

INHERITING 'ETERNAL LIFE' IN LUKE'S TRAVEL NARRATIVE:

REDACTION AND NARRATIVE IN LUKE 9.51-19.44

by

Jon Mark Reeves

*Bachelor of Science, 2004
Southwestern Assemblies of God University
Waxahachie, TX*

*Master of Theological Studies, 2008
Brite Divinity School
Fort Worth, TX*

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the

Brite Divinity School

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Theology in Biblical Interpretation

Fort Worth, TX

August 2011

INHERITING 'ETERNAL LIFE' IN LUKE'S TRAVEL NARRATIVE:

REDACTION AND NARRATIVE IN LUKE 9.51-19.44

APPROVED BY

THESIS COMMITTEE:

Dr. Warren Carter

Thesis Director

Dr. Francisco Lozada, Jr.

Reader

Dr. Jeffrey Williams

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Dr. Nancy J. Ramsay

Dean

WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish photocopy or reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
<i>Outline of the Argument</i>	
<i>Method and Approach</i>	
Method and approach 1: redaction criticism of Luke	
Method and approach 2: narrative criticism of Luke	
Combining redaction- and narrative-critical approaches in this thesis	
Chapter 1. Redaction in Luke 10.25-29 and 18.18-23.....	15
<i>Redaction of the Question: Reading κληρονομῆσω as Future Indicative</i>	
<i>Conzelmann's Eschatological Luke: Adopting a Modified Theory</i>	
Chapter 2. Reading Luke's Travel Narrative as Narrative, Part 1: Reading Intertexts.....	28
<i>Deuteronomy 5-6</i>	
<i>Leviticus 19</i>	
Chapter 3. Reading Luke's Travel Narrative as Narrative, Part 2: Reading Luke.....	38
<i>Luke's Use(s) of Israel's Scripture</i>	
<i>Five Intertextual Themes from Torah in the Travel Narrative</i>	
Conclusion.....	51
Bibliography.....	53

Introduction

Scholarship on the Lukan Travel Narrative (Luke 9.51-19.44) has focused little attention on Luke's redaction of Mark's 'eternal life'¹ question (Mark 10.17||Luke 10.25; 18.18), even though Luke uses the question twice, once towards the beginning of the Travel Narrative and once towards the end. In this thesis, I work through what I can best describe as one argument with two layers. My overall thesis is that Luke's redaction of the 'eternal life' question affects a reading of the Travel Narrative by emphasizing the eschatological nature of 'eternal life' over against the life of the (narrative) present age, an age characterized by the rule of Rome.

Outline of the Argument

I have organized this thesis in three chapters. In the first chapter, I treat Luke's redaction of the 'eternal life' question (Luke 10.25; 18.18). My redaction analysis focuses on two points of argumentation: (1) I am arguing for a specific reading of the verb κληρονομήσω as a future indicative rather than as an aorist subjunctive, which it clearly is in Mark 10.17, and (2) I am arguing for a particular function of the participle ποιήσας, which Luke redacted from the aorist subjunctive form ποιήσω in Mark 10.17. The main result of Luke's redaction is that it gives the affected scenes a definitive eschatological tenor.

¹Throughout, I maintain the single quotes around 'eternal life' to indicate that this is a loose English equivalent of the Greek ζῶντι αἰώνιον. I will provide a description of Luke's concept of 'eternal life' at a later point.

The second chapter is devoted to the answers which are given to the Lukan pair of ‘eternal life’ questions, namely the citations from Deut 5-6 and Lev 19. By exploring intertextual connections between Luke’s Gospel and the scriptures of Israel, I highlight five rather general thematic connections between the citations from Torah and Luke’s Travel Narrative. The themes drawn from Torah are (1) God as God of the people, (2) a listing of commands with the further injunction to do/keep them, (3) Israel’s inheritance of the land, (4) Israel’s former captivity in Egypt, and (5) ethical treatment of others, including both neighbors and strangers.

Finally, in chapter 3, I return to my analysis of the Third Gospel in order to trace the effects of Luke’s ‘eternal life’ redactions on the plot of the Travel Narrative section of Luke. In the first part of the chapter, I comment briefly on Luke’s use(s) of scripture. The second part of this chapter is devoted to an analysis of Luke’s use of the five themes from the previous chapter.

Method and Approach

In order to make my argument for the central section of Luke, I have chosen to employ a hybrid methodological approach. For the initial phase of my argument (ch. 1), in which I emphasize differences and similarities between Luke and the other two Synoptics, I have utilized some of the tools of redaction criticism. For the latter part of my overall argument (chs. 2 and 3), I rely on a modified narrative-critical approach, which considers the authorial audience, in order to trace the effects of the ‘eternal life’ questions, along with the answers, throughout the Travel Narrative.

Method and approach 1: redaction criticism of Luke

By the early 1930s Rudolf Bultmann had already described Luke as being “even more

dependent on his sources than Matthew...² Apart from the literary ability to put together an historical order (τάξις)³ out of his source material, Bultmann's Luke displayed no real identity as an author in his own right, a consequence of Bultmann's form-critical focus.⁴ Using form criticism, Bultmann sliced and diced the Synoptics into smaller, individual units—organized categorically as sayings of Jesus and stories about Jesus—in an effort to ascertain the history behind each unit in its transformation from a more fluid, oral form to its fixed, written form.⁵ This method dictates that the scholar must attempt to distinguish units of traditional material from the material supplied by the 'editors' of the Gospels.⁶ One of the operating assumptions

²Rudolf Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (1963; reprint, New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 367; originally published as *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921; 2nd edition, 1931).

³Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 366. It should be noted that in the verses Bultmann cites (Luke 1.1-4), Luke does not refer to the writing with the noun τάξις; rather, in describing what 'many' (πολλοί) have set their hands to do, the aorist infinitive of the verb ἀνατάσσομαι is used to denote their purpose of ordering a διήγησις, an 'account' or 'narrative'. For Bultmann's form-critical analysis, a Luke who created an 'order' out of his sources is enough; however, one might read the emphasis in Luke 1.1-4 falling instead on Luke's purpose *to write* (γράψαι), perhaps denoting a more active level of involvement than a mere passive compiler could attain. This raises the question of whether or not Bultmann's form-critical Luke is an accurate representation of the purpose set out in Luke 1.1-4.

⁴The other major form-critical work on the Synoptic Gospels is Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 2nd edition (Tübingen: Mohr, 1933); in English translation as *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Scribner's, 1965). The major difference between the respective works of Dibelius and Bultmann is that of scope. While Bultmann worked systematically through the Synoptics, Dibelius had focused only on selected parts, primarily narrative, of the tradition. Also, Bultmann distinguishes his own work from that of Dibelius by stating that the form critic must make "judgements about facts (the genuineness of a saying, the historicity of a report and the like)" (*History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 5). Further, in describing the circular nature of historical investigation of the NT, Bultmann notes that Dibelius starts with a reconstruction of the community and its needs to inform his work with the units of the tradition, while Bultmann himself begins with a study of the units of the tradition to inform his reconstruction of the community and its needs. Bultmann, however, saw their work as "mutually complementary and corrective" (*History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 5).

⁵Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 3-6.

⁶In addition to Dibelius and Bultmann, see also Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919). The separation of traditional units from editorial material was also Schmidt's approach; however, while Schmidt often gets grouped in with Dibelius and Bultmann for making a form-critical contribution, Stephen Hultgren (*Narrative Elements in the Double Tradition: A Study of Their Place within the Framework of the Gospel Narrative* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002], 37) sees Schmidt's work more at the crossroads between Wrede's *Messianic Secret* and the Dibelius-Bultmann brand of form criticism, because Schmidt is also concerned with the historical nature of Jesus' ministry. For Wrede, see *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des*

was that the literary form of a piece of traditional material could help the scholar determine the use of that part of the tradition in the life of the early community, also known as a unit's 'setting in life' (*Sitz im Leben*), but usually limited to 'religious' settings. The scholar could then expect to determine something of a picture of the religious life of that early community, but not necessarily anything about the particular evangelist. Thus, given the aims of form criticism, Bultmann saw as a positive this rather passive figure of Luke-as-compiler:

This is a good thing for the worth of his book as a source, as is the fact that he does not permit his dogmatic conceptions to exercise any essential influence on his work. That can hardly be called meritorious, for he has obviously not adopted a strongly marked position with specific tendencies. It is possible to point out some favorite themes: a liking for the poor and the despised, a sentimental trait with which we may join a certain predilection for women. These traits are of course just as much due to the tradition which Luke used.⁷

Although form criticism dominated scholarship on the Gospels for years between the 1920s and 1950s, scholars began to question one of the main assumptions of form criticism, that the evangelists played little to no role in influencing the theology portrayed in the Gospels as complete documents.

When Conzelmann's redaction-critical study of Luke, *Die Mitte der Zeit* (published in English as *The Theology of St. Luke*), appeared in 1954, it offered both a pointed critique of the method of *Formgeschichte* and a new way forward.⁸ While neither the first exercise in redaction criticism over all,⁹ nor the first to coin the term *Redaktionsgeschichte*,¹⁰ Conzelmann's *Theology*

Markusevangeliums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1901); in English translation as *The Messianic Secret*, trans. J.C.G. Greig (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971).

⁷Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 367.

⁸Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1954); in English translation as *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Row, 1961).

⁹Perrin argues that R.H. Lightfoot's 1934 Bampton Lectures already anticipated redaction criticism, and also mentions Günther Bornkamm's 1948 redaction-critical article on Matthew. See Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?*, *Guides to Biblical Scholarship* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 21-24 (on Lightfoot), 25-28 (on Bornkamm).

of *St. Luke* is credited with charting new territory in Lukan studies by changing how scholars viewed Luke as an author and theologian: the author of Luke ceased existence as a historian who compiled sources and became a theologian with an agenda.¹¹ For Conzelmann, the theological agenda of Luke as an author needed to reflect the historical occasion of the writing. Conzelmann identified this occasion as the Church trying to work out how to live in light of a delayed parousia.¹² The expected end had not come after all.

In order to argue his case for Luke's concern for the delayed parousia, Conzelmann read Luke through the lens of *Heilsgeschichte*. The interpretive *crux* in the text for Conzelmann is Luke 16.16: 'The law and the prophets were until John; from then the kingdom of God is preached and everyone enters into it by force.' Arguing from this verse, Conzelmann divided history into three different epochs, of which the bookends are creation and the parousia—the importance of this is that the parousia is not an epoch in *Heilsgeschichte*, but rather the end of history.¹³

Conzelmann's three phases of salvation history are: (1) the time of Israel (which includes John the Baptist as the last of the prophets¹⁴), (2) the time of Jesus' ministry, and (3) the post-

¹⁰The term first appears after Conzelmann published *Die Mitte der Zeit* in a redaction-critical study of Mark written by Willi Marxsen (*Der Evangelist Markus* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956; 2nd ed. 1959]). See Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?*, 1, 33-39.

¹¹Interestingly, Talbert traces this development in the view of Luke (from historian to theologian) to Bultmann. Talbert argues that Bultmann opened this discussion in *Theology of the New Testament*, and that from there it was Bultmann's students, notably Käsemann and Conzelmann, who developed more fully this new, more theologically focused Luke. See Charles H. Talbert, "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke," *Interpretation* 30 (1976): 381-3.

¹²Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 14. See also 97: "Luke's eschatology, compared with the original conception of the imminence of the Kingdom, is a secondary construction based on certain considerations which with the passage of time cannot be avoided. It is obvious what gives rise to these reflections—the delay of the Parousia."

¹³*Ibid.*, 17.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 22-27.

ascension period of the Church.¹⁵ While other scholars criticized Conzelmann for his three-part division of the ages,¹⁶ what cannot be understated is the effect which Conzelmann's Luke-as-theologian had on the field of Lukan studies: Luke was a theologian first, and his views for how the Church was to relate to the world were of secondary importance and resulted from his theological perspective.¹⁷ For the next few decades, redaction critics would argue back and forth as to what Luke's *theological* outlook actually was. Quite some time passed before one of them questioned Conzelmann's privileging of Luke's theology over other categories of existence.

In 1987, Philip Esler responded to Conzelmann's thesis by raising serious concerns about seeing Luke's theology as a cause for his social and political views rather than seeing social and political concerns as sources for the construction of a theological perspective. Esler opened his study by asking, "What if social and political exigencies played a vital role in the formation of Luke's theology, rather than merely constituting the areas in which it was applied?"¹⁸ Using methods derived from the social sciences, Esler argued that Luke's theology can only be understood within its socio-political context as a theology which served to legitimate a newly-formed group.¹⁹ This understanding formed the basic assumption underlying Esler's redaction-critical analysis of Luke—Esler dubbed the approach "socio-redaction criticism." Esler's

¹⁵Ibid., 16-17.

¹⁶For example, Werner Georg Kümmel, "'Das Gesetz und die Propheten gehen bis Johannes,' Lukas 16,16 im Zusammenhang der heilsgeschichtlichen Theologie der Lukasschriften," in *Verborum veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Otto Böcher and Klaus Haacker (Wuppertal: Theologischer Verl. Brockhaus, 1970), 89-102. Kümmel saw two phases of *Heilsgeschichte* as opposed to Conzelmann's three.

¹⁷Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 137.

¹⁸Philip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1.

¹⁹Ibid., 16ff. The primary work from which Esler draws is Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966).

tampering with the traditional way of doing redaction criticism shows that redaction criticism can still be useful, especially when used in tandem with other methods.

The main contribution of the redaction critics to Lukan studies is quite clear: scholars began to pay attention to a Lukan author who propagated a particular theological perspective through changes to the stories and sayings of the Gospel traditions. With the work of Esler, it became evident that redaction criticism could be used alongside other methods to establish more than just a theological perspective of an evangelist, but also social and political concerns as well. Before too long, however, New Testament scholars began to inquire more about the internal dynamics of these stories as whole pieces, rather than just as individual episodes and the circumstances leading up to their composition.

Method and approach 2: narrative criticism of Luke

By the mid-1970s, something of a paradigm shift was underway in the guild of biblical studies. Scholars had begun to question the value of practicing traditional historical criticism.²⁰ A new way of doing Gospel criticism was coming about, and this new way was clearly distinguishable from previous historical-critical work. The focus was now the whole of a text rather than individual pericopes. As the whole of the text became more and more a priority of focus, the comparative work of the redaction critics became less of a concern for some. Also, the hunt for the history of the traditions and communities behind the text gave way to a new focus on the final, or canonical, form of the text. Yet another change came about in the literature engaged by scholars; indeed, rather than reading Conzelmann and other redaction critics, Lukan scholars

²⁰For example, see Walter Wink, *The Bible in Human Transformation: Toward a New Paradigm for Biblical Study* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973); Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974).

began to focus on other ancient literature of similar genre,²¹ as well as the work of modern literary critics.²²

Following the pattern set in place by New Criticism from the field of literary studies in the 1940s, which determined that external factors (e.g., historical context of the author) only get in the way of interpreting the meaning of a text on its own terms, biblical scholars began to examine the stories of the bible as narratives which create meaning internally. Internal factors such as characters, plot, and literary devices (e.g., irony, repetition, etc.) became suddenly important. It was in this mode that the first narrative-critical studies of New Testament gospels were carried out, notably the collaboration between Rhoads and Michie, *Mark as Story*,²³ Culpepper's *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*,²⁴ and Kingsbury's *Matthew as Story*.²⁵

While many literary studies of Luke-Acts were published in the period from the mid-1980s to the early-1990s,²⁶ one in particular stands out in its relevance to this present thesis. In 1989,

²¹The genre debates occupy a place all their own in the recent history of Lukan scholarship; therefore, as this aspect of Lukan scholarship is not within my immediate focus, I mention it only in passing. For some of the literature, see David L. Balch, "The Genre of Luke-Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel, or Political History?," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 33 no1 (Fall 1990): 5-19; Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), esp. 1-19; David L. Barr, "The Conventions of Classical Biography and the Genre of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Study," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, edited by Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 63-88.

²²For this list of differences between historical-critical and literary-critical work, see Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 3-4. Moore derives these differences from Charles Talbert's review of Fitzmyer's Anchor Bible commentary on Luke. Other scholars, however, might draw out different distinctions as well. Powell, for example, wants to add that the new literary criticism is based on models of communication (speech-act theory). See Mark Allen Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 8-9.

²³David M. Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

²⁴R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

²⁵Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

²⁶Although a full listing is not possible here, see Joseph B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1986); Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary*

David Moessner published a literary analysis of Luke's Travel Narrative.²⁷ Moessner understands Luke's portrayal of Jesus as a Moses-like prophet, and the real key to understanding the Travel Narrative is to read Jesus and the other characters, respectively, as Moses and the people portrayed in Deuteronomy.

While through this process I found my research drawing me to conclusions somewhat similar to Moessner's, there are some methodological differences between his work in *Lord of the Banquet* and my analysis in this thesis. While Moessner claims not to follow any one particular mode of literary analysis,²⁸ his work on Luke fits in with many of the narrative studies of that period—i.e., the effects of New Criticism had not quite worn away, and scholars were still locating meaning *in* the text, so to say. Moessner does rely on Jewish literature roughly contemporary with Luke (not just the scriptures of Israel throughout, but also Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls²⁹), but the primary focus is the internal meaning found in Luke's narrative. Since the time Moessner's work appeared, however, scholars have gained a broader understanding of the narrative approach.

While some consideration was given to the 'implied' reader in the first wave of narrative-critical studies on the gospels,³⁰ as time went on more attention began to be focused on readers and the reading experience. This shift in focus included the advent of reader response criticism in

Interpretation, in 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-90); Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991); William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993).

²⁷David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

²⁸Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 6.

²⁹Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 85-91.

³⁰For example, see Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, 205-27.

New Testament studies,³¹ as well as forays into postmodern considerations of how texts and ‘real’ readers interact in real contexts,³² the latter of which opened the door for cultural (i.e., ideological) criticism in the mid-to-late 1990s.³³ These changes have not gone unnoticed by New Testament narrative critics. At present, one can find scholars practicing hybrid forms of narrative criticism in which the old boundaries between author, text, and reader are much more permeable than they used to be.³⁴

One way of accounting for the reader(s) in a narrative-critical approach is to consider what Peter Rabinowitz called the “authorial audience.”³⁵ The authorial audience is presupposed in the text as the audience for whom the author writes. It is what Carter has called a “contextualized implied reader.”³⁶ Conceived in this way, the audience becomes a means by which contextual factors (e.g., social, political, theological or religious, etc.) affect the reading of the narrative. This is far from the closed-off boundaries of earlier narrative-critical work in Gospels studies, in which external criteria had little-to-no influence on the reading of the story.

³¹Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

³²Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, 108-30; see now Stephen D. Moore, *The Bible in Theory: Critical and Postcritical Essays*, Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 57 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010).

³³For an overview of cultural criticism, see Fernando F. Segovia, *Decolonizing Biblical Studies: A View from the Margins* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000), 34-52.

³⁴Joel B. Green, “Narrative Criticism,” in *Methods for Luke*, *Methods in Biblical Interpretation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 75.

³⁵Peter J. Rabinowitz, “Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences,” *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 126-7. The other three audiences identified by Rabinowitz are the actual audience (“the flesh-and-blood people who read the book” [126]), the narrative audience (“an imitation audience” [127]), and the ideal narrative audience (“the audience for which the narrator wishes he [*sic*] were writing” [134]).

³⁶Warren Carter, *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), 4.

Combining redaction- and narrative-critical approaches in this thesis

The idea behind this thesis first saw the light of day in the form of a short response paper with a redaction-critical focus which I wrote for Prof. Carter's seminar on Luke at Brite Divinity School in the spring of 2010. While translating Luke 10, on a close reading I decided to pay attention to what seemed to be an out-of-place question (Luke 10.25). On a closer reading, however, I noticed what seemed to be a peculiar wording in the Greek text which, when not quickly glossed over with a matching translation from its Synoptic parallels in Matthew and Mark (as do virtually all of the popular English translations and commentaries), seemed to carry the possibility of a new direction, or at least a new emphasis, for interpretation. It is this initial comparative focus, which drew out a matching set of peculiarities within Luke's Travel Narrative (Luke 10.25; 18.18), that I owe to redaction criticism. That is not to say, however, that I adhere strictly to the method, or to all of the attending assumptions.

For example, since redaction criticism considers alterations made to a source or sources, the redaction critic must operate, whether explicitly or not, with a particular source theory in mind. The dominance of the Two-source Hypothesis—Mark and Q were the sources for Matthew and Luke—had no small part to play in early redaction-critical work on Matthew and Luke, as was the case with Conzelmann.³⁷ Beginning with the assumption that Mark and Q lay behind Luke as primary sources, a scholar such as Conzelmann took care to note where Luke altered (primarily) the Markan source. The points at which deviations from source materials occur are the places in

³⁷In 1969, Perrin commented: "The most successful redaction-critical work has been done on the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, since in these we have one major source which each evangelist used, the Gospel of Mark, and can reconstruct a good deal of another, the sayings source 'Q.' But similar work can be done wherever the use of traditional material can be determined or the particular activity of the author detected..." See Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?*, 2.

the text which are examined for evidence of both Luke's theological intentions as an author and circumstances surrounding the situation of the community being addressed.

While attention will be given in chapter 1 to Synoptic parallels, I utilize the method merely to show difference rather than to stress reliance on or deviance from a source. In order to be up front on the matter of source theory, I state briefly what my assumptions have been throughout this process. While the Two-source hypothesis has its convenience (i.e., it easily explains non-Markan source material), due to recent work on the Synoptic problem I am operating with the assumption of Markan priority, but without Q³⁸—the issue being not outright denial of another source for Luke, but that current reconstructions of Q create as many problems as they solve.³⁹

As for combining a redaction-critical approach with a narrative approach in this thesis, there are some precedents for such hybridity in Gospels studies. On the combination of historical-critical and literary methods in general, one can name works by several scholars. Warren Carter's work not only on Matthew, but also on Luke and John⁴⁰, often combines insights and models from social-scientific criticism (a close-enough cousin of historical criticism⁴¹) with audience-

³⁸See Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*, The Biblical Seminar 80 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). Goodacre, a proponent of the Farrer-Goulder approach (Markan priority without Q), has played a key role in recent attacks on the dominance and prominence of the Two-source Hypothesis.

³⁹See Joseph Allen Weaks, "Mark Without Mark: Problematizing the Reliability of a Reconstructed Text of Q," (Ph.D. diss., Brite Divinity School, 2010). Weaks' argument is that a version of Mark reconstructed from Matthew and Luke is considerably inconsistent with the canonical version of Mark's Gospel and is, therefore, unreliable. The question is that if we cannot use Matthew and Luke to reconstruct a reliable version of a text which we do have (Mark), then how can we continue to use Matthew and Luke to reconstruct a reliable version of a text which we do not have (Q)? The question goes back to the early 20th century with B.H. Streeter, but Weaks has argued the point rather definitively in his own right. For an overview of Streeter and recent work on the problem of a reconstructed Mark, see Weaks, "Mark Without Mark," 8-15.

⁴⁰On Matthew, see Warren Carter, *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 103 (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994); *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading*, The Bible and Liberation Series (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000); *Matthew and Empire*; on Luke, see "Getting Martha Out of the Kitchen: Luke 10.38-42 Again," in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 214-31; on John, see *John and Empire: Initial Explorations* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2008).

oriented approaches. Joel Green has written two books on Luke, one commentary and one overview of Luke's theology,⁴² each of which employs both social scientific approaches and discourse/narrative analysis. Jack Kingsbury's narrative-critical analysis of Matthew utilizes the same basic literary structure as his earlier redaction-critical work on the same Gospel.⁴³ David Rhoads' second edition of *Mark as Story* shows the careful reader glimpses into Rhoads' other ventures into social-scientific criticism.⁴⁴ Coleman Baker's recent dissertation on Acts is a study which combines social identity theory from the social sciences and narrative criticism, along with audience-oriented elements.⁴⁵ The list could certainly go on and on.

So while redaction- and narrative-critical paradigms share little-to-no similarities,⁴⁶ I have found each useful in my research for this thesis. Throughout the process of my research, the idea has been to let my questions regarding Luke's text determine the method(s) which I employ. Regarding the first chapter, where I examine Luke's alteration of the 'eternal life' question, redaction criticism allows me to develop an argument regarding Luke's authorial purposes behind the changes the evangelist made to the Markan material. In the final two chapters, my

⁴¹Jerome H. Neyrey, "Preface," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), xii-xiii.

⁴²Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997); *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, New Testament Theology (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

⁴³Jack D. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*. Kingsbury's earlier redaction study (*Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1975]) identified three primary units in Matthew: 1.1-4.16; 4.17-16.20; 16.21-28.20. Kingsbury's later narrative analysis follows these same divisions, leaving an impression of the redaction study on the narrative work.

⁴⁴For example, David Rhoads, Joanna Dewey, and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, 2nd edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 65.

⁴⁵Coleman A. Baker, *Identity, Memory, and Narrative in Early Christianity: Peter, Paul, and Recategorization in the Book of Acts* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011).

⁴⁶See, however, the assessment of Moore (*Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, 57), that redaction criticism can be seen as a subfield of narrative criticism. While anachronistic in terms of which approach came first in biblical studies, Moore's statement has provoked much thought for me through this process. While I have not applied Moore's suggestion directly to this study, I do realize that the redaction-critical portion of my thesis more or less serves the more narrative aims of the later chapters.

questions turn more to the story portrayed in the Travel Narrative, or how Luke's redaction of the 'eternal life' questions affect this story. This change of focus requires a change in approach; therefore, for the final two chapters I employ a narrative-critical approach which takes into account the authorial audience. As for my use of this audience, I must make certain assumptions, guided by the text where possible. My basic assumptions are, at the least, that Luke's authorial audience has knowledge of the Greek language, knowledge of traditions concerning Jesus, at least some knowledge of the scriptures of Israel (e.g., Luke 4.16-21; 7.27; 10.26-27; 18.20; 19.38, 46; 20.17, 37, 42; 23.30, 34; 24.27, 44-45), and knowledge of the Roman imperial context of the first-century Mediterranean world (e.g., Luke 2.1-2; 3.1).

Chapter 1

Redaction in Luke 10.25-29 and 18.18-23

In order to argue successfully that Luke emphasizes both praxis and an eschatological future with the theme of ‘eternal life’ in the Travel Narrative, I need first to deal in this chapter with a pair of important Lukan redactions in the Travel Narrative. These occur in 10.25-29 and 18.18-23. The first pericope contains a question-and-answer session between a ‘certain lawyer’ and Jesus (10.25-29). The second pericope also contains a question-and-answer scene, this time between a ‘certain ruler’ and Jesus (18.18-23). What draws one to consider these two pericopes together is that Luke has created a situation in which the pericopes share a common question: τί ποιήσας ζῶναι αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; Both of Jesus’ interrogators, it seems, are curious about the inheritance of ‘eternal life’. In this chapter, I am arguing that this pair of Lukan redactions opens the possibility to consider the future inheritance of ‘eternal life’ as a key thematic and literary parallel in the Travel Narrative.

Redaction of the Question: Reading κληρονομήσω as Future Indicative

The first occurrence of the question under consideration begins with a ‘certain lawyer’ (νομικός τις) rising to test Jesus (Luke 10.25). Although this scene has parallels in the Synoptics (Matt 22.34-40||Mark 12.28-34||Luke 10.25-28), we find a notable difference in subject matter here in Luke 10. While Matthew and Mark are concerned with commandments at this point, Luke focuses instead on the inheritance of ‘eternal life’.

In Mark 12.28, ‘one of the scribes’ (εἷς τῶν γραμματέων) asks Jesus, “Which is the most important commandment of all?” (ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων;). Similarly, in Matt 22.36, one of the Pharisees⁴⁷ asks Jesus, “Which commandment is greatest in the law?” (ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ;).⁴⁸ In each of these cases, the character of Jesus breaks the reply into two parts: the first being Deut 6.4-5 for Mark and Deut 6.5 for Matthew, and the second being a separate quote from Lev 19.18b.

While Luke’s form of the initial question in 10.25 has nothing to do with commandments or Torah, Torah does come up in the following verse (10.26). In the Lukan scene, rather than quote from Torah, Jesus answers his interrogator with a pair of questions: ‘What is written in the law? How do you read?’ (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις;). The lawyer replies by quoting Deut 6.5 and Lev 19.18b, the same verses from Torah which one reads in the parallel accounts in Matthew and Mark (although for Mark it is Deut 6.4-5). So rather than having Jesus quote Torah as in Matthew and Mark, Luke has Jesus direct the initial ‘eternal life’ question toward an answer to be found in Torah, an answer which the lawyer already knows and, without skipping a beat, quotes. Because the parallels from Matthew and Mark deal with the topic of commandments, or Torah, it only makes sense that Luke eventually gets there as well; however, with Luke’s version, the evangelist seems concerned first to introduce the topic of inheriting ‘eternal life’.

The second occurrence of Luke’s doubly-asked question comes in Luke 18.18, which has Synoptic parallels in Matt 19.16-22||Mark 10.17-22||Luke 18.18-23. Here a ‘certain ruler’ (τις

⁴⁷In 22.35, I read εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν as referring back to οἱ Φαρισαῖοι in v34. I also omit the doubtful inclusion of νομικός in v35.

⁴⁸On the reading of the superlative for the positive forms of πρώτη in Mark 12.28 and μεγάλη in Matt 22.36, see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §245.

ἄρχων) poses the question to Jesus—the character in Matt 19 and Mark 10 is simply ‘one’ (εἷς). Just as in 10.25, the answer to the question is comprised of a series of commands from Torah (Deut 5.16-20 LXX). When one performs a comparison of the Synoptic parallels for this passage, however, a striking difference in the wording of the question emerges. The ‘eternal life’ question appears in the Synoptics in the following forms, all different⁴⁹:

Matt 19.16: τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;

Mark 10.17: τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

Luke 18.18 (and 10.25): τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

It is at this point that the comparison leads one to consider the implications of Luke’s redaction of the wording of the question. In what follows, I lay out my argument for why I think Luke is stressing both the eschatological nature of the question by emphasizing the future tense of κληρονομήσω and the emphasis on present praxis in the use of the participle ποιήσας.

In comparing Luke’s version of the question with Mark’s,⁵⁰ one notices both a different form of the verb ποιέω and the absence in Luke of the conjunction ἵνα, moving the verb κληρονομέω from a subordinate (dependent) clause in Mark’s version to the main (independent) clause of the sentence in Luke’s version. In the main clause of Mark 10.17, one reads the conjugated form ποιήσω, which in form is either future active indicative 1st singular or aorist active subjunctive 1st singular. Given that the sentence is a question (note the interrogative pronoun τί), perhaps the

⁴⁹Curiously, Johnson begins his comment on Luke 18.18 by stating, “Although the form of the question is the same as in Mark 10:17 and Matt 19:16...” Yet even a cursory reading of the Greek texts reveals significant differences. See Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, Sacra Pagina 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 276.

⁵⁰Because my primary focus is Luke’s version of the text, and also because I assume Markan priority, my focus is on Luke and Mark; therefore, for reasons regarding clarity of focus in this chapter, I do not engage Matthew’s version of the question in the body of the paper. My reason for quoting it above is to emphasize Luke’s differences.

best reading is to take ποιήσω as a deliberative subjunctive.⁵¹ The rest of Mark 10.17 appears as a dependent clause which pairs the subordinating conjunction ἵνα with the verb in the conjugated form κληρονομήσω. In form, κληρονομήσω could be either future active indicative 1st singular or aorist active subjunctive 1st singular; however, given its occurrence in the dependent clause governed by the conjunction ἵνα, the most likely reading for κληρονομήσω in Mark 10.17 is as an aorist subjunctive functioning in a purpose clause.⁵² If one reads ποιήσω in the main clause as a deliberative subjunctive, and κληρονομήσω in the subordinate clause as a subjunctive denoting purpose, then this leads to a translation of Mark's version of the question that looks something like, 'What shall I do in order to inherit eternal life?'

When it comes to the form of the question in Luke 10.25 and 18.18, however, one notices that Luke has changed ποιέω from its finite form in Mark 10.17 to the aorist active participle ποιήσας. Further, while Luke agrees with Mark on the form of κληρονομήσω, a key change has occurred: Luke's version of the question does not utilize the subordinating conjunction ἵνα. The dropping of ἵνα places κληρονομέω as the main verb of the sentence, with the participle ποιήσας functioning adverbially in relation to the main verb. Luke's redaction, then, raises two important syntactical questions: (1) How does one classify the adverbial participle?, and (2) How does one read κληρονομήσω in Luke 10.25 and 18.18? Is it a deliberative aorist subjunctive? Is it a future indicative?

⁵¹See Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar*, §366.

⁵²The use of ἵνα plus a verb in the subjunctive mood is a common way of denoting purpose in Hellenistic Greek. See James A. Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1979), 120-21; Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar*, §369. Further, redaction-critical evidence from Matt 19.16 supports that Matthew might have read Mark's κληρονομήσω as subjunctive. Matthew retains ἵνα but redacts the verb to the aorist subjunctive σχῶ, which could not be confused with the future indicative of the same verb (έξω).

First, regarding the classification of the participle, there are two issues to cover: tense and adverbial function. Regarding the former, the aorist tense of the participle refers less to time than to type of action, or aspect.⁵³ There is, however, somewhat of a temporal element. The important thing to note is that the tense/aspect of the participle is relative to that of the finite verb in the clause. For the aorist participle, this implies past time in relation to the finite verb, or an already completed action(s) relative to the action of the finite verb. To define the temporal relationship between the aorist participle ποιήσας and the main verb which it modifies, κληρονομήσω, is to state that Luke sees the ‘doing’ as a completed action before the ‘inheriting’ occurs.

Now regarding the latter issue, the adverbial function of ποιήσας, there are several options to consider. The trouble for any translator is that the participle itself does not reveal anything as to its circumstance. This must be worked out from context.⁵⁴ Given this, one must present evidence for an argument to support any suggestion for the classification of the adverbial function of ποιήσας in Luke 10.25; 18.18. One way to determine the circumstance of the participle is to refer back to the relationship between the aorist participle and the finite verb, where the implication is that the ‘doing’ is a completed action before the occurrence of the ‘inheriting’. One possible choice is to use the participle in a temporal circumstance (‘After I have done what...?’).⁵⁵ Other options are possible as well. One can translate the participle as expressing instrument or means (‘By means of having done what...?’).⁵⁶ Another option is to take it as expressing cause

⁵³See Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar*, §339.

⁵⁴H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2069: “The force of these circumstantial participles does not lie in the participle itself, but is derived from the context.”

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, §2061.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, §2063. I found two ‘translation handbooks’ in which the authors prefer a circumstance of means, but neither handbook offers a supporting argument or any evidence for the reading. See Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010),

(‘Because I have done what...?’).⁵⁷ These are only some of the possibilities.⁵⁸ Granted, there is some ambiguity regarding the circumstance of the participle, but I read instrumental function as one of the best choices given the context: the characters who ask the question are inquiring as to the means by which ‘eternal life’ can be attained.

A rather odd thing is that commentators on Luke’s Gospel continue to treat the participle ποιήσας as if it has the same function of Mark 10.17’s deliberative subjunctive ποιήσω. It has been noted not a few times that Luke changes Mark’s τί ποιήσω ἵνα... to τί ποιήσας...; however, I have seen no discussion of what that might mean here. Jeremias notes Luke’s change to the participle without any further explanation.⁵⁹ Filip Noël, who also cites Jeremias, writes that Luke’s use of the participle is “grammatically better” than Mark’s version; however, no argument is put forth for why Luke seems just to be a better grammarian who has no other possible interest in changing his Markan source other than to correct its grammar.⁶⁰ Wolter’s comments are perhaps the most intriguing. He notes that Mark 10.17 is the likely source for Luke’s question, and also that Luke has changed τί ποιήσω to τί ποιήσας. Wolter then comments that Luke loves the form of the ‘*Was-soll-ich-tun?*’ question and supports this by citing eight

360, 574; J. Reiling and J. L. Swllengrebel, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*, Helps for Translators 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 416.

⁵⁷Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2064.

⁵⁸While there is no definitive choice for how the participle functions here in Luke’s redaction, it is easy to rule out some of the options for the circumstance of a participle (e.g., purpose [Smyth, §2065], concession [Smyth, §2066], condition [Smyth, §2067]).

⁵⁹Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 190.

⁶⁰Filip Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9,51-19,28*, *Collectanea Biblica et Religiosa Antiqua V* (Brussel: Wetenschappelijk Comité voor Godsdienstgeschiedenis Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten 2004), 366.

other Lukan texts.⁶¹ Four of these references (Luke 3.10, 12, 14; Acts 2.37) combine the neuter interrogative pronoun with the aorist active subjunctive 1st plural form of ποιέω (so, τί ποιήσωμεν). Three of the references (Luke 12.17; 16.3; Acts 22.10) combine the neuter interrogative pronoun with the aorist active subjunctive 1st singular form of ποιέω (so, τί ποιήσω). One reference (Acts 16.30) does not utilize the subjunctive of ποιέω, but rather the infinitive: ‘What is necessary for me to do...?’ (τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν...). Taking into account the seven references in which Luke clearly uses the deliberative subjunctive ποιήσω/ποιήσωμεν, I can agree with Wolter that Luke does seem to love the ‘What-should-I-do?’ question; however, given the absence of any argument for why Wolter sees the participle ποιήσας functioning as would a deliberative subjunctive, I have to wonder if Luke 10.25; 18.18 actually represents such a ‘*Was-soll-ich-tun?*’ question. Luke was very familiar with the syntactical form of τί + ποιήσω/ποιήσωμεν. So why did Luke change Mark’s τί ποιήσω on these two occasions? Wolter has not answered this specific question, nor has he explored another option for the function of the participle. The answer to this question must focus on redactional elements rather than just form (Wolter’s ‘What-should-I-do?’ form, that is). The redactional elements indicate that Luke uses the participle in an adverbial function, likely to emphasize that the action of the participle is the means by which the action of the main verb will be brought about.

Now the second decision to be made concerns the verb κληρονομήσω. As previously stated, the problem is whether to classify it as a deliberative aorist subjunctive or as a future indicative. While the option for reading this verb as a subjunctive is possible because of its form, there does not seem to be a good reason to do so. As Smyth comments on the deliberative subjunctive, “The

⁶¹Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 392.

subjunctive question does not refer to a future fact, but to what is, under the present circumstances, advantageous or proper to do or say.”⁶² This situation works for ποιήσω in Mark 10.17: ‘What should I do (ποιήσω) in order to inherit eternal life?’ Applying Smyth’s definition of the deliberative subjunctive, in Mark 10.17 the verb ποιήσω does not refer to the future fact of the action of doing. In Luke, however, the verb in question is not the action of doing, but the action of inheriting. So the translator of Luke’s version of the question must decide if this same situation (i.e., the verb does not point to the future fact of the action) can apply to the inheriting, which would be the primary consequence of classifying Luke’s use of κληρονομήσω as a deliberative subjunctive.

There is another option which works quite well: κληρονομήσω in Luke 10.25; 18.18 is a future indicative. Going back to Smyth’s comment on the deliberative subjunctive, reading Luke’s use of κληρονομήσω as a future indicative removes any uncertainty regarding the future fact of the action of inheriting. Further, when compared to Mark’s use of the subjunctive κληρονομήσω in a purpose clause, Luke is adding further emphasis to the future fact of the inheriting. In Mark 10.17, the use of the conjunction ἵνα to denote purpose does not limit the action of the subjunctive verb in terms of time, manner, or condition.⁶³ Luke’s use of the future tense, however, does seem to limit the action of the verb to a future time.⁶⁴

To support my reading of the future tense of κληρονομήσω, I turn to the places in the text of Luke where the topic of the division of the ‘ages’ comes up. In Luke 16.8, the character of Jesus

⁶²Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1805.

⁶³Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2193a.

⁶⁴Although not commenting on grammatical or syntactical issues, Marshall does note that the verb κληρονομέω “here has the idea of being qualified now to receive a future blessing from God.” See I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1978), 442.

refers to ‘the children of this age’ (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου), demarcating the narrative present time. In 18.30, Jesus refers to getting back many more things than were lost for the sake of God’s kingdom ‘in this time’ (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ), and further to receiving ‘eternal life’ ‘in the age which is coming’ (ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ). Further, in 20.34-5, Luke has Jesus saying, ‘The children of this age (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) marry and are given in marriage, but the ones who are considered worthy to obtain that age (τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου) and the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage.’ These verses from Luke’s Gospel portray a view of time divided into two ‘ages’, one concurrent with the narrative present and one expected in the future.⁶⁵

There is possible further support from Second Temple Jewish sources that ‘eternal life’ carried an eschatological connotation in that context, an influence which may have found its way into Luke’s Gospel.⁶⁶ Three of these texts which actually include the phrase ζῶην αἰώνιον are Dan 12.2; 4 Macc 15.3; and *Pss. Sol.* 3.12. In two of these texts, ‘eternal life’ comes after the future tense verb ἀναστήσονται. In Dan 12.2, the subjects are ‘many of those who are sleeping in the breadth of the land’ (πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων ἐν τῷ πλάτει τῆς γῆς). In *Pss. Sol.* 3.12, the subjects are ‘those who fear the Lord’ (οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον). Both verses then have ‘[they] will stand up⁶⁷ into eternal life’ (ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζῶην αἰώνιον). The implication is that the state of ‘eternal life’ is an effect of the future action of the verb, something not too far off from

⁶⁵Green characterizes Luke’s view of time as divided into two ages. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 593.

⁶⁶See Hermann Sasse, s.v. “αἰώνιος,” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1964), 1:209; Rudolf Bultmann, s.v. “ζάω,” *TDNT*, 2:856-9.

⁶⁷The future middle indicative of ἀνίστημι is merely a marker of the verb being intransitive, so my translation reflects an active voice.

my argument regarding the pairing of the future tense verb κληρονομήσω with ‘eternal life’ in Luke’s Gospel.

Given not only the different wording of the sentence, but also the substitution of the ‘eternal life’ question for the ‘greatest commandment’ question in Luke 10.25, it seems that some level of redactional activity has occurred. Long before Conzelmann brought into focus Luke as an author with an agenda, however, Bultmann had already analyzed Luke’s Gospel with an eye toward literary form. Although he accounts for the editorial activity of Luke in attaching “speech sections” to “*traditional* apophthegms,”⁶⁸ Bultmann also suggests that because Luke uses 10.25-29 to introduce the Parable of the Good Samaritan, Luke could have been relying on a non-Markan source for the connection.⁶⁹ Even after the advent of redaction criticism, the theory that Luke relied on a non-Markan source for 10.25-29 still swayed scholars. For Harrington,⁷⁰ it is “more reasonable” that Luke followed a source other than Mark, and Fitzmyer, although he sees Mark 10.17 behind Luke 18.18, wants to attribute Luke 10.25-28 to “L”.⁷¹ But especially since Conzelmann’s *Theology of St. Luke*, many scholars see a Lukan redaction of Mark’s episodes. Although Schramm thinks a non-Markan source lies behind Luke 10.25-28, he also thinks that Luke had read Mark, and also that Luke redacted Mark 10.17 for the question.⁷² Marshall refers

⁶⁸Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 334.

⁶⁹Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 23.

⁷⁰For example, see Wilfred J. Harrington, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (New York: Newman Press, 1967), 151.

⁷¹Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2 vols., Anchor Bible 28-28A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981-85), 2:877, 1196.

⁷²Tim Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 47-8.

to Luke 10.25/18.18 as “Luke’s re-wording of Mk. 10:17”.⁷³ Schneider sees Luke’s redaction of Mark in both Luke 10.25ff.⁷⁴ and 18.18ff.⁷⁵ C.F. Evans refers to “Luke’s version” of the question, which Evans states could very well be based on Mark 10.17.⁷⁶ Bovon notes the possibility of Mark 10.17 as a source for Luke’s question.⁷⁷ Wolter, as noted above, also sees Mark 10.17 as the source for Luke’s question.⁷⁸ The majority of scholars consulted here lean toward a Markan source and Lukan redaction when it comes to the ‘eternal life’ question.

As a result of my analysis, I am arguing that Luke’s redaction of the ‘eternal life’ question emphasizes two crucial differences from Mark 10.17. The first is a clear focus on the future tense of the inheriting (i.e., its eschatological dimension). The second is clarity regarding the ‘doing’ which is to take place, which modifies the inheriting and which must occur as an instrument or means of bringing it about.

Conzelmann’s Eschatological Luke: Adopting a Modified Theory

In part, Luke’s redaction of the ‘eternal life’ question fits Conzelmann’s view of Luke as an author concerned heavily with eschatology, and this because of the delay of the parousia. I am, therefore, indebted to Conzelmann in my work on the redaction of the pericopes under

⁷³Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 442, see also 684. Marshall also concedes the possibility that Luke 10.25ff. could be unique to Luke’s source.

⁷⁴Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2. Auflage, 2 vols., Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Band 3 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn; Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1984), 1:247.

⁷⁵Ibid., 2:369, where Schneider sees Mark 10.17-31 as Luke’s only source for Luke 18.18-30.

⁷⁶Christopher Francis Evans, *Saint Luke*, TPI New Testament Commentaries (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 464-5. Although Evans mentions “Luke’s version” of the question, there is no discussion of Greek grammar and syntax.

⁷⁷François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 4 vols., Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3 (Zürich: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989-2009), 2:85n.12.

⁷⁸Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 392.

consideration, although Conzelmann himself did not comment on Luke's alternative wording of the 'eternal life' question. Conzelmann does comment on Luke's redactional activity in 10.25ff., but this is to show Luke's use of νόμος in place of Mark's ἐντολή.⁷⁹ In other words, Conzelmann was cognizant of some aspects of Luke's redactional activity in 10.25; however, Conzelmann's focus was elsewhere (i.e., Luke's view of scripture). Of course, one scholar cannot be expected to cover it all; however, although Conzelmann's *Theology of St. Luke* has maintained quite a presence in Lukan studies this past half century, some of the criticism leveled at Conzelmann's work focused on his inattention to significant Lukan themes.⁸⁰ This is one of the reasons I have undertaken the larger question of how the theme of inheriting 'eternal life' affects interpretation of Luke's story: precisely because I think, on one hand, it supports the eschatological emphasis Conzelmann attributes to Luke, and, on the other hand, because Conzelmann himself did not take up Luke's redaction of the question.

There is, however, at least one significant issue which needs to be addressed in order to preclude any notions that I am in full agreement with Conzelmann's thesis. My main point of contention is with Conzelmann's *heilsgeschichtlich* reading of Luke 16.16, which he used to structure three different epochs of history.⁸¹ Conzelmann wants to read μέχρι Ἰωαννοῦ in 16.16 as inclusive of John the Baptist—i.e., that John belongs to the first of the three epochs, to Israel's scripture and prophets. Since Conzelmann, however, scholars have agreed little on how to take the phrase. It could mean 'until John' in an inclusive sense, as Conzelmann argues; however, more scholars seem comfortable with commenting on the ambiguity of not knowing whether

⁷⁹Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 160n.1.

⁸⁰For example, see Marianne Palmer Bonz, *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 7: "...[Conzelmann's] analysis is somewhat weakened by his failure to illuminate the more significant literary elements discernible in Luke's composition, which also have a bearing on interpretation."

⁸¹Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 16-17.

‘until John’ includes or excludes (or even includes and excludes) John from ‘the law and the prophets’.⁸² As it turns out, evidence against Conzelmann’s three-epoch theory is easily proffered. Besides the very next verse (16.17), which seems to support continued use of the law for Luke,⁸³ there is also the problem of how Luke divides the ages, as previously mentioned, in 16.8; 18.30; and 20.34-5. These scenes seem to put forward the idea that Luke saw two ages, not three.⁸⁴ So while I am willing to move forward with Conzelmann’s reading of Luke as having a definitive eschatological outlook, I must amend his theory of the ages.

Summary Remarks

In this chapter I have argued that Luke’s pair of ‘eternal life’ questions are redacted and that they emphasize both the future tense of the verb κληρονομήσω and the instrumental circumstance of the participle ποιήσας. The result of Luke’s redaction is that the action of the participle, the ‘doing’, serves as a means, or instrument, by which the future action of the verb which it modifies, the ‘inheriting’, will come about. The result of Luke’s redaction is that it gives these two Lukan scenes a definitive eschatological element, especially when compared to the probable Markan sources, one of which (Mark 10.17) deals with ‘eternal life’ without establishing a definitive temporality, and one of which (Mark 12.28) is concerned with ‘the most important commandment’.

⁸²See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2:1116-1118; L.T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 250; Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 3:99.

⁸³Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 603.

⁸⁴Still, there are scholars who defend Conzelmann’s division of salvation history into three ages. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 61-63. Fitzmyer notes that Conzelmann builds on the 1926 work of H. von Baer (*Der heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften*) in setting forth Luke’s three-stage *Heilsgeschichte*. Further, Fitzmyer is in basic agreement with Conzelmann’s scheme, yet offers slight modifications (e.g., the inclusion of the infancy narratives, consideration of Mary’s place in salvation history, expanded consideration of the place of John the Baptist).

Chapter 2

Reading Luke's Travel Narrative as Narrative, Part 1: Reading Intertexts

While in the previous chapter I focused on what Luke does with the question part of the question-and-answer exchanges under consideration, such attention must also be given to the answers themselves. Because these answers are quotations from Torah, in this chapter I turn to read the intertexts from which Luke draws. These texts are Deuteronomy 5-6 and Leviticus 19, both from the LXX. This intertextual reading serves as one element of my narrative analysis of the Travel Narrative.⁸⁵ In the next chapter, I will work with the function of these intertexts in Luke's narrative.

To inform my approach, I depend on previous work in Synoptics studies which gives attention to the wider scriptural contexts of the citations in the Gospel narratives. Warren Carter⁸⁶ has drawn on the work of John M. Foley⁸⁷ to argue that when Matthew's Gospel cites a verse or passage from Torah or the Prophets, the citation is invoking also the wider scriptural context. Carter criticizes previous work, especially by redaction critics, which pays attention

⁸⁵While intertextual reading does not necessarily have to be part of a narrative-critical approach, I am following Joel Green's suggestion that focusing on intertextual references can serve as one element of a narrative-critical study of a text. See Joel B. Green, "Narrative Criticism," 98.

⁸⁶Warren Carter, *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), 93-107; "Love as Societal Vision and Counter-Imperial Practice in Matthew 22.34-40," in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, vol. 2: The Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Thomas R. Hatina, Library of New Testament Studies (New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), 30-44. While Carter employs an audience-oriented approach rather than

⁸⁷John M. Foley, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991).

only to the words cited, work which seems to focus only on questions of text form (a Greek text? Hebrew? Aramaic?), issues surrounding text selection (an author who selected citations freely, or who followed a ‘school’?), and an author’s purpose in using the citation (e.g., paraenetic or apologetic?).⁸⁸ Using Foley’s metonymic approach, Carter summarizes, “The part summons the whole; the citation evokes a much larger tradition.”⁸⁹ The guiding question in this chapter, therefore, will be, “What tradition does Luke invoke by citing verses from Deut 5-6 and Lev 19?”

Deuteronomy 5-6

To begin, in Luke 10.27 there is a citation from Deut 6.5, and in Luke 18.20 there is a citation of phrases from Deut 5.16-20. Since I want to consider these Lukan citations in their wider, original context in Torah, I point out five prominent themes which are present in the portion of Deuteronomy’s narrative under consideration (Deut 5-6). These themes are: (1) the identification of God as God of the people; (2) the listing of commands with the further injunction to do/keep them; (3) the inheritance of the land; (4) Israel’s former captivity in Egypt; and (5) ethical treatment of others, including neighbors and strangers. These thematic categories are by no means exclusive; therefore, a given passage might deal with any number of these themes. Still, given the variety of material in Deut 5-6, I find this organization helpful.

(1) God as God of the people

The verses which comprise Deut 5-6 project almost ubiquitously the theme of identifying God

⁸⁸Carter, *Matthew and Empire*, 94.

⁸⁹Carter, *Matthew and Empire*, 96.

as the God of the Israelites who were enslaved in Egypt: Deut 5.2, 6, 9, 11-12, 14-16, 24, 25, 27, 32-33; 6.1-2, 4-5, 10, 12-13, 15-18, 20, and 24-25.

(2) Listing of commands, along with injunctions to do them

Many commands are listed. To start the list of commands, God tells Israel, ‘There will not be for you (σοι)⁹⁰ other gods before me’ (5.7); ‘You will not make (οὐ ποιήσεις) for yourself idols...’ (5.8); ‘You will not bow down (οὐ προσκυνήσεις) to them and never perform service (οὐδὲ μὴ λατρεύσης) to them...’ (5.9); ‘You will not take (οὐ λήμψη) the name of the Lord your (σου) God in a meaningless way’ (5.11). With 5.12 comes the subject of Sabbath, and this topic continues through v.15. The children of Israel are told to ‘keep (φύλαξαι) the day of the Sabbaths in order to keep it holy’ (5.12) and that they are to work for six days (5.13). In 5.14, God commands Israel that regarding the seventh day, ‘...you will not do (οὐ ποιήσεις) any work on it...’.

The next five commands listed are those cited in Luke 18.20: ‘Honor (τίμα) your (σου) father and your (σου) mother...’ (5.16); ‘You will not commit adultery (οὐ μοιχεύσεις)’ (5.17); ‘You will not murder (οὐ φονεύσεις)’ (5.18); ‘You will not steal (οὐ κλέψεις)’ (5.19); and ‘You will not false witness (οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις) a false witness⁹¹ against your neighbor (πλησίον σου)’ (5.20).

In 5.21, the people of Israel are commanded that ‘you will not desire’ (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) the wife of ‘your neighbor’ (πλησίον σου), nor any of your neighbor’s possessions in general, including house, slaves, and livestock.

⁹⁰Where a second person pronoun is used in the Greek text of the LXX, whether as a stand-alone pronoun or as part of a conjugated verb, I note whether it is singular or plural throughout the chapter. This is to serve a purpose in the next chapter, where I will refer back to the use of the second person pronoun in the LXX texts analyzed here.

⁹¹While awkward, my translation seeks to reflect the pleonasm between the verb (ψευδομαρτυρέω) and direct object (μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ) in the Greek text.

In Deut 6, reminders of the commands continue. The first verse serves as a reminder that ‘these are the commands (ἐντολαί) and the ordinances (δικαιώματα) and the judgments (κρίματα), as many as the Lord our God commanded in order to teach you (ὑμᾶς)...’ (6.1). Deut 6.5, the verse cited in Luke 10.27, commands, ‘You will love the Lord your God...’ (ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου...). Three more commands having to do with Israel’s relation to God are listed in the middle of ch.6: ‘You will fear (φοβηθήση) the Lord your (σου) God and you will do service (λατρεύσεις...) to him...’ (6.13); ‘You will not walk (οὐ πορεύσεσθε) after other gods from the gods of the nations which surround you (ὑμῶν)’ (6.14); and ‘You will not test (οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις) the Lord your (σου) God...’ (6.16).

There are also the further injunctions to ‘hear’ (ἀκούω), ‘keep’ (φυλάσσω), and/or ‘do’ (ποιέω) said commands. Deut 5.1 opens with the imperative for Israel to ‘hear’ (ἄκουε) the commands, and ends with, ‘...and you will learn (μαθήσεσθε) them and you will keep watch to do (φυλάξεσθε ποιεῖν) them’. Regarding the Sabbath, the people are to ‘keep’ (φύλαξαι) it (5.12; also 5.15). At the end of ch.5 there are still further instructions to ‘do’ the commands (5.31) and to ‘keep watch to do’ them (5.32). Just as ch.5 closes with reminders to ‘do’ the commands, ch.6 opens with one. After setting out many commands, God wants Israel ‘to do (ποιεῖν) thusly’ (6.1). This is closely followed by two more imperative statements for Israel to ‘hear’ (6.3, 4), and also another reminder to ‘keep watch to do’ (φύλαξαι ποιεῖν) in 6.3. By the time we get to the middle of ch.6, there are two more orders to keep and do the commands: ‘Keeping you will keep (φυλάσσων φυλάξῃ) the commands of the Lord your (σου) God...’ (6.17), and ‘You will do (ποιήσεις) the pleasing and noble thing before the Lord your (ὑμῶν) God...’ (6.18). By inference from its parallel placement with verse 17, one can suppose that ‘the pleasing and noble thing’ in verse 18 relates somehow to the commands.

(3) Inheriting the land

The inheritance of the land is of key importance in Deut 5-6. In these chapters, possession of the land occurs sometimes with the verb ‘give’ (δίδωμι), sometimes with the verb ‘inherit’ (κληρονομέω), and once with neither verb (cf. 6.15, where removal from the land is a mode of God’s punishment). When the land is given, it is God who gives the land to Israel. In the command to honor one’s father and mother (5.16), there is a pair of final purpose clauses: ‘...in order that (ἵνα) it be well for you (σοι), and in order that you be (γένη) long-lived upon the land, which the Lord your (σου) God is giving (δίδωσιν) you (σοι).’ In 5.31, it is imperative that the people do the commands in the land, ‘which I am giving (δίδωμι) to them by lot’. The giving of the land appears in another purpose clause—this time with purpose denoted by the infinitive—explaining why God spoke to the ancestors of the people: ‘in order to give you (δοῦναί σοι) a land flowing with milk and honey’ (6.3). Similarly, in 6.10 the land is the object of God’s giving due to the promise God made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

When it comes to inheriting the land, 5.33 speaks of living long in the land, ‘which you will inherit (κληρονομήσετε)’. The beginning of ch.6 describes the reason for Israel going into the land in terms of purpose: ‘in order to inherit (κληρονομήσαι) it’ (6.1). The text in 6.18 also couches inheriting the land in terms of purpose: ‘You will do the pleasing and noble thing...in order that (ἵνα) it be well for you (σοι) and [in order that] you enter into (εἰσέλθης) and inherit (κληρονομήσης) the good land...’.

(4) Israel’s captivity in Egypt

These two chapters refer several times to Israel’s former captivity in Egypt. What is important to note here is that whenever the Egyptian captivity comes up, the text identifies God as the

deliverer of the people: ‘I am the Lord your (σου) God who led you (σε) out of the land of Egypt out of a house of slavery’ (5.6); ‘And you will remember (μνησθήση) that you were (ἦσθα) a slave in the land of Egypt and the Lord your (σου) God led you (σε) out of there...’ (5.15); ‘And these are the ordinances and the judgments, as many as the Lord commanded to the children of Israel in the wilderness after leading them out of the land of Egypt...’ (6.4); and ‘[after enjoying the fruits of the land]...do not forget the Lord your (σου) God who led you (σε) out of the land of Egypt out of a house of slavery’ (6.12).

(5) Ethical treatment of others, including neighbors and strangers

Finally, the ethical treatment of others, especially neighbors and strangers, comprises the fifth prominent theme. Regarding the Sabbath command, one is not to do any work, nor are ones sons, daughters, male slaves, female slaves, or livestock. Also included in the prohibition to work on the Sabbath is the ‘stranger (προσέλυτος) living among you (σοι)’ (5.14). The command to honor one’s parents has to do with how one treats others (5.16), and the commands not to commit adultery (5.17), not to murder (5.18), and not to steal (5.19) certainly do as well. What is peculiar about verses 17-19, however, is that the verbs do not have direct objects. Whom should one not murder? From whom should one not steal? Given the content of the following two commands, there might be a little room for inferencing. A false witness should not be done ‘against your neighbor (κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου)’ (5.20), and one should desire neither the wife nor the possessions of ‘your neighbor (πλησίον σου)’ (5.21). Given that the prohibition of actions in verses 20-21 has to do with ones neighbor, I am inferring that the actions which God prohibits in verses 17-19 must not be done to ones neighbor.

At the end of Deut 6, verses 20-25 raise an interesting set of issues which offer a prime example of how the five different themes are interrelated. Here the question arises as to what to

say to subsequent generations about all of this when children ask, ‘What are the testimonies (μαρτύρια) and the ordinances (δικαιώματα) and the judgments (κρίματα)...?’ (6.20). The answer to be given to the question, ‘What are these?’, begins not with a recounting of the commands in Deut 5, but with a reminder that ‘we were slaves (οϊκέται) to Pharaoh in the land of Egypt, and the Lord led us out of there...’ (6.21). Following this, there still is not a list of commands, but a recounting of God’s purpose in leading Israel from Egypt: ‘And [the Lord] led us out of there, in order that he lead us into [the land] in order to give (δοῦναι) us this land (τὴν γῆν ταύτην), which he swore to our fathers’ (6.23). Only after recounting Egypt and God’s promise of the land does one read anything regarding the commands. Only, it is not what the commands are specifically, as the question demanded, but yet another reminder to do them: ‘And the Lord commanded to us to do (ποιεῖν) all these ordinances (δικαιώματα)...in order that it be well for us all the days, in order that we live just as even [we live] today’ (6.24). Doing the commands leads to continued existence in the land, with a further reward, also based on the condition of doing the commands, of a promise for ‘mercy’ (ἐλεημοσύνη) in 6.25.

The initial question in Deut 6.20 serves not as an occasion to relist all the previous commands; rather, the question provides an opportunity to reconsider the dominant themes at play in this portion of the narrative, and also to see their interrelatedness. God, who delivered Israel from slavery in Egypt, is the God of the people. God commands Israel to act in certain ways. The subject matter of these commands has to do with either relation to God or ethical treatment of others, both neighbors and strangers—or love of God and love of neighbor. The result of doing the commands is entering and inheriting the land.

Leviticus 19

In addition to the citations from Deuteronomy, there is also in Luke 10.27 a direct quote from

Lev 19.18b: ‘You will love your neighbor as yourself’ (ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν).⁹² As with Luke’s quotes from Deuteronomy, however, it is not as if this verse stands alone, apart from a larger context which invokes prominent themes from the scriptural traditions of Israel. Although much of Lev 19 deals with matters which Luke might not be invoking (e.g., how much time is allowed before an offering is inedible), there are key issues which might affect a reading of Luke. I organize thematically the content from Lev 19 according to the same 5 categories with which I read Deut 5-6.

(1) God as God of the people

There is a noticeable refrain of God identifying as the God of the people: Lev 19.2, 4, 12, 18, 25, 28, 31-32, 34, 36, and 37. This relationship undergirds all the commands, as well as the reminders to keep them. Both Lev 19 and Deut 5-6 present this connection between God and the people of Israel as absolutely crucial to understanding any of the other themes.

(2) Listing of commands, along with injunctions to do them

In addition to listing many commands, some of which have parallels in Deut 5-6 (e.g., Sabbath observance) and some which do not (e.g., 19.19, concerning the inter-breeding of animals, the mixing of agricultural seeds, and the interweaving of different fabrics), there is the express further command to keep them and to do them: ‘You will keep (φυλάξεσθε) my law’ (19.19) and ‘You will keep (φυλάξεσθε) my every law and my every ordinance (προστάγματα) and you will do (ποιήσετε) them’ (19.37).

(3) The land

The third prominent theme evoked in Lev 19 is the land; however, in Lev 19, the verb

⁹²Although Mark 12.31 and Matt 22.39 retain the verb ἀγαπήσεις, Luke drops it because the two quotes from Torah in Luke 10.27 are spliced together.

‘inherit’ (κληρονομέω) does not occur in connection to the land. Note, however, 19.23 and 33, respectively: ‘And when you enter (εἰσέλθητε) the land, which the Lord your (ὕμων) God is giving (δίδωσιν) to you (ὕμῖν)...’; ‘And if a certain stranger (τις προσήλυτος) comes to you (ὕμῖν) in your (ὕμων) land...’. In the course of defining God’s relationship with Israel and what Israel is to do, reminders occur which tie the people directly to the land they have received.

(4) Israel’s captivity in Egypt

There are two repetitions of Israel’s captivity in Egypt. In 19.34 the people are reminded that ‘you were strangers (προσήμετοι ἐγενήθητε) in the land of Egypt’. In verse 36 God reminds the people of God’s identification as their deliverer: ‘I am the Lord your (ὕμων) God who led you (ὕμας) out of the land of Egypt’.

(5) Ethical treatment of neighbors (and strangers)

Finally, there are instructions on how to treat other people, especially neighbors and strangers. Those deemed neighbors deserve certain treatment: ‘Each one (ἕκαστος) will not slander (οὐ συκοφαντήσει) his/her neighbor (πλησίον)’ (19.11); ‘You will not act unjustly (οὐκ ἀδικήσεις) to your neighbor (πλησίον) and you will not kidnap (οὐχ ἄρπάσεις) [your neighbor]...’ (19.13); ‘...you will reprove (ἐλέγξεις) by means of a reprove your neighbor (πλησίον σου) and not receive (λήμψη) sin because of him’ (19.17); ‘...and you will love your neighbor as yourself’ (19.18: καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν). For strangers, proper behavior is defined in one instance as providing for those who are not able to obtain their own resources apart from the charity of the people. The people are expected to have leftovers from their harvests and are commanded to act charitably with those leftovers: ‘...for the poor person and for the stranger (τῷ προσηλύτῳ) you will leave (καταλείψεις) them’ (19.10). Such charity is required because the

people of Israel are to remember their own status in Egypt, a memory which serves as the impetus to treat strangers as they treat other Israelites (19.33-34): ‘But if a certain stranger comes to you (ὕμῶν) in your (ὕμῶν) land, do not oppress (οὐ θλίψετε) him; as the native among you (ἐν ὕμῶν) will be the stranger who comes to you (πρὸς ὑμᾶς), and you will love (ἀγαπήσεις) him as yourself, because you all were (ἐγενήθητε) strangers in the land of Egypt; I am the Lord your (ὕμῶν) God’.

Summary Remarks

The narrative contexts of Luke’s ‘eternal life’ questions contain citations to Torah, specifically to Deut 5.16-20; 6.5 and Lev 19.18b. Using Foley’s metonymic approach, I have made room to consider that the Torah citations in Luke 10.27; 18.20 point not only to the actual citations themselves, but also to the wider contexts in which those citations appear. In this chapter, I identified those wider contexts as Deut 5-6 and Lev 19. Working through these texts brought out five prominent themes: (1) the identification of God as God of the people; (2) the listing of commands with the further injunction to do/keep them; (3) the inheritance of the land; (4) Israel’s former captivity in Egypt; and (5) ethical treatment of others, including neighbors and strangers. This intertextual reading serves as the first phase of my narrative analysis of Luke’s Travel Narrative. In the next chapter, I will examine how these themes work in Luke’s Travel Narrative.

Chapter 3

Reading Luke's Travel Narrative as Narrative, Part 2: Reading Luke

In the previous chapters I have explained my reading of Luke's redaction of the 'eternal life' questions and laid out a framework by which to interpret the intertextual elements from Torah. In this chapter I continue my analysis of Luke by reading the Travel Narrative material through the lens of the five themes identified in the previous chapter. Before I begin this analysis, however, I address briefly the issue of Luke's use of Israel's scripture.

Luke's Use(s) of Israel's Scripture

At this point it is necessary to address the function(s) of scriptural citation and/or allusion in Luke's Gospel.⁹³ Many scholars have argued that the fulfillment of prophecy, or proof from prophecy, most aptly characterizes Luke's use of scripture.⁹⁴ Schubert, in the 1954 *Festschrift* for Bultmann, saw in Luke 24 (especially verse 44) a program for seeing Luke's use of scripture in the Gospel as fulfillment of prophecies concerning Jesus.⁹⁵ Luke Johnson's commentary on

⁹³For some, but not all, of what follows, I have referred to François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)*, 2nd revised edition (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 87-121 (ch.2, "The Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel"); however, there is one trail down which Bovon goes that does not serve my aims in this thesis (i.e., determining which text of the scriptures, if any, Luke used [LXX? Other Greek? MT? Oral tradition?]).

⁹⁴See Charles H. Talbert, "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, edited by Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 91-103.

⁹⁵P. Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*, edited by W. Eltester (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), 165-86. Further, while Schubert looked at Luke 24 and read backward into the Gospel, Jacques Dupont later read Luke 24.27, 44 forward into Acts as a program for interpreting scripture references in the speech sections of Acts in the same mode of

Luke also focuses heavily on this theme of prophecy and fulfillment. For Johnson's literary analysis of

Luke, prophecy and fulfillment becomes a literary device which extends beyond the function of scripture to include also the prophecies made by characters in the story.⁹⁶

In addition to Luke's use of scripture to demonstrate prophecy and fulfillment, there have also been many studies which draw out typologies based not only on characters from the scriptures (especially Abraham, Moses, and David),⁹⁷ but also based on narrative sections of scripture, most notably Deuteronomy. In a 1955 essay, Christopher F. Evans argued that Luke 9.51-18.14 follows the order and substance of the material presented in Deut 1-26.⁹⁸ While there has been much contention concerning Christopher Evans' hypothesis, Craig A. Evans has since proposed a more nuanced approach to the issue.⁹⁹ For Craig Evans, any attempt to match up Deut 1-26 to Luke's Travel Narrative is subjective at best; therefore, "objective controls" are needed—although, to what degree said controls are truly 'objective', and if one should desire this anyway, seems more open for discussion than Evans lets on. According to Craig Evans, the scholar who does a passage-by-passage comparative analysis of Deut 1-26 and Luke 9.51-18.14 should look for (1) common vocabulary between the texts, (2) common themes between the texts, and (3)

fulfillment. See Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. John R. Keating (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 129-159.

⁹⁶Johnson, *Luke*, 15-21.

⁹⁷For bibliography and summaries, see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 100-06.

⁹⁸Christopher Francis Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, edited by D.E. Nineham (1955; repr., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), 37-53. Evans stopped his comparative analysis at Deut 26 because Deut 27ff. contained only the "blessings and cursings" that went along with the law (50).

⁹⁹Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 121-39. In ch.9, "Luke 16:1-18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis," Craig Evans reviews Christopher Evans' thesis, and also lists both those who agree with Christopher Evans (122 n.2) and those who have not agreed (122 n.3).

what Evans calls “exegetical coherence,” wherein the scholar considers other interpretations of Deuteronomy which are historically contemporaneous to Luke’s Gospel and then sees if these other interpretations offer potential meaning for Luke’s use of the Deuteronomy material.¹⁰⁰

Also in the line of typological studies is the literary analysis of the Travel Narrative by David Moessner. Moessner uses Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as the ‘Prophet like Moses’ to argue that Luke 9.51-19.44 is a typology of the Deuteronomy narrative which tells of Israel’s expectations and experiences just after the exodus from Egypt.

My point in reviewing briefly some of the ideas regarding Luke’s use of scripture is meant to serve one purpose: to show that many of these ideas are viable possibilities in and of themselves, possibilities which at the very least must be considered together in order to see Luke’s use of scripture as more pluriform than any one categorization can manage. Luke’s Gospel makes use of scripture in many ways. I am not arguing against those who claim Luke uses scriptural citations and allusions to portray prophecy and fulfillment, nor am I saying that typologies have no place in Luke.

Five Intertextual Themes from Torah in the Travel Narrative

As a result of reading the intertexts from Deut 5-6 and Lev 19, I have outlined five prominent themes from these Torah texts. Coming now to Luke’s Travel Narrative, I consider those themes, with some modification, in light of the content of Luke’s story. As in my treatment of the intertexts from Torah, I am not presenting these themes as exclusive categories; rather, they overlap in significant ways, one contributing to the clarification of the others.

(1) God as God of the authorial audience

¹⁰⁰Evans and Sanders, *Luke and Scripture*, 137-38.

Luke's story assumes that the God identified in the scriptures and traditions of Israel, as well as in the various expressions of Judaism in the Second Temple period, is the God also of the authorial audience, both Jews and non-Jews alike (Luke 24.47). Luke establishes this identity for God from the beginning of the Gospel. One can notice this especially in Mary's song, which both identifies Israel as God's servant and makes a connection to Abraham and his descendants (Luke 1.54-55). Zachariah's prophecy also functions in this regard as an occasion to identify God as the God of Israel (Luke 1.69), as well as to connect figures from Israel's past, both David (verse 69) and Abraham (verse 73), to the story. Established at the beginning of the Gospel, this theocentric theme is continued right through to the very last line, which describes the post-Easter believers as blessing God in the Temple (24.53). Luke's story overall, including the Travel Narrative, joins the authorial audience to the God of Israel by connecting characters in that story to the larger tradition both through references to major figures (e.g., David and Abraham) and through characters' actions (e.g., Temple worship), not to mention nearly ubiquitous references and allusions to Israel's scriptures.

(2) Listing of commands, along with injunctions to do them

At two points in the Travel Narrative, Luke lists commands from Torah (Luke 10.27; 18.20). If any structural significance is to be given to the placement of these commands, it is worth noting that these Torah citations appear, respectively, near the beginning and near the end of the Travel Narrative and seem to frame the material in this section of the Gospel. The audience is thus confronted with Torah commands near the beginning of this section and again near its conclusion. While the content of these commands is limited to love of God and neighbor (10.27), a prohibition against adultery, a prohibition against murder, a prohibition against bearing false witness, and the command to honor one's parents (18.20), Luke's authorial audience would

understand these commands to reflect the wider tradition in Torah, at least in Deut 5-7 and Lev 19, the contexts from which these commands are taken. Luke is invoking this larger tradition from Torah, and the audience is expected to follow this tradition (Luke 16.17).¹⁰¹ Luke invokes this tradition also in the claim that proper behavior can be found in ‘Moses and the prophets’ (Luke 16.19-31). Part of the understanding of the audience would be to consider the commands both individually and corporately. The commands cited by Luke are in the second-person singular, but the commands in the tradition from Deuteronomy and Leviticus vary between the singular and plural number in the verbs used.¹⁰²

Along with the listing of commands from Torah, Luke also stresses the importance of doing such things. As in the Torah intertexts, commands appear with reminders to do them. The Good Samaritan parable offers an example of this. The parable is an attempt to clarify the question of the lawyer, ‘And who is my neighbor?’ (10.29). Rather than simply answer the question directly, Jesus instead points out proper neighborly behavior, behavior which is to be applied universally to all people. Jesus then tells the lawyer to ‘do likewise’ (10.37), which reminds the audience of what Jesus said just previously v.28: ‘Do this and live.’¹⁰³ Luke takes his cue from the Torah intertexts by describing proper behavior and then following up with the injunction to do such things.

(3) Inheritance of ‘eternal life’

¹⁰¹Scholars who use *Heilsgeschichte* to explain Luke claim that Torah adherence was unique to the time of the ministry of Jesus. See Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 147. But the participation in the text of the audience calls for a reconsideration of this claim.

¹⁰²Supra, n.90.

¹⁰³The verb ποιέω appears first in the Travel Narrative in this scene (10.25) and plays an important part in the story thereafter.

While the Torah intertexts repeat again and again the theme of Israel's inheritance of the land, I am arguing that for Luke, one should consider modifying this to the inheritance of 'eternal life'. Others have commented briefly on such a connection. Green links the inheritance of the land in Deut 6 with the inheritance of life in Dan 12.¹⁰⁴ C.F. Evans sees Luke's use of the verb 'inherit' as "especially Deuteronomic," and draws a connection between the inheritance of the land and the promise of life attached to such inheritance in Deut 6.24.¹⁰⁵ Other evidence from Deut 5 ties together the theme of the 'age' (Deut 5.29) and the future inheritance of the land (5.33). The latter of these two verses places the verb in the future tense: 'you will inherit' (κληρονομήσετε). For Deut 5, the future inheritance of the land is connected to the occurrence of life 'through the age' (δι' αἰῶνος) in Deut 5.29. It is therefore plausible that Luke's authorial audience could have connected Luke's use of the future tense of inheriting 'eternal life' (Luke 10.25; 18.18) with the Deuteronomic theme of the future inheritance of the land, which would be accompanied by life 'through the age'.

Of course, the question arises as to what 'eternal life' would mean for Luke's authorial audience. The answer seems to have two facets.¹⁰⁶ The first refers to the eschatological (future) state of life after death as the result of an ἀνάστασις. I covered this meaning in the first chapter of this thesis, and there are many scholars who adhere to this conception of 'eternal life', an understanding which is based primarily on the interpretation of various Second Temple texts which are considered possible sources for the idea.¹⁰⁷ Within the aims of a narrative approach to

¹⁰⁴Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 654.

¹⁰⁵C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 465.

¹⁰⁶Craig Evans combines these two possibilities. See Evans, *Luke*, 275.

¹⁰⁷See Bultmann, s.v. "ζάω," *TDNT*, 2:856; Sasse, s.v. "αἰώνιος," *TDNT*, 1:209; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 465; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 121; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 442; Green, *Luke*, 428.

Luke, there is evidence from Luke's narrative to support this eschatological view of life in a future age (Luke 18.30). The second part of the answer is connected to Luke's use of Kingdom-of-God language. While some scholars do not see an explicit connection between inheriting 'eternal life' and entering into (εἰσπορεύομαι) the Kingdom of God (Luke 18.24),¹⁰⁸ Wolter has argued for seeing the two events as synonymous.¹⁰⁹ As part of his argument, Wolter draws a connection between Luke 18 and Luke 12.32ff., where God's giving of the Kingdom is mentioned along with 'treasure in the heavens' (12.33). The connection is based on the occurrence of the phrase 'treasure in the heavens' (12.33; 18.22) in close proximity with the kingdom in both Luke 12 and 18. The conclusion drawn by Wolter is that inheriting 'eternal life' is a further clarification of 'treasure in the heavens', and thus the connection to entering into the kingdom is stated.¹¹⁰

Concerning the inheritance of 'eternal life', Luke's authorial audience would read such an event as a future eschatological occurrence. If we are to pair entering the kingdom with the inheritance of 'eternal life', then something must be said as to the nature of the kingdom. While some have argued for the kingdom as present,¹¹¹ the eschatological emphasis on 'eternal life' suggests either an ahistorical, metaphysical kingdom¹¹² or a future inauguration of the kingdom. Since I am arguing for the inheritance of 'eternal life' as a future occurrence, as well as for a

¹⁰⁸Green (*Luke*, 658) connects Kingdom entrance with 'being saved' in Luke 18.26. C.F. Evans (*Saint Luke*, 652) comments that it is unclear whether 'eternal life' and entrance into the Kingdom are synonymous.

¹⁰⁹In comments on Luke 10.25, Wolter 'eternal life' and the attainment to eternal salvation; however, in comments on Luke 18, Wolter writes that inheriting 'eternal life' "...means the same thing as 'to enter into the Kingdom of God' (...meint dasselbe wie „in das Reich Gottes eingehen“)." See Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 392, 599.

¹¹⁰Wolter, 600.

¹¹¹For example, Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 2nd edition (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929), 181.

¹¹²Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 113.

synonymous connection between such inheritance and kingdom entrance, it seems necessary also to argue for a future inauguration of the kingdom.

Many of the references to the kingdom in Luke's Gospel seem to have no temporal import, and those verses which do mention the kingdom in reference to time appear not to agree. There is some tension between expressions of a realized, present kingdom and kingdom that will appear in the future. The possible evidence for an already-present kingdom in the Travel Narrative presents a kingdom which is near (Luke 10.9, 11), a kingdom which is 'upon you' (11.20), a kingdom which is 'inside you' (17.20-21), and a kingdom which is entered into (in the present tense; 16.16; 18.24-25). But the extent to which this kingdom is realized is not clear. Further, the use of the present tense to describe entrance into the kingdom could very well refer to a present possibility which anticipates a future event.

The evidence from the narrative for a not-yet-realized kingdom seems to be more significant. There are two instances in which the action of eating in the kingdom is described as a future event (13.29; 14.15). At several other points in Luke's story there seems to be an immediate, yet still unrealized, kingdom in mind (9.27; 11.2; 19.11-12; 23.51). Luke's authorial audience would have read Luke as saying that entrance into the kingdom, along with the inheritance of 'eternal life', is an event which has not yet happened. Besides, there was another kingdom which was already present: the Roman Empire.

(4) The Church's existence under imperial Rome

Remembrance of Israel's captivity in Egypt is a common refrain in the Torah intertexts. The concern seems to be the memory of prior enslavement and oppression under a foreign socio-political entity, the Egyptian Empire. If one is to count this recurring theme as carrying any importance for Luke's authorial audience in the late-1st century CE, the obvious move is to

consider the context of the Mediterranean region under Rome's *imperium*. Luke is certainly aware of Rome's political rule, and scholars have long pointed to the opening verses of Luke 3 as evidence of this awareness—this due to Luke's mention of political figures (e.g., Tiberias Caesar, Pontius Pilate) and administrative regions.¹¹³ Although Luke's awareness of Rome is generally acknowledged, scholars have expressed less agreement when talking about Luke's suggestions for negotiating existence under Rome.¹¹⁴ Conzelmann saw Luke's writing as an apology to the empire on behalf of the church, an apology which Conzelmann notes the empire did not accept.¹¹⁵ Esler later argued that Luke portrays the dual allegiance to Jesus and to Rome as compatible.¹¹⁶ Still others have argued for more nuanced approaches. Walton suggests a position of "critical distance" between the church and Rome.¹¹⁷ Burrus describes Luke-Acts as both "radically subversive" and "skilfully accomodationist."¹¹⁸ I find positions such as Walton's and Burrus' to fit better with Luke's story. There is evidence both for accommodation and for subversion/resistance. On one hand, tax collectors and soldiers may receive ethical instruction, but their positions in the imperial order are not questioned (3.12-14; 19.1-10). On the other hand,

¹¹³Moxnes describes Luke's geographic interests as "partly political." See Halvor Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 19.

¹¹⁴For a summary of views, see Steve Walton, "The State They Were In: Luke's View of the Roman Empire," in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, edited by Peter Oakes (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 1-41; Carter, "Singing in the Reign," in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications), 30.

¹¹⁵Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 137-49.

¹¹⁶Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 201-19.

¹¹⁷Walton, "The State They Were In," 35: "Where co-operation and mutual respect are possible, Christians should do nothing to harm those; where the empire or its representatives turn against the church, the Christian stance is to be twofold: to call the state back to its former ways and to bear faithful witness to Jesus."

¹¹⁸Virginia Burrus, "The Gospel of Luke and The Acts of the Apostles," in *A Postcolonial Commentary on the New Testament Writings*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and R.S. Sugirtharajah (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 133.

talk of a new kingdom and a new ruler (1.32-33; 21.25-28), who inaugurates a new social order (4.18-19; 6.20-26; 12.37; 18.29-30), can hardly be seen as friendly toward Rome.

Luke's opinion on Rome's rule seems quite complex. At times, Luke seems simply resigned to the world as it is, mentioning Roman rulers (2.1; 3.1), jurisdictions (3.1; but Roman presence is implied in all geographic references), and agents (3.12-14; 19.2) all with no explicit criticism. At other times, however, there seems to be rather strong criticism of Rome's political and social practices, as seen, for example, in Luke's disapproval of the practices of 'the kings of the Nations' (22.25-26). For the purpose of my argument in this thesis, I am highlighting the more subversive strain. The focus on a future life in a non-Roman kingdom which has yet to appear brings out this side of Luke, and Luke's audience would have seen such criticism of Rome's way of life as connected strongly to the final theme under consideration, the ethical treatment of others.

(5) Ethical treatment of others

Luke's story places strong emphasis on the ethical treatment of people. This gets expressed rather generally in the citation of the command from Torah to love one's neighbor (Luke 10.27). In particular, Luke frames such behavior as 'doing mercy' (ποιῶν ἔλεος). Regarding the agent of such mercy doing, the authorial audience understands God as the one who does mercy (Deut 5.10; Luke 1.72), a behavior which humans should imitate (Luke 10.37). When it comes to the question of who should imitate this divine behavior, as well as how they should imitate it, Luke focuses in particular on the rich, having made already a basic distinction between rich and poor elsewhere in the narrative (e.g., Luke 6.20ff.). For Luke, the primary way for the rich to treat others in an ethical manner through the action of doing mercy is to redistribute wealth and

possessions.¹¹⁹ Jesus requires followers to give freely to beggars (6.30), as well as to sell possessions and give alms (12.33); the Good Samaritan gives freely of his wealth to care for another (10.30-37); and the rich ruler must give away his wealth in order to inherit ‘eternal life’ (18.18-23).

Given the authorial audience’s context in a world under Rome’s rule, economic redistribution as an expression of doing mercy must be considered in this social and economic context as well. While the overall relationship between Luke’s Gospel and the Roman Empire is best described as a complex series of negotiative processes, when it comes to the subject of wealth, we find in Luke more of an antagonistic perspective, especially in Luke’s criticism of the Roman patronage system.¹²⁰ Green has argued that Luke disapproves of the patronage system on two levels. First, there is a social critique. Patrons used such interpersonal relationships to seek status improvement, and Luke wants his audience to follow the model of service in the message of Jesus rather than seek any status advancements (6.27-36; 12.37; 22.27). Second, Green argues for a religious-political critique. Under the Roman principate, patron-client relations, including the patronage of the emperor,¹²¹ were sanctioned ultimately by Roman deities. Luke, however, presents Jesus as God’s son and agent, thereby delegitimizing Rome’s religious, and also political, claims.¹²²

Of course, for Luke such criticism is aimed only at one partner in such a relationship: the wealthier partner, the patron. As one scholar has put it, Luke “...is not encouraging [the rich]

¹¹⁹There has been disagreement over the years as to whether or not Luke offers a consistent treatment of ethics concerning wealth. For an overview of this scholarship, see Christopher M. Hays, *Luke’s Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character*, WUNT 2.Reihe 275 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 1-24.

¹²⁰Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 119-21.

¹²¹On the emperor as patron, see Garnsey and Saller, *The Roman Empire*, 149-50. On such relationships between elites in Rome, see Richard P. Saller, *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), esp. 7-78.

¹²²I find no reason not to agree with Green’s assessment of this matter.

that all is well, but warning them that all is not.”¹²³ Luke’s critique of the patronage system, therefore, is truly a critique of the roles and expectations of the wealthy in their interactions with the poor, and the primary issue seems to be the giving of money without the expectation of a return gift, or alms-giving (6.35).¹²⁴ Such a relationship was usually characterized by the wealthy patron bestowing a material or monetary gift upon the client, who then reciprocated with an immaterial gift, such as a bestowal of honor upon the patron.¹²⁵ Luke’s audience should read this as a rewriting of the standard interpersonal relationships with which they were familiar. The obligation of the rich seems to stay the same. They are to continue to offer monetary assistance to the poor (16.1-31; 18.22). The obligation of the poor, however, is no longer to bestow honor upon the patron (6.35). Luke transforms the status-seeking practice of giving money to the poor to an act of loving one’s neighbor, to an act of doing mercy (cf. 10.37). That Luke seems to privilege the poor should be obvious to the audience, especially in light of the more positive things Luke has to say about the poor: the good news is meant for the poor (Luke 4.18); the kingdom of God belongs to the poor (6.20); the poor, along with the physically disabled and the blind—designations which could hardly be exclusive of one another, given the nutrition and health levels of the poor¹²⁶—receive priority of place at the table (14.15-24). The rich, however, either receive instructions about redistributing wealth, as with the Pharisees¹²⁷ (11.37-44; 14.1-

¹²³Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 198.

¹²⁴For an overview of the important works on Lukan alms-giving, see James A. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke’s Travel Narrative*, Biblical Interpretation Series 88 (Boston: Brill, 2007), 6-11.

¹²⁵For work on patron-client relations in Lukan scholarship, see Halvor Moxnes, “Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 241-68. See also S.N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

¹²⁶Warren Carter, *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide* (Nashville: Abingdom, 2006), 100-18.

14; 16.1-31) and the rich ruler (18.22), or appear to repent of past economic abuses of others, as does Zacchaeus (19.8).

For Luke and the authorial audience, the proper ethical treatment of others is framed primarily in terms of the rich redistributing wealth to the poor without any expectation of repayment. This conflicts with the standards of behavior in the Roman economy. The audience would understand that this behavior originates elsewhere than Rome's empire, for proper treatment of the poor can be learned from Torah and the prophets (Luke 16.19-31).

Summary Remarks

In this chapter I have explored Luke's adaptation of the previously identified five themes from Torah. By privileging an eschatological reading of the 'eternal life' questions, I am suggesting that Luke's authorial audience would see the interrelation of these themes in the following manner. God is God of the people. God commands the people to act in certain ways. The subject matter of these commands has to do with either relation to God or proper ethical treatment of others, especially the poor. The result of doing such things will be the future inheritance of 'eternal life' and deliverance from Rome's kingdom through entrance into a new kingdom at some point in the future. These are the resulting expectations of the audience.

¹²⁷Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 139-53.

Conclusion

On the front end of this project, I proposed to argue the thesis statement that Luke's redaction of the 'eternal life' question affects a reading of the Travel Narrative by emphasizing the eschatological nature of 'eternal life' over against the life of the (narrative) present age, an age characterized by the rule of Rome. I then focused my attention on dividing this overall argument into three related parts.

First, I used a redaction-critical approach to Luke's 'eternal life' questions (Luke 10.25; 18.18) in order to show that Luke's changes to the tradition result in an eschatological focus. The redaction of the aorist subjunctive verb ποιήσω (cf. Mark 10.17) into Luke's use of the aorist participle ποιήσας, together along with the deletion of the conjunction ἵνα, leads to reading the verb κληρονομήσω as a future indicative rather than as an aorist subjunctive. This places the action of the inheriting in the future. The participle ποιήσας then functions adverbially to modify this inheriting as an instrument or means of bringing about the inheritance.

Second, I then turned my attention to Luke's answers to the 'eternal life' question, answers composed of citations from Torah, namely from Deut 5-6 and Lev 19. Using the metonymic approach of John Foley, I read Luke's specific, brief citations as evoking the larger tradition of their original context. After working through Deut 5-6 and Lev 19, I identified five prominent themes at work in these texts: (1) the identification of God as God of the people; (2) the listing of commands with the further injunction to do/keep them; (3) the inheritance of the land; (4)

Israel's former captivity in Egypt; and (5) ethical treatment of others, including neighbors and strangers.

Third, in the final chapter I turned to a narrative reading of Luke in which I adapted the five themes identified in the Torah intertexts to Luke's story. In this chapter, I made the following adjustments to the thematic framework: (1) God as God of the authorial audience; (2) listing of commands, along with injunctions to do them; (3) inheritance of 'eternal life'; (4) the Church's existence under imperial Rome; and (5) ethical treatment of others. With support from Luke's narrative, I suggested Luke's authorial audience understands God to be their own God, and that this God commands certain behavior. The audience is to focus this behavior on proper ethical treatment of others, especially the poor. The result of such proper behavior will be the future inheritance of 'eternal life' and the future deliverance from Rome's empire by means of entering into a new kingdom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, Coleman A. *Identity, Memory, and Narrative in Early Christianity: Peter, Paul, and Recategorization in the Book of Acts*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.
- Balch, David L. "The Genre of Luke-Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel, or Political History?." *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 33 no1 (Fall 1990): 5-19.
- Barr, David L. "The Conventions of Classical Biography and the Genre of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Study." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, edited by Charles H. Talbert, 63-88. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bonz, Marianne Palmer. *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 9,51-14,35)*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Teilband 2. Zürich: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996.
- _____. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15,1-19,27)*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Teilband 3. Zürich: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- _____. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)*. 2nd Revised Edition. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winberry. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1979.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Revised Edition. Translated by John Marsh. 1963. Reprint, New York: Harper and Row, 1976. Originally published as *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921; 2nd edition, 1931.

- _____. “ζάω.” Pages 855-72 in vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964-1976.
- Burrus, Virginia. “The Gospel of Luke and The Acts of the Apostles.” In *A Postcolonial Commentary on the New Testament Writings*, edited by Fernando F. Segovia and R.S. Sugirtharajah, 133-55. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Carter, Warren. *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 103. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- _____. *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading*. The Bible and Liberation Series. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000.
- _____. *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- _____. “Getting Martha Out of the Kitchen: Luke 10.38-42 Again.” In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine, 214-31. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- _____. *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006.
- _____. “Love as Societal Vision and Counter-Imperial Practice in Matthew 22.34-40.” In *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, vol. 2: The Gospel of Matthew*, edited by Thomas R. Hatina, 30-44. Library of New Testament Studies. New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- _____. *John and Empire: Initial Explorations*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- _____. “Singing in the Reign: Performing Luke’s Songs and Negotiating the Roman Empire (Luke 1-2).” In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 23-43. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 151. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper and Row, 1961. Originally published as *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1954.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Culy, Martin M., Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall. *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010.

- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Scribner's, 1965. Originally published as *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. 2nd Edition. Tübingen: Mohr, 1933.
- Eisenstadt, S.N., and L. Roniger. *Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- _____. Dupont, Jacques. *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by John R. Keating. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A. *Luke*. New International Biblical Commentary, New Testament Series 3. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990.
- Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Evans, Christopher Francis. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, edited by D.E. Nineham, 37-53. 1955. Reprint, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.
- _____. *Saint Luke*. TPI New Testament Commentaries. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Vol. 1. Anchor Bible 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.
- _____. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Vol. 2. Anchor Bible 28A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- _____. *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Foley, John M. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Fowler, Robert M. *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Frei, Hans. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Garnsey, Peter, and Richard Saller. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. The Biblical Seminar 80. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Green, Joel B. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. New Testament Theology. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997.
- _____. "Narrative Criticism." In *Methods for Luke*, edited by Joel B. Green, 74-112. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Harrington, Wilfred J. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. New York: Newman Press, 1967.
- Hays, Christopher M. *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 275. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Hultgren, Stephen. *Narrative Elements in the Double Tradition: A Study of Their Place within the Framework of the Gospel Narrative*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 113. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 39. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Kelber, Werner H. *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983. Reprint, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1975.
- _____. *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- _____. *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2nd edition. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929.

- Kümmel, Werner Georg. “‘Das Gesetz und die Propheten gehen bis Johannes,’ Lukas 16,16 im Zusammenhang der heilsgeschichtlichen Theologie der Lukasschriften.” In *Verborum veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Otto Böcher and Klaus Haacker, 89-102. Wuppertal: Theologischer Verl. Brockhaus, 1970.
- Kurz, William S. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1978.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Der Evangelist Markus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Metzger, James A. *Consumption and Wealth in Luke’s Travel Narrative*. Biblical Interpretation Series 88. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Bible in Theory: Critical and Postcritical Essays*. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 57. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke’s Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- _____. “Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts.” In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 241-68. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. “Preface.” In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, ix-xviii. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Noël, Filip. *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9,51-19,28*. Collectanea Biblica et Religiosa Antiqua 5. Brussel: Wetenschappelijk Comité voor Godsdienstgeschiedenis Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2004.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?.* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?.* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

- _____. "Narrative Criticism." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, edited by Joel B. Green, 239-55. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121-41.
- Reiling, J. and J. L. Swellengrebel. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*. Helps for Translators 10. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Rhoads, David M., and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Rhoads, David M., Joanna Dewey, and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. 2nd edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Saller, Richard P. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Sasse, Hermann. "αἰώνιος." Pages 208-09 in vol. 1 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964-1976.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919.
- Schneider, Gerhard. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 2. Auflage. In 2 vols. Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Band 3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn; Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1984.
- Schramm, Tim. *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 14. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Schubert, P. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." In *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*, edited by W. Eltester, 165-86. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954.
- Segovia, Fernando F. *Decolonizing Biblical Studies: A View from the Margins*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.

- Talbert, Charles H. "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke." *Interpretation* 30 (1976): 381-95.
- _____. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- _____. "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, edited by Charles H. Talbert, 91-103. New York: Crossroads, 1984.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-90.
- _____. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Tyson, Joseph B. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- Walton, Steve. "The State They Were In: Luke's View of the Roman Empire." In *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, edited by Peter Oakes, 1-41. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Weeks, Joseph Allen. "Mark Without Mark: Problematizing the Reliability of a Reconstructed Text of Q." Ph.D. diss., Brite Divinity School, 2010.
- Wink, Walter. *The Bible in Human Transformation: Toward a New Paradigm for Biblical Study*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.
- Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Wrede, William. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J.C.G. Greig. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971. Originally published as *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1901.