Luke

MIKEAL C. PARSONS

Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Improved Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

© 2015 by Mikeal C. Parsons

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
PO Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516–6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Parsons, Mikeal C. (Mikeal Carl), 1957–
Luke / Mikeal C. Parsons.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 978-0-8010-3190-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Bible. Luke—Commentaries. I. Title.
BS2595.53.P37 2015
226.4′07—dc23 2014042999

Translations from the Gospel of Luke (with occasional small adjustments) are from Martin M. Culy, Joshua J. Stigall, and Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, copyright © 2010 by Baylor University Press. Used by permission.

Unless otherwise indicated, all other Scripture quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled ESV are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version® (ESV®), copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved. ESV Text Edition: 2007

Scripture quotations labeled KJV are from the King James Version of the Bible.

Scripture quotations labeled REB are from the Revised English Bible © 1989 Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press.

Scripture quotations labeled RSV are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright 1952 [2nd edition, 1971] by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

In keeping with biblical principles of creation stewardship, Baker Publishing Group advocates the responsible use of our natural resources. As a member of the Green Press Initiative, our company uses recycled paper when possible. The text paper of this book is composed in part of post-consumer waste.

green press INITIATIVE

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

For Heidi

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript — COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Contents

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Improvised Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT PROTECTED Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Figures and Tables

Figures

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Improvised Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Tables

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Foreword

Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament is a series that sets out to comment on the final form of the New Testament text in a way that pays due attention both to the cultural, literary, and theological settings in which the text took form and to the interests of the contemporary readers to whom the commentaries are addressed. This series is aimed squarely at students—including MA students in religious and theological studies programs, seminarians, and upper-division undergraduates—who have theological interests in the biblical text. Thus, the didactic aim of the series is to enable students to understand each book of the New Testament as a literary whole rooted in a particular ancient setting and related to its context within the New Testament.

The name "Paideia" (Greek for "education") reflects (1) the instructional aim of the series—giving contemporary students a basic grounding in academic New Testament studies by guiding their engagement with New Testament texts; (2) the fact that the New Testament texts as literary unities are shaped by the educational categories and ideas (rhetorical, narratological, etc.) of their ancient writers and readers; and (3) the pedagogical aims of the texts themselves—their central aim being not simply to impart information but to form the theological convictions and moral habits of their readers.

Each commentary deals with the text in terms of larger rhetorical units; these are not verse-by-verse commentaries. This series thus stands within the stream of recent commentaries that attend to the final form of the text. Such reader-centered literary approaches are inherently more accessible to liberal arts students without extensive linguistic and historical-critical preparation than older exegetical approaches, but within the reader-centered world the sanest practitioners have paid careful attention to the extratext of the original readers, including not only these readers' knowledge of the geography, history, and other contextual elements reflected in the text but also their ability to respond

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

correctly to the literary and rhetorical conventions used in the text. Paideia commentaries pay deliberate attention to this extratextual repertoire in order to highlight the ways in which the text is designed to persuade and move its readers. Each rhetorical unit is explored from three angles: (1) introductory matters; (2) tracing the train of thought or narrative or rhetorical flow of the argument; and (3) theological issues raised by the text that are of interest to the contemporary Christian. Thus, the primary focus remains on the text and not its historical context or its interpretation in the secondary literature.

Our authors represent a variety of confessional points of view: Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox. What they share, beyond being New Testament scholars of national and international repute, is a commitment to reading the biblical text as theological documents within their ancient contexts. Working within the broad parameters described here, each author brings his or her own considerable exegetical talents and deep theological commitments to the task of laying bare the interpretation of Scripture for the faith and practice of God's people everywhere.

Mikeal C. Parsons
Charles H. Talbert
Bruce W. Longenecker

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript — COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Preface

Paideia *Luke* represents my most recent stop in a lifelong journey with the Lukan writings. Luke's version of the gospel has been my favorite of the four since childhood. My first encounter with Luke in an academic context occurred over thirty years ago in my first semester of seminary in a Greek exegesis course on Luke taught by John Polhill in Louisville, Kentucky, in which we worked carefully through Luke's grammar with I. Howard Marshall's then recently published commentary as our primary guide. My professional career began with a published version of my dissertation, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (1987), followed by *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (with Richard I. Pervo, 1993), *Body and Character in Luke and Acts* (2006, 2011) and *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (2007, 2014). A trilogy of works on Luke and visual art, *Illuminating Luke* (2003, 2005, 2007), cowritten with my wife, Heidi Hornik, was sandwiched between two handbooks on the Greek text of Acts (with Martin Culy, 2003) and Luke (with Martin Culy and Joshua Stigall, 2010). Three edited volumes explored the interpretation of Acts in the works of three twentieth-century scholars, *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: North American Contributions to the Study of Acts* (with Joseph B. Tyson, 1992); the treatment of Acts among Baptist interpreters, *The Acts of the Apostles: Four Centuries of Baptist Interpretation* (with Beth Barr, Bill Leonard, and Doug Weaver, 2009); and the sea changes that occurred in Acts study in American and European scholarship since Vielhauer, *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Paul and Israel's Legacy* (with Daniel Marguerat, David Moessner, and Michael Wolter, 2012). Paideia *Luke* now joins its companion volume Paideia *Acts* (2008) and will be followed finally by *Acts through the Centuries* (with Heidi Hornik, forthcoming) in the Blackwell-Wiley Reception History Commentary Series.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

These books represent various attempts to understand Luke and Acts in their originating contexts and their subsequent reception histories and, more importantly, to better know and love the God who is revealed by Luke's Jesus. As of now, I intend these two volumes, Paideia *Luke* and *Acts through the Centuries*, to be the last of my book-length contributions to the study of the Lukan writings, though, God willing, the journey will continue with occasional articles, classroom teaching, and dissertation supervision. It is time (some would say well past time!) to turn my attention and energies to other aspects of the New Testament.

Truth be told, I was not keen to write a commentary on Luke as part of my engagement with the Lukan writings. I felt that the commentary on Acts represented my best effort in that particular genre (and for my "take" on commentary writing that applies also to this volume, I point the reader to the preface of Paideia *Acts*). But our attempts to secure a commentator for Luke failed, and my coeditor, Charles Talbert, and Baker editor, James Ernest, prevailed upon me to accept the assignment. I am very grateful that they did! I also owe a debt of gratitude to the countless graduate students whose own research shaped my reading of Luke, and to Jon Carman and John Duncan who proofread the manuscript at various stages and helped prepare the indexes. I am particularly grateful to the administration and faculty of Baylor University for their continued support of my work. A better work environment I cannot imagine.

Nor can I imagine a more faithful companion in life than Heidi Hornik. Her life as a spouse, mother, daughter, sister, scholar, and teacher is marked by profound integrity. Our personal relationship over the years has been wonderfully rich and, along with our children, a source of deep and abiding joy. Professionally, we have joined together on numerous projects, none more rewarding than the work we have done together on the visual interpretation of Luke and Acts. I happily dedicate this volume to Heidi, the love of my life.

Mikeal C. Parsons
Department of Religion
Baylor University

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript — COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Abbreviations

General

ca.	*circa*, approximately	no.	number
cf.	*confer*, compare	NT	New Testament
chap(s).	chapter(s)	OT	Old Testament
col(s).	column(s)	prol.	prologue
e.g.	*exempli gratia*, for example	Q	Quelle (hypothetical common source for Matthew and Luke)
Eng.	English		
esp.	especially	sg.	singular
frg(s).	fragment(s)	s.v.	*sub verbo*, under the word
hapax	*hapax legomenon*, term appearing only once	v(v).	verse(s)
		v.l.	*varia lectio*, variant reading
i.e.	*id est*, that is	vol(s).	volume(s)
lit.	literally	x	no. of times a form occurs

Bible Texts, Editions, and Versions

ASV	American Standard Version	NET	The NET Bible (New English Translation)
ESV	English Standard Version		
KJV	King James (Authorized) Version	NIV	New International Version
		NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
LXX	Septuagint, the Greek Bible	REB	Revised English Bible
MT	Masoretic Text, the Hebrew Bible	RSV	Revised Standard Version
NA^{28}	*Nestle-Aland: Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland et al. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.	UBS^{4}	*The Greek New Testament*. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland et al. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1994.
NASB	New American Standard Bible		

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Imprint of Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Ancient Corpora

Old Testament

Gen.	Genesis
Exod.	Exodus
Lev.	Leviticus
Num.	Numbers
Deut.	Deuteronomy
Josh.	Joshua
Judg.	Judges
Ruth	Ruth
1–2 Sam.	1–2 Samuel
1–2 Kings	1–2 Kings
1–2 Chron.	1–2 Chronicles
Ezra	Ezra
Neh.	Nehemiah
Esther	Esther
Job	Job
Ps(s).	Psalm(s)
Prov.	Proverbs
Eccles.	Ecclesiastes
Song	Song of Songs
Isa.	Isaiah
Jer.	Jeremiah
Lam.	Lamentations
Ezek.	Ezekiel
Dan.	Daniel
Hosea	Hosea
Joel	Joel
Amos	Amos
Obad.	Obadiah
Jon.	Jonah
Mic.	Micah
Nah.	Nahum
Hab.	Habakkuk
Zeph.	Zephaniah
Hag.	Haggai
Zech.	Zechariah
Mal.	Malachi

Deuterocanonical Books

1–2 Esd.	1–2 Esdras
1–4 Macc.	1–4 Maccabees
Sir.	Sirach/Ecclesiasticus
Sus.	Susanna
Tob.	Tobit
Wis.	Wisdom of Solomon

New Testament

Matt.	Matthew
Mark	Mark
Luke	Luke
John	John
Acts	Acts
Rom.	Romans
1–2 Cor.	1–2 Corinthians
Gal.	Galatians
Eph.	Ephesians
Phil.	Philippians
Col.	Colossians
1–2 Thess.	1–2 Thessalonians
1–2 Tim.	1–2 Timothy
Titus	Titus
Philem.	Philemon
Heb.	Hebrews
James	James
1–2 Pet.	1–2 Peter
1–3 John	1–3 John
Jude	Jude
Rev.	Revelation

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

Apoc. El.	*Apocalypse of Elijah*
2 Bar.	*2 Baruch (Syriac Apocalypse)*
3 Bar.	*3 Baruch (Greek Apocalypse)*
1 En.	*1 Enoch (Ethiopic Apocalypse)*
2 En.	*2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse)*
4 Ezra	*4 Ezra*
Jos. Asen.	*Joseph and Aseneth*
Jub.	*Jubilees*
L.A.B.	*Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* (Pseudo-Philo)
L.A.E.	*Life of Adam and Eve*
Let. Aris.	*Letter of Aristeas*
Odes Sol.	*Odes of Solomon*
Pss. Sol.	*Psalms of Solomon*
Sib. Or.	*Sibylline Oracles*

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

T. Ab.	*Testament of Abraham*
T. Benj.	*Testament of Benjamin*
T. Gad	*Testament of Gad*
T. Jud.	*Testament of Judah*
T. Levi	*Testament of Levi*
T. Mos.	*Testament of Moses*
T. Naph.	*Testament of Naphtali*
T. Sol.	*Testament of Solomon*

Dead Sea Scrolls

Dead Sea Scrolls not listed here are cited by cave number followed by the letter *Q* (for Qumran) and the document number (e.g., 4Q175).

CD	*Damascus Document*
1QapGen^{ar}	*Genesis Apocryphon*
1QM	*Milḥamah* (*War Scroll*)
1QpHab	*Pesher Habakkuk*
1QS	*Serek Hayaḥad* (*Rule of the Community*/*Manual of Discipline*)
1QSa	*Rule of the Congregation*
4QSam^{a}	Samuel
11QMelch	*Melchizedek*
11QtgJob	*Targum of Job*

Targumic Texts

Tg. Song	*Song of Songs Targum*

Rabbinic Works

The letters prefixed to the names of Mishnaic tractates indicate the following sources: Mishnah (*m.*), Tosefta (*t.*), Babylonian Talmud (*b.*), and Jerusalem/Palestinian Talmud (*y.*).

ʿAbod. Zar.	*ʿAbodah Zarah*
ʾAbot R. Nat.	*ʾAbot de Rabbi Nathan*
B. Bat.	*Baba Batra*
B. Qam.	*Baba Qamma*
Ber.	*Berakot*
Esther Rab.	*Esther Rabbah*
Ketub.	*Ketubbot*
Lev. Rab.	*Leviticus Rabbah*
Midr. Ps.	*Midrash on Psalms*
Miqw.	*Miqwaʾot*
Nid.	*Niddah*
Pesaḥ.	*Pesaḥim*
Qidd.	*Qiddušin*
Ruth Rab.	*Ruth Rabbah*
Šabb.	*Šabbat*
Sanh.	*Sanhedrin*
Šeb.	*Šebiʿit*
Šeqal.	*Šeqalim*
Song Rab.	*Song of Songs Rabbah*
Soṭah	*Soṭah*
Sukkah	*Sukkah*
Taʿan.	*Taʿanit*
Tamid	*Tamid*
Ṭehar.	*Ṭeharot*
Yad.	*Yadayim*
Yoma	*Yoma*

Apostolic Fathers

Barn.	*Barnabas*
1–2 Clem.	*1–2 Clement*
Did.	*Didache*
Diogn.	*Diognetus*
Herm. *Sim.*	Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitude*
Ign. *Magn.*	Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*
Pol. *Phil.*	Polycarp, *To the Philippians*

New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Acts Phil.	*Acts of Philip*
Acts Pil.	*Acts of Pilate*
Apos. Con.	*Apostolic Constitutions and Canons*
Gos. Pet.	*Gospel of Peter*
Gos. Thom.	*Gospel of Thomas*
Inf. Gos. Thom.	*Infancy Gospel of Thomas*
Prot. Jas.	*Protevangelium of James*

Ancient Authors

Aelius Aristides

Hier. log.	*Hieroi logoi* (*Sacred Tales*)

Aeschylus

Eum.	*Eumenides*

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Ambrose

Cain	*De Cain et Abel* (*Cain and Abel*)
Exp. Luc.	*Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* (*Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke*)

Aphthonius

Prog.	*Progymnasmata* (*Preliminary Exercises*)

Apuleius

Flor.	*Florida*
Metam.	*Metamorphoses* (*The Golden Ass*)

Archilochus

Carm.	*Carmina*

Aristophanes

Lys.	*Lysistrata*

Aristotle

Eth. eud.	*Ethica eudemia* (*Eudemian Ethics*)
Eth. nic.	*Ethica nichomachea* (*Nichomachean Ethics*)
Hist. an.	*Historia animalium* (*History of Animals*)
Rhet.	*Rhetorica* (*Rhetoric*)

Arrian

Epict. diss.	*Epicteti dissertationes* (*Discourses of Epictetus*)

Athenaeus

Deipn.	*Deipnosophistae* (*Banquet of the Learned*)

Augustine

Civ.	*De civitate Dei* (*The City of God*)
Cons.	*De consensu evangelistarum* (*Harmony of the Gospels*)
Serm.	*Sermones* (*Sermons*)

Caelius Aurelianus

Tard. pass.	*Tardarum passionum* (*On Chronic Diseases*)

Celsus

Med.	*De medicina* (*On Medicine*)

Chariton

Chaer.	*De Chaerea et Callirhoe* (*Chaereas and Callirhoe*)

Cicero

Amic.	*De amicitia* (*On Friendship*)
De or.	*De oratore* (*On the Orator*)
Div.	*De divinatione* (*On Divination*)
Inv.	*De inventione rhetorica* (*On Rhetorical Invention*)
Top.	*Topica* (*Topics*)

Clement of Alexandria

Strom.	*Stromata* (*Miscellanies*)

Corpus Hippocraticum

M. sacr.	*De morbo sacro* (*The Sacred Disease*)

Cyril of Alexandria

Comm. Luke	*Commentary on Luke*

Cyril of Jerusalem

Catech.	*Catechetical Lectures*

Demetrius

Eloc.	*De elocutione* (*On Style*)

Demosthenes

1 Aristog.	*In Aristogitonem* (*Against Aristogeiton*)
Or.	*Orationes* (*Orations*)

Dio Cassius

Hist. Rom.	*Historia Romana* (*Roman History*)

Dio Chrysostom

Charid.	*Charidemus* (*Or.* 30)
Or.	*Orationes* (*Orations*)
Ven.	*Venator* (*Or.* 7)

Diodorus Siculus

Bibl. hist.	*Bibliotheca historica* (*Library of History*)

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Diogenes Laertius

Vit. phil.	*Vitae philosophorum* (*Lives of the Philosophers*)

Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Ant. rom.	*Antiquitates romanae* (*Roman Antiquities*)
Thuc.	*De Thucydide* (*On Thucydides*)

Epictetus

Diatr.	*Diatribai* (*Dissertationes*)

Epiphanius

Pan.	*Panarion* (*Refutation of All Heresies*)

Euripides

Alc.	*Alcestis*
Hipp.	*Hippolytus*

Eusebius

Hist. eccl.	*Historia ecclesiastica* (*Ecclesiastical History*)

Galen

On Progn.	*On Prognosis*

Heliodorus

Aeth.	*Aethiopica*

Herodotus

Hist.	*Historiae* (*Histories*)

Hesiod

Op.	*Opera et dies* (*Works and Days*)

Hippolytus

Trad. ap.	*Traditio apostolica* (*The Apostolic Tradition*)

Homer

Il.	*Iliad*
Od.	*Odyssey*

Horace

Carm.	*Carmina* (*Odes*)
Ep.	*Epistulae* (*Epistles*)
Sat.	*Satirae* (*Satires*)

Irenaeus

Haer.	*Adversus haereses* (*Against Heresies*)

Isocrates

Nic.	*Nicocles*

Jerome

Comm. Isa.	*Commentariorum in Isaiam* (*Commentary on Isaiah*)
Epist.	*Epistulae* (*Letters*)
Tract. Ps.	*Tractatus in Psalmos* (*Tractate on Psalms*)
Vir. ill.	*De viris illustribus* (*On Illustrious Men*)

John Chrysostom

Hom. Gal.	*Homiliae in epistulam ad Galatas commentarius* (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*)
Hom. Matt.	*Homiliae in Matthaeum* (*Homilies on Matthew*)
Hom. Rom.	*Homiliae in epistulam ad Romanos* (*Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans*)

Josephus

Ag. Ap.	*Against Apion*
Ant.	*Antiquities of the Jews*
J.W.	*Jewish War*
Life	*The Life*

Justin Martyr

1 Apol.	*Apologia i* (*First Apology*)
2 Apol.	*Apologia ii* (*Second Apology*)
Dial.	*Dialogus cum Tryphone* (*Dialogue with Trypho*)

Juvenal

Sat.	*Satirae* (*Satires*)

Livy

Hist.	*Historiae* (*Histories*)

Longus

Daphn.	*Daphnis and Chloe*

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Lucian

Symp.	*Symposium*

Melito

Frag.	*Fragments*

Menander

Dysk.	*Dyskolos*

Nicolaus

Prog.	*Progymnasmata* (*Preliminary Exercises*)

Origen

Cels.	*Contra Celsum* (*Against Celsus*)
Comm. Jo.	*Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* (*Commentary on the Gospel of John*)
Comm. Matt.	*Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* (*Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*)
Fr. Luc.	*Fragmenta in Lucam* (*Fragments on Luke*)
Hom. Jer.	*Homiliae in Jeremiam* (*Homilies on Jeremiah*)
Hom. Luc.	*Homiliae in Lucam* (*Homilies on Luke*)
Mart.	*Exhortatio ad martyrium* (*Exhortation to Martyrdom*)

Ovid

Metam.	*Metamorphoses*

Pausanias

Descr.	*Graeciae descriptio* (*Description of Greece*)

Petronius

Sat.	*Satyricon*

Philo

Abr.	*De Abrahamo* (*On the Life of Abraham*)
Decal.	*De decalogo* (*On the Decalogue*)
Flacc.	*In Flaccum* (*Against Flaccus*)
Her.	*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* (*Who Is the Heir?*)
Legat.	*Legatio ad Gaium* (*On the Embassy to Gaius*)
Mos.	*De vita Mosis* (*On the Life of Moses*)
Sacr.	*De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* (*On the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel*)
Spec.	*De specialibus legibus* (*On the Special Laws*)
Virt.	*De virtutibus* (*On the Virtues*)

Philostratus

Vit. Apoll.	*Vita Apollonii* (*Life of Apollonius of Tyana*)
Vit. soph.	*Vitae sophistarum* (*Lives of the Sophists*)

Photius

Lex.	*Lexicon*

Plato

Apol.	*Apologia* (*Apology of Socrates*)
Euthyphr.	*Euthyphro*
Gorg.	*Gorgias*
Resp.	*Respublica* (*Republic*)
Soph.	*Sophista* (*Sophist*)

Plautus

Mil. glor.	*Miles gloriosus* (*The Swaggering Soldier*)

Pliny the Elder

Nat.	*Naturalis historia* (*Natural History*)

Plutarch

Adul. amic.	*De adulatore et amico* (*How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend*)
Aem.	*Aemilius Paullus*
Alc.	*Alcibiades*
Apoph. Lac.	*Apophthegmata laconica* (*Sayings of the Spartans*)
Cohib. ira	*De cohibenda ira* (*On the Control of Anger*)
Cons. Apoll.	*Consolatio ad Apollonium* (*Letter of Condolence to Apollonius*)

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Cor. *Marcius Coriolanus*
Cupid. divit. *De cupiditate divitiarum* (*On the Love of Wealth*)
Curios. *De curiositate* (*On Being a Busybody*)
Eum. *Eumenes*
Fac. *De facie in orbe lunae* (*On the Face in the Moon*)
Lib. ed. *De liberis educandis* (*On the Education of Children*)
Luc. *Lucullus*
Rom. *Romulus*
Quaest. rom. *Quaestiones romanae et graecae* (*Roman and Greek Questions*)
Sept. sap. conv. *Septem Sapientium Convivium* (*Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*)
Them. *Themistocles*
Tim. *Timolion*

Polemo
Phys. *De physiognomia* (*On Physiognomy*)

Pollux
Onom. *Onomasticon*

Polybius
Hist. *Historiae* (*Histories*)

Pseudo-Aristotle
Physiog. *Physiognomonica* (*Physiognomics*)

Pseudo-Hermogenes (Ps.-Hermogenes)
Prog. *Progymnasmata* (*Preliminary Exercises*)

Quintilian
Decl. *Declamationes* (*Declamations*)
Inst. *Institutio oratoria* (*Institutes of Oratory*)

Seneca
Ben. *De beneficiis* (*On Benefits*)
Brev. vit. *De brevitate vitae* (*On the Shortness of Life*)
Ep. *Epistulae morales* (*Moral Letters*)
Lucil. *Ad Lucilium* (*To Lucilius*)
Tro. *Troades* (*The Trojan Women*)

Sextus Empiricus
Pyr. *Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes* (*Outlines of Pyrrhonism*)

Sophocles
El. *Elektra*

Stobaeus
Flor. *Florilegium* (*Anthology*)

Strabo
Geogr. *Geographica* (*Geography*)

Suetonius
Aug. *Divus Augustus* (*Divine Augustus*)
Gramm. *De grammaticis* (*On Grammarians*)
Vesp. *Vespasianus* (*Vespasian*)

Tacitus
Ann. *Annales* (*Annals*)
Dial. *Dialogus de oratoribus* (*Dialogue on Oratory*)
Hist. *Historiae* (*Histories*)

Tertullian
Idol. *De idololatria* (*Idolatry*)
Marc. *Adversus Marcionem* (*Against Marcion*)
Praescr. *De praescriptione haereticorum* (*Prescription against Heretics*)

Theon
Prog. *Progymnasmata* (*Preliminary Exercises*)

Varro
Ling. *De lingua latina* (*On the Latin Language*)

Virgil
Aen. *Aeneid*
Georg. *Georgica*

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Xenophon	
Hell.	*Hellenica*
Mem.	*Memorabilia*
Xenophon of Ephesus	
Anth.	*An Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes*

Ancient Collections and Anonymous Works

Anon. Lat.	Anonymous Latin treatise *De physiognomonia*
Hom. Hym.	*Homeric Hymns*
Res gest. divi Aug.	*Res gestae divi Augusti*
Rh. Al.	*Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*
Rhet. Her.	*Rhetorica ad Herennium*

Series, Collections, and Reference Works

ANF	Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 vols. Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1885–97. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
APOT	R. H. Charles, ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.
BDAG	W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDF	*A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited by F. Blass and A. Debrunner. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
FC	Fathers of the Church: A New Translation. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1947–.
IG	*Inscriptiones graecae*. Editio minor. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1924–.
I.Priene	F. H. von Gaertringen and C. J. Fredrich. *Die Inschriften von Priene*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968.
L&N	J. P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
MM	J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. 1930. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
OTP	James H. Charlesworth, ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–85.
PL	Patrologia latina [= Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina]. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 221 vols. Paris, 1844–65 (with indexes).
SEG	Supplementum epigraphicum graecum
SIG	*Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. Edited by W. Dittenberger. 4 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1915–24.
Str-B	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. Munich: Beck, 1922–61.
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript — COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Luke

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Introduction

The Gospel of Luke has certainly not suffered from any lack of scholarly attention over the past few decades. Commentaries continue to pour forth (Bock 1994–96; Fitzmyer 1981–85; Johnson 1991; Culpepper 1995; Green 1997; Talbert 1982, 2002; Vinson 2008; D. Garland 2011; Carroll 2012). This introduction aims to address topics necessary to orient the reader in using the commentary as a guide for interpreting Luke's Gospel. Some of these issues are typically associated with critical introductions (authorship, date, place, etc.); others are not. The focus of the introduction, as with the commentary, is on the text and its interpretation (for more on interpretation see Bovon 2002–13; Parsons 2008a, 7–11).

To orient the user of this commentary, it is helpful to speak of the now familiar relationship among author, text, and audience, adjusted here to account for the particular shape of composition and reception of ancient texts.

Model of Communication for Reading Ancient Literature

Author(s) → Scribe(s) → Text → Lector → Audience

The process of composing texts in antiquity often involved a scribe, whose participation in the process may have varied from that of being a kind of human "word processor" who simply wrote down everything dictated by the author to the role of coauthor of the document. The role(s) of the scribe has been rather fully explored in Pauline studies (O'Connor 1995). Most likely, if Luke did use a scribe it would have been for the purposes of writing down his dictation.

The other end of the model likewise represents a complicated situation. It is widely recognized in NT studies that early Christian literature would have been read to a congregation or gathering of Christians by one appointed to

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

that task, usually referred to as the "reader" or "lector" (see Shiell 2004). The role of the reader was later institutionalized in the church in the form of the lector, a minor office in the church (see Tertullian, *Praescr.* 41; Hippolytus, *Trad. ap.* 1.12). We find references to "readers" and "public reading" in the various types of literature in the NT (Mark 13:14; 1 Tim. 4:13; Rev. 1:3; cf. Gamble 1995, 218–24). At the beginning of the Christian movement, then, those tapped for the task of public reading, whether of the Jewish Scriptures or of emerging Christian literature, would have been chosen on the basis of their gifts for public speaking. In addition to the reader being literate, this person's gifts would have included a strong voice and most likely some training in rhetoric. Among the rhetoricians, a strong voice was a natural gift. The reader of early Christian texts presumably had the "gift" of public speaking. The result of this idea being translated into the Christian thoughtworld was that effective public speaking was construed as evidence of a spiritual gift (*Apos. Con.* 8.22).

In the Roman period, training in rhetoric began in elementary school and continued, for those interested in pursuing a career in politics, through several advanced levels. We may assume that the first lectors or readers of early Christian literature were among those most highly trained in the practice of rhetoric. One bit of evidence for this point is found in Irenaeus, who claims that some heretics "do not know how to read Paul"; he gives as an example the need to clarify the use of *hyperbaton*, the transposition of words, in 2 Thess. 2:8 (*Haer.* 3.7.2). Irenaeus, at least, presumes that the "orthodox" reader will have enough rhetorical training to avoid some basic mistakes in delivery.

Relatively little attention is paid in this commentary to the actual "performance" of Luke's Gospel by the reader or lector, but the user of the commentary is well advised always to keep this fact in mind: the author of Luke expected his audience to experience the text aurally and communally (on the burgeoning field of "performance criticism," see Shiner 2003). For this reason, the commentary refers to "audience" or "authorial audience" (see Culy 2010) rather than "reader," not only in order to respect the role reserved for the "reader" or "lector" who "performs" the text by reading (or perhaps reciting) it aloud, but also to underscore the aural and communal context within which Luke expected his work to be experienced, and within which, in practice, it was. One imagines, then, a social context of early Christian worship in which the Third Gospel, as one among several early Christian texts, was read aloud as part of a Christian meeting, perhaps after a meal (following the pattern of the Hellenistic symposium), both for edification and for entertainment. The use of Luke as the textual basis for Christian proclamation did not arise until later.

The aim of this commentary, in keeping with the overall goals of the series in which it is published, is to read the final form of Luke's Gospel within the first-century historical, cultural, rhetorical, and theological contexts in which it was composed, as well as the first half of the first-century context, which

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

it purports to recount. The focus here is on the earliest reception of the final form of Luke. The rubrics of author, text, and audience thus serve as helpful reminders of the importance of the first communication between author and audience in the form of a written text within its historical context. Exploring the author, in terms of issues of composition, and the audience, in terms of its reception and formation, allows the focus to remain on the text itself, not as an autonomous entity removed from its historical moorings but rather as a written communication between author and audience deeply embedded and implicated within its historical circumstances. The history of interpretation plays a role, in the sense that knowledge of it can give clues as to the important issues raised by the text, as they have been understood over the history of the reception of the Third Gospel within the Christian community. Contextualizing the text in this way also allows theological issues of interest to contemporary Christian communities to arise naturally out of the exegetical treatment.

Assessing the Traditions of Authorship

Over the centuries, numerous traditions have evolved around this somewhat shadowy evangelist: Luke is credited with writing not only his Gospel but the NT book of Acts as well (on the assessment of the literary relationship of Luke and Acts, see below). He was, according to tradition, a physician and a friend of Paul, and he is described as a gentile writing for a gentile audience. The textual evidence suggests that these stories are very early, dating to the first and second century. By the fourth century, these traditions were well enough established to be summarized by the historian Eusebius and the church father Jerome (see the sidebar, "The Infancy of Luke's Own Narrative").

The Gospel title—*Kata Loukan* ([The Gospel] according to Luke)—appears at the end of the oldest extant manuscript of the Gospel of Luke, a papyrus known as $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, now in the Bodmer Library in Geneva. But this fragmentary manuscript dates only to about AD 175 to 225, or 100 to 125 years after the Gospel is thought to have been written. The title probably reflects the oldest tradition, linking an author named Luke to the writing of the Third Gospel. The reliability of this tradition, however, is uncertain. What else do we know about the author?

In the prologue to the Gospel the author seems to identify himself as a second-generation Christian relying on others' eyewitness testimonies (see comments on Luke 1:1–4). He cannot therefore be counted among the apostles. Furthermore, throughout the book of Acts, when describing Paul's activities the narrator occasionally shifts from the third- to the first-person plural "we" (Acts 16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1–28:16). For example, of Paul's final trip to Jerusalem, he writes: "When we found a ship bound for Phoenicia, we went on board and set sail. We came in sight of Cyprus; and leaving it on our

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

The Infancy of Luke's Own Narrative

The biography of Luke developed early. By the early fourth century, Eusebius—the bishop of Caesarea and the father of church history—had identified most of the traditions that scholars puzzle over today. In his *Ecclesiastical History* (ca. 312–24), Eusebius wrote:

> *"Luke, being by birth one of the people of Antioch, by profession a physician, having been with Paul a good deal, and having associated intimately with the rest of the apostles, has left us examples of the art of curing souls that he obtained from them in two divinely inspired books—the Gospel, which he testifies that he wrote out even as they delivered to him who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, all of whom [or "all of which facts"] he says he had followed even from the beginning, and the Acts of the Apostles, which he composed, receiving his information with his own eyes, no longer by hearsay."* (*Hist. eccl.* 3.4, trans. Cadbury 1922a, 233–35)

The church father Jerome (347–420) could add few details to Eusebius's account:

> *"The third [evangelist], Luke the physician, by birth a Syrian of Antioch, 'whose praise is in the gospel,' and himself a disciple of the apostle Paul, composed his book in the districts of Achaia and Boeotia, 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."* (*Comm. Matt.* preface, trans. Cadbury 1922a, 239)

left, we sailed to Syria and landed at Tyre, because the ship was to unload its cargo there. We looked up the disciples and stayed there for seven days. Through the Spirit they told Paul not to go into Jerusalem" (Acts 21:2–4). The church father Irenaeus was one of the first to interpret these "we" passages as evidence that Luke was a companion of Paul: "But that this Luke was inseparable from Paul and was his fellow-worker in the gospel he himself makes clear, not boasting of it, but compelled to do so by truth itself" (*Haer.* 3.14.1, trans. Cadbury 1922a, 213).

Modern scholars, however, are deeply divided regarding the significance of the "we" passages: Some argue that the first-person narration derives from diary material and demonstrates participation by the Gospel writer (or at least by the author of the diary material) (see Hemer 1989). Others argue that the author or a later editor is responsible for creating the first-person narration and that the "we" passages may not be used as evidence that the author was an inseparable or even sometime companion of Paul. Based on apparent tensions between the Lukan Paul and the Paul of the epistles, some have questioned whether the author of Acts knew Paul at all, much less was his traveling companion (see Vielhauer 1963 and the recent assessment of his work in Moessner et al. 2012). For example, Luke and Paul give conflicting

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

accounts regarding the number and nature of Paul's visits to Jerusalem, and (except in Acts 20:28) the Lukan Paul never refers to the death of Jesus as a saving event—a central point in the Letters of Paul (Rom. 3:25; 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; etc.). Still other scholars have argued that first-person narration was simply a common literary device in ancient sea-voyage literature and may not be used as evidence that the author was an eyewitness to the events narrated (Robbins 1978). None of these views has won a clear majority of support.

The name *Loukas* appears three times in letters attributed to Paul. This Luke, however, is never explicitly identified as the author of the Third Gospel. In a letter to Philemon, a Christian living in Colossae in Asia Minor, Paul lists a man named Luke as one of his "fellow workers" (Philem. 24); in an open letter to the Christian community of Colossae, the author sends greetings from "Luke, the beloved physician" (Col. 4:14). Finally, the author of the Pastoral Epistles, most likely one of Paul's followers who writes in Paul's voice, inserts these words in 2 Timothy: "Do your best to come to me soon, for Demas, in love with this present world, has deserted me and gone to Thessalonica; Crescens has gone to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. *Only Luke is with me.* Get Mark and bring him with you, for he is useful in my ministry" (2 Tim. 4:9–11; emphasis added). These scant references have augmented—or simply reflect—Luke's reputation as one of Paul's most faithful companions.

These references also lead us to the next assertion traditionally made about Luke: he was a physician, as is suggested by Col. 4:14. This too is repeated in the writings of Irenaeus and in the Muratorian Canon but has received mixed reviews in recent scholarship. Late in the nineteenth century, William K. Hobart searched the healing stories in Luke for what he believed were medical terms, such as "crippled," "pregnant," and "abscess," or ordinary words used in a "medical" sense. From this "internal evidence" Hobart (1882) concluded that Luke and Acts were written by the same person, and that the writer was a medical man. Henry Cadbury soon dismantled this argument by demonstrating that the terms on Hobart's lists occur in the Septuagint, Josephus, Plutarch, and Lucian, all nonmedical writers. Cadbury concluded, "The style of Luke bears no more evidence of medical training and interest than does the language of other writers who were not physicians" (1920, 50). In a tongue-in-cheek lexical note titled "Luke and the Horse-Doctors," Cadbury later (1933) showed that Luke's vocabulary shows a remarkable similarity with the corpus of writings of ancient veterinarians. His refutation was so effective that he virtually eliminated this special pleading to a so-called medical vocabulary (Fitzmyer 1981–85, 1:51–53). His students used to jest that Cadbury earned his doctorate by taking Luke's away. Cadbury (1920), however, remained agnostic regarding the identification of the author of the Third Gospel with Luke the physician.

The long-dominant view that Luke was a gentile has roots that reach back as far as the second century to an extrabiblical text, *Prologue to the Gospels.* This

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Reserved Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

text, also known as the *Anti-Marcionite Prologue*, contained a description of Luke that Eusebius, among others, followed: "Luke was a Syrian of Antioch, by profession a physician, the disciple of the apostles, and later a follower of Paul" (trans. Fitzmyer 1981–85, 1:38; see Gutwenger 1946, 393–409).

The view that Luke was a gentile does not rest solely on the tradition that he was an Antiochene, however. Rather, some accept Col. 4:14 as identifying Luke as a gentile. In the preceding verses of this letter, the author lists a number of Jews who worked with Paul: "Aristarchus my fellow prisoner greets you, as does Mark the cousin of Barnabas, concerning whom you have received instructions—if he comes to you, welcome him. And Jesus who is called Justus greets you. *These are the only ones of the circumcision among my co-workers for the kingdom of God*, and they have been a comfort to me" (Col. 4:10–11; emphasis added). The author then goes on to list a handful of other workers who, many readers presume, must be not Jews but "Greeks." He includes "Luke, the beloved physician" in this latter list (Col. 4:14).

Recently, however, a small but vocal minority has raised the possibility that Luke was Jewish, or at least deeply interested in Judaism (see Jervell 1972; Tiede 1980). They assume that the Luke referred to in Colossians was either a "God-fearer" with deep Jewish interests or not the same person as the author of the Gospel. This view too has ancient roots. In the fourth century, Bishop Epiphanius of Cyprus suggested that Luke was one of the seventy disciples sent out by Jesus (Luke 10) and was thus presumably Jewish (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 51.110).

Some have assumed that if Luke was from such a well-known Greco-Roman city as Antioch, he must have been a gentile. However, Antioch did have a Jewish community: Josephus notes that the first Seleucid king, Seleucus Nicator (ca. 358–281 BC), who made Antioch his capital, granted the local Jews citizenship in gratitude for their having fought with the Greek armies. Thus, even the tradition that Luke was from Antioch, an "Antiochene," does not preclude his being Jewish (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.39). And according to John Chrysostom, who served as deacon of Antioch in the late fourth century AD, the city had several synagogues. The archaeological evidence of the Jewish community is limited, however, to a small stone fragment of a menorah and a lead curse tablet referring to the biblical God Yahweh. Furthermore, the narratives of Luke and Acts themselves have led scholars like David Tiede to conclude that "the polemics, scriptural arguments, and 'proofs' which are rehearsed in Luke-Acts are part of an intrafamily struggle [among Jews] that, in the wake of the destruction of the temple, is deteriorating into a fight over who is really the faithful 'Israel'" (Tiede 1980, 7).

Luke's literary artistry has long been recognized. The early church scholar Jerome (ca. 347–420) asserts that Luke's "language in the Gospel, as well as in the Acts of the Apostles, that is, in both volumes is more elegant, and smacks of secular eloquence" (*Comm. Isa.* 3.6, trans. Cadbury 1922a, 235–37). This view of Luke's literary prowess continued through the medieval and

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Renaissance periods. In the thirteenth century, the writer Jacobus de Voragine (1229–98) praised Luke's writing as clear, pleasing, and touching: "His gospel is permeated by much truth, filled with much usefulness, adorned with much charm, and confirmed by many authorities" (*Golden Legend*, 2.251, trans. Ryan 1995). In ancient rhetorical traditions, clarity was often linked to vividness (appealing to the eye and not the ear; Quintilian, *Inst*. 8.3.62; *Rhet*. *Her*. 4.39.51). Perhaps Luke's vivid prose combined with his careful attention to Mary's story commended him as the obvious choice to be the sole portrayer of Mary's true likeness.

Physician, gentile or Jew, companion of Paul, writer of the Third Gospel and Acts—what one thinks about the identity of Luke rests in large part on one's assessment of these traditions. Did the early church have information about the identity of the author of Luke and Acts that is no longer available to us? Or did someone looking to identify the otherwise anonymous author simply deduce Luke's identity from the text of the NT?

Presumably the Gospel's prologue, where the author seems to identify himself as a second-generation Christian, excludes identifying the author as an apostle (and thus makes the choice of a "lesser" figure almost inevitable). The "we" sections in Acts seem to demand someone who was a companion of Paul, and Luke the beloved physician emerges as a likely—though, importantly, not the only—candidate.

However, we must consider the stability of the tradition that identifies Luke as the author (see Hengel 2000). Strictly speaking, the Third Gospel is an anonymous document, making no internal claims about its authorship. That all testimony agrees in identifying the author as a relatively obscure man named Luke is no trivial matter. Regardless of his identity, the author of Luke and Acts has left for us works that remain two of the most significant contributions by an early Christian to our understanding of the founder of Christianity and his first followers.

The Text of Luke and Issues of Intertextuality

Narrowly speaking, critical introductions to the "text" of Luke usually include discussions of the manuscript evidence and issues of textual criticism. While the term "text" is used here more broadly to speak of issues related to the work itself (rather than the author or audience), it is wise to begin with this more narrow understanding.

Occasionally, the commentary will treat textual variants as they might shed light on the meaning of a particular passage (e.g., see esp. the treatment of the notoriously difficult problems associated with Luke 22:43–44; for other textual issues in Luke see Culy, Parsons, and Stigall 2010), but the text of the Third Gospel does not have the same colorful textual history as does its

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

sequel, the Acts of the Apostles (see below and Parsons 2008a, 11–15). For that reason and for the most part, I follow the text of NA[28]/UBS[4] in the commentary. There is one notable set of exceptions that occur mostly in Luke 24 and are part of a larger and fascinating chapter in the history of the text of the NT. Based on the work of Michael Martin (2005), who has revived the insights of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort (1881, 176), I follow the shorter text in seven places in Luke 24:

24:3: The word "Lord" is added before Jesus in "they did not find the body of Jesus."

24:5b: The sentence "He is not here; he has been raised" is added after the question "Why are you looking for the living among the dead?"

24:12: The entire verse is added: "Then Peter got up and ran to the tomb. When he bent over [to look inside], he saw the pieces of linen cloth lying there alone. Then he went home, amazed at what had happened."

24:36b: The clause "And he said to them, 'Peace be with you!'" is added at the end of the verse.

24:40: The entire verse is added: "When he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet."

24:51b: The clause "and he was brought up into heaven" is added at the end of the verse.

24:52: The phrase "after they had worshiped him" is added toward the beginning of the verse.

Luke, Acts, and the Other Gospels

There are also questions regarding the literary relationship between Luke and Acts that the widespread consensus that the author of Luke also wrote the Acts of the Apostles does not necessarily clarify (interest in the question of unity has reemerged since Parsons and Pervo 1993; see Rowe 2005, 2007; Johnson 2005; Bockmuehl 2005; Bird 2007; Spencer 2007). Each document has its own distinct reception history (see Gregory 2003, 300–301), a point that speaks against a precanonical "narrative" unity of the two documents. For example, the evidence of early Gospel collections fails to support an original unity (Parsons and Pervo 1993). The oldest copy of the fourfold Gospel, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ (ca. AD 200), also contains Acts but has the Gospels in the traditional order: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Codex Bezae preserves the so-called Western order of the two apostles (Matthew and John), followed by the two "apostolic companions" (Luke and Mark). Here Luke and Acts could easily have been placed together, but Mark stands between Luke and Acts. Thus a great opportunity was missed to place Luke last in the order and alongside Acts, preserving both the tetraevangelium *and* the unity of Luke and Acts. The Cheltenham Canon (ca. 360) and the stichometry provided in Codex Claromontanus (seventh century) place Luke

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

last among the Gospels, but Acts comes after the Pauline Epistles in the former and at the end of the NT books in the latter. $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ (seventh century) puts Acts with the General Epistles (see Parsons and Pervo 1993, 22). The inescapable conclusion is that there is simply no manuscript evidence in which Luke and Acts ever appear side by side, ready for reading as one, continuous whole. Some have countered that the reception history does not necessarily reflect authorial intention, and in the example of Luke/Acts, most certainly does not (Johnson 2005). But is this necessarily the case?

That the textual history of Luke is distinct from that of Luke's other volume, the Acts of the Apostles, is not always fully appreciated in discussions of the relationship between Luke and Acts from the point of view of *intentio operis* (the intention of the work). Bruce Metzger has noted: "The text of the book of the Acts of the Apostles circulated in the early church in two quite distinct forms, commonly called the Alexandrian and the Western" (1994, 222). The same cannot be said about Luke's Gospel. Furthermore, while the Western tradition of Acts shares features with that of Luke (as well as of the other Gospels and the Pauline corpus), "there are variants of another kind, peculiar to the Western text of Acts" (1994, 233). These variants

> include many additions, long and short, of a substantive nature that reveal the hand of a reviser. . . . The reviser, who was obviously a meticulous and well-informed scholar, eliminated seams and gaps and added historical, biographical, and geographical details. Apparently, the reviser did his work at an early date, before the text of Acts had come to be generally regarded as a sacred text that must be preserved inviolate. (Metzger 1994, 233)

Regardless of how one accounts for the origins of these two textual traditions of Acts (Metzger 1994, 225–32), their existence provides further support for the conclusion that Acts has its own distinctive transmission history and points to a circulation of the text of Acts independent of the Third Gospel.

The little evidence that we do have, then, does *not* suggest that these two documents, Luke and Acts, were published together by Luke as one volume or even published at the same time, only later to be separated from each other with the emergence of the fourfold Gospel. Rather, the manuscript traditions suggest two distinct transmission histories, one for the Gospel and one for Acts. At the least, this implies that the two were published and disseminated separately and, quite probably, at different times. Furthermore, there is nothing in the Lukan prologue (1:1–4) that suggests that Luke already had Acts in mind when he wrote the Third Gospel (see Parsons 2007, 40–50). Thus, while reference will be made in the commentary to places in Acts that, in retrospect and after both documents were composed and circulated, enrich our reading of the Gospel, these points of contact are not based on the assumption that they were available to the authorial audience.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

The prologue to the Third Gospel also suggests that Luke writes, in part, because previous attempts at Gospels have proven, in his opinion, unsuccessful in producing a rhetorically persuasive narrative (see Parsons 2007, 40–50). On the basis of Luke's reference to "many" other attempts to write accounts of Jesus's life, it seems that a plurality of Gospels was already a reality by the time the Third Gospel was written (probably in the 80s or early 90s). The number and content of these other "Gospels" is unknown; the "many" (even if hyperbolic) may have included "heretics" who "used traditional material in the interest of their own perverse propaganda" (Danker 1988, 24). In this sense, Luke may have been partially successful in replacing some of these previous "attempts," of which he is critical (and thus contributed to the loss of some early accounts that are no longer extant). Still, Luke probably did not think his version of the Jesus story would replace *all* other versions. And even if he did, by the time he published Acts, he would have known that this was not the case. His account of "the things accomplished" (Luke 1:1) had taken its place alongside other versions. Thus, when Luke wrote Acts he did so in the full knowledge that it would be read as a "sequel," not just to his Gospel, but to a plurality of narratives about Jesus, what would later be dubbed simply as "the gospel" (of which there emerged four authoritative versions, but still of ONE gospel). These Gospels (Luke and Mark and an indeterminate number of others) were already being read together in Christian worship by the time Acts was published (Parsons 2009).

From a plurality of Gospels would eventually emerge the notion of one Gospel in four versions, indirectly attested by the longer ending of Mark, which presumes a fourfold Gospel in the early second century (see Kelhoffer 2000). When canonizers/collectors placed Acts after the fourfold Gospel (whether in the "Eastern" or "Western" order), they were actually *fulfilling* the *intentio operis* that Luke be read primarily in relationship to the other Gospels. Later, Acts would be read as the sequel to "the Gospel," with Luke as the "first among equals," albeit in ways Luke could not perhaps have fully anticipated.

So the Third Gospel was originally read and heard as one version among several of the one story of Jesus. The relationship of Luke to those other versions is typically pursued along source-critical lines: which Gospel writer used which other texts? That question is typically answered from the point of view of composition. In this commentary (as with its companion, the Paideia commentary on Acts; see Parsons 2008a), I am attempting to understand the earliest reception of Luke by the "authorial audience" (see below) and so pose the question from a slightly different perspective (i.e., from the other end of the author/audience communication model): within what intertextual web did the authorial audience hear Luke's version of the story of Jesus? For purposes of the commentary, I am assuming that the early Christian audience was familiar with Mark and also with traditions found in common between Luke and Matthew. While from a compositional point of view, most scholars

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

label as "Q" the ultimate source of this double tradition (though not all; e.g., consider the work of Farrer Hypothesis advocates, Mark Goodacre [2002], etc.), I analyze Luke from the point of view of its earliest reception and conclude that even if Luke was working with Q at a compositional level (a point about which I remain stubbornly agnostic), it is impossible finally to know if Luke's authorial audience had access to that double tradition material either through Matthew's Gospel or Q. It is reasonable, therefore, to ask how the authorial audience would have responded to Luke's version of the Jesus story, which at times presents a significantly different account of the same story. Here we are not interested in the minute alterations of single words or slight shifts in word order (the common stock of source and redaction criticism) but rather focus on those changes that the authorial audience, familiar with Matthew (or Q?) and Mark, would not have missed (which, of course, may at times include change of wording or word order). And we ask, what would be the rhetorical impact of such modifications on the authorial audience? Here, then, the issue is the way in which these previous texts are echoed and reconfigured in this new text. How did the authorial audience, familiar with Matthew and Mark, respond to Luke's version of the Jesus story? And how did the perceived genre of those Gospels affect the hearer's understanding?

Luke and Genre

Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship on the Gospels recognized similarities between the canonical Gospels and ancient biographies and assumed they belonged to the same genre (Renan 1863; Votaw 1915). That view was soon overturned by the writings of Rudolf Bultmann, who mounted a forceful argument against this view and concluded that the canonical Gospels were *sui generis*, a genre unto themselves (1928, cols. 418–22). This opinion held sway in critical scholarship until the last quarter of the twentieth century. Earlier attempts (Shuler 1975, 1982; Talbert 1977) to classify the Gospels as ancient biographies had a mixed reception, but with the work of Richard Burridge (1992, 2004), the pendulum has seemingly swung back fully in the direction of Renan and Votaw. After a careful and exhaustive study of extant Greco-Roman biographies, and allowing for some minor differences, Burridge concludes that the canonical Gospels belong to the genre of ancient *bios* or biography. Ancient *bioi* focus on elucidating the "essence" of the individual who is the subject of the biography. What is the payoff in knowing the genre of the Gospels or, indeed, of any writing? Burridge elaborates: "To avoid the errors likely in simple application of a text to ourselves without regard for the setting and background of either, appreciation of genre is crucial as a major 'filter' through which the author 'encoded' his message, and through which we may 'decode' the same" (1992, 247). We may further classify the canonical Gospels in the subgenre of the encomiastic biography, whose purpose includes the praise of its subject around a cluster of topics. These topics are

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

not required in every encomium (the progymnasmatists do not even agree on the list of topics), but they do recur with a remarkable frequency in ancient biography (e.g., Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*; Philo, *On the Life of Moses*; Josephus, *The Life*; cited by Martin 2008; see also Hock 1995, 15–20, on the *Protevangelium of James*).

These encomiastic features provide a convenient way of understanding the general flow of Luke's narrative. In line with the progymnastic conventions (Shuler 1990, 474–79; Martin 2008), Luke addresses the topics of Jesus's origins (1:26–31; 3:21–38; Aphthonius, *Prog.* 22R; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 15; cf. Theon, *Prog.* 110); the marvelous occurrences associated with his birth (2:1–39; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 15; Nicolaus, *Prog.* 51, 59–60); his nurture and training (2:40–52; 4:1–13; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 16, 19; Nicolaus, *Prog.* 52; Theon, *Prog.* 110); his pursuits and deeds (4:14–21:38; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 16, 19); the manner (and meaning) of his death (22:1–23:49; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 16, 19; Aphthonius, *Prog.* 42); and events after his death (23:50–24:53; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 16, 19). The proposed structure of Luke's Gospel in this commentary presumes, but does not conform exactly to, this basic list (see below).

Although they did not necessarily agree in every detail, the progymnastic theorists and authors of ancient *bios* literature did concur that after describing the national origin, birth, nurture, and upbringing of the significant person, one should turn attention to the subject's public accomplishments. According to Pseudo-Hermogenes, this involved an account of the subject's "profession, that is, what sort of life he led, a philosopher or a rhetor or a soldier? Most important are his deeds; for his deeds are part of his way of living. That is, having chosen a soldier's life, what sort of things did he accomplish in it?" (Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 16, trans. author). Thus, the deeds in an ancient *bios* were understood as both illustrating and fulfilling the subject's chosen profession and were necessary to give the "full range" of the subject's life (Burridge 2004; Martin 2008, 23–24). Certainly Luke agreed with this concern, as nearly two-thirds of the Third Gospel is devoted to an account of Jesus's public ministry (4:14–21:38).

For those treating philosophers or teachers (see Lucian, *Demonax*; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*; Philo, *On the Life of Moses*), these deeds included the person's teaching (Burridge 2004, 202). Quintilian, for example, commented: "In some cases the more attractive course has proved to be to follow the successive stages of a man's life and the order of his actions; thus under his first years would come praise of his natural abilities, then of his education, then of the whole series of his works, that is to say his deeds and sayings" (*Inst.* 3.7.15, trans. Russell 2001; cf. Theon, *Prog.* 78). Thus, it comes as no surprise that Luke characterizes Jesus's greatness in terms both of his mighty words and of his mighty deeds (Luke 24:19; cf. Acts 1:1; 2:22–24), and in light of these comments about the structure and function of ancient *bioi*,

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

this section of Luke that deals with Jesus's "pursuits and deeds" (4:14–19:44), that is, his public ministry, is the largest section in the Third Gospel and may aptly be further divided into two smaller units according to the locale of Jesus's public activities:

Jesus's Mighty Words and Deeds in Galilee (4:14–9:50)
Jesus's Mighty Words and Deeds along the Way (9:51–19:44)

In Luke's *bios* of Jesus, Jesus's mighty words and deeds substantiate the christological claims Luke is making for Jesus and his vocation (see Burridge 2004, 248–50, 288–94).

And what is that vocation? Jesus is God's Messiah (kingship was a typical *bios* topic; see Aphthonius, *Prog.* 41). Luke has already informed the audience of this in the announcement of Jesus's birth; he will be the "'Son of the Most High'; and the Lord God will give the throne of his ancestor David to him. He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and his kingdom will have no end" (1:32–33). At his baptism, God declares that Jesus is the "beloved Son" (3:22). These two claims about Jesus—Davidic descent and divine sonship—are complementary, not competitive, titles (cf. Philo's complementary description of Moses as prophet, lawgiver, priest, and king in *On the Life of Moses*), and both point to Jesus's vocation as Messiah (see 4:41, in which the two titles are essentially presented as synonyms). Jesus's "messiahship is confirmed by both his Davidic descent and his sonship to God" (M. Strauss 1995, 92). Later, his role as eschatological prophet will serve to enrich this portrait of Jesus (24:19), and more immediately, the Lukan Jesus will reveal his messianic ministry as God's anointed one in Isaianic terms (4:14–30). Jesus's mighty words and deeds then must be viewed, in terms of the topics of an ancient *bios*, as an explication of Jesus's vocation as Messiah. Furthermore, these titles assigned to Jesus—whether Son, Messiah, or Prophet—are not static but rather accrue their meaning as the *bios* of Jesus unfolds in the Third Gospel.

The climax occurs in the Gospel's last section, which deals with the manner of Jesus's death (22:1–23:49; the account of the Last Supper is included here rather than with Jesus's pursuits and deeds, for reasons explained at that point in the commentary) and the events that follow his death, which revolve around the fact that the grave cannot hold him (23:50–24:53).

The Audience of Luke and Issues of Reception and Formation

Interest in the "reader(s)" or "audience" of biblical texts has soared in recent decades (see Fowler 1991; Powell 1990). Understanding the terminology of reader-oriented interpretations, however, is not always easy. This

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Reserved Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Outline of Luke

Jesus's origins and training (1:1–4:13)
- Preface (1:1–4)
- Annunciations: John and Jesus (1:5–56)
- Birth and training: John and Jesus (1:57–2:52)
- Beginning Jesus's Public Ministry (3:1–4:13)

Jesus's mighty words and deeds in Galilee (4:14–9:50)
- Jesus's mission and miracles and the ingathering of his followers (4:14–6:49)
- Jesus's marvelous words and deeds (7:1–8:56)
- Jesus's miracles and mission and the sending out of his followers (9:1–50)

Jesus's mighty words and deeds along the way (part 1) (9:51–14:35)
- Beginning the journey (Luke 9:51–11:13)
- Jesus in dialogue (11:14–13:9)
- More healings and parables (13:10–14:35)

Jesus's mighty words and deeds along the way (part 2) (15:1–19:44)
- The character of God and the "lost" parables (15:1–32)
- The use and abuse of wealth (16:1–17:10)
- Jesus's teaching about the kingdom (17:11–18:30)
- Drawing near to Jerusalem (18:31–19:44)

Jesus in Jerusalem: teachings, death, and resurrection (19:45–24:53)
- Jesus in and around the temple (19:45–21:38)
- The meaning and manner of Jesus's death (22:1–23:49)
- Jesus's burial, empty tomb, and postresurrection appearances (23:50–24:53)

commentary attempts to consider two kinds of readers or audiences: the constructed "authorial audience" and real, flesh-and-blood contemporary Christian communities, although the focus in the commentary proper is clearly on the former.

The Authorial Audience of Luke

This commentary is written from the perspective of the authorial audience, that is, the reception of the text by the audience that the author had in mind when he wrote his Gospel (see Rabinowitz 1987; Carter 1996; Talbert 1998, 2003; Parsons 2007). Presumably the authorial audience knew how to respond appropriately (if unconsciously) to the effects of persuasive rhetoric. Thus, the commentary attempts to understand the ways in which the rhetorical strategies, literary conventions, and cultural scripts in the final form of Luke

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

were received by the authorial audience. The authorial audience is not a real, flesh-and-blood audience; it is, nonetheless, historically circumscribed.

The effort, then, is both historical and hermeneutical, and it is important to outline the parameters of that historical task. First, Luke's authorial audience is not to be mistaken for a specific second-century community; in other words, there was no "Lukan community" per se whose interests and needs we can tease from between the lines of Luke's Gospel (Johnson 1979). Rather, the Gospel of Luke was addressed to a general Christian audience, living in the Roman Empire at the turn of the second century (Bauckham 1998a). Thus, Luke is read in its historical context, but as Bauckham says, "That context is not the evangelist's community. It is the early Christian movement in the late first century" (1998a, 46). For this reason, attempts to locate the provenance of either the author or the audience have failed to create a critical consensus and, more telling, have proven mostly irrelevant for interpreting the text.

For purposes of the commentary, I assume that both Luke and the authorial audience of the Third Gospel were familiar with the cultural scripts and rhetorical conventions of the larger Greco-Roman world, scripts and conventions that were extant in specific documents that they may or may not have known. The audience is also familiar with the basic themes of the Jewish Scriptures, other Second Temple Jewish literature (or at least the prominent themes that those documents preserve and reflect), and other early Christian literature (at least Mark, double tradition material that they accessed through Matthew, and perhaps some other Christian literature).

The commentary focuses on how the authorial audience heard Luke within the web of other texts and contexts familiar to that audience. And we ask, what would be the rhetorical impact of such "intertextuality" on the authorial audience? Here, then, the issue is the way in which these cultural scripts and rhetorical conventions are echoed and reconfigured in this new text. This kind of intertextual exploration takes into account those rhetorical conventions, social scripts, and theological concepts reflected in those texts and with which the audience would likely have been familiar.

Luke also understood his task as having hermeneutical implications. Education, or *paideia*, in the ancient world (not unlike today in many quarters) "was based on the transmission of an established body of knowledge, about which there was wide consensus" (Cribiore 2001, 8). The transmission of traditional values resulted in the formation of the moral character of the students (or audience; Penner 2003). Theon of Alexandria, author of the earliest of the extant progymnasmata, confirms this point several times: "Surely the exercise . . . not only creates a certain faculty of speech but also good character [*ethos*], while we are being exercised in the moral sayings of the wise" (Theon, *Prog.* 60.18, trans. Kennedy 2003, 4; see also 71.6; 78.9). Thus, beyond acquiring facility in grammar and rhetoric, a fortunate by-product of the rhetorical

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

exercises from the teacher's point of view was the shaping of moral habits that reflected the prevailing cultural values of the day.

At the same time that Luke acquired the ability to read and write through his rhetorical education, he also learned *ethos* argumentation, that is, how to shape the moral character of his audience and thus how to inculcate those values in the student/audience's moral vision. The moral vision propagated by the progymnasmatists was elitist, racist, and sexist. The ideal was the free, male Roman citizen against whom all others were deemed inferior (Gleason 1995). While Luke invokes the methods and categories of rhetorical argument, he often does so only to subvert or overturn them, a rhetorical move of *ethos* argumentation that he no doubt learned from the very teachers of grammar and rhetoric whose moral vision he so severely challenges (Parsons 2007). In its place, Luke offers a vision of God's family that is inclusive of Jew and gentile, rich and disenfranchised, male and female, slave and free, the physically whole and the physically disabled. Luke's use of rhetoric is aimed at forming the moral character and theological vision of the Christian community so that the followers may more faithfully imitate the founder, Jesus the Christ, whose story he tells (for a similar argument, see Bockmuehl 2006).

The Contemporary Christian Audience(s) of Luke

The contemporary Christian community is invited to participate in this vision, to adopt the point of view of the authorial audience Luke had in mind. Of course, such imitation of the authorial audience by a contemporary Christian community, removed by space and time, can only be approximate at best and may entail, from time to time, acknowledging contextual differences. For example, the contemporary Christian reader, living in a post-Holocaust context, must acknowledge the difficulty and difference in hearing Luke's story of the conflict between Jesus and his followers and other Jewish groups, as Luke intended it, as an intra-Jewish debate.

The "Theological Issues" section of the commentary draws on interpretive issues of interest to the contemporary Christian community, whose preunderstanding of Luke is shaped to varying degrees by these diverse liturgical and theological influences. Luke's own commitment to this formation of Christian character functions as the springboard for these reflections. Sometimes this section raises theological issues within the context of the larger Christian canon. At other times, the history of the interpretation of the text is brought to bear. As the meaning(s) of the text for the authorial audience comes into focus, the implications for the contemporary faith community become more transparent. This is not to suggest that the "Theological Issues" sections exhaust the possible topics for consideration; rather, they should be viewed as conversation starters and as attempts to extend Luke's spiritual formation of his audience into faithful disciples who can know more fully the truth of the matters in which they have been instructed.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript — COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Conclusion

To summarize: The author of the Third Gospel, who is traditionally known as Luke, also wrote what became known as the Acts of the Apostles as a sequel to a plurality of Gospels then currently in use, of which the Third Gospel (which "Luke" also wrote) stands as the "first among equals." The Third Gospel was written in the 80s (or 90s), followed some years later by Acts (within the first two decades of the second century, ca. AD 110). Little can be known for certain regarding the identity of the author of Luke; what is clear is that the text presents a distinct portrait of Jesus that takes its place alongside other versions of that story. In his composition of his Gospel, Luke demonstrated command of a number of rhetorical conventions and techniques, drew on various cultural and social scripts, and wrote his story of Jesus within the generic contours of ancient biography or *bios* (see Burridge 1992, 2004). The Third Gospel was written *not* for a specific "Lukan community" (Johnson 1979; Bauckham 1998a) but rather for a general audience of early Christians living in the ancient Mediterranean world. We cannot know—and fortunately for our purposes do not need to know—exactly where Luke was composed. It is difficult to distinguish when Luke's writing reflects things as they were when they happened, or things as they were in Luke's day at the time of his writing, or things as Luke hoped they would be. Luke's primary purpose in writing is to "school" his intended audience in the moral and theological implications of the Christian vision by telling the story of that movement's founder, Jesus of Nazareth. For contemporary Christians to adopt the point of view of the authorial audience (with the nuances necessary for a document set in circumstances nineteen hundred years ago) is to share in this vision; it is to be theologically formed by the perspectives of this part of the Christian canon.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

PART 1

Luke 1:1–4:13

Jesus's Origins and Training

Under the influence of source and redactional analyses, many modern commentators have viewed the infancy narrative of Luke 1–2 as the first discrete unit of the Third Gospel (Plummer 1903; Laurentin 1957; Leaney 1961–62; Morris 1974; Fitzmyer 1981–85; Nolland 1989–93; Johnson 1991; Ernst 1993; Bock 1994–96; Culpepper 1995; Bovon 2002–13; but cf. Talbert 2002). From a redactional point of view, a clear demarcation emerges between Luke 1–2 (which contains material unique to Luke) and Luke 3 (which, like Mark, begins with the ministry of John and the baptism of Jesus). Based on the progymnastic topic lists conventional for ancient *bioi*, however, it is more likely that the authorial audience would have expected the opening segment to deal with matters related to Jesus's "prepublic" career and thus would have heard Luke 1:1–4:13, the material leading up to the beginning of Jesus's public ministry in Nazareth, as a coherent unit (see the introduction; Martin 2008). Furthermore, Luke employs the rhetorical device of *synkrisis*, or comparison, in his presentation of Jesus's origins and nurture/training. Specifically, he compares Jesus's origins and training with those of John the Baptist.

This Jesus/John comparison is especially concentrated on origins and nurture/training in this opening unit, 1:1–4:13 (see table 1), but does throughout

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Synkrisis in Luke

In its simplest terms, *synkrisis* is "language setting the better or worse side by side" (Theon, *Prog.* 112, trans. Kennedy 2003, 52). Comparing two similarly noteworthy persons (or objects) for the purpose of praise is a *synkrisis* in a double encomium (see the introduction), which occurs, according to Nicolaus, when "the subjects under discussion are both equal to each other or that one is greater than the other" (Nicolaus, *Prog.* 60, trans. Kennedy 2003, 162; see Aphthonius, *Prog.* 31R–32R). In Luke 1:1–4:13, we have an example of a double encomium in which Luke praises both John the Baptist and Jesus but clearly prefers Jesus as John the Baptist's superior.

Luke 1:1–4:13 in Context

- ▶ **Jesus's origins and training (1:1–4:13)**
  - **Preface (1:1–4)**
  - **Annunciations: John and Jesus (1:5–56)**
    - The annunciation of John's birth (1:5–25)
    - The annunciation of Jesus's birth (1:26–38)
    - The visitation (1:39–56)
  - **Birth and training: John and Jesus (1:57–2:52)**
    - John's birth and upbringing (1:57–80)
    - Jesus's birth and upbringing (2:1–52)
  - **Beginning Jesus's public ministry (3:1–4:13)**
    - John in the wilderness (3:1–20)
    - Jesus in the wilderness (3:21–4:13)
- **Jesus's mighty words and deeds in Galilee (4:14–9:50)**
- **Jesus's mighty words and deeds along the way (part 1) (9:51–14:35)**
- **Jesus's mighty words and deeds along the way (part 2) (15:1–19:44)**
- **Jesus in Jerusalem: teachings, death, and resurrection (19:45–24:53)**

the rest of the Gospel touch on the entire range of progymnastic topics, including John's pursuits and deeds (5:33–35; 7:18–33; 11:1; 16:16; 20:1–8), the manner of his death (9:7–9), and events after his death (9:7–20; see Martin 2008, 40).

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Table 1. John the Baptist and Jesus Compared

Topic of *synkrisis*	John the Baptist	Jesus
Homeland	Judea (1:5a)	Galilee (1:26a)
City	Jerusalem (implied by father's status as "priest"; 1:5b)	Nazareth (1:26b), but born in Bethlehem (2:4)
Father	Zechariah (1:5b)	Joseph (1:27a), but conceived by the Holy Spirit as God's son (1:35; cf. 3:21–38)
Ancestors	Zechariah from the priestly order of Abijah (1:5b)	Joseph from the house of David (1:27b)
Mother	Zechariah's wife, a descendent of Aaron (1:5c); "Her name was Elizabeth" (1:5c)	"The name of the virgin was Mary" (1:27c)
Marvelous occurrences at birth	Zechariah's vision of an angel (1:11–12)	Mary's vision of an angel (1:28–29)
	angel's oracle to Zechariah concerning birth, name, and career (= preparer figure) of son (1:13–17)	angel's oracle to Mary concerning birth, name, and career (= Messiah) of son (1:30–37)
	Zechariah does not believe the oracle; he receives another oracle concerning his punishment for his unbelief (1:18–23)	Mary believes the oracle; she receives another oracle—from Elizabeth—blessing her and praising her for her belief (1:38–45)
	oracle's fulfillment celebrated by Elizabeth: the Lord "looks favorably upon her" (she conceives despite barrenness; 1:24–25)	oracle's fulfillment celebrated by Mary: the Lord "looks favorably upon her" (she conceives despite virginity; 1:46–56)
	oracle's fulfillment: Elizabeth bears a son (1:57)	oracle's fulfillment: Mary bears a son (2:1–7)
	neighbors/relatives told of birth (1:58)	shepherds told of birth (2:8–13) through visions (2:9, 13) and oracles (2:10–12, 14); given a "sign": "you will find a child wrapped in bands of cloth and lying in a manger" (2:12 NRSV)
		shepherd's witness, report marvelous events that occurred immediately after birth; amazement ensues (2:8–20)
		portentous distancing from Joseph: Jesus dedicated as firstborn to his "Father's house" (2:49), but not sacrificially redeemed by Joseph

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Topic of *synkrisis*	John the Baptist	Jesus
		oracle's fulfillment: the child is named Jesus at his circumcision (2:21)
		Mary, hearing the shepherd's report, ponders marvelous events that occurred after Jesus's birth (2:19)
		three concluding oracles concerning the child Jesus (2:25–39)
Nurture and training	the child grows and becomes strong (1:80a)	the child grows and becomes strong (2:40–52)
	was in wilderness prior to beginning public career (1:80b)	was in wilderness prior to beginning public career (3:21–23; 4:1–13)

Note: Modified from Martin 2008, 39; see also O'Fearghail 1991, 16, 30.

The purpose of this *synkrisis* is to demonstrate the "superiority of Jesus" (O'Fearghail 1991, 35). The outline on page 22 takes into account the rhetorical topics of origins and nurture/training and the rhetorical vehicle of *synkrisis* through which those topics are conveyed.

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Luke 1:1–4

Preface

Introductory Matters

The literature on Luke's preface is voluminous (see preeminently Alexander 1993; also Cadbury 1921, 1922b, 1922c; van Unnik 1973; Klein 1964; Du Plessis 1974; Callan 1985; Marshall 1993; Palmer 1993; and especially Moessner 1996, 1999a, 1999b, 2008). Unlike his canonical counterparts, Luke begins his Gospel with a self-conscious reflection on the task at hand. He does so in a well-crafted sentence that consists of forty-two Greek words. Luke's preface reflects the pattern of prefaces in ancient historiography (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Polybius, Josephus), biography (e.g., Philo, *On the Life of Moses*), some novels (e.g., Lucian's satirical preface in *A True Story*), and scientific treatises (including some rhetorical handbooks; see Alexander 1993).

Tracing the Narrative Flow

1:1–4. Ancient prefaces tended to include certain elements, and Luke's opening sentence contains many of them. (1) There is a statement about the author's predecessors—Luke begins: **Many have attempted to compose a narrative** (1:1a)—often accompanied by critical remarks about their shortcomings (see comments below). (2) The work's subject matter is usually stated. So Luke describes **the events that have been**

Luke 1:1–4 in the Narrative Flow

Jesus's origins and training (1:1–4:13)

►Preface (1:1–4)

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Reserved Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

fulfilled among us (1:1b). It is impossible on the basis of the prologue itself to determine whether these "events" include those recorded in the Acts of the Apostles; on other grounds, however, it has been argued that Acts was written several decades later than Luke (see the introduction; Parsons 2008a, 16–17; 2009). (3) The writer's qualifications are given. Luke claims to be one **who has become thoroughly familiar with everything over a long period of time** (1:3a). (4) The plan or arrangement of the work is given. Luke claims to have given an **orderly account** (1:3b). (5) The purpose(s) for writing is given. Luke writes so that his reader **might know the certainty of the words you were taught** (1:4). (6) Sometimes the author's name is given. This element is missing in Luke. (7) Sometimes the addressee is named. In Luke, the addressee is the **most excellent Theophilus**, whose name means "friend of God" (1:3c; Talbert 1982, 7–10; Culpepper 1995, 39).

There has been much debate about the first component. Did Luke, like so many ancient writers, intend to criticize others who had written about Jesus? Further, if Luke did intend to refer to his predecessors' inadequacies, would the authorial audience have understood these criticisms? These questions require careful and nuanced examination of the prologue's structure.

Some have seen a two-part structure in the preface arranged in a protasis/apodosis pattern ("since" [vv. 1–2]; "then" [vv. 3–4]), with each part containing three corresponding elements. John Nolland, however, has argued that the "just as" (v. 2), rather than qualifying the writing activity of the "many," points to a comparison with what follows in verse 3. Further, the use of the word "passed on" (*paradidōmi*) may suggest the transmission of oral material rather than written narratives (see esp. Acts 16:4; also 1 Cor. 11:2, 23). Thus, verses 1 and 2 should be taken as parallel clauses, each with an independent relationship to verse 3 (Nolland 1989–93, 1:8; see table 2).

Table 2. Structure of Prologue

	Written sources (1:1)	**Oral traditions (1:2)**	**Luke's project (1:3)**
Clause	Since	just as	it seemed good
Who?	many	those who were, from the beginning, eyewitnesses who became servants of the message	to me as well
How?	have attempted to compose	handed to us	(as one) who has carefully investigated everything for a significant amount of time, to write . . . for you
What?	a narrative	[the message/tradition]	an orderly account
Why?	the events that have been fulfilled among us		so that you might know the certainty of the words you were taught

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

In this construal, Luke is both continuous with and discontinuous from his predecessors. On the one hand, Luke shows his continuity with those previous attempts to narrate the Jesus story by beginning with a term, "since" or "inasmuch," that rightly suggests a causal relation between these earlier narratives and Luke's own narrative. Luke writes because others have written. The continuity is clear also in the phrase "it seemed good to me as well [*kamoi*]." Here Luke intends to stand in the tradition of those who had earlier narrated the matters that had been fulfilled. On the other hand, of course, Luke does write, and the very act of writing seems to imply some criticism of previous attempts. But how much criticism? This question takes us into the rhetorical flow of the argument itself (for much of what follows, see Parsons 2007, 40–50).

While there seems to be no criticism of those eyewitnesses who handed down the oral tradition (1:2), there is evidence of some dissatisfaction on Luke's part with his literary predecessors mentioned in 1:1 (see Klein 1964). We do not know the extent of the "many" (though it presumably included Mark; see the introduction). The use of this term and its cognates was a known rhetorical device employed in the beginning of narratives and speeches (e.g., Sir. prol. 1; Heb. 1:1; Acts 24:2, 10) and should not therefore be pressed to mean a large number. The term "attempt" (*epecheirēsan*; lit., "take into hand") is crucial for understanding Luke's attitude. The term is sometimes used in a neutral sense of "undertaken" (Polybius, *Hist*. 2.37.4), even in literary prefaces (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.13). Elsewhere, however, the term is used in a negative sense—that is, "they have attempted but did not succeed" (Josephus, *Life* 40; Herm. *Sim*. 92.6). More important, Luke will later use the term twice in Acts, and in both instances it is used in this negative sense: "He [Saul] was both speaking and debating against the Hellenists; but they were trying unsuccessfully to kill him" (Acts 9:29); "Now some of the itinerant Jewish exorcists also attempted unsuccessfully to invoke the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits" (19:13). Luke's own use of the term, coupled with how prefaces typically contained a critique (implicit or explicit) of the writer's predecessors, leads to the conclusion that the use of the term in the preface would have been understood in its pejorative sense, "many have attempted unsuccessfully to write a narrative." For Luke, from a rhetorical perspective, these attempts failed *as rhetorical narratives* because either they lacked adequate coverage of the topics necessary for a *bios* (origins, birth, training and nurture, words and deeds, manner of death, and events after death; see the introduction) or they did not arrange the story in a rhetorically compelling way. To be sure, Luke would use the "many" as *sources* for his own narrative, even if they themselves did not reach the level of rhetorically complete and well-formed *narratives*.

Even though Mark has no doubt employed the *topoi* of his *bios* of Jesus to his own satisfaction, Luke was apparently dissatisfied with his effort. One of the problems Luke would have had with Mark's Gospel was that, in beginning with the public ministry of Jesus and omitting any reference to his birth, Mark

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

presented an incomplete rhetorical narrative in terms of the "origins" and/or "good birth" of Jesus. Missing from Mark is an account of Jesus's birth, and information regarding his place and family of origins and his nurture/training are minimal (see Mark 1:9–13). All these elements are present in Luke 1–2 and are presented in what Luke claims to be a reliable way. Luke refers to **those who were, from the beginning, eyewitnesses who became servants of the message** (1:2). For the authorial audience familiar with the opening line of Mark, the use of the word "beginning" (*archē*) in Luke 1:2 would have had strong echoes with Mark 1:1, "The beginning [*archē*] of the good news of Jesus." While there is much scholarly discussion of the meaning of *archē* in Mark 1:1, many early readers of Mark interpreted it to refer to the beginning of Jesus's story with his baptism by John the Baptist, as seen in Augustine's observations: "Note that Mark mentions nothing of the nativity or infancy or youth of the Lord. He has made his Gospel *begin* directly with the preaching of John" (*Cons.* 2.6.18, trans. Oden and Hall 1998, 2; emphasis added).

Mark's Gospel begins with John's preaching and Jesus's baptism. Mark's beginning, while perhaps the place to start the "good news," is, for Luke, inappropriate for a rhetorically complete "narrative." Luke claims that he has received the message from those servants of the word who were eyewitnesses from the beginning. And for Luke, beginning properly included the story of Jesus's birth and his family. In fact, to be a complete narrative from a rhetorical perspective, Luke's story had to include these elements.

So who were these "eyewitnesses from the beginning"? Many have taken this phrase to refer to the tradition passed on by the apostles, and certainly the apostles would be included among these eyewitnesses. For Luke, however, these "eyewitnesses from the beginning"/"servants" would also have included those who witnessed the events surrounding the birth of Jesus. Mary, Jesus's mother, and Simeon would surely count as eyewitnesses who became servants. In Luke 1:38, after Gabriel has revealed to Mary God's plan for her to bear the child Jesus, Mary responds: "I am the servant of the Lord! May it happen to me according to your word." Later in the Magnificat, she exclaims that God has looked upon the humble state of his *servant* (1:48). When Simeon, whom Luke describes as "righteous and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel" (2:25), receives the Christ child in his arms, he praises God, saying, "Now you are dismissing your *servant* in peace, Lord, according to your word, for my eyes have seen your salvation" (2:29–30). The appeal to eyewitnesses/servants from the beginning does not serve to ensure historical reliability (as some have claimed), but it does fit Luke's need to present a narrative that is, rhetorically speaking, complete. Further, if Luke's copy of Mark ended at 16:8, Luke might also have regarded this story as rhetorically incomplete in its ending, since it did not have the requisite account of events that occurred after the character's death (see Theon, *Prog.* 78, trans. Kennedy 2003; Ps.-Hermogenes, *Prog.* 16, 19, trans. Kennedy 2003).

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

Luke is likewise concerned with the presentation of events in the narrative. Luke claims to be "thoroughly familiar with everything" from the start (on this translation see Cadbury 1922b; 1922c; Moessner 2008); thus Luke is able to present not only a complete story but also a well-formed one that is rhetorically persuasive (Moessner 2008, 299). When read in light of the rhetorical exercises for story writing, this claim informs the audience that what is to follow is a properly executed narrative, not only complete in its coverage of the story of Jesus from start to finish, but ordered in such a way as to enhance understanding.

Luke claims to write in "an orderly fashion" (*kathexēs*; 1:3). What exactly does Luke mean by this term? Our first clue comes in Luke's use of the word elsewhere in his writings (Luke 8:1; Acts 3:24; 11:4; 18:23). Of those, surely the most significant is Luke's later use of the term in Acts 11:4. When the Jerusalem church heard about Peter's associations with gentiles, they sent an envoy to question him about these events. The narrator notes that Peter began to explain "in order" or "step by step" (*kathexēs*). The modern reader expecting the story to be told in chronological sequence will be surprised to hear that Peter begins by reversing the order of presentation of the visions: his own vision precedes that of Cornelius (cf. Acts 10, where Cornelius's vision is narrated first, followed by Peter's). But the word "in order" has little to do with chronological or linear order. Rather, Peter (and in a larger sense the narrator) is seeking to present the events in a manner that his audience will find convincing (Tannehill 1986–90, 2:144). For Luke, "in order" has to do with a rhetorically persuasive presentation. That was what Peter was attempting to do in Acts 11, and it is what Luke purports to do in his preface.

Presentation, of course, was an issue of concern to the rhetoricians. Theon writes: "Virtues of a narrative are three: clarity, conciseness, credibility. Best of all, if it is possible, the narrative should have all these virtues" (Theon, *Prog.* 79, trans. Kennedy 2003, 29). Clarity is an important (perhaps the most important) element of narrative, according to Theon, and one way clarity is achieved is through the "arrangement" (*taxis*) of the subject matter (Theon, *Prog.* 80, trans. Kennedy 2003). By order in the narrative, Theon does not imply any kind of strict historical or chronological order. Further, Theon distinguishes between unintentionally confusing the order of events, which he says one must guard against (Theon, *Prog.* 80), and intentionally rearranging the order, of which he approves (Theon, *Prog.* 86–87, trans. Kennedy 2003).

Not all later rhetorical treatises agreed with this practice of transposing the order, especially those associated with judicial speeches that may have revolved around preserving the exact sequence of events (e.g., *Rh. Al.* 30.1438a.28–31; *Rhet. Her.* 1.9.15). Quintilian, however, in support of this procedure, writes: "Neither do I agree with those who assert that the order of our *statement of facts* should always follow the actual order of events, but I have a preference for adopting the order which I consider most suitable" (*Inst.* 4.2.83, trans. Butler 1921; emphasis original).

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

By claiming that he will narrate his story "in an orderly fashion," Luke strongly hints that his literary predecessors, and certainly Mark, did not achieve the very important feature of "clarity" in their narratives (cf. the similar critique of Thucydides by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 9; cited in Moessner 2008, 294–95; also Theon, *Prog.* 80). Luke may have been the first to criticize Mark in this way, but he was certainly not the last. Papias wrote that Mark "wrote down accurately everything that he recalled of the Lord's words and deeds—but not in order. For he neither heard the Lord nor accompanied him; but later, as I indicated, he accompanied Peter, who used to adapt his teachings for the needs at hand, not arranging, as it were, an orderly composition" (*Fragments of Papias* 3.15, trans. Ehrman, 2003). Thus, it was possible to have a complete narrative in terms of content that was ineffective in its order of presentation. Luke, who like Mark "had neither heard the Lord nor accompanied him," was determined to write in an "orderly"—and rhetorically compelling—fashion.

For Luke, the "what" of his message, its content, was irreducibly shaped by and inextricably interwoven with the "how" of his message, that is, its rhetoric. It is as though, in contrast to his predecessors, Luke is saying to his audience: "If you want to gain a clearer understanding of the true significance of all of these events, then you must 'follow' the carefully arranged divisions and sequences of my . . . work" (Moessner 2008, 299). One notable example of how order of presentation affects the understanding of the narrative is the placement and expansion of the people-fishing saying of Mark 1:16–20, which, in Luke's version (5:1–11), is preceded by the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (Luke 4:38–39) in order to make the story more rhetorically credible, another virtue of a rhetorically well-formed narrative (see Parsons 2007, 24–25). Elsewhere in the commentary are detailed examples of changes Luke makes in the presentation of his narrative because Mark (for example) has, in his opinion, fallen short of the clarity, brevity, and plausibility that were rhetorically indispensable to the narrative (see Irenaeus's famous parable of the mosaic of the king in *Haer.* 1.8.1).

Finally, what is the goal of Luke's rhetorically persuasive presentation? That too is stated clearly in the preface: "so that you might know the certainty of the words you were taught" (1:4). The language here suggests that the audience in mind is primarily Christian and that the purpose of Luke's Gospel is one of instruction and assurance of "those events that have been fulfilled among us" (1:1). Here, for theological reasons, Luke departs from the rhetorical tradition that views narrative as explanation of "things that have happened or as though they have happened" (Theon, *Prog.* 78, trans. Kennedy 2003, 28). Luke's narrative, rather, is about matters that have been prophesied, whether by the Jewish Scriptures, living prophets, or heavenly messengers, and have now been fulfilled through the words and deeds of Jesus. "Certainty" is a standard rhetorical topic that has a persuasive appeal to the audience (see Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.4.12; 1.5.3; *Rhet. Her.* 3.2.3). Though the persuasive

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

quality of Luke's Gospel can be evaluated only after a close analysis of the whole Gospel, Luke's motive in writing includes an attempt to present these events that have been fulfilled and about which the audience has already been instructed in a rhetorically compelling order so that the authorial audience finds confirmation of the truthfulness of the narrative. Luke's narrative is thus both informational and transformational in character. By following closely this rhetorically complete and well-formed narrative, Theophilus will find his friendship with God deepened and enriched.

Theological Issues

Recently, much attention has been given to narrative beginnings, though there is no consensus regarding their significance (Said 1985; Rimmon-Kenan 2002; Parsons 1990). Luke's preface serves, as many have noted, as part of a frame that marks the boundaries of the work and separates it from the space of the real world that surrounds it. That the beginning of a narrative stands at the critical junction between the "real" world of the audience and the "symbolic" world of the text makes taking the audience into account unavoidable. A group of scholars, sometimes referred to as the Tel Aviv School (Meir Sternberg, Menakhem Perry, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan), have explored the ways in which the order of a text affects the meaning appropriated by its reader. They have labeled the way the beginning of a text shapes its subsequent reading as the "primacy effect" (Sternberg 1978, 96).

Giving or withholding information can be used to create certain first impressions, and the primacy effect of those first expressions ensures that the audience will cling to those first thoughts as long as the narrative will possibly allow. Perry has observed: "There are cases in which meanings, constructed at the beginning of the text as a result of the distribution of information in the text-continuum, will remain stable until the reading is over simply because once constructed there is nothing in the sequel of the text to contradict or undermine them so as to cause their final rejection" (1979, 48). At times, though, hypotheses formed at the beginning of a text are subverted by later information. Thus, expectations have to be reexamined and sometimes revised (1979, 52).

What are the expectations that Luke creates with his preface? He suggests that, though he stands in continuity with his predecessors in his desire to narrate the story of Jesus, his will be a well-formed narrative, one that meets the expectations of a rhetorically complete story. Further, by promising to reassure his audience about the truthfulness of the matters in which they have already been instructed, he subjects his own storytelling prowess to the same prophecy-fulfillment schema that he uses to describe the contents of the story he narrates. He claims to have investigated everything carefully and completely and to have written "in order" so that the "friend of God" might be certain

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—Copyright Protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.

of the truth of previous teachings—a tall order indeed. Luke's preface is an invitation to the audience to suspend disbelief for the moment and enter and experience his world—a world filled with birth and death, with miracle and treachery, with song and parable, with conflict and resolution. Any reenactment of Luke's story, then, whether through preaching or teaching, ought to extend that invitation anew. Will Luke meet or disappoint the expectations his preface creates? Perhaps we shall know better when we reach the end.

> We shall not cease from exploration
> And the end of all our exploring
> Will be to arrive where we started
> And know the place for the first time. (T. S. Eliot, "Little Gidding")

Mikeal C. Parsons, Luke
(Unpublished manuscript—COPYRIGHT protected Baker Publishing Group)
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2015. Used by permission.