making Luke's meaning "I have decided to investigate everything . . . and (then) to write."<sup>77</sup> However, while an aorist participle in such a construction could be equivalent to an aorist infinitive with καί (as the parallel passages Lk. 9:59 and Mt. 8:21, pointed out by Grimm, illustrate), a perfect participle cannot be,<sup>78</sup> because the meaning of a perfect participle (when it has the characteristic perfective force) is not the same as that of an aorist participle. Therefore, in Lk. 1:3 we must understand, as B. Weiss explains, that the participle "eben das Resultat seines in der Vergangenheit liegenden Thuns bezeichnet, wodurch er sich zu seinem Entschluss befähigt glaubte."<sup>79</sup> Since Luke's "following" took place before he decided to write his gospel, that activity cannot be interpreted as the deliberate gathering of material for his book. Recognizing this, Zahn infers that Luke's investigations must have been carried out "for other reasons, and because of his own interest in the facts."<sup>80</sup> We may say with A. Plummer that Luke "had brought himself abreast of" the gospel events "by careful investigation," and in his gospel "is giving us the results of careful investigation,"<sup>81</sup> but only if we understand that that investigation did not consist of the gathering of material for use in writing his gospel.

It is generally assumed that the meaning "investigate," or at least "follow by means of investigation," is well attested for the verb παρὰκολουθεῖν. Thus, Bauer includes the word "investigate" in his third category of the word's meaning: "follow a thing, trace or investigate a thing."<sup>82</sup> However, the lexical basis for the modern interpretation of παρὰκολουθεῖν was called into question by Cadbury in his initial treatment of Luke's preface.<sup>83</sup> Then, in

a more detailed study of the word, he argued at length that the various passages in Greek literature which had been (and still are) adduced as evidence for the existence of the meaning "investigate" do not, in fact, support that meaning.<sup>84</sup> His evaluation of the lexical evidence went unanswered for some time,<sup>85</sup> yet the modern interpretation continued to be propounded, as though he had written nothing. Thirty-five years later, Cadbury could only ask in exasperation, "Can anyone adduce from Hellenistic literature an example of παρακολουθῶ meaning 'investigate'?"<sup>86</sup> Indirectly in response to Cadbury, E. Haenchen appealed to two passages from Demosthenes (who, of course, was not a Hellenistic writer) mentioned in Bauer's lexicon, arguing that they supported the modern interpretation of Lk. 1:3.<sup>87</sup> Kümmel has likewise appealed to Bauer and "the reference there to Demosthenes" against Cadbury.<sup>88</sup> Similarly, Marshall has declared that Cadbury's "claim that the word cannot mean 'to investigate' is not compelling," also referring the reader to the same lexicon.<sup>89</sup> Finally, we may note that Fitzmyer answers Cadbury by appealing to Haenchen.<sup>90</sup> These responses all amount to one thing: an appeal to the passages presented by Bauer.

Turning then to Bauer, we find five passages (in addition to Lk. 1:3) listed in support of the definitions "follow a thing, trace or investigate a thing."<sup>91</sup> However, while they provide ample support for the meanings "follow a thing" and "trace a thing," they provide no support for "investigate a thing." In the first passage, Demosthenes (in De corona 172), having himself in mind, refers to "the man who from first to last had closely watched the sequence of events (παρακολουθηκότα τοῖς πράγμασιν), and had rightly fathomed (συλλελογισμένον) the purposes and desires of Philip." And in a similar passage (De falsa legatione 257) Demosthenes says, "(I

have the most accurate knowledge of his villainies and have watched him closely throughout (καὶ παρακολουθήκως ἄπασι)."<sup>92</sup> In the third passage, Josephus (in Ap. I.53) declares that "it is the duty of one who promises to present his readers with actual facts first to obtain an exact knowledge of them himself, either through having been in close touch with the events (ἢ παρακολουθηκότα τοῖς γεγονόσιν), or by inquiry from those who knew them." In each of these three passages, as the wider context of each makes even clearer, the writer is referring to the tracing<sup>93</sup> or keeping abreast of current events as they unfold.<sup>94</sup> And in the passage from Josephus, the "following" of events as they occur is even contrasted with later inquiry or investigation into them.

Haenchen rightly observes that in the two passages in Demosthenes the verb παρακολουθέω does not refer to eyewitness observation. He puts forward "inform oneself" as the true meaning of the verb in each case.<sup>95</sup> We would argue, however, that the verb actually refers more narrowly to the keeping abreast of, or keeping in touch with, developments as they unfold, whether through personal observation or through informants.<sup>96</sup> The difference between "keep abreast of" and "inform oneself" may seem slight, but the former retains the basic meaning of the verb, namely "follow," whereas the latter does not.<sup>97</sup> The trouble with Haenchen's proposed definition is that it is too broad, and thus suggests different things in different contexts. With reference to current events, as in Demosthenes, it rightly suggests the keeping abreast of developments. But with reference to past events, as in Lk. 1:3 (on the assumption that πᾶσι is neuter), it suggests something quite different, namely investigation, study, or inquiry. This is of course the modern interpretation of the passage, which Haenchen

is endeavoring to uphold. But one cannot "follow" past events by investigating, studying, or inquiring into them. One can only follow them in the sense that, as we shall soon see,<sup>98</sup> one follows with one's mind the course of history as it is related in a narrative.

Demosthenes' use of παρακολουθῶ to refer to one's keeping abreast of current events is well illustrated in his Oratio in Olympiodorum 40.<sup>99</sup> There he says that "the defendant refused to refer our differences to our common friends and relatives who had full knowledge of all the circumstances of the case, and had followed (παρηκολούθηκόσιν) them from the beginning." The verb in De corona 172 clearly has the same meaning as it does here, for in both passages its object is τοῖς πράγμασιν and it is modified by εἰς ἀρχῆς. Thus, there should be no question but that in these passages there is a specific reference to the following of developments as they unfold.

In the fourth passage mentioned by Bauer, Josephus (in Ap. I.218) notes that certain historians were unable "to follow quite accurately the meaning of our records" (μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας τοῖς ἡμετέροις γράμμασι παρακολουθεῖν). Here the verb means "to understand (what is written),"<sup>100</sup> and thus belongs under Bauer's second heading (i.e. "follow with the mind, understand, . . ."), not his third one. One can research a subject by following the meaning of a text on that subject, but the two concepts should not be confused with each other.

Finally, Bauer cites a letter written in 152 B.C., in which Apollonius asks Ptolemaeus to summon him and a third party before him in order to judge between them, νομίζω γὰρ μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων παρακολουθήσαντά σε τῆ ἀληθείᾳ πικρότερον προσενεχθήσεσθ' αὐτῷ,

which U. Wilcken translates as "denn ich glaube, daß Du ganz besonders vor den andern der Wahrheit die Ehre geben und ihn schärfer anfassen wirst,"<sup>101</sup> but which Cadbury translates as "for I think you will deal more (most?) severely with him since you most of anybody else (sic) have been cognizant of the truth of the case."<sup>102</sup> But whether παρακολουθήσαντά σε τῆι ἀληθείαι should be translated as "you will abide by the truth" (roughly following Wilcken) or as "you have been cognizant of the truth of the case" (Cadbury),<sup>103</sup> it does not refer to an investigation. J. H. Moulton and Milligan initially thought that this passage meant "when you have investigated the truth you will deal with him most severely," thus providing evidence in support of the modern interpretation of Lk. 1:3,<sup>104</sup> but Cadbury's research convinced Milligan (Moulton being deceased) that in this instance παρακολουθέω did not mean "investigate" after all, and that the modern interpretation should be abandoned.<sup>105</sup>

Thus we see that the passages listed by Bauer do not provide any support for the idea that παρακολουθέω ever meant "investigate." It remains true, as Maddox says, that Cadbury's lexical argument "has never been refuted."<sup>106</sup>

Zahn cites only one of these passages (i.e. Josephus, Ap. I.218) in support of the meaning "to pursue and follow . . . with the purpose of historical investigation and exposition," but he also cites two others from Polybius, namely Hist. I.12.7 and III.32.2.<sup>107</sup> But in both cases the verb refers to the mental following of a course of events, not to historical investigation.<sup>108</sup> In I.12.7 Polybius says regarding the early history of Rome, "To follow out (παρακολουθήσαι) this previous history . . . seems to me necessary for anyone who hopes to gain a proper general survey of

their present supremacy." He is explaining to his readers why he will occasionally provide them with information about earlier events, and thus is referring to the (reader's) following with understanding of what is written (in his work). In III.32.2 Polybius says that it is relatively easy to read his forty books "and thus to follow (παρακολουθεῖν) clearly events in Italy, Sicily, and Libya." Once again, reference is being made to the mental following of what is written, not to the investigation of a subject.<sup>109</sup>

Zahn also tries to support the modern interpretation of Lk. 1:3 by pointing to Epictetus, Diss. I.5.5, 6.13, 18, 9.4, 26.13, 14, passages in which παρακολουθεῖν means "to pursue and follow with the critical and apprehending intelligence."<sup>110</sup> But this is simply the meaning given by Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich as "follow with the mind, understand, . . .," citing I.6.13,<sup>111</sup> and that is the meaning adopted by the Latin interpretation of Lk. 1:3, not the modern interpretation of it. Grimm similarly appeals to Epictetus for evidence that παρακολουθεῖν was used "von philosophischem Nachdenken und Forschen," citing I.9.4, 17 [14, 15, 18]; II.16.33; IV.7.7.<sup>112</sup> However, in each passage mentioned by Zahn or Grimm the verb clearly means "follow with the mind" or "understand."<sup>113</sup> For example, in I.5.5 Epictetus refers to a man who is "in such a state that he cannot follow an argument step by step (παρακολουθεῖν), or even understand (συνείναι) one." The one passage where this is not immediately obvious is I.9.4, where mention is made (in Oldfather's translation) of "anyone who has attentively studied (παρηκολουθηκώς) the administration of the universe and learned (μεμαθηκώς)" certain things about it. Nothing in the context indicates that anything more than "has understood" is meant by παρηκολουθηκώς, in

line with Epictetus's usage elsewhere, although μεμαθηκώς suggests an ingressive sense for it, "has come to understand."<sup>114</sup>

Finally, van Unnik has tried to justify the modern interpretation of Lk. 1:3 by pointing to Josephus, Vit. 357.<sup>115</sup> In this passage Josephus tells the historian Justus that (in Thackeray's translation, followed by van Unnik) "you neither knew (ἐπιστάμενος) what happened in Galilee--for you were then at Berytus with the king--nor acquainted yourself with (παρακολουθήσας) all that the Romans endured or inflicted upon us at the siege of Jotapata; nor was it in your power to ascertain (πυθέσθαι) the part which I myself played in the siege, since all possible informants perished in that conflict." We would suggest that Josephus here, as we have seen to be the case in Ap. I.53, uses the verb παρακολουθῶ to denote the following of a course of events (i.e. "all that . . . [happened] at the siege of Jotapata") as it unfolds.<sup>116</sup> His complaint is that Justus did not (and could not at Berytus, far to the north in Syria) keep abreast of developments during the siege of Jotapata in Galilee. The verb obviously refers in some manner to the acquiring of information, but the vague meaning given to it by Thackeray, and expressed by van Unnik as "to get acquainted with information,"<sup>117</sup> has no lexical support, is not required by the context, and therefore must give way to the well-attested and contextually appropriate meaning, "to keep abreast of (current events)."

Nonetheless, van Unnik presents an argument in support of his interpretation. He supposes that ἐπιστάμενος denotes firsthand knowledge, that πυθέσθαι has in view the querying of eyewitnesses, and that παρακολουθήσας must refer to an activity qualitatively "distinct from" that denoted by the other two verbs. From this he

concludes that "παρακολουθεῖν is to get acquainted with all available information, even if it is not directly from eyewitnesses." But despite the words "even if," van Unnik means to exclude contact with eyewitnesses from the scope of the verb.<sup>118</sup> Then, as if this verb could have no other meaning in Lk. 1:3 than that used here by Josephus, he infers from its use in Lk. 1:3 that "Luke had no contact with direct disciples of Jesus, had used written material and had been searching for other information."

But van Unnik's interpretation of Josephus (not to mention his jump to Luke's preface) is open to serious question. The "neither . . . nor . . . nor" construction probably distinguishes objects of knowledge (with increasing specificity), not so much means of acquiring knowledge. That is, Justus first of all did not know what was happening in Galilee in general. Secondly, he did not keep abreast of developments in the siege at Jotapata. And thirdly, he had no way of determining what Josephus did during that siege. The verbs in these three statements permit some overlap in meaning. But even if we grant that the activities denoted by them are distinct, van Unnik's explanation of their distinctions in meaning is still doubtful. Even if ἐπιστάμενος alone refers to firsthand knowledge, it would still be reasonable to think that παρακολουθήσας denotes the following of contemporary events through fresh reports, and (as the context demands) that πυθέσθαι denotes the investigation of past events. This distinction between παρακολουθῶ and πυθάνομαι is precisely the one which we have seen<sup>119</sup> expressed by Josephus with these verbs in Ap. I.53 (though we would include personal observation within the scope of παρακολουθῶ in both passages). Thus, whether we see a distinction in matters learned or in manners of learning, this passage provides no evidence

that παρακολουθῶ ever meant "investigate."

Creed admits that παρακολουθῶ "does not itself mean 'to investigate'," but he argues that one who is not an eyewitness could be said "to have followed accurately a course of events" only if he had conducted an investigation.<sup>120</sup> However, this presupposes that Luke is claiming to have followed a past course of events, which is a point at issue. According to Cadbury's interpretation, Luke followed a contemporary course of events, and according to the ancient interpretation he followed the apostles. And even if πᾶσιν does refer to a past course of events, according to the Latin interpretation Luke followed those events with his mind as they were handed down to him. Thus, there is no reason to insist that an investigation of the life and teachings of Jesus must be in view.

We can only conclude that the modern interpretation attributes to the word παρακολουθήκῃτι a meaning which has not been shown to have existed, and which is by no means required by the context. It is of course theoretically possible that Lk. 1:3 is the only passage in all of Greek literature where the word παρακολουθῶ has this meaning. However, since the other three interpretations have solid lexical support, only their unacceptability on contextual or historical grounds would warrant us to give the modern interpretation any further consideration.

If Luke did not investigate everything, he must, according to Cadbury, have kept in touch with the course of events as an observer of them or even as a participant in them. In support of this interpretation, Cadbury contended that the perfect tense of the participle παρακολουθήκῃτι meant that Luke had gained his information "as the events took place."<sup>121</sup> But Robertson correctly replied that "there is absolutely nothing in the perfect tense itself

to suggest any notion of 'as the events took place,'"<sup>122</sup> and Cadbury seems to have dropped the idea.<sup>123</sup> Apart from this faulty inference, Cadbury's only reason for adopting his interpretation is that in excluding the modern interpretation on lexical grounds "we seem to be forced to adopt" it.<sup>124</sup> But since there are two other interpretations available, this argument is worthless in the absence of a demonstration that they, too, can be ruled out.

Cadbury's interpretation has been rejected for various reasons. It has been argued, for example, that it is inconsistent with the adverb ἀκριβῶς.<sup>125</sup> This objection presupposes that ἀκριβῶς is part of the participial phrase, which we have shown not to be the case.<sup>126</sup> But even if it were part of the phrase, it would still make sense to say that one has kept abreast of events "carefully" or observed them "closely" (so RSV).<sup>127</sup> However, actual participation in the events would seem to be ruled out, as one does not participate "carefully."<sup>128</sup>

Cadbury's interpretation has also been rejected on the grounds that Luke distinguishes himself (as part of "us") from the eyewitnesses in vs. 2, and therefore could not be claiming in vs. 3 to have been one.<sup>129</sup> This argument is not strictly valid, however. The "eyewitnesses" mentioned in vs. 2 are the twelve apostles, and therefore Luke could have been a non-apostolic eyewitness. Also satisfactory is Dupont's explanation that Luke is merely distinguishing himself in vs. 2 from the eyewitnesses who have been such "from the beginning," thus allowing himself to claim in vs. 3 that he became one at a later date.<sup>130</sup> Despite these logical possibilities, however, it is hard to believe that Luke would have emphasized his own personal knowledge of events after having represented himself as a recipient of the traditions of them, especially since

he was not one of the special eyewitnesses who had authority to formulate tradition. The implication of vs. 2 would seem to be that Luke was at best in a position only to pass on the authoritative traditions, whether or not he had witnessed anything. It must be doubted that he would then proceed to make much of what, if anything, he himself had observed.

A better reason for rejecting Cadbury's interpretation is that it cannot plausibly explain the word πάντων, "them all." This word would have to refer back to all "the things" previously mentioned in vs. 1, that is, to all the deeds and teachings of Jesus. But Cadbury and almost everyone else recognize that Luke was not an observer of any of the gospel history, let alone of "all" of it. Therefore, we can hardly understand Luke to be claiming that he had kept abreast of the entire course of the gospel history.<sup>131</sup> It is insufficient to say, with Tenney, that Luke was a contemporary of the gospel history "in the sense that he lived in the generation of those who had witnessed it,"<sup>132</sup> because that would not make him an observer of it.

Perhaps feeling the force of this objection, Cadbury suggests that Luke's claim may have been made insincerely, since "the preface was peculiarly liable to exaggeration in antiquity, and claims of αὐτοψία were not always sincere."<sup>133</sup> The fact of the matter, on the contrary, is that there is no evidence that the preface was "peculiarly liable" to exaggeration.<sup>134</sup> The personal character and literary purposes of the writer determined then, as now, the extent to which he would tell the truth as he knew it, whatever he was writing. And the fact that certain other writers made insincere claims of αὐτοψία certainly provides no basis for calling Luke's or anyone else's sincerity into question.

Cadbury's more serious suggestion in defense of his interpretation is, as we have seen,<sup>135</sup> that the events to which Luke refers are those related in the latter chapters of Acts (especially in the "we" sections of chs. 16ff.). But this would mean that the  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  of Lk. 1:1 are the travels of Paul, not the gospel history, as we have shown them to be. And even if the early history of the church could somehow be included among those events, Cadbury's interpretation would still have to be rejected because "all" the events in view would still include the gospel events.<sup>136</sup>

This difficulty cannot be avoided by supposing that Luke's following of events took place only "for a long time" ( $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\delta\epsilon\nu$ ), not from the beginning of them.<sup>137</sup> Luke claims to have followed  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ , namely "all" the events narrated (on this interpretation), not just those which took place during the "long time" when Luke was observing them. Indeed, an unlimited "them all" could not, on this interpretation, be logically combined with a limiting "for a long time." On the other hand, one could argue that  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  does not mean "them all," referring back to the  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  of vs. 1, but just means "everything" in a vague sense. But it is doubtful that anyone could have kept abreast of "everything" (in the church?) "for a long time." Ropes replies, "That he writes  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  is no more than to say that he has stood near the centre of things, and is at the most a pardonable exaggeration," which no one would take "with absolute literalness."<sup>138</sup> However,  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  cannot be reduced to "things," and if the connection with  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu$  in vs. 1 is broken, there is no indication what things Luke is referring to. Furthermore, one who had a personal acquaintance with only the latter travels of Paul, or perhaps even all that is narrated in the second half of Acts,<sup>139</sup> could hardly be understood to have observed the events related in

Luke and Acts "for a long time," for the events of Ac. 16-28 occurred within a period of only a few years.<sup>140</sup>

Cadbury's interpretation must also be rejected because the participial phrase expresses Luke's personal qualification for writing. Even if Luke had the writing of Acts in view as well as the writing of his gospel, the fact remains that his observation of, and participation in, some of the events in the second half of Acts hardly qualified him as an authority on the gospel history and early church history.<sup>141</sup> It is incomprehensible that Luke would have said nothing about his qualification to write a gospel history. Thus we see yet again that Cadbury's interpretation of παρακολουθή- κει is at odds with the context, and therefore must be rejected.

If the modern interpretation is lexically unacceptable and Cadbury's interpretation is contextually unacceptable, we are left with the two interpretations of antiquity. We will first consider the Latin interpretation, according to which Luke (carefully) followed with his mind all the gospel traditions from their beginning (or, for a long time).

There is something to be said for the Latin interpretation. It adopts a well-attested meaning for the participle. Also, Luke's argument becomes clear: he has gained a thorough knowledge of the gospel traditions, and thus is in a position to record them.

On the other hand, if Luke is referring to his knowledge of the gospel history, or to his acquisition of such knowledge, it is hard to see why he has used the verb παρακολουθέω, rather than one more directly denoting knowledgeableness. Ordinarily, at least, one "follows with the mind" a narrative or an argument presented in an order to be followed, yet it is hard to find an ordering of material in πᾶσιν, the object of the participle. This word could

refer to the gospel traditions, yet the temporal and material order which Westcott finds in "a gradual unfolding of the whole Gospel in the course of the Apostolic work which he had watched"<sup>142</sup> seems to read too much into the text.  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  could also refer directly to the deeds and teachings of Jesus, but even if Luke followed them in the sequence provided by an oral gospel, it is very doubtful that "all of them" would have been included in such a gospel. The Latin interpretation requires  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  to represent a cycle of tradition, not a body of traditions, or a course of events, not a group of events, and either one is probably more than  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  can convey by itself.

Furthermore, it is hard to see how Luke is specially qualified to write a gospel if he claims merely to have followed with his mind (i.e. listened attentively to) the whole gospel history, even if he has done so "for a long time" or "from the beginning" ( $\delta\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ ). Many others, including some of his predecessors, could no doubt have made the same claim. After saying that his predecessors attempted to record the gospel traditions in their truly apostolic form, one would expect him to explain why he is in a better position to do so. One would expect him to claim a special relationship with the "eyewitnesses and servants of the word," yet on the Latin interpretation he fails to claim any direct connection with them at all.

These objections would largely disappear if one were to argue that Luke used the verb  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\lambda\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  with the broad meaning "understand" (so AV). But it is unclear whether the notion of following an ordered progression ever completely disappeared from the verb in this usage, even when it is best translated as "understand." Furthermore, there would still be two problems. First,  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  would

refer back to πραγμάτων in vs. 1, quite a distance away. Second, ἄνωθεν would serve little purpose. It would be pointless for Luke to say that he has understood things "for a long time," and it would be redundant for him to say that he has understood them all "from their beginning."

These objections to the Latin interpretation are significant, but not fatal. If the ancient interpretation should have more serious weaknesses, we would be inclined to accept the Latin interpretation as correct.

The ancient interpretation, that Luke followed all the apostles as a disciple of them, has in its favor its great antiquity in the Greek-speaking church. Also, it gives a well-attested meaning to παρακολουθηκῶτι. The phrase παρακολουθηκῶτι ἄνωθεν πάντων could quite naturally mean "having been a follower of them all for a long time," if this were contextually and historically acceptable. Personal accompaniment (with the implication of discipleship) was ordinarily expressed by the simple and more common verb ἀκολουθῶ,<sup>143</sup> and it would be reasonable to think that in its place Luke here chose the more elegant word παρακολουθῶ.

Also in favor of the ancient interpretation is the fact that it does not have the weaknesses of the Latin interpretation. If Luke is claiming to have been an immediate follower of the apostles, he establishes his special qualification for the task of recording the gospel traditions handed down by them. And since he has followed them all, and done so "for a long time," he is particularly well-qualified to record the gospel traditions in an authentic and reliable form. Thus, the ancient interpretation fits into the argument of the preface perfectly.

Furthermore, the antecedent for πάντων, on this interpretation,

has been clearly spelled out at the end of vs. 2 as "those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word." Indeed, one would expect the expression "them all" to refer to the persons or things just mentioned, rather than to persons or things more remotely mentioned. In this respect the ancient interpretation has a distinct advantage over the other interpretations, for which the antecedent of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  is the relatively distant  $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$  of vs. 1.

Despite all that is to be said for the ancient interpretation, however, it has been summarily dismissed or else simply ignored by modern scholars, virtually without exception. For example, Zahn declares that it "requires no refutation,"<sup>144</sup> even though it "is not impossible linguistically."<sup>145</sup> "It seems to find little support in modern times," observes Cadbury, "and may perhaps be dismissed."<sup>146</sup> Several reasons have been advanced for the modern rejection of the ancient interpretation, which we shall now consider.

First of all, it has been thought that  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  should be construed as part of the participial phrase, and that this word is incompatible with the ancient interpretation.<sup>147</sup> However, we have determined that  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  is not part of the phrase, but rather modifies  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$ .<sup>148</sup> Still, it would not be impossible to understand Luke as saying that he has followed the eyewitnesses and servants of the word "closely" (i.e. "attentively"). Nonetheless, the construction of  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  with  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$  does make the ancient interpretation easier.<sup>149</sup>

Fitzmyer has argued against interpreting  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  as masculine that "the intervening adv. anōthen and the lack of a def. art. with pasin favor the vaguer neuter meaning."<sup>150</sup> However,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\upsilon$  pre-

sents no obstacle to the ancient interpretation. It would modify the participle and indicate that Luke followed the apostles "for a long time." Nor is there any reason why one should expect an article before a masculine  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$  understood pronominally as "them all." For example, in Lk. 3:16 John answers "them all," expressed as  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$  without an article.<sup>151</sup>

It has been argued, in the third place, that the immediate context forbids the ancient interpretation. According to Grimm, following C. G. Wilke,<sup>152</sup> the activity of "following" began when Luke decided to write, which was after his predecessors had composed their narratives, and thus could not have consisted of a lengthy accompanying of the apostles.<sup>153</sup> But this argument presupposes a syntactical construction that we have shown to be erroneous.<sup>154</sup> Luke did not decide "to follow and to write." Rather, "being in the position of having followed," he decided "to write."

Grimm, again following Wilke,<sup>155</sup> also argues that an object must be supplied for  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$  in vs. 3, and that this object must have been previously mentioned. Since  $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$  in vs. 1 is too remote,  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$  in vs. 3 must be the object implied. And since  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$  then denotes things written, it must be neuter, not masculine.<sup>156</sup> However, on the modern interpretation espoused by Grimm, the antecedent of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$  is  $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$ , and if  $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$  is not too remote from  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$ , it can hardly be said to be too remote from  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$  to supply its object. In any case, we have seen<sup>157</sup> that  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$  requires an indication of what Luke is going to write (i.e. literary genre), not an indication of that about which he is going to write (i.e. subject matter). And with  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\zeta\eta\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$  he does indicate his intention to write a narrative.<sup>158</sup>

Another reason for rejecting the ancient interpretation has been forcefully expressed by Godet, who declares that it "would lead to an egregiously false idea; the author could not have accompanied all the apostles!"<sup>159</sup> Blass similarly objects that "although it is quite possible that Luke had at some time seen one or more of the Twelve, it would be a gross exaggeration if he asserted of himself that he had been from the beginning (ἀνωθεν) a constant follower of all the apostles."<sup>160</sup> However, Luke does not always use the word πάντας in the strictly exhaustive sense which Godet and Blass suppose it to have here. It can refer to an object comprehensively, rather than exhaustively, as in Ac. 1:1.<sup>161</sup> Furthermore, on the ancient interpretation ἀνωθεν would mean "for a long time," not "from the beginning," as Blass supposes. Moreover, Luke's words need not be interpreted to mean that he accompanied each eyewitness and servant of the word as a traveling companion, let alone that he did so constantly, as Blass would require. As Zahn (who has no sympathy for this interpretation) notes, the expression παρηκολούθηκώς τινι denotes "not a travelling companion but a disciple, who has for some time enjoyed the instruction of a teacher and lived in familiar intercourse with him."<sup>162</sup> Luke's words can reasonably be interpreted as a claim to have been a disciple of the whole company of apostles for a considerable period of time. He could easily have done this by spending a number of years with the apostles at Jerusalem, while most of them were still there (or at least based there). There is nothing historically implausible in this, as we shall see.<sup>163</sup> Luke was no doubt more closely associated with different apostles at different times, yet he could have gained a comprehensive knowledge of their teachings about Jesus.<sup>164</sup> To be sure, Luke is claiming an exceptional,

firsthand acquaintance with the apostles, but that is precisely his qualification for writing a genuinely apostolic gospel.<sup>165</sup>

Wilke adds yet another objection: "Um καθεξῆς schreiben zu können, mußte der Verfasser allem ἀνωθεν nachgehen."<sup>166</sup> His point would seem to be that a work written "in chronological order" would require an investigation of all the facts "from the beginning (onward)" in order to determine their historical sequence. We would dispute the meaning of both Greek words, but even if Luke had to investigate everything from the beginning, it would not necessarily follow that he is saying so here.

Mußner considers that πᾶσιν in Lk. 1:3 is probably neuter, referring to "die πράγματα des Lebens Jesu," because Luke in Ac. 1:1 refers to these very things with the neuter word πᾶντων.<sup>167</sup> However, the word πᾶς is far too common for this argument to have any force. The gender and referent of a common word in Luke's preface can hardly be determined by the gender and referent of the same word in another book.

Finally, Cadbury has suggested that the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3 was advanced because it "suited the requirement that the gospels should be either by apostles or by those who followed them."<sup>168</sup> However, no proponent of this interpretation is known ever to have so argued. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the apostolicity of the Third Gospel was ever felt to be in need of exegetical bolstering. Since everyone apparently accepted that Luke had written it, and his apostolic connection was clearly established by references to him in Paul's epistles and by the "we" passages in Acts, there is no reason to think that the "requirement" of which Cadbury speaks would have influenced the interpretation of Lk. 1:3. (And even if it had, that would not necessarily

make the interpretation wrong.) Rather, as we shall see,<sup>169</sup> the ancient division of gospel writers into "apostles" and "those who followed them" was actually based (in part) upon the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3. Thus, Cadbury has put the cart before the horse.

Yet another argument could also be advanced against the ancient interpretation. It could be argued that ἀνωθεν must have the same meaning as ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in vs. 2, namely "from the beginning" (instead of "for a long time").<sup>170</sup> But anyone who was a follower of the apostles "from the beginning" would presumably have been one from the earliest days of the Jerusalem church, which Luke almost certainly was not. Thus, the ancient interpretation would have to be ruled out on historical grounds (unless we chose to accuse Luke of misrepresenting himself).<sup>171</sup> However, since ἀνωθεν can mean "for a long time," there is no reason to insist that it must mean "from the beginning" here. This has been disputed by Kümmel, who argues that it must mean "from the beginning" because "the reader could not perceive a change of meaning from 1:2 to 1:3."<sup>172</sup> But one can argue about a "change of meaning" only when an expression recurs, and not when, as here, we have two different expressions.

One could also argue that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἀνωθεν are synonymous in Luke's preface because they are synonymous in Ac. 26:4-5, the only other place, interestingly enough, where either expression occurs in Luke's writings.<sup>173</sup> In each case, one could argue, Luke used ἀνωθεν for the sake of variety after having just used ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.<sup>174</sup> However, even if the two expressions were synonymous in Ac. 26, they would not necessarily be synonymous in Lk. 1.

Furthermore, they are not, in fact, synonymous in Ac. 26. In vs. 4 Paul speaks of "my way of life (βίωσίν μου) from my youth

onward (ἐκ νεότητος), which from its beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) has been pursued among my own people and at Jerusalem (ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μοι ἐν τῇ Ἱεροσολύμοις). The expression ἐκ νεότητος, as may be seen from its use in the Septuagint (Gen. 8:21; 1 Kgdms. 12:2; Psa. 70:17) and elsewhere in the New Testament (Mk. 10:20; Lk. 18:21), looks back to the earliest awakenings of moral sense and religious feeling, which in Paul must have been experienced in his childhood, probably his early childhood. The time spent "among my own people" could, if distinguished from that spent "at Jerusalem," be (or at least include) Paul's early years in Tarsus,<sup>175</sup> but Luke probably has in mind only his childhood spent in Jerusalem.<sup>176</sup> Since he pursued his "way of life" among the Jewish people, he is clearly referring to the Jewish way of life. Paul emphasizes that it is his Jewish way of life "from its beginning" (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) that is in view. Thus, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς reaches well back into his childhood, to the point where his religious and moral conscience first began to find outward expression.

"All the Jews" (πάντες [οἱ] Ἰουδαῖοι) know that he has always followed the Jewish way of life (vs. 4), Paul says, "having known about me for a long time (ἄνωθεν)--if they are willing to testify--that I have lived as a Pharisee in accordance with the strictest sect of our religion" (vs. 5). It is not known when Paul became a Pharisee, but it was certainly many years after he had begun to follow the Jewish way of life as a young child, and was probably after he completed his studies under Gamaliel. Since the word ἄνωθεν covers the period of time during which the Jews knew him to be a Pharisee, it follows that it does not reach as far back into his life as does ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in vs. 4. Therefore, it cannot mean "from the beginning (of his way of life)," like ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, but must

rather mean "for a long time."

This has been recognized by many scholars,<sup>177</sup> but has been denied by Haenchen (among others<sup>178</sup>), who interprets Luke's reference to Paul's Pharisaic life in vs. 5 as an amplification of his "way of life" mentioned in vs. 4, so that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἀνωθεν may both mean "from the beginning" and refer back to the beginning of his "generally well-known Pharisaic youth."<sup>179</sup> By Paul's "youth" Haenchen evidently means "his youth at the feet of Gamaliel," subsequent to "his childhood in Jerusalem,"<sup>180</sup> but, as we have seen, the expression "from my youth onward" reaches back into Paul's childhood well prior to his studies under Gamaliel.

Furthermore, it is inaccurate to speak of Paul's "Pharisaic youth,"<sup>181</sup> as the equation of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἀνωθεν in Ac. 26:4-5 requires one to do, for although Paul was no doubt taught to observe the law in accordance with Pharisaic interpretations of it, both as a child by his father (see Ac. 23:6) and as a youth by Gamaliel, he could not have been admitted to the fraternity of Pharisees as a child,<sup>182</sup> and probably not as a teenage youth, while still a student. As J. Jeremias observes, "the Pharisees were by no means simply men living according to the religious precepts laid down by Pharisaic scribes," but rather were "members of religious associations, pursuing these ends."<sup>183</sup> The <sup>h</sup>Pharisaic <sub>k</sub>communities were closed societies, to which one could be admitted only after one had learned the laws of purity and tithing and had demonstrated an ability to follow them during a period of probation.<sup>184</sup> Paul says that the Jews knew him as "a Pharisee," not merely as one who was learning to live in a Pharisaic manner.

Moreover, "all the Jews"--that is, Paul's accusers (as the clause "if they are willing to testify" shows), namely, the chief

priests and elders of the Jews at Jerusalem (see 25:1-2, 6-7, 15; 26:2), acting for the whole Jewish nation (25:24)--may have known about Paul for a long time as a notable Jerusalem Pharisee, but it can hardly be imagined that they had all known about his Jewish way of life from his earliest youth, whether that be his childhood or his student days. This would necessarily be so if the phrase "among my own people" in 26:4 refers to the Jews of Tarsus, far from Jerusalem. But even on the more likely assumption that the phrase "at Jerusalem" modifies the phrase "among my own people," it is still doubtful that all those who would decades later bring charges against him would have known about him since the beginning of his youthful walk in Judaism.

It should be clear, then, that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἄνωθεν are not synonymous expressions in Ac. 26:4-5. While ἀπ' ἀρχῆς does mean "from the beginning," ἄνωθεν does not. It means, rather, "for a long time." Since ἄνωθεν has this meaning in Ac. 26:5, it may certainly have it in Lk. 1:3 (if the context permits), as required by the ancient interpretation (on the assumption that Luke was not one of the first Christians). Indeed, the fact that ἄνωθεν means "for a long time" in Ac. 26:5 suggests that it has the same meaning in Lk. 1:3. In any case, however, Luke's use of ἄνωθεν does not provide any legitimate grounds for objecting to the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3.

Thus we see that the various objections to the ancient interpretation are in each case based upon false premises. Unlike the Latin interpretation, which has definite weaknesses, and the modern interpretation and Cadbury's interpretation, which have fatal weaknesses, the ancient interpretation has no real weakness. And, furthermore, the ancient interpretation has significant strengths.

Consequently, we adopt it as the correct one. Luke is claiming as his special qualification for writing a gospel the fact that for a long time he has been a follower of all the original eyewitnesses and servants of the word. Having been a close disciple of the entire group of original tradition bearers, and thus having become particularly well-acquainted with the original gospel traditions, Luke has decided to respond to Theophilus's request for trustworthy information about Jesus by writing an accurate narrative of the gospel history.<sup>185</sup>

If Luke wrote his gospel after having been a follower of the apostles for a long time, we are pointed to a relatively early date for its composition. As Cadbury observes, the word ἀνωθεν in Lk. 1:3 represents time "considered with reference to the present, starting from a point remote from the present and extending down to the present."<sup>186</sup> This indicates that Luke was still a follower of the apostles when he decided to write his gospel, and thus that the apostles, on the whole, were still alive and active. This corroborates our use of the present perfect to translate γέγονα in vs. 2 (i.e. "have been"--and thus still are),<sup>187</sup> and suggests a date before A.D. 70.

An early date for Luke's gospel is confirmed by the fact that it was written before Acts (see Ac. 1:1), for which a date of about 62 can be established with considerable confidence. Acts concludes with Paul under house arrest in Rome in about that year, waiting for Caesar to hear his appeal. The narrative in the final chapters of Acts builds toward Paul's appearance before Caesar, an event explicitly anticipated many times (see 25:11-12, 21, 25; 26:32; 27:1, 24; 28:14, 19, 30; cf. 23:11). Even an angel tells Paul that he "must" stand before Caesar (27:24). It is simply incomprehen-

sible that after all this build-up Luke would end his narrative with Paul waiting for Caesar to hear his appeal, if in fact that appeal had been heard and Paul's case had been concluded before Luke wrote. Since Luke does not tell us the disposition of Paul's case, we must infer that Acts was written before his appeal was heard. (While the poignancy of Ac. 20:17-38 is understandable if Luke knew of Paul's martyrdom, it by no means presupposes such knowledge. The possibility of martyrdom in Jerusalem is entertained in 21:13, but nowhere is martyrdom in Rome anticipated. Indeed, Acts concludes, in 28:30-31, on an optimistic note.)

It is no answer that Acts is not a biography of Paul, and that, in view of 1:8, Luke was content merely to bring the gospel to its final destination, Rome. The last half of Acts is biographical, in the sense that it follows the course of Paul's ministry, ignoring all other developments in the church. Furthermore, 1:8 presents the program not for Acts, but rather for "you" (i.e. the apostles), and thus for the whole apostolic church (as partially related in Acts). And in any case Rome--which had received the gospel before Paul arrived there, according to 28:15--is hardly "the end of the earth" mentioned in 1:8, for that expression simply encompasses the gentile nations in general (see Lk. 24:47; Ac. 13:46-47).

It is also no answer that for apologetic purposes Luke deliberately omitted any mention of Paul's execution, because that fact could hardly have been concealed (had Luke wanted, dishonestly, to do so). Rather, Luke's picture of official Roman toleration of Christianity reflects the situation prior to the Neronian persecution and the subsequent official hostility toward the growing new religion. It is useless to speculate that Luke intended to con-

tinue his history in a third volume, for just as his first volume completes the account of Jesus, so his second would have completed the account of Paul (or at least of the judicial process begun in ch. 21). Even more unlikely are the other conceivable explanations for the abrupt ending of Acts, as assembled by E. Reuss: "It must remain undecided whether the author was interrupted in his work by external circumstances, perhaps his death; or perhaps a portion has been lost; or the author stood in a special relation to the church at Rome, which rendered it unnecessary to write more; or the dominant theological aim of the narrative (§ 210) being fully satisfied by that which was said at the last, made a further account unnecessary; or finally whether the editor came to the end of the document which he last followed (§§ 204, 211) and had no further material."<sup>188</sup>

We can only conclude that Acts was written while Paul was under arrest in Rome, and, judging by Luke's focus on Paul, was written in connection with his confinement there. And if Acts is dated at about 62, Luke's gospel may be reasonably dated in the fifties.

"The most serious objection" to the early date of Luke is, as F. B. Clogg puts it, "that it necessitates dating Mark, one of the sources of Luke's Gospel, as early as A.D. 50-60, which is possible, but very improbable."<sup>189</sup> But it is methodologically unsound to insist that all the evidence must be made to fit a certain theory of gospel origins. Rather, the evidence must be interpreted objectively on its own terms, and only then may source criticism proceed. If the evidence points strongly to an earlier date for Luke than for Mark, then the theory of Marcan priority will have to be reassessed.

A post-70 date for Luke's gospel is often said to be evidenced by Lk. 21:20-24, which, it is argued, is a rewriting of Mk. 13:14, 17-20 in the light of the destruction of Jerusalem. We would agree that Luke has reworked the tradition recorded by Mark (and by Matthew), but he has done so simply to remove its obscurities. There is nothing in Luke's account which may not be inferred from the original tradition or the "abomination of desolation" passages in Daniel with which the dominical teaching is connected. Furthermore, the prophecy of the fall of Jerusalem is cast in general terms appropriate to ancient siege warfare. So while the details of the prophecy correspond to what actually happened, it is hard to see how Jerusalem could have been destroyed without those things happening.

We may also observe that an early dating of the Third Gospel supports the traditional ascription of authorship to Luke, the associate of Paul. We have seen that the author was indeed a follower of the apostles, though for our purposes it does not matter whether or not he was the Luke who accompanied Paul.

Luke could reasonably have claimed to have been a follower of all the apostles for a long time only if he had spent several years at Jerusalem while the original apostles were still there. They were still there (or at least were based there) at least until the year 50 or so (see Ac. 8:1; 15:4). Since Luke about then became closely associated with Paul (see Ac. 16:11ff. and the subsequent "we" passages,<sup>190</sup> and presumably Col. 4:14; 2 Tim. 4:11; Phlm. 24), probably as an expert in the gospel traditions and a teacher of them,<sup>191</sup> and then wrote his gospel sometime in the fifties, it would seem that his years at Jerusalem should be dated in the forties. If the tradition of Luke's Antiochene origin is correct,

he probably became a Christian there and subsequently went to Jerusalem to study under the apostles.

Although our exegesis of the participial phrase in Lk. 1:3 has been completed, our confidence in the correctness of the ancient interpretation--and, indeed, in the truthfulness of Luke's representations--will be enhanced by an investigation of its origin. We have already traced the ancient interpretation back from Eusebius and others to Origen, Irenaeus, the anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke, and Justin Martyr, and thus back to the middle of the second century.<sup>192</sup> In order to trace it back further, it will be helpful to note that in the ancient church the non-apostolic evangelists Mark and Luke were commonly classified together as followers of the apostles, as may be seen in the writings of Justin,<sup>193</sup> Irenaeus (by implication),<sup>194</sup> Tertullian,<sup>195</sup> and John Chrysostom.<sup>196</sup> (The earliest traditions regarding these two evangelists were in fact more broadly similar, as Westcott observes: "The early account of the origin of the Gospel of St Luke is strictly parallel to that of the origin of St Mark's Gospel, but less detailed."<sup>197</sup>) It would be reasonable to suppose, in view of the similar positions of Mark and Luke, that the practice of coupling them together as followers of the apostles arose as an extension of Luke's self-designation in Lk. 1:3 to Mark. On the other hand, one could argue that they were coupled together in this way simply because Mark was held to be a follower of Peter and Luke of Paul, without Lk. 1:3 coming into play at all. However, there is evidence in both Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria that Lk. 1:3 provided the terminology for this joint description of the two evangelists.

Irenaeus, in the third book of his treatise Against Heresies, after defending the authority of Luke and of the full text of his

gospel (in ch. 14), and after defending the authority of Paul (from the writings of Luke) and of his public (i.e. epistolary) teachings (in ch. 15), says, "The opinion of the apostles, therefore, and of those (Mark and Luke) who learned from their words, concerning God, has been made manifest."<sup>198</sup> The parenthetical words "Mark and Luke" in this passage are supplied by the translators, but they represent the sense.<sup>199</sup> This statement is reminiscent of one in 14.2, that Luke delivered to us "what he had learned from" the apostles, and, as we have seen,<sup>200</sup> that passage probably reflects the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3. Apparently, Luke's relationship with Paul and the other apostles is generalized in 15.3 to cover Mark's relationship with Peter (and other apostles). In other words, Luke and Mark are described by Irenaeus with language based upon Luke's self-description in Lk. 1:3.

Somewhat later in his third book, Irenaeus lists the writers of the New Testament as the apostles "Peter, and John, and Matthew, and Paul, and the rest successively, as well as their followers (οἱ τούτων ἀκόλουθοι, horum adsectatores)."<sup>201</sup> The words "their followers" certainly refer to Luke and Mark, and almost certainly to no one else.<sup>202</sup> Thus we again find Irenaeus coupling these two evangelists together as followers of the apostles, a designation which would seem to reflect Luke's claim to have been "a follower of them all" in Lk. 1:3.

Clement of Alexandria, as quoted by Eusebius, relates "a tradition of the primitive elders" to the effect that Mark was "one who had followed him for a long time" (ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πάλαι, "him" being the apostle Peter.<sup>203</sup> This description of Mark bears a definite resemblance to that of Luke in Lk. 1:3.<sup>204</sup> Clement's verb ἀκολουθῶ is a simpler form of Luke's παρακολουθῶ, and interchange-

able with it in this usage.<sup>205</sup> The adverb  $\nu\acute{o}\rho\rho\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  is here used synonymously with Luke's  $\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ .<sup>206</sup> And with  $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omega}$  Clement specifies one of those to whom Luke refers as  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ . Thus, each word in Luke's self-description has its counterpart in Clement's description of Mark. The resemblances could be coincidental, but it seems more likely, especially in consideration of the similar evidence from other Church Fathers, that Luke's self-description was at an early date applied to Mark, and thus also to both of them together.

The origin of this traditional description of Mark and Luke may have been lost sight of by some who later repeated it. Tertullian declares that the two were "companions of apostles or followers of apostles" and "apostolic men,"<sup>207</sup> yet he says specifically of Luke only that he was "the follower (sectator) of a later apostle, Paul."<sup>208</sup> Similarly, John Chrysostom notes that Luke "was a disciple of Paul" and that Mark was one "of Peter."<sup>209</sup> However, his statement does not necessarily imply that Luke and Mark were not also, to a lesser extent, followers of other apostles. The original tradition probably specified that Luke had been a follower of the apostles, and in particular of Paul, and that Mark had been a follower of them as well, but particularly of Peter. Later writers evidently emphasized their connections with the great apostles Paul and Peter, and either ignored or forgot about their wider apostolic connections.

Clement attributed his description of Mark to "the primitive elders," and we may therefore infer that they had passed on, and perhaps first set forth, the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3. H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton (following Harnack) place these elders in Asia Minor,<sup>210</sup> and the evidence does indeed point to an Asian provenance for the ancient interpretation and its application

to Mark. Irenaeus knew the tradition, and he came from Asia. Justin also gave expression to it, and he resided in Asia for a number of years after his conversion.

But most significant of all is the evidence of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, concerning the tradition handed down (i.e. for the first time) by an earlier Asian luminary, "the elder John." According to Papias, "the elder," whom he earlier identifies as "the elder John," taught that Mark "was . . . a follower . . . of Peter" (παρηκολούθησεν . . . Πέτρῳ).<sup>211</sup> This tradition is clearly the same one as that which Clement attributes to "the primitive elders," and the elder named John was undoubtedly one of those Asian elders, perhaps the chief one. And since this tradition, both when referring to Mark alone and particularly when referring to Mark and Luke together, was evidently drawn from Lk. 1:3 in Luke's case, and patterned after it in Mark's case, we may reasonably conclude that the elder John was the author of it. The ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3, then, would appear to go back to him.

This conclusion would seem to be confirmed by further evidence that Papias, and the circle of elders from which he came, held the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3 and the tradition based upon it. Eusebius quotes Papias as saying that "if anyone chanced to come who had actually been a follower of the elders (παρηκολουθηκώς . . . τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου)," he would ask him for the teachings of the elders. Papias then identifies these elders as seven apostles (listed by name) and "any other of the Lord's disciples."<sup>212</sup> Papias, then, is speaking of those who had been followers of Jesus' immediate disciples, notably the apostles.<sup>213</sup> Now Luke, according to Lk. 1:3, was such a follower of these eyewitnesses of Jesus, and

so was Mark. So, too, were others, some of whom were questioned by Papias. Papias's words *παρηκολουθηκώς . . . τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις* are thus a generalization of Luke's words *παρηκολουθηκόντι . . . πᾶσιν*, where the expression *τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις* designates substantially the same persons as *πᾶσιν*. Once again, this resemblance may be coincidental, but it seems more likely that Papias is echoing Lk. 1:3.<sup>214</sup>

It is also significant that the tradition handed down by "the elder" (i.e. John) and preserved by Papias includes the statement that Mark "wrote accurately, howbeit not in order" (*ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψε, οὐ μὲντοι τάξει*).<sup>215</sup> These words look very much like they reflect Luke's statement in Lk. 1:3 that he intends *ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι*, "to write to you accurately with a narrative."<sup>216</sup> The words *ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν* in Papias are practically the same as Luke's *ἀκριβῶς . . . γράψαι*. Also, Papias's adverbial use of *τάξις* is much like Luke's use of *καθεξῆς*.<sup>217</sup> Luke arranged his material "in order," i.e. in a fitting narrative manner, but Mark did not arrange his "in order," i.e. in the artful manner expected of historical narratives.<sup>218</sup> And there is yet a further connection with Luke's preface, for Mark is said to have written accurately "what was either said or done by the Lord" (*τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*). These words remind one of Luke's description of the contents of his gospel, "everything . . . that Jesus began to do and to teach" (Ac. 1:1),<sup>219</sup> a description which interprets the words *ἰῶν . . . πραγμάτων* in Lk. 1:1,<sup>220</sup> and which probably would have been drawn into a consideration of Luke's preface.<sup>221</sup>

It would seem, then, that much of the tradition handed down by the elder John concerning Mark and his gospel arose by way of comparison with what Luke has to say about himself and his gospel in Lk. 1:3 (and elsewhere). That is, John said that Mark, like Luke,

had been a follower of Jesus' original disciples, that Mark's gospel, like Luke's, was written accurately, and that Mark, this time unlike Luke, did not put his material together in the usual manner of narrative composition.

In Papias, then, there are three statements which are parallel to one or another portion of Lk. 1:3. In two of them, the elder John speaks about Mark and his gospel in terms echoing Lk. 1:3. In the third, Papias speaks of those who were in the same position as Luke, and does so in terms reflecting Lk. 1:3. Any one of these parallels could be explained away as coincidental. But it is difficult to believe that in the few surviving fragments of Papias there would be three verbal parallels with Lk. 1:3, all of them coincidental. It is particularly significant that the two portions of John's tradition which reflect Lk. 1:3 are complementary, paralleling every word which Luke uses to describe himself (i.e. *παρηκολούθηκόντι, πᾶσιν*) and his gospel (i.e. *ἀκριβῶς, καθ' ἑσῆς, γράψαι*), except one (i.e. *ἀνωθεν*). And that one unparalleled word is, as we have seen, paralleled in Clement's tradition from "the primitive elders," which goes back to John. And when the parallels with Lk. 1:3 in Papias and Clement have added to them the traditions in Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Chrysostom conjoining Luke and Mark in terms reflecting Luke's self-description, it becomes difficult to deny that Lk. 1:3, and particularly the ancient interpretation of the participial phrase in it, is at the bottom of it all. This combined evidence points to the conclusion that the elder John, and those around and after him (including Papias), interpreted Lk. 1:3 to mean that Luke was a follower of the apostles.

The connection between the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3 and the elder John is largely established by the fragments of

Papias preserved by Eusebius. We may be confident that Eusebius has quoted Papias with at least substantial accuracy, but the reliability of Papias has so often been questioned that we must consider whether he has repeated John's traditions with sufficient accuracy to justify our inferences from them. Papias may of course have gotten some of the details mixed up, but at least the fundamental point--that Luke and Mark were followers of the apostles--should be accepted as having come from John. Three facts point to this conclusion. First, Papias was a personal disciple of John. He "compared notes" with other disciples of John, and treasured his teachings.<sup>222</sup> Second, the points of contact between Papias's representations of John's tradition and Lk. 1:3 are too extensive to be merely coincidental, and yet are too subtle to have been deliberately interwoven by Papias. Third, the connection with Lk. 1:3 has apparently independent confirmation from the Asiatic tradition reported by Clement of Alexandria. Therefore, there is good reason to accept the evidence of Papias and infer from it that the elder John set forth an interpretation of Lk. 1:3 that included the ancient interpretation of its participial phrase.

We have traced the ancient interpretation, then, back to the elder John. But who was this John? Some have identified him as the apostle John, while others have identified him as an otherwise unknown man of the same name, evidently an Asian church leader of the first half of the second century. In view of the complexity of this important question, we have devoted an appendix to the thorough examination of it. The conclusion which is there reached, and reached, in our estimation, with a high degree of probability attaching to it, is that the elder John was none other than the apostle John, residing at Ephesus in his old age.

This brings us to the extraordinary conclusion that the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3, which we have found to be correct on strictly grammatico-historical grounds, was first set forth by the apostle John. We are not going to argue that John was an infallible interpreter of Luke's preface, although an apostolic exegesis of a New Testament passage would surely carry considerable weight. The significance of the fact that we have John's exegesis of Lk. 1:3 is rather that he was one of those persons to whom Luke's word  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\upsilon$ , on the ancient interpretation, refers. Furthermore, he undoubtedly kept in close contact with the other apostles (especially before leaving Judea), and the apostolic church in general. He would have known whether Luke had or had not been a follower of all the apostles, including himself, for a long time. Now in setting forth his interpretation of Lk. 1:3, and using it as a basis for comparing Mark and his gospel with Luke and his gospel, John clearly accepted Luke's self-description as true. He certainly would not have done so if he did not know Luke to have been one of his followers, and a follower of the other apostles. Therefore, even if John's interpretation of Lk. 1:3 were incorrect, we could still be sure that Luke's claim, on that interpretation, is correct. In other words, John confirms that Luke was, as a matter of historical fact, one who had been a follower of all the apostles for a long time. It would be futile for anyone to argue that Luke could not or did not have such extensive associations with the apostles, for one of the chief apostles himself confirms that he did. Finally, if John was acquainted with Luke's preface, we may infer that he was acquainted with the rest of his book. John evidently accepted Luke as a knowledgeable authority on the gospel traditions, and accepted his written gospel as an accurate presen-

tation of them.

Luke's expert knowledge of the gospel traditions is probably also confirmed by the apostle Paul. In 2 Cor. 8:18 he tells the Corinthians that he has sent to them, with Titus, "the brother whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches." Origen and other Church Fathers declared that this unnamed "brother" was Luke, and they were probably correct.<sup>223</sup> By "the gospel" we would understand neither his written gospel (which may, however, have already been written<sup>224</sup>), nor the preaching of the gospel, but rather, as in Mk. 1:1, the gospel tradition as a whole. Throughout the churches this man's expert knowledge of the gospel traditions was recognized. It would certainly be most natural to identify this associate of Paul as Luke, the author of the Third Gospel. It is significant that his fame extended throughout "all the churches," for this correlates with Luke's having been a follower of "all" the apostles, the founders of all the churches. We cannot be certain that Paul refers to Luke in 2 Cor. 8:18, but such a reference seems probable.

We conclude, then, that the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3, though discarded by modern scholarship long ago, is in fact correct. Luke decided to write a gospel "having been a follower of them all [i.e. the apostles] for a long time." His long association with the apostles, during which he gained a thorough knowledge of their traditions about Jesus, qualified him to record them accurately. This interpretation may be traced back to the apostle John, who confirmed Luke's apostolic connections and evidently approved the contents of his gospel. And the apostle Paul probably also testifies to Luke's expert knowledge of the gospel tradition.

## LUKE'S PURPOSE IN WRITING (VS. 4)

Luke concludes his preface by stating the immediate purpose for which he has decided to write a gospel narrative. He is writing a gospel, he tells Theophilus in vs. 4, "in order that you may know what is certain with regard to the matters in which you have been instructed" (ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν). The conjunction ἵνα introduces a statement of purpose. The syntax and precise terms of the statement, however, are matters of some dispute.

The direct object of ἐπιγνῶς is τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, but the intervening words, περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων, present the problem of correctly interpreting the incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause.<sup>1</sup> Most scholars have resolved these words into περὶ τῶν λόγων οὓς κατηχήθης,<sup>2</sup> but some have preferred to resolve them into τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης.<sup>3</sup> (A third possibility, περὶ τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης, has attracted virtually no support,<sup>4</sup> and for good reason.<sup>5</sup>)

The majority view is supported by Lucan usage. The construction περὶ + relative + verb + noun also occurs (with the addition of an adjective) in Lk. 3:19 (περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν ποιητῶν) and 19:37 (περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων), and in both cases the noun must be construed as the object of περὶ, with its definite article absorbed by the relative. Similarly, λόγων in Lk. 1:4 should be construed as the object of περὶ, with its article absorbed by ὧν.

Furthermore, if the minority view were correct, and Luke intended us to understand (τῶν) λόγων as that about which Theophilus had been informed, it is hard to see why he did not simply write τῶν λόγων, for without the article λόγων looks like the object of περιί. Moreover, as we shall see,<sup>6</sup> the minority view requires an unsatisfactory interpretation of the passage. For these reasons, then, we should understand Luke as referring to τὴν ἀσφάλειαν περὶ τῶν λόγων οὗς κειμήλιος. It is this resolution of Luke's words that we will now endeavor to interpret.

Luke is writing to Theophilus in order that he may know τὴν ἀσφάλειαν with regard to certain matters. Exegetes have disagreed whether Luke uses the noun ἀσφάλεια abstractly, referring to the quality of "certainty," "trustworthiness," "reliability," "factuality," or the like,<sup>7</sup> or concretely, referring to "what is certain," "the truth," or the like.<sup>8</sup> The abstract sense is attested in extra-biblical literature,<sup>9</sup> whereas the concrete sense apparently is not.<sup>10</sup> However, the word was given many other concrete meanings,<sup>11</sup> and the one suggested here would certainly be a natural adaptation of the related abstract sense.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, we must consider both the abstract and the concrete senses as theoretically possible, and allow the context to determine which one is appropriate.

The fact that τὴν ἀσφάλειαν is (on our understanding of the syntax) modified by the prepositional phrase περὶ τῶν λόγων requires a concrete meaning for the expression. That is, the preposition περιί requires that τὴν ἀσφάλειαν be concrete. One can speak of "what is certain" about something, but not of "the (quality of) certainty" about something. If τὴν ἀσφάλειαν meant "the certainty," it would be followed by the simple genitive τῶν λόγων, indicat-

ing that these matters possessed the quality of certainty. Indeed, if the minority view of the syntax of vs. 4 were correct, that is what we would have. But the majority view of its syntax requires that a concrete meaning be given to τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

That τὴν ἀσφάλειαν should be understood concretely, and not abstractly, follows not only from its connection with περὶ, but also from what we see Luke doing in his gospel. As Creed observes, Luke's work "does not merely prove or authenticate what Theophilus has already learnt," but rather "conveys in a permanent and assured form what he has previously learnt in a less systematic manner." Therefore, "to give τὴν ἀσφάλειαν the meaning of 'the quality of certainty' fits the sense less well."<sup>13</sup> Luke's work is simply a recital of the gospel history. As such it does not establish the certainty of anything. But it is a statement of "what is certain," in Luke's view, about Jesus.<sup>14</sup>

Luke wants Theophilus to know what is certain περὶ τῶν λόγων οὓς κατηχήθης, "with regard to the matters in which you have been instructed." As we shall see, some would understand κατηχήθης as referring to Theophilus's having been informed, rather than his having been instructed. But in either case the preposition περὶ introduces τῶν λόγων as the subject matter "about" or "with regard to" which Luke wants Theophilus to have certain knowledge. Thus, the words τῶν λόγων should be translated as "the matters."<sup>15</sup>

Since Luke is going to write his gospel "in order that" (ὅνα) Theophilus may gain knowledge concerning certain matters, it follows that they consist of those things covered by his gospel, namely, the life and teachings of Jesus. We should understand τῶν λόγων, then, as equivalent to τῶν . . . πραγμάτων in vs. 1. Thus, the expression refers in a general way to the gospel history,<sup>16</sup>

with which Theophilus already has some acquaintance.<sup>17</sup>

More than the gospel history cannot be denoted by τῶν λόγων because an account of the gospel history, as Luke decided to write, would not set forth what is certain about other matters.<sup>18</sup> It is not enough to say that a gospel narrative would provide a solid historical foundation for Christian teaching, because the full range of apostolic doctrine could hardly be derived with certainty from such a narrative. Therefore, we cannot agree with those who see in τῶν λόγων a broad reference to Christian instruction,<sup>19</sup> perhaps being "the words" which constitute "the word" mentioned in vs. 2.<sup>20</sup> Theophilus may well have been instructed in the Christian faith, but the fact that Luke wrote a gospel narrative rather than a manual of doctrine shows that the words τῶν λόγων refer only to the facts of the gospel history.<sup>21</sup> Luke also wrote an account of apostolic church history, but there is no evidence that formal instruction in church history was already being given, especially the history of Paul's missionary journeys.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, the instruction to which Luke refers in Lk. 1:4 must be limited to instruction in the deeds and teachings of Jesus.<sup>23</sup>

As is the case in vs. 1, where Luke describes the contents of his predecessors' narratives (and thus of his own) as "the things that are well-established among us," so it is the case here, where Luke describes what Theophilus has heard (and thus what Luke will write about), that Luke's words--"the matters in which you have been instructed"--are so vague that one who has read only his preface would have no idea what he is referring to. We can determine what he is talking about by examining the contents of his gospel and relating them to the information previously received by Theophilus. But we may be sure that Luke did not expect his immediately

intended reader, Theophilus, to adopt such a procedure. Rather, he must have expected Theophilus to know what he was referring to. From this we may infer that Theophilus was a real person, not an idealized figure, that Luke's dedication of his work to him was a matter of serious importance, not merely a conventional flourish, and that Theophilus had previously communicated with Luke, giving him some idea of what he had learned about Jesus, expressing some uncertainty about the reliability of his information, and asking Luke, as one whom he knew to have an expert knowledge of the gospel traditions, to tell him what was certain about the life and teachings of Jesus. In response, Luke agreed to write an accurate gospel narrative for him, in which he would convey what he knew to be certain about Jesus.

Luke tells Theophilus that he wants him to know what is certain about the matters "in which you have been instructed" (οὓς κατηχήθης). The verb κατηχέω is used in the Lucan writings and elsewhere in the New Testament in two senses: "inform (of)" (Ac. 21:21, 24) and "instruct (in)" (Ac. 18:25; Rom. 2:18; 1 Cor. 14:19; Gal. 6:6). Not until the post-biblical period was the word used specifically with reference to catechetical instruction.<sup>24</sup> An object in the accusative case is used with the verb to denote either that of which one is informed (as in Ac. 21:24, ὧν κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ οὐδέν ἔστιν, where ὧν is a contraction of τούτων ἃ) or that in which one is instructed (as in Ac. 18:25, κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου). Therefore, the words οὓς κατηχήθης in our resolution of Lk. 1:4 could, by themselves, mean either "of which you have been informed" or "in which you have been instructed." The latter is the traditional interpretation, which most scholars continue to follow. However, some scholars have adopted the former

interpretation,<sup>25</sup> including those advocating the minority view of the passage's syntax.<sup>26</sup> Both interpretations are contextually appropriate, as well as grammatically possible. It makes just as much sense for Luke to want Theophilus to know what is certain about the matters of which he has been informed as about those in which he has been instructed.

Commentators have generally felt that Theophilus had received instruction in the Christian religion, but they have not sufficiently justified their view. Marshall, for example, judges that while it is "possible that Theophilus had learned about Jesus by hearsay," it is "more probable that he had received formal Christian instruction." But he provides no argument in support of his opinion.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, those who have felt that Theophilus had been informed of Christian teachings have, due to the novelty of their view, been obliged to advance arguments in support of it. Let us consider them.

According to Zahn, one Christian would not have addressed a fellow Christian as "most excellent" (vs. 3). Therefore, he reasons, Theophilus was not a Christian and had not received instruction in Christian things.<sup>28</sup> And since Theophilus is addressed in Ac. 1:1 without a title, Zahn deduces that he may have been converted after Luke wrote his gospel.<sup>29</sup> This argument is untenable, however. It is quite impossible to establish a priori how Luke would have addressed Theophilus if the latter had been a Christian. And even if it would have been relatively unlikely for one Christian to address another one as "most excellent" in ordinary circumstances, it must be remembered that Luke's preface is a highly formal statement, in which such an acknowledgement of Theophilus's rank would have been considered quite appropriate. Furthermore,

Theophilus's conversion can hardly be deduced from Ac. 1:1. The addressing of Theophilus in Ac. 1:1 cannot really be compared with that in Lk. 1:3, for Acts does not have a formal preface, but merely a few introductory words which lead into the narrative without a break. This more informal opening may simply indicate that the relationship between Luke and Theophilus had become more informal, in which case a simpler address would have been sufficient. Or, Theophilus may have lost his office or rank. In any case, nothing can be inferred about his religion on the basis of his manner of address in Lk. 1:3 and Ac. 1:1.<sup>30</sup> Zahn argues that Luke's gospel was written "to give Theophilus his first real knowledge, fundamental insight, and conviction" regarding the gospel traditions, which things a Christian would already have had.<sup>31</sup> But this reads much more into vs. 4 than is really there. Luke wanted Theophilus to know "what is certain" about the life of Jesus, and this desire is entirely consistent with his already having received Christian instruction, including an introduction to the gospel traditions.

Cadbury presents a linguistic argument against Theophilus's being a Christian. He argues at length that Luke's vocabulary in Lk. 1:4 (and elsewhere in the preface) would very likely have been used by him only in the context of accusations, and from this he infers that Theophilus may have received hostile information about Jesus.<sup>32</sup> His argument is long and subtle, but it is a rather astonishing concatenation of half-truths and non sequiturs.

Cadbury begins by claiming that Luke, being "an individualist in style and diction," would probably have used the verb  $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  in Lk. 1:4 in the same way that he used it elsewhere in his writings (i.e. in Ac. 18:25; 21:21, 24), rather than in some other way attested elsewhere in the New Testament (where it always means

"instruct (in)" or in other Hellenistic literature (where it is used "of all kinds of information or instruction").<sup>33</sup> It is surprising that Cadbury can explain so much of Luke's preface in terms of conventional rhetorical style, yet on this occasion can brush all other usage aside with the pronouncement that Luke is "an individualist in style and diction." But surely the ordinary meanings of words were available to Luke, and surely his writings did not exhaust his vocabulary. Only if the immediate context in Lk. 1:4 were similar to that of Ac. 18:25 or that of 21:21, 24, would it be probable that the word has the same meaning in both passages. In a different context, Luke could well have used  $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\chi\epsilon\omega$  with a different meaning.

However, even if we arbitrarily restrict our consideration to the meanings of  $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\chi\epsilon\omega$  used in Acts, we find that while Luke does use the word with the meaning "inform (of)" in 21:21, 24, he also uses it with the other basic meaning, "instruct (in)," in 18:25. In the latter verse Luke is certainly saying that Apollos was "instructed in the way of the Lord," not merely "informed of" it. Cadbury tries to neutralize the verb's meaning here by pointing to "the imperfection of the knowledge" referred to, in view of which "one cannot press the meaning of the verb far from its neutral sense of information received without any implication as to whether it is accurate or not."<sup>34</sup> But the accuracy of the knowledge received has nothing to do with the meaning of the verb. One can be accurately informed or inaccurately instructed. Apollos was deficiently instructed, but instructed all the same.

Cadbury then considers "the other two cases" in Acts, which, however, are really only one case, since 21:24 merely repeats vs. 21 at this point. Here the word means "inform (of)," and is used

in connection with hostile information. However, Cadbury is wrong to say that it "plainly means hostile information."<sup>35</sup> The word itself simply means "inform (of)," without necessarily implying hostility or erroneousness.<sup>36</sup> Only the context can establish whether the information is hostile or not.

Cadbury then claims that κατηγοέω in Ac. 21 is "practically equivalent to κατηγορέω," since "the idiom οὐδέν ἔστιν [sic] ὧν" occurs in the New Testament only in Ac. 21:24 (with κατηγοέω) and 25:11 (with κατηγορέω).<sup>37</sup> But even if this so-called idiom were used only with these two verbs, they would not thereby be shown to be synonymous. Furthermore, it is by no means evident that the same "idiom" is present in both cases, for in 21:24 ὧν resolves into τούτων ᾧ, whereas in 25:11 it may just as easily be interpreted as a simple genitive.<sup>38</sup> And even if κατηγοέω in Ac. 21:21, 24 were equivalent to κατηγορέω, it would not follow, as Cadbury supposes, that "if κατηγοήθης is to be given any but the most colourless significance" in Lk. 1:4--i.e. that which he allows in Ac. 18:25--"we have good reason for feeling that there lurks the thought of accusation that is associated with the word by the same writer elsewhere."<sup>39</sup> Since κατηγοέω would not always be synonymous with κατηγορέω, only the context could suggest such a lurking thought in Lk. 1:4, just as only the context does in Ac. 21:21, 24, but does not in Ac. 18:25.

Cadbury seeks to bolster his argument by showing that two other words in Lk. 1:4 are associated with accusation or rumor in Acts. He points out that the expressions τὸ ἀσφάλές (Ac. 21:34; 22:30) and ἀσφάλές τι (25:26), which he takes (rightly) to be equivalent to τὴν ἀσφάλειαν in Lk. 1:4,<sup>40</sup> are used in connection with accusations, and in one case even in close proximity to the

verb κατηγορέω. From this he deduces that in Luke's mind there was an "association of thought" between ἀσφάλές (and thus ἀσφάλεια) and accusation (and thus κατηγορέω).<sup>41</sup> He then goes on to show that "the same idea precisely surrounds Luke's use of the verb ἐπιτινώσκω," at least in some instances of its use.<sup>42</sup> Finally, Cadbury finds other words in Luke's preface (i.e. ἀκριβῶς, ἄνωθεν, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καθεξῆς, and "even" λόγος) which are used in Acts in connection with accusations, and which thus "confirm rather than contradict the suggestion of apologetic motive."<sup>43</sup> On the basis of these linguistic associations, and the fact that Theophilus may have been a Roman official, Cadbury infers that he "may . . . have been . . . invoked to deal fairly with the Christians."<sup>44</sup> Cadbury finally concludes that Luke hoped "that his work would correct any impressions adverse to the Christians that 'the most excellent Theophilus' might have received."<sup>45</sup>

Cadbury's appeal to the Lucan usage of ἀσφάλές, ἐπιτινώσκω, etc., is misplaced. It is true that three times in Acts ἀσφάλές is used in connection with judicial inquiry. But it hardly follows from this that Luke could not have used, or even probably would not have used, the cognate noun ἀσφάλεια in a context in which accusations were not involved. It must be remembered that judicial proceedings and other disputes dominate the subject matter of Acts, and that the expressions "the facts" (τὸ ἀσφάλές) and "something definite" (ἀσφάλές τι) are apt to appear in such contexts. But this does not establish any "association of thought" between ἀσφάλεια and accusation. Cadbury's appeal to Luke's use of ἐπιτινώσκω is even weaker, for while Luke often uses this word with reference to judicial inquiry into accusations (see Lk. 23:7; Ac. 22:24, 29; 23:28; 24:8, 11; 25:10; cf. 19:34), which is to be expected of a

verb meaning, among other things, "find out, ascertain," he more often uses it in other connections (see Lk. 1:22; 5:22; 7:37; 24:16, 31; Ac. 3:10; 4:13; 9:30; 12:14; 27:39; 28:1). Weakest of all is Cadbury's appeal to Luke's use of other words in Luke's preface. The fact that ἀκριβῶς (usually ἀκριβέστερον) is used in connection with judicial inquiries in Ac. 23:15, 20 and 24:22 hardly confirms the operation of an "apologetic motive" in Luke's preface, for the word is used in 18:25, 26 in a non-judicial context. The words ἄνωθεν and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς are used in a judicial setting in Ac. 26:4, 5, but there, as in Lk. 1:2, 3, Luke is simply using them to describe lengths of time, which could be done in innumerable non-judicial settings. The adverb καθ' ἑσῆς is used to describe Peter's defense in Ac. 11:4, but one can hardly infer from this that Luke uses it in connection with an apologia in Lk. 1:3, for the word is used in non-accusatorial contexts in Lk. 8:1; Ac. 3:24; 18:23, and its parallel usage in Lk. 1:3 and Ac. 11:4 is due to the fact that narrative statements are being described as such, not to the circumstance that they are defensive in character. Finally, it is true that λόγος could be used in connection with accusations, but manifestly Luke could (and did) use it in many other connections. No one would deny that all these words could have been used in connection with judicial proceedings or other disputes, but the way in which Luke uses them elsewhere in his writings does not establish the slightest probability that they are so used in his preface. Only the preface itself could suggest that Luke has an apologetic motive for writing, and that it does not do.<sup>46</sup>

Yet another argument that Theophilus was not a Christian has been advanced by G. N. Stanton. From the premises that the content of the eyewitness reports (Lk. 1:2) was essentially the same as the

content of Luke's gospel (vs. 4) and that the former is described as ὁ λόγος, Stanton deduces that Luke would also have described the latter as ὁ λόγος. And since Luke uses the expression ὁ λόγος in Acts to denote the message preached in evangelistic addresses (e.g., Peter's speech to Cornelius in ch. 10), it follows that "Luke's Gospel is evangelistic in intention" and thus that "Theophilus is in the same position as Cornelius: neither is a committed Christian, but both have heard something about Jesus and the Christian message."<sup>47</sup> We will allow that Luke would have been willing to describe the contents of his gospel as "the word," just as Mark described the contents of his gospel as "the gospel" (1:1), even though, properly speaking, the gospel traditions were only part of the word,<sup>48</sup> a fact that Stanton himself earlier recognizes.<sup>49</sup> However, while the evangelistic addresses in Acts do proclaim the word, it does not follow that Luke's gospel is evangelistic unless the word was expressed only in evangelistic situations. But this necessary assumption is certainly false. The gospel traditions were repeated within the church, as Luke clearly implies in Lk. 1:1 (on this writer's interpretation) and 1:2 (on virtually all interpretations), and is otherwise indisputable. Indeed, Stanton agrees that "for Luke, the life and character of Jesus is part and parcel of the message of the church," in both evangelistic and non-evangelistic situations.<sup>50</sup> There is no reason to suppose that the "servants of the word" (Lk. 1:2) handed down these traditions to fellow Christians as anything other than "the word," as Stanton himself deduces from the passage. The gospel traditions were used in evangelistic preaching, but their primary function, according to this verse, was to edify committed Christians. Furthermore, a written gospel like Luke's, whose "fullness and length," as Stanton

concedes, "mark it off from any form of initial preaching likely to have been known in the early church,"<sup>51</sup> is much more likely to have been prepared principally for the edification of Christians, rather than for evangelistic purposes. It must be remembered that Luke's gospel is a straightforward narrative of the life and teachings of Jesus, and does not have (except by implication) any of the argument about his significance or the call for repentance and faith which characterize the evangelistic proclamation of the gospel in Acts. Luke's narrative is, as Creed remarks, "written by a believer for believers."<sup>52</sup> Thus, Stanton's argument fails to establish that Theophilus was not a Christian.<sup>53</sup>

Thus, the arguments advanced in support of the view that Theophilus had been informed of Christian teaching, but not instructed in it, must be rejected.

There is some reason to think, on the other hand, that Theophilus had been instructed in the deeds and teachings of Jesus. If he had merely been informed of these matters, we could infer that his informers had brought them to his attention because Christianity was a matter of concern to them,<sup>54</sup> and not necessarily to him. Yet what we have been able to infer about Theophilus and his prior relationship with Luke<sup>55</sup> indicates that he was personally interested in obtaining the most accurate and reliable accounts of the gospel history, and thus sought out Luke to provide him with such information. This interest in the gospel history is explicable if we assume that he had already received a rudimentary (and, to him, unsatisfactory) account of the life and teachings of Jesus, but it is inexplicable if he had merely heard some accusations hurled at Christians and their faith.<sup>56</sup> His apparent willingness to be Luke's literary patron, and thus to promote Christian litera-

ture,<sup>57</sup> is even more difficult to understand if he was not himself a Christian. Finally, it is hard to believe that Theophilus would have been informed only of the life of Jesus, and not of a wider range of objectionable Christian beliefs and practices. Yet, he apparently asked Luke only for information about the life and teachings of Jesus. For these reasons, we conclude that Theophilus had been instructed in, rather than just informed of, the life and teachings of Jesus.

This brings us, finally, to the last word of Luke's preface requiring comment. Luke has decided to write his gospel, he tells Theophilus, in order that "you may know" (ἐπιγινῶς) what is certain about the life and teachings of Jesus. Evidently, Theophilus had received information about Jesus, and was not sure what was true and what was not. Perhaps he had received conflicting information from various sources, or perhaps he considered some of his information incredible. In any case, Luke was writing to him in order that he might know what was certain. Formerly, Theophilus did not know what was certain; now he would know.

In this context, Luke would seem to be using the verb ἐπιγινώσκω with the simple and well-established meaning, "know."<sup>58</sup> With this meaning, as with other meanings, ἐπιγινώσκω is virtually equivalent to γινώσκω.<sup>59</sup> Once again Luke has chosen the more elegant word.

However, some commentators have supposed that ἐπιγινώσκω, as used here by Luke, has an intensive force which γινώσκω would not have. Plummer, for example, says that "the compound ἐπιγινῶς indicates additional and more thorough knowledge."<sup>60</sup> Some have suggested along this line that Luke wants Theophilus to "know better," or the like.<sup>61</sup> However, that the preposition ἐπι( ever does add an

intensive force to γινώσκω has been challenged by J. A. Robinson. According to him, the additional force of the preposition, when it is present at all, is directive, rather than intensive.<sup>62</sup> That is, "γινώσκειν means 'to know' in the fullest sense that can be given to the word 'knowledge': ἐπιγινώσκειν directs attention to some particular point in regard to which 'knowledge' is affirmed."<sup>63</sup> In our opinion, Robinson makes out his case very well.<sup>64</sup> But even if ἐπιγινώσκω does have an intensive force on occasion,<sup>65</sup> the fact that it usually does not means that the use of ἐπιγινώσκω rather than γινώσκω in Lk. 1:4 does not itself suggest that an intensification of knowledge is in view.

Turning, then, to the context, we find no basis for the view that ἐπιγινώσκω is used with an intensive force. If it were, we would understand that Theophilus already has partial knowledge, and is about to receive fuller knowledge. But while it is true that Theophilus's knowledge is about to be increased, it is also true that the object of ἐπιγινῶς is τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, not (τῶν) λόγων. If it were the latter, it would be reasonable to understand Luke as saying that he intends for Theophilus to know the gospel history more fully. But it makes little sense to speak of knowing what is certain more fully. It makes much more sense to speak of knowing what is certain. We have already determined that Theophilus did not know what was certain about the life and teachings of Jesus. Luke was writing so that he would know what was certain.

An examination of Luke's use of γινώσκω and ἐπιγινώσκω elsewhere in his writings bears out this conclusion, for nowhere else is the intensive meaning attested. Lk. 1:4 could, of course, be the sole instance of an intensive usage. But since Luke uses ἐπιγινώσκω quite often (viz. twenty times), and since a clear pattern

of usage emerges for the two verbs, this is unlikely. Luke uses both verbs to signify various shades of knowing and coming to know. Both verbs cover much the same ground, but as a general rule Luke expresses the concept of knowing with γινώσκω and the concept of coming to know with ἐπιγινώσκω. Thus, γινώσκω means "know" some thirty-four times and "understand" in Lk. 18:34; Ac. 8:30, while it means "find out" in Lk. 19:15; Ac. 17:13; 21:34; 22:30, "perceive" in Lk. 8:46; Ac. 23:6, and "recognize" in Lk. 6:44. On the other hand, ἐπιγινώσκω means "know" only once (in Ac. 25:10), elsewhere meaning "find out" (Lk. 7:37; 23:7; Ac. 9:30; 22:24, 29; 23:28; 24:8, 11; 28:1), "perceive" (Lk. 1:22; 5:22; Ac. 19:34), or "recognize" (Lk. 24:16, 31; Ac. 3:10; 4:13; 12:14; 27:39). On the basis of this evidence it can hardly be maintained that for Luke ἐπιγινώσκω indicates a fullness of knowledge beyond that indicated by γινώσκω. And in the one passage where ἐπιγινώσκω means "know," i.e. Ac. 25:10, a fullness of knowledge is indicated by the adverb κάλλιστ, thus demonstrating that the verb alone could not convey it.

The evidence of Lucan usage, of Greek usage more generally, and of the context together leads to the conclusion that ἐπιγινώσκω means "you may know" (or perhaps "you may get to know"), not "you may know more thoroughly" or the like. Luke intends for Theophilus to know what is certain about the matters in which he has been instructed and about which he has asked Luke, as an authority on the original gospel traditions, for accurate and reliable information.

## THE ARGUMENT AND SCOPE OF LUKE'S PREFACE

The results of our exegetical study of Luke's preface may now be brought together in this translation of it: "(1) Since many have undertaken to draw up a narrative account of the things that are well-established among us, (2) just as those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed them down to us, (3) I have decided, for my part, having been a follower of them all for a long time, to write an accurate narrative for you, most excellent Theophilus, (4) in order that you may know what is certain with regard to the matters in which you have been instructed."

Luke's statement is quite a mouthful. But it was obviously drafted with great care, and thus we may assume that it is, when properly understood, clear and coherent. However, this has been denied by Cadbury, who introduces his own translation of the preface by drawing attention to "all its imitated obscurity and verbal irregularity."<sup>1</sup> His translation is: "WHEREAS many have ventured to recompose a narrative about the matters consummated among us, as those who had been at the start witnesses and helpers in the mission handed down to us, I also, gentle Theophilus, decided to write for you seriatim since I had been now for a long time back in immediate touch with everything circumstantially, in order that you may gather the correctness as regards the accounts that you have been given to understand."<sup>2</sup> We would suggest that the obscurity

and verbal irregularity of Cadbury's translation reflect his consistently faulty interpretations, not Luke's actual statement. At nearly every turn we have taken issue with Cadbury's interpretations,<sup>3</sup> and now we see what they amount to.

We would submit, on the other hand, that our interpretations, as brought together in our final translation, present a clear and coherent picture, with little of the obscurity and none of the verbal irregularity presented by Cadbury. There is some obscurity in Luke's references to "the things that are well-established among us" and "the matters in which you have been instructed," since, as we have already explained,<sup>4</sup> these "things" and "matters" were spelled out in previous communication between Theophilus and Luke. But since they coincide with the subject matter of Luke's gospel, their identity is easily ascertained.

As we have seen,<sup>5</sup> Luke's basic argument is that "since" the literary efforts of his predecessors present a problem, "I have decided" to do something about it. Others had tried, without full success, to record the gospel traditions just as the apostles had handed them down. To remedy the situation, Luke decided to write an accurate gospel narrative. He felt qualified and no doubt obliged to do this because he had long been a follower of all the apostles, and from them had learned the authentic traditions. From his gospel Theophilus (and anyone else) would be able to learn what was certain about the life and teachings of Jesus.

We may now reconstruct the course of events which, according to Luke's own account of them, resulted in his writing of a gospel. From the earliest days of the church (i.e. "the beginning") the apostles (i.e. the "servants of the word"), notably the Twelve (i.e. the "eyewitnesses"), had been handing down to the church

accounts of the deeds and teachings of Jesus (vs. 2). Luke himself became a follower of these apostles, indeed seeking them all out, and learned the gospel traditions from them (vs. 3). The gospel history was often repeated within the church, and thus became firmly established within it (vs. 1). However, as time passed and the church expanded beyond the direct control of the apostles, the gospel traditions were not always repeated accurately, and questions arose concerning their details. As a result, a certain Theophilus could not determine, from his instruction, what was certain about Jesus, and he expressed his concern to Luke (vs. 4). A number of narratives of Jesus' life had already been written (vs. 1), in an attempt to record the authentic gospel traditions (vs. 2), but Luke could not recommend any of them to Theophilus. Instead, he resolved to write an accurate gospel narrative for him (and for the church at large) (vs. 3). He felt qualified to do this because he, presumably unlike his predecessors, had been a personal disciple of all the apostles for a considerable length of time (vs. 3), and had used the opportunity (as the apostles John and probably Paul confirm) to become an expert in the authentic traditions. He was therefore in a position to relate what was certain about the life and teachings of Jesus (vss. 3-4).

It will appear from all that we have said that Luke's preface is an introduction to the Gospel according to Luke, not an introduction to "Luke-Acts." That is, it refers exclusively to the life and teachings of Jesus, and not at all to the events of the apostolic age. In vs. 1 "the things that are well-established among us" can only be the deeds and teachings of Jesus, because church history, unlike the gospel history, was not taught in the church, at least not sufficiently to become "well-established" in it. Even

Schürmann, whose interpretation of vs. 1 is more amenable to a wider view than is ours, rightly insists, "Die πράξεις ἀποστόλων sind nicht in den εὐαγγέλια beschlossen zu denken!"<sup>6</sup> This is confirmed by the fact that "many" writers had compiled narrative accounts of these things (vs. 1), for while at least several gospel narratives were written at an early date, there were apparently no (and certainly not "many") predecessors to Acts.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the "things" narrated by Luke's predecessors, and therefore in the work introduced by Luke's preface, were proclaimed by the apostolic "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (vs. 2), but the apostles were eyewitnesses of Jesus, not of themselves and of the church, and their "word" (i.e. the gospel) likewise pertained to Jesus, not to themselves.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, traditions about Jesus, but not about the apostolic church, were "handed down" to that church (vs. 2).<sup>9</sup> Finally, Luke indicates in vs. 4 that his book will let Theophilus know what is certain with regard to "the matters in which you have been instructed," and while Christians received instruction in the life and teachings of Jesus, they were not instructed in the events of the apostolic age.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the narrative that Luke is introducing must be the Gospel, not Acts.<sup>11</sup> If we did not have Acts in our possession, no one would have guessed from Luke's preface that it had ever been written.<sup>12</sup>

It has also been argued, rightly, in our view, that Luke could not have been thinking of the events of the apostolic age while writing his preface because of the "we" sections in Acts. That is, Luke excludes himself from the authoritative group of eyewitnesses in Lk. 1:2, yet in the "we" sections of Acts presents his own eyewitness accounts.<sup>13</sup> This argument would not carry any weight with those who explain Luke's use of the first person plural in these

passages as a literary device, but for those who accept the traditional interpretation, it should provide support for the view that Acts is beyond the purview of Luke's preface. It is not enough to reply that Luke differentiates himself only from the eyewitnesses who have been such from the beginning, as does A. Beck,<sup>14</sup> for it is their tradition (with that of the servants of the word) alone in which he expresses any interest, and which he intends to record.

Several arguments to the contrary have been advanced. However, they are generally based upon misinterpretations of the text, and even then do not necessarily follow. Some of those who interpret "the things that are well-established among us" (vs. 1) as "the things accomplished/completed/fulfilled among us" (even joined by some who see a reference to "the things confirmed/fully believed among us") have inferred that at least the earlier events related in Acts are included in this description.<sup>15</sup> But these events would still have to be the subject matter of the many narratives already written (vs. 1), as well as of the apostolic traditions (vs. 2), and thus the events of the apostolic age cannot be in view.<sup>16</sup> Zahn infers from the expression ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς in vs. 2 that "Luke, like some of his predecessors, e.g. Mark, became an eye-witness and a minister of the word during the course of events which he was attempting to set forth," which would then have to include those related in Acts,<sup>17</sup> but while the phrase probably is intended to exclude certain "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" from view, there is no reason to think that Luke included himself among them.<sup>18</sup> Dillon thinks that in the word γινόμενοι in vs. 2 "Luke is already hinting that the story will not end with the departure of the Lord from the earth,"<sup>19</sup> but this notion is based upon the false assumption that the eyewitnesses "became" servants of the word, and even

then it does not necessarily follow that Luke will narrate their ministry. F. C. Baur argues that  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  in vs. 3 is so comprehensive that it must bring into view the events related in Acts,<sup>20</sup> but the scope of a neuter  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  would have to be determined by the context (especially by "the things" mentioned in vs. 1), and in any case the word is masculine.<sup>21</sup> Cadbury and others who have adopted his interpretation of vs. 3 have understood Luke to be claiming to have kept abreast of, or even participated in, the events which he intends to record, that is, as it turns out, those in Acts.<sup>22</sup> But it would be equally consistent with this interpretation (and more consistent with the rest of the preface) to suppose that Luke had been an eyewitness of Jesus.<sup>23</sup> Those who have adopted the geographical interpretation of  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\eta\rho$  in vs. 3 have naturally seen a reference to the spread of the gospel as related in Acts,<sup>24</sup> but even if this interpretation were right, the geographical progression of Jesus' ministry would be enough to satisfy it. It has also been suggested that the instruction which Theophilus had received (vs. 4) would have included information about the early years of the church, as related in Acts.<sup>25</sup> However, we have seen that the instruction to which Luke refers in vs. 4 is simply instruction in the gospel history.<sup>26</sup> Thus, there is nothing in Luke's preface which suggests that it is an introduction to Acts.

It has also been argued that Luke and Acts are the two volumes of a single work, commonly called "Luke-Acts" these days,<sup>27</sup> and therefore that Lk. 1:1-4 should (in accordance with the usual practice) be the preface to the entire work, with the events related in Acts thus coming within its purview.<sup>28</sup> But even if Luke and Acts were the two volumes of a single work, the possibility that Luke might have limited the scope of his preface to its first

volume cannot be excluded a priori.<sup>29</sup> He may not have decided to add the second volume until after he had finished writing his gospel.<sup>30</sup> Or, he may have planned to write a separate preface (as some see in Ac. 1:1ff.) for his second volume--even if that was not the usual practice. In any case, only the actual words of the preface can reveal its scope, and they introduce only the gospel history.

Furthermore, there are decisive reasons for rejecting the concept of "Luke-Acts," even though, as Maddox observes, "today most workers in this field accept it as proven."<sup>31</sup> It is of course true that the history of the expansion of Christianity as told in Acts is closely connected with the history of Jesus' earthly life and ministry as told in Luke (see Lk. 24:46-49; Ac. 1:1-9), and thus that Acts may be considered the sequel to Luke.<sup>32</sup> But the gospel history and the apostolic history are still distinct subjects.

Luke himself establishes that Acts is a separate work, for in Ac. 1:1 he refers to his gospel as τὸν . . . πρῶτον λόγον, "my first narrative" (or, "my first treatise"). The word λόγος was used in the first century A.D. (as in previous centuries) to designate (among other things) a complete work, but not, it would seem, an individual book in a multi-volume work. Robertson comments in connection with Ac. 1:1 that the word λόγος commonly means "treatise or historical narrative,"<sup>33</sup> and he is supported by Wilke-Grimm-Thayer.<sup>34</sup> Writers earlier than, and contemporaneous with Luke did not refer to a book in a multi-volume work as a λόγος, but rather as a βιβλίον (or, βιβλίον)<sup>35</sup> or a βύβλος (or, βιβλος).<sup>36</sup> (They often used simply an ordinal number to denote a book, and one occasionally finds other terms, such as γράμμα, σύνταγμα, and

σύνταξις, used in this way.) Thus, for example, Polybius opens the second book of his History with the words, "In the preceding book (Ἐν μὲν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βύβλῳ) I stated . . ."<sup>37</sup> Diodorus of Sicily similarly begins the second book of his Library of History by saying, "The preceding Book (Ἡ μὲν πρὸ ταύτης βίβλος), being the first of the whole work, embraces the facts which concern Egypt."<sup>38</sup> Closer to Luke's time, Josephus begins the second book of his treatise Against Apion with the words, "In the first volume of this work (Διὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον βιβλίον), my most esteemed Epaphroditus, I demonstrated the antiquity of our race."<sup>39</sup> And Luke's contemporary, Dioscorides, begins the second and each successive book of his De materia medica by referring to the previous βιβλίον or βιβλία.<sup>40</sup> We may conclude from this and similar evidence that if Luke considered Acts to be the second volume of a two-volume work, he would not have referred to his gospel in Ac. 1:1 as a λόγος, but rather as something else, most likely a βιβλίον or βίβλος.

It is true that well after Luke's day the word λόγος came to be used synonymously with βιβλίον and βίβλος, but this later usage cannot be extrapolated back into the first century. The first writer to use λόγος in this way was, so far as we can determine, Galen, who wrote one hundred years after Luke.<sup>41</sup> But other second-century writers apparently did not use the word in this way, continuing rather to use βιβλίον and βίβλος (and other expressions).<sup>42</sup> Therefore, there is no reason to suppose that Galen's use of λόγος in this manner reflects first-century usage at all.<sup>43</sup>

Despite the clear pattern of Hellenistic usage before and during the first century, numerous modern scholars have asserted that in Ac. 1:1 Luke is referring to "the first book" (or, "the former book") of his supposedly two-volume work, as though it were

well-established that the word λόγος was commonly used in the first century to mean "book," but was never used to mean "treatise" or "(complete) narrative."<sup>44</sup> However, a demonstration that it could have carried the former meaning would not prove that it has that meaning in Ac. 1:1, since the latter meaning was also current. If both meanings were current, its use in Ac. 1:1 would not disclose the relationship between Luke and Acts.

The evidence that has been brought forward to show that λόγος was used in the first century to designate an individual book in a multi-volume work is far from convincing. Lake and Cadbury tell us that "λόγος was a customary name for a division of a work which covered more than one roll of papyrus" ("though," they concede, "it was sometimes used more loosely"), and in support of this assertion they refer the reader to the "complete statement of the meaning and history of this and other technical words" made by T. Birt.<sup>45</sup>

Turning to Birt, then, we do indeed find this statement (to which Zahn also appeals<sup>46</sup>): "λόγος heisst Buch, und ein grösseres Werk setzt sich aus mehreren λόγοι zusammen."<sup>47</sup> His evidence for this usage, however, is all much later than the time of Luke. He first points to the usage of Photius in the ninth century. Then he observes that in the manuscript tradition--but not in the original works themselves--the individual books of certain classical and Hellenistic writers are sometimes entitled ΛΟΓΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ, etc.<sup>48</sup>

But these titles reflect the usage of much later editors, not the usage of the authors themselves. We have seen that Dioscorides, a younger contemporary of Luke, referred to his books as βιβλία, yet in the later manuscript tradition they are provided with the titles ΛΟΓΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ, etc. (Incidentally, editors commonly enumerated individual books as βιβλία, or simply by number (ἕρ αἴμα), not just

as λόγοι.) Birt completes his evidence: "So kann schon Galen ein siebentes Buch als ἐβδόμεον λόγον citiren."<sup>49</sup> Birt cannot trace this usage back earlier than Galen, as we have been unable to do, and thus his evidence provides no basis for Lake and Cadbury's assertion (which Birt does not make) that λόγος was a "customary" term for a book in the first century. The customary term rather was βιβλίον, as Galen himself indicates, speaking of "whatever work we perform seated, such as writing with the book (τὸ βιβλίον) spread out on our laps."<sup>50</sup>

It is true that the second and successive books (except for the sixth) of Xenophon's Anabasis open with a summary of the previous book, which is termed a λόγος. Some commentators on Acts have cited one or more of these summaries as illustrative of Luke's usage in Ac. 1:1.<sup>51</sup> However, as C. L. Brownson notes (and as other editors recognize), "All these summaries must have been the work of a late editor."<sup>52</sup> Once again we encounter a meaning of λόγος which developed well after the time of Luke.

Bauer, however, cites passages in Herodotus, Plato, and Philo, in which, like Ac. 1:1, the word λόγος allegedly refers to a book in a multi-volume work.<sup>53</sup> The most relevant passage is the one in Philo, for he alone of the three was roughly a contemporary of Luke. Philo begins his essay, Every Good Man Is Free, with these words: "Our former treatise (τὸ μὲν πρότερον λόγος), Theodotus, had for its theme 'every bad man is a slave' . . . The present treatise is closely akin to that, its full brother, indeed, we may say its twin, and in it we shall show that every man of worth is free."<sup>54</sup> Clearly, Philo wrote two essays for Theodotus on complementary themes. But however complementary their subject matter may have been, they were nonetheless written as separate works.<sup>55</sup>

There is no basis for Cadbury's assertion that "Philo's essay . . . refers to a lost preceding volume."<sup>56</sup> Philo refers to a previous essay, not to "Volume One" of the present essay.

No different is the passage in Plato cited by Bauer. In Parmenides Zeno reads the writings (referred to both as τὰ γράμματα and as οἱ λόγοι) which he has just brought to Athens, whereupon Socrates asks "that the first thesis of the first treatise (τοῦ πρώτου λόγου) be read again."<sup>57</sup> Here again we find the word denoting an entire work, not one volume of a multi-volume work.

The passage in Herodotus to which Bauer calls attention is V.36, which locates I.92 ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν λόγων. Godley translates these words as "in the first book of my history," but they would more accurately be translated as "in the first part of my history," since the division of his History into nine books was the work of a later (Hellenistic) editor.<sup>58</sup> But despite Godley's anachronistic translation of ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ, he correctly understands τῶν λόγων as the equivalent of τοῦ λόγου, "my history." So do other translators.<sup>59</sup> There is no evidence that Herodotus divided his work into books (or other formal divisions) which he would have described as a series of λόγοι. Thus, it would be wrong to interpret V.36 as meaning ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ (λόγῳ) τῶν λόγων, "in the first (book) of my books."<sup>60</sup> Such an idea would have been expressed as ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ.<sup>61</sup>

A wider look at the usage of Herodotus confirms that he never used the word λόγος with the meaning of "book, volume." He refers to his entire work as ὁ λόγος in I.5, 95; II.123; IV.30; VI.19 (bis); VII.152, 171, and as οἱ λόγοι in V.36; VII.93. He probably refers to another work of his ("the Assyrian history") in I.106, 184, again using a plural form of λόγος. He also uses the plural

in VI.137, referring to the historical work of Hecataeus. In these passages λόγος in either number means "history," the singular form perhaps emphasizing the unity of the work and the plural form perhaps emphasizing the diversity of its subject matter.<sup>62</sup>

This conclusion is confirmed by Herodotus's use of the word λόγος in both numbers to denote a portion of his work. The difference between the singular and the plural is essentially stylistic: ἐν ἄλλῳ λόγῳ (II.38; VI.39), ἐν ἑτέροισι λόγοισι (I.106), ἐν τοῖσι ὀπίσθε λόγοισι (I.75; V.22; VII.213), ἐν τοῖσι Λιβυκοῖσι λόγοισι (II.161; cf. I.106, 184, which may have a similar usage of λόγος).<sup>63</sup> With the exception of II.161, where a distinct section (i.e. IV.145-205) is specified by the subject matter with which it deals, these references are quite vague, and cannot reasonably be understood as specifying well delineated sections of material, let alone a particular "book."<sup>64</sup> And where the plural is employed (as in II.161), individual λόγοι cannot possibly be distinguished.<sup>65</sup>

We may summarize the usage of Herodotus, then, by saying that he uses the word λόγος in both the singular and the plural to refer either to an entire work or to a portion of a work (usually vaguely defined). When he uses the plural form, he does not imply that individual λόγοι can be distinguished. Neither in V.36 nor in any other passage does he indicate that either his (posthumously divided!) or anyone else's multi-volume work consists of books called λόγοι.

Thus, the evidence of Herodotus, Plato, and Philo illustrates the fact that before and during the time of Luke the word λόγος was used to designate a complete work, but not a book in a multi-volume work. We must conclude, therefore, that when Luke refers to his gospel as a λόγος in Ac. 1:1, he is implying that it is a complete

work, not one volume of "Luke-Acts."

This conclusion is not undermined by the fact that Luke refers to his gospel as his "first" work. Zahn insists that "independent writings could not be enumerated and called 'the first book' and the 'second book',"<sup>66</sup> but we have already seen that Philo does just that. Just as Philo wrote two complementary, yet distinct essays for Theodotus, so Luke wrote two complementary, yet distinct narratives for Theophilus. Luke's narratives are not enumerated as the formal divisions of a literary whole, but rather as individual works addressed to Theophilus.

In addition to the manner in which Luke refers to his gospel in Ac. 1:1, there is further evidence which indicates that Luke and Acts are separate works. First of all, Luke relates Jesus' final words to his disciples, the Ascension, and the disciples' return to Jerusalem, both at the close of his gospel (Lk. 24:44-53) and at the beginning of Acts (1:4-14). If Luke had begun Acts merely by summarizing the contents of his gospel (as he does in Ac. 1:1) or of its final chapter (as he does in Ac. 1:2-3) before proceeding with the narrative, one could plausibly argue that Luke and Acts form one continuous narrative. But this repetition of material suggests that the reader of the first chapter of Acts was not expected to have just read the last chapter of Luke. Furthermore, there are significant differences between Lk. 24 and Ac. 1, both in content and in emphasis. Both the repetition of material and the new elements in Acts indicate not only that Acts was written and issued separately from Luke, but also, since Theophilus had previously read Luke, that a certain period of time elapsed between the issuing of the two works.<sup>67</sup> And while Lk. 24:44-53 and Ac. 1:4-14 narrate the same events, they have different emphases appro-

appropriate to the different works in which they are located. In Luke the final words of Jesus primarily interpret his death and resurrection, and thus form an appropriate conclusion to the gospel history. But in Acts Jesus' final words are restricted to his instructions for the future, a matter only briefly touched upon in Luke, and thus we are given an appropriate introduction to the apostolic history.

It is also significant that in writing Acts Luke did not presuppose a knowledge of his gospel narrative. Rather, he repeated whatever was directly relevant to his new narrative. We have already seen this in his retelling of Jesus' final words to his disciples, his ascension, and the disciples' return to Jerusalem. Similarly, Luke provides a list of the twelve apostles (minus Judas Iscariot, of course) in Ac. 1:13, which repeats (in a slightly different order) the list provided in Lk. 6:13-16. Such a list is understandable at the beginning of an independent account of the apostolic history, but not if the narrative in Acts is merely a continuation of that in Luke. Luke lists the apostles in Ac. 1:13 on the assumption that the reader would not necessarily know who they were, and this assumption would hardly have been made in the middle of "Luke-Acts."<sup>68</sup> It may also be noted that the explanation given in Ac. 1:5 regarding baptism repeats the information provided in Lk. 3:16. Luke evidently expected his two works to circulate separately.

On the other hand, Maddox calls attention to several connections between Luke and Acts which, in his view, "confirm" their literary unity. But the weakness of his arguments only confirms that Luke and Acts are separate works. He first points to "the fact that the mission of Jesus begins with a scene in which the

rejection of the message of salvation by the Jews and its acceptance by the Gentiles is anticipated, and [that] the mission of Paul ends with a scene in which this is declared to be an established fact (Luke 4:16-30; Acts 28:17-28)," and he judges this to be "a deliberate, structural element."<sup>69</sup> But his interpretation of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth is dubious,<sup>70</sup> and in any case there is no reason why an unfolding theme common to two separate works cannot be anticipated at the start of the first one and expressly declared at the close of the second one.

Maddox also argues that "Luke omits certain details from Mark in his parallel passage in the Gospel, in order then to pick them up in a similar passage in Acts," the one significant example of which is "the transference from Jesus to Stephen of the charge of claiming that Jesus would destroy the Temple (Mark 14:56-59/Acts 6:11-14)."<sup>71</sup> However, since Luke does not include in his gospel any mention of the Sanhedrin's abortive efforts to obtain witnesses against Jesus (Mk. 14:55-61),<sup>72</sup> it can hardly be argued that he has omitted "in his parallel passage" the detail of the accusation regarding the temple. There was probably a connection between the accusation brought against Jesus and the one brought against Stephen, the latter being an extension of the former, but it is wholly improbable that Luke would have deliberately left out the accusation against Jesus merely because he intended to relate a similar one against Stephen. One would think, rather, that he would have deliberately included it in order to provide background for the accusation brought against Stephen.<sup>73</sup> The other examples put forward by Maddox--namely, the omission of any parallel to "putting them all out" (Mk. 5:40) in Lk. 8:51 in order to pick up this detail in Ac. 9:40, and the omission of any parallel to "not

during the feast" (Mk. 14:2) in Lk. 22:2 in order to pick up this detail in Ac. 12:4<sup>74</sup>--cannot be taken seriously.<sup>75</sup>

"Most important of all," Maddox concludes, "is the fact that Luke 24:47-49 explicitly looks forward to Acts and especially to Acts 1-2."<sup>76</sup> However, it only looks forward to the events related in Acts, not to their narration. Luke, by recording these prophetic words of Jesus, hardly obligated himself to narrate the fulfillment of them, let alone in the same work.<sup>77</sup> Maddox objects that for Luke not to have followed with Volume Two would have left his gospel with "something of an anti-climax."<sup>78</sup> However, the other three canonical gospels end with similarly "anti-climactic" (i.e. forward-looking) words of Jesus. This literary anti-climax merely reflects the fact that the gospel history was, apart from Pentecost and the spread of the gospel throughout the world, something of an anti-climax.

We may conclude, then, that Luke and Acts are separate works, and that the preface to Luke pertains only to the gospel history. This is clear from the preface itself and is confirmed by Ac. 1:1 and other considerations. The arguments advanced in favor of the concept of "Luke-Acts" do not stand up to scrutiny.

## THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM IN THE LIGHT OF LUKE'S PREFACE

Now that we have completed our exegetical study of Luke's preface, we are ready to consider what light it may shed on the synoptic problem. We will proceed on the assumption that our exegesis is correct, although other interpretations will be considered to some extent.<sup>1</sup>

Nearly all students of the synoptic problem now accept that there is a direct literary relationship among the synoptic gospels. Nearly everyone also accepts that Luke is secondary. The main question has been whether Matthew or Mark was the original gospel, and thus (on the assumption of literary dependence) the primary source for the other two synoptics.

But when we turn to Luke's preface to find out whether he used Matthew or Mark as his primary source, we find that Luke has no interest in our question. Indeed, he seems oblivious to the major issues and chief results of synoptic research as it pertains to the origin of his gospel. One might have hoped him to say something informative like this: "(1) Since Mark has drawn up a gospel narrative and the author of Q has collected many teachings of Jesus, (2) just as their communities have developed traditions about him to meet the needs of their respective *Sitze im Leben*, (3) I have decided, after diligently gathering much additional material, to insert it and the Q material into the Marcan outline, all in one comprehensive volume, redacting it all in such a way,

most excellent Theophilus, (4) that you may know that Jesus lived in the middle of time." But instead we find only this: "(1) Since many have undertaken to draw up a narrative account of the things that are well-established among us, (2) just as those who from the beginning have been eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed them down to us, (3) I have decided, for my part, having been a follower of them all for a long time, to write an accurate narrative for you, most excellent Theophilus, (4) in order that you may know what is certain with regard to the matters in which you have been instructed."

What is going on here? Did Luke not know about his heavy dependence on Mark and Q (or, perhaps, Matthew)? The question, of course, is absurd. Luke certainly did know what his sources of information were. But the fact remains that he mentions neither Mark, nor Q, nor Matthew, nor any other specific work. He does refer in a general way to previous writers, but without telling us how, or even that, he made use of their writings.

How is Luke's silence on matters of literary criticism to be explained? The easy answer would be that he was not interested in them. However, he does devote his preface to the fundamental concerns of gospel criticism, namely his predecessors in gospel writing (vs. 1), the origin of the gospel tradition (vs. 2), his own acquaintance with that tradition and his intention to put it into literary form (vs. 3), and his specific purpose in writing (vs. 4). Thus we see that Luke is in fact interested in the basic concerns of modern criticism. Yet, as the "modern" rewriting of Luke's preface above is meant to show, the explanations provided by modern scholars bear little resemblance to those provided by Luke. This being so, one can hardly avoid wondering whether scholarship

may have gone astray. It is at least striking that Luke had so much that he could have said, according to modern theories, and yet said so little, if any, of it.

It is perhaps true that nothing in Luke's preface directly contradicts the leading theories of synoptic origins (by which we mean the two-source theory in its many forms, including Streeter's four-document hypothesis, and also the revived Griesbach hypothesis). Whether they are really compatible or not, we are about to consider. But in any event it must be remembered that Luke, according to these theories, borrowed extensively from at least one written source. It is hard to believe that Luke would have discussed the origins of his gospel, and even devoted half of his statement to the undertakings of his predecessors, without so much as acknowledging his profound debt to their writings or even (as was often done in prefaces) mentioning at least his chief predecessor by name. To be sure, we cannot insist on what Luke would or would not have done under various circumstances. At this point, however, we must at least recognize the marked difference between his account of the origin of his gospel and modern reconstructions of that origin.

Now if Luke used one or more written sources to the extent assumed by the leading modern theories, it or they would undoubtedly be mentioned in his preface. It is not plausible that Luke would have described the original transmission of the gospel history (vs. 2), the many efforts which had been made to record it (vs. 1), and his own acquaintance with it (vs. 3), without at least alluding to the sources upon which he relied so heavily for his material. That is, he would not have discussed works with which he had little or nothing to do, while ignoring those which were of

central importance to his own work. And he would not have discussed his acquiring of information without indicating whence he acquired it. Thus, Luke's significant written sources must be found in his preface, if in fact he made use of any.

Furthermore, if any written source is to be found in Luke's preface, it must be found in vs. 1 among the narrative accounts written by his predecessors. The handing down of the gospel traditions mentioned in vs. 2 was done orally, as we have seen,<sup>2</sup> and thus no written source is to be found there.

Turning then to the narrative accounts mentioned in vs. 1, let us consider whether the written sources often thought to have been used by Luke fit the description given in that verse (along with vs. 2). Mark and Matthew certainly do fit the description. Each is a "narrative account"<sup>3</sup> and each narrates "the things that are well-established among us" (or, for that matter, "the things accomplished/completed/fulfilled among us," as others would understand Luke's words), i.e. the gospel history as a whole.<sup>4</sup> Each, furthermore, is easily explained as an attempt to record the gospel traditions "just as" they had originally and authoritatively been handed down to the church.

We can go further, and say that if either Mark or Matthew had been known to Luke, it would have been included among the narratives to which he refers. The word "many" in vs. 1 is so broad and indefinite that it must have been intended to include every work fitting the description given. If only some of the works fitting that description had been in view, Luke would presumably have designated their authors more specifically. However, since the "many" are distinguished from the "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (i.e. the apostles), one could understand vs. 2 as limiting

the scope of the word "many" to non-apostolic writers, thus leaving open the possibility that an apostle (i.e. Matthew) may have, to Luke's knowledge, written a gospel narrative.<sup>5</sup> But in that case an apostolic narrative would be excluded from the purview of Luke's preface altogether, and Luke could hardly have ignored a work of such authority, given his concern for eyewitness testimony (vs. 2), the establishment of the gospel traditions (vs. 1), and certainty (vs. 4). Therefore, it is probable that Luke did not know of any narrative written by an apostle.<sup>6</sup> Thus, if either Mark or (a necessarily non-apostolic) Matthew was known to Luke, it was one of the narratives mentioned by him.<sup>7</sup>

It is more difficult to determine whether the "Q" hypothesized by most advocates of Marcan priority fits Luke's description in vs. 1, since its contents are disputed. It is generally considered to have been basically a collection of sayings material, with relatively little narrative material in it, and probably no overall narrative structure. If so, it is doubtful whether the category of "narrative account" could be reasonably stretched to include such a work.<sup>8</sup> However, some would assign to Q more narrative material than that common to Matthew and Luke but absent from Mark, and some would even give it a passion narrative. Such a Q could be called a "narrative account," if it had an overall narrative structure, but such an enlarged Q is not too often defended. And even then it would be doubtful whether Q would have been sufficiently comprehensive to be said to have recorded "the things that are well-established among us." Since these words describe the gospel history as a whole, it is hard to see how a collection of material omitting most of the Marcan material, which surely represents most of the core of the gospel tradition, could be so described. This

would especially be true if the extent of Q is limited, as it usually is, largely to the non-Marcan material common to Matthew and Luke. We must therefore conclude that the hypothesized Q, especially as ordinarily reconstructed, was neither "a narrative account" nor a record of "the things that are well-established among us," and thus is not in view in vs. 1. (If, however, Q is thought of as part of the oral apostolic tradition, it could be brought within the scope of vs. 2.) Since there is no room in Luke's preface for a written Q, that hypothesized document could not have been a basic source used by him.

Various special sources have occasionally been put forward for Luke--e.g., an "L" or "Sondergut" incorporating most of Luke's special material, an infancy narrative, and a passion narrative. Some of these are indeed narrative in character. However, none is at all comprehensive enough to qualify as a record of "the things that are well-established among us." Since only a fairly comprehensive narrative account of the gospel history can satisfy the description of vs. 1, we can only accept Mark and Matthew, out of all the written sources frequently considered to have been used by Luke, as matching that description.

Most scholars have been content to assume that the narrative accounts described by Luke include (or even consist of<sup>9</sup>) his written sources, without giving careful consideration to the suitability of that description. Generally speaking, commentators simply read their view of synoptic origins into Lk. 1:1 and leave it at that. Accordingly, most have seen a reference to Mark<sup>10</sup> and Q (in one or more collections),<sup>11</sup> and even Luke's special source (in one or more collections),<sup>12</sup> while some have seen a reference to both Mark and Matthew<sup>13</sup> or (especially on the Griesbach hypothesis)

only Matthew.<sup>14</sup> Other sources have also been suggested.<sup>15</sup> These writers usually appeal to the results of source criticism, or simply assume those results, when they identify these works in Luke's preface.<sup>16</sup> While those who argue that Luke is referring only to lost writings generally support their claim with exegetical arguments (of varying merit),<sup>17</sup> those who see a specific reference to one or more extant or reconstructed works rarely offer any exegetical argument. There is, indeed, no reasonable exegetical argument that can be made, for Luke's description of his predecessors' narratives is not so specific as to point to any particular work(s).<sup>18</sup> On the basis of our exegesis, however, it is clear that only Mark, Matthew, or a comparable work, but not Q, L, or any other incomprehensive source, could be in view.

Mark and/or Matthew may, as comprehensive gospel narratives, have been among the works to which Luke refers in his preface. But were they? They would have been, if they were already written. However, there are good reasons for dating both of them after the early date that we have established for Luke.<sup>19</sup> But in view of the problematics involved with dating the gospels, and in view of our determination to follow the logic of Luke's preface without trying to accommodate the results of other avenues of research, we will grant for the sake of argument that Luke may have known Mark and/or Matthew, and thus may have included them among the narrative accounts of his predecessors.<sup>20</sup> The question then arises, what use did Luke, according to his preface, make of these works?

In answering this question, we must first observe that Luke treats all the narrative accounts of his predecessors alike. He does not differentiate among them in any way. Rather, he groups his predecessors together as "many," and treats their narratives as

the general literary background to his own work. For the purposes of his preface, all of these narratives have the same relationship to his own work.

Now according to the generally accepted theories of synoptic origins, Luke made very substantial use of Mark or Matthew, but only negligible, if any, use of any other comprehensive gospel narrative. But if this was so, it is difficult to understand why he would have given them all the same status as his literary antecedents. After all, he is describing the history of the gospel tradition and the recording of it as these things relate to his own narrative, and not simply surveying the relevant literature for its own sake.<sup>21</sup> It is not inconceivable that he would have had nothing more to say about a work upon which he was heavily dependent than about those of which he made little or no use, but it is certainly extraordinary that he lumps them all together as he does.

It seems to this writer, endeavoring simply to look at Luke's preface as it stands, free from all theories of synoptic origins, that the most reasonable explanation for the fact that Luke related each of the works of his many predecessors to his own gospel in the same way is, quite simply, that they all had the same literary relationship to it. If so, Luke did not rely on one or two and ignore the others. Rather, he either used all these narratives as sources, without one overshadowing the others, or he used none of them.

This brings us, then, to the next, and decisive question: what was Luke's relationship to the narratives of his predecessors, and, in particular, did he use them as his sources? Unfortunately, he neither explicitly affirms nor explicitly denies that he used them as sources. Consequently, we must look carefully at his

statement in order to determine what his relationship to them was.

Since Luke refers to the writings of his predecessors, he at least knew of their existence. It is generally taken for granted that he had read them or had access to them,<sup>22</sup> and thus could have used them as sources if he had wanted to do so. It is doubtful, however, whether Luke--unless we grant him a photographic memory--could have used as a source a work which he had only read a number of years previously. To speak meaningfully of sources, especially where (as synoptic theories require) the extensive borrowing of words is concerned, one must assume that the writings in question were open before Luke as he was writing. But since the many narratives to which Luke refers were probably written in various parts of the Christian world for local use, it is doubtful that they would have already been collected in one place for his use. Luke could have traveled widely in order to consult and take notes from these various works. However, there is no indication in his preface that he conducted such research for the purpose of writing a gospel, even if one (erroneously) understands Lk. 1:3 as referring to the investigation of the gospel history.<sup>23</sup> Thus, it is by no means self-evident that Luke would have had even most of the narratives mentioned in vs. 1 at his fingertips (even in the form of notes) when he sat down to write his gospel. Yet that would seem to be required if we are correct in inferring that these narratives all had the same relationship to Luke's gospel--unless, of course, they were not his sources of information. Let us suppose, however, that somehow Luke had access to these works when he wrote his gospel.

If we grant that Luke had specific knowledge of the contents of these works, it would seem reasonable that he would have made use

of that knowledge. It is only natural to assume that he would have made use of all available information, and would have incorporated in his gospel anything from these sources that seemed suitable and reliable,<sup>24</sup> even if only a little,<sup>25</sup> and even if the sources were in some respect defective.<sup>26</sup> That knowledge implies use is indeed generally assumed.<sup>27</sup>

But there is a hidden assumption in this argument from knowledge to use, which is that Luke, when he set about to write his gospel, had a need for the information contained in the narratives of his predecessors. The idea seems to be that written sources would have been indispensable to Luke as he recorded the gospel history.<sup>28</sup> But if Luke already had a thorough knowledge of the gospel traditions, he would have had little use for works purporting to record them,<sup>29</sup> especially if he knew them to be deficient.<sup>30</sup> Luke may well have had better sources of information than the narratives mentioned in vs. 1.<sup>31</sup> He observes that those writings were secondary to the apostolic tradition, and so if he himself had direct access to that tradition, he would have had little or no use for them.<sup>32</sup> The question therefore is, what did Luke already know?

Here a definite answer is at hand. Luke says in vs. 3 that when he decided to write his gospel he had "been a follower of them all"--i.e. of the apostles just mentioned in vs. 2--"for a long time." As their immediate disciple over a period of years he would have gained a good knowledge of the very traditions that his many predecessors had tried to get back to. Luke is perhaps too modest to assert outright that he has an expert, and indeed superior knowledge of the gospel traditions. But that is clearly what he implies. Admittedly, our interpretation of vs. 3 has not been in

vogue among modern commentators. But if it is correct, then we must accept that Luke had a thorough knowledge of the gospel traditions obtained directly from the apostles themselves. This conclusion, indeed, we have found confirmed by the apostle John (especially through Papias and Clement of Alexandria) and probably by the apostle Paul, as well.<sup>33</sup> With such expert knowledge, Luke would have had little need to turn to secondary sources for information. Therefore, we cannot infer from Luke's acquaintance with the narratives of his predecessors that he used them as sources to any significant extent.

This conclusion is not dependent upon our adoption of what we have called the ancient interpretation of vs. 3.<sup>34</sup> On the Latin interpretation of it, namely that Luke gained an understanding of the entire course of the gospel history as it was taught by the apostles,<sup>35</sup> Luke's knowledge of the original gospel traditions is equally asserted. Whether he is saying that he followed the apostles or followed their teaching, he is claiming a thorough knowledge of the gospel history.<sup>36</sup> Even on the modern interpretation, that Luke investigated the gospel history carefully from its beginning,<sup>37</sup> it would not necessarily follow that his investigation took him to written narratives to any great extent,<sup>38</sup> for he could have investigated the facts, at least for the most part, by speaking with eyewitnesses.<sup>39</sup> According to one advocate of the modern interpretation, Luke "had the fullest firsthand information with which to begin and was thus bound to follow no other writer. While he certainly knew what the 'many' (1:1) had written he did not depend on any of these documents (not even on Matthew's and Mark's) but altogether on the testimony of the eyewitnesses."<sup>40</sup> Many other advocates of the modern interpretation have acknowledged that

Luke's investigations took him to oral sources, as well as to written ones,<sup>41</sup> even predominantly to oral sources.<sup>42</sup> It must be remembered, finally, that the investigation to which Luke refers on this interpretation took place before he decided to write his gospel, and thus does not refer to the use of sources in the writing of it.

It is sometimes argued that Luke could not have had any direct contact with the apostles because he presents himself as a Christian of the third generation (or, of the third stage of the tradition). According to this view, the "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" belonged to the first (i.e. apostolic) generation, which developed the oral gospel tradition, the "many" belonged to the second generation, which put the gospel tradition into its earliest written form, and then Luke belonged to the third generation of the church, which expanded the earlier literature into more elaborate written gospels.<sup>43</sup> This view would seem to be a refinement of the position that Luke puts himself, along with his predecessors, in the second generation, subsequent to the apostolic generation.<sup>44</sup> Those dating Luke closer to the fall of Jerusalem tend to see two generations in Luke's preface; those dating it more towards the end of the century (or even into the second century) tend to see three generations.

These conceptualizations may fit in nicely with modern reconstructions of the development of the synoptic tradition, but they have no basis in Luke's preface. If, as Luke says in vs. 3, he was a follower of the apostles "for a long time" prior to writing his gospel, then he obviously belonged to the apostolic generation.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, the words "from the beginning" in vs. 2 also imply that the apostles were still flourishing when Luke wrote his pref-

ace.<sup>46</sup> He was a contemporary of the apostles for many years, both before and (if our dating of his gospel in the fifties is correct) after his preface was penned. The "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" are distinguished from "us" (including both the "many" and Luke) not by age, but by function.<sup>47</sup> That is, the former taught and the latter learned. Time did elapse between the first oral proclamation of the gospel traditions and their recording by Luke's predecessors, and between their writing and Luke's, but his preface shows that all this took place during the apostolic period. There is, as van Unnik observes, a "curious twist in the reasoning" when "these phases become equivalent with periods," and "we are given to understand that they span many years."<sup>48</sup>

It could perhaps be argued that even though Luke may have had considerable knowledge of the gospel traditions, he still would have drawn his material from the narratives of his predecessors because of his great respect for them as deposits of apostolic tradition.<sup>49</sup> But Luke's supposedly high opinion of these narratives is inferred from a misinterpretation of the expression "just as" in vs. 2, which, as we have seen,<sup>50</sup> refers to what their authors "have undertaken to draw up," not to what they necessarily succeeded in drawing up.

We must conclude that Luke's preface provides no basis for thinking that the narrative accounts of his predecessors were used by him as sources. This does not mean, of course, that he did not so use them. It may be that he did use them, but for some reason did not intimate that he did (or was about to) do so. Perhaps his preface simply does not indicate whether he did or not.<sup>51</sup> Before we reach such an inconclusive result, however, let us consider whether there are any indications in the preface that he did not

use the narratives of his predecessors as sources.

Let us consider, first of all, the fact that Luke neither explicitly affirms nor explicitly denies using written sources. We would submit that if the narratives of his predecessors were his sources, it is highly unlikely that he would have mentioned and described them without acknowledging his use of them. He certainly had nothing to hide, for, as we are often reminded, what we would today condemn as plagiarism was not looked upon in the same way in the ancient world, where borrowing often amounted to preservation. The point is not simply that Luke does not address the issue of sources. That would not mean much, one way or the other. Rather, the point is that in discussing his sources--if they were his sources--he would naturally have acknowledged them as such.<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, if Luke had not used (or was not going to use) any written sources (at least to any appreciable extent), he would not have had any reason to deny using them. Consequently, we may reasonably infer from his failure to mention any use of the gospel narratives discussed by him, that his gospel was not written in dependence on them.<sup>53</sup>

This argument would be undercut if Cadbury were correct in asserting that "if we may judge from other prefaces to allude to predecessors whom one followed without stating that one followed them was not unusual in antiquity."<sup>54</sup> Unfortunately, Cadbury does not provide any examples of this allegedly "not unusual" practice. This is perhaps not surprising, as examples are hard to come by. Certainly the customary practice when mentioning one's sources was to acknowledge them as such.<sup>55</sup> When earlier writers are mentioned, but not acknowledged as sources, the reason ordinarily is that they were not used as sources.<sup>56</sup>

It is true that Polybius mentions "several modern writers" whose works he used, without acknowledging that use in his preface.<sup>57</sup> However, they are mentioned only as those who "deal with particular wars and certain matters connected with them," a practice that he finds deficient and which is to be contrasted with his own more comprehensive approach.<sup>58</sup> If Polybius, like Luke, had presented their works as the literary background against which his own work was to be understood, then an acknowledgement of his use of them would have been expected. But in this context an acknowledgement would have been out of place. Furthermore, these writers provided only a small portion of his material, and in the body of his work he does both acknowledge his use of them and interact with them.<sup>59</sup> Such, in fact, was the common practice of Hellenistic historians, one conspicuously absent from Luke's narrative.

We should consider, in the second place, Luke's opinion of the value of his predecessors' narratives. He obviously thought that they were deficient in some respect, and that he could improve upon them, or else he would have had no reason to write yet another narrative account of the life and teachings of Jesus.<sup>60</sup> However, he may have considered them unsatisfactory only for his specific purpose, e.g., because they were incomplete,<sup>61</sup> in which case they could have been quite suitable for use as source material. Thus, we must look for specific criticism, if any, in the preface. We have already seen that Luke's use of the verb ἐπιχρῆσθαι in vs. 1 probably does not, by itself, imply any criticism of his predecessors.<sup>62</sup> Most scholars, however, have seen in Luke's self-description in vs. 3 an implied criticism of them, or at least an intimation that he intends to surpass them in certain particulars,<sup>63</sup> although a few have denied this.<sup>64</sup>

Those who have discerned criticism of Luke's predecessors in vs. 3 have nearly all done so on the basis of faulty interpretations of it, especially the modern interpretation of its participial phrase, and thus their inferences are certainly open to question. It has been suggested that the words ἀνωθεν πᾶσιν (or either one of them), mistakenly understood as "everything from the beginning," imply that Luke intended his gospel to be more comprehensive than the narratives of his predecessors, in particular pushing the account back to the events surrounding the birth of Jesus.<sup>65</sup> It has also been argued that ἀκριβῶς, mistakenly understood as "carefully" and as referring to Luke's care in conducting research, implies that he intended his gospel to be the product of greater care than those of his predecessors, and thus more accurate.<sup>66</sup> It has even been supposed that παρεκολουθηκότι implies that Luke conducted research where his predecessors did not.<sup>67</sup> However, all these words, on the modern interpretation, refer to Luke's investigations conducted before he decided to write, and thus not to his gospel and the producing of it. Furthermore, it is by no means clear that these words describing Luke's qualification for writing would necessarily deny such qualification to his predecessors. And, in any case, the modern interpretation is wrong.

It has similarly been suggested that Luke, in proposing to write "in order" (of whatever sort), implies that his predecessors have not sufficiently done so.<sup>68</sup> But once again, an author's characterization of his own work does not necessarily deny that characterization to the works of others. And, in any case, we have shown that καθ' ἑξῆς refers to the narrative character of Luke's writing,<sup>69</sup> which is precisely the character of his predecessors' works.

If any criticism of Luke's predecessors is to be found, it must be found in the structure of his argument, not merely in the details of his self-description. And, of course, we must begin with the correct interpretation of vs. 3. The question to be answered is whether the quality of his predecessors' narratives was sufficient, in his view, to allow him (if he so desired) to use them as sources of information. But in order to determine what he might have drawn upon, we must first consider what he was trying to accomplish.

Luke intended to write, as he says, "an accurate narrative" for Theophilus (vs. 3), so that he would know "what is certain" about the life and teachings of Jesus (vs. 4). This concern for accuracy and certainty controls the overall argument of his preface,<sup>70</sup> and therefore must have been uppermost in his thinking as he wrote. In view of this overriding concern, we may be sure that he would not have incorporated in his gospel any material whose accuracy he was unsure about. If he was not satisfied with the accuracy of a certain writer, he would not have used his inaccurate accounts as source material. Admittedly, one might find, in a generally inaccurate narrative, some material which struck one as accurate, and thus worthy of use. But the wholesale incorporation of material from sources (even with redaction), as posited by the leading theories of synoptic origins, would be out of the question unless those works were first accepted as fundamentally sound.

It is therefore highly significant that Luke regarded the narrative accounts of his predecessors as inadequate. To be sure, he does not disparage his predecessors, as many ancient writers do.<sup>71</sup> But in saying that they "have undertaken to draw up" a gospel narrative "just as" the gospel history had originally been

handed down, rather than that they "have drawn up" such a narrative, Luke implies that they have fallen short of the desired standard of accuracy.<sup>72</sup> And since their narratives left Luke with the responsibility "to write an accurate narrative"--precisely what they had undertaken to do--he clearly considered them to have fallen short of their goal. In a word, their works were inaccurate.<sup>73</sup> It was left to him to tell Theophilus what the existing literature could not tell him, namely "what is certain" about the ministry of Jesus.<sup>74</sup>

We have argued that Luke would not have made substantial use of his predecessors' accounts if he had considered them inaccurate, and that he did consider them to be inaccurate. It follows, then, that Luke did not use them, at least to any significant extent, as sources.<sup>75</sup> The gospels of Mark and/or Matthew, if known to him, would have been included among the narratives of his predecessors, and therefore neither one was a basic source of material for him.

It would be useless to argue that Luke could have undertaken to produce an accurate narrative out of inaccurate material simply by correcting the inaccuracies of his sources as he went along. Such a procedure, though not inconceivable,<sup>76</sup> is wholly implausible. Luke would have to have had a detailed knowledge of the gospel history that was independent of these written sources in order to follow them wherever they were correct and change them wherever they were incorrect. But anyone with such knowledge would not have had any need to follow such (or any other) written sources in the first place. With a thorough knowledge of the gospel history in his head, all he would have had to do was to write down what he knew.

Furthermore, a comparison of Luke's gospel with the parallel

material of Mark (or Matthew), on the assumption of literary dependence, does not give one the impression that Luke has reworked an inaccurate text in order to produce a more accurate one. The discrepancies between Luke and Mark (or Matthew) in parallel material are relatively minor, and few of them can be very convincingly explained as deliberate corrections of error. As W. E. Bundy points out, when Luke takes material from Mark or his other presumed sources, "he seems to do so with complete credulity."<sup>77</sup> Luke's adding, omitting, and rewriting can easily be explained as the adding of new information, the omitting of unimportant details, and the reexpressing of awkward or obscure passages. On the whole, then, Luke would seem to have regarded his basic source, be that Mark or Matthew, as highly accurate, reliable, and authoritative. But that is not at all how he regarded the works of his predecessors. So once again we are pointed to the conclusion that neither Mark nor Matthew was a basic source for Luke.

We come, then, to the third and final consideration. We have already argued that Luke's failure to acknowledge any use of the writings of his predecessors reflects the fact that he did not use them as sources. We have also argued that Luke, in undertaking to write an accurate gospel account, would not have based his account on the inaccurate texts of his predecessors. But Luke must have obtained his material from somewhere. And that brings us to our third point, which is that Luke, by his own account, learned the gospel history directly from the apostles, and in his gospel recorded what he had learned from them. Since the oral accounts of the apostles were his sources of information, it follows that the writings of his predecessors were not his sources (at least to any significant extent).

This third point, of course, presupposes that we have correctly interpreted vs. 3 as "I have decided, for my part, having been a follower of them all (i.e. the apostles) for a long time, to write an accurate narrative for you, most excellent Theophilus."<sup>78</sup> The words "having been a follower of them all for a long time" express Luke's qualification for writing. Because he has been a follower, or disciple, of the whole apostolic band for a long time, he is now in a position to record the gospel traditions accurately. He is not simply claiming the authority that might devolve upon one with apostolic connections, but rather is claiming a thorough knowledge of the apostolic tradition. The point of the adverbial expression "for a long time" is that for many years he has been learning from the apostles, so that now he has a thorough and mature knowledge of the gospel traditions. With that knowledge he will be able to write an accurate account of the gospel history.<sup>79</sup> Indeed, with that expert knowledge he feels a responsibility to write.

Admittedly, Luke does not explicitly say that his gospel will be a record of the gospel history as he has learned it from the apostles themselves. But that is certainly the natural implication of his words. Luke's knowledge of the gospel history has come from the apostles. It would only have been natural for him to draw upon that knowledge when writing a gospel narrative.<sup>80</sup> Some use of written sources is not strictly excluded by vs. 3, but since it is Luke's direct knowledge of the apostolic testimony--and not, except negatively, his knowledge of inaccurate gospel narratives--that impels him to take up the pen, we must infer that it is his own knowledge that he intends to record. One could perhaps argue that the works of his predecessors must have affected his understanding of the gospel history, or that he may have felt inclined to consult

one or more of these works at some point. Luke does not indicate, however, that their works have contributed anything to his knowledge or that they will contribute anything to his account. All he says about his preparation or qualification for writing is that he has been a follower of the apostles. We must take seriously his claim to have gained a thorough knowledge of their traditions about Jesus. When we do, we can only conclude that Luke's gospel is the product of that knowledge, virtually (if not completely) unaffected by the narratives of his predecessors.

Various lines of evidence, then, converge on this conclusion: Luke recorded the gospel traditions that he had learned directly from the apostles, and wrote independently of Mark, Matthew, Q, or any other possible written source. It may be helpful at this point to outline the argument by which this conclusion has been reached.

1. Preliminary Observation: Luke's preface bears so little resemblance to modern theories of gospel origins, that one must question whether those theories are in fact true.

2. Potential Written Sources in Luke's Preface

2.1. Only comprehensive narratives qualify as potential sources.

2.11. If Luke followed written sources, at least his main ones would be mentioned in his preface (as scholars have generally assumed to be the case).

2.12. These written sources would have to be found among the works mentioned in vs. 1, since vs. 2 refers to the oral transmission of the gospel tradition.

2.13. The works of vs. 1 are described as comprehensive, narrative accounts of the gospel history.

2.14. Mark and Matthew fit this description, and thus would

be in view if known to Luke.

2.15. Works that are not both narrative in character and comprehensive in scope, such as Q, do not fit this description, are therefore not in view in the preface, and therefore could not have been significant sources for Luke.

2.2. The early date of Luke's gospel makes it doubtful that he knew of either Mark's or Matthew's gospel, but we will assume otherwise in order to explore further the possibility of Lucan dependence on Mark or Matthew.

2.3. Luke does not differentiate among his predecessors' narratives, which suggests (contrary to the leading theories of synoptic origins) that they all have the same relationship to his narrative, either as sources or not as sources.

### 3. Luke's Relationship to His Predecessors' Narratives: Arguments for the Use of Them

3.1. It is argued that Luke's knowledge of these works implies his use of them, but:

3.11. It is doubtful that he could have had them all at his fingertips (even in the form of notes) when he wrote, as a source theory (in the light of 2.3, above) would require.

3.12. This argument presupposes that Luke could have used the information contained in them, but, in view of his expert, independent knowledge of the original gospel tradition, this is at least largely untrue.

3.2. It is argued that Luke presents himself as a second- or third-generation Christian, who would have to have relied on written sources, but he actually presents himself as a contemporary of the apostles.

3.3. It is argued that Luke so respected the narratives of

his predecessors that he would have borrowed from them, but this alleged respect is inferred on the basis of faulty exegesis.

#### 4. Luke's Relationship to His Predecessors' Narratives:

##### Arguments for Nonuse

4.1. Luke's failure to acknowledge any use of his predecessors' narratives indicates that he did not use them as sources, especially since it was the usual practice, when referring to sources in one's preface, to acknowledge them as such.

4.2. Since Luke wanted above all to write an accurate narrative, and regarded the narratives of his predecessors as inaccurate, he would not have made much, if any, use of them.

4.3. Luke indicates that his gospel will simply record the gospel traditions that he has learned directly from the apostles, thus implying that written sources do not come into the picture.

We conclude, therefore, that Luke did not, at least to any appreciable extent, use written sources in the composition of his gospel. Rather, he drew his material directly from the oral gospel tradition, which he had learned over the years from the apostles. It would be safe to assume that he had also been imparting that tradition to others for many years, and to some extent had put his personal stamp upon it.

## THE LITERARY PHENOMENA OF THE SYNOPTICS RECONSIDERED

Our conclusion, that Luke recorded the oral apostolic traditions about Jesus without using the gospels of Mark or Matthew, or any other written source (at least to any significant extent), flies in the face of two centuries of synoptic research. If our interpretation of Luke's preface is correct, synoptic studies will have to be fundamentally reoriented. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to show that the synoptic gospels, with all their verbal agreements and disagreements, can be reasonably accounted for on the assumption of Lucan independence, and to point the way forward to a better understanding of the history of the synoptic tradition.

As we turn our attention to the literary data of the synoptics, we must remember that Luke, in his preface, has provided us with a starting point for analysis. If our interpretation of it is correct, then the literary data should not point to a different conclusion. Thus, the question is not whether these data point more probably to Lucan literary independence or dependence. Rather, the question is whether they can be plausibly--even if seemingly improbably--explained in a manner consistent with Luke's claim to literary independence. This claim is not merely a hypothesis to be tested by the literary evidence, but rather a careful statement of historical fact made by the author of one of the synoptics himself. Only if the literary data unequivocally demand Lucan dependence on written sources can Luke's preface, or at least

our interpretation of it, be set aside. Of course, the correct interpretation of the synoptic data ought to commend itself to the impartial investigator, once all the facts are properly taken into account. Hopefully that will prove to be the case with our interpretation.

Luke's literary independence would not, of course, rule out the possibility of literary relationships among the synoptic gospels. Matthew could still be dependent upon Mark, or vice versa. Either or both of them could be dependent upon Luke. However, the hypothetical document "Q" would have to be given up, since the argument for its existence assumes Luke's use of Mark. Only by eliminating the "Marcan" material from Luke and Matthew can the remaining material common to them be plausibly isolated and attributed to a common source.

But if one grants the independence of Luke and the nonexistence of Q, then the theory of synoptic origins that has dominated the field for a century, namely the two-source theory, more or less collapses. All that remains of it is Matthean dependence upon Mark. One would have to say that Mark and Luke drew their common material from oral tradition, and in that case it is hard to see why Matthew could not have drawn his "Marcan" material from the same oral tradition as Mark and Luke. We would be pointed toward that conclusion by the fact that Matthew and Luke would have derived their "Q" material from oral tradition, unless, as few would argue, Matthew derived his from Luke. If Matthew was as well-acquainted with the "Q" tradition as was Luke, then he was probably as well-acquainted with the "Marcan" tradition as were Luke and Mark. If Luke and Mark could have independently reproduced that tradition in such similar fashion, then so could Matthew,

judging by his handling of the "Q" tradition. Thus, under the weight of Lucan independence the two-source theory tends to collapse into an oral theory of synoptic origins.

The other leading theory of synoptic origins, namely the Griesbach hypothesis, holds up somewhat better if Lucan independence be granted. Its main thesis, that Mark is derived from Matthew and Luke, seems, at first, to remain intact. However, Lucan dependence upon Matthew would have to be replaced by Matthean dependence upon Luke. But this is highly implausible, for there is no good reason why Matthew would have omitted most of Luke's central section (9:51-18:14). This material is much better explained as that which Luke has assembled and incorporated into a given framework than as that which Matthew has deliberately omitted from his principal source. If Matthew is accordingly made independent of Luke, there is little reason to deny Mark's literary independence, too. Apart from all this, of course, it is hard to imagine how anyone writing a gospel on the basis of Matthew and Luke would come up with Mark.<sup>1</sup>

Thus we see that Luke's literary independence suggests the literary independence of Matthew and Mark, as well. Accordingly, we will adopt as the working hypothesis of this chapter that all three synoptic gospels were based directly upon the oral gospel tradition. This is more than our interpretation of Luke's preface requires, but Lucan origins can be fully explained only within a comprehensive theory of synoptic origins.

That Matthew and Mark were well-acquainted with the oral tradition underlying the material that they have in common, and thus could have (and naturally would have) drawn that material directly from it, may be inferred from the fact that they both

record Jesus as saying that "wherever the/<sup>t</sup>his gospel is preached in the whole world, what she has done will be told for a memorial to her" (Mt. 26:13; Mk. 14:9). Neither evangelist would have recorded such a statement if he knew the gospel preaching to be otherwise. Evidently, then, both of them were aware of an oral gospel tradition that included an account of the anointing at Bethany, and which was being repeated throughout the church. It is only reasonable to assume that they, as writers of gospels, would have known that oral gospel tradition well. And if they, like Luke, knew the gospel tradition well, it is only reasonable to suppose that they, like Luke, would have recorded what they knew of it, conceivably making some use of written material, but at least basically relying on their own knowledge.

It could be argued to the contrary, following most modern commentators (but not earlier ones), that the injunction "let him who reads understand," which is present in the same context in both Mt. 24:15 and Mk. 13:14, is the appeal of the evangelist to his readers (perhaps originally drawn from an apocalyptic leaflet thought by some to underlie the Olivet discourse). Such an injunction would not, of course, have been part of any oral tradition. Its presence in both Matthew and Mark would therefore point to literary borrowing by one from the other (or both from a common written source), and the borrowing could hardly be confined to this one passage.<sup>2</sup> However, the injunction can also be understood as part of the discourse. That is, Jesus urges the reader of Daniel's prophecies, to which he has just referred, to understand the coming calamities in the light of those previously veiled prophecies. Such advice would be appropriate in the light of Dan. 11:33; 12:4, 8-10. Since a parenthetical appeal to the reader of the gospel

would be inappropriate to the narrative style of Matthew and Mark, and would be without parallel in the entire synoptic tradition, it is better to understand the injunction as part of the discourse.<sup>3</sup>

We will work out our oral theory of synoptic origins in response to the various arguments that have been put forward against the oral theory and in favor of a documentary hypothesis. The chief arguments are based on the extensive similarities existing among the synoptics. We will examine these arguments first, and then consider others that have been advanced. As we do, there will take shape an oral theory that takes account of the literary data.

The first argument based on the similarities of the synoptic gospels is that they contain so much of the same material that literary dependence is indicated. "It is obvious," declares Nickle, "that the first three Gospels tell the same story." Their "common subject matter" is indicated, he says, by the fact that 90% of "the 661 verses in Mark's narrative" are "in the Gospel of Matthew," while 50% of them are "in the Gospel of Luke."<sup>4</sup> E. Lohse similarly declares that "of the 666 [sic] verses contained in Mark, we find more than 600 in Matthew," so that "with minor exceptions Matthew takes over the whole of Mark's material," while Luke takes over 350 verses from Mark.<sup>5</sup> And according to another authority, "Von seinen 661 (ohne 16, 9-20) Versen finden sich der Substanz nach über 600 auch bei Mt und ungefähr 350 auch bei Lk . . ."<sup>6</sup> These statements, which are typical rather than exceptional, derive from Streeter.<sup>7</sup> The figures are impressive, especially for Matthew's reproduction of Mark. Underlying them, however, is a serious misrepresentation that produces a significant inflation of the extent to which Marcan material is present in Matthew and Luke. The data do not represent Mark's paralleled verses, as is claimed,

but rather verses (whether paralleled or not) in paralleled sections of Mark. For example, the feeding of the five thousand is related by Mark in fifteen verses (6:30-44), but Matthew's account (14:13-21, together with 9:36) parallels only eleven of those verses (i.e. not 6:30-31, 37b-38a, 40), and Luke's account (9:10-17) parallels only twelve of them (i.e. not 6:31, 33b-34a, 37b-38a). Yet Streeter and his uncritical followers would have us believe that all fifteen of Mark's verses are taken over by both Matthew and Luke.

The truth is that 79% of Mark's verses (and not 90%) are paralleled (often only partially) in Matthew, and that 62% of them are paralleled in Luke.<sup>8</sup> R. Morgenthaler, counting sentences instead of verses, gives similar figures: for Matthew, 80% (709 out of 885); for Luke, 64% (565 out of 885).<sup>9</sup> But Streeter's distorted data have continued to hold the field. The true figure for Luke is paradoxically higher than that given by Streeter (i.e. 53%, or 350 out of 661 verses) because he minimizes Lucan use of Mark, in furtherance of his Proto-Luke hypothesis.<sup>10</sup> But Nickle, on another occasion apparently following the more common two-source analysis, gives the figure for Lucan use of Mark as almost 70%,<sup>11</sup> which inflates the true figure of 62% about as much as the figure of 90% for Matthew inflates the true figure of 79%.

But even the true figures overstate the "Marcan" element in the other synoptics, because often only part of the substance of a given verse in Mark is to be found in Matthew or Luke. "Substance" is of course difficult to quantify, but we would estimate that about 70-75% of Mark's substance is present in Matthew, and that about 50-55% of it is present in Luke.

And even these figures convey a false impression of the extent

to which the three synoptics "tell the same story." This is so because Matthew and Luke do not always tell the same parts of Mark's story. Only about 52% of Mark's verses (342 out of 661) are paralleled (often only partially) in both Matthew and Luke, and this material accounts for less than 30% of either Matthew's or Luke's total material. Furthermore, Matthew and Luke often (especially in the latter chapters) do not parallel the same portions of Mark's verses. We would estimate that only about 40% of Mark's substance is actually common to all three synoptics. So much, then, for the notion that they "tell the same story"! Especially in Matthew and Luke, but even in Mark, the material paralleled by the other two gospels constitutes a relatively small portion of the whole gospel.

The impression that the synoptics "tell the same story" largely arises--apart from misleading statistics--from the fact that a considerable amount of material is given by two of the gospels, though not by the third. When the verses common to any pair of synoptics are combined with those common to all three, an interlocking pattern, or web of correspondence emerges. That is, 66% of Matthew's verses (700 out of 1068), 90% of Mark's (592 out of 661), and 48% of Luke's (555 out of 1149) are paralleled (at least in part) in one or both of the other gospels. It is this web of corresponding material, and not the material common to all three gospels, that forms "the same story."

But even this material does not constitute a majority of the synoptic material. Indeed, it constitutes only about 43% of the entire recorded synoptic tradition. The material present in only one of the synoptics totals about 1031 verses (of which 775 are in unparalleled sections), while the material present in at least two

of the synoptics (not counted twice or thrice, of course) totals only about 771 verses (including partially paralleled verses).<sup>12</sup> Since most of the synoptic material is present in only one gospel, and that common to all three constitutes only a minority of the material in each gospel, it is woefully inadequate to say that the synoptics "tell the same story." Consequently, the argument for literary dependence based upon this alleged fact is not particularly compelling.

Some who have argued for literary dependence on the basis of the common synoptic material have misunderstood the nature of the oral tradition. P. J. Gloag, for example, declares this: "If the Gospels arose from oral tradition, we should not have expected so great an identity of particulars in a life so full as that of Christ."<sup>13</sup> Gloag seems to think that the oral tradition would have consisted of a vast, amorphous conglomeration of reminiscences of, and stories about, Jesus' every word and deed. However, while there were no doubt many stories about, Lk. 1:1-2 tells us that there was also a definite body of authoritative tradition formulated and handed down by the apostles (vs. 2), and that the reproduction of this tradition (in whole or in part) was generally the object of gospel writers (vs. 1). Given this limited body of authoritative tradition, it is by no means surprising that Matthew, Mark, and Luke have as much material in common as they do.

A. S. Peake finds it "difficult to explain," on the oral theory, why only those incidents were selected for inclusion in the tradition that we find preserved in the synoptics.<sup>14</sup> It would seem to be clear enough, however, that those incidents would have been selected that were considered most important and instructive. The object would not have been to include everything that could possibly

be remembered about Jesus (cf. Jn. 21:25), but to produce a tradition of manageable size. And, of course, some of the apostolic tradition was probably not recorded by any of the synoptists (cf. Ac. 20:35).

The mix of paralleled and unparalleled material in the synoptics is easily explained on an oral theory. Since the apostles to a large extent worked together, especially at Jerusalem, and yet were individually authoritative eyewitnesses and servants of the word, we should expect that the tradition handed down by them would have consisted of a core of basic material, no doubt covering the ministry of Jesus, which would have been common to the group (and thus to the church) as a whole, augmented by independent material associated more with individual apostles (and thus less well known). And since Peter was the leader of, and chief spokesman for, the apostles in the early years of the church, the basic tradition would probably have borne a Petrine stamp. If three writers then undertook independently of one another to record such a body of tradition, one would expect most of the basic tradition to be reproduced twice or thrice, but most of the independent traditions to be reproduced only once or perhaps twice. And this is just what we find in the synoptic gospels: generally speaking, a basic, connected narrative followed by at least two writers at a time, supplemented by unconnected, apparently independent traditions given by one, but sometimes by two writers.<sup>15</sup>

Our figures for the relative amounts of paralleled and unparalleled material are quite compatible with, and indeed provide support for, the independent origin of the synoptic gospels, especially as traditionally understood. Mark has traditionally been understood to have reproduced the Petrine tradition, which, as we

have indicated, would probably have basically corresponded with the core of the apostolic tradition. And we do indeed find that Mark almost entirely confined his gospel to the basic tradition. Matthew has traditionally been identified as the apostle of that name, who would naturally have supplemented the basic tradition in his gospel with additional traditions largely of Jewish-Christian interest. And that is what we find in his gospel, where the basic tradition is faithfully reproduced and is integrated with considerable additional material. The apostolic authorship of the First Gospel is widely repudiated today, but many scholars have admitted at least indirect Matthean (or more broadly apostolic) input into it. Be that as it may, the contents of Matthew, in comparison with the contents of the other synoptics, are quite compatible with an hypothesis connecting it with one of the twelve apostles other than Peter. Luke has traditionally been associated with Paul, who was probably the most independent of the apostles. We have also seen that Luke claims an acquaintance with all the apostles (in Lk. 1:3), and thus with the apostolic tradition in general. We would thus expect his gospel to be the most diverse in its contents. And we do, as about half of his work is devoted to the independent traditions. Thus we see that the proportions of paralleled and unparalleled material in the synoptic gospels are fully compatible with our theory of their independent derivation from the apostolic tradition, especially as traditionally understood.

We have suggested that the basic gospel tradition would have covered the main points of the ministry of Jesus. But F. C. Burkitt tells us that if "mere floating tradition" underlay the synoptic gospels, "I cannot but think that the incidents identi-

cally related by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, would have been to a larger extent the critical points of the Ministry, and not a capricious selection of anecdotes."<sup>16</sup> We would argue that the basic tradition was significantly larger than the so-called "triple tradition" to which Burkitt limits our attention. But even the triple tradition is far more than "a capricious selection of anecdotes," as it includes the ministry of John, the baptism of Jesus, the temptation of Jesus (in part), many incidents and various teachings from Jesus' Galilean ministry, the parable of the sower (among others), the commissioning of the Twelve, the feeding of the five thousand, Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, the Transfiguration, Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, the cleansing of the temple, various incidents in the temple, the Olivet prophecy, the institution of the Lord's Supper, most of the passion narrative, and the women at the empty tomb. These, surely, were "the critical points of the Ministry." And, as we have indicated, we would include in the basic tradition most of the other paralleled material.

Another objection has been raised by Bleek. He asks how an oral tradition could have arisen at Jerusalem which made no mention of Jesus' earlier visits to that city (and which ignored the chronological framework provided by them), as related in John.<sup>17</sup> However, the provenance of the oral tradition would not necessarily have influenced the location of the events related in it. It was formulated largely by Galileans who accompanied Jesus throughout his public ministry, not by local people eager to tell stories about their hometown.

Bleek goes on to argue that three independent evangelists would not have ignored all that Jesus did at Jerusalem prior to his

triumphal entry into it.<sup>18</sup> This is probably true, if any prior visits to that city were recounted in the oral tradition. But we would argue that no such visits were part of the original tradition, at least the basic tradition. The Johannine tradition, in our view, arose basically apart from, and later than, though not in ignorance of, the original apostolic tradition. Its separate character is shown by the fact that it does not contain any material in synoptic form, even when covering events related in the synoptics. This does not deny that there was a "Johannine" input into the original tradition (note especially Mt. 11:27 = Lk. 10:22). But if we begin with Luke's preface, we see that the written synoptic tradition (i.e. Luke's own work, and any other narratives like it) derives from the oral apostolic tradition. The variety and complexity of the written synoptic tradition, furthermore, points to a broad range of underlying oral traditions. It cannot reasonably be denied, therefore, that the synoptic gospels basically cover the full range of the oral tradition. Thus, while the Fourth Gospel may well pick up some details of the original tradition not included in the synoptics, on the whole it would seem that the Johannine tradition was not part of it.

W. Sanday at this point objects that the apostle John surely helped to formulate the oral tradition, in which case the synoptic gospels, if they are truly representative of it, would contain a sizeable Johannine element as we see it in the Fourth Gospel. Sanday therefore infers that the synoptic gospels do not give us "a central tradition at all."<sup>19</sup> But it is by no means clear that the apostle John's input into the oral tradition would have consisted of any material as we find it in the Fourth Gospel. John's Gospel more likely represents a later, more theologically developed

presentation of Jesus than we find in the synoptic tradition. His gospel probably presupposes (and then largely ignores) the synoptic tradition, for he could hardly have been ignorant of it. Finally, the more that one disassociates the Fourth Gospel from the apostle John (as scholars tend to do today), the more this problem recedes.

It must be recognized, furthermore, that the problem posed by the nonsynoptic character of the Fourth Gospel is not peculiar to the oral theory of synoptic origins. The problem also faces the theory of literary dependence. It is hardly adequate for Sanday to explain that the three synoptics present only one individual's account, probably Peter's (through Mark, followed by Matthew and Luke), rather than "a central tradition."<sup>20</sup> Matthew and Luke did not, after all, merely rehash Mark, even according to the two-source theory favored by Sanday. Rather, they must be understood as having combined a wide range of traditions (i.e. the Marcan tradition, one or more Q traditions, and the special traditions). The question would still remain why Matthew and Luke, in augmenting Mark, did not draw upon the Johannine tradition. Nor is it clear why Mark (or Peter) and the author of Q ignored that tradition, too. The only reasonable explanation is that the Johannine material was developed independently of, and later than, the synoptic tradition.

Finally, we may consider Peake's objection to there having been such a "degree of fixity" in the content of the oral tradition. "It scarcely seems probable," he declares, "that a teacher should confine himself strictly to the same cycle of stories."<sup>21</sup> Some versions of the oral theory may posit one fixed cycle of tradition, but ours does not. We have seen that there is more unparalleled material in the synoptics than paralleled material, and

thus that there was more independent tradition in circulation than there was tradition constituting the central "cycle of stories." Teachers of the oral traditions, like the synoptists, were no doubt free to rearrange and combine these traditions. And even the central core of material was evidently open to modification in content, for none of the synoptists adhered rigidly to it in constructing their gospels. We know nothing of the fixity of content against which Peake argues, though of course there must have been a limit to the tradition that was authentically apostolic.

The second major argument against an oral theory is that the common synoptic material is presented in each gospel in much the same relative order, and that this similarity of order would not have resulted had three writers been independently recording the oral tradition.<sup>22</sup> However, those who make this argument tend to exaggerate the extent to which the synoptic gospels agree in the ordering of their common material. Generally speaking, they have in view only the "Marcan" material (though this is often not stated), and thus ignore the material common to Matthew and Luke alone, much of which is arranged differently in the two gospels.

But even the "Marcan" material is not ordered in the same way in the synoptics nearly as much as is often supposed. E. P. Sanders points out that "the statement that both Matthew and Luke generally support Mark's order is a great over-simplification," since Matthew and Luke both follow Mark's order for only 28 out of 61 Marcan pericopes before Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, and for only 30 out of 40 thereafter ("if we overlook the constant rearrangement by Luke of large portions of the material within the Passion narrative pericopes").<sup>23</sup> These figures are somewhat misleading, however, because not all of Mark's pericopes are paral-

leled by both Matthew and Luke. On the other hand, because Mark is divided into only 101 sections, the data are oversimplified in favor of agreement. The present writer would divide Mark into 158 units of material (comprising 84 "pericopes"), the order of which Matthew changes 27 times (out of 144 paralleled units), and Luke 19 times (out of 111 paralleled units). In other words, Matthew and Mark have the same order of common material about 81% of the time, and Mark and Luke about 83% of the time. But only 103 out of Mark's 158 units are paralleled in both Matthew and Luke, and of these 65, or 63% of them, are placed in the same order in all three gospels. Prior to the entry into Jerusalem, all three follow the same order of material in only 27 out of 55 common units (49%), but thereafter in 38 out of 48 common units (79%).

When one considers that only 63% of the units of material common to all three synoptics are presented in the same order, and that at least one third of that is simply natural order (especially in the passion narrative), one sees that the three synoptists disagree in their placement of well over half the material for which there is any scope for alternative arrangement. Thus we see how ill conceived is V. H. Stanton's judgment, which is by no means atypical, that it is "highly improbable" that the sequence of an oral outline could have been retained by three independent writers "so little altered as we see it."<sup>24</sup> So little altered indeed!

On the other hand, a web of correspondence emerges from these data, just as it did from those for the contents of the synoptic gospels. And it is the impression created by this phenomenon that probably underlies most of the exaggerated statements that one finds regarding the similar order of common synoptic material. That is to say, when the material presented in the same order in

any two gospels is added to that having the same order in all three, most of the paralleled synoptic material is embraced. The web of correspondence is clearly seen by comparing the order of common material in each pair of gospels. As we have noted, Matthew and Mark have the same order of common material over 80% of the time, as do Mark and Luke. For Matthew and Luke the figure is about 48%, but it rises to 66% if the material in Lk. 9:51-18:14 is omitted from consideration.<sup>25</sup>

As these figures suggest, the common order of synoptic material is basically that of Mark. When Matthew's order of material diverges from Mark's, Luke's order (where there are parallel units) almost always agrees with Mark's. Similarly, when Luke's order diverges from Mark's, Matthew almost always agrees with Mark. Within units of material Mark sometimes departs from the order followed by Matthew and Luke, but for only one unit of material does Mark depart from the order followed by both Matthew and Luke.<sup>26</sup> It should also be noted that "non-Markan" material in Matthew and Luke is often located in the same place relative to their "Markan" material.<sup>27</sup> Thus, while the web of correspondence approximates Mark, it does not include all of Mark and it extends beyond Mark into Matthew and Luke. This is true with respect to both content and order of material.

The synoptic agreements in order are easily explained on an oral theory. Wherever two or three gospels agree in the ordering of their material, that material was evidently so ordered in the oral tradition. Such material would have belonged to the basic narrative tradition. Since the basic tradition formed a narrative, its contents would naturally have been arranged in a standard order. But this order, though carefully followed by Mark, was not

sacrosanct, since both Matthew and Luke departed from it fairly often when a rearrangement of material would not disrupt the natural sequence of events.

But some have maintained that a long narrative sequence would never have characterized the oral tradition. De Wette points out that in Acts the apostolic preaching contains only brief summaries of the gospel history.<sup>28</sup> However, Luke presents examples only of missionary preaching done outside the church, not of instruction carried out within the church, where the more elaborate gospel tradition was "handed down to us" (Lk. 1:2; see also 1 Cor. 11:23; 2 Thes. 2:15). Some, of course, would say that Luke created the apostolic preaching in Acts, and in any case he surely intended to present no more than a brief summary of the preaching done. We know from Luke's preface that the apostles formulated the original tradition, and there is no reason why they could not or would not have formulated at least its narrative core in a definite order, having either chronological sequence (whether exact or approximate) or topical arrangement, or both, in mind. Since the basic narrative could well have been so ordered, it would be rash to insist that it was not.

Peake admits that a fixed order, if chronological, would be easy to account for in the oral tradition. But, he says, the common synoptic outline "is probably not chronological." He doubts that "an artificial order" would ever have become established.<sup>29</sup> However, the synoptic outline is undeniably chronological in its main features. The rest of it may well have been intended to be arranged chronologically (at least approximately so). The tradition was formulated, after all, by eyewitnesses (Lk. 1:2), who would have had some idea of the actual order of events. (The fact

that explicit indications of chronological sequence are often missing does not necessarily mean that chronological order was being ignored.) Topical or thematic principles of arrangement may also have been at work. Thus, what may seem to be an "artificial" sequence to a modern scholar may have been quite sensible to those who put it together. Peake goes on to say that a teacher would not have repeated his accounts in the same order time after time "unless he was guided to it by some definite principle."<sup>30</sup> But guidance was provided by the authority of apostolic formulation. This guidance, however, was not a matter of constraint, for Matthew, Luke, and presumably other teachers felt free to adapt the outline as their purposes required.

Others have argued that a basic narrative outline, once formulated, could not have been maintained until the synoptists wrote. This is not a problem for Peake, who says that "the difficulty is not that, once the order was fixed, it should be remembered,"<sup>31</sup> but A. H. McNeille thinks that the preservation of the same order of material "in widely different places" in the church "must have been so difficult as to amount to an impossibility."<sup>32</sup> And for D. Guthrie "the real crux seems to be whether an extensive Gospel framework could have been transmitted by oral methods."<sup>33</sup> However, if the verbal details of the individual accounts could be preserved--a matter about to be considered--then surely the order of those accounts could have been preserved. Furthermore, the question is not whether every teacher in every corner of the church could have remembered the original order of material. Rather, the question is whether three gifted experts in that tradition could have done so. It would be rash and presumptive to insist that they could not.

But, it is argued, the common sequence extends even to minor points, to trivial details.<sup>34</sup> However, what a modern scholar might consider "trivial" may not have been considered trivial by those who included it in the basic tradition. It is to be expected that some of the seemingly less important sequences would be retained by all three synoptists, if only by chance, while others would not. Furthermore, the examples of this phenomenon that have been cited hardly support the conclusions drawn from them. E. Hoskyns and N. Davey tell us that the "identity of order" found in sequences like Mk. 10:13-34; Mt. 19:13-20:19; Lk. 18:15-34 "cried out" (in the history of synoptic research) "for some explanation other than that three evangelists wrote three independent narratives."<sup>35</sup> However, the supposedly remarkable sequence to which Hoskyns and Davey draw our attention consists of only three pericopes, the first two of which are thematically related. Furthermore, there is no "identity of order" here, as there are no less than three differences in the placement of this material!<sup>36</sup>

Similarly, although K. Uchida recognizes that much of the synoptic outline would have been fixed at the oral stage, he can see "no intrinsic reason" why all three synoptists should, for example, have "put the Feeding of the Five Thousand after the Death of John the Baptist."<sup>37</sup> However, the account of John's death (Mk. 6:17-29) is clearly told where it is in order to explain Herod's reaction (6:14-16) to the ministry of Jesus' disciples (6:7-13). After that, quite naturally, the disciples return to Jesus (6:30), whereupon they retire to be alone together (6:31-32), only to be pursued by a great crowd (6:33), upon whom Jesus has compassion (6:34-44). This is narrative sequence at its best, and could easily have been settled at the oral stage, even though only Mark

presents the full sequence.<sup>38</sup>

Nickle draws attention to the "similar sentence and word order" of parallel passages.<sup>39</sup> However, the material within an account allows only limited scope for rearrangement without its logical flow being lost. Traditions would have been handed down not only with a certain content, but also with that content arranged in a certain order. Even so, the synoptists sometimes rearranged the material within a pericope. In the account of the feeding of the five thousand, for example, Luke at 9:12 changes the evidently standard order found in Mt. 14:15 and Mk. 6:35-36, and places the information of Mt. 14:21 and Mk. 6:44 at 9:14a rather than after 9:17.

Finally, it has sometimes been alleged that a gospel writer, after interrupting the synoptic outline to record additional material, would have been unable to resume the original narrative sequence as easily as Matthew and Luke were able to, unless they had a written source to follow. In McNeile's words, "It is very improbable that these two writers, in reproducing large quantities of non-Marcian material, would be able so consistently to revert to the original order of sections if their source was only the common oral outlines."<sup>40</sup> However, this supposed difficulty is purely imaginary. First of all, as Guthrie points out, "the dominant sequence might have become deeply imprinted through constant repetition, and have reasserted itself almost subconsciously without the intervention of a written reminder."<sup>41</sup> But, objects Stanton, for a writer "depending upon memory the natural effect of the working of the laws of association would be that when some fresh incident or piece of Teaching was recalled the old order of thought would be more or less extensively disturbed."<sup>42</sup> This objection might carry some

weight if an oral recital of the basic narrative were interrupted. But if Matthew or Luke could not recall where they had left the basic narrative, all they would have had to do was to look back in their manuscript and see where they had left it. Furthermore, Matthew and Luke did not simply reproduce the synoptic outline with various insertions. Rather, they reworked the outline, omitting certain portions and rearranging others in a sophisticated manner. In other words, they knew the synoptic material thoroughly, and could adapt it easily. It is the inability of many modern scholars to appreciate the evangelists' ability to handle the tradition that underlies this and most other objections to the oral theory. If one grants that there could have been three men who had a good grasp of the oral gospel traditions, then the basic arguments against the oral theory collapse.

The third major argument against the oral theory on the grounds of the synoptic similarities is that the verbal agreement characterizing parallel passages is so extensive that it could only have arisen through literary borrowing. The verbal agreements are indeed extensive and often quite remarkable. However, it seems to us that three experts in the relatively fixed oral traditions could have recorded them with all the exact and partial verbal correspondences that we see in the synoptic gospels.

While the fact of extensive verbal correspondence is obvious to anyone who has examined parallel synoptic passages, the extent of this correspondence is difficult to quantify accurately. It is difficult to be sure that a modern critical edition of the gospels does in fact represent the original texts with such exactness that minute verbal similarities and differences can be meaningfully tabulated. Furthermore, it is not always clear whether two similar

passages are in fact parallel (i.e. whether they represent the same tradition). Moreover, it is difficult to know how to treat partial verbal correspondences and differences in word order. Thus, statistics on verbal agreement ought to be taken with a pinch of salt.

Morgenthaler, using the 24th edition of the Nestle-Aland text, counts 18,298 words in Matthew, 11,078 in Mark, and 19,448 in Luke.<sup>43</sup> He calculates that Matthew's 709 "Marcan" sentences consist of 8,555 words, of which 4,230 are identical (in both form and order) to corresponding words in Mark, and that Luke's 565 "Marcan" sentences consist of 6,737 words, of which 2,675 are identical in Mark.<sup>44</sup> He also calculates that the material common to Matthew and Luke alone (i.e. the "Q" tradition) consists of 3,861 words in Matthew and 3,663 in Luke, of which 1,851 are identical in the two gospels.<sup>45</sup> Thus, in parallel sentences 49% of Matthew's words and 40% of Luke's are identical to words in Mark. And for the parallel sentences in material common to Matthew and Luke alone, 48% of Matthew's words and 51% of Luke's are identical to the other's wording. (These figures would be somewhat higher if partial verbal correspondences were also included.) These figures, however, leave unparalleled sentences out of the picture. The total picture is this: 38% of Mark's words (4,230 out of 11,078) appear in Matthew and 24% of them (2,675 out of 11,078) appear in Luke. The words supposedly taken from Mark and Q total only 33% of Matthew's total number of words (6,081 out of 18,298), and only 23% of Luke's (4,526 out of 19,448).<sup>46</sup>

While the percentages of Mark's actual words found in Matthew (38%) and in Luke (24%) are significant, they are far lower than those commonly claimed by those arguing on the basis of them for literary dependence in general and Marcan priority in particular.

Kümmel, for example, claims that, according to Morgenthaler, "Mt has 8,555 of Mk's 11,078 words, while Lk has 6,737."<sup>47</sup> But this misrepresents Morgenthaler's figures for words in parallel sentences (i.e. 8,555 and 6,737) as the figures for parallel words in those sentences (i.e. 4,230 and 2,675), thus inflating the true figure for Matthew by 102% and for Luke by 152%. Kümmel also presents similar data drawn from de Solages: "In sections common to Mt and/or Lk there are 10,650 words of Mark, 8,189 of which are in both Gospels (7,040 in Lk and 7,678 in Mt)."<sup>48</sup> These numbers actually quantify words in parallel material, not parallel words in that material.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, de Solages actually gives the total for paralleled Marcan material as 10,950 words, not 10,650.<sup>50</sup>

Nickle, then, converting Kümmel's figures (from de Solages) into percentages, declares, "In those sections of Matthew which relate the same traditions as in Mark the incidence of the use of the same words is over seventy-three [sic] percent. Luke used about sixty-six percent of Mark's words . . ."<sup>51</sup> But these percentages are nonsensical, for Nickle has taken the number 10,650, which (when properly reported as 10,950) is the total for Marcan material paralleled by either Matthew or Luke, and treated it as the total for both the material shared by Mark and Matthew and that shared by Mark and Luke. And the numbers 7,678 and 7,040, which Nickle has calculated as a percentage of 10,650, actually quantify the Matthean and Lucan representation of the triple tradition, not their representation of Mark.<sup>52</sup> It is through this comedy of errors that Nickle arrives at "probably the most significant criterion for indicating literary dependence," namely the "extensive vocabulary agreement."<sup>53</sup>

Similarly disturbing is the manner in which Streeter, in his

highly influential chapter on "The Fundamental Solution," and recently R. P. Martin, in his New Testament introduction, distort the figures of J. C. Hawkins in their effort to establish Marcan priority. Hawkins originally wrote that where Luke follows Mark in the "Ministry-narrative" (beginning with Mk. 1:14 and extending to the passion narrative), 53% of his words (2,829 out of 5,320 words in 311 verses) "are also found either wholly or in part in Mark," the corresponding figure for Matthew's use of Mark's words in such material being 51% (4,173 out of 8,180 words in 477 verses).<sup>54</sup> These figures are probably accurate enough, though a misleading impression is created by counting partial agreements alongside exact agreements.

Citing Hawkins, Streeter then declares that Matthew compresses "the 600 odd verses taken from Mark," yet nevertheless "employs 51% of the actual words used by Mark." Although he does not say so, Streeter probably means 51% of the words in Mark's 600 verses, not 51% of the words in the entire 661 verses of Mark. A similar limitation can be discerned when he declares that "when following Mark, Luke . . . retains 53% of the actual words of Mark." This presumably means 53% of the words in Mark's 350 verses thought by Streeter to have been used by Luke.<sup>55</sup> However, Streeter has taken Hawkins's percentages for the ministry narrative and applied them to the entire gospel narrative. Furthermore, in speaking of "actual words" he treats partial verbal agreements as if they were exact agreements. Moreover, he presents Hawkins's percentages for the words in Matthew and Luke present in Mark as though they were percentages for the words in (the relatively verbose) Mark present in Matthew and Luke. The net effect of these three misrepresentations is to overstate the use of Marcan words by both Matthew and

Luke. If the figures of 51% and 53% are reduced to 46% and 28%, respectively, to take into account Mark's verses not paralleled in Matthew and Luke, we arrive at numbers still considerably in excess of Morgenthaler's accurate figures for Mark's words found in Matthew and Luke, namely 38% and 24%, respectively. The figure for Luke (i.e. 28%) is less out of line than that for Matthew because Streeter accepts relatively few verses in the Lucan passion narrative as Marcan in origin.

Finally, the superficial impression given by Streeter's manner of expression has been repeated by Martin in less ambiguous terms: "Matthew . . . employs 51% of the actual words of Mark," with "Luke . . . reproducing 50% [sic] of his words."<sup>56</sup> These figures overstate Matthew's use of Marcan words (as calculated by Morgenthaler) by 34% and Luke's use of them by 121%.

In studying gospel origins, it is important to have an accurate knowledge of the data to be interpreted. It is most disturbing, therefore, to see inflated figures for verbal correspondence being bandied about. It is doubly disturbing to see how carelessly these figures have been arrived at. It would appear that many, if not most of those who speak so confidently about the extent of verbal agreement in the synoptics have exaggerated notions of the actual phenomenon. And what is worse, the tendency to overstate the extent of verbal agreement is part of a general pattern of overstating the synoptic correspondences. We have seen how the similarities in content and in order of material are characteristically exaggerated by those arguing for literary dependence, and now we see how the extent of verbal agreement is similarly exaggerated. And it is on the basis of these exaggerations that the oral theory of gospel origins has been cast aside.

The most useful statistics for an objective analysis of the verbal correspondences among the synoptic gospels are those presented by de Solages. His work has tended to be ignored, perhaps because his statistics are complex and difficult to decipher, perhaps because his interpretations of them are simplistic, and perhaps because he seems oblivious to the work of others. Nonetheless, his data are highly valuable, since they are very detailed and (unlike Morgenthaler's) are not limited by the presupposition of a certain theory of gospel origins. According to de Solages, using the text of Lagrange's synopsis, Matthew contains 18,518 words, Mark 11,090 (plus the 172 words of 16:9-20), and Luke 19,587.<sup>57</sup> He counts 1,853 words as occurring in all three gospels in identical form,<sup>58</sup> which amounts to 10% of Matthew's words, 17% of Mark's, and 9% of Luke's.

In the triple tradition de Solages calculates that the material (roughly sentences or clauses) common to Matthew and Mark (whether or not paralleled by Luke) consists of 6,734 words in Matthew and 7,567 in Mark, of which 4,351 are parallel (3,568 being identical and 783 equivalent). The corresponding figures for material common to Mark and Luke are 7,541 words in Mark and 6,405 in Luke, of which 3,535 are parallel (2,817 being identical and 718 equivalent). And for material common to Matthew and Luke he finds 6,331 words in Matthew and 6,094 in Luke, of which 2,925 are parallel (2,268 being identical and 657 equivalent).<sup>59</sup> Thus, where (in the triple tradition) Matthew is parallel to Mark (i.e. makes the same statement), 65% of Matthew's words (4,351 out of 6,734) are present (in whole or in part) in Mark, and where Matthew is parallel to Luke, 46% of Matthew's words (2,925 out of 6,331) are present in Luke. Where Mark is parallel to Matthew, 57% of Mark's

words (4,351 out of 7,567) are present in Matthew, and where Mark is parallel to Luke, 47% of Mark's words (3,535 out of 7,541) are present in Luke. Where Luke is parallel to Matthew, 48% of Luke's words (2,925 out of 6,094) are present in Matthew, and where Luke is parallel to Mark, 55% of Luke's words (3,535 out of 6,405) are present in Mark.

In the double tradition of Matthew and Mark, de Solages calculates that Matthew has 1,858 words and Mark has 2,289 in parallel material (again, narrowly defined as sentences and clauses), of which 1,230 are parallel (i.e. identical or equivalent).<sup>60</sup> In this material, then, 66% of Matthew's words are present (in whole or in part) in Mark, and 54% of Mark's are present in Matthew. In the double tradition of Mark and Luke, Mark has 352 words and Luke has 301, of which 178 are parallel.<sup>61</sup> In this material, then, 51% of Mark's words are present (in whole or in part) in Luke, and 59% of Luke's words are present in Mark. Finally, in the double tradition of Matthew and Luke, Matthew has 4,198 words and Luke has 4,134, of which 2,302 are parallel.<sup>62</sup> In this material, then, 55% of Matthew's words are present in Luke (in whole or in part), and 56% of Luke's are present in Matthew.

The extent of (at least partial) verbal correspondence between Matthew and Mark is nearly the same in the triple and double traditions: for Matthew, 65% and 66%; for Mark, 57% and 54%. The same may be said in the case of Mark and Luke: for Mark, 47% and 51%; for Luke, 55% and 59%. But the extent of verbal correspondence between Matthew and Luke in their double tradition is significantly higher (i.e. nearly 20% higher) than it is in the triple tradition: for Matthew, 46% triple and 55% double; for Luke, 48% and 56%. These figures would suggest that the double traditions of Matthew

and Mark and of Mark and Luke are probably part of the same tradition as the triple tradition, but that the double tradition of Matthew and Luke, at least in part, may not be. At least, another factor is at work in this particular material. It consists predominantly of discourse material, which in the triple tradition also shows a higher degree of verbal agreement than does narrative material.<sup>63</sup> But even if this fact were entirely to explain the differences in the percentages, the question would still remain why this material, unlike the triple and other double traditions, is predominantly discourse in character. This phenomenon will be examined more closely in due course.<sup>64</sup>

The statistics presented by Morgenthaler and de Solages show that both verbal similarity and verbal dissimilarity characterize the synoptic gospels, and that the two phenomena are closely intertwined. The full extent of the dissimilarity is shown by the fact that the words that are identical in all three gospels constitute a mere 6% of the synoptic tradition.<sup>65</sup> If we limit our attention to the triple tradition, we find that about 23% of their wording is the same.<sup>66</sup> And if we limit our attention even further to the clauses repeated (with variation) in all three synoptics, we find that roughly 40% of the wording is the same.<sup>67</sup> The verbal similarity is greater, of course, for any pair of synoptic gospels. As we have seen, for any pair of synoptics, in either the triple or any double tradition, the figures for verbal correspondence (in whole or in part) in parallel statements range between 46% and 66%.

These figures manifest the same web of correspondence observed earlier with respect to both contents and order of material. If any two gospels have more in common than all three (in the triple tradition), then it follows that in making the same statements each

one diverges from the other two on occasion. This is, in fact, a very common phenomenon, though our statistics do not quantify it. When the verbal agreements of any two synoptics are added to the agreements of all three, most of the content of the triple tradition is covered. It is this web of correspondence, which is much more extensive than the verbal agreements of all three synoptics together, and significantly more extensive than the verbal agreement of any two synoptics alone, that gives the impression of overwhelming verbal agreement among the synoptics.

For example, in the account of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mt. 16:13-16 = Mk. 8:27-29 = Lk. 9:18-20) Matthew uses 65 words, Mark 67, and Luke 58. Counting both exact and partial parallels, we find only 29 words shared by all three (21 being exact parallels), but 52 words present in any two or all three gospels. Of these 52 words, 48 are in Matthew, 47 in Mark, and 38 in Luke. Thus, Matthew and Mark share 14 words absent from Luke (7 of which are in Mt. 16:13a = Mk. 8:27a, for which Luke has no parallel statement), Mark and Luke share 4 that are absent from Matthew, and Matthew and Luke share 5 that are absent from Mark. In this particular case the number of words in the web of verbal correspondence (52) is not much higher than the totals for paralleled words in Matthew (48) and Mark (47), but this is largely because Luke has no statements paralleled only by Matthew or Mark. In many other accounts there are such statements, though in the triple tradition as a whole more statements are found only in Matthew and Mark than in either other pair of gospels alone.

A second phenomenon to be observed, in addition to the web of correspondence within which the individual synoptists often go their own way, is the centrality of Mark. This is indicated by the

fact that the words occurring in all three gospels constitute (according to de Solages) 17% of Mark's text, but only 10% of Matthew's and 9% of Luke's. This is, of course, mainly due to the fact that Mark has much less unparalleled material than do the others. But the centrality of Mark also appears in the triple tradition. In this material there are many more agreements (either in statements made or in words used in statements made by all three) between Matthew and Mark against Luke or between Mark and Luke against Matthew than there are between Matthew and Luke against Mark. Many individual accounts form exceptions to this rule (the account of Peter's confession being one), some of which are very striking. But on the whole the rule holds. The web of correspondence in the triple tradition neither fully encompasses Mark nor is limited to Mark, but it more closely approximates Mark than either other gospel.

Finally, it must be borne in mind that the statistics of verbal agreement that we have given are only totals and percentages. Hidden in them is the fact that the extent of verbal agreement between the parallel passages of any two gospels varies considerably from passage to passage. Some parallel passages are practically identical. For example, Matthew (7:3-5) and Luke (6:41-42) relate Jesus' teaching on the speck and the log in almost identical words. They share 58 words (in whole or in part) out of Matthew's 64 and Luke's 69 total words. On the other hand, Matthew (17:20b) and Luke (17:5-6) relate Jesus' teaching on faith being like a mustard seed with relatively few words in common. They share only 8 words (5 of which express the essential simile) out of Matthew's 23 and Luke's 34 words. For most sections of material, though, the extent of verbal agreement is roughly in the middle

between these extremes. But even within a single section the extent of verbal agreement can change dramatically. For example, in the account of the boy with an unclean spirit (Mt. 17:14-18 = Mk. 9:14-27 = Lk. 9:37-43a) there is relatively little verbal agreement apart from one place where it is quite close (i.e. at Mt. 17:16-17 and parallels). Most of the verbal dissimilarity in parallel sections is to be attributed (as here) to differences in content, but even in parallel statements there is sometimes a considerable amount of variation in wording. As a rule, however, the verbal connections between parallel statements are clear enough.

As we might expect (judging by what we have already observed), those arguing for a literary relationship among the synoptics tend to ignore the passages where the verbal agreement is low and concentrate their attention on the ones where it is high. Kümmel, for example, lists a variety of passages of which it can be said (with a fair amount of exaggeration) that "large sections are word for word the same," but he does not draw attention to the opposite phenomenon (or even to the typical case) before inferring that "the Synoptics are in some way literarily dependent on one another."<sup>68</sup> Similarly, Farmer exhibits the high degree of verbal correspondence characterizing certain passages, supposedly "as illustrations of the kind of verbal similarity which exists among these Gospels,"<sup>69</sup> whereas in fact he presents evidence only from material where the verbal correspondence is high.<sup>70</sup> For example, the common element in his one detailed illustration from the triple tradition (viz. Mt. 8:2-4 = Mk. 1:40-45 = Lk. 5:12-16) is in fact considerably greater than the average: for Matthew, 168% greater; for Mark, 52% greater; for Luke, 30% greater (the percentages for Mark and Luke being much lower than the one for Matthew largely because Matthew's

text is considerably shorter).<sup>71</sup> Other examples of this selective portrayal of the evidence could easily be given.<sup>72</sup> Once again we see that a lack of objectivity underlies so much of the argumentation presented on behalf of synoptic literary interconnections, whether that argumentation concerns the content, the order of material, or the verbal correspondences of the gospels.

At this point one might reply that, yes, the argument against the oral theory could have been made more carefully, but that the high degree of verbal correspondence in some passages, whatever it may be in other passages, still demands a theory of literary dependence. As R. H. Fuller comments, one need only write out in parallel columns the account of Jesus' temptation in Mt. 4:1-11 = Mk. 1:12-13 = Lk. 4:1-13 to see "the obvious literary relationship between the first three gospels."<sup>73</sup> We would of course agree that a relationship of some sort is obvious, but we fail to see why it must be a literary one. The easiest explanation for the phenomenon of verbal correspondence, considered by itself, may be that one writer has borrowed from another, or that they have used the same written source(s). However, since we know that an extensive oral gospel tradition was in existence when the synoptics were written, it is quite possible that two or three of the synoptists may have derived their common material directly from that tradition, with a mixture of verbal agreements and disagreements naturally following. With regard to the "longer passages in which many words are identical" Hawkins wisely cautions those who would deem a literary connection to be obvious: "Here especially it should be borne in mind that in the earliest Christian days there was undoubtedly a habit and a power of accurate oral transmission, to which there is no parallel now. We therefore may not say of any closely similar

passages that they cannot be thus accounted for."<sup>74</sup>

The plausibility of the oral theory increases substantially when we look at the entire pattern of verbal agreement and disagreement. No one who has studied this phenomenon thoroughly can have failed to be impressed by its complexity and variability. Verbal agreement is usually intermeshed with verbal disagreement. And the extent of verbal agreement varies remarkably, both from pericope to pericope and from clause to clause. Surely one would have expected a simpler pattern of verbal correspondence if literary borrowing had taken place. What we rather see in the synoptics, we would suggest, are three independent literary expressions of a rich tradition, relatively fixed in some places, but with more variety of content and expression in other places.

The passages where the extent of verbal resemblance is low are particularly difficult to explain on the assumption that one writer is basing his account on that of the other. In such cases one often encounters the explanation that the borrower had access to a divergent oral tradition. Similarly, notable additions or changes in the midst of verbal parallelism are often thought to point to the intrusion of supplementary oral tradition. But is it not strange that, say, Luke had access to so many traditions similar to those that he found in Mark, but did not have access to those followed by Mark? Why would he have known secondary traditions, but not the primary tradition (except as recorded by Mark)? Once we grant that Luke should have known the traditions underlying Mark if he knew any traditions, there is little reason to insist that he must have used Mark.

We cannot agree with those who argue that an oral theory cannot explain the verbal correspondence characterizing so much of

the synoptic tradition.<sup>75</sup> It is argued, first of all, that a verbally fixed tradition would not have arisen in the apostolic church. But Lk. 1:2 says that the apostles, as eyewitnesses and servants of the word, "handed down" the authentic gospel tradition to the church. The verb "handed down" implies the existence of a definite, authoritative body of tradition,<sup>76</sup> which in turn implies both deliberate formulation and controlled transmission. It is of course true, as Gloag puts it, that "even in the description of the same event by eye-witnesses, there is always a variety in the expressions employed,"<sup>77</sup> but Luke does not speak simply of eye-witnesses each telling his own story. Rather, he speaks of the apostles together formulating the gospel tradition. It is impossible to hand down content apart from words expressing it; we may therefore be sure that at least some verbal regularity characterized the original tradition. We would agree with Peake that fixity of form would not have arisen merely "in the course of repetition,"<sup>78</sup> but Luke does not speak of such a process. Rather, he speaks of the deliberate formulation of the original gospel tradition. Order did not arise out of disorder; rather, it was there at the beginning. Luke knew those who had been handing down the authentic tradition, and was himself an expert in that tradition. His testimony about its origin must carry more weight than any amount of modern speculation about what "would" or "could" have happened to produce the gospel tradition.

Luke does not tell us the extent to which the oral traditions were originally fixed in form. Nor does he tell us whether they became more fixed or less fixed as the years passed. Nor does he tell us whether the apostles handed down an oral gospel as such or a more amorphous collection of traditions. The apostles would

probably have been more concerned with content than with exact wording, and so variety of expression would probably have characterized the tradition from the start. The web of correspondence which we have identified indicates that while most of the tradition was somewhat fluid in its expression, certain wording was repeated more often than other. The more common wording may have been the original wording (if there was one), or it may have become such over time. Certain portions of the tradition, notably words spoken (and not just by Jesus), were evidently more settled in their wording than were other portions, presumably because of their importance.<sup>79</sup>

Sanday objects that the synoptic tradition does not look like the product of a committee of apostles, but rather like the product of one individual (especially in comparison with the Fourth Gospel). This is so, he says, because Matthew and Luke basically follow Mark, who gives us Peter's tradition.<sup>80</sup> This greatly oversimplifies the variety and complexity of the synoptic tradition, yet there is a certain individuality at least to much of the basic tradition. It may well be, then, that one apostle, most likely Peter, was primarily responsible for the formulation of it. The early chapters of Acts portray Peter as the leader of, and spokesman for, the twelve apostles. Furthermore, Mark limits himself almost exclusively to the basic tradition, and the ecclesiastical tradition that Mark recorded the Petrine tradition is rather strong. Thus, it would be reasonable to associate the basic tradition particularly with Peter. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the independent traditions were more extensive than the basic tradition, and thus that the other apostles would have had ample scope to make their supplementary contributions. Any attempt to

link particular traditions with particular apostles would be highly conjectural, but at least we can see that Sanday's objection to the oral theory does not really present any difficulty to it.

But, it is said, the gospel traditions, once formulated, would not or could not have been preserved with the fixity of form that we find in the synoptics. This would have required memorization, and surely no one in the church would have resorted to that!<sup>81</sup> But why not? It is hardly sufficient to appeal to a romanticized conception of the apostolic age, as does Holtzmann when he declares memorization to be in conflict with "dem lebendigen Geiste der schöpferischen Epoche."<sup>82</sup> Actually, we would agree with Bleek that there was probably no "preconcerted arrangement . . . mechanically to learn the traditional Gospel by heart, and to repeat it memoriter word for word."<sup>83</sup> We have argued that the wording of the oral gospel traditions always remained more or less fluid, and so there was not a set text to learn by rote. Furthermore, if a fixed tradition had been rigorously taught, the considerable verbal variation in the synoptics would be difficult to explain.<sup>84</sup>

We have argued that in the transmission of the gospel tradition the primary emphasis would have been placed upon content, rather than upon wording. Wording would have naturally been regularized to a certain extent because it cannot be divorced from content. And since the content of the original tradition would seem to have been rather carefully controlled, it is probable that the wording of that tradition was regularized more than one might have expected. And where wording was considered to be particularly important (e.g., in the teachings of Jesus), even more emphasis would have been placed upon exactness of wording. Nonetheless, the patterns of synoptic verbal agreement show that wording was rarely,

if ever, rigidly fixed. Such moderately fluid traditions could not have been mechanically memorized, but they could have been carefully taught and thoroughly learned. It is in this connection, and not with regard to an imagined scheme of rigorous memorization,<sup>85</sup> that one must remember, as Hawkins points out in cautioning against a facile dismissal of the oral theory, "that the memories of teachers and learners were trained and cultivated in Judaea to an extent far beyond anything within our own experience."<sup>86</sup> We need not posit "a definite order of teachers or catechists who made it their business to teach this oral gospel," as Moffatt rightly finds implausible,<sup>87</sup> but we would suggest that the teaching ministry of the church emphasized the gospel tradition, and some people no doubt became experts in it.

S. Davidson objects that Jewish learning procedures are irrelevant, "for the circle of hearers in which the oral gospel is supposed to have been formed was wider, more miscellaneous, less intellectual than the class that treasured up the sayings of the Jewish rabbis."<sup>88</sup> Now it is certainly true that apostolic Christianity was not an elitist movement. We do not know how many early Christians were as "intellectual" as the rabbis and their disciples (but cf. Ac. 6:7), but Luke certainly portrays the leaders of the early church as men of ability, motivation, and spiritual endowment. There were undoubtedly many in the church who were able and eager to learn from the apostles and teach to others the traditions about the one who had transformed their lives. The gospel tradition, after all, was not a vast body of material, like the Jewish oral tradition. We would estimate that the complete basic tradition could easily have been recited in less than two hours. And all the traditions recorded by Luke could have been repeated in

well under three hours.

Some would argue that poetry or teachings could have been preserved through oral transmission, but that prose narrative would probably have been too difficult to retain.<sup>89</sup> But we fail to see why short narrative accounts would be particularly difficult to remember in roughly the same form, and in a certain sequence. Surely narrative, with its story line as an aid to the memory, would be just as easy to retain in a relatively fixed form as would abstract teachings. There is no reason to think that the content, and thus the wording of the gospel narrative would not have been a matter of any concern, even if there was greater concern to retain the words of Jesus in a set form.

But McNeille objects that the retention of the same words "in widely different places" in the church "must have been so difficult as to amount to an impossibility."<sup>90</sup> We would certainly agree that as the church expanded and as time passed, the original form of the synoptic tradition would have become increasingly difficult to retain. Indeed, it was this problem that evidently troubled Theophilus and compelled Luke to write his gospel. We are not pretending for one minute that there were thousands of Christians scattered around the Mediterranean who could have produced a synoptic gospel. Indeed, Luke implies in his preface that many had tried to do just that--i.e. to record the authentic apostolic tradition--but had fallen short of that goal. But we do not see any reason why three men in the church--perhaps an apostle (Matthew) and definitely close followers of apostles (Luke, Mark, and perhaps Matthew)--could not have succeeded in doing so at a time when the gospel tradition was losing its original shape.

The question boils down to this: could there have been three

experts in the apostolic tradition? It would be rash to insist that there could not have been. And if there could have been three such experts, then we cannot agree with Peake that there is a serious difficulty in thinking that the gospel tradition "can have been so faithfully remembered and reproduced by three writers independently."<sup>91</sup>

E. F. Scott finds "the fatal objection" to the oral theory to be that verbal agreement is maintained despite differences in arrangement. "Every one who has tried to commit a speech to memory is well aware that when the sentences get out of place the thread is hopelessly lost." Therefore, the gospel writers, relying only on their memory, would not have been "able to vary the order of their narrative at will."<sup>92</sup> But the gospel tradition was hardly comparable to a speech where "the thread" gets lost if a sentence is misplaced. Rather, it was (in the basic narrative) a series of individual accounts, many of which could be told in a different order without losing anything. Furthermore, the gospel writers had not just tried the day before to memorize their material. They had most likely been hearing, studying, repeating, and applying the tradition for many years before undertaking to put it into written form. Finally, if one of the evangelists had ever lost his way while rearranging his material, he would simply have read back through his manuscript and found his way again.

Many would no doubt agree that three experts could have recorded a relatively fixed oral tradition and preserved much of the wording. But the synoptic verbal agreement is sometimes found in the most minute and seemingly insignificant details, and this is often held to be inexplicable on the oral theory.<sup>93</sup> However, since the oral tradition was very compact, it must be doubted whether

there were many details in it that were considered insignificant. Bleek finds it especially inexplicable that three independent writers would occasionally quote the Old Testament in agreement with each other, yet against both the Hebrew and the Greek texts.<sup>94</sup> But once one recognizes that the synoptists in these instances were simply following the tradition, in which a certain form of quotation had evidently been standardized, their verbal agreement is easily understood. B. Weiss is struck by the verbal agreements in "conjunctions and connecting particles,"<sup>95</sup> but when one considers that there were few options (often only καί and δε), and that the context often favored one or the other, these occasional agreements become much less astonishing. Furthermore, there is no reason why such words would not have been regularized to some extent, especially in clauses otherwise fixed in form. These words may seem intrinsically trifling, but they have their necessary place in the flow of narrative, and thus would have been fixed to some extent.

Burkitt finds it impossible to believe that verbal agreement would have been secured in the oral tradition on various "matters of secondary detail," such as the distinction between the baskets (κόφιναι) used at the feeding of the five thousand and the creels (σπυρίδες) used at the feeding of the four thousand, but not in such crucial matters as "the story of the resurrection, the words from the cross, the narrative of the Last Supper."<sup>96</sup> However, it is inevitable that at some points, such as the references to baskets, two or three synoptists would agree where the oral tradition probably allowed some latitude of expression. In certain important matters, such as the passion and resurrection narratives, it is not surprising that alternative or supplementary traditions (as used by Luke) existed alongside the basic tradition (as

followed here by Matthew and Mark). And, as a matter of fact, the Last Supper (once one recognizes Lk. 22:19b-20 as genuine) and the words from the Cross are related with a high degree of verbal similarity where the same tradition is being presented.

It is also argued that rare, unusual, and even peculiar expressions are sometimes found in two or three of the synoptics, and that this would not be the case if their writers had been independently following the oral tradition.<sup>97</sup> But if a rare or unusual word was present in the oral tradition, it would have been conspicuous, and thus quite likely to be remembered and recorded. And what strikes us as a peculiar expression unfit for literary use may have been quite acceptable to the gospel writers, especially if it was a regular part of the oral tradition. Nickle draws attention to "a famous example of the exact reproduction of an unusual grammatical construction" in Mt. 9:6 = Mk. 2:10 = Lk. 5:24, where in each gospel "Jesus abruptly interrupted his remarks to the critical scribes without finishing the sentence he had begun, and addressed the paralytic directly." This, we are told, is "the kind of awkward construction that usually did not long survive the abrasive polishing effect that the process of oral transmission had on harsh or unusual grammatical expressions."<sup>98</sup> But we would suggest that this construction produced a strikingly dramatic effect as the account was related orally, and that our three evangelists could easily have been quite happy to retain it. And if, on the two-source theory, Matthew and Luke were content to take it from Mark, there is no reason why, on the oral theory, all three could not have taken it from the oral tradition. Furthermore, if this construction could survive the supposedly "abrasive polishing" of the tradition until the first synoptist wrote, it could well have

survived until the third one wrote.

According to A. Jülicher and E. Fascher, these peculiar expressions are present in Matthew and Luke, and yet are obviously literary peculiarities of Mark, from whom, then, they were derived.<sup>99</sup> But there is another explanation: these are the peculiarities of the basic tradition, which Mark preserves more faithfully than Matthew or Luke, thus giving the impression that they are characteristic of his writing style. In other words, Matthew and Luke often "edited" the oral tradition where Mark did not.

It is certainly true that the synoptic agreements are sometimes quite striking. But it is also true that there are some places where the disagreements are quite striking. It is hardly to be expected that everywhere a fixed percentage of agreement would obtain. The extent of agreement naturally fluctuates, for a variety of reasons. But in no case is the extent of agreement so high that the oral theory must be ruled out. We are unconvinced by Stanton's attempt to find such agreement in the passages relating Jesus' three predictions of his passion. He notes that these predictions are "given at exactly corresponding points and with the peculiarities of the several announcements preserved in each Gospel" (at Mk. 8:31, 9:31, 10:33-34, and parallels). "It is surely most unlikely," he declares, "that in oral tradition the different occasions and the words used at them would not have been confused."<sup>100</sup> However, these predictions were an important part of the basic tradition, since they showed that Jesus' death was part of the plan of God, to which he had willingly yielded. Their similar placement in each gospel is due to the fact that none of the evangelists saw any reason to depart from the order established for the basic tradition. Also, it is evident that some emphasis was

placed on retaining the precise content of each prediction. No doubt some people got the occasions and wordings confused, but surely those who had learned the tradition well, and repeated it regularly, could have kept them straight. We see here the diligence and commitment of those who transmitted and recorded the gospel tradition.

We have now examined the various arguments against the oral theory, and in favor of a literary theory, that are based upon the similarities of the synoptics in content, order, and wording. Some of them are stronger than others, but none of them refute the oral theory. We have been able to explain the data on which they are based with what seems to us to be an entirely reasonable and historically plausible oral theory. There are, however, a number of other arguments that have been put forward against the oral theory, and we should consider them, as well.

It has been argued against the supposition of a gospel tradition of apostolic origin that in Acts we find apostolic sermons containing only the gospel outline, not synoptic tradition.<sup>101</sup> But, as we have already explained,<sup>102</sup> these summary accounts of messages delivered outside the church are not the place to look for evidence of the gospel tradition handed down within the church. Gloag also observes that we find "few traditionary sayings of our Lord" in the Epistles,<sup>103</sup> but it was not their purpose, except on rare occasion (notably 1 Cor. 11:23-26), to repeat the gospel accounts. In any case, Luke tells us in his preface that the gospel tradition was of apostolic origin, and his positive testimony far outweighs these misguided arguments from silence.

Sanday recognizes that the gospel tradition was of apostolic origin, and he concedes that it could have had a high degree of

fixity, but, he says, "it still remains to ask whether we have any evidence that the tradition handed down by the apostles at Jerusalem was actually of this nature."<sup>104</sup> We would argue that the synoptic gospels provide massive evidence of a relatively fixed oral tradition, but such evidence would be held to be inadmissible because of the possibility of literary connections. There is, however, the evidence provided by 1 Cor. 11:23-26, a passage in which Paul presents the synoptic tradition concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper. He says explicitly in vs. 23 that he is repeating a tradition that he has previously "handed down" to the Corinthian church. This is precisely the activity spoken of in Lk. 1:2. That is, he taught this tradition to the Corinthians when he was with them, and now has occasion to repeat it in writing. One could perhaps argue that Paul handed down this piece of tradition in isolation from the rest of the synoptic tradition, simply as part of his instruction concerning the Lord's Supper. However, since the Corinthians evidently had very little understanding of the Supper, it would seem that Paul had not given them much instruction concerning it. Therefore, it is much more probable that he handed down this tradition simply in connection with the rest of the gospel tradition. Paul's reminder in 1 Cor. 15:1-5 of the most important parts of the gospel that he had "handed down" to them confirms that he had handed down at least a good portion of the synoptic tradition. And his references to other portions of the tradition in 7:10-11 and 9:14 (cf. 1 Tim. 5:18) as instructions from "the Lord" would have been enigmatic to the Corinthians if he had not previously handed down those traditions to them, too. (Some would also see synoptic tradition underlying 1 Thes. 4:15-17, but we are not persuaded.) These passages together suggest that

Paul taught a wide range of oral gospel traditions.

Only for the Lord's Supper does Paul repeat in full the oral tradition that he delivered to the Corinthians, and significantly, his words manifest a high degree of correspondence with the words used by the synoptists for this piece of tradition, notably Luke's words. H. Chavannes, in arguing against the standardization of the apostolic gospel tradition, points out that Paul's text does not exactly correspond with the synoptic texts,<sup>105</sup> but these texts themselves show that this tradition was not absolutely fixed in its wording. Since Paul's quotation of the tradition is undoubtedly independent of the synoptic gospels, it should be evident that Paul had an excellent knowledge of the synoptic tradition, and that that tradition was relatively fixed in its wording.<sup>106</sup>

P. Ewald argues that there would not have been any inclination in the apostolic age to standardize the gospel tradition because the church was then awaiting the imminent return of Christ.<sup>107</sup> But this argument is entirely speculative, and is belied by the dynamic character of the apostolic church. The apostles and their followers were not all sitting on their hands doing nothing but looking up toward the sky!<sup>108</sup> Ewald also asserts that the gospel history was well-known in Palestine, so that a standardized gospel tradition would have been unnecessary.<sup>109</sup> As a matter of fact, however, it was not that well-known. Much of what Jesus did and said was private or semiprivate, and his public ministry was known to most people only by hearsay.

It has also been argued that the extensive verbal agreements among the synoptics cannot be explained by the oral theory unless the oral tradition was in Greek form, but that an apostolic oral tradition would have been formulated in Aramaic. The Aramaic

tradition would have to have been translated into Greek, but a translation of oral tradition seems implausible and the synoptic tradition does not look like it was translated from Aramaic.<sup>110</sup> But the Semitisms, and especially the Aramaisms in the synoptic gospels may well point to an Aramaic substratum underlying portions of the synoptic tradition.<sup>111</sup> And there would have been every reason for Aramaic traditions to be reformulated in Greek at an early date, since Ac. 6:1, which mentions "the Hellenists" alongside "the Hebrews" in the original Jerusalem church, shows that a Greek tradition would have been as necessary as an Aramaic one. The evidence for an originally Aramaic tradition is not unambiguous, however, for the Semitic element in the synoptic gospels may simply reflect the speech of Jesus (and others), the Semitic coloring of the Greek spoken by the Jewish formulators of the tradition, the style of the Septuagint, and/or parallel Aramaic tradition.<sup>112</sup> The original language of the synoptic tradition could well have been Greek, for most of the first Christians, including the apostles, probably knew Greek, at least as a second language. But whether the tradition was originally Greek, Aramaic, or partly each, there is definite evidence that it did exist in Greek in apostolic times. The recounting of Greek oral tradition in 1 Cor. 11:23-26 makes the existence of it abundantly clear, since Paul was not quoting a document.

Peake objects to the oral theory on the grounds that it cannot explain the formation of the two main synoptic traditions, namely "the Triple Tradition" and "the Double Tradition." If one was the original and official tradition, how, he asks, did the other one rise to a place of prominence?<sup>113</sup> Moffatt repeats this objection, extending it to the special material of Matthew and Luke, too.<sup>114</sup>

But this objection is based upon an erroneous classification of the synoptic tradition, because it presupposes the two-source theory. The distinction between "the Triple Tradition" (presumably including the double traditions of Matthew and Mark and of Mark and Luke) and "the Double Tradition" (of Matthew and Luke) is quite arbitrary, unless one presupposes Marcan priority and literary dependence. It is unfair to ask the oral theory to explain artificial constructions built on the foundation of an alien theory. As we shall see in the next chapter, about half of "the Double Tradition" belongs with "the Triple Tradition" as the basic tradition, and the rest of the synoptic material consists mainly of independent traditions. That there should have been a core tradition consisting of the basic gospel story, and that it should have been supplemented by more peripheral independent traditions, is not at all unreasonable.

But if the core tradition included the material common to Matthew and Luke--or about half of it, according to our theory--it will then be asked why Mark would have omitted it.<sup>115</sup> This objection will loom especially large for those for whom this material, which contains many ethical teachings of Jesus, "is of the highest interest and value."<sup>116</sup> In our view Mark probably knew most of this material, but deliberately did not include it in his gospel. It evidently did not suit his purposes. To a large extent Mark favored narrative material over discourse material,<sup>117</sup> especially where the latter would have been mostly relevant to a Palestinian Jewish audience. But whether or not we can explain all of Mark's purposes, the fact remains, as Guthrie points out, that "on any theory which assumes Marcan priority the difficulty exists."<sup>118</sup> Whatever the structure and form of the gospel tradition may have been, Mark chose to incorporate relatively little of Jesus' teach-

ings in his gospel.

According to Stanton, the gospels of both Matthew and Luke show signs of the "intentional and skilful arrangement" of their Marcan with their non-Marcan material (or, we would say, of the basic narrative with the independent traditions). Matthew, especially, combined his material to produce "well-constructed discourses, each of which has a distinct aim and character." The only natural explanation for such skillful construction is that Matthew and Luke "each had both the Marcan outline and the additional matter, or a considerable portion of it, lying before him in a written form, when he set about combining them, so that he could frame a plan how best to introduce the latter into the former and could systematically carry out his plan."<sup>119</sup> However, neither Matthew nor Luke consists of the Marcan outline with additional matter inserted into it. The "Marcan outline" is considerably rearranged in both gospels. And especially in Matthew the non-Marcan material is so thoroughly and often minutely rearranged, and combined with Marcan material with such sophistication, that such a work could never have been produced in the simplistic manner suggested by Stanton. Both Matthew and Luke must have had a thorough and comprehensive grasp of their material before they wrote. Having Mark and Q lying before them (in inconvenient rolls?) would not have enabled them to combine all their material as they did. Stanton seems to think that they had little acquaintance with the synoptic material (apart from reading their sources), and were practically unaware of its narrative and thematic connections. But it is much more likely that Matthew and Luke wrote as experts in the tradition, not as novices who could do little more than arrange note cards. It would have been a stupendous feat for Matthew,

paging back and forth through Q and M, or unrolling and rerolling them, to have been able to gather together the Sermon on the Mount as effectively as he did. It is far more likely that the teachings presented in this sermon had been assembled through years of teaching. Matthew could have used written sources for this, but he also could have drawn exclusively upon the oral teaching of the apostles. We would argue, then, that when Matthew and Luke sat down to write their gospels, they had already worked with the synoptic material for a long time, and had probably arranged it in their teaching much as we see it in their written gospels.

It is usually claimed that the synoptic agreements are too extensive for the oral theory, but it is also sometimes claimed (even by the same writers!) that the synoptic disagreements are too extensive for the oral theory. It is argued that the synoptic accounts would not vary as widely as they often do if there had really been a fixed oral tradition.<sup>120</sup> But surely the wording of documents is as fixed as the wording of any oral tradition, so one could equally argue in this manner that the synoptics could not be literarily related. The explanation, of course, is that the oral tradition was only relatively fixed, being more variable in some places than others. But, it is said, all the special material in Matthew and Luke belies the existence of a single oral tradition.<sup>121</sup> But we have recognized the existence of many independent traditions alongside the basic narrative tradition. Zahn finds "the uniformity of the oral tradition" contradicted by the "widely differing traditions" in the apostolic church "regarding the most important parts of the Gospel history,"<sup>122</sup> but it is precisely at such points that one would expect there to have been independent traditions covering much the same ground as the basic narrative tradition.

The existence of the latter is surely not drawn into question by the presence of the former.

According to B. Weiss, the differences in wording that occur alongside the verbal parallels "do not usually bear the character of accidental variations as they arise in oral tradition, but the constant type of intentional literary modifications."<sup>123</sup> But there is not the slightest reason why an author cannot intentionally modify a certain form of oral tradition in the same way that he might intentionally modify material taken from a written source. Stanton declares that many of the verbal differences "give clearly the impression that they are due to the revision of St Mark by the authors of the two other Gospels." That is, they are "stylistic improvements" or display "the idiosyncrasies of the first or the third evangelist."<sup>124</sup> But this "impression" arises simply because Mark remains most faithful to the standard form of the basic narrative tradition. Matthew and Luke introduce "stylistic improvements" and their own "idiosyncrasies," but Mark tends to follow the central form of the tradition. Mark's style of writing reflects the nonliterary style of the oral tradition. But since Matthew and Luke only introduce their changes to a "limited extent," Stanton concludes that they must have been "held in check (as it were)" by their documentary sources.<sup>125</sup> However, they could just as easily have been restrained by the standardization of the oral tradition.

All the arguments in favor of Marcan priority (and Matthean and Lucan dependence upon Mark), and not just the argument based upon style, presuppose a direct literary relationship of some sort, and therefore cannot be brought forward against the oral theory. As formulated by Streeter, these arguments are five in number. With regard to the first three he says this: "This conjunction and

alternation of Matthew and Luke in their agreement with Mark as regards (a) content, (b) wording, (c) order, is only explicable if they are incorporating a source identical, or all but identical, with Mark."<sup>126</sup> Advocates of Matthean priority maintain that this is a logical fallacy, since all that is established is that Mark is the central gospel (i.e. the middle term) among the three synoptics. This claim is correct, although Mark's centrality would point to its priority, as a matter of historical probability, on the assumption of literary dependence. But the centrality of Mark on the oral theory is easily explained. Mark simply limited himself, for the most part, to the basic narrative tradition, generally followed the most common wording of it, and held with little variation to its order of material.

Streeter's fourth argument is this: "The primitive character of Mark is further shown by (a) the use of phrases likely to cause offence, which are omitted or toned down in the other Gospels, (b) roughness of style and grammar, and the preservation of Aramaic words."<sup>127</sup> This is a strong argument, though somewhat subjective. But if Mark preserves a more primitive form of tradition, while Matthew and Luke preserve it in a more polished form, then all is easily explained on the oral theory.

Streeter argues, in the fifth place, that "the way in which Marcan and non-Marcan material is distributed in Matthew and Luke respectively looks as if each had before him the Marcan material in a single document, and was faced with the problem of combining this with material from other sources." That is, Matthew attaches non-Marcan material to the Marcan framework on a thematic principle, while Luke presents alternate blocks of Marcan and non-Marcan material (though necessarily weaving the two together in the

passion narrative).<sup>128</sup> We have already pointed out that this is a great oversimplification of the data.<sup>129</sup> Furthermore, the distinction between "Marcan" and "non-Marcan" material in Matthew and Luke obviously presupposes Marcan priority. One could posit, on the oral theory, two cycles of tradition, the Marcan and the non-Marcan, which would account for these data. We have actually argued somewhat similarly that underlying the synoptics is a basic narrative tradition supplemented by independent traditions.

This completes our examination of the many arguments that have been aimed at the oral theory of synoptic origins. Many of them are weak, some of them carry some weight, but not one of them refutes the oral theory. Nonetheless, there is a cumulative weight to the arguments based on the synoptic similarities that cannot be denied. G. M. Styler combines these arguments quite effectively: "But there is such a close similarity at many points, in arrangement and order as well as in wording, in narrative as well as in reported speech and dialogue, that the ascription of all this to anything but a literary relationship, direct or indirect, is very hard to credit."<sup>130</sup> The synoptic agreements, it is commonly said, are just too extensive to be explained by an oral theory.<sup>131</sup> Some will concede an outside possibility that the oral theory could suffice,<sup>132</sup> but most would agree with Uchida when he says that a theory of literary dependence will explain the synoptic agreements "far more readily" than the oral theory.<sup>133</sup> It would have been easy for Matthew and Luke to copy Mark and Q, making various changes, but generally following their sources, so why insist that the three evangelists had an expert knowledge of a rather fixed oral tradition that would not have been easy to formulate and transmit?

We will readily acknowledge that literary dependence is the easy, initially apparent explanation for the extensive synoptic similarities. However, the explanation that at first sight seems obvious is not always the correct one. After all, the obvious explanation for the facts that the earth is unmoving under our feet, that the sun and moon follow circular paths across the sky, and that the stars and planets are only tiny specks of light visible at night, is the geocentric theory of the universe. Naturally, this was for many centuries the assured result of astronomical research. But when these phenomena were examined more closely, facts emerged that were inconsistent with the initially obvious explanation. For example, the apparently erratic paths of the planets did not fit in with the theory. But rather than abandon the theory that was so obviously true, "epicycles" were introduced into it, without the slightest independent evidence for their existence, in order to explain the otherwise anomalous movements of the planets. These epicycles, though in themselves implausible, seemed quite justifiable from the point of view of geocentric astronomical theory, and they "worked" beautifully. But as the difficulties mounted in modern times, the whole geocentric theory was finally overturned. The earth was not the center of the universe, after all.

In the case of the synoptic gospels, once we make the "obvious" assumption that they are literarily related wherever they resemble one another, we find that the centrality of the Marcan form of tradition and the primitive character of Mark point to Marcan priority. And when we postulate "Q" as a second primitive source, we find that the complicated patterns of synoptic interrelationship are simplified, revealing a natural process of literary development.

Out of Mark and Q the more complicated Matthew and Luke were independently formed.

However, when the data are examined more closely, anomalies appear. Matthew and Luke ought not, as texts independently based on Mark, to agree together against it, and yet they do in content (hence Q is postulated), order of material (though rarely), and wording. The agreements in wording, the so-called minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, are especially troublesome. And there are other "planetary" phenomena, too, such as the apparently secondary passages in Mark, and the parallel passages with relatively little resemblance to each other. In order to account for these anomalies, a wide variety of complications are introduced into the two-source theory. The two common factors in the synoptic tradition, namely Mark and Q, prove to be unstable, and even intangible quantities in the hands of theorists, as Vorlagen (especially an "Urmarkus"), revisions of Mark before or after its use by Matthew and/or Luke, recensions of Q, "strata" of tradition, defective sources, overlapping sources, touches of oral tradition, parallel (though independent) redactional processes, slight Marcan use of Q, slight Lucan use of Matthew, textual corruption in the best or even all extant manuscripts, and the like are brought into the picture. But are not these merely the epicycles of the two-source theory, which may reconcile the anomalous data with the general theory, but which are more or less implausible apart from that theory? If scholars find such explanations satisfying, it is because they remove difficulties from the general theory to which they are committed, not because they are historically probable or are supported by evidence other than the anomalies.

But the data that seem anomalous on the two-source theory are

easily explained by our oral theory. If the three evangelists independently drew upon the same oral tradition, it is only natural that each one would on occasion depart from the form of tradition followed by the other two, resulting in agreements between any two gospels against the third in content, order, and wording. Thus, the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are entirely predictable on our theory. If these agreements are considerably fewer in number than those between Matthew and Mark against Luke or between Mark and Luke against Matthew, this is because Mark, as a follower of the apostle who played the leading role in the formulation of the basic narrative tradition, did not depart from the usual form of that tradition as often as Matthew or Luke did. The secondary passages in Mark likewise present no problem, as it is only natural that Mark (whether following Peter or not) would have expanded upon the basic tradition at points, just as Matthew and Luke did. Finally, in an oral tradition it is not unlikely that certain portions of it would be more variable in form than others, and thus it comes as no surprise that some parallel passages have relatively little resemblance to each other. Thus, the data that tax the imaginations of the theorists of Marcan priority are quite predictable on our oral theory.

Our interpretation of Luke's preface establishes his literary independence and leaves the leading theories of synoptic literary dependence in a shambles. Our reconsideration of the synoptic data leads to the conclusion that underlying the synoptics are a basic narrative tradition and a body of independent traditions. The arguments against the oral theory, at least as we have propounded it, have been shown to be inadequate. The data that seem anomalous on the two-source theory are actually predictable on our oral

theory. If we can accept that the formulators and recorders of the oral gospel tradition were men of ability, expertise, and motivation, then we should follow the lead provided by Luke's preface and accept the oral theory of synoptic origins. In the next (and concluding) chapter we will analyze the synoptic material in accordance with our oral theory, and find striking confirmation that our analysis, and the theory underlying it, are well-founded.

## A NEW ANALYSIS OF THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

We have argued that the three synoptists independently drew their material directly from the oral gospel tradition. As a rule, then, synoptic agreements in content, order, and wording preserve many of the more regular features of the oral tradition. Synoptic disagreements, on the other hand, largely reflect the variability and adaptability of the tradition. Because the tradition was rather fluid, it did not have a fixed original form that can now be reconstructed. However, the basic content and much of the standard wording of the various oral accounts, especially those related in more than one gospel, are ordinarily clear enough.

We have also argued that the oral tradition consisted of a basic narrative tradition and a somewhat larger body of independent traditions. The material in the basic narrative, as befitting a narrative, was arranged in a set (though not unalterable) order. The independent traditions, on the other hand, were not related to one another (except, perhaps, for some small clusters) or connected to the basic narrative. Thus, accounts ordered alike in any two synoptics would ordinarily belong to the basic narrative. Two synoptists may have independently decided to connect two or more independent traditions together in the same way, or to attach them to the basic narrative in the same way, but this probably would not have happened very often. Thus, the basic narrative can be largely reconstructed by studying the order of parallel material in the

synoptics. It must be remembered, however, that not all of the basic narrative is necessarily preserved by at least two synoptics in its original order.

We may begin to reconstruct the basic narrative tradition, then, by piecing together all the material ordered alike in at least two synoptics. This is actually more difficult than it sounds, so let us proceed step by step. (The material involved in each step is put in a category of the same number in the reconstructed basic narrative below.) First, the units of material common to all three synoptics, and ordered alike in all three, should be listed in that order. Second, into this list should be integrated the material common to all three synoptics, but ordered alike (relative to material already identified as belonging to the basic narrative--and so for each further step) in only two of them. Third, the material presented in Matthew and Mark only, and ordered alike in them, should be added in. Fourth, the material presented in Mark and Luke only, and ordered alike in them, should be added in. Fifth, the material common to Matthew and Luke only, and ordered alike in them, should be added in. In the third, fourth, and fifth steps material is considered to be ordered alike if it belongs to the same sequence, the placement of part of which is already established, even though the sequence as a whole may be placed differently in the two gospels.

There remains a certain amount of material, common to all three or to any two of the synoptics, which is not ordered alike in at least two of them. In order to evaluate it, it should be noted that in the material common to all three synoptics, but ordered alike in only two of them, Mark almost always preserves the original order. The sole exception is the teaching on judging and

giving, related in Mt. 7:1-2 = Mk. 4:24c-d = Lk. 6:37-38. Since Mark does not relate the sermon of Mt. 5-7 and Lk. 6, he obviously cannot retain this teaching in that context. Evidently, then, Mark preserves the order of the basic narrative wherever possible. We may infer, then, that the material common to all three synoptics, or to Matthew and Mark alone, or to Mark and Luke alone, but placed differently in each gospel, is placed by Mark (wherever possible) in accordance with the order established by the basic narrative.

Accordingly, our sixth step is to insert into the basic narrative reconstructed so far the material common to all three gospels, but placed differently in each one. We do not see any reason to place any of this material anywhere else than where Mark places it, with one exception. That exception is the saying concerning tasteless salt, found in Mt. 5:13 = Mk. 9:50 = Lk. 14:34-35. Mark appears to have added it onto 9:49 because of the catchword "salt." Luke places it among independent tradition, and it may be an independent tradition, too. However, it is hard to believe that an independent saying about salt would have been so prominent (and indeed uniquely so) as to be recorded in all three synoptics. We are inclined to believe that it belonged to the basic narrative, and that Matthew preserves the original placement of it alongside the saying concerning light in the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>1</sup> Mark chose to omit this sermon, and so, as in the case of the teaching on judging and giving (Mk. 4:24c-d), he was obliged to put the saying in another context, if anywhere. Luke abbreviated the sermon, choosing to put this and other of the omitted material elsewhere in his gospel.

Similarly, our seventh step is to add the material common to Matthew and Mark alone, but placed differently in them. Again, we

see only one place where we ought to depart from Mark's placement of this material, and that is the teaching on forgiveness in Mt. 6:14-15 and Mk. 11:25-26 (with vs. 25a picking up the language of Mt. 6:5a). (We accept Mk. 11:26 as genuine, though the parallelism would stand without it.<sup>2</sup>) The passage is foreign to the Marcan context, but has been appended to 11:20-24 because that passage also deals with prayer. The saying could derive from the independent tradition, but, as we shall be seeing in this chapter, Mark does not seem to have used that tradition. Since Mk. 11:25a connects this saying with Mt. 6:5-8 (an otherwise unparalleled teaching regarding prayer), it would seem that Mt. 6:5-8 was followed by 6:14-15 (= Mk. 11:25-26) in the basic narrative (Mt. 6:9-13 = Lk. 11:1-4 clearly being independent material). Once again, Mark is forced to put this teaching out of its original context because he does not relate the Sermon on the Mount.

Our eighth step would have been to add the material common to Mark and Luke alone, but placed differently in them, but there is no such material.

As our eighth step, some material common to Matthew and Luke alone can be added to the basic narrative because it belongs within similar sequences (or groupings, where the material is ordered differently) in the two gospels, even though the sequence (or grouping) in one gospel (or both, if Mark is partially parallel) is placed out of the original order. Since part of each sequence or grouping has already been located in the basic tradition, the rest should be brought in. (This step extends the fifth step.)

One cluster of this material calls for special comment. Mt. 24:15-22 = Mk. 13:14-20 is paralleled in part by Lk. 17:31-32 (in addition to 21:20-24). Lk. 17:31-32, in turn, is part of a group-

ing of material, 17:22-27, 31-32, 34-37, the rest of which is paralleled only in Matthew, but also in the Olivet prophecy (at 24:26-28, 37-41). Because this material common to Matthew and Luke alone is connected with the Marcan outline through Mt. 24:15-22 = Mk. 13:14-20 = Lk. 17:31-32; 21:20-24, it can be placed in the Olivet prophecy of the basic narrative tradition. Luke seems to have removed this material from its original context on the assumption that it refers to the coming of the Son of Man at the Last Judgment, not to the destruction of Jerusalem, and accordingly he placed it with similar material in ch. 17.

So far, we have been guided in our reconstruction of the basic narrative tradition by two principles: first, that material arranged in the same order in different gospels had that order in the basic narrative; and second, that Mark preserves the original order when his arrangement is different from that of Matthew and/or Luke. But neither principle helps us when we consider the material common to Matthew and Luke, but arranged differently in them. Over half of their "double tradition" is in this category, in striking contrast to the "double traditions" of Matthew and Mark and of Mark and Luke, where differences in order are infrequent in the first instance and nonexistent in the second. This would suggest that the double tradition of Matthew and Luke, where its material is arranged differently, constitutes a different category of material, i.e. that it belongs to the body of independent traditions.

However, certain units of this material give indications that they do belong to the basic narrative tradition. We include this material in the basic narrative as our ninth step. But since there is no hard and fast rule by which to identify this material, our treatment of it cannot be said to be in every case above dispute.

First of all, we would include Mt. 9:26 = Lk. 4:14b (on the news about Jesus). Matthew seems to have particularized the general statement of the oral tradition, as given by Luke (cf. Mt. 9:31). One could argue that Luke has generalized an originally specific statement as given in Matthew, but Matthew has a tendency to take statements belonging to one account and use them in another one. And if Mt. 9:26 originally formed the conclusion to the account of Jairus's daughter and the woman with a hemorrhage (Mt. 9:18-25 = Mk. 5:22-43 = Lk. 8:41-56), it is hard to see why Mark and Luke, who between them reproduce nearly all of Matthew's abbreviated account, would have both omitted this verse at the conclusion of their accounts.

We would also include Mt. 8:1 and Lk. 6:17a-c (on Jesus' descent) in the basic narrative. These brief statements probably derive from the same original tradition, yet that tradition could never have circulated by itself. It should not be treated as an introduction to Mt. 8:2-4, because it does not introduce the parallel passages Mk. 1:40-45 and Lk. 5:12-16. To us Mt. 8:1 looks like an adaptation of the language of Lk. 6:17a-c. That is, in the oral tradition, as preserved by Luke, Jesus chose the Twelve, descended, and was followed by crowds, to whom he gave a sermon. Matthew has Jesus give this sermon while still on a mountain (i.e. on the hills, where crowds can gather?) and thus has Jesus descend (the rest of the way?) after giving it.

Three passages in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, placed by Luke elsewhere than in his parallel sermon of ch. 6, we would judge to have belonged to the original oral account of that sermon. The first passage is 5:17-20, vs. 18 of which is reproduced at Lk. 16:17 (on the permanence of the law). This teaching does not look

original after Lk. 16:16, but rather looks as though it has been placed there to guard against anyone drawing the opposite conclusion from vs. 16. On the other hand, Mt. 5:18 is integral to 5:17-20, and this unit forms a natural introduction to the section on the law and righteousness, 5:17-48. Since Luke decided to omit all but the concluding portion of this discussion of the fine points of legal interpretation, it is not surprising that he omitted the introductory passage preserved by Matthew. Furthermore, this passage does not appear to be derived from the independent tradition, because it is placed at the beginning of a section. Ordinarily, independent sayings tradition is added after related material in the basic narrative, not before it.

The two units consisting of Mt. 6:19-21 = Lk. 12:33-34 (on treasure and the heart) and Mt. 6:25-34 = Lk. 12:22-32 (on anxiety for food and clothing) are placed together by both Matthew and Luke (though related in reverse order), although Matthew inserts between them two small units of clearly independent tradition. Since these two passages are not all that closely related, it is doubtful that they would have been conjoined in the independent tradition. Their juxtaposition points rather to their having belonged to the basic narrative. Furthermore, Mt. 6:19-21, 25-34 seems to be the framework of basic narrative into which 6:22-23, 24 is inserted. Since Luke does not relate in ch. 6 any of the material in Mt. 6, it is not surprising that he puts this material elsewhere.

We would also put Mt. 11:2-6 = Lk. 7:18-23 (on the messengers from John) and its sequel, Mt. 11:7-11, 14-19 = Lk. 7:24-28, 31-35 (on John and the kingdom) in the basic narrative, for two reasons. First, these are really two units of narrative tradition, not one, and such sequences are much more likely to be found in the basic

tradition than in the independent tradition. Second, this material presupposes previous narrative (see Mt. 11:2 = Lk. 7:18), as independent tradition would not do. We accept Luke's placement as the original one, since material from the basic narrative, in its original order, both precedes (7:1-10) and follows (8:4-18) Luke's narrative about John (though unparalleled material is there, too: 7:11-17, 36-50; 8:1-3), and is tied to it (see 7:18), whereas the original narrative sequence is not to be found in the Matthean context (chs. 10-12). Also, Matthew only connects this narrative vaguely with its context.

Finally, we must consider whether any material preserved in only one gospel derives from the basic narrative tradition. It is certainly possible that two of the three synoptists (or indeed all three!) may have omitted the same section of the basic narrative. Thus, if any material found in only one gospel seems to fit into the narrative, and a good explanation for its absence from the other two synoptics is forthcoming, then it should be included, though with caution.

Our tenth step, then, is to add in the unparalleled Marcan material that probably belonged to the basic oral narrative. Here we are on rather firm ground, since Mark seems to have confined himself, perhaps exclusively, to the basic narrative tradition. Thus, at least most of his unparalleled material probably derives from that tradition. In our view, all of this material, namely 3:20-21, 4:26-29, 7:32-37, 8:22-26, and 11:19, but with the probable exception of 14:51-52, belonged to the basic narrative. All this material fits in well with the Marcan narrative sequence, which, as we have seen, is almost always the same as that of the basic narrative. Mk. 3:20-21 (on the supposed madness of Jesus)

should be placed immediately before 3:22-27 in the basic narrative, not immediately after 3:14-19, for 3:20-21 clearly belongs with 3:22-35. Matthew and Luke may have omitted the tradition recorded in Mk. 3:20-21 as derogatory to the Lord, but more likely they omitted it because it introduced 3:22-27 (on Jesus and Beelzebul), which they place in other contexts, where such an introductory account would be inappropriate. The parable of Mk. 4:26-29 (on the seed growing secretly) was perhaps omitted by both Matthew and Luke as redundant to other parables of the kingdom. The miracles of Mk. 7:32-37 and 8:22-26 were perhaps omitted by Matthew and Luke because of the means of healing employed by Jesus. But more likely they were omitted by Luke simply because he omits the cycle of tradition taking Jesus out of Galilee (i.e. the "Great Omission" of Mk. 6:45-8:26), except for the crucial confession at Caesarea Philippi (where, however, he fails to mention the location). And Matthew probably omits them as redundant to other healing miracles. His knowledge of the first account is indicated by the fact that in 15:29-31 (= Mk. 7:31) he speaks in general terms about Jesus' miracles, thus encompassing the miracle of Mk. 7:32-37, the tradition regarding which he probably alludes to (cf. Mt. 15:31 with Mk. 7:37). Finally, Matthew and Luke probably omitted Mk. 11:19 (on Jesus' leaving at evening) as an unnecessary detail.

Mk. 14:51-52 (on the escape of a young man) could perhaps be assigned to the basic narrative tradition, with its omission by Matthew and Luke being explained as the omission of a trivial detail. However, it is difficult to imagine how such an extraneous account, which did not involve any of the apostles (see vs. 50), would have come to be part of the basic apostolic gospel tradition. To us the recital of this adventure of an anonymous youth

is inexplicable unless it is the reminiscence of the author himself. Thus, it is the one passage in Mark that we are inclined to exclude from the basic narrative. (We would also exclude it from the independent tradition, attributing it, like various parenthetical explanations in the gospel, to the author.)

As our eleventh step, we add to our reconstruction of the basic narrative the unparalleled material of Luke that appears to derive from it. We find only one unit of this material that commends itself as belonging to the basic narrative, namely Lk. 17:28-30 (on the days of Lot). We include this passage in the basic narrative because the material before it (i.e. 17:22-27) and after it (i.e. 17:31-32, 34-37) derives from the basic tradition. We find it improbable that this passage would have arisen and circulated independently of this context, especially vss. 26-27. Matthew reproduces Lk. 17:26-27 (at 24:37-39), but apparently omits vss. 28-30 as redundant to vss. 26-27. Mark does not record the tradition of Mt. 24:37-39 = Lk. 17:26-27, and so his omission of Lk. 17:28-30 is understandable.

The twelfth, and last step in our reconstruction of the basic narrative tradition is to add certain material that is recorded only by Matthew. There is a fair amount of this material, especially in the Sermon on the Mount.

In the section of the Sermon on the Mount dealing with interpretations of the law, Mt. 5:17-48, we have already identified the introductory passage (vss. 17-20) and the last two of the six antitheses (vss. 38-42 and 43-48) as belonging to the basic tradition. We would now argue that the first two and the fourth antitheses, but not the third, belong to it, too. Matthew's antithetical formula, "You have heard that it was said . . . but I say to you"

(or the like), is evidently original, since Luke introduces Jesus' position with "but" (ἀλλὰ) in 6:27 without first giving the contrasting position. In Luke's text Jesus' position is contrasted with the behavior criticized in previous verses, but this contrast is clearly secondary to that given by Matthew. Luke combines the last two antitheses (in 6:27-36) and obscures their originally antithetical character by not giving the false position in either case. Since Luke abbreviates this material, it is likely that Matthew's fuller presentation, including other antitheses, is original. The third antithesis should be distinguished from the other five, however, since its introductory formula is different from theirs (omitting "You have heard that"). Furthermore, it deals with a subject (i.e. divorce) that is closely related to that of the preceding antithesis (i.e. adultery). Therefore, it is better to treat Matthew's third antithesis as an insertion into the basic tradition. It could perhaps be unparalleled material derived from independent tradition, but we would judge it to be an adaptation of Jesus' teaching on divorce in Mt. 19:9 = Mk. 10:10-12 = Lk. 16:18. Matthew adds related material at the end of the first two antitheses, and we have seen that he characteristically does so after material in the basic tradition. For these reasons, then, we accept Mt. 5:21-22, 27-28, 33-37 as probably part of the basic narrative tradition.

We also accept Mt. 6:1 (introducing 6:2-18), 2-4 (on genuine almsgiving), 5-8 (on genuine prayer), 16-18 (on genuine fasting) as part of the basic tradition. We have already argued that 6:14-15 (= Mk. 11:25-26, on forgiveness) belongs in the basic tradition, and that the connection of Mk. 11:25a with Mt. 6:5a shows that Mt. 6:5-8 belongs there, too, with 6:14-15.<sup>3</sup> One could argue that

Matthew introduced (and restructured) independent tradition to build up a series of teachings on the pattern of 6:5-8, but since a similarly patterned series of teachings in 5:17-48 has been found to have originated in the basic tradition, it is probable that this series has the same origin, and not just one portion of it. Since this series of teachings is primarily aimed at Jewish religious hypocrisy, its omission by Mark (except for the more general teaching of 6:14-15) and Luke is understandable. As is usually the case, Matthew inserts into this basic tradition a related piece of tradition, this time apparently independent tradition, 6:9-13 (= Lk. 11:1-4, on the Lord's Prayer).

We are inclined, though hesitantly, to include the two accounts of healing in Mt. 9:27-31 and 9:32-34 as part of the basic narrative. They are closely linked in time and place with the preceding account (see vss. 27 and 32). In chs. 8-9 Matthew brings together seven other accounts of Jesus' healing activity, each one of which belongs to the basic tradition either shortly before or shortly after the sermon of chs. 5-7, and thus it seems reasonable to infer that the other two accounts of healing, especially since they are closely connected with the preceding one, probably also were drawn by Matthew from the basic tradition. On the other hand, one would have expected Mark (who relates six of the other seven healing accounts in Mt. 8-9) and Luke (who relates all seven) to relate at least one of these two healings. However, they may have been omitted as redundant to other healings (cf. Mt. 9:27-31 with Mt. 20:29-34 = Mk. 10:46-52 = Lk. 18:35-43, and Mt. 9:32-34 with Mt. 12:22-29 = Mk. 3:22-27 = Lk. 11:14-22) or as anticlimactic after the account of the healing of Jairus's daughter and the woman with a hemorrhage in Mt. 9:18-25 = Mk. 5:22-43 = Lk. 8:41-56, which

Mark and Luke tell in elaborate detail.

The basic tradition is difficult to delineate with confidence in the collection of parables given in Mt. 13. On the basis of Marcan and Lucan parallels, vss. 1-23 (basically on the parable of the sower), except for the independent tradition of vss. 16-17, and vss. 31-35 (giving two other parables and an explanation for Jesus' use of parables) are definitely derived from the basic tradition. Intertwined with this material is the parable of the tares (vss. 24-30) and its explanation (vss. 36-43). Much of Matthew's independent tradition consists of parables, and this may be part of that material. On the other hand, 13:24-30, 36-43 is well integrated into the surrounding basic tradition. In particular, the references to "the house" and "the multitudes" in vs. 36 presuppose the references to them in vss. 1-2. Also, the parable of the tares is separated from its explanation by five verses of basic tradition, which one would not have expected if this divided material had originally been one unit of independent tradition. Furthermore, in the material that would directly precede the explanation of the parable, namely Mt. 13:34-35 = Mk. 4:33-34, Mark adds that Jesus would explain his parables privately to his disciples (vs. 34b), which may well reflect a knowledge of the tradition behind Mt. 13:36-43. The explanation of the parable in terms of the Son of Man and his angels carrying out the judgment of God is certainly consonant with other teaching in the basic tradition (see Mt. 16:27 = Mk. 8:38 = Lk. 9:26; cf. Mt. 24:30-31 = Mk. 13:26-27 = Lk. 21:27), though also with a parable in the independent tradition (see Mt. 25:31-46). In our judgment, these considerations point toward Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43 belonging to the basic tradition. Mark and Luke perhaps omitted it as redundant to other parables.

The remaining parables in Mt. 13, namely those in vss. 44-50, together with Jesus' final comments in vss. 51-52, are more difficult to assess. They may have belonged to the basic tradition, but in the absence of positive evidence to this effect, we will leave them out.

Finally, we would place Mt. 28:16-20 in the basic narrative tradition. Earlier in the narrative Jesus tells his disciples that after his resurrection he will appear to them in Galilee (in Mt. 26:32 = Mk. 14:28, but not in Luke's parallel unit, 22:31-34), and after his resurrection an angel repeats this prediction to the women at the tomb and gives them instructions to remind the disciples of it (in Mt. 28:7 = Mk. 16:7, but not in Luke's parallel unit, 23:56b-24:11). Mark's gospel breaks off abruptly at this point with the women fleeing in fear (Mk. 16:7 = Mt. 28:8), but Matthew continues smoothly with Jesus appearing to the women and instructing them to tell the disciples to meet him in Galilee (28:9-10). Then they depart for Galilee as instructed and see Jesus there (28:16-20). Even if 28:9-10 be deemed independent tradition, 26:32 and 28:7 demand that in the basic narrative Jesus and the disciples meet together in Galilee after the Resurrection. Because of that, Luke, who wants to record post-Resurrection appearances only in Jerusalem, omits these predictions (and the appearance of Jesus recorded in Mt. 28:9-10) from his narrative. Thus, we have no doubt but that Mt. 28:16-20 was part of the basic narrative tradition. We also include 28:9-10 (as part of 28:1-10), because the disciples' departure for Galilee in obedience to Jesus' command presupposes a command, as we find in this text, and not merely a prediction, as in 26:32 and 28:7.<sup>4</sup>

Our reconstruction of the basic narrative tradition is now

complete. The material comprising it (as best we can determine), as it finds independent expression in each of the three synoptic gospels, and in its original order, is listed below. Parentheses enclose material whose original order has been changed by the evangelist. The material is divided into twelve categories, which correspond to the twelve steps taken to reconstruct the narrative.

These categories are:

1. Material common to all three synoptics, and ordered alike in all three.
2. Material common to all three synoptics, and placed (relative to the above material) alike in two of them.
3. Material common to Matthew and Mark only, and placed alike in them.
4. Material common to Mark and Luke only, and placed alike in them.
5. Material common to Matthew and Luke only, and placed alike in them.
6. Material common to all three synoptics, and placed differently in each one.
7. Material common to Matthew and Mark only, and placed differently in them.  
(There is no material common to Mark and Luke only, and placed differently in them.)
8. Material common to Matthew and Luke only, and located within the same, but differently placed sequences or groupings of basic narrative tradition.
9. Material common to Matthew and Luke only, that is placed differently in them, yet gives indications of belonging to the basic narrative.

10. Unparalleled material in Mark probably drawn from the basic narrative.

11. Unparalleled material in Luke probably drawn from the basic narrative.

12. Unparalleled material in Matthew probably drawn from the basic narrative.

It should be noted that the material in categories one through eight is identified as basic tradition, and placed in it, with a high degree of confidence, except for Mt. 5:13 = Mk. 9:50 = Lk. 14:34-35 and Mt. 6:14-15 = Mk. 11:25-26, where Mark's order is not adhered to. The material in categories nine through twelve, however, has varying degrees of probability attached to it. All the material in these categories is discussed above. It is quite possible, of course, that we have overlooked some synoptic material that belongs to the basic narrative.

It should also be noted that various accounts assigned to the basic tradition contain details or even whole verses that probably do not derive from that tradition, but were added to it by the evangelist (e.g., Lk. 22:31-32, and perhaps vs. 33).

#### THE BASIC NARRATIVE TRADITION

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
1	3:1-3	1:1-4	3:1-6
3	3:4-6	1:5-6	
5	3:7-10 (=7:19)		3:7-9
1	3:11-12	1:7-8	3:15-17
1	3:13-17	1:9-11	3:21-22
1	4:1	1:12-13c	4:1-2b
5	4:2-11a		4:2c-13
3	4:11b	1:13d	
1	4:12	1:14a	4:14a

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
3	4:17	1:14b-15	
9	(9:26)		4:14b
3	4:18-22	1:16-20	
5	4:23a,c		4:15
4		1:21	4:31
2	(7:28-29)	1:22	4:32
4		1:23-27	4:33-36
1	4:24a	1:28	4:37
2	(8:14-15)	1:29-31	4:38-39
1(+2)	4:24b-c; (8:16-17)	1:32-34	4:40-41
4		1:35-38	4:42-43
2	(4:23b,d,e) (=9:35c-d)	1:39	4:44
2	(8:2-4)	1:40-45	5:12-16
2	(9:2-8)	2:1-12	5:17-26
2	(9:9)	2:13-14	5:27-28
2	(9:10-13)	2:15-17	5:29-32
2	(9:14-15)	2:18-20	5:33-35
2	(9:16-17)	2:21-22	5:36-39
2	(12:1-8)	2:23-28	6:1-5
2	(12:9-14)	3:1-6	6:6-11
2(+6)	4:25; (12:15-21)	3:7-12	(6:17d-19)
1	5:1	3:13	6:12-13a
2	(10:2-4)	3:14-19	6:13b-16
9	(8:1)		6:17a-c
5	5:2-10		6:20-21
5	5:11-12		6:22-23
6	5:13	(9:50)	(14:34-35)
9	5:17-20		16:17
12	5:21-22		
12	5:27-28		
12	5:33-37		
5	5:38-42		6:29-30
5	5:43-48		6:(27-28,)32-36
12	6:1		
12	6:2-4		
12	6:5-8		
7	6:14-15	(11:25-{26})	

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
12	6:16-18		
9	6:19-21		(12:33-34)
9	6:25-34		(12:22-32)
2	7:1-2	(4:24c-d)	6:37-38
5	7:3-5		6:41-42
5(+9)	7:15-18,20; (12:33,34b-35)		6:43-45
5	7:21-23		6:46
5	7:24-27		6:47-49
5	8:5-10,13		7:1-10
9	(11:2-6)		7:18-23
9	(11:7-11,14-19)		7:24-35
10		3:20-21	
6	(12:22-29)	3:22-27	(11:14-22)
8	(12:30)		(11:23)
7	(12:31,32c)	3:28-30	
8	(12:38-42)		(11:29-32)
8	(12:43-45)		(11:24-26)
6	(12:46-50)	3:31-35	(8:19-21)
2	(13:1-9)	4:1-9	8:4-8
2	(13:10-11,13-15,18-23)	4:10-20	8:9-15
4		4:21-23	8:16-17
2	(13:12)	4:24a-b,25	8:18
10		4:26-29	
12	(13:24-30)		
6	(13:31-32)	4:30-32	(13:18-19)
8	(13:33)		(13:20-21)
7	(13:34-35)	4:33-34	
12	(13:36-43)		
1	8:18,23-27	4:35-41	8:22-25
1	8:28-34	5:1-20	8:26-39
1	9:1	5:21	8:40
1	9:18-25	5:22-43	8:41-56
12	9:27-31		
12	9:32-34		
7	(13:53-58)	6:1-6a	
3	9:35a-b	6:6b-c	
1	10:1,5-7a,8-10a,11,14,23	6:7-11	9:1-5

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
4		6:12-13	9:6
1	14:1-2	6:14-16	9:7-9
2	14:3-4	6:17-18	(3:19-20)
3	14:5-12	6:19-29	
1(+2)	14:13-21; (9:36)	6:30-44	9:10-17
3	14:22-33	6:45-52	
3	14:34-36	6:53-56	
3	15:1-9	7:1-13	
3	15:10-14a,15-20	7:14-23	
3	15:21-28	7:24-30	
3	15:29-31	7:31	
10		7:32-37	
3	15:32-39	8:1-10	
3	16:1-2a,4	8:11-13	
3	16:5-12	8:14-21	
10		8:22-26	
1	16:13-16	8:27-29	9:18-20
1	16:20	8:30	9:21
1	16:21-28 (=10:39)	8:31-9:1	9:22-27
1	17:1-8	9:2-8	9:28-36a
1	17:9	9:9-10	9:36b
3	17:10-13	9:11-13	
1	17:14-18	9:14-27	9:37-43a
3	17:19-20b, {21}	9:28-29	
1	17:22-23	9:30-32	9:43b-45
3	17:24-27	9:33a	
1(+2)	18:1-3a,4-5; (10:40)	9:33b-37	9:46-48
4		9:38-40	9:49-50
3	(10:41-42)	9:41	
2	18:6-7,10,14	9:42	(17:1-2)
3	18:8-9 (=5:29-30)	9:43-49	
5	18:15-20		(17:3)
5	18:21-22		(17:4)
3	19:1-2	10:1	
3	19:3-8	10:2-9	
2	19:9 (=5:31-32)	10:10-12	(16:18)
1(+2)	19:13-15; (18:3b)	10:13-16	18:15-17

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
1	19:16-28b,29	10:17-30	18:18-30
3	19:30	10:31	
1	20:17-19	10:32-34	18:31-34
3	20:20-24	10:35-41	
3	20:25-28 (=23:11)	10:42-45	
1	20:29-34	10:46-52	18:35-43
1	21:1-9	11:1-10	19:28-40
3	21:10-11	11:11a	
7	(21:17)	11:11b-d	
7	(21:18-19)	11:12-14	
1	21:12-13	11:15-17	19:45-46
4		11:18a-b	19:47-48a
2	(22:33)	11:18c	19:48b
10		11:19	
3	21:20-22	11:20-24	
1	21:23-27	11:27-33	20:1-8
1	21:33-46	12:1-12	20:9-19
1	22:15-22	12:13-17	20:20-26
1	22:23-32	12:18-27	20:27-38
3	22:34-40	12:28-31	
2	(22:46b)	12:32-34	20:39-40
1	22:41-46a	12:35-37	20:41-44
1	23:1-3,5-7,{14}	12:38-40	20:45-47
4		12:41-44	21:1-4
1	24:1-2	13:1-2	21:5-6
1	24:3-8	13:3-8	21:7-11
1(+2,6)	24:9-14; (10:17-22)	13:9-13	21:12-19; (12:11-12)
1(+2)	24:15-22	13:14-20	21:20-24; (17:31-32)
3	24:23-25	13:21-23	
8	24:26-27		(17:22-25)
8	24:28		(17:37)
1	24:29-31	13:24-27	21:25-28
1	24:32-35	13:28-31	21:29-33
3	24:36	13:32	
8	24:37-39		(17:26-27)
11			(17:28-30)
8	24:40-41		(17:34-35,{36})

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
3	24:42	13:33-37	
1	26:1-5	14:1-2	22:1-2
3	26:6-13	14:3-9	
1	26:14-16	14:10-11	22:3-6
1	26:17-19	14:12-16	22:7-13
1	26:20	14:17	22:14
2	26:21-25	14:18-21	(22:21-23)
2	26:26-28	14:22-24	(22:19-20)
1	26:29	14:25	22:15-18
2	26:30	14:26	(22:39)
1	26:31-35	14:27-31	22:31-34
1	26:36-46	14:32-42	22:40-46
1	26:47-56	14:43-50	22:47-53
1	26:57	14:53	22:54a
1	26:58	14:54	22:54b-55
3	26:59-63a	14:55-61a	
2	26:63b-66	14:61b-64	(22:66-71)
2	26:67-68	14:65	(22:63-65)
1	26:69-70	14:66-68b	22:56-57
1	26:71-72	14:68c-70a	22:58
1	26:73-75	14:70b-72	22:59-62
3	27:1	15:1a	
1	27:2	15:1b	23:1
1	27:11	15:2	23:3
3	27:12	15:3	
3	27:13-14	15:4-5	
1	27:15-26	15:6-15	23:18-25
3	27:27-30	15:16-19	
1	27:31	15:20	23:26a
1	27:32	15:21	23:26b
1	27:33-44	15:22-32	23:33-38
1	27:45	15:33	23:44-45a
3	27:46-49	15:34-36	
1	27:50	15:37	23:46
2	27:51	15:38	(23:45b)
1	27:54-56	15:39-41	23:47-49
1	27:57-61	15:42-47	23:50-56a

Category	Matthew	Mark	Luke
1	28:1-10	16:1-8	23:56b-24:11
12	28:16-20		

The material in each gospel not assigned above to the basic narrative tradition belongs to the independent tradition (with the exception of Mk. 14:51-52 and other minor additions inserted by the synoptists). Most of this occurs in Matthew or Luke alone, but some of it is to be found in both gospels. As we will have occasion to refer to the latter material below, we will list it here (in Luke's order):

INDEPENDENT TRADITION RECORDED IN BOTH MATTHEW AND LUKE

Matthew	Luke
7:12	6:31
15:14b	6:39
10:24-25	6:40
8:19-22	9:57-62
10:7b,10b,12-13,15-16	10:1,3-12
9:37-38	10:2
11:20-24	10:13-15
11:25-27	10:21-22
13:16-17	10:23-24
6:9-13	11:1-4
7:7-11	11:9-13
5:15	11:33
6:22-23	11:34-36
23:25-28	11:37-41
23:4,13,15,23,29-36	11:42-52
10:26-33	12:1-9
12:32a-b	12:10
24:43-51	12:39-48
10:34-36	12:51-53
16:[2b-3]	(?) 12:54-56
5:25-26	12:57-59

Matthew	Luke
7:13-14	13:22-24
8:11-12	13:28-29
20:16	13:30
23:37-39	13:34-35
23:12	14:11 (=18:14b)
10:37-38	14:25-27
18:12-13	15:1-7
6:24	16:13
11:12-13	16:16
17:20c-e	17:5-6
25:29	19:26
19:28c-f	22:28-30

Matthew and Luke do not present this material in the same order, since the independent traditions were not arranged in any order. (How this lack of any discernible order accords with the Q hypothesis we leave to its proponents to explain.) There would seem to be a few small clusters of this material, however: Lk. 10:13-15 with 10:23-24, and 11:37-41 with 11:42-52. Lk. 12:1-9, though we give it as one unit, may be a cluster of three related teachings. Similarly, Lk. 12:39-48 may be a cluster of two units. That such clusters would have formed among the independent traditions is by no means improbable.

Our final task is to test the merits of our analysis of the synoptic tradition. In order to do this, a comparison with the standard two-source theory will prove helpful. According to the two-source theory, the synoptic material consists of (1) Marcan material, (2) Q material, (3) Matthew's special material, and (4) Luke's special material. But according to our oral theory, the synoptic material consists of (1) the basic narrative tradition and (2) independent traditions. The basic narrative tradition, as

we have reconstructed it, consists of (1) the Marcan material, (2) half of the Q material, and (3 and 4) some of the special Matthean and Lucan material. The independent tradition, then, consists of (1) half of the Q material and (2) most of the special Matthean and Lucan material. Therefore, the two-source theory and our oral theory differ, so far as the structure of the synoptic tradition is concerned, chiefly in their treatment of the material common to Matthew and Luke alone. According to the two-source theory, this material derives from a specific entity, "Q." According to our oral theory, however, there never was any such entity at all. Rather, half of this material was an integral part of the basic narrative tradition, while the other half was independent tradition.

In order to assess the relative merits of the two-source theory and our oral theory, then, let us focus on the "Q" material. Does this material really constitute a separate entity, distinguishable in Matthew and Luke from the Marcan and special traditions, or can two parts of it be distinguished, one of which is bound up with the Marcan material as part of a larger entity (i.e. the basic narrative tradition), and the other part of which has no discernible connection with that entity, and which should be distinguished from it?

Before this question can be answered, it will be necessary to delineate the material to be examined. This is not easy, for there has been considerable disagreement as to the contents of Q. This being so, we will adopt a rather narrow view of Q. That is, we will define it as the material common to Matthew and Luke, but not found in Mark. It is of course highly unlikely that both Matthew and Luke would have incorporated all of the Q sections in their gospels, just as they did not both incorporate all of Mark (on the

two-source theory), and thus it would have no doubt been the case that some of Q would have found its way only into Matthew and some of it only into Luke. But there is no consensus of opinion as to what unparalleled material (if any) comes from Q, and usually Q is limited to paralleled material. But there is also disagreement on what material is common to Matthew and Luke, but not found in Mark. The problem is that certain accounts found in all three synoptics (e.g., the temptation of Jesus and the Beelzebul controversy) contain a considerable amount of material common to Matthew and Luke alone. It has been suggested that Mark and Q overlapped at these points and that Matthew and Luke conflated their two sources (and in the same manner, independently of each other!), or that Mark used Q in these instances. It is not improbable that Mark and Q would have overlapped to some extent, but to anyone who is not trying to fit these seemingly anomalous accounts into the two-source theory, they are clearly triple tradition which Mark (for a change) gives in a shortened form. Thus, we are going to limit our attention to material that constitutes distinct units in the synoptic texts as they stand, and which is found in Matthew and Luke alone. This brings into view the great majority of material that is commonly attributed to Q, and we may assume that the rest of Q, if there ever was a Q, would have shared the characteristics of this material.

Now if Q really was an entity distinct from Mark, we would not expect Matthew to have inserted Q material into the Marcan outline at the same places as Luke did, except (barring coincidences) where there was an obvious reason for putting it there. The fact is, however, that fourteen units of material common to Matthew and Luke only (i.e. the material in category five) are located in the same

place (relative to the Marcan outline) in both gospels. The eight units of teaching material in Mt. 5-7 and Lk. 6 should perhaps be considered as only one extended instance of this phenomenon, as should the two units Mt. 18:15-20 = Lk. 17:3 and Mt. 18:21-22 = Lk. 17:4, for these sequences would arguably have reflected the order of material in Q. But the fact remains that six portions of Q material are attached to the Marcan narrative in precisely the same way by both Matthew and Luke: in Matthew, (1) 3:7-10, (2) 4:2-11a, (3) 4:23a,c, (4) 5:2-12, 38-48; 7:3-5, 15-18, 20-27, (5) 8:5-10, 13, and (6) 18:15-22. Admittedly, there would have been few options for the insertion of Mt. 3:7-10 = Lk. 3:7-9 (on John's preaching of repentance), and only one reasonable one for Mt. 4:2-11a = Lk. 4:2c-13 (on the temptation of Jesus). But in the remaining four instances it is most difficult to imagine why Matthew and Luke would have inserted the same Q material into the Marcan outline at the same places. Why, for example, would they both have thought that the same sayings material should be compiled into a sermon (if that had not already been done in Q) and inserted between Mk. 3:19 and 20, a context which does not make any mention of a sermon? There is surely more to these instances of similar arrangement than coincidence or similar thought processes can plausibly account for.

The fourteen Q units that are placed in the Marcan outline at the same places in Matthew and Luke constitute about half of the Q material that we have assigned to the basic narrative tradition (i.e. 14 out of 29 units). Another eight units (i.e. those in category eight) are also closely tied to the Marcan outline in that in both Matthew and Luke they are part of similar sequences or groupings, another part of which in each gospel consists of Marcan

material. The final seven units (i.e. those in category nine) are recorded in accordance with the original (i.e. essentially Marcan) order of the basic narrative in either Matthew or Luke, though not in the other. Thus, Matthew and Luke testify together (and independently) that 22 out of the 29 Q units assigned to the basic narrative tradition have a definite connection with the Marcan outline. Such a connection for the other seven units is indicated by either Matthew or Luke. But the remaining 33 units of Q material cannot with any confidence be attached to the Marcan outline, and thus we have assigned them to the independent tradition. It would thus appear that about half of the Q material belonged with the Marcan material in a larger, ordered entity, which we have called the basic narrative tradition, while the rest of it consisted of independent traditions.

If our division of Q material were mistaken, independent confirmation of its validity would, of course, not be forthcoming. However, confirmation of it does appear, when we consider various phenomena that have been thought to support the two-source theory (with or without the Proto-Luke hypothesis). Let us look at these matters in some detail.

The hypothesized source Q has often been described as a "sayings source," since most of its material consists of teachings of Jesus, either with or without a brief narrative framework. This homogeneity, indeed, has lent a certain plausibility to the Q hypothesis. The fact remains, however, that the material common to Matthew and Luke alone is sometimes not of this character. It includes Mt. 3:7-10 = Lk. 3:7-9, on the ministry and teaching of John the Baptist. This would be relevant background material in a narrative about Jesus, but would be out of place in a collection of

the teachings of Jesus. Q also includes the three temptations of Jesus in Mt. 4:2-11a = Lk. 4:2c-13, where we learn that he could out-quote the Devil, but where we do not find any of his teachings. Then there are three tid-bits of narrative, Mt. 9:26 = Lk. 4:14b, Mt. 4:23a,c = Lk. 4:15, and Mt. 8:1 = Lk. 6:17a-c, which arguably could have been attached to sayings material in Q, but which, at least in the first two cases, much more probably belong with other narrative material. Also, quite inexplicably, there is in Q the account of the healing of the centurion's servant in Mt. 8:5-10, 13 = Lk. 7:1-10, which is typically "Marcan," or basic narrative material. Its absence from Mark is easily explained by the fact that Mark omits the surrounding portions of the basic narrative, but its presence in Q is not easily explained. Finally, Q is supposed to have contained the narrative relating Jesus' encounter with messengers from John in Mt. 11:2-6 = Lk. 7:18-23, of which only the last verse is sayings material. All of this material is more appropriate in a narrative account of the ministry of Jesus than in a collection of his teachings. And, as one might expect, each unit of it gives indications of belonging in the basic narrative tradition. Four of the units (i.e., in Luke, 3:7-9; 4:2c-13; 4:15; 7:1-10) are in category five, and thus have clearly preserved connections with the basic narrative. The other three are in category nine, and thus have lesser, but sufficient connections with it. It may be just a coincidence that all the Q material that would be anomalous in a sayings source turns out to be interconnected with the Marcian material in the basic narrative, but it is more likely that this fact demonstrates the superiority of our analysis of the structure of the synoptic tradition over that given by the two-source theory.

There is, of course, a fair amount of narrative material in the independent tradition. We have not simply assigned all narrative material to the basic tradition and then pointed to its absence from the remaining Q material as confirmation of our analysis! However, it must be remembered that the basic tradition was the primary and dominant tradition, while the independent tradition was only supplementary. Thus, it is relatively unlikely that much of the independent tradition would have been recorded by both of the synoptists who drew upon it. That which they both would have recorded is more likely to have consisted of short teachings of Jesus, which were no doubt especially prized and which were easily inserted alongside related teachings in the basic narrative. Thus, the fact that each of the 33 units of Q material that appears to have been derived from the independent tradition consists of at least predominantly sayings material tends to confirm the validity of our analysis.

Further confirmation of it appears when we consider the synoptic "doublets," i.e. similar passages in the same gospel. This phenomenon was introduced into the discussion of the synoptic problem (and named) by G. H. Weisse in 1838,<sup>5</sup> and ever since it has been thought by many to provide strong, and perhaps decisive evidence for the two-source theory.<sup>6</sup> However, it will be seen that the evidence, though superficially consistent with the two-source theory, actually supports--indeed, overwhelmingly supports--our somewhat different theory.

The argument from doublets assumes that a given source will not ordinarily repeat the same material (unless it is itself composite), though different sources treating the same subject will contain some of the same material. If a writer draws upon such

overlapping sources, it is argued, he may well (whether intentionally or not) include the same material twice, once taking it from one source and the other time from another source. Thus, if the same material is found repeated in the synoptic tradition in portions of it assigned on independent grounds to different sources, but not in portions of it assigned to the same source, then the source criticism is confirmed, at least for the passages involved, and probably for the theory in general.

This would seem to be a valid argument, one not only generally applicable to literary criticism, but also one specifically appropriate to synoptic criticism. The synoptic tradition was concise and rather brief, and so one would not expect to find repetitions within one well-organized body of tradition or within a written source based directly upon such oral tradition. However, one might expect to find doublets in a more amorphous, less organized body of traditions, such as we have observed the independent tradition to be.

Furthermore, it must be recognized that similar events do occur, and that similar events may well be recorded in a narrative, even with similar words at times. Thus, narrative (including conversational) doublets must be treated, for the purposes of source criticism, with great caution. It would be foolish to identify separate sources for the feeding of the five thousand (in Matthew, Mark, and Luke) and the feeding of the four thousand (in Matthew and Mark), even though the two accounts are structured in similar ways. Similarly, Jesus' three predictions of his death and resurrection (each of which is given in each synoptic gospel) are not to be treated as the same prediction and attributed to three different sources. Indeed, it would be advisable to ignore all narrative

doublings for which the verbal agreement is not extensive, and assume that the similarity of the passages involved is due to the similarity of the distinct events being described. As a matter of fact, very few of the doublings ordinarily brought into the discussion of the synoptic problem are narrative in character, and the extent of their agreement is never very great.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, while Hawkins may be formally correct in defining doublings as "repetitions of the same or closely similar sentences in the same Gospel,"<sup>8</sup> for the purpose of source criticism it would be better to limit our attention, as is commonly done, to "sayings" of Jesus repeated in the same gospel.<sup>9</sup>

It is true, of course, that the same saying can be uttered on different occasions, and that similar teachings could be present in the same body of tradition (whether oral or written). However, when the sayings doublings are examined, it becomes apparent that in the great majority of cases at least one of the passages (normally the non-Markan one) is only loosely tied to its context. In other words, it has evidently been attached by the evangelist to material with which it was not originally connected. Thus, it cannot very easily be argued that we have here the same teaching given on a different occasion. On the other hand, if a sayings doubling is integral to its context in both passages, and both contexts would be appropriate in the same narrative, then it must be questioned whether such doublings are suitable for source criticism. For example, similar sayings are to be found in Mk. 8:31, 9:31, and 10:33-34 (being Jesus' predictions of his passion), yet all three are integral to their context, and thus cannot be assigned to different sources apart from that context. That a basic narrative of Jesus' ministry would include three occasions on which Jesus

spoke such corrective words is not beyond reason, and thus we should not suppose that Mark has drawn the same prediction from three different sources.<sup>10</sup> Sayings doublets that are integral to their context are, like narrative doublets, better excluded from consideration unless the extent of the similarity is quite high.

Another problem is that of deciding how much similarity of content or expression is necessary in order to identify two passages as forming a doublet. Since similar teachings of Jesus would naturally have become part of the gospel tradition, a high degree of similarity should be required for doublets. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between similar sayings and actual doublets, but it is better to be cautious in identifying doublets for the purpose of source criticism. Hawkins was properly cautious in drawing up his list of 22 doublets in Matthew, one in Mark, eleven in Luke, and one special case,<sup>11</sup> and we will largely confine ourselves to his list.

The fact that there is only one true doublet in Mark (viz. the unparalleled 9:35 and 10:43-44 = Mt. 20:26-27, repeated in 23:11; cf. the probably independent Lk. 22:26), but so many in Matthew and Luke, tends to confirm that there were few, if any, doublets in separate traditions (on our theory) or source documents (on the two-source theory). According to our theory, Mark is based almost entirely on the basic narrative tradition, where few repetitions of sayings would be expected. Similarly, most advocates of Marcan priority do not attribute his material to overlapping sources. Furthermore, while Mk. 10:43-44 is certainly part of the basic narrative tradition (since it is paralleled by Matthew), 9:35 looks like a detail added to it by Mark, for both Matthew and Luke do not give it in their parallel accounts (see Mt. 18:1-3a, 4-5; 10:40 =

Mk. 9:33b-37 = Lk. 9:46-48). (This simple and rather obvious explanation is not available on the two-source theory, of course, unless one distinguishes between the Marcan source and canonical Mark.) A second doublet (or triplet), namely the saying, "He who has ears, etc.," is found in Mark at 4:9 and 4:23 (and at 7:16 in all but a few of the "best" manuscripts), but Hawkins rightly treats this saying as a special case,<sup>12</sup> for it is an adjunct to other sayings and is found in several different contexts in the synoptics.

The distribution of doublets in Luke is particularly striking. As G. B. Caird points out, ten of the eleven identified by Hawkins consist of pairs of passages, one member of which, under the two-source theory, is assigned to Mark and the other member of which is assigned to Q or Luke's special material. This implies that "Luke has included one version of a saying from Mark and another version from one of his other sources," usually Q.<sup>13</sup> However, our analysis of the synoptic tradition explains these ten doublets equally well.<sup>14</sup> They consist of one passage from the material that we have assigned (on independent principles) to the basic narrative tradition and of another passage from the material that we have assigned to the independent tradition. This may be seen from the following list of the Lucan doublets, numbered after Hawkins,<sup>15</sup> with his eighth doublet, Lk. 9:46 (= Mt. 18:1 = Mk. 9:34) and 22:24, omitted because it is a narrative doublet (though its inclusion would strengthen our argument).

#### Doublets in Luke

	Basic Narrative Tradition			Independent Tradition		
	Mt.	= Mk.	= Lk. A	Lk. B	= Mt.	
(1)	---	4:21	8:16	11:33	5:15	Q
(2)	---	4:22	8:17	12:2	10:26	Q

	Mt.	= Mk.	= Lk. A	Lk. B	= Mt.	
(3)	13:12	4:25	8:18	19:26	25:29	Q
(4)	10:7a,8-10a, 11,14	6:8b-11	9:2b-5	10:4-11	10:7b,10b, 12-13	Q
(5)	16:24	8:34	9:23	14:27	10:38	Q
(6)	16:25 = 10:39	8:35	9:24	17:33	---	
(7)	---	8:38a	9:26a	12:9	10:33	Q
(9)	23:6-7	12:38-39	20:46	11:43	---	Q
(10)	10:19-20	13:11	12:11-12	21:14-15 (?)	---	
(11)	---	---	---	14:11	23:12	Q
				= 18:14		

On the surface, then, both our theory and the two-source theory can explain the Lucan doublets. Such a result is possible because the basic narrative tradition is roughly comparable to Mark, and the independent tradition is roughly comparable to Q and the special traditions. The two theories differ, in their analysis of the synoptic tradition, basically in that ours assigns about half of Q to the basic narrative tradition alongside Mark. Because of this basic difference, we may be able to determine which theory explains the evidence better, by considering the distribution of the Q versions of the Lucan doublets. That is, if our theory is correct, these passages should all (or nearly all) be among the Q material that we have assigned to the independent tradition, not among the Q material assigned to the basic narrative tradition, where they would (in all but one case) repeat a saying present elsewhere in that tradition. But if the two-source theory is correct, the Q versions of the doublets should be distributed more or less randomly throughout Q, and not all congregated in those portions of it that we have capriciously (according to the Q hypothesis) assigned to the independent tradition. Here, then, is

an objective test of these two theories of synoptic origins. Let us look at the evidence, which consists of seven Q passages, six of which have Matthean parallels (viz. nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7), and the other of which is an integral part of a Q section (viz. no. 9). (14:11 must be disregarded, as it does not have a parallel in the basic narrative tradition.)

The simple fact is that all seven of these Q passages are among those that we have identified as independent tradition. They are widely (i.e. more or less randomly) distributed within Luke's Q material belonging to the independent tradition; not one is found in the Q material belonging to the basic narrative tradition.

Since we have assigned 114 out of Luke's 215 Q verses (and partial verses) to the independent tradition, the probability that any given one of these seven Q passages would (on the two-source theory) be among the verses assigned to the independent tradition is  $114/215$ , or 0.53. Thus, the probability that all seven would be there is  $(0.53)^7$ , or about 0.01.<sup>16</sup> But since these doublets consist of (Jesus') saying material, and we have assigned 98 out of Luke's 166 verses of Q sayings material to the independent tradition, it would probably be more accurate to calculate the probability that all seven passages would be in the independent tradition as  $(98/166)^7$ , i.e.  $(0.59)^7$ , or about 0.025. The probability of our analysis being correct, and the Q hypothesis being wrong, then, would be either 1.0 minus 0.01, or 0.99, or else 1.0 minus 0.025, or 0.975. But whether the probability in our favor is 0.99 or "only" 0.975, it is a very high probability indeed.

Wernle identifies not seven Lucan doublets pairing Marcan and Q passages, but nine. He adds the Q passages 12:52 and 17:33.<sup>17</sup> But while 17:33 does in fact form a doublet with a Marcan passage

in Luke, it is neither paralleled in Matthew (for Mt. 10:39 anticipates 16:25 without any connection with Lk. 17:33) nor part of a Q section. And 12:52, though in Q, does not really form a doublet with 21:16, since their similarity is negligible. Nonetheless, if Wernle's list were accepted as correct, it would provide further support for our theory over against the two-source theory, for all of his Q passages are among the material that we have assigned to the independent tradition.

The doublets in Matthew provide further, and similarly emphatic support for our analysis of the synoptic tradition. The situation here is more complicated, however, because of Matthew's tendency to repeat the same piece of tradition. On the basis of verbal similarity, lack of parallels, and contextual considerations, it is our judgment that the same tradition is repeated in Hawkins's Matthean doublets nos. 1 (with modifications in 5:29b, 30b), 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 (where 10:39 and 16:25 represent the same tradition, and Lk. 17:33 is an independent version), 9, 13, 15 (though Mt. 9:35a-b = Mk. 6:6b-e is not part of a doublet), and 20. (Nos. 4 and 22 should perhaps also be added.)<sup>18</sup> These doublets must, of course, be ignored for the purposes of source analysis, although no. 9 requires more attention, as 16:4, though a repetition of 12:39, is substituted for a similar passage in Mark.

Of the remaining thirteen doublets, six must also be removed from consideration. Five (in addition to no. 15, which repeats the same tradition) are narrative doublets, the passages of which merely relate similar events or details of events (viz. nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21). The other one (viz. no. 9) is a sayings doublet, but it is in each passage integral to its context, and is therefore inappropriate for source criticism.<sup>19</sup> The two passages

involved, Mt. 12:39 and 16:4, relate Jesus' similar responses to similar demands that he produce a sign. In Mt. 12:38-42 = Lk. 11:29-32 (Q) some of the scribes and Pharisees seek a sign from heaven (though Luke omits the request), and the Pharisees and Sadducees do so in Mt. 16:1-2a, 4 = Mk. 8:11-13. Jesus would have often been badgered for such a sign (see 1 Cor. 1:22), and it should not be at all surprising that two such incidents would be part of the basic narrative tradition, just as three predictions of the passion were part of it. In the Q account, which comes first in the basic narrative, Jesus condemns "this generation" as "wicked" for seeking a sign, and says that it will only be given the "sign of Jonah" (Mt. 12:39 = Lk. 11:29), which is then explained (Mt. 12:40 = Lk. 11:30) with elaboration (Mt. 12:41-42 = Lk. 11:31-32). In the Marcan account (Mt. 16:4 = Mk. 8:12), Jesus sighs, asks why "this generation" seeks for a sign, and then says that none will be given to it (Mk. 8:12). (Jesus' answer in Mt. 16:4 is a repetition of that given in 12:39.) This curt, exasperated reply is what one would expect to find in a narrative not long after the more elaborate earlier answer to the same question. Furthermore, the verbal correspondence between the two passages is low, considering their similarity in subject matter. Mark's account neither condemns the Pharisees for wickedness nor mentions the sign of Jonah, so it is better to treat the two accounts as similar responses to the same question, not as the same saying. Since both passages are integral to their context, fit into the same narrative, and do not manifest extensive similarity in content or wording, they do not constitute a true doublet for source-critical purposes.

We are thus left with seven significant Matthean doublets. Their pattern is comparable to that of the ten significant Lucan

doublings: most bring together passages from the basic narrative tradition and the independent tradition, but two bring together passages from the independent tradition. Here is the list of them (numbered after Hawkins<sup>20</sup>):

Doublings in Matthew

	Basic Narrative Trad.			Independent Trad.	
	Mk.	= Lk.	= Mt. A	Mt. B	= Lk.
(4)	---	---	---	10:15	10:12 Q
				= 11:24	Q
(7)	8:34	9:23	16:24	10:38	14:27 Q
(10)	4:25	8:18	13:12	25:29	19:26 Q
(11)	11:23	---	21:21	17:20c-e	17:6 Q
(12)	10:31	---	19:30	20:16	13:30 Q
(14)	13:35	---	24:42	25:13	---
(22)	---	---	---	16:19	---
				= 18:18	Q

These doublings, like the Lucan doublings, can be explained equally well by our theory of synoptic origins and by the two-source theory--until, that is, one looks at the distribution of Q passages involved. (The two doublings from the independent tradition are not unexpected, because of its diversity of origin and lack of organization.) Here we have seven Q passages, five of which have parallels in Luke, and two of which (viz. 11:24 and 18:18) belong to Q sections (though not paralleled by Luke). And all seven of them are among the verses of Q that we have on independent grounds assigned to the independent tradition. But since three of the passages (viz. 10:15, 11:24, and 18:18) do not have a parallel in the basic narrative tradition (and thus not in Mark), they ought to be set aside, for the purpose of testing our theory of synoptic origins against the two-source theory, leaving these four passages: 10:38, 17:20c-e, 20:16, and 25:29. Since 99 out of

Matthew's 225 verses or partial verses (i.e. 44%) belong to the independent tradition, the probability (on the two-source theory) that all four of these passages would turn out to be among the Q material that we have assigned to that tradition is  $(0.44)^4$ , or 0.04. Or, considering only (Jesus') sayings material, 96 out of 190 verses of which (i.e. 50.5%) belong to the independent tradition, the probability is  $(0.505)^4$ , or 0.065. Thus, on the basis of the Matthean doublets the probability that our theory is to be preferred to the two-source theory is either 0.96 (i.e. 1.0 minus 0.04) or 0.935 (i.e. 1.0 minus 0.065). As in the case of the Lucan doublets, the probability in our favor is overwhelming.

Wernle's list of Matthean doublets is not particularly helpful, for in addition to a number of Hawkins's doublets he presents several where the extent of similarity is too slight to justify their classification as doublets.<sup>21</sup> Four of these dubious doublets involve a Q passage, and three of them we have assigned to the independent tradition (viz. 10:35, 12:32, and 7:8). The fourth passage, 24:26, is somewhat similar to the Marcan passage, 24:23, but Hawkins rightly comments that the resemblances between them are not "sufficient to constitute doublets."<sup>22</sup>

Although doublets are ordinarily confined to passages occurring in the same gospel, it would be better to look throughout the synoptic tradition for sayings of Jesus that can be attributed to two different sources. The same saying might, for example, be found in one context in Mark and in another one in Matthew and Luke, yet this doublet would not appear as either a Matthean or a Lucan doublet. Therefore, we should examine Burkitt's list of thirty-one "doubly attested sayings," that is, sayings attested both in Mark and in a broadly defined Q.<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately, however,

Burkitt's list is highly defective. Eleven of his pairings (viz. nos. 2, 3, 10, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 28, and 29) attribute parallel passages to separate sources, one of the pairings (viz. no. 9) is the special saying, "He who has ears, etc.,"<sup>24</sup> and in another one (viz. no. 6) the Q version is only conjectured to have existed. In the remaining eighteen sayings, the non-Marcian version is twelve times found in both Matthew and Luke (viz. nos. 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 27, and 30), six times in Luke alone (viz. nos. 1, 5, 13, 22, 26, and 31), and not once in Matthew alone. The six sayings whose non-Marcian version is attested in Luke alone are all found among the independent traditions, but while this is wholly consistent with our theory, it would in any event be expected, since very little of Luke's special material has been assigned to the basic narrative. But since we have assigned about 45% of the Q sayings material to the basic narrative, one would expect, if that assignment violated the integrity of a real Q, that that material would contain about five or six of the twelve sayings whose non-Marcian version is attested in both Matthew and Luke. However, it contains only two, both of which we have already encountered and shown not to be true doublets. One is Burkitt's no. 15, which is Hawkins's Matthean doublet no. 9, which we have rejected because both passages are integral to their respective contexts.<sup>25</sup> The other is Burkitt's no. 30 (i.e. Mt. 24:23 and 26), which Wernle accepts as a Matthean doublet, but which Hawkins properly rejects as involving insufficiently similar statements.<sup>26</sup>

Of Burkitt's remaining ten doubly attested sayings, we have already accepted seven as true Lucan or Matthean doublets (viz. nos. 7, 8, 11, 14, 17, 23, and 27). One other (viz. no. 24) brings together only vaguely similar sayings. That leaves two sayings

which qualify as true doublets, though neither has been classified as a Lucan or a Matthean doublet. The first is no. 4, where Mt. 12:31b = Mk. 3:29 forms a doublet with Mt. 12:32b = Lk. 12:10b (Q). This is a Matthean doublet that Hawkins missed. The other doublet is no. 16, where Mt. 16:6 = Mk. 8:15 forms a doublet with Lk. 12:1b (unparalleled in a Q section). As our theory predicts, the Q passage in each of these two additional doublets is located in the independent tradition. The probability (on the two-source theory) for the Matthean Q passage's being there is 0.505 and for the Lucan passage's being there is 0.59, which, when multiplied together, comes to 0.30 for their both being there.

We can now consolidate all of the true doublets into one group and calculate the probability that our theory of synoptic origins, rather than the two-source theory, provides the correct explanation for them. We have recognized seven Lucan doublets from Hawkins's list, four Matthean doublets from his list, and two others from Burkitt's list, as those which pair Marcan and Q material. Since two of the Lucan doublets also appear as Matthean doublets (i.e. nos. 3 and 5 in Luke and nos. 10 and 7 in Matthew), we will eliminate two of the Lucan doublets in adding up a total of eleven doublets. The probability that the Q version of all eleven would (on the two-source theory) just happen to be in the Q material that we have identified as independent tradition is extremely low. On the basis of the relative amounts of Q material that we have identified in the two traditions as sayings of Jesus, the probability for the five remaining Lucan passages would be  $(0.59)^5$ , for the four Matthean passages  $(0.505)^4$ , and for Burkitt's two other passages,  $(0.59)(0.505)$ . For all eleven passages, then, the probability is  $(0.59)^6(0.505)^5$ , or a negligible 0.0014, that the two-source

theory is correct. On the other hand, the probability is 0.9986 (out of 1.0) that our theory is correct. The doublets involving Q passages demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that our theory of synoptic origins is valid. Our theory is built up on the assumption of the literary independence of the three synoptics, and that assumption, derived from our study of Luke's preface, would now seem to be overwhelmingly vindicated.

But there is yet further confirmation for our analysis of the synoptic tradition. Let us consider the Proto-Luke hypothesis, according to which Luke first combined Q and his special source L into Proto-Luke, and subsequently incorporated Mark into it to produce the gospel as we know it. The division of Luke's gospel into Proto-Lucan and Marcan material is rather similar to our division of it into material drawn from the independent tradition and from the basic narrative tradition. The independent tradition (as used by Luke) is roughly the same as Proto-Luke, the chief difference being that Proto-Luke includes the half of Q that we have assigned to the basic narrative tradition. Now according to the advocates of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, there are certain stylistic differences between the Proto-Lucan and the Marcan material in Luke. The fact of the matter is, however, that in these matters of style the half of Q that we have put in the basic narrative tradition (on quite independent grounds) does not exhibit the Proto-Lucan stylistic traits. Thus, these stylistic matters actually differentiate the basic narrative tradition from the independent tradition, not Q and L from Luke's Marcan material.

The first matter of style is the use of  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in narrative to refer to Jesus. Caird observes, following Streeter,<sup>27</sup> that just as "Matthew and Mark never refer to Jesus as 'the Lord' in narrative,"

so also Luke, when "editing Mark," never does so, although elsewhere (in both Q and L passages) he does fourteen times. From this distribution of κύριος in Lucan narrative Caird deduces that Luke employed this usage editorially when combining Q and L into Proto-Luke, but did not do so when later adding Marcan material to produce his full gospel.<sup>28</sup> Actually, the usage occurs fifteen or sixteen times in Luke's gospel.<sup>29</sup> And, as a matter of fact, Luke does once, when "editing Mark," employ this usage, namely at 22:61b (cf. Mk. 14:72), no doubt because he does so in vs. 61a (a detail added to the narrative by Luke). It is nonetheless significant that this usage is rare in Luke's narrative Marcan material, but much more common in his Q (at 7:19; 10:1; 11:39; 12:42; 17:5, 6) and L (at 7:13; 10:39, 41; 13:15; 18:6; 19:8) narrative material, and occurs even in material apparently added by Luke to the Marcan narrative (at 22:31 (?), 61a; 24:3).

Now if the two-source theory (with or without Proto-Luke) were correct, and our treatment of Q were wrong, one would expect the six Q references to Jesus as "Lord" to be found both in the Q material that we have assigned to the basic narrative and in the Q material that we have assigned to the independent tradition. Indeed, since the "narrative" portions of Q in the independent tradition consist almost entirely of brief introductory statements, whereas all the truly narrative sections of it belong to the basic narrative tradition, one would expect most of the Q references to Jesus as "Lord" to be in the Q material assigned to the basic narrative. On the other hand, if our analysis were correct, one would expect the Q material in the basic tradition, like the Marcan material that constitutes most of it, not to have any of these references.

Our analysis is therefore strongly supported by the fact that at least five out of these six references occur in the Q material assigned to the independent tradition. The only possible exception is 7:19, and there "the Lord" is a questionable reading. We are inclined to reject it on textual-critical grounds,<sup>30</sup> but if it could be shown to be genuine, we would explain it as the second instance (alongside of 22:61b) of Luke's introduction of this usage into the basic narrative tradition. Or, it could be argued that the passage that contains it, being in the somewhat tentative category nine of the basic narrative tradition, really belongs in the independent tradition. In any case, if we limit our attention to the five textually certain Q references to Jesus as "the Lord," the fact that all five are in the independent tradition weighs heavily against the Q hypothesis and in favor of our analysis.

There are different ways of calculating the probability that this distribution would have resulted if the two-source theory were correct and our analysis of the Q material were incorrect. First, we could consider the places in Luke's Q narrative where he could have used the term "the Lord," namely his explicit or implicit references to Jesus (but excluding possessive pronouns). We count 40 such references in the Q material assigned to the basic narrative tradition, and 38 in that assigned to the independent tradition. But in many of these cases it would have been completely unnatural to use any designation other than a pronoun. If we eliminate these, we are left with 28 places in the basic tradition and 28 in the independent tradition where Luke could have used the expression "the Lord." Thus, the probability that all five occurrences of this expression would be in the material that we have classified as independent tradition is, on the two-source

theory,  $(28/56)^5$ , or 0.03. Secondly, we could ignore the places where Luke thought that a pronoun was appropriate, and consider only the places where he refers to Jesus by name (i.e. "Jesus") or title (i.e. "the Lord"). He does so 8 times in the Q basic tradition and 7 times in the Q independent tradition. The probability in question would then be  $(7/15)^5$ , or 0.02 (or, if 7:19 be excluded as textually uncertain,  $(7/14)^5$ , or 0.03). Thus we see that the probability that this stylistic phenomenon can be explained by the two-source theory is a mere 0.02 or 0.03, while the probability that it is to be explained by our theory is 1.0 minus that, or an overwhelming 0.97 or 0.98. Once again we find decisive support for our theory of synoptic origins.

If Luke's occasional designation of Jesus as "the Lord" in narrative portions of the independent tradition be attributed to Lucan style, then his reluctance to introduce that designation in material taken from the basic tradition is probably to be explained by his faithfulness to that more venerable tradition. We are more inclined, however, to explain this usage as one that was common in the independent tradition (and in the apostolic church generally), but which for some reason was absent from the (more conservative?) basic narrative tradition. Since Mark stuck to the basic tradition, his failure to refer to Jesus as "the Lord" is readily understandable. Matthew, however, made considerable use of the independent tradition. Perhaps he, too, was reluctant to call the earthly Jesus "the Lord" (though he may have done so in 28:16 with reference to the risen Jesus). On the other hand, he drew very little narrative material from the independent tradition in which Jesus is mentioned (except as a child), and so he had few occasions to adopt this usage, which was uncommon anyway. Apart from the case of

Lk. 7:19, which we have argued is no case at all, Luke adopts this usage in Q material only in statements for which Matthew's account has no parallel.

Streeter, but not Caird, also tries to support the Proto-Luke hypothesis by appealing to the distribution of the vocative κύριε in address to Jesus in Luke's gospel. Luke, he says, uses the expression sixteen times, twice in Marcan material and the rest in material assigned to Proto-Luke: six times in Q, and eight times in L.<sup>31</sup> Streeter tries to explain away the two occurrences of κύριε in Luke's Marcan material, but his arguments are unconvincing. He suggests that "the addition of κύριε" in Lk. 5:12 may be "a textual assimilation" to Mt. 8:2, "since it makes a minor agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark."<sup>32</sup> But this suggestion lacks manuscript support. We cannot rewrite Luke in order to fit it into our literary theories. The same minor agreement occurs at Mt. 20:33 = Lk. 18:41, where Mark substitutes ῥαββουνί (10:51). Streeter explains that Luke has substituted κύριε here because he "avoids all Hebrew words" and "never uses ῥαββεί."<sup>33</sup> But he overlooks that Matthew also has κύριε here, and Matthew does use words of Hebrew origin, including ῥαββί. We may infer from these two minor agreements that this reading was the usual one in these places in the basic narrative. That Mark would omit the first reference (at 1:40) and change the second one (at 10:51) should not come as a surprise, since he uses this form of address only once (at 7:28, on the lips of the Syrophenician woman). Matthew, by comparison, uses it nineteen times, ten of which occur in passages with close Marcan parallels. Since Luke uses κύριε in his Marcan material as well as in his Q and L material, one cannot argue that Luke must have combined Q and L using this expression and then added Marcan

material without using it.

There may have been a greater tendency to have Jesus addressed as "Lord" in the independent tradition than in the basic narrative. This would explain the fact that this usage is found only twice in Luke's Marcan material, but eight times in his unparalleled material. Similarly, we find that this usage, which occurs seven times in his Q material (including 9:59, which Streeter evidently omitted), occurs mostly in that portion of Q which we have assigned to the independent tradition (viz. 9:59, 61; 11:1; 12:41; 13:23), but also in the portion belonging to the basic narrative tradition (viz. 7:6; 17:37). If our analysis of Q were incorrect, this usage would probably be more evenly distributed in the two portions of Q. Our suggestion that the use of  $\kappa\upsilon\tilde{\rho}\iota\epsilon$  was less common in the basic narrative tradition is not contradicted by its frequent use in that material by Matthew, for this usage was clearly a favorite of his. It was also a usage avoided by Mark, as we have seen.

Another matter of style is, as Caird says, that Luke "regularly" calls the Jewish legal experts "lawyers" in Q and L passages, but "scribes" in Marcan passages.<sup>34</sup> Luke mentions "lawyers" in both his Q material (at 11:45, 46, 52, all in the same unit of material) and his special material (at 7:30; 10:25; 14:3). Elsewhere in the synoptics this term appears only in Mt. 22:35, where Mark reads "scribes." Luke mentions "scribes" frequently in Marcan material (at 5:21, 30; 6:7; 9:22; 19:47; 20:1, 19, 39, 46; 22:2, 66), but also in both his Q material (at 15:2) and his special material (at 11:53; 23:10).

The term "lawyers" is distributed in Luke's Q material as our analysis of Q would predict. That is, the term does not occur in the Q material that we have assigned to the basic narrative tradi-

tion, but rather in the Q material that belongs in the independent tradition alongside the unparalleled material in which the term is also found. But since only one unit of Q material is involved, this provides only weak confirmation for our analysis.

Caird does not actually say so, but he gives the impression that Luke favored the term "lawyers" in producing Proto-Luke, and then added his Marcan material with its references to "scribes."<sup>35</sup> But this impression misrepresents the facts. Although the term "scribes" was evidently used in the basic (i.e. Marcan) narrative to the exclusion of "lawyers," Luke shows no preference in his independent (or Q plus L) material, using "scribes" in three units of it and "lawyers" in four. From these facts we would infer that both terms were used in the independent tradition, but that for some reason only one was used in the basic narrative tradition. Matthew's failure to use the term "lawyers" in his independent tradition does not show that Luke's use of this term is to be attributed to his own editorial preference rather than to the usage of the independent tradition. Rather, Matthew's failure to use it is to be explained by the fact that he, unlike Luke, drew very little material from the independent tradition that involved Jewish legal experts. He did draw upon the independent tradition represented by Mt. 23:4, 13, 15, 23, 29-36 = Lk. 11:42-52 (on woes to the Pharisees), where Luke refers to lawyers three times. But in two of those cases (viz. vss. 45 and 46) there is no parallel statement in Matthew. And in the third case, although Matthew does read "scribes" (23:13) where Luke has "lawyers" (11:52), he does so in order to repeat the refrain, "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" (see also vss. 15, 23, 25, 27, 29), and for this reason has adopted the expression "scribes and Pharisees" where Luke has

"lawyers."

Thus we see that certain matters of style, notably the use of the word "Lord" in Lucan narrative, provide further confirmation for our theory of synoptic origins. The connection of Q material with the Marcan outline, the distribution of narrative material in Q, the distribution of the Q versions of doublets, and now the distribution of certain expressions in Luke, together provide overwhelming confirmation for our assumption of the literary independence of the three synoptic gospels and for our "two-tradition theory" based upon it. They also indicate that the major conclusion of our study of Luke's preface, namely his literary independence, is correct.

But is there any other explanation? It could perhaps be argued that our "basic narrative tradition" was not an oral gospel, but rather a written gospel used independently by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. But it is most incredible that a written gospel of such evidently wide circulation and high authority would have disappeared even from the memory of the church. Furthermore, Luke's preface is wholly against such a notion, both because no such work is mentioned there and because he indicates his reliance upon the oral gospel tradition. Thus, we maintain that the common basis of the synoptic gospels was oral, not written in form. The oral tradition consisted of a basic narrative tradition, which formed the foundation for each of the three synoptic gospels, and a body of independent traditions, which provided supplementary material for Matthew and Luke. This may be called "the two-tradition theory" of synoptic origins, both to distinguish it from other oral theories and to indicate its similarity to the two-source theory.

## APPENDIX

### THE IDENTITY OF THE ELDER JOHN

Papias, an early second-century bishop of Hierapolis, refers to "the elder John" in the preface to his Expositions of the Dominical Oracles, in a passage preserved by Eusebius in the third book of his Ecclesiastical History. This reference comes after a list of apostles that includes John. The question therefore arises whether "the elder John" is to be identified with, or distinguished from, the apostle John previously mentioned.

In his preface Papias promises that along with his interpretations of the dominical oracles he will record "all that ever I carefully learnt and carefully recalled from the elders, guaranteeing its truth. For I did not take delight, as most men do, in those who have much to say, but in those who teach what is true; not in those who recall foreign commandments, but in those who recall the commandments given by the Lord to faith, and reaching us from the truth itself."<sup>1</sup> Papias continues: "And if anyone chanced to come who had actually been a follower of the elders, I would enquire as to the discourses of the elders, what Andrew or what Peter, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples had said; and the things which Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, were saying." The Greek text of this crucial sentence is εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος

ἢ τί Θωμαῆς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν ἄτε Ἀριστίου καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν. Papias concludes: "For I supposed that things out of books did not profit me so much as the utterances of a voice which liveth and abideth."<sup>2</sup>

Papias mentions the elder John, as such, only in the clause, "and the things which Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, were saying." This John is identified as "the elder" and, together with Aristion, is described as one of the "disciples of the Lord." Since the meaning of the expression "the elder" is not easy to ascertain, let us first examine the other expression used in connection with this John, namely "disciples of the Lord."

This description is first used in the previous clause, where reference is made to all of the Lord's disciples, that is, to the seven most prominent of the twelve apostles, each of whom is mentioned by name,<sup>3</sup> and "any other of the Lord's disciples." Here the expression "the Lord's disciples" clearly refers to the personal disciples of Jesus, not to Christians in some broader sense.<sup>4</sup> Now since the same description is applied to Aristion and the elder John in the next clause, we must understand that these two men had both been personal disciples of Jesus. According to Papias, then, the elder John was a personal disciple of Jesus, and thus not a second-generation Christian.<sup>5</sup>

Since Aristion and perhaps the elder John were not apostles, and yet were disciples of the Lord, it follows that the expression "disciples of the Lord" cannot be restricted to the twelve apostles. The apostles were the most important of Jesus' immediate disciples, but he had others as well (cf. Ac. 1:21-23). Thus, when Papias speaks of "any other of the Lord's disciples," he does not simply

mean "any other of the twelve apostles." His residual category includes Aristion, the elder John (if he was not the apostle John), and whoever else may have been a personal disciple of Jesus, whether an apostle or not.

A. Harnack recognizes that the expression "the Lord's disciples," when used after the seven named apostles, refers to "Apostel oder Herrnschüler im strengen Sinne," but he argues that in connection with Aristion and the elder John the same expression refers to "Herrnschüler im weiteren Sinne." These he identifies as those "die, aus Palästina stammend, alte Christen waren und etwa als Kinder den Herrn eben noch gesehen."<sup>6</sup> But this distinction is not exegetically defensible. It is arbitrary to suppose that the simple expression "disciples of the Lord" would be used in different senses in consecutive clauses so closely related. The concession that Aristion and the elder John may have seen Jesus as children only underscores the futility of the supposed distinction.<sup>7</sup>

Harnack draws this distinction because the words of Papias would otherwise present to him an historical difficulty. He notes that Aristion and the elder John were still alive (as the tense of λέγουσιν implies) at the time of Papias's investigations (which he dates at ca. 100), and thus would have been too old to have once been disciples of the Lord in the strict sense.<sup>8</sup> But that follows only if his relatively late dating of Papias's investigations is correct--and that, in turn, depends upon the date of his Expositions, which is much disputed (dates between 90 and 160 having been suggested), but which Harnack puts very late, between 145 and 160<sup>9</sup>--and if (on that dating) we can be sure that two of Jesus' younger disciples could not have lived to the age of ninety or so, which can hardly be insisted upon.<sup>10</sup> Harnack also appeals to the fact

that in Acts the early Jewish Christians, especially those of Palestine, were known as μαθηταί,<sup>11</sup> but this name applied to gentile Christians as well (see Ac. 15:10), and simply meant "Christians."<sup>12</sup> He draws particular attention to Ac. 21:16, where reference is made to "an early disciple," but the adjective "early" implies that later converts were also called "disciples." Furthermore, Papias adds the modifying phrase "of the Lord," implying a close connection with Jesus not shared by other disciples, and that distinguishing connection could only be a personal acquaintance with him. Moreover, it would go without saying that Aristion and the elder John were disciples in a broad sense. Thus, Acts provides no support for the interpretation of Papias advanced by Harnack. We must accept that Papias identifies Aristion and the elder John as personal disciples of Jesus, as men who could "recall the commandments given by the Lord to faith."

This conclusion has been challenged on textual grounds by certain scholars. E. A. Abbott conjectured that Papias and then Eusebius had actually written "disciples of the disciples of the Lord," but that copyists and translators alike had corrupted the text of Eusebius.<sup>13</sup> But B. W. Bacon correctly replied that if Papias had so written, Eusebius would undoubtedly have drawn attention to those words in §§ 5-7, where he seeks to prove that the elder John was not the apostle John.<sup>14</sup> Besides, Abbott's proposed text is very awkward and unnatural.

Bacon himself conjectured that Papias had originally written "the disciples of those [above named apostles]" (ΟΙΤΟΥΤΩΝΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ), but that this reading was corrupted to "disciples of the Lord" (ΟΙΤΟΥΚΥΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ) in the manuscript of Papias used by Eusebius.<sup>15</sup> However, it is hard to see why anyone would have written "the

disciples of those" rather than "their disciples" or "disciples of the apostles." Contrary to Bacon,<sup>16</sup> his conjecture is not supported by Irenaeus's references to "the elders who were disciples of the apostles" (Haer. V.5.1, 36.2; cf. IV.27.1), for there is no reason to suppose that Irenaeus based his description of these elders upon the conjecturally similar expression of Papias, even if the traditions attributed to them were drawn from Papias, as seems probable.<sup>17</sup> Irenaeus was simply referring to the ancient worthies of the church in his customary manner. This is shown by his reference to "the elders before us, who also were disciples of the apostles" in a letter to Florinus which has nothing to do with traditions preserved by Papias.<sup>18</sup>

W. Larfeld objects to the conjectural emendations proposed by Abbott and Bacon that it is highly unlikely that Papias would have described his last two authorities in such a vague manner. Also, he points out that geography would have made it unlikely for them to have been disciples of even most of the apostles. But since he cannot make sense of Papias's statement as it stands, Larfeld propounds yet another conjectural emendation. The original reading, he argues, was τοῦ Ἰωάννου μαθηταί, making Aristion and the elder John "disciples of John" the apostle, not disciples of the Lord. He claims that Ἰωάννου would have been abbreviated as  $\overline{\text{IΩΥ}}$ , which could have been mistaken for  $\overline{\text{ΚΟΥ}}$  at a time when K was written much like IC.<sup>19</sup> However, there is no reason to think that Papias would have abbreviated Ἰωάννου in the first place. Furthermore, the abbreviation would have ended in -ΟΥ, not -Υ. Moreover, it is by no means clear that Papias would have referred to hearers or followers of John as his "disciples." And, the difference between  $\overline{\text{IΩ}}$  and  $\overline{\text{ΚΟ}}$  is greater than Larfeld wants to believe. Therefore, his

conjecture must be rejected as highly improbable.

T. Mommsen sought to dispose of the troublesome description of the elder John by arguing that the words "disciples of the Lord" had been interpolated into the Greek text of Eusebius, since they were not to be found in the Syriac version of Eusebius.<sup>20</sup> Mommsen's view was subsequently adopted by M.-J. Lagrange,<sup>21</sup> G. Bardy,<sup>22</sup> and almost by R. Schnackenburg.<sup>23</sup> Now it is true that the Syriac version was probably prepared from a good Greek text during the lifetime of Eusebius or shortly thereafter, and that the two extant Syriac manuscripts are very ancient, dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, three or four centuries earlier than any surviving Greek manuscript.<sup>24</sup> And to some extent the Syriac may be used to emend the Greek text, since, in the words of its editors, "of the two qualities most desirable in a version--faithfulness and literary skill--our Syriac translator shews both in a considerable degree."<sup>25</sup> However, it must be borne in mind that a number of scribes stand between the extant Syriac manuscripts and the original Syriac text,<sup>26</sup> and that "a common feature" of the Syriac text is "the omission of words, clauses, and groups of clauses."<sup>27</sup>

Turning then to the Syriac text, we find that Mommsen and his followers have given a misleading account of it. It does, to be sure, present nothing equivalent to τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί, but it also shows no knowledge of the next word, λέγουσιν.<sup>28</sup> Thus, where the Greek has two clauses, the Syriac has one, with Aristion and the elder John simply appended to the preceding list of the Lord's disciples: "of Andrew what he said, or Peter what he said, or what Philip or what Thomas, or what James or what John or Matthew or one of the other disciples of our Lord, or what Aristion or John the elder."

Here the apostle John is clearly distinguished from the elder John, and the latter is apparently excluded from the company of disciples--just as many scholars have struggled to interpret the more difficult Greek text. However, apparent ease of interpretation does not justify an uncritical approach to textual criticism.<sup>29</sup> It is clear on internal grounds that the Syriac text does not accurately represent the original Greek. The words "or any other of the Lord's disciples" obviously constitute a residual category with which a list of names is concluded, and immediately after which other names would not simply be added, as we find in the Syriac.

Furthermore, there is good reason to think that the two extant Syriac manuscripts do not even accurately represent the original Syriac translation. When we turn to the Armenian version of Eusebius, which, according to A. Merx, was translated from the Syriac with "the utmost accuracy" well before the earliest extant Syriac manuscript was produced, and is known from three late manuscripts derived from the same, probably ancient exemplar,<sup>30</sup> we find "Aristion or John, the elders," instead of the Syriac "Aristion or John the elder."<sup>31</sup> The difference between the extant Syriac reading and the Syriac text evidently underlying the Armenian version is (in the absence of vowel marks) a mere two dots which, when placed over a singular noun in the emphatic state, as here, make it plural. These dots could easily have been omitted during the transmission of the Syriac text subsequent to the Armenian translation from it. Such an omission could have been made inadvertently, but it was probably made intentionally, as an attempted correction, in order to conform the text to the references to "the elder John" elsewhere in the chapter.

Circumstantial evidence that this did in fact occur is pro-

vided in § 7 and again in § 14, where reference is made in both the Greek and the Syriac to "the elder John," whereas in § 4 the same Greek word order is reversed in the Syriac to "John the elder." We would suggest that the reversal of word order in § 4 was not capricious or stylistic, but rather is to be explained on the assumption that the Greek text known to us lay before the Syriac translator. Thinking that "the elder" and "disciples of the Lord" were redundant expressions, and that the latter need not be repeated in the sentence, he decided (in his characteristic manner) to simplify the text by pluralizing "the elder" and omitting "disciples of the Lord." He then removed "the elder" from before "John" and placed "the elders" after it, so that both Aristion and John would be so described. (He also appears to have taken λέγονσιν to be redundant to εἶπεν, and thus omitted it, too.) Subsequently, a Syriac copyist corrected the number of the noun, but not its place in the text. Thus we see that the combined Syriac and Armenian evidence indicates that the original Greek text was the same as that preserved by the Greek manuscripts.<sup>32</sup>

We conclude, then, that Papias described Aristion and the elder John as "disciples of the Lord," and understood that the elder John, like Aristion, was a personal disciple of Jesus. This would seem to suggest that the elder John was the apostle of that name. However, it is conceivable that Jesus had two disciples named John, or at least that Papias thought so.

We may now turn our attention to the designation "the elder" in the phrase "the elder John." It is necessary to identify "the elders" to whom Papias previously refers, and then consider whether he uses the term "the elder" in the same manner, designating John as one of these elders.

In the first part of his statement (§ 3 in Eusebius), Papias indicates that when he was younger he "learnt" certain things well from the elders, and thus "recalled" thereafter what they had taught him. He did so, he explains, because he delighted "in those who teach what is true." This can only mean that Papias sought out the elders and personally heard them teach. They taught him the truth, he learned it well from them, and could later recall their teachings.<sup>33</sup> Papias then explains that his delight in the elders, as "those who teach what is true," was a delight in "those who recall the commandments given by the Lord to faith, and reaching us from the truth itself." If the elders were those who could "recall the commandments given by the Lord," they obviously were the personal disciples of Jesus, those whom he calls "the Lord's disciples" in § 4. J. B. Lightfoot comments that Papias is speaking of "incidents in our Lord's life which are related by an eye-witness without intermediation between Christ and the reporter," and he notes that "the truth itself" is a Johannine personification of Christ.<sup>34</sup> The elders recalled what Jesus had taught them, and likewise Papias recalled what they had passed on to him.<sup>35</sup>

In § 4 Papias confirms that the elders of whom he is speaking were the personal disciples of Jesus. He indicates that not only did he himself learn directly from the elders, but also when anyone happened to come by, presumably at a later date, who had (also) been a follower of the elders, he would inquire of them "as to the discourses of the elders, what (τῶν . . . λόγων, τῶν) Andrew or what Peter, . . . or any other of the Lord's disciples had said." In this passage "the discourses of the elders" are put in apposition to, and thus are described as, "what . . . the Lord's disciples had said." Thus, the elders were the Lord's disciples, namely the

twelve apostles and any other personal disciples of Jesus.<sup>36</sup>

Larfeld objects to this exegesis that it makes Papias a clumsy writer. If Papias had wanted simply to identify the elders, he would naturally have written, according to Larfeld, "the discourses of the elders, namely Andrew, etc."<sup>37</sup> However, Papias is not simply identifying the elders. He is also differentiating their discourses into what they had once said and what two of them (i.e. the two who were still alive) were still saying at the time of his inquiries. Furthermore, Papias has never been held up as a model of clarity and simplicity.

It is not difficult to see why the same men would be called both "the Lord's disciples" and "the elders." The phrase "of the Lord" indicates that the words "disciples of the Lord" express the relationship of these men to Jesus. That is, in the days of his ministry on this earth, they followed him as their teacher and master. The word "elders," on the other hand, expresses the status of these men relative to those of inferior age, respect, and/or authority, and thus signifies the position which the immediate disciples of Jesus held in the church, and by which, we may infer, they were remembered after their decease.<sup>38</sup> Thus, contrary to J. Regul, the identification of "the elders" as "the Lord's disciples" does not face the "Problem" that "zwei verschiedene Bezeichnungen auf eine und dieselbe Gruppe von Personen angewandt wird."<sup>39</sup> This is a problem only for those who do not recognize the complementary character of the two designations, one having in view their relationship with the earthly Jesus, and the other having in view their relationship with other Christians.<sup>40</sup>

Eusebius understood Papias as equating "the elders" with the seven named apostles and the other disciples of the Lord, noting in

§ 7 (as in § 2) that he "acknowledges that he received the discourses of the apostles from those who had been their followers."<sup>41</sup> So did the translator of the Syriac version of Eusebius, as well as Rufinus and Jerome.<sup>42</sup> So also have most modern scholars.<sup>43</sup>

Some scholars, however, have preferred to interpret λόγους, τ' as "discourses as to what," rather than as "discourses, what." On this interpretation, the statements of the Lord's disciples are the subject matter of the discourses of the elders, and thus the elders turn out to be the disciples of the Lord's disciples.<sup>44</sup> But while this interpretation may not be grammatically impossible (although to convey such an idea a construction with περί, e.g., λόγους περὶ ᾧ, would have been expected<sup>45</sup>), it constitutes, according to one scholar not unacquainted with the Greek used by the early Church Fathers, "a violent wresting of the grammatical connection."<sup>46</sup> It introduces unnecessary complexities and leads to an identification of the elders at variance with that clearly established by § 3. It is easy to understand Papias's great interest in what the immediate disciples of Jesus had said, but not such an interest in what others had said that they had heard the disciples of Jesus say. It is hard to see why anyone would render τ' here as "as to what" instead of as "what," unless he were intent on putting a generation between Papias and the apostles.<sup>47</sup> But this is no way to do exegesis.

In support of the alleged distinction between the elders and the disciples of the Lord, it has been argued that Papias would not have called the apostles "elders" because other early Christian writers did not so refer to them. As Abbott notes, "no other instance is alleged in which the name 'Elders' is given to 'Apostles'."<sup>48</sup> However, the surviving literature of Papias and his

contemporaries is so meager that it would be precarious to suppose that we can establish the terminology which Papias would have used. Furthermore, one can not insist that Papias's terminology must have been restricted to that employed by other writers. Only an analysis of his words in their contexts can disclose what his usage actually was. Moreover, we are not saying that he used the word "elders" to designate the apostles. Rather, he had a wider group in view, namely, all the personal disciples of Jesus, as esteemed by the next generation of Christians. There was no other established term for this group of men, and we may even infer from Papias that "the elders" was that term in his generation.

It has been pointed out that Irenaeus uses the word "elders" to denote disciples of the apostles, rather than disciples of Jesus. This usage is most importantly found in passages drawing upon Papias's Expositions and probably showing some knowledge of its preface. Thus, it has been argued, "the elders" of whom Papias speaks must also have been the disciples of the apostles.<sup>49</sup>

The clearest passage is Haer. V.33.3-4, where Irenaeus reports what "the elders who saw John, the disciple of the Lord, related that they had heard from him" (§ 3), and then says that "these things are borne witness to in writing by Papias, the hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp, in his fourth book" (§ 4). Since the elders of whom Irenaeus here speaks "saw John," they obviously were not themselves disciples of Jesus, but rather disciples of at least one of his disciples. And since Papias was "the hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp," it is clear that Papias was one of "the elders who saw John" and "heard" him. Since Papias recorded the things that these elders had heard from John, we may infer that he recorded both his own recollections of John

and those of others who had heard that apostle.<sup>50</sup> Now this is precisely what Papias himself tells us in his preface. That is, Papias says that he will record both "all that ever I carefully learnt and carefully recalled" and "the discourses" related to him by others who had heard those whom he had himself heard. But Papias calls these men whom he and others had heard "the elders." Irenaeus calls Papias and the others who had heard the apostle John "elders," while Papias reserves that term for John and the other personal disciples of Jesus. Thus, they call different men "the elders." Furthermore, Irenaeus says that Papias and the other elders were followers of the apostle John, and this confirms that when Papias speaks of himself and the others as having heard and followed "the elders," these elders were the apostle John and the other disciples of the Lord.

The second significant passage in Irenaeus is II.22.5, where reference is made to something to which "the gospel and all the elders testify; those who were conversant in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord, [affirming] that John conveyed to them that information." "Some of them," he continues, "saw not only John, but the other apostles also, and heard the very same account from them, and bear testimony as to the [validity of] the statement." Here "the elders" are said to have been conversant not only with "John, the disciple of the Lord," but also, in some cases, with "the other apostles also." There can be little question but that these elders, like those mentioned in V.33.3-4, were Papias and his Asian contemporaries who had also been followers of the apostle John. Once again we see that it was Papias and his contemporaries who heard John and (as is here made explicit) other apostles, without a generation of elders coming between them. Although Papias

himself says that he learned from "the elders," and thus probably heard more than one apostle (i.e. John), we may infer from Irenaeus that the statement which he is passing on, no doubt as found in Papias's Expositions, was said there to have been heard by him from John and confirmed by others (i.e. other followers of the elders, who chanced to come by) as having also been given by other apostles.

It is clear, then, that Irenaeus did not call "elders" those whom Papias called "elders." For Irenaeus, the elders were Papias and the other followers of the apostles. For Papias, the elders were the apostles and any other immediate disciples of Jesus. Furthermore, it would appear that Irenaeus understood Papias in this manner, even though for him the elders were men of the generation following the apostles.<sup>51</sup>

Papias and Irenaeus called different generations of church authorities "the elders" simply because Papias lived a generation or two before Irenaeus. For both men "the elders" were the authorities of the previous generation or two who had initially handed down or subsequently passed on authoritative teachings to the present generation of the church, and were now very old or (generally) deceased.<sup>52</sup> For Papias, in the early second century, the elders were naturally the apostles and other disciples of the Lord whom he had known in his earlier days. But for Irenaeus, in the latter half of the second century, the elders were the disciples of the apostles (see IV.32.1; V.5.1, 33.3, 36.2; cf. V.30.1) and the disciples of those disciples (see IV.27.1).<sup>53</sup>

One final objection to the equating of "the elders" mentioned by Papias with "the Lord's disciples" is that this would make him, according to § 3, a hearer of every one of them, including James, who was martyred well before Papias was born.<sup>54</sup> However, when

Papias says that he learned from "the elders," he surely is referring to the elders then living, not to all who had ever lived. Furthermore, Papias uses the expression "the elders" in a collective or corporate sense. He learned from them as a group, though not necessarily from every one of them individually. Moreover, the supposed difficulty facing our identification of Papias's elders is not removed by identifying them instead as the disciples of the apostles, for it can hardly be imagined that he knew every disciple of every apostle.

Now that we have identified "the elders" of Papias as those whom he also calls "the Lord's disciples," we are ready to consider the expression "the elder" in his reference to "Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord." It appears at once that Papias is designating John as "the elder" in a sense different from that in which he has previously spoken of "the elders." Otherwise, the designation would be pointless. Since the elder John is described as a disciple of the Lord, and "the Lord's disciples" are identical to "the elders," little purpose could be served by identifying him as an elder in this sense. He would not in this manner be distinguished from Aristion,<sup>55</sup> or from the apostle John previously mentioned, for both of these men, being disciples of the Lord, were elders, too.<sup>56</sup>

Lightfoot perceived that the elder John was an elder in a special sense, and he argued that Papias was referring to John's ecclesiastical office. Although Papias did not supply official titles for any other of the Lord's disciples, he did so for John, according to Lightfoot, in order to differentiate him from the John previously listed among the apostles.<sup>57</sup> However, if Papias had simply been indicating the office held by this John, he would

have written "John the elder," not "the elder John."<sup>58</sup> Lightfoot maintains that Papias put this John's title in the emphatic position in order to emphasize that this was a different John than the one previously mentioned.<sup>59</sup> This explanation might be plausible if Papias had just been discussing the apostle John. But since the apostle John had only been mentioned inconspicuously as the sixth in a list of seven apostles, there would not have been any reason for Papias to think that a reference to "John the elder" would not have satisfied his supposed desire to differentiate between the two Johns. Lightfoot also supposes that among Papias's contemporaries "'the Presbyter John' must have been a common mode of designation in contradistinction to 'the Apostle John',"<sup>60</sup> but there is no evidence that the latter was called "the Apostle John." And even if he was, this would not have required that another John, who happened to be an elder, be known as "the elder John," rather than "John" or "John, the elder." Therefore, we conclude that Lightfoot has not established that "the elder John" was a non-apostolic John holding the office of presbyter. Rather, the emphatic placement of the words "the elder" suggests that something other than ecclesiastical office is in view.<sup>61</sup>

The actual meaning of the term "the elder" emerges elsewhere in Papias's Expositions, as quoted and summarized by Eusebius. The historian tells us that "Papias gives us in his work accounts of the aforesaid Aristion of the sayings of the Lord, and traditions of the elder John."<sup>62</sup> He then quotes "a tradition which he has set forth concerning Mark," which Papias introduces with the words, "This also the elder (ὁ πρεσβύτερος) used to say."<sup>63</sup> Clearly, "the elder" to whom Papias here refers is, as Eusebius indicates, the disciple whom he introduces in his preface as "the elder John."<sup>64</sup>

The significance of the fact that Papias introduces this tradition of the elder John by attributing it to "the elder," but without mentioning the name John, may be inferred from Eusebius's earlier statement, made with reference to Aristion and the elder John, that Papias "mentions them by name frequently in his treatises and sets forth their traditions."<sup>65</sup> It is clear from the Greek text of this statement that Papias mentioned them by name in connection with his presentation of their traditions.<sup>66</sup> In the one full example which Eusebius presents of Papias's evidently characteristic manner of presenting traditions, we find that Papias mentions--"by name," according to Eusebius--"the elder."<sup>67</sup> Evidently, then, the expression "the elder" was the name, or epithet, by which Papias throughout the body of his Expositions referred to the man introduced in his preface as "the elder John" and recognized by Eusebius as such.

From this it follows that "the elder" is the epithet of a man named John. It should therefore be capitalized as a proper name, "the Elder." The name "John," then, is in apposition to the epithet "the Elder."<sup>68</sup> Thus, Papias is actually referring to "the Elder, (i.e.) John," not "the elder John." Additional evidence for this is provided by the fact that, as J. Munck points out in another connection, "It is a mistake to think that a man can be known both as 'the Presbyter,' used as a title of distinction for the venerable leader of the Church in Asia, and at the same time as 'John the presbyter.'"<sup>69</sup> Since Papias called John "the Elder," he would not also have called him "the elder John." Evidently, Papias wanted to identify "the Elder" for the benefit of anyone who would not recognize the epithet, and thus wrote "the Elder, John." The name "John" is explanatory of "the Elder," and not, as nearly everyone has assumed, vice versa.

The meaning of the epithet "the Elder" is clear enough. All the disciples of the Lord were elders to Papias, but John was the elder, the elder par excellence.<sup>70</sup> He was honored by Papias, and presumably by the rest of the Asian church, above all other elders.

The precise meaning of Papias's words, "Aristion and the Elder, John, disciples of the Lord," is now clear. Two men are mentioned, Aristion and someone known as "the Elder." For the sake of clarity, the latter is parenthetically identified as John. Both men are described as having been "disciples of the Lord," that is, personal disciples of Jesus. From the epithet "the Elder" we may infer that among all the elders, that is, all the personal disciples of Jesus, and especially the apostles, John gained recognition in the Asian church as the elder par excellence.

We are now ready to determine the identity of "the Elder, John." According to Papias, this John was a personal disciple of Jesus and later became one of "the elders" in the church. Only one man fitting this description is known to history (apart, possibly, from this notice in Papias): the apostle John. This would suggest that "the Elder, John," was the apostle John. However, there may have been another disciple of Jesus named John who later became an elder in the church and was known to Papias. This is not impossible, but it must be regarded as improbable.

The probability that "the Elder, John," was the apostle John becomes very strong when we consider that out of the august body of apostles and other disciple-elders, whether they had any personal connection with Asia or not, the one given a special place by Papias and, presumably, by the Asian church in general, was the John known as "the Elder." It is difficult to believe that a non-apostolic disciple could have attained such a stature above all the

apostles, especially in a major Christian center like Asia. On the other hand, it is just conceivable that a non-apostolic disciple could have gained this distinction after the apostles had died (or, while alive, if they had nothing to do with Asia), so that of the few original disciples known in Asia he was the elder par excellence. This possibility is negated, however, by two considerations. First, such an evidently illustrious John would almost certainly have been mentioned by Asian (or well-informed non-Asian) writers other than Papias, yet none is known to have done so. Even Eusebius, with his great library, could not find any written record of a second John, and thus could argue for his existence only by referring to a report of there being two tombs of John in Ephesus.<sup>71</sup> Secondly, Papias lists seven apostles among those known at the time of his writing as "elders," even though they had all died by then. For Papias, then, John was "the Elder" among all the elders, including the renowned apostles, whether dead or alive. Since he attained a stature in Asia that set him apart from all other disciples of Jesus, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that he was the apostle John, not an otherwise unknown disciple of the same name. It was to the authority of the apostle John that the Asian church ultimately appealed in the Quartodeciman controversy,<sup>72</sup> thus showing that he was in their estimation the apostle par excellence, or, in Papias's terminology, "the Elder."

Our identification of "the Elder" as the apostle John is supported by the strong tradition that this apostle spent his latter years at Ephesus. One would expect an apostle to gain a special distinction in his own city and region, especially in his old age. Furthermore, even if there had been two disciples of Jesus named John, it is unlikely that both would have migrated to Asia, and

extremely unlikely that the non-apostolic John would have become known as "the Elder" in preference to an apostle who was living (or had recently lived) in the same region.

The reliability of the tradition of the apostle John's residence in Asia is evident from the fact that Eusebius cites on various occasions Irenaeus (who was raised in Asia), Polycrates (later bishop of Ephesus), Apollonius (an Asian writer), the unnamed author of "the record of our ancient men," Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Dionysius of Alexandria in support of it.<sup>73</sup> The evidence of Irenaeus, Polycrates, and Apollonius is particularly weighty. Irenaeus and Polycrates were taught by Asian elders no later than the middle of the second century (assuming they were born ca. 125), and Apollonius was probably educated shortly thereafter.<sup>74</sup> Therefore, the tradition of John's Asian ministry must have been widely accepted by the generation of elders who instructed these three men. Such a well-established tradition could not have originated later than the first quarter of the second century, at a time when older Christians would have been able to recollect who had been among them in the latter part of the first century. If John had not been in Asia at the close of the first century, it is extremely difficult to explain how a tradition to that effect could have arisen and gained acceptance among church leaders within a generation. This is especially true because there were many traditions--i.e. memories--of John's activities and teachings, not simply a bare report of his presence (or of "a" John's presence) in Asia. These traditions may well have been embellished as they were repeated during the second century, and some legends no doubt arose around them, but underlying them all must be the fact that John had been living in Asia.

It is particularly noteworthy that Irenaeus recalled very clearly (by his own account) in his youth having heard Polycarp "tell of his intercourse with John."<sup>75</sup> There can be no question but that he understood Polycarp to be referring to the apostle John. This is proved by a reference in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, in which he refers to what Polycarp "had always observed with John the disciple of our Lord and the other apostles with whom he consorted."<sup>76</sup> Now it is inconceivable that Polycarp would have falsely claimed to have been a disciple of the apostle John. It is also inconceivable that Irenaeus would have deliberately misrepresented him as so claiming, if only because his representations were on at least one occasion directed at someone who had himself been a close disciple of Polycarp, namely Florinus.<sup>77</sup>

However, it has been suggested that Irenaeus, being only a youth when he heard Polycarp, may have misunderstood him. According to this theory, Polycarp spoke of a non-apostolic disciple named John, whom the young Irenaeus mistook for the apostolic disciple of that name.<sup>78</sup> However, Irenaeus insists that "I distinctly recall the events of that time better than those of recent years," remembering "the very place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit as he discoursed, his goings out and his comings in, the character of his life, his bodily appearance, the discourses he would address to the multitude, how he would tell of his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord, how he would relate from memory their words." "I used to listen diligently even then" to his accounts of the apostles' teachings, Irenaeus continues, "noting them down not on paper but in my heart."<sup>79</sup> Irenaeus is so emphatic about the clarity of his youthful memories of Polycarp, with whom he evidently had extensive

contact, that it must be accepted that he heard Polycarp speaking about the apostle John on a number of occasions. One may question whether his accounts of John's teachings (as told by Polycarp) always represent accurately what the apostle taught, but they definitely go back to him, however imperfectly. Since Irenaeus heard Polycarp speak about John and pass on his teachings on several, if not many occasions, we can hardly doubt that he correctly perceived who it was that Polycarp was speaking about.

And even if Irenaeus had consistently misunderstood Polycarp on this basic point, Florinus, whom Irenaeus knew to have been closer to Polycarp (and older) than himself,<sup>80</sup> would presumably have corrected him, in which case he would not have misrepresented the identity of John in his subsequent work, Against Heresies.<sup>81</sup> Furthermore, Irenaeus learned about John's teachings from "all the elders," and not just from Polycarp, "who were conversant in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord," including some who "saw not only John, but the other apostles also."<sup>82</sup> It is not credible that all the elders of Asia were passing on teachings from a non-apostolic John, and that Irenaeus always mistook them to be referring to the apostle John. Moreover, Irenaeus knew of others who had heard Polycarp tell about John's activity in Ephesus (i.e. his encounter with Cerinthus).<sup>83</sup> Their testimonies corroborated Irenaeus's youthful memories of Polycarp speaking about the apostle John, not some other John.

Irenaeus's testimony has been challenged on grounds other than the age at which he heard Polycarp. W. G. Kümmel claims that it "remains unclear" whether Irenaeus's reference (in II.22.5) to John's presence in Asia "is a tradition of the presbyters or whether it was added by Irenaeus."<sup>84</sup> However, the elders in view, whom

whom Irenaeus knew to have been residents of Asia, surely would not have been "conversant . . . with John" anywhere but "in Asia." Irenaeus elsewhere specifies Asia (and Ephesus in particular) as the scene of John's activity,<sup>85</sup> and it is only reasonable to infer that Irenaeus learned of this from the Asian elders who passed on to him what they had learned from John.<sup>86</sup>

Kümmel also questions Irenaeus's report of Polycarp's accounts of John's Asian ministry because "Polycarp himself in his letter to the Philippians does not appeal to his relationship with an apostle."<sup>87</sup> But this is only an argument from silence, and thus is worthless in the absence of a demonstration that in writing to this Pauline church he would have appealed to his relationship with John if he had had one. And, as Schnackenburg observes, Polycarp wrote other epistles no longer extant, and in his epistle to the Philippians "wished to honour St Paul, on account of the recipients."<sup>88</sup> Schnackenburg himself thinks that Irenaeus may have been "confused about the John mentioned by St Polycarp" because he erroneously calls Papias "the hearer of [the apostle] John, and a companion of Polycarp,"<sup>89</sup> rather than a hearer of another John.<sup>90</sup> But, as we have demonstrated, this much maligned statement is in fact correct, for Papias was, by his own account, a hearer of the apostle John.

We conclude, therefore, that there is no valid reason to question the reliability of Irenaeus's testimony that, according to Polycarp and others, the apostle John had spent the latter years of his long life in Asia. Since Polycarp and the others were certainly not fabricating their acquaintance with John in Asia, we ought to accept it as factual. The solid evidence provided by Irenaeus is confirmed by other knowledgeable second- and early third-century sources, both Asian and non-Asian. It is simply not credible that

the many Johannine traditions could have arisen around a non-apostolic John and then that this illustrious John would have quickly vanished from memory while the accounts of his activity and teachings were all mistakenly transferred to the apostle John. The available historical evidence belies such speculation. The apostle John definitely resided in Asia in the latter first century.

This conclusion has been challenged on the basis of certain evidence that John may have been martyred. R. H. Charles, who may be taken as representative of this position,<sup>91</sup> argues that what he calls "the primitive tradition as to the martyrdom of John the Apostle" was replaced by "the later tradition represented by Irenaeus," and that John had actually been martyred in Palestine in the sixties.<sup>92</sup> Charles places great weight upon "the silence of ecclesiastical writers down to 180 A.D. as to any residence of John the Apostle in Asia Minor," having particularly in view Ignatius, Justin, and Hegesippus.<sup>93</sup> However, we have seen that the writings of Irenaeus and others in the years 180-200 relate accounts of John that go back to Polycarp and his contemporaries, many of whom had known and heard John. And as for the alleged silence of Ignatius, Justin, and Hegesippus, we must bear in mind that historical information is provided in the works of Ignatius and Justin only incidentally, and that only fragments of Hegesippus's Memoirs have survived. Nonetheless, all three writers do arguably provide evidence of John's residence in Asia.

Ignatius, in Eph. 11, refers to "those Christians of Ephesus who moreover were ever of one mind with the Apostles," and it is not unreasonable to infer from the plural "Apostles" that he is alluding to John's residence in Ephesus, as well as Paul's.<sup>94</sup> It is true that in § 12 Ignatius mentions only Paul's connection with

Ephesus -- a fact which greatly impresses Charles<sup>95</sup>--but this is so because, in Ignatius's words, Ephesus was "the high-road of those that are on their way to die unto God," among whom was Paul (cf. Ac. 20:17-23), "in whose foot-steps I would fain be found treading." John did not pass through Ephesus on the way to martyrdom, and thus is not given as an example.<sup>96</sup>

Justin, in his Dialogue with Trypho, notes that "there was a certain man with us (παρα' ἡμῶν) whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied, by a revelation that was made to him."<sup>97</sup> This dialogue probably took place at Ephesus,<sup>98</sup> and thus the word "us" here probably refers to the Christian community in that city.<sup>99</sup> If so, Justin alludes to the Ephesian residence of the apostle John. But even if this is not the case, the fact that Justin attributes the book of Revelation to the apostle John shows, as P. W. Schmiedel recognizes, that "Justin must have held the Ephesian John to be the apostle of that name."<sup>100</sup>

The testimony of Hegesippus is probably provided by Eusebius in H.E. III.20.9, where "the record of our ancient men" is said to relate that John returned to Ephesus from his exile on the island of Patmos after the death of Domitian. This is probably a reference to the Memoirs of Hegesippus.<sup>101</sup> But if it is not, we at least have a source of comparable age. In either case, there is an important second-century record of John's life in Asia which is no longer extant, but which belies "the silence" claimed by Charles.

Charles presents as positive evidence for John's martyrdom statements from John Chrysostom (late 4th cent.), the North African work De rebaptismate (ca. 250), Aphraates (4th cent.), the Syriac Martyrology (411), the Calendar of Carthage (ca. 505), and, perhaps most significantly, Papias, as presented in an epitome (7th or 8th

cent.) of the Christian History of Philip of Side (5th cent.) and in a passage interpolated in a manuscript of the Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolus (9th cent.).<sup>102</sup> In order to evaluate this evidence properly, it must be remembered that John (at least according to ancient tradition) was banished to the island of Patmos in his old age (presumably to die there) during the Domitianic persecution,<sup>103</sup> and that for his faithful testimony and his willingness to give up his life he was regarded as a "martyr" (so Polycrates<sup>104</sup>) in second-century terminology,<sup>105</sup> even though he survived Domitian and returned to Ephesus, where he died.<sup>106</sup> John's brother, James, also suffered martyrdom, being put to death by Herod Agrippa I (see Ac. 12:1-2). It should come as no surprise, then, that the two sons of Zebedee would sometimes be mentioned together as martyrs, and even that John's martyrdom would occasionally be upgraded to a martyrdom of blood, like his brother's. This is especially true since Jesus had prophesied that the sons of Zebedee would drink his cup and receive his baptism (Mt. 20:23; Mk. 10:39).<sup>107</sup> Indeed, this prophecy of Jesus (interpreted as referring to martyrdom), and not an independent tradition of John's martyrdom of blood, underlies the evidence presented by Charles. This connection is often explicitly made, and at other times it is implicit in the fact that James and John are mentioned together.

Chrysostom states in his Homilies on Matthew that the two brothers suffered "a violent death,"<sup>108</sup> but this statement is simply an interpretation of Mt. 20:23, not an assertion of historical fact based upon tradition. There is other evidence which suggests that he knew of John's Asian residence,<sup>109</sup> and so his interpretation of Jesus' prophecy is best explained as a careless combination

of the two martyrdoms in the terms of James's.<sup>110</sup> Alternatively, Chrysostom may have supposed that John was martyred in Asia after a long life.

In De rebaptismate we similarly find an interpretation of Jesus' words. His words to the two brothers are explained with the comment that they faced baptism "in their own blood."<sup>111</sup> No tradition about John is to be found here.

The passage in Georgius Hamartolus (discussed below in detail) likewise presents John's martyrdom as a fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy. It also shows how easily John's martyrdom of banishment could be taken as a martyrdom of blood, for the interpolator cites Origen's commentary on Matthew as evidence for it, whereas in fact Origen speaks quite distinctly of John's martyrdom (μαρτύριον) of banishment on Patmos.<sup>112</sup>

Aphraates clearly has Jesus' prophecy in mind when he says that "James and John walked in the footsteps of their Master Christ."<sup>113</sup> Jesus' prophecy is not explicitly mentioned, but the allusion to it is clear enough. Again, there is no evidence here of any tradition about John independent of that prophecy.

The Syriac Martyrology indicates that John and James were martyred at Jerusalem, which is best taken to mean that both were put to death there.<sup>114</sup> But this is merely an application of the circumstances of James's martyrdom to John in the light of Jesus' prophecy. The Syriac Martyrology looks very much like a somewhat careless abridgment of a lost (4th cent.) Greek calendar which was largely reproduced in the Hieronymian Calendar. Judging by the Hieronymian Calendar, this Greek calendar, on the same day as the Syriac Martyrology, memorialized John alongside James, the Lord's brother.<sup>115</sup> If so, the Syriac Martyrology first confuses James,

the Lord's brother, with James, the son of Zebedee, and then, as part of the abridgment, joins John with James in being martyred at Jerusalem,<sup>116</sup> probably under the influence of Jesus' prophecy concerning the two sons of Zebedee.

The Calendar of Carthage actually refers to John the Baptist, not John the apostle, alongside James, and while Charles is quite sure that this is a scribal blunder,<sup>117</sup> it is more likely an attempted correction, since the Baptist, but not the apostle, was put to death, as the calendar states, by Herod (though not the same Herod as put James to death).<sup>118</sup> This calendar (at least at this point) is the product of a string of blunders, not a source of authentic tradition about John.

We see, then, that behind these "independent authorities," as Charles styles them,<sup>119</sup> is simply an historically speculative and exegetically unnecessary inference drawn from Jesus' prophecy that James and John would drink his cup and receive his baptism, not an ancient tradition of any value.

We are left, then, with the statement attributed to Papias in the epitome of Philip of Side and in an interpolation in one manuscript of Georgius Hamartolus.<sup>120</sup> Philip, in a passage dealing with "Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who was a disciple of John the Divine," and who "wrote five books of Oracles of the Lord," says: "Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews." Georgius, on the other hand, is discussing the apostle John, and the interpolated passage relates that he "received the honour of martyrdom," evidence for which is the fact that "Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who was an eye-witness of him, in the second book of the Oracles of the Lord says that he was killed by the Jews." This passage is clearly based upon the

words of Philip (or, conceivably, upon a common source), omitting the reference to James in accordance with Georgius's subject matter, and thus has no independent value.<sup>121</sup>

Charles deduces from this statement attributed to Papias that John was slain by the Jews in Palestine before A.D. 70, and thus "was never in Asia Minor."<sup>122</sup> However, both Philip and the interpolator of Georgius evidently thought that the Jews of Asia killed John.<sup>123</sup> Philip represents Papias (who was born no earlier than A.D. 60) as "a disciple of John," and this implies that the apostle was present in Asia in the latter years of the first century. The interpolator of Georgius allowed his author to relate that John returned to Ephesus from Patmos during the reign of Nerva, and to say that he was then "the sole survivor of the twelve Apostles," but he changed the text, which went on to say that John, "after writing his Gospel, fell asleep in peace,"<sup>124</sup> to "after writing his Gospel received the honour of martyrdom," after which the material from Philip was added. After showing that John's martyrdom fulfilled Jesus' prophecy, and that (supposedly) Origen confirmed John's martyrdom in his interpretation of that prophecy, the interpolator permitted the original text of Georgius to continue, in which Eusebius is quoted as saying that John received by lot "Asia, where also he made his residence and died at Ephesus."<sup>125</sup> If "the Jews" killed John, then, they did so at Ephesus near the year 100, not in Palestine before the fall of Jerusalem.

It is highly improbable, in any case, that Papias made the statement attributed to him by Philip (especially as it is interpreted by Charles). Irenaeus, Eusebius, and undoubtedly other authorities referring to John's Asian residence were acquainted with Papias's Expositions, and could not have ignored such a state-

ment. Indeed, any intimation that John had suffered a martyrdom of death would have been eagerly seized upon by all. Eusebius, furthermore, would no doubt have quoted Papias's statement, if it referred to a martyrdom in Palestine before A.D. 70, to show that "the elder John" could not have been the apostle John and to confirm his suspicion that the John exiled on the island of Patmos was not the apostle John.<sup>126</sup> But Eusebius knew that John had resided in Asia, and apparently had no knowledge of any evidence to the contrary. Moreover, it is hardly to be imagined that Papias would have set forth an account of John's martyrdom in Palestine completely at variance with the many traditions of Polycarp, whom Irenaeus calls Papias's "companion,"<sup>127</sup> and his other fellow elders in Asia.

Finally, there is good reason to believe that Philip's representation of Papias's account is actually a misrepresentation of a passage in Eusebius. Nearly everything in Philip's account of Papias, both before and after the reference to John's martyrdom, is manifestly drawn, either by Philip or a written source used by him, from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History.<sup>128</sup> Indeed, the rubric at the head of the passage says just that.<sup>129</sup> Therefore, Philip's account of John's martyrdom is no doubt based upon Eusebius, and not upon Papias. It would seem to be based upon Eusebius's account of the martyrdom of James the Just (the Lord's brother), at the place where Josephus is quoted as saying that he was killed by the Jews.<sup>130</sup> This account is presented in the second book of Eusebius, which Philip evidently misrepresented as Papias's second book. Other details of Philip's corruption of this passage have been variously explained,<sup>131</sup> but in our view it is most likely that James, the Lord's brother, was mistaken for James, the son of

Zebedee, and then that the latter's brother, John, was linked with him under the influence of Jesus' prophecy of their future suffering. That Philip should mistake Eusebius's quotation of Josephus for a quotation of Papias (or perhaps correct it as one) is not surprising, for he also misrepresented a quotation of Quadratus as a statement of Papias.<sup>132</sup> Indeed, Philip was, as Lightfoot observes in another context, "a notoriously pretentious and careless writer."<sup>133</sup> His encyclopedic and poorly organized Christian History (no longer extant) was condemned by Socrates Scholasticus as "useless alike, in my opinion, to the ignorant and the learned."<sup>134</sup> It is certainly useless to anyone trying to determine the manner of John's death.

The argument for John's early martyrdom is based upon such late, unreliable, and demonstrably erroneous sources, that it must be rejected as completely groundless. A weak case could be made that he was martyred in Asia at the close of the first century, but this would concede the essential point, namely his Asian residence in the latter first century. We must agree with F. F. Bruce that "the evidence on which the 'critical myth' of John the apostle's early death rests is so flimsy that, as A. S. Peake put it, it 'would have provoked derision if it had been adduced in favour of a conservative conclusion'."<sup>135</sup>

Thus we reach the conclusion that the apostle John definitely resided in Asia in the latter years of the first century. This fact, as we said before setting out to establish it,<sup>136</sup> lends considerable support to our identification of "the Elder, John," as the apostle John.

Our identification of "the Elder" is further strengthened by the evidence in the Gospel according to John that the apostle John

would reach (or had already reached) a great age (see Jn. 21:23). This correlates with the ancient tradition that he lived until the time of Trajan, that is, at least until the year 98.<sup>137</sup> The substantial correctness of this tradition is evident from the fact that Polycarp was John's disciple. Since Polycarp was born near the year 70,<sup>138</sup> his period of discipleship could not reasonably be placed earlier than 85-100. And if the tradition of John's suffering during the Domitianic persecution is correct, his great age at death is confirmed. The exceptional length of John's life is significant because Papias's use of the present tense form λέγουσιν in connection with Aristion and the Elder (John) implies that when Papias was acquiring his information, these were the only living disciples of Jesus with whom he had any contact.<sup>139</sup> Since Papias would undoubtedly have included the apostle John in this list of living disciples if he had still been alive, it follows that "the Elder, John," could be another John only if this John outlived the apostle by a good margin. But it is extremely unlikely that any disciple of Jesus (and one named John, no less) could have lived several years longer than the apostle John.<sup>140</sup> Therefore, it is only reasonable to conclude that "the Elder" was the apostle John.

We now have a remarkable set of coincidences between the Elder, John, as known from Papias, and the apostle John, as known from early Christian sources. Both were personal disciples of Jesus. Both were named John. Both moved to Asia and lived there for a considerable period of time. Both died at a very old age. The only reasonable explanation for these coincidences is that the apostle John was the John whom Papias knew as "the Elder."

Furthermore, the fact that Eusebius could substantiate the existence of a second John only by inferring it, as had Dionysius

of Alexandria (but not in connection with Papias's statement),<sup>141</sup> from a rumor that there were two tombs (or monuments) in Ephesus said to be John's<sup>142</sup>--hardly a convincing inference, for there could easily have been two tombs reputed to be the resting place of the apostle--shows that the writers of the second century knew nothing of such a man. It is impossible to believe that a disciple of Jesus revered in Asia as "the Elder" could, upon his death, have lapsed into total obscurity, failing even to obtain a mention in Polycrates' list of luminaries who had died there.<sup>143</sup>

That Papias's words ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης mean "the Elder, John," and refer to the apostle John, is further established by the reception of the Second and Third Epistles of John as having been written by the apostle. The author of these epistles identifies himself in the opening words of each epistle simply as ὁ πρεσβύτερος, "the Elder." This man was recognized in the second century as the apostle John, although some doubts about his authorship of the epistles were expressed later.<sup>144</sup> This attribution of authorship to the apostle John shows that whoever "the Elder" may actually have been, that epithet was regarded in the second century as belonging to the apostle John. If John did write the two epistles, then obviously the recipients of them, and no doubt the wider Asian church, knew him as "the Elder." On the other hand, if someone else wrote the epistles, there would have been no reason to attribute them to the apostle John unless the epithet "the Elder" was known to have belonged to him.<sup>145</sup>

One could perhaps argue that the true author of the epistles, one "John the elder," was later mistaken for the apostle John. But such a confusion could not have arisen, in the absence of the name John in the epistles (and in 1 John, as well), unless the apostle

John had been known as "the Elder." This point is easily overlooked. Abbott, for example, tells us that "the confusion" between the two Johns "was all the more easy because two of the three Epistles attributed to John the Apostle are written in the name of 'John the Elder'."<sup>146</sup> But the name "John" is not to be found in either epistle!

One might also argue that a vague recollection of someone named "John the elder" was sufficient for the reference to "the Elder" in each epistle to be understood as "John the elder," who was then taken to be the apostle John. But this explanation seems rather contrived and speculative, especially since there is no solid evidence that such a "John the elder" ever existed. There was no doubt an elder somewhere named John, but there were many elders with other names, and so there would have been no reason to suppose that someone referring to himself as "the Elder" was named John.

The ancient attribution of 2 and 3 John to the apostle John is explicable only if he was known as "the Elder." Now it is most unlikely that there were two men named John in the late first century, one an apostle and the other not, both of whom were known as "the Elder." Therefore, "the Elder" known to Papias once again turns out to be the apostle John.

Although the evidence, both exegetical and historical, seems overwhelming that Papias was referring to the apostle John when he wrote "the Elder, John," several objections to this identification must be considered.

It may be objected, first of all, that Papias would not have mentioned the same John twice. According to this argument, Papias presents two lists of names, one consisting of apostles, and the

other consisting of non-apostolic disciples, with "John" placed in the first list and "the elder John" in the second. From this it follows that "the elder John" is not the apostle John. This is Eusebius's argument,<sup>147</sup> repeated by Jerome.<sup>148</sup> It has been repeated by many modern scholars, sometimes with expressions of amazement that other scholars are unable to see the obvious.<sup>149</sup> This argument assumes that Papias's two lists of disciples are mutually exclusive. However, Papias plainly indicates that this is not so. The two men mentioned in the second list are included in the first list, for the first one consists of all the disciples of the Lord (i.e. seven disciples mentioned by name and "any other of the Lord's disciples"), thus including the two particular "disciples of the Lord" comprising the second list. Munck assumes as self-evident that "these two are not included among 'or any other of the Lord's disciples' in the preceding sentence, although they are expressly described as the Lord's disciples,"<sup>150</sup> but this assumption denies consistency of expression to Papias. Regul asserts that Aristion and the elder John are separated from the first group of disciples "durch die anonyme Masse" of other disciples,<sup>151</sup> but while this is an accurate description of the relative position of the words in the text, it ignores their interrelationships, for the words "any other" necessarily include any disciples other than the seven previously mentioned. They may "aus dieser Anonymität selbst wieder namentlich und durch betonten Neuansatz . . . herausgehoben werden,"<sup>152</sup> but they are still included in the first list, whether anonymously (Aristion) or not (John).

Papias does not distinguish between groups of disciples, but rather between different times of speaking, namely the past and the present. He distinguishes between what all the disciples "had

said" and what two particular disciples "were (still) saying."<sup>153</sup> Aristion and John had been speaking and were still speaking; the others were now silent, presumably having died.

In a related objection it is inferred from the tenses of εἶπεν and λέγουσιν that at the time of Papias's inquiries all those (including the apostle John) who "had said" anything were no longer speaking, and thus were dead, while Aristion and the elder John "were saying" things, and thus were alive. The apostle John, being dead, could therefore not be the John still living.<sup>154</sup> But this is pressing the force of the aorist tense far beyond reason, for not only the deceased have spoken in the past. Furthermore, since all the disciples of the Lord are included in the first list, we would have to conclude on this interpretation of εἶπεν that Aristion and the elder John were also dead.

Yet, it must be admitted that there is something awkward about Papias's manner of expression. There would seem to be unnecessary repetitiveness in his statement, and the relative clause containing the reference to "the Elder, John," would seem to be awkwardly attached to the rest of the sentence. We could shrug this off, as G. Salmon does, as "a mere slovenliness of composition,"<sup>155</sup> taking note of Eusebius's judgment that Papias was "a man of exceedingly small intelligence."<sup>156</sup> There is, however, a better explanation. H. J. Lawlor has argued, convincingly, in our opinion (although we would not accept the validity of all his arguments or conclusions), that there is a lacuna in the text between the interrogative and relative clauses.<sup>157</sup> We would emphasize that our conclusion that "the Elder, John," is the apostle John is not at all dependent upon the correctness of Lawlor's insight. However, there is good evidence for it, and it does remove the difficulties from the text.

Lawlor initially thought that Eusebius was responsible for the lacuna, but he later attributed it to a scribe.<sup>158</sup> However, since the lacuna is present in the Syriac-Armenian text produced not many years after the publication of the work in Greek, and was also in the Greek manuscripts used by Rufinus and Jerome, it was most likely introduced by Eusebius or in the initial copying of his manuscript for publication. Since Eusebius, as we shall see, apparently refers to what was contained in the omitted words of Papias, they were probably omitted inadvertently.

Let us first examine the structure of the passage as it presently stands in the manuscripts of Eusebius. The interrogative clause, "what (τί) Andrew or what (τί) Peter, etc. . . . had said," is followed rather abruptly by the relative clause, "and the things which (ἃ ἔειπεν) Aristion and the elder John . . . were saying." The connection between the two clauses has been variously explained,<sup>159</sup> but the great majority of interpreters have understood the relative clause as syntactically parallel to the interrogative clause, with ἃ essentially equivalent to the previously repeated τί.<sup>160</sup> This is certainly the simplest and most natural explanation of the text. "The discourses of the elders" would then be understood to consist of both "what" had been said and "the things which" were being said.<sup>161</sup> This yields an acceptable sense, and poses no real problem for our interpretation of the passage.

Nonetheless, Eusebius himself presents evidence which suggests that there is a lacuna before the relative clause, and he even indicates the content of the omitted words. In § 7 he observes, paraphrasing what he has quoted in § 4, that Papias "acknowledges that he received the discourses of the apostles from those who had been their followers, but says that he was himself an actual hearer

of Aristion and of the elder John." The portion of this phrase preceding the comma clearly (and correctly) summarizes Papias's words, "And if anyone chanced to come who had actually been a follower of the elders, I would enquire as to the discourses of the elders, what Andrew, etc. . . . had said," and the portion following the comma is obviously based upon the next words of Papias, "and the things which Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, were saying." But Papias nowhere "says"--or even implies--in the text as it now stands (or anywhere else, for that matter) that he was a hearer of Aristion and John, let alone, if ἄ is functionally equivalent to the previously repeated τί, in contradistinction to the apostles previously mentioned. It is hardly plausible that Eusebius would have inferred that Papias was himself a hearer of Aristion and John merely from the tense of λέγουσιν, as some have suggested,<sup>162</sup> for the present time denoted by the verb is the time of Papias's inquiries, and "the things which" Aristion and John were saying were heard by their followers who informed Papias, not by Papias himself (in the Eusebian text).

It has been suggested that Eusebius was doubtful about his interpretation, and therefore qualified it by adding, "Certainly (γούν) he mentions them by name frequently in his treatises and sets forth their traditions."<sup>163</sup> But J. Chapman has shown that γούν should be translated "in fact," not "at any rate," in accordance with the context.<sup>164</sup> Eusebius is confirming and elaborating upon Papias's statement,<sup>165</sup> not conceding that Papias may not actually have made it.<sup>166</sup>

Since Eusebius repeats for us the substance of what Papias explicitly "says," there is considerable merit in Lawlor's suggestion that there is a lacuna in the quotation of Papias, and that

the omitted words "contained a verb by which the antecedent of  $\acute{\alpha}$  was governed" and "made the direct statement that Papias had heard Aristion and the elder John."<sup>167</sup> The original text of Papias may also be reflected by Irenaeus's reference to Papias as "the hearer of John,"<sup>168</sup> although Irenaeus may have acquired this information elsewhere.

If Lawlor's insight is correct, the awkwardness of Papias's saying that he asked both what John had once said and what he was still saying, is removed. Instead, Papias says that he asked the followers of the Lord's disciples what they could recall hearing them say, and that he himself heard what two of those disciples, Aristion and the Elder (John), were saying. If this is the substance of what Papias actually wrote, and it probably is, then there is no difficulty in John's being mentioned twice, once in the list of those whom others had heard, and once in the list of those whom Papias himself had heard. In the first list he is simply called "John," because Papias is listing by name the disciples whom others may have heard. But in the second list he is mentioning those whom he has himself heard, and since he knew John only in his old age, when he was known as "the Elder," Papias so refers to him, adding his name, "John," for the benefit of any who might not recognize the epithet.<sup>169</sup>

Lawlor's insight clarifies other matters, too. One would expect, after Papias promises to record "all that ever I carefully learnt and carefully recalled from the elders," that he would at least mention those elders whom he himself heard. And, it turns out, he does do this, stating that he heard Aristion and John. The question posed by J. N. Sanders, "Why did he not take the short journey from Hierapolis to Ephesus to find out for himself what

John was saying?"<sup>170</sup> now has an answer: he did just that, and wrote in his preface that he had done so.

It also becomes clear why Papias's Expositions contained a considerable amount of material from Aristion and John,<sup>171</sup> but evidently not so much from the other disciples of Jesus. Papias would naturally have relied more on what he had heard from the disciples than on what others recalled hearing them say. This confirms that "all that ever I carefully learnt and carefully recalled from the elders" refers, at least mainly, to his recollections of Aristion and John. Indeed, the prominence which Papias evidently gave to their traditions constitutes indirect evidence that Lawlor's textual insight is correct, for it indicates that Papias had a special connection with them.

A third objection to the identification of "the Elder, John," with the apostle John is that, as Eusebius observes,<sup>172</sup> he is mentioned after the obscure Aristion. Surely, it may be argued, Papias would have put an apostle first.<sup>173</sup> This is, to be sure, what one might expect Papias to have done. However, it is clear from his seemingly haphazard list of apostles--i.e. Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew, in that order--that he did not always list disciples of the Lord in the order of their prominence.<sup>174</sup> Therefore, we can hardly insist that he would have done so in the case of Aristion and John. The first pair of apostles, Andrew and Peter, are listed in the order of increasing prominence, and Papias may have wished to do the same with Aristion and John. Or, he may have put Aristion first because he died first, or because John had already been mentioned, or because he knew Aristion first, or just because he thought of him first. There is no reason to think that Papias considered Aristion to be more

prominent than the Elder, and so the order in which they are mentioned does not imply that the latter was not an apostle.

We must also consider Schnackenburg's argument that since Papias recorded the παραδόσεις of the elder John (according to Eusebius, H.E. III.39.14), this John was probably "a bearer of tradition, who handed on what he had himself heard, but can hardly have been himself an immediate witness of the deeds and words of the Lord."<sup>175</sup> But the traditions of the elder John could have been those which John, as an eyewitness, first handed down. Luke implies as much in Lk. 1:2, where he says that the eyewitnesses of Jesus "handed down" (παρέδωσαν) the gospel traditions--necessarily in the first instance. Thus, there is no problem in speaking of the traditions of an eyewitness.

Schnackenburg also objects to identifying the Elder, John, as a personal disciple of Jesus--even though he admits that Papias probably so identified him<sup>176</sup>--on the grounds that Papias's inquiries about Aristion's and John's statements "may have gone on for a long time, perhaps till the writing of his work," which would mean that two of Jesus' disciples "must have lived into the first decades of the second century," which is improbable.<sup>177</sup> However, Schnackenburg concedes that the date of Papias's work is not settled, with some scholars even putting it in the first century.<sup>178</sup> But even granting that no disciple of Jesus could have been alive when Papias wrote, it can hardly be denied that the words with which Papias introduces his discussion of inquiries, "and if anyone chanced to come who had actually been a follower of the elders," not to mention the whole tenor of the preceding passage, indicate that his information was acquired many years earlier. It was acquired out of personal interest, not as research for a book

about to be written. There is no exegetical or historical obstacle to placing his acquisition of information from Aristion and John, whether obtained at first or second hand, in the years 80-100 (and dating his Expositions at ca. 110, since Eusebius discusses Papias in his treatment of the reign of Trajan, 98-117, and places his work in the same period as, but probably right after, the epistles of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp<sup>179</sup>), a period during at least a part of which two disciples of Jesus could quite easily have still been alive.<sup>180</sup>

In conclusion, then, the disciple of Jesus whom Papias calls "the Elder, John," was the apostle John. "The Elder" was John's epithet late in life, when Papias knew him. The positive evidence for this conclusion, both exegetical and historical, is very strong indeed. The objections to it, upon careful examination, are quite weak.

## NOTES

### CHAPTER 1

<sup>1</sup> For a thorough survey of the wide variety of opinion on the synoptic problem advanced during this century, see Uchida, "Synoptic Problem."

<sup>2</sup> Synoptic Gospels, 81.

<sup>3</sup> This new situation is illustrated by J. A. Fitzmyer's treatment of the synoptic problem in Luke, 63-81. Although a firm advocate of the two-source theory, he interacts regularly with opposing arguments, rather than simply ignoring them.

<sup>4</sup> This would not be true if the preface was added by a later hand. According to F. C. Baur (in Evangelien, 516), it was added by the last supposed editor of the text (writing after Marcion), "wie sich von selbst versteht." However, the connection between this preface and the introductory words of Acts, and its stylistic affinities with the formal letters and speeches in the second half of Acts (see Robbins, "Prefaces," 100-104), not to mention the results of modern textual criticism, leave no doubt that the original author wrote the preface. This is taken for granted by scholars today.

<sup>5</sup> F. Godet (in Luke, I, 54) observes that "every theory as to the origin of the synoptics, which is not constructed out of the materials furnished by this preface, runs the risk of being thrown aside as a tissue of vain hypotheses the day after it has seen the light." And A. Plummer (in Luke, 2) comments: "This prologue contains all that we really know respecting the composition of early narratives of the life of Christ, and it is the test by which theories as to the origin of our Gospels must be judged."

<sup>6</sup> Similarly, F. Blass comments (in "Gospels," 395) that "Luke's preface is by far the most important passage for the origin of the Gospels, indeed it is the only witness, so we must first consider it carefully." And E. F. Scott remarks (in Literature, 30) that Luke's preface "must always form the starting point of synoptic inquiry, for it is here alone that an evangelist speaks in his own person about the aims and methods of his work."

<sup>7</sup> Synoptische Frage, 2.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 2-3.

## Notes for pp. 6-10

11 "Proömium," 33. See also Credner, Einl., 146. E. Reuss remarks (in History, 203): "Few passages of the N.T. have been explained in more different ways, in the interests of every conceivable system, than these four lines."

12 Evangelien, 243-248.

13 See his Synoptiker, 304.

14 "Previewing," 206.

15 Ibid., 227n.

16 "Prologues," 100.

## CHAPTER 2

1 "Purpose Expressed," 439n. Cf. Harvey, Companion, 222: The "conformity to convention" characterizing Luke's preface "makes it impossible for us to draw any precise conclusions from his language." "Even the specific purpose expressed in the preface," says Cadbury (in "Commentary," 490), "must not be applied too seriously to the work as a whole." So also Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 42; Marxsen, Int., 156; Dillon, "Previewing," 205, 207.

2 See Cadbury, "Commentary," 490.

3 Ant. Rom. I.1.1.

4 So Cadbury, "Commentary," 490. Cadbury aptly comments (in Making, 196), "It is in the bare fact of his using a preface rather than in its details that Luke's relation to literature is apparent."

5 These remarks are largely based on an examination of the prefaces to the works published in LCL, as well as other prefaces from which parallels to Luke's preface have been drawn.

6 Cf. Lieberich, Proömien, I, 48-49. See also Cadbury, Making, 195; Earl, "Prologue-form," 842-843. According to C. H. Talbert (in Luke, 7-10), a writer of an ancient historical or biographical work would "regularly" (p. 7) indicate in his preface (1) his predecessors, (2) his work's subject matter, (3) his qualifications for writing, (4) the plan, arrangements, or contents of his work, (5) his purpose for writing, (6) his own name, and (7) the formal addressee of his work. However, some of these "components" (as Talbert styles them) occur much more frequently than others. And one could easily add other components: e.g., the importance of the subject and the merits of one's work. Also, prefaces often turned into extended essays in their own right.

7 "Commentary," 490.

8 Ibid.

## Notes for pp. 10-11

<sup>9</sup> Cadbury was much closer to the truth on another occasion, when he wrote (in Making, 195): "But it would seem that the circumstances of the case determined quite naturally what a preface should include and that the rules were more useful in preventing the bad taste of rhetors than in correcting the natural expression of a sensible writer. Certain subjects were often mentioned in prefaces, and probably for the same reason, viz., their naturalness to the occasion." The "rules" to which he refers are those which "rhetorical rule-books" supposedly prescribed for the contents of the preface, "largely on the basis of the technique of the orator's exordium" (pp. 194-195). His one example (upon the basis of which he generalizes) is Lucian, Hist. conscrib. 52-54, where a few brief observations on the practice of "the best historians" (notably Herodotus and Thucydides) are made: "Whenever he does use a preface, he will make two points only, not three like the orators. He will omit the appeal for a favourable hearing and give his audience what will interest and instruct them. . . . He will make what is to come easy to understand and quite clear, if he sets forth the causes and outlines the main events." The connection between these "rules" and Luke's preface is obscure, to say the least.

<sup>10</sup> Even Cadbury (in Making, 195-196) recognizes this: "The likeness of circumstances often led different writers to deal with much the same subjects and in much the same way." In such cases there is no need to explain the similarities "as due to imitation, influence or plagiarism." Generally speaking, Cadbury shows a more sensible understanding of the similarities of ancient prefaces in his The Making of Luke-Acts than in his earlier "Commentary on the Preface of Luke."

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Lieberich, Proömien, I, 49-50.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., I, 50. Lieberich thinks, however, that if more of the better literature of the period had survived, we would have "gewiss ein farbenreicheres Bild." Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> "Commentary," 490n.

<sup>14</sup> After noting the commonplace that "Luke in writing this preface acted in accordance with literary habits of his time," W. C. van Unnik (in "Once More," 8) chides those who take this as "the last word" on the subject: "If we do not content ourselves with this handbook-knowledge, but take the trouble of consulting the introductions of other authors like Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Diodorus Siculus or Josephus, we do find that Luke is not just copying a certain model 'How to write a prooemium?', but that he takes his own stand."

<sup>15</sup> Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi (Lipsiae, 1874), 165-166.

<sup>16</sup> Int., 263.

<sup>17</sup> Philology, 2-4.

<sup>18</sup> Int., III, 82n. See also Loisy, Évangiles, I, 269n.; Cadbury,

## Notes for pp. 11-15

Making, 196.

<sup>19</sup> In the judgment of E. Meyer (in Ursprung, I, 8), the view that Luke was dependent on Dioscorides is "recht naiv." According to A. Loisy (in Luc, 71), such a view would be "tout à fait risqué."

<sup>20</sup> See A. H. Buck, The Growth of Medicine from the Earliest Times to about 1800 (New Haven, 1917), 157-159; W. Haberling, "Sextius Niger," in Biographisches Lexikon der hervorragenden Ärzte aller Zeiten und Völker [vor 1880], ed. by A. Hirsch et al. (3rd ed.; München, 1962), V:243-244; J. C. Huber (Memmingen), "Dioskorides, 2," *ibid.*, II:275; Miltner, "Laecanius. 4," in PW, XII (1924):396-397; M. Wellmann, "Areios. 13," in PW, II (1896):626; *id.*, "Dioskurides. 12," in PW, V (1905):1131-1142, at col. 1131.

<sup>21</sup> Op. cit., 158.

<sup>22</sup> "Dioscorides, Pedanius," Micropaedia (15th ed.; Chicago, 1974), 3:563b.

<sup>23</sup> The date of Luke's gospel is discussed below, pp. 142-145.

<sup>24</sup> If one wished to indulge in historical romance, it would be easy to imagine that Dioscorides became interested in Christianity through his fellow physician, Luke, and that his fellow Cilician, Luke's associate Paul, was also involved. Referring to Dioscorides and "the great school at Tarsus," Plummer (in Luke, 6) comments: "That he and S. Luke may have been there at the same time with S. Paul, seems to be a not impossible conjecture."

<sup>25</sup> The significant ones are assembled in Klostermann, 1-2; Wikenhauser, Geschichtswert, 137-140.

<sup>26</sup> Thus, it is wrong for E. Lohse (in "Lukas als Theologe," 256-257) to dress up the basic elements and structure of Luke's preface in a generalized fashion (with two variations: see p. 259 and n.), as if Hellenistic writers "gewöhnlich" followed this pattern, and then state that Luke's preface was written in imitation of "diese übliche Form." The individual elements of his preface have rough parallels in other literature, but the preface as a whole does not. Lists of slight parallels and loose talk (initiated by Cadbury) about the conventionality of ancient prefaces seem to have produced a distorted impression of ancient prefaces in general, and Luke's preface in particular, in the minds of many who, like Lohse (as his footnotes indicate), are content to rely upon the work of Cadbury.

<sup>27</sup> B.J. I.17.

<sup>28</sup> See Schlatter, Lukas, 23-28.

<sup>29</sup> "Purpose," 261. Similarly, Dillon (in "Previewing," 207n.) asserts that this passage in Josephus "confirms that we are in the presence of stock phraseology for literary prefaces."

<sup>30</sup> Ap. I.53, 55.

## Notes for pp. 16-18

- 31 "Preface," 305.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 305-307.
- 33 Cf. Josephus, Ant. I.1-2. The narrative portion of Luke's gospel does not suggest that he was motivated by a desire to display rhetorical skill.
- 34 "Preface," 309.
- 35 Proömien, I, 48-49.

## CHAPTER 3

<sup>1</sup> So Hauck, 2, 5, 16; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 43; pace Knox. Blass (in "Gospels," 396) would allow as few as three.

<sup>2</sup> Grimm (in "Proömium," 65) supposes that "nur etwa ein halbes Dutzend solcher Schriften" would have been enough to be called "many." G. L. Hahn (in Lucas, I, 70) infers that there had been "eine grössere Anzahl." A. B. Bruce (in "Synoptic Gospels," 458) sees a reference to "the crowd of early essayists." Loisy (in Évangiles, I, 271) infers that there must have been "un assez grand nombre d'écrits" extant. M.-J. Lagrange (in Luc, 2) agrees that "πῶλλοί signifie ordinairement un grand nombre," but since "il paraît impossible qu'il y ait eu un très grand nombre de récits évangéliques complets," he considers that "quelques-uns" would be within the range of πῶλλοί. F. Hauck (in Lukas, 2) sees "eine ganze Reihe" of writings, and R. C. H. Lenski (in Luke, 25) "quite a number."

<sup>3</sup> Pace Grosheide, "Synoptic Problem," 58. H. Alford (in Testament, I, 437) comments: "It is probable that in almost every Church where an eye-witness preached, his testimony would be taken down, and framed into some δῆγμα, more or less complete, of the life and sayings of the Lord." More cautious is the judgment of N. B. Stonehouse (in Witness, 30) that "there is nothing improbable in the view that by the sixth decade of the first century several attempts had been made in the various churches to provide written accounts of the apostolic preaching and teaching." Cf. Thiersch, Kritik, 165; v. Hofmann, 6; Schlatter, Lukas, 18-19. Quite unwarranted is the suggestion of C. G. Wilke (in Urevangelist, 112-113) that Luke has in view the evangelists referred to in Eph. 4:11 and 2 Tim. 4:5 (cf. Ac. 21:8).

<sup>4</sup> So J. Weiss, 410: "Das Wort 'viele' mahnt uns, wie wenig wir doch von den Anfängen des urchristlichen Schrifttums wissen." So also A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, E.T. (London, 1911), 125n.: "But with our complete ignorance of the circumstances it is quite inadmissible for us any longer so to tie ourselves down to one decade as to say that a decade later there were 'many' that could have been written, while a decade earlier there could not have been many."

## Notes for pp. 18-23

<sup>5</sup> So, e.g., Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 2.

<sup>6</sup> "Gospels Criticism," 40.

<sup>7</sup> See BAG, s.v. Virtually all modern scholars have recognized that this word has a causal force in Lk. 1:1, not (pace Hahn) merely a temporal force. See Zahn, 42n.

<sup>8</sup> BDF, § 456(3). This statement is often quoted or repeated, with or without an acknowledgement of its source. Likewise, BDR, § 456(3). So also Godet; A. B. Bruce; Creed, 3 (on πολλοί); Fitzmyer; Dillon, "Previewing," 206, 218.

<sup>9</sup> Lukas, 17.

<sup>10</sup> Tradition, 12.

<sup>11</sup> Making, 29.

<sup>12</sup> "πολλοί," 265.

<sup>13</sup> Int., 129. But if the word does indeed reveal "nothing," Kümmel can hardly argue (on p. 150) that a date for the composition of Luke in the sixties is "scarcely compatible" with Lk. 1:1 "since by the year 60 'many' gospel writings could not have been in existence."

<sup>14</sup> "Zur Chronologie des Paulus," Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse for 1907, 263-299, at pp. 294-295.

<sup>15</sup> "Commentary," 492-493.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 493.

<sup>17</sup> Inst. IV.1.5, 16. See also D. L. Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (New York, 1957), 112-115.

<sup>18</sup> "Commentary," 492-493.

<sup>19</sup> "πολλοί," 263-265. Bauer's material is simply reproduced from E. Fraenkel, "Eine Anfangsformel attischer Reden," Glotta 39 (1961): 1-5.

<sup>20</sup> The biblical passages to which reference is made are Ac. 24:2, 10; Jn. 20:30; Heb. 1:1.

<sup>21</sup> This fact is easily lost sight of. É. Trocmé (in Livre des Actes, 42), for instance, asserts that the "schéma conventionnel" to which Luke conformed his preface included a "rappel de l'oeuvre des 'nombreux' prédécesseurs de l'écrivain."

<sup>22</sup> Luke, 3.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

## Notes for pp. 23-24

<sup>24</sup> Although the date of Paul's hearing before Felix is disputed, there are good reasons for dating it in the year 58, plus or minus a year. See E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, rev. and ed. by G. Vermes and F. Millar, I (Edinburgh, 1973), 465-466; D. Plooijs, De Chronologie van het Leven van Paulus (Leiden, 1918), 49-79, 157-165, 173-174; G. Ogg, The Chronology of the Life of Paul (London, 1968), 146-170; Bruce, Paul, 317-318; pace Haenchen, Acts, 68-71. Thus, Felix had already been procurator for about six years, a period considerably longer than that of any of his predecessors (Fadus, two years; Alexander, two years; Cumanus, four years) or successors (Festus, two years; Albinus, two years; Florus, two years), and one which, in that turbulent land, could justly be described as having spanned "many years." (On the probable dates for the procurators of Judea, see Schürer, op. cit., I, 455-470.)

<sup>25</sup> See "Note XXXIV. The Chronology of Acts," in BC, V (1933), 445-474, at p. 465. Since Lake adopts the short Pauline chronology, and allows Felix a procuratorial office of only three or four years (pp. 470-471), he supposes that the "many years" of Ac. 24:10 include the period when Felix presumably held "some military office in Samaria" while Cumanus was procurator (p. 465). But it is doubtful that Felix held any such office, for the supposition that he did is merely an effort to salvage a kernel of truth from Tacitus's mistaken statement (in Ann. XII.54) that Felix exercised procuratorial power in Samaria while Ventidius Cumanus did so in Galilee, which he mistakenly calls "the other half of the province." If Felix had held any notable position in Samaria, Josephus would undoubtedly have mentioned him in his detailed accounts of the dispute between certain Galileans and Samaritans which occurred while Cumanus was procurator and which resulted in his recall and dismissal (Ant. XX.118-136; B.J. II.232-246). Felix is introduced as the one whom Claudius sent to Judea to replace Cumanus (Ant. XX.137; B.J. II.247), which implies that he had not already been there. Lake (op. cit., 465) argues that Jonathan the high priest would not have asked for the appointment of Felix (according to Josephus, Ant. XX.162) if he had not been known to him in Palestine, but E. Haenchen (in Acts, 69-70) is probably right in suggesting that Jonathan had offered to ask for Felix if the latter's influential brother, Pallas, could secure Claudius's judgment in favor of the Jews in their dispute with Cumanus and the Samaritans. And even if Felix had held office in Samaria, he had not done so as "a judge of this nation" (Ac. 24:10), i.e. of the Jews. Thus, the "many years" of Ac. 24:10 were the years when Felix was procurator of Judea, and since they were many in number, this passage (together with Ac. 24:27) contradicts the short Pauline chronology.

<sup>26</sup> Acts, 300.

<sup>27</sup> In the preamble of a letter to the Alexandrians, Claudius notes that their ambassadors "discoursed at length concerning the city, directing my attention to the goodwill towards you which for many years past, you know, you have found stored up in me; for you are by disposition loyal to the Augusti, as is manifest to me by

## Notes for pp. 24-25

many tokens, and in particular have shown and received many good offices in relation to my house, of which (to mention but the last instance, disregarding the others) my brother Germanicus Caesar is the supreme exemplar, addressing you more frankly, by word of mouth" (H. I. Bell and W. E. Crum, eds., Jews and Christians in Egypt (Oxford, 1924), 27). There is no indication here that the "many years past" (ἐκ πολλῶν χρόνων, p. 23) refer to the one or two years during which he had already been emperor. Rather, it is clear from the context that he is speaking of himself as part of the Augustan house, of which he had been a member for many years. Since the Augusti had long been benefactors of Alexandria--the benefaction of Germanicus is dated by Tacitus (in Ann. II.59) in the year 19, some 22 years earlier--Claudius could claim to have had the Augustan good will stored up within him "for many years past." (A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, in Select Papyri, LCL (London and New York, 1932-34), II, 81, translate this phrase as "from long ago.") Claudius makes no pretense of having been emperor all this time. Rather, he recognizes that he has recently become such, for he goes on to pledge, "I on my side will continue to display the time-honoured solicitude for the interests of the city, with which my family has a traditional friendship" (p. 29).

28 Marshall, Acts, 376. See also Haenchen, Acts, 654 (quoting Lake and Cadbury); Conzelmann, ApG., 141 (reproducing the argument of Lake and Cadbury); Hanson, Acts, 228 (reproducing the argument of Lake and Cadbury); Schneider, ApG., II, 347n. (following Conzelmann); Schille, ApG., 433; cf. Roloff, ApG., 337.

29 Luke does not tell us who any of his predecessors were, but this does not imply, as Haenchen (in Weg Jesu, 3) supposes, "daß diese erste Evangelienliteratur anonym erschien." (So also Bundy, Jesus, 2.) Luke makes a summary reference to his predecessors without indicating whether or not they had written anonymously.

30 See pp. 6-7.

31 See Tradition, 11-12.

32 Others (besides Schwartz, Cadbury, Dibelius, J. Bauer, and Kümmel) discounting the force of πολλοί in Lk. 1:1 include Klostermann, 2; Scott, Literature, 31; Schmid; Sahlin, Messias, 44 (one work by several writers is enough for this "rhetorische Hyperbel"); Gilmour in IntB, VIII:27; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 258; Bundy, Jesus, 2; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 42 (one predecessor is enough); Grundmann, 7, 43; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 362; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 261; Marxsen, Int., 156; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 194n.; Fuller, Int., 118; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 2-3; Schulz, Stunde, 243-244; von Campenhausen, Formation, 124; Schürmann, I, 6n.; Higgins, "Preface and Kerygma," 81 and n.; Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 40; Lohse, Formation, 150; du Plessis, "Purpose," 261; Schneider; Schneider, "Zweck," 48; Marshall; Fitzmyer ("perhaps"); Dillon, "Previewing," 207; Juel, Luke-Acts, 15 (perhaps); Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 422; cf. Schweizer, 2, 11.

33 "ΠΟΛΛΟΙ," 266.

## Notes for pp. 25-26

34 "Previewing," 207. See also Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 362; Marxsen, Int., 156; Schulz, Stunde, 243-244.

35 Gospels, 257.

36 Luke the Historian, 21.

37 See LSJ and BAG, s.v.

38 So Bloomfield, Recensio Synoptica, II, 162: "There seems, however, some allusion to the arduousness of such a work, executed, as it were, magno conatu. So Hesych. explains ἐπιχειρεῖν by τολμᾶν, 'to venture upon.'" So also Photius, Luc., ad loc.; de Wette; Thiersch, Kritik, 166; Meyer; van Oosterzee; Bleek; Holtzmann, Evangelien, 245; Bisping; Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 38; Keil, 182; Zahn, Int., III, 44; Zahn, 43; Manson; Schlatter, Lukas, 19; Hauck; Lenski, 25; Marshall, 41; pace B. Weiss ("nicht bloss"); Hahn; Lagrange; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 259n. According to W. F. Arndt (in Luke, 39), there is an allusion to the importance of the task.

39 See the references in BAG. See also van Unnik, "Once More," 15.

40 Thus, H. Lesêtre (in "Méthode," 171-172) is quite wrong to say that in Ac. 9:29 and 19:13 Luke gives the verb ἐπιχειρεῖω "une signification sensiblement péjorative." Luke is of course unsympathetic to the undertakings mentioned in these two passages, and he indicates that they both failed. But all of this is in the context, not in the verb ἐπιχειρεῖω. Luke's use of this verb leaves the result open.

41 So Grimm, "Proömium," 37; MM, s.v. ἐπιχειρεῖω; Cadbury, "Commentary," 493-494; van Unnik, "Once More," 15; Glöckner, Verkündigung, 11-12; and so modern commentators generally. A hint of less than full success is discerned by B. Weiss; Holtzmann ("höchstens"); Farrar; A. B. Bruce; Zahn, Int., III, 44 (possibly).

42 Luc. 1.1. So also, following Origen, Ambrose, Luc., I.2-3.

43 H.E. III.24.15.

44 De cons. ev. IV.8.

45 Luc., ad loc.

46 Notes, 139.

47 It is found in Lardner, Supplement, I, 81-83 (following Beausobre against Grotius); Campbell, II, 176; Clarke; Credner, Einl., 157; Dunwell. H. Sahlin (in Messias, 44) sees a stress being put on the "Dreistigkeit" of Luke's predecessors, who, he actually argues, prepared "einen falschen Bericht über Paulus" (pp. 43-44n.). For more on Sahlin, see below, p. 166 n. 46 (p. 427).

## Notes for pp. 27-29

- 48 See below, p. 87.
- 49 "Theologisches Programm," 195-196; pace Glöckner, Verkündigung, 11-12.
- 50 Stunde, 244.
- 51 Luke, 291-292.
- 52 Mor. 968C-D.
- 53 Haer. III.21.2.
- 54 Int., 190. Cf. Whitaker, "Philology," 266-268; Hauck.
- 55 See Lessing, "New Hypothesis," 77-78; Marsh, Origin and Composition, 197-199. Lessing even suggests that Luke quotes the title of the narrative (translated into Greek from Hebrew) as δὴ γρησὶν . . . παραμάρων, perhaps extending to the end of vs. 2. Marsh agrees that the title (extending to the end of vs. 2) is quoted. He argues (on p. 198) that if vs. 2 were Luke's own words, he would have written αὐτοῖς rather than ἡμῶν, for one would say that others "have undertaken to write a history, as eye-witnesses have related the facts to them." But Luke's point could just as easily be that his predecessors have undertaken to record the facts related to "us" Christians in general. Furthermore, the vague words "Narrative of the things which have been fulfilled among us" (so Lessing, p. 77), with or without vs. 2 appended, hardly sound like a title.
- 56 Philology, 14-16, and "Gospels," 196, followed closely by Zahn, 44-45; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 50. So also Klostermann, "Lukas," 362 (translation), but not Klostermann, 2 (translation); Stuhlmüller.
- 57 "Theologisches Programm," 200. So also Schulz, Stunde, 244-245; du Plessis, "Purpose," 262-263 (apparently).
- 58 Pace Zahn, 41 (each of Luke's predecessors undertook "eine Erzählung wiederzugeben"); Lenski, 26.
- 59 So Grimm, "Proömium," 36; cf. van Unnik, "Once More," 12; G. Kennedy in Fuller, "Classics," 182-183. Lessing and Marsh were aware of this problem, and each sidestepped it in his own way. Lessing commented (in "New Hypothesis," 78), "Admittedly all this would be even more probable if τὴν stood before δὴ γρησὶν." And Marsh remarked (in Origin and Composition, 198n.), "Whether this omission [of the article] is sufficient to destroy the whole conjecture, I leave to be determined by the learned." Cf. Haenchen's criticisms of Klein's position in Acts, 126-127.
- 60 Ep. Arist. 144. See Creed; Delling in TDNT, VIII:32. Blass and Zahn were unaware of this passage.
- 61 So Lampe, s.v. ἀνατάσσω, 1.

## Notes for pp. 29-30

62 So WGT, s.v. ἀνατάσσωμαι ("to put together in order, arrange, compose"); LSJ, s.v. ἀνατάσσω (Med., "set in order"); pace BAG, s.v. ἀνατάσσωμαι (probably "reproduce a narrative (in writing)," rather than "draw up, compile"). Most commentators favor "compile," "compose," or the like.

63 Cf. van Unnik, "Once More," 12-13: In the light of contemporary practice, it would appear that Luke has in view the putting in order of collected material. However, the ordering or arranging probably implied by -τάσσωμαι in the verb (cf. Ac. 28:23) would refer to the author's treatment of his material, and (as in Irenaeus, Haer. III.21.2) would thus not necessarily imply (pace Wilke, Urevangelist, 112-113) that that material was previously without order or arrangement. Nonetheless, at least some disorder in it would seem to be implied.

64 This distinction is noted by Euthymius, Comm., ad loc.

65 "Commentary," 494, perhaps following A. B. Bruce. Haenchen (in "Das 'Wir'," 362), H. Schürmann (in Lukasev., I, 7n.), and du Plessis (in "Purpose," 262) erroneously represent this as Cadbury's own view, perhaps having been led astray by a misleading footnote of Lohse's (in "Lukas als Theologe," 259n.).

66 "Commentary," 494.

67 Luke's reason for this is explained below, pp. 66-67.

68 J. Ernst (in Lukas, 47) declares that Luke, in using the word δόξης, is above all characterizing his own intended work, not the works of his predecessors. But that is not what Luke says. If the works which Ernst thinks Luke has in mind are not all narrative accounts, he should revise his list of Luke's predecessors, not change Luke's statement.

69 In TDNT, II:909. For other uses of the word, see LSJ and Lampe, s.v.

70 See below, p. 33.

71 Büchsel in TDNT, II:909. Cf. Hadas, Aristeas, 56-58.

72 Luke, 292. Fitzmyer supplies many examples of this usage.

73 BAGD, s.v., gives "narrative, account," referring to "a historical report." We prefer to translate δόξης in Lk. 1:1 as "a narrative account," rather than as "a narrative" (so RV, RSV) or "an account" (so NEB, NIV; cf. JB). The translation "an account" is unduly vague, since it does not bring out the narrative character of the accounts. But the translation "a narrative" is somewhat awkward in the context. That is, "the things" narrated include the things which "Jesus began . . . to teach" (Ac. 1:1), but one would not speak of "a narrative" of Jesus' teachings. It is more felicitous to speak of "a narrative account" of them.

## Notes for pp. 30-33

74 "Once More," 14.

75 Luke, 292. But we can hardly agree with him (pp. 172-174) that Luke uses δὲ ἄλλοι as "the quasi-title" of his work. It is not Luke's first word, and he employs it simply to describe the works of his predecessors.

76 So Whitby; Grosheide, "Synoptic Problem," 58-59.

77 So Lenski, 26 (so far as "have undertaken" is concerned).

78 So de Wette; Wilke, Urevangelist, 109-111; Holtzmann, Evangelien, 244; Hahn; Zahn, 45; Schmid, 29; Lenski, 26. Since F. W. Grosheide (in "Synoptic Problem," 58-59) understands Luke to be referring to the composing or arranging of oral accounts, he is forced to connect the καί of vs. 3 with παρακολουθήκότες, not γράψαι, which is hardly plausible. See below, pp. 93-94.

79 See Farmer, Synoptic Problem, 221-223; Ellis, "Gospels Criticism," 48. Both Farmer and Ellis advance their exegesis with hesitation. And Farmer seems to shift his interpretation of δὲ ἄλλοι from "a (particular) narrative" to "narrative," thus enabling him to suggest that other narrative material may also be in view.

80 The joint composition which Farmer has in view is a process of tradition development and redaction, much like the process which Lessing thought had produced the primitive narrative. But according to Lessing and Marsh the "many" of Lk. 1:1 used that narrative, whereas according to Farmer and Ellis they produced it. Cf. Breen, I, 20: Luke refers to "a general movement among the early Christians . . . to induce a historical and logical order into the Gospel narrative."

81 See above, p. 28. G. M. Styler (in "Priority," 304n.) agrees that Farmer has not put forward "the natural meaning of the Greek."

82 Cf. BDF, § 140. If Luke had used the plural, it would have been implied that each writer had produced more than one narrative.

## CHAPTER 4

1 Although περί, as used here, means "about, concerning," the word "of" can carry this meaning, and English idiom prefers "narrative account of" (cf. AV, RSV, NEB, JB, NIV) to "narrative account about/concerning" (cf. RV).

2 Cf. Zahn, 47-48; Schürmann, I, 3.

3 So van Unnik, "Once More," 8.

4 See below, pp. 109 and 158-159.

5 Cf. Schanz, 46: "Lucas setzte die Bekanntschaft mit den mehr

## Notes for pp. 33-36

angedeuteten als beschriebenen Verhältnissen bei seinen Lesern voraus, so daß die späteren Generationen nur auf Vermuthungen angewiesen sind, welche je nach dem Standpunkte des Exegeten sehr verschieden ausfallen." And E. Meyer (in Ursprung, I, 9) comments: "Gleich das Prooemium ist inhaltlich so gefaßt, daß ein nicht-orientierter Heide es nicht verstehn kann."

<sup>6</sup> Virtually no one would dispute this, but some would also see a reference in Lk. 1:1 to at least the first part of the apostolic history. See below, pp. 173-174, 175, for a refutation of this view.

<sup>7</sup> So Hahn. Cf. Nösgen; Fitzmyer, 293.

<sup>8</sup> Cadbury (in "Commentary," 496), without mentioning that this usage is characteristic of Luke, hints that an expression like τὰ γενόμενα would have been too "colourless" to use in a preface. But there is no objective basis for this opinion. Cf. Arndt.

<sup>9</sup> So Grimm, "Proömium," 36. See also Meyer.

<sup>10</sup> Smaller collections of gospel material may have been in existence, but Luke is not concerned with them in vs. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Seeing a reference to Mark and/or Matthew, or to lost works of comparable (i.e. comprehensive) scope are Westcott, Int., 190; Bleek, Int., I, 281; Bleek, I, 31; Godet, I, 35; Grimm, "Proömium," 69; v. Hofmann, 5; Hahn, I, 70 (but cf. pp. 75-76); Bacon, Int., 195; Burton, "Purpose and Plan," 248; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271; Streeter, Gospels, 558; Feine, Jesus, 59; Büchsel in TDNT, II:909; Schmid; Lenski, 29; Arndt; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 2, 3; Thompson; Conzelmann-Lindemann, Arbeitsbuch, 54; Fitzmyer, 292; pace Barnes; Ebrard, Geschichte, 1035-1036; B. Weiss; Zahn, 46; Stonehouse, Witness, 30-31; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 43; Schürmann, I, 6, 11n.

<sup>12</sup> Evangelien-Kritik, 66.

<sup>13</sup> "Historiker," 14-15 (citing H. Lausberg).

<sup>14</sup> See above, p. 33, and below, pp. 108-109.

<sup>15</sup> So Alford; B. Weiss, 265; Holtzmann; Blass, Philology, 16; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271n.; Klostermann, 2; Cadbury, "Knowledge Claimed," 413; Lenski, 28; Arndt; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 198-199; Dillon, "Previewing," 212n.; cf. du Plessis, "Purpose," 264.

<sup>16</sup> "Knowledge Claimed," 413.

<sup>17</sup> Int., 129n. Presumably the two generations are not identical.

<sup>18</sup> "Evangelien-schrift," 267-269; Lukasev., I, 5-6, 8. So also Schneider, 39; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 389-392 (the same group from two points of view). Cf. Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 178.

## Notes for pp. 36-43

19 Luke, 41. See also Stonehouse, Origins, 122-124; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 424.

20 Thus, Luke is not referring to the Jewish people, pace Wilke, Urevangelist, 109.

21 Philology, 14, followed by Stonehouse in Witness, 27 (but not in Origins, 123).

22 Pace Hahn, I, 8, 72-73. But see below, pp. 145-146.

23 "Previewing," 209-211. So also B. Weiss, 265: "den Verfasser und die Leser, sofern sie Christen sind."

24 "Dear Theo," 134.

25 Cf. E. De W. Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek (3rd ed.; Edinburgh, 1898), § 154: The perfect participle "may have reference to the past action and the resulting state or only to the resulting state."

26 J. B. Lightfoot (in Colossians and Philemon, 240) observes that the verb "is almost exclusively biblical and ecclesiastical," and Cadbury (in "Commentary," 495) confirms this observation. So also MM, s.v. The ecclesiastical usage is more varied than the biblical usage, but is no more helpful in determining Luke's usage in Lk. 1:1. See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, 240; BAG and Lampe, s.v. In the non-literary papyri, the verb often denotes the satisfying of obligations, which sheds no light on Luke's preface. See Deissmann, Light, 86-87; Moulton, "Notes," 118-119; LSJ, s.v.; MM, s.v.; F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden, ed. by E. Kießling (Berlin, 1925-31), s.v.

27 So, e.g., Delling in TDNT, VI:309.

28 See above, p. 38.

29 The English translator (Cadbury), following Migne, reads effectum. Rauer reads affectum, "state of mind."

30 Luc. 1.2-3.

31 See BAG, s.v.

32 It may also be noted that Col. 2:7, one of the passages providing elements for the quotation of Paul, also has the word βεβαιούμενοι, though Origen prefers to use the equivalent τεθεμελιωμένοι from Eph. 3:17 and Col. 1:23.

33 Cf. OLD, s.v. ostendō, 11: "to show by argument or evidence, establish, demonstrate."

34 Cf. OLD, s.v. confirmō, 6.b, "to establish (teachings) firmly (in the mind)," and γ, "to support, confirm, or prove (an argument, opinion, etc., by adducing reasons, evidence, authority, etc.)."

## Notes for pp. 44-46

- 35 Frag. 1(b).
- 36 H.E. III.24.15. The words  $\delta\upsilon$  and  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  are drawn from vs. 4, and substitute for  $\tau\omega\upsilon$  . . .  $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$  in vs. 1.
- 37 Ep. fest. 39.
- 38 Horner's translation of the Sahidic text, "which were accepted ( $\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\tau$   $\bar{\eta}\rho\eta\tau$ ) among us," is supported by Crum, s.v.  $\tau\omega\tau$ , With  $\rho\eta\tau$ , c (p. 438b), giving for  $\tau$ .  $\eta\rho$ . the meaning "consent, agree," and citing Lk. 1:1. A. Beck (in Prolog, 4n.), Lagrange (in "Luc, I, 1," 96; Luc, 3), and Fitzmyer (in Luke, 293, following Lagrange) mistakenly place the Sahidic among the ancient versions which trans-late  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\upsilon$  as "fulfilled, completed" in some sense. On these see below, pp. 47-49.
- 39 "Commentary," 496.
- 40 Eusebius's inference from Lk. 1:1 that Luke "had been con-  
vinced" ( $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ ) looks like it was drawn from Origen.
- 41 See Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, 240; Lampe, s.v. Cf. Campbell, II, 506; Zahn, Int., III, 83n.
- 42 Pace Campbell; de Wette; Ebrard, Geschichte, 142; Bleek; Bisping; Godet; B. Weiss; Hahn; Plummer, 3; Beck, Prolog, 4n.; Lagrange, "Luc, I, 1," 96-97; Lagrange, 3; Cadbury, "Commentary," 495-496; Lenski, 26-27; Stonehouse, Witness, 26; Fitzmyer.
- 43 Stonehouse's suggestion (in Witness, 31) that Eusebius may have been working from a faulty memory of Luke's exact words is negated by the skillful manner in which he weaves together words drawn from different parts of it.
- 44 Luc., ad loc.
- 45 Luc., ad loc.
- 46 Accordingly, the translation of  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$   $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$  presented by Migne is multis argumentis comprobatae sunt.
- 47 Comm., ad loc.
- 48 Gospels, I, 2.
- 49 Novum Testamentum, I, 2.
- 50 This is also the focus of Calvin's remaining remarks on this verse.
- 51 See also Trapp; Whitby (in part); Henry; Hug, Int., 388 ("notorious"); Olshausen (recognizing that  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$  is equivalent to  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota\alpha$ ); Barnes; Alford; Birks, Horae, 32, 55; Webster-Wilkinson; D. Brown; Feine, Überlieferung, 1; Farrar; Breen.

## Notes for pp. 46-47

<sup>52</sup> Mark and Luke, I, 274-275. Cf. Nösgen, 286: "volle Sicherheit erhalten habend, zur vollen Überzeugung gebracht, vollbeglaubt."

<sup>53</sup> Expositor, I, 1-2. So also Clarke, N.T., I, 369: "Facts confirmed by the fullest evidence." Cf. Webster-Wilkinson ("believed on sure grounds").

<sup>54</sup> Testament, I, 257. Cf. Foote, 8: things "which, having been confirmed by full evidence, are fully credited by us Christians."

<sup>55</sup> Markus und Lukas, 154. Schlatter later commented (in Lukas, 20) that Luke indicates "daß die Kirche ein deutliches, von vielen geprüftes und erprobtes Wissen über Jesus besitzt."

<sup>56</sup> P. 190. J. B. Lightfoot adopted Westcott's earlier rendering in S. Clement of Rome. The Two Epistles to the Corinthians (London, 1869), 157-158, repudiated it in Colossians and Philemon (1st ed., 1875), 240 (p. 306 in the first edition), but published it again (unwittingly?) in Fathers, Part I (1890), II, 158, reproducing the notes in his earlier edition of Clement's epistles at this point.

<sup>57</sup> So also Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon (London, n.d.), s.v. παροφθαλμῶ: "pass. of things, to be fully established as a matter of certainty, Lu. 1:1."

<sup>58</sup> Luke, 2.

<sup>59</sup> Origins, 142 (but cf. p. 74). For his earlier view, see below, p. 58 n. 105 (p. 375).

<sup>60</sup> "Papias's 'Exposition'," 32 (translating "which have become matter of full assurance among us").

<sup>61</sup> Lukas, 14. According to Rengstorf the participle is "doppelsinnig," indicating both completion and certainty, with Luke's personal certainty especially in view.

<sup>62</sup> Luke, 39-40.

<sup>63</sup> Christian Words (Edinburgh, 1980), 26 (following the AV: "which are most surely believed").

<sup>64</sup> A different, though related view has been advanced by G. H. Whitaker (in "Philology," 262-265, followed by Ragg). He explains (on p. 264) that Luke "writes in his Preface of the πράγματα 'which have come to full-bearing in' Christians." That is, according to his much-needed "Additional Note," 239, there is a reference to the "rich fruitfulness . . . in life and conduct" which has resulted from Christian conviction. This interpretation probably lies behind Cadbury's seemingly extraneous remark (in "Commentary," 496), "Nor does the agricultural force of -φθέρω remain" in the word.

<sup>65</sup> So Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 196 (insofar as this meaning is thought to refer to the taking place of events).

## Notes for pp. 47-54

66 "Commentary," 496.

67 See LSJ, BAG, and Lampe, s.v. All three give "fulfill" as one meaning of the word, but not in the sense of "accomplish, complete." BAG does give "accomplish" as its meaning in Lk. 1:1 (as does WGT, s.v., b), following modern exegesis, but does not adduce any other passage as confirming the existence of this meaning. All three lexicons, on the other hand, give "complete" or "make complete" as one meaning of πληροῦω, with ample citation of supporting evidence.

68 "Commentary," 496 (evidently adopting the language of Lagrange, "Luc, I, 1," 96). Of course, Cadbury does not rave over the first-hand knowledge of the early translators when he is not prepared to accept their renderings, as in the case of καθεξῆς in vs. 3. See "Commentary," 505.

69 The African Old Latin (i.e., here, only MS. e) similarly reads quae impletae sunt in nobis.

70 Augustine repeated the Vulgate text in De cons. ev. IV.8, but did not comment on this portion of Lk. 1:1.

71 See the discussion of Burkitt, Evangelion, II, 286. Luke's preface has not survived in the Curetonian MS. On the Peshitta see above, p. 44.

72 See Crum, s.v. Χωκ, A.II, giving "complete, finish" (p. 761b), and B, giving the same meanings for Χ. εβ•ολ (p. 762a). On the Sahidic see above, p. 44 and n. 38 (p. 371).

73 So Easton, in.

74 See below, pp. 63-65.

75 See OLD, s.v. compleō, 8, and impleō, 10.b; Smith (Mrs. Margoliouth), s.v. ⲕⲉⲃⲟⲗ, Shaphel (p. 274a).

76 See above, pp. 42-43.

77 Luc. I.3. Cf. OLD, s.v. redundō, 7: "To be present to excess."

78 Luc. I.4.

79 So BAG, s.v. πληροῦω, 4.b, compared with §§ 2, 3, 5.

80 We are indebted to H. Hammond (in Paraphrase and Annotations, 186) for this reference. Modern scholarship does not seem to be aware of it.

81 Colossians and Philemon, 240.

82 Luc. 3.

## Notes for pp. 55-57

- 83 See Robertson, Word Pictures, IV, 633; Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 71; Gealy in IntB, XI:518; Brox, Pastoralbriefe, 268, 275-276; cf. Dibelius-Gonzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 124.
- 84 So Bernard, Pastoral Epistles, 148; Parry, Pastoral Epistles, 70; Scott, Pastoral Epistles, 140-141 (departing from Moffatt's excellent translation, "to make a full statement of the gospel"); Kelly, Pastoral Epistles, 219.
- 85 See Lightfoot, Epistles of Paul, 161.
- 86 So Lock, Pastoral Epistles, 119; Jeremias, Timotheus und Titus, 66; Guthrie, Pastoral Epistles, 176.
- 87 We would also argue that πληρώω has this meaning in Rom. 15:19 and Col. 1:25, though very few commentators have perceived this. See also Eusebius, Demonstratio evangelica, III.6.25.
- 88 This linguistic affinity between Luke and the Pastoral Epistles may be added to the many others tabulated by S. G. Wilson in Luke and the Pastoral Epistles (London, 1979), 5-11. We would hesitate to infer from them that Luke wrote or had a hand in the writing of the Pastorals, but they do establish a similar linguistic background.
- 89 Colossians and Philemon, 240. So also BAG, s.v. πληροφόρέω, 1.b. The text is τὸς πεπληροφόρημένος ἀγάπης; ("Who is filled with love?"), for which Lightfoot (in Fathers, Part I, II, 299) provides the overly literal translation, "Who is fulfilled with love?"
- 90 The shepherd tells Hermas that the Lord "will fulfil (πληροφύσει) the petition of your soul."
- 91 Colossians and Philemon, 240. The text is ἐπληροφόρηθη καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν ἀνθρώποις τοῦ πειῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν, which may be translated as "the heart within the sons of men has been fully persuaded (or, set) to do evil." See LSJ, s.v. πληροφόρεω, II.2; Delling in TDNT, VI:309.
- 92 LSJ, s.v. πληροφόρεω, 2, cites this passage (with Lk. 1:1) for the meaning (in the passive) "to be fulfilled." Cf. below, pp. 63-65.
- 93 See Deissmann, Licht, 68n.
- 94 Light, 86-87n.
- 95 See Deissmann, Licht, 87n.
- 96 Römer, 56. Lagrange's list is in fact based on Lietzmann's, as appears from Lagrange's earlier "Luc, I, 1," 97.
- 97 This interpretation is supported by Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, 240; WGT, s.v. πληροφόρεω, c; BAG, s.v., 2. Lagrange (in "Luc, I, 1," 99) agrees, attributing Lietzmann's classification of

## Notes for pp. 57-59

this passage to "un lapsus" (p. 99n.).

98 See Lampe, s.v. πληροφόρέω, 4.

99 "Luc, I, 1," 99; Luc, 3.

100 WGT, s.v. πληροφόρέω, c.

101 Colossians and Philemon, 240.

102 Hebräer, III, 233-234n.

103 P. 103.

104 See above, p. 33 n. 6 (p. 369).

105 Different interpreters emphasize different aspects of this interpretation. See Bengel; Campbell; de Wette; Bleek; Bisping; Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 40, 55; v. Hofmann, 5; B. Weiss, 264; Keil, 182; Schanz; Holtzmann; Hahn; Blass, Philology, 15; J. Weiss, 410; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 270-271; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 47; Loisy, 72; Easton, 1; Hauck; Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, 62 (translation); Rengstorff (in part); Schmid; Lenski, 26, 28; Bowie in IntB; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 102; Haenchen, Acts, 126-127; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 103; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363; Reicke, Luke, 46, 76; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 263 (in part); Flender, Luke, 64-65; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 1 (translation); von Campenhausen, Formation, 125; Schürmann, I, 5 (in part); Marshall (in part); Schmithals, 17-18; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 391.

106 So Bengel; Schanz; Zahn, Int., III, 45 ("in the writer's lifetime"); Robertson, Luke the Historian, 46-47; Easton, 1; Gadbury, Making, 22; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 103; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 39; Reicke, Luke, 46; von Campenhausen, Formation, 125; Glöckner, Verkündigung, 19-21 (Luke and the Christians of his generation were contemporaries of the gospel events); Marshall; Fitzmyer, 292 ("in Luke's recent past"); cf. Beck, Prolog, 7.

107 So Hammond; Whitby; cf. Delling in TDNT, VI:310 ("to achieve," "to bring forth"); VIII:32 ("the events enacted among us"); but cf. Dillon, "Previewing," 209-210.

108 See B. Weiss; Nösgen; Lagrange; Arndt; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 197-198; Dillon, "Previewing," 209-211.

109 See above, pp. 35-38.

110 So Bengel; Bleek ("der damals lebende Geschlecht mit dem vorhergehenden"); Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 41; v. Hofmann, 5 (the sphere of Christendom); B. Weiss, 265; Holtzmann; Plummer; Klostermann ("unter den Christen überhaupt"); Lagrange; Geldenhuys, 56n.; Delling in TDNT, VI:310 ("in a historical sphere into which the author is directly drawn"); Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 263, 267-269 ("die Generation der Endzeit"); Flender, Luke, 65 and n.; Schürmann, I, 5-6, 8; Reiling-Swellengrebel; Kümmel, Int., 129n.

## Notes for pp. 59-61

("the generation of the End-time"); du Plessis, "Purpose," 264; Marshall; cf. Stonehouse, Origins, 123; Dillon, "Previewing," 211; Schweizer.

111 Advocates of it often refer to Justin, Dial. 81, where the apostle John is said to have been μαρ' ἡμῶν, "with us," i.e. with us here at Ephesus, but at a time well before Justin arrived there. See below, p. 339. Similarly, it is said in Ac. 6:14 that Moses handed down the law "to us" (ἡμῶν), that is, to the Israelite nation as a whole, of all generations. See below, p. 70.

112 "Purpose," 264. That is, although "the Christ event" was "an historical event" experienced by some believers, it was "an open ended event including all the believers up to the time of writing."

113 Luc, 4.

114 "Luke," 119. See also Geldenhuys, 56n.; Delling in TDNT, VI: 310; Kümmel, Int., 129; Dillon, "Previewing," 211; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 391-392; cf. (with a different interpretation of the participle) Stonehouse, Witness, 27; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 261; Fitzmyer; Schweizer, 10 ("the saving event . . . , though past, still lives in the present"); Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 424.

115 So Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271; E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 11; Loisy; Creed; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 39, 46-48, 125; van Unnik, "Once More," 26n. (apparently); Marshall, "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 295; cf. Cadbury, "Commentary," 496, 497-498.

116 See below, pp. 173-186.

117 See above, pp. 33-34.

118 This objection would not apply to the obsolete view (see above, p. 58) that Luke refers to "the things done" among us by Jesus. However, these "things" should also include the teachings of Jesus, which were not "done."

119 See Zahn, Int., III, 53-54; Beck, Prolog, 4n.; Zahn, 48; Klostermann, 2 (apparently); Cadbury, "Commentary," 496 (apparently). Cf. Barth, Einl., 176, 196; Plooijs, "Work of St. Luke," 515; E. Meyer, Ursprung, 10-11. According to A. M. Pope (in "Key Word," 47-48), Luke has the entire course of history in view (for ἀν' ἀρχῆς; in vs. 2 recalls Gen. 1:1), all the events of which "had come to their fruition" in the flowering of Christianity.

120 E.g., Lake-Cadbury, Acts, 3: "The sentence does not mean that the Gospel tells the beginning of an activity of which Acts gives the end," thus undermining Cadbury's suggestion in "Commentary," 496 (cf. p. 494n.).

121 So Dillon, "Previewing," 210.

122 So Lenski, 27; Flender, Luke, 65. Recognizing this, Zahn (in Lucas, 49) claims that Lk. 1:1 does not refer to a completion "in

## Notes for pp. 61-64

absolutem Sinn." But what is an incomplete completion? Zahn suggests that Luke has in mind "nur ein Ruhepunkt," but surely  $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda\eta\text{-}\rho\sigma\phi\omicron\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$  does not mean "which have reached a resting point." Originally, E. Klostermann (in "Lukas," 362) similarly interpreted the participle as referring to the things that were "zum vorläufigen Abschluß gekommenen," but later (in Lukasev., 2) he omitted the word "vorläufigen."

123 So Beck, Prolog, 36.

124 See below, p. 143.

125 Zahn, Int., III, 56-62, esp. p. 61.

126 Grimm (in "Proömium," 55) observes that the events of the apostolic age were, "als Lucas schrieb, noch im Verlauf begriffen."

127 "Theologisches Programm," 198.

128 Klein's effort (ibid., 198-199n.) to make lexical and grammatical sense of his interpretation is quite forced.

129 Stunde, 245-246. Schulz's interpretation of Luke's preface is in general heavily influenced by Klein's.

130 "Previewing," 214. (See also Dillon, Eye-witnesses to Ministers, 271-272.) Dillon seeks to distance himself from those interpreters who are "wringing the philological potential of the prologue dry without reading it from perspectives gained from the further study of Luke's composition" (p. 212). Cf. above, pp. 6-7.

131 Dillon, "Previewing," 212. Cf. Sneed, "Exegesis," 41.

132 So Pope, "Key Word," 47; Delling in TDNT, VI:310; Luck, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 60; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 263; Delling in TDNT, VIII:32; Schürmann, I, 4-5; du Plessis, "Purpose," 263-264; Marshall; Dillon, "Previewing," 209n., 212, 214. The notion of a divine passive is often advocated by those who think that Luke is referring to things "fulfilled among us" (see below, pp. 63-65); see Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 261; Grundmann; Bartsch, Wachet, 12. Du Plessis (on p. 265) also claims that "the passive  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ " in vs. 2--which is actually in the middle voice--"again implies the Divine appointment." This comment appears to have been taken from Schürmann's statement in "Evangelien-schrift," 269, repeated in Lukasev., I, 9, that "hinter dem passivischen  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ " is hiding "die göttliche Bestallung."

133 "New Hypothesis," 77: "Probably this would be a reference to the numerous prophecies fulfilled by the events of the teaching and acts of Christ."

134 See Grimm, "Proömium," 41. Early advocates of it included H. W. J. Thiersch (in Kritik, 164) and J. H. A. Ebrard (in Geschichte, 142). The RV probably has this interpretation in mind: "those matters which have been fulfilled among us."

## Notes for p. 64

135 See Stonehouse, Witness, 26-27; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 261-270, esp. pp. 261, 264; Bundy, Jesus, 4; Wilckens, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 228; Moorman, Path to Glory, 5; Wilckens, Missionsreden, 68; Grundmann, 43-44 (also seeing a possible reference to certainty: "Taten, die Gott erfüllt hat und die über allen Zweifel hinaus gewiß sind."); Bartsch, Wachet, 12, 13; Stonehouse, Origins, 132 (cf. p. 123: perhaps also retaining the "accomplished, completed" interpretation); Marxsen, Int., 156, 157; Farmer, Synoptic Problem, 222; Harrison, Int., 200; Thompson, 10 ("probably") (cf. p. 44); NIV (apparently); Feuillet, "Témoins oculaires," 241; Morris (perhaps); Drury, Tradition, 82 (apparently); Ernst; Hendriksen, 55, 61; Fitzmyer, 293; Schweizer; Maddox, Purpose, 141, 186-187; Talbert, 8, 240.

136 Luke, 293.

137 See Grimm, "Proömium," 41.

138 See above, pp. 55-56.

139 See above, pp. 58-60. Ebrard (in Geschichte, 145), Lohse (in "Lukas als Theologe," 257n.; Formation, 151), W. Grundmann (in Lukas, 44), G. H. P. Thompson (in Luke, 44), W. Hendriksen (in Luke, 56), Fitzmyer (in Luke, 293-294), and R. Maddox (in Purpose, 142, 187) explain that the events of Acts are included within the scope of vs. 1. (Fitzmyer also sees a reference to Christians of all generations.) This is denied by Ernst (in Lukas, 48-49), who adopts Klein's view (see above, p. 62) that the events of the time of Jesus "wird in der daran anschließenden 'Zeit der Kirche' 'als vollständig dargestellt' verstanden." Stonehouse (in Origins, 123; cf. Witness, 27) and E. Schweizer (in Luke, 11) see a reference to Christians of all generations.

140 So v. Hofmann, 5; Hahn; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 196; Brown, "Prologues," 103. Fitzmyer (in Lukas, 293) concedes: "There is no other known instance of pragmata being used with plerophorein, and this remains a difficulty."

141 It is surprising that interpreters can be so taken with the "fulfillment" theme, that they become oblivious to the basic grammatical distinctions between subject and object, or between active and passive voice. For example, D. Juel (in Luke-Acts) explains that "the events . . . fill up or fill out something" (p. 16), namely the ancient promises of God (pp. 44, 117), yet he translates Lk. 1:1 as "events that have been fulfilled in our midst" (p. 44).

142 See above, pp. 33-34, 60.

143 This would seem to be the idea of those who have endeavored to combine the "accomplished, completed" and "fulfilled" lines of interpretation into one (with the idea of fulfillment usually dominating): Bisping ("vielleicht"); Godet; Cadbury, Making, 22, 303-304, 347; Steinmüller; Piper, "Purpose," 16-17, 19, 24-25 (adding that Jesus completed the events spoken of in the Old Testament and that his spiritual fullness overflows in Acts--all implied in

## Notes for pp. 64-67

Lk. 1:1!); Geldenhuys, 56n.; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 46-48; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 263, 267; Schürmann, I, 5; Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 41; Lohse, Formation, 151 ("happened as the realization of salvation history"); Thompson, 44 (cf. p. 10); du Plessis, "Purpose," 263-264; Schneider; Schneider, "καταξής," 131, in comparison with his "Zweck," 48; Marshall; Juel, Luke-Acts, 16, 44, 117; Marshall, "Luke and his 'Gospel,'" 295; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 423-424; cf. Dillon, "Previewing," 211-212.

<sup>144</sup> "Commentary," 496; but see Making, 303-304. See also Zahn, Int., III, 83n.

## CHAPTER 5

<sup>1</sup> So Ebrard, Geschichte, 145. Cf. H. Olshausen in Gospels and Acts, I, 81: "As to the manner in which the πολλοί (many) have applied these sources, St Luke, with forbearance, expresses himself vaguely."

<sup>2</sup> So Thiessen, Int., 126; Lenski, 29; Wilckens, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 228; id., Missionsreden, 68; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 259 (cf. Ernst, 50); Delling in TDNT, VIII:32; Schürmann, I, 8; van Unnik, "Once More," 16; Schneider; Marshall, 41; Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 119; Fitzmyer; cf. Fongstorf, 15; Müller, Traditionsgesch., 177, 185.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 91.

<sup>4</sup> In accordance with the formal character of his preface, Luke adopts the literary (classical) form παρέθεσαν instead of the ordinal (koine) παρέδωκαν, which he uses in Lk. 24:20 (cf. παρέδωκεν in Ac. 3:13). See EBF, § 95(1). Cf. Cadbury, "Commentary," 497.

<sup>5</sup> Grimm (in "Proömium," 44), for example, comments: "Auch ist als Objekt des παρέθεσαν sicher τὰ πρᾶγματα zu denken, nicht das entferntere διήγημα." So also Zahn, 51; Schürmann, I, 7n.

<sup>6</sup> Like J. L. Hug (in Int., 388), Klein (in "Theologisches Proömium," 200-201) argues that the object is διήγημα in vs. 1, but this would be plausible only if διήγημα meant "the oral gospel narrative" and ἀνατίθεσθαι meant "to reproduce in written form," neither of which is at all likely. See above, pp. 27-28, 30. Cf. Haenchen's criticisms of Klein's position in Acts, 146-147.

<sup>7</sup> So ISJ, s.v. παρέδωκεν, I.4.b.

<sup>8</sup> See WLL, s.vv. παρέδωκεν, 1, and παρέδωκεν, 2; BAG, s.vv. παρέδωκεν, 3, and παρέδωκεν, 2. Van Unnik points out (in "Once More," 14) that in extra-biblical Hellenistic literature the verb was used more broadly to mean "to pass on certain information, either orally or by writing," but it can hardly be held that the handing down of the original gospel traditions is done specifically

## Notes for pp. 67-70

in view.

<sup>9</sup> Thus, it is better to translate παραδίδωμι as "hand down," rather than "hand on."

<sup>10</sup> See below, pp. 70, 81-82.

<sup>11</sup> Hug (in Int., 389), A. Clarke (in Bible, N.T., I, 369), T. R. Birks (in Horae, 56-57), Arndt (in Luke, 9, 39, 40), and J. Wenham (in "Gospel Origins," 119-120), however, think that the gospels of Matthew and Mark are alluded to in this verse. Cadbury (in "Commentary," 497) sees a reference to Mark. Written material is at least partly in view according to Olshausen; Bleek, Int., I, 282; Bleek, I, 28, 31-32; Meyer (including "the λόγια of Matthew"); Holtzmann, Evangelien, 244-245 (notably the sources "Urmarcus" and "Urmatthäus";--but cf. his Einl., 386, 387: mainly oral information, but perhaps some connection with the eyewitness Matthew through Q and with Mark as a servant of the word); B. Weiss; Keil, 183 (perhaps including Matthew); Creed; Hauck (perhaps); Ellis; Morris (perhaps). Earlier writers holding this view are mentioned by Grimm, "Proömium," 44.

<sup>12</sup> pace Hug, Int., 389; cf. v. Hofmann, 6.

<sup>13</sup> So Calvin, I, 3; Wilke, Urevangelist, 112; Thiersch, Kritik, 164; Alford; van Oosterzee; Westcott, Int., 190; Davidson, Study, I, 427; Godet, I, 54, 55-56, 65; Grimm, "Proömium," 45; Nösgen; Blass, Philology, 16; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 17-18; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 272; Moffatt, Int., 263; Zahn, 45, 53; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 49; Lagrange; Loisy; Easton; Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 216, 218; W. Michaelis, Einl., 18; Stonehouse, Witness, 30; Grundmann; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363; id., Weg Jesu, 2; Delling in TDNT, VIII:33; Schürmann, I, 7n.; Fitzmyer; cf. de Wette; pace Meyer; Holtzmann, Evangelien, 244; Plummer; Schmid.

<sup>14</sup> So Lenski, 31.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Godet, I, 55-56.

<sup>16</sup> Zahn (in Int., III, 48-49) advances other reasons for seeing an exclusive reference to oral transmission, but none of them seem valid to us. We cannot agree with L. Vaganay (in Problème synoptique, 34) and Haenchen (in "Das 'Wir'," 363; Weg Jesu, 2) that "servants of the word" would necessarily have handed down gospel tradition only in oral form.

<sup>17</sup> See above, pp. 35-37.

<sup>18</sup> So Bloomfield; Gilmour in IntB; Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 132n. Few commentators bother to identify "us" in vs. 2, since its meaning is rather obvious.

<sup>19</sup> pace Blass, "Gospels," 396-397, 399; Thiessen, Int., 126; Hiebert, Int., I, 118.

## Notes for pp. 70-71

20 So Grimm, "Proömium," 45; Goguel, *Int.*, I, 496; Major, 259-260; Schürmann, I, 8n.; pace Webster-Wilkinson; Holtzmann; Hahn; Ramsay, *Bethlehem*, 11; Beck, *Prolog*, 9; Geldenhuys, 15, 24; cf. Robertson, *Luke the Historian*, 48-49.

21 The words τοῦ λόγου must be construed with ὑπαρέτα alone, and not with the more distant αὐτόπται as well, since the phrase "eye-witnesses of the word" does not make any sense, unless "the word" is understood in the Johannine sense as a reference to the incarnate Son of God. So Plummer; Cadbury, "Commentary," 500; and almost all other modern commentators. See below, p. 78 n. 55 (p. 384). Minear (in "Dear Theo," 142-143; cf. A. B. Bruce) understands "the word" as the gospel, and still construes "eyewitnesses" with it: "To have seen and heard the Word was a way of saying that doors into heaven had been opened and the Spirit had descended on them, revealing God's intentions for various human situations." This rather fanciful interpretation does not seem to have gained any support. Sahlin (in *Messias*, 40-42) construes αὐτόπται with τοῦ λόγου and ends up giving vs. 2 the bizarre translation, "wie diejenigen uns berichtet haben, die von Anfang an als Augenzeugen und Protokollführer des Rechtsfalls amtieren haben."

22 See Birks, *Horae*, 32; v. Hofmann, 5; B. Weiss; Hahn, I, 74, 75; Zahn, *Int.*, III, 46 and 84n.; Barth, *Einl.*, 196; Zahn, 51; Lagrange, 3-5; Cadbury, "Commentary," 498; Loisy (despite his exegesis); Creed; Dibelius, *Tradition*, 12; Hauck; Stonehouse, *Witness*, 28; Wilckens, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 228; id., *Missionsreden*, 68; Grundmann, 43 (translation) (but cf. p. 44); Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363; id., *Weg Jesu*, 1 (translation); Schulz, *Stunde*, 246; Kümmel, *Int.*, 128; Wikenhauser-Schmid, *Einl.*, 256; Hendriksen (translation; but cf. his exegesis); Schmithals, 17 (translation); Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 424-425; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 375.

23 So Doddridge; Campbell; Olshausen; Godet; Nösgen; Goguel, *Int.*, I, 114, 115-116; Loisy, *Origins*, 143; Kittel in *TDNT*, IV:115; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 269n.; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 204-205; Schürmann, I, 4 (translation), 9n.; Vögtle, "Widmung," 31; Reiling-Swellengrebel, 9; Nellessen, *Zeugnis*, 232; Schneider; Marshall (apparently); Dillon, *Eye-witnesses to Ministers*, 271; id., "Previewing," 214-215; Fitzmyer; Schweizer, *Lukas*, 7 (translation). Ernst (in *Lukas*, 47 (translation), 49) construes ἀπ' ἀρχῆς with αὐτόπται alone, but construes γινόμενοι with both αὐτόπται and ὑπαρέται.

24 "Evangelien-schrift," 269n. So also his *Lukasev.*, I, 9n.; Nellessen, *Zeugnis*, 232.

25 See below, pp. 83-84.

26 See below, pp. 84-85.

27 So Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 204-205; Dillon, "Previewing," 215n., 215-216; cf. Schulz, *Stunde*, 247.

28 See below, pp. 76-77 and 90. As his appeal to Ac. 13:31 (and

## Notes for pp. 71-73

1:8) and his use of the term "Predigtzeugnis" indicate, Klein (in "Theologisches Programm," 204-205), like Dillon (in "Previewing," 215-216), supposes that the apostolic witnessing to what they have seen is their serving (i.e. preaching) of the word. But, as we shall see (see below, pp. 78-79), service of the word does not consist of testifying to one's firsthand knowledge of the gospel history.

29 "Theologisches Programm," 204-205.

30 "Synoptiker," 26.

31 Synoptiker, 303-304.

32 Cf. Feuillet, "Témoins oculaires," 243-244.

33 See Klostermann, 2-3.

34 The same inference may be drawn from  $\delta\upsilon\omega\theta\epsilon\upsilon\iota$  in vs. 3 (see below, p. 142). Blass (in Philology, 17) comments: "From  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$  it has been wrongly inferred that in the author's time those eye-witnesses already belonged to a past age, whilst in reality the past tense refers only to their quality as eye-witnesses and as first teachers." So also Schmid; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 104n. Creed's observation (in Luke, 2) that "the perspective is that of an age when  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\rho\iota\tau\alpha$  have passed away" reflects his view on the dating of Luke's gospel (see pp. xxii-xxiii, lvi), not anything in Luke's preface.

35 So Creed; Dibelius, Tradition, 12; Lenski, 29. The eyewitnesses are said to be identical to the servants of the word by Origen, Luc., 1.5; Ambrose, Luc. 1.8 (following Origen); de Wette; Meyer; van Oosterzee; Westcott, Int., 190; Godet; B. Weiss; Nösgen; Hahn, I, 74, 75; Burton, "Purpose and Plan," 248; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271n.; W. Michaelis in TDNT, V:348; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 268; Stonehouse, Origins, 116; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 205; Guthrie, Int., 228; Schulz, Stunde, 246-247; Rengstorff in TDNT, VIII:543; Schürmann, I, 9; Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 41; Minear, "Dear Theo," 142; du Plessis, "Purpose," 266; Nellessen, Zeugnis, 231; Ernst, 50; Marshall; Schmithals, 17; Fitzmyer; Dillon, "Previewing," 215 and n.; Schweizer; cf. Schmid; Ellis, "Gospels Criticism," 47. Arguing for two complementary functions, Stonehouse (in Witness, 28) says that "ministers of the word would as such necessarily transmit information," while "eye-witnesses would as such only receive it." However, an "eyewitness as such" surely is one who witnesses to what his eyes have seen, and not just one who witnesses with his eyes. Stonehouse admits as much in Origins, 116-117. See above, p. 71.

36 "The Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Reappraisal," JETS 25 (1982):161-174, at p. 167. The emphasis is added by Carson. See also BAG, s.v.  $\delta$ , 10.a.

37 So also Grimm, "Proömium," 43 (citing the passages in Matthew

## Notes for pp. 73-77

with which Carson is principally concerned); Schanz.

38 The meaning of this phrase is discussed below, pp. 82-85.

39 "Commentary," 498-500.

40 "Knowledge Claimed," 419.

41 See Lucian, Ver. hist. I.2-4, who has such romances and other accounts of "miracles and fables" in mind, not the works of serious historians.

42 According to Colson (in "Preface," 308-309), Cadbury has done just that, generalizing on the basis of flimsy evidence.

43 Int., I, 131. See also A. W. Mosley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World," NTS 12 (1965-66):10-26.

44 "Commentary," 499.

45 Luke, 4.

46 Cf. van Unnik, "Once More," 11, 13-14.

47 Luke and the Gnostics (Nashville, 1966), 23, 32. On Luke's alleged anti-Gnosticism, see Ellis, 64; W. C. van Unnik, "Die Apostelgeschichte und die Häresien," ZNW 58 (1967):240-246; G. H. Talbert, "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," NTS 14 (1967-68):259-271; R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament (Oxford, 1968), 44-45; E. M. Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism (London, 1973), 36.

48 Pace Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 205. Cf. Nellessen, Zeugnis, 232.

49 Dillon (in "Previewing," 216), like R. Glöckner (in Verkündigung, 22) before him, objects that "the disciples--and not only the Twelve, so far as I can see--"are appointed here as Christ's witnesses, and it is true that "the eleven" are last mentioned (in vs. 33) in the company of "those with them." But while the compressed narrative in Lk. 24 allows for the possibility that others besides the apostles were present on this occasion, Luke makes it clear in his more detailed account in Acts 1 that it was "the apostles" (vs. 2), listed by name (vs. 13), whom Jesus appointed as his official witnesses (vs. 8), whether or not anyone else was present at their appointment.

50 When Peter says in Ac. 2:32 that "we all are witnesses" of the Resurrection, he means himself and the other apostles "standing with" him (vs. 14), not the entire company of 120 prophesying people (as Minear asserts in "Dear Theo," 144).

51 Pace Bengel.

52 So Thiersch, Kritik, 164; Davidson, Int., I, 177, 179; Meyer;

## Notes for pp. 77-78

Bisping, 143, 148 (including Mary); Grimm, "Proömium," 43; Dunwell; B. Weiss; Keil, 183; Loisy, Evangelies, I, 271; Zahn, 51-52 (including the witnesses of events related in Acts) (cf. his Int., III, 47-48); Klostermann, 3 (apparently); Bowie in IntB; Caird; Stuhlmüller; Glöckner, Verkündigung, 21-23; Nellessen, Zeugnis, 231; Hendriksen; Dillon, "Previewing," 216-217n.; Ellis, "Gospels Criticism," 47; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 425.

<sup>53</sup> So Nösgen; Hahn, I, 10, 19-20, 74-75; Lagrange; Wilckens, Missionsreden, 148; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 268; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 205; Schulz, Stunde, 246; Schürmann, I, 9; Ernst, 50; Schneider, "Zweck," 48; Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 119; Schmithals, 17; id., App., 19; Schweizer; Talbert, 8. A wider apostolic circle is in view according to Baur, Evangelien, 517 (the apostles and their associates); W. Michaelis, Einl., 16; Stonehouse, Witness, 28 ("the apostles and perhaps a few of their associates"); Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363; Stonehouse, Origins, 116; Guthrie, Int., 228 ("mainly . . . apostles or apostolic men"); Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 177, 180 (all those mentioned in Lk. 24:33; cf. Lk. 6:13; Ac. 1:21).

<sup>54</sup> In 22:20 Paul relates that he had spoken to the Lord about "the blood of Stephen your witness (τοῦ μάρτυρός σου)." This passage could be the earliest one in which the word μάρτυς means "martyr" (i.e. "witness unto death"), but this is doubtful. The word σου is significant in this regard, for while Jesus had witnesses (thus μου μάρτυρες in Ac. 1:8), it would be awkward to say that he had martyrs. See also R. P. Casey, "Note V. Μάρτυς," in BC, V (1933), 30-37, at p. 33.

<sup>55</sup> In view of Luke's usage elsewhere, we must reject the view advanced by Origen (in Luc. 1.4), repeated by Ambrose (in Luc. I.5-7), and supported by codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (which reads γενόμενου for γενόμενοι) and Euthymius (in Comm., ad loc.), that the λόγος is "the Word" of otherwise distinctly Johannine usage, i.e. the incarnate deity. According to Origen, "the word" does not refer at all to the physical presence of Jesus, but only to his divinity, which believers alone could see. Cf. Hammond; Webster-Wilkinson; White, "Logos," 129-130. Pope (in "Key Word," 50) argues that λόγος here refers to "the mind of God," the "outward expression" of which is to be seen in the events related. G. C. Morgan (in Luke, 12) sees a reference to "those who had actually seen Jesus, and served Him in the days of His flesh," and likewise J. R. H. Moorman (in Path to Glory, 4-5) argues that the transmitters of the gospel tradition were "those who had in fact seen the Christ and had ministered to him." Thompson (in Luke, 45) sees a reference to "God's revelation of himself through the person and mission of Jesus." A. Feuillet (in "Témoins oculaires," 242, 246, 253, 255; cf. Morris) sees in Luke's usage a development toward the Johannine Logos. According to another interpretation, which was once commonly held, but is today obsolete (though defended by Bleek, A. Bisping, and A. E. Breen; cf. de Wette, Int., 184-185; A. B. Bruce; Stuhlmüller), "the word," like "the things" in vs. 1, refers to the gospel events. This view is thoroughly refuted by Campbell, Gospels, II, 508-509.

## Notes for pp. 78-79

<sup>56</sup> Luke uses the word *εὐαγγέλιον* only in Ac. 15:7; 20:24, although he uses the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι* ten times in Luke and fifteen times in Acts. It is clear from Ac. 8:25 and 15:7 that "the word" and "the gospel" are synonymous expressions.

<sup>57</sup> In TDNT, IV:114.

<sup>58</sup> Schmid, 30.

<sup>59</sup> In TDNT, IV:117. See also Campbell; Bloomfield; Creed; Ellis; Fitzmyer.

<sup>60</sup> Rengstorf (in TDNT, VIII:543) comments that they "had unre-servedly put their persons and work in the service of Jesus' cause." R. Balducelli (in "Riesenfeld," 419) says, "Since the genitive is certainly objective, the phrase 'ministers of the word' denotes people who devote their services to what is here called 'the word.'"

<sup>61</sup> So Campbell; Bloomfield; Meyer; Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 42; Keil, 183; Plummer; Zahn, Int., III, 47; Blass, Philology, 16; Goguel, Int., I, 116; Robertson; Dibelius, Tradition, 12; Hauck; Schmid; Arndt; Reicke, Luke, 19, 46; Caird; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 204; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 2; Schulz, Stunde, 246; von Campenhausen, Formation, 125n.; Spivey-Smith, Anatomy, 153; Morris; du Plessis, "Purpose," 266; Nellessen, Zeugnis, 232; cf. Beck, Prolog, 35-36. According to P.-G. Müller (in Traditionsprozeß, 180), their ministry also involved interpreting the Old Testament.

<sup>62</sup> Luke, 12.

<sup>63</sup> Calvin (in Gospels, I, 3) comments: God "gives them a distinction that places them above the rank of human authority: he means, that they who gave him testimony on the Gospel had been divinely entrusted with the role of publishing it." Cf. Minear, "Dear Theo," 134: "I believe that the 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word' include all the prophetic spokesmen of divine revelation who, according to both volumes, had been filled with the Spirit." Minear has in view both apostles and prophets.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Stonehouse, Witness, 38; Wilckens, Missionsreden, 146n.; Stonehouse, Origins, 133-134; Nellessen, Zeugnis, 223, 228-229, 231, 234; Marshall, Acts, 396; Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 132n. Contrary to some (see Whitby, I, 292; Birks, Horae, 56-57; B. Weiss (apparently); Holtzmann, 304; Zahn, 23; Cadbury, "Commentary," 497; Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 218, 219; R. O. P. Taylor, "The Ministry of Mark," ExpT 54 (1942-43): 136-138, at pp. 137-138; id., The Groundwork of the Gospels (Oxford, 1946), 21-26; K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala, 1954), 32-33, 34; Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 119; Ellis, "Gospels Criticism," 48; cf. B. T. Holmes, "Luke's Description of John Mark," JBL 54 (1935):63-72), John Mark is not called such a *ὑπαρέτης* in Ac. 13:5. There he is said to be a *ὑπαρέτης* of Barnabas and Paul, not of the word. He was (in accordance with the usual meaning of the word: see BAG, s.v.) their personal attendant or their assistant in ministry (cf. Ac. 15:36-41);

## Notes for pp. 79-81

Col. 4:10-11; Phm. 24; 2 Tim. 4:11; 1 Pet. 5:13). See Creed, 4; Stonehouse, Witness, 37-38; Haenchen, Acts, 397; Stonehouse, Origins, 134n.; Rengstorff in TDNT, VIII:541; Neil, Acts, 154-155; Marshall, Acts, 218; Schneider, App., II, 120n.

65 The external evidence favors the shorter text, as only B syr(p,h) cop(sa) arm and several other manuscripts include με, against p74 N A Byz it(ar,e,gig) vg cop(bo). Perhaps the word was added by copyists who, supposing that the α absorbed into the first εν (= τούτων α) was an accusative of general reference, rather than a direct object, thought that the object of εἶδες was missing and ought to be supplied. However, if με is authentic, the meaning of the text is not much different: "of the things in which you have seen me."

66 Thus, Lenski (in Luke, 29-30) is wrong to distinguish the servants of the word from the eleven apostles.

67 Haenchen (in Acts, 263n.) comments that the expression "the word" here "designates teaching and preaching, for which according to Luke the Apostles were solely responsible." See also Kittel in TDNT, IV:115.

68 So Schürmann, "Evangelienchrift," 269n.; Marshall, Acts, 396; cf. Schürmann, I, 9n. According to Lesêtre (in "Méthode," 173-174), and probably correctly, Luke had Paul particularly in mind when he added the expression "servants of the word" to "eyewitnesses," because he, unlike the twelve apostles, had not been an eyewitness of the deeds and teachings of Jesus.

69 Cf. Zahn, Int., III, 47: Philip, the brothers of Jesus, and other early disciples are suggested.

70 We cannot discuss here all that has ever been said about the use of the term "apostle" in the New Testament. We would suggest, however, that a distinction should be made between the "apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. 11:13; 1 Thes. 2:6; cf. 1 Cor. 1:1; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 1:1; Col. 1:1; 1 Tim. 1:1; 2 Tim. 1:1; Tit. 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:1; 2 Pet. 1:1), i.e. those commissioned directly by Christ, and the "apostles of the churches" (2 Cor. 8:23), i.e. those commissioned by the churches. Andronicus and Junias (Rom. 16:7), like Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:25), were probably apostles in the latter sense only, for they were hardly "prominent" among the apostles commissioned by Christ. The apostles of Christ would then be divided into the Twelve, commissioned by him in person (including a replacement chosen later), and the others (notably Paul), commissioned through a revelation of the risen Christ to them. This variety of usage reflects the fact that an "apostle" was basically one who was "sent forth," so that even Jesus Christ could be called an "apostle," as one sent forth by God (Heb. 3:1-2).

71 According to Maddox (in Purpose, 70), "in Acts Paul does not receive the title of apostle." He is called an apostle in 14:4, 14 not because Luke meant to do so, but "presumably" because he, in following "the old tradition" containing that designation, "has for

## Notes for pp. 81-82

once neglected to amend the language to conform it to his own conception" (p. 72). We, however, prefer to let that which Luke has actually written (in this case on two occasions) determine "his own conception," and not dismiss as non-Lucan that which does not fit a certain theory of his conceptualization. Luke nowhere denies that Paul was an apostle, nor do his accounts of the commissioning of the original apostles in Lk. 6:13-16 and Ac. 1:2-13 necessarily imply that other apostles would not be subsequently commissioned. It is true that Luke does not refer to "the apostle Paul," or the like, but it is also true that he does not refer to Peter or to any other apostle as an apostle. He simply refers to them by their name. Only when he has occasion to refer to a plurality of apostles (as indeed in Ac. 14:4, 14) does he use the word "apostle" (in the plural). Furthermore, the fact that Luke refers to "the apostles" in Ac. 14:4 without having previously described Paul and Barnabas as such, shows that he expected his readers to know that they were apostles. It might seem that in Ac. 15:2, 4, 22 Paul and Barnabas are distinguished from "the apostles," but here Luke is merely distinguishing them from the apostles--and the elders, and indeed "the whole church" (vs. 22)--at Jerusalem.

<sup>72</sup> On Gal. 1:19 see the careful exegesis of F. F. Bruce in Galatians, 100-101; pace Betz, Galatia, 78 (asserting exegetical ambiguity). On 1 Cor. 9:5 see Mayor, James, xxviii; Héring, First Corinthians, 77. On 1 Cor. 15:7 see Hort, James, xviii-xix.

<sup>73</sup> According to Ellis (in "Gospels Criticism," 47n.), Cleopas and his unnamed companion were apostles because Luke describes them as "two of them" in Lk. 24:13, the antecedent of "them" being "the apostles" in vs. 10. But at the beginning of a new pericope in vs. 13 (especially after the interruption of vs. 12, which is probably genuine) it is better to take "them" as a general reference to the disciples gathered together in vss. 8-11, who consisted of "the eleven" and "all the rest" (vs. 9; cf. vs. 33). "The apostles" (vs. 10) at this point (i.e. the day of Jesus' resurrection) were "the eleven" only (cf. Ac. 1:26), for the other apostles would not be commissioned by Christ until later. Thus, Cleopas and his companion were among "the rest" (vs. 9), i.e. the non-apostolic disciples (cf. Ac. 1:15).

<sup>74</sup> See Irenaeus, Haer. III.14.2; IV.praef.3; Origen, Luc. 1.4-5; Eusebius, H.E. III.4.6, 24.15; Ambrose, Luc. 1.5, 8-9; Euthymius, Comm., ad loc.; Calvin; Hammond; Henry; de Wette; Ebrard, Geschichte, 145; van Oosterzee; Bleek; Godet, I, 65; A. B. Bruce; Schlatter, 155; J. Weiss, 410; Blass, "Gospels," 396; Easton; Schlatter, Lukas, 21; Luce; Thiessen, Int., 126; Geldenhuys, 52, 56n.; Arndt; Wilckens, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 229, 233; Gerhardsson, Memory, 243-244 ("primarily"); Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 268; Harrison, Int., 200 ("chiefly"); Flender, Luke, 65-66; Schulz, Stunde, 246; von Campenhausen, Formation, 125 and n. ("primarily"); Schürmann, I, 9; Burchard, Zeuge, 112; Thompson; Schneider; Schneider, "Zweck," 48; Marshall; Schenke-Fischer, Einl., II, 138-139; S. Brown, "Prologues," 103; Schmithals, 17; Fitzmyer.

<sup>75</sup> So Gerhardsson, Memory, 243-244. But Balducelli (in "Riesen-

feld," 419-420) is wrong to restrict the scope of "the word" to the gospel traditions.

<sup>76</sup> See Mt. 3:1-2, 5, 11; Mk. 1:4-5, 7; Lk. 3:3, 16; Jn. 1:20, 27. Thus, Schmithals's assertion (in Lukas, 19), "daß die apostolische Predigt in der Apostelgeschichte keineswegs auf den Stoff des Evangeliums zurückgreift," goes too far.

<sup>77</sup> See above, pp. 71-72. Cf. Ac. 26:4, τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενόμενὴν .

<sup>78</sup> So Euthymius, Comm., ad loc.; Henry; Doddridge; Campbell; Clarke; Bloomfield, Supp., 66; de Wette; Alford; Meyer; van Oosterzee; Bleek; D. Brown; Godet; B. Weiss; Keil, 183; Schanz; Holtzmann, Einl., 386-387; Nösgen; Holtzmann; Feine, Überlieferung, 3; Hahn; Plummer; Blass, Philology, 16-17; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 15; Burton, "Purpose and Plan," 248n.; Blass, "Gospels," 396; Lagrange; Easton; Creed; Robertson; Manson; Schlatter, Lukas, 21; Hauck; Loisy, Origins, 143; Thiessen, Int., 126; Geldenhuys, 56n.; Gilmour in IntB; Arndt; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 127; Luck, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 61; Wilckens, Missionsreden, 107; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 268n.; Harrison, Int., 200; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 201, 205, 208, 209; Schulz, Stunde, 246-247; Schürmann, I, 9; Reiling-Swellengrebel; Lohse, Formation, 150; Thompson; Kümmel, Int., 128; Samain, "Notion de APXH," 317; Morris; Nellesen, Zeugnis, 232; Ernst; Schneider; Marshall; S. Brown, "Prologues," 104; Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 119; Schmithals, 17; Fitzmyer, 298; Schweizer; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 425; cf. Cadbury, "Commentary," 498, 502-503; Lenski, 29. But Glöckner argues (in Verkündigung, 23-26) that Luke does not have such a definite beginning in mind; rather, he employs a vague "theologisch-heilsgeschichtliches Konzept" (p. 25).

<sup>79</sup> So Olshausen; Barnes (probably); Bisping; Grimm, "Proömium," 43; Lesêtre, "Méthode," 173; Beck, Prolog, 46; Plooiij, "Again," 117-118; van Unnik, "Once More," 24n.; du Plessis, "Purpose," 266.

<sup>80</sup> Beck (in Prolog, 8-9), linking ἀπ' ἀρχῆς unduly with αὐτόπρασ, adopts the curious view that the "eyewitnesses" were the eyewitnesses of the events related in Lk. 1-2, and that the "servants of the word" were the eyewitnesses of the subsequent history. Pope (in "Key Word," 48-49), interpreting "from the beginning" as a reference to the Creation, and "the word" as a reference to the mind of God revealed in history, goes on to imagine that among the servants of the word Luke "may be including those Greek philosophers and poets, who, all unknown to themselves, were preparing the way of the Lord."

<sup>81</sup> Lucas, I, 75, appealing to Lk. 6:13 and Mk. 3:14 (misprinted as 3:4). Cf. Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 180; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 425n.

<sup>82</sup> See above, pp. 77-79.

<sup>83</sup> So Zahn, Int., III, 46; W. Michaelis, Einl., 16; cf. Harrison, Int., 200-201. The other gospel writers do not represent the situation differently.

## Notes for pp. 83-86

84 It is perhaps because of this problem that many scholars have understood Luke to be saying that "the eyewitnesses from the beginning became servants of the word (at Pentecost)." But, as we have seen (see above, pp. 71-72), this syntax cannot be accepted.

85 See Évangiles, I, 271n. So also Zahn, Int., III, 46-48, although he suggests (on p. 46) that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς could "possibly" refer to "the beginning of the Christian preaching after the resurrection of Jesus" in connection with the eyewitnesses as well as in connection with the servants of the word. Cadbury (in "Commentary," 498, and pp. 502-503 in the light of "Knowledge Claimed," 409) seems to have held a position similar to Zahn's, although he does not say so directly.

86 Évangiles, I, 271n. Loisy puts forward the same explanation in Luc, 73, speaking of "un flottement de la perspective, où le ministère de Jésus se confond avec les débuts de la prédication apostolique, le tout formant le commencement du christianisme." But "en toute rigueur de langage," he concedes, only the baptism of Jesus would be in view. Cf. Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 14, 211n.

87 Markus und Lukas, 266n.

88 Ibid.

89 See ibid., 265.

90 See above, pp. 76-77.

91 This would also follow if the phrase "from the beginning" referred to the beginning of Jesus' ministry. So Davidson, Study, I, 436. Paul is excluded by this phrase, according to B. Weiss (in Markus und Lukas, 253) and J. Weiss (in "Evangelien," 410). According to Zahn (in Lucas, 52), Luke intended the phrase to exclude the narrative writers to whom he refers, including himself, who was an eyewitness in Acts, and Mark, who was an eyewitness in Mk. 14: 51-52 and in Acts.

92 Paul would have to be included if there is any truth in the tradition recorded by Irenaeus (in Haer., III.1.1): "Luke also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him."

93 Cf. Cadbury, "Commentary," 498; Zahn, Int., III, 47.

94 See above, p. 73.

95 Alternatively, Paul may have been an exceptional case for which Luke chose not to make provision in his highly compressed preface. To this writer, however, the other explanation seems more likely.

96 Cf. Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 254; Luke writes to preserve and support the authentic apostolic tradition against its enemies arising from within and coming from without the church (Ac. 20:29, 30). See also Schürmann, I, 3, 11, 14; Marshall, Historian

and Theologian, 39; Kümmel, Int., 146-147; Marshall, 40; Schmithals, 19; Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 188; cf. Schweizer, 11, 12; pace Dillon, "Previewing," 227n. Ellis (in Luke, 64) agrees that "in some considerable measure Luke's purpose is to counter heretical misinformation," perhaps including that put forward by "gnostic-type groups." We would disagree with him, though, in saying that Luke's reference to "the truth" in vs. 4 "presupposes denials or heretical perversions of it." It may simply presuppose ignorance of it.

97 We have interpreted the expressions "eyewitnesses" and "servants of the word" narrowly, but if they were interpreted broadly (see above, pp. 77 and 78), then the phrase "from the beginning" would distinguish those eyewitnesses and preachers who originally delivered the gospel traditions to the church from those who passed them on. So, in effect, Campbell. Cf. Zahn, Int., III, 46. But Luke's use of the words μάρτυς, ὑπηρέτης, and λόγος (τοῦ θεοῦ) argues against this view.

98 In Luc. 1.2 he comments on the word "many" in Lk. 1:1, "The Church has four Gospels, the heretical sects many." So also Athanasius, Ep. fest. 39 (evidently); Ambrose, Luc. I.1-2; Epiphanius, Haer. 51.7.3. Eusebius and Augustine, like Origen, are critical of the presumption of these (non-canonical) writers, but do not accuse them of writing heretical gospels. See above, p. 26. Photius (in Luc., ad loc.) understands Luke as referring to Matthew and Mark, although he also comments that the spread of apocryphal gospels induced Luke to write a trustworthy one. Theophylact (in Luc., ad loc.) and Euthymius (in Comm., ad loc.) see a reference to the writers of apocryphal gospels.

## CHAPTER 6

<sup>1</sup> Cf. BAG, s.v. δοκέω, 3.b. Grimm (in "Proömium," 46) translates "so habe auch ich beschlossen," as have many German commentators since.

<sup>2</sup> R. P. C. Hanson (in Acts, 164) observes that "this is the most complex and, from a grammatical point of view, most carefully constructed sentence in the whole of Luke's extant work," second only to the sentence which constitutes Luke's preface. "It is therefore certain," he says, "that Luke himself composed it." However, Luke was not the only Christian who could write complex and carefully constructed sentences. Since the letter which Luke quotes was written before he wrote his gospel, it is possible that Luke modeled his opening sentence after the opening sentence of this letter. But whatever the connection between Lk. 1:1-4 and Ac. 15:24-26, if any, may be, they have the same basic structure.

<sup>3</sup> Similarly, the NEB translates ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν as "we have resolved."

<sup>4</sup> See Josephus, Ant., XVI.162-163.

## Notes for pp. 89-92

- 5 See Eusebius, H.E. X.5.18-19.
- 6 See Eusebius, H.E. X.7.1.
- 7 But cf. Schulz, Stunde, 247-248.
- 8 See above, pp. 26-27.
- 9 See below, pp. 95-100.
- 10 See below, pp. 156-159.
- 11 For further discussion, see below, pp. 202-204.
- 12 As do Meyer, I, 274; Zahn, Int., III, 45; Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, 63.
- 13 Bisping (in Marcus und Lukas, 143) aptly comments: "Das Unge-nügende dieser verschiedenen Geschichtsversuche gibt dem Lukas die Veranlassung auch seinerseits Hand an's Werk zu legen." So also Foote, 9. Van Unnik (in "Once More," 16) draws attention to the "nice parallel" offered by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. I.6.2-3: My predecessors "touched only in a summary way upon the early events that followed the founding of the city. For these reasons, therefore, I have determined (ἐβόηέ μου) not to pass over a noble period of history which the older writers left untouched . . ."
- 14 So Bengel, II, 2; Ebrard, Geschichte, 1035; Webster-Wilkinson, I, 237.
- 15 See above, pp. 66-67.
- 16 So Calvin, I, 2: "The answer is, that although he spares the others who had written before him, he does not altogether approve their work. He does not expressly say that they wrote with insufficient information, but his own claim of certainty over facts is a gentle derogation of their trustworthiness and indubity." Luke does not take them to task because "perhaps their transgression was slight, due more to hasty enthusiasm than to mischief, and so no cause for his attacking them more fiercely." So also Henry; Campbell, II, 176-177; Bloomfield, I, 257; Ebrard, Geschichte, 145, 1035; Davidson, Int., I, 177, 178; Kelly, 13-14.
- 17 Luke, I, 53. See also Lessing, "New Hypothesis," 76; Hug, Int., 388; Bleek, I, 29; v. Hofmann, 4; B. Weiss, 264; Holtzmann, 304; Hahn, I, 76; Plummer, 4; Blass, Philology, 3; Zahn, Int., III, 44; Schlatter, 153, 154; J. Weiss, 410; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271; Machen, Literature, 160; Hartl, "Benutzung des Matthäus," 334-335; Zahn, 43; Klostermann, 2; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 45-46; Lagrange, 5 (on vs. 2); Cadbury, "Commentary," 493-494; Robertson, "Implications," 320; Loisy, 72; Easton, 1; Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 216; Manson, 1, 2; Hauck; Rengstorff, 13; Schmid, 29; Lenski, 24, 31; Geldenhuys, 51-52; Stonehouse, Witness, 32; Gilmour in IntB; Wikenhauser, Int., 210; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 55-56;

## Notes for pp. 92-94

Bundy, *Jesus*, 2; Bauer, "ΠΟΛΛΟΙ," 265; Caird; Haenchen, *Weg Jesu*, 3; Schürmann, I, 6; Marshall, *Historian and Theologian*, 41; Wikenhauser-Schmid, *Einl.*, 256; Ernst, 47; Marshall, 40, 41; Fitzmyer, 291, 296; Dillon, "Previewing," 207; Müller, *Traditionsprozeß*, 176; Talbert, 7 (probably).

18 Cf. Thiersch, *Kritik*, 166.

19 *Luke*, I, 55.

20 *Gospels*, I, 2. So also J. D. Michaelis, *Int.*, III, pt. I, 267; Campbell, II, 175; Ebrard, *Geschichte*, 145; Zahn, 42 (despite what he says on p. 43); Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 195. R. A. Knox (in *Gospels*, 117) comments, "the retort would be too obvious, that there were enough already." However, his explanation is no better: "But since there is already a plurality of gospels in existence, there can be no suggestion of impiety if I add to their number." It would perhaps have been consistent for Luke both to appeal to the works of his predecessors as justification for his similar work and also to have considered them defective (so Lessing, "New Hypothesis," 76), but, as we have argued, Luke does not actually say anything about such justification.

21 *Geog.* I.2.1.

22 *De materia medica*, praef.1.

23 The Old Latin MSS. b q, the Vulgate MSS. B G O, and the Gothic version add the phrase *et spiritui sancto* (or its equivalent), indicating that Luke and the (inspiring) Holy Spirit decided to write a gospel for Theophilus. This reading, which lacks sufficient external support to be seriously considered, evidently reflects Ac. 15:28, ἐδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν.

24 *Int.*, III, 44.

25 *Ibid.* So also Zahn, 43; Stonehouse, *Witness*, 32; cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 70: Luke "unternahm also nichts Anderes, als was schon die πολλοὶ versucht hatten."

26 See Whitby, I, 292; Bengel, II, 2; Godet, I, 60; Plummer, 4; Zahn, 43; Klostermann, 3; Cadbury, "Commentary," 493-494; Easton, 1; Lenski, 25; Stonehouse, *Witness*, 31-32; van Unnik, "Purpose," 13 and n.; Schürmann, "Evangelienchrift," 259; Stonehouse, *Origins*, 116, 118; van Unnik, "Once More," 15-16.

27 Cf. BAG, s.v. καθ' ἑμὲ, 3.b: "I for my part, I in turn." The NEB and the JB read "in my turn" instead of "for my part," but the preface as a whole would seem to indicate that Luke is doing more than just taking his turn. Luke sees himself not simply as the latest in a series of gospel writers, but rather as the one who, in implicit contrast to the "many" who have already written, will enable the reader to know "what is certain" (vs. 4).

28 So Westcott, *Int.*, 191.

## Notes for pp. 94-98

- <sup>29</sup> Such deductions are drawn by Alford; Grimm, "Proömium," 70 (though he backs away somewhat); Schanz, 48; Zahn, Int., III, 44-45.
- <sup>30</sup> See above, pp. 90-91.
- <sup>31</sup> This difficulty does not provide any warrant for Cadbury's suggestion (in "Commentary," 504) that "perhaps it goes partly with each." Van Unnik (in "Once More," 17) agrees with Cadbury that the adverb "works both ways." So also Baur, Evangelien, 518.
- <sup>32</sup> See B.J. I.2, 6, 9, 17, 22, 26; Ap. I.15, 18, 29, 36; cf. Ant. I.17; Vit. 27.
- <sup>33</sup> See Ap. I.53.
- <sup>34</sup> See Eusebius, H.E. III.39.15.
- <sup>35</sup> See below, pp. 150-151.
- <sup>36</sup> Luc. 1.6.
- <sup>37</sup> H.E. III.4.6.
- <sup>38</sup> H.E. III.24.15.
- <sup>39</sup> Ep. fest. 39.
- <sup>40</sup> Ac., p. 645B.
- <sup>41</sup> De cons. ev. IV.8.
- <sup>42</sup> Some manuscripts of the Vulgate (followed by many printed editions), however, read omnia a principio (reversing the Greek word order) rather than a principio omnibus, just before diligenter.
- <sup>43</sup> Luc. I.11.
- <sup>44</sup> Construing ἀκριβῶς with γράψαι, however, are Barth, Einl., 176, 196 (but cf. p. 197); Hawkins, "Luke's Use of Mark," 35; Cadbury, "Commentary," 504; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 44 (probably) (but cf. p. 126); Rinaldi, "'Risalendo'," 252 (translation), 255; pace Cadbury, Making, 347 (cf. p. 346). U. Wilckens (in "Kerygma bei Lukas," 228-229) and H.-M. Schenke and K. M. Fischer (in Einl., II, 128) treat ἀκριβῶς as if it modified γράψαι. J. Kürzinger (in "Lk 1,3," 254) argues for the connection, harking back to Luther's original translation. G. Schille (in Apq., 30-31) agrees with Kürzinger.
- <sup>45</sup> "Purpose," 268.
- <sup>46</sup> "Καθεστῆς," 253.
- <sup>47</sup> "Previewing," 218n.

## Notes for pp. 98-101

48 Luke, 5, followed by Stonehouse, Witness, 36-37.

49 Lukasev., I, 10n., repeating his "Evangelien-schrift," 260n.

50 So Rinaldi, "'Risalendo,'" 255. Cf. Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 254.

51 See below, pp. 101-106.

52 Van Unnik (in "Once More," 17) is "not sure" that Creed has correctly assessed "the rhythm of the sentence," pointing out that "Dionysius Halic. does combine it [i.e. ἀκριβῶς] with the verb 'to write' in the preface to his Roman Antiquities: ἀκριβῶς ἀνέγραψε (I.6.2, cited on p. 25n.).

53 J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. III: Syntax, by N. Turner (Edinburgh, 1963), 227. So also BDF and BDR, § 474(2).

54 "Position of Adverbs," 114-115. Davies limits his study to "actual adverbs," excluding from consideration those words which, though classified as adverbs in lexicons, are used as another part of speech. Also ignored are relative, interrogative, negative, and other adverbs whose position is determined "by considerations other than the fact that they are adverbs." Adverbial forms of numerals are excluded, "since it is difficult to classify them." Adverbs in several passages (including ἀκριβῶς in Lk. 1:3) are initially set aside because it is difficult to decide which words are modified by them; these cases are finally examined in the light of the patterns deduced (pp. 106-107).

55 Ibid., 112.

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid., 115.

59 So Baur, Evangelien, 520. Cf. Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 254.

60 Dillon (in "Previewing," 224), however, argues that "the καθεξῆς of the main clause is what contributes directly to the realization of the author's purpose in writing." (Cf. Martin, Foundations, I, 120-121.) That is, by writing in an "orderly" way, which Dillon interprets as a reference to that order of material which places "each event and word" into "the overarching and compelling logic of the divine plan at every step" (p. 223), Luke intends to produce "a 'certainty' (ἀσφάλεια) for his cultivated patron . . . about the significance of the reported events as God's action in history." But Dillon has misinterpreted both καθεξῆς and ἀσφάλεια, overloading them both with far too much theologizing. Only by such artificial interpretation can a causal relationship between writing καθεξῆς and knowing ἵν' ἀσφάλειαν be established.

61 Cf. BAG, s.v. καθεξῆς: "in order, one after the other of

## Notes for p. 101

sequence in time, space, or logic."

62 So Hug, Int., 391-392; Credner, Einl., 145-146; Bleek, Evangelien-Kritik, 13-14; Bisping; Davidson, Study, I, 426; Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 49-50; Plumptre; Feine, Überlieferung, 2; Hahn, I, 20-21, 41, 78; Lesêtre, "Méthode," 174-175; Bacon, Int., 217; Chase, Credibility, 17; Wrede, Entstehung, 45; Barth, Einl., 176, 196, 234; F. Dibelius, "Herkunft der Sonderstücke," 339 ("in geschichtliche Reihenfolge"); Spitta, Grundschrift, ix; Schmidt, Rahmen, 316; Ragg; Easton; Jülicher-Pascher, Einl., 313; Rengstorff, 15; Clogg, Int., 240; Major; Arndt; Fuller, Int., 119; cf. Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 33.

63 So Wieseler, Synopsis, 25; Thiersch, Kritik, 167-168; Meyer; Bleek; B. Weiss.

64 So Whitby; Doddridge; Bengel, II, 3 (in part); Olshausen; Foote, 9 (in part); Birks, Horae, 33; van Oosterzee; v. Hofmann, 8; Keil, 183-184; Schanz; Farrar, 31, 43; A. B. Bruce; Wikenhauser, Geschichtswert, 140; F. C. Burkitt, "Vestigia," 485-486; Robertson; Schmid; W. Michaelis, Einl., 65; Marshall; cf. McNeile, Int., 23; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 261.

65 So B. H. Streeter, "On the Original Order of Q," in Studies in the Synoptic Problem, ed. by W. Sanday (Oxford, 1911), pp. 139-164, at p. 164; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 262; Schürmann, I, 12-13; Ernst; cf. McNeile, Int., 33; Kümmel, Int., 130; Schneider, "Zweck," 49.

66 So Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 211; Schulz, Stunde, 249; Samain, "Notion de *ΑΡΧΗ*," 324n.; cf. Schmithals, 19; but cf. Haenchen, Acts, 127; Völkel, "Καταφενης," 290-291; Schneider, "Zweck," 49-50. This interpretation is not as modern as one might think, for it was advanced as an alternative explanation by D. Whitby (in Commentary, I, 293) in 1703.

67 So Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 260-261; Grundmann; cf. Holtzmann, Einl., 387; Luce; Stuhlmüller; Ernst; S. Brown, "Prologues," 106, 109.

68 So Goulder, Midrash and Lection, 456-457; but cf. Morris, "Lectionaries," 133-134.

69 So Trapp ("distinctly, and yet coherently"); Campbell ("distinctly, particularly, as opposed to confusedly, generally"); Bloomfield; Barnes; Foote, 9; Ebrard, Geschichte, 143-144; Davidson, Int., I, 178 (but cf. his Study, I, 426-427); Westcott, Int., 192; Dunwell ("a clear and methodical account"); Holtzmann, Einl., 387 (referring to the organization of material into a Galilean, a Samaritan, and a Judean section); Nösgen; Holtzmann; Plummer; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 14; Zahn, Int., III, 52-53; Beck, Prolog, 45; J. Weiss, 410; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 273n.; Moffatt, Int., 263; Kelly ("regular," "in a methodical manner"); Machen, Literature, 161; Klostermann; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 53-54; Lagrange; Morgan, 13 ("artistic"); Hauck; Luce (following Holtzmann's geo-

## Notes for pp. 101-102

graphical divisions); Steinmueller, 231 ("artistic"); RSV; Lenski, 33; Geldenhuys, 57n.; Gilmour in IntB; Tenney, Survey, 171; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 45; Wilckens, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 229; id., Missionsreden, 69; Caird; Harrison, Int., 201; Guthrie, Int., 99; JB; Harrington; Reiling-Swellengrebel; Sneed, "Exegesis," 41; Thompson; Kümmel, Int., 129; Morris (probably); Hendriksen, 56-57, 62; Craddock, Gospels, 105, 106; Fitzmyer, 290, 298-299; Dillon, "Previewing," 219-223; Talbert, 9; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 427; cf. Stuhlmüller.

<sup>70</sup> So Foote, 9 (in part); Ebrard, Geschichte, 145, 146; Alford ("consecutively"); Webster-Wilkinson; D. Brown; Godet, II, 382; Blass, Philology, 18-19; Zahn, Int., III, 52-53; Schlatter, 155; Blass, "Gospels," 396; Whitaker, "Philology," 269-270; Lagrange; Cadbury, "Commentary," 505 (perhaps); Loisy; Cadbury, Making, 345; Creed; Manson; Schlatter, Lukas, 22-23; Scott, Literature, 32 ("in sequence" and "coordinated"); Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, 62 (translation); Loisy, Origins, 74, 144; Geldenhuys; Stonehouse, Witness, 41; NEB; Ellis; Higgins, "Preface and Kerygma," 82; Lohse, Formation, 150; Völkel, "καθ'ἑξῆς," 298 (but cf. Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 255); Glöckner, Verkündigung, 26 ("lückenlose Sukzession," apparently); Mussner, "καθ'ἑξῆς," 253-255 ("lückenlos") (but cf. Schneider; Schneider, "καθ'ἑξῆς," 128-129; Dillon, "Previewing," 220n.); Drury, Tradition, 4, 82; Schmithals, 18; Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 182 ("lückenlos"); Schweizer ("sequential"); Mußner, "Gemeinde," 388-389 ("lückenlos").

<sup>71</sup> So Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 46; Spivey-Smith, Anatomy, 154 (putting Jesus between Israel and the church); Lohse, Formation, 150.

<sup>72</sup> So Schneider, "καθ'ἑξῆς," 130-131; id., "Zweck," 50-51; LaVerdiere, 5; Fitzmyer, 290; Dillon, "Previewing," 223; cf. Schneider.

<sup>73</sup> So Knox.

<sup>74</sup> So Westcott, Int., 192; Plummer; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 14; Zahn, Int., III, 52; Zahn, 55-56; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 53; Lagrange; Creed; Geldenhuys, 41, 57n.; Guthrie, Int., 93 and n.; cf. Machen, Literature, 161; von Campenhausen, Formation, 124-125n.

<sup>75</sup> See the passages cited in the preceding paragraph.

<sup>76</sup> So Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 251.

<sup>77</sup> To his credit, K. L. Schmidt (in Rahmen, 316, cf. pp. 46-48) did not follow this procedure. Rather, he interpreted Lk. 1:3 as it stands, and then examined the contents of Luke's gospel to see if it was ordered as Luke had said it would be--and found that it was not. However, he erroneously supposed that καθ'ἑξῆς indicated chronological order. If he had not begun with this incorrect interpretation, he presumably would have withheld the judgment that Luke had spoken "etwas geschwollen und übertreibend." Lagrange (in Luc, 2), by way of contrast, speaks of "le ton de modestie du prologue." W. E. Bundy (in Jesus, 4) advises us not to take Luke's

## Notes for pp. 102-103

statement too seriously, since Luke's gospel has "less natural sequence, less narrative progression, less dramatic development, and less systematic treatment than is found in either Matthew or Mark." But perhaps he misunderstands what Luke is saying, too.

78 The ellipsis represents a circumstantial participial phrase stating Luke's qualification for writing ("having followed them all (πασι) for a long time (ἄνωθεν)"), and likewise telling us nothing about Luke's manner of arranging material. K. Wieseler (in Synopsis, 25n.) and J. J. van Oosterzee (in Luke, 12) find a hint of his arrangement in the word ἄνωθεν, and Mussner (in "καθεξῆς," 253-254) looks to πασι, but they misinterpret these words, and in any case the connections which they draw with καθεξῆς have no syntactical basis. Not surprisingly, they reach different conclusions.

79 "Zweck," 49-50.

80 "Commentary," 505. In one paragraph Cadbury argues that "if an etymological sense is retained by the preposition in καθεξῆς it is probably the distributive force," so that "the word is perhaps best represented in English by 'successively' or 'continuously.'" But in the next paragraph he argues, seemingly to the contrary, that Luke's use of καθεξῆς "not improbably" reflects the meaning "'next,' 'hereafter,'" which may best be expressed as "hereinafter." In a later work (i.e. Making, 345-346) he explains that both ideas are, in his opinion, present in καθεξῆς: "I think the first part of the word implies that events will be told one at a time 'in succession,' and the use of the simple word ἐξῆς in prefaces and elsewhere merely means that the narrative is to follow at once, like our 'hereinafter' or 'as follows.'" However, the resulting "in succession hereinafter" is indeed a linguistic monstrosity, bringing together two ideas which can hardly be combined in one word. In his final translation (p. 347), Cadbury drops the second idea and gives "seriatim" for καθεξῆς.

81 So Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 45. Equally impossible is the somewhat similar idea advanced by J. A. Bengel (in Gnomon, II, 3), that after Luke had gained his knowledge of the gospel history "it was the next thing [καθεξῆς] to follow, that he should describe them." Καθεξῆς can mean "next" when used adjectivally (as in Lk. 8:1), but probably not when used adverbially. Furthermore, Bengel incorrectly presupposes that παρηκολούθηκότες is to be understood as relative to ἰερῶν, rather than to ἑδωκε (on which see below, pp. 118-119).

82 "Commentary," 505.

83 M. Völkel (in "καθεξῆς," 295, 298), on the other hand, emphasizes the difference between καθεξῆς and ἐξῆς. But he goes too far, for they surely are synonymous in Lk. 7:11 and 8:1.

84 His citations of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom., "iv. sub fin., v. ad init., vi. ad init.," seem to be mistaken, as neither word occurs in these passages. Also, he misinterprets Thucydides, Hist., "ii. ad init.," where ἐξῆς means "in order":

## Notes for pp. 103-106

"The events of the war have been recorded in the order (ἐξῆς) of their occurrence, summer by summer and winter by winter."

<sup>85</sup> See LSJ, BAG, and Lampe, s.vv.

<sup>86</sup> "Lk 1,3," 253. The passage is also numbered as 22.3.

<sup>87</sup> Fathers, Part II, II, 985, 1006-1009, 1066.

<sup>88</sup> "Lk 1,3," 253. Kürzinger (on p. 252) also finds this meaning in Ac. 11:4, a closely related passage that will be considered shortly.

<sup>89</sup> "Purpose," 269. Marshall (in Historian and Theologian, 40n.) reports that J. Jeremias adopted "hereinafter" as the meaning of καθ'ἑξῆς in a seminar held in 1959-60.

<sup>90</sup> So Schweizer. This confusion goes back to Cadbury's subtle suggestion (in "Commentary," 505) that ἐξῆς and ἐφεξῆς could mean "'next,' 'hereafter.'" Either word may mean "next" (as in Lk. 9:37), but a phrase like ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς (Lk. 7:11) or τῆ ἐξῆς (Ac. 21:1; 25:17; 27:18; cf. Lk. 9:37) is required to convey a meaning like "hereafter."

<sup>91</sup> Luke, 43.

<sup>92</sup> There would not seem to be a closely analogous passage outside the Lucan writings.

<sup>93</sup> "Theologisches Programm," 211. So also Samain, "Notion de ΑΡΧΗ," 324n.; Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 252 and n.

<sup>94</sup> This expectation is not met by supplying a pronoun object for γράψαι (i.e. αὐτά or πάντα), referring back to πραγμάτων or πᾶσιν (as do Grimm, "Proömium," 49; Zahn, 54; Schürmann, I, 13n.; van Unnik, "Once More," 16), for the flow of the passage requires here an indication of literary genre, not of subject matter.

<sup>95</sup> Interestingly enough, although the translators of the NEB evidently thought that καθ'ἑξῆς meant "in a connected manner" in Lk. 1:3, their perception of the requirements of the context led them to the translation "to write a connected narrative for you," thus essentially capturing the true meaning of καθ'ἑξῆς by supplying the direct object "a narrative." (And in Ac. 11:4 the NEB reads, "laying before them the facts as they had happened.") Similarly, Doddridge (in Expositor, I, 2-3) paraphrases, "to write an orderly Account of them . . . to thee." Cf. Webster-Wilkinson: "in a connected narrative." The NIV translates, "to write an orderly account for you."

<sup>96</sup> So Bleek, Int., I, 281; Cadbury, "Commentary," 495; cf. Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 200; Fitzmyer, 288; pace Schürmann, I, 12n.

<sup>97</sup> See Zahn, Int., III, 6n.; Klostermann; cf. BAG, s.v. θεοφιλήs.

## Notes for pp. 107-108

98 See Origen, Luc., 1,6, followed by Ambrose, Luc. I.12. Epiphanius (in Haer. 51.7.4) was unsure. For modern advocates of this position see Plooij, "Work of St. Luke," 518-519; id., "Again," 122; Menestrina, "Incipit," 217-218; Schmithals, 17; Schmithals, ApG., 19; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 382-383. Entertaining the possibilities are Major; Knox; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 213; Spivey-Smith, Anatomy, 154; Ernst. According to B. Reicke (in Luke, 28-29) and Schürmann (in "Evangelienchrift," 252), the name belongs to an historical figure, but may also have a symbolic meaning. Many writers have supposed that Theophilus--the man, not his name--represents Luke's wider intended audience.

99 This conclusion is defended by Calvin, I, 1; Poole; Whitby; Campbell; Clarke; Bleek; Grimm, "Proömium," 58-59; Hahn; Plummer; Beck, Prolog, 12; Lagrange; Cadbury, "Commentary," 508; Loisy, 76; Scott, Literature, 30; Stonehouse, Witness, 41-42; Jacquier, Actes, 3; Bruce, Book of Acts, 31; Vögtle, "Widmung," 32. See also Fitzmyer. See also pp. 158-159, below.

100 See E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 6; Cadbury, "Commentary," 505-506.

101 See Zahn, Int., III, 42 and 81-82n.; Zahn, 56-57; E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 6-7; Cadbury, "Commentary," 506; Creed, 1-2; Vögtle, "Widmung," 32; cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 50.

102 Pace Bloomfield (in Testament, I, 258), who considers it "very doubtful" that Luke would have written to a prominent man, and who therefore suggests that Theophilus was "most excellent" in a moral sense.

103 The History of the Origins of Christianity, vol. 5: The Gospels, E.T. (London, [1890]), 134.

104 So Lightfoot, Fathers, Part I, I, 19, 33-42.

105 Gospels, 534-539. Cf. McNeile, Int., 40-41; Steinmueller; Haenchen, Acts, 136n. (disapproving); Caird (doubtful).

106 "Theophilus."

107 So Loisy, Évangiles, I, 274-275; Loisy, 76.

108 So Schlatter, 155; F. Dibelius, "Herkunft der Sonderstücke," 339 ("vielleicht"); Loisy, 76; Rengstorff, 16 ("möglich"); Grundmann, 45; cf. E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 8 (Theophilus showed an interest in Luke's work).

109 "Proömium," 59. So also Lenski, 13. Cf. Zahn, 54; Klostermann, "Lukas," 363 (unlike his Lukasev., 3).

110 Making, 203-204. So also Grimm, "Proömium," 59-60; Haenchen, Acts, 136n.

111 See Zahn, Int., III, 42 and 81n.; Zahn, 56.

## Notes for pp. 108-110

- 112 See Grimm, "Proömium," 59.
- 113 Cf. J. Weiss, 409-410. See below, pp. 158-159.
- 114 See above, pp. 32-33.
- 115 So Bleek.
- 116 Cf. K. Dziatzko, "Buch," in *PW*, III (1899):939-971, at col. 966: "Selbst die Widmung und Übersendung eines B. an einen Freund oder Gönner ist zunächst nur ein privater Act . . ." See also Wikenhauser, *Geschichtswert*, 136.
- 117 So Blass, *Philology*, 19; A. B. Bruce (perhaps); Zahn, *Int.*, III, 44; Schlatter, 155 ("vielleicht"); Zahn, 56 (suggesting that Luke's dedication was an implicit request for assistance); E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, I, 7; Jülicher-Fascher, *Einl.*, 314; Hauck; Ropes, *Synoptic Gospels*, 62; Rengstorff, 15; Lenski, 13 (following Zahn); M. Dibelius, "The First Christian Historian" (1948), in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by H. Greeven, E.T. (London, 1956), 123-137, at p. 135; Hauck, *Entstehung*, 138; Goodspeed, "Notes," 84 (Luke's "publisher"); Franzmann, *Word Grows*, 196; Grundmann; Stählin, *Apq.*, 11; Schürmann, "Evangelienchrift," 251; Caird; Marxsen, *Int.*, 156; Harrison, *Int.*, 202; Ellis; Harrington; Munck, *Acts*, xvi; Schulz, *Stunde*, 243, 249; Stuhlmueller; Schürmann, I, 2; Vögtle, "Widmung," 40-41; Marshall, *Historian and Theologian*, 38; Thompson ("perhaps"); Morris; Marshall, 39, 43; Roloff, *Apq.*, 18; Juel, *Luke-Acts*, 11; pace Ernst; Dillon, "Previewing," 224 (but cf. p. 223n.). Haenchen (in *Acts*, 137n.) allows for the possibility.
- 118 So Vögtle, "Widmung," 33-36, 40 (followed by Kümmel, *Int.*, 129n.; Schneider).
- 119 See below, pp. 173-186.
- 120 *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* (Darmstadt, 1967), 54. See also pp. 29-30 and Dziatzko, op. cit., 965-967.
- 121 "Widmung," 36. Vögtle adds (on p. 40) that Theophilus "in der Erwartung des Lukas zur Verbreitung seiner Schrift mithelfen sollte." So also Schneider.
- 122 See Cadbury, *Making*, 202-203. Cf. A. D. Nock's review of Dibelius's *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte in Gnomon* 25 (1953):497-506, at pp. 501-502 (reprinted in his *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. by Zeph Stewart (Oxford, 1972), II, 821-832, at pp. 825-826).
- 123 Blass (in *Philology*, 19), following Otto, states that "in the dedication of books κρᾶτιστε occurs when the person addressed is something like a patron, whilst φιλιατε denotes familiarity." If true, this would establish that Theophilus was Luke's patron. However, it is only a generalization, and it cannot be proved in some cases (e.g., the dedication to κρᾶτιστε Διογενητε in the *Epistle to Diognetus*; cf. H. G. Meecham, *The Epistle to Diognetus* (Manchester,

## Notes for pp. 110-114

1949), 92-93). Nonetheless, even a broad generalization has some force.

## CHAPTER 7

<sup>1</sup> Fitzmyer (in Luke, 296) calls the participle in it "the crucial word in the modern interpretation of the Lucan prologue." Cf. Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 426.

<sup>2</sup> Making, 303.

<sup>3</sup> BAG also notes here "follow faithfully, follow as a rule," as in 1 Tim. 4:6; 2 Tim. 3:10. Elsewhere in the New Testament παρακολουθεω occurs only (besides in Lk. 1:3) in the longer ending of Mark, at 16:17, which BAG places in the first category.

<sup>4</sup> BAG, s.v. LSJ gives practically the same range of meanings, although it does not give "investigate." See also Fitzmyer, 296.

<sup>5</sup> This is a common Lucan usage. The word πας (in the plural) means "them all," as the object of a verb or preposition, in Lk. 3:16, 20; 4:36; 6:19; 7:16; 9:15 v.l., 23; 17:27, 29; 21:3; Ac. 9:40; 19:34. The synonymous πᾶς is so used (in the plural) in Lk. 5:26; 7:16 v.l., 9:15; 17:27 v.l., 29 v.l.; Ac. 27:33. But according to Cadbury (in "Commentary," 503) πᾶσιν in Lk. 1:3 "more likely is used without antecedent but in much the same sense."

<sup>6</sup> But cf. Cadbury, "Commentary," 501; id., "Knowledge Claimed," 402n.

<sup>7</sup> However, various earlier writers understood it as an adverb of place, supposing that "from above" means "from God" (as in Jn. 19:11; Jas. 1:17; 3:15, 17, and perhaps Jn. 3) and refers to the divine origin of Luke's knowledge of the gospel history. So L. Gaussen, Theopneustia, E.T. (London, 1841), 406-408, enlisting the support of Erasmus, Gomar, Henry, J. Lightfoot, and other commentators, to whom may be added Trapp. Cf. Whitby. Morgan adopts this interpretation (in Luke, 13), explaining that Luke "was claiming that his scientific work was under the guidance of heaven itself." Cf. Pope, "Key Word," 48. However, this interpretation requires an unnatural meaning for the verb παρακολουθεω. One would have expected a verb like λαμβάνω.

<sup>8</sup> See BAG, s.v. ἀνωθεν, 2.

<sup>9</sup> See Grimm, "Proömium," 48n.; Nestle, "Luke i.3," 140 (citing also the Philoxenian version).

<sup>10</sup> In H.E. III.24.15 Eusebius interprets Luke's preface as teaching that "he gave us in his own Gospel the certain record of those events whose truth he had firmly grasped by the aid of his intercourse and stay with Paul and his converse with the other apostles." And in III.4.6 he relates that Luke "was very frequently in the

## Notes for p. 114

company of Paul," a fact easily gathered from the Pauline epistles and Acts, "and had no merely casual acquaintanceship with the rest of the apostles," a fact which could only have been deduced from Lk. 1:2-3. He then explains that Luke himself testifies that he wrote his gospel "in accordance with what they delivered unto him (καθ' ἃ παρέδοσαν αὐτῷ), which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, all of whom, he also goes on to say, he had followed closely from the first (οἷς καὶ φησὶν ἔτ' ἄνωθεν ἅπασι παρηκολουθηκέναι)." H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton (in Eusebius, II, 81) comment: "The πᾶσιν ('all things') in Luke 1.3 is regarded as masc.; and apparently this interpretation is the basis of the statement in the previous clause as to St. Luke's 'acquaintance with the rest of the apostles.'" (So also Zahn, Int., III, 6n.; Nestle, "Luke 1.3," 139; Zahn, 54n.; Fitzmyer, 297.) Lake (in Eusebius, I, 197n.), however, supposes that there is a "difficulty" in the Greek: "Is it the tradition or the eyewitnesses which Luke (in the opinion of Eusebius) claims to have followed? The Greek is quite ambiguous." It is true that the words οἷς . . . ἅπασι could, by themselves, be either masculine or neuter, but it would be a decidedly unnatural reading of the text to construe them as referring back to "what" (ἃ), rather than to the immediately preceding words, "which (οἷς) from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." Furthermore, the preceding statement and the one in III.24.15 confirm that in Eusebius's view Luke is claiming to have been a follower of all the apostles.

11 In Haer. 51.7.4 Epiphanius substitutes τοῖς αὐτόπταις καὶ ὑπαρέταις τοῦ λόγου γενομένοις for πᾶσιν in quoting Lk. 1:3. See also Nestle, "Luke 1.3," 139; Zahn, 54n.; Fitzmyer, 297.

12 Euthalius writes in Ac., p. 645B: συναπεδήμει γὰρ τοῖς τε ἄλλοις ἀποστόλοις, καὶ μάλιστα τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ εἰδῶς ἀκριβῶς γράφει, especially Paul, and, knowing them, writes accurately." See Zahn, Int., III, 6n.; Nestle, "Luke 1.3," 139-140. (Euthalius, whose identity is obscure, may perhaps be dated in the fifth century rather than the fourth.)

13 In Ac. 1 Chrysostom says that Luke adhered to Paul, "whom he constantly followed (παρακολουθεῖν)." This may reflect Lk. 1:3, although the resemblances may be only coincidental. Chrysostom goes on to quote Lk. 1:3 and 1:2, and infer from these verses that Luke in his gospel "composed an account . . . of things which he has received from others," namely from the apostles mentioned in vs. 2. This is a valid inference only if πᾶσιν in vs. 3 refers to the "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" in vs. 2. However, Chrysostom may be drawing his inference (invalidly, though plausibly) from the words "have handed down to us" in vs. 2. See above, p. 70.

14 In Luc. 1.6, as reconstructed by Rauer, Origen comments on the text "Ἔδοξε κάμῳ ἀνωθεν παρηκολουθηκῶτι first γράφω δὲ οὐ ψιλῆν ἀκοήν, φησὶν, παραλαβὼν, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς παρηκολουθηκῶς ἄνωθεν (+ πᾶσιν, v.l.)" and then διαβεβαιοῦται, ὅτι παρηκολούθησεν οὐ τισι

## Notes for p. 114

τῶν εἰρημένων, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν. The corresponding comment in Jerome's translation is Inculcat ac replicat, quoniam ea, quae scripturus est, non rumore cognoverit, sed ab initio ipse fuerit consecutus, which Cadbury translates as "He emphasizes and repeats, since he has not learned by vague report the things that he is about to write, but from the first has followed them himself." In the second Greek comment, Luke's πᾶσιν is interpreted as a comprehensive reference to τῶν εἰρημένων, "those mentioned," (Cf. τὸ εἰρημένον in Lk. 2:24; Ac. 2:16; Rom. 4:18, and ὁ ῥηθεὶς in Mt. 3:3.) Origen does not specify who or what "all of those mentioned" (i.e. by Luke) are, but since the preceding portion of his homily deals with the eyewitnesses and servants of the word mentioned just previously by Luke in 1:2, it is more natural to understand τῶν εἰρημένων as referring to them (so Thiersch, Kritik, 203-204) than to a neuter object not indicated in the homily (pace C. Delarue's Latin translation of Origen in J. Kirchofer, Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus (Zürich, 1844), 55, which Thiersch mistakes for Jerome's translation). Furthermore, Origen's first comment, which we would translate as "He says, 'I am writing not mere hearsay that I have come across, but rather (am writing) accurately, having followed (them) for a long time'" (see above, p. 96), indicates that Luke recorded firsthand information (rather than hearsay) gained through "following (them)," which can only mean that he acquired his information directly from the eyewitnesses, i.e. through personal contact with them. Jerome's translation would seem to combine Origen's two comments into one, with Inculcat translating φησὶν, and replicat translating διαβεβαίουται, but the point of the second comment gets lost in the process. It is not clear whether Jerome uses the verb consequor with the meaning "to follow as an attendant, attend on" (OLD, s.v., 1.b), in accordance with our understanding of Origen, or with the meaning "to pursue with the mind; to follow, grasp, comprehend" (§ 6), which would accord with his own interpretation of Luke's words (see below, p. 115 and n. 27 (p. 406)).

15 In Haer. Irenaeus calls Luke "the disciple and follower (sectator) of the apostles" (I.23.1), "the follower (sectator) and disciple of the apostles" (III.10.1), and "not merely a follower (ἀκόλουθος, prosecutor), but also a fellow-labourer of the apostles, but especially of Paul" (III.14.1). See Zahn, Int., III, 6n.; Zahn, 54n.; Cadbury, "Commentary," 503; Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 221 (following Cadbury); Haenchen, Acts, 12n. (but cf. p. 9); Fitzmyer.

16 At the close of Haer. III.14.2 Irenaeus states that just as the apostles delivered to everyone what they had learned from Jesus, "thus also does Luke . . . deliver to us what he had learned from them," and to support this statement he quotes Lk. 1:2, "Even as they delivered them unto us . . ." Now since this verse refers to what the apostles passed on to the church as a whole, and not necessarily to Luke directly (see above, p. 70), its application to Luke probably indicates, as Zahn observes (in Int., III, 6n.), that Irenaeus "saw in the παρακολουθηκοῖς ἀνθρώπων πᾶσιν of ver. 3 a reference to his accompanying the eye-witnesses as a disciple or a travelling-companion." (So also Cadbury, "Commentary," 503 ("evi-

## Notes for p. 114

dently"); cf. Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 219.) Indeed, Irenaeus's statement that Luke "had learned from them" probably presupposes this interpretation.

17 According to the opening statement of this prologue (which was taken over into the so-called Monarchian prologue to Luke), Luke "was a disciple of apostles, and later followed (παρακολούθησας, secutus est) Paul until his martyrdom." See Zahn, 54n.

18 Despite J. Regul's influential elaboration (in Evangeliienprologe, 77-80, 197-206) of Haenchen's arguments (in Acts, 10-12n.) against the anti-Marcionite character and second-century date (i.e. ca. 160-180) of this prologue, which for all three "anti-Marcionite" prologues were established by D. de Bruyne (in "Les plus anciens prologues latins des Évangiles," Revue Bénédictine 40 (1928):193-214, esp. pp. 204-206, 209-214) and strongly supported by A. von Harnack (in "Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologe und die Bildung des Neuen Testament," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse for 1928, 322-341, esp. pp. 331-333, 335-337), the present writer is of the view (cf. Bruce, Men and Movements, 130) that the prologue to Luke shares with Irenaeus (see Haer. III.11.4 and esp. 14.3, 4) and the Muratorian Canon a common anti-Marcionite (and anti-Valentinian) polemic (i.e. references to "this whole Gospel," to "the accurate narrative of the dispensation," to "heretical and vain fantasies," to the necessity of including an account of John's birth in the gospel history, to the importance of John's preparatory work, and to Old Testament prophecy)--yet not so similarly worded or structured that a literary dependence of Irenaeus upon the prologue (so de Bruyne, op. cit., 206, 210; von Harnack, op. cit., 335) or vice versa (so R. G. Heard, "The Old Gospel Prologues," JTS, N.S. 6 (1955):1-16, at p. 16) is indicated, rather than a common background--and thus evidently dates from the latter half of the second century, at least in its original form. The disproportionate length of the prologue to Luke probably reflects the fact that Marcion's one gospel was his revision of Luke. But even if Regul is right in dating the prologue in the first half of the fourth century (op. cit., 265, 266), we would still want to say with Heard (op. cit., 11) that it probably incorporates, as its opening paragraph, "if not an earlier and purely biographical Prologue, at least earlier and very valuable biographical material." Its description of Luke is reminiscent of Irenaeus, Haer. I.23.1; III.10.1, and thus looks like a second-century formulation.

19 In Dial. 103 Justin remarks that the canonical gospels were composed by the apostles "and those who followed them" (καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολούθησάντων). He is clearly alluding to Mark and Luke as those who had been followers of the apostles, and at least in the case of Luke this would seem to reflect Lk. 1:3. (So Zahn, Int., III, 6n.; Nestle, "Luke 1.3," 139; Zahn, 54n.; Cadbury, "Commentary," 503 ("perhaps"); id., "Knowledge Claimed," 402n.; Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 221 (following Cadbury); Fitzmyer, 296, 297. Cf. the "Western" order of gospels: Matthew, John (apostles), Luke, Mark (followers of the apostles).) Schürmann (in Lukasev. I, 10n.; so also his "Evangelien-schrift," 258n.), indeed, finds in

## Notes for pp. 114-115

Justin and Irenaeus "die frühen 'Kommentare' zu Lk 1,3." And B. W. Bacon (in "Témoignage de Luc," 216) refers to their "paraphrases du passage de Luc." However, it is not clear from Justin's statement alone, isolated from the similar statements of others in the early church, whether he understood that Mark and Luke had each been a follower of the apostles in general or only that they had followed the apostles Peter and Paul, respectively. But in view of the second-century tradition, the former interpretation is probably the correct one.

<sup>20</sup> Since Justin's reference to the categories of gospel writers was made quite incidentally, it was undoubtedly already a standard formulation. Tertullian (in Marc. IV.2.2) repeats the formulation with the addition of the evangelists' names, no doubt independently of Justin's passing remark, thus confirming its traditional character.

<sup>21</sup> It seems to have been adopted by W. Burkitt (in Notes, 139), or at least incorporated in his interpretation. Apparently C. G. Kùchler, in his De simplicitate scriptorum sacrorum (Lipsiae, 1821), on p. 26, was the last person to put forward this position. See Wilke, Urevangelist, 116n.; Grimm, "Proömium," 48.

<sup>22</sup> See his "Témoignage de Luc," 217, 221-222.

<sup>23</sup> The African Old Latin (i.e. MS. e, k being defective here) reads ab initio diligenter omnia adsecuto. The European Old Latin and the Vulgate read adsecuto a principio omnibus diligenter (but on the construal of diligenter, see above, p. 97), although some Old Latin manuscripts and most printed editions of the Vulgate read omnia instead of omnibus. We may infer from adsecuto that omnibus is neuter, like omnia, and not masculine (so Nestle, "Luke 1.3," 140). The verb adsequor is evidently used with the meaning "to grasp with the mind, think of, understand, appreciate" (OLD, s.v. assequor, 6), referring to mental objects, as its other meanings would be inappropriate here. This would seem to be confirmed by the fact that the verb adsequor occurs elsewhere in the Vulgate only in 1 Tim. 4:6 and 2 Tim. 3:10, the two passages in the New Testament where παρὰ κολουθῆω definitely means "follow with the mind" (though in a slightly different sense: see BAG, s.v., 2). Accordingly, omnibus/omnia refers back to the gospel history which has been handed down (vs. 2).

<sup>24</sup> "Knowledge Claimed," 402. See also Zahn, Int., III, 85n. ("to pursue and follow with the critical and apprehending intelligence"); Cadbury, "Commentary," 501.

<sup>25</sup> Pace Cadbury (in "Commentary," 501), who assumes that "if this interpretation is adopted here, Luke is claiming to have read the διηγήσεις which the preceding writers had composed." See also his "Knowledge Claimed," 402-403. This interpretation is impossible because, as we have seen (see above, p. 113), πᾶσι cannot refer back to the narratives implied by vs. 1.

<sup>26</sup> Luc. I.11.

## Notes for p. 115

27 In Matt. praef., Jerome says that Luke uolumen condidit quaedam altius repetens et ut ipse in proemio confitetur audita magis quam uisa describens. Cadbury translates these words as "composed his book . . . investigating some things from an earlier time, and, as he himself confesses in his preface, describing what he had heard rather than what he had seen." But it is incorrect to translate repetens as "investigating," for the context indicates that the word refers to the writing itself, not to the preparation for writing. Luke had heard the gospel accounts, and was now "repeating" or "tracing" them in his gospel. See OLD, s.v. repetō, 4 and 7. Cf. Jerome, De vir. ill. 7, which closely follows Eusebius, H.E. III.4.6, but omits his statement of the ancient interpretation.

28 In De cons. ev. IV.8, Augustine quotes the Vulgate text of Lk. 1:1-4. (According to C. H. Milne, A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text or Texts of the Gospels Used by Saint Augustine (Cambridge, 1926), xii-xliii, Augustine was careful to use the Vulgate in this work.) However, he does not comment on this portion of vs. 3 in his exposition of Luke's preface.

29 See above, p. 114 n. 14 (pp. 402-403).

30 In his adaptation of Luke's preface in Ep. fest. 39, he says "it seemed to me also, . . . having learned from the beginning (μαθόντι ἀνωθεν) . . ." He evidently understands Luke to be referring to his having learned the gospel traditions, but this could have been readily inferred from the ancient interpretation (which would not have suited his adaptation).

31 The Sahidic represents Luke as saying in vs. 3, "I was willing also, having followed all things from (the) first accurately (ἐαίολαγῶτ̄ ἡσα ὀωβ̄ ἡιη̄ χιη̄ ἡωορῆ̄ ὀῆ̄ οῤωρῶ̄), for to write them (ἐτρασὀαίκοῤ) to thee one (by) one, most excellent Theophile." The suffix pronoun κοῤ, "them," clearly refers back to ὀωβ̄ ἡιη̄, "all things," and indicates that the things which Luke followed were the things which he wrote, i.e. the gospel accounts (or, perhaps, the gospel events). Luke learned them, and subsequently decided to write them down.

32 Lk. 1:3 reads in the Bohairic, "it was pleasing to me also, having traced everything accurately (lit. in certainty) (ἐαίμωϣ̄ ἡσα ὀωβ̄ ἡιβεν̄ ϣεν̄ οῤταῤπο), so to write (εῤϣαί) to thee, most excellent Theophilus." Since ὀωβ̄ ἡιβεν̄ means "everything," not "everyone" (οῤον̄ ἡιβεν̄), the ancient interpretation is excluded, leaving the other interpretation of antiquity, which we have called the Latin interpretation. However, since the verb μωϣ̄, followed by the preposition ἡσα-, has only the general meaning "go after, follow" (Crum, s.v. μωϣ̄, p. 204a), and there is no suffix pronoun after εῤϣαί, "to write" (unlike the Sahidic), the translator may simply have been providing a "literal" rendering without a precise interpretation in mind.

33 The Sinaitic Syriac manuscript reads "it hath seemed good to me, even me, who have investigated (ⲕⲏⲓⲙⲟⲩⲛ) them all [i.e. all the

## Notes for p. 115

things mentioned in vs. 1] from the beginning, carefully one by one to write them to thee, illustrious Theophilus." C. Brogkemann, Lexicon Syriacum (2nd ed.; Halis Saxonum, 1928), s.v. ܦܥܠ (p. 65), gives for the Pa'el "5. expertus est (παρακολουθεῖν)," citing Lk. 1:3. (The other four meanings which he gives are examinavit, scrutatus est; disputavit; exposuit; demonstravit.) He seems to be crediting the Old Syriac with Cadbury's interpretation (see below, pp. 116-117), that Luke had personal experience of the things he is about to relate, but that is beyond the verb's ordinary range of meaning and is not suggested by the context. Smith (Mrs. Margoliouth), s.v. ܦܥܠ (p. 41a), gives as the fundamental meaning of the verb in the Pa'el "to try, test metal; to examine, dispute." The meaning adopted in Burkitt's translation, "investigate," is a possible variation of "examine." But perhaps "follow with the mind," as a variation of "examine," is meant. Luke, having followed (i.e. traced the course of) the gospel history with his mind, proceeded to write out the deeds and teachings of Jesus accurately, one by one.

34 In Luc., ad loc., Photius equates Luke's reception of the gospel traditions with his following (of them).

35 Comm., ad loc.

36 The AV reads, "having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first," followed by Hammond, 183; Henry (in part).

37 In Gnomon, II, 3, Bengel comments that παρακολουθεῖν was used "of him who has been all but present himself at all the events, and who has learned them from those who were actually present; for instance, Paul uses it of Timothy, 2 Tim. iii.10."

38 "Knowledge Claimed," 402-403. However, he may have in mind only the following of what is written, not the following of what is said. S. Brown (in "Prologues," 106) finds room for Luke's "following what is read" in his interpretation of vs. 3.

39 In Lukas und Markus, 6, de Wette translates the participial phrase as "nachdem ich Alles von Anbeginn sorgfältig verfolgt und in Erfahrung gebracht." See below, p. 116 n. 51 (p. 408).

40 Luke, 9.

41 In Int., 191-192, Westcott says that Luke "claims for himself a knowledge of the Apostolic preaching continuous from the first." That is, he "appears to speak of a gradual unfolding of the whole Gospel in the course of the Apostolic work which he had watched from the first step throughout in every detail." The verb παρακολουθεῖν is used by Luke with reference to "the careful following of teaching," and ἄνωθεν indicates that "his knowledge started from the first and extended to every point" of the gospel tradition. Cf. Kelly.

42 John, 133.

## Notes for pp. 115-116

<sup>43</sup> "Sonderstücke," 338: "Von Anfang an hat er den Geschichten von Jesus, die er hörte, genaue Beachtung geschenkt, und zwar allen; das heißt, . . . seit er Christ geworden war, hat er auf derartige Kunde aufgepaßt." (Cadbury, in "Knowledge Claimed," 408, mistranslates and misinterprets Dibelius as holding what we are about to call the modern interpretation--as well as mistaking him for M. Dibelius.) Whereas Westcott refers ἄνωθεν to the course of the gospel tradition's unfolding, Dibelius refers it to the course of Luke's acquaintance with that tradition.

<sup>44</sup> "Témoignage de Luc," 222: "Luc fait remarquer . . . que 'longtemps auparavant' il a 'suivi fidèlement' cet enseignement dans son intégrité, l'ayant appris de première source, et lui ayant prêté une 'attention scrupuleuse'."

<sup>45</sup> See above, p. 115 n. 33 (pp. 406-407).

<sup>46</sup> Gospels, I, 3.

<sup>47</sup> See, e.g., Kümmel, Int., 179n.; Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 39-40; Samain, "Notion de ΑΡΧΗ," 324.

<sup>48</sup> Thus Doddridge (in Expositor, I, 2) says: "The Original . . . plainly signifies that Accuracy of Investigation, on which the perfect understanding of his Subject was built." Similarly, Meyer (in Mark and Luke, I, 277) comments: "Παρακολ., of the mental tracing, investigating, whereby one arrives at a knowledge of the matter."

<sup>49</sup> So Lagrange; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 103; Caird (following the RSV); Guthrie, Int., 93n., 99 (but cf. p. 235); Marshall; cf. Klostermann.

<sup>50</sup> So Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 186 ("erneut," "noch einmal"); Müßner, "Gemeinde," 374-375: "was diese schon zu tun 'versuchten', will auch Lukas nun seinerseits 'erneut' tun." Bleek (in Evangelien, I, 29) also considered this interpretation ("von neueren"), but he rejected it as improbable. It is true that ἄνωθεν can mean "again, anew" (see BAG, s.v. 3), but the implication of such a meaning in Lk. 1:3 would seem to be that Luke himself (and not someone else) had already investigated things once before (cf. Jn. 3:3, 7; Gal. 4:9).

<sup>51</sup> So Whitby, I, 288, 293; Henry (in part); Doddridge; Campbell, II, 195, 509-510; Clarke; Olshausen; Bloomfield; de Wette, 6 (adding the Latin interpretation onto the modern one: παρακολοῦσθαι here means "zugleich erforschen und in Erfahrung bringen"); Wilke, Urengeliste, 109, 117; Ebrard, Geschichte, 143, 145; Thiersch, Kritik, 167; Davidson, Int., I, 177; id., Study, I, 426; Alford; Meyer; Webster-Wilkinson, I, 237-238, 238 (on vs. 4); van Oosterzee; Bleek; D. Brown; Bisping; Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 49; Plumptre; v. Hofmann, 7, 8; B. Weiss; Keil, 183; Schanz; RV; Nösgen; Holtzmann; Feine, Überlieferung, 2-3; Hahn; Farrar; Gloag, Int., 226; Plummer; Blass, Philology, 17-18 (but cf. his "Gospels," 396); Ramsay, Bethlehem, 11-12; Breen; Zahn, Int., III, 50-52;

## Notes for pp. 116-117

Bacon, Int., 217 (but see n. 44, above); Beck, Prolog., 5, 45; Burton, "Purpose and Plan," 248n., 249; J. Weiss, 410; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 272-273n.; Barth, Einl., 196, 197; Spitta, Grund-schrift, ix; Zahn, 55; Machen, Literature, 160-161; Schmidt, Rahmen, 316; Klostermann; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 51; Goguel, Int., I, 114-115n.; Easton, 1, 2; Creed; Manson; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 313; Schlatter, Lukas, 22; Scott, Literature, 31; Dibelius, Tradition, 11 (apparently); Hauck; Rengstorff, 13 (translation), 15 (presumably); Schmid; Lenski, 32; W. Michaelis, Einl., 64; Stonehouse, Witness, 33-34, 36; Geldenhuys; Gilmour in IntE; Arndt; Moorman, Path to Glory, 3; Grundmann; NEB (apparently); Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 365; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 271 (cf. p. 258 and n.); Léon-Dufour, Évangiles, 193, 194; Harrison, Int., 201; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 207-210; Flender, Luke, 65, 66; JB; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 3; Harrington; Schulz, Stunde, 243 (translation), 249; Stuhlmüller; Schürmann, I, 10-11; Vögtle, "Widmung," 31-32; Higgins, "Preface and Kerygma," 82; Reiling-Swellengrebel; NIV; Kümmel, Int., 129 and n.; Wikenhauser-Schmid, Einl., 256; Samain, "Notion de *APXH*," 323-324; van Unnik, "Once More," 16-17, 24n.; Morris; du Plessis, "Purpose," 266-268; Glöckner, Verkündigung, 26, 27 (apparently); Hiebert, Int., I, 118, 140; Martin, Foundations, I, 120; Ernst; Schneider; id., "Zweck," 49, 50; Hendriksen, 56, 62; Fitzmyer, 289, 290; Dillon, "Previewing," 218-219; Schweizer (probably); Talbert, 8; Schille, App., 30; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 426-427; cf. Bengel. (Not all of these writers specifically mention the events of Lk. 1-2.) According to Cadbury (in "Commentary," 502-503), A. H. McNeile (in Int., 89, 94), and Fitzmyer (in Luke, 298), however, the beginning in view on this interpretation is John's ministry, as denoted by  $\alpha\rho\chi\eta\iota$  in vs. 2.

<sup>52</sup> So Reuss, History, 203 (back to the original sources); Dévoidère, "Prologue," 715 ("l'origine de la tradition chrétienne," i.e. the "premières sources" of it); Steinmüller, "Luke," 229-230 (the "very fountainhead" of the gospel tradition, namely the apostles and Mary).

<sup>53</sup> So Feine, Jesus, 59, 61.

<sup>54</sup> "Commentary," 501-502.

<sup>55</sup> "Knowledge Claimed," 408-409. See also his Making, 346-347.

<sup>56</sup> See "Knowledge Claimed," 418-419; Making, 346-347; "'We' and 'I' Passages," 130-131. It should be noted (as his critics often fail to notice) that Cadbury, while seeing a reference to Luke's personal observation of events, recognized that the verb itself could mean nothing more specific than "keep in touch with." One can "keep in touch" with events through secondhand contemporary information as well as through firsthand observation, and Cadbury never excluded the former possibility. He inferred from other considerations that personal observation and participation were involved in Luke's following of events, but he allowed (in "Knowledge Claimed," 419) that "both presence and indirect though contemporary

## Notes for pp. 117-118

information" were within the scope of the verb.

57 "Knowledge Claimed," 408n.

58 Int., 389-391, 393. According to Hug (p. 394), Luke was one of the Seventy. Hug's interpretation is adopted by Wenham in "Gospel Origins," 120, 121. Cf. Foote, 9.

59 "Preface," 70-71; see also his Synoptic Gospels, 63-64.

60 Luc, 75.

61 MM, s.v. παρακολουθέω.

62 Luke, 2.

63 Messias, 43.

64 The RSV reads, "having followed all things closely for some time past."

65 Survey, 170-171.

66 Livre des Actes, 126-127. Unlike Cadbury, however, Trocmé interprets ἀνωθεν as "depuis toujours," i.e. "depuis sa jeunesse, sa conversion ou son entrée dans un ministère ecclésiastique."

67 Sources of Acts, 104-108.

68 "Preface and Kerygma," 82, 88. See also Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 39-40. Cf. MM, s.v. παρακολουθέω; Ellis, 63.

69 Luke, 45 ("probably").

70 Purpose, 4-5.

71 "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 295-296.

72 Literature, 161.

73 Luke, 53.

74 Int., 129.

75 Lukas, 44.

76 On the other hand, in Bundy's opinion (in Jesus, 3) Luke patently did not undertake "patient research," for in his gospel "one finds, in most cases, a faithful transcription rather than a critical reproduction of materials as he found them in his sources." But instead of questioning the correctness of the modern interpretation of vs. 3, Bundy explains (without providing any supporting evidence) that Luke is making a "conventional" statement that one ought not to take too seriously.

## Notes for pp. 119-120

77 "Proömium," 48. So also, at least in substance, de Wette; Wilke, Urevangelist, 109n., 116n.; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 51; id., "Implications," 319; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 374.

78 So Holtzmann.

79 Markus und Lukas, 266n. So also Holtzmann; Hahn; A. B. Bruce; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 12-13; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 272n.; F. Dibelius, "Herkunft der Sonderstücke," 338; Zahn, 54; Klostermann; Lagrange; Cadbury, "Commentary," 502; du Plessis, "Purpose," 267. The great majority of translators and commentators are in implicit agreement with the syntactical interpretation underlying this position.

80 Int., III, 50-51. See also p. 85n. But Zahn, too, cannot free himself from speaking of Luke's "preparatory investigations" (pp. 44-45).

81 Luke, 4,5.

82 BAG, s.v. Bauer, s.v., reads "eine Sache verfolgen, einer Sache nachgehen." However, LSJ does not include "investigate" or anything closely comparable among the word's definitions. It does give "trace" (which Arndt and Gingrich have added to Bauer's definition) and cite Demosthenes, De falsa legatione 257, but, as we shall see, this passage refers to the following of the course of contemporary events, not to historical research or other investigation. Similarly, S. C. Woodhouse, in his English-Greek Dictionary (London, 1932), lists παρακολουθεῖν under the entries "follow" (in the sense of following an argument), "accompany," and "attend" (in the sense of "accompany"), but not among the numerous Greek equivalents to "investigate," "examine," "inquire," "pursue," "search," "trace," and "track."

83 "Commentary," 501-502. See Cadbury, "'We' and 'I' Passages," 132.

84 "Knowledge Claimed," 403-408. See also Hug, Int., 390-391n.; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 126-127; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 105; cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 47. Luce comments (in Luke, 2): "There appears to be no warrant for assigning to the word the sense of deliberate investigation, although Luke's apologists love thus to modernise it."

85 Stonehouse (in Witness, 34-37) did criticize Cadbury's interpretation of the Lucan passage, but he did not answer his objections to the modern interpretation. Cadbury responded to Stonehouse in "'We' and 'I' Passages," 132, and Stonehouse followed with a lengthy rejoinder in Origins, 118-128. In his rejoinder (on pp. 121-122) Stonehouse drew attention to the considerable variety of meanings that could be conveyed by the verb παρακολουθεῖν (as noted by Cadbury himself), yet overlooked the fact that Cadbury did not include "investigate" among them, and he failed to put forward any passages supporting such a meaning.

86 "'We' and 'I' Passages," 131.

## Notes for pp. 120-121

87 "Das 'Wir'," 364n.

88 Int., 179n. Kümmel, like Haenchen before him (see below, p. 121), argues that one could "follow" events without personally observing them. But Cadbury never denied this, for the reception of information at second hand is not at all inconsistent with one's keeping abreast of current events. See above, p. 117 n. 56 (pp. 409-410). The real issue is whether the verb παρακολουθῶ was ever used to refer to the investigation of past events, as well as to the keeping abreast of current events (whether by direct observation or not), and that is what Haenchen and Kümmel have failed to establish.

89 Luke, 42. In "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 295, Marshall appeals to one passage noted by Bauer (i.e. Josephus, Ap. I.218), but without supporting exegesis.

90 Luke, 297.

91 BAG, s.v. παρακολουθῶ, 3.

92 This passage has been cited in connection with Lk. 1:3 at least since the time of Calvin (see his Gospels, I, 3), and in support of various interpretations.

93 So LSJ for the passages in Demosthenes.

94 So Hug, Int., 390-391n.; Grimm, "Proömium," 47 ("von Begebenheiten der Gegenwart, die einer, ohne daß er überall Augenzeuge zu sein braucht oder sein kann, von einem gewissen Standpunkte als aufmerksamer Beobachter verfolgt und dadurch in den Stand gesetzt wird, über ihren Verlauf und ihr Ergebnis ein Urteil sich zu bilden"); Cadbury, "Knowledge Claimed," 404-405. See also Lagrange; du Plessis, "Purpose," 267; (and especially) Maddox, Purpose, 25n. Cf. Jos. Conc., s.v. παρακολουθῶ ("to be present at").

95 "Das 'Wir'," 364n. Cf. van Unnik, "Once More," 17. See also Kümmel, Int., 179 and n. Haenchen's remarks are directed against Dupont's explanation (in Sources des Actes, 103n.) that in De corona 172 Demosthenes speaks "du fait que, seul, il est resté à son poste au milieu des dangers et n'a pas cessé de jouer un rôle prépondérant dans la conduite des affaires." In reply to Haenchen (in Sources of Acts, 111n.), Dupont admitted--without changing his earlier statement (see p. 106n.)--that Demosthenes "is not only speaking of events in which he has taken part personally; some of them have taken place at a distance and he only knows them from the information he has received about them." But in this case he has not investigated events of the past, but rather "has kept himself informed of events as they have occurred."

96 This is quite clear to translators of, and commentators on, Demosthenes, who do not have a particular interpretation of Lk. 1:3 to promote. See, in addition to the translation of C. A. Vince and J. H. Vince, which we have quoted, that of C. R. Kennedy in The

## Notes for pp. 121-123

Orations of Demosthenes on the Crown, and on the Embassy, Bohn's Classical Library (London, 1866), 69 and 199, that of G. Mathieu in Démosthène, plaidoyers politiques, vols. III-IV, Collection des Universités de France (Paris, 1945, 1947), III, 105, and IV, 82, and that of A. N. W. Saunders in Demosthenes and Aeschines (Baltimore, 1975), 296, and the commentary of R. Shilleto in Demosthenis de falsa legatione (Cambridge, 1844), 149, A. Westermann in Ausgewählte Reden des Demosthenes, II (4th ed.; Berlin, 1868), 102, B. Drake in The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown (Cambridge, 1851), 82, R. Whiston in Demosthenes, with an English Commentary (London, 1859-68), I, 494, and II, 120, A. Holmes in Demosthenes with English Notes, pt. I: De Corona (London, 1871), 118, G. A. Simcox and W. H. Simcox in The Orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown (Oxford, 1872), 200, and W. W. Goodwin in Demosthenes on the Crown (Cambridge, 1901), 125. On the other hand, T. Leland, in The Orations of Demosthenes (London, 1830), 505, provides a translation of De corona 172 somewhat supportive of the modern interpretation of Lk. 1:3, namely "the man who had traced these affairs to their very source." But ἐξ ἀρχῆς can hardly mean "to their very source." Demosthenes is speaking of following things from (ἐξ), not of tracing them back to, their beginning.

97 Haenchen appeals to the fact that in the activity described by Demosthenes (in De corona 172) "das ἐξετάζειν eine Rolle spielt." This refers to the continuation of the passage which we have quoted above: "for anyone who had not grasped (εἰδώς) those purposes, or had not studied (ἐξητακώς) them long beforehand, . . . was not the man to appreciate the needs of the hour." Unfortunately, the translation "studied" is open to misunderstanding, for the verb ἐξετάζω simply means "examine well or closely, scrutinize, review" (LSJ, s.v., [I]). Demosthenes studied Philip's activity in the sense that he carefully analyzed it in order to discern his intentions, but not in the sense that he engaged in historical research. (Cf. Maddox, Purpose, 25n.) In any case, there is no reason to think that ἐξητακώς necessarily sheds any light on the meaning of παρακολουθηκότα, for it could just as well (and probably does) pick up the idea expressed by συλλελογισμένον ("had . . . fathomed"), for the verb συλλογίζομαι means "compute, reckon," and then "conclude from premises, infer" (LSJ, s.v., [I], II). The thought of παρακολουθηκότα is picked up by εἰδώς ("had . . . grasped"): the course of events was followed closely, and thus understood.

98 See below, pp. 123-124.

99 So Hug, Int., 391n.

100 So Cadbury, "Knowledge Claimed," 404n., supported by Maddox, Purpose, 25n.; cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 47; Jos. Conc., s.v. παρακολουθεῖν ("to follow, observe, keep to"); pace Zahn, Int., III, 85n. (seeing a reference to "an intelligent study of the O. T. Scriptures"); van Unnik, "Once More," 17.

101 Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde), I (Berlin, 1927), 338.

## Notes for pp. 123-125

- 102 "Knowledge Claimed," 406.
- 103 The present writer agrees with Wilcken against Cadbury, because the time of παρακολουθήσαντα seems to be just prior to that of προσενεχθήσεσθ', and thus belongs to the future hearing. Apollonius's confidence that Ptolemaeus will "follow" the truth is based upon his earlier statement that for the wrong committed against him "wünschte ich nicht einen andern, sondern Dich selbst zum Zeugen heranzuziehen" (Wilcken, op. cit., I, 338).
- 104 "Lexical Notes," 286-287, followed by Lagrange.
- 105 See MM, s.v. Cf. below, p. 126 n. 118 (p. 415).
- 106 Purpose, 4.
- 107 Int., III, 85n. (The former passage is erroneously cited in Zahn's E.T. as I.13.7.) Whitaker (in "Philology," 268) also cites the latter passage in support of the notion of investigation.
- 108 So BAG, s.v. παρακολουθῆω, 2, for III.32.2. BAG does not deal with I.12.7.
- 109 Cadbury (in "Knowledge Claimed," 404n.) comments that "these passages certainly deal with the reader's attention and understanding, not the author's research."
- 110 Int., III, 85n. (Zahn's numbering of these passages is somewhat garbled; we have given the citations intended.)
- 111 BAG, s.v., 2. No passage from Epictetus is cited for any other meaning.
- 112 "Proömium," 48.
- 113 Cadbury's response to Grimm (in "Knowledge Claimed," 404) is on the right track, but he defines Epictetus's usage rather narrowly: "But the verb in Epictetus does not mean philosophic reflection and research, but rather the understanding and obeying (i.e. following) of the divine will, the Stoic life according to nature." In addition to passages mentioned by Grimm, Cadbury cites (on p. 404n.) II.10.4 and III.20.13.
- 114 So P. E. Matheson in his translation of Epictetus, The Discourses and Manual (Oxford, 1916), I, 70: "When a man therefore has learnt to understand the government of the universe and has realized, etc." Cf. II.10.3, "for you possess the faculty of understanding (παρακολουθητικῶς) the divine administration of the world, and of reasoning upon the consequences thereof."
- 115 "Once More," 16-17.
- 116 So Hug, Int., 391n.
- 117 Jos. Conc., s.v. παρακολουθῆω, similarly defines the verb in

## Notes for pp. 125-129

this passage (alone) as "to become acquainted with, get to know, learn," probably under the influence of Thackeray.

118 Here (at n. 65) van Unnik cites MM, s.v. (cf. above, p. 123), but while Milligan does interpret παρακολούθησις in Lk. 1:3 as "having acquired familiarity" (with the facts), a vague expression resembling van Unnik's, they have quite different ideas in mind. Van Unnik has research in view, but Milligan expressly rejects the sense "having investigated them," understanding rather (with Cadbury) that Luke has "so kept in touch with them" (through contemporary reports) "that his witness is practically contemporary witness." Van Unnik also finds Polybius, Hist. XII.25a.4 "interesting," but there Polybius uses παρακολούθειν of following with understanding what one reads: "Can anyone who reads these (παρακολουθεῖ τῶν ἀνεγνώκτων) help noticing that Timaeus has untruthfully reported them in his work, and has done so of set purpose?"

119 See above, p. 121.

120 Luke, 4-5. Cf. Stonehouse, Origins, 120-121.

121 "Commentary," 502.

122 "Implications," 319.

123 See "Knowledge Claimed," 408-409, explaining the tense of the participle differently.

124 Ibid., 408-409.

125 So Zahn, Int., III, 85n.; Stonehouse, Witness, 36-37; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 364-365; Kümmel, Int., 179; Fitzmyer; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 427.

126 See above, pp. 95-100.

127 So Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, 62 (translation); Dupont, Sources of Acts, 112n.

128 See Maddox, Purpose, 25-26n. In Making, 347 (translation), Cadbury decides that ἀκριβῶς indicates the immediacy with which Luke kept in touch with events.

129 So Zahn, Int., III, 85n.; Lagrange; Stonehouse, Witness, 35; Ellis, 63; Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 39; Fitzmyer; Schweizer.

130 Sources of Acts, 103-104. Cf. Foote, 9; Machen, Literature, 159. But unsatisfactory is Cadbury's response (in "Knowledge Claimed," 414), that "the author is not making exclusive contrasts but inclusive comparisons."

131 So Creed; Schweizer; cf. Morris.

132 Survey, 170.

## Notes for pp. 129-135

- 133 "Knowledge Claimed," 419.
- 134 Cf. chapter 2, above.
- 135 See above, pp. 116-117.
- 136 So Stonehouse, Origins, 125-126; Kümmel, Int., 179; Samain, "Notion de APXH," 324.
- 137 So Cadbury, "Knowledge Claimed," 409, 418; Ropes, "Preface," 71; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 107.
- 138 "Preface," 71. Cadbury (in "'We' and 'I' Passages," 131) appeals to this explanation. See also his "Knowledge Claimed," 418.
- 139 But cf. Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 365. In "'We' and 'I' Passages," 131, Cadbury tries to broaden Luke's personal knowledge from the intermittent "we" sections to "Acts as a whole or its later part." But Luke almost certainly had no personal knowledge of the earliest Christian developments, especially if he was a gentile.
- 140 So Stonehouse, Witness, 36; cf. id., Origins, 125-126.
- 141 So Stonehouse, Witness, 36; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 365.
- 142 Int., 191.
- 143 See Lk. 5:11, 27, 28; 9:23, 49, 57, 59, 61; 18:22, 28; cf. 7:9; 9:11; 18:43; Ac. 13:43. Cf. Zahn, Int., II, 455n.
- 144 Int., III, 85n.
- 145 *Ibid.*, III, 6n.
- 146 "Knowledge Claimed," 402.
- 147 So Wilke, Urevangelist, 117n.; Ebrard, Geschichte, 143; Thiersch, Kritik, 167; Grimm, "Proömium," 48; Blass, Philology, 17-18; Zahn, Int., III, 85n.; Zahn, 54; Cadbury, "Knowledge Claimed," 402n. (but cf. above, p. 98 n. 44 (p. 393)); Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 221; Schlatter, Lukas, 22; van Unnik, "Once More," 16.
- 148 See above, pp. 95-100.
- 149 So Schürmann, I, 10n.; Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 254.
- 150 Luke, 297.
- 151 For further examples of this anarthrous usage, see above, p. 113 n. 5 (p. 401).
- 152 Urevangelist, 109n., 116n.
- 153 "Proömium," 48. So also, perhaps, Bisping, 148-149; Nestle,

## Notes for pp. 135-137

"Luke 1.3," 140. Zahn (in Int., III, 6n.) also thinks that "the context" is decisive against the ancient interpretation, but he rejects Grimm's argument (see pp. 50-51) and does not give one of his own. Fitzmyer also finds the ancient interpretation incompatible with "the context," but he does not say why. Perhaps these writers have ἀρεῶς in mind.

154 See above, pp. 118-119.

155 Urevangelist, 117n.

156 "Proömium," 49. So also Thiersch, Kritik, 47; Beck, Prolog, 46.

157 See above, p. 106.

158 See above, p. 106.

159 Luke, I, 60. This argument goes back to Wilke, Urevangelist, 117n.

160 Philology, 17. So also Robertson, Luke the Historian, 51. Cf. Ebrard, Geschichte, 143; Thiersch, Kritik, 167.

161 There Luke says that in his previous narrative he related "all" that Jesus did and taught, even though (on all theories of synoptic origins) he did not include everything known to him about Jesus.

162 Int., III, 455n.

163 See below, pp. 145-146.

164 According to Bacon (in "Témoignage de Luc," 221), Luke's statement (on the ancient interpretation) would not be excessive if πᾶσι refers to "les fondateurs de l'église locale parmi les Gentils (vraisemblablement l'église de Rome)." But πᾶσι must refer to the whole group of apostles. Nothing in the preface suggests a more limited reference.

165 If anyone still finds Luke's statement (on the ancient interpretation) incredible, we can only remind him of the insightful remark of Quintilian (in Inst. IV.2.34), "There are many things which are true, but scarcely credible, just as there are many things which are plausible though false."

166 Urevangelist, 117n.

167 "Gemeinde," 376.

168 "Knowledge Claimed," 402, 415-416. In "'We' and 'I' Passages," 131, Cadbury explains that this interpretation was attractive to "the early Christian writers, who were concerned to think Luke-Acts written by a disciple of the apostles." See also Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 126. Cf. Schürmann, "Evangelienchrift," 258n.;

## Notes for pp. 137-139

id., Lukasev., I, 10n.; Fitzmyer.

169 See below, pp. 146-148.

170 Modern scholars have debated the relative scope of these two expressions, on the assumption that both refer to a certain "beginning" of the gospel history. We have already rejected such an interpretation of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (see above, pp. 82-85), and we would have to do the same for ἀνωθεν if we were to accept the ancient interpretation of Lk. 1:3.

171 Fitzmyer (in Luke, 297, in the light of p. 298) may have this argument in mind when he claims that ἀνωθεν does not suit a masculine πᾶσις.

172 Int., 179. See also Grimm, "Proömium," 43.

173 See Grimm, "Proömium," 43.

174 So Cadbury, "Commentary," 502-503 (but cf. his "'We' and 'I' Passages," 130); Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363-364; Kümmel, Int., 179; van Unnik, "Once More," 24n.; cf. van Oosterzee.

175 So Lake-Cadbury, Acts, 315; Bruce, Acts, 441 (with hesitation); Williams, Acts, 263; cf. Munck, Acts, 241.

176 In Ac. 22:3 Paul says, "I am a Jew, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, but brought up in this city, educated at the feet of Gamaliel according to the strict letter of the law of the fathers (παρὰ τοῦς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκριβείαν τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου)." Van Unnik has demonstrated in Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth, E.T. (London, 1962), contrary to the consensus of previous scholarship, that the phrase "at the feet of Gamaliel" modifies "educated," not "brought up," for the latter expression must, between references to birth and education (as in Ac. 7:20-22, and in numerous passages outside the New Testament) refer to Paul's childhood upbringing (presumably at home), not to his formal education under Gamaliel. Most scholars have accepted van Unnik's exegesis, whether or not they have accepted the truth of Luke's statement (see Haenchen, Acts, 624-625, esp. p. 624n.; Stählin, ApG., 283-284; Conzelmann, ApG., 134; Hanson, Acts, 214-215; Munck, Acts, 217, 309 (W. F. Albright); G. Bornkamm, Paul, E.T. (London, 1971), 3; Bruce, Paul, 43; Marshall, Acts, 353-354; Roloff, ApG., 322; Schneider, ApG., II, 320), although the older view has not been left without any support (see R. N. Longenecker, Paul: Apostle of Liberty (New York, 1964), 25-26). If Paul was brought up as a child in Jerusalem, it must have been there that he began to adopt a Jewish way of life. Ac. 26:4 would say precisely that if  $\tau\epsilon$  were excluded from the text (as in C Byz vg, against  $\mathcal{N}$  A B and modern editors), but if we accept the word as authentic, its force is probably explicative: "actually," or "and indeed" (so van Unnik, op. cit., 48-49, following Beyer and Bauernfeind; so also Hanson, Acts, 237; Marshall, Acts, 391). One could perhaps suppose that Paul's childhood began in Tarsus and was spent mostly in Jerusalem, but this would be a less reasonable way to harmonize Ac. 22:3 with 26:4.

## Notes for pp. 140-145

177 See Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 215; Lake-Cadbury, Acts, 315; Bruce, Acts, 441; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 107; Munck, Acts, 239; Marshall, Acts, 391; Schneider, Apog., II, 371; Schille, Apog., 446 (translation).

178 E.g., van Unnik, op. cit., 47; Conzelmann, Apog., 147; Fitzmyer, 298 (following Haenchen); Schmithals, Apog., 224 (translation). Klein (in "Theologisches Programm," 208-209) argues that ἀνωθεν points back to a beginning previous to that indicated by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, both here and in Lk. 1:2-3, i.e. to the birth of Paul and similarly to the birth of John and Jesus, but Paul's accusers had not known him from his birth (in Tarsus!), and neither had he been a Pharisee from birth.

179 Acts, 682-683. See also his "Das 'Wir'," 364.

180 Acts, 624-625. However, in "Das 'Wir'," 364, Haenchen recognizes that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς refers to Paul's life "von Kindheit an."

181 Bruce (in Book of Acts, 489) similarly says that Paul was "brought up a Pharisee."

182 Haenchen suggests as much in "Das 'Wir'," 364, for his argument requires that "das Leben, das er von Kindheit an geführt hat" was "sein Pharisäerleben."

183 Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, E.T. (London, 1969), 247.

184 Ibid., 251. See also A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (London, 1883), I, 311-312. Cf. Josephus, Vit. 10-12: After training with the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, Josephus decided at the age of nineteen "to govern my life by the rules of the Pharisees."

185 We may reasonably infer from Theophilus's request that he did not have ready access to any of the apostles. This does not mean that all the apostles had passed away, but only that he did not expect to hear any of them telling the gospel story in the near future. He probably lived in a place not often visited by them.

186 "Knowledge Claimed," 418n.

187 See above, pp. 72-73.

188 History, 204.

189 Int., 237.

190 Luke's use of the first person plural in 16:10-18; 20:5-16; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16; cf. 11:28 v.l. cannot be persuasively explained as the employment of a fictitious literary device, because of its sporadic incidence. Nor can the "we" sections be explained as extracts from a written source, because their literary style is the same as that of the surrounding material. If Luke so thoroughly recast this alleged source in his own style, it is hard to imagine

## Notes for pp. 145-147

why all the first person plural verbs and pronouns were not corrected to the third person plural, in accordance with the style of the rest of the book. The most reasonable explanation for the "we" sections is that Luke was a member of Paul's party, accompanying him in these portions of the narrative, but not being directly involved in the other portions. Doubts concerning this natural interpretation have arisen largely because of the differences between Luke's picture of Paul in Acts and Paul's own picture of himself in his epistles, and between the theology of Luke and that of Paul. However, there is no reason to insist that every associate of Paul would have portrayed him just as he portrayed himself, especially for different purposes, or that the theology of his every associate would reproduce his. Besides, these differences are not as pronounced as they are sometimes made out to be.

191 See below, p. 154.

192 See above, p. 114.

193 Dial. 103.

194 Haer. III.15.3, 21.3.

195 Marc. IV.2.1, 2.

196 Matt. 1.5.

197 Int., 189.

198 Haer. III.15.3.

199 So Harvey, Sancti Irenaei, II, 6n., putting Luke first. See also n. 202, below.

200 See above, p. 114 n. 16 (pp. 403-404).

201 Haer. III.21.3.

202 Irenaeus definitely attributed 1 Peter to Peter, the Gospel according to John, 1 and 2 John, and Revelation to John, the Gospel according to Matthew to Matthew, and twelve epistles of Paul (i.e. Romans through Titus) to Paul. (See F. R. M. Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum (Cambridge, 1914), 211-234.) His introduction of a quotation from 1 Peter with the words "Peter says in his epistle" (Haer. IV.9.2) may indicate that he did not recognize 2 Peter as canonical (but see Bigg, Peter and Jude, 206; Hitchcock, op. cit., 221-223; on the possible (mis)quotation of 2 Pet. 3:8 found alike in Haer. V.23.2 and 28.3, see F. H. Chase, "Peter, Second Epistle of," in A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by J. Hastings, III (Edinburgh and New York, 1900), 796-818, at p. 800; Mayor, Jude and Second Peter, cxxi-cxxii), but if he did, he undoubtedly accepted Peter (so 2 Pet. 1:1) as its author. We may safely assume that Irenaeus accepted 3 John as John's and Philemon as Paul's, but had no occasion to quote from either one. That leaves, in addition to the writings of Luke and Mark, only Hebrews, James, and Jude as

## Notes for p. 147

works which may, in Irenaeus's view, have been written by "followers" of the apostles. However, room must be found for "the rest" of the writing apostles, and so Irenaeus must have attributed at least two of these three books to apostles (in the broad sense of that term). One of them was undoubtedly James, the Lord's brother, who was an apostle (see Gal. 1:19; 2:9; compare Ac. 15:6, 22 with vs. 13, 19). Jude, the brother of James, probably had the same apostolic status as James (though not his eminence), and would not have been regarded merely as a follower of the apostles (cf. Ac. 1:14).

Modern scholars are in general agreement that Irenaeus did not accept the Pauline authorship of Hebrews (see, e.g., the arguments of Bleek, Hebräer, I, 114-118, repeated by Lünemann, Hebrews, 9; B. F. Westcott, A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament (7th ed.; London, 1896), 391; Spicq, Hébreux, I, 183). The strongest evidence supporting this judgment is, in Lünemann's words, "the fact that Irenaeus, in his great work Advers. Haereses, often as he had occasion to cite this epistle, and frequently as he otherwise adduces proof passages from the epistles of Paul, yet nowhere appeals to the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Hebrews, 9). However, a belief in the non-Pauline authorship of Hebrews would not have inhibited Irenaeus from appealing to it, for he clearly regarded it as Scripture (see Haer. III.6.5; Frag. 37). We would suggest (pace Westcott, Hebrews, lxiv) that Irenaeus was reluctant to appeal to Hebrews in a controversial work like Against Heresies simply because the apostolicity and authority of the epistle were disputed in the West (chiefly at Rome) at the time.

There is, in fact, some evidence that Irenaeus did accept the epistle as Pauline. In Frag. 37 (i.e. the second Pfaffian fragment, Harvey's Frag. 36) he appeals in succession to texts drawn from Malachi, Revelation, Romans, and Hebrews. The authors of the first three are identified by name, but the passage from Hebrews is introduced simply with the words, "And again" (καὶ πάλιν). From this one could infer that Irenaeus had no idea (or did not choose to say) who wrote Hebrews. But the words "and again" seem rather to carry forward the words which introduce the passage in Romans (and here we supply our own translation), "And Paul exhorts us" (καὶ ὁ Παῦλος παρακαλεῖ ἡμᾶς). Since the passage in Hebrews is an exhortation, just like the one in Romans, Irenaeus seems to be implying by the words "and again" that Paul again exhorts us. Bleek (in Hebräer, I, 118-119n.) recognized that the passage from Hebrews is introduced after the one from Romans "als seien beide von demselben Verfasser," but he dismissed this evidence on the grounds that the authenticity of the fragment was "höchst zweifelhaft," despite its affinities with Irenaeus's Against Heresies. More recent scholars, however, have accepted its authenticity. One of them is Westcott (in History of the Canon, 391), who concedes that Irenaeus seems to be attributing Hebrews to Paul, but who, without offering an alternative interpretation of Irenaeus's words, concludes that he probably did not regard Hebrews as Pauline.

Now if Irenaeus did attribute Hebrews to Paul, as seems somewhat probable to us, then "the rest" of the writing apostles were James and Jude, and the "followers" of the apostles were Luke and Mark. On the other hand, if Irenaeus did not attribute Hebrews to Paul, he probably considered it to have been written by another apostle

## Notes for pp. 147-150

(Barnabas?). There is an outside chance that he considered Hebrews to have been authored by a "follower" of the apostles, but in the absence of any ancient tradition to this effect, this possibility is remote. And if Irenaeus had no idea who had written Hebrews, he would have had no reason to include its author with Luke and Mark as "followers" of the apostles. Therefore, whatever Irenaeus may have thought about the authorship of Hebrews, it is highly likely that he had only Luke and Mark specifically in mind when he referred to the "followers" of the apostles.

203 H.E. VI.14.5, 6.

204 So Nestle, "Luke 1.3," 140.

205 See Zahn, Int., III, 455n.

206 See LSJ, s.v. πρόσωθεν (Att. πάρρηθεν).

207 Marc. IV.2.1, 2.

208 Ibid., § 4.

209 Matt. 1.5.

210 Eusebius, II, 200.

211 See Eusebius, H.E. III.39.15. A comparison of §§ 4 and 7 with § 15 shows that "the elder" who handed down this tradition about Mark was the man identified earlier as "the elder John." For further discussion, see below, pp. 330-331. E. Nestle (in "Luke 1.3," 140) sees a possible connection between Papias's description of Mark and Lk. 1:3.

212 H.E. III.39.4. This passage is discussed in detail in the appendix, below.

213 In § 7 Eusebius paraphrases Papias as saying that he has received the discourses of the apostles "from those who had been their followers" (παρά τῶν αὐτοῖς παρεκλουθηκότων).

214 So Credner, Einl., 202. So also A. Hilgenfeld, according to G. Salmon (in Int., 92), who is "disposed to think he is right." Lightfoot (in Essays, 186) is not impressed by the arguments of Credner and Hilgenfeld, although he is quite sure that Papias knew the Third Gospel. Luthardt (in John, 133) comments that Papias "clearly refers here to the use of παρεκλουθηέν . . . in Luke 1.3." Lake (in Eusebius, I, 292) suggests a connection with Lk. 1:3 in the margin opposite Papias's words. Cf. Cadbury, "Commentary," 503.

215 Eusebius, H.E. III.39.15.

216 So B. Orchard in Fuller, "Classics," 183; cf. Bacon, "Témoignage de Luc," 221; Kürzinger, "Lk 1,3," 254.

## Notes for pp. 150-155

- 217 So W. Michaelis, Einl., 45.
- 218 On the meaning of  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$ , as used by Papias, see F. H. Colson, " $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$  in Papias," JTS 14 (1912-13):62-69 (but cf. A. Wright, " $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$  in Papias," JTS 14 (1912-13):298-300, arguing that chronological order is meant); J. Kürzinger, "Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäusevangeliums," BZ, N.S. 4 (1960):19-38, at p. 31; id., "Die Aussage des Papias von Hierapolis zur literarischen Form des Markusevangeliums," BZ, N.S. 21 (1977):245-264, at pp. 252-253. According to Papias, Mark wrote "as he recalled" Peter's discourses, which had not been given "with a view to putting together the Dominical oracles in orderly fashion." But Blass (in Philology, 18) thinks that the  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$  of Papias is not comparable to the  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  of Luke. For a survey of alternative interpretations, see Gloag, Int., 170-171.
- 219 So Kürzinger, "Aussage des Papias," 250.
- 220 See above, p. 33.
- 221 Güttgemanns (in "Historiker," 23-26) finds additional expressions in the Papias fragment that correspond to similar terms in Luke's preface, but the connection in each case less clearly points to Papias's use of Luke's preface.
- 222 See Eusebius, H.E. III.39.3-4, which is discussed in detail in the appendix, below.
- 223 See Birks, Horae, 254-255; Rendall, Corinthians, 79, 81, 83; Hughes, Second Corinthians, 312-316.
- 224 See above, pp. 142-145.

## CHAPTER 8

<sup>1</sup> Plummer (in Luke, lxiii) observes that this construction is "very common" in Luke (and Acts), unlike the other gospels, occurring in 1:4; 2:20; 3:19; 5:9; 9:36, 43; 12:46; 15:16; 19:37, etc.

<sup>2</sup> So Thiersch, Kritik, 169; Meyer; Bisping; Godet; Grimm, "Proömium," 53; v. Hofmann; B. Weiss; Keil, 184; Holtzmann; A. B. Bruce; Plummer; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 274n. (omitting  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ ); Klostermann; Lagrange; Cadbury, "Commentary," 508; Easton; Creed; Scott, Literature, 31; Vogel, "Luk. 1,4," 205; BDF, § 294(5); Marshall; S. Brown, "Prologues," 108 (apparently); Fitzmyer; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 374 (apparently).

<sup>3</sup> So Euthymius, Comm., ad loc.; de Wette; Alford, I, 8]; Bleek; Hahn; Zahn, Int., III, 82n.; Zahn, 58-59; Schmidt in TDNT, I:506; Hauck, 16 (translation); Lenski, 35; van Unnik, "Purpose," 13; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 1 (translation); Schulz, Stunde, 249 (apparently); Schürmann, I, 15n.; Ernst (apparently); Schneider (apparently); Schweizer, 10 (translation). BAG and BAGD present a confused

## Notes for pp. 155-157

picture, giving this resolution s.v. κατηρέω, 2.a, in Greek, but not in the English translation! (But Bauer's German translation is consistent with the resolution given for the Greek.) BAG, s.v. ος, 5.d, is undecided.

<sup>4</sup> It was adopted by Bornemann, according to Bleek (in Evangeliën, I, 31) and Grimm (in "Proömium," 52). It has apparently been adopted by du Plessis (in "Purpose," 269-270), who translates, "concerning the words about which you have been informed (instructed)." Cf. Hendriksen, 59; "the exact truth with respect to the matters concerning which you received instruction." It is also mentioned as a theoretical possibility by Thiersch, Kritik, 169; Godet; Plummer; Zahn, 58; Klostermann; Cadbury, "Commentary," 508.

<sup>5</sup> A preposition may be omitted (i.e. understood) before a relative pronoun, if it would repeat one used with the antecedent noun, as in Lk. 12:46, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (sc. ἐν) ἡ . . . καὶ ἐν ὧρα (sc. ἐν) ἡ; 1:25; Ac. 1:21; 13:2, 38. See BAG, s.v. ος, 6; BDF § 294(3). But this straightforward construction (i.e. preposition + object + relative) is not present in Lk. 1:4. The words περὶ ὧν . . . λόγων would seem to be overloaded with incorporation, attraction, and rearrangement if they must first be understood as περὶ τῶν λόγων ὧν and that then understood as περὶ τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν.

<sup>6</sup> See below, pp. 156-157.

<sup>7</sup> So most commentators.

<sup>8</sup> So Hug, Int., 392; Wilke, Urevangelist, 115 ("das Sichere"); Ebrard, Geschichte, 145 ("das Sichere"); Thiersch, Kritik, 169 ("das Zuverlässige"); Grimm, "Proömium," 53; Ropes, "Style," 305; Cadbury, "Purpose Expressed," 434-435 (following Ropes); id., "Commentary," 509; Ropes, "Preface," 67-68; Loisy, 75 (translation, but cf. p. 76 ("certitude")); Easton, 1 (giving both "the facts" and "the certainty"); Cadbury, Making, 346 (despite pp. 315, 347); Creed; Manson (following Moffatt's translation); RSV; Bowie in IntB; Leaney; NEB ("authentic knowledge"); Reicke, Luke, 15 (but cf. p. 28); Morris; du Plessis, "Purpose," 270-271; Hendriksen.

<sup>9</sup> See LSJ, s.v.

<sup>10</sup> For this reason, Colson (in "Preface," 303-304) rejects it.

<sup>11</sup> See LSJ, s.v. See also Colson, "Preface," 304.

<sup>12</sup> See Ropes, "Preface," 68-69; Creed.

<sup>13</sup> Luke, 5. See also Grimm, "Proömium," 53.

<sup>14</sup> Ropes (in "Style," 305; see also his "Preface," 68) aptly comments that "the mere repetition of the story by Luke would not convince of its trustworthiness, but can well be said to supply full and accurate knowledge of the matters treated." Colson (in "Preface," 303), however, is unconvinced.

<sup>15</sup> So Ropes, "Style," 305; Hendriksen, 62.

## Notes for pp. 157-158

16 So Wilke, Urevangelist, 118; Guericke, Isagogik, 179; Bleek; Godet (with "religious interpretation"); Hahn; Burton, "Purpose and Plan," 249; Cadbury, "Commentary," 509 ("events reported"); Loisy; Stonehouse, Witness, 33, 44; Bowie in IntB; Grundmann; Reicke, Luke, 28. (Some of these writers would also include in τῶν λόγων the events related in Acts.) Similarly seeing a reference to the gospel accounts (and, according to some, accounts in Acts) are Hug, Int., 392; Olshausen; Thiersch, Kritik, 169; Alford; Plumptre ("mainly"); Grimm, "Proömium," 52; A. B. Bruce; Zahn, Int., III, 43 ("words, discourses, or teachings relating to the πράγματα"); Beck, Prolog, 4, 47; Zahn, 58; Klostermann; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 55; Vogel, "Luk. 1,4," 204-205; Hauck; Rengstorff; Lenski, 35; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 270n.; Wilckens, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 228, 229; id., Missionsreden, 68, 69; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 1 (translation); Mußner, "Gemeinde," 376, 383-384; cf. Leaney, 7, 78 ("reports" of "the Christian story"). According to du Plessis (in "Purpose," 270) there is a reference to both "the events and the preaching." However, Luke wanted Theophilus to know about the ministry of Jesus, not about accounts of that ministry.

17 We may infer, with Hahn (in Lucas, I, 81), "dass Theophilus bisher von den Thatsachen des Lebens Jesu und von seinen Lehren eine nur unvollständige Kenntniss erhalten hatte."

18 So Vogel, "Luk. 1,4," 204.

19 So Euthymius, Comm., ad loc., and most modern scholars. Seeing a reference to the "kerygma" are W. Michaelis in TDNT, V:348 ("the primitive Christian proclamation of Christ"); Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 11; Luck, "Kerygma bei Lukas," 54-56; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 256-257 (cf. his Lukasev., I, 15-16); Dillon, "Previewing," 224-225.

20 So Westcott, Int., 190n.; B. Weiss; Schanz; Holtzmann; Plummer; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 274n.; Easton; Ellis ("probably"); S. Brown, "Prologues," 107; cf. Robertson, Luke the Historian, 55n.

21 According to Klein (in "Theologisches Programm," 213), these λόγοι are the writings of Luke's predecessors. Schneider (in Lukas, 40) allows this as a possibility. However, Luke surely would not have been concerned to tell Theophilus what was certain with regard to previous literature, but rather what was certain with regard to the matters dealt with in that literature.

22 Marshall (in "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 296) argues to the contrary that "it is surely inconceivable that the teaching given to Theophilus said nothing about the experience of the Holy Spirit." But such teaching could hardly be assumed to include an account of church history. Marshall also says that J. Jervell (in "The Problem of Traditions in Acts," in his Luke and the People of God (Minneapolis, 1972), 19-39) has shown that "the kerygma may well have included accounts of how the gospel has been effective in the foundation of the various churches." Jervell does show from the Pauline epistles that "reports of the work of the apostle, the growth and life of a congregation, and progress of mission had

## Notes for pp. 158-161

their place in the life of the congregation" (p. 32), but his effort to stretch this into "preaching about the apostles" and "a tradition about apostolic times" (p. 36) is based on dubious exegesis (e.g., his identification of the proclaiming mentioned in Rom. 1:8 as kerygmatic preaching and his equation of "the word of the Lord" with "your faith in God" in 1 Thes. 1:8 (pp. 23-25)). Evidence is lacking that in Luke's day formal instruction was given in the church history related in Acts at all comparable to the formal instruction given in the gospel history related in Luke.

<sup>23</sup> As we shall see in the next chapter, Luke's preface pertains only to his gospel, not to Acts as well.

<sup>24</sup> See BAG, s.v. See also Burton, Galatians, 336-337.

<sup>25</sup> So Beck, Prolog, 46-47 (but cf. p. 4); Ropes, "Style," 305; Whitaker, "Philology," 271; Klostermann, 2 (translation); Cadbury, "Commentary," 509 ("probably"), 510; Loisy, 76; Pope, "Key Word," 44-45; Vogel, "Luk. 1,4," 204-205; Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, 62 (translation); Beyer in TDNT, III:639-640; RSV; Gilmour in IntB (probably); Leaney, 78; NEB; Thompson; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 428; cf. Blass, Philology, 20; Reicke, Luke, 15.

<sup>26</sup> So Bleek; Zahn, Int., III, 43 and 82n.; Zahn, 59; Lenski, 35; cf. du Plessis, "Purpose," 269-270 (probably). It would make sense to interpret τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν κατηχηθῆς as "the words about which you have been informed," but not as "the words about which you have been instructed."

<sup>27</sup> Luke, 43.

<sup>28</sup> This argument was originally advanced by J. D. Michaelis (in Int., III, pt. I, 237), who also argued that the expression "among us" in vs. 1 "seems to imply that Theophilus was at that time not of the number." But his translator, H. Marsh, justly remarks (at III, pt. II, 155) that this alleged antithesis is "wholly imaginary."

<sup>29</sup> Int., III, 42-43; Lucas, 57-58; Apq., 9-10.

<sup>30</sup> So Beck, Prolog, 13; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 274n.; Klostermann (reversing the opinion expressed in "Lukas," 363); E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 7; Cadbury, "Commentary," 507n.; Creed; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 313 (sarcastically referring to Zahn as "die Alleswisser"); Hauck; Schmid, 31; W. Michaelis, Einl., 130; Stonehouse, Witness, 42; Grundmann, 45; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 252n.; Ellis; Schürmann, I, 13-14n.; Hendriksen, 58; Schweizer; cf. Maddox, Purpose, 13-14. Zahn is supported by J. Weiss, 409; Loisy, 76 (though questioning Theophilus's conversion); Manson; Lenski, 11, 33; Knox (perhaps); Bundy, Jesus, 5 (at least in part).

<sup>31</sup> Int., III, 43.

<sup>32</sup> "Purpose Expressed," 432-441. So also his "Commentary," 510. Cf. Flender, Luke, 63: The preface exhibits "similarities with the

## Notes for pp. 161-167

technical language of the legal profession." These "legal expressions" are those to which Cadbury draws attention.

33 "Purpose Expressed," 432-433.

34 Ibid., 433.

35 Ibid.

36 See BAG, s.v., 1.

37 "Purpose Expressed," 433-434.

38 So BAG, s.v. κατηγορέω, 1.a.

39 "Purpose Expressed," 434.

40 The equivalence of these expressions was previously pointed out by Ropes (in "Style," 305) as an illustration of "Luke's fondness for varying his phrase."

41 "Purpose Expressed," 434-435.

42 Ibid., 435-436.

43 Ibid., 436-437.

44 Ibid., 437.

45 Ibid., 441. See also Bundy, Jesus, 5.

46 Sahlin (in Messias, 39-47) develops Cadbury's handling of Luke's preface even further, and, with the help of the most fantastic exegesis (see, e.g., above, pp. 26 n. 47 (p. 365) and 71 n. 21 (p. 381)), is able to imagine "dass beinahe jedes Wort des Lk-Prologs der juristischen Sphäre entweder tatsächlich entnommen ist oder ihr wenigstens entnommen sein kann" (p. 43). In his view, Luke's preface is closely associated with the latter half of Acts, which he sees as an apology for Paul (p. 44). The preface says nothing about the gospel history or about gospel literature (pp. 45-46), being solely concerned with Paul's judicial process!

47 New Testament Preaching, 28-30.

48 See above, pp. 81-82.

49 New Testament Preaching, 28: The speeches in Acts which proclaim the word "include a sketch of the ministry of Jesus."

50 Ibid., 30.

51 Ibid.

52 Luke, lxxiii.

## Notes for pp. 167-171

<sup>53</sup> We would, however, endorse the conclusion that Stanton is seeking to establish, namely, that in Acts "Luke wished to show the readers of his day that an account of the life and character of Jesus was part of the preaching of the church--and always had been" (p. 28). An appeal to Lk. 1:4 at this point, however, is misplaced.

<sup>54</sup> So Cadbury, "Purpose Expressed," 432-434, 437, 441.

<sup>55</sup> See above, pp. 108-109.

<sup>56</sup> Also, as Schweizer (in Luke, 13) points out, Roman officials could hardly have been expected to "plow through so much material to find a few details bearing on the question of whether or not this group was dangerous."

<sup>57</sup> See above, pp. 109-110.

<sup>58</sup> So most commentators, but with very little comment.

<sup>59</sup> See BAG, s.v. ἐπιγινώσκω, 2.

<sup>60</sup> Luke, 5. So also Bengel; Bloomfield; Webster-Wilkinson; D. Brown; Grimm, "Proömium," 53; B. Weiss; Keil, 184; Schanz; Hahn; Farrar; Lagrange, 7 (translation); Robertson; Hauck; Stonehouse, Witness, 44; Arndt; Reiling-Swellengrebel; Fitzmyer (perhaps). BAG, s.v. ἐπιγινώσκω, 1.a, lists Lk. 1:4 under the group of meanings "know exactly, completely, through and through." Bauer, s.v. καταξέω, 2.a, gives the same sense in his translation of this verse (i.e. "genau erkennt"), but BAG and BAGD do not (i.e. "know").

<sup>61</sup> So Theophylact, Luc., ad loc.; Euthymius, Comm., ad loc.; Lardner, Supplement, I, 84; Alford; Lagrange, 7; cf. Bultmann in TDNT, I:704 ("confirm").

<sup>62</sup> "On the meaning of ἐπιγνώσις," in Ephesians, 248-254. So also MM, s.v. ἐπιγινώσκω. Cf. R. E. Picirelli, "The Meaning of 'Epignosis'," EQ 47 (1975):85-93.

<sup>63</sup> Ephesians, 249.

<sup>64</sup> We would question, though, whether a directive force is present in Lk. 1:4. According to Robinson (in Ephesians, 250), in this verse "we have the word used with good effect to indicate the discernment of a particular point in regard to things already known." To us, this explanation seems rather artificial.

<sup>65</sup> See Lightfoot, Philippians, 86; id., Colossians and Philemon, 137-138; BAG, s.v. ἐπιγινώσκω, 1.a. Note 1 Cor. 13:12 in particular.

## CHAPTER 9

<sup>1</sup> Making, 347.

## Notes for pp. 171-175

- 2 Ibid.
- 3 His interpretation of the words ἐπεχείρησαν in vs. 1, ἄνωθεν in vs. 3, and ῥῆν . . . ἀσφάλειαν in vs. 4 are exceptions, but in each case they are used to promote other interpretations which are faulty. His most important contribution (though anticipated by Hug and Grimm) is his lexical argument against interpreting παρακολωθεῖν as "investigate" in vs. 3, but unfortunately his own interpretation of the word is also unacceptable.
- 4 See above, pp. 32-33, 109, and 158-159.
- 5 See above, pp. 90-91.
- 6 Lukasev., I, 4.
- 7 So Schneckenburger, Zweck, 14-15; Grimm, "Proömium," 57; Jones, "Reply," 225; Lenski, 13, 27; Bundy, Jesus, 5; Dupont, Sources of Acts, 110n.; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363; Klein, "Theologisches Programm," 205; Flender, Luke, 64; Higgins, "Preface and Kerygma," 81; Schneider, "Zweck," 48; S. Brown, "Prologues," 101; Schweizer, Lukas, 8; cf. Bartsch, Wachet, 14; pace Whitby, I, 292; Beck, Prolog, 37 (but cf. p. 38); Cadbury, "Commentary," 492. Trocmé's explanation (in Livre des Actes, 47; cf. Schmid), that Luke is thinking of "toute la série d'événements rapportée partiellement dans ces ouvrages," is clearly artificial. Each of Luke's predecessors undertook to narrate the history which he related, not merely one portion of it.
- 8 So Reuss, History, 204; Schneider, "Zweck," 48; Spivey-Smith, Anatomy, 155; cf. Arndt, 38; pace Cadbury, "Commentary," 492; Maddox, Purpose, 5.
- 9 So Schneckenburger, Zweck, 13-14; Godet, I, 58; Schanz, 47n.; Higgins, "Preface and Kerygma," 81; pace E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 11.
- 10 So Reuss, History, 204; Godet, I, 58; but cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 55, allowing that much of the early history of the church was included in the instruction received by Theophilus. See above, p. 158.
- 11 So Campbell, II, 178-179. Representative modern authors are cited for and against the inclusion of Acts within the scope of Luke's preface by Schürmann, I, 4n.; Kümmel, Int., 128n.; Dillon, "Previewing," 217-218n.
- 12 So Thiersch, Kritik, 163; Grimm, "Proömium," 57-58; pace Zahn, Int., III, 54.
- 13 So Schneckenburger, Zweck, 14; Grimm, "Proömium," 55.
- 14 Prolog, 36.
- 15 So Whitby, I, 292; Bengel, II, 2; Olshausen, I, 79-80; Alford, II, 15; Zahn, Int., III, 53-54; Beck, Prolog, 4, 35, 37; Chase,

## Notes for pp. 175-177

Credibility, 16-17; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 270 (perhaps); Zahn, 50; Loisy, Actes, 92, 133-134; Cadbury, "Commentary," 492, 496; Klostermann, 1, 2; Loisy; Creed; Scott, Literature, 76; Hauck; Schmid; Piper, "Purpose," 16-17, 24-25; Stonehouse, Witness, 33; Gilmour in IntB; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 39, 47-48, 125; Franzmann, Word Grows, 196; Grundmann; Lohse, Formation, 151; Martin, Foundations, I, 244; Schmithals, 18; Fitzmyer, 289, 292; Marshall, "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 295; cf. Kümmel, Int., 128, 129.

16 It is certainly no answer that Luke's predecessors related "only half the story" said by him to have been their subject matter, as Marshall suggests (in "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 295).

17 Int., III, 46, 54.

18 See above, p. 86.

19 "Previewing," 217. Cf. Chase, Credibility, 17.

20 Evangeliën, 519. Cf. Hendriksen, 55.

21 See above, pp. 113, 114, 141-142.

22 See the references to Cadbury, Ropes, Trocmé (with p. 125), Dupont, Higgins, Maddox, and Marshall above, pp. 116-117.

23 So Wenham, "Gospel Origins," 120.

24 So Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 260-261; Grundmann. Cf. Chase, Credibility, 17 (following a chronological interpretation).

25 So Alford, II, 15; Potwin, "Preface," 329; Cadbury, "Commentary," 492; Burchard, Zeuge, 185; Dillon, "Previewing," 225; Marshall, "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 296; cf. Meyer, Acts, I, 9; E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 10.

26 See above, p. 158.

27 The expression "Luke-Acts" was put forward (and popularized) by Cadbury (in Making, 11; see also p. x) "in order to emphasize the historic unity of the two volumes addressed to Theophilus." Cadbury was not the first to use the term however, for as early as 1900 Bacon (in Int., 211) was writing of "the double work, Luke-Acts."

28 So Zahn, Int., III, 54; Chase, Credibility, 16; Zahn, 50; E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 10-11; Cadbury, "Commentary," 491-492; id., "Knowledge Claimed," 414; Ropes, "Preface," 71; Loisy, 71-72; McNeile, Int., 93 (following Cadbury); Creed, 1; Hauck, 16; Stonehouse, Witness, 11-13; Gilmour in IntB, VIII:26-27; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 257 (following Cadbury); Cadbury, "'We' and 'I' Passages," 131; Grundmann, 43; Higgins, "Preface and Kerygma," 79, 81; Marshall, "Luke and his 'Gospel'," 296; cf. Kümmel, Int., 128.

29 So Schneider, "Zweck," 47. Cf. Schweizer, 11: "Although Luke

## Notes for p. 177

almost certainly had his second book in mind from the outset, he did not write his preface for them both." According to Loisy (in Évangiles, I, 270), only Luke's gospel may be in view in the preface, even though it is, properly speaking, the preface for Acts, too.

<sup>30</sup> This possibility is conceded by Reuss, History, 204; Scott, Literature, 76; Maddox, Purpose, 4.

<sup>31</sup> Purpose, 3. According to W. Neil (in Acts, 25), "Few scholars, ancient or modern, have dissented from" the view that Acts constitutes "Part II of a two-volume work." Neil's representation of modern opinion, at least in the twentieth century, is not greatly exaggerated, but his representation of ancient opinion is simply wrong. Ancient opinion is best reflected (and was probably also influenced) by the fact that Luke and Acts were given distinct titles, as befitting separate works, and were always separated in the New Testament canon. The early ecclesiastical writers treat Luke and Acts as separate works, although this is more often assumed than argued. For example, Eusebius (in H.E. III.25.1) begins his account of the New Testament canon with these words: "Well then, we must set in the first place the holy quaternion of the Gospels; which are followed by the book of the Acts of the Apostles." John Chrysostom, the one ancient writer who has left us extensive comments on Acts (Origen's work not being extant), similarly treats Luke and Acts as separate works. At one point (in Ac. 1:3) he says, "And why did he not make one book of it, to send to one man Theophilus, but has divided it into two subjects (ὑποθέσεις [probably "works," as in Eusebius, H.E. V.7.1])? For clearness, and to give the brother a pause for rest. Besides, the two treatises (αἱ πραγματεῖαι) are distinct in their subject-matter." Cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 57. Zahn (in Int., III, 85n.) alleges that Augustine (in De cons. ev. IV.8) understands Luke's preface as referring "to both of Luke's books," but this is not true. Augustine only argues that Luke's preface, when compared with Ac. 1:1-2, shows "that this same Luke is also the writer of the other book which bears the name of the Acts of the Apostles."

<sup>32</sup> "If Luke conceived of the Acts as a quite independent undertaking," according to Stonehouse (in Witness, 12), "one would expect a somewhat similar preface at the beginning of the Acts." But this assumes that Luke had a similar literary design in writing Acts, which may not have been the case. The lack of a formal preface on the order of Lk. 1:1-4 at the beginning of Acts is easily accounted for by the fact that Acts was written to the same person (in the first instance) as the Gospel, and as a sequel to it. In this respect Acts is much like Philo's essay, Every Good Man Is Free, a work which, as a sequel, begins much like Acts (see below, pp. 180-181).

<sup>33</sup> Word Pictures, III, 3. So also Campbell, II, 179; Grimm, "Proömium," 54 ("den ersten Bericht").

<sup>34</sup> WGT, s.v. λόγος, I.5: "a narration, narrative: of a written narrative, a continuous account of things done, Acts 1.1." LSJ,

## Notes for pp. 177-178

s.v. λόγος, V.3, gives as a specific sense of the broad meaning "tale, story" both "histories" (in the plural) and "a historical work" (in the singular).

35 So LSJ, s.v., II.2: "book as the division of a work;" Lampe, s.v., B.1: "division or volume of a work."

36 So LSJ, s.v., I.4: "a division of a book."

37 Hist. II.1.1. See also A. Mauersberger, Polybios-Lexikon (Berlin, 1956- ), s.vv. βιβλίον, βιβλος, θυβλίον, and βύβλος (each of which denotes a "Teil eines Gesamtwerkes"), and cf. s.v. λόγος, I. ④ ("hist. Bericht," but never "Buch").

38 Bib. hist. II.1.1.

39 Ap. II.1. See also II.296. See also Jos. Conc., s.vv. βιβλίον and βιβλος (each meaning "book, scroll"), and cf. s.v. λόγος (meaning "narrative, story" and "part (of a book)," but not "book" or "volume").

40 E.g., his second book begins: Ἐν μὲν τῷ πρὸ τούτου βιβλίῳ, φιλτάτε Ἀρκίε, . . .

41 In De usu partium, at the close of his first book (I.25), Galen lists the contents of the following sixteen books, referring to the first book (just completed) as a λόγος, the tenth as βιβλίον, the eleventh and seventeenth as γράμματα, the sixteenth as a σύγγραμμα, and the rest only by number (e.g., διὰ τοῦ τρίτου and ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ πέμπτῳ). These terms are clearly used synonymously. Elsewhere in this work (which we will cite by the volume, page, and line number of Helmreich's edition) Galen uses the word λόγος to indicate both an entire work (vol. I: 70.20, 85.26, 111.18, 122.25, 263.13, 278.12, 374.18; vol. II: 111.1, 167.25, 173.19, 183.10, 259.26, 448.11) and an individual book of it (vol. I: 60.7, 64.12, 65.5, 66.14, 68.27, 69.10, 21, 299.9, 375.12, 437.15, 441.15, 453.19; vol. II: 1.9, 53.17, 54.17, 93.10, 107.2, 111.10, 124.12, 190.1, 202.11, 233.1, 6, 266.19, 21, 284.15, 285.6, 293.11, 324.18, 332.25, 336.24, 337.5, 436.21, 437.3, 451.20, 27). The words βιβλίον (vol. I: 249.11; vol. II: 105.7, 233.8; cf. I.86.5, 157.2; II.205.26) and γράμματα (vol. I: 65.10, 299.5; vol. II: 1.7, 21.9, 26, 49.11, 233.3, 267.2, 275.27) also denote an individual book. Galen's pattern of usage is not consistent in his various works. For example, in De naturalibus facultatibus (which we will cite by the page number of the LCL edition), written while De usu partium was being written (see p. 143), Galen often uses the word λόγος, either in the singular (5 (bis), 10, 96, 216 (bis), 280, 296) or in the plural (174, 280) to denote an entire work. He sometimes calls a book within a work a λόγος (218, 222, 290), but uses γράμμα just as much (112, 116, 280, 326), and also σύγγραμμα (110). (Hippocrates' short work On the Nature of Man is termed a βιβλίον on p. 204.) In De anatomicis administrationibus, written shortly after De usu partium, we find in the portion extant in Greek (cited by the page number of Kühn's edition) that the word βιβλίον, neglected in the two previously mentioned works, emerges

## Notes for pp. 178-180

as the term which characteristically denotes a book in a multi-volume work (see 217, 292, 353, 354, 417, 420 (bis), 421, 458, 470 (bis), 571, 589, 591, 651, 659). A book is also called a γράφμα (366, 371, 416, 588, 589, 652, 656, 658, 660) or a ὑπόμνημα (683), and occasionally a λόγος (279, 579, 707), although λόγος more often designates a complete work (218, 236, 417, 421, 689). It is most difficult, if not impossible, to account for Galen's varying usage. Perhaps he generally referred to a particular book as a λόγος when he thought of it as a discussion complete in itself, but used βιβλίον and γράφμα simply to denote a division of a work.

42 A search of second-century Greek literature (at least at the beginning and end of the individual books of multi-volume works) reveals that the words βιβλος and βιβλίον, but not λόγος, were used to designate individual books. For βιβλος see Appian, Hist. Rom. praef.14, 15; Artemidorus, Oneir. I.82; II.praef., 70; Athenaeus, Deip. 127d, 185; Clement of Alexandria, Strom. VI.1.3; Irenaeus, Haer. III.praef., 25.7 (cf. I.31.4, extant only in Latin); IV.praef.1, 2, 3 (cf. II.praef.1, 7.3, 12.1, 7, 14.9, extant only in Latin), 32.2, 41.4; V.praef. For βιβλίον see Artemidorus, Oneir. III.praef., 66; IV.praef., 84; V.praef.; Philostratus, Vit. soph. praef.; Pollux, Onom. III.155; VI.1; VII.1; IX.1; X.1; Polyaeus, Strat. I.praef.13, and the opening line of books II-VIII. If an example of a similar second-century use of λόγος (apart from Galen) could be found, it would be an exceptional case.

43 Indeed, one may question whether Galen's usage is actually his, and not that of various later editors.

44 So Meyer, I, 265; id., Acts, I, 1, 9, 32 (though he is sometimes ambiguous); Alexander, Acts, I, 2; Holtzmann, Apog., 23 (but cf. p. 4, supporting "eine relative Unabhängigkeit"); Zahn, Int., III, 85-86n.; Loisy, Actes, 133; Cadbury, "Commentary," 491; Jacquier, Actes, 3; Cadbury, Making, 8-9; Lake-Cadbury, Acts, 2; Wikenhauser, Apog., 24; Bauernfeind, Apog., 19; W. Michaelis, Einl., 129, 130; Bruce, Acts, 65; Dupont, Actes, 35; van Unnik, "Purpose," 7-8; Haenchen, Acts, 136-137; Thompson, 2; Kümmel, Int., 156 (but cf. pp. 157-159); Martin, Foundations, I, 244 (apparently); Schneider, Apog., I, 76, 191; Fitzmyer, 9; Talbert, 11. Dissenting opinions are offered by J. B. Lightfoot, "Acts of the Apostles," in A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by W. Smith and J. M. Fuller (2nd ed. (of vol. I); London, 1893), I: pt. I, 25-43, at p. 26; Stählin, Apog., 4, 11; Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 10-11, 15n.; id., Apog., 25.

45 Acts, 2. See also Bruce, Acts, 65.

46 Int., III, 85n.; Apog., 12n.

47 Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur (Berlin, 1882), 28.

48 Ibid., 28-29.

49 Ibid., 29.

## Notes for pp. 180-183

- 50 De usu partium, III.9.
- 51 E.g., see Meyer, Acts, I, 32.
- 52 Xenophon, Anabasis, I, 344. Thus, L. S. Potwin (in "Preface," 331) is wrong to cite these summaries as written by Xenophon.
- 53 BAG, s.v. λόγος, 1.a.ζ.
- 54 Quod omnis probus liber sit 1.
- 55 Zahn (in ApG., 12n.) describes the first essay as the "Gegenstück" of the second.
- 56 Making, 9. Cf. Schille, ApG., 66.
- 57 Parmen., Steph. III, 127C-D.
- 58 See R. W. Macan, Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books (London, 1895), I, x-xi, 180n.; W. W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus (Oxford, 1912), II, 14. These writers suggest that "the first part" which Herodotus has in mind is I.1-94, but when writing Book V he may have had a vaguer notion of "the first part" of his work. The vagueness of these "parts" is indicated by the fact that in VII.93 Herodotus locates I.171 ἐν τοῖσι πρώτοισι τῶν λόγων.
- 59 See the translations of Cary, Rawlinson, and Macaulay.
- 60 Such is the understanding of Powell, who translates the phrase as "in the first of my histories."
- 61 This is overlooked by J. E. Powell in his A Lexicon to Herodotus (Cambridge, 1938), s.v. λόγος, 4.d.θ, resulting in his misclassification of V.36 and VII.93.
- 62 Cary, Rawlinson, Macaulay, and Godley make no distinction between the singular and plural forms, rendering both as "history."
- 63 According to LSJ, s.v. λόγος, V.3, λόγος in these passages denotes "one section" of an historical work, whether the word is used in the singular or the plural.
- 64 So How and Wells, op. cit., II, 14-15. Note that I.75 places I.121-130 and VI.39 places VI.103 ἐν ἄλλῳ λόγῳ.
- 65 It is surprising, therefore, that LSJ (s.v. λόγος, V.3) should say that λόγος in this usage is "like later βίβλος," citing these passages as evidence, followed by Ac. 1:1. There is of course a similarity between the sections of a work and the books of a multi-volume work, but the sections to which Herodotus is referring are not books.
- 66 Int., III, 85n.

## Notes for pp. 183-186

67 So Schneckenburger, Zweck, 7-13; Grimm, "Proömium," 56-57; Holtzmann, APG., 4; Stählin, APG., 4. Even Beck (in Prolog, 37) admits this, but his gratuitous explanation for Luke's second narrative of the Ascension, namely that Theophilus desired further information about it, is hardly adequate, for it fails to recognize that the Ascension both concludes the history of Jesus (on earth) and introduces the history of the church (with Jesus in heaven).

68 So Grimm, "Proömium," 58; Holtzmann, APG., 4.

69 Purpose, 5. Cf. Thompson, 2.

70 In Lk. 4:23-24 Jesus contrasts his acceptance at Capernaum (with attending miracles) with the skepticism which he is encountering in his hometown "country" of Nazareth (with a corresponding lack of miracles). Then in vss. 25-27 he illustrates the principle involved by noting that Elijah and Elisha performed miracles for foreigners while Israelites with similar needs were bypassed. It is unwarranted to see in the rejection at Nazareth and acceptance (by Jews!) at Capernaum a deliberate Lucan anticipation of the eventual Jewish rejection and gentile acceptance of the Christian gospel. The reference to the activity of Elijah and Elisha is intended to explain the similar activity of Jesus, not (pace, e.g., Creed, Luke, 66) to prefigure the future responses of Jews and gentiles to the gospel. As Meyer (in Mark and Luke, II, 28n.) aptly observes, "Whether in general Luke looked on the rejection of Christ in Nazareth as a 'significant prelude for the rejection of Christ by His whole people' (Weiss in the Stud. u. Krit. 1861, p. 697), cannot be decided at all, as he gives no hint on the subject." What Luke does not hint, his interpreters ought not to imagine.

71 Purpose, 5. Maddox says that this Lucan procedure "has often been observed," perhaps in confusion with the widely held view that Luke omits certain Marcan pericopes because he prefers to relate a similar one (in his gospel, not in Acts) drawn from another source.

72 Cf. Lk. 22:54, 66-71.

73 Compare Lk. 23:34 (if authentic) with Ac. 7:60, and Lk. 23:46 with Ac. 7:59.

74 Purpose, 5.

75 Maddox (*ibid.*) also suggests that Lk. 21:12-19 anticipates the narration of persecution in Acts, but it, like its synoptic parallels (for which no "Acts" followed), anticipates the fact of persecution, not its narration. He also suggests (on pp. 5-6) that the mention of a single cloud in Lk. 21:27 anticipates the narrative in Ac. 1:9-11, but it at most anticipates the event of ascension, not the narration of it, and in any case the connection is dubious.

76 Purpose, 6. So also E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 11.

## Notes for pp. 186-191

77 So Schneckenburger, Zweck, 9; Dillon, "Previewing," 218n.

78 Purpose, 6.

## CHAPTER 10

<sup>1</sup> The results of our exegesis are summarized on pp. 171, 172-173.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 68-69.

<sup>3</sup> Pace Hahn (in Lucas, I, 23, 76), according to whom the narratives in view were merely notes taken down from the apostolic discourses. But see above, pp. 29-31.

<sup>4</sup> See above, pp. 33-35.

<sup>5</sup> So Lagrange, Luc, 4; Schmid, 30; Wikenhauser, Int., 210; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 56. The distinction between the "many" and the "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" would not be pressed by Schlatter (in Lukas, 22), Creed (in Luke, 4), Ellis (in Luke, 63), and Fitzmyer (in Luke, 291), but it seems natural enough, and is recognized by most commentators. Because of the distinction, the First Gospel, written by the apostle Matthew, is not in view, according to Bloomfield, I, 257; Alford, I, 436; Bisping, 147; Farrar, 43; Plummer, 2; Arndt, 9 (nor is the apostolic Mark in view!); cf. Godet, I, 56. Nor can the apostolic Q be meant, according to Meyer, I, 274; B. Weiss, 264n.; cf. J. Weiss, 410.

<sup>6</sup> This conclusion is reached by Wilke, Urevangelist, 112; Credner, Einl., 156-158; Bleek, Evangelien-Kritik, 67; Godet, I, 56; Holtzmann, Einl., 387; J. Weiss, 410; Blass, "Gospels," 396; Machen, Literature, 159; Klostermann, 2; Goguel, Int., I, 116; Loisy, 73; Manson, 2; W. Michaelis, Einl., 19; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363; id., Weg Jesu, 2; Schweizer, 11; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 429; cf. Dillon, "Previewing," 210.

<sup>7</sup> Zahn (in Int., III, 49-50; see also Lucas, 23) argues that Mark "exactly suits" Luke's description, and so is in view. (Cf. Machen, Literature, 160n.) He supposes that the phrase "from the beginning" in vs. 2 enables someone who became an eyewitness well along in Jesus' ministry, such as Mark, to be included among the "many." But this misconstrues the expression "from the beginning," which refers to the beginning of the apostolic witness to Jesus, not to the beginning of that to which they bore witness (see above, pp. 82-86). Zahn also sees in the expression "have undertaken" in vs. 1 an intimation that Mark left his work unfinished at 16:8, but such an interpretation is far-fetched. We are hardly to believe that all of Luke's predecessors were unable to complete their writings.

<sup>8</sup> So Meyer, I, 274; Godet, I, 56 (where "excluded" should be "included"); Grimm, "Proömium," 71; B. Weiss, Int., 298; W.

## Notes for pp. 191-192

Michaelis, Einl., 20, 83; cf. Easton, 3; pace Sneed, "Exegesis," 40. Contrary to Trocmé (in Livre des Actes, 43), the words "to draw up a narrative account" are not so vague that any written source used by Luke could be included within their scope.

<sup>9</sup> So Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 258; Marxsen, Int., 156; Schulz, Stunde, 243; Schürmann, I, 6-7; Ernst, 47; Schmithals, 9, 18. But J. Weiss (in "Evangelien," 410) and Easton (in Luke, 3) properly point out that Luke's written sources, on the two-source theory, were not many in number. This assumes, of course, as we have argued (see above, pp. 19-25), that the word "many" in Lk. 1:1 is not merely a rhetorical expression.

<sup>10</sup> See Bisping, 147 (perhaps); B. Weiss, 264n.; Keil, 182; Feine, Überlieferung, 4; Gloag, Int., 228; Zahn, Int., III, 49-50; J. Weiss, 410; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271 (but cf. his Luc, 72); Zahn, 23, 52; Machen, Literature, 160 ("perhaps"); Goguel, Int., I, 115; Streeter, Gospels, 558-559; Robertson, "Implications," 320; Easton, 3; Creed, 3; Robertson, II, 3; Hauck, 2; Luce; Rengstorff, 13; Clogg, Int., 240; W. Michaelis, Einl., 20, 83; Heard, Int., 46; Geldenhuys, 24-25, 52; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 102; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 258; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 43; Reicke, Luke, 19; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 261; Marxsen, Int., 156; Ellis, 63; Fuller, Int., 118-119; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 2n., 3; Schulz, Stunde, 243-244; Schürmann, I, 6n.; Vögtle, "Widmung," 41; Sneed, "Exegesis," 40; Martin, Foundations, I, 120, 139; Ernst, 47; Schneider, 38; Hendriksen, 55; Marshall, 41; Schmithals, 9, 18; Fitzmyer, 291; Dillon, "Previewing," 207; Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 175-176, 188; Schweizer, 2; Juel, Luke-Acts, 15; cf. Styler, "Priority," 304.

<sup>11</sup> See Feine, Überlieferung, 4, 8; J. Weiss, 410; Goguel, Int., I, 115; Streeter, Gospels, 559 (perhaps); Easton, 3 (perhaps); Creed, 3; Robertson, II, 3; Hauck, 2; Luce; Clogg, Int., 240; Heard, Int., 46; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 258 (though Q was probably oral, p. 258n.); Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 43 (probably); Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 261; Marxsen, Int., 156; Fuller, Int., 118-119; Harrington, 32; Schulz, Stunde, 243-244; Schürmann, I, 6n.; Vögtle, "Widmung," 41; Sneed, "Exegesis," 40; Ernst, 47; Schneider, 38; Marshall, 41; Schmithals, 9, 18; Fitzmyer, 291; Dillon, "Previewing," 207; Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 175-176, 188; Schweizer, 2; Juel, Luke-Acts, 15.

<sup>12</sup> See Feine, Überlieferung, 4, 11-12; J. Weiss, 410; Easton, 3; Hauck, 5; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 258; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 43 (so far as it was written); Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 261; Marxsen, Int., 156; Fuller, Int., 118-119; Schulz, Stunde, 243-244; Schürmann, I, 6n.; Sneed, "Exegesis," 40; Ernst, 47; Schneider, 38 (so far as it was written); Schmithals, 9, 18; Fitzmyer, 291 (though it was not "solely written!"); Dillon, "Previewing," 207; Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 175-176, 188; Schweizer, 2-3; cf. Gloag, Int., 227; Streeter, Gospels, 559 (perhaps); Creed, 3; Robertson, II, 3; Hendriksen, 55; Marshall, 41.

<sup>13</sup> See Credner, Einl., 206 (very possibly); Meyer, I, 273-274;

## Notes for pp. 192-194

Schanz, 48 (perhaps); Schlatter, Lukas, 19; cf. de Wette, 5 (definitely Matthew or its source; probably the Mark known to Papias); Loisy, Évangiles, I, 271 (perhaps an earlier form of Matthew); Rengstorff, 13 (perhaps Matthew); Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 43 (perhaps Matthew); Harrington, 32 (Mark and "the Greek version of Aramaic Matthew"). According to P. Schanz (in Lucas, 47-48) and Holtzmann (in Synoptiker, 303), a reference to the canonical gospels was first seen by Maldonatus.

<sup>14</sup> See Davidson, Study, I, 431; Farmer, Synoptic Problem, 221-223 (probably). Cf. de Wette, Int., 148, 161.

<sup>15</sup> See de Wette, 5 (perhaps the Gospel to the Hebrews); Feine, Überlieferung, 4 ("die synoptische Grundschrift"); J. Weiss, 410 (unspecified); Rengstorff, 13 (other unspecified gospels); W. Michaelis, Einl., 20 (perhaps some "evangelienartige Darstellungen"); Wikenhauser, Int., 211 ("minor written sources"); Schürmann, I, 6n. (an infancy narrative, a passion narrative (perhaps), and an account of the Lord's Supper); Hendriksen, 55 (an infancy narrative); Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 175-176, 188 (an infancy narrative and a passion narrative); cf. Streeter, Gospels, 559 (perhaps); Robertson, II, 3; Marshall, 41.

<sup>16</sup> For appeals to the results of source criticism, see Grimm, "Proömium," 61-62, 71 (Luke independent of Mark and Matthew); B. Weiss, 264n.; Feine, Überlieferung, 4, 8, 11-12; Hahn, I, 76 (Luke independent); Gloag, Int., 227-228; Goguel, Int., I, 115; Streeter, Gospels, 559; Robertson, II, 3; Rengstorff, 13; Heard, Int., 46; Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," 258; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 43; Reicke, Luke, 19; Schürmann, "Evangelienchrift," 261; Marxsen, Int., 156; Fuller, Int., 118-119; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 3; Ernst, 47; Schmithals, 9, 18; Fitzmyer, 291; Dillon, "Previewing," 207; cf. Klostermann, 3.

<sup>17</sup> See Lardner, Supplement, I, 80-84; Bloomfield, I, 257; Credner, Einl., 157-158; Davidson, Int., I, 180 (but cf. his Study, I, 431); Alford, I, 436-437; Godet, I, 56-57; II, 428; Grimm, "Proömium," 61-63, 71; Hahn, I, 76; Lesêtre, "Méthode," 172; Plummer, 2 (but cf. p. xxiii); Beck, Prolog, 38; Arndt, 9.

<sup>18</sup> Pace Zahn, discussed above, n. 7. C. F. Keil (in Markus und Lukas, 182) offers the lame argument that the "many" were pupils and helpers of the apostles, as was Mark. But this does not point to Mark unless all of these pupils and helpers wrote narrative accounts. Farmer (in Synoptic Problem, 221-223) argues that Matthew suits Luke's description well.

<sup>19</sup> See above, pp. 142-145.

<sup>20</sup> Styler (in "Priority," 304) makes the curious assertion that Luke's reference to many predecessors "makes it natural to suppose that he follows Mark in time rather than vice versa." But surely others, perhaps including Mark, could still have written after Luke.

<sup>21</sup> According to Haenchen (in Weg Jesu, 3), Luke mentioned the

## Notes for pp. 194-197

narratives of his predecessors simply to justify his own writing of a gospel, and thus had no need to indicate whether he had used any of them as sources. However, we have seen that this explanation is wrong (see above, pp. 92-93).

22 So Keil, 173; Hahn, I, 20, 70; Burton, "Purpose and Plan," 249; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 50. This is usually assumed without being stated.

23 See above, pp. 118-119.

24 So Davidson, Int., I, 179, 409; van Oosterzee, 12; Bleek, Int., I, 284; Davidson, Study, I, 426; Godet, I, 57; B. Weiss, 266; A. B. Bruce, 5; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 327; Wikenhauser, Int., 210; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4," 427; cf. Cadbury, Making, 63-64.

25 So Hahn, I, 23; Plummer, xxiii; Zahn, Int., III, 52.

26 So A. B. Bruce, 5; Bartsch, Wachet, 13.

27 See de Wette, Int., 148; Wernle, Synoptische Frage, 2; Barth, Einl., 222-223; Klostermann, 3; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 50; E. Meyer, Ursprung, I, 9-10; Hauck, 2, 16; Schmid, 29; Reicke, Luke, 19; Caird, 43; Marxsen, Int., 156; Kümmel, Int., 47; Ernst, 47; Fitzmyer, 290-291 (cf. p. 65). This assumption is evidently made by the many commentators who identify the narratives of Lk. 1:1 (or at least some of them) as Luke's sources, without explanation.

28 So Schürmann, I, 6; Marshall, 41; Schmithals, 9; cf. Meyer, I, 275.

29 So Hahn, I, 22; Plummer, xxiii.

30 So Nösgen, 283; Hahn, I, 22.

31 So Holtzmann, Evangelien, 247.

32 So Holtzmann, Evangelien, 247; Nösgen, 283.

33 See above, pp. 146-154.

34 See above, pp. 114, 133-154.

35 See above, pp. 114-115, 131-133.

36 So Westcott (an advocate of the Latin interpretation), Int., 191: "The same term (παρακολούθειν) describes the personal attendance on a teacher and the careful following of teaching. The long companionship seems to be the criterion of the complete knowledge."

37 See above, pp. 115-116, 117-127.

38 Face de Wette, 2; Davidson, Int., I, 179; Grimm, "Proömium," 70-71; B. Weiss, Markus und Lukas, 7th ed., I, 265; Feine, Über-

## Notes for pp. 197-199

lieferung, 2; Rengstorf, 7; Schmid, 29; Thiessen, Int., 126 (probably); Schürmann, I, 7, 10-11; van Unnik, "Once More," 17; du Plessis, "Purpose," 266.

39 So Nösgen, 283; cf. Holtzmann, Evangelien, 247.

40 Lenski, 20.

41 See de Wette, Int., 148; Davidson, Int., I, 179-180; Meyer, I, 261; Davidson, Study, I, 426; Godet, I, 65; Gloag, Int., 226; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 18; Breen, I, 22; Chase, Credibility, 18-19; Clogg, Int., 240, 242; Hauck, Entstehung, 139; Stonehouse, Witness, 34; Wikenhauser, Int., 210; Harrison, Int., 201; Wikenhauser-Schmid, Einl., 256; Müller, Traditionsprozeß, 185, 186; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 376-377. According to B. Weiss (in Int., 298), Wernle (in Synoptische Frage, 2), and Loisy (in Évangiles, I, 272; Luc, 73-74), however, Luke knew the oral gospel tradition only through written records of it.

42 See Bisping, 143-144; Keil, 173-174; Zahn, Int., III, 51; Beck, Prolog, 9 (but cf. pp. 38-41); Steinmueller, 229-230; Guthrie, Int., 227; cf. Arndt, 8-9, 39. Exclusively oral sources are in view according to Webster-Wilkinson, I, 238 (apparently); Nösgen, 283; cf. Hahn, I, 19-22 (but cf. pp. 23, 70).

43 So Scott, Literature, 31; Loisy, Origins, 74 (the third or fourth generation); Marxsen, Int., 161; Fuller, Int., 119; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 2 (apparently); Spivey-Smith, Anatomy, 151 ("apparently"); Kümmel, Int., 130; Conzelmann-Lindemann, Arbeitsbuch, 427; Martin, Foundations, I, 119-120; Schneider, 38; Koester, Int., II, 311-312; Schmithals, 17; Fitzmyer, 289; Dillon, "Previewing," 210; Juel, Luke-Acts, 7; Mußner, "Gemeinde," 384. Cf. Baur, Evangelien, 517.

44 So Meyer, I, 276; A. B. Bruce, 459; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 11; Loisy, 74-75; Barth, Einl., 202; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 269 (apparently); Schulz, Stunde, 237; Reiling-Swellengrebel, 9; cf. Holtzmann, Einl., 386 (putting Luke in a later generation); Wernle, Synoptische Frage, 2 (the second or third generation); Wrede, Entstehung, 46-47 (a later generation); Marshall, Historian and Theologian, 41 ("the second or a subsequent generation of believers"); Nickle, Synoptic Gospels, 145.

45 See above, p. 142.

46 See above, pp. 72-73.

47 So Lagrange, 4.

48 "Once More," 11. Van Unnik thinks that Luke's preface "does not say a word about" the time involved, but there we differ with him. Cf. Glöckner, Verkündigung, 19-21.

49 So Schürmann, I, 7. Cf. B. Weiss, Markus und Lukas, 7th ed., I, 265; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 272.

## Notes for pp. 199-201

- <sup>50</sup> See above, p. 66.
- <sup>51</sup> So Uchida, "Synoptic Problem," 469.
- <sup>52</sup> Cf. *ibid.*: "It is certainly arguable that it is somewhat puzzling why Luke did not make a more specific reference to his sources if he employed basic sources like Mark and Q." This admission comes from an advocate of the two-source theory.
- <sup>53</sup> This is admitted by D. Guthrie (in *Int.*, 227), even though he accepts Luke's use of written sources, including Mark (see p. 235): "Luke seems to suggest that he is writing an independent account, for although he mentions the earlier attempts he does not say that he used them."
- <sup>54</sup> *Making*, 63. By "followed" Cadbury means "used (as a source)."
- <sup>55</sup> See, e.g., Diodorus of Sicily, *Bib. hist.* I.3.5, 4.1; Strabo, *Geog.* I.2.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* I.7.3 (cf. I.89.1); Philo, *Vit. Mos.* I.4; Dioscorides, *De materia medica*, praef.5 (referring to information gained ἐξ ἱστορίας, in addition to personal observations and inquiries, i.e. from the written accounts of his predecessors (not "histories," of course), as in § 1); Josephus, *Ant.* I.5 (cf. Thackeray's introductory remarks, pp. xii-xiv); *id.*, *Ap.* I.2-5; Appian, *Hist. Rom.* praef.12; Arrian, *Alex. Anab.* I.praef.; Artemidorus, *Oneir.* I.praef.; Dio, *Hist. Rom.* I.1.2.
- <sup>56</sup> So, e.g., Hippocrates, *De prisca medicina*, 1; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* I.2-3; Josephus, *B.J.* I.6-7, 15 (cf. Thackeray's remarks, pp. xix-xxii).
- <sup>57</sup> *Hist.* I.4.3.
- <sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, I.4.
- <sup>59</sup> On Polybius's sources see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1957-79), I, 26-35, and on the writers alluded to in I.4.3 see I, 44-45.
- <sup>60</sup> So J. D. Michaelis, *Int.*, III, pt. I, 267; Thiersch, *Kritik*, 166; Davidson, *Int.*, I, 178; Grimm, "Proömium," 70; Plummer, 2; A. B. Bruce, 5; Klostermann, 2; Lagrange, 6; Cadbury, "Commentary," 493; Easton, 1; Creed, 3; Vaganay, *Problème synoptique*, 43; Trocmé, *Livre des Actes*, 43-44; Ellis, 63; Haenchen, *Weg Jesu*, 3; Delling in *TDNT*, VIII:32n.; Kümmel, *Int.*, 129.
- <sup>61</sup> So Glöckner, *Verkündigung*, 12. But see above, pp. 90-91.
- <sup>62</sup> See above, pp. 26-27.
- <sup>63</sup> For general statements of this sort see Zahn, *Int.*, III, 44-45; Klostermann, 2; Cadbury, "Commentary," 493 (but cf. his *Making*, 303); Trocmé, *Livre des Actes*, 43-44. Loisy (in *Évangiles*, I, 273) argues (plausibly enough) that Luke's implied criticisms need not all apply to all of his predecessors, but the fact remains that

## Notes for pp. 201-202

Luke does not differentiate among them in his preface in any way.

<sup>64</sup> See Meyer, I, 274; Grimm, "Proömium," 70; v. Hofmann, 7; Cadbury, Making, 303; Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, 63; Lenski, 25, 32; cf. Easton, 1 (seeing criticism in vs. 4, however). Blass (in Philology, 18) roundly asserts, "I do not think there is any trace of criticism in the whole proem." (But later, in "Gospels," 396, Blass is less emphatic, saying only that Luke "has certainly disdained to compare his work with that of others as something better, in the usual manner of such prefaces." And on p. 395 he accepts that Luke intended to write a gospel that was more complete than those of his predecessors.) B. Weiss (in Markus und Lukas, 253, 267), Robertson (in Luke the Historian, 45), and Hauck (in Lukas, 2, 17) deny that Luke disparages his predecessors, but they accept that he seeks to surpass them. Such an intention, however, implies mild criticism.

<sup>65</sup> So Olshausen, I, 81; Bloomfield, I, 258; Davidson, Int., I, 178; Alford, I, 437; Bisping, 149; B. Weiss, 253; Holtzmann, Einl., 386-387; Nösgen, 287; Hahn, I, 20; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 15; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 272; Barth, Einl., 176, 196; Spitta, Grundschrift, viii; Zahn, 23, 55; Goguel, Int., I, 117; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 313; Scott, Literature, 31; Heard, Int., 80; Vaganay, Problème synoptique, 43, 103; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 44; Haenchen, "Das 'Wir'," 363 (probably); Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 260; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 3; Schneider, 40; Hendriksen, 55; Fitzmyer, 291 (probably); cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 70; pace Keil, 183; Cadbury, "Commentary," 503. Most of these writers state only one part of the position, and it is not always clear which word or words they are basing their position on.

<sup>66</sup> So J. D. Michaelis, Int., III, pt. I, 267; Olshausen, I, 81; Bloomfield, I, 258; Credner, Einl., 145, 154-155; Guericke, Isagogik, 177n.; Davidson, Int., I, 178; Reuss, History, 203; Bisping, 149; B. Weiss, 253; Holtzmann, Einl., 386; Hahn, I, 20; Bacon, Int., 217; Barth, Einl., 176, 196; Spitta, Grundschrift, viii; Machen, Literature, 160, 161; Goguel, Int., I, 117, 453; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 313; Scott, Literature, 31-32; Heard, Int., 80; Trocmé, Livre des Actes, 44; Haenchen, Weg Jesu, 3; Fitzmyer, 291 (probably); cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 70; Wrede, Entstehung, 45; pace Ramsay, Bethlehem, 15; Robertson, Luke the Historian, 52 (cf. p. 45); Marshall, 40.

<sup>67</sup> So Olshausen, I, 81; Nösgen, 287; apparently Fitzmyer, 291 (probably); cf. Craddock, Gospels, 103.

<sup>68</sup> So Olshausen, I, 81; Bloomfield, I, 258; Credner, Einl., 145-146, 154-155; Ebrard, Geschichte, 146; Davidson, Int., I, 178; B. Weiss, 253; Holtzmann, Einl., 387; Nösgen, 287; Hahn, I, 20, 78; Bacon, Int., 217; Barth, Einl., 176, 196; Loisy, Évangiles, I, 273; Wrede, Entstehung, 45; Zahn, 55; Machen, Literature, 160, 161; Lagrange, 6; Goguel, Int., I, 117, 453; Loisy, 72 (probably); Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 313; Schürmann, "Evangelien-schrift," 261; Harrison, Int., 201 (perhaps); Schneider, 40; Craddock, Gospels, 103; Fitzmyer, 291 (probably); cf. Grimm, "Proömium," 70; pace

## Notes for pp. 202-209

Ramsay, Bethlehem, 15.

69 See above, pp. 104-106.

70 See above, pp. 172-173.

71 See above, p. 91.

72 See above, pp. 66-67.

73 See above, pp. 90-91. Breen (in Exposition, I, 20) comments: "Luke seems to infer that he is writing for an existing need, and that therefore the efforts of those who had tried to order the events of Christ's life had failed to accomplish that for which they strove."

74 That Luke's reference to certainty implies that his predecessors' works were deficient is noted by Bloomfield, I, 257, 258; Credner, Einl., 146, 154-155; Ebrard, Geschichte, 145, 146; Thiersch, Kritik, 166; Davidson, Int., I, 178; id., Study, I, 427; Ramsay, Bethlehem, 14; Beck, Prolog, 6; Barth, Einl., 176, 196; Easton, 1; Bartsch, Wachet, 13; Marxsen, Int., 156 (apparently); Schulz, Stunde, 244 (apparently); Craddock, Gospels, 103.

75 So Ebrard, Geschichte, 146.

76 J. D. Michaelis (in Int., III, pt. I, 94, 267) suggests that Luke (and Matthew and Mark, too) followed such a procedure.

77 Jesus, 3.

78 We would reach the same conclusion if we were to adopt the only alternative interpretation that we find at all defensible, namely that Luke has "followed with his mind (i.e. understood) them all (i.e. the whole gospel history) for a long time (or, from the beginning)." See above, pp. 131-133 and 197.

79 Luke assumes, of course, that the apostolic tradition is historically accurate. This is implied by his description of the apostles as "eyewitnesses and servants of the word," for by "eyewitnesses" he means those who could recall what had actually happened (see above, pp. 73-77) and by "servants of the word" he means those who had received their tradition by revelation (see above, pp. 77-82).

80 Cf. Eusebius, H.E. VI.14.5, 6, relating "a tradition of the primitive elders" regarding the origin of Mark's gospel as related by Clement of Alexandria: Mark, "as one who had followed him (i.e. Peter) for a long time and remembered what had been spoken" by him, was asked "to make a record of what was said." The form of this tradition, we have argued (see above, pp. 147-148), has its roots in Luke's preface (by way of comparison). Mark recorded what he remembered from having followed Peter for a long time, just as Luke (by natural inference from his preface) recorded what he remembered from having been a follower of all the apostles for a long time.

## CHAPTER 11

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. M. Tuckett, The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis, SNTSMS 44 (Cambridge, 1983).

<sup>2</sup> So Peake, Int., 109. It is surprising that this argument has only rarely been used against the oral theory.

<sup>3</sup> See Stanton, Gospels, II, 115-116n.; H. Ridderbos, The Coming of the Kingdom, E.T. (Philadelphia, 1962), 478; (especially) Marshall, 772; Gundry, Matthew, 481; cf. Cranfield, Mark, 403.

<sup>4</sup> Synoptic Gospels, 79-80.

<sup>5</sup> Formation, 125.

<sup>6</sup> Wikenhauser-Schmid, Einl., 273.

<sup>7</sup> See his Gospels, 159, 160.

<sup>8</sup> These figures, and others in this chapter for which no source is given, are based on an analysis of the synoptic material undertaken by the present author.

<sup>9</sup> Synopse, 68.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Streeter, Gospels, 159-160.

<sup>11</sup> Synoptic Gospels, 130.

<sup>12</sup> The 771 verses of paralleled material consist of 592 verses of Mark that are paralleled in Matthew and/or Luke and 179 verses of Matthew that are paralleled only in Luke (in 169 verses). Of the 1031 unparalleled verses, 368 are in Matthew (of which 111 are in paralleled sections), 69 are in Mark (of which 49 are in paralleled sections), and 594 (not counting 4 in the preface) are in Luke (of which 96 are in paralleled sections).

<sup>13</sup> Int., 55. See also Peake, Int., 107, 108; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 323.

<sup>14</sup> Int., 107.

<sup>15</sup> This will be discussed in detail in chapter 12.

<sup>16</sup> Gospel History, 34.

<sup>17</sup> Evangelien-Kritik, 70; Int., I, 253. See also Ewald, Hauptproblem, 12-14; Sanday, "Survey," 186; Gloag, Int., 55; Peake, Int., 107.

<sup>18</sup> Evangelien-Kritik, 70-71; Int., 253-254.

## Notes for pp. 221-228

- 19 "Survey," 186-187. Cf. Chavannes, "Ressemblances," 151.
- 20 "Survey," 187.
- 21 Int., 107-108.
- 22 So de Wette, Int., 145; Bleek, Int., 254; B. Weiss, Life, I, 28; Stanton, Gospels, II, 24; McNeile, Int., 60; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 323; Hoskyns-Davey, Riddle, 76; Wikenhauser-Schmid, Einl., 277; Martin, Foundations, I, 140; Nickle, Synoptic Gospels, 79, 80.
- 23 "Argument from Order," 253-254. Sanders follows Huck's division of material into pericopes.
- 24 Gospels, II, 24.
- 25 For Matthew and Luke the data are somewhat difficult to quantify. There are many small units of material, especially in material arranged differently. Also, the two writers will sometimes place sequences of units in different places, while retaining the same order within the sequence. And the order of consecutive sections is sometimes simply reversed. For Lk. 1:1-9:50 33 out of 63 units of material paralleled by Matthew are placed in the same order by Matthew (52%), for 9:51-18:14 only 3 out of 47 (6%), but for 18:15-24:53 43 out of 53 (81%), for a total of 79 out of 163 (48%).
- 26 I.e. the teaching on judging and giving, where Mt. 7:1-2 and Lk. 6:37-38 agree against Mk. 4:24b. Mark's divergence is explained by the fact that he does not present the Matthean and Lucan context for this teaching. Sanders (in "Argument from Order," 255) proposes six other instances of agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark, but one involves an Old Testament quotation applicable in two different passages (no. 2), two involve order within sections (nos. 3 and 4), in one the parallelism is incomplete (no. 5), and in the other two nonparallel material is compared (nos. 6 and 7).
- 27 Cf. Sanders, "Argument from Order," 257-258. This fact, which is decidedly uncongenial to the two-source theory, tends to be (unwittingly?) suppressed methodologically, since "Marcan" and "Q" material are treated as separate entities. See below, pp. 290-291.
- 28 Int., 145.
- 29 Int., 108. Cf. Salmon, Int., 124.
- 30 Int., 108.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Int., 60. So also Harrison, Int., 144.
- 33 Int., 127n.
- 34 So Hoskyns-Davey, Riddle, 76; Wikenhauser, Int., 234; Martin,

## Notes for pp. 228-232

Foundations, I, 140; Uchida, "Synoptic Problem," 476.

35 Riddle, 76.

36 Mk. 10:15 is paralleled by Mt. 18:3b, Mk. 10:31 is paralleled by Lk. 13:30, and Mt. 19:28b is paralleled by Lk. 22:28-30. Furthermore, Mt. 20:1-16 and other individual verses are not paralleled at all.

37 "Synoptic Problem," 475-476.

38 Since the account of John's imprisonment and execution is obviously introduced to explain why Herod could think that Jesus was a resurrected John, and thus has an important function where it is in the synoptic outline, it is surprising that Peake (in Int., 109), probably following Salmon (in Int., 123), would find it unlikely that "such dislocation of the true order as the story of John the Baptist's imprisonment would have been found both in Matthew and Mark and at the same point, if they had been depending simply on oral tradition." Matthew and Mark were following the oral tradition (though Luke did not, choosing to relate the imprisonment of John at 3:19-20, in order to round off the account of his ministry, and then omitting the account of his execution).

39 Synoptic Gospels, 79, 80.

40 Int., 60. See also Stanton, Gospels, II, 24; Scott, Literature, 28; cf. Guthrie, Int., 127.

41 Int., 127.

42 Gospels, II, 24. See also Scott, Literature, 28.

43 Synopse, 89.

44 Ibid., 68.

45 Ibid., 83.

46 Morgenthaler (ibid., 166) is so struck by the high proportion of non-Marcian and non-Q words in Matthew and Luke that he puts an exclamation point after his summary of these data.

47 Int., 57n.

48 Ibid., 57.

49 See de Solages, Synopsis, 1049.

50 Ibid. The number 10,650 is a subtotal, which does not include material common to Mark and Matthew, for which Luke provides alternative tradition (e.g., the rejection at Nazareth).

51 Synoptic Gospels, 80 and 188n.

## Notes for pp. 232-240

- 52 See de Solages, Synopsis, 1041.
- 53 Synoptic Gospels, 80, 79.
- 54 "Luke's Use of Mark," 85-86.
- 55 Gospels, 159, 160.
- 56 Foundations, I, 140.
- 57 Synopsis, 1049.
- 58 Ibid., 1041, 1045.
- 59 Ibid., 1041. "Equivalent" words have the same or a cognate lexical form. De Solages also presents figures for synonyms and analogous expressions, but these are parallels in content, not verbal parallels.
- 60 Ibid., 1044, 1045.
- 61 Ibid., 1043.
- 62 Ibid., 1047.
- 63 Cf. Morgenthaler, Synopse, 163.
- 64 See below, pp. 292-294.
- 65 De Solages counts 1853 words that appear in all three gospels. These constitute 10% of Matthew, 17% of Mark, and 9% of Luke. Now 10% of Matthew's 1067 verses, 17% of Mark's 661, and 9% of Luke's 1147 average out to 107 verses, which is 6% of the 1,802 verses of synoptic material (as calculated above, pp. 216-217).
- 66 I.e. 1,853 out of the 8,189 words of Mark identified by de Solages (in Synopsis, 1041) as the triple tradition.
- 67 We have estimated that 40% of Mark's substance is common to both Matthew and Luke (see above, p. 216). This amounts to 264 verses. 17% of Mark's words, equivalent to 112 of his 661 verses, are the same in the other synoptics, and 112 is 42% of 264 (i.e. "roughly 40%").
- 68 Int., 43.
- 69 Synoptic Problem, 202-208.
- 70 He does admit (on p. 205) that "many times" the extent of verbal agreement is "less" than that characterizing one of his examples, but he presents this example as "not atypical" (followed by others where the extent of verbal agreement is higher). In this example (i.e. Mt. 15:32-39 = Mk. 8:1-10), 90 words are shared out of 129 words in Matthew and 126 in Mark (excluding the 20 words of 7:1a, 7b, which constitute unparalleled statements). Thus, here

## Notes for pp. 240-245

70% of Matthew's words and 71% of Mark's words are paralleled in the other account. A truly typical example would yield the figures 66% and 54%, respectively (see above, pp. 235-236). However, de Solages (in Synopsis, 836) would retain Mk. 7:1a, 7b as paralleled material, thus reducing the percentage of Matthean words in Mark's passage from 71% to 62%, still somewhat above the average of 54%.

71 According to de Solages (in Synopsis, 1041), in the triple tradition 1,818 words are identical in Matthew (out of 7,678 total words), Mark (out of 8,189 total words), and Luke (out of 7,040 total words). That comes to 24% for Matthew, 22% for Mark, and 26% for Luke. By comparison, in Farmer's example the figures are 63% for Matthew (33 out of 52 words), 34% for Mark (33 out of 98 words), and 34% for Luke (33 out of 98 words). (The comparative percentages that we give in the text are based on percentages more precise than those given here.)

72 See, e.g., Hoskyns-Davey, Riddle, 76; Fuller, Int., 69.

73 Int., 69.

74 Horae, 65 (cf. p. 54n.). See also Guthrie, Int., 127; Uchida, "Synoptic Problem," 472.

75 This objection is expressed in a general way by de Wette, Int., 145; Davidson, Study, I, 353; Holtzmann, Einl., 351; Barth, Einl., 222, 226; Streeter, Gospels, 183-184; Wikenhauser, Int., 234; Farmer, Synoptic Problem, 203 (by implication); Wikenhauser-Schmid, Einl., 277; Stoldt, Marcian Hypothesis, 3-4; Nickle, Synoptic Gospels, 79, 80.

76 See above, pp. 67-68.

77 Int., 55.

78 Int., 108.

79 Peake (in Int., 108) argues that the oral tradition (on the oral theory) would have to have been much more stereotyped than we find it in the synoptics, "when we allow for the imperfect memories of the writers." But while each writer no doubt introduced a certain amount of individual expression, there is no reason to think that the degree of verbal variation found in the synoptics is substantially (if at all) higher than that which characterized the apostolic tradition. The synoptists probably intended their gospels to preserve the authentic tradition in the face of its increasing corruption. Luke, at least, evidently felt constrained to record "what is certain" about Jesus (Lk. 1:4) because it had become difficult to distinguish between authentic and inauthentic information (see above, p. 173). Thus, the synoptists probably stuck close to standard formulations, as a rule.

80 "Survey," 187.

81 So Bleek, Evangelien-Kritik, 69-70; id., Int., I, 253; Holtz-

## Notes for pp. 245-251

mann, Einl., 351.

82 Einl., 351.

83 Int., I, 253.

84 Cf. Goguel, Int., I, 111; Guthrie, Int., 127.

85 As suggested by B. Gerhardsson in Memory, 334.

86 Horae, 54n. So also Sanday, "Survey," 182; Guthrie, Int., 127. See Torrey, Gospels, 257-260.

87 Int., 180.

88 Study, I, 353. Davidson also refers to "the manifoldness of the sayings of Jesus compared with the more easily retained and concise dicta" of the rabbis, but this distinction is hardly supportable, and even if it were true it would be negated by the relative paucity of the sayings of Jesus.

89 So Hawkins, Horae, 66; Schmiedel, "Gospels," 1845; Stanton, Gospels, II, 25; Scott, Literature, 27; cf. Chavannes, "Ressemblances," 144.

90 Int., 60. So also Ewald, Hauptproblem, 18; Harrison, Int., 144. Cf. Stanton, Gospels, II, 22.

91 Int., 108.

92 Literature, 27.

93 So Bleek, Evangelien-Kritik, 69-70; id., Int., I, 253; B. Weiss, Life, I, 28; Holtzmann, Einl., 351; B. Weiss, Int., II, 209; Gloag, Int., 55; Schmiedel, "Gospels," 1845; Burkitt, Gospel History, 35; Peake, Int., 109; Stanton, Gospels, II, 29n.; McNeile, Int., 60; Clogg, Int., 182.

94 Evangelien-Kritik, 69-70; id., Int., I, 253.

95 Life, I, 28; so also Int., II, 209 ("introductory and transition formulas").

96 Gospel History, 34-35. So also Clogg, Int., 182; Harrison, Int., 145.

97 So de Wette, Int., 145; Davidson, Study, I, 253; Hawkins, Horae, 54 (probably); Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 327; Stoldt, Marcan Hypothesis, 3-4; Nickle, Synoptic Gospels, 79, 80.

98 Synoptic Gospels, 80. Cf. Harrison, Int., 145.

99 Einl., 327.

100 Gospels, II, 29n.

## Notes for pp. 252-256

101 So Hug, Int., 389; de Wette, Int., 145; Gloag, Int., 55; Chavannes, "Ressemblances," 143; cf. Ewald, Hauptproblem, 16.

102 See above, p. 226.

103 Int., 56. So also de Wette, Int., 145.

104 "Survey," 182.

105 "Ressemblances," 143.

106 Some would perhaps argue that Paul would have known this piece of tradition especially well, and that it would have been fixed in form when the rest of the tradition was not, because of its presumed repetition in the liturgy of the Eucharist. We would suggest, however, that such an argument reads later ecclesiastical developments back into the church of the fifties. In 11:23 Paul reminds the Corinthians of the gospel tradition that he had handed down to them, in terms just like his reminder of 15:3, and does not mention any eucharistic liturgy (useful though such a reference would have been).

107 Hauptproblem, 14.

108 Cf. above, pp. 18-19.

109 Hauptproblem, 15.

110 So Wilke, Urevangelist, 143 (elaborating on pp. 143-161). See also B. Weiss, Life, I, 27; Chavannes, "Ressemblances," 148; Peake, Int., 109; Moffatt, Int., 181; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 323, 327. Wilke devotes the first part of his Urevangelist (pp. 26-161) to a refutation of the theory that all three synoptics derive from a rigidly uniform and comprehensive oral gospel, a form of the oral theory with which we cannot agree. Once one recognizes a flexible tradition, as we have argued for, most of his arguments evaporate.

111 See M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3rd ed.; Oxford, 1967); Taylor, Mark, 55-66; cf. Torrey, Gospels, 237-286.

112 Cf. N. Turner, "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts," in Studies in New Testament Language and Text (Festschrift for G. D. Kilpatrick), ed. by J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 44 (Leiden, 1976), 387-400.

113 Int., 106.

114 Int., 180.

115 So Peake, Int., 107; Stanton, Gospels, II, 22; McNeile, Int., 60; Guthrie, Int., 128; cf. Harrison, Int., 144-145.

116 Stanton, Gospels, II, 22. Cf. Peake, Int., 107.

## Notes for pp. 256-269

- 117 So Guthrie, Int., 128, answers the objection.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Gospels, II, 23-24.
- 120 So Schmiedel, "Gospels," 1845; Jülicher-Fascher, Einl., 327. Cf. Lohse, Formation, 125.
- 121 So Ewald, Hauptproblem, 21; Sanday, "Survey," 182; Scott, Literature, 27.
- 122 Int., II, 603.
- 123 Life, I, 28. So also Holtzmann, Einl., 351; B. Weiss, Int., 209.
- 124 Gospels, II, 28-29.
- 125 Ibid., II, 29.
- 126 Gospels, 151.
- 127 Ibid., 151-152.
- 128 Ibid., 152.
- 129 See above, pp. 257-258. Streeter's characterization of Luke actually conflicts with his theory of Proto-Luke, according to which Marcan material was inserted into a non-Marcan framework (see pp. 199, 208, 214, 218-219).
- 130 "Priority," 288.
- 131 So, e.g., W. Michaelis, Einl., 80; Marxsen, Int., 115; Kümmel, Int., 47; Schenke-Fischer, Einl., II, 17.
- 132 See, e.g., Sanday, "Survey," 182; Styler, "Priority," 288 (by implication); cf. Scott, Literature, 27.
- 133 "Synoptic Problem," 491.

## CHAPTER 12

<sup>1</sup> However, Matthew's introduction to the teaching, "You are the salt of the earth," is probably not original, but rather an interpretative remark intended to parallel "You are the light of the world" (perhaps also an addition) in vs. 14. Mark and Luke no doubt (assuming their independence of each other) preserve the original opening statement: "Salt is good."

<sup>2</sup> Basically, the Alexandrian textual tradition excludes vs. 26 and the Western and Byzantine traditions include it. One could (as

## Notes for pp. 269-297

modern editors generally do) dismiss this verse as a Western interpolation derived from Mt. 6:15, but we accept it as authentic for three reasons. First, we would argue that it was accidentally omitted from the Alexandrian archetype through homoeoteleuton, as both vs. 25 and vs. 26 end with the same three words. This would be the obvious explanation if the verse had been omitted in any other textual tradition; we see no reason to exempt the Alexandrian from the corrupting tendencies common to ancient copyists (cf. Mt. 12:47). Second, there are significant verbal differences between Mt. 6:15 and Mk. 11:26, probably more than one would expect from an interpolator, yet of the same order as those between Mt. 6:14 and Mk. 11:25. Third, Mk. 11:26 differs from Mt. 6:15 in much the same ways that Mk. 11:25 differs from Mt. 6:14, but interpolators rarely assimilated their interpolations so closely to their author's manner of expression. In other words, Mk. 11:26 is distinctly Marcan.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 269.

<sup>4</sup> Thus we see that the notion that the earliest synoptic tradition told of women at the empty tomb, but nothing more of the resurrected Jesus, is quite erroneous. We do not know whether Mark intended to conclude his gospel at 16:8, or whether he was unable to complete it, or whether its "last page" has been lost. Be that as it may, the basic narrative did not end there.

<sup>5</sup> Evangelische Geschichte, I, 80-83. See also his Evangelienfrage, 146-155.

<sup>6</sup> So, e.g., Holtzmann, Evangelien, 254-258; Wernle, Synoptische Frage, 111-113, 209-210; Stanton, Gospels, II, 45-46; Streeter, Gospels, 191, 204; Caird, 24; Kümmel, Int., 66-67; Schenke-Fischer, Eiñl., II, 19.

<sup>7</sup> In order to refute the argument that the doublets consistently bring together Marcan and non-Marcan (usually Q) passages, H. H. Stoldt (in Marcan Hypothesis, 177) presents a list of alleged Marcan doublets, but, as he himself points out, these are in all but two cases narrative doublets--and often in the same account. In each case the extent of verbal agreement is small. Stoldt presents similar statements as if they were doublets.

<sup>8</sup> Horae, 80.

<sup>9</sup> So Weisse, Evangelische Geschichte, I, 82; id., Evangelienfrage, 146; Wernle, Synoptische Frage, 111; Burkitt, Gospel History, 148; Caird, 24. But Caird, in adopting Hawkins's list of Lucan doublets, includes one narrative doublet.

<sup>10</sup> So Hawkins, Horae, 99n., recognizing the principle involved, namely, that "they are so expressly assigned to three distinct occasions."

<sup>11</sup> Horae, 80-107 (setting forth the Greek texts of each doublet).

12 Ibid., 106-107.

13 Luke, 24.

14 The eleventh doublet, Lk. 14:11 and 18:14, probably represents the same piece of independent tradition, which originally belonged at 14:11 and was deliberately added at 18:14 (where it fits less naturally).

15 Horae, 99-106. Caird's similar list (in Luke, 24) contains a number of errors. In particular it should be noted that Luke has removed the tradition represented by Mt. 10:19-20 = Mk. 13:11 from the Olivet prophecy and has placed it at 12:11-12, putting in its place 21:14-15, which may come from the independent tradition, but which is more likely a restatement of the removed teaching in Luke's own words. But even if we accepted Caird's presentation of the data, they would still be consistent with our analysis of the synoptic tradition.

16 For the benefit of those unacquainted with basic probability theory, we should explain that the probabilities of all the possible outcomes of an event add up to 1. For example, a tossed coin may come up either heads or tails, with equal likelihood. The probability that it would come up heads is one in two, i.e.  $1/2$ , which is 0.5. The probability that it would come up tails is likewise 0.5. And the probability that it would come up either heads or tails is 0.5 plus 0.5, or 1.0. The probability that two or more outcomes (of separate events) will result is calculated by multiplying together the probabilities for each of the individual outcomes. Thus, the probability that a tossed coin will come up heads three times in a row is 0.5 times 0.5 times 0.5, i.e.  $(0.5)^3$ , or 0.125 (that is, one chance in eight).

17 Synoptische Frage, 111.

18 B. G. Butler, in The Originality of St Matthew (Cambridge, 1951), 138-146, argues that the doublets where Matthew repeats himself are Hawkins's nos. 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13, and 20, and perhaps (though Jesus may have been repeating himself) nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11. Our list differs from Butler's chiefly in that we exclude nos. 10 and 11 and include no. 15. The verbal agreement in nos. 10 and especially 11 is insufficient to infer Matthean repetition, especially since both passages in each case have definite affinities to different parallel passages. But the verbal agreement is sufficient in no. 15.

19 See above, pp. 296-297.

20 Horae, 82-99.

21 I.e. 10:21 and 10:35, 12:31 and 12:32, 21:22 and 7:8, 24:23 and 24:26, 11:14 and 17:11, 24:5, 11, and 24, 3:7 and 12:34; 23:33, and 3:12 and 13:30 (Synoptische Frage, 112).

22 Horae, 99. G. D. Kilpatrick, in The Origins of the Gospel

## Notes for pp. 304-311

according to St. Matthew (Oxford, 1946), 84-92, produces a list of doublets that "can be explained partly or wholly as arising out of an overlapping of sources" (p. 92), consisting of eight of Hawkins's doublets and this one rejected by him.

23 Gospel History, 147-166.

24 On which see above, p. 298.

25 See above, pp. 301-302.

26 See above, p. 304.

27 Gospels, 212-213.

28 Luke, 26.

29 Caird apparently omits "of the Lord Jesus" in 24:3 as a "Western noninterpolation." The words "And the Lord said" in 22:31 are more questionable, as they are absent from Alexandrian witnesses and look like an editorial insertion, but they are accepted as genuine by Streeter (in Gospels, 213).

30 Only a handful of manuscripts, mostly Alexandrian (incl. B it(a,ff<sup>2</sup>) read κϵϕιων, while all others, representing all textual traditions (incl. K A Byz syr cop(bo) and most Latin witnesses), read ϪϪϵϐϐ. Since the incorrect reading evidently arose accidentally, rather than intentionally, we would identify as the erroneous reading the one that would require the fewest scribal errors to account for the manuscripts containing the reading. In our view, an erroneous transcription was made by an Alexandrian scribe and also by a Western scribe, each of whom probably read  $\overline{IN}$  or  $\overline{IHN}$  (with the I and H too close together?) as  $\overline{KN}$ , possibly influenced by  $\overline{KC}$  in 7:13. It is mistaken to appeal to Lucan style in favor of κϵϕιων, for this usage is practically nonexistent in Luke's basic narrative material.

31 Gospels, 213-214.

32 *Ibid.*, 213. See also p. 309, where it is pointed out that certain manuscripts, chiefly Alexandrian (and, we would say, others influenced by that textual tradition), also read κϵϕιϵ in Mk. 1:40 (a fact that is helpful in getting rid of minor agreements against Mark, but which weakens the argument for Proto-Luke, and thus is ignored on p. 213). Critical editors generally desert their favorite text at this point, sensing an assimilation to Matthew and/or Luke. Streeter then proceeds to hold up this imagined "orgy of assimilation in these small details" as evidence that "no text can be relied upon," so that assimilation may also have corrupted all known texts of either Mt. 8:2 or Lk. 5:12. But the fact that any one text may at times be wrong hardly implies that they may all be wrong wherever they do not support our literary theory.

33 *Ibid.*, 213.

## Notes for pp. 312-318

- 34 Luke, 26. But cf. Streeter, Gospels, 214n.
- 35 Caird is so paraphrased by Martin in Foundations, I, 155.

## APPENDIX

- 1 H.E. III.39.3.
- 2 Ibid., § 4. We have slightly revised Oulton's translation at three points, each time with Lake.
- 3 Philip and James, as listed with Andrew, Peter, Thomas, John, and Matthew, must, like them, be understood as the original apostles of those names, not as Philip the evangelist and/or James, the Lord's brother.
- 4 See Munck, "Presbyters," 219.
- 5 So Milligan, "John the Presbyter," 110-111; Lightfoot, Essays, 145; Schmiedel, "John," 2508; Zahn, Int., II, 437; Stanton, Gospels, I, 169-170; Streeter, Gospels, 434; Munck, "Presbyters," 239; Schnackenburg, John, I, 80-81n.; Kümmel, Int., 243; Brown, Epistles of John, 650; cf. Braun, Jean, I, 360.
- 6 Chronologie, I, 660.
- 7 P. W. Schmiedel (in "John," 2508) seems to have this idea in mind when he maintains that the expression "disciples of the Lord" has a wider meaning in connection with Aristion and the elder John, indicating "a personal yet not long-continued acquaintance with Jesus." But to interject the notion of "not long-continued" is wholly arbitrary. Elsewhere (in "Gospels," 1815) he finds the expression unsuitable to the context and dismisses it as an interpolation in the text of Eusebius.
- 8 Chronologie, I, 660.
- 9 Ibid., I, 356-357. But see below, p. 356.
- 10 See below, pp. 355-356.
- 11 Chronologie, I, 660-661.
- 12 See also Munck, "Presbyters," 231-232.
- 13 "'Elders'," 341n. E. Renan proposed the same conjecture in Histoire des origines du Christianisme, vol. 4: L'Antechrist (Paris, 1873), 345n.
- 14 "Emendation," 179.
- 15 Ibid., 179-182; "Elders," 185; "Elder John," 11. Schmiedel favored Bacon's emendation in "Gospels," 1815n., but he backed away

## Notes for pp. 318-323

from such a "bold" step in "John," 2508-2509. J. Moffatt (in Int., 600) also favored Bacon's emendation, though he was willing to adopt any theory of textual corruption or interpolation rather than accept the text as it stands.

16 "Emendation," 180-181.

17 "The elders who were disciples of the apostles" were probably "the elders who saw John, the disciple of the Lord" (V.33,3), whose traditions Irenaeus credits Papias with having recorded (§ 4). See also Harnack, Chronologie, I, 334-336n.; Loofs, Quellen bei Irenaeus, 310-325, esp. pp. 317-319.

18 See Eusebius, H.E. V.20.4.

19 "Zeugnis," 391-392.

20 "Papianisches," 158. Schmiedel (in "Gospels," 1815) had previously appealed to the absence of the expression in the Armenian version (apparently unaware of the Syriac reading) when arguing that it had been interpolated.

21 Jean, xxxiii.

22 "Jean le Presbytre," 844.

23 John, I, 80-81n.

24 See Wright-McLean, Eusebius in Syriac, v, ix; Nestle, Eusebius aus dem Syrischen, v-vi.

25 Wright-McLean, Eusebius in Syriac, ix, x.

26 So ibid., vii-viii.

27 Ibid., ix.

28 For the text see Wright-McLean, Eusebius in Syriac, 177.

29 And thus J. Munck (in "Presbyters," 230n.) will not delete the phrase "disciples of the Lord," saying that "lectio difficilior is to be preferred."

30 "Armenian Version," xiii-xiv, xvii.

31 See Wright-McLean, Eusebius in Syriac, 177n.

32 The Greek text is supported by Jerome's quotation of Papias's words in De vir. ill. 18, evidently taken from Eusebius, and also by Rufinus's Latin translation of Eusebius (despite its inaccuracy at this point).

33 So Godet, John, I, 53; Luthardt, John, 134 (following Zahn against Weizsäcker); Bardenhewer, Geschichte, I, 539-540; Moffatt, Int., 600; W. Michaelis, Einl., 93; Bernard, John, lii; Regul, Evangelienprologe, 8. J. Regul rightly criticizes those who infer

## Notes for pp. 323-325

from § 4, a section difficult to interpret, that Papias was not a personal disciple of the elders, and then reject the clear meaning of § 3 because it is inconsistent with their interpretation of § 4. P. Corssen (in "Warum," 206) illustrates this approach: "Wenn Papias sagt, er habe seine Kunde von den Älteren, so Klingt das, als habe er sie unmittelbar aus ihrem Munde. Aber die nähere Erklärung, die nachfolgt, zeigt, dass sie ihm nur mittelbar zugekommen war, durch Leute, die jene gehört hatten." One could perhaps learn from others through unmentioned intermediaries, but one could hardly "recall" through intermediaries. See also Gundry, Matthew, 612.

<sup>34</sup> Essays, 193-194.

<sup>35</sup> Papias perhaps confirms this interpretation of § 3 by placing the word καί before παρακολουθηκώς in § 4. This καί could reasonably be translated "also," thus indicating that Papias, like the others whom he is about to mention, had been a follower of the elders. So Milligan, "John the Presbyter," 116-117n.

<sup>36</sup> Munck (in "Presbyters," 239-240) accepts that the elders of interest to Papias were all disciples of the Lord, but he argues that "the presbyters comprise the widest circle of authorities from the older generation," including many who were not personal disciples of Jesus. However, Papias's use of the expression "the elders" does not support this view.

<sup>37</sup> "Zeugnis," 386.

<sup>38</sup> So Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 136.

<sup>39</sup> Evangelienprologe, 120. Similarly, Corssen (in "Warum," 206) says that the elders are not the disciples of the Lord "da diese durch die Bezeichnung, Schüler des Herrn, vielmehr von den Presbytern unterschieden zu werden scheinen." So also Moffatt, Int., 600.

<sup>40</sup> It may seem strange to some that Papias does not refer to "the apostles," even when listing seven of them by name. This is to be explained by the fact that Papias's interest lay with those who had been eyewitnesses of Jesus (see § 3), not so much with those who had held the title of apostle. So Zahn, Int., II, 437. Furthermore, the eyewitnesses of interest to Papias included some, e.g. Aristion, who were not apostles. Thus, Papias did not have occasion to use the term "apostle."

<sup>41</sup> H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton (in Eusebius, II, 112, 114), observing that Eusebius substitutes "apostles" for Papias's "elders," infer that "the elders," or "the Lord's disciples," were, in Eusebius's view, precisely the same persons as the apostles. However, this does not necessarily follow. Eusebius may simply be referring to the apostles as the most important of the wider body of Jesus' disciples.

<sup>42</sup> See Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 122, 134-135; Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 112-113.

## Notes for pp. 325-328

<sup>43</sup> So Milligan, "John the Presbyter," 109-110; Luthardt, John, 135; Leimbach, Papiasfragment, 41-46; Lightfoot, Essays, 143, 145-146; Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 122, 134-136; Stanton, Gospels, I, 168; Nolloth, Fourth Evangelist, 60n.; Lake, Eusebius, I, 293; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 10; Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, I, 99; II, 112-113 (see also Lawlor, "Eusebius on Papias," 206-207); W. Michaelis, Einl., 93; Wotke, "Papias," 969; Nunn, Authorship, 59; Munck, "Presbyters," 230, 236; Petrie, "Authorship of Matthew," 19n.; Lee, "Presbyter John," 316; Gundry, Matthew, 611-612. Most of these scholars err, however, in supposing that the elders were exclusively, and not just chiefly, the twelve apostles.

<sup>44</sup> So Weiffenbach, Papias-Fragment, 73-76; Harnack, Chronologie, I, 660; Schmiedel, "John," 2507, 2508; Moffatt, Int., 599; Chapman, John the Presbyter, 9-12; Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 386-387; Bernard, John, liii (despite his translation, p. lii); Braun, Jean, I, 359; Kümmel, Int., 242.

<sup>45</sup> So Leimbach, Papiasfragment, 45; Lee, "Presbyter John," 316.

<sup>46</sup> Lightfoot, Essays, 146n. Cf. Lee, "Presbyter John," 316.

<sup>47</sup> In C. S. Petrie's words (in "Authorship of Matthew," 19n.), this rendering "instead of offering a translation, propounds a point of view."

<sup>48</sup> "'Elders,'" 334.

<sup>49</sup> So Abbott, "'Elders,'" 334-336; Harnack, Chronologie, I, 661; Chapman, John the Presbyter, 13-16; Bernard, John, xlvi-xlvii, liii; Bornkamm in TDNT, VI:677; Braun, Jean, I, 361-362; Schnackenburg, John, I, 80; Regul, Evangelienprologe, 121-122.

<sup>50</sup> There can be no doubt but that by "John, the disciple of the Lord," Irenaeus means the apostle John, for in II.22.5 he mentions "John, the disciple of the Lord," and then refers to "not only John, but the other apostles also." See below, p. 335.

<sup>51</sup> Irenaeus employs the same usage in IV.28.1; V.5.1, 36.1, 2 (bis); cf. V.30.1. In none of these passages is there the slightest reason to identify Irenaeus's elders with those of Papias.

<sup>52</sup> See Luthardt, John, 132-133; Lee, "Presbyter John," 317. Cf. Zahn, Int., II, 452n.; In Papias, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and occasionally Origen and Hippolytus, the term οἱ παρρησιαῖοι, "which of itself may denote the men of the distant past," as in Heb. 11:2, "comes to signify the teachers of the next preceding generation only when the speaker characterises those to whom he applies it as his own personal instructors. The succeeding generation calls them the old men or the fathers when their ranks begin to be thinned, and also after they have altogether given place to the younger."

<sup>53</sup> See Godet, John, I, 54; Leimbach, Papiasfragment, 81-90; Lightfoot, Essays, 145-146; Zahn, Int., II, 452n.; Munck, "Presby-

## Notes for pp. 328-331

ters," 235-236. Lightfoot notes that "in the next age" Irenaeus and others of his stature had come to be known as "elders" in the same sense. Apparently, as time went on, the various generations of elders came to be thought of together as "the elders" (compare our term, "the Church Fathers"), and thus Eusebius (in H.E. V.8.1) speaks of "the ancient elders and writers of the Church," notably Irenaeus. The apostles were by this time in a separate category.

<sup>54</sup> So Moffatt, Int., 600; Regul, Evangelienprologe, 124.

<sup>55</sup> Page Bardenhewer, Geschichte, I, 539; Nolloth, Fourth Evangelist, 61; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 10; Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 114; Wotke, "Papias," 969; Gundry, Matthew, 612. These writers mistakenly assume that "the elders" were the twelve apostles, only.

<sup>56</sup> So Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 138, 143.

<sup>57</sup> Essays, 144, 146. So also Godet, John, I, 54; Weiffenbach, Papias-Fragment, 46, 116-117 (and thus also distinguishing him from Aristion, pp. 114-115); Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 389; Munck, "Presbyters," 238. Others holding that John is called "the elder" (in whatever sense) in order to distinguish him from John the apostle include Harnack, Chronologie, I, 661; Bardy, "Jean le Presbytre," 844, 845; Regul, Evangelienprologe, 117; Kümmel, Int., 243.

<sup>58</sup> So Petrie, "Authorship of Matthew," 21.

<sup>59</sup> Essays, 144.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 146.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 142, 143.

<sup>62</sup> H.E. III.39.14. Lawlor and Oulton translate "of John the elder," but the Greek text is τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., §§ 14, 15.

<sup>64</sup> So, e.g., Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 115; Bernard, John, liv; Gundry, Matthew, 613.

<sup>65</sup> H.E. III.39.7.

<sup>66</sup> The text is: ὀνομαστὶ γούν πολλάκις αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάσιν τίθησιν αὐτῶν παραδόσεις. Note the participial form μνημονεύσας and the placement of ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάσιν between μνημονεύσας and τίθησιν.

<sup>67</sup> The tradition which Eusebius quotes from Papias concerning Matthew in § 16 is definitely that of "the elder," because it is in a sequence with the previously quoted tradition concerning Mark and is introduced by Eusebius as "the statement concerning Matthew." But Eusebius leaves out the first part of the elder's statement, as οὖν introducing the quoted segment indicates, and also omits Papias's attribution of it to the elder.

## Notes for pp. 331-336

- 68 So Leimbach, Papiasfragment, 116; Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 143; cf. Sanday, Criticism, 253; Schoedel, Papias, 100; Petrie, "Authorship of Matthew," 22.
- 69 "Presbyters," 238. See also Salmon, Int., 269.
- 70 So Leimbach, Papiasfragment, 116-117; Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 144; Streeter, Gospels, 434; Bernard, John, lxiii-lxiv; cf. Sanday, Criticism, 253 ("the Venerable"). Similarly, Clement of Alexandria referred to Pantaenus as "the elder" or "the blessed elder," meaning, according to Lawlor and Oulton (in Eusebius, II, 166), "his teacher par excellence." See also Zahn, Int., II, 437.
- 71 H.E. III.39.6.
- 72 See Eusebius, H.E. V.24.16 (quoting Irenaeus); cf. 24.2-7 (quoting Polycrates).
- 73 See H.E. III.1.1-2, 18.1-3, 20.9, 23.1-19, 31.2-3; IV.14.6; V.8.4, 18.14, 20.4-5, 24.1-3; VII.25.16. See also Irenaeus, Haer. II.22.5. Cf. Tertullian, Marc. IV.5.2; id., De praescr. haer. 32 (mentioning the written record of the succession of bishops kept by the church of Smyrna, according to which "Polycarp was placed therein by John").
- 74 See Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 176, 185, 187-188.
- 75 See Eusebius, H.E. V.20.5-6. See also V.24.16; Irenaeus, Haer. III.3.4.
- 76 See Eusebius, H.E. V.24.16. Irenaeus also includes among the apostles the John known personally to the Asian elders in Haer. II.22.5 (partially quoted in Eusebius, H.E. III.23.3). In III.3.4 (quoted in Eusebius, H.E. III.23.4) he implies twice that John was an apostle.
- 77 See Eusebius, H.E. V.20.4-6. C. E. Luthardt (in John, 146) comments with regard to these recollections that "the tone in which he speaks of them to the friend of his youth is so confident and sure of the matter, that deception is impossible." Cf. Lee, "Presbyter John," 314.
- 78 So, e.g., Streeter, Gospels, 443-444; Kümmel, Int., 240-241. Cf. Luthardt, John, 118-123.
- 79 See Eusebius, H.E. V.20.5-7.
- 80 See ibid., V.20.5.
- 81 On the relative dates of Irenaeus's letter to Florinus and his Against Heresies see Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 182-183.
- 82 Haer. II.22.5.
- 83 See Haer. III.3.4.

## Notes for pp. 336-339

84 Int., 241. (Kümmel cites II.22.5 as II.33.3, following Harvey's divisions.)

85 See Haer. III.1.1, 3.4.

86 Kümmel remarks on II.22.5 (in Int., 241) that "it is not said of them that they knew John the disciple of the Lord," but only that they "had heard of" him. But this is a serious mistranslation of the German original (Einl., 206), where Kümmel actually says that "es wird von ihnen wieder nur gesagt, daß sie den Herrenjünger Johannes gekannt haben," and that they him "gehört haben." Kümmel recognizes that, according to Irenaeus's tradition, the elders knew and heard John, but he questions whether they necessarily did so in Asia.

87 Int., 240. Schnackenburg (in John, I, 79n.) notes that this argument "is constantly invoked."

88 John, I, 79.

89 Haer. V.33.4.

90 John, I, 79.

91 See also Moffatt, Int., 601-608, and the literature cited on p. 602.

92 Revelation, I, 1. See also Schmiedel, "John," 2509-2511. The literature for and against this hypothesis is summarized by Braun, Jean, I, 375.

93 Revelation, I, xlv.

94 So Godet, John, I, 50 (with hesitation); Luthardt, John, 126; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 20; id., Authorship, 22.

95 Revelation, I, xlv.

96 So Godet, John, I, 50; Luthardt, John, 125-126; Lightfoot, Fathers, Part II, II, 64; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 19-20; id., Authorship, 21-22.

97 Dial. 81.

98 So Eusebius, H.E. IV.18.6, perhaps following the lost preface of Justin's Dialogue.

99 So V. Taylor, The Gospels (5th ed.; London, 1945), 101; Brown, John, lxxxix. Schmiedel (in "John," 2507) disputes this interpretation, preferring the more general meaning, "among us Christians." Cf. 1 Clem. 1, τοῖς παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέροις, "to the older men among you," i.e. among those at Corinth.

100 "John," 2507. But he later declares (in col. 2511) that "Justin and Hegesippus . . . tell nothing about John."

## Notes for pp. 339-341

- 101 So Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 90-92. In H.E. III.32.2 and IV.8.1 Eusebius hints that he may not always have cited Hegesippus by name.
- 102 Revelation, I, xlvii-xlix. Charles also infers John's martyrdom from the indirect evidence of Heracleon (ca. 145) (on which see Luthardt, John, 128; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 44-46; Bernard, John, xlvii), the Martyrdom of Andrew, Clement of Alexandria (on which see Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 46), the Muratorian Canon, and Epiphanius, but this evidence is ambiguous at best.
- 103 See Rev. 1:2, 9; Origen, Matt. XVI.6, citing tradition and the book of Revelation; Eusebius, H.E. III.18.1-3, citing Hegesippus (probably) and Irenaeus, Haer. V.30.3.
- 104 See Eusebius, H.E. V.24.3.
- 105 See Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 158. Cf. Bernard, John, 1-11.
- 106 So Eusebius, H.E. III.20.8-9, 23.1-4, 39.6.
- 107 This imagery is consistent with martyrdom, but need not mean more than "taking up the cross" of Jesus, i.e. suffering for his name. See Stanton, Gospels, III, 117-120.
- 108 Matt. 65.2.
- 109 In Matt. 76.2 he states that John "lived a long time after the taking of the city" of Jerusalem, which is probably an allusion to his time in Asia. Chrysostom could hardly have been unaware of the tradition of John's Asian residence, and there was no competing tradition of a long life completed elsewhere.
- 110 H. P. V. Nunn (in Son of Zebedee, 42) dismisses Chrysostom's words as being located "in a rhetorical passage."
- 111 See Charles, Revelation, I, xlviii (whose text we follow).
- 112 Matt. XVI.6 (at the end). Perhaps some thought that John died while in exile. See Schmiedel, "John," 2509-2510, for further discussion. See also Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 16-17; id., Authorship, 93-94.
- 113 De persecutione 23. J. H. Bernard (in John, xliii) comments that Aphraates's words do not require that John suffered death, but in the context it is clear that death is in view, for the brothers are included among the apostolic confessors and martyrs, terms which (unlike "the persecuted"), as used by Aphraates, imply suffering unto death.
- 114 Pace Bernard, John, xliii-xliv.
- 115 See Stanton, Gospels, III, 113-114; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 49-50.

## Notes for pp. 342-345

116 So Stanton, Gospels, III, 115. V. H. Stanton finds a similar error of compression in another entry.

117 Revelation, I, xlix.

118 A. Wikenhauser (in Int., 289) and R. E. Brown (in John, lxxxix) suggest that John the Baptist was originally coupled with James, and that later editors erroneously changed the Baptist to the apostle. But this seems unlikely, for Apbraates mentions John and James in connection with the other apostles. Also, the relatively late Calendar of Carthage provides the only evidence linking the Baptist with James.

119 Revelation, I, xlvi.

120 The passage is found in only one of the twenty-seven manuscripts of Georgius's work (i.e. codex Coislilianus), and it interrupts the flow of argument. It also probably contradicts the statement directly following it, that John died (presumably of natural causes) at Ephesus. It is clearly, then, an interpolation. The shorter and longer texts are presented side by side for comparison in Nunn, Authorship, 90-91.

121 So Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 148; Chapman, John the Presbyter, 99-100; Lockton, "Martyrdom," 83; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 54-55; id., Authorship, 90-92; Braun, Jean, I, 408-411; Schnackenburg, John, I, 87.

122 Revelation, I, 1.

123 So Luthardt, John, 127-128.

124 See Nunn, Authorship, 90.

125 See Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 56-57; id., Authorship, 91.

126 Cf. H.E. III.24.2, 4, 39.6.

127 Haer. V.33.4.

128 See Lockton, "Martyrdom," 81-82; Bernard, John, xxxviii-xl; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 54-55; id., Authorship, 89.

129 See Bernard, John, xxxviii; Nunn, Authorship, 88.

130 H.E. II.23.20.

131 See Bernard, John, xl-xliii.

132 See Lockton, "Martyrdom," 82; Bernard, John, xli; Nunn, Authorship, 89.

133 J. B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays (London, 1893), 95. Lightfoot provides some examples of Philip's remarkable carelessness.

## Notes for pp. 345-349

- 134 H.E. VII.27.
- 135 Men and Movements, 138.
- 136 See above, pp. 333-334.
- 137 See Irenaeus, Haer. II.22.5, 33.3; III.3.4; Eusebius, H.E. III.23.6, quoting Clement of Alexandria.
- 138 In Mart. Pol. 9, written just after Polycarp's martyrdom, and thus probably correct on this point, he is said to have been 86 years old when martyred in 155 or so. See Lightfoot, Fathers, Part II, I, 421-422, 588-610, 629-660; Lawlor-Culton, Eusebius, II, 131-133.
- 139 See below, pp. 349-350.
- 140 Face Bernard, John, liv (despite accepting the tradition of the apostle's great age).
- 141 See Eusebius, H.E. VII.25.16.
- 142 Ibid., III.39.6.
- 143 See ibid., V.24.2-5.
- 144 A. Plummer (in Epistles of John, lxx) summarizes the external evidence for and against the apostolic authorship of 2 John (and thus also of 3 John) with the observation that "those witnesses who are nearest to S. John in time are favourable to the Apostolic authorship and seem to know of no other view." Origen was the first to indicate that "not all" accepted these epistles as apostolic (see Eusebius, H.E. VI.25.10). Eusebius (in H.E. III.25.3) listed among the disputed writings "the second and third [epistles] of John, so named, whether they belong to the evangelist or perhaps to some other of the same name as he," no doubt having in mind "the elder John" shortly thereafter (in 39.5-7) to be distinguished. Jerome (in De vir. ill. 18) stated that "many" people attributed the two epistles to John the elder, but in saying this he was (as he himself says) merely repeating his previous statement (in § 9) that the two epistles "are said to be the work of John the presbyter." In both passages the context shows that Jerome is following Eusebius, and so his statements do not provide independent evidence for the existence of any "John the elder."
- 145 The personal character of the two epistles would seem to rule out the possibility of pseudonymity. But if someone did write under the pseudonym "the Elder," the existence of an authority, probably apostolic, known by that name would be confirmed.
- 146 "'Elders'," 345-346.
- 147 H.E. III.39.5.
- 148 De vir. ill. 18.

## Notes for pp. 349-352

149 See McGiffert, Eusebius, 170n.; Schmiedel, "John," 2507-2508; Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 388; Bardy, "Jean le Presbytre," 845; Barrett, John, 106-107; Schnackenburg, John, I, 80; Brown, John, xci; Kummel, Int., 242; cf. Godet, John, I, 54; Lightfoot, Essays, 144.

150 "Presbyters," 230.

151 Evangelienprologe, 117.

152 Ibid.

153 So Milligan, "John the Presbyter," 111; Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 140-141; id., II, 453n.; Bardenhewer, Geschichte, I, 539; Nolloth, Fourth Evangelist, 60-61, 62-63; Nunn, Son of Zebedee, 10; Bernard, John, liii; W. Michaelis, Einl., 93; Nunn, Authorship, 60; Guthrie, Int., 268; Petrie, "Authorship of Matthew," 21-22; Gundry, Matthew, 612-613; cf. Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 387.

154 So Weiffenbach, Papias-Fragment, 77; Schmiedel, "John," 2507; Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 387, 389; Bernard, John, liv; Puech, Histoire, II, 98; Bardy, "Jean le Presbytre," 845; Munck, "Presbyters," 230-231; Bornkamm in TDNT, VI:677n.; Brown, John, xci; Kummel, Int., 242; Haenchen, Johannesev., 9, 10.

155 Int., 289.

156 H.E. III.39.13. But cf. Munck, "Presbyters," 225.

157 "Eusebius on Papias," 207-210.

158 Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, II, 113.

159 See Regul, Evangelienprologe, 126-132.

160 So, e.g., Weiffenbach, Papias-Fragment, 73-74, 96-97; Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 138; Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 387 (referring to the general agreement on this point); Munck, "Presbyters," 237n.

161 Schmiedel (in "John," 2508, 2509), contradicting his previous view (in "Gospels," 1814-1815), suggests that "the discourses of the elders" were "as to what" (τί) the apostles had said, and that those discourses consisted of "the things which" (ἃ) Aristion and the elder John were saying, thus identifying "the elders" as "Aristion and the elder John." But this view has found little favor, for it introduces unnatural complexities and does not explain the conjunction τε. Also, it is doubtful that "the elders" would have been only two in number.

162 So Milligan, "John the Presbyter," 108-109; Zahn, "Apostel in Asien," 123-124; Schmiedel, "Gospels," 1814; Stanton, Gospels, I, 169; Puech, Histoire, II, 99.

163 So Schmiedel, "Gospels," 1814; Stanton, Gospels, I, 169; Bacon, "Elder John," 5, 6; Lagrange, Jean, xxx; Bernard, John, liii.

## Notes for pp. 352-356

- 164 John the Presbyter, 28-30.
- 165 So Corssen, "Eusebius," 243.
- 166 For Eusebius's similar use of the particle  $\rho\omicron\upsilon\tau$  see, e.g., H.E. I.2.7, 12.
- 167 "Eusebius on Papias," 210. Munck (in "Presbyters," 240-243n.) takes issue with Lawlor's position, but offers no explanation for Eusebius's statement in § 7. He devotes his criticism to Lawlor's appeal to Eusebius's other omissions in quotations, but even if Eusebius did ordinarily quote his sources more carefully than Lawlor admits, the accuracy of this particular quotation would still remain to be determined.
- 168 Haer. V.33.4. Cf. Chapman, John the Presbyter, 31-32.
- 169 This explains the seemingly "unnatural" and "artificial" manner in which Papias, according to Munck (in "Presbyters," 238), refers to the same person in two different ways so close together.
- 170 Sanders-Mastin, John, 35.
- 171 So Eusebius, H.E. III.39.7, 14.
- 172 H.E. III.39.5.
- 173 So Schmiedel, "John," 2508.
- 174 These considerations may have shaped his ordering of the apostles: Andrew and Peter were brothers; Philip and Thomas were sometimes paired together (as in Ac. 1:13, though not in Mt. 10:3; Mk. 3:18; Lk. 6:14-15; cf. Jn. 14:5, 8); James and John were brothers; one member of each of these three pairs (i.e. Andrew, Philip, and John) probably migrated to Asia (see Lightfoot, Essays, 91); Andrew, Peter, and Philip were the first three disciples named in John's Gospel (see 1:40-44, but the unnamed disciple of vs. 35-40 is probably John); and, John and Matthew were the two apostles recognized as having written gospels.
- 175 John, I, 90. So also Lagrange, Jean, xxxi.
- 176 John, I, 80-81n. But surely Papias was in a position to know whether "the Elder," whom Schnackenburg agrees he personally heard (*ibid.*, 90), was a personal disciple of Jesus or not.
- 177 *Ibid.*, I, 89. So also Larfeld, "Zeugnis," 390.
- 178 John, I, 89 and n.
- 179 H.E. III.39.1; cf. 36.1-2. See also Sanday, Criticism, 250-251; Bartlet, "Papias's 'Exposition'," 20-22; Munck, "Presbyters," 240; Schoedel, Papias, 91-92; Gundry, Matthew, 610-611; Yarbrough, "Date of Papias;" Orchard, "Guidelines," 394-397, 402.

## Notes for p. 356

180 While it is improbable that any given disciple would have lived until the close of the first century, it is not unreasonable to think that one or two of them might have.